ISSN 1725-5228

Dziennik Urzędowy C 340 E

Unii Europejskiej

Wydanie polskie

Informacje i zawiadomienia

Tom 56

21 listopada 2013 r.

Powiadomienie nr | Treść | Strona

IV *Informacje*

INFORMACJE INSTYTUCJI, ORGANÓW I JEDNOSTEK ORGANIZACYJNYCH UNII EUROPEJSKIEJ

Parlament Europejski

PYTANIA PISEMNE Z ODPOWIEDZIĄ

2013/C 340 E/01 Pytania pisemne skierowane przez posłów do Parlamentu Europejskiego i odpowiedzi na te pytania udzielone przez instytucję Unii Europejskiej 1

(Patrz: Informacja dla czytelnika)

PL

Informacja dla czytelnika

Publikacja niniejsza zawiera pytania pisemne skierowane przez posłów do Parlamentu Europejskiego i odpowiedzi na te pytania udzielone przez instytucję Unii Europejskiej.

Przed ich ewentualnym tłumaczeniem wszystkie pytania i odpowiedzi są podane w oryginalnej wersji językowej.

W niektórych przypadkach jest możliwe, że odpowiedzi udzielono w języku innym niż oryginalny język pytania. Zależy to od języka roboczego komisji, do której zwrócono się o udzielenie odpowiedzi.

Poniższe pytania i odpowiedzi są publikowane zgodnie z art. 117 i 118 Regulaminu Parlamentu Europejskiego.

Wszystkie pytania i odpowiedzi są dostępne w zakładce „Pytania poselskie" na stronie internetowej Parlamentu Europejskiego (Europarl) pod następującym adresem:

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

ROZWINIĘCIA SKRÓTÓW NAZW GRUP POLITYCZNYCH

PPE	Grupa Europejskiej Partii Ludowej (Chrześcijańscy Demokraci)
S&D	Grupa Postępowego Sojuszu Socjalistów i Demokratów w Parlamencie Europejskim
ALDE	Grupa Porozumienia Liberałów i Demokratów na rzecz Europy
Verts/ALE	Grupa Zielonych/Wolne Przymierze Europejskie
ECR	Grupa Europejskich Konserwatystów i Reformatorów
GUE/NGL	Konfederacyjna Grupa Zjednoczonej Lewicy Europejskiej/Nordycka Zielona Lewica
EFD	Europa Wolności i Demokracji
NI	Niezrzeszeni

PL

IV

(Informacje)

INFORMACJE INSTYTUCJI, ORGANÓW I JEDNOSTEK ORGANIZACYJNYCH UNII EUROPEJSKIEJ

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

PYTANIA PISEMNE Z ODPOWIEDZIĄ

Pytania pisemne skierowane przez posłów do Parlamentu Europejskiego i odpowiedzi na te pytania udzielone przez instytucję Unii Europejskiej

(2013/C 340 E/01)

Treść **Strona**

E-011468/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Portuguese researchers identify a new treatment for osteoarthritis
Versão portuguesa 25
English version 27

E-011469/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Cuts in food bank support
Versão portuguesa 28
English version 29

E-011470/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: FAO Report: need for greater investment in agriculture
Versão portuguesa 30
English version 31

E-011471/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Food waste
Versão portuguesa 32
English version 33

E-011472/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Kyoto Protocol
Versão portuguesa 34
English version 35

E-011473/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: EU citizens having difficulty obtaining work visas in Brazil
Versão portuguesa 36
English version 37

E-011474/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Using polyphosphates in cod processing
Versão portuguesa 38
English version 39

E-011475/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: EURAF — agroforestry 1
Versão portuguesa 40
English version 42

E-011481/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: EURAF: agroforestry 7
Versão portuguesa 40
English version 42

E-011476/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: EURAF — agroforestry 2
Versão portuguesa 43
English version 44

E-011477/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: EURAF — agroforestry 3
Versão portuguesa 45
English version 46

E-011478/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: EURAF — agroforestry 4
Versão portuguesa 47
English version 48

E-011479/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: EURAF — agroforestry 5
Versão portuguesa 49
English version 50

E-011480/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: EURAF: agroforestry 6
Versão portuguesa 51
English version 52

E-011482/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Textile industry: negotiations between the EU and Canada
Versão portuguesa 53
English version 54

E-011483/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Cases of whooping cough are on the increase in EU countries
Versão portuguesa 55
English version 56

E-011484/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: North Korea threatens peace by launching a 'rocket' into space
Versão portuguesa 57
English version 58

E-011485/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Creating a development bank to manage EU funds
Versão portuguesa 59
English version 60

E-011486/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Consumer protection in e-commerce
Versão portuguesa 61
English version 62

E-011487/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Ireland granted more time to repay its loan to the Troika
Versão portuguesa 63
English version 64

E-011488/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Fraud and money laundering in online gambling
Versão portuguesa 65
English version 66

E-011489/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Reindustrialisation of the European Union
Versão portuguesa 67
English version 68

E-011490/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Social Investment Package
Versão portuguesa 69
English version 70

E-011491/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: A common visa policy
Versão portuguesa 71
English version 72

E-011492/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Databases
Versão portuguesa 73
English version 74

E-011493/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Improved financing conditions for Portugal under the terms of support from the Troika
Versão portuguesa 75
English version 76

E-011494/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Moody's negative outlook for the European Investment Bank and the Council of Europe Development Bank
Versão portuguesa 77
English version 78

E-011495/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Significant yield differences in eurozone bonds
Versão portuguesa 79
English version 80

E-011496/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Rise in Portugal's exports
Versão portuguesa 81
English version 82

E-011497/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Investment in Portugal at 1980s levels
Versão portuguesa 83
English version 84

E-011498/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Tax avoidance in the EU, technology multinationals
Versão portuguesa 85
English version 86

E-011499/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Unemployment in Portugal in October 2012
Versão portuguesa 87
English version 88

E-011500/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Recession in nearly a third of EU countries
Versão portuguesa ... 89
English version ... 90

E-011501/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Poverty in Portugal
Versão portuguesa ... 91
English version ... 92

E-011502/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Economic stagnation in Germany
Versão portuguesa ... 93
English version ... 94

E-011503/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Worsening of the recession in Portugal
Versão portuguesa ... 95
English version ... 96

E-011504/12 by Alf Svensson to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — EU policy towards Rwanda in relation to the situation in eastern DRC
Svensk version ... 97
English version ... 98

E-011506/12 by Jutta Steinruck to the Commission
Subject: Falling wage levels in connection with opening up the inter-city coach market
Deutsche Fassung ... 99
English version ... 100

E-011507/12 by Brian Simpson, Spyros Danellis, Wojciech Michał Olejniczak, Phil Prendergast, Pavel Poc, Iratxe García Pérez and Jens Nilsson to the Commission
Subject: Rural Development Programmes: transitional arrangements for 2014
Versión española ... 101
České znění ... 102
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 103
Wersja polska ... 104
Svensk version ... 105
English version ... 106

E-011587/12 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: CAP post-2013
English version ... 106

E-011508/12 by Ashley Fox to the Commission
Subject: The treatment of bears in Vietnam
English version ... 107

E-011509/12 by Jan Mulder to the Commission
Subject: Biogas plants
Nederlandse versie ... 108
English version ... 109

E-011510/12 by Morten Løkkegaard to the Commission
Subject: Norwegian and UK contributions to the EU
Dansk udgave ... 110
English version ... 111

E-011511/12 by Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz to the Commission
Subject: The crisis in the European car industry
Magyar változat ... 112
English version ... 113

E-011512/12 by Joanna Senyszyn to the Commission
Subject: Anti-trafficking projects
Wersja polska ... 114
English version ... 115

E-011513/12 by Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă to the Commission
Subject: Steel industry
Versiunea în limba română ... 116
English version ... 117

E-011514/12 by Roberta Angelilli, Jacek Protasiewicz, Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio, Elena Băsescu, Georgios Papanikolaou, Heinz K. Becker, Nuno Melo, Danuta Jazłowiecka, Licia Ronzulli, Anna Záborská, Maria do Céu Patrão Neves, Filip Kaczmarek, Maria Da Graça Carvalho, Sari Essayah, Mariya Gabriel, Burkhard Balz, Potito Salatto, Clemente Mastella, Jan Kozłowski, Lara Comi, Zoltán Bagó, Jim Higgins, Mário David, Eduard Kukan, Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris, José Manuel Fernandes, Nuno Teixeira, Georgios Papastamkos, Carlo Fidanza, Piotr Borys, Iva Zanicchi, Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska, József Szájer, Antonio Cancian, Zofija Mazej Kukovič, Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa, Eva Ortiz Vilella, Anne Delvaux, Giovanni La Via, Erminia Mazzoni, Georges Bach, Lívia Járóka, Konstantinos Poupakis, Svetoslav Hristov Malinov, Gabriel Mato Adrover, Marco Scurria, Ioannis A. Tsoukalas, Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska, Philippe Boulland, Monica Luisa Macovei, Mario Mauro, Esther Herranz García, Amalia Sartori, Czesław Adam Siekierski, Inese Vaidere, Georgios Koumoutsakos, Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar, María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora, Paolo Bartolozzi, Paweł Zalewski, Małgorzata Handzlik, Salvador Garriga Polledo, Edit Bauer, Lena Kolarska-Bobińska, Marietta Giannakou, Salvador Sedó i Alabart, László Surján, Regina Bastos, Pablo Arias Echeverría, Elisabeth Köstinger, Elena Oana Antonescu, Salvatore Tatarella, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Astrid Lulling, Kinga Gál, Peter Šťastný and Radvilė Mo to the Commission
Subject: Information on measures to tackle youth unemployment
българска версия ... 118
Versión española ... 120
Deutsche Fassung ... 122
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 124
Version française ... 126
Versione italiana ... 128
Latviešu valodas versija ... 130
Tekstas lietuvių kalba ... 132
Magyar változat ... 134
Nederlandse versie ... 136
Wersja polska ... 138
Versão portuguesa ... 140
Versiunea în limba română ... 142
Slovenské znenie ... 144
Slovenska različica ... 146
Suomenkielinen versio ... 148
English version ... 150

P-011515/12 by Trevor Colman to the Commission
Subject: Implementing rules on flight and duty time limitations and rest requirements
English version ... 152

E-011516/12 by Jutta Steinruck to the Commission
Subject: Social dumping through the posting of bogus self-employed persons from third countries
Deutsche Fassung ... 153
English version ... 155

E-011518/12 by Maurice Ponga to the Commission
Subject: Free movement of workers in the OCTs — principle of non-discrimination
Version française ... 156
English version ... 157

E-011519/12 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Protecting SMEs against scams
Version française ... 158
English version ... 159

E-011520/12 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Football referee death — violence against match officials
Version française ... 160
English version ... 161

E-011521/12 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Possibility of funding for a scientific and cultural project in the municipality of Radicofani, province of Siena
Versione italiana ... 162
English version ... 163

E-011522/12 by Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă to the Commission
Subject: Liberalisation of vine planting rights
Versiunea în limba română ... 164
English version ... 165

E-011523/12 by Karl-Heinz Florenz to the Commission
Subject: Amendment to the Working Time Directive 2003/88/EC and the situation of voluntary work in general and volunteer firefighters in particular
Deutsche Fassung ... 166
English version ... 167

E-011524/12 by Karl-Heinz Florenz to the Commission
Subject: Live plucking/gathering feathers from live geese
Deutsche Fassung ... 168
English version ... 170

E-011526/12 by Theodoros Skylakakis to the Commission
Subject: Selection on the basis of merit of heads of public institutions in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 172
English version ... 173

E-011527/12 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: Bycatch technology
English version ... 174

E-011529/12 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Full protection from adverse changes in employment conditions for Hellenic Sugar Industry employees transferred on the basis of Council Regulation (EC) No 320/2006
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 175
English version ... 177

E-011531/12 by Filip Kaczmarek to the Commission
Subject: Further possible sanctions against North Korea
Wersja polska ... 179
English version ... 180

E-011532/12 by Bernadette Vergnaud to the Commission
Subject: Activities promoting and developing 112 and the 'eCall' project
Version française ... 181
English version ... 182

E-011534/12 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Investigation into Deutsche Bank by the US Securities and Exchange Commission
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 183
English version ... 184

E-011535/12 by David Casa to the Commission
Subject: Unified patent system
Verżjoni Maltija ... 185
English version ... 186

E-011536/12 by David Casa to the Commission
Subject: EU delegation in Iraq
Verżjoni Maltija 187
English version 188

E-011537/12 by David Casa to the Commission
Subject: Action against marketing scams
Verżjoni Maltija 189
English version 190

E-011538/12 by Jacek Włosowicz, Zbigniew Ziobro, Tadeusz Cymański and Jacek Olgierd Kurski to the Commission
Subject: Relationship between the European Commission's state aid services and independent nations regulators
Wersja polska 191
English version 193

E-011539/12 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission
Subject: 'System data' in the context of private-sector child safety activities
Svensk version 195
English version 196

E-011540/12 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission
Subject: Inconsistency in Commission policy with respect to the Convention of Cybercrime and the Global Alliance against Child Sexual Abuse Online
Svensk version 197
English version 198

E-011541/12 by Liam Aylward to the Commission
Subject: EASA opinion on flight time limitations for pilots and cabin crew
English version 199

E-011543/12 by Liam Aylward to the Commission
Subject: Tax rates on defibrillators
English version 200

E-011544/12 by Liam Aylward to the Commission
Subject: Diaspora centre
English version 201

E-011545/12 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: Peer-to-peer checks under Regulation (EC) No 834/2007
English version 202

E-011546/12 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008
English version 202

P-011548/12 by Martina Anderson to the Commission
Subject: Use of full body scanners at EU airports
English version 204

E-011652/12 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission
Subject: EU enlargement and public relations — the particular case of Croatia
Versiunea în limba română 205
English version 206

E-011549/12 by Roger Helmer to the Commission
Subject: Croatia
English version 206

E-011550/12 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: Waste tyre exports
English version 208

E-011551/12 by Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă to the Commission
Subject: Safety of winter sports facilities
Versiunea în limba română ... 209
English version ... 210

E-011552/12 by Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă to the Commission
Subject: New harbours for vessels across Europe
Versiunea în limba română ... 211
English version ... 212

E-011553/12 by Morten Messerschmidt to the Commission
Subject: Double taxation of pensions in relation to EC law
Dansk udgave ... 213
English version ... 214

E-011554/12 by Morten Messerschmidt to the Commission
Subject: Use of crosses and halos in the EU
Dansk udgave ... 215
English version ... 216

E-011555/12 by Morten Messerschmidt to the Commission
Subject: VAT compensation in connection with the cross-border sale of cars
Dansk udgave ... 217
English version ... 219

E-011556/12 by Morten Messerschmidt to the Commission
Subject: Disruption in the supply of essential items to Greece
Dansk udgave ... 221
English version ... 222

E-011557/12 by Morten Messerschmidt to the Commission
Subject: EU rules for the publication of documents
Dansk udgave ... 223
English version ... 224

E-011558/12 by John Stuart Agnew to the Commission
Subject: Meaning of 'free trade'
English version ... 225

E-011559/12 by John Stuart Agnew to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Apostasy and freedom
English version ... 226

E-011560/12 by John Stuart Agnew to the Commission
Subject: EU's egregious error
English version ... 227

E-011561/12 by John Stuart Agnew to the Commission
Subject: EU acting 'ultra vires'
English version ... 228

E-011563/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: State aid criteria
English version ... 229

E-011564/12 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Call for the Commission to protect designations of origin for camembert
Versione italiana ... 230
English version ... 231

E-011565/12 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Call for the Commission to monitor the waste involved in the bridge over the Straits of Messina
Versione italiana ... 232
English version ... 233

E-011566/12 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: The Commission should monitor toxic substances found in Chinese teas
Versione italiana ... 234
English version ... 235

E-011567/12 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Real cost of current accounts in the EU
Versione italiana ... 236
English version ... 237

E-011568/12 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Women in Cambodia face jail for defending housing rights
Versión española ... 238
English version ... 239

E-011569/12 by Françoise Castex to the Commission
Subject: Abuse of selective distribution rules
Version française ... 240
English version ... 241

P-011571/12 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: Exploiting natural resources in Western Sahara
Versión española ... 242
English version ... 243

P-011572/12 by Julie Girling to the Commission
Subject: Possible emergency measures to maintain technical conservation prohibition
English version ... 244

E-011573/12 by Claude Turmes to the Commission
Subject: UK electricity market reform (EMR), state aid for nuclear
Version française ... 245
English version ... 246

E-011575/12 by Mariya Gabriel to the Commission
Subject: Method for calculating the rates of payment for participants in the Lifelong Learning Programme and Horizon 2020
българска версия ... 247
English version ... 249

E-011576/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Fracking or hydraulic fracturing
Versión española ... 251
English version ... 253

E-011578/12 by Bendt Bendtsen to the Commission
Subject: The consequences of changes in Norwegian duties for Norway and for EU exports
Dansk udgave ... 255
English version ... 256

E-011579/12 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission
Subject: Assessment of product safety for cosmetics — Consumers' and SMEs' interests
Deutsche Fassung ... 257
English version ... 259

E-011580/12 by Julie Girling to the Commission
Subject: Gibraltar on EU maps
English version ... 261

E-011581/12 by Jörg Leichtfried to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Arrest of Vietnamese citizens and labour activists
Deutsche Fassung ... 262
English version ... 263

E-011582/12 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: Excavation and earthmoving in Parco dei Monti Simbruini (Simbruini Mountain Park) in the Lazio region (Italy)
Versión española ... 264
English version ... 266

E-011583/12 by Isabella Lövin and Kriton Arsenis to the Commission
Subject: Welfare of farmed fish
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 267
Svensk version ... 268
English version ... 269

E-011585/12 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Animal welfare in Romania
English version ... 270

E-011586/12 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Ban on baby boxes
English version ... 271

E-011588/12 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Impact of Croatian accession
English version ... 272

E-011589/12 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Cross-compliance breaches
English version ... 273

E-011590/12 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Financial package for Egypt
English version ... 274

E-011591/12 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Erasmus programme
English version ... 275

E-011592/12 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Hamas attacks on Israel
English version ... 276

E-011593/12 by Philippe Juvin to the Commission
Subject: Collective redress
Version française ... 277
English version ... 278

E-011594/12 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Possibility of funding for the ONLUS Anagramma association set up to support differently able persons
Versione italiana ... 279
English version ... 280

E-011595/12 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Possibility of funding for clown therapy
Versione italiana ... 281
English version ... 282

E-011597/12 by Piotr Borys to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Arrest warrant issued against yet another politician in connection with the events in Zhanaozen and the intensified persecution of 'Alga!' party members in Kazakhstan
Wersja polska ... 283
English version ... 285

E-011598/12 by Konrad Szymański to the Commission
Subject: Excessive controls on Polish nationals at the Polish-Swedish maritime border and their compliance with Schengen provisions
Wersja polska ... 286
English version ... 287

E-011599/12 by Konrad Szymański to the Commission
Subject: Compliance of Polish laws with Council Directive 2008/118/EC and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
Wersja polska ... 288
English version ... 290

E-011600/12 by Edite Estrela to the Commission
Subject: Abortion law in the Republic of Ireland
Versão portuguesa ... 292
English version ... 293

P-011602/12 by Marisa Matias to the Commission
Subject: Privatisation of Aeroportos de Portugal (ANA)
Versão portuguesa ... 294
English version ... 295

E-011603/12 by María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora to the Commission
Subject: Involvement of businesses in the negotiating process for the EU-Japan free trade agreement
Versión española ... 296
English version ... 297

E-011604/12 by George Lyon to the Commission
Subject: UPDATE: Implementation of Directive 2008/120/EC on protection of pigs — Ban on individual sow stalls
English version ... 298

E-011605/12 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Persecution of Christians in Syria
English version ... 299

E-011606/12 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Structural and cohesion policy
English version ... 300

E-011607/12 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Travel insurance
English version ... 301

E-011608/12 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Laser eye surgery
English version ... 302

E-011609/12 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Implications of changes to MOT testing
English version ... 303

E-011610/12 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: United Kingdom: tax on the location of the player and not of the operator
Version française ... 304
English version ... 305

E-011611/12 by Patrizia Toia to the Commission
Subject: MUOS in Niscemi, Caltanissetta
Versione italiana ... 306
English version ... 307

E-011612/12 by Alfredo Antoniozzi to the Commission
Subject: The management of the Euribor rate and its impact on variable-rate mortgages
Versione italiana ... 308
English version ... 310

E-011613/12 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Further attacks in Nigeria
English version ... 311

E-011614/12 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Hezbollah
English version ... 312

E-011615/12 by Kathleen Van Brempt to the Commission
Subject: Sustainability criteria for solid biomass
Nederlandse versie ... 313
English version ... 314

P-011616/12 by Vital Moreira to the Commission
Subject: Safeguard investigation initiated by Morocco on EU exports of bars and rods
Versão portuguesa ... 315
English version ... 316

E-011618/12 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Possible new Egyptian constitution
Deutsche Fassung ... 317
English version ... 318

E-011619/12 by Jorgo Chatzimarkakis to the Commission
Subject: Upstream barriers to trade in Europe for non-harmonised products, particularly car parts
Deutsche Fassung ... 319
English version ... 321

E-011620/12 by Jim Higgins to the Commission
Subject: The proximity of sewage plants to residential dwellings
English version ... 323

E-011621/12 by Emine Bozkurt and Alejandro Cercas to the Commission
Subject: Social security rights of Turkish workers in the EU following the Council Decision of 6 December 2012
Versión española ... 324
Nederlandse versie ... 325
English version ... 326

E-011623/12 by Syed Kamall to the Commission
Subject: Kidnappings and murders in Egypt
English version ... 327

E-011624/12 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Natural disasters: floods — innovative solutions and environmental engineering research
Versione italiana ... 328
English version ... 330

E-011625/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Follow-up of the MoU for the Spanish financial sector
Versión española ... 331
English version ... 332

E-011626/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Relation between banking institutions and savings banks
Versión española ... 333
English version ... 334

E-011627/12 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Continuation of medical siege at Camp Liberty and psychological torture of residents
Versione italiana ... 335
English version ... 336

E-011628/12 by Maria Eleni Koppa to the Commission
Subject: EU assistance to civil society organisations
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 337
English version ... 338

E-011630/12 by Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: Clean air targets in London
English version ... 339

E-011631/12 by Adam Bielan to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Religious freedom violations in Chin State, Burma/Myanmar
Wersja polska ... 340
English version ... 341

E-011633/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Criminal case against Russia's opposition
Versione italiana ... 342
English version ... 343

E-011634/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: 2012 — the deadliest year for journalists worldwide
Versione italiana ... 344
English version ... 346

E-011635/12 by Dominique Riquet to the Commission
Subject: Passenger transport by rail: detailed rules for establishing a public service obligation
Version française ... 348
English version ... 349

E-011637/12 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Taking care of others: family support networks
Versione italiana ... 350
English version ... 351

E-011638/12 by Giancarlo Scottà to the Commission
Subject: 'Italian sounding' products
Versione italiana ... 352
English version ... 354

E-011639/12 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission
Subject: Completion of the waterway between Padua and the sea to avert the risk of flooding on the Veneto plain, in keeping with Directive 2007/60/EC
Versione italiana ... 356
English version ... 358

E-011640/12 by Filip Kaczmarek to the Commission
Subject: VAT on e-books
Wersja polska ... 359
English version ... 360

E-011641/12 by Hannu Takkula to the Commission
Subject: Fatah's logo and flag
Suomenkielinen versio ... 361
English version ... 362

E-011642/12 by Ingeborg Gräßle to the Commission
Subject: Conflict of objectives in relation to personal involvement of the OLAF Director-General in investigations
Deutsche Fassung ... 363
English version ... 365

E-011643/12 by Ingeborg Gräßle to the Commission
Subject: Commission meeting with representatives of the tobacco industry
Deutsche Fassung ... 366
English version ... 367

E-011644/12 by Julie Girling to the Commission
Subject: Phenylbutazone and food producing animals
English version ... 368

E-011645/12 by Bas Eickhout to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of the directive on the energy performance of buildings
Nederlandse versie ... 369
English version ... 370

E-011646/12 by Francisco Sosa Wagner to the Commission
Subject: Taxation of the Spanish cogeneration sector
Versión española ... 371
English version ... 372

E-011647/12 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Procedure for acquiring Bulgarian citizenship
Deutsche Fassung ... 373
English version ... 374

E-011648/12 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Funding for European transport infrastructure
Deutsche Fassung ... 375
English version ... 376

E-011649/12 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Development aid and combating famine in South Sudan
Deutsche Fassung ... 377
English version ... 378

E-011651/12 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Clarification regarding passenger name record data sharing with the US by Member States
Deutsche Fassung ... 379
English version ... 380

E-011653/12 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission
Subject: Public procurement and research on corruption
Versiunea în limba română ... 381
English version ... 382

E-011654/12 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission
Subject: Data quality of TED
Versiunea în limba română ... 383
English version ... 384

E-011655/12 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission
Subject: Greater transparency in access to TED data
Versiunea în limba română ... 385
English version ... 386

E-011656/12 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission
Subject: Information about research projects — procurement and outcomes
Versiunea în limba română ... 387
English version ... 388

E-011657/12 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission
Subject: Information about research projects — procurement and outcomes
Versiunea în limba română ... 387
English version ... 388

E-011658/12 by Martin Callanan to the Commission
Subject: European Commission communication budget — cost and tendering process for banners hung on the Berlaymont building
English version ... 389

E-011659/12 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Famagusta — the 'ghost town'
Deutsche Fassung ... 390
English version ... 391

E-011660/12 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Budget line 22 02 07 03 for 2013
Deutsche Fassung ... 392
English version ... 393

E-011666/12 by Véronique Mathieu, Sonia Alfano, Edit Bauer, Tanja Fajon, Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio, Salvatore Iacolino, Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, Kinga Gál, Monika Hohlmeier, Ioan Enciu, Bill Newton Dunn, Edit Herczog, Simon Busuttil and Kinga Göncz to the Commission
Subject: Training of police forces in the European Union — Maintaining the CEPOL independent agency
Versión española ... 394
Deutsche Fassung ... 395
Version française ... 397
Versione italiana ... 398
Magyar változat ... 400
Verżjoni Maltija ... 401
Versiunea în limba română ... 402
Slovenska različica ... 403
English version ... 404

E-011667/12 by Søren Bo Søndergaard to the Commission
Subject: Benefits and inconveniences of using European Summer Time
Dansk udgave ... 405
English version ... 406

E-011668/12 by Søren Bo Søndergaard to the Commission
Subject: Action to combat illegal child labour and trafficking
Dansk udgave ... 407
English version ... 408

E-011669/12 by Hubert Pirker, Georges Bach, Jim Higgins and Dominique Riquet to the Commission
Subject: European Aviation Safety Agency opinion on flight-time limitations for air crew
Deutsche Fassung ... 409
Version française ... 411
English version ... 413

E-011670/12 by Brice Hortefeux to the Commission
Subject: European Union support for the worldwide eradication of polio
Version française ... 414
English version ... 415

E-011671/12 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Request for clarification on the costs of the 'Puzzled by Policy' application
Versione italiana ... 416
English version ... 417

E-011672/12 by Tomasz Piotr Poręba to the Commission
Subject: Declaring 25 May the European Day honouring the Heroes of the Fight against Totalitarianism
Wersja polska ... 418
English version ... 419

E-011673/12 by Antonio López-Istúriz White to the Commission
Subject: Space for Mediterranean Countries Initiative
Versión española ... 420
English version ... 421

E-011674/12 by Antonio López-Istúriz White to the Commission
Subject: Spanish resin production
Versión española ... 422
English version ... 423

E-011675/12 by Christel Schaldemose to the Commission
Subject: EU rules on organic foodstuffs
Dansk udgave ... 424
English version ... 425

E-011676/12 by Anja Weisgerber to the Commission
Subject: Distinction between cosmetic products and medical devices in the case of tooth-bleaching products
Deutsche Fassung ... 426
English version ... 427

E-011677/12 by Ingeborg Gräßle to the Commission
Subject: Role of a Swedish national expert in OLAF investigations
Deutsche Fassung ... 428
English version ... 429

E-011678/12 by Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy to the Commission
Subject: Misuse of EU funds in the Czech Republic
Nederlandse versie ... 430
English version ... 432

E-011679/12 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Support for Tunisia
Versione italiana ... 433
English version ... 434

P-011680/12 by Paul Murphy to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of the Floods Directive
English version ... 435

E-011681/12 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Classification of substances which are dangerous for the consumer: concerns regarding the panel
Version française ... 436
English version ... 438

E-011682/12 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Trade agreement between the European Union and Palestine
Version française ... 439
English version ... 440

E-011683/12 by Rachida Dati to the Commission
Subject: Carbon inclusion mechanism at the borders of the European Union
Version française ... 441
English version ... 442

E-011684/12 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission
Subject: Use of radioactive weapons in military activities and risk to human health in the EU
Versione italiana ... 443
English version ... 445

E-011685/12 by Phil Bennion to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Corruption in South Asia
English version ... 447

E-011686/12 by Silvia-Adriana Ţicău to the Commission
Subject: Report on the impact of increased demand for biofuels
Versiunea în limba română ... 448
English version ... 449

E-011687/12 by Silvia-Adriana Ţicău to the Commission
Subject: Report on the functioning of the verification method referred to in Article 18(2) of Directive 2009/28/EC on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources
Versiunea în limba română ... 450
English version ... 451

E-011688/12 by Silvia-Adriana Ţicău to the Commission
Subject: Sustainable energy for all
Versiunea în limba română ... 452
English version ... 453

E-011689/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Good practices for tackling the school drop-out rate
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 454
English version ... 455

E-011690/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: ESF and ERDF resources for youth employment
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 456
English version ... 457

E-011691/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: e-books
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 458
English version ... 459

E-011692/12 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Construction of a biological purification plant in the Marmaries — Kokkina area of the island of Tinos
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 460
English version ... 461

E-011693/12 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Integration of the Prüm Convention into EU legislation
Deutsche Fassung ... 462
English version ... 463

E-011694/12 by Sophie Auconie to the Commission
Subject: Eligibility of sports projects for ERDF funding
Version française ... 464
English version ... 465

E-011695/12 by Thomas Mann to the Commission
Subject: Spain's coastal protection law
Deutsche Fassung ... 466
English version ... 467

E-011697/12 by Silvia-Adriana Ţicău to the Commission
Subject: Interconnection of national electronic registers of road transport undertakings
Versiunea în limba română ... 468
English version ... 469

E-011698/12 by Silvia-Adriana Ţicău to the Commission
Subject: Interoperability of electronic road toll systems
Versiunea în limba română ... 470
English version ... 471

P-011699/12 by Silvia-Adriana Ţicău to the Council
Subject: Irish Presidency of the EU — lifting barriers for Romanian and Bulgarian workers
Versiunea în limba română ... 472
English version ... 473

E-011700/12 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Wind turbines in Farini
Versione italiana ... 474
English version ... 475

P-011701/12 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Tax on transfer of real estate from ATEbank to Piraeus Bank
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 476
English version ... 477

P-011702/12 by Michèle Rivasi to the Commission
Subject: Composition of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) working group on endocrine disruptors
Version française ... 478
English version ... 479

P-011703/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Safety of European citizens and precautionary measures under Italian law imposing an obligation to stay in a specified place: the case of Tezze sul Brenta (Province of Vicenza)
Versione italiana ... 480
English version ... 481

P-011704/12 by Janusz Wojciechowski to the Commission
Subject: Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 of 24 September 2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing
Wersja polska ... 482
English version ... 483

E-000001/13 by Janusz Wojciechowski to the Commission
Subject: CHAP(2012)02494 case
Wersja polska ... 484
English version ... 485

E-000002/13 by Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou to the Commission
Subject: Imbalances between Member States as regards youth unemployment and measures to address them
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 486
English version ... 488

E-000003/13 by Charalampos Angourakis to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — The new imperialist spheres of influence drawn in blood
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 489
English version ... 490

E-000004/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Greek state auction for Thessaloniki metro extension project
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 491
English version ... 492

E-000005/13 by Michèle Rivasi to the Commission
Subject: Registration of skin cancer
Version française ... 493
English version ... 494

E-000006/13 by Louis Grech to the Commission
Subject: Environment Action Programme (EAP)
Verżjoni Maltija ... 495
English version ... 496

E-000007/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission
Subject: Clarification of the copyright situation regarding the survey initiated by the Commission on the structure of the cultural and creative sectors in Europe
Svensk version ... 497
English version ... 498

E-000008/13 by Ashley Fox to the Commission
Subject: Access to rail transport for wheelchair passengers in the EU
English version ... 499

E-000009/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Council
Subject: Three scenarios for the Union in 2030
Version française ... 501
English version ... 502

E-000010/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Three scenarios for the Union in 2030
Version française ... 503
English version ... 505

E-000011/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Critical situation in the Caucasus
Version française ... 507
English version ... 508

E-000012/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Instagram and consumer rights
Version française ... 509
English version ... 511

E-000013/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Mental health and energy drinks: a dangerous cocktail
Version française ... 513
English version ... 514

E-000014/13 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission
Subject: Approval of the implementing development plan for Ca' Roman in the municipality of Venice in the absence of the strategic environmental assessment (SEA) referred to in Directive 2001/42/EC
Versione italiana ... 515
English version ... 516

E-000015/13 by Cornelis de Jong to the Commission
Subject: Trade in animal-tested cosmetics
Nederlandse versie ... 518
English version ... 519

E-000016/13 by Lucas Hartong to the Commission
Subject: Appointment of a tobacco lobbyist to the Ethics Committee on Lobbying
Nederlandse versie ... 520
English version ... 521

E-000017/13 by Christel Schaldemose to the Commission
Subject: Values for tar, nicotine and carbon monoxide in the new proposal for a revision of the Tobacco Products Directive
Dansk udgave ... 522
English version ... 523

E-000018/13 by Christian Engström to the Commission
Subject: Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) — what did the Court ask the Commission?
Svensk version ... 524
English version ... 525

E-000019/13 by Patricia van der Kammen to the Commission
Subject: Privatisation of drinking water
Nederlandse versie ... 526
English version ... 527

E-000020/13 by Patricia van der Kammen to the Commission
Subject: Compulsory water-saving shower heads
Nederlandse versie ... 528
English version ... 529

E-000021/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Freedom of religion
Versione italiana ... 530
English version ... 532

E-000022/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: A bergamot-tinged war?
Versione italiana ... 534
English version ... 536

P-000023/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission
Subject: Carbon monoxide
English version ... 537

P-000024/13 by Toine Manders to the Commission
Subject: European classification system for medicines based on risks of impairment of driving ability
Nederlandse versie ... 538
English version ... 540

E-000025/13 by Charalampos Angourakis to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Military attack on FARC-EP
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 541
English version ... 542

E-000026/13 by Derek Vaughan to the Commission
Subject: Tackling racism in football
English version ... 543

E-000027/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Case of international abduction of minors to Russia
Versione italiana ... 544
English version ... 546

E-000028/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Case of international abduction of minors to Russia
Versione italiana ... 548
English version ... 550

E-000029/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Case of international abduction of a minor to Russia
Versione italiana ... 552
English version ... 553

E-000030/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Case of international abduction of a minor to Russia
Versione italiana ... 554
English version ... 555

E-000031/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Case of international abduction of minors to France
Versione italiana ... 556
English version ... 557

E-000032/13 by Patricia van der Kammen to the Commission
Subject: Nefarious practices at Ryanair
Nederlandse versie ... 558
English version ... 560

P-000042/13 by Saïd El Khadraoui to the Commission
Subject: Ryanair aircraft flying with too little fuel on board
Nederlandse versie ... 558
English version ... 560

E-000054/13 by Ivo Belet to the Commission
Subject: Safety issues raised by limited quantities of fuel carried on Ryanair flights
Nederlandse versie ... 559
English version ... 561

E-000033/13 by Patricia van der Kammen to the Commission
Subject: Inappropriate farm subsidies
Nederlandse versie ... 562
English version ... 564

E-000034/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission
Subject: Food security and food education
English version ... 566

E-000035/13 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission
Subject: Strictly supervised conditions in respect of the application of the derogations laid down in Article 9(c) of Directive 2009/147/EC (Birds Directive)
Versione italiana ... 567
English version ... 568

E-000036/13 by Crescenzio Rivellini to the Commission
Subject: Situation of Italian prisons and funding available for integrating prisoners and for families
Versione italiana ... 569
English version ... 571

E-000037/13 by Ria Oomen-Ruijten to the Commission
Subject: Accumulation of pension entitlements by frontier workers in Belgium
Nederlandse versie ... 572
English version ... 573

P-000038/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Free movement of capital
Versione italiana ... 574
English version ... 575

P-000039/13 by Bart Staes to the Commission
Subject: The Dalli case and lobbying by the tobacco industry
Nederlandse versie ... 576
English version ... 577

E-000040/13 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission
Subject: Turkish Minister: 'Christianity is no longer a religion'
Nederlandse versie ... 578
English version ... 579

P-000041/13 by Isabelle Thomas to the Commission
Subject: Drawing up the action plan for the Atlantic region
Version française ... 580
English version ... 581

E-000043/13 by Emine Bozkurt to the Commission
Subject: Use of the European Social Fund in Poland
Nederlandse versie ... 582
English version ... 583

P-000044/13 by Julie Girling to the Commission
Subject: Schmallenberg virus
English version ... 584

E-000046/13 by Marian Harkin to the Commission
Subject: Good Samaritan law
English version ... 585

E-000047/13 by Sajjad Karim to the Commission
Subject: Dutch diving regulations — recognition of professional qualifications
English version ... 586

E-000048/13 by Chris Davies to the Commission
Subject: EU humanitarian aid to Burma
English version ... 587

E-000049/13 by Saïd El Khadraoui to the Commission
Subject: Possible breach of rules concerning the common charging scheme for air navigation services
Nederlandse versie ... 588
English version ... 589

E-000050/13 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission
Subject: Concerns due to arsenic concentrations in ore that is planned to be extracted at Krumovgrad, Bulgaria
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 590
English version ... 591

E-000051/13 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission
Subject: Illegally granted mining concession without tender or environmental impact assessment at Krumovgrad, Bulgaria
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 592
English version ... 593

E-000052/13 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission
Subject: Pollution from mining facilities in Bulgaria
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 594
English version ... 595

E-000053/13 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission
Subject: Arsenic contamination of Topolnitsa reservoir (Bulgaria) by the mining industry
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 596
English version ... 597

E-000055/13 by Marek Henryk Migalski to the Commission
Subject: Investigation into Russian opposition activist
Wersja polska ... 598
English version ... 599

E-000056/13 by Marek Henryk Migalski to the Commission
Subject: Employment in management posts in EU institutions
Wersja polska ... 600
English version ... 601

E-000057/13 by Mariya Gabriel to the Commission
Subject: Legislative amendments envisaged by the Commission for early 2013 which reduce or prohibit the use of natural ingredients in perfumes
българска версия ... 602
English version ... 603

E-000058/13 by Dan Jørgensen to the Commission
Subject: Problems concerning the implementation of EU transport rules
Dansk udgave ... 604
English version ... 605

E-000059/13 by Matteo Salvini to the Commission
Subject: EU policies to tackle illegal immigration
Versione italiana ... 606
English version ... 607

E-000060/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Abduction of a minor in Romania
Versione italiana ... 608
English version ... 610

P-000061/13 by Michael Cramer to the Commission
Subject: EASA opinion 04/2012 on flight time limitations
Deutsche Fassung ... 611
English version ... 612

P-000062/13 by Emma McClarkin to the Commission
Subject: European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR)
English version ... 613

E-000063/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Spanish Ministry of Defence debt and expenditure
Versión española ... 614
English version ... 615

E-000064/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: Recapitalisation of banks in Cyprus
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 616
English version ... 617

E-000065/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: Support programmes for the unemployed
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 618
English version ... 619

E-000066/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: VAT fraud
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 620
English version ... 621

E-000067/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: State benefits and welfare entitlements
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 622
English version ... 623

E-000068/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: International Conference and the Republic of Cyprus
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 624
English version ... 625

E-000069/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: Cyprus' debt
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 626
English version ... 627

E-000070/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: Immigration
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 628
English version ... 629

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011468/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Investigadores portugueses identificam novo tratamento para a osteoartrose

Considerando que:

— A osteoartrose, vulgarmente chamada artrose, é uma das múltiplas doenças reumáticas e, de longe, a mais comum; que é uma doença de natureza degenerativa que envolve todas as articulações, sendo uma das principais causas de incapacidades motoras a nível laboral a partir dos 50 anos; que esta doença afeta milhões de pessoas e não existe um medicamento eficaz para o seu tratamento;

— Segundo a Organização Mundial de Saúde, a osteoartrose é uma das 17 doenças prioritárias na área da prevenção e do tratamento; que a evolução da doença é um processo longo com custos diretos e indiretos muito elevados, tanto para o doente, como para o Serviço Nacional de Saúde;

— foi recentemente identificado por uma equipa de investigadores da Universidade de Coimbra um composto natural, extraído do zimbro, com elevado potencial para o tratamento da osteoartrose; que o composto identificado demonstra um enorme potencial para travar a doença e promover a regeneração do tecido da cartilagem;

— O processo de investigação em curso ainda não assegurou o financiamento necessário;

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento desta importante descoberta?

2. Sabendo que esta doença é considerada prioritária pela OMS, poderá a investigação em causa beneficiar de apoio financeiro por parte da Comissão Europeia?

Resposta dada por Máire Geoghegan-Quinn em nome da Comissão
(15 de fevereiro de 2013)

A Comissão está consciente da potencialidade da aplicação de compostos extraídos do zimbro no tratamento da osteoartrite (OA), tal como referido pelo Senhor Deputado ([1]).

Embora a investigação específica sobre a utilização de zimbro ou outras matérias vegetais no tratamento da OA ainda não tenha sido apoiada, a investigação sobre o diagnóstico, o acompanhamento e o tratamento desta doença tem sido amplamente tratada no âmbito dos Sexto e Sétimo Programas-Quadro de Investigação e Desenvolvimento Tecnológico (6.° PQ, 2002-2006; 7.° PQ, 2007-2013).

No 7. ° PQ, mais de 59 milhões de euros foram consagrados ao estudo e à luta contra a OA. Entre os domínios abrangidos contam-se, por exemplo, o papel da predisposição genética em grandes grupos da população (TREAT OA ([2])), o desenvolvimento de ferramentas de diagnóstico com base em nanotecnologias (Nanodiara ([3])), bem como a validação de novos biomarcadores de diagnóstico (D-BOARD ([4])), o estudo do papel da alimentação e do exercício em casa na progressão da OA nas pessoas idosas (DO-Health ([5])) e o desenvolvimento de materiais manipulados por técnicas de bioengenharia para a regeneração da cartilagem (OPHIS ([6]), Regenknee ([7])).

([1]) http://www.ijbbb.org/papers/3-X20013.pdf
([2]) http://www.treatoa.eu.
([3]) http://www.nanodiara.eu/.
([4]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/305815.
([5]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/278588.
([6]) http://www.istec.cnr.it/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=240:composite-phenotypic-triggers-for-bone-and-cartilage-repair-ophis-2011-2014-fp7-nmp-2009-small-3-246373&catid=69&Itemid=48&lang=en.
([7]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/267114.

Além disso, o Programa «Saúde Pública» (2008-2013) está a apoiar um projeto, iniciado em 2010, para o desenvolvimento de uma «Rede europeia de vigilância e informação sobre as doenças musculoesqueléticas» (Eumusc.NET ([8]), 1 milhão de euros).

([8]) http://www.eumusc.net/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011468/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Portuguese researchers identify a new treatment for osteoarthritis

Osteoarthritis, commonly known as arthritis, is one of many rheumatic diseases and by far the most common. It is a degenerative disease that affects all joints and is one of the main causes of mobility impairment impacting on the working lives of people over 50. This disease affects millions of people and there is no effective drug to treat it.

According to the World Health Organisation (WHO), osteoarthritis is one of 17 priority diseases in terms of prevention and treatment. The disease develops over a long period of time with very high direct and indirect costs, both for the patient and for the National Health Service.

A team of researchers from the University of Coimbra recently identified a natural compound extracted from juniper, which has good potential for treating osteoarthritis. The compound identified shows great potential in terms of curbing the condition and promoting the regeneration of cartilage tissue.

The ongoing research has not yet secured the necessary funding.

1. Is the Commission aware of this important discovery?

2. As osteoarthritis is considered a priority disease by the WHO, will it grant financial support for this research?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2013)

The Commission is aware of the potential application of compounds extracted from juniper in the treatment of osteoarthritis (OA), as mentioned by the Honourable Member ([1]).

Although specific research on the use of juniper or other plant materials in the treatment of OA has not yet been supported, research on the diagnosis, monitoring and treatment of this disease has been extensively addressed within the Sixth and Seventh Framework Programmes for Research and Technological Development (FP6, 2002-2006; FP7, 2007-2013).

Within FP7, over EUR 59 million have been devoted to studying and combatting OA. Areas addressed include for instance the role of genetic predisposition in large population cohorts (TREAT OA ([2])), the development of nanotechnology based diagnostic tools (NANODIARA ([3])) as well as the validation of novel diagnostics biomarkers (D-BOARD ([4])), the study of the role of diet and home exercise on OA progression in the elderly (DO-HEALTH ([5])) and the development of bioengineered materials for cartilage regeneration (OPHIS ([6]), REGENKNEE ([7])).

In addition, the Public Health Programme (2008-2013) is supporting a project, started in 2010, for the development of a 'European Musculoskeletal Conditions Surveillance and Information Network' (EUMUSC.NET ([8]), EUR 1 million).

([1]) http://www.ijbbb.org/papers/3-X20013.pdf
([2]) http://www.treatoa.eu
([3]) http://www.nanodiara.eu/
([4]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/305815
([5]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/278588
([6]) http://www.istec.cnr.it/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=240:composite-phenotypic-triggers-for-bone-and-cartilage-repair-ophis-2011-2014-fp7-nmp-2009-small-3-246373&catid=69&Itemid=48&lang=en
([7]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/267114
([8]) http://www.eumusc.net/

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011469/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Corte nos apoios aos bancos alimentares

Considerando que:

— O Programa Comunitário de Apoio Alimentar a Carenciados (PCAAC), instituído em 1987, beneficiou, desde a sua criação, 18 milhões de cidadãos europeus em 20 Estados-Membros; que mais de metade do total dos alimentos entregues pelas instituições nos Estados-Membros provinha do Programa Europeu;

— O PCAAC contribui diretamente para combater a pobreza e promover a inclusão social, revelando-se imprescindível em vários Estados-Membros, designadamente Portugal, que não dispõe de um programa alimentar próprio;

— O PCAAC irá desaparecer no final de 2013 e será substituído por um novo Fundo para apoiar os cidadãos europeus mais carenciados, com uma dotação global prevista de 2,5 mil milhões de euros para o período 2014-2020, passando a haver menos dinheiro para distribuir por mais países;

— Segundo o Eurostat, 79 milhões de pessoas vivem na Europa abaixo do limiar de pobreza e 30 milhões sofrem de subnutrição, e nos últimos anos, tendo os 240 Bancos Alimentares distribuído 360 mil toneladas de produtos alimentares a instituições de solidariedade social em 21 países europeus;

— É fundamental a criação de um mecanismo europeu claro e determinado que reforce a solidariedade e o combate à pobreza, cujo principal eixo seja o apoio alimentar, e que possa ser conjugado, de forma célere e eficaz, com os recursos dos Estados-Membros, da sociedade civil e dos voluntários;

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Com que valores pode Portugal contar durante o período 2014-2020 e de que forma vão ser estruturados?

2. Pode a Comissão assegurar que o apoio alimentar será uma das prioridades do Fundo?

3. Que medidas complementares estão a ser definidas, que permitam, nomeadamente, conjugar a medida com os recursos dos Estados-Membros?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(21 de fevereiro de 2013)

A proposta da Comissão para o próximo quadro financeiro plurianual (QFP) prevê uma dotação de 2,5 mil milhões de euros para o Fundo de Auxílio Europeu às Pessoas Mais Carenciadas, confirmado pelas conclusões do Conselho Europeu de 7-9 de fevereiro. A repartição anual por Estado-Membro, assim como a afetação concreta a Portugal ainda será determinada pela Comissão num ato de execução baseado no número de pessoas que sofrem de formas graves de privação material e na população que vive em agregados com baixa intensidade de trabalho.

O Fundo de Auxílio Europeu às Pessoas Mais Carenciadas deve ser executado através de gestão partilhada, com base nos programas operacionais nacionais, nos quais cada Estado-Membro identificará e justificará o tipo de auxílio material a suportar pelo Fundo a partir das opções incluídas no regulamento, incluindo assistência de qualidade. Os Estados-Membros poderiam focar-se num tipo de auxílio material ou combinar vários, dependendo das circunstâncias e das escolhas nacionais. Esta flexibilidade será essencial para garantir a capacidade de resposta do instrumento às necessidades locais, o que maximizará a sua eficácia.

De acordo com o artigo 4.° da proposta da Comissão, o Fundo de Auxílio Europeu às Pessoas Mais Carenciadas deverá apoiar os esquemas nacionais na prestação de auxílio material aos mais carenciados. Além disso, prevê-se um cofinanciamento nacional que fomente as sinergias entre o Fundo de Auxílio Europeu às Pessoas Mais Carenciadas e os recursos nacionais.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011469/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Cuts in food bank support

Since it was founded in 1987, the European food aid programme for deprived persons (PEAD) has helped 18 million EU citizens in 20 Member States; more than half of the total food handed out by charities in the Member States has come from this EU programme.

The PEAD directly helps to combat poverty and to promote social inclusion and has proved vital in several Member States, particularly Portugal, which does not have a national food programme.

The PEAD will cease to exist at the end of 2013 and will be replaced by a new fund to support the most deprived EU citizens. A total budget of EUR 2.5 billion is planned for the period 2014-2020, meaning that there will be less money to distribute among more countries.

According to Eurostat, 79 million people in Europe are living below the poverty line and 30 million suffer from malnutrition. In recent years the 240 food banks have distributed 360 000 tonnes of food to charities in 21 European countries.

It is essential to create a clear and specific European mechanism to strengthen solidarity and to combat poverty, based on food aid, which can be quickly and efficiently combined with the resources of Member States, civil society and volunteers.

1. How much will Portugal receive from this fund during the period 2014-2020 and how will this amount be structured?

2. Can the Commission guarantee that food aid will be one of the fund's priorities?

3. What additional measures will be implemented which in particular will enable this fund to be used alongside Member States' resources?

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

The Commission's proposal for the next multi-annual financial framework (MFF) foresees a budget of 2.5 billion EUR for the Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived, confirmed by the conclusions of the European Council of 7-9 February. The annual breakdown by Member State and thus also the concrete allocation to Portugal is to be determined by the Commission in an implementing act on the basis of the number of people suffering from severe material deprivation and the population living in households with very low work intensity.

The FEAD would be implemented in shared management, on the basis of national operational programmes, in which each Member State will identify and justify the type of material assistance that would be supported by the FEAD from the options included in the regulation including good assistance. The Member States would be able to focus on one type of material assistance or to combine them, depending on the national circumstances and choices. This flexibility will be key to ensure the responsiveness of the instrument to the local needs, hence maximising its effectiveness.

According to Article 4 of the Commission's proposal, the FEAD should support national schemes providing material assistance to the Most Deprived. In addition, a public national co-financing is foreseen, fostering the synergies between the FEAD and the national resources.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011470/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Relatório FAO: necessidade de maior investimento na agricultura

Segundo dados do relatório da ONU para a Agricultura e Alimentação (FAO), a agricultura vai enfrentar grandes desafios nas próximas décadas, nomeadamente satisfazer o crescimento da procura de alimentos devido ao aumento populacional.

O relatório refere ainda que «para satisfazer as necessidades e erradicar a fome e subnutrição, e ao mesmo tempo conservar os recursos naturais, é preciso estimular o crescimento da produção agrícola e garantir mais e melhores investimentos».

Recentemente foram divulgados cortes que irão ser aplicados nas verbas destinadas aos apoios ao setor agrícola.

Assim pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento do referido relatório? Como o avalia?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş on em nome da Comissão
(11 de fevereiro de 2013)

A Comissão está perfeitamente ao corrente da mais recente publicação de referência da Organização para a Alimentação e a Agricultura (FAO) sobre o Estado Mundial da Agricultura e da Alimentação (SOFA). A Comissão participou num painel de discussão sobre o SOFA que se realizou em Roma em dezembro de 2012 à margem do Conselho da FAO.

O SOFA 2012, intitulado «Investir na agricultura para um futuro melhor», conclui que erradicar a fome exigirá «melhoramentos drásticos tanto no nível como na qualidade do investimento público no setor». A Comissão regozija-se vivamente com esta publicação. Na sua comunicação «Aumentar o impacto da política de desenvolvimento da UE: uma Agenda para a Mudança» ([1]), a Comissão sublinhou igualmente a importância da agricultura enquanto setor com fortes efeitos multiplicadores para o crescimento sustentável e a segurança alimentar nos países em desenvolvimento. A segurança alimentar continua igualmente a constituir um objetivo essencial da política agrícola comum, tal como sublinhado na comunicação e propostas «A PAC no horizonte 2020: responder aos desafios do futuro em matéria de alimentação, recursos naturais e territoriais» ([2]). Além disso, a publicação deste relatório FAO fornece elementos analíticos para o processo de consulta sobre os princípios para um investimento responsável na agricultura (RAI), no âmbito do Comité da Segurança Alimentar Mundial. Os investimentos na agricultura foram amplamente debatidos durante a Semana Verde realizada em Berlim em janeiro, para a qual a Comissão também deu um importante contributo.

Além disso, a Comissão nota que, embora os investimentos na agricultura sejam cruciais, é igualmente necessário envidar esforços para combater a subnutrição. Uma próxima comunicação sublinhará a forma como a Comissão tenciona abordar os problemas de raquitismo e emaciação, com especial atenção para a nutrição materna e infantil.

([1]) COM(2011) 637 final.
([2]) COM(2010) 672 final e propostas jurídicas subsequentes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011470/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: FAO Report: need for greater investment in agriculture

According to the report by the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), agriculture will face major challenges in the decades ahead, particularly in order to meet the growing demand for food due to population growth.

The report also states that in order to meet needs and eradicate hunger and malnutrition, while conserving natural resources, it is necessary to stimulate the growth of agricultural production and ensure more and better investments.

It was recently announced that cuts are to be made to the funds allocated to support the agricultural sector.

I therefore ask the Commission:

Is it aware of this report? What does it think of it?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(11 February 2013)

The Commission is well aware of the latest flagship publication of the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) on the State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA). The Commission participated in a panel discussion on SOFA taking place in Rome in December 2012 in the margins of the FAO Council.

The 2012 SOFA entitled 'Investing in agriculture for a better future' concludes that eradicating hunger will require a 'dramatic improvements in both the level and quality of government investment in the sector'. The Commission strongly welcomes this publication. In its communication for 'Increasing the impact of the EU Development Policy: an Agenda for change' ([1]), the Commission also underlined the importance of agriculture as a sector with strong multiplier effects for sustainable growth and food security in developing countries. Food security also remains a key goal of the common agricultural policy, as outlined in the communication and proposals 'The CAP towards 2020: meeting the food, natural resources and territorial challenges of the future' ([2]). Furthermore, the publication of this FAO report provides analytical elements for the consultation process on the principles for Responsible Agricultural Investments (RAI) within the Committee on World Food Security. Investment in agriculture was also discussed at length during Green Week in Berlin in January, to which the Commission also strongly contributed.

Furthermore, the Commission notes that, while investment in agriculture is crucial, efforts also need to be made to address under-nutrition. An upcoming Communication will highlight the way it intends to tackle the problems of stunting and wasting, with a focus on maternal and child nutrition.

([1]) COM(2011) 637 final.
([2]) COM(2010) 672 final and subsequent legal proposals.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011471/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Desperdício alimentar

Considerando que:

— De acordo com o Comissário Europeu Potocnik, e pese embora a extensa legislação atualmente existente que visa combater as razões dos desperdícios alimentares nas diversas fases da cadeia alimentar, 90 milhões de toneladas de alimentos, sem contar com os desperdícios relacionados com a agricultura e pesca, são desperdiçados anualmente (dados de 2011).

— Em Portugal, de acordo com o recente primeiro estudo nacional (de Dezembro de 2012) sobre perdas e desperdícios, 1 milhão de toneladas é quanto o país deita fora.

— Em contrapartida, e segundo o Eurostat, 79 milhões de pessoas vivem na Europa abaixo do limiar de pobreza e 30 milhões sofrem de subnutrição, e em Portugal, pelo menos 200 mil pessoas passam fome, número que deve ser considerado subavaliado.

— Em 2011, a Comissão Europeia comprometeu-se, conjuntamente com todos os intervenientes, a avaliar esta situação e a apresentar medidas concretas que atenuassem o desperdício nas diferentes fases de produção, incluindo o consumidor final.

Assim, e volvido um ano, pergunto à Comissão:

Que medidas foram implementadas e qual foi o seu impacto real? Que medidas estão previstas para os próximos anos, para minorar este desajustamento? Está a Comissão em condições de assegurar que estas medidas serão contempladas na estratégia de apoio alimentar 2014-2020, como sinal claro da coerência entre as políticas europeias de combate à pobreza?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(20 de fevereiro de 2013)

A Comissão está a analisar, em cooperação estreita com as partes interessadas, formas de reduzir o desperdício de alimentos e está a debater possíveis medidas a nível comunitário para complementar as medidas a nível nacional. A reunião mais recente do grupo de trabalho responsável pelo desperdício de alimentos, inserido no Grupo Consultivo da Cadeia Alimentar, da Saúde Animal e da Fitossanidade (8 de fevereiro de 2013), centrou-se em tópicos específicos, tais como a doação de excedentes de comida a bancos de alimentos, o sistema de indicação da data nos rótulos, a alimentação animal, as cadeias de abastecimento alimentar curtas, a bioenergia, entre outros. Em paralelo, a Comissão divulga informações através do seu sítio Web dedicado ao assunto ([1]): um pequeno filme de grande difusão sobre o desperdício alimentar, «10 dicas para não desperdiçar alimentos», em todas as línguas da UE, e elementos para esclarecer o significado de «a consumir de preferência antes de …» e «data-limite de consumo». A Comissão também está a compilar boas práticas de aplicação fácil que estarão brevemente disponíveis no sítio Web. O Eurostat está a preparar uma recolha de dados sobre o desperdício alimentar que ocorre na cadeia de oferta e consumo de comida. Espera-se que os Estados-Membros forneçam dados numa base voluntária até ao outono de 2014.

A Comissão publicou, em agosto de 2011, orientações sobre a preparação de programas de prevenção do desperdício de alimentos («Guidelines on the Preparation of Food Waste Prevention Programes» ([2])) que têm como objetivo ajudar os Estados-Membros a desenvolverem programas nacionais de prevenção de resíduos no domínio do desperdício alimentar.

Por fim, a Comissão está atualmente a preparar uma comunicação sobre alimentação sustentável («Sustainable Food»), prevista para o final de 2013, onde o desperdício de comida será uma questão central.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/sustainability/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/prevention/pdf/prevention_guidelines.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011471/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Food waste

Given that:

— According to Commissioner Potočnik, despite the extensive legislation currently in force which aims to tackle the causes of food waste at various stages of the food chain, 90 million tonnes of food, excluding agriculture and fisheries waste, is thrown away each year (data from 2011).

— According to Portugal's first national study on the subject which was carried out recently (December 2012), the country throws away one million tonnes of waste.

— In contrast, according to Eurostat, 79 million people in Europe are living below the poverty line and 30 million suffer from malnutrition. In Portugal, at least 200 000 people go hungry, a number which should be regarded as an underestimate.

— In 2011, the Commission, along with all stakeholders, made a commitment to assess the situation and to propose specific measures to reduce waste at different production stages, including the final consumer.

One year on, I would therefore ask the Commission:

What measures were implemented and what was their actual impact? What measures are planned for the coming years to reduce this discrepancy? Can it ensure that these measures will be addressed in the 2014-2020 food support strategy, as a clear sign of the coherence between EU policies to combat poverty?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2013)

The Commission is analysing, in close cooperation with stakeholders, how to reduce food waste and is discussing possible EU measures to complement national measures. The most recent meeting of the Working Group on Food Waste in the context of the Advisory Group on the Food Chain, Animal and Plant Health (8 February 2013) focused on specific topics such as: the donation of surplus food to food banks, date labelling, feed, short food supply chains, bio-energy, etc. In parallel, the Commission is disseminating information via its dedicated website ([1]): a viral clip on food waste, '10 tips to reduce food waste' in all EU languages, clarification of 'best before' and 'use by' labels. The Commission is also compiling good practices in a user-friendly way, which will soon be available on the website. Eurostat is preparing a data collection on food waste arising in the food supply and consumption chain. Results from Member States providing data on a voluntary basis are expected by autumn 2014.

It has published on August 2011 'Guidelines on the Preparation of Food Waste Prevention Programmes' ([2]) which aims to help Member States to develop National Waste Prevention Programmes on the issue of food waste.

Lastly, the Commission is currently preparing a communication on 'Sustainable Food' foreseen for end 2013 where food waste will be a key issue.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/sustainability/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/prevention/pdf/prevention_guidelines.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011472/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Protocolo de Quioto

Considerando que:

— O Protocolo de Quioto foi recentemente prolongado na Conferência Climática das Nações Unidas até 2020.

— O acordo para a extensão do protocolo foi conseguido sem parte dos maiores poluidores do mundo, como os Estados Unidos, o Canada, a Índia ou o Brasil, e obriga os subscritores a reduzir a emissão de gases com efeito de estufa.

Assim, pergunto:

Qual a posição da UE relativamente a esta matéria?

Considera a Comissão que a extensão do prolongamento do protocolo de Quioto até 2020 sem parte dos maiores poluidores do mundo poderá pôr em risco no futuro a redução da emissão de gases com efeito de estufa?

Resposta dada por Connie Hedegaard em nome da Comissão
(15 de fevereiro de 2013)

A UE anuiu em aderir a um segundo período de compromissos ao abrigo do Protocolo de Quioto, no contexto de um pacote mais vasto a executar no período 2013-2020, que constitui o período de transição para um novo acordo internacional que abranja todas as partes; este acordo deverá ser concluído até 2015 e aplicável a partir de 2020.

No contexto deste pacote mais vasto, além dos países com objetivos para 2013-2020 ao abrigo do Protocolo de Quioto, mais sessenta países desenvolvidos e em desenvolvimento, como os Estados Unidos, o Canadá, a China, a Índia e o Brasil, comprometeram-se a realizar ações de atenuação no período até 2020, no contexto da Convenção-Quadro das Nações Unidas sobre as Alterações Climáticas. Tanto os Estados Unidos como o Canadá se comprometeram a reduzir as emissões em 17 % relativamente a 2005; a Índia comprometeu-se a reduzir o consumo de energia em 20-25 % relativamente a 2005 e o Brasil comprometeu-se a reduzir as emissões em 36,1 a 38,9 % relativamente à situação presente. No total, a quota das emissões mundiais abrangidas por compromissos relativos a vários tipos de ações de atenuação, ao abrigo do Protocolo de Quioto e da Convenção, ascende a 83 %.

Além disso, a UE preconiza a necessidade urgente de suprir as disparidades em matéria de atenuação anteriores a 2020 por meio de ações reforçadas a realizar pelos países desenvolvidos e pelos países em desenvolvimento; preconiza também a necessidade de um empenho ativo em negociações para um novo acordo abrangente com a participação de todos. O Portal Climático de Doha, acordado na Conferência de Doha sobre o Clima, em dezembro de 2012, reafirmou a decisão de prosseguir as negociações numa via única (Plataforma de Durban), na qual todos os países participem e que abranja tanto o Acordo de 2015 como a questão das disparidades em matéria de atenuação anteriores a 2020.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011472/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Kyoto Protocol

The Kyoto Protocol was recently extended to 2020 at the United Nations Climate Conference.

The agreement to extend the protocol was concluded without some of the world's biggest polluters such as the United States, Canada, India and Brazil, and obliges signatories to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

What is the EU's stance on this issue?

Does the Commission believe that extending the Kyoto Protocol to 2020 without the agreement of some of the world's biggest polluters could jeopardise the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the future?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2013)

The EU agreed to be included in a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol as part of a broader package that applies during the 2013-2020 transition towards a new international agreement applicable to all which is to be completed by 2015 and apply from 2020 onwards.

In this broader package, in addition to the countries with 2013-2020 targets under the Kyoto Protocol, a further sixty developed and developing countries, including the United States, Canada, China, India and Brazil, have committed to pledges for mitigation action in the period up to 2020 under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. Both the United States and Canada have pledged to reduce emissions by 17% (compared to 2005), India has pledged to reduce energy intensity by 20-25% (compared to 2005) and Brazil has pledged to reduce emissions by 36.1 to 38.9% compared to business-as-usual. In total, the share of global emissions covered by commitments for different kinds of mitigation action both under the Kyoto Protocol and the Convention amounts to 83%.

In addition, the EU advocates the urgent need to address the mitigation gap pre-2020 through enhanced actions by both developed and developing countries, as well as the need to actively engage in negotiations for a new and comprehensive agreement with all on board. The Doha Climate Gateway, agreed at the Doha climate conference in December 2012, reaffirmed the decision to pursue negotiations under one single track (the Durban Platform), in which all countries participate and where both the 2015 Agreement and the pre-2020 mitigation gap will be addressed.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011473/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Brasil — Dificuldade na obtenção de vistos de trabalho para cidadãos da UE

Considerando que:

— A Organização Internacional para as Migrações (OIM) revelou recentemente que a crise económica está a inverter o fluxo migratório entre os países da Europa e da América Latina, que se converteu nos últimos anos no principal destino de jovens europeus;

— Entre os países que registaram o maior número de saídas figuram a Espanha (47 701), a Alemanha (20 926), a Holanda (17 168) e a Itália (15 701), sendo o Brasil, a Argentina, a Venezuela e o México os principais recetores;

— No caso dos jovens portugueses, essencialmente engenheiros civis e arquitetos, o principal destino é o Brasil;

— Estes jovens procuram oportunidades nas crescentes vagas criadas em função dos preparativos para o Mundial de Futebol de 2014 e os Jogos Olímpicos de 2016;

— As autoridades brasileiras estão a dificultar a emissão de vistos de trabalho a cidadãos da UE, que reúnem os requisitos face à falta de quadros técnicos no Brasil;

— Em Janeiro de 2013, terá lugar a cimeira UE — Brasil, em Brasília.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento desta situação?

Não considera oportuno que, na referida cimeira, se possa discutir uma eventual flexibilização, por parte das autoridades brasileiras, no que respeita à concessão de vistos de trabalho a cidadãos da UE?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão
(5 de março de 2013)

As dificuldades com que os cidadãos da UE se têm defrontado na obtenção de vistos de trabalho no Brasil não têm sido comunicadas à Comissão. No entanto, a Comissão está ciente das oportunidades de trabalho emergentes para os cidadãos da UE nos países da Comunidade de Estados da América Latina e das Caraíbas (CELAC) e está determinada a continuar a trabalhar em conjunto com aquela região, incluindo o Brasil, para melhor organizar a migração legal e a promover uma mobilidade bem gerida, em sintonia com a Abordagem Global para a Migração e a Mobilidade. Esta cooperação surge no âmbito do Diálogo Estruturado e Abrangente UE-CELAC sobre Migrações criado em junho de 2009.

O Plano de Ação Conjunto UE-Brasil 2012-2014 procura melhorar o intercâmbio, organizando melhor os fluxos migratórios regulares e abordando eficazmente todas as dimensões do fenómeno migratório. A recente vaga de migração europeia para o Brasil foi efetivamente debatida em diferentes momentos aquando da cimeira UE-Brasil. As autoridades brasileiras reiteraram o seu interesse em receber jovens europeus qualificados que poderão desempenhar um papel na modernização e renovação da força de trabalho do país.

Acresce que as questões da migração fazem também parte das negociações em curso para a conclusão de um Acordo de Associação entre a UE e o Mercosul.

Por último, em conformidade com a declaração da cimeira UE-CELAC, recentemente adotada, a Comissão pretende enfrentar os desafios dos fluxos migratórios dinâmicos entre as duas regiões, baseando-se em factos e informações relevantes. O estudo da OIM mencionado na questão, financiado pela Comissão e baseado nos dados do Eurostat de 2011 para os anos de 2008 e 2009, é um primeiro passo para melhorar os nossos conhecimentos sobre o fenómeno.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011473/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: EU citizens having difficulty obtaining work visas in Brazil

The International Organisation for Migration (IOM) recently revealed that the economic crisis is causing a reversal in migration between Europe and Latin America, which in recent years has become the destination of choice for young Europeans.

Those countries which have seen the largest exoduses include Spain (47 701), Germany (20 926), the Netherlands (17 168) and Italy (15 701), with Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela and Mexico being the main destinations.

For young Portuguese, namely civil engineers and architects, Brazil is the destination of choice.

These young people are seeking opportunities among the growing vacancies created by preparations for the 2014 World Cup and the 2016 Olympic Games.

The Brazilian authorities are making it difficult for EU citizens who meet the requirements to obtain work visas due to a lack of technical staff in Brazil.

The EU-Brazil Summit will take place in Brasilia in January 2013.

Is the Commission aware of this situation?

Does it not see this summit as an opportunity to discuss a possible relaxation by the Brazilian authorities in terms of granting work visas to EU citizens?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2013)

Difficulties faced by EU citizens in obtaining work visas in Brazil have not been brought to the attention of the Commission. However, the Commission is aware of the labour opportunities emerging in Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC) countries for EU citizens and is determined to continue to work with the region, including Brazil, in better organising legal migration and fostering well managed mobility in line with the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility. Cooperation takes places as part of the EU-CELAC Comprehensive and Structured Dialogue on Migration established in June 2009.

The EU-Brazil Joint Action Plan 2012-2014 calls for further exchanges on better organising regular migration flows and effectively addressing all the dimensions of the migration phenomenon. The recent wave of European migration to Brazil was indeed discussed in different moments on the occasion of the EU-Brazil Summit. The Brazilian authorities have reiterated their interest in receiving qualified young Europeans who could play a role in the modernisation and upgrading of the country's labour force.

Moreover Migration issues are also part of the ongoing negotiations for the conclusion of an Association Agreement between the EU and MERCOSUR.

Finally, in line with the recently adopted EU-CELAC Summit Declaration, the Commission aims to address the challenges of the ever changing migration flows between the two regions, based on relevant facts and information. The IOM study mentioned in the question, funded by the Commission and based on 2011 Eurostat data for years 2008 and 2009, is a first step to improve our knowledge of the phenomenon.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011474/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Utilização de polifosfatos na transformação do bacalhau

Considerando que:

— A indústria portuguesa de processamento do bacalhau representa, atualmente, 1 800 postos de trabalho diretos, apresentando uma faturação de 400 milhões de euros;

— Em 2011, Portugal importou 24 mil toneladas de bacalhau seco, o equivalente a 150 milhões de euros;

— A Comissão Europeia continua em negociações com Portugal sobre uma eventual introdução de polifosfatos no bacalhau de cura tradicional;

— A futura proposta deverá ser apresentada apenas no início de 2013;

— Recentemente, o Governo português enviou uma proposta à Comissão Europeia, no sentido de introduzir uma exceção para o produto destinado ao mercado português;

— Ao longo de cinco séculos, Portugal desenvolveu e aperfeiçoou um processo de secagem do bacalhau reconhecido pela sua qualidade em todo o mundo, sendo uma das principais bandeiras da gastronomia portuguesa.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tendo em conta que a introdução de polifosfatos constitui uma forte ameaça à viabilidade económica da indústria portuguesa de transformação de bacalhau, pondera a Comissão aceitar a exceção ao referido produto destinado ao mercado português?

Poderia a certificação deste produto ser parte da solução do referido problema?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(7 de fevereiro de 2013)

O uso de polifosfatos no peixe salgado deverá ser objeto de uma proposta da Comissão que será apresentada e discutida com os Estados-Membros nas próximas semanas. Assim que forem autorizados, os polifosfatos terão de ser rotulados na lista de ingredientes, em concordância com a Diretiva 2000/13/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho de 20 de março de 2000 relativa à aproximação das legislações dos Estados-Membros respeitantes à rotulagem, apresentação e publicidade dos géneros alimentícios. Além disso, os produtores de peixe de salga húmida não-tratado poderão também rotular o peixe em conformidade.

Por conseguinte, os produtores de bacalhau e os consumidores devem poder continuar a escolher o tipo de produtos. A produção tradicional do «bacalhau» em Portugal vai continuar a ser possível uma vez que os dois tipos de produtos (peixe salgado por salga húmida tratado e não-tratado) podem coexistir e ambos servem os mercados onde são alvo de procura.

Além disso, para permitir que os produtores de bacalhau se adaptem a uma situação em que o peixe tratado com polifosfatos poderá entrar no mercado, a Comissão tenciona propor a criação de um período de transição. Durante este período, os produtores de bacalhau poderão criar acordos com os seus fornecedores de peixe salgado por salga húmida para se certificarem de que os produtos não foram tratados com polifosfatos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011474/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Using polyphosphates in cod processing

Given that:

— The Portuguese cod processing industry currently accounts for 1 800 direct jobs, generating a turnover of EUR 400 million;

— In 2011, Portugal imported 24 000 tonnes of dried cod, worth EUR 150 million;

— The Commission is still in talks with Portugal about the possibility of introducing polyphosphates in salted cod;

— The future proposal will only be tabled in early 2013;

— The Portuguese Government recently submitted a proposal to the Commission to introduce an exception for cod destined for the Portuguese market;

— Over five centuries, Portugal has developed and perfected a process of drying cod which is recognised for its quality throughout the world and is one of the main specialities of Portuguese cuisine.

I would ask the Commission:

As the introduction of polyphosphates is a serious threat to the economic viability of the Portuguese cod processing industry, will it consider adopting the exception for cod destined for the Portuguese market?

Could certifying this product be part of the solution to this problem?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(7 February 2013)

The use of polyphosphates in salted fish should be the object of a Commission proposal due to be presented and discussed with the Member States in the coming weeks. Once authorised, polyphosphate will have to be labelled on the list of ingredients in accordance with Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 March 2000 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs. Furthermore, producers of non-treated wet salted fish also have the possibility to label the fish accordingly.

Therefore, bacalhau producers and consumers should be able to continue to choose the type of products. The traditional production of 'bacalhau' in Portugal will continue to be possible since the two types of products — treated and untreated wet salted fish — could co-exist and both serve the markets in which they are demanded.

In addition, to allow bacalhau producers to adapt to the situation where fish treated with polyphosphates could be placed on the market, the Commission would propose to establish a transitional period. During this period, bacalhau producers could make agreements with their suppliers of wet slated fish to certify that products have not been treated with phosphates.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011475/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: EURAF: Agroflorestas 1

A European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF) organizou recentemente em Bruxelas a primeira conferência científica sobre agroflorestas, com a participação de 17 países europeus e delegados da América do Norte e de África.

A EURAF descreve a agrofloresta como «a mistura de árvores com animais/colheita, um elemento chave para a segurança alimentar e energética num mundo imprevisível, sujeito a alterações climáticas e à escassez de combustíveis».

Como conclusão da conferência, foram emitidas 7 declarações com o intuito de alertar a Comissão Europeia para o tema da agrofloresta na discussão da futura PAC.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Qual a posição da Comissão relativamente à declaração da EURAF que considera que os sistemas agroflorestais tradicionais devem ser reconhecidos e regenerados e que deve ser promovida a implementação de sistemas agroflorestais inovadores?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011481/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: EURAF: Agroflorestas 7

A European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF) organizou recentemente em Bruxelas a primeira conferência científica sobre agroflorestas, com a participação de 17 países europeus e delegados da América do Norte e de África.

A EURAF descreve a agrofloresta como «a mistura de árvores com animais/colheita, um elemento chave para a segurança alimentar e energética num mundo imprevisível, sujeito a alterações climáticas e à escassez de combustíveis».

Como conclusão da conferência, foram emitidas 7 declarações com o intuito de alertar a Comissão Europeia para o tema da agrofloresta na discussão da futura PAC.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Qual a posição da Comissão relativamente à declaração da EURAF, que refere que os benefícios dos sistemas agroflorestais para a adaptação e mitigação das alterações climáticas devem ser reconhecidos e valorizados na política da União Europeia para as alterações climáticas?

Resposta conjunta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(22 de fevereiro de 2013)

A Comissão está consciente dos múltiplos benefícios dos sistemas agroflorestais. Na proposta de regulamento relativo ao desenvolvimento rural ([1]) após 2013, a Comissão inclui a elegibilidade dos custos de manutenção dos sistemas agroflorestais até 3 anos, permitindo a criação de sistemas agroflorestais em terrenos agrícolas e não agrícolas e o alargamento da lista de beneficiários potenciais, desde agricultores a proprietários rurais particulares, incluindo, no caso de sistemas silvopastoris, proprietários de florestas, rendeiros, municípios e respetivas associações.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/legal-proposals/com627/627_en.pdf

Segundo a Proposta de Decisão relativa a regras contabilísticas e planos de ação para as emissões e absorções de gases com efeito de estufa resultantes das atividades relacionadas com o uso do solo, a reafetação do solo e a silvicultura ([2]), o balanço dos gases com efeitos de estufa dos sistemas agroflorestais será contabilizado no âmbito da gestão florestal, na condição de os sistemas agroflorestais respeitarem a definição de floresta (de acordo com os seguintes critérios: área mínima da superfície, coberto arbóreo mínimo ou índice de densidade equivalente, árvores com potencial para atingir uma altura mínima aquando da maturidade).

([2]) COM(2012) 93 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011475/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: EURAF — agroforestry 1

The European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF) recently held the first scientific conference on agroforestry in Brussels, with the participation of 17 European countries and delegates from North America and Africa.

EURAF describes agroforestry as the 'mixture of trees with crops/animals', and points out that it is 'a key component of food and fuel security in an unpredictable world affected by climate change and fossil fuels scarcity'.

To wind up the conference, seven statements were issued with the aim of drawing the Commission's attention to agroforestry in the context of the debate on the future CAP.

What is the Commission's position on the EURAF statement that traditional agroforestry systems should be recognised and renewed, and the implementation of innovative agroforestry systems should be promoted?

Question for written answer E-011481/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: EURAF: agroforestry 7

The European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF) recently held the first scientific conference on agroforestry, which took place in Brussels and was attended by participants from 17 European countries and delegates from North America and Africa.

According to EURAF, agroforestry, 'the "on purpose" mixture of trees with crops/animals, is a key component of food and fuel security in an unpredictable world affected by climate change and fossil fuels scarcity'.

The seven statements issued at the end of the conference were aimed at raising awareness of agroforestry within the Commission in anticipation of the discussion on the future CAP.

What does the Commission think about the EURAF statement that the benefits of agroforestry systems for climate change adaptation and mitigation should be recognised and turned to account in EU climate action policy?

Joint answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2013)

The Commission is aware of the multiple benefits of agroforestry systems. In its proposal for a Rural Development Regulation ([1]) post 2013, the Commission includes the eligibility of maintenance costs for agroforestry systems up to 3 years, allowing the establishment of agroforestry systems on agricultural land and non-agricultural land and extension of the list of potential beneficiaries from farmers to private landowners, including forest owners in the case of silvo-pastoral systems, tenants, municipalities and their associations.

According to the draft Decision on accounting rules and action plans on greenhouse gas emissions and removals resulting from activities related to land use, land use change and forestry ([2]), the greenhouse gas balance of agroforestry systems would be accounted under forest management, provided that agroforestry systems meet the definition for forest (according to three criteria: minimal size of the area, minimal tree crown cover or equivalent stocking level, minimal tree height at maturity).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/legal-proposals/com627/627_en.pdf
([2]) COM(2012) 93 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011476/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: EURAF: Agroflorestas 2

A European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF) organizou recentemente em Bruxelas a primeira conferência científica sobre agroflorestas, com a participação de 17 países europeus e delegados da América do Norte e de África.

A EURAF descreve a agrofloresta como «a mistura de árvores com animais/colheita, um elemento chave para a segurança alimentar e energética num mundo imprevisível, sujeito a alterações climáticas e à escassez de combustíveis».

Como conclusão da conferência, foram emitidas 7 declarações com o intuito de alertar a Comissão Europeia para o tema da agrofloresta na discussão na futura PAC.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Qual o entendimento da Comissão relativamente à declaração da EURAF no sentido de tornar os sistemas agroflorestais totalmente elegíveis no âmbito do primeiro pilar da Política Agrícola Comum?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(21 de fevereiro de 2013)

As regras pormenorizadas relativas à elegibilidade das terras para pagamentos diretos, nomeadamente as regras respeitantes ao tratamento de determinados casos em que as zonas agrícolas incluem árvores, serão estabelecidas em atos delegados com base no artigo 77.°, n.° 2, alínea b), da proposta de regulamento horizontal apresentada pela Comissão ([1]). As futuras regras devem assegurar que as ajudas diretas são concedidas para a utilização das terras agrícolas em atividades agrícolas. Na elaboração dessas regras, será devidamente tomada em conta a questão dos sistemas agroflorestais.

No entanto, no seu documento de reflexão sobre a ecologização, a Comissão indicava já que poderia vir a ponderar a elegibilidade de zonas com extensos sistemas agrícolas/pastoris tradicionais, inclusive nos casos em que a erva e outras forrageiras herbáceas não são predominantes, que desempenhem um papel essencial na biodiversidade e evitem a erosão dos solos e a libertação de carbono.

([1]) COM(2011) 628 final/2.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011476/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: EURAF — agroforestry 2

The European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF) recently held the first scientific conference on agroforestry in Brussels, with the participation of 17 European countries and delegates from North America and Africa.

EURAF describes agroforestry as the 'mixture of trees with crops/animals', and points out that it is 'a key component of food and fuel security in an unpredictable world affected by climate change and fossil fuels scarcity'.

To wind up the conference, seven statements were issued with the aim of drawing the Commission's attention to agroforestry in the context of the debate on the future CAP.

What is the Commission's view on the EURAF statement that agroforestry systems should be made fully eligible under the first pillar of the common agricultural policy?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(21 February 2013)

The detailed rules on the eligibility of land to direct payments, including rules on how to deal with certain cases where agricultural areas contain trees, will be established in delegated acts based on Article 77(2)(b) of the Commission proposal for a Horizontal Regulation ([1]). The future rules will need to ensure that direct aids are granted to agricultural land used for an agricultural activity. When drafting the rules, full consideration will be given to the issue of agroforestry systems.

However, in its 'Concept Paper on greening' the Commission has already indicated that it could consider recognising as eligible, areas with extensive traditional pastoral/agricultural systems, even if grasses and other herbaceous species are not predominant, and which play a key role for biodiversity and prevent soil erosion and carbon release.

([1]) COM(2011) 628 final/2.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011477/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: EURAF: Agroflorestas 3

A European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF) organizou recentemente em Bruxelas a primeira conferência científica sobre agroflorestas, com a participação de 17 países europeus e delegados da América do Norte e de África.

A EURAF descreve a agrofloresta como «a mistura de árvores com animais/colheita, um elemento chave para a segurança alimentar e energética num mundo imprevisível, sujeito a alterações climáticas e à escassez de combustíveis».

Como conclusão da conferência, foram emitidas 7 declarações com o intuito de alertar a Comissão Europeia para o tema da agrofloresta na discussão da futura PAC.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Qual a posição da Comissão relativamente à declaração da EURAF que prevê uma ampla medida para o estabelecimento de sistemas agroflorestais (incluindo linhas de bordadura) a ser incluída no segundo pilar da PAC, por forma a ajudar os agricultores a implementarem estes sistemas adaptados ao ambiente?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(22 de fevereiro de 2013)

A Comissão concorda com a importância desta medida agroflorestal e propôs continuar a alargar o seu âmbito no decorrer do próximo período de programação do desenvolvimento rural. Todavia, cabe aos Estados-Membros decidir se a incluem nos programas respetivos. A repartição dos fundos relativamente ao orçamento disponível para dedicar a esta medida específica depende igualmente dos Estados-Membros.

Na Proposta de Regulamento relativo ao apoio ao desenvolvimento rural (2011/0282 (COD)), a Comissão propõe a concessão de apoio aos custos de criação de sistemas agroflorestais e um prémio anual por hectare para cobrir os custos de manutenção durante um determinado número de anos. Por conseguinte, a criação de sistemas agroflorestais está abrangida pela proposta da Comissão.

No entanto, a instalação de linhas de bordadura não é abrangida pelo proposto no artigo 24.°, sobre apoio à criação de sistemas agroflorestais. No período de programação em vigor a instalação de linhas de bordadura é elegível ao abrigo da medida «Investimentos não produtivos» do artigo 41.° do Regulamento (CE) n.° 1698/2005 do Conselho ([1]). Na proposta da Comissão para o próximo período de programação a instalação de linhas de bordadura poderá ser elegível ao abrigo da medida «Investimentos em ativos corpóreos» (artigo 18.° da Proposta de Regulamento 2011/0282 (COD)). Por conseguinte, no próximo período de programação, os sistemas agroflorestais podem ser apoiados de forma ampla e exequível.

([1]) JO L 277 de 21.10.2005.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011477/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: EURAF — agroforestry 3

The European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF) recently held the first scientific conference on agroforestry in Brussels, with the participation of 17 European countries and delegates from North America and Africa.

EURAF describes agroforestry as the 'mixture of trees with crops/animals', and points out that it is 'a key component of food and fuel security in an unpredictable world affected by climate change and fossil fuels scarcity'.

To wind up the conference, seven statements were issued with the aim of drawing the Commission's attention to agroforestry in the context of the debate on the future CAP.

What is the Commission's position on the EURAF statement that a broad agroforestry measure for the establishment of agroforestry systems (including hedges) should be included in the second pillar of the CAP, to help farmers implement such systems geared to their environment?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2013)

The Commission agrees with the importance of agro-forestry measure, and has proposed to continue and widen the scope of this particular measure during the next Programming period of Rural Development. However, the Member States decide whether they include the agro-forestry measure in their Rural Development Programme. The share of funds in relation to the available budget dedicated to this particular measure also depends on each Member State.

In its proposal for a new Rural Development Regulation (2011/0282 (COD)) the Commission proposes to grant support for the costs of establishment of agro-forestry systems and an annual premium per hectare to cover the costs of maintenance for a given number of years. Therefore, the establishment of agro-forestry systems is covered by the Commission proposal.

However, the establishment of hedges is not covered by the proposed Article 24 for support for establishment of agro-forestry systems. In the current Programming period the establishment of hedges is eligible under the measure 'Non-productive investments' of the article 41 of the current Council Regulation 1698/2005 ([1]). In the Commission proposal for the next Programming period the establishment of hedges could be eligible under the measure 'Investments in physical assets' (Article 18 of 2011/0282 (COD)). Consequently, the agro-forestry systems could be supported in a broad and feasible way during the next Programming period.

([1]) OJ L 277, 21.10.2005.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011478/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: EURAF: Agroflorestas 4

A European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF) organizou recentemente em Bruxelas a primeira conferência científica sobre agroflorestas, com a participação de 17 países europeus e delegados da América do Norte e de África.

A EURAF descreve a agrofloresta como «a mistura de árvores com animais/colheita, um elemento chave para a segurança alimentar e energética num mundo imprevisível, sujeito a alterações climáticas e à escassez de combustíveis».

Como conclusão da conferência, foram emitidas 7 declarações com o intuito de alertar a Comissão Europeia para o tema da agrofloresta na discussão da futura PAC.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Qual a posição da Comissão relativamente à declaração da EURAF que considera importante uma medida para ajudar os agricultores na gestão e regeneração de sistemas agroflorestais tradicionais em risco, a incluir no segundo pilar da PAC?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(25 de fevereiro de 2013)

A Comissão concorda com a importância da medida agroflorestal, cujo âmbito de aplicação propôs continuar e alargar durante o próximo período de programação do desenvolvimento rural. No entanto, compete aos Estados-Membros decidir se incluem a medida agroflorestal nos respetivos programas de desenvolvimento rural. Depende igualmente de cada Estado-Membro a percentagem de fundos em relação ao orçamento disponível afetado a esta medida específica.

Segundo a proposta da Comissão, o apoio deve cobrir os custos de estabelecimento e um prémio anual por hectare destinado a cobrir as despesas de manutenção durante um período limitado. Os Estados-Membros, tendo em conta as condições edafoclimáticas locais, as espécies florestais e a necessidade de garantir a utilização agrícola das terras, determinam o número máximo de árvores existentes no regime que combina a exploração florestal e a exploração agrícola nas mesmas terras. Os Estados-Membros estariam em posição de adotar medidas centradas nos sistemas agroflorestais ameaçados.

Além disso, a gestão dos ecossistemas agroflorestais tradicionais, como o montado em Portugal ou as *dehesas* em Espanha, pode ser apoiada no âmbito de medidas agroambientais. O apoio no âmbito desta medida está condicionado à observância do nível de referência dos requisitos obrigatórios. Todas as ações e compromissos financiados devem ser voluntários e fixados para além desse nível de referência.

A proposta da Comissão de regulamento relativo ao desenvolvimento rural para o próximo período de programação ([1]) baseia-se numa avaliação de impacto ([2]) e está, desde 2011, em fase de negociação com os Estados-Membros.

([1]) Proposta de regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativo ao apoio ao desenvolvimento rural pelo Fundo Europeu Agrícola de Desenvolvimento Rural (FEADER), COM(2011) 627 final/2):
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/legal-proposals/com627/627_pt.pdf

([2]) Documento de trabalho dos serviços da Comissão – Resumo da avaliação de impacto: A política agrícola comum no horizonte 2020: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/analysis/perspec/cap-2020/impact-assessment/summary_pt.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011478/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: EURAF — agroforestry 4

The European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF) recently held the first scientific conference on agroforestry in Brussels, with the participation of 17 European countries and delegates from North America and Africa.

EURAF describes agroforestry as the 'mixture of trees with crops/animals', and points out that it is 'a key component of food and fuel security in an unpredictable world affected by climate change and fossil fuels scarcity'.

To wind up the conference, seven statements were issued with the aim of drawing the Commission's attention to agroforestry in the context of the debate on the future CAP.

What is the Commission's position on the EURAF statement attaching importance to a measure to help farmers manage and renew endangered traditional agroforestry systems, to be included in the second pillar of the CAP?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2013)

The Commission agrees with the importance of agro-forestry measure, and has proposed to continue and widen the scope of this particular measure during the next Programming period of Rural Development. However, the Member States decide whether they include the agro-forestry measure in their Rural Development Programme. The share of funds in relation to the available budget dedicated to this particular measure also depends on each Member State.

According to the Commission proposal, the support would cover the costs of establishment and an annual premium per hectare to cover the costs of maintenance for a limited period. The Member States, taking account of local pedo-climatic conditions, forestry species and the need to ensure agricultural use of the land, shall determine the maximum number of trees that are grown in combination with agriculture on the same land. The Member States would be in position of targeting measures to endangered agroforestry systems.

Moreover, the management of the traditional agroforestry ecosystems such as 'montado' in Portugal or 'dehesas' in Spain can be supported under agri-environment measure. The support under this measure is conditional to the respect of the reference level made of mandatory requirements. All the supported actions and commitments must be voluntary and be set beyond such reference level.

The Commission proposal for the Rural Development Regulation for the next Programming ([1]) period is based on an impact assessment ([2]) and has been in the negotiation phase with the Member States since 2011.

([1]) 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

([2]) Commission Staff Working Paper — Executive Summary of the impact assessment: Common Agricultural Policy towards 2020: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/analysis/perspec/cap-2020/impact-assessment/summary_en.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011479/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: EURAF: Agroflorestas 5

A European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF) organizou recentemente em Bruxelas a primeira conferência científica sobre agroflorestas, com a participação de 17 países europeus e delegados da América do Norte e de África.

A EURAF descreve a agrofloresta como «a mistura de árvores com animais/colheita, um elemento chave para a segurança alimentar e energética num mundo imprevisível, sujeito a alterações climáticas e à escassez de combustíveis».

Como conclusão da conferência, foram emitidas 7 declarações com o intuito de alertar a Comissão Europeia para o tema da agrofloresta na discussão da futura PAC.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Qual a posição da Comissão relativamente à declaração da EURAF, que prevê a possibilidade de implementação dos sistemas agroflorestais na Europa e que a adoção das medidas incluídas no segundo pilar da PAC deve ser obrigatória para todos os Estados-Membros no próximo regulamento para o desenvolvimento rural?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão (5.2.2013)
(22 de fevereiro de 2013)

A Comissão está consciente das vantagens da medida agroflorestal e incluiu, por isso, na sua proposta de novo regulamento relativo ao desenvolvimento rural (2011/0282 (COD)) a continuação e o alargamento do âmbito desta medida específica, como é explicado nas respostas da Comissão E-011475/2012 e E-011481/2012 respeitantes às declarações da EURAF.

A proposta da Comissão de Regulamento relativo ao desenvolvimento rural para o próximo período de programação baseia-se em avaliação de impacto e está, desde 2011, na fase de negociação com os Estados-Membros. O parecer do Parlamento Europeu está pendente ainda.

Os Estados-Membros podem escolher, por sua iniciativa, as medidas mais pertinentes para os seus programas de desenvolvimento rural, com base na análise SWOT em cada Estado-Membro. As medidas devem, por conseguinte, ser escolhidas no plano nacional, com exceção das medidas «agroambientais e climáticas» e «Leader», que devem fazer parte dos programas de desenvolvimento rural de cada Estado-Membro.

A União Europeia não dispõe de uma política florestal comum. A decisão quanto à inclusão ou não inclusão das medidas florestais nos programas de desenvolvimento rural depende de cada Estado-Membro.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011479/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: EURAF — agroforestry 5

The European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF) recently held the first scientific conference on agroforestry in Brussels, with the participation of 17 European countries and delegates from North America and Africa.

EURAF describes agroforestry as the 'mixture of trees with crops/animals', and points out that it is 'a key component of food and fuel security in an unpredictable world affected by climate change and fossil fuels scarcity'.

To wind up the conference, seven statements were issued with the aim of drawing the Commission's attention to agroforestry in the context of the debate on the future CAP.

What is the Commission's position on the EURAF statement highlighting the possibility of agroforestry systems being implemented throughout Europe, and taking the view that the adoption of measures included in the second pillar of the CAP should be compulsory for all Member States in the next rural development regulation?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2013)

The Commission is aware of the benefits of the agro-forestry measure and has therefore introduced in its proposal for a new Rural Development Regulation (2011/0282 (COD)) to continue as well as to widen the scope of this particular measure, as explained in the Commission answers E-011475/2012 and E-011481/2012 regarding the statements of the EURAF.

The Commission proposal for the Rural Development Regulation for the next Programming period is based on impact assessment and it has been in the negotiation phase with the Member States since the year 2011. The opinion of the European Parliament is still outstanding.

The Member States can choose themselves those measures that are most pertinent for them in their Rural Development Programmes, based on the SWOT analysis in each Member State. The measures are therefore to be chosen at national level, apart from the measures 'Agri-environment-climate' and 'Leader' that must be a part of the Rural Development Programmes in each Member State.

The European Union does not have a common Forestry Policy. The decision whether the Forestry measures are included in the Rural Development Programmes depends on each Member State.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011480/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: EURAF: Agroflorestas 6

A European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF) organizou recentemente em Bruxelas a primeira conferência científica sobre agroflorestas, com a participação de 17 países europeus e delegados da América do Norte e de África.

A EURAF descreve a agrofloresta como «a mistura de árvores com animais/colheita, um elemento chave para a segurança alimentar e energética num mundo imprevisível, sujeito a alterações climáticas e à escassez de combustíveis».

Como conclusão da conferência, foram emitidas 7 declarações com o intuito de alertar a Comissão Europeia para o tema da agrofloresta na discussão da futura PAC.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Qual a posição da Comissão relativamente à declaração da EURAF que defende os sistemas agroflorestais e considera que estes devem ser elegíveis para inclusão como áreas de interesse ecológico («*ecological focus área*») nas explorações agrícolas?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(20 de fevereiro de 2013)

Um dos objetivos da reforma da política agrícola comum consiste em reconhecer melhor e encorajar a agricultura sustentável. Foi nesse espírito que a Comissão propôs que o artigo 32.° do Regulamento Pagamentos Diretos ([1]) estabelecesse a obrigação de os agricultores criarem superfícies de interesse ecológico. O n.° 2 desse artigo habilita a Comissão a «adotar atos delegados em conformidade com o artigo 55.° a fim de definir mais precisamente os tipos de superfícies de interesse ecológico referidos no n.° 1 [do mesmo artigo] e de acrescentar e definir outros tipos de superfícies de interesse ecológico».

Durante as discussões sobre a reforma, a Comissão indicou as suas intenções em relação ao teor dos futuros atos delegados e esclareceu que muitos elementos típicos da agrossilvicultura poderiam ser reconhecidos como superfícies de interesse ecológico, a saber, árvores em linha ou árvores em grupo (até um certo limite). Note-se, porém, que a Comissão terá de garantir que as ajudas diretas são concedidas a terras agrícolas e não a florestas, pelo que são propostas limitações para a percentagem de tais elementos nas terras agrícolas.

([1]) COM(2011) 625 final/2.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011480/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: EURAF: agroforestry 6

The European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF) recently held the first scientific conference on agroforestry, which took place in Brussels and was attended by participants from 17 European countries and delegates from North America and Africa.

According to EURAF, agroforestry, 'the "on purpose" mixture of trees with crops/animals, is a key component of food and fuel security in an unpredictable world affected by climate change and fossil fuels scarcity'.

The seven statements issued at the end of the conference were aimed at raising awareness of agroforestry within the Commission in anticipation of the discussion on the future CAP.

How does the Commission view EURAF's advocacy of agroforestry systems and its call for them to be eligible for inclusion in the ecological focus areas of farms?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2013)

One of the goals of the reform of the common agricultural policy is to better recognise and to further encourage sustainable agriculture. It is in this spirit that the Commission proposed in Article 32 of the direct payments ([1]) Regulation to establish an obligation for farmers to set up Ecological Focus Areas (EFA). Paragraph 2 of this Article empowers the Commission to 'adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 55 to further define the types of ecological focus areas referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article and to add and define other types of ecological focus areas'.

The Commission has, during the discussions on the reform indicated its intentions with regard to the content of these future delegated acts and made it clear that many elements typical of agro-forestry could be recognised as EFAs, such as, up to a limit, trees in line or trees in group. However, please keep in mind that the Commission will need to ensure that direct aids are granted to agricultural land and not to forests, therefore limitations are proposed as regards the proportion of such features on agricultural land.

([1]) COM(625) final/2.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011482/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Setor têxtil: negociações UE-Canadá

Tendo em conta a carta datada de 8 de novembro, enviada pela Euratex ao Comissário Karel de Gucht, em que é exposta a preocupação do setor têxtil da UE face ao possível resultado das negociações UE-Canadá.

Considerando que:

— O setor têxtil da UE tem-se debatido, nos últimos anos, com enormes problemas de concorrência desleal, servindo, sistematicamente, como moeda de troca para acordos comerciais com países terceiros;

— O recente acordo com o Paquistão foi muito penalizador para o setor têxtil da UE;

— O acordo CETA (Canada-EU Trade Agreement), tal e qual se apresenta, não revela a reciprocidade desejável e, certamente, irá contribuir ainda mais para acentuar o desequilíbrio do referido setor;

— Na UE sempre se privilegiou a dupla transformação como forma de se obter a origem preferencial;

— O Canadá tem defendido a regra de transformação única, uma vez que a sua cadeia de abastecimento está integrada no acordo NAFTA e uma parte considerável do fornecimento é feita na Ásia;

— O setor têxtil canadiano não tem grande expressão comparativamente ao da UE.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Que avaliação faz da situação descrita?

Sabendo que o Canadá pretende, através deste acordo, beneficiar de uma exceção, embora não seja um país menos desenvolvido, considera justo e aceitável que se possa estar a abrir um precedente para futuros acordos que prejudicarão tremendamente o já debilitado setor têxtil da UE?

Em que ponto se encontram estas negociações e que contrapartida beneficiará a UE com o referido acordo?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(18 de fevereiro de 2013)

As negociações para um Acordo Económico e Comercial Global (AECG) entre a UE e o Canadá entraram na fase final. Ambas as partes estão atualmente a negociar a todos os níveis com o objetivo de finalizar as conversações no primeiro trimestre de 2013. Um acordo comercial global entre os dois parceiros poderá aumentar o comércio bilateral em 25,7 mil milhões de euros.

A Comissão tomou em devida consideração as posições da indústria têxtil expressas na carta a que o Senhor Deputado se refere. A Comissão continua a ter como objetivo conseguir um pacote global equilibrado e recíproco para a indústria têxtil. No que diz respeito às regras de origem dos têxteis, a UE e o Canadá encontram-se de facto a discutir uma derrogação muito limitada da regra geral da UE relativa à origem e esperam alcançar uma solução de compromisso entre as diferentes abordagens preconizadas por cada parte. Esta derrogação vai basear-se no nível atual de comércio de têxteis entre os dois parceiros. Devido à natureza recíproca desta derrogação, os produtores europeus também deverão beneficiar de novas oportunidades significativas. Importa referir que a indústria têxtil da UE mantém um excedente saudável no seu comércio com o Canadá. Assim, a nossa posição tem uma natureza mais ofensiva que defensiva.

É bastante claro que o AECG entre a UE e o Canadá não será um precedente para as gerações futuras. A Comissão tem como política tratar cada negociação como um caso separado com circunstâncias únicas que têm de ser consideradas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011482/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Textile industry: negotiations between the EU and Canada

On 8 November 2012, Euratex sent a letter to Commissioner Karel de Gucht expressing the EU textile industry's concern over the possible outcome of negotiations between the EU and Canada.

In recent years the EU textile industry has struggled with major problems in terms of unfair competition, systematically serving as a bargaining chip for trade agreements with third countries.

The recent agreement with Pakistan was very damaging for the EU textile industry.

The CETA (Canada-EU Trade Agreement) does not currently provide the desirable reciprocity and will undoubtedly lead to further imbalance in the industry.

The EU has always favoured double transformation as a way to obtain preferential origin.

Canada has advocated the single transformation rule, as its supply chain is included in the North American Free Trade Agreement and a substantial proportion of the supplies are made in Asia.

The Canadian textile industry has little weight compared to that of the EU.

How does the Commission view this situation?

Given that Canada intends to qualify for an exception through this agreement, despite not being a least developed country, does it believe that it is fair and acceptable to set a precedent for future agreements that will seriously harm the already weakened EU textile industry?

What is the state of play of these negotiations and how will the EU benefit from this agreement?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

Negotiations for an EU-Canada Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) have entered their final phase. Both sides are now negotiating at all levels with the objective of finalising talks in the first quarter of 2013. A comprehensive trade agreement between the two partners could increase bilateral trade by EUR 25.7 billion.

The Commission has taken diligent note of the positions of the textiles industry which were expressed in the letter to which the Honourable Member refers. The Commission continues to aim for a balanced and reciprocal overall package on textiles. On textiles Rules of Origin, the EU and Canada are indeed discussing a very limited derogation to the general EU rule of origin as a compromise solution between the different approaches of both sides. This derogation will be based on the current level of trade in textiles between the two partners. Due to the reciprocal nature of this derogation, European producers would also be provided with significant new opportunities. It should be noted that the EU textiles industry maintains a healthy surplus in its trade with Canada. Our position is therefore rather offensive than defensive.

It is very clear that the EU-Canada CETA will not serve as a precedent for future negotiations. It is the policy of the Commission to treat each negotiation as a separate case with unique circumstances that need to be taken into account.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011483/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Casos de tosse convulsa estão a aumentar nos países da UE

Considerando que:

— Os casos de tosse convulsa, uma doença de declaração obrigatória (para a qual existe vacina gratuita em Portugal, incluída no Plano Nacional de Vacinação), está a aumentar em Portugal e em muitos outros países;

— Este ano, em Portugal, desde janeiro até ao mês passado, o registo desta doença de declaração obrigatória somava 189 casos e três mortes de lactentes;

— Portugal acompanha o padrão do resto dos países da União Europeia, onde se verifica um aumento do número de casos;

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento da evolução desta doença?

2. Como a justifica?

3. Que medidas pondera para a inverter?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(11 de fevereiro de 2013)

A Comissão está ciente do aumento dos casos de tosse convulsa (coqueluche) na UE. A epidemiologia da tosse convulsa mudou nas últimas duas décadas, sendo que o maior aumento de casos foi verificado entre adolescentes e adultos, os quais representam uma fonte importante de transmissão da tosse convulsa às crianças mais novas e vulneráveis.

O motivo desta evolução não é inteiramente claro. Porém, o aumento dos casos de tosse convulsa registados pode estar ligado a melhores métodos de diagnóstico e a uma maior consciência de que a tosse convulsa é uma doença atípica para este grupo etário. Uma outra explicação pode basear-se no facto de anteriormente se administrarem vacinas do tipo célula inteira a crianças de primeira infância, mas não às restantes crianças e a adultos, o que causou uma acumulação de indivíduos suscetíveis nestes escalões etários superiores. Além disso, a proteção contra a tosse convulsa diminui com o tempo. Estes fatores levaram vários países a implementarem estratégias que recomendam a administração de doses adicionais de vacinas a adolescentes e adultos.

O Centro Europeu de Prevenção e Controlo das Doenças desenvolveu linhas de orientação para a vacinação da difteria, do tétano e da tosse convulsa ([1]), onde recomenda a administração de doses adicionais e campanhas de atualização da vacinação dos adolescentes. O CEPCD considera ainda que poderá ser necessário vacinar os adultos contra a tosse convulsa para proteção dos lactentes, principalmente aqueles que têm menos de seis meses de idade, quando se verificarem maiores taxas de hospitalização e de mortalidade.

A Comissão continuará a apoiar os Estados-Membros através do seguimento das conclusões do Conselho sobre a imunização infantil ([2]). Em outubro de 2012, a Comissão organizou uma conferência sobre a imunização infantil ([3]) com uma grande variedade de partes interessadas para avaliar as medidas tomadas até agora.

([1]) http://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/0911_GUI_Scientific_Panel_on_Childhood_Immunisation_DTP.pdf
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2011:202:0004:0006:PT:PDF.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/vaccination/events/ev_20121016_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011483/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Cases of whooping cough are on the increase in EU countries

Cases of whooping cough, a notifiable disease (for which there is a free vaccine in Portugal, included in the National Vaccination Plan), are on the increase in Portugal and in many other countries.

In Portugal 189 cases of whooping cough were recorded and 3 infants died from the disease between January 2012 and last month.

Portugal is following the pattern of the other EU countries, where the number of cases has increased.

1. Is the Commission aware of the spread of this disease?

2. How can it be justified?

3. What action will it take to reverse it?

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

The Commission is aware of the increase of cases of whooping cough (pertussis) in the EU. The epidemiology of pertussis has changed over the past two decades, with the highest increase of cases seen among adolescents and adults who represent an important source of pertussis infection to the youngest, most vulnerable infants.

The reasons for this change are not entirely clear. However, the increase in cases of pertussis registered could be linked to better diagnostic methods and a higher awareness of pertussis as an atypical disease in this age group. A further explanation could be the previous use of whole-cell pertussis vaccine amongst young children but not amongst older children and adults, with a consequent accumulation of susceptible individuals in these older age groups. Also, the protection against pertussis following vaccination decreases over time. These factors have led several countries to implement strategies recommending booster doses of vaccination in adolescents and adults.

The European Centre for Diseases prevention and Control developed guidance on diphtheria-tetanus-pertussis vaccination ([1]) in which it recommends further booster doses and catch-up vaccination campaigns in adolescents. The ECDC also considers that pertussis vaccination might be needed also for adults for protection of the youngest infants, especially under six months of age, when the highest rates of hospitalisation and mortality occur.

The Commission will continue to support the Member States through follow-up of the Council Conclusions on childhood immunisation ([2]). In October 2012, the Commission organised a Conference on childhood immunisation ([3]) with a wide range of stakeholders, to take stock of actions taken so far.

([1]) http://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/0911_GUI_Scientific_Panel_on_Childhood_Immunisation_DTP.pdf
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2011:202:0004:0006:EN:PDF.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/vaccination/events/ev_20121016_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011484/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Coreia do Norte ameaça paz com lançamento de «rocket» para o espaço

Considerando que:

— A Coreia do Norte lançou, esta quarta-feira, dia 12 de dezembro, um «rocket» para o espaço;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Não considera o ato em causa uma ameaça à paz e segurança da região, violando as resoluções 1718 e 1874 do Conselho de Segurança da ONU, que proíbem qualquer atividade relacionada com mísseis balísticos?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(6 de março de 2013)

Em 12 de dezembro de 2012, o dia do «lançamento do satélite» da RPDC, a Alta Representante da União Europeia para os Negócios Estrangeiros e a Política de Segurança e Vice-Presidente da Comissão (AR/VP) proferiu uma declaração que abordava o tema suscitado pelo eurodeputado Melo:

«O lançamento realizado hoje pela RPDC é mais um passo numa tentativa de longa duração da parte da RPDC de se dotar de tecnologia de mísseis balísticos e, por conseguinte, constitui uma clara violação das obrigações internacionais da RPDC, em particular das Resoluções 1718 e 1874 do Conselho de Segurança das Nações Unidas.

Exorto a RPDC a cumprir, imediata, total e incondicionalmente, as suas obrigações decorrentes das resoluções pertinentes do Conselho de Segurança da ONU, do Acordo de Salvaguardas Generalizadas com a AIEA no âmbito do TNP, bem como dos seus compromissos em matéria de desnuclearização no âmbito da Declaração Conjunta de 2005 no processo das Conversações a Seis.

A UE irá ponderar uma resposta apropriada, em estreita consulta com os principais parceiros, e em consonância com as deliberações do CSNU, incluindo possíveis medidas restritivas adicionais.»

Numa declaração anterior após a RPDC ter anunciado que iria lançar o «satélite», a A/VP já tinha declarado que um tal lançamento constituiria um «ato de provocação, que ameaça a paz e a segurança na região, e que conduz a um isolamento cada vez maior da RPDC, comprometendo assim os esforços diplomáticos em curso para encontrar uma solução pacífica para a questão nuclear.»

Em 24 de janeiro de 2013, a AR/VP congratulou-se com a adoção pelo CSNU da Resolução 2087, a qual sublinha a enorme preocupação da comunidade internacional quanto às repetidas violações da Coreia do Norte das suas obrigações internacionais. A UE irá considerar, em consulta os seus principais parceiros, a tomada de medidas de apoio à Resolução 2087.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011484/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: North Korea threatens peace by launching a 'rocket' into space

On Wednesday 12 December 2012 North Korea launched a 'rocket' into space.

Does the Commission not believe that this act threatens peace and security in the region and is in breach of UN Security Council Resolutions 1718 and 1874, which ban any ballistic missile-related activity?

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

On 12 December 2012, the day of the DPRK's 'satellite launch', the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and Vice-President of the Commission (HR/VP) issued a statement which addressed the issue raised by MEP Melo:

'The launch from DPRK earlier today is another step in a long-running attempt by the DPRK to acquire ballistic missile technology and is thus a clear violation of the DPRK's international obligations, in particular under UN Security Council Resolutions 1718 and 1874.

I urge the DPRK to comply, without delay, fully and unconditionally with its obligations under relevant UN Security Council Resolutions, its IAEA Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement under the NPT, and its commitments towards denuclearization under the 2005 Joint Statement of the Six Party Talks.

The EU will consider an appropriate response, in close consultation with key partners, and in line with UNSC deliberations, including possible additional restrictive measures.'

In an earlier statement after the announcement of the DPRK that it was going to launch the 'satellite', the HR/VP had already said that such a launch would be 'a provocative act, threatening peace and security in the region, and lead to a further isolation of the DPRK, thus undermining ongoing diplomatic efforts to find a peaceful solution for the nuclear issue.'

On 24 January 2013, the HR/VP welcomed the adoption by the UNSC of Resolution 2087 which underlines the depth of international concern about North Korea's repeated violations of its international obligations. The EU will consider, in consultation with its key partners, measures to support Resolution 2087.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011485/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Criação de um banco de fomento para gestão de fundos comunitários

Considerando que:

— Foi apresentada, recentemente, em Portugal, a possibilidade de o Quadro Estratégico Comum (QEC), que integra os fundos estruturais da União Europeia para o período 2014-2020, ser gerido por um novo banco público (um banco de fomento);

— Segundos dados da Comissão Europeia, Portugal é um dos melhores países na UE em termos de desenho, absorção e implementação dos fundos comunitários, conseguindo usar 58,4 % da totalidade do quadro (21 mil milhões) quando a média europeia é de 44 %.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Como avalia a possibilidade de criação deste banco público para gestão de fundos comunitários?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(11 de fevereiro de 2013)

A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta dada à pergunta escrita E-010412/2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011485/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Creating a development bank to manage EU funds

Given that:

— The proposal to create a new public bank (development bank) to manage the Common Strategic Framework (CSF), which includes the EU Structural Funds 2014-2020, was recently tabled in Portugal;

— According to data from the Commission, Portugal is one of the EU countries which best plans for, absorbs and implements EU funds, using 58.4% of the total framework (EUR 21 billion) when the EU average is 44%.

I would ask the Commission:

How does it view the proposal to create this public bank to manage EU funds?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(11 February 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-010412/2012.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011486/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Proteção do consumidor no comércio eletrónico

Considerando que:

— A Comissão Europeia revelou, recentemente, que mais 75 % dos sítios Internet que vendem jogos, livros, vídeos e música, que podem ser descarregados para um computador ou dispositivo móvel, podem não cumprir as regras de defesa do consumidor, nomeadamente, no que respeita às regras que regulam a publicidade e as informações sobre os custos dos conteúdos digitais em causa;

— Mais de 3 em cada 4 da totalidade dos sítios Web (254 sítios) foram sinalizados para investigação posterior, 14 deles em Portugal;

Pergunto à Comissão:

De que forma está a ser processada a fiscalização para identificar casos de violação das normas europeias de defesa dos consumidores para, posteriormente, garantir a sua aplicação?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(11 de fevereiro de 2013)

À luz da legislação da UE sobre a defesa do consumidor, as autoridades nacionais comptetentes são as principais responsáveis pelos inquéritos relacionados com as atividades de empresas ativas no seu mercado interno devendo, se necessário, garantir a sua aplicação efetiva.

A fiscalização a que o Senhor Deputado se refere foi uma ação coordenada de fiscalização («Sweep» — ação de fiscalização). Numa ação de fiscalização, as autoridades nacionais competentes verificam simultaneamente, sob a coordenação da Comissão, uma amostra de sítios web para verificar a conformidade com a legislação em matéria de defesa dos consumidores. Numa segunda fase, as autoridades nacionais adotam, se for caso disso, medidas de execução.

As cinco ações de fiscalização já concluídas contribuíram para melhorar a conformidade nos setores visados (cerca de 2 200 sítios web de venda de bilhetes de avião, toques de telemóveis, produtos eletrónicos, bilhetes para eventos desportivos e culturais e crédito ao consumo). Em média, 80 % dos sítios web considerados em violação do direito dos consumidores foram corrigidos no prazo máximo de um ano após as primeiras conclusões, enquanto os restantes sítios web foram corrigidos posteriormente ([1]).

([1]) Para mais informações, consultar: http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/enforcement/sweeps_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011486/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Consumer protection in e-commerce

The Commission recently revealed that over 75% of websites selling games, books, videos and music that can be downloaded to a computer or a mobile device may not comply with consumer protection regulations, notably those governing advertising and information on the costs of the digital content in question.

More than 3 in 4 websites (254 sites in total) were flagged for further investigation, 14 of which are in Portugal.

What monitoring is taking place to identify cases in breach of EU consumer protection regulations and subsequently to ensure that such regulations are implemented?

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

National enforcement authorities are primarily responsible for investigating activities of companies active on their domestic market in the light of EU consumer legislation and, if necessary, follow-up with enforcement action.

The monitoring to which the Honourable Member is referring was a coordinated enforcement action ('sweep'). In a sweep, national enforcement authorities check simultaneously, under the coordination of the Commission, a sample of websites for compliance with consumer law. In a second phase, the national authorities take enforcement action, if appropriate.

The five sweeps completed so far have helped to improve compliance in the targeted sectors (about 2200 websites selling airline tickets, ringtones for mobile phones, electronic goods, tickets for sports and cultural events, and consumer credit). On average, 80% of the websites found to be in breach of consumer law were corrected at the latest within a year after the initial findings, while the remaining websites were corrected subsequently ([1]).

([1]) See for more details: http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/enforcement/sweeps_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011487/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Irlanda — alargamento do prazo de pagamento do empréstimo à Troika

Considerando que:

— No final de 2010, atingida pela crise financeira, a Irlanda teve de pedir assistência financeira à Troika (UE, BCE e FMI);

— O plano de resgate à Irlanda prevê mais de 85 mil milhões de euros durante 3 anos;

— Mais de 30 mil milhões de euros foram utilizados para resgatar o Irish Bank e o Irish Nationwide Building Society (INBS);

— O Governador do Banco Central da Irlanda, Patrick Honohan, afirmou, em declarações recentes, que a Irlanda precisará de um prazo mais alargado para pagamento da dívida;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Confirma a concessão de um prazo mais alargado para pagamento do empréstimo à Troika?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Como é do conhecimento do Senhor Deputado, os Chefes de Estado e de Governo da área do euro decidiram, a 21 de julho de 2011, reduzir as taxas de juro e dilatar os prazos de vencimento dos empréstimos do FEEF aos países beneficiários do programa, aplicando tratamento igual à Irlanda, a Portugal e à Grécia. O programa de assistência financeira à Irlanda sofreu alguns ajustamentos ([1]) e prossegue o debate sobre novos ajustamentos. Em fevereiro de 2013, as autoridades irlandesas tomaram medidas importantes relativamente às promissórias, prevendo-se que essas medidas contribuam para aumentar a confiança e para o êxito do programa de estabilização financeira.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2011/pdf/ocp88_en.pdf
European Economy, Occasional Papers 88.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011487/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Ireland granted more time to repay its loan to the Troika

In late 2010, having been hit by the financial crisis, Ireland sought financial assistance from the Troika (European Union, European Central Bank and International Monetary Fund).

Ireland's bailout package is worth more than EUR 85 billion over three years.

Over EUR 30 billion was used to bail out Anglo Irish Bank and the Irish Nationwide Building Society (INBS).

In a recent statement the Governor of the Central Bank of Ireland, Patrick Honohan, said that Ireland will need more time to repay the debt.

Can the Commission confirm that Ireland has been granted more time to repay its loan to the Troika?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

As you are aware, the Heads of State or Government of the Euro area decided on 21 July 2011 to lower the interest rates and extend the maturities for EFSF loans to programme countries, extending equivalent treatment to Ireland, Portugal and Greece. Some specific adjustments have been made to the financial assistance programme for Ireland ([1]). Discussions on further adjustments are ongoing. In February 2013, the Irish Authorities took major steps regarding the Promissory Notes, which should further boost confidence and help to facilitate a successful outcome as regards the financial stability programme.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2011/pdf/ocp88_en.pdf, European Economy,Occasional Papers 88.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011488/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Fraude e branqueamento de capitais em jogos em linha

Considerando que:

— O jogo em linha é uma das atividades de serviços em crescimento mais rápido na UE, abrangendo as apostas desportivas e o póquer, os jogos de casino e as lotarias, com 6,8 milhões de consumidores;

— Existem milhares de sítios de jogo em linha não regulamentados a que os consumidores estão expostos e que apresentam riscos significativos;

— O branqueamento de capitais e a fraude devem ser combatidos, o desporto deve ser salvaguardado contra a viciação de resultados relacionada com apostas e as normas nacionais devem respeitar a legislação da UE;

— Dado o seu caráter transfronteiriço, os Estados-Membros não podem aplicar eficazmente, a nível individual, os mecanismos de luta antifraude, motivo por que será necessário adotar uma abordagem que agrupe a UE, os Estados-Membros e o setor;

— Foi apresentado pela Comissão Europeia em Bruxelas, no passado mês de outubro, um plano de ação para regulamentar o jogo em linha;

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Sabendo que o jogo a dinheiro é uma área da estrita competência dos Estados-Membros, salvaguardados os devidos limites, conforme tem vindo a ser amplamente reconhecido pelo Tribunal de Justiça da União Europeia e sublinhado pelo Conselho e pelo Parlamento Europeu, como tenciona a Comissão clarificar o enquadramento jurídico do jogo em linha?

2. Está prevista a criação de um mecanismo que permita o integral cumprimento da lei vigente em cada Estado-Membro?

Resposta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão
(21 de fevereiro de 2013)

1. Acompanha a Comunicação «Para um enquadramento europeu completo do jogo em linha» ([1]) o documento de trabalho dos serviços da Comissão «*Online gambling in the Internal Market*» ([2]), que visa melhorar a clareza jurídica do quadro normativo do jogo em linha. Nesse sentido, este documento de trabalho contém uma panorâmica geral da jurisprudência do Tribunal de Justiça da União Europeia, que ajudará os Estados-Membros a compreenderem o complexo quadro legal da UE no domínio em apreço.

2. Na sua comunicação, a Comissão reconhece que a aplicação efetiva, por parte dos Estados-Membros, da respetiva legislação nacional — que tem como requisito prévio essencial o cumprimento do direito da União — é necessária para a realização dos objetivos de interesse público subjacentes às políticas nacionais em matéria de jogo. O plano de ação estabelece uma série de iniciativas destinadas a garantir a conformidade da legislação em vigor em cada Estado-Membro, esta última essencialmente uma competência nacional. Em primeiro lugar, o plano de ação indica que os Estados-Membros devem dispor de autoridades reguladoras que assegurem a aplicação e a conformidade efetivas das normas em matéria de jogo. Em segundo lugar, a Comissão promoverá o intercâmbio de informações e de melhores práticas no que diz respeito às medidas de aplicação e estudará os benefícios e possíveis limitações das medidas de aplicação reativas, como por exemplo o bloqueio de pagamentos e a desativação do acesso a sítios Web a nível da UE. A Comissão constituiu recentemente um grupo de peritos em serviços de jogo, que integra as autoridades competentes dos Estados-Membros responsáveis pela regulação destes serviços. Este grupo de peritos permitirá compartilhar experiências e boas práticas, nomeadamente ao nível das políticas de fiscalização nacionais.

([1]) COM(2012) 596 final.
([2]) SWD(2012) 345 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011488/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Fraud and money laundering in online gambling

Online gambling, including sports betting and poker, casino games and lotteries, is one of the fastest growing service activities in the EU, with 6.8 million consumers.

Consumers are exposed to thousands of unregulated gambling websites, which carry significant risks.

Money laundering and fraud must be combated, sport must be safeguarded against betting-related match-fixing and national regulations must comply with EC law.

Due to its cross-border dimension, individual Member States cannot effectively implement anti-fraud mechanisms. An approach that brings together the EU, the Member States and the industry is necessary.

In October 2012 in Brussels the Commission delivered an action plan to regulate online gambling.

1. As gambling is an area that falls within the strict competence of the Member States, safeguarding the due limits, as has been widely recognised by the Court of Justice of the European Union and underlined by the Council and Parliament, how does the Commission intend to clarify the legal framework of online gambling?

2. Will it create a mechanism to ensure full compliance of the law in force in each Member State?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(21 February 2013)

1. The communication 'Towards a comprehensive framework for online gambling' ([1]) is accompanied by a staff working paper 'Online gambling in the internal market' ([2]) which is intended to enhance legal clarity in relation to the regulatory framework on online gambling. To this end, the staff working paper contains a comprehensive overview of the case-law of the Court of Justice of the European Union that will help Member States to understand the complex EU legal framework on online gambling.

2. In the communication, the Commission recognises that effective enforcement by Member States of their national legislation — an essential prerequisite of which is compliance with EC law — is necessary for the attainment of the public interest objectives of their gambling policy. The action plan sets out a series of initiatives which are aimed at ensuring compliance of the law in force in each Member State which is primarily a national competence. First, the action plan indicates that the Member States should have regulatory authorities that ensure an effective implementation and compliance of gambling rules. Second, the Commission will enhance the exchange of information and best practices on enforcement measures and explore the benefits and possible limits of responsive enforcement measures, such as payment blocking and disabling access to websites, at EU level. The Commission has recently set up an expert group on gambling services composed of Member States' competent authorities which are responsible for regulating such services. This expert group will bring about an exchange of experiences and good practices, including on national enforcement policies.

([1]) COM(2012) 596 final.
([2]) SWD(2012) 345 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011489/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Reindustrialização da União Europeia

Considerando que:

— Desde 2008, a UE perdeu 3 milhões de empregos na indústria e a produção industrial caiu cerca de 10 por cento;

— Um grupo de cinco ministros europeus responsáveis pelas pastas da Economia e da Indústria de Portugal, Espanha, França, Itália e Alemanha considera que chegou o momento de a União Europeia inverter o ciclo de deslocalização de empresas e perda de emprego, pelo que propôs uma nova política industrial na UE durante a reunião do Conselho da Competitividade da UE, realizada em Bruxelas;

— O grupo exorta os 27 a adotarem novas políticas comuns para atrair investimento perdido nas últimas décadas para países que não pertencem à UE, relançando a competitividade da indústria como principal motor de crescimento e criação de emprego na Europa nos próximos anos;

Pergunto:

1. Como avalia a tomada de posição dos Ministros da Economia e da Indústria dos referidos países?

2. Como poderá a Europa promover o relançamento da sua indústria?

3. Quais as linhas de reforma do enquadramento aos auxílios de Estado necessárias para se garantir que as nossas empresas não fiquem numa posição de desvantagem em relação aos seus concorrentes internacionais?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(18 de fevereiro de 2013)

1. A Comissão está de acordo quanto à necessidade de reverter o ciclo de deslocação de empresas e de perda de emprego e também acredita que o restabelecimento da competitividade industrial deverá ser um motor do relançamento e de crescimento nos próximos anos. A Comissão definiu a sua estratégia na Comunicação sobre Política Industrial de outubro de 2012 ([1]). O objetivo é o de reverter a tendência de queda da indústria do seu nível atual de 15,6 % do PIB da UE para chegar aos 20 % até 2020.

2. Melhorar a nossa competitividade é crucial para a recuperação da indústria. A política industrial proposta centra-se principalmente na reversão da tendência atual através da melhoria das condições-quadro. Propõe-se em particular que esta política se centre: em investimentos na inovação, em melhores condições de mercado, num melhor acesso ao financiamento e aos mercados de capitais e numa melhoria do capital humano e das competências. O objetivo é o de fomentar a competitividade industrial.

3. O propósito do controlo dos auxílios estatais da UE é o de evitar distorções da concorrência no mercado interno. O objetivo da presente análise do quadro dos auxílios estatais da UE é o de simplificar as regras para os casos que aparentemente não suscitam problemas e proporcionar incentivos para centrar a ajuda em «boas» medidas de auxílios horizontais que melhorem a competitividade e o crescimento.

([1]) COM(2012) 582 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011489/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Reindustrialisation of the European Union

Since 2008 the EU has lost three million manufacturing jobs and industrial production has fallen by around 10%.

A group of five European economy and industry ministers from Portugal, Spain, France, Italy and Germany believe that it is time for the EU to reverse the cycle of business relocations and job losses, and proposed a new EU industrial policy during the meeting of the EU Competitiveness Council in Brussels.

The group is calling on the 27 Member States to adopt new common policies to attract investment lost in recent decades to countries outside the EU, re-establishing industrial competitiveness as the EU's main engine of growth and job creation in the coming years.

1. What is the Commission's view of the stance adopted by the economy and industry ministers from these countries?

2. How can the EU promote the recovery of its industry?

3. What reforms to the state aid framework are needed to ensure that our companies are not at a disadvantage compared with their international competitors?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

1. The Commission agrees on the need to reverse the cycle of business relocations and job losses, and that re-establishing industrial competitiveness should be a main driver of recovery and growth in the coming years. The Commission has set out its strategy in the Industrial Policy Communication from October 2012 ([1]). The goal is to reverse industry's downward trend from its current level of 15.6% of EU GDP to as much as 20% by 2020.

2. Improving our competitiveness is crucial for the recovery of industry. The proposed industrial policy focuses notably on reversing the trend by improving framework conditions. In particular it is proposed to focus on: investments in innovation, better market conditions, better access to finance and capital, improved human capital and skills. The objective is to foster industrial competitiveness.

3. The purpose of EU state aid control is to prevent distortions of competition in the internal market. The objective of the current review of the EU State aid framework is notably to simplify the rules for unproblematic cases and to provide incentives to focus aid on 'good' horizontal aid measures improving competitiveness and growth.

([1]) COM(2012)582 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011490/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Pacote de investimento social

Considerando que:

— Lieve Fransen, diretora-geral dos Assuntos Sociais, na Comissão Europeia, responsável pelo acompanhamento da Estratégia 2020, através da qual os Estados-Membros se comprometeram a criar condições para que, em dez anos, 20 milhões de europeus saíssem da pobreza, reconheceu, no passado dia 6 de dezembro, na Conferência Europeia contra a Pobreza, em Bruxelas, que o plano está a falhar;

— Foi anunciado, ainda recentemente, pelo Comissário Europeu do Emprego e dos Assuntos Sociais, László Andor, a adoção de um «pacote de investimento social» para o início de 2013;

— O pacote de investimento social terá um conjunto de orientações para modernizar o modelo social europeu, apostando na sustentabilidade dos orçamentos para políticas sociais,

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que medidas tenciona a Comissão inscrever no «pacote de investimento social»?

2. A sustentabilidade dos orçamentos para políticas sociais defendida pela Comissão implicará a possibilidade de impor sanções aos Estados que não cumpram as metas de combate à pobreza?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(1 de março de 2013)

1. O Pacote de Investimento Social ([1]) fornece orientações aos Estados-Membros para que definam políticas sociais mais eficazes e eficientes em resposta aos importantes desafios que atualmente enfrentam.

Focaliza-se nos seguintes aspetos:

— Políticas sociais simplificadas e mais bem orientadas, de modo a repor a adequação e a sustentabilidade dos sistemas de proteção social. Alguns países apresentam resultados sociais melhores do que outros, apesar de disporem de orçamentos idênticos ou inferiores, o que prova que é possível melhorar a eficácia das despesas com a política social.

— Melhoria da integração das pessoas na sociedade e no mercado de trabalho. A existência de estruturas de acolhimento de crianças e de educação a preços acessíveis, a prevenção do abandono escolar precoce, a formação e a assistência na procura de emprego, o apoio em termos de habitação e a acessibilidade dos cuidados de saúde são áreas de intervenção com forte dimensão de investimento social.

— A garantia de que os sistemas de proteção social dão resposta às necessidades das pessoas em momentos críticos das suas vidas. A prevenção e a preparação das pessoas contra os riscos diminuem a necessidade de despesas sociais mais elevadas em caso de privação.

A Comunicação dá também aos Estados-Membros orientações para usar com maior eficácia os apoios financeiros da UE, designadamente o Fundo Social Europeu, para realizar os objetivos definidos. No contexto do Semestre Europeu, a Comissão irá acompanhar de perto os desempenhos individuais dos sistemas de proteção social nacionais e formular, se necessário, recomendações específicas por país.

2. Quanto à possibilidade de impor sanções aos países que não cumprem as suas metas relativas ao combate à pobreza, importa referir que não existem níveis de pobreza definidos para cada país para sustentar a meta global da UE do combate à pobreza e à exclusão social.

([1]) Comunicação COM(2013)83 + 7 SWD (38-44) de 20/2/2013.
Recomendação da Comissão — Investir nas crianças C(2013) 778.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011490/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Social Investment Package

Considering that:

— Lieve Fransen, Director-General of Social Affairs at the European Commission, responsible for monitoring the 2020 strategy, under which Member States have undertaken to create the right conditions for 20 million Europeans to climb out of poverty in 10 years, acknowledged at the European Convention of the Platform against Poverty on 6 December last that the plan was not working;

— László Andor, Commissioner for employment, social affairs and inclusion, recently announced the adoption of a social investment package in early 2013;

— The package will contain a series of guidelines for modernising the European social model, basing its approach on the sustainability of budgets for social policies;

I should like to ask the Commission:

1. What measures does the Commission intend to take under the 'social investment package'?

2. Will the social policy budget sustainability advocated by the Commission entail the possibility of imposing sanctions on countries which do not meet the targets for combating poverty?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(1 March 2013)

1. The Social Investment Package ([1]) gives guidance to Member States on more efficient and effective social policies in response to the significant challenges they currently face.

It focuses on:

— Simplified and better targeted social policies, to provide adequate and sustainable social protection systems. Some countries have better social outcomes than others despite having similar or lower budgets, demonstrating that there is room for more efficient social policy spending.

— Improving people's integration in society and the labour market. Affordable quality childcare and education, prevention of early school leaving, training and job-search assistance, housing support and accessible healthcare are all policy areas with a strong social investment dimension.

— Ensuring that social protection systems respond to people's needs at critical moments throughout their lives. Preventing and preparing people against risks reduces the need for higher social spending once hardship has occurred.

The communication offers guidance to Member States on how best to use EU financial support, notably from the European Social Fund, to implement the outlined objectives. The Commission will closely monitor the performance of individual Member States' social protection systems through the European Semester and formulate, where necessary, Country Specific Recommendations.

2. As concerns the possibility of imposing sanctions on countries which do not meet the targets for combating poverty, it should be noted that there are no binding country specific poverty targets to underpin the overall EU target for fighting poverty and social exclusion.

([1]) Communication COM(2013)83 + 7 SWD (38-44) of 20/02/2013.
Commission Recommendation investing in children C(2013)778.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011491/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Política comum de vistos

Considerando que:

— A política comum de vistos relaciona-se diretamente com o crescimento da economia;

— A Comissão Europeia, na sua Comunicação de 7 de novembro de 2012, relativa à implementação e desenvolvimento de uma política comum de vistos para estimular o crescimento da UE, afirma a intenção de apresentar brevemente uma proposta legislativa no quadro da iniciativa Smart Borders (Fronteiras Inteligentes), de forma a facilitar a atribuição de vistos para nacionais de países terceiros.

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Sabendo que a proposta legislativa em causa se propõe assegurar fluxos mais rápidos de viajantes nas fronteiras da UE, que mecanismos adicionais serão utilizados para que as questões de segurança não sejam descuradas?

2. Implica esta iniciativa alguma regra de reciprocidade relativamente aos países terceiros abrangidos?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão
(14 de fevereiro de 2013)

A facilitação da emissão de vistos aos viajantes com documentos legítimos, como proposta na comunicação mencionada pelo Senhor Deputado, não constitui uma ameaça para a segurança da UE nem implica um aumento dos riscos de migração irregular. Esta facilitação destina-se a encurtar, facilitar e simplificar os procedimentos, mas não afeta as condições de emissão de vistos: os requerentes de vistos continuam a ter de demonstrar que preenchem as condições exigidas. Os consulados dos Estados-Membros são responsáveis pela verificação do preenchimento destas condições, por exemplo recorrendo aos documentos comprovativos apresentados pelos requerentes ou a uma entrevista pessoal. Esta prática será mantida no futuro. O Sistema de Informação sobre Vistos (VIS) prestará apoio ao trabalho assegurado pelos consulados para garantir a ausência de abusos no procedimento de apresentação de pedidos. As informações armazenadas no VIS, incluindo dados biométricos, são sistematicamente verificadas nas fronteiras externas.

Para reforçar a segurança e facilitar as viagens, a Comissão tenciona adotar, em 2013, um pacote de propostas legislativas relativas a um Sistema de Entrada/Saída (EES), a um Programa de Viajantes Registados (RTP) e às alterações correspondentes no Código das Fronteiras Schengen. O EES destina-se a permitir um cálculo exato e fiável das estadas autorizadas, bem como a identificar e controlar os viajantes de países terceiros. O RTP visa facilitar a passagem na fronteira externa da UE de viajantes frequentes de países terceiros que foram objeto de um controlo de segurança e de documentação prévios.

A reciprocidade é um elemento essencial da política de vistos. Sempre que a UE dispensa da obrigação de visto os nacionais de países terceiros, exige uma isenção de vistos recíproca para os cidadãos da UE que se deslocam a esses países terceiros. Do mesmo modo, quando facilita a emissão de vistos aos cidadãos de um país terceiro, esse país deve proporcionar pelo menos o mesmo nível de facilitação de vistos aos cidadãos da UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011491/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: A common visa policy

Whereas:

— A common visa policy is closely linked to economic growth;

— In its communication of 7 November 2012 on the implementation and development of the common visa policy to spur growth in the EU, the Commission stated its intention to present in the near future a legislative proposal as part of the Smart Borders initiative, in order to facilitate the issuing of visas to third-country nationals;

I should like to ask the Commission:.

1. Given that the legislative proposal in question proposes ensuring more rapid tourist flows at the EU's borders, what additional mechanisms will be deployed to guarantee that security issues are not overlooked?

2. Does this initiative entail any reciprocal measures for the third countries concerned?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(14 February 2013)

Visa facilitation for legitimate travellers, as proposed in the communication mentioned by the Honourable Member, will not threaten the EU's security or increase risks of irregular migration. These facilitations aim at shortening, easing and streamlining procedures, but do not affect the issuing conditions: visa applicants must still demonstrate that they fulfil these conditions. Member States' consulates are responsible for verifying this using, for example, the supporting documents submitted by applicants or a personal interview. This practice will continue in the future. The Visa Information System (VIS) will support the work of consulates to ensure that the application process is not abused. Information stored in the VIS, including biometrics, is systematically checked at the external borders.

To enhance security and facilitate travel the Commission plans to adopt in 2013 legislative proposals for a smart borders package consisting of an Entry/Exit System (EES), a Registered Traveller Programme (RTP) and related amendments to the Schengen Borders Code. The EES will aim to permit the accurate and reliable calculation of authorised stays as well as identification and verification of third-country travellers. The RTP will aim to facilitate border crossings for frequent, pre-vetted and pre-screened third-country travellers at the external border.

Reciprocity is an essential element of visa policy. When the EU waives the visa obligation for citizens of third countries, it also requests a reciprocal visa waiver for EU citizens visiting those third countries. Similarly, when visa facilitation is granted to citizens of a third country, that country must provide at least the same level of visa facilitation to EU citizens.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011492/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Bases de dados

Considerando que:

— A era digital trouxe uma avalanche de dados sem precedentes, com informação despejada por milhões de pessoas em blogues e redes sociais, a circular por servidores informáticos;

— É crucial saber onde, como e com que garantias de preservação todos estes dados são guardados;

— As bases de dados com informações classificadas, como as em segredo de Estado, são informações sensíveis;

— Alguns Estados-Membros têm decidido no sentido de entregar estas bases de dados a uma entidade privada;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Sabendo que esta situação leva ao risco de as grandes empresas, que têm capacidade financeira para construir grandes centros de dados se sobreporem aos Estados, que medidas estão inscritas na agenda da Comissão no sentido de defender uma abordagem ética na preservação da informação?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(19 de março de 2013)

A necessidade de adaptar o atual quadro jurídico em matéria de proteção dos dados, que remonta à Diretiva 95/46/CE ([1]), em consonância com a economia digital, é um dos principais motivos que levou a Comissão a apresentar a proposta de 25 de janeiro de 2012 de um quadro jurídico forte e uniforme que ofereça segurança jurídica em matéria de proteção de dados ([2]).

A proposta aborda as questões levantadas pelo Senhor Deputado relativas à proteção de dados pessoais. Clarifica a importante questão do direito aplicável, assegurando a aplicação direta e uniforme de um conjunto único de regras nos 27 Estados-Membros. Será vantajoso para as empresas e os cidadãos, já que cria condições equitativas de concorrência e reduz os encargos administrativos e os custos de conformidade para as empresas em toda a Europa, ao mesmo tempo que garante um elevado nível de proteção dos cidadãos e lhes proporciona um maior controlo sobre os seus dados. Uma maior transparência do tratamento de dados contribuirá igualmente para aumentar a confiança dos consumidores e explorar todas as potencialidades do mercado digital. A proposta facilita a transferência de dados pessoais para países fora da UE e do EEE e, ao mesmo tempo, assegura a continuidade da proteção das pessoas em causa.

O novo quadro jurídico proporcionará as condições necessárias para a adoção de códigos de conduta e normas aplicáveis à nuvem, caso as partes interessadas considerem necessários regimes de certificação que permitam verificar se o fornecedor aplicou as normas de segurança informática e as salvaguardas adequadas nas transferências de dados.

Estas questões sublinham a importância da proposta de regulamento em matéria de proteção de dados.

([1]) Diretiva 95/46/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa à proteção das pessoas singulares no que diz respeito ao tratamento de dados pessoais e à livre circulação desses dados.

([2]) Proposta de Regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativo à proteção das pessoas singulares no que diz respeito ao tratamento de dados pessoais e à livre circulação desses dados (regulamento geral sobre a proteção de dados) [COM(2012) 11 final]; Proposta de diretiva do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa à proteção das pessoas singulares no que diz respeito ao tratamento de dados pessoais pelas autoridades competentes para efeitos de prevenção, investigação, deteção e de repressão de infrações penais ou de execução de sanções penais, e à livre circulação desses dados [COM(2012) 10 final].

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011492/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Databases

Whereas:

— The digital age has brought with it an unprecedented deluge of data, with information produced by millions of people on blogs and social networks and then distributed through computer servers;

— It is crucial to know where, how and with what guarantees for preservation all of these data are stored;

— Databases containing classified information, such as State secrets, hold sensitive information;

— Some Member States have decided to hand over the management of these databases to private-sector companies;

I should like to ask the Commission:

Given that this situation runs the risk of large corporations — which have the financial power to set up huge data centres — encroaching on the role of States, what measures does the Commission plan in order to defend an ethical approach to holding information?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(19 March 2013)

The need to bring the current data protection legal framework, dating back to Directive 95/46/EC ([1]), in line with the digital economy, is one of the main motivations for the Commission to present the proposal of 25 January 2012 for a strong and uniform legal framework providing legal certainty on data protection ([2]).

The proposed regulation addresses the issues raised by the Honourably Member as regards the protection of personal data. It clarifies the important question of applicable law, by ensuring that a single set of rules would apply directly and uniformly across all 27 Member States. It will be good for business and citizens by ensuring a level playing field and by reducing administrative burden and compliance costs throughout Europe for businesses, while ensuring a high level of protection for individuals and giving them more control over their data. Increased transparency of data processing will also help increase consumer trust and untap the potential of the digital market further. The proposal facilitates transfers of personal data to countries outside the EU and EEA while ensuring the continuity of protection of the concerned individuals.

The new legal framework will provide for the necessary conditions for the adoption of codes of conduct and standards, also for cloud computing, where stakeholders see a need for certification schemes that verify that the provider has implemented the appropriate IT security standards and safeguards for data transfers.

These issues underline the importance of the proposed Data Protection Regulation.

([1]) Directive 95/46/EC, Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data.

([2]) COM(2012) 11 final, Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data (General Data Protection Regulation); COM(2012) 10 final, Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by competent authorities for the purposes of prevention, investigation, detection or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties, and the free movement of such data.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011493/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Melhoria das condições de financiamento para Portugal no âmbito do apoio da Troika

Portugal e Grécia são apoiados no âmbito da Troika pelo FMI, pelo Mecanismo de Estabilização Financeira e pelo Fundo de Estabilização Financeira.

Na Grécia, esse fundo de estabilidade beneficiou de um alongamento das maturidades dos empréstimos, e de um diferimento do pagamento de juros.

O fundo de estabilidade representa cerca de um terço do valor do resgate a Portugal.

Assim pergunto à Comissão:

É possível que Portugal, à semelhança da Grécia, beneficie de um alargamento do prazo e de diferimento dos juros, na componente do resgate correspondente ao fundo de estabilização financeira, que representa cerca de um terço do valor do resgate disponibilizado a Portugal?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(13 de fevereiro de 2013)

O Governo português solicitou recentemente aos seus parceiros europeus uma prorrogação dos prazos de vencimento dos empréstimos concedidos pelo Fundo Europeu de Estabilização Financeira (FEEF) e o Mecanismo Europeu de Estabilização Financeira, no âmbito do programa de ajustamento económico para Portugal. O pedido foi acolhido positivamente pelo Conselho Ecofin e a Comissão Europeia está atualmente a avaliar as opções pertinentes do ponto de vista da viabilidade jurídica e operacional.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011493/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Improved financing conditions for Portugal under the terms of support from the Troika

Portugal and Greece are supported under the Troika by the IMF, the Financial Stabilisation Mechanism and the Financial Stabilisation Fund.

In Greece, this stability fund has been granted an extension of loan maturities and a deferral of interest payments.

The stability fund represents about one third of the value of the Portugal bailout.

I therefore ask the Commission:

Is it possible for Portugal, like Greece, to be granted a deadline extension and deferral of interest payments on the bailout component corresponding to the financial stabilisation fund, which represents about one third of the value of the bailout offered to Portugal?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(13 February 2013)

The Portuguese Government has recently asked its European partners for an extensions of the maturities of the loans provided by the European Finacial Stabilisation Fund (EFSF) and the European Financial Support Mechanism under the Economic Adjustment Programme for Portugal. The request has been positively received by the Ecofin Council and the European Commission is currently assessing the available options from the perspective of the legal and operational feasibility.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011494/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Perspetiva negativa da Moody's para o Banco Europeu de Investimento e o Banco de Desenvolvimento do Conselho da Europa

A agência de rating Moody's colocou em perspetiva negativa o Banco Europeu de Investimento e o Banco de Desenvolvimento do Conselho da Europa que mantiveram, no entanto, a nota mais alta AAA

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento desta intenção da Moody's?

Que motivos poderão levar a Moody's a baixar o rating do Banco Europeu de Investimento e do Banco de Desenvolvimento do Conselho da Europa?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(14 de fevereiro de 2013)

A Comissão informa o Senhor Deputado que as perspetivas da Moody's relativamente à notação do Banco Europeu de Investimento e do Banco de Desenvolvimento do Conselho da Europa foram publicadas num comunicado de imprensa em 8 de dezembro de 2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-changes-outlook-on-Aaa-ratings-of-EIB-and-CEB--PR_261636.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011494/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Moody's negative outlook for the European Investment Bank and the Council of Europe Development Bank

The Moody's rating agency has issued a negative outlook for the European Investment Bank and the Council of Europe Development Bank which have, however, both retained their maximum AAA rating.

Is the Commission aware of Moody's intentions?

What reasons might Moody's have for downgrading its rating of the European Investment Bank and the Council of Europe Development Bank?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(14 February 2013)

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that the views of Moody's in relation to the rating of the European Investment Bank and the Council of Europe Development Bank have been published in a press release on 8 December 2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-changes-outlook-on-Aaa-ratings-of-EIB-and-CEB--PR_261636

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011495/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Grandes diferenças nas «yields» das obrigações na zona euro

A fragmentação da zona euro é gritante: França e Alemanha conseguem descer substancialmente os custos de financiamento da sua dívida soberana, inclusive no caso dos prazos mais curtos das obrigações alemãs (Bunds), os investidores aceitam «yields» negativas, enquanto Espanha, Itália e Irlanda veem as «yields» das suas obrigações aumentar e o risco de incumprimento da sua dívida subir.

O alargamento deste fosso ocorreu na própria semana em que Mário Draghi, presidente do Banco Central Europeu, declarou que tem observado nos últimos meses uma melhoria na «confiança dos mercados», sobretudo depois do anúncio do programa do banco central para uma eventual compra de dívida no mercado secundário conhecido pela sigla OMT.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

O que pode estar a contribuir para que esta fragmentação se mantenha?

O que está a falhar nos vários mecanismos para a resolução dos problemas da dívida soberana, para se continuar a verificar tais diferenças?

Que sinal tem que ser dado aos investidores para inverter esta tendência?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(2 de abril de 2013)

A Comissão partilha a opinião do Senhor Deputado segundo a qual a fragmentação dos mercados financeiros da área do euro é fonte de preocupação. No entanto, diversos indicadores — como, por exemplo, o decréscimo dos *yields* nos Estados-Membros vulneráveis, tanto para as emissões feitas por empresas como para a dívida soberana, o aumento na emissão de obrigações pelo setor privado, a diminuição dos *spreads* nos *swaps* de risco de incumprimento, o maior afluxo de capital para a área do euro e o aumento dos depósitos nos sistemas bancários de alguns dos Estados-Membros mais afetados pela crise — têm vindo a melhorar ao longo dos últimos meses e poderão contribuir para diminuir essa fragmentação. A melhoria deve-se a uma série de fatores, nomeadamente o anúncio pelo Banco Central Europeu das OMT (Transações Monetárias Definitivas), o pagamento efetuado ao abrigo do segundo programa de ajustamento económico para a Grécia e o acordo dos líderes da UE sobre uma União Bancária, a par com a execução do processo de consolidação orçamental e de reformas estruturais nos Estados-Membros.

Existe um forte empenho na prossecução da consolidação orçamental e das reformas estruturais na área do euro, bem como de uma genuína União Económica e Monetária, a fim de que o reforço da confiança dos investidores permita que a recente melhoria dos mercados financeiros se torne mais duradoura e, em última análise, mais favorável à economia real. O acordo político entre os colegisladores sobre o primeiro pilar da União Bancária, o Mecanismo Único de Supervisão (MUS), constitui uma etapa importante. O MUS estará plenamente em vigor a partir de meados de 2014. Constitui uma condição prévia para a eventual recapitalização direta dos bancos pelo MEE. Além disso, a Comissão já começou a trabalhar com vista ao lançamento da próxima fase fundamental da União Bancária, um Mecanismo Único de Resolução (MER) destinado às entidades bancárias, e apresentará uma proposta legislativa antes do verão.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011495/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Significant yield differences in eurozone bonds

The fragmentation of the eurozone is stark: France and Germany have been able to lower the cost of financing their sovereign debt substantially and even where the shorter maturities of German bonds (Bunds) are concerned, investors accept negative yields, while Spain, Italy and Ireland are seeing the yield of their bonds increase and the risk of defaulting on their debt rise.

This gap has widened in the very week in which Mario Draghi, President of the European Central Bank, stated that he has seen an improvement in 'market confidence' in recent months, especially since the announcement of the ECB's programme for the possible purchase of secondary market debt, known as Outright Monetary Transactions (OMT).

What could be helping to keep this fragmentation in place?

Where are the various mechanisms designed to solve sovereign debt-related problems going so badly wrong that these disparities remain?

What message should be sent to investors in order to reverse this trend?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's view that fragmentation of the euro-area financial markets is a source of concern. However, a number of indicators improved over the past few months and might help to decrease fragmentation, e.g. a decrease in corporate and sovereign yields in vulnerable Member States (MS), an increase in private sector bond issuance, lower credit default swap spreads, higher capital inflows into the euro area and increasing deposits in the banking systems of some MS most affected by the crisis. This improvement has been due to a range of factors, including the European Central Bank's announcement of the OMTs, the disbursement under the second economic adjustment programme for Greece and the EU leaders' agreement on a Banking Union, which have gone hand in hand with the implementation of fiscal consolidation and structural reforms in MS.

There is a strong commitment to continue with fiscal consolidation and structural reforms within the euro area, as well as to advancing with building the genuine Economic and Monetary Union so that reinforced investor confidence allows the recent improvement in financial markets to become more long-lasting and ultimately being more supportive to the real economy. The political agreement of the co-legislators on the first pillar of the Banking Union, the Single Supervisory Mechanism (SSM), is an important step. The SSM will be fully in place mid-2014. It is a precondition for a possible direct recapitalisation of banks by the ESM. Moreover, the Commission has started working on the next critical part of the Banking Union, a Single Resolution Mechanism (SRM) to resolve banks, and will present a legislative proposal before the summer.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011496/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Crescimento das exportações em Portugal

As exportações em Portugal têm sido um dos principais fatores para que a economia não registe uma recessão ainda maior. Apesar de ter exportado 35,5 % do PIB em 2011, um *record*, a média da UE é de 42 %, sendo que países com a dimensão de Portugal exportam cerca de 60 % a 80 % do seu PIB.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

A que tipo de mecanismos pode Portugal recorrer junto dos seus parceiros da UE, para incrementar os valores da exportações portuguesas, e ao mesmo tempo ajudar Portugal a sair da recessão económica?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(11 de fevereiro de 2013)

Não obstante os bons resultados registados a nível das exportações desde 2010, que, segundo as últimas previsões da Comissão, deverão manter-se nos próximos anos, a parte que as exportações representam no PIB é ainda relativamente baixa em Portugal comparativamente a países de dimensão idêntica.

No contexto do Programa de Ajustamento Económico, as autoridades portuguesas procuram reequilibrar a economia no sentido do setor dos bens transacionáveis, o que exige um aumento permanente da competitividade externa e a reafetação dos recursos (trabalho, capital e financiamento) ao setor dos bens transacionáveis. As autoridades portuguesas podem agir a vários níveis. Para informações mais pormenorizadas, consultar o memorando de entendimento.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011496/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Rise in Portugal's exports

Exports have been one of the main factors preventing Portugal's economy from sinking even further into recession. Although its exports in 2011 totalled a record 35.5% of GDP, the EU average is 42%, with exports from countries of a similar size to Portugal accounting for between 60% and 80% of their GDP.

What type of mechanism could Portugal use together with its EU partners to increase its exports, and which would also help the country to climb out of economic recession?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(11 February 2013)

Notwithstanding the good export performance since 2010, which, according to the latest Commission forecast, is set to be maintained in the coming years, the share of exports in GDP is still relatively small in Portugal compared to countries of a similar size.

In the context of the Economic Adjustment Programme, the Portuguese authorities endeavour a rebalancing of the economy towards the tradables sector. This requires permanent gains in external competitiveness and a reallocation of resources (labour, capital and financing) to the tradables sector. The Portuguese authorities can act on several levels. Further details can be found in the memorandum of understanding.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011497/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Investimento em Portugal ao nível da década de 80

Segundo dados da Comissão, o investimento em Portugal está ao nível do verificado em meados da década de 80. Se o investimento se tivesse mantido estável em relação ao realizado em 2008, o seu efeito no PIB em 2013 representaria cerca de 40 mil milhões de euros.

É evidente que sem investimento não há crescimento.

E para que o programa de ajuda financeira seja bem-sucedido em Portugal, é fundamental crescimento, o que supostamente deveria ocorrer a partir de 2014.

Assim pergunto à Comissão:

Que pode ser feito ao nível da UE, para ajudar a que os níveis de investimento privado, em Portugal, voltem a crescer para valores que signifiquem crescimento económico e criação de emprego?

Não considera a Comissão que, tendo Portugal vindo a aplicar exemplarmente o acordado no memorando de entendimento subscrito com a Troika, novas decisões devem agora ser ponderadas, para que o pretendido crescimento possa ocorrer?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(21 de fevereiro de 2013)

Portugal registou um declínio da atividade de investimento ao longo de uma década. Com um nível estimado em 16 % em 2012, a parte do investimento fixo no PIB situa-se atualmente abaixo da média da zona euro. A Comissão prevê o atrofiamento deste declínio no final do ano, em consequência da retoma dos investimentos no setor das exportações, onde as empresas começam a deparar-se com limitações em termos de capacidades.

Uma condição prévia para o aceleramento dos investimentos é a existência de condições menos restritivas de concessão de empréstimos pelos bancos. Neste contexto, o programa de ajustamento económico para Portugal prevê uma série de iniciativas que visam facilitar as condições de concessão de empréstimos, especialmente no caso das pequenas e médias empresas (PME).

A nível da UE, Portugal é apoiado pela reorientação dos fundos estruturais para setores com elevado potencial de crescimento. Assim, no âmbito da recente reprogramação dos fundos estruturais, foram adotadas certas medidas a fim de incentivar a criação de postos de trabalho e melhorar as condições de financiamento das PME. Em especial, houve um reforço substancial do programa operacional de competitividade com um montante de 450 milhões de euros, a adicionar aos instrumentos existentes que visam facilitar o acesso das PME ao financiamento. Foram igualmente atribuídos fundos suplementares para os programas destinados a promover a investigação e o desenvolvimento, assim como a valorização do capital humano.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011497/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Investment in Portugal at 1980s levels

According to Commission figures, investment in Portugal is now at the level it was in the mid-1980s. If investment had remained stable at the 2008 level, its contribution to GDP in 2013 would be around EUR 40 000 million.

Clearly, without investment there is no growth.

And for the financial assistance programme to succeed properly in Portugal, growth — which is supposed to take place as of 2014 — is vital.

Thus:

Can the Commission state what can be done at EU level to help private investment in Portugal return to levels that support economic growth and job creation?

Does the Commission not believe that, since Portugal has been exemplary in implementing the agreement set out in the memorandum of understanding signed with the Troika , new decisions now have to be weighed up so that the sought-after growth can take place?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(21 February 2013)

Portugal has suffered a decade-long decline in investment activity and, at an estimated 16% in 2012, the share of fixed investment in GDP has now fallen below the euro area average. The Commission expects this decline to bottom out towards the end of this year as a result of investment picking up in the export sector where companies are start hitting at capacity constraints.

A pre-condition for investment to gather pace is that lending conditions applied by banks become less restrictive. Against this background, the Economic Adjustment Programme for Portugal envisages a number of initiatives aimed at easing lending conditions, especially for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).

On the EU-level Portugal is being helped by the re-channelling of structural funds towards sectors with a high growth potential. For instance, a number of measures have been adopted in the recent reprogramming of the Structural Funds so as to encourage job creation and alleviate financing conditions for SMEs. In particular, the Operational Programme for Competitiveness has been significantly reinforced with an amount of EUR 450 million on top of the existing instruments with a view to easing access to finance for SMEs. Additional funds have also been allocated to the programmes aimed at promoting Research and Development and upgrading Human Capital.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011498/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Evasão fiscal na UE, multinacionais tecnológicas

Segundo cálculos da Comissão Europeia, as empresas tecnológicas como Google, Apple, Facebook, Amazon, entre outras, provocam uma evasão fiscal que pode chegar a um bilião de euros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

Como justifica os mencionados valores?

De que forma se efetiva a referida evasão fiscal?

Que medidas foram decididas pela Comissão para a evitar?

Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão
(19 de fevereiro de 2013)

Quando apresentou a sua comunicação relativa a um plano de ação para reforçar a luta contra a fraude e a evasão fiscais (COM(2012) 722 final), a Comissão referiu que se perdem um bilião de euros todos os anos na UE devido a fraude e evasão fiscais. Este número é estimado a partir de um estudo recente ([1]). Corresponde a perdas de receitas resultantes de todas as formas de fraude e evasão fiscais na UE e inclui todos os impostos, não apenas os impostos sobre o rendimento e certamente não apenas os relacionados com empresas em nome individual ou tecnológicas. Estas perdas não podem ser justificadas e estão muitas vezes associadas a distorções no mercado interno. Assim, a Comissão apresentou o plano de ação já mencionado que inclui 34 medidas a muito curto, médio e a longo prazo. Para uma análise mais completa dos tipos de fraude e de evasão fiscal, o Senhor Deputado pode consultar a comunicação já mencionada, a avaliação de impacto que a acompanha (SWD(2012) 403 final) e a sua síntese (SWD(2012) 404 final). As duas recomendações relativas ao planeamento fiscal agressivo (C(2012) 8806 final) e as medidas destinadas a encorajar os países terceiros a aplicar normas mínimas de boa governação em questões fiscais (C(2012) 8805 final) representam passos importantes para combater o planeamento fiscal agressivo e a evasão fiscal no domínio dos impostos sobre as sociedades. A Comissão acredita que a implementação destas recomendações permitiria aos Estados-Membros enfrentarem melhor as questões abordadas.

([1]) «Closing the European Tax Gap, A report for Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists & Democrats in the European Parliament», de Richard Murphy (http://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/gpes/media3/documents/3842_EN_richard_murphy_eu_tax_gap_en_120229.pdf).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011498/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Tax avoidance in the EU, technology multinationals

According to European Commission calculations, technology firms such as Google, Apple, Facebook, Amazon, *inter alia*, are avoiding at levels which could amount to as much as EUR 1 billion.

I would therefore put the following question to the Commission:

How can these amounts be justified?

In what way is this tax avoidance being carried out?

What measures have been decided on by the Commission to prevent this?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(19 February 2013)

When presenting its communication on an Action Plan to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion (COM(2012) 722 final), the Commission mentioned that one trillion Euro is lost due to tax evasion and avoidance every year in the EU. This is an estimated figure from a recent study ([1]). It refers to revenue lost from all forms of tax fraud and evasion in the EU including all taxes, not just corporate income tax and certainly not relating only to individual or technology firms. Such losses cannot be justified, and they frequently go with distortions in the internal market. Therefore, the Commission presented the abovementioned Action Plan which includes 34 actions for the immediate, short term, medium term and long term. For a fuller analysis of the types of fraud and evasion the Honourable Member is referred to the said Communication, the accompanying Impact Assessment (SWD (2012) 403 final) and its Executive Summary (SWD(2012) 404 final). The two Recommendations on Aggressive tax planning (C(2012) 8806 final) and measures intended to encourage third countries to apply minimum standards of good governance in tax matters (C(2012) 8805 final) represent important steps to address aggressive tax planning and tax evasion in the area of company taxes. The Commission believes that the implementation of these Recommendations would enable Member States to better tackle the issues described.

([1]) Closing the European Tax Gap, A report for Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists & Democrats in the European Parliament, by Richard Murphy (http://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/gpes/media3/documents/3842_EN_richard_murphy_eu_tax_gap_en_120229.pdf).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011499/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Desemprego em Portugal em outubro de 2012

A taxa de desemprego em Portugal subiu para 16,3 % em outubro de 2012 (16,2 % no mês anterior) de acordo com os dados do Eurostat divulgados.

É de salientar que aparentemente existiu uma revisão da taxa de desemprego para os meses anteriores, pois até agora a taxa de desemprego (de acordo com o próprio Eurostat e também OCDE) ainda não havia sequer atingido em Portugal os 16 %. E de acordo com estes novos valores divulgados pelo Eurostat, a taxa de desemprego atingiu os 16 % logo em julho.

Por sua vez, também a taxa de desemprego jovem subiu para 39,1 % em outubro (39 % em setembro).

Estes valores são obviamente trágicos, revelando o efeito perverso do excesso de austeridade, quando não existem medidas compensatórias pelo lado do crescimento económico.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

Como avaliou os novos valores para o desemprego em Portugal?

Considera que a execução de quaisquer planos de assistência financeira é compatível com taxas de desemprego desta dimensão?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(27 de fevereiro de 2013)

A Comissão concorda com o Senhor Deputado em relação ao facto de o desemprego ter atingido valores muito preocupantes em Portugal. A taxa de desemprego tem aumentado e atingiu os 16,6 % no terceiro trimestre de 2012, o que demonstra uma degradação do mercado de trabalho em consequência da desaceleração da economia.

Foram adotadas várias medidas para reformar o mercado de trabalho, em conformidade com Programa de Ajustamento Económico para Portugal, com o objetivo de melhorar o funcionamento do mercado de trabalho e de promover o emprego. Além disso, o Governo português deu início a uma reforma dos serviços públicos de emprego com vista a aumentar a sua eficácia e adotou várias políticas ativas no mercado de trabalho que têm como objetivo apoiar a criação de emprego, reforçar a ativação e aumentar a oferta de oportunidades de formação eficazes.

Foi ainda aprovada uma reprogramação dos fundos estruturais, no final de 2012 com o objetivo de atenuar os efeitos adversos do atual processo de ajustamento da economia portuguesa. Entre os seus principais objetivos contam-se o combate ao desemprego jovem e facilitação das condições de financiamento às pequenas e médias empresas. O programa Impulso Jovem, que é um dos alicerces deste processo de reprogramação e que tem um valor de 344 milhões de euros, tem como objetivo chegar a 90 000 jovens desempregados através de estágios, programas de formação, incentivos ao empreendedorismo e reduções orientadas das contribuições sociais das PME.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011499/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Unemployment in Portugal in October 2012

The unemployment rate in Portugal rose to 16.3% in October 2012 (from 16.2% the previous month), according to the figures published by Eurostat.

It should be pointed out that the unemployment rate for the previous months was apparently revised, as at that point (according to Eurostat itself and the OECD as well) it had not even reached 16% in Portugal yet. According to the new figures published by Eurostat, the unemployment rate reached 16% as early as July.

The youth unemployment rate rose to 39.1% in October (39% in September).

These figures are clearly terrible, revealing the harmful effect of excessive austerity which is not offset by economic growth measures.

What is the Commission's assessment of the new unemployment figures for Portugal?

Does it believe that implementing any financial assistance plans is compatible with unemployment rates of this scale?

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

The Commission agrees with the Honourable Member that unemployment has reached very worrying levels in Portugal. The unemployment rate has been rising, having reached 16.6% in the third quarter of 2012, showing a deterioration of the labour market resulting from the economic downturn.

Several measures have been adopted to reform the labour market in line with the Economic Adjustment Programme for Portugal with the aim of improving labour market functioning and fostering employment. Additionally, the Portuguese Government started a reform of Public Employment Services with a view to increasing its efficiency and has adopted a number of Active Labour Market Policies aimed at supporting employment creation, strengthening activation and offering more effective training opportunities.

Moreover, a recent reprogramming of the Structural Funds was approved at the end of 2012 with the aim of alleviating the adverse effects of the ongoing adjustment process in the Portuguese economy. Its main goals are to tackle youth unemployment and alleviate the financing conditions for small and medium-sized enterprises. The programme Impulso Jovem, which is one of the cornerstones of this reprogramming exercise, amounting to EUR 344 million, aims to reach 90 000 young unemployed through traineeships, training programmes, incentives for entrepreneurship and targeted reductions of social contributions to SMEs.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011500/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Recessão em quase um terço dos países da UE

O Eurostat divulgou um boletim com a evolução do PIB nos mais diversos Estados-Membros.

Tendo em conta os países para os quais existem dados comparáveis, Portugal foi, no 3.° trimestre, o 2.° país da União que mais contraiu comparativamente com o trimestre anterior (atrás da Holanda), e o 2.° país que mais contraiu comparativamente com o mesmo trimestre do ano anterior (atrás da Grécia).

De acordo com os dados do Eurostat, podemos destacar vários países já em recessão na UE:

República Checa;

Espanha;

Itália;

Chipre;

Hungria;

Portugal;

Eslovénia;

Finlândia;

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento deste boletim do Eurostat?

Não considera que esta tendência, mesmo tendo em conta o objetivo de diferentes planos de assistência financeira, pode fazer perigar o projeto europeu?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

As contas anuais e trimestrais dos Estados-Membros compiladas pelo Eurostat são uma importante fonte de informação económica. A queda do PIB da área do euro no terceiro trimestre de 2012 constava, em grande parte, das previsões efetuadas pela Comissão no outono de 2012. O crescimento negativo do PIB em diversos países implicou um decréscimo do PIB no conjunto da área do euro.

Todavia, surgiram recentemente alguns indícios de estabilização. As tensões existentes nos mercados financeiros da área do euro atenuaram-se bastante desde o verão passado, tendo-se verificado nos últimos três meses um aumento dos indicadores de confiança das empresas e dos consumidores. São visíveis os progressos conseguidos na correção dos grandes desequilíbrios das contas externas. Prevê-se que, nos países deficitários, as contas correntes continuem a melhorar, à medida que o ajustamento for sendo complementado pela recuperação crescente da competitividade e pela transferência de recursos para a produção de bens e serviços transacionáveis. Espera-se igualmente um contributo crescente dos países excedentários para o processo de reajustamento.

Já foram adotadas muitas reformas estruturais ambiciosas, prevendo-se que os efeitos benéficos dessas medidas se vão notando gradualmente. Continua a ser importante proceder a este ajustamento, reforçando simultaneamente as bases para a criação de emprego e para um crescimento sustentável.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011500/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Recession in nearly a third of EU countries

Eurostat has issued a bulletin detailing GDP trends in a range of Member States.

Looking at the countries for which comparable data are available, Portugal was, in the third quarter, the country experiencing the second greatest fall compared with the previous quarter (after the Netherlands), and the country experiencing the second greatest fall compared with the previous year (after Greece).

According to the Eurostat data, several EU States are already clearly in recession:

— Czech Republic;

— Spain;

— Italy;

— Cyprus;

— Hungary;

— Portugal;

— Slovenia;

— Finland.

Is the Commission aware of this Eurostat bulletin?

Does it not consider that, even bearing in mind the aim of there being different levels of financial assistance, this trend could jeopardise the European project?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

The annual and quarterly national accounts of Member States compiled by Eurostat are a major source of economic information. The fall of euro area GDP in the third quarter of 2012 was largely anticipated in the Commission autumn 2012 forecast. GDP growth was negative in a number of countries, implying a GDP decline in the euro area as a whole.

However, some signals of stabilisation have appeared recently. The tensions on euro-area financial markets have eased considerably since last summer, and business and consumer confidence indicators in the last three months have increased. There is visible progress in the adjustment of large external imbalances. Current accounts in deficit countries are expected to narrow further as adjustment is increasingly supported by a recovery of competitiveness and shifts of resources towards the production of tradable goods and services. The contribution to the adjustment of surplus countries is also expected to grow over time.

Many ambitious structural reforms have already been adopted, with the beneficial effects expected to gradually become visible over time. It remains important to facilitate this adjustment while at the same time strengthening the foundations of sustainable growth and job creation.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011501/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Pobreza em Portugal

O Eurostat revela que Portugal é, neste momento, o terceiro país da zona euro com o maior percentual de pessoas pobres. No ano passado, quase 2,6 milhões de portugueses viviam em risco de pobreza ou exclusão social, um quarto da população. O número tem vindo a diminuir em relação a 2010 (25,3 %) e 2008 (26 %). Nos últimos três anos, esse indicador apresentou uma queda de 1,6 %. Portugal é o terceiro país na zona do euro onde o indicador é pior, depois da Espanha (21,8 %) e Grécia (21,4 %). Em 2011, o indicador de Portugal foi de cerca de 18 %.

Assim pergunto à Comissão:

Não considera que assimetrias tão evidentes justificam maior esforço corretivo na implementação de políticas de coesão?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(27 de fevereiro de 2013)

A Comissão com partilha das preocupações do Senhor Deputado. O facto de um em cada quatro cidadãos viver em risco de pobreza ou exclusão social é um sinal claro de que devem ser desenvolvidos mais esforços para melhorar a situação.

A Comissão tem vindo a apoiar Portugal como país do programa, através do aceleramento da concessão de fundos da UE, do aumento das taxas de cofinanciamento e da reprogramação do Quadro Estratégico de Referência Nacional (QREN), que fornece fundos adicionais para combater a pobreza. Os serviços da Comissão também estão a cooperar estreitamente com as autoridades portuguesas, encorajando-as a usar da melhor forma os recursos existentes nos atuais programas para combater o desemprego jovem, o abandono escolar precoce e outras medidas para combater a pobreza.

Tendo em vista o futuro, a Comissão propôs novas regras para os fundos estruturais e para o FSE para o próximo período de programação 2014-2020. Estas propostas, que estão atualmente a ser negociadas, incluem uma forte dimensão social uma vez que propõem que um mínimo de 20 % do FSE seja atribuído a medidas de inclusão social. Além destas propostas, a Comissão propôs a criação de um programa para as pessoas mais carenciadas com uma dotação global de 2 500 mil milhões de euros. A Comissão apresentou a Portugal, em janeiro de 2013, a sua posição em relação ao uso de fundos estruturais em 2014-2020. O FSE deve concentrar-se no combate ao desemprego, em particular entre a juventude, assim como em melhorar a qualidade da educação e da formação e na integração de pessoas em risco de pobreza e as que se encontram em situação de exclusão social.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011501/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Poverty in Portugal

According to Eurostat, Portugal currently has the third highest percentage of people living in poverty of any country in the eurozone. Last year, almost 2.6 million Portuguese citizens, or a quarter of the population, were at risk of poverty or social exclusion. The indicator has fallen compared to 2010 (25.3%) and 2008 (26%). In the last three years, it has fallen by 1.6%. Portugal has the third worst indicator in the eurozone, after Spain (21.8%) and Greece (21.4%). In 2011, Portugal's indicator was around 18%.

Does the Commission not consider that such glaring disparities constitute grounds for greater efforts to correct cohesion policy implementation?

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

The Commission shares the concerns of the Honourable Member. One in four citizens living at risk of poverty or social exclusion is definitely a signal that more efforts must be undertaken to improve the situation.

The Commission has been supporting Portugal as a programme-country, by speeding up the release of EU funding, increasing co-financing rates and approving a reprogramming of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) that provides additional funds for the fight against poverty. The Commission Services are also cooperating closely with Portugal's authorities encouraging them to use the existing resources in the current programmes to the best use to fight against youth unemployment, early school leaving and other measures to combat poverty.

In view of the future, the Commission proposed last year new rules for Structural Funds and the ESF over the next programming period 2014-2020. These proposals, which are currently under negotiation, include a strong social dimension proposing a minimum share of 20% of the ESF to be dedicated to social inclusion actions. Further to these proposals the Commission also proposed the creation of a programme for the most deprived people with an overall allocation of EUR 2.5 billion. The Commission presented in January 2013 to Portugal its position on the use of structural funds in 2014-2020. The ESF should concentrate on the fight against unemployment, in particular among the young, along with improving the quality of education and training and the integration of people at risk of poverty and socially excluded.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011502/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Estagnação económica na Alemanha

O Bundesbank, banco central alemão, divulgou as suas previsões de evolução do Produto Interno Bruto (PIB) da economia alemã, apontando para um crescimento de 0,7 % este ano e ainda menor, de 0,4 %, para o próximo ano.

As previsões anteriores do Bundesbank apontavam para 1 % em 2012 e 1,6 % em 2013.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

Considera que previsões tão dececionantes, num país que se tem revelado um verdadeiro «motor» europeu, possam traduzir um dano colateral de políticas de austeridade implementadas noutros países, com reflexos negativos no mercado único?

Considera que tais previsões deveriam suscitar a possibilidade de se reponderarem os planos definidos para as economias europeias em maiores dificuldades num futuro próximo?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(27 de fevereiro de 2013)

A publicação de novos indicadores económicos e as atualizações de dados podem requerer uma revisão das previsões económicas. Em relação às previsões do Bundesbank publicadas em dezembro de 2012, é de observar que, na sua primeira estimativa do crescimento do PIB para 2012, publicada em janeiro de 2013, o instituto de estatísticas alemão indicava igualmente um valor de 0,7 %. Relativamente a 2013, no relatório económico anual publicado em janeiro de 2013, o Governo Federal alemão previu também um aumento do PIB de 0,4 %. A Comissão apresentará uma atualização das suas previsões económicas para os Estados-Membros da UE em fevereiro de 2013. Esta atualização não terá apenas em conta as novas publicações de dados, mas atenderá também às relações económicas e comerciais entre o conjunto dos Estados-Membros, incluindo as relações com a Alemanha, assim como ao impacto das medidas de política económica aplicadas em cada país.

A evolução económica na Alemanha afeta as economias de outros Estados-Membros e vice-versa. Não obstante os fundamentos intactos, a economia alemã não escapa ao atual abrandamento da atividade económica mundial e às incertezas que pairam sobre área do euro. As perspetivas de crescimento de todos os Estados-Membros dependem da capacidade de dar uma resposta decisiva à crise da dívida soberana e de demonstrar que o euro constitui uma moeda estável e forte, devendo os membros da área do euro dar provas da sua determinação e capacidade de aplicar políticas económicas sólidas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011502/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Economic stagnation in Germany

The Bundesbank, Germany's central bank, has published its forecasts for gross domestic product (GDP) trends in the German economy, suggesting growth of 0.7% this year and an even lower 0.4% next year.

The Bundesbank's previous forecasts were for 1% in 2012 and 1.6% in 2013.

Does the Commission consider that such disappointing forecasts, in a country that has proven to be a real driving force for Europe, could cause collateral damage in the form of austerity policies implemented in other countries, having a detrimental effect on the single market?

Does the Commission consider that such forecasts should allow for the possibility in the near future of reweighting the plans drawn up for Europe's economies in greatest difficulty?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(27 February 2013)

The release of new economic indicators or data revisions might entail a revision of an economic forecast. Concerning the forecast of the Bundesbank published in December 2012, the German Statistical Offices' first estimate of GDP growth for the year 2012 published in January 2013 has been 0.7% as well. For 2013 the German Federal Government also projects an increase in GDP by 0.4%, according to its annual economic report published in January 2013. The Commission will provide an update of its economic outlook for the Member States of the EU in February 2013. This update will not only factor in the assessment of new data releases, but also consider the economic and commercial relationship between all the Member States, including those with Germany, as well as the impact of policy measures in individual countries.

Economic developments in Germany affect the economies of other Member States and vice versa. Despite its intact fundamentals, the German economy does not escape the current slowdown of global economic activity and the prevailing uncertainty in the euro area. The growth prospects of all Member States depend on dealing decisively with the sovereign debt crisis and demonstrating that the Euro is a stable and strong currency whose members are determined and capable of implementing sound economic policies.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011503/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Agravamento da recessão em Portugal

Segundo o Instituto Nacional de Estatística (INE) português, a recessão da economia em Portugal tem vindo a acentuar-se, e a quebra do PIB no terceiro trimestre foi de 3,5 % face ao mesmo período do ano passado. Face ao segundo semestre, o PIB recuou 0,9 %.

Assim, pergunto à comissão:

Tem acompanhado esta evolução negativa da economia portuguesa?

Como a avalia, quando comparadas com previsões anteriores da Comissão?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(15 de fevereiro de 2013)

A Comissão tem acompanhado permanentemente a evolução da economia portuguesa no contexto das previsões dos serviços da Comissão e das revisões trimestrais realizadas no âmbito do programa de ajustamento económico para Portugal.

Embora os dados relativos ao último trimestre de 2012 não tenham ainda sido publicados, a evolução económica no passado ano parece ter estado em conformidade com as previsões estabelecidas pela Comissão na primavera de 2012. Isto é válido em particular para as exportações, que beneficiaram de melhorias na competitividade dos preços, mas abrandaram no segundo semestre após a deterioração da conjuntura externa, assim como para a procura interna, que, tal como projetado, estava enfraquecida devido aos efeitos da consolidação orçamental e das fragilidades do mercado de trabalho. Em consequência, foram apenas necessários pequenos ajustamentos nas perspetivas de crescimento das previsões de outono da Comissão. Estas projeções apontam para que a tendência negativa da economia portuguesa será interrompida no segundo semestre de 2013, com a recuperação a ganhar ritmo em 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011503/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Worsening of the recession in Portugal

According to the Portuguese National Statistics Institute (INE), the economic recession in Portugal has been getting worse, and GDP fell by 3.5% more in the third quarter than in the same period last year. Comparing the second half of the year, GDP was down 0.9%.

Therefore:

Has the Commission kept abreast of this downward trend in the Portuguese economy?

What is the Commission's assessment of it, comparing it with previous Commission forecasts?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2013)

The Commission is continuously monitoring the Portuguese economy in the context of the Commission services' forecast exercises and the quarterly reviews carried out under the Economic Adjustment Programme for Portugal.

Although data for the final quarter of 2012 have not yet been published, economic developments in the past year appear to have been in line with the forecast produced by the Commission in spring 2012. This holds in particular for exports, which benefitted from improvements in price competitiveness but decelerated in the second semester following the deterioration of the external environment, as well as for domestic demand, which, as projected, was weak due to the effects of fiscal consolidation and the weak labour market. As a consequence, only minor adjustments to the growth outlook were necessary in the Commission's autumn forecast. The forecast projects that the downward trend of the Portuguese economy will come to a halt in the second half of 2013 with the recovery gathering pace in 2014.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-011504/12
till kommissionen (Vice-ordföranden/Höga representanten)
Alf Svensson (PPE)
(17 december 2012)

Angående: VP/HR – EU:s politik gentemot Rwanda i relation till situationen i östra DRK

Situationen i östra Demokratiska Republiken Kongo är åter mycket allvarlig. Även om yttre påtryckningar, bland annat från EU, övertygade rebellstyrkan M23 att lämna Goma efter ett par veckors ockupation, behövs mycket större insatser från omvärlden. Vi i EU kan inte nöja oss med att *hantera* eller *begränsa* konflikten. Vi måste börja arbeta mer aktivt för att faktiskt bidra till att *avsluta* den.

Det är ju känt att de personliga relationerna mellan rebelledaren Bosco Ntaganda och Rwandas president Paul Kagame är tämligen djupa och går tillbaka till tiden då de tillsammans var aktiva i Rwandan Patriotic Front. Allmänt vedertaget är också att Rwandas inblandning i den nuvarande konflikten i DRK, i form av aktivt och passivt stöd till M23, bidrar till att förlänga och fördjupa den.

Mina frågor blir därför:

1. På vilket sätt har vice ordföranden för kommissionen/unionens höga representant agerat, eller ämnar agera, gentemot Paul Kagame för att markera EU:s stora missnöje med Rwandas inblandning i konflikten i östra DRK?

2. Vilka sanktioner kan bli aktuella från EU:s sida för att begränsa Rwandas möjligheter att fortsätta understödja konflikten i östra DRK?

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

EU anser fortfarande att säkerheten och den humanitära situationen i östra delen av Demokratiska republiken Kongo är oroande. Unionen är fast besluten att bidra till hållbara lösningar av den rådande krisen och dess regionala konsekvenser.

I sina slutsatser av den 18 september, 19 november och 10 december fördömde rådet (utrikes frågor) M23-rebellerna och allt externt stöd till upproret.

EU har klargjort sin ståndpunkt och sina förväntningar för Rwanda och Demokratiska republiken Kongo. Den höga representanten/vice ordförande Catherine Ashton har utfärdat flera uttalanden om situationen i östra Kongo och sammanträdde med president Kagame och president Kabila i samband med FN:s generalförsamling i New York i september 2012.

EU har beslutat att skjuta upp alla nya beslut om ytterligare budgetstöd till Rwanda tills man får en försäkran från Rwanda om landets roll och konstruktiva engagemang i sökandet efter lösningar i östra delen av Demokratiska republiken Kongo.

Under tiden stödjer EU de insatser som görs av FN, Afrikanska unionen och den internationella konferensen om regionen vid de stora sjöarna för att främja en varaktig fred. EU välkomnar också FN:s generalsekreterares ansträngningar för att få fram ett ramavtal, som fastställer de övergripande mål som ska uppnås på nationell och regional nivå.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011504/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Alf Svensson (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — EU policy towards Rwanda in relation to the situation in eastern DRC

The situation in the east of the Democratic Republic of Congo is once again very serious. Even though external pressure, including from the EU, persuaded the rebel M23 force to leave Goma after a few weeks of occupation, much greater effort is required from the outside world. We in the EU cannot be content just to manage or limit the conflict. We have to start working more actively to effectively resolve it.

It is common knowledge that the personal relationship between the rebel leader Bosco Ntaganda and Rwandan President Paul Kagame is fairly deep and goes back to the time when they were active together in the Rwandan Patriotic Front. It is also widely recognised that Rwanda's involvement in the current conflict in the DRC, in the form of active and passive support to M23, is a contributory factor in extending and deepening this conflict.

1. What action has the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union taken, or does she intend to take, against Paul Kagame to express the EU's strong displeasure with Rwanda's involvement in the conflict in eastern DRC?

2. What sanctions can be considered by the EU to limit Rwanda's ability to continue to support the conflict in eastern DRC?

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

The EU remains concerned about the security and humanitarian situation in eastern Congo and is firmly committed to contribute to sustainable solutions for the Eastern DRC crisis and its regional implications.

In its conclusions of the 18 September, 19 November and the 10 December, the Foreign Affaires Council condemned the M23 sedition and any external support to the rebellion.

The EU has made clear its position and expectations to Rwanda and DRC. The High Representative/Vice-President of the Commission Ms. Ashton issued several statements on the situation in Eastern Congo and has held meetings with Presidents Kagame and Kabila in the margins of the UN General Assembly in New York in September 2012.

The EU decided to postpone all new decisions on additional budget support to Rwanda, while we seek reassurances from Rwanda about its role and its constructive engagement in the search of solutions in the eastern DRC.

In the meantime, the EU backs efforts of the UN, AU and the International Conference of the Great Lakes Region (ICGLR) to promote a sustainable peace and welcome the efforts of the UNSG to conclude a 'framework agreement', defining global objectives to be met at national and regional level.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011506/12
an die Kommission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(17. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Sinkendes Lohnniveau im Zuge der Öffnung des Fernbusmarktes

Gewerkschaften befürchten in der Busbranche Lohndumping im großen Stil. Bereits jetzt werden nach Angaben des Vereins von deutschen Unternehmen ausländische Fahrer zum Lohnniveau ihrer Heimatländer auf innerdeutschen Strecken eingesetzt. Dies wird mit der Öffnung des Fernbusmarktes weiter zunehmen. Ein großer deutscher Busunternehmer hat bereits angekündigt, seine Busfahrer vom Arbeitsmarkt in Portugal zu holen.

Bei der Neufassung des Personenbeförderungsgesetzes, mit der der Fernbusmarkt geöffnet wurde, sind wichtige Aspekte wie Schutz von Lohn- und Sozialstandards für die Busfahrer einfach nicht berücksichtigt worden.

Ist sich die Kommission dieser Probleme im Zusammenhang mit der Öffnung des Fernbusmarktes bewusst?

Wie möchte die Kommission gegen das Lohndumping in der (Fern)Busbranche vorgehen, und welche konkreten Maßnahmen sind hierzu geplant?

Wie soll sichergestellt werden, dass sich diese Probleme nicht auf den Linienbusverkehr auswirken?

Wie möchte die Kommission eine Verbesserung des Schutzes von Lohn- und Sozialstandards für Busfahrer gewährleisten?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(26. Februar 2013)

Die Kommission ist der Auffassung, dass die Öffnung des Fernbusmarktes in Deutschland eine positive Entwicklung darstellt. Die Freizügigkeit der Arbeitnehmer berechtigt alle Bürger, sich ungehindert in einen anderen Mitgliedstaat zu begeben, um dort zu arbeiten und zu wohnen, und schützt sie davor, im Bereich der Beschäftigung, des Entgelts und anderer Arbeitsbedingungen gegenüber den Staatsangehörigen des betreffenden Mitgliedstaates diskriminiert zu werden.

In Abhängigkeit von der konkreten Situation können die Fahrer auch unter die Richtlinie 96/71/EG ([1]) fallen, nach der sie Anspruch auf einen Kernbestand an klar definierten Mindestarbeits- und -beschäftigungsbedingungen haben, die auch die Mindestlohnsätze des Mitgliedstaates, in dem sie arbeiten, umfassen. Die Kommission hat einen Vorschlag ([2]) für eine Durchsetzungsrichtlinie verabschiedet, damit die Durchführung, Anwendung und Durchsetzung der Richtlinie 96/71/EG durch die Mitgliedstaaten in der Praxis verbessert wird. Darüber hinaus gilt für Busfahrer die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 561/2006 ([3]) zur Harmonisierung der Sozialvorschriften im Straßenverkehr in Bezug auf die Lenk- und Ruhezeiten.

Die oben genannten Rechtsakte bilden ein umfassendes Regelwerk über den Schutz der Arbeitnehmer vor allem für Fälle, in denen sie ihr Heimatland zwecks Arbeitssuche verlassen. Die Kommission wird die ihr zur Kenntnis gebrachten einschlägigen Fälle genau verfolgen, um sicherzustellen, dass die Rechte der betroffenen Arbeitnehmer geschützt werden. Allerdings muss daran erinnert werden, dass die Höhe der Entlohnung eines Arbeitnehmers nicht in den Zuständigkeitsbereich der EU fällt.

([1]) Richtlinie 96/71/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 16. Dezember 1996 über die Entsendung von Arbeitnehmern im Rahmen der Erbringung von Dienstleistungen, ABl. L 18 vom 21.1.1997.
([2]) KOM(2012)131 endg.
([3]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 561/2006 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 15. März 2006 zur Harmonisierung bestimmter Sozialvorschriften im Straßenverkehr und zur Änderung der Verordnungen (EWG) Nr. 3821/85 und (EG) Nr. 2135/98 der Rates sowie zur Aufhebung der Verordnung (EWG) Nr. 3820/85 des Rates, ABl. L 102 vom 11.4.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011506/12
to the Commission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Falling wage levels in connection with opening up the inter-city coach market

Trade unions are concerned about the prospect of large-scale wage dumping in the bus and coach sector. According to the association, German companies are already using foreign drivers — paid at the wage levels of their home countries — on routes within Germany, and this is expected to increase further as the coach market is opened up. One major German bus company has already stated that it will get its drivers from the Portuguese labour market.

The revision of the Passenger Transport Act, which opened up the coach market, simply ignored key elements such as protecting drivers' pay and social standards.

Is the Commission aware of this issue with the opening up of the coach market?

How does the Commission intend to proceed against wage dumping in the bus and coach sector, and what specific actions are planned in this connection?

How can it be ensured that these problems do not affect local bus transport?

How does the Commission propose to ensure better protection for bus and coach drivers' pay and social standards?

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

The Commission considers the opening up of the coach market in Germany as a positive development. The free movement of workers gives every citizen the right to move freely to another Member State to work and reside there for that purpose and protects them against discrimination as regards employment, remuneration and other working conditions in comparison to nationals of that Member State.

Depending on the actual situation of the drivers in question, they may also be subject to Directive 96/71/EC ([1]) according to which they are entitled to a core set ('nucleus') of clearly defined minimum terms and conditions of employment, which include the minimum rates of pay of the Member State where they are working. The Commission has adopted a proposal ([2]) for an Enforcement Directive in order to improve the way Directive 96/71/EC is implemented, applied and enforced in practice by the Member States. Moreover, coach drivers are covered by Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 ([3]), which harmonised the social legislation relating to road transport as regards driving times and rest periods.

The abovementioned acts provide a comprehensive set of rules on the protection of workers especially when moving from their home country in search of employment. The Commission will be closely following any such case brought to its attention in order to secure that the rights of the employees concerned are protected. However, it should be recalled that the actual remuneration of an employee does not fall under the competence of the EU.

([1]) OJ L 18, 21.1.1997, 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.
([2]) COM(2012) 131 final.
([3]) Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2006 on the harmonisation of certain social legislation relating to road transport and amending Council Regulations (EEC) No 3821/85 and (EC) No 2135/98 and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 3820/85, OJ L 102, 11.4.2006.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011507/12
a la Comisión
Brian Simpson (S&D), Spyros Danellis (S&D), Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D), Phil Prendergast (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D) y Jens Nilsson (S&D)
(17 de diciembre de 2012)

Asunto: Programas de Desarrollo Rural: medidas transitorias para 2014

En el año 2014 se pondrá fin en toda Europa a un gran número de regímenes agroambientales financiados por contratos del Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Desarrollo Rural (FEADER). Hay muchos regímenes agroambientales «clásicos» que han venido aplicándose durante diez años o más. La mayoría de los beneficiarios de estos regímenes agroambientales «clásicos» se localizan en zonas remotas y elevadas y dependen fuertemente de los acuerdos agroambientales como fuente de ingresos a cambio de la prestación de beneficios públicos vitales. Aun si se acordara sin más dilación la nueva normativa de desarrollo rural, con casi total seguridad los nuevos programas no se aprobarían ni se pondrían en práctica antes del 1 de enero de 2014. En ausencia de un nuevo programa y de medidas de apoyo, estos agricultores no tendrán ningún esquema de apoyo rural alternativo que solicitar cuando se acaben los contratos existentes al final de 2014. Por lo tanto, existe el riesgo de que se pierda todo el avance que se ha logrado hasta el día de hoy en el ámbito medioambiental, lo que podría tener graves consecuencias para los espacios de la red Natura 2000 y para el resto de zonas rurales.

¿Qué medidas tomará la Comisión para asegurar la preservación de los logros medioambientales que se han conseguido gracias al anterior Programa de Desarrollo Rural, así como la salvaguarda de los ingresos de los agricultores?

Seguramente, la Comisión considera que es importante garantizar que ni los agricultores ni el propio medio ambiente sufran como consecuencia de que no se llegue a tiempo a un acuerdo sobre el presupuesto de la UE o sobre propuestas de política agrícola común para los próximos Programas de Desarrollo Rural, que deberían comenzar en 2014. ¿Es así?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(22 de febrero de 2013)

Es difícil en el momento actual prever si habrá o no algún retraso en la adopción del marco normativo de la política de desarrollo rural. La Comisión está haciendo todo lo posible para acelerar la adopción del Reglamento en la materia. Si, pese a ello, se produjera algún retraso, los programas de desarrollo rural correrían el riesgo de comenzar a aplicarse tardíamente. No obstante, como parte del debate más amplio con los Estados miembros sobre las propuestas de la PAC y sobre la forma de enlazar mejor los dos períodos de programación 2007-2013 y 2014-2020, se están estudiando en particular aquellas medidas relacionadas con la superficie que garantizan prácticas específicas respetuosas del medio ambiente o, en general, una buena gestión de la tierra.

Además, de acuerdo con el proyecto de Reglamento sobre disposiciones comunes ([1]), la subvencionabilidad de los gastos del próximo período de programación se iniciará el 1 de enero de 2014, o en la la fecha de presentación de los programas si esta fecha es anterior a aquella. Los Estados miembros pueden por tanto comenzar a aplicar sus programas de desarrollo rural —si están suficientemente estabilizados y bajo su propia responsabilidad— a partir del 1 de enero de 2014, y ello incluso aunque los programas no estén todavía aprobados. Tras su aprobación, será posible ya solicitar al Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Desarrollo Rural (Feader) el reembolso de los gastos que hayan realizado los Estados miembros.

([1]) COM(2011) 615.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-011507/12
Komisi
Brian Simpson (S&D), Spyros Danellis (S&D), Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D), Phil Prendergast (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D) a Jens Nilsson (S&D)
(17. prosince 2012)

Předmět: Programy pro rozvoj venkova: přechodná opatření pro rok 2014

V roce 2014 skončí v Evropě velké množství programů v oblasti zemědělství a životního prostředí, které jsou financovány z prostředků na ně vyhrazených v rozpočtu Evropského zemědělského fondu pro rozvoj venkova (EZFRV). Mezi nimi je mnoho zavedených programů v oblasti zemědělství a životního prostředí, které se provádějí již 10 i více let. Mnozí příjemci těchto již zavedených programů se nacházejí v odlehlých hornatých oblastech a jsou silně závislí na agroenvironmentálních dohodách jakožto zdroji příjmů, které jsou jim poskytovány výměnou za klíčové přínosy veřejnosti. I kdyby byly nové předpisy o rozvoji venkova přijaty bez dalšího odkladu, je téměř jisté, že nové programy nebudou schváleny ani zavedeny do 1. ledna 2014. Nebude-li k dispozici nový program ani podpůrná opatření, zemědělcům nebude moci být nabídnut žádný náhradní program na podporu rozvoje venkova, který by se použil po ukončení jejich stávajících závazků v roce 2014. Vzniká tedy riziko, že dobrý stav životního prostředí, jejž bylo dosud dosaženo, může být ohrožen, což by případně mohlo mít vážné důsledky pro síť Natura 2000 i pro širší venkovské prostředí.

Jaká opatření přijme Komise, aby zajistila, že pokrok v oblasti životního prostředí dosažený v rámci předcházejících programů pro rozvoj venkova bude zachován a příjmy těchto zemědělců zaručeny?

Bezpochyby je důležité zajistit, aby ani zemědělci ani životní prostředí neutrpěli újmu v důsledku toho, že nebylo včas dosaženo shody jak v případě rozpočtu EU, tak při schvalování návrhů SZP tak, aby mohly být další programy pro rozvoj venkova zahájeny v roce 2014?

Odpověď pana Cioloşe jménem Komise
(22. února 2013)

V tuto chvíli je velmi těžké odhadovat případné zpoždění při přijímání právního rámce politiky pro rozvoj venkova. Komise vyvíjí maximální úsilí, aby se přijetí nařízení o rozvoji venkova urychlilo. Pokud by byl právní rámec přijat se zpožděním, hrozilo by, že i provádění programů rozvoje venkova začne opožděně. V rámci širších diskuzí s členskými státy o návrzích SZP a o nejvhodnějším způsobu překlenutí programových období 2007-2013 a 2014-2020 jsou brána v potaz zejména opatření týkající se oblastí, které zajišťují ekologicky šetrné postupy či obecně hospodaření s půdou.

Podle návrhu nařízení o společných ustanoveních ([1]) bude pro příští programové období stanoven začátek způsobilosti výdajů buď ode dne předložení programu, nebo od 1. ledna 2014 – podle toho, co nastane dříve. Členské státy tedy budou moci začít na vlastní riziko provádět své programy rozvoje venkova od 1. ledna 2014, bude-li dostatečně zajištěna jejich stabilita, a to i když tyto programy ještě nebudou schváleny. Náklady vynaložené členskými státy bude Evropský zemědělský fond pro regionální rozvoj moci uhradit po schválení programů.

([1]) KOM(2011) 615.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011507/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Brian Simpson (S&D), Spyros Danellis (S&D), Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D), Phil Prendergast (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D) και Jens Nilsson (S&D)
(17 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Προγράμματα ανάπτυξης της υπαίθρου: μεταβατικές ρυθμίσεις για το 2014

Σε ολόκληρη την Ευρώπη, ένας σημαντικός αριθμός γεωργοπεριβαλλοντικών προγραμμάτων χρηματοδοτούμενων από πιστώσεις του Ευρωπαϊκού Γεωργικού Ταμείου Αγροτικής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΓΤΑΑ) θα φτάσει στο τέρμα του το 2014. Πολλά από αυτά είναι «καθιερωμένα» γεωργοπεριβαλλοντικά προγράμματα που εφαρμόζονται εδώ και δέκα χρόνια ή και περισσότερο. Πολλοί από τους δικαιούχους αυτών των «καθιερωμένων» προγραμμάτων είναι εγκατεστημένοι σε απομακρυσμένα υψίπεδα και εξαρτώνται σε μέγιστο βαθμό από γεωργοπεριβαλλοντικές συμφωνίες που αποτελούν για αυτούς πηγή εισοδήματος το οποίο λαμβάνουν σε αντάλλαγμα για την παροχή ζωτικών υπηρεσιών προς το γενικό συμφέρον. Ακόμη και αν ο νέος κανονισμός για την ανάπτυξη της υπαίθρου συμφωνηθεί χωρίς άλλη χρονοτριβή, είναι σχεδόν σίγουρο ότι τα νέα προγράμματα δεν πρόκειται να έχουν εγκριθεί εγκαίρως για να αρχίσουν να εφαρμόζονται από 1ης Ιανουαρίου 2014. Δεδομένης της απουσίας νέου προγράμματος και μέτρων στήριξης, οι γεωργοί αυτοί δεν θα έχουν κανένα εναλλακτικό πρόγραμμα ενίσχυσης του τομέα της ανάπτυξης της υπαίθρου στο οποίο να μπορούν να κάνουν αίτηση όταν λήξουν οι σημερινές υποχρεώσεις τους το 2014. Δημιουργείται συνεπώς ο κίνδυνος να χαθούν όσα περιβαλλοντικής φύσης πλεονεκτήματα έχουν επιτευχθεί μέχρι σήμερα, με ενδεχομένως σοβαρές συνέπειες για τις τοποθεσίες Natura 2000 και γενικά την ύπαιθρο.

Ποιες ρυθμίσεις προτίθεται να θεσπίσει η Επιτροπή προκειμένου να διασφαλίσει ότι δεν θα χαθούν τα περιβαλλοντικά οφέλη που έχουν επιτευχθεί μέσω των προηγούμενων προγραμμάτων ανάπτυξης της υπαίθρου και ότι δεν θα θιγεί το εισόδημα αυτών των γεωργών;

Συμφωνεί η Επιτροπή ότι έχει σημασία να εξασφαλιστεί ότι δεν θα θιγούν ούτε οι γεωργοί, ούτε το περιβάλλον εξαιτίας της αδυναμίας να εξευρεθεί εγκαίρως συμφωνία είτε επί του προϋπολογισμού είτε επί των προτάσεων της ΚΓΠ εν όψει των επόμενων προγραμμάτων για την ανάπτυξη της υπαίθρου που πρέπει να αρχίσουν το 2014;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Cioloş εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Προς το παρόν, είναι δύσκολο να προβλεφθούν ενδεχόμενες καθυστερήσεις στη θέσπιση του νομικού πλαισίου για την πολιτική αγροτικής ανάπτυξης. Η Επιτροπή καταβάλλει κάθε δυνατή προσπάθεια για την επιτάχυνση της έκδοσης του κανονισμού για την αγροτική ανάπτυξη. Ενδεχόμενες καθυστερήσεις θα μπορούσαν να έχουν ως συνέπεια την καθυστερημένη έναρξη της εφαρμογής των προγραμμάτων αγροτικής ανάπτυξης. Στο πλαίσιο των ευρύτερων συζητήσεων με τα κράτη μέλη σχετικά με τις προτάσεις της ΚΓΠ και τον καλύτερο τρόπο κάλυψης του κενού μεταξύ των δύο περιόδων προγραμματισμού, 2007-2013 και 2014-2020, εξετάζονται ειδικότερα τα μέτρα που συνδέονται με την έκταση τα οποία διασφαλίζουν συγκεκριμένες πρακτικές φιλικές προς το περιβάλλον ή, γενικότερα, καλύτερης διαχείρισης της γης.

Επιπλέον, σύμφωνα με το σχέδιο «κανονισμού περί καθορισμού κοινών διατάξεων» ([1]), η επιλεξιμότητα των δαπανών για την επόμενη περίοδο προγραμματισμού θα ξεκινήσει είτε από την ημερομηνία υποβολής του προγράμματος είτε από την 1η Ιανουαρίου 2014, αναλόγως του ποια ημερομηνία προηγείται. Επομένως, τα κράτη μέλη μπορούν να αρχίσουν να εφαρμόζουν τα προγράμματά τους αγροτικής ανάπτυξης, εφόσον είναι επαρκώς σταθεροποιημένα και με δική τους ευθύνη, από την 1η Ιανουαρίου 2014, ακόμη κι αν τα προγράμματα αυτά δεν έχουν ακόμη εγκριθεί. Η επιστροφή των δαπανών που πραγματοποιούν τα κράτη μέλη από το Ευρωπαϊκό Γεωργικό Ταμείο Αγροτικής Ανάπτυξης θα είναι εφικτή μόνο μετά την έγκριση των προγραμμάτων.

([1]) COM(2011)615.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011507/12
do Komisji
Brian Simpson (S&D), Spyros Danellis (S&D), Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D), Phil Prendergast (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D) oraz Jens Nilsson (S&D)
(17 grudnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Programy rozwoju obszarów wiejskich: ustalenia przejściowe na 2014 r.

W całej Europie duża liczba programów agro-środowiskowych finansowanych ze środków Europejskiego Funduszu Rolnego na rzecz Rozwoju Obszarów Wiejskich (EFRROW) dobiegnie końca w 2014 r. Wśród nich wiele jest „typowych" programów agro-środowiskowych, które funkcjonowały przez 10 lub więcej lat. Wielu beneficjentów tych „typowych" programów zamieszkuje odległe, wysoko położone rejony i jest w ogromnym stopniu zależna od programów agro-środowiskowych jako źródła dochodu w zamian za dostawę ważnych z punktu widzenia społeczeństwa dóbr. Nawet jeśli nowe rozporządzenie dotyczące rozwoju obszarów wiejskich zostanie bez dalszej zwłoki uzgodnione, prawie pewne jest, że nowe programy nie zostaną zatwierdzone i uruchomione przed 1 stycznia 2014 r. Wobec braku nowego programu i środków wsparcia rolnicy nie będą mieli żadnego alternatywnego programu wsparcia rozwoju wiejskiego, do którego mogliby się zwrócić, jeśli ich istniejące zobowiązania wygasną w 2014 r. W związku z tym istnieje ryzyko, że to co udało się jak dotąd osiągnąć dla środowiska może zostać zaprzepaszczone, powodując potencjalnie poważne konsekwencje dla obszarów Natura 2000 i szerzej pojętego krajobrazu wiejskiego.

Jakie rozwiązania zamierza wprowadzić Komisja, aby zagwarantować, że korzyści uzyskane dla środowiska dzięki poprzednim programom rozwoju obszarów wiejskich zostaną zachowane a dochód tych rolników zabezpieczony?

Z pewnością istotne jest zagwarantowanie, aby ani rolnicy ani środowisko nie ucierpiały w rezultacie braku uzgodnień w sprawie budżetu UE lub wniosków w sprawie WPR w terminie, tak aby kolejne programy rozwoju obszarów wiejskich mogły się rozpocząć w 2014 r.?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Daciana Cioloşa w imieniu Komisji
(22 lutego 2013 r.)

Trudno jest obecnie przewidzieć ewentualne opóźnienia w przyjmowaniu nowych ram prawnych w zakresie polityki rozwoju obszarów wiejskich. Komisja dokłada wszelkich starań, aby przyspieszyć przyjęcie rozporządzenia w sprawie rozwoju obszarów wiejskich. Opóźnienia stworzyłyby zagrożenie późniejszego rozpoczęcia realizacji programów rozwoju obszarów wiejskich. Szczegółowe kwestie dotyczące środków odnoszących się do obszarów, na których stosuje się specyficzne, przyjazne dla środowiska praktyki lub sposób zarządzania gruntami, są na ogół poruszane w kontekście szerszych negocjacji z państwami członkowskimi na temat wniosków w sprawie WPR oraz tego, w jaki sposób najlepiej dokonać przejścia z jednego okresu programowania, tj. 2007-2013, do drugiego, tj. 2014-2020.

Ponadto zgodnie z projektem „rozporządzenia sprawie wspólnych przepisów" ([1]), kwalifikowalność wydatków w następnym okresie programowania będzie uwzględniana od wcześniejszego z terminów: albo od przedłożenia danego programu albo od dnia 1 stycznia 2014 r. W związku z tym, jeśli programy rozwoju obszarów wiejskich państw członkowskich będą wystarczająco dopracowane, państwa te mogą od dnia 1 stycznia 2014 r. rozpocząć ich realizację na własną odpowiedzialność, nawet jeżeli programy te nie będą jeszcze zatwierdzone. Zwrot wydatków poniesionych przez państwa członkowskie z Europejskiego Funduszu Rolnego na rzecz Rozwoju Obszarów Wiejskich nastąpi po zatwierdzeniu przedmiotowych programów.

([1]) COM(2011) 615.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-011507/12
till kommissionen
Brian Simpson (S&D), Spyros Danellis (S&D), Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D), Phil Prendergast (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D) och Jens Nilsson (S&D)
(17 december 2012)

Angående: Program för utveckling av landsbygden: övergångslösningar för 2014

Över hela Europa kommer ett stort antal miljöåtgärder inom jordbruket, finansierade genom Europeiska jordbruksfonden för landsbygdsutveckling (EJFLU), att löpa ut under 2014. Ett flertal ”klassiska” miljöåtgärder har funnits i tio år, eller mer. Många av dem som får stöd genom dessa ”klassiska” åtgärder är jordbrukare i avlägsna bergstrakter, som är kraftigt beroende av den inkomstkälla som dessa miljöåtgärder utgör, och som i gengäld uträttar ett arbete som är av stor allmän nytta. Även om den nya förordningen om landsbygdsutveckling skulle antas snabbt är det nästan helt säkert att de nya programmen inte kommer att vara godkända och i gång den 1 januari 2014. Utan ett nytt program och utan stödåtgärder kommer de berörda jordbrukarna inte att ha något alternativt system för landsbygdsutveckling där de kan söka stöd när deras nuvarande anslag försvinner 2014. Det finns följaktligen en risk att de goda miljöresultat som hittills uppnåtts går förlorade, med potentiellt allvarliga konsekvenser för Natura 2000-områden och landsbygden i stort.

Vad kommer kommissionen att göra för att se till att de miljövinster som gjorts genom tidigare program för landsbygdens utveckling bibehålls och att de berörda jordbrukarnas inkomster skyddas?

Nog måste det anses viktigt att se till att varken jordbrukarna eller miljön drabbas negativt av att man eventuellt inte lyckas enas om antingen EU:s budget eller förslag angående den gemensamma jordbrukspolitiken i tid för att nästa omgång program för landsbygdsutveckling ska kunna dra i gång 2014?

Samlat svar från Dacian Cioloș på kommissionens vägnar
(22 februari 2013)

Det är för närvarande svårt att förutse om den rättsliga ramen för landsbygdsutvecklingspolitiken kommer att antas med förseningar. Kommissionen gör sitt yttersta för att påskynda antagandet av regler om landsbygdsutveckling. Fördröjningar skulle innebära att genomförandet av programmen för landsbygdsutveckling riskerar att bli försenat. I synnerhet när det gäller åtgärder i områden med särskilda miljövänliga metoder eller miljövänlig markförvaltning i allmänhet sker överväganden vid mera omfattande diskussioner med medlemsstaterna om förslagen om den gemensamma jordbrukspolitiken och om hur man får den bästa övergången mellan programperioderna 2007-2013 och 2014-2020.

Enligt förslaget till förordning om gemensamma bestämmelser ([1]) kommer utgifternas stödberättigande för nästa programperiod att räknas antingen från det att programmet lämnas in eller från den 1 januari 2014, beroende på vilket som infaller först. Därför kan medlemsstaterna börja genomföra sina program för landsbygdsutveckling, om de är tillräckligt stabila och på egen risk, från och med den 1 januari 2014, även om programmen ännu inte godkänts. Europeiska jordbruksfonden för landsbygdsutveckling kommer att kunna återbetala medlemsstaternas utgifter efter det att programmen godkänts.

([1]) KOM(2011) 615.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011507/12
to the Commission
Brian Simpson (S&D), Spyros Danellis (S&D), Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D), Phil Prendergast (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D) and Jens Nilsson (S&D)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Rural Development Programmes: transitional arrangements for 2014

Across Europe, a large number of agri-environment schemes, financed by European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) commitments, will be coming to an end in 2014. There are numerous 'classic' agri-environment schemes which have been in place for 10 years or more. Many of the beneficiaries of these 'classic' schemes are located in remote upland areas and are heavily dependent on agri-environment agreements as a source of income in return for the delivery of vital public benefits. Even if the new rural development regulation is agreed without further delay, it is almost certain that the new programmes will not be approved and in place by 1 January 2014. In the absence of a new programme and support measures, these farmers will have no alternative rural development support scheme to apply for when their existing commitments end in 2014. There is consequently a risk that the environmental good achieved to date may be lost, with potentially serious consequences for Natura 2000 sites and the wider countryside.

What arrangements will the Commission put in place to ensure that the environmental gains achieved by the previous Rural Development Programmes are maintained, and the income of these farmers safeguarded?

It is surely important to ensure that neither farmers nor the environment suffer as a result of a failure to agree either the EU budget or the CAP proposals in time for the next Rural Development Programmes to start in 2014?

Question for written answer E-011587/12
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: CAP post-2013

If the Common Agriculture Policy post-2013 is not in place by 1 January 2014, what mechanism will be put in place to allow the continuation of Pillar 2 schemes? If these schemes are not extended, what impact will this policy gap have on farmers and rural dwellers?

Joint answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2013)

At this moment in time, it is difficult to anticipate any possible delays in the adoption of the legal framework for the rural development policy. The Commission is doing its utmost to accelerate adoption of rural development regulation. Delays would create a risk of a late start of the implementation of rural development programmes. Considerations in particular regarding the measures related to areas which ensure specific environmentally friendly practices or land management in general are taking place in the context of broader discussions with the Member States about the CAP proposals and how to best bridge the two programming periods, 2007-2013 and 2014-2020.

Furthermore, according to the draft 'Common Provisions Regulation' ([1]), the eligibility of expenditure for the next programming period will start either from the submission of the programme or 1 January 2014, whichever is earlier. Therefore, Member States can start implementing their rural development programmes, if sufficiently stabilised and at their own risk, from 1 January 2014 onwards even if the programmes are not yet approved. Reimbursements of expenditure incurred by Member States by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development will be possible after the programmes are approved.

([1]) COM(2011) 615.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011508/12
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: The treatment of bears in Vietnam

I have recently been advised of the possible closure of the Animals Asia Vietnam Bear Rescue Centre in Chat Dau Valley in Tam Dao National Park, Vietnam, to make way for a commercial development project following the declaration of the land as an area of national defence significance. This is the only rescue centre in Vietnam dedicated solely to rescuing bears, and houses 104 rescued moon bears. Before their rescue, these bears had been kept in small cages and painfully drained of their bile for the bile trade. The closure of this centre would entail the eviction of the rescued bears. Given that these bears have undergone years of rehabilitation at the Rescue Centre, relocating them would submit them to renewed mental and physical suffering.

Animals Asia has been working with the Vietnamese Government to end the practice of bear bile farming in Vietnam since 2005. The EU-Vietnam Partnership and Cooperation Agreement came into force this year, and negotiations have begun for an EU-Vietnam Free Trade Agreement. In that regard, what steps will the Commission be taking to ensure that the rescued bears can continue to be rehabilitated at the Animals Asia Vietnam Bear Rescue Centre?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(14 February 2013)

The conservation of, and trade in, bears is regulated at the international level through the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), and more particularly CITES Resolution 10.8, which specifically relates to those issues.

As to the specific case mentioned by the Honourable Member, the EU Delegation in Hanoi co-signed together with other like-minded partners a joint letter to the Prime Minister expressing concern over the threatened closure of the Vietnam Bear Rescue Centre at Tam Dao National Park and stating that the closure of Vietnam's first and only bear rescue centre was bound to call into question Vietnam's commitment to ending bear farming and the broader commitment to protecting endangered wildlife. The letter was sent on 12 October 2012. Following this EU initiative the Prime Minister decided to override the previous decision by the Minister of Agriculture (to move the centre) and instead to let the Bear Centre stay and operate where it is.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011509/12
aan de Commissie
Jan Mulder (ALDE)
(17 december 2012)

Betreft: Biovergisters

De Nederlandse pers maakte onlangs gewag van de fraudegevoeligheid van sommige biovergisters door het gebruik van steeds meer gevaarlijk afval in deze vergisters. Als consequentie daarvan ontstaan er steeds meer risico's voor de menselijke gezondheid en voor het milieu, speciaal door bodemverontreiniging.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van deze berichten en onderschrijft ze deze?

2. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van soortgelijke berichten uit andere EU lidstaten?

3. Acht de Commissie het aan de hand van deze berichten nodig nadere wetgeving voor te stellen om de ongewenste consequenties van biogasopwekking tegen te gaan?

4. Acht de Commissie de huidige wetgeving adequaat in verband met de door de jaren heen geuitte kritiek dat het digestaat wordt aangemerkt als dierlijke mest en niet als een heel ander product, wat het eigenlijk is?

Antwoord van de heer Potočnik namens de Commissie
(18 februari 2013)

De Commissie heeft geen weet van gevallen waarbij gevaarlijk afval wordt gebruikt in biogasinstallaties in Nederland of in andere lidstaten van de EU.

Artikel 18 van de Europese Kaderrichtlijn Afvalstoffen ([1]) (Richtlijn 2008/98/EG) verbiedt het mengen van gevaarlijke afvalstoffen met andere categorieën gevaarlijke afvalstoffen of andere afvalstoffen. Het gebruik van gevaarlijke afvalstoffen als grondstof in biogasinstallaties is daarom onwettig, tenzij aan alle voorwaarden van artikel 18, lid 2, van de richtlijn is voldaan d.w.z. dat de exploitant van de biogasinstallatie beschikt over een vergunning overeenkomstig artikel 23 van de richtlijn, het afvalbeheer geen gevaar vormt voor de menselijke gezondheid en het milieu, en de handeling in kwestie in overeenstemming is met de beste beschikbare technieken.

De Commissie acht aanvullende wetgeving op dit gebied niet noodzakelijk, aangezien het verbod op het mengen van gevaarlijke afvalstoffen door de bevoegde autoriteiten van de lidstaten moet worden afgedwongen.

([1]) PB L 312 van 22.11.2008, blz. 3-30.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011509/12
to the Commission
Jan Mulder (ALDE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Biogas plants

Reports have recently appeared in the Dutch press concerning the susceptibility to fraud of some biogas plants due to the use of increasingly hazardous waste in them. As a result, more and more risks are arising to human health and the environment, particularly because of soil pollution.

1. Is the Commission aware of these reports, and does it endorse them?

2. Is the Commission aware of similar reports from other EU Member States?

3. In the light of these reports, does the Commission consider it necessary to propose legislation with the aim of combating the undesirable effects of biogas production?

4. Does the Commission consider the existing legislation to be adequate, in view of the criticism which has been expressed over the years that the digestate is classified as manure and not as a completely different product, which it is in reality?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

The Commission is not aware of cases of usage of hazardous waste in the biogas plants in Netherlands or in other EU Member States.

Article 18 of the EU Waste Framework Directive ([1]) (Directive 2008/98/EC) bans the mixing of hazardous waste with other categories of hazardous wastes and with other wastes. Therefore, the use of hazardous waste as an input material in biogas plants is illegal unless the cumulative conditions set out in Article 18.2 of the directive are met. That is, the biogas installation operator holds a permit in accordance with Article 23 of the directive; waste management is carried out without endangering human health and the environment; and the mixing operation conforms to best available techniques.

The Commission does not see a need for additional legislation in this area as the mixing ban should be enforced by the competent autorities of the Member States.

([1]) OJ L 312, 22.11.2008, p. 3-30.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-011510/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(17. december 2012)

Om: Norge og Det Forenede Kongeriges bidrag til EU-budgettet

I den polske udenrigsminister Radek Sikorskis tale på Blenheim Palace om Det Forenede Kongerige og Europa den 21. september 2012 udtalte ministeren, at »Norges nettobidrag til EU-budgettet i øjeblikket faktisk er højere, per indbygger, end Det Forenede Kongeriges.« Ministeren har udtalt det samme i The Economist.

En dansk EU-ekspert har fremført nøjagtig samme argument, og påstanden er kort tid efter blevet diskuteret i Danmarks Radio.

— Vil Kommissionen oplyse, om det er sandt, at Det Forenede Kongerige betaler et højere bidrag til EU per indbygger end Norge?

— Vil Kommissionen desuden oplyse de nøjagtige tal for følgende:

1. Norges bruttobidrag til EU-budgettet.

2. Det Forenede Kongeriges bruttobidrag til EU-budgettet.

3. Norges samlede nettobidrag til EU-budgettet samt nettobidraget per indbygger.

4. Det Forenede Kongeriges samlede nettobidrag til EU-budgettet samt nettobidraget per indbygger.

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Lanusz Lewandowski
(20. februar 2013)

Kommissionen offentliggør ikke bidrag til EU pr. indbygger, hverken for medlemsstaterne eller EFTA-landene. Medlemsstaternes bidrag til EU-budgettet offentliggøres hvert år i finansoversigten. Den seneste version findes på:

http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/publications/2011/fin_report/fin_report_11_en.pdf

og der findes detaljerede data for hver medlemsstat for perioden 2000-2011 på:

http://ec.europa.eu/budget/figures/interactive/index_en.cfm

De forhåndenværende oplysninger om Norges og Det Forenede Kongeriges bidrag til EU-budgettet findes i bilaget.

Det synes dog irrelevant at sammenligne Det Forenede Kongeriges (eller enhver anden medlemsstats) bidrag til og modtagne midler fra EU-budgettet med Norge. Norge bidrager kun til visse specifikke programmer, som landet deltager i. Derfor er Norges direkte bidrag til EU-budgettet af en helt anden størrelsesorden end Det Forenede Kongeriges bidrag.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011510/12
to the Commission
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Norwegian and UK contributions to the EU

In his Blenheim Palace speech on the UK and Europe of 21 September 2012, Mr Radek Sikorski, Foreign Minister of Poland, stated that 'at the moment, Norway's net contribution to the EU budget is actually higher, per capita, than Britain's'. The same statement by the minister is quoted in The Economist.

Exactly the same argument has been presented by a Danish EU expert, but this claim was disputed shortly afterwards by the Danish public service radio station, Danmarks Radio (DR).

— Will the Commission please clarify whether it is true that the UK pays more per capita to the EU than Norway?

— In addition, the Commission is asked to provide precise figures for the following:

1. Norway's gross contribution to the EU;

2. the UK's gross contribution to the EU;

3. Norway's total net contribution to the EU and its net contribution per capita;

4. the UK's total net contribution to the EU and its net contribution per capita.

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2013)

The Commission does not publish any contributions per capita either for Member States or for EFTA countries. The contributions by the Member States to the EU budget are published every year in the financial report. The latest version of the financial report can be found under the following link:

http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/publications/2011/fin_report/fin_report_11_en.pdf

and detailed data per Member State for the period 2000-2011 at:

http://ec.europa.eu/budget/figures/interactive/index_en.cfm

The available information on the United Kingdom's and Norway's total contributions to the EU budget is presented in the annex.

However, comparing contributions to and the receipts from the EU budget of the United Kingdom (or any other Member States) with Norway seems hardly relevant. Norway only contributes to a few specific programmes in which it participates. Consequently, its direct contribution to the EU budget is on a completely different scale compared to the United Kingdom's contribution.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-011511/12
a Bizottság számára
Gáll-Pelcz Ildikó (PPE)
(2012. december 17.)

Tárgy: Az európai autóipari válságról

Szedi áldozatait az autóipari krízis: az Opel és a Ford üzemeket zár be, a Suzuki kivonul az Egyesült Államokból, a Saab megszűnt létezni, a francia autóipar pedig évtizedek óta a legmélyebb válságba jutott. A Center of Automotive Management előrejelzése szerint a helyzet Európában 2013-ban csak tovább romolhat: „Az idén 11,8 millióra csökken az autóeladások száma Európában és jövőre is csak arra számíthatunk, hogy már sorban a hatodik éve csökken az autópiaci forgalom" – áll a tanulmányban. Európában legkevesebb öt vagy nyolc üzem válik feleslegessé, amelyek válságidőkben túlzott költségterhet rónak a gyártókra.

1. Tud-e a Bizottság átfogó képet adni az Európai Unió autóiparának folyamatban lévő szerkezetátalakításáról?

2. Tud-e a Bizottság tájékoztatást adni arról, hogy dolgoz-e ki az Unió erős autóiparának fenntartása érdekében új elgondolásokat és esetleg új szakpolitikát?

Antonio Tajani válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. február 13.)

Jelenleg az Európai Unió gépjárműiparában számos szerkezeti változás megy végbe, döntően a jelenlegi makrogazdasági körülmények hatására, amelyekből a legtöbb a strukturális túlkínálathoz köthető.

Ezen átalakulások átfogó vizsgálatához a képviselő úr figyelmébe ajánlom a CARS 21 magas szintű csoport végleges jelentését ([1]), amelyben részletes elemzés található az EU gépjárműiparának jelenlegi gazdasági helyzetéről.

Az új ágazati politikákat illetően a Bizottság nemrég fogadta el a „CARS 2020: Cselekvési terv a versenyképes és fenntartható európai gépjárműiparért" című közleményt ([2]), amely négy pilléren nyugszik, és amelynek célja az uniós gépjárműipar egészséges és versenyképes ipari bázisának védelme. E pillérek cselekvéseket tartalmaznak többek között a fejlett technológiákba történő beruházás és a tiszta üzemű gépjárművek irányába mutató innováció elősegítésére; a piaci viszonyok javítására; az ipar globális piacra jutásának támogatására; valamint a készségekbe és a képzésekbe való befektetés elősegítésére.

A CARS 2020 cselekvési terv negyedik pillére az alkalmazkodásra való felkészüléssel és a szerkezetátalakítás lebonyolításával foglalkozik. Hosszú távú cselekvéseket tartalmaz különösen annak biztosítása érdekében, hogy a gépjárműipari munkaerő lépést tartson a technológiai változásokkal.

A Bizottság jelenleg a bejelentett politikák végrehajtásán dolgozik. E folyamat nyomon követésére és az érintett felekkel való párbeszéd továbbfolytatására hamarosan külön „CARS 2020" elnevezésű szakpolitikai folyamat létesül.

([1]) Itt olvasható: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/automotive/files/cars-21-final-report-2012_en.pdf
([2]) COM/2012/0636.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011511/12
to the Commission
Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: The crisis in the European car industry

The crisis in the car industry is producing victims: both the Opel and the Ford plants are being closed down, Suzuki is withdrawing from the USA, Saab has ceased to exist, and the French car industry is in the deepest crisis which has hit it for decades. According to a forecast by the Centre of Automotive Management, the situation in Europe is likely only to deteriorate further in 2013: 'The number of car sales in Europe will fall to 11.8 million this year, and in future too, we can only expect activity on the car market to decline for the sixth year in succession', to quote the study. In Europe, at least five or eight plants will become superfluous, which in times of crisis will impose an excessive financial burden on manufacturers.

1. Can the Commission provide a comprehensive picture of the structural transformations which are taking place in the European Union's car industry?

2. Can the Commission indicate whether it is preparing new ideas and possibly a new sectoral policy with a view to preserving the Union's strong car industry?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(13 February 2013)

There are a number of structural transformations taking place in the European Union's automotive industry, mainly as a result of the present macroeconomic conditions, most of which are related to structural overcapacity.

For a comprehensive examination of these transformations, the Honourable Member is referred to the Final Report ([1]) of the CARS 21 High Level Group, which includes a thorough analysis of the current economic situation of the EU automotive industry.

As regards new sectoral policies, the Commission has recently adopted the CARS 2020 Action Plan for a competitive and sustainable automotive industry in Europe ([2]), which is articulated around four pillars, aiming to safeguard a healthy and competitive industrial base for the automotive industry in the European Union. These pillars include actions aimed at the promotion of investment in advanced technologies and innovation for clean vehicles; improving market conditions; supporting industry in accessing the global market; and promoting investment in skills and training.

For example, the fourth pillar of the CARS 2020 Action Plan deals with anticipating adaptation and managing restructuring. It contains actions with a long-term horizon, notably to ensure that the car industry's workforce keeps abreast of the technological changes.

The Commission is now working on the implementation of the policies announced. In order to monitor this process, and continue the dialogue with the stakeholders, a dedicated process called 'CARS 2020' will soon be established.

([1]) Available on http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/automotive/files/cars-21-final-report-2012_en.pdf
([2]) COM/2012/0636.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011512/12
do Komisji
Joanna Senyszyn (S&D)
(17 grudnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Projekty anty-traffickingowe

Od czasu przyjęcia w 1997 r. wspólnego działania Rady dotyczącego zwalczania handlu ludźmi i seksualnego wykorzystywania dzieci zrealizowano wiele inicjatyw mających na celu przeciwdziałanie tym przestępstwom.

Aby móc ocenić dotychczasowe zaangażowanie Unii Europejskiej w tej materii, proszę Komisję o udostępnienie danych dotyczących dotacji, jakie zostały z w latach 1997-2012 przeznaczone na projekty anty-traffickingowe, w tym m.in. programy STOP, Daphne, Aegis, Tacis, Equal, programy rozwojowe i inne.

W zeszłym roku została przyjęta nowa dyrektywa 2011/36/UE w sprawie zapobiegania handlowi ludźmi i zwalczania tego procederu oraz ochrony ofiar. Czy Komisja posiada informacje, jak przedstawia się implementacja tej dyrektywy w poszczególnych krajach członkowskich i jakie ewentualne trudności przy tym występują?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Cecylię Malmström w imieniu Komisji
(8 lutego 2013 r.)

Komisja Europejska udzieliła wsparcia wielu projektom w dziedzinie handlu ludźmi, w ramach różnych unijnych instrumentów finansowych. Handel ludźmi jest priorytetem programu finansowego „Zapobieganie i walka z przestępczością" (ISEC) od czasu jego uruchomienia w 2007 r. Różne projekty dotyczące handlu ludźmi są też finansowane w ramach programu Dafne: „Środki przeciwdziałania przemocy wobec kobiet, młodzieży i dzieci"; program ogólny „Solidarność i zarządzanie przepływami migracyjnymi" (SOLID); instrumenty finansowe w zakresie współpracy z państwami trzecimi, w tym instrumenty tematyczne, takie jak program tematyczny „Migracja i azyl" oraz instrumenty geograficzne, takie jak instrument finansowania współpracy na rzecz rozwoju (DCI). Główne cele tych projektów to wsparcie i szkolenia w zakresie wdrażania przepisów zwalczających handel ludźmi, dochodzenia i ścigania takich przestępstw oraz wsparcie, ochrona i pomoc dla ofiar handlu ludźmi.

Unijna strona internetowa poświęcona zwalczaniu handlu ludźmi ([1]) zawiera kompletne informacje na temat projektów finansowanych w przeszłości. Zgodnie ze strategią UE na rzecz wyeliminowania handlu ludźmi ([2]) Komisja przeprowadzi kompleksowy przegląd tych projektów celem wzmocnienia przyszłych projektów i zapewnienia solidnych podstaw dla spójnych, opłacalnych i strategicznych inicjatyw w zakresie finansowania oraz polityki UE.

Państwa członkowskie powinny dokonać transpozycji dyrektywy w sprawie zwalczania handlu ludźmi ([3]) do dnia 6 kwietnia 2013 r. Po upływie tego terminu Komisja przedłoży Parlamentowi Europejskiemu i Radzie sprawozdanie oceniające, w jakim stopniu państwa członkowskie podjęły niezbędne działania w celu zapewnienia zgodności z dyrektywą.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/index.action.
([2]) Strategia UE na rzecz wyeliminowania handlu ludźmi na lata 2012-2016, COM(2012)286 final.
([3]) Dyrektywa 2011/36/UE w sprawie zapobiegania handlowi ludźmi i zwalczania tego procederu oraz ochrony ofiar, zastępująca decyzję ramową Rady 2002/629/WSiSW.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011512/12
to the Commission
Joanna Senyszyn (S&D)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Anti-trafficking projects

Since the adoption in 1997 of a joint action by the Council on combating trafficking in human beings and the sexual exploitation of children, a large number of initiatives have been mounted with a view to addressing these forms of crime.

So as to be able to assess the EU's current commitment in this area, could the Commission please provide information on the funding granted between 1997 and 2012 to anti-trafficking projects such as the STOP, Daphne, Aegis, Tacis and Equal programmes, as well as development programmes and others?

The year 2011 saw the adoption of Directive 2011/36/EU on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims. Does the Commission have information on the state of play with regard to the implementation of the directive in the various Member States and on any difficulties that may have arisen in the process?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(8 February 2013)

The European Commission has supported numerous projects on trafficking in human beings under a number of EU financial instruments. Trafficking has been a priority of the financial programme 'Prevention and fight against crime' (ISEC) since its inception in 2007. Various projects on trafficking are also funded under the Daphne Programme: 'Measures to combat violence against women, young persons and children'; the General Programme 'Solidarity and management of migration flows' (SOLID); financial instruments dealing with cooperation with third countries including thematic instruments such as the Thematic Programme 'Migration and Asylum' and geographic instruments such as the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI). The focus has been on support and training for the enactment of anti-trafficking legislation, investigation and prosecution, and on support, protection and assistance to victims of trafficking in human beings.

The EU Anti-Trafficking website ([1]) provides full information on projects that have been funded in the past. In line with the EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings ([2]), the Commission will conduct a comprehensive review of these projects in order to strengthen future projects and provide a solid basis for coherent, cost effective and strategic EU policy and funding initiatives.

Member States should transpose the anti-trafficking directive ([3]) by 6 April 2013. The Commission will subsequently submit a report to the European Parliament and the Council, assessing the extent to which the Member States have taken the necessary measures to comply with the directive.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/index.action.
([2]) The EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016 COM(2012)286 final.
([3]) Directive 2011/36/EU on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011513/12
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(17 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Industria siderurgică

Industria siderurgică numără aproximativ 360 000 de lucrători și reprezintă un sector economic crucial al Uniunii Europene.

În contextul actual al politicii industriale a Uniunii Europene, este esențial din punct de vedere strategic să se prevină relocarea combinatelor și a producției siderurgice în afara Uniunii Europene și să se asigure securitatea forței de muncă, astfel încât și în contextul politicii de mediu a UE să se asigure faptul că echilibrul ecologic este consolidat.

În aceste condiții care este strategia Comisiei pentru a stimula creșterea economică, dar și ocuparea forței de muncă din industria siderurgică pe perioada actualei crizei economice și a asigura compatibilitatea cu sănătatea și siguranța cetățenilor de pe teritoriul Uniunii?

Răspuns dat de dl Tajani în numele Comisiei
(5 martie 2013)

Comisia împărtășește opinia distinsului membru în ceea ce privește importanța industriei siderurgice, a prevenirii relocalizării, garantării securității forței de muncă și îmbunătățirii echilibrului ecologic.

În iulie 2012, Comisia a convocat o masă rotundă la nivel înalt privind viitorul industriei siderurgice europene, care a reprezentat o platformă de dialog între membrii Comisiei, industrie și organizațiile sindicale. Parlamentul European a participat la lucrările celor două reuniuni din 2012 în care masa rotundă a realizat o evaluare a provocărilor cheie și a factorilor care afectează competitivitatea sectorului. A treia reuniune a avut loc la 12 februarie 2013 și, în cadrul ei, s-a adoptat un set final de recomandări strategice specifice pentru Comisie. Cele mai importante state membre producătoare de oțel au participat la acest exercițiu, în calitate de observatori, alături de reprezentanți ai Parlamentului European. Trebuie remarcat faptul că dialogul și proiectele de recomandări strategice abordează domenii de importanță pentru durabilitatea economică, socială și ecologică și includ chestiuni cum ar fi rolul cercetării, dezvoltării și inovării în ceea ce privește producția de oțel cu emisii scăzute de dioxid de carbon și eforturile care trebuie susținute în ceea ce privește competențele, resursele și eficiența energetică. Recomandările mesei rotunde la nivel înalt vor fi făcute publice după adoptarea lor de către grup.

Comisia intenționează să dea curs acestor recomandări până în iunie 2013, printr-un plan de acțiune pentru industria siderurgică din UE. Planul de acțiune va stabili o strategie de politică la nivelul UE cu scopul de a garanta că sunt implementate condițiile-cadru adecvate. Acesta va fi apoi transmis Parlamentului European și Consiliului pentru a adopta măsurile corespunzătoare.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011513/12
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(17 December 2012)

Subject: Steel industry

The steel industry provides around 360 000 jobs and is a crucial economic sector for the European Union.

In the context of the European Union's current industrial policy, it is strategically vital to prevent the relocation of steel plants and production outside the European Union and to ensure the security of the workforce, and in terms of EU environment policy, it is equally essential to ensure that the ecological balance is enhanced.

In this light, what is the Commission's strategy to boost growth and employment in the steel industry during the current economic crisis and ensure that it is compatible with the health and safety of all EU citizens?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2013)

The Commission shares the views of the Honourable Member with regards to the importance of the steel industry, of preventing relocation, ensuring the security of the workforce and enhancing the ecological balance.

In July 2012, the Commission convoked a High-level Roundtable on the future of the European Steel Industry as a platform for dialogue between the members of the Commission, industry and trade unions. The European Parliament participated in the work of the two meetings in 2012 during which the Roundtable carried out an assessment of key challenges and factors affecting the competitiveness of the sector. The third meeting took place on 12 February 2013 and adopted a final set of specific policy recommendations to the Commission. The most important steel producing Member States have participated in this exercise as observers alongside representatives of the European Parliament. It should be noted that the dialogue and draft policy recommendations touch on areas of importance for economic, social and environmental sustainability and deal with issues such as the role of R&D and innovation related to low-carbon steel production and the efforts that need to be carried out as far as skills, resource and energy efficiency. The recommendations of the High Level Roundtable will be made public upon adoption by Group.

The Commission plans to respond to these recommendations, by June 2013 through an Action Plan for the EU steel industry. The action plan will set up an EU-wide policy strategy aiming to ensure that the right framework conditions are in place. It will then be forwarded to the European Parliament and the Council for the appropriate action.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-011514/12
до Комисията

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) и Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)

(17 декември 2012 г.)

Относно: Информация относно мерки за справяне с младежката безработица

На 30 януари 2012 г., по време на неофициалната среща на високо равнище на Европейския съвет, Комисията сформира осем „екипа за действие“, които бяха изпратени в осемте държави от ЕС с най-високи равнища на младежка безработица (Италия, Испания, Гърция, Словакия, Литва, Португалия, Латвия и Ирландия), като обяви в същото време, че 82 милиарда евро неразпределени европейски средства трябва да се използват за инициативи във връзка с младежката безработица. На 23 май 2012 г. председателят Барозу представи първите резултати от работата на „екипите за действие“. Около 7,3 милиарда евро от предоставените европейски средства са били насочени чрез тази инициатива за ускорено изпълнение или преразпределение в полза на най-малко 460 000 младежи и 56 000 МСП.

Може ли Комисията да заяви:

— дали е наличен актуален преглед на работата на „екипите за действие“ и на консултациите с другите седем държави с младежка безработица над средната стойност за ЕС (България, Кипър, Полша, Румъния, Унгария, Франция и Швеция),

— дали е налична по-точна и скорошна информация относно финансираните проекти и относно проектите, които са в процес на одобрение, включително информация, която би се отнасяла до възможни промени в оперативните програми,

— дали е направен анализ на добрите практики и дали е разработена дългосрочна стратегия за действие относно младежката безработица,

— дали е била консултирана някоя младежка организация, както се изисква в съобщението на Комисията, в което се предлага инициатива „Възможности за младежта“, и в резолюцията на Парламента от 24 май 2012 г. относно възможностите за младежта, и ако това е станало, кога, тъй като изглежда, че никакво подобно действие не е било предприето до този момент,

— какви мерки спомена председателят Барозу в речта си относно състоянието на Съюза, когато спомена, наред с другото, стартирането на „пакет за младежта“ за създаване на схема за гаранция за младежта и рамка за качество на професионалното обучение — и кога ще ги видим,

— дали са налични резултатите от консултациите относно „рамката за качество за улесняване на професионалното обучение“,

— как се развива инициативата „Възможности за младежта“ и какви мерки са взети?

Отговор, даден от г-н Andor от името на Комисията
(27 февруари 2013 г.)

На 5 декември 2012 г. беше приет Пакета за младежка заетост ([1]), обявен от председателя Барозу. В пакета Комисията представи своя анализ на стратегията и актуализирана информация за прилагането на инициативата „Възможности за младежта“ ([2]), на действията на равнището ЕС, както и информация за мерките, предприети от 28 страни — по-специално за осемте страни, набелязани през февруари 2012 г, относно мобилизиране на средства или промяна на програмите по фондовете на ЕС.

До този момент финансиране от ЕС в размер на около 16 млрд. EUR е насочено целево към ускорено усвояване или преразпределено чрез тази инициатива, като се очаква най-малко 780 000 млади хора и 55 000 МСП да се възползват от него ([3]). Това е свързано с промени в програмите, които вече са направени. Наскоро бяха представени ограничен брой допълнителни искания, най-вече от Испания и Италия, за промени в програмите, за които Комисията трябва да вземе решение.

Комисията се допита до заинтересованите страни, включително Европейския младежки форум. Държавите членки трябваше да организират консултации на национално равнище. Обширни консултации с младите хора по въпросите на младежката заетост бяха проведени в рамките на структурирания диалог между младите хора и лицата, определящи политиката през 2010-2011 г., резултатите от който бяха включени в работата на Комисията в тази област ([4]).

Парламентът обсъди предложението за създаване на гаранция за младежта и през януари прие резолюция в негова подкрепа. Преговорите в Съвета по създаването на гаранция за младежта са започнали с оглед приемането на препоръката през февруари 2013 г.

Що се отнася до рамката за качество на стажовете, понастоящем Комисията проучва мненията на социалните партньори съгласно член 154 от ДФЕС. Отговорите от проведеното през април 2012 г. широко допитване са достъпни на интернет страницата на ГД „Трудова заетост“ ([5]).

([1]) COM (2012) 727-728-729 окончателен от 5 декември 2012 г.
([2]) COM(2011) 933 от 2 февруари 2011 г.
([3]) Тези последни данни се основават на действителните преразпределения, прилагани от държавите членки.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_bg.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=bg&consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011514/12
a la Comisión

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) y Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)

(17 de diciembre de 2012)

Asunto: Solicitud de información sobre las medidas para combatir el desempleo juvenil

Durante una cumbre informal del Consejo Europeo, celebrada el 30 de enero de 2012, la Comisión creó ocho «equipos de acción» que fueron enviados a los ocho Estados miembros con las tasas de desempleo juvenil más elevadas: Italia, España, Grecia, Eslovaquia, Lituania, Portugal, Letonia e Irlanda. Asimismo, la Comisión informó de que 82 000 millones de euros de fondos europeos pendientes de asignación se destinarán a iniciativas para combatir el desempleo juvenil. El 23 de mayo, el Presidente Barroso presentó los primeros resultados de la labor de los «equipos de acción». Alrededor de 7 300 millones de euros de los fondos asignados se canalizaron a través de esta iniciativa para desbloquearse o reasignarse con mayor rapidez, en beneficio de al menos de 460 000 jóvenes desempleados y 56 000 pequeñas y medianas empresas.

¿Podría indicar la Comisión:

— si hay disponible un informe actualizado sobre la labor llevada a cabo por los «equipos de acción» y las consultas realizadas con los otros siete Estados miembros con una tasa de desempleo juvenil que se encuentra por encima de la media comunitaria (Bulgaria, Chipre, Francia, Hungría, Polonia, Rumanía y Suecia);

— si hay disponible información más precisa y reciente sobre los proyectos financiados por la UE y los que se encuentran en fase de aprobación, incluidos todos aquellos proyectos que pudieran ocasionar cambios en los programas operativos;

— si se ha realizado un análisis de buenas prácticas, y si se ha desarrollado una estrategia de acción a largo plazo para potenciar el empleo juvenil;

— si se ha consultado a alguna asociación juvenil, conforme a lo dispuesto en la Comunicación de la Comisión en la que se proponía una «Iniciativa de Oportunidades para la Juventud» y en la Resolución del Parlamento Europeo, de 24 de mayo de 2012, sobre la «Iniciativa de Oportunidades para la Juventud», y en caso afirmativo, cuándo, puesto que no parece que se haya adoptado aún ninguna medida al respecto;

— cuáles son las medidas anunciadas por el Presidente Barroso durante su discurso sobre el estado de la Unión en el que mencionó, entre otras cosas, el lanzamiento de un «un paquete de iniciativas para la juventud» que establecería un sistema de garantías juveniles y un marco de calidad que facilitará la formación profesional, y cuándo se prevé su realización;

— si los resultados de la consulta sobre un «marco de calidad que facilitará la formación profesional» están disponibles;

— si puede proporcionar datos actualizados sobre el progreso de la «Iniciativa de Oportunidades para la Juventud» y qué medidas se han adoptado?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de febrero de 2013)

El paquete de medidas para el empleo juvenil ([1]) anunciado por el Presidente Barroso fue adoptado el 5 de diciembre de 2012. En este conjunto de medidas, la Comisión presentó su análisis, su estrategia, una actualización de la aplicación de la «Iniciativa de Oportunidades para la Juventud» ([2]), algunas acciones a nivel de la UE y 28 fichas de países con información sobre la movilización o la reprogramación de fondos de la UE, destinados en particular a los ocho países individualizados en febrero de 2012.

A través de esta iniciativa se han destinado hasta el momento, para asignación acelerada o reasignación, unos 16 000 000 millones de euros, de los que probablemente se beneficiarán al menos unos 780 000 jóvenes y 55 000 PYME ([3]). Estas sumas corresponden a reprogramaciones que ya han tenido lugar; más recientemente se ha presentado un pequeño número de solicitudes de reprogramación, sobre todo de España e Italia, que está pendiente de decisión de la Comisión.

La Comisión ha celebrado consultas con las partes interesadas, incluido el Foro Europeo de la Juventud. Las consultas a nivel nacional quedaron a cargo de los Estados miembros. En 2010-2011 se celebraron asimismo amplias consultas sobre empleo juvenil con jóvenes en el marco del Diálogo Estructurado entre los jóvenes y los responsables de la política de juventud, consultas cuyos resultados pasaron a engrosar la base de los trabajos de la Comisión en este ámbito ([4]).

El Parlamento debatió la «Garantía juvenil» y en enero adoptó una resolución para respaldarla. Las negociaciones en el Consejo sobre la Garantía juvenil han dado comienzo y se pretende que la Recomendación sea adoptada en febrero de 2013.

Por lo que se refiere al Marco de calidad para los periodos de prácticas, la Comisión está recabando la opinión de los interlocutores sociales, como dispone el artículo 154 del TFUE. Pueden verse las respuestas a la consulta pública de abril de 2012 en las páginas web de la DG de Empleo ([5]).

([1]) COM(2002) 727-728-729 final de 5 de diciembre de 2012.
([2]) COM(2011) 933 de 20 de diciembre de 2011.
([3]) Estas últimas cifras se basan en la reasignación real efectuada por los Estados miembros.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_es.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=es&consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011514/12
an die Kommission

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) und Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)

(17. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Informationen zu Maßnahmen zur Bekämpfung der Jugendarbeitslosigkeit

Während der informellen Tagung des Europäischen Rates vom 30. Januar 2012 hat die Kommission acht „Aktionsgruppen“ eingerichtet, die in die Mitgliedstaaten mit einer hohen Jugendarbeitslosigkeit (Italien, Spanien, Griechenland, Slowakei, Litauen, Portugal, Lettland und Irland) entsandt wurden; sie kündigte hierbei an, dass bislang nicht zugewiesene EU-Mittel in Höhe von 82 Mrd. EUR für Maßnahmen zur Bekämpfung der Jugendarbeitslosigkeit verwandt werden sollen. Am 23. Mai 2012 legte Präsident Barroso die ersten von den „Aktionsgruppen“ erzielten Ergebnisse vor. Von den vorgesehenen EU-Mitteln wurden etwa 7,3 Mrd. EUR für eine beschleunigte Umsetzung zugunsten von mindestens 460 000 jungen Menschen und 56 000 KMU vorgesehen bzw. umgewidmet.

Die Kommission wird gebeten darzulegen,

— ob eine aktualisierte Bewertung der Tätigkeit der „Aktionsgruppen“ und der Konsultationen mit den anderen sieben Ländern, in denen die Jugendarbeitslosenrate über dem EU-Durchschnitt liegt (Bulgarien, Zypern, Frankreich, Ungarn, Polen, Rumänien und Schweden), verfügbar ist,

— ob genauere und aktuellere Informationen zu den geförderten Projekten und zu Projekten, die derzeit genehmigt werden (einschließlich Projekte, die mögliche Änderungen der operationellen Programme betreffen können), vorliegen,

— ob bewährte Verfahren analysiert wurden und ob eine langfristige Aktionsstrategie für die Beschäftigung junger Menschen formuliert worden ist,

— ob, wie in der Mitteilung der Kommission, in der „Chancen für junge Menschen“ vorgeschlagen werden, und in der Entschließung des Parlaments vom 24. Mai 2012 zu den Chancen junger Menschen gefordert, eine Jugendorganisation konsultiert wurde, und, soweit dies der Fall war, zu welchem Zeitpunkt, denn bislang wurden offenbar keine Maßnahmen ergriffen,

— auf welche Maßnahmen sich Präsident Barroso in seiner Rede zur Lage der Union bezogen hat, die unter anderem die Einführung eines „Jugendpakets“ vorsehen, um eine Garantieregelung für junge Menschen einzuführen und einen Qualitätsrahmen für die berufliche Bildung zu schaffen — und wann hiermit zu rechnen ist?

— ob die Ergebnisse der Konsultation zu dem Qualitätsrahmen für die berufliche Bildung vorliegen,

— welche Fortschritte bei der Initiative „Chancen für junge Menschen“ zu verzeichnen sind und welche Maßnahmen bereits ergriffen worden sind.

Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission
(27. Februar 2013)

Das von Präsident Barroso angekündigte Beschäftigungspaket für junge Menschen ([1]) wurde am 5. Dezember 2012 genehmigt. In diesem Paket legte die Kommission ihre Analyse, ihre Strategie und eine Aktualisierung im Zusammenhang mit der Umsetzung der Initiative „Chancen für junge Menschen“ ([2]) vor; dargestellt werden ferner die auf EU-Ebene ergriffenen Maßnahmen sowie 28 länderspezifische Fact Sheets mit Informationen über die Mobilisierung und Umverteilung von EU-Mitteln insbesondere zugunsten der acht im Februar 2012 ausgewählten Länder.

Rund 16 Mrd. EUR aus EU-Mitteln wurden bisher für die beschleunigte Umsetzung oder die Neuzuweisung im Rahmen dieser Initiative eingesetzt, die mindestens 780 000 jungen Menschen und 55 000 KMU zugutekommen dürften ([3]). Die Mittel betreffen die bereits erfolgte Umverteilung. Kürzlich ging eine begrenzte Zahl weiterer Anträge auf Umverteilung insbesondere von Spanien und Italien ein, wozu die entsprechenden Kommissionsbeschlüsse noch ausstehen.

Die Kommission hat die Interessenträger an, u. a. das Europäische Jugendforum, konsultiert. Die Konsultationen auf nationaler Ebene waren Aufgabe der Mitgliedstaaten. Im Rahmen des strukturierten Dialogs zwischen jungen Menschen und Entscheidungsträgern fanden 2010-2011 ausführliche Konsultationen mit jungen Menschen statt, deren Ergebnisse in die Arbeit der Kommission in diesem Bereich eingeflossen sind ([4]).

Nach ausführlichen Erörterungen über eine Jugendgarantie verabschiedete das Europäische Parlament im Januar eine entsprechende befürwortende Entschließung. Inzwischen hat der Rat die Verhandlungen über die Jugendgarantie aufgenommen und wird im Februar 2013 eine Empfehlung hierzu annehmen.

Gemäß Artikel 154 AEUV holt die Kommission derzeit die Stellungnahmen der Sozialpartner zu dem in Aussicht genommenen Qualitätsrahmen für Praktika ein. Die Antworten im Verlauf der öffentlichen Konsultationen vom April 2012 sind auf der Website der GD Beschäftigung ([5]) zugänglich.

([1]) KOM(2012)727 endg. vom 5. Dezember 2012.
([2]) KOM(2011)933 endg. vom 20. Dezember 2011.
([3]) Diese jüngsten Zahlen basieren auf der aktuellen Neuzuweisung durch die Mitgliedstaaten.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_de.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=de&consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011514/12
προς την Επιτροπή

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) και Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)

(17 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ενημέρωση όσον αφορά μέτρα για την αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας των νέων

Στις 30 Ιανουαρίου 2012, κατά την άτυπη σύνοδο κορυφής του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου, η Επιτροπή συγκρότησε οκτώ «ομάδες δράσης», οι οποίες στάλθηκαν στις οκτώ χώρες της ΕΕ με τα υψηλότερα ποσοστά ανεργίας των νέων (Ιταλία, Ισπανία, Ελλάδα, Σλοβακία, Λιθουανία, Πορτογαλία, Λετονία και Ιρλανδία), ανακοινώνοντας παράλληλα ότι 82 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ αδιάθετων ευρωπαϊκών κονδυλίων επρόκειτο να δεσμευτούν σε πρωτοβουλίες για την ανεργία των νέων. Στις 23 Μαΐου 2012, ο Πρόεδρος Barroso παρουσίασε τα πρώτα αποτελέσματα του έργου των «ομάδων δράσης». Από τις αναληφθείσες πιστώσεις της ΕΕ, περίπου 7,3 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ διοχετεύθηκαν μέσω της πρωτοβουλίας αυτής για εσπευσμένη διάθεση ή ανακατανομή, προς όφελος τουλάχιστον 460 000 νέων και 56 000 ΜΜΕ.

Μπορεί να αναφέρει η Επιτροπή:

— εάν διατίθεται επικαιροποιημένη επισκόπηση του έργου των «ομάδων δράσης» και των διαβουλεύσεων με τις υπόλοιπες επτά χώρες με ποσοστό ανεργίας των νέων πάνω από τον μέσο όρο της ΕΕ (Βουλγαρία, Κύπρος, Γαλλία, Ουγγαρία, Πολωνία, Ρουμανία και Σουηδία),

— εάν διατίθενται πιο ακριβείς και πρόσφατες πληροφορίες σχετικά με τα χρηματοδοτούμενα έργα και τα έργα που υπόκεινται σε διαδικασία έγκρισης, συμπεριλαμβανομένων πληροφοριών που ενδέχεται να αφορούν τυχόν μεταβολές των επιχειρησιακών προγραμμάτων,

— εάν έχει πραγματοποιηθεί ανάλυση των ορθών πρακτικών και εάν έχει καταρτιστεί μακροπρόθεσμη στρατηγική δράσης για την ανεργία των νέων,

— εάν έχει πραγματοποιηθεί διαβούλευση με κάποια οργάνωση νεολαίας, όπως είχε ζητηθεί στο πλαίσιο της ανακοίνωσης της Επιτροπής με την οποία προτεινόταν η πρωτοβουλία «Ευκαιρίες για τους νέους», και στο ψήφισμα του Κοινοβουλίου της 24ης Μαΐου 2012 σχετικά με τις ευκαιρίες για τους νέους, και, εάν ισχύει κάτι τέτοιο, πότε πραγματοποιήθηκε αυτή, καθώς δεν φαίνεται να έχουν αναληφθεί σχετικές πρωτοβουλίες μέχρι στιγμής,

— σε ποια μέτρα αναφερόταν ο πρόεδρος Barroso στην ομιλία του για την κατάσταση της Ένωσης — όπου ανέφερε, μεταξύ άλλων, ότι θα παρουσιαστεί «δέσμη μέτρων για τη νεολαία» με σκοπό τη θέσπιση συστήματος παροχής εγγυήσεων για τη νεολαία και ποιοτικού πλαισίου για την επαγγελματική κατάρτιση — και πότε θα υλοποιηθούν τα μέτρα αυτά,

— εάν είναι διαθέσιμα τα αποτελέσματα της διαβούλευσης σχετικά με το «ποιοτικό πλαίσιο που θα διευκολύνει την επαγγελματική κατάρτιση»,

— ποια είναι η πρόοδος της πρωτοβουλίας «Ευκαιρίες για τους νέους» και ποια μέτρα έχουν ληφθεί;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Η δέσμη μέτρων για την απασχόληση των νέων ([1]) όπως ανακοινώθηκε από τον Πρόεδρο Barroso, εγκρίθηκε στις 5 Δεκεμβρίου 2012. Στην εν λόγω δέσμη μέτρων, η Επιτροπή παρουσίασε την ανάλυσή της, τη στρατηγική της και μια επικαιροποίηση σχετικά με την εφαρμογή της πρωτοβουλίας «Ευκαιρίες για τους νέους» ([2]), δράσεις σε επίπεδο ΕΕ, καθώς και 28 δελτία ανά χώρα με πληροφορίες σχετικά με την κινητοποίηση ή τον επαναπρογραμματισμό των ευρωπαϊκών κονδυλίων, ιδίως για τις οκτώ χώρες στις οποίες απευθυνόταν τον Φεβρουάριο του 2012.

Περίπου 16 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ από τις χρηματοδοτήσεις της ΕΕ προορίζονται, μέχρι στιγμής, για ταχύτερη διανομή ή ανακατανομή, μέσω της εν λόγω πρωτοβουλίας, υπέρ 780 000 νέων και 55 000 ΜΜΕ τουλάχιστον ([3]). Το ποσό αυτό αφορά τον επαναπρογραμματισμό, ο οποίος έχει ήδη πραγματοποιηθεί, ενώ ένας περιορισμένος αριθμός περαιτέρω απαιτήσεων για επαναπρογραμματισμό υποβλήθηκε πρόσφατα, ειδικότερα από την Ισπανία και την Ιταλία, οι οποίες αναμένουν την απόφαση της Επιτροπής.

Η Επιτροπή πραγματοποίησε διαβουλεύσεις με τους ενδιαφερομένους, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του Ευρωπαϊκού φόρουμ για τη νεολαία. Οι διαβουλεύσεις σε εθνικό επίπεδο αφέθηκαν στα κράτη μέλη. Εκτενείς διαβουλεύσεις με νέους σχετικά με την απασχόληση των νέων διεξήχθησαν στο πλαίσιο του διαρθρωμένου διαλόγου, μεταξύ των νέων και των υπευθύνων για τη λήψη αποφάσεων το 2010-2011, τα αποτελέσματα των οποίων τροφοδότησαν το έργο της Επιτροπής σ' αυτό το πεδίο ([4]).

Το Κοινοβούλιο συζήτησε την πρωτοβουλία «Ευρωπαϊκές εγγυήσεις για τους νέους» και ενέκρινε ψήφισμα, το οποίο θα υποστηρίξει τον Ιανουάριο. Οι διαπραγματεύσεις στο Συμβούλιο σχετικά με τις εν λόγω εγγυήσεις για τους νέους έχουν ξεκινήσει, με σκοπό την έγκριση της σύστασης τον Φεβρουάριο του 2013.

Όσον αφορά το πλαίσιο ποιότητας για τις περιόδους πρακτικής άσκησης, η Επιτροπή καλεί, επί του παρόντος, τους κοινωνικούς εταίρους να εκφράσουν τις απόψεις τους δυνάμει του άρθρου 154 της ΣΛΕΕ. Οι απαντήσεις στην ανοικτή διαβούλευση που πραγματοποιήθηκε τον Απρίλιο του 2012, είναι διαθέσιμες στην ιστοσελίδα της ΓΔ Απασχόλησης ([5]).

([1]) COM(2012)727-728-729 τελικό της 5ης Δεκεμβρίου 2012.
([2]) COM(2011)933 της 20ής Δεκεμβρίου 2011.
([3]) Τα τελευταία στοιχεία βασίζονται στην πραγματική ανακατανομή που εφαρμόστηκε από τα κράτη μέλη.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_en.html.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=en&consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011514/12
à la Commission

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) et Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)

(17 décembre 2012)

Objet: Demande d'information sur les mesures visant à combattre le chômage des jeunes

Lors du Conseil européen informel du 30 janvier 2012, la Commission a constitué huit «équipes d'action» qui ont été envoyées dans les huit États membres de l'Union dans lesquels le taux de chômage des jeunes est le plus élevé (Italie, Espagne, Grèce, Slovaquie, Lituanie, Portugal, Lettonie et Irlande). Elle a en outre annoncé, à cette occasion, que 82 milliards d'euros en provenance de fonds européens n'ayant pas encore été affectés seraient alloués afin d'appuyer des initiatives visant à lutter contre le chômage des jeunes. Le 23 mai 2012, le président Barroso a présenté les premiers résultats obtenus par ces «équipes d'action». Quelque 7,3 milliards d'euros de fonds de l'Union ont été, à la faveur de cette initiative, destinés à être dégagés plus rapidement ou réaffectés dans le but de bénéficier à au moins 460 000 jeunes et 56 000 PME.

La Commission pourrait-elle répondre aux questions suivantes:

— Existe-t-il un bilan actualisé du travail accompli par les «équipes d'action» ainsi que desconsultations menées avec les sept autres pays dont le taux de chômage des jeunes estsupérieur à la moyenne de l'Union européenne (Bulgarie, Chypre, France, Hongrie,Pologne, Roumanie et Suède)?

— Des données plus précises et récentes sont-elles disponibles sur les projets financés ou enen cours d'approbation, y compris tous les projets susceptibles de concerner d'éventuellesmodifications des programmes opérationnels?

— Les bonnes pratiques ont-elles fait l'objet d'une analyse, et une stratégie d'action à longterme en faveur de l'emploi des jeunes a-t-elle été définie?

— Une consultation a-t-elle eu lieu avec des organisations de jeunes, comme il était prévudans la communication de la Commission qui proposait une «initiative sur lesperspectives d'emploi des jeunes» de même que dans la résolution du Parlementeuropéen, du 24 mai 2012, sur les perspectives d'emploi des jeunes? Dans l'affirmative,quand a-t-elle été menée, dans la mesure où il semble qu'aucune action n'ait encore étéentreprise dans ce domaine?

— À quelles mesures se référait le président Barroso dans son discours sur l'état de l'Union,lorsqu'il mentionnait, entre autres, le lancement d'un «paquet Jeunesse» instaurant undispositif de garantie pour la jeunesse et un cadre de qualité pour faciliter la formationprofessionnelle? Quand est-il prévu de mettre en œuvre ce train de mesures?

— Les résultats de la consultation sur le cadre de qualité pour faciliter la formationprofessionnelle sont-ils disponibles?

— Quels sont les progrès enregistrés au titre de l'«initiative sur les perspectives d'emploi desjeunes», et quelles mesures ont été adoptées dans ce cadre?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(27 février 2013)

Le «paquet Emploi jeunes» ([1]) annoncé par le président Barroso a été adopté le 5 décembre 2012. La Commission y a présenté son analyse, sa stratégie et un bilan actualisé de l'application de l'initiative sur les perspectives d'emploi des jeunes ([2]), les actions à mener à l'échelon de l'UE ainsi que 28 fiches-pays contenant des informations sur la mobilisation ou la reprogrammation des fonds de l'UE, en particulier pour les huit États membres visés en février 2012.

Environ 16 milliards d'euros de fonds de l'UE ont jusqu'ici fait l'objet d'une utilisation accélérée ou d'une réaffectation au titre de l'initiative sur les perspectives d'emplois des jeunes, et au moins 780 000 jeunes et 55 000 PME sont susceptibles d'en bénéficier ([3]). Ces chiffres concernent une reprogrammation qui a déjà eu lieu; un petit nombre de demandes supplémentaires de reprogrammation ont été récemment introduites, notamment par l'Espagne et l'Italie, et doivent encore faire l'objet d'une décision de la Commission.

La Commission a consulté les parties prenantes, y compris le Forum européen de la jeunesse. Les consultations à l'échelon national ont été laissées à la responsabilité des États membres. La jeunesse a été amplement consultée sur l'emploi des jeunes dans le cadre du dialogue structuré entre jeunes et responsables politiques en 2010 et 2011, et les résultats de cette consultation ont alimenté les travaux de la Commission dans ce domaine ([4]).

Le Parlement a débattu de la «Garantie pour la jeunesse» et a adopté une résolution la soutenant en janvier. Les négociations au sein du Conseil sur l'établissement de cette garantie ont commencé en vue de l'adoption d'une recommandation en février 2013.

En ce qui concerne le cadre de qualité pour les stages, la Commission recueille actuellement l'avis des partenaires sociaux conformément à l'article 154 du TFUE. Les réponses à la consultation publique, entamée en avril 2012, sont accessibles sur le site web de la DG Emploi ([5]).

([1]) COM(2012) 727-728-729 final du 5 décembre 2012.
([2]) COM(2011) 933 du 20 décembre 2011.
([3]) Ces chiffres (les plus récents) sont fondés sur les réaffectations effectuées par les États membres.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_fr.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=fr&consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011514/12
alla Commissione

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) e Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)

(17 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: Informazioni sulle misure per combattere la disoccupazione giovanile

Il 30 gennaio 2012, durante il vertice informale del Consiglio europeo, la Commissione ha istituito otto gruppi d'azione da inviare negli otto paesi dell'Unione europea con il più alto tasso di disoccupazione (Italia, Spagna, Grecia, Slovacchia, Lituania, Portogallo, Lettonia e Irlanda), annunciando inoltre l'impiego di 82 miliardi di euro di fondi europei non assegnati da destinare a iniziative per la disoccupazione giovanile. Il 23 maggio il Presidente Barroso ha presentato i primi risultati conseguiti dal gruppo d'azione. Circa 7,3 miliardi di euro dei suddetti fondi europei erano stati canalizzati attraverso questa iniziativa per essere stanziati o riassegnati più rapidamente a favore di almeno 460 000 giovani e 56 000 PMI.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

— se è disponibile un'analisi aggiornata sull'attività dei gruppi d'azione e sulle consultazioni con gli altri sette paesi che presentano un tasso di disoccupazione sopra la media europea (Bulgaria, Cipro, Francia, Ungheria, Polonia, Romania e Svezia);

— se sono disponibili informazioni più accurate e recenti sui progetti finanziati e su quelli in corso di approvazione, compresi quelli relativi a eventuali modifiche dei programmi operativi;

— se è stata elaborata un'analisi delle buone pratiche e se è stata formulata una strategia d'azione a lungo termine per l'occupazione giovanile;

— se ed eventualmente quando sono state consultate le organizzazioni giovanili, come richiesto nella Comunicazione della Commissione europea in cui è stata proposta l'iniziativa «Opportunità per i giovani» e nella risoluzione del Parlamento europeo del 24 maggio 2012 sulle opportunità per i giovani, poiché non risultano ad oggi azioni intraprese in tal senso;

— quali saranno e quando verranno concretizzate le misure annunciate dal Presidente Barroso durante il discorso sullo Stato dell'Unione in cui si menzionava, tra le altre cose, il lancio di un «pacchetto gioventù» volto a creare un sistema di garanzia per i giovani e un quadro di qualità per facilitare la formazione professionale;

— se sono disponibili i risultati della consultazione «quadro di qualità per facilitare la formazione professionale»;

— qual è lo stato di avanzamento dell'iniziativa «Opportunità per i giovani» e quali misure sono state adottate?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(27 febbraio 2013)

Il pacchetto per l'Occupazione giovanile ([1]) annunciato dal presidente Barroso è stato adottato il 5 dicembre 2012. In tale pacchetto la Commissione ha presentato la propria analisi, la propria strategia e un aggiornamento sull'attuazione dell'iniziativa Opportunità per i giovani ([2]), le azioni a livello di UE nonché 28 schede per paese contenenti informazioni sulla mobilitazione o riprogrammazione dei fondi UE, in particolare per gli otto paesi selezionati nel febbraio 2012.

Con questa iniziativa sono stati destinati a un'erogazione accelerata o a una riassegnazione circa 16 miliardi di euro di finanziamenti UE che dovrebbero andare a favore di almeno 780 000 giovani e di 55 000 PMI ([3]). Ciò è legato a una riprogrammazione che ha già avuto luogo, mentre di recente è stato presentato un numero limitato di ulteriori richieste di riprogrammazione, segnatamente da Spagna e Italia, che ora sono in attesa di decisione della Commissione.

La Commissione ha consultato gli stakeholder compreso il Forum europeo della gioventù. Le consultazioni a livello nazionale sono state affidate agli Stati membri. Nel 2010-2011 si sono svolte ampie consultazioni con i giovani in tema di occupazione giovanile nell'ambito del dialogo strutturato tra i giovani e i decisori politici, i cui risultati hanno alimentato i lavori della Commissione in questo ambito ([4]).

Il Parlamento ha dibattuto la Garanzia per i giovani e ha adottato a gennaio una risoluzione al suo appoggio. In seno al Consiglio sono iniziati i negoziati relativi alla Garanzia per i giovani ed è prevista l'adozione della raccomandazione nel febbraio 2013.

Per quanto concerne il Quadro di qualità per i tirocini, la Commissione sta raccogliendo i pareri delle parti sociali in forza dell'articolo 154 del TFUE. Le risposte alla consultazione aperta dell'aprile 2012 sono accessibili sul sito web della DG Occupazione ([5]).

([1]) COM(2012)727-728-729 final del 5 dicembre 2012.
([2]) COM(2011)933 del 20 dicembre 2011.
([3]) Queste ultime cifre si basano sulla riassegnazione effettiva attuata dagli Stati membri.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_en.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=en&consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-011514/12
Komisijai

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) un Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)

(2012. gada 17. decembris)

Temats: Informācija par pasākumiem jauniešu bezdarba problēmas risināšanai

Eiropadomes neoficiālā samita laikā 2012. gada 30. janvārī Komisija izveidoja astoņas darba grupas, kas tika nosūtītas uz astoņām ES valstīm, kurās ir augstākie jauniešu bezdarba rādītāji (Itālija, Spānija, Grieķija, Slovākija, Lietuva, Portugāle, Latvija un Īrija), vienlaikus paziņojot, ka jauniešu bezdarba novēršanas iniciatīvām no vēl neizmantotajiem Eiropas līdzekļiem būtu jāpiešķir EUR 82 miljardi. 2012. gada 23. maijā Komisijas priekšsēdētājs Ž. M. Barrozu iepazīstināja ar pirmajiem darba grupu rezultātiem. No piešķirtajiem ES līdzekļiem apmēram EUR 7,3 miljardi ir izmantoti ar šīs iniciatīvas starpniecību nolūkā vismaz 460 000 jauniešu un 56 000 MVU atvieglināt līdzekļu saņemšanu vai pārdalīšanu.

Ņemot to vērā, vai Komisija var precizēt:

— vai ir pieejams atjaunināts pārskats par darba grupu paveikto un konsultācijām ar pārējām septiņām valstīm, kurās jauniešu bezdarba līmenis pārsniedz vidējo rādītāju ES (Bulgārija, Kipra, Francija, Ungārija, Polija, Rumānija un Zviedrija)?

— vai ir pieejama precīzāka un jaunāka informācija par finansētajiem projektiem un par apstiprināšanā esošajiem projektiem, ietverot jebkādu informāciju, kas varētu attiekties uz iespējamajām darbības programmu izmaiņām?

— vai ir analizēti labas prakses piemēri un vai ir izstrādāta ilgtermiņa rīcības stratēģija jauniešu bezdarba novēršanai?

— vai ir notikusi apspriešanās ar kādu no jauniešu organizācijām, kā tas prasīts Komisijas paziņojumā, ar ko ierosina "Jaunatnes iespēju iniciatīvu", un Parlamenta 2012. gada 24. maija rezolūcijā par iniciatīvu jauniešu nodarbinātības izredžu palielināšanai, un gadījumā, ja šāda apspriešanās ir notikusi, vai iespējams norādīt, kad tā ir notikusi, jo pagaidām nekas neliecina, ka šādi pasākumi ir notikuši?

— uz kādiem pasākumiem Komisijas priekšsēdētājs Ž. M. Barrozu atsaucās savā runā par Savienības stāvokli, kad viņš cita starpā minēja, ka ir sākta jauniešiem paredzēta tiesību aktu kopuma īstenošana nolūkā radīt jauniešu garantijas shēmu un kvalitatīvu sistēmu arodapmācībai, un kad ar šiem pasākumiem varēs iepazīties?

— vai ir pieejami rezultāti konsultācijām par kvalitatīvu sistēmu arodapmācības sekmēšanai?

— kā norit "Jaunatnes iespēju iniciatīvas" īstenošana un kādi pasākumi ir veikti?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Lāslo Andors
(2013. gada 27. februāris)

Jauniešu nodarbinātības pasākumu kopums ([1]), ko izsludināja Komisijas priekšsēdētājs Ž. M. Barrozu, tika pieņemts 2012. gada 5. decembrī. Šajā kopumā Komisija iekļāva "Jaunatnes iespēju iniciatīvas" ([2]) ieviešanas analīzi, stratēģiju un jaunāko informāciju par šīs iniciatīvas ieviešanu, pasākumus ES līmenī, kā arī tādus pārskatus par 28 valstīm, kuros iekļauta informācija par ES fondu izmantošanu un pārplānošanu, jo īpaši attiecībā uz astoņām 2012. gada februārī izraudzītajām valstīm.

Līdz šim saistībā ar šo iniciatīvu aptuveni EUR 16 miljardi ES finansējuma ir paredzēti paātrinātai piešķiršanai vai pārdalei, un vismaz 780 000 jauniešu un 55 000 MVU varētu gūt labumu ([3]). Tas attiecas uz pārprogrammēšanu, kas jau ir notikusi; nesen ir iesniegts neliels skaits pārprogrammēšanas pieprasījumu (konkrēti Spānija un Itālija) un tiek gaidīts Komisijas lēmums.

Komisija apspriedās ar ieinteresētajām personām, arī ar Eiropas Jaunatnes forumu. Apspriešanās valsts līmenī bija dalībvalstu ziņā. Plašas apspriešanās ar jauniešiem par jauniešu nodarbinātību 2010.–2011. gadā noritēja strukturētā jauniešu un politikas veidotāju dialoga satvarā, kura rezultāti iekļauti Komisijas darbā šajā jomā ([4]).

Parlaments apsprieda Eiropas Jaunatnes iniciatīvu un janvārī pieņēma rezolūciju tās atbalstam. Pārrunas Padomē par Jaunatnes garantiju uzsāktas, lai 2013. gada februārī pieņemtu ieteikumu.

Attiecībā uz stažēšanās kvalitātes sistēmu Komisija saskaņā ar LESD 154. pantu pašlaik noskaidro sociālo partneru viedokli. Atbildes uz 2012. gada aprīļa atklāto apspriešanu ir pieejamas Nodarbinātības ģenerāldirektorāta vietnē ([5]).

([1]) COM(2012) 727-728-729 final, 2012. gada 5. decembris.
([2]) COM(2011) 933, 2011. gada 20. decembris.
([3]) Šie pēdējie skaitļi iegūti, pamatojoties uz reālo pārdali, ko īstenojušas dalībvalstis.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_lv.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=lv&consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-011514/12
Komisijai
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) ir Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)
(2012 m. gruodžio 17 d.)

Tema: Informacija apie priemones, kuriomis siekiama sumažinti jaunimo nedarbą

2012 m. sausio 30 d. neoficialiame Europos Vadovų Tarybos susitikime Komisija įsteigė aštuonias veiksmų grupes, kurios buvo nusiųstos į aštuonias ES šalis, kuriose yra didžiausias jaunimo nedarbo lygis (Italija, Ispanija, Graikija, Slovakija, Lietuva, Portugalija, Latvija ir Airija), ir tuo pat metu paskelbė, kad 82 mlrd. eurų neasignuotųjų Europos lėšų įsipareigota iniciatyvoms, skirtoms jaunimo nedarbo klausimui spręsti, finansuoti. 2012 m. gegužės 23 d. pirmininkas J. M. Barroso pateikė pirmuosius veiksmų grupių darbo rezultatus. Šiai iniciatyvai įgyvendinti skirta maždaug 7,3 mlrd. eurų iš įsipareigotų ES lėšų, siekiant greičiau jas panaudoti arba perskirstyti, tikintis suteikti pagalbą ne mažiau kaip 460 000 jaunuolių ir 56 000 MVĮ.

Ar Komisija gali patvirtinti:

— ar parengta nauja veiklos grupių atlikto darbo ir konsultacijų su kitomis septyniomis šalimis, kuriose jaunimo nedarbo lygis viršija ES vidurkį (Bulgarija, Kipras, Prancūzija, Vengrija, Lenkija, Rumunija ir Švedija), apžvalga?

— ar yra tikslesnės ir naujesnės informacijos apie finansuojamus projektus ir pateiktus patvirtinti projektus, įskaitant visus projektus, kurie galėtų būti susiję su galimais veiklos programų pakeitimais?

— ar išanalizuota pažangioji patirtis ir ar parengta ilgalaikė veiklos strategija jaunimo nedarbo srityje?

— ar konsultuotasi su kokia nors jaunimo organizacija, kaip reikalaujama Europos Komisijos komunikate „Jaunimo galimybių iniciatyva“ ir Europos Parlamento 2012 m. gegužės 24 d. rezoliucijoje dėl jaunimo galimybių, ir jei konsultuotasi, kada, nes, regis, iki šiol tokių veiksmų nebuvo imtasi?

— kokias priemones pirmininkas J. M. Barroso minėjo savo kalboje dėl Sąjungos padėties, kurioje, be kita ko, paminėjo pradedamą įgyvendinti „jaunimo paketą“, skirtą jaunimo garantijų schemai ir kokybiškai profesinio mokymo sistemai sukurti, ir kada tos priemonės bus pradėtos taikyti?

— ar žinomi konsultavimosi, naudojantis kokybiška sistema, skirta profesiniam mokymui palengvinti, rezultatai?

— kaip įgyvendinama „Jaunimo galimybių iniciatyva“ ir kokių priemonių imtasi

L. Andor atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2013 m. vasario 27 d.)

Komisijos Pirmininko J.-M. Barroso paminėtas Jaunimo užimtumo srities dokumentų rinkinys ([1]) buvo priimtas 2012 m. gruodžio 5 d. Tame rinkinyje Komisija pateikė analizę, strategiją ir „Jaunimo galimybių iniciatyvos“ ([2]) įgyvendinimo pažangą, nurodė ES lygmens veiksmus ir 28 valstybių suvestinę informaciją apie ES lėšų nukreipimą ir programų pakeitimą, ypač aštuoniose valstybėse, kurios buvo svarstomos 2012 m. vasario mėn.

Iki šiol maždaug 16 mlrd. eurų ES lėšų skirta tam, kad iniciatyvos rezultatai būtų pasiekti greičiau arba kad ją įgyvendinant lėšos būtų perskirstytos; tai galėtų būti naudinga mažiausiai 780 000 jaunuolių ir 55 000 mažųjų ir vidutinių įmonių ([3]). Tos lėšos susijusios su jau atliktais programų pakeitimais; neseniai Ispanija ir Italija pateikė dar keletą programų pakeitimo prašymų, ir Komisija juos dabar nagrinėja.

Komisija konsultavosi su suinteresuotosiomis šalimis, įskaitant Europos jaunimo forumą. Ar rengti nacionalines konsultacijas, sprendė valstybės narės. Išsamios konsultacijos su jaunimu dėl jaunimo užimtumo vyko 2010-2011 m. jaunimo ir ES institucijų struktūrinio dialogo forma, ir į jų rezultatus Komisija atsižvelgė šios srities darbuose ([4]).

Parlamentas aptarė jaunimo garantijų iniciatyvą ir sausio mėn. priėmė jai palankią rezoliuciją. Derybos Taryboje dėl jaunimo garantijos prasidėjo tikintis 2013 m. vasario mėn. priimti rekomendaciją.

Dėl stažuočių kokybės sistemos Komisija šiuo metu renka socialinių partnerių nuomones pagal SESV 154 straipsnį. Su atsakymais į 2012 m. balandžio mėn. viešos konsultacijos klausimus galima susipažinti Komisijos Užimtumo generalinio direktorato (DG EMPL) svetainėje ([5]).

([1]) COM(2012) 727-728-729 galutinis, 2012 m. gruodžio 5 d.
([2]) COM(2011) 933, 2011 m. gruodžio 20 d.
([3]) Šie naujausi skaičiai paremti valstybių narių atliktu vėliausiu perskirstymu.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_en.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=en&consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-011514/12
a Bizottság számára

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Bagó Zoltán (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), Szájer József (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Járóka Lívia (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Bauer Edit (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Surján László (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Gál Kinga (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Kósa Ádám (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Őry Csaba (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) és Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)

(2012. december 17.)

Tárgy: Információ a fiatalokat érintő munkanélküliség kezelését célzó intézkedésekről

2012. január 30-án az Európai Tanács nem hivatalos ülésén a Bizottság nyolc „akciócsoportot” hozott létre, amelyeket azokba az európai országokba küldött, ahol a legmagasabb a fiatal munkanélküliek aránya (Olaszország, Spanyolország, Görögország, Szlovákia, Litvánia, Portugália, Lettország és Írország), és egyidejűleg bejelentette, hogy 82 milliárd eurót, amely az európai alapokból még nem került kiosztásra, a fiatalokat érintő munkanélküliség leküzdését célzó kezdeményezésekre különít el. 2012. május 23-án Barroso elnök ismertette az akciócsoportok munkájának első eredményeit. Az elkülönített uniós forrásokból körülbelül 7,3 milliárd eurót juttattak el a gyorsított teljesítésre vagy újrafelosztásra vonatkozó e kezdeményezés révén legalább 460 000 fiatal és 56 000 kkv támogatására.

Meg tudja-e mondani a Bizottság, hogy

— rendelkezésre áll-e az „akciócsoportok” munkájának és a fiatalok uniós átlag feletti munkanélküliségi arányával rendelkező hét országgal (Bulgáriával, Ciprussal, Franciaországgal, Lengyelországgal, Magyarországgal, Romániával és Svédországgal) folytatott konzultációknak naprakész felülvizsgálata,

— elérhető-e pontosabb és frissebb információ a támogatott projektekről és a jóváhagyásra váró projektekről, beleértve az operatív programok esetleges változásait érintő információkat is,

— készült-e elemzés a bevált gyakorlatokról, illetve kialakítottak-e hosszú távú stratégiát a fiatalok munkanélküliségére vonatkozóan,

— konzultáltak-e ifjúsági szervezetekkel, ahogyan azt a Bizottság „Több lehetőséget a fiataloknak” kezdeményezést javasló közleménye és a Parlament 2012. május 24-i, a fiatalok lehetőségeiről szóló állásfoglalása kérte, és amennyiben igen, mikor, mivel eddig nem úgy tűnik, mintha sor került volna konzultációra,

— milyen intézkedésekre utalt Barroso elnök az Unió helyzetéről szóló beszédében – amikor többek között említést tett egy ifjúsági intézkedéscsomag elindításáról, amelynek célja a szakképzés ifjúsági garanciarendszerének és minőségi keretrendszerének létrehozása –, és mikor lehetünk tanúi ezen intézkedések megvalósulásának,

— rendelkezésre állnak-e a szakképzést megkönnyítő minőségi keretrendszerről szóló konzultáció eredményei,

— hogyan halad a „Több lehetőséget a fiataloknak" kezdeményezés és milyen intézkedéseket tettek eddig?

Andor László biztos válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. február 27.)

2012. december 5-én elfogadásra került a Barroso elnök által bejelentett, fiatalok foglalkoztatására vonatkozó csomag ([1]) A csomag a Bizottság által készített elemzést és stratégiát, valamint a „Több lehetőséget a fiataloknak" kezdeményezés ([2]) végrehajtására vonatkozó naprakész információkat tartalmazza, bemutatja egyrészt az uniós szintű intézkedéseket, másrészt 28 ország, elsősorban a 2012 februárjában kijelölt nyolc ország helyzetét az uniós források mobilizálását, illetve átprogramozását tekintetbe véve.

Az említett kezdeményezés keretében eddig mintegy 16 milliárd euró összegű uniós forrást különítettek el soron kívüli kiosztás vagy átcsoportosítás céljára, amelyből valószínűsíthetően legalább 780 000 fiatal és 55 000 kkv részesül majd ([3]). Ezek az adatok a már végrehajtott átprogramozásra vonatkoznak, ezen kívül néhány további átprogramozási kérelem is érkezett nemrégiben, elsősorban Spanyolország és Olaszország részéről, amelyekről még nem született bizottsági döntés.

A Bizottság egyeztetett az érdekelt felekkel, többek között az Európai Ifjúsági Fórummal. A nemzeti szintű konzultációk a tagállamok hatáskörébe tartoztak. 2010-2011 folyamán széles körű konzultációk folytak a fiatalokkal a foglalkoztatásukat érintő kérdésekről, a döntéshozók és a fiatalok strukturált párbeszéd keretében egyeztettek, ennek eredményeit pedig a Bizottság beépítette a témával kapcsolatos tevékenységébe ([4]).

Az ifjúsági garanciát a Parlament megvitatta, majd januárban állásfoglalást fogadott el annak támogatásáról. A Tanács szintén megkezdte az ifjúsági garanciával kapcsolatos tárgyalásokat, hogy az erről szóló ajánlást 2013 februárjában el lehessen fogadni.

A szakmai gyakorlatok minőségi keretrendszerével kapcsolatban a Bizottság jelenleg konzultál a szociális partnerekkel, az EUMSZ 154. cikkének megfelelően. A 2012. áprilisi nyilvános konzultáció során érkezett válaszok a Foglalkoztatási Főigazgatóság honlapján ([5]) érhetők el.

([1]) COM(2012) 727-728-729 végleges, 2012. december 5.
([2]) COM(2011) 933, 2011. december 20.
([3]) Ezek a legfrissebb számadatok, amelyek a tagállamok által ténylegesen végrehajtott átcsoportosításon alapulnak.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_hu.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=hu&consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011514/12
aan de Commissie
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) en Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)
(17 december 2012)

Betreft: Informatie over maatregelen ter bestrijding van de jeugdwerkloosheid

Op 30 januari 2012, tijdens de informele top van de Europese Raad, heeft de Commissie acht actieteams opgericht die zijn uitgezonden naar de acht EU-landen met de hoogste jeugdwerkloosheidscijfers (Italië, Spanje, Griekenland, Slowakije, Litouwen, Portugal, Letland en Ierland) en heeft zij tegelijk aangekondigd dat 82 miljard EUR aan niet-toegewezen Europese middelen beschikbaar zou worden gesteld voor initiatieven op het gebied van jeugdwerkloosheid. Op 23 mei 2012 heeft voorzitter Barroso de eerste resultaten van het werk van de actieteams gepresenteerd. Van de beschikbaar gestelde EU-middelen is ongeveer 7,3 miljard EUR door dit initiatief gesluisd met het oog op versnelde terbeschikkingstelling of herbestemming, ten gunste van op zijn minst 460 000 jongeren en 56 000 kmo's.

Kan de Commissie meedelen:

— of een geactualiseerde evaluatie van het werk van de actieteams en van het overleg met de zeven andere landen met een jeugdwerkloosheidscijfer boven het EU-gemiddelde (Bulgarije, Cyprus, Frankrijk, Hongarije, Polen, Roemenië en Zweden) beschikbaar is,

— of preciezere en recentere informatie beschikbaar is over de gefinancierde projecten en de projecten in de goedkeuringsfase, inclusief eventuele projecten die betrekking kunnen hebben op mogelijke veranderingen in operationele programma's,

— of een analyse is uitgevoerd van goede praktijken en of een strategie voor langetermijnactie op het gebied van jeugdwerkloosheid is geformuleerd,

— of er jeugdorganisaties zijn geraadpleegd, overeenkomstig het verzoek in de mededeling van de Commissie betreffende het voorstel voor het initiatief „Kansen voor jongeren" en de resolutie van het Europees Parlement van 24 mei 2012 over dit initiatief, en, zo ja, wanneer, aangezien het er niet op lijkt dat al actie in deze zin is ondernomen,

— welke maatregelen voorzitter Barroso bedoelde in zijn toespraak over de staat van de Unie, toen hij het onder andere had over de creatie een „jongerenpakket" met een jeugdgarantieregeling en een kwaliteitskader voor beroepsopleiding, en wanneer deze er zullen komen,

— of de resultaten van de raadpleging over het „kwaliteitskader om het volgen van een beroepsopleiding te faciliteren" beschikbaar zijn,

— hoe het met het initiatief „Kansen voor jongeren" is gesteld en welke maatregelen zijn genomen?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(27 februari 2013)

Het door voorzitter Barroso aangekondigde jeugdwerkgelegenheidspakket ([1]) werd op 5 december 2012 goedgekeurd. In dit pakket presenteerde de Commissie haar beoordeling, haar strategie en een update betreffende de tenuitvoerlegging van het initiatief „Kansen voor jongeren" ([2]). Verder bevat het pakket activiteiten op EU-niveau en 28 landenfiches met informatie over de beschikbaarstelling of herprogrammering van EU-middelen, met name voor de acht in februari 2012 voor ondersteuning uitgekozen landen.

In het kader van dit initiatief is tot dusver overeengekomen om circa 16 miljard euro aan EU-financiering te herbestemmen of sneller beschikbaar te stellen, en ten minste 780 000 jongeren en 55 000 kmo's zullen hier waarschijnlijk van profiteren ([3]). Dit heeft betrekking op herprogrammeringen die reeds hebben plaatsgevonden; een beperkt aantal verdere aanvragen voor herprogrammeringen zijn recentelijk ingediend, met name door Spanje en Italië, en wachten momenteel op een besluit van de Commissie.

De Commissie heeft de belanghebbenden geraadpleegd, inclusief het Europees Jeugdforum. De raadplegingen op nationaal niveau werden overgelaten aan de lidstaten. Tijdens de gestructureerde dialoog tussen jongeren en beleidsmakers in 2010-2011 werden uitgebreide gesprekken gehouden met jongeren over jeugdwerkloosheid; de resultaten hiervan zijn gebruikt voor de werkzaamheden van de Commissie op dit gebied ([4]).

Het Parlement heeft de jeugdgarantie besproken en heeft in januari een resolutie aangenomen ter ondersteuning ervan. Onderhandelingen in de Raad betreffende de jeugdgarantie zijn begonnen met het oog op de goedkeuring van de aanbeveling in februari 2013.

Met betrekking tot het Europees kwaliteitshandvest voor stages raadpleegt de Commissie de sociale partners momenteel krachtens artikel 154 VWEU. Antwoorden op de openbare raadpleging van april 2012 zijn toegankelijk op de website van DG Werkgelegenheid ([5]).

([1]) COM(2012) 727-728-729 final van 5.12.2012.
([2]) COM(2011) 933 van 20.12.2011.
([3]) Deze meest recente cijfers zijn gebaseerd op de herbestemmingen die daadwerkelijk door de lidstaten zijn uitgevoerd.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_nl.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=nl & consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011514/12
do Komisji

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) oraz Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)

(17 grudnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Informacja na temat środków niezbędnych do rozwiązania problemu bezrobocia wśród młodzieży

Na nieformalnym szczycie Rady Europejskiej w dniu 30 stycznia 2012 r. Komisja utworzyła osiem „grup działania", które miały zostać wysłane do ośmiu państw członkowskich o najwyższej stopie bezrobocia osób młodych (Włochy, Hiszpania, Grecja, Słowacja, Litwa, Portugalia, Łotwa i Irlandia) i jednocześnie ogłosiła, że nierozdzielne do tej pory środki z funduszy europejskich w wysokości 82 mld euro zostaną przeznaczone na wsparcie inicjatyw na rzecz walki z bezrobociem osób młodych. W dniu 23 maja 2012 r. przewodniczący Barroso przedstawił pierwsze wyniki prac „grup działania". Z przyznanych funduszy UE około 7,3 mld EUR zostało przekazanych w ramach tej inicjatywy na przyspieszoną realizację lub realokację, z czego skorzystało co najmniej 460 000 młodych ludzi i 56 000 MŚP.

Czy Komisja może potwierdzić:

— czy dostępny jest zaktualizowany przegląd prac „grup działania" i konsultacji z pozostałymi siedmioma państwami o stopie bezrobocia osób młodych przekraczającej średnią UE (Bułgaria, Cypr, Francja, Węgry, Polska, Rumunia i Szwecja),

— czy dostępne są bardziej precyzyjne i bardziej aktualne informacje na temat finansowanych projektów i projektów będących w trakcie procedury zatwierdzania, w tym projektów, które mogłyby być związane z ewentualnymi zamianami w programach operacyjnych,

— czy przeprowadzono analizę dobrych praktyk i czy określono strategię długoterminowych działań na rzecz zatrudnienia młodych,

— czy przeprowadzono konsultacje z jakąkolwiek organizacją młodzieżową, jak postulowano w komunikacie Komisji proponującym inicjatywę „Szanse dla młodzieży" i w rezolucji Parlamentu z dnia 24 maja 2012 r. w sprawie szans dla młodzieży, a jeżeli tak, kiedy to miało miejsce, bo nie wydaje się, żeby takie działania zostały dotąd podjęte,

— jakie działania miał na myśli przewodniczący Barroso, kiedy w swoim orędziu o stanie Unii mówił, między innymi, o wprowadzeniu pakietu na rzecz młodzieży w celu stworzenia systemu gwarancji dla młodzieży i ram na rzecz zapewniania jakości w odniesieniu do szkolenia zawodowego, i kiedy je zobaczymy,

— czy dostępne są wyniki konsultacji na temat ram na rzecz zapewniania jakości mających ułatwić szkolenie zawodowe,

— jak przebiega realizacja inicjatywy „Szanse dla młodzieży" i jakie działania zostały podjęte?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(27 lutego 2013 r.)

W dniu 5 grudnia 2012 r. przyjęto zapowiedziany przez przewodniczącego José M. Barroso pakiet na rzecz zatrudnienia młodzieży ([1]). Komisja przedstawiła w tym pakiecie swoją analizę, strategię i aktualne informacje dotyczące wdrażania inicjatywy „Szanse dla młodzieży" ([2]), działań na poziomie UE oraz 28 kart dotyczących poszczególnych państw z informacjami na temat mobilizacji lub przeprogramowania unijnych funduszy, w szczególności ośmiu państw, na których skoncentrowano się w lutym 2012 r.

Około 16 mld EUR z unijnych środków przeznaczono na przyspieszoną realizację lub realokację za pomocą tej inicjatywy, z czego ma skorzystać co najmniej 780 tys. młodych ludzi i 55 tys. MŚP ([3]). Dane te dotyczą przeprogramowania już dokonanego; pewną niewielką liczbę wniosków o przeprogramowanie, które oczekują na decyzję Komisji, przedstawiły niedawno między innymi Hiszpania i Włochy.

Komisja przeprowadziła konsultacje z zainteresowanymi stronami, w tym także z Europejskim Forum Młodzieży. Konsultacje na poziomie krajowym pozostawały w gestii państw członkowskich. W ramach usystematyzowanego dialogu młodych ludzi z decydentami w latach 2010-2011 odbyły się zakrojone na szeroką skalę konsultacje z młodymi ludźmi poświęcone kwestii zatrudnienia młodzieży, których wyniki uwzględniono w pracach Komisji w tej dziedzinie ([4]).

Parlament Europejski omówił proponowaną gwarancję dla młodzieży i w styczniu br. przyjął rezolucję popierającą ją. Rada rozpoczęła negocjacje na temat gwarancji dla młodzieży, a przyjęcie zalecenia planowane jest na luty 2013 r.

Co się tyczy kwestii ram jakości dla staży, Komisja zbiera obecnie opinie partnerów społecznych zgodnie z art. 154 TFUE. Na stronie internetowej DG ds. Zatrudnienia ([5]) można zapoznać się z odpowiedziami nadesłanymi w ramach otwartych konsultacji z kwietnia 2012 r.

([1]) COM (2012) 727-728-729 final z dnia 5 grudnia 2012 r.
([2]) COM(2011) 933 z dnia 20 grudnia 2011 r.
([3]) Najnowsze dane liczbowe opierają się na rzeczywistych realokacjach wdrożonych przez państwa członkowskie.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_pl.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=pl&consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011514/12
à Comissão

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) e Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)

(17 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Informações sobre as medidas de combate ao desemprego entre os jovens

Em 30 de janeiro de 2012, durante a cimeira informal do Conselho Europeu, a Comissão criou oito «equipas operacionais», que foram enviadas para os oito países da UE com as mais elevadas taxas de desemprego entre os jovens (Itália, Espanha, Grécia, Eslováquia, Lituânia, Portugal, Letónia e Irlanda), anunciando, ao mesmo tempo, que iriam ser atribuídos 82 mil milhões de euros provenientes de fundos europeus não atribuídos a iniciativas de fomento de emprego para os jovens. Em 23 de maio de 2012, o Presidente Barroso apresentou os primeiros resultados do trabalho dessas «equipas operacionais». Dos fundos comunitários atribuídos, cerca de 7,3 mil milhões de euros haviam já sido canalizados a título desta iniciativa para distribuição ou reafetação aceleradas, beneficiando, pelo menos, 460 000 jovens e 56 000 PME.

Poderá a Comissão revelar:

— se está disponível uma versão atualizada, quer do trabalho das «equipas operacionais», quer das consultas mantidas com os outros sete países com uma taxa de desemprego jovem superior à média da UE (Bulgária, Chipre, França, Hungria, Polónia, Roménia e Suécia);

— se estão disponíveis informações mais precisas e recentes sobre projetos já financiados e sobre projetos a aguardar aprovação, inclusive sobre matérias que poderiam dizer respeito a eventuais alterações aos programas operacionais;

— se já foi levada a cabo uma análise sobre práticas de excelência e se já foi elaborada uma estratégia de ação a longo prazo para o emprego jovem;

— se alguma organização juvenil foi consultada, como se solicitou na Comunicação da Comissão que propôs uma «Iniciativa Oportunidades para a Juventude» e na resolução do Parlamento Europeu, de 24 de maio de 2012, sobre o mesmo tema (e, em caso afirmativo, em que datas), na medida em que não parece que uma tal ação tenha sido até agora empreendida;

— a que medidas se referia o Presidente Barroso no seu discurso sobre o Estado da União — quando mencionou, entre outras coisas, o lançamento de um «pacote para a juventude» destinado a instituir um sistema de garantia jovem e uma estrutura de qualidade para a formação profissional — e quando é que elas verão a luz do dia;

— se os resultados da consulta sobre a «estrutura de qualidade para facilitar a formação profissional» já se encontram disponíveis;

— o modo como a «Iniciativa Oportunidades para a Juventude» tem vindo a progredir e quais as medidas que já foram tomadas.

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(27 de fevereiro de 2013)

O pacote relativo ao emprego dos jovens ([1]) anunciado pelo Presidente Barroso foi adotado em 5 de dezembro de 2012. Neste pacote, a Comissão apresentou a sua análise, a sua estratégia e uma atualização relativa à implementação da iniciativa Oportunidades para a Juventude ([2]), ações a nível da UE e ainda 28 fichas por país com informações sobre a mobilização ou reprogramação de fundos da UE, em particular, os oito países em causa em fevereiro de 2012.

Até agora, foram canalizados cerca de 16 mil milhões de euros do financiamento da UE para distribuição acelerada ou reafetação a título desta iniciativa que beneficia pelo menos 780 000 jovens e 55 000 PME ([3]). Estes números estão relacionados com a reprogramação que já ocorreu, mas ainda existe um número limitado de pedidos de reprogramação enviados recentemente, nomeadamente pela Espanha e pela Itália, e que aguardam pela decisão da Comissão.

A Comissão consultou as partes interessadas, incluindo o Fórum Europeu da Juventude. Os Estados-Membros ficaram encarregues das consultas a nível nacional. Os jovens foram amplamente consultados sobre o emprego jovem no quadro de um diálogo estruturado entre os jovens e os responsáveis políticos, em 2010 e 2011. Os resultados desta consulta foram introduzidos no trabalho que a Comissão desenvolve neste domínio ([4]).

O Parlamento debateu a Garantia Europeia da Juventude e aprovou, em janeiro, uma resolução que a apoia. As negociações no Conselho sobre a Garantia Europeia da Juventude já foram iniciadas com o objetivo de adotar a recomendação em fevereiro de 2013.

Quanto ao quadro de qualidade para os estágios, a Comissão está atualmente a recolher as opiniões dos parceiros sociais ao abrigo do artigo 154.° do TFUE. As respostas da consulta aberta de abril de 2012 estão disponíveis no sítio Web da DG Emprego ([5]).

([1]) COM(2012) 727-728-729 final de 5 de dezembro de 2012.
([2]) COM(2011) 933 de 20 de dezembro de 2011.
([3]) Os últimos números baseiam-se na atual reafetação implementada pelos Estados-Membros.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_en.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=en&consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011514/12
adresată Comisiei
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) şi Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)
(17 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Informații privind măsurile ce vizează combaterea șomajului în rândul tinerilor

La 30 ianuarie 2012, cu ocazia reuniunii informale a Consiliului European, Comisia a înființat opt „echipe de acțiune” care au fost trimise în cele opt țări din UE unde se înregistrează cele mai ridicate rate ale șomajului în rândul tinerilor (Italia, Spania, Grecia, Slovacia, Lituania, Portugalia, Letonia și Irlanda) și a anunțat, în același timp, că 82 de miliarde de euro din fonduri europene nealocate urmează să fie angajate pentru inițiative destinate combaterii șomajului în rândul tinerilor. La 23 mai 2012, președintele Barroso a prezentat primele rezultate ale activității „echipelor de acțiune”. Din fondurile europene angajate, circa 7,3 miliarde de euro au fost canalizate prin intermediul acestei inițiative în scopul distribuirii accelerate sau realocării, în beneficiul a cel puțin 460 000 de tineri și 56 000 de IMM-uri.

Poate Comisia preciza:

— dacă este disponibilă o actualizare revizuită a activității „echipelor de acțiune” și a consultărilor cu celelalte șapte țări unde se înregistrează o rată a șomajului în rândul tinerilor peste media UE (Bulgaria, Cipru, Franța, Ungaria, Polonia, România și Suedia);

— dacă sunt disponibile informații mai precise și mai recente privind proiectele finanțate și privind proiectele în curs de aprobare, inclusiv informații care s-ar putea referi la posibile modificări ale programelor operaționale;

— dacă s-a realizat o analiză a bunelor practici și dacă a fost formulată o strategie de acțiune pe termen lung care să vizeze șomajul în rândul tinerilor;

— dacă a fost consultată vreo organizație de tineret, după cum se solicită în Comunicarea Comisiei prin care se propune „Inițiativa privind oportunitățile pentru tineri” și în Rezoluția Parlamentului din 24 mai 2012 privind oportunitățile pentru tineri și, în caz afirmativ, momentul la care această consultare a avut loc, deoarece nu pare că până în prezent a fost realizată o astfel de acțiune;

— la ce măsuri s-a referit Președintele Barroso în discursul său privind starea Uniunii atunci când a menționat, printre altele, lansarea unui „pachet pentru tineri” pentru a înființa sistemul de garantare pentru tineri și cadrul de calitate pentru formarea profesională și momentul în care vom vedea aceste măsuri;

— dacă sunt disponibile rezultatele consultării privind „cadrul de calitate pentru facilitarea formării profesionale”;

— cum progresează „Inițiativa privind oportunitățile pentru tineri” și ce măsuri au fost luate?

Răspuns dat de dl Andoron în numele Comisiei
(27 februarie 2013)

Pachetul privind ocuparea forței de muncă în rândul tinerilor ([1]) anunțat de președintele Barroso, a fost adoptat la 5 decembrie 2012. În acest pachet, Comisia și-a prezentat analiza, strategia și o actualizare a implementării Inițiativei privind oportunitățile pentru tineri ([2]), acțiunile întreprinse la nivelul UE, precum și cele 28 fișe de țară cu informații referitoare la mobilizarea sau reprogramarea fondurilor UE, în special pentru cele opt țări vizate în februarie 2012.

Până în prezent, aproximativ 16 miliarde EUR din finanțarea UE au făcut obiectul distribuirii accelerate sau realocării prin această inițiativă, numărul potențialilor beneficiari fiind de 780 000 în rândul tinerilor și de 55 000 în rândul IMM-urilor ([3]). Acestea se referă la reprogramarea care a avut loc deja, un număr limitat de cereri suplimentare pentru reprogramare fiind prezentate recent, în special de către Spania și Italia și sunt în așteptarea deciziei Comisiei.

Comisia a consultat părțile interesate, inclusiv Forumul European al Tineretului. Consultările la nivel național au fost lăsate la latitudinea statelor membre. În perioada 2010-2011, între tineri și factorii decizionali au avut loc consultări ample în cadrul dialogului structurat pe tema ocupării forței de muncă tinere, ale căror rezultate au fost incluse în activitatea Comisiei în acest domeniu ([4]).

Parlamentul a dezbătut Garanția pentru tineret și a adoptat o rezoluție în favoarea acesteia în ianuarie. De asemenea, au început negocierile în cadrul Consiliului cu privire la Garanția pentru tineret, în vederea adoptării Recomandării în februarie 2013.

În ceea ce privește cadrul de calitate pentru stagii, Comisia consultă, în prezent, punctele de vedere ale partenerilor sociali, în conformitate cu articolul 154 din TFUE. Răspunsurile la consultarea publică din aprilie 2012 sunt disponibile pe site-ul internet al DG Ocuparea forței de muncă ([5]).

([1]) COM (2012) 727-728-729 final din 5 decembrie 2012.
([2]) COM (2011) 933 din 20 decembrie 2011.
([3]) Aceste cifre recente se bazează pe realocarea efectivă pusă în aplicare de statele membre.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_en.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=en&consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011514/12
Komisii

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) a Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)

(17. decembra 2012)

Vec: Informácie o opatreniach na boj proti nezamestnanosti

Dňa 30. januára 2012, počas neformálneho samitu Európskej rady, Komisia zostavila osem akčných tímov, ktoré vyslala do ôsmich krajín EÚ s najvyššou mierou nezamestnanosti mladých ľudí (Taliansko, Španielsko, Grécko, Slovensko, Litva, Portugalsko, Lotyšsko a Írsko), a zároveň oznámila, že 82 miliárd EUR z nepridelených európskych fondov sa vyčlenení na iniciatívy v oblasti nezamestnanosti mladých ľudí. Dňa 23. mája 2012 predseda Barroso predložil prvé výsledky práce akčných tímov. Z poskytnutých fondov EÚ bolo na túto iniciatívu vyčlenených približne 7,3 miliárd EUR, aby urýchlili poskytovanie a prerozdeľovanie a priniesli úžitok aspoň 460 000 mladým ľuďom a 56 000 MSP.

Môže Komisia uviesť,

— či je k dispozícii aktualizovaný prehľad práce akčných tímov a konzultácií s ďalšími siedmimi krajinami, v ktorých je miera nezamestnanosti mladých ľudí vyššia ako priemer EÚ (Bulharsko, Cyprus, Francúzsko, Maďarsko, Poľsko, Rumunsko, Švédsko),

— či sú k dispozícii presnejšie a aktuálnejšie informácie o financovaných projektoch a o projektoch, ktoré čakajú na schválenie, vrátane všetkých, ktoré sa môžu týkať možných zmien v operačných programoch$

— či sa osvedčené postupy analyzovali a či sa pre zamestnanosť mladých ľudí vytvorila dlhodobá akčná stratégia$

— či bola nejaká mládežnícka organizácia požiadaná o vyjadrenie, ako o to žiadala Komisia v oznámení, kde navrhovala iniciatívu Príležitosti pre mladých, a ako to uviedol Parlament v uznesení z 24. mája 2012 o príležitostiach pre mladých ľudí, a ak bola, tak kedy, pretože sa zdá, že zatiaľ sa nič také neudialo$

— o akých opatreniach hovoril predseda Barroso v prejave o stave Únie, keď okrem iného spomenul zavedenie balíka opatrení pre mladých, ktorý pomôže vytvoriť systém záruk pre mladých ľudí a rámec zabezpečenia kvality odbornej prípravy, a kedy budú zavedené$

— či sú k dispozícii výsledky konzultácií o rámci zabezpečenia kvality odbornej prípravy$

— ako napreduje iniciatíva Príležitosti pre mladých a aké opatrenia sa prijali?

Odpoveď pána Andora v mene Komisie
(27. februára 2013)

Balík opatrení v oblasti zamestnanosti mladých ([1]), ktorý oznámil predseda Barroso, bol prijatý 5. decembra 2012. V tomto balíku Komisia predstavila svoju analýzu, stratégiu a aktuálny stav realizácie iniciatívy „Príležitosti pre mladých“ ([2]), opatrení na úrovni EÚ, ako aj 28 výkazov krajín, ktoré obsahujú informácie o využití alebo zmene plánovania finančných prostriedkov EÚ, najmä pre osem cieľových krajín vybraných vo februári 2012.

Doposiaľ bolo na urýchlené poskytovanie alebo prerozdeľovanie v rámci tejto iniciatívy vyčlenených približne 16 miliárd EUR z finančných prostriedkov EÚ, pričom je pravdepodobné, že z toho bude mať úžitok minimálne 780 000 mladých ľudí a 55 000 MSP ([3]). Týka sa to už realizovanej zmeny plánovania; nedávno bol predložený určitý obmedzený počet ďalších žiadostí o zmenu plánovania (najmä zo strany Španielska a Talianska), o ktorých rozhodne Komisia.

Komisia požiadala o vyjadrenie zainteresované strany vrátane Európskeho fóra mládeže. Konzultácie na národnej úrovni boli prenechané členským štátom. V rámci štruktúrovaného dialógu medzi mladými ľuďmi a tvorcami politík prebehli v rokoch 2010 – 2011 rozsiahle konzultácie s mladými ľuďmi o otázkach zamestnanosti mládeže, pričom ich výsledky Komisia zohľadňuje vo svojej práci v tejto oblasti ([4]).

Parlament prerokoval záruku pre mladých ľudí a prijal uznesenie na jej podporu v januári. Rada už začala o záruke pre mladých ľudí rokovať s cieľom prijať odporúčanie vo februári 2013.

Pokiaľ ide o rámec kvality pre stáže, Komisia v súčasnosti zisťuje názory sociálnych partnerov v zmysle článku 154 ZFEÚ. Odozvy na otvorenú konzultáciu z apríla 2012 sú k dispozícii na internetovej stránke GR pre zamestnanosť ([5]).

([1]) KOM(2012) 727-728-729 v konečnom znení z 5. decembra 2012.
([2]) KOM(2011) 933 z 20. decembra 2011.
([3]) Tieto najnovšie hodnoty vychádzajú zo skutočného prerozdelenia realizovaného členskými štátmi.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_sk.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=sk&consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-011514/12
za Komisijo

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) in Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)

(17. december 2012)

Zadeva: Informacije o ukrepih za spoprijem z brezposelnostjo mladih

Komisija je na neuradnem vrhu Evropskega sveta 30. januarja 2012 ustanovila osem skupin za ukrepanje, ki so bile napotene v osem držav članic EU z najvišjimi stopnjami brezposelnosti mladih (Italija, Španija, Grčija, Slovaška, Litva, Portugalska, Latvija in Irska), ter hkrati napovedala, da se bo 82 milijard evrov še nedodeljenih sredstev iz evropskih skladov namenilo pobudam v zvezi z brezposelnostjo mladih. Predsednik Barroso je 23. maja 2012 predstavil prve rezultate dela skupin za ukrepanje. Približno 7,3 milijarde evrov navedenih sredstev EU je bilo usmerjenih prek te pobude, da bi bila hitreje dodeljena ali prerazporejena v korist najmanj 460 000 mladih in 56 000 malih in srednjih podjetij.

Ali lahko Komisija pove:

— ali je na voljo posodobljen pregled dela skupin za ukrepanje in posvetovanj z drugimi sedmimi državami, v katerih so stopnje brezposelnosti nad povprečjem EU (Bolgarija, Ciper, Francija, Madžarska, Poljska, Romunija in Švedska);

— ali so na voljo natančnejše in novejše informacije o financiranih projektih in projektih v postopku odobritve, vključno s tistimi, ki bi lahko zadevali morebitne spremembe operativnih programov;

— ali je bila opravljena analiza zgledov dobre prakse in izdelana strategija dolgoročnega ukrepanja za zaposlenost mladih;

— ali je bilo opravljeno posvetovanje s kakšno mladinsko organizacijo, kot je bilo zahtevano v sporočilu Komisije, v katerem je bila predlagana pobuda „Priložnosti za mlade“, in v resoluciji Parlamenta z dne 24. maja 2012 o priložnostih za mlade, in če je bilo, kdaj natančno, saj ne kaže, da bi bili doslej sprejeti kaki tovrstni ukrepi;

— na katere ukrepe se je nanašal predsednik Barroso v govoru o poročilu o stanju v Uniji, ko je med drugim omenil uvedbo ukrepov „svežnja za mlade“ za uvedbo jamstva za mlade in okvira za kakovost poklicnega usposabljanja, ter kdaj jih bomo lahko videli;

— ali so na voljo rezultati posvetovanj o okviru kakovosti za spodbujanje poklicnega usposabljanja in

— kako napreduje pobuda „Priložnosti za mlade“ in kateri ukrepi so bili sprejeti?

Odgovor g. Andorja v imenu Komisije
(27. februar 2013)

Sveženj o zaposlovanju mladih ([1]), ki ga je napovedal predsednik Barroso, je bil sprejet 5. decembra 2012. Komisija je v tem svežnju predstavila svojo analizo, strategijo in najnovejše informacije o izvajanju pobude o priložnostih za mlade ([2]), ukrepe na ravni EU in 28 dosjejev za posamezne države z informacijami o sprostitvi ali spremenjenem načrtovanju porabe sredstev EU, zlasti za osem držav, določenih februarja 2012.

Doslej je bilo s to pobudo približno 16 milijard EUR sredstev EU namenjenih za pospešeno izvajanje ali prerazporeditev, od česar naj bi imelo korist najmanj 780 000 mladih in 55 000 MSP ([3]). Ti podatki se nanašajo na ponovno načrtovanje, ki je že bilo izvedeno, nedavno pa je bilo vloženo manjše število dodatnih zahtevkov za ponovno načrtovanje, zlasti Španije in Italije, ki še čakajo na odločitev Komisije.

Komisija se je posvetovala z zainteresiranimi stranmi, tudi z Evropskim mladinskim forumom. Posvetovanje na nacionalni ravni je bilo prepuščeno državam članicam. V letih 2010–2011 so potekala obsežna posvetovanja z mladimi o zaposlovanju mladih v okviru strukturiranega dialoga med mladimi in oblikovalci politike, rezultate teh posvetovanj pa je Komisija upoštevala pri svojem delu na tem področju ([4]).

Parlament je razpravljal o jamstvu za mlade in ga podprl z januarja sprejeto resolucijo. Pogajanja o jamstvu za mlade v Svetu so se začela, da bi se februarja 2013 sprejelo priporočilo.

Komisija trenutno na podlagi člena 154 PDEU zbira stališča socialnih partnerjev o okviru za kakovost pripravništev. Odgovori na odprto posvetovanje iz aprila 2012 so na voljo na spletišču GD za zaposlovanje ([5]).

([1]) COM (2012) 727-728-729 final, z dne 5. decembra 2012.
([2]) COM(2011) 933, z dne 20. decembra 2011.
([3]) Ti najnovejši podatki temeljijo na dejanski prerazporeditvi, ki jo izvajajo države članice.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_sl.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=sl&consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-011514/12
komissiolle

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) ja Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)

(17. joulukuuta 2012)

Aihe: Tiedot toimista nuorisotyöttömyyden torjumiseksi

Eurooppa-neuvoston epävirallisessa huippukokouksessa 30. tammikuuta komissio perusti kahdeksan toimintaryhmää, jotka lähetettiin kahdeksaan nuorisotyöttömyydestä eniten kärsivään EU-maahan (Italia, Espanja, Kreikka, Slovakia, Liettua, Portugali, Latvia ja Irlanti). Samalla komissio ilmoitti, että 82 miljardia euroa unionin sitomattomia varoja osoitetaan nuorisotyöttömyyttä koskeviin aloitteisiin. Puheenjohtaja Barroso esitteli toimintaryhmien työn ensimmäiset tulokset 23. toukokuuta 2012. Unionin tähän aloitteiseen myöntämistä määrärahoista noin 7,3 miljardia kohdennettiin tavoitteiden saavuttamisen nopeuttamiseen tai jaettavaksi uudelleen niin, että ne hyödyttävät 460 000 nuorta ja 56 000 pk-yritystä.

Voiko komissio ilmoittaa

— onko saatavana päivitetty katsaus toimintaryhmien työstä ja keskusteluista niiden seitsemän maan kanssa, joiden nuorisotyöttömyys ylittää EU:n keskiarvon (Bulgaria, Kypros, Ranska, Unkari, Puola, Romania ja Ruotsi),

— onko saatavana täsmällisiä ja tuoreita tietoja rahoitetuista hankkeista ja hyväksyttävänä olevista hankkeista, mukaan luettuina hankkeet, jotka mahdollisesti koskevat toimintaohjelmiin mahdollisesti tehtäviä muutoksia,

— onko tehty analyysi hyvistä käytänteistä ja onko laadittu nuorisotyöttömyyttä koskeva pitkän aikavälin toimintastrategia,

— onko nuorisojärjestöjä kuultu, kuten pyydetään komission tiedonannossa, jossa ehdotetaan ”Mahdollisuuksia nuorille -aloitetta”, ja parlamentin 24. toukokuuta 2012 antamassa päätöslauselmassa mahdollisuuksista nuorisolle, ja jos on, milloin, sillä näyttää siltä, että tällaisia toimia ei ole vielä toteutettu,

— mitä toimia puheenjohtaja Barroso tarkoitti puheessaan unionin tilasta, kun hän mainitsi muun muassa nuorisopaketin käynnistämisen nuorisotakuujärjestelmän ja ammatillisen koulutuksen laatukehyksen luomiseksi, ja milloin näemme näiden toimien toteutuvan,

— ovatko tulokset ammatillisen koulutuksen edistämisen laatukehystä koskevista kuulemisista saatavina,

— miten Mahdollisuuksia nuorille -aloite etenee ja mitä toimia sen puitteissa on toteutettu?

László Andorin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(27. helmikuuta 2013)

Puheenjohtaja Barroson esittämä nuorisotyöttömyyspaketti ([1]) on hyväksytty 5. joulukuuta 2012. Paketissa komissio esittelee Mahdollisuuksia nuorille -aloitetta koskevan analyysin, strategian ja aloitteen täytäntöönpanoa koskevan ajantasaisen tilanteen ([2]), EU:n toimet sekä 28 maakohtaista katsausta, jotka sisältävät tietoa EU:n varojen käyttöönotosta ja uudelleenohjelmoinnista, erityisesti niiden kahdeksan maan osalta, joihin kohdistettiin kohdentamistoimia helmikuussa 2012.

Tähän mennessä aloitteessa on varattu noin 16 miljardia euroa EU:n varoja nopeaan kohdentamiseen tai uudelleenosoittamiseen, mistä ainakin 780 000 nuorta ja 55 000 pk-yritystä todennäköisesti hyötyy ([3]). Edellä tarkoitetut luvut liittyvät jo toteutettuun uudelleenohjelmointiin, ja lisäksi erityisesti Espanja ja Italia ovat äskettäin esittäneet joitakin uusia uudelleenohjelmointipyyntöjä, jotka odottavat komission päätöstä.

Komissio on kuullut sidosryhmiä, muun muassa Euroopan nuorisofoorumia. Kansallisen tason kuulemiset on jätetty jäsenvaltioiden vastuulle. Poliittisten päättäjien ja nuorten välisen jäsennellyn vuoropuhelun yhteydessä vuonna 2010-2011 järjestettiin nuorisotyöllisyydestä laajat nuorten kuulemiset, joista saatuja tuloksia komissio on käyttänyt työssään ([4]).

Euroopan parlamentti on keskustellut nuorisotakuusta ja hyväksynyt sitä tukevan päätöslauselman tammikuussa. Nuorisotakuuta koskevat keskustelut on aloitettu neuvostossa, joka pyrkii hyväksymään sitä koskevan suosituksen helmikuussa 2013.

Harjoittelujaksojen laatukehyksen osalta komissio selvittää parhaillaan Euroopan unionin toiminnasta tehdyn sopimuksen 154 artiklan mukaisesti työmarkkinaosapuolten mielipiteitä. Huhtikuussa 2012 järjestetyn avoimen kuulemistilaisuuden vastaukset ovat nähtävissä työllisyyden pääosaston verkkosivustolla ([5]).

([1]) COM(2012) 727-728-729 lopullinen, 5. joulukuuta 2012.
([2]) KOM(2011) 933, 20 joulukuuta 2011.
([3]) Nämä uusimmat luvut perustuvat todelliseen uudelleenkohdentamiseen jäsenvaltioissa.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_fi.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=fi&consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011514/12
to the Commission

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Nuno Melo (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Sari Essayah (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Burkhard Balz (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Mário David (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Piotr Borys (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Anne Delvaux (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Svetoslav Hristov Malinov (PPE), Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), Inese Vaidere (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar (PPE), María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE), Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Milan Zver (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paul Rübig (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Michèle Striffler (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Pilar Ayuso (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Petri Sarvamaa (PPE), Andrzej Grzyb (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), Tiziano Motti (PPE), Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Diogo Feio (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) and Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)

(17 December 2012)

Subject: Information on measures to tackle youth unemployment

On 30 January 2012, during the informal summit of the European Council, the Commission set up eight 'action teams' that were sent to the eight EU countries with the highest rates of youth unemployment (Italy, Spain, Greece, Slovakia, Lithuania, Portugal, Latvia and Ireland), announcing, at the same time, that EUR 82 billion of unassigned European funds were to be committed to initiatives for youth unemployment. On 23 May 2012 President Barroso presented the first results of the work of the 'action teams'. Of the EU funds committed, about EUR 7.3 billion had been channelled through this initiative for accelerated delivery or reallocation, to the benefit of at least 460 000 young people and 56 000 SMEs.

Can the Commission state

— whether an updated review of the work of the 'action teams', and of the consultations with the other seven countries with a youth unemployment rate above the EU average (Bulgaria, Cyprus, France, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Sweden), is available,

— whether more precise and recent information is available on funded projects and on projects undergoing approval, including any that might concern possible changes to operational programmes,

— whether an analysis has been made of good practices, and whether a long-term action strategy for youth employment has been formulated,

— whether any youth organisation has been consulted, as requested in the Commission's Communication proposing a 'Youth Opportunities Initiative' and in Parliament's resolution of 24 May 2012 on youth opportunities, and, if so, when, since it does not seem as if any such action has been taken so far,

— what measures President Barroso was referring to in his speech on the State of the Union — when he mentioned, among other things, the launch of a 'youth package' to create a youth guarantee scheme and a quality framework for vocational training — and when we will see them,

— whether the results of the 'quality framework to facilitate vocational training' consultation are available,

— how the 'Youth Opportunities Initiative' is progressing and what measures have been taken?

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

The Youth Employment Package ([1]) announced by President Barroso was adopted on 5 December 2012. In this package, the Commission presented its analysis, its strategy and an update on the implementation of the Youth Opportunity Initiative ([2]), EU-level actions as well as 28 country-fiches with information on mobilisation or reprogramming of EU funds, in particular for the eight countries targeted in February 2012.

About EUR 16 billion of EU financing has been targeted for accelerated delivery or reallocation through this initiative so far, with at least 780 000 young people and 55 000 SMEs likely to benefit ([3]). These relate to re-programming which has already taken place, a limited number of further requests for reprogramming have recently been submitted, notably by Spain and Italy and are awaiting Commission decision.

The Commission consulted the stakeholders including the European Youth Forum. Consultations at national level were left to Member States. Extensive consultations with young people on youth employment were held under the Structured Dialogue between young people and policy-makers in 2010-2011, the results of which fed into the Commission's work in this area ([4]).

The Parliament debated the Youth Guarantee and adopted a resolution supporting it in January. Negotiations in the Council on the Youth Guarantee have started with a view to the adoption of the recommendation in February 2013.

For the Quality Framework for Traineeships, the Commission is currently seeking the views of social partners under Article 154 TFEU. Replies to the April 2012 open consultation are accessible on DG Employment website ([5]).

([1]) COM(2012) 727-728-729 final of 5 December 2012.
([2]) COM(2011) 933 of 20 December 2011.
([3]) These latest figures are based on the actual reallocation implemented by Member States.
([4]) http://europa.eu/youth/active_citizenship/structured_dialogue/index_eu_en.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=333&langId=en&consultId=10&visib=0&furtherConsult=yes.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011515/12
to the Commission
Trevor Colman (NI)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Implementing rules on flight and duty time limitations and rest requirements

Can the Commission advise me as to why, when Parliament insisted in 2006 that EU rules on flight time limitations (FTL) could only be set at a minimum level, allowing Member States to maintain or adopt stricter safety standards if they so wished, this will no longer be possible under the new EU rules?

The current 'non-regression' principle, enshrined in today's legislation, has enabled several countries to strive for higher safety levels than prescribed by the EU. This will no longer be possible under the new EU rules. Countries will be forced to adopt the same regulations, even when they are weaker than those currently in place, as is the case in the UK.

Would the Commission share my opinion that the EU should enable Member States to supplement the EU-wide rules with 'safety enhancements' in those areas where there would otherwise be reductions in safety standards or where the Member State would like to see enhanced protection?

Failing this, the UK Civil Aviation Authority's CAP 371 'The Avoidance of Fatigue In Aircrews' should be used as a guideline for the proposed amending regulation.

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(6 February 2013)

The Recital enshrined in today's legislation (EU-OPS Regulation (EEC) No 3922/91 ([1])) that enables Member States to apply more protective flight time limitations (FTL) is justified because the current rules are not based on a detailed assessment of scientific principles, national and international practices and given that some areas are left to Member States' discretion.

Such detailed assessment has been performed by the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) when preparing its proposals for revised FTL rules. EASA also proposes to cover all areas of FTL by common rules or recommendations.

The Agency believes that the proposed rules would provide a robust, balanced and realistic basis for European operators, equivalent to most exigent (safest) EU national regimes. These views are shared by most Member States, including the UK.

The possibility to apply national stricter FTL rules deviating from provisions proposed by EASA would still be allowed, in line with prescribed procedures already existing in the framework of the EASA Basic Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 ([2]).

As it is the case today under EU-OPS, the revised FTL rules would be without prejudice to more protective social legislation, including stringent collective labour agreements.

The Commission is currently assessing the opinion released by EASA with a view to prepare a draft legislative measure to be adopted under the relevant comitilogy rules.

([1]) OJ L 373, 31.12.1991.
([2]) OJ L 79, 19.3.2008.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011516/12
an die Kommission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(18. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Sozialdumping durch Entsendung von Scheinselbstständigen aus Drittstaaten

Immer häufiger beschäftigen polnische Baufirmen Arbeiter aus Drittstaaten, vor allem aus der Ukraine, Weißrussland, Georgien, Moldawien und der Russischen Föderation. Durch die interne polnische Saisonarbeitsregelung dürfen die Staatsangehörigen dieser Länder ohne Arbeitsgenehmigung bis zu sechs Monate im Jahr in Polen arbeiten. Nach einem Monat Beschäftigung in Polen können sie zur Dienstleistungsausführung nach Deutschland entsandt werden. Sie werden fast ausschließlich aufgrund eines Auftragsvertrages beschäftigt, der derzeit in Polen eine weit verbreitete und beliebte Form der Umgehung von regulären Beschäftigungsverhältnissen bildet. Vom Auftragsverhältnis werden in Polen nur geringe oder keine Sozialversicherungsbeiträge abgeführt, und die Arbeitnehmer haben keinen arbeitsrechtlichen Schutz.

Der polnische Sozialversicherungsträger ZUS, der für die Ausstellung von A1-Entsendebescheinigungen zuständig ist, vertritt eine erweiterte Auslegung des Begriffs „Beschäftigter" in Artikel 12 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 883/2004, aufgrund welcher auch die Auftragnehmer als Arbeitnehmer im rechtlichen Sinne angesehen werden. Diese zweifelhafte Auslegung weicht nicht nur von polnischem Recht ab, sondern stellt auch einen Verstoß gegen die europäischen Vorgaben dar.

Infolgedessen werden die A1-Bescheinigungen über die Anwendung von polnischem Sozialrecht für die Auftragnehmer ausgestellt, für die keine Sozialversicherungsbeiträge abgeführt werden. Die Bescheinigung entfaltet absolute Bindewirkung und schließt die Anwendung des deutschen Sozialversicherungsrechts vollständig aus. So können polnische Arbeitgeber Arbeiter ohne Sozialversicherungskosten nach Deutschland entsenden, was die Benachteiligung der Beschäftigten und Wettbewerbsverzerrungen zur Folge hat.

1. Ist sich die Kommission dieses Problems bewusst?

2. Welche Maßnahmen möchte die Kommission ergreifen, um gegen diese Art von Lohndumping vorzugehen?

3. Wie soll sichergestellt werden, dass die Entsendung von Scheinselbstständigen aus Drittstaaten unterbunden wird?

Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission
(25. Februar 2013)

1. Der Kommission ist das von der Frau Abgeordneten beschriebene Problem nicht bekannt.

2. Für die von der Frau Abgeordneten beschriebene Situation ist in den Artikeln 5 und 6 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 987/2009 ([1]) ein Vermittlungsverfahren für Fälle vorgesehen, in denen Mitgliedstaaten unterschiedliche Auffassungen vertreten, welches nationale Recht anzuwenden sei. Gemäß diesem Verfahren ([2]) kann der zuständige Träger in Deutschland den Träger, der die A1-Bescheinigung ausgestellt hat, kontaktieren. Er kann um die notwendige Klarstellung der Entscheidung ersuchen und gegebenenfalls verlangen, dass das fragliche Dokument widerrufen oder für ungültig erklärt, bzw. die Entscheidung überprüft oder annulliert wird.

Der ersuchte Träger ist verpflichtet, innerhalb einer festgelegten Frist zu antworten. Wenn die Träger — und in einer zweiten Stufe — die Behörden der betreffenden Mitgliedstaaten keine Einigung erzielen, kann die Angelegenheit der Verwaltungskommission für die Koordinierung der Systeme der sozialen Sicherheit ([3]) vorgelegt werden. Als letzten Schritt kann die Kommission ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren gegen einen Mitgliedstaat einleiten, wenn dieser gegen EU-Recht verstößt. Jeder Mitgliedstaat und jede Einzelperson kann die Kommission darüber informieren, dass ein anderer Mitgliedstaat möglicherweise gegen EU-Recht verstößt.

([1]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 987/2009 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 16. September 2009 zur Festlegung der Modalitäten für die Durchführung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 883/2004 über die Koordinierung der Systeme der sozialen Sicherheit (Text von Bedeutung für den EWR und die Schweiz), ABl. L 284 vom 30.10.2009.

([2]) Beschluss Nr. A1 der Verwaltungskommission für die Koordinierung der Systeme der sozialen Sicherheit vom 12. Juni 2009 über die Einrichtung eines Dialog- und Vermittlungsverfahrens zu Fragen der Gültigkeit von Dokumenten, der Bestimmung der anzuwendenden Rechtsvorschriften und der Leistungserbringung gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 883/2004 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates, ABl. C 106 vom 24.4.2010.

([3]) Artikel 71 und 72 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 883/2004.

3. Der Vorschlag der Kommission zur Durchsetzung der Richtlinie 96/71/EG ([4]) beinhaltet Maßnahmen, die dazu beitragen sollten, das Phänomen der Scheinselbstständigkeit besser in den Griff zu bekommen. Vor allem die Kriterien zur Klärung des Begriffs „Entsendung“ und die Einführung einer beschränkten, unmittelbaren Haftung des Subunternehmers sollten in dieser Hinsicht hilfreich sein.

([4]) KOM(2012)131 endg. vom 21.3.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011516/12
to the Commission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Social dumping through the posting of bogus self-employed persons from third countries

There are more and more Polish building companies using employees from third countries, especially Ukraine, Belarus, Georgia, Moldavia and the Russian Federation. Polish seasonal employment laws allow nationals of these countries to work for up to six months a year in Poland without a work permit. After working for one month in Poland they can be posted to Germany in order to provide services. Nearly all of them are employed on the basis of a 'mission contract', which in Poland is a widely used and popular means of circumventing normal employer-employee relations. Such contracts are only subject to limited social security contributions or none at all, and employees have no protection under labour law.

The Polish social security institution ZUS, responsible for issuing A1 posting certificates, is in favour of a broad interpretation of the term 'employee' within the meaning of Article 12 of Regulation (EC) 883/2004, allowing those working on such contracts to be viewed as legal employees. Not only is this dubious interpretation inconsistent with Polish law, it is also in breach of European standards.

As a result, A1 certificates of Polish social security rights are only issued for contractors not paying social security contributions. These certificates are fully binding and completely exclude application of German social security legislation. This means that Polish employees can post their employees to Germany without having to pay social security costs, thus disadvantaging employees and leading to distortions of competition.

1. Is the Commission aware of this problem?

2. Which steps could the Commission take to deal with this kind of wage dumping?

3. How can the posting of bogus self-employed persons from third countries be prevented?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2013)

1. The Commission is not aware of the problem as described by the Honourable Member.

2. In the situation as described by the Honourable Member, Articles 5 and 6 of Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 ([1]) provide for a conciliation procedure to be followed in cases where there is a difference of views between Member States concerning the determination of the applicable legislation. Under this procedure ([2]), the competent institution in Germany may contact the institution that issued the A1 certificate to ask for a necessary clarification of the decision, and, where appropriate, to withdraw or declare invalid the relevant document, or to review or annul its decision.

The requested institution is obliged to reply within a fixed deadline. If the institutions and, in a second stage, the authorities of the Member State cannot reach an agreement, the matter may be referred to the Administrative Commission for the Coordination of Social Security Systems ([3]) The Commission can as an ultimate step open an infringement procedure against a Member State if it fails to comply with EC law. It is open for Each Member State or individual to inform the Commission of any possible violation of EC law by another Member State.

3. The Commission's proposal on the enforcement of Directive 96/71/EC ([4]) contains measures which should contribute to tackle better the phenomenon of false self-employment. In particular the criteria clarifying the notion of posting and the introduction of a limited direct subcontractor liability should provide useful tools in this respect.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems (Text with relevance for the EEA and for Switzerland), OJ L 284, 30.10.2009.

([2]) As laid down in Decision A1of the Administrative Commission for the Coordination of Social Security Systems of 12 June 2009 concerning the establishment of a dialogue and conciliation procedure concerning the validity of documents, the determination of the applicable legislation and the provision of benefits under Regulation (EC) No 883/2004, OJ C 106, 24.4.2010.

([3]) See Articles 71 and 72 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004.

([4]) COM(2012) 131 final, 21.3.2012.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011518/12
à la Commission
Maurice Ponga (PPE)
(18 décembre 2012)

Objet: Liberté de circulation des travailleurs dans les PTOM — Principe de non-discrimination

La quatrième partie du traité FUE, qui porte sur l'association des PTOM à l'Union, décrit les principes de cette association. L'article 203 précise la procédure et indique que c'est au Conseil d'établir, en statuant à l'unanimité et sur proposition de la Commission, les dispositions relatives aux modalités et à la procédure de l'association entre les PTOM et l'Union.

Le Conseil s'est prononcé sur les modalités de l'association par le biais d'une décision du 27 novembre 2001, révisée par la suite le 19 mars 2007 (la «décision d'association outre-mer», ou DAO).

Concernant le droit d'établissement et de la prestation de services, le principe est celui de la non-discrimination entre les États membres, les ressortissants des PTOM pouvant être privilégiés par rapport à ceux des États membres. En effet, l'article 45 de la DAO prévoit que «les autorités des PTOM traitent les sociétés, ressortissants et entreprises des États membres de manière non moins favorable qu'ils traitent les sociétés, ressortissants et entreprises d'un pays tiers et ne discriminent pas entre les sociétés, ressortissants et entreprises des États membres», même si, «dans le but de promouvoir ou soutenir l'emploi local, les autorités d'un PTOM peuvent établir des réglementations, en faveur de leurs habitants et des activités locales».

Cependant, aucune disposition ne semble avoir été prise dans la DAO concernant la libre circulation des travailleurs.

1. En l'absence de disposition particulière prévue dans la DAO relative à la libre circulation des travailleurs, la Commission considère-t-elle qu'en la matière, le principe de non-discrimination, aménagé comme c'est le cas pour la liberté d'établissement et de prestation de services, s'applique mutatis mutandis?

2. Dans le cas contraire, les PTOM ont-ils le droit de discriminer les citoyens européens entre eux en vertu de leur droit local?

Réponse donnée par M. Piebalgs au nom de la Commission
(20 février 2013)

1. Le traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne (TFUE) prévoit que la liberté de circulation des travailleurs des pays et territoires d'outre-mer (PTOM), visés à son annexe II, doit être explicitement régie par des actes du Conseil (article 202 du TFUE). Aucun acte de ce type n'a jusqu'à présent été adopté par le Conseil.

Selon le TFUE, les relations entre l'UE et les PTOM sont définies par une décision du Conseil (décision d'association outre-mer ([1])). La décision d'association outre-mer actuellement en vigueur ne contient pas de dispositions régissant la liberté de circulation des travailleurs. Sur la base de l'article 199, paragraphe 5, du TFUE concernant la liberté d'établissement et de prestation de services, les autorités des PTOM ont l'obligation d'accorder le statut de la nation la plus favorisée aux États membres et d'interdire toute discrimination entre les ressortissants, les sociétés ou les entreprises des États membres. Étant donné que l'article 202 du TFUE demande explicitement que la libre circulation des travailleurs en relation avec les PTOM soit régie par des actes adoptés par le Conseil, il est impossible de remplacer cette obligation en appliquant *mutadis mutandis* les dispositions d'un acte du Conseil existant concernant l'association entre les PTOM et l'UE, car celui-ci a une base juridique différente.

2. Sur la base de ce qui précède, le droit des citoyens de l'Union européenne de travailler dans les PTOM est uniquement régi par le droit territorial propre à chaque PTOM. C'est ce droit qui détermine si les règles en matière de libre circulation des travailleurs peuvent ou non s'appliquer différemment (aux ressortissants des États membres de l'UE et aux habitants de chaque PTOM).

([1]) Décision 2001/822/CE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011518/12
to the Commission
Maurice Ponga (PPE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Free movement of workers in the OCTs — principle of non-discrimination

Part IV of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union sets out the principles underpinning the association of the OCTs with the EU. Article 203 clarifies the procedure and states that it is the responsibility of the Council, acting unanimously on a proposal from the Commission, to lay down provisions as regards the detailed rules and the procedure for the association of the OCTs with the Union.

The Council set out detailed rules for the association by way of a decision on 27 November 2001, subsequently amended on 19 March 2007 (the 'Overseas Association Decision', or OAD).

Regarding the right of establishment and the right to provide services, the underlying principle is non-discrimination between the Member States, while OCT nationals can be prioritised over Member State nationals. Indeed, Article 45 of the OAD stipulates that 'the OCT authorities shall afford nationals, companies or enterprises of the Member States treatment that is no less favourable than that which they extend to nationals, companies or enterprises of third countries and shall not discriminate between nationals, companies or enterprises of Member States', although 'the authorities of an OCT may with a view to promoting or supporting local employment, adopt regulations to aid their inhabitants and local activities'.

However, no provision seems to have been made in the OAD with regard to the free movement of workers.

1. In the absence of specific provisions in the OAD with regard to the free movement of workers, does the Commission consider that the principle of non-discrimination, adapted in the same way as for the freedom of establishment and to provide services, applies here *mutatis mutandis*?

2. If not, do the OCTs have the right to discriminate between EU citizens in accordance with their local law?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2013)

1. The Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU) foresees that the freedom of movement of workers for Overseas Countries and Territories (OCTs) listed in Annex II of the TFEU must explicitly be regulated by acts of the Council (Article 202 of the TFEU). No such act has hitherto been adopted by the Council.

According to the TFEU, relations between the Union and the OCTs are defined by a Council Decision (Overseas Association Decision ([1])). The Overseas Association Decision currently in force does not include provisions regulating the freedom of movement of workers. On the basis of Article 199(5) of the TFEU regarding the freedom of establishment and trade in services, it obliges OCTs authorities to grant most favoured nation status to, and prohibit discrimination between, nationals, companies or enterprises of Member States. As Article 202 of the TFEU explicitly requires acts adopted by Council to regulate the free movement of workers in relation to OCTs, it is not possible to substitute this requirement by applying *mutatis mutandis* the provisions of an existing Council act on the association of OCTs with the EU, which has a different legal basis.

2. On the basis of the above, the rights of EU citizens to work in OCTs are regulated solely by the respective territorial law of the OCTs. These laws determine whether different treatment [of nationals of EU Member States and the inhabitants of the respective OCTs] is allowed or prohibited with regard to the free movement of workers.

([1]) Decision 2001/822/EC.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011519/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 décembre 2012)

Objet: Protection des PME contre les escroqueries

Chaque jour, des entreprises, des professionnels et des organisations de la société civile établis dans l'Union sont victimes de fraudes par marketing. Ces fraudes vont de la communication d'informations fausses ou trompeuses sur le service à l'envoi d'offres gratuites qui s'avèrent payantes ou de formulaires trompeurs demandant la mise à jour d'informations dans des annuaires professionnels. Les chiffres révèlent une nouvelle tendance susceptible de toucher les entreprises du monde entier. Les techniques de marketing de masse se diffusant partout, les éditeurs d'annuaires aux fins d'escroqueries les plus notoires pourraient envoyer jusqu'à 6 millions de formulaires par an. Le préjudice financier que subissent les diverses entreprises victimes d'escroqueries à l'annuaire professionnel oscillerait, selon les estimations, entre 1 000 euros et 5 000 euros par an pour chaque entreprise. Les 23 millions de petites et moyennes entreprises (PME) que compte l'Europe représentent 99 % des entreprises de l'Union et ont généré 85 % de nouveaux emplois nets dans l'Union entre 2002 et 2010. Elles sont le principal moteur de la croissance économique, et leurs droits devraient être protégés.

1. Comment la Commission compte-t-elle améliorer l'exécution des règles visant à lutter contre les pratiques commerciales trompeuses par-delà les frontières?

2. Comment la Commission compte-t-elle renforcer les règles interdisant certaines pratiques?

3. En quoi consiste l'analyse d'impact exhaustive de la Commission et invitera-t-elle les différents acteurs (dont les PME) à y participer?

4. À quelle date la Commission compte-t-elle faire sa proposition?

Réponse donnée par Mme Reding au nom de la Commission
(1er mars 2013)

Comme elle l'a indiqué dans une communication récente ([1]), la Commission européenne est convaincue que la lutte contre les pratiques commerciales trompeuses requiert à la fois une meilleure exécution de la législation et un renforcement des règles visant à protéger les entreprises, notamment dans le cadre d'opérations transfrontières.

En ce qui concerne l'exécution, la Commission entend, à titre de mesure préliminaire, mettre en place une coopération informelle ad hoc entre les États membres pour que ceux-ci partagent leurs informations et coordonnent leurs actions. La première réunion du groupe constitué à cet effet est prévue en mars 2013.

En outre, la Commission a lancé, dans le cadre des travaux de préparation de sa proposition législative, une analyse d'impact approfondie afin de déterminer les options à retenir.

La Commission a déjà consulté les parties intéressées à la fin de 2011, lors d'une large consultation publique. Elle va aussi, à présent, associer pleinement les acteurs concernés, en particulier les PME, et les États membres à l'élaboration de sa proposition législative.

Pour cela, elle a mis en place un «panel de PME» pour recueillir les avis des petites et moyennes entreprises quant aux pratiques commerciales trompeuses.

([1]) COM(2012)702.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011519/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Protecting SMEs against scams

Every day, businesses, professionals and civil society organisations in the European Union fall victim to mass marketing fraud. Scams can take a number of different forms, including the provision of false or misleading information about services, fake 'free offers' and fraudulent forms requesting information updates for business directories. The figures point to a new trend that could affect businesses worldwide. Given the extensive reach of mass-marketing techniques, the most notorious producers of scam directories could be sending out as many as 6 million such fraudulent forms per year. The financial loss suffered by the various businesses that fall victim to professional directory scams has been estimated at between EUR 1000 and EUR 5000 per enterprise, per year. Europe's 23 million small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) represent 99% of the total number of businesses in the European Union and generated 85% of new jobs in the EU between 2002 and 2010. They are the main driver of economic growth and their rights should be protected.

1. How does the Commission intend to improve the enforcement of the rules aimed at combating misleading commercial practices across borders?

2. How does the Commission intend to strengthen the rules prohibiting specific practices?

3. What does the Commission's exhaustive impact analysis comprise and will it ask the various players concerned (including SMEs) to be involved in it?

4. On what date does the Commission intend to introduce its proposal?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(1 March 2013)

As announced in a recent Communication ([1]), the European Commission believes that the problem of misleading marketing practices requires both stepped up enforcement and strengthening of the rules protecting businesses, especially in cross-border transactions.

With regard to the enforcement and as a preliminary step, the Commission intends to establish an ad hoc informal cooperation among Member States to share information and coordinate actions. The first meeting of this group is planned for March 2013.

Moreover, the Commission, in view of its preparation for a legislative proposal, has launched an extensive impact assessment process to identify the best policy options.

The Commission already consulted stakeholders in an extensive public consultation at the end of 2011. The Commission will equally now fully involve stakeholders, and in particular SMEs, as well as the Member States in the preparation process for a legislative proposal.

To this end, the Commission has launched an SME Test Panel asking small and medium-sized enterprises about misleading marketing practices.

([1]) COM(2012)702.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011520/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 décembre 2012)

Objet: Décès d'un arbitre de football — violence envers le corps arbitral

En décembre 2012, aux Pays-Bas, un arbitre de football a été assassiné sur un terrain par quelques adolescents. La semaine précédente, le père d'un jeune joueur de 15 ans a, durant une autre rencontre, tabassé et envoyé à l'hôpital un autre arbitre. Ces faits sont hélas devenus courants. Chaque semaine, les arbitres de football sont victimes de leur hobby et certains le payent de leur vie.

Le 30 juin 2000, la Commission déclarait, dans une communication sur la fonction sociale du sport, que «le football ne peut pas être un sport de délassement pour la famille si les parents craignent d'emmener, voire d'envoyer seuls leurs enfants au stade à cause des groupes de hooligans. Et je constate avec une grande préoccupation que des phénomènes de violence ne se limitent point à des grands évènements de masse; des phénomènes de violence se produisent aussi en ligue régionale ou même cantonale, chez les adultes aussi bien que chez les jeunes».

1. Pour faire suite à cette déclaration, la Commission compte-t-elle s'exprimer de manière officielle sur ces débauches de violence dont les arbitres sont victimes?

2. La Commission envisage-t-elle de collaborer avec la FIFA et l'UEFA dans des campagnes de sensibilisation visant jeunes et adultes?

3. La Commission ne pourrait-elle pas mettre en place un groupe de travail avec les autorités footballistiques compétentes afin de déterminer quels pourraient être les outils les plus adéquats pour lutter contre ce fléau?

Réponse donnée par Mme Vassiliou au nom de la Commission
(12 février 2013)

Le décès rapporté par l'Honorable Parlementaire prouve que la violence dans le domaine du sport ne concerne pas que les spectateurs. La Commission salue les mesures concrètes prises au niveau national. Dans ce contexte, l'échange de bonnes pratiques peut certainement contribuer à la lutte contre la violence. C'est la raison pour laquelle la Commission a apporté son soutien à des projets transnationaux visant à lutter contre la violence et l'intolérance dans le sport dans le cadre des actions préparatoires dans le domaine du sport. En outre, la Commission a proposé de donner la priorité à ce dossier dans le futur chapitre consacré au sport du programme «Erasmus pour tous», le nouveau programme pour l'éducation, la formation, la jeunesse et le sport ([1]).

Dans sa communication intitulée «Développer la dimension européenne du sport» ([2]), la Commission rappelle qu'il importe dans ce domaine de déployer des efforts conjoints au niveau de l'Union européenne. Elle encourage la mise en place d'une approche plus vaste couvrant un large éventail de disciplines sportives et comprenant des volets préventif et répressif.

Dans le cadre de son dialogue structuré, la Commission entretient des contacts réguliers avec l'UEFA, la FIFA, l'Association européenne des clubs (ECA) et l'Association des ligues européennes de football professionnel (EPFL) au sujet des évolutions récentes dans le domaine du football. La lutte contre la violence et l'intolérance est l'un des thèmes récurrents abordés dans le cadre de l'ordre du jour permanent.

Par ailleurs, la prévention et la violence dans le sport et la lutte contre celle-ci est l'une des priorités du plan de travail de l'Union européenne en faveur du sport pour 2011-2014 ([3]). Cependant, aucun groupe d'experts spécialement chargé de la violence dans le sport n'a été créé par le Conseil dans le cadre du plan de travail. La Commission fera rapport sur les résultats du plan de travail d'ici la fin 2013 et prendra en compte le thème de la violence à l'encontre des sportifs, ainsi que des arbitres, pour la planification des futures actions dans le domaine du sport.

([1]) Commission européenne: Proposition de règlement du Parlement et du Conseil établissant «ERASMUS POUR TOUS», le programme de l'Union pour l'éducation, la formation, la jeunesse et le sport, 23 novembre 2011.
([2]) Communication du 18 janvier 2011.
([3]) Résolution du Conseil sur un plan de travail de l'Union européenne en faveur du sport 2011-2014, JO C 162, 1.6.2011

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011520/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Football referee death — violence against match officials

In December 2012, a football referee was fatally attacked on the field in the Netherlands by a number of teenagers. At another match the previous week, the father of a young 15-year-old player attacked another referee, who was then hospitalised. Such events have unfortunately become common. Every week, football referees are victims of their hobby and some are paying with their lives.

On 30 June 2000, in a communication on the social function of sport, the Commission declared that 'football cannot be a family leisure activity if parents fear taking or sending their children on their own to a match because of groups of hooligans. And I note with great concern that violence is not limited to major mass events, but is also occurring in the lower leagues, among adults as well as young people'.

1. To follow up on this declaration, will the Commission make an official statement on this profusion of violence of which referees are the victims?

2. Does the Commission envisage working with FIFA and UEFA on awareness campaigns targeting young people and adults?

3. Could the Commission not set up a working group with the relevant football authorities to ascertain what might be the most suitable tools for combating this scourge?

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

The fatality reported by the Honourable Member demonstrates that violence in sport is not limited to spectators' violence. The Commission welcomes concrete measures taken at the national level. In this context the exchange of good practices can certainly contribute to the fight against violence. This is the reason why the Commission has provided support to transnational projects to fight violence and intolerance in sports in the framework of the preparatory actions in the field of sport. Moreover, the Commission has proposed to give priority to this topic in the future Sport Chapter of 'Erasmus for All', the new Programme for education, training, youth and sport ([1]).

The Commission stresses the importance of European joint efforts in the field in its communication 'Developing the European dimension in sport' ([2]). It promotes a wider approach covering many sport disciplines, striking a balance between prevention and law enforcement measures.

In the framework of its structured dialogue the Commission has regular contacts with UEFA, FIFA, the European Club Association and the European professional football leagues about several developments in football. The fight against violence and intolerance is one of the topics on the rolling agenda.

Furthermore, the prevention of and fight against violence in sport is one of the priorities for the European Union Work Plan for Sport for 2011-2014 ([3]). However, no group of experts to deal specifically with violence in sport was set up by the Council in the framework of the Work Plan. The Commission will report by the end of 2013 on the results of the Work Plan and will take into consideration the issue of violence against sports people, including match officials, for the planning of future activities in the field of Sport.

([1]) European Commission: Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing 'ERASMUS FOR ALL': the Union Programme for Education, Training, Youth and Sport, 23 November 2011.
([2]) Communication 2011 (012 final) on 18 January 2011.
([3]) Resolution of the Council on a European Union Work Plan for Sport for 2011-2014, OJ C 162/1 on 1 June 2011

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011521/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(18 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: Possibili finanziamenti per la realizzazione di un progetto scientifico-culturale nel Comune di Radicofani, in provincia di Siena

L'Associazione «Astroturistika Astrofili» da anni si occupa della divulgazione scientifica e culturale dell'astronomia. Tale associazione attualmente è impegnata nella realizzazione di un progetto scientifico-culturale, denominato «Astroturismo», nel Comune di Radicofani in provincia di Siena. L'obiettivo di questo progetto è quello di istituire un polo scientifico di ricerca e didattica astronomica con cui ampliare il già esistente osservatorio astronomico e attraverso il quale dare impulso al turismo culturale e allo sviluppo economico nell'area sud della provincia di Siena.

Il parco a tema scientifico si inserirebbe all'interno del Parco delle Stelle Val d'Orcia, patrimonio mondiale dell'Umanità, riconosciuto dall'UNESCO, e costituirebbe un centro di ricerca e di studio per la diffusione della conoscenza dello spazio e delle stelle, oltre che diventare un centro di attrazione turistica. Tale centro offrirebbe per di più percorsi formativi agli studenti e laboratori culturali per persone di ogni età.

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

1. se esistono possibili finanziamenti per il progetto suesposto;

2. quali azioni o programmi sono previsti per la ricerca scientifica e la cultura nella nuova programmazione 2014-2020;

3. quale è il quadro generale della situazione.

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(20 febbraio 2013)

1. Il programma Toscana per il 2007-2013 cofinanziato dal Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR), potrebbe eventualmente finanziare il progetto menzionato dall'onorevole deputata nel contesto dell'asse V (Valorizzazione delle risorse endogene per lo sviluppo territoriale sostenibile).

In linea con il principio di gestione condivisa che si applica per l'attuazione della politica di coesione, la selezione e l'implementazione dei progetti rientra nelle responsabilità delle autorità nazionali. Per ulteriori informazioni la Commissione suggerisce pertanto all'onorevole deputata di mettersi direttamente in contatto con l'autorità di gestione del programma:

Autorità di gestione del programma operativo Toscana:
Regione Toscana
Direzione Generale Competitività del sistema regionale e sviluppo delle competenze
Via Luca Giordano, 13
50132 — FIRENZE
autoritagestionecreo@regione.toscana.it

2. Le discussioni in merito alle disposizioni legislative per il periodo 2014-2020 sono ancora in corso. Gli investimenti destinati ad essere supportati in questo periodo dal FESR devono avere un impatto socioeconomico sull'economia regionale in termini di innovazione, competitività, crescita e occupazione e avere una chiara correlazione con le priorità enunciate nella Strategia Europa 2020.

3. Una panoramica di progetti analoghi cofinanziati a valere su Fondi strutturali a livello di UE è disponibile al seguente indirizzo:
http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/projects/stories/index_it.cfm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011521/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Possibility of funding for a scientific and cultural project in the municipality of Radicofani, province of Siena

For many years, the *Astroturistika Astrofili* association has been dealing with the scientific and cultural popularisation of astronomy. This association is currently involved in a scientific and cultural project called 'Astroturismo' in the town of Radicofani, province of Siena. The aim of this project is to establish a scientific research and astronomy education hub through which to expand the existing astronomical observatory and to boost cultural tourism and economic development in the south of the province of Siena.

The scientific theme park would be part of the *Parco delle Stelle* in the *Val d'Orcia*, a Unesco World Heritage site, and would be, in addition to becoming a tourist attraction, a research and study centre for the dissemination of knowledge of space and the stars. This centre would also provide training courses for students and cultural workshops for people of all ages.

Can the Commission therefore:

1. say whether any funding might be available for this project;

2. say what measures or programmes have been planned for scientific research and culture in the new 2014-2020 programming period;

3. give an overview of the situation?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2013)

1. The 2007-2013 Tuscany programme co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) could possibly finance the project mentioned by the Honourable Member under priority V (Enhancement of endogenous resources for sustainable territorial development).

In line with the shared management principle used for the implementation of cohesion policy, project selection and implementation is the responsibility of the national authorities. For more information the Commission therefore suggests the Honourable Member contacts directly the managing authority of the programme:

Managing authority of operational programme Toscana:
Regione Toscana
Direzione Generale Competitività del sistema regionale e sviluppo delle competenze
Via Luca Giordano, 13
50132 — FIRENZE
autoritagestionecreo@regione.toscana.it

2. Discussions on the legislative provisions for the 2014-2020 period are currently ongoing. Investments to be supported in this period by the ERDF shall have a socioeconomic impact on the regional economy in terms of innovation, competitiveness, growth and jobs, and have a clear link with the priorities outlined in the Europe 2020 strategy.

3. An overview of similar projects co-financed under the Structural Funds at EU level is available at the following address:
http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/projects/stories/index_en.cfm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011522/12
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(18 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Liberalizarea dreptului de plantare a viței de vie

Subiectul liberalizării dreptului de plantare a viței de vie începând cu 2016 a stârnit în ultima vreme numeroase controverse în lumea vitivinicolă și în lumea economică europeană. Desigur, țările cu tradiție în producerea vinurilor sunt împotriva acestei liberalizări, care ar putea să le aducă reale prejudicii economice și ar duce la scăderea calității și imaginii vinurilor europene.

În acest context, din punctul de vedere al Comisiei, care va fi impactul finalizării acestor restricții, a liberalizării drepturilor de plantare, asupra pieței vinului european?

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(7 februarie 2013)

Pe întreaga durată a anului 2012, în cadrul unui grup la nivel înalt, au avut loc o serie de discuții referitoare la reglementarea plantării viței de vie în Uniunea Europeană. Grupul la nivel înalt a fost înființat în urma preocupărilor exprimate de câteva state membre producătoare de vinuri, de anumiți membri ai Parlamentului European și de mai multe organizații de părți interesate la nivelul UE. Ultima reuniune a grupului la nivel înalt a avut loc la 14 decembrie 2012.

În concluziile acesteia, s-a indicat că majoritatea membrilor sunt dispuși să participe la definirea unui nou sistem de autorizare a plantării de viță de vie pentru toate statele membre producătoare de vinuri și pentru toate categoriile de vin, într-un cadru comun la nivelul UE. Noul sistem ar trebui să fie mai deschis decât cel actual și ar trebui să permită, în anumite limite, noi plantări de viță de vie în diferitele state membre ale UE. În plus, ar trebui să se instituie un nou mecanism general de protecție la nivelul UE, pentru asigurarea unei creșteri ordonate a noilor plantații.

În curând, raportul final cu aceste concluzii va fi transmis comisarului și tuturor părților implicate (Consiliul, Parlamentul European etc.) și va fi făcut public. Măsurile în urma acestui raport vor fi decise în contextul discuțiilor referitoare la reforma PAC.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011522/12
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Liberalisation of vine planting rights

The liberalisation of vine planting rights from 2016 has been the subject of much controversy recently among winegrowers and in the European business world. Traditional wine-producing countries are naturally opposed to this liberalisation, which could cause real economic damage and lead to a deterioration in the quality and image of European wines.

In this context, what impact does the Commission expect the ending of restrictions and the liberalisation of planting rights to have on the European wine market?

Answer given by Mr Cioloș on behalf of the Commission
(7 February 2013)

A discussion took place during the whole year of 2012 on the regulation of vine plantings in the European Union in the context of a High Level Group (HLG). This HLG was established following the concerns expressed by several wine-producing Member States, certain European Parliament MEPs and a number of stakeholder organisations at EU level. The last meeting of this HLG took place on 14 December 2012.

In its conclusions, it was indicated that the majority of the members are ready to work on the definition of a new system of vine planting authorisations for all wine-producing Member States and all categories of wine, within a common framework at EU level. The new system should be more open than the current one and should allow, within certain limits, new vine plantings in the different Members States of the EU. Moreover, a general safeguard mechanism should be established at EU level in order to ensure an orderly growth of new plantings.

A final report with these conclusions will be shortly transmitted to the Commissioner and all concerned parties (Council, European Parliament, etc.), and will be made public. The follow-up will be done in the context of discussions related to the CAP reform.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011523/12
an die Kommission
Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)
(18. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Novelle der Arbeitszeitrichtlinie 2003/88EG und die Situation der ehrenamtlichen Tätigkeit allgemein bzw. der Freiwilligen Feuerwehr im besonderen

Wie Ende der letzten Woche bekannt wurde, sind die Verhandlungen über eine Revision der EU-Arbeitszeitrichtlinie, die seit Dezember 2011 zwischen den Sozialpartnern geführt wurden, gescheitert.

Kann die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Welche weiteren Schritte plant die Kommission? Wie sieht der zeitliche Rahmen aus? Wird die Kommission nun ihrerseits einen Vorschlag unterbreiten?

2. Von besonderem Interesse ist die Situation in den Mitgliedstaaten in Bezug auf die Arbeitszeitrichtlinie und die ehrenamtliche Tätigkeit allgemein bzw. die Tätigkeiten der Freiwilligen Feuerwehr im besonderen. Derzeit sind die Regelungen in Bezug auf eine Höchstarbeitszeit sehr unterschiedlich ausgestaltet. Nach deutschem und österreichischem Recht gelten Personen, die als Freiwillige tätig sind, nicht als Arbeitnehmer, fallen demnach also auch nicht unter die Arbeitszeitrichtlinie, die nur für Arbeitnehmer gilt. In anderen Mitgliedstaaten sieht die Situation jedoch anders aus — was die Lage kompliziert macht. Das zuständige Mitglied der Kommission äußerte bereits, dass man nicht Feuerwehrleute generell vom Geltungsbereich der Richtlinie ausnehmen kann; eine Klärung der Situation ist jedoch unbedingt notwendig. Wie will die Kommission dies sicherstellen?

Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission
(22. Februar 2013)

Die branchenübergreifenden Sozialpartner auf EU-Ebene, die über eine Überarbeitung der Arbeitszeitrichtlinie verhandelten, haben der Kommission Ende Dezember 2012 mitgeteilt, dass sie die Verhandlungen unterbrochen haben, da sie Schwierigkeiten hatten, einen für alle Seiten annehmbaren Kompromiss zu erzielen. Die Frist für den Abschluss der Verhandlungen lief am 31. Dezember 2012 aus.

Die Kommission holt derzeit u. a. von den Verhandlungsführern alle erforderlichen Informationen über die Ergebnisse der Verhandlungen ein und wird zum gegebenen Zeitpunkt über das weitere Vorgehen entscheiden, um die Umsetzung der Richtlinie in mehreren Punkten, z. B. was den Status freiwilliger Feuerwehrleute angeht, zu klären und zu verbessern.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011523/12
to the Commission
Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Amendment to the Working Time Directive 2003/88/EC and the situation of voluntary work in general and volunteer firefighters in particular

It transpired at the end of last week that the negotiations on the revision of the EU Working Time Directive that had been taking place between the social partners since December 2011 had failed.

In this context, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What further steps is the Commission planning? How does the timeframe look? Will the Commission now publish a proposal of its own?

2. Of particular interest is the situation in the Member States as regards the Working Time Directive, voluntary work in general and the work of volunteer firefighters in particular. The rules on maximum working time currently differ considerably. Under German and Austrian law, persons serving as volunteers do not count as employees and do not, therefore, fall within the scope of the Working Time Directive, which applies only to employees. In other Member States, however, the situation is different — which complicates matters. The Commissioner responsible has already said that there could be no blanket exemption from the directive for firefighters; however, the situation needs without fail to be clarified. How does the Commission propose to achieve this?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2013)

The EU cross-industry social partners who were negotiating a revision of the Working Time Directive informed the Commission at the end of December 2012 that the negotiations were suspended owing to difficulties in reaching a mutually acceptable compromise. The deadline for those negotiations was 31 December 2012.

The Commission is currently gathering the necessary information, including from negotiators, about the outcomes of the negotiations and will decide in due course on how to proceed in order to clarify and improve the implementation of the directive on a number of issues, including the status of volunteer fire-fighters.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011524/12
an die Kommission
Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)
(18. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Lebendrupf/Federgewinnung von lebenden Gänsen

In Bezug auf Lebendrupf bzw. die Federgewinnung von lebenden Gänsen wird in der Richtlinie 98/58/EG über den Schutz landwirtschaftlicher Nutztiere festgelegt, dass sichergestellt werden soll, dass den Tieren keine unnötigen Schmerzen, Leiden oder Schäden zugefügt werden. Die EFSA veröffentlichte 2010 ein Gutachten, das zu dem Schluss gelangte, dass dieses Verfahren zwar durchgeführt werden könne, ohne dass den Tieren Schmerzen zugefügt werden, allerdings unter den derzeit üblichen Bedingungen das Rupfen von Federn auf schmerzhafte Art unvermeidbar ist. Sie empfehlen daher die Einführung eines Kontrollsystems, um sicherzustellen, dass von lebenden Gänsen nur in der Mauser Federn gewonnen werden. In der zu Hausgänsen formulierten Empfehlung des Ständigen Ausschusses des Europarates zum europäischen Übereinkommen zum Schutz von Tieren in landwirtschaftlichen Tierhaltungen heißt es, dass „Federn, einschließlich Daunen, nicht von lebenden Vögeln gerupft werden dürfen". Es werden jedoch immer mehr Fälle von Tierquälerei bekannt (v. a. in Ungarn und Polen).

Kann die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Wie sieht die Kommission die Gesetzeslage allgemein in Bezug auf Lebendrupf? Wie werden die verschiedenen Rechtsinstrumente bewertet? Unter welchen Umständen dürfen Federn von lebenden Gänsen gewonnen werden?

2. Welche EU-Mitgliedstaaten haben das Europäische Übereinkommen zum Schutz von Tieren in landwirtschaftlichen Tierhaltungen unterzeichnet? Wie wurde die Umsetzung bisher überprüft? Welche Daten werden in Bezug auf die verwendeten Verfahren und die Kontrollen erhoben?

3. Welche weiteren Schritte hat die Kommission nach dem Gutachten der EFSA und deren Empfehlung zur Einführung eines Kontrollsystems unternommen? Wie will die Kommission sicherstellen, dass die europäischen Verbraucher über die Art und Weise der Gewinnung von Gänsefedern unterrichtet bzw. hierzu die Möglichkeit haben? Ist ein europäisches Gütesystem geplant?

4. Welche weiteren Schritte plant die Kommission, um sicherzustellen, dass die Situation sich endlich verbessert — insbesondere in Ungarn und Polen?

5. Wie bewertet die Kommission die derzeit angestrebte Initiative von europäischen Nichtregierungsorganisationen, Lebendrupf/ Federgewinnung von lebenden Gänsen allgemein zu verbieten?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(13. Februar 2013)

Die Kommission verweist auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E 11289/2012 ([1]) zur Rechtslage in Bezug auf Lebendrupf/Federgewinnung von lebenden Gänsen und die von der Kommission getroffenen Maßnahmen zur Überwachung der Situation.

25 Mitgliedstaaten haben das Europäische Übereinkommen zum Schutz von Tieren in landwirtschaftlichen Tierhaltungen ratifiziert. Die Liste der Unterzeichnerländer ist auf der Website des Europarats ([2]) einsehbar. Da die Europäische Union das Übereinkommen unterzeichnet und ratifiziert hat, sind das Übereinkommen und die darauf aufbauenden Empfehlungen Bestandteil des EU-Rechts und als solche für alle Mitgliedstaaten sowie für die Europäische Union rechtlich bindend.

Laut dem Verband der Europäischen Bettfedern- und Bettwarenindustrie e. V. (EDFA) werden mehr als 98 % der von der Branche verwendeten Daunen und Federn nach dem Schlachten der Tiere gewonnen.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html#sidesForm.
([2]) http://wayback.archive-it.org/1365/20120819004147/
http://www.conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/ChercheSig.asp?NT=087&CM=1&DF=&CL=ENG.

Nach der Annahme der EU-Strategie für den Schutz und das Wohlergehen von Tieren 2012-2015 ([3]) denkt die Kommission außerdem derzeit darüber nach, wie die Tierschutzinformationen für Verbraucher verbessert werden können.

Die Kommission erkennt die Initiative verschiedener europäischer Tierschutzorganisationen an, die sich dafür einsetzen, auch die Gewinnung von Federn von lebenden Gänsen zu verbieten. Die Kommission ist jedoch der Ansicht, dass in diesem Bereich Fortschritte besser dadurch erzielt werden können, dass die derzeitigen EU-Rechtsvorschriften in den wenigen betroffenen Mitgliedstaaten besser durchgesetzt und alle betroffenen Akteure stärker sensibilisiert werden.

([3]) KOM(2012)6 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011524/12
to the Commission
Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Live plucking/gathering feathers from live geese

With regard to live plucking and gathering feathers from live geese, Directive 98/58/EC concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes states that it must be ensured that animals are not caused any unnecessary pain, suffering or injury. The EFSA published a report in 2010 concluding that the procedure could be performed without causing pain to the birds, but that painful plucking of feathers was unavoidable under currently typical conditions. It therefore recommended introducing a control system to ensure that only moulting feathers are gathered from live geese. The recommendation of the Standing Committee of the European Convention for the protection of animals kept for farming purposes of the Council of Europe, on domestic geese, states that 'feathers, including down, shall not be plucked from live birds'. However, the number of cases of animal cruelty coming to light is constantly increasing (particularly in Hungary and Poland).

Could the Commission answer the following questions on this issue:

1. What is the Commission's view, in general, of the legal situation regarding live plucking? What is its assessment of the various legal instruments? Under what circumstances is it permissible to gather feathers from live geese?

2. Which EU Member States have signed the European Convention for the protection of animals kept for farming purposes? How has implementation been monitored to date? What information has been gathered regarding the procedures used and inspections?

3. What further steps has the Commission taken following the EFSA's report and its recommendation that a control system should be introduced? How does the Commission propose to ensure that European consumers are informed about how goose feathers are obtained, or have the opportunity to access such information? Are there plans for a European quality system?

4. What further steps does the Commission plan to take to ensure that the situation finally improves, particularly in Hungary and Poland?

5. What is the Commission's assessment of the initiative currently being pursued by European non-governmental organisations to ban live plucking/gathering feathers from live geese completely?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(13 February 2013)

The Commission would refer to its answer to Written Question E 11289/2012 ([1]) regarding the legal situation on plucking/harvesting feathers from live geese and the steps taken by the Commission to monitor the situation.

25 Member States signed and ratified the European Convention for the protection of animals kept for farming purposes; the detailed list is available on the website of the Council of Europe ([2]). However, since the European Union signed and ratified the Convention, the Convention and its subsequent recommendations are part of EC law. As such they are legally binding for all Member States as well as for the Union.

According to the European Down and Feather Association, 98% of the down and feathers processed by their industry is collected after the slaughter of birds.

In addition, the Commission, following the adoption of the EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 ([3]), is presently reflecting on how information to consumers on animal welfare can be improved.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html#sidesForm.
([2]) http://wayback.archive-it.org/1365/20120819004147/http://www.conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/ChercheSig.asp?NT=087&CM=1&DF=&CL=ENG.
([3]) COM(2012) 6 final.

The Commission acknowledges the initiative of several European animal welfare NGOs asking to ban also the practice of gathering feathers from live geese. However, the Commission considers that progress on this issue can be better achieved by improved enforcement of the current EU legislation in the few Member States concerned, and by increased awareness of all actors on this issue.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011526/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(18 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αξιοκρατική επιλογή επικεφαλής δημοσίων οργανισμών στην Ελλάδα

Σύμφωνα με το Μνημόνιο για τις οικονομικές και δημοσιονομικές πολιτικές (Memorandum of Economic and Financial Policies) το οποίο υπογράφηκε μεταξύ της Ελλάδας, της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας και του Διεθνούς Νομισματικού Ταμείου, τον Μάρτιο 2012, η Ελλάδα δεσμεύεται σε προαπαιτούμενη δράση που αφορά τον διορισμό Γενικού Γραμματέα για τα έσοδα, με διαφανή, συγκεκριμένα και αξιοκρατικά κριτήρια.

Πριν από 2,5 χρόνια ανέλαβε επικεφαλής του Οργανισμού Αγροτικών Ασφαλίσεων (ΕΛΓΑ) ο κ. Θόδωρος Σαρρής, ο οποίος, σύμφωνα με αλλεπάλληλα δημοσιεύματα στον ελληνικό τύπο, εκτέλεσε παραδειγματικά τα καθήκοντά του: περιόρισε δραστικά τις ψεύτικες αποζημιώσεις, διπλασίασε τα ετήσια έσοδα από 75 σε 150 εκατ. ευρώ περίπου, μεταρρύθμισε τις διαδικασίες είσπραξης εσόδων ώστε να μην πληρώνουν μόνο οι έντιμοι αγρότες, περιόρισε το κονδύλι μισθοδοσίας από 53 εκατ. σε 16 εκατ. ευρώ περίπου και ενώ το 2010 ο ΕΛΓΑ χρωστούσε 4,2 δις ευρώ και, κάθε χρόνο δημιουργούσε νέο έλλειμμα 400 εκ. ευρώ περίπου, σήμερα έγινε πλεονασματικός.

Παρ' όλα αυτά, προς έκπληξη της ελληνικής κοινής γνώμης, η κυβέρνηση προχώρησε τις ημέρες αυτές στην αιφνιδιαστική αντικατάστασή του, χωρίς αιτιολογία υλοποιώντας κατά τα δημοσιεύματα του τύπου σχετική συμφωνία διανομής κυβερνητικών θέσεων μεταξύ των τριών κομμάτων των κυβερνητικών εταίρων.

Ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, εάν ως μέλος της Τρόικας, σκοπεύει να ενθαρρύνει την αξιοκρατική επιλογή επικεφαλής μεγάλων δημόσιων οργανισμών στην Ελλάδα, οι οποίοι διαχειρίζονται εθνικά ή/ και ευρωπαϊκά κονδύλια.

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή εργάζεται δραστήρια για να ενθαρρύνει την αξιοκρατική επιλογή των επικεφαλής των μεγάλων δημόσιων οργανισμών στην Ελλάδα. Για παράδειγμα έχει ξεκινήσει ένα εκτεταμένο εγχείρημα βάσει του Μνημονίου Συνεννόησης, στο πλαίσιο του οποίου οι αξιολογήσεις των επιδόσεων των δημοσίων υπαλλήλων πρέπει να έχουν ολοκληρωθεί μέχρι τον Δεκέμβριο του 2013 (βλ. τμήμα 2.7.1.1.2 του Μνημονίου).

Όσον αφορά τους επικεφαλής των σημαντικών δημόσιων οργανισμών, οι ελληνικές αρχές έχουν δεσμευτεί να διορίσουν ως Γενικό Γραμματέα Εσόδων πρόσωπο με εμπειρία ως ανώτατο διοικητικό στέλεχος, εμπειρία σε φορολογικά θέματα και άψογη φήμη. Στην εν λόγω υπηρεσία τα διευθυντικά στελέχη υπόκεινται στον καθορισμό στόχων όσον αφορά τις επιδόσεις και σε τακτικές αξιολογήσεις.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011526/12
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Selection on the basis of merit of heads of public institutions in Greece

According to the Memorandum of Economic and Financial Policies between Greece, the Commission, the European Central Bank and the International Monetary Fund, which was signed in March 2012, Greece is committed to a 'prior action' involving the appointment of a Secretary General for revenue by transparent, specific and meritocratic criteria.

Two and a half years ago, Mr Theodoros Sarris took over as head of the Agricultural Insurance Organisation (ELGA). According to repeated reports in the Greek press, he has performed his duties in an exemplarily fashion: he has drastically reduced the number of false claims, doubled annual revenue from EUR 75 to approximately EUR 150 million, reformed the revenue collection procedures so as to avoid a situation in which only honest farmers pay, reduced payroll expenses from EUR 53 million to approximately EUR 16 million and, whereas in 2010 the ELGA owed EUR 4.2 billion and every year registered a new deficit of some EUR 400 million, today it runs a surplus.

Nevertheless, to the surprise of Greek public opinion, the government has just unexpectedly replaced him, without providing any justification: according to press reports, it is honouring an agreement to distribute governmental positions between the three parties in government.

Will the Commission say whether, as a member of the Troika, it intends to encourage the merit-based selection of the heads of major public organisations in Greece which manage national and/or EU funds?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(5 February 2013)

The Commission actively works to encourage the merit-based selection of the heads of major public organisations in Greece. For instance a comprehensive exercise is being undertaken in line with the memorandum of understanding (MoU), whereby the assessments of performance of civil servants is to be completed by December 2013 (see Section 2.7.1.1.2 of the MoU).

Concerning the heads of important public organisations, the Greek Authorities have committed to appoint as Secretary General of the revenue administration a person with senior management experience, expertise in tax matters, and an impeccable reputation. In this administration the managers are subject to performance targets and regular assessments.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011527/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Bycatch technology

The European Union has rules in place on fishing net sizes, but bycatch remains a problem.

A British inventor has developed a series of 'escape rings' for fish which can be fitted to trawler nets; they exploit the escape behaviour and physiology of different fish, meaning that fewer undersized fish are caught. This innovation has recently won an award from the James Dyson Foundation, which is based in the South-West region of the UK.

Is the Commission aware of this innovation? Will officials look at how its application could further reduce bycatch in European waters?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 2013)

The Commission is always interested and supportive of new and innovative solutions to reduce by-catches and eliminate discards.

Improving the selectivity of fishing gear is beneficial for reducing unwanted catches. However, before any such device could be considered applicable to EU fisheries, it needs to be scientifically and technically assessed through testing at sea. Such testing will provide an understanding of the potential benefits in terms of by-catch reduction and discard elimination.

Funding for the development of selective fishing methods and initiatives geared at by-catch reduction and elimination of discards including testing of such devices under pilot projects is eligible under the European Fisheries Fund (EFF). These funds are managed nationally by the Member States. The Commission considers it very important that support is provided for initiatives on selective fishing and has included this in its proposal for the future European Maritime and Fisheries Fund.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011529/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(18 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Πλήρης προστασία από δυσμενείς εργασιακές μεταβολές των μεταταχθέντων, βάσει (ΕΚ) αριθ. 320/2006 του Συμβουλίου, εργαζομένων από την Ελληνική Βιομηχανία Ζάχαρης

Στο πλαίσιο της αναδιάρθρωσης του κλάδου ζάχαρης στην ΕΕ και για την εναρμόνιση της Ελληνικής Βιομηχανίας Ζάχαρης ΑΕ (ΕΒΖ ΑΕ) προκρίθηκε η συμμετοχή της στο Ευρωπαϊκό Πρόγραμμα Χορήγησης Ενίσχυσης για τις Επιχειρήσεις που εγκαταλείπουν μέρος της παραγωγής τους, βάσει ποσόστωσης, και, αντιστοίχως η υπαγωγή της στο κανονιστικό πλαίσιο του (ΕΚ) αριθ. 320/2006 του Συμβουλίου. Τόσο στο σχέδιο αναδιάρθρωσης, όσο και στην αίτηση αποποίησης που υποβλήθηκε από την ΕΒΖ ΑΕ στο Υπουργείο Αγροτικής Ανάπτυξης και Τροφίμων υπήρξε δέσμευση — απόλυτα συμβατή με το άρθρο 4 (γ) του (ΕΚ) αριθ. 320/2006 — υλοποίησης ενός Κοινωνικού Προγράμματος με προτεραιότητα στους εργαζομένους των δύο εργοστασίων της επιχείρησης σε Λάρισα και Ξάνθη που θα έπαυαν τη λειτουργία τους. Το Υπουργείο Εργασίας (8.6.2007) συγκρότησε ειδική ομάδα εργασίας. Οι δύο δράσεις του Κοινωνικού Προγράμματος ενσωματώθηκαν στην ελληνική έννομη τάξη με το ν. 3660/2008 και προέβλεπαν:

α) Πρόγραμμα Ειδικής Επιδότησης Ανεργίας και β) Δυνατότητα Μεταφοράς Προσωπικού — Αναγκαστικές Μετατάξεις στην Περιφερειακή Αυτοδιοίκηση σε νεοσυσταθείσες προσωποπαγείς — και όχι οργανικές θέσεις — με πλήρη εργασιακά και ασφαλιστικά δικαιώματα. Η ΕΒΖ ΑΕ προέβη σε όλες τις απαραίτητες ενέργειες όπως φαίνεται και από την Τελική Έκθεση (σύμφωνα με τον (ΕΚ) αριθ. 968/2006 της Επιτροπής 27.6.2006) στην οποία αναφέρεται ρητά η δέσμευση για διασφάλιση των θέσεων εργασίας και ειδικότερα των εργαζομένων στις μονάδες που έκλεισαν. Με τον 4046/2012, όμως, οι εν λόγω εργαζόμενοι δεν εξαιρούνται από το Πρόγραμμα Κινητικότητας-Διαθεσιμότητας με συνέπεια τον κίνδυνο περαιτέρω απώλειας εργασιακών δικαιωμάτων ή ακόμη και της εργασίας τους. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς κρίνει το γεγονός της μη εξαίρεσης των μεταταχθέντων εργαζομένων της ΕΒΖ ΑΕ όταν το έτερο σκέλος του Προγράμματος, η Ειδική Επιδότηση Ανεργίας, εφαρμόζεται κανονικά και με δεδομένο ότι η διασφάλιση των συγκεκριμένων εργασιακών θέσεων προβλέπεται ρητά στους σχετικούς Ευρωπαϊκούς Κανονισμούς, αποτελώντας σαφή δέσμευση της χώρας μας;

2. Ποιο είναι το μοντέλο που ακολουθήθηκε στα υπόλοιπα κράτη-μέλη, οι επιχειρήσεις των οποίων συμμετείχαν στο συγκεκριμένο Πρόγραμμα Αναδιάρθρωσης;

3. Προτίθεται να εκδώσει σχετικές συστάσεις προς την Ελλάδα προκειμένου να εξαιρούνται οι μεταταχθέντες βάσει Ευρωπαϊκών Προγραμμάτων εργαζόμενοι από τις διαδικασίες κινητικότητας;

Απάντηση του κ. Ciolos εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(18 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Βάσει του νομικού πλαισίου της Ένωσης για το ταμείο αναδιάρθρωσης στον τομέα της ζάχαρης, τα κράτη μέλη είχαν πλήρη ευθύνη για την εφαρμογή του στο έδαφός τους:

— Το άρθρο 5 παράγραφος 1 του κανονισμού του Συμβουλίου (ΕΚ) αριθ. 320/2006 ([1]) ορίζει ότι «*τα κράτη μέλη αποφασίζουν όσον αφορά τη χορήγηση της ενίσχυσης αναδιάρθρωσης*»,

— Το άρθρο 5 παράγραφος 4 του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 320/2006 ορίζει ότι «*τα κράτη μέλη παρακολουθούν, ελέγχουν και επαληθεύουν την υλοποίηση της ενίσχυσης αναδιάρθρωσης, όπως την έχουν εγκρίνει*»,

Τα κράτη μέλη ενημέρωσαν την Επιτροπή για τις αποφάσεις τους. Η ανακοίνωση αυτή είχε αποκλειστικά ενημερωτικό χαρακτήρα και δεν συνιστούσε επίσημη έγκριση των αποφάσεων των κρατών μελών από τις υπηρεσίες της Επιτροπής:

— Το άρθρο 9 παράγραφος 7 του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 968/2006 ([2]) ορίζει ότι «*τα κράτη μέλη_αποφασίζουν όσον αφορά την επιλεξιμότητα του κοινωνικού προγράμματος και ενημερώνουν την επιχείρηση και την Επιτροπή σχετικά με την απόφασή τους*»,

— Το άρθρο 10 παράγραφος 4 του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 968/2006 της Επιτροπής ορίζει ότι «*Αντίγραφο του συνολικού εγκριθέντος σχεδίου αναδιάρθρωσης αποστέλλεται στην Επιτροπή από την αρμόδια αρχή του κράτους μέλους*».

([1]) ΕΕ L 58 της 28.2.2006.
([2]) ΕΕ L 176 της 30.6.2006.

Συνεπώς, δεν εμπίπτει στις αρμοδιότητες της Επιτροπής να απευθύνει συστάσεις στις ελληνικές αρχές σχετικά με την εφαρμογή του ταμείου αναδιάρθρωσης.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011529/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Full protection from adverse changes in employment conditions for Hellenic Sugar Industry employees transferred on the basis of Council Regulation (EC) No 320/2006

As part of the restructuring of the EU sugar industry and in order to harmonise the Hellenic Sugar Industry Ltd, it was announced that the latter would be included in the European aid scheme for enterprises renouncing part of their production quotas and be subjected to the regulatory framework of Council Regulation (EC) No 320 / 2006. Both the restructuring scheme and the application to renounce part of the quota submitted by the above company to the Ministry of Rural Development and Food contained a commitment — fully compatible with Article 4(c) of Regulation (EC) No 320/2006 — to implement a Social Programme giving priority to workers at the two Hellenic Sugar Industry plants in Larissa and Xanthi, respectively, which will cease production. On 8 June 2007, the Ministry of Labour set up a special working group on this issue. The two actions of the Social Programme were incorporated into Greek law by Law 3660/2008 and provided for the following:

(a) A special unemployment allowance scheme and

(b) the possibility of transferring personnel — compulsory transfers to local government in newly established *ad personam* (and not establishment plan) posts, with full employment and insurance rights. The company made all the necessary arrangements, as the final report shows (in accordance with Commission Regulation (EC) No 968/2006 of /27/06/2006) which refers specifically to the commitment to secure jobs in particular of workers at plants that have closed. However, in law No 4046/2012 these workers are not excluded from the mobility-availability programme and thus face the risk of a further loss of employment rights or even of losing their jobs. In this context, will the Commission say:

1. How does it view the failure to exempt Hellenic Sugar Industry employees given that the other part of the programme, the special unemployment allowance scheme, is being applied fully and given that the relevant European regulations specifically provide for safeguards for the jobs in question which thus constitutes a clear commitment for Greece?

2. What is the model followed in other Member States whose companies have participated in this restructuring scheme?

3. Will it issue recommendations to Greece to exempt workers being transferred under EU programmes from the mobility procedures?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

Within the legal framework of the Union's sugar restructuring fund, Member States had full responsibility for its implementation within their territory:

— Article 5(1) of Council Regulation (EC) No 320/2006 ([1]) states that '*Member States shall decide on the granting of the restructuring aid*';

— Article 5(4) of Council Regulation (EC) No 320/2006 states that '*Member States shall monitor, control and verify the implementation of the restructuring aid as approved by it*';

Member States informed the Commission of their decisions. This communication was purely informative and did not imply formal approval of the Member States' decisions by the Commission's services:

— Article 9(7) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 968/2006 ([2]) states that '*Member States shall decide on the eligibility of the social plan and inform the undertaking and the Commission of its decision*';

— Article 10(4) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 968/2006 states that '*A full copy of the approved restructuring plan shall be sent by the competent authority to the Commission*';

([1]) OJ L58, 28.2.2006.
([2]) OJ L176, 30.6.2006.

It is therefore not within the competence of the Commission to issue recommendations to the Greek authorities on the implementation of the restructuring fund.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011531/12
do Komisji
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(18 grudnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Dalsze ewentualne sankcje wobec Korei Północnej

Satelita wystrzelony przez Koreę Północną na rakiecie dalekiego zasięgu w dniu 12 grudnia krąży po orbicie bez zakłóceń według informacji dostarczonych przez władze Korei Południowej. Rządy na całym świecie potępiły wystrzelenie rakiety, twierdząc że stanowi to naruszenie prawa międzynarodowego. Korea Północna argumentuje, że umieszczenie satelity na orbicie miało charakter pokojowy, ale mimo to pojawiły się powszechne obawy co do wznowienia działań militarnych przez Koreę Północną.

Unia Europejska również potępiła wystrzelenie rakiety, jako jedna z wielu instytucji politycznych. Catherine Ashton nazwała je kolejnym krokiem w od dawna trwających staraniach Koreańskiej Republiki Ludowo-Demokratycznej w celu zdobycia technologii produkcji rakiet balistycznych. Podkreśliła także, że UE rozważy odpowiednią reakcję na to wydarzenie, w bliskiej współpracy z najważniejszymi partnerami, i zasugerowała ewentualność wprowadzenia dalszych środków ograniczających lub nałożenia sankcji na Koreę Północną.

Moje pytanie do Komisji dotyczy tego, na jakim etapie znajduje się Komisja w przyjmowaniu tych nowych środków ograniczających i kiedy możemy się spodziewać kolejnego oświadczenia w tej sprawie.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji
(26 lutego 2013 r.)

System sankcji UE wobec Korei Północnej służy zarówno wdrożeniu sankcji nałożonych przez Organizację Narodów Zjednoczonych (ONZ), jak i zastosowaniu autonomicznych, dodatkowych środków mających na celu wzmocnienie środków podjętych na szczeblu ONZ. W tym kontekście należy zauważyć, że w ramach ONZ nadal prowadzone są rozmowy w sprawie podjęcia ewentualnych działań w odniesieniu do Koreańskiej Republiki Ludowo-Demokratycznej (KRLD) w związku z wystrzeleniem rakiety w grudniu 2012 r. Działania UE, także w kwestii ewentualnego przyjęcia nowych autonomicznych, dodatkowych środków ograniczających, zostaną określone stosownie do wyniku tych rozmów. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji oświadczyła, że UE rozważy właściwą odpowiedź w ścisłym porozumieniu ze swoimi najważniejszymi partnerami.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011531/12
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Further possible sanctions against North Korea

The satellite that North Korea launched on a long-range rocket on 12 December is orbiting normally, according to South Korean officials. Authorities from around the world have condemned this launch as being in violation of international law. North Korea claims that this was a peaceful satellite launch, but it has sparked widespread fears of renewed North Korean military action.

The European Union is one of the political authorities to condemn the launch; Catherine Ashton called it another step in a long-running attempt by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to acquire ballistic missile technology. She also stated that the EU would consider an appropriate response, in close consultation with key partners, suggesting the possibility of further restrictive measures or sanctions against North Korea.

I would like to ask where the Commission is in terms of adopting these new restrictive measures and when we can expect another announcement to be made.

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

The EU's sanctions regime against North Korea implements both United Nations (UN) sanctions and includes additional autonomous measures reinforcing the measures taken at UN level. In this context, it is noted that in the UN, discussions are still ongoing as regards possible steps with regard to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), after the rocket launch of December 2012. The EU's response, including possible adoption of new additional autonomous restrictive measures, will be determined in the light of the outcome of discussions at UN level. The HR/VP has stated that the EU would consider an appropriate response in close consultation with key partners.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011532/12
à la Commission
Bernadette Vergnaud (S&D)
(18 décembre 2012)

Objet: Activités de promotion et de développement du 112 et du projet «eCall»

En ce qui concerne la mise en œuvre du numéro d'urgence européen 112 et du projet «eCall» (basé sur le 112), il apparaît qu'une grande activité a été déployée pour faciliter le développement d'eCall. Il semble cependant que, dans le même temps, un nombre beaucoup plus réduit d'activités aient été organisées pour améliorer le fonctionnement du 112.

La Commission peut-elle transmettre une liste détaillée des activités organisées pour chacun de ces sujets et présenter les justifications des efforts consentis pour chacun d'entre eux?

Réponse donnée par Mme Kroes au nom de la Commission
(20 février 2013)

Le numéro d'urgence 112 et les initiatives autour du service eCall desservent le même objectif, qui est de secourir efficacement les citoyens européens en situation de détresse. Ecall est financé dans le cadre du projet HeERO, qui relève du programme d'appui stratégique en matière de TIC et vise à la mise en place d'un système électronique de sécurité appelant automatiquement les services d'urgence en cas d'accident grave. L'appel sera dirigé, comme tout autre appel d'urgence, vers le numéro 112. Grâce aux financements de l'UE, le déploiement et la mise en œuvre du système eCall pourront être assurés par le secteur concerné à l'horizon 2015, dans tous les États membres. Le modem intégré à la voiture permettra une localisation précise à partir des données GNSS.

En ce qui concerne le numéro d'urgence 112, la Commission s'efforce constamment de promouvoir l'usage. L'année dernière, elle a ainsi invité les compagnies de transport à sensibiliser les touristes à l'existence de ce numéro, qui peut sauver des vies. Cette année, la Commission souhaiterait associer aussi les agences de voyages à ces efforts. De plus, année après année, la publication de l'enquête annuelle Eurobaromètre et du rapport sur la mise en œuvre du 112 facilite les échanges de meilleures pratiques entre États membres. Pour renforcer l'efficacité des appels d'urgence, la Commission a engagé des discussions avec les experts des États membres afin de contribuer à la diffusion des meilleures solutions pour la mise en œuvre de critères plus stricts de localisation des appels. Des informations à jour sur les initiatives autour du 112 sont disponibles sur le site web http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/112.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011532/12
to the Commission
Bernadette Vergnaud (S&D)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Activities promoting and developing 112 and the 'eCall' project

With regard to the introduction of the European emergency number 112 and the 'eCall' project (based on 112), it would seem that much has been done to facilitate the development of eCall. However, it seems that much less has been done to improve the way that 112 works.

Can the Commission forward a detailed list of the activities organised for each of these projects, and explain why these activities have been undertaken?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2013)

The 112 emergency number and eCall initiatives have the same goal, bringing effective relief to European citizens in distress. ECall is financed throught the ICT Policy Support Programme in the HeERO project to promote an electronic safety system automatically calling emergency services in case of a serious accident. This call will be directed, like any other emergency call, to the 112 number. EU financing contributed to ensure that by 2015 the eCall system will be deployed by the industry and implemented in all Member States. In eCall the inbuilt modem of the car would provide accurate caller location based on GNSS data.

Regarding the 112 emergency number, the Commission continuously promotes the usage of the number. Last year the Commission called on transport companies to promote this life-saving number amongst tourists. This year the Commission would like to see Tour Operators coming on-board. In addition each year the yearly Eurobarometer report and the 112 implementation report to facilitate the exchange of best practice between Member States is published. In order to make emergency calls more efficient, the Commission is in discussions with Member States' experts in view of helping to disseminate the best solutions for implementing more stringent caller location criteria. Up-to-date information on 112 initiatives is available on the website http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/112.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011534/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(18 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Έρευνα σε βάρος της Deutsche Bank από την αμερικανική Επιτροπή Κεφαλαιαγοράς

Η Αμερικανική Επιτροπή Κεφαλαιαγοράς (SEC) ερευνά καταγγελίες σε βάρος της Deutsche Bank ότι η γερμανική τράπεζα απέκρυψε ζημιές έως 12 δισ. δολαρίων από παράγωγα στις δραστηριότητες της στις ΗΠΑ. Συγκεκριμένα, ερευνάται ότι η τράπεζα κατά τη διάρκεια της χρηματοπιστωτικής κρίσης 2007-2009, αποτίμησε «λανθασμένα» την αξία περίπλοκων παραγώγων (leveraged super senior trades), τα οποία αν είχαν αποτιμηθεί σε τρέχουσες αξίες (mark-to-trades), τότε θα είχαν προκύψει λογιστικές ζημιές που ενδεχομένως θα οδηγούσαν τα ίδια κεφάλαια της Deutsche Bank σε επικίνδυνα χαμηλά επίπεδα και στην ανάγκη παρέμβασης για την αντιμετώπιση συστημικού κινδύνου.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Τι γνωρίζει σχετικά με την ανωτέρω καταγγελία; Ποιο είναι το ευρωπαϊκό νομικό πλαίσιο που υπάρχει; Τι αρμοδιότητες διαθέτουν σήμερα οι θεσμοί της ΕΕ προκειμένου να ερευνήσουν την υπόθεση;

2. Τα stress tests των ευρωπαϊκών τραπεζών του 2011 ήταν αξιόπιστα; Γιατί δεν ανέδειξαν την γιγαντιαία έκθεση της Deutsche Bank στα ανωτέρω «τοξικά» παράγωγα;

3. Προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να ερευνήσει την υπόθεση ή θα αφήσει την Αμερικανική Επιτροπή Κεφαλαιαγοράς (SEC) να «βγάλει το φίδι από την τρύπα», όπως κάνει σε όλες τις ανάλογες περιπτώσεις που η SEC ερευνά γερμανικές εταιρείες;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

1. Η Επιτροπή δεν είναι σε θέση να καθορίσει κατά πόσον η έκθεση της Deutsche Bank είναι ακριβής. Το ΔΠΧΑ ([1]) αποτελεί το λογιστικό πλαίσιο που εφαρμόζεται στους ενοποιημένους λογαριασμούς εισηγμένων στο χρηματιστήριο εταιρειών στην Ευρώπη και στις ΗΠΑ. Βάσει του πλαισίου του ΔΠΧΑ, τα παράγωγα θα μπορούσαν να αποτιμηθούν σε εύλογη αξία. Ο εν λόγω λογιστικός κανόνας μπορεί να οδηγήσει σε μεγάλα κέρδη ή ζημίες στα κοινοποιηθέντα αποτελέσματα. Πράγμα που θα επηρεάσει τα υποχρεωτικά κεφάλαια μιας τράπεζας. Όταν δεν διατίθενται τιμές προσφοράς στην αγορά ή δεδομένα αγοράς για την αποτίμηση της εύλογης αξίας των παραγώγων, οι τράπεζες καθορίζουν την εύλογη αξία τους χρησιμοποιώντας μαθηματικά πρότυπα που βασίζονται σε παραδοχές. Οι μετρήσεις αυτές υπόκεινται σε έλεγχο. Το ΣΔΛΠ ([2]) εξέδωσε πρόσφατα ένα νέο πρότυπο ([3]) για την αποτίμηση της εύλογης αξίας (ΔΠΧΑ 13) το οποίο βελτιώνει τις προηγούμενες κατευθύνσεις σχετικά με το θέμα αυτό.

2. Ο στόχος της προσομοίωσης ακραίων καταστάσεων (stress test) του 2011 σε επίπεδο ΕΕ ήταν να αξιολογηθεί η ανθεκτικότητα μεγάλου τμήματος του τραπεζικού συστήματος της ΕΕ. Η προσομοίωση αυτή αποτελούσε σημαντική βελτίωση σε σχέση με προηγούμενες προσομοιώσεις, έχοντας τρεις βαθμίδες διασφάλισης ποιότητας και ενισχυμένη διαφάνεια. Βασίστηκε στα χρηματοοικονομικά στοιχεία των τραπεζών του τέλους του έτους 2010, τα οποία χορηγήθηκαν από τις ίδιες τις τράπεζες, στη συνέχεια αναλύθηκαν από εθνικές εποπτικές αρχές και τέλος, ελέγχθηκε από την ΕΑΤ ([4]) η συνοχή τους με άλλα αποτελέσματα τραπεζών. Στο πλαίσιο της προσομοίωσης δεν απαιτήθηκε η κοινοποίηση πρόσθετων στοιχείων για παράγωγα τραπεζών (εκτός από την περίπτωση των κρατικών ομολόγων).

3. Στην Ευρώπη, η αξιολόγηση της εφαρμογής ενός λογιστικού προτύπου εμπίπτει στην αρμοδιότητα των ελεγκτών των εταιρειών και των εθνικών ρυθμιστικών αρχών της αγοράς ([5]). Οι εθνικές ρυθμιστικές αρχές της αγοράς συντονίζονται σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο από την ΕΑΚΑΑ ([6]), σε ένα φόρουμ που ονομάζεται EECS ([7]). Η ΕΑΚΑΑ δημοσιεύει τακτικά στον δικτυακό της τόπο αποσπάσματα εκτελεστικών αποφάσεων της ΕΟΚΕΕ σχετικά με το ΔΠΧΑ ([8]).

([1]) Διεθνές Πρότυπο Χρηματοοικονομικής Αναφοράς.
([2]) Συμβούλιο Διεθνών Λογιστικών Προτύπων.
([3]) Εγκρίθηκε από την ΕΕ το 2012 και άρχισε να ισχύει από την 1η Ιανουαρίου 2013.
([4]) Ευρωπαϊκή Αρχή Τραπεζών.
([5]) BaFin and Deutsche Prüfstelle für Rechnungslegung DPR στην περίπτωση της Deutsche Bank.
([6]) Ευρωπαϊκή Αρχή Κινητών Αξιών και Αγορών.
([7]) Συντονιστικές Συναντήσεις Ευρωπαϊκών Ρυθμιστικών Αρχών.
([8]) http://www.esma.europa.eu/page/IFRS-Enforcement-0.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011534/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Investigation into Deutsche Bank by the US Securities and Exchange Commission

The US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) is investigating allegations that Deutsche Bank concealed losses of up to US USD 12 billion from its derivative activities in the US. The investigations are focusing on whether, during the 2007-2009 financial crisis, it 'mistakenly' valued complex derivatives (leveraged super senior trades), which, if they had been valued at current market rates (mark-to-trades), would have revealed accounting losses that would probably have reduced Deutsche Bank equity to dangerously low levels, necessitating action to address the systemic risk.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What does it know about these allegations? What is the existing European legal framework in this connection? What powers are currently available to EU institutions to investigate this case?

2. Were the 2011 European bank stress tests reliable? Why did they not reveal Deutsche Bank's enormous exposure to these 'toxic' derivatives?

3. Will it investigate this case or leave it to the US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to get to the bottom of these allegations, as it invariably does in cases in which the SECinvestigates German companies?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

1. The Commission is not in a position to determine whether Deutsche Bank's reporting was accurate. IFRS ([1]) is the accounting framework applicable for the consolidated accounts of companies listed in Europe and for European companies listed in the US. Under the IFRS framework, derivatives should have been measured at fair value. Such an accounting rule can lead to large gains or losses in reported results which will affect the regulatory capital of a bank. When there is no market quotation or market data available to measure the fair value of derivatives, banks determine their fair value using mathematical models based on assumptions. These measurements are subject to audit. The IASB ([2]) recently issued a new standard ([3]) on fair value measurement (IFRS 13) which improves the previous guidance on that issue.

2. The objective of the 2011 EU-wide stress test was to assess the resilience of a large part of the EU banking system. The exercise represented a marked improvement over previous tests, with three layers of quality assurance and enhanced transparency. It was based on banks' financial information at year-end 2010, provided by the banks themselves, then scrutinised by national supervisors and further controlled for consistency with other banks' results by the EBA ([4]). The exercise has not requested additional disclosure on banks' derivative portfolios (except for sovereign exposures).

3. In Europe, the assessment of the application of an accounting standard is the responsibility of a company's auditors and the national market regulators ([5]). National market regulators are coordinated at European level by ESMA ([6]), in a forum named EECS ([7]). ESMA publishes regularly on its website extracts of EECS enforcement decisions made on IFRS ([8]).

([1]) International Financing Reporting Standards.
([2]) International Accounting Standards Board.
([3]) Endorsed by the EU in 2012 and is applicable from 1January 2013.
([4]) European Banking Authority.
([5]) BaFin and Deutsche Prüfstelle für Rechnungslegung DPR in the case of Deutsche Bank.
([6]) European Securities and Markets Authority.
([7]) European Enforcers Coordination Sessions.
([8]) http://www.esma.europa.eu/page/IFRS-Enforcement-0.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-011535/12
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(18 ta' Diċembru 2012)

Suġġett: Sistema tal-privattivi unifikata

Peress li l-MPE ivvutaw biex tiġi introdotta sistema tal-privattivi unifikata, xi pajjiżi kienu mħassba dwar id-diskriminazzjoni possibbli b'rabta mal-lingwa. Minħabba li l-applikazzjonijiet u l-approvazzjonijiet se jkollhom jinkitbu bl-Ingliż, bil-Ġermaniż jew bil-Franċiż biss, xi whud jibżgħu li dan jista' joħloq vantaġġ inġust għall-impriżi li joperaw b'dawn il-lingwi.

X'inhi l-pożizzjoni tal-Kummissjoni fir-rigward ta' din l-allegazzjoni?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Barnier f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(8 ta' Marzu 2013)

Ir-Regolament 1260/2012 bl-ebda mod ma jirfes fuq ir-reġim lingwistiku attwali tal-Uffiċċju Ewropew tal-Privattivi, li skontu l-applikazzjonijiet jistgħu jiġu ppreżentati f'kull lingwa, iżda l-applikanti għandhom jipprovdu traduzzjoni tal-applikazzjoni f'waħda mil-lingwi uffiċjali tal-EPO (l-Ingliż, il-Franċiż jew il-Ġermaniż). Madankollu, skont l-arranġamenti għat-traduzzjoni għall-protezzjoni tal-privattiva unitarja, l-SMEs, il-persuni fiżiċi, l-organizzazzjonijiet mingħajr skop ta' qligħ, l-universitajiet u l-organizzazzjonijiet pubbliċi tar-riċerka li għandhom ir-residenza tagħhom jew il-post ewlieni tan-negozju tagħhom fi kwalunkwe wieħed mis-27 Stat Membru tal-UE jieħdu kumpens tal-ispejjeż kollha tat-traduzzjoni (sa limitu) jekk l-applikazzjoni tkun ġiet ippreżentata f'lingwa uffiċjali tal-UE minbarra l-Ingliż, il-Franċiż jew il-Ġermaniż. Barra minn hekk, it-tnaqqis fil-miżati stabbilit fl-Artikolu 14 tar-Regoli tal-Konvenzjoni tal-Privattivi Ewropej relatat mal-miżati, se jibqa' applikabbli.

Barra minn hekk, għall-perjodu tranżitorju ta' massimu ta' 12-il sena, il-privattivi Ewropej b'effett unitarju mogħtija bil-Franċiż jew bil-Ġermaniż iridu jiġu tradotti bl-Ingliż, u dawk mogħtija bl-Ingliż jiġu tradotti f'lingwa uffiċjali oħra tal-UE. Barra minn hekk, it-tagħrif dwar il-privattivi se jkun disponibbli mingħajr ħlas fil-lingwi kollha tal-UE minħabba traduzzjonijiet awtomatiċi ta' kwalità għolja pprovduti mill-EPO. Illum dan is-servizz ikopri 13-il lingwa; sa tmiem l-2014 huwa mistenni li jkopri 32 lingwa, inklużi l-lingwi kollha tal-UE.

Fid-dawl ta' dan ta' hawn fuq il-Kummissjoni ma tqisx li r-reġim tal-lingwa stabbilit għal protezzjoni unitarja joħloq diskriminazzjoni marbuta mal-lingwi, u lanqas ma joħloq vantaġġ inġust għal impriżi li joperaw bl-Ingliż, bil-Franċiż jew bil-Ġermaniż.

Il-Kummissjoni tirreferi wkoll għat-tweġiba tagħha għall-mistoqsija bil-miktub E-1002/2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011535/12
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Unified patent system

As MEPs have voted to introduce a unified patent system, concerns have been raised by some countries over possible language-related discrimination. Given that applications and approvals will have to be drafted in English, German or French only, some fear that this might create an unfair advantage for undertakings that operate in these languages.

What is the position of the Commission with regard to this claim?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(8 March 2013)

Regulation 1260/2012 leaves untouched the current language regime of the European Patent Office, according to which applications can be filed in any language, but the applicants have to provide a translation of the application in one of the EPO official languages (English, French or German). However, under the translation arrangements for the unitary patent protection, SMEs, natural persons, non-profit organisations, universities and public research organisations having their residence or principal place of business within any of the 27 EU Member States will get a compensation of all translation costs (up to a ceiling) if the application was filed in an official language of the EU other than English, French or German. Additionally, the fee reduction established under Article 14 of European Patent Convention Rules relating to Fees, will remain applicable.

Moreover, for a transitional period of max. 12 years, European patents with unitary effect granted in French or German will need to be translated into English, and the ones granted in English will be translated to another official language of the EU. Furthermore, the information on patents will be available free of charge in all EU languages due to high-quality machine translations provided by EPO. Today this service covers 13 languages; by the end of 2014 it is expected to cover 32 languages, including all languages of the EU.

In view of the above the Commission does not consider the language regime established for unitary protection to bring language-related discrimination, nor to create an unfair advantage for undertakings that operate in English, French or German.

The Commission also refers to its answer to Written Question E-1002/2011.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-011536/12
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(18 ta' Diċembru 2012)

Suġġett: Delegazzjoni tal-UE fl-Iraq

L-MPE reċentement talbu għal preżenza aktar qawwija tal-UE fl-Iraq, filwaqt li stqarrew li d-delegazzjoni tal-UE fil-pajjiż ma kinitx kompletament kapaċi twettaq monitoraġġ tal-implimentazzjoni tal-inizjattivi ffinanzjati mill-UE minħabba nuqqas ta' sede adegwata u ta' kopertura tas-sigurtà.

Biex l-inizjattivi tal-UE jkunu effettivi fil-post, l-implimentazzjoni tagħhom teħtieġ monitoraġġ affidabbli. Il-Kummissjoni beħsiebha tieħu miżuri biex issewwi dawn in-nuqqasijiet attwali, u b'liema modi beħsiebha tagħmel id-delegazzjoni tal-UE fl-Iraq aktar b'saħħitha u effettiva?

Tweġiba mogħtija mir-Rappreżentant Għoli/il-Viċi President Ashton f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(28 ta' Frar 2013)

Sa mill-ħolqien tagħha, id-Delegazzjoni tal-UE fl-Iraq ġiet kollokata fl-ambaxxata Brittanika f'Bagdad. L-akkomodazzjoni mogħtija lill-persunal hija standard għar-residenti kollha, Brittaniċi jew inkwilini oħra, u hija kompletament adattata għat-theddid u r-riskji lokali għas-sigurtà fiżika (ħitan solidi, protezzjoni minn fuq, twieqi għal kontra l-balal eċċ.). Il-bini tal-uffiċċju huwa kondiviż mal-uffiċjali tar-Renju Unit u inkwilini oħra, iżda d-Delegazzjoni tal-UE għandha l-ispazju għall-uffiċċji separat għaliha.

Il-ħolqien ta' uffiċċji ġodda ddedikati għad-Delegazzjoni se jieħu ż-żmien minħabba li s-sit imqiegħed għad-dispożizzjoni tas-SEAE mill-gvern Iraqin irid jiġi kompletament rinovat. Il-proċeduri ta' akkwist assoċjati u sussegwentement il-bini se jkunu kumplessi, partikolarment minħabba l-isfida tal-ambjent ta' sigurtà.

It-tishiħ tal-preżenza tal-Kummissjoni (DEVCO) f'Bagdad huwa l-objettiv primarju tal-Kummissjoni. L-implimentazzjoni ta' dan l-objettiv hija kkundizzjonata mis-sitwazzjoni tas-sigurtà u bħalissa qed tiġi analizzata. Għalissa, il-persunal ta' DEVCO bbażat f'Amman qed jiżgura l-preżenza regolari f'Bagdad permezz ta' missjonijiet frekwenti biex iħejju u jsegwu l-implimentazzjoni ta' proġetti ffinanzjati mill-UE.

Is-SEAE bħalissa qed jeżamina l-pjani tal-bini l-ġdid tad-Delegazzjoni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011536/12
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: EU delegation in Iraq

MEPs recently called for a stronger EU presence in Iraq, stating that the EU delegation in the country was not fully able to monitor the implementation of EU-funded initiatives due to a lack of adequate premises and security cover.

For EU initiatives to be effective on the ground, their implementation requires reliable monitoring. Does the Commission intend to take measures to remedy these current shortcomings, and in what ways does the Commission intend to make the EU delegation in Iraq stronger and more effective?

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

Since its creation, the EU Delegation in Iraq has been collocated within the British Embassy in Baghdad. The accommodation provided to the staff is standard for all the residents, British or other tenants, and it is fully adapted to the local physical security threats and risks (solid walls, overhead protection, bulletproof windows etc.). The office premises are shared with UK officials and other tenants, but the EU Delegation has its own dedicated office spaces.

The creation of new premises dedicated to the Delegation will take time as the site put at the disposal of the EEAS by the Iraqi Government has to be completely renovated. The associated procurement procedures and subsequent building will be complex, particularly given the challenging security environement.

Strengthening the Commission (DEVCO) presence in Bagdad is a primary objective of the Commission. The implementation of this objective is conditioned by the security situation and is currently under review. For the time being, DEVCO staff based in Amman ensures a regular presence in Bagdad through frequent missions to prepare and follow-up implementation of EU-funded projects.

The EEAS is currently looking at the plans for the new Delegation premises.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-011537/12
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(18 ta' Diċembru 2012)

Suġġett: Azzjoni kontra inganni kummerċjali

Il-Kummissjoni reċentement ippreżentat il-pjanijiet tagħha biex tittratta l-inganni kummerċjali billi ssaħħaħ id-Direttiva eżistenti dwar reklamar qarrieqi u komparattiv (id-Direttiva 2006/114/KE).

Flimkien ma' leġiżlazzjoni aktar stretta, il-Kummissjoni tqis li jkun ta' siwi li tniedi kampanja ta' sensibilizzazzjoni għan-negozji, biex is-sidien ta' negozji jiġu infurmati dwar l-eżistenza u l-perikli ta' dawn l-inganni kummerċjali?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Reding f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(1 ta' Marzu 2013)

Il-Kummissjoni Ewropea hija konxja li hemm diversi azzjonijiet li jqajmu kuxjenza kontra prattiki ta' kummerċjalizzazzjoni qarrieqa bejn in-negozji, partikolarment fil-Pajjiżi il-Baxxi, fid-Danimarka jew fir-Renju Unit. Dawn l-inizjattivi huma tabilħaqq ta' suċċess u jillimitaw in-numru ta' kumpaniji li jisfaw vittmi ta' prattiki ta' kummerċjalizzazzjoni qarrieqa.

F'dan il-kuntest, il-Kummissjoni temmen li dawn l-inizjattivi li jqajmu kuxjenza jkunu l-aktar effettivi biex jilħqu intrapriżi żgħar u ġodda meta jkunu organizzati fuq livell lokali jew nazzjonali. Għalhekk, f'dan l-istadju, ma jidhirx li kampanja Ewropea għat-tqajjim ta' kuxjenza hija l-aktar mod effiċjenti biex nimxu "l quddiem.

Madanakollu l-Kummissjoni ser tassoċja mill-qrib intrapriżi żgħar u ta" daqs medju fil-proċess kontinwu ta' reviżjoni tad-Direttiva dwar Reklamar Qarrieqi u Komparattiv u se tkompli attivament ixxerred informazzjoni dwar prattiki ta' kummerċjalizzazzjoni qarrieqa permezz tan-Netwerk Ewropew għall-Intrapriżi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011537/12
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Action against marketing scams

The Commission recently presented its plans to tackle marketing scams by strengthening the existing Misleading and Comparative Advertising Directive (Directive 2006/114/EC).

In addition to tougher legislation, does the Commission consider it useful to carry out an awareness-raising campaign for businesses, to inform business owners of the existence and dangers of these marketing scams?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(1 March 2013)

The European Commission is aware of several awareness raising actions against business-to-business misleading marketing practices, in particular in the Netherlands, Denmark or the United Kingdom. Such initiatives are indeed successful and limit the number of companies that fall victim to misleading marketing practices.

In this context, the Commission believes that such awareness raising initiatives are most effective in reaching small and new enterprises when organised at a local or national level. Therefore, a European awareness raising campaign does not, at this stage, seem to be the most efficient way forward.

The Commission will however closely associate small and medium-sized enterprises in the ongoing review process of the Misleading and Comparative Advertising Directive and will continue to actively disseminate information about the misleading marketing practices through the Enterprise Europe Network.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011538/12
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD), Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD), Tadeusz Cymański (EFD) oraz Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD)
(18 grudnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Stosunki między służbami Komisji Europejskiej zajmującymi się pomocą publiczną a krajowymi organami regulacyjnymi

Wiele powiedziano już na temat związku między konkurencją (zwłaszcza polityką antymonopolową) i regulacjami krajowymi. Z jednej strony, przepisy dotyczące konkurencji są stosowane ex post, podczas gdy regulacje krajowe stosuje się ex ante i uzupełniają się one nawzajem. Z drugiej strony, brak jest informacji o związku między zasadami udzielania pomocy publicznej i regulacjami krajowymi w sektorach regulowanych, takich jak łączność elektroniczna i energetyka.

W sektorach regulowanych sama Unia Europejska jakiś czas temu nakazała utworzyć niezależne krajowe organy regulacyjne, którym powierzono pieczę nad prawidłowym funkcjonowaniem odpowiednich rynków krajowych na przejrzystych i gwarantujących konkurencję warunkach, tak aby krajowe rynki regulowane mogły się rozwijać w sposób spójny z rynkami krajowymi pozostałych państw członkowskich UE. Jeśli chodzi o spełnianie tej funkcji przez sektory regulowane uprasza się Komisję o udzielenie odpowiedzi na następujące pytania:

1. Jak postrzega Komisja relacje między jej służbami zajmującymi się pomocą publiczną a niezależnymi krajowymi organami regulacyjnymi państw członkowskich?

2. Stwierdzono, że służby Komisji zajmujące się pomocą publiczną wykorzystują informacje uzyskane od zainteresowanych stron odnośnie do wystąpienia zakłócenia konkurencji na skutek udzielenia pomocy publicznej. Czy Komisja zgadza się, że krajowe organy regulacyjne są najlepszym źródłem wiarygodnej informacji dla jej służb zajmujących się pomocą publiczną?

3. Czy Komisja uznaje niezależność krajowych organów regulacyjnych i pozwala im na samodzielne wykonywanie powierzonych im obowiązków?

4. Czy uczestnicy rynku funkcjonują w obrębie unijnych ram prawnych i regulacyjnych, kiedy ściśle i ponad wszelką wątpliwość stosują się do decyzji niezależnych krajowych organów regulacyjnych?

5. W jaki sposób zapewnione jest przestrzeganie przez Komisję zasady pewności prawa w stosunku do wszystkich uczestników rynku w odniesieniu do autorytetu i statusu krajowych organów regulacyjnych podczas wykonywania przez nich obowiązków?

6. Czy służby Komisji zajmujące się pomocą publiczną prowadzą politykę interwencji i kontroli sposobu wykonywania przez krajowe organy regulacyjne przypisanych im funkcji?

7. Jakie są granice takich interwencji i kontroli, o ile istnieją, w celu zapobiegania podważaniu kompetencji, autorytetu i uprawnień powierzonych krajowym organom regulacyjnym przez samą Unię Europejską?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Joaquina Almunię w imieniu Komisji
(4 marca 2013 r.)

Jak zostało to podkreślone przez szanownych Panów Posłów, krajowe organy regulacyjne odgrywają kluczową rolę w zapewnieniu właściwego funkcjonowania ich odpowiednich rynków. W dziedzinie łączności elektronicznej przegląd ram regulacyjnych dokonany w 2009 r. przyczynił się do dalszego zwiększenia niezależności krajowych organów regulacyjnych, zapewniając bardziej skuteczne stosowanie tych ram i przewidywalność decyzji ([1]).

Służby Komisji odpowiedzialne za kontrolę pomocy państwa nawiązują kontakty z krajowymi organami regulacyjnymi i w razie potrzeby z nimi współpracują, przy jednoczesnym poszanowaniu kompetencji instytucjonalnych Komisji i państw członkowskich w zakresie kontroli pomocy państwa, a także funkcji konstytucyjnych i regulacyjnych, jakie pełnią krajowe organy.

([1]) W szczególności art. 3 dyrektywy ramowej; dyrektywa 2002/21/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 7 marca 2002 r. w sprawie wspólnych ram regulacyjnych sieci i usług łączności elektronicznej (Dz.U. L 108 z 24.4.2002, s. 33), zmieniona dyrektywą 2009/140/WE (Dz.U. L 337 z 18.12.2009, s. 37) i rozporządzeniem 544/2009 (Dz.U. L 167 z 18.6.2009, s. 12).

W dziedzinie sieci szerokopasmowych współpraca jest dobrze rozwinięta, a krajowe organy regulacyjne mają w tym obszarze szczególnie istotne zadanie opracowywania prokonkurencyjnego środka pomocy państwa, stanowiącego wsparcie sieci szerokopasmowych. Krajowe organy regulacyjne pozyskały wiedzę techniczną i specjalistyczną, a więc są najlepiej przygotowane do wspierania władz publicznych w odniesieniu do programów pomocy państwa. Wytyczne UE w sprawie stosowania reguł pomocy państwa w odniesieniu do szybkiej budowy/rozbudowy sieci szerokopasmowych zawierają zatem wskazanie, że należy się konsultować z krajowymi organami regulacyjnymi w kwestiach opracowywania środków pomocy państwa. Rola krajowych organów regulacyjnych została szczegółowo uszczegółowiona w zmienionych wytycznych, przyjętych w dniu 19 grudnia 2012 r. ([2]).

W praktyce organ udzielający pomocy musi zwracać się o poradę do krajowych organów regulacyjnych przynajmniej w następujących sytuacjach: 1) przy wyborze obszarów docelowych; 2) przy określaniu cen za dostęp hurtowy oraz warunków jego zapewniania; (3) przy rozstrzyganiu sporów między podmiotem ubiegającym się o dostęp i operatorami otrzymującymi pomoc. W zależności od podstawy prawnej i możliwości administracyjnych, pomoc krajowych organów regulacyjnych może być przydatna także w odniesieniu do innych aspektów programu pomocy.

([2]) Dz.U. C25 z 26.1.2013, s. 1; http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/legislation/broadband_guidelines_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011538/12
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD), Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD), Tadeusz Cymański (EFD) and Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Relationship between the European Commission's state aid services and independent nations regulators

Much has been said regarding the relationship between competition (in particular antitrust) and national regulations. On the one hand, the competitions laws apply *ex post*, whereas national regulation applies *ex ante*, and the two complement each other. On the other hand, there is no information on the relationship between state aid rules and national regulation in regulated sectors, such as e-communication and energy.

In these regulated sectors, the European Union itself mandated some time ago the creation of independent National Regulatory Authorities (NRAs) entrusted with the proper functioning of their respective national markets under open and competitive conditions, ensuring that national regulated markets develop in a cohesive manner with other EU national Member State markets. Regarding the performance of these functions by the regulated sectors, could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. How does the Commission regard the relationship between its state aid services and the independent NRAs of the Member States?

2. It is noted that the Commission state aid services rely on information from interested parties as to the existence of distortions of competitions resulting from state aid. Does the Commission agree that the NRAs are best placed to supply the Commission state aid services with reliable information?

3. Does the Commission acknowledge the independence of the NRAs and allow them to perform their duties independently?

4. Are market participants within the boundaries of the EU legal and regulatory framework when they strictly and conclusively abide by the decisions of the independent NRAs?

5. How is the principle of legal certainty for the whole spectrum of market participants ensured by the Commission as to the authority and status of NRAs in the exercise of their duties?

6. Does the Commission state aid service have a policy of intervening and controlling the way in which the NRAs discharge their constitutional functions?

7. What are the boundaries of such interventions and controls, if any, with a view to avoiding undermining the independence, authority and powers granted to the NRAs by the European Union itself?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2013)

As highlighted by the Honourable Member, National Regulatory Authorities (NRAs) play a crucial role in the proper functioning of their respective markets. In the field of electronic communications, the 2009 review of the Regulatory Framework for electronic communications further strengthened the NRAs independence to ensure a more effective application of the framework and the predictability of decisions ([1]).

The Commission services in charge of state aid control liaise and cooperate where necessary with NRAs, while respecting the institutional competences of the Commission and the Member States in the field of state aid control, and of the constitutional and regulatory functions of NRAs.

([1]) In particular Article 3 of the framework Directive; Directive 2002/21/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 March 2002 on a common regulatory framework for electronic communications networks and services (OJ L 108, 24.4.2002, p. 33) as amended by Directive 2009/140/EC (OJ L 337, 18.12.2009, p. 37) and Regulation 544/2009 (OJ L 167, 18.6.2009, p. 12).

Cooperation is well developed in the area of broadband, where the role of NRAs in designing a pro-competitive state aid measure in support of broadband is particularly important. The NRAs have gained technical knowledge and expertise, and so are best placed to support public authorities with regard to state aid schemes. Thus the EU Guidelines for the application of state aid rules in relation to the rapid deployment of broadband networks provide that NRAs should be consulted concerning the design of the state aid measures. The role of NRAs has been further detailed in the revised guidelines, adopted on 19 December 2012 ([2]).

In practice, the aid-granting authority must seek advice from the NRA at least (1) in selecting the target areas, (2) in designing wholesale access prices and conditions, (3) for dispute resolution between the access seeker and the subsidised operators, should such a situation emerge. Depending on the legal basis and the administrative capabilities, the NRA's help could be valuable in other aspects of the aid scheme.

([2]) OJ C25, 26.01.2013, p.1; http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/legislation/broadband_guidelines_en.pdf

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-011539/12
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(18 december 2012)

Angående: "Systemuppgifter" i samband med den privata sektorns insatser för barns säkerhet

Bilagan till förklaringen om inrättandet av en global allians mot exploatering av barn på Internet ([1]), där deltagarnas avsikter presenteras närmare, innehåller följande stycke:

"Uppmuntra den privata sektorn att delta i arbetet med att identifiera och undanröja känt barnpornografiskt material som finns i den berörda staten, inbegripet att i största möjliga mån öka volymen systemuppgifter som undersöks för att hitta barnpornografiska bilder."

Kan kommissionen förklara vad som specifikt avses med "systemuppgifter" i detta sammanhang?

Svar från Cecila Malmström på kommissionens vägnar
(4 mars 2013)

Det mål som anges i förklaringen om inrättandet av en global allians mot exploatering av barn på internet syftar till att uppmuntra leverantörer av elektroniska tjänster och internettjänster att frivilligt vidta målinriktade åtgärder för att hitta barnpornografiska bilder i sina system. Tekniken för detta finns och används redan och den består av programvaruverktyg som söker igenom bildinnehållet för att hitta kända barnpornografiska bilder, med hjälp av t.ex. digitala koder (hashvärden). Sådana system söker uteslutande efter bilder som redan identifierats som olagliga. Företagen skulle använda ett helt automatiskt system, specifikt inriktat på att hitta och rapportera endast kända och kontrollerade barnpornografiska bilder och skulle inte granska eller avslöja några andra uppgifter.

Denna typ av teknik är ett användbart verktyg som effektivt kan utnyttjas av den privata sektorn för att minska tillgången till barnpornografi på nätet och förhindra att offren drabbas av en fortsatt användning av bilderna.

Myndigheterna, framför allt justitie- och inrikesministrarna, i de länder som går med i den globala alliansen har åtagit sig att uppfylla ett antal mål. Det gäller bland annat insatser för att identifiera och skydda offren, utreda ärenden och åtala förövare. De ska också öka medvetenheten om riskerna för barn på nätet samt minska tillgången till barnpornografi på nätet. De kommer därför att sträva efter att uppnå målen och vidta särskilda åtgärder inom sin jurisdiktion. De särskilda åtgärderna, samt dessa åtgärders omfattning och innehåll, kommer att avgöras av de deltagande länderna, utifrån den egna nationella situationen.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-is-new/news/news/2012/docs/20121205-declaration-anex_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011539/12
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: 'System data' in the context of private-sector child safety activities

The annex to the Declaration on Launching the Global Alliance against Child Sexual Abuse Online ([1]), further setting forth the intent of the participants, contains the following paragraph:

'Encourage participation by the private sector in identifying and removing known child pornography material located in the relevant State, including increasing as much as possible the volume of system data examined for child pornography images.'

Could the Commission explain what, specifically, is meant by 'system data' in this context?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2013)

The objective of the operational goal provided for in the Declaration on the Launch of the Global Alliance against Child Sexual Abuse Online is to encourage electronic/Internet service providers to voluntarily employ targeted measures to find child sexual abuse images on their systems. Technologies available and already in use for this purpose consist of software tools to search system image content for known child pornography images, using for example digital codes (hash values). Such systems search exclusively for previously identified, illegal images. Companies would use a fully automated system to specifically target, find and report only known or vetted child pornography images, without examining or revealing any other data.

These technologies are a useful tool that can be employed by the private sector effectively to reduce the availability of child pornography online and the re-victimisation of children.

Authorities, mainly Ministers of Justice and Home Affairs of countries joining the Global Alliance, have committed to pursuing a number of policy targets. These include efforts to identify and protect child victims, investigate cases and prosecute offenders, increase awareness of risks for children online, and reduce the availability of child pornography online. They will aim to reach operational goals and undertake specific action within their jurisdiction for that purpose. Specific actions, their extent and content, will be decided by participant countries, in accordance with their national situation.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-is-new/news/news/2012/docs/20121205-declaration-anex_en.pdf

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-011540/12
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(18 december 2012)

Angående: Inkonsekvens i kommissionens hållning avseende konventionen om it-brottslighet och den globala alliansen mot sexuell exploatering av barn på internet

Kan kommissionen förklara varför den aktivt stöder både Europarådets konvetion om it-brottslighet – som innehåller ett specifikt undantag som innebär att parterna får avstå från att kriminalisera anskaffande eller innehav av barnpornografiskt material – och den globala alliansen mot sexuell exploatering av barn på Internet, som uttryckligen begär en kriminalisering?

Svar från Cecilia Malmström på kommissionens vägnar
(15 februari 2013)

Såsom påpekats av parlamentsledamoten stöder kommissionen aktivt Europarådets konvention om it-brottslighet eftersom det är det effektivaste internationella rättsliga instrumentet inom det berörda området. Vad gäller kriminaliseringen av anskaffande eller innehav av barnpornografiskt material kunde någon allmän överenskommelse inte nås vid förhandlingarna om konventionen så därför inkluderar den möjligheten för parterna att införa en reservation om denna bestämmelse.

Detta urholkar inte konventionens värde som en solid grund för antagandet av nationell lagstiftning inom området it-brottslighet, och som en effektiv referens för internationellt samarbete. För att överkomma detta särskilda tomrum inkluderades i rådets rambeslut 2004/68/JHA medlemsstaternas skyldighet att göra förvärv eller innehav av barnpornografi till en straffbar gärning. Det beslutet har ersatts av direktiv 2011/92/EU om bekämpande av sexuella övergrepp mot barn, sexuell exploatering av barn och barnpornografi, som ytterligare preciserar betydelsen av ”innehav” av barnpornografi.

Deklarationen som åtföljer den globala alliansen mot sexuell exploatering av barn på internet är därför fullt förenlig med den nuvarande EU-lagstiftningen. Kommissionen anser att principerna i Europarådets konvention, tillsammans med de skyldigheter som fastställs i direktiv 2011/92/EU och det starka politiska engagemang som uttrycks i den globala alliansens deklaration, kommer att göra det möjligt för Europeiska unionen att på ett mera effektivt sätt bekämpa sexualbrott och sexuella övergrepp mot barn på internet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011540/12
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Inconsistency in Commission policy with respect to the Convention of Cybercrime and the Global Alliance against Child Sexual Abuse Online

Can the Commission explain why it actively supports both the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime, which includes a specific derogation whereby parties may not criminalise procurement or possession of child abuse material, and the Global Alliance against Child Sexual Abuse Online, which specifically demands criminalisation?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2013)

As noted by the Honourable Member, the Commission actively supports the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime, as it is the most effective international legal instrument in the field concerned. As regards the criminalisation of procurement or possession of child abuse material, general agreement could not be reached during negotiations on the Convention, and so it includes the possibility for Parties to introduce a reservation on this provision.

This does not undermine the value of the Convention as a solid basis for the adoption of national legislation in the area of cybercrime and as an effective reference for international cooperation. However, to overcome this specific gap, Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA included the obligation for Member States to make acquisition or possession of child pornography a criminal offence. That decision has been replaced by Directive 2011/92/EU on combating the sexual abuse, sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, which further specifies the meaning of 'possession' of child pornography.

The Declaration accompanying the Global Alliance against child sexual abuse online is therefore fully consistent with the current EU legislation. The Commission believes that the principles enshrined in the Council of Europe Convention, in conjunction with the obligations set out in Directive 2011/92/EU and the strong political commitment expressed in the Global Alliance Declaration will enable the European Union to fight more effectively sexual crimes and child sexual abuse online.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011541/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: EASA opinion on flight time limitations for pilots and cabin crew

1. In 2011 the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) commissioned three separate scientific reports, which concluded that flying at night should be limited to a flight duty of 10 hours, since anything above this would create critical levels of fatigue and hence a potential safety risk. This being the case, could the Commission explain why the EASA has proposed that the limit should be 11-12:30 hours of flight duty at night?

2. In these scientific reports it was concluded that flight duty times of up to 14 hours a day should only be allowed for duties starting within a short time window of 4 hours, namely between 8.00 and 12.00. The EASA proposal would allow a one-hour extension twice a week for duties starting between 6.15 and 19.00, i.e. a time window of 12:45. This window is three times longer than that recommended by scientists. What are the specific criteria for believing that 14-hour flight duties are safe between 6.15 and 19.00?

3. Could the Commission confirm that the EASA has based its proposed rules on flight and duty time limitations and rest requirements (FTL) on scientific and medical evidence in each case?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(21 February 2013)

The Commission refers the Honorable Member to its answers to written questions E-009003/2012, E-011134/2012 and P-011515/2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011543/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Tax rates on defibrillators

A defibrillator is a life-saving machine that gives the heart an electric shock in cases of cardiac arrest. For every minute that passes without defibrillation, chances of survival decrease by 14%. Research shows that applying a controlled shock within five minutes of collapse provides the best possible chances of survival. Access to defibrillators at local and community level increases the chance of survival.

1. In this connection, could the Commission outline what supports it has in place to assist community groups in accessing defibrillators?

At present defibrillators, other than implantable defibrillators, are liable to VAT at the standard rate, currently 23%. There is no provision in VAT law that would make it possible to exempt from VAT or apply a zero rate to the supply of such products. Under the EU VAT Directive, Member States may retain the zero rate on goods and services which were in place on 1 January 1991, but cannot extend the zero rate to new goods and services.

2. Does the Commission intend to review the VAT rate on defibrillators?

3. Given the life-saving benefits of defibrillators, will the Commission consider applying a zero rate to this item?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(6 February 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-8798/2010 by Ms Lena EK ([1]). In addition to this answer, the following elements should be mentioned.

VAT is a general consumption tax meant for raising revenue which Member States redistribute according to their budgetary, social, or policy requirements. Zero rates are thus in conflict with the nature of VAT as a general consumption tax levied on all taxable supplies of goods and services. This principle is the view of a large majority of Member States, who can only accept zero rates as strictly limited derogations to the normal rules, with no possibility of their extension.

Furthermore, the use of reduced rates is often not the most suitable instrument for pursuing policy objectives, particularly for ensuring financial redistribution to poor households or encouraging the consumption of socially desirable products. Reduction of VAT rates does not systematically lead to equivalent decrease in prices. Therefore, the review of the current VAT rates structure announced by the communication on the future of VAT ([2]) will mainly consist of restricting the scope of the VAT reduced rates rather than its extension. In that framework, introducing a zero rate to the VAT rates structure is not envisaged.

Lastly, it should be pointed out that Member States are free to grant financial support to assist community groups or similar organisations, provided that in doing so they comply with EC law, in particular the provisions on state aid.

However, it is in the competence of Member States to establish Automated Defibrillators programmes and national strategies for access to such devices.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) COM(2011) 851 final — Communication on the future of VAT — Towards a simpler, more robust and efficient VAT system tailored to the single market.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011544/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Diaspora centre

Could the Commission provide details of programmes and funding streams, if any, which would be available for a regional area to develop and run a national diaspora centre?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 2013)

The notion of 'diaspora' is not clearly defined in the EU acquis; it may refer to EU nationals as well as to third-country nationals. With regard to the integration of third-country nationals, there are specific funding possibilities under the European Integration Fund (EIF) and, as from 2014, under the future Asylum & Migration Fund (AMF). Complementary funding may also be available under the European Social Fund (ESF) as part of general EU social inclusion policies.

For more specific information on funding possibilities under the European Integration Fund (EIF), the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the website of the Commission's Directorate-General Home Affairs (http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/financing/index_en.htm), which is regularly updated.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011545/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Peer-to-peer checks under Regulation (EC) No 834/2007

Under Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 the agriculture ministers agreed principles and general rules for organic production and the labelling of organic products. This is undoubtedly a sector which requires public confidence in the true provenance of the products.

The rules allow the central authority of a Member State (the competent authority) for the organisation of official controls in the field of organic production to delegate tasks to one or more control bodies. These control bodies can be independent third parties, can be public or private, and must carry out certification in the field of organic production in accordance with European rules.

Article 27(8) provides for a competent authority to undertake audits and inspections on the control bodies it delegates powers to. Notwithstanding these checks, and with due regard to free movement under Article 34, does the legislation provide for peer-to-peer checks of certifications made by one control body on the products of another control body

(1) resident within the same Member State (where multiple control bodies are registered)?

(2) which has arrived from another Member State?

Question for written answer E-011546/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008

The United Kingdom Government is currently consulting on its implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008, which set out rules on organic productions and certification. The UK appears to have narrowly interpreted Article 34(1) and Article 28(4) of Regulation (EC) No 834/2007, asserting that, under the principle of mutual recognition, additional checks by a control body in the UK on products with certifications that were undertaken by a control body in another Member State would not be allowed.

1. Can the Commission confirm whether this assessment is correct?

2. Do the regulations allow control bodies to conduct random tests on products already certified by other control bodies? If so, can such tests include investigations as to the organic provenance of the products, or are they limited to other factors such as food safety, as suggested by the UK Government?

Joint answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(19 February 2013)

According to Article 27(3) of Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 ([1]), the nature and frequency of controls shall be determined on the basis of an assessment of the risk of occurrence of irregularities and infringements. All operators, with the exception of wholesalers dealing only with pre-packaged goods and operators selling to the final consumer or user, are subject to at least an annual verification of compliance. Each control body, according to the assessment of the risk and subject to the requirement for an annual verification of compliance as described above, will need — on a case-by-case approach — to decide on the nature and frequency of controls of its operators.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91, OJ L 189, 20.07.2007, p.1.

Controls may include organic products found with an operator and eventually certified by other control bodies, independently if these bodies are approved in the same or in a different Member State. However, in accordance with Article 34 ([2]), control bodies may not prohibit or restrict the marketing of organic products controlled by another control body located in another Member State on grounds relating to the method of production, to the labelling or to the presentation of that method in so far as those products meet the requirements of this regulation. In particular no additional controls or financial burdens in addition to those foreseen in Title V of Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 may be imposed.

According to Article 92 of Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 ([3]), a Member State must inform the Commission and the Member State concerned of any irregularity or infringement affecting the organic status of organic products coming from another Member State.

A request for information to the UK competent authority on the application of the organic production control system will be sent by the Commission.

([2]) Article 34 of Regulation (EC) No 834/2007.

([3]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 of 5 September 2008 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products with regard to organic production, labelling and control, OJ L 250, 18.9.2008, p. 1-84.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011548/12
to the Commission
Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Use of full body scanners at EU airports

Many EU airports have introduced full body scanners into their airport security regime.

Does EU legislation provide any guidance or alternatives for travellers who exhibit negative side effects resulting from the use of these scanners, or who because of health or privacy concerns choose not to be subject to a body scan?

Do citizens have the right to demand an alternative search (as was the case with previous trials, for example the backscatter scanners, at Manchester Airport)?

Does the 'no scan, no fly' policy used at some airports comply with EC law, and especially with the free movement of persons as enshrined in the Treaties?

Where can a comprehensive list of all body scanners used at EU airports, together with one outlining passengers' rights, be found?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(30 January 2013)

To the Commission's knowledge only a few airports in the UK and the Netherlands have introduced security scanners into their daily operations.

EU legislation in respect of security scanners ([1]) requires that passengers be offered an opt-out from security scanner screening and an alternative control method instead. Safeguards became necessary to compensate for the earlier security scanners' deficiencies, which were X-ray technology and human reviewing of body images.

Today, without exception, security scanners deployed at EU airports have to be based on millimetre wave technology instead of X-ray. Moreover human reviewing is being systematically replaced by Automatic Threat Recognition (ATR). New technology has thus significantly reduced both health and privacy concerns.

The Commission is currently carrying out a legal assessment whether UK measures to deny passengers an opt-out from security scanner screening constitutes a breach of EU legislation. As already committed to at earlier occasions the Commission will inform the European Parliament as soon as it takes an official position on this subject.

The Commission has no comprehensive list of security scanners deployed. EU airport operators are in principle free to choose the control methods that best fit their security operations in accordance with EU aviation security legislation.

([1]) OJ L 97, 9.4.2008.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011652/12
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(20 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Extinderea UE și relațiile publice — cazul special al Croației

În 2012, Comisia a acordat un contract-cadru de prestare de servicii integrate de informare și comunicare în domeniul extinderii UE (ref. 2011/S 124-204970). Valoarea totală a contractului cu durata de 4 ani se ridică la 20 de milioane de euro. Se pare că obiectivul acestui contract este unul dublu: (i) de a explica și a susține politica de extindere a UE și (ii) de a combate criticile cu privire la aderarea planificată a Croației în 2013.

Comisarul Štefan Füle a declarat, în cadrul unui interviu acordat la 29 octombrie 2012 revistei germane „Der Spiegel", că „Croația trebuie să-și facă temele în ceea ce privește concurența, sistemul judiciar și drepturile fundamentale". În ediția din 16 decembrie 2012 a ziarului „The Sunday Times", s-a menționat că Standard & Poor's a scăzut ratingul de credit al Croației la categoria „junk", ceea ce reflectă lipsa de reforme care a dus la deteriorarea economiei acestei țări. În acest ziar, se remarcă în special faptul că investitorii străini sunt descurajați de corupția răspândită la scară largă și de criminalitatea organizată, precum și de un stat de drept fragil de la a investi în Croația.

1. Cât din cei 20 de milioane de euro se alocă proiectelor de relații publice care se concentrează pe Croația?

2. Cum intenționează Comisia să îmbine ambiția sa de a combate criticile aduse cu privire la aderarea Croației în 2013 cu faptul că în Croația există în continuare probleme grave legate de reforma sistemului judiciar, de lupta împotriva corupției și de respectarea drepturilor fundamentale?

Răspuns comun dat de dl Füle în numele Comisiei
(19 februarie 2013)

Obiectivele campaniei de informare și de comunicare lansate de Comisie cu ocazia aderării Croației la Uniunea Europeană sunt următoarele: oferirea de informații factuale cu privire la apropiata aderare a Croației la UE, sprijinirea dezbaterilor publice documentate, mărirea gradului de înțelegere, a simțului de implicare și a susținerii aderării Croației și, în general, a politicii de extindere a UE, precum și mărirea gradului de conștientizare prin prezentarea cetățenilor UE a Croației contemporane. Campania se desfășoară în toate cele 27 de state membre, iar cheltuielile aferente acesteia se ridică la 1 498 332 EUR.

Încă de la solicitarea aderării la UE în 2003, Croația a trecut printr-un proces riguros de preaderare prin care s-a pus un accent deosebit pe aspecte legate de statul de drept. Croația a înregistrat progrese majore în ceea ce privește asigurarea independenței judiciare, îmbunătățirea eficienței sistemului judiciar, asigurarea unui istoric consecvent al rezultatelor semnificative în lupta împotriva corupției, asigurarea unui istoric îmbunătățit al măsurilor de prevenire a corupției, precum și în ceea ce privește combaterea conflictelor de interese și criminalitatea organizată. Aceste aspecte au făcut obiectul unor criterii de referință exigente, fiind monitorizate atent de către Comisie.

În raportul global de monitorizare din octombrie 2012, Comisia informează, oferind exemple concrete, cu privire la progresul înregistrat de Croația în aceste domenii și a identificat o serie de aspecte în privința cărora Croația a trebuit să aducă îmbunătățiri suplimentare. În prezent, Comisia pregătește următorul raport care urmează să fie publicat în martie 2013 și în care va fi prezentată, în special, evaluarea progreselor înregistrate de Croația în privința domeniilor prioritare identificate de către Comisie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011549/12
to the Commission
Roger Helmer (EFD)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Croatia

Can the Commission confirm media reports that EU funding of EUR 20 million has been allocated for a PR programme aimed at creating a positive view of Croatia as it approaches EU accession ([1])?

If so, will this not be seen as a transparent attempt to counter negative views resulting from the fact that Croatia is clearly not a free and democratic country under the rule of law? Is it not therefore misleading propaganda, and is it not wrong and reprehensible for taxpayers' money to be spent in this way to deceive the taxpayer?

Is the Commission aware of credible reports of the influence of organised crime on government in Croatia, of widespread corruption, of suppression of the media, and of trafficking in drugs, weapons and people via Croatia? Or of the delays in the Croatian justice system which represent a denial of the basic rights of property and enforceable contracts?

Isn't it time for the Commission to present an honest and factual view of Croatia, rather than spending money on a PR campaign designed to paper over the cracks?

Question for written answer E-011652/12
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: EU enlargement and public relations — the particular case of Croatia

In 2012 the Commission awarded a framework contract for the provision of integrated information and communication services in the area of EU enlargement (ref. 2011/S 124-204970). The total value of the 4-year contract is EUR 20 million. The aim of the contract is reported to be twofold: (i) to explain and support the EU enlargement policy, and (ii) to mitigate the criticism of Croatia's planned accession in 2013.

In an interview in the German newspaper *Der Spiegel* of 29 October 2012, Commissioner Štefan Füle stated that 'Croatia has to do its homework in the areas of competition, the judiciary and fundamental rights.' In its 16 December 2012 issue, The *Sunday Times* reported that Croatia had seen its credit rating downgraded by Standard & Poor to 'junk status', reflecting the lack of reforms which had led to the deterioration of the country's economy. The *Sunday Times* notes in particular that foreign investors are deterred from investing in Croatia by the widespread corruption and organised crime, and the weak rule of law.

1. Of the EUR 20 million, how much is earmarked for public relations projects focusing on Croatia?

2. How does the Commission intend to combine its ambition to mitigate the criticism levelled against Croatia's accession in 2013 with the fact that serious weaknesses remain in Croatia, especially when it comes to the reform of the judiciary, the fight against corruption and respect for fundamental rights?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(19 February 2013)

The aims of the information and communication campaign undertaken by the Commission in view of Croatia's accession to the Union are to provide citizens in the Member States with factual information about the forthcoming accession of Croatia to the EU, to support an informed public debate; to increase understanding, sense of involvement and support for Croatia's accession and the EU's enlargement policy in general; and to raise awareness by presenting contemporary Croatia to EU citizens. The campaign covers all 27 Member States and will cost EUR 1 498 332.

([1]) http://tinyurl.com/clbc65x.

Since applying for EU membership in 2003, Croatia has gone through a rigorous pre-accession process, where particular emphasis has been put on issues related to the rule of law. Croatia has made important progress with the establishment of an independent judiciary, the improvement of its efficiency, a sustained track record of substantial results in the fight against corruption, an improved track record of prevention measures against corruption, and important steps to combat conflict of interest and organised crime. These issues have been the subject of demanding benchmarks, monitored closely by the Commission.

In its Comprehensive Monitoring Report of October 2012, the Commission reported, factually, the progress made by Croatia in these areas and identified a number of points where Croatia had to make further progress. The Commission is now preparing its next Report, to be published in March 2013, where, in particular, Croatia's progress on the priority areas identified by the Commission will be assessed.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011550/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Waste tyre exports

Economic growth and globalisation have seen an increase in the volume of waste being transported across borders. In some cases, this waste can replace trade in natural resources because of the recovery of materials. However, it is important that such an export trade does not allow Member States to negate their responsibility to deal with this waste, and pass the problem on to another part of the world.

The EU has legislated (under Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 and Regulation (EC) No 1418/2007) to control the shipment of waste. Waste pneumatic tyres (Code B3140) are exported from the UK for burning in power stations in Asia or to act as ballast in cargo vessels. In the latter case the fate of the tyres is not always clear. Directive 2008/98/EC defines both recovery and disposal.

Member States have an obligation to carry out inspections on waste shipments to ensure that they are in line with European Union rules.

1. Is the Commission satisfied that the UK authorities are complying with the Waste Shipment Regulations and Green List Regulations with regard to the export of tyres to South Korea, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia and Hong Kong?

2. Is the Commission satisfied that the UK has adequate procedures in place to ensure the end fate of exported tyres exported to Asian markets, in line with EU legislation?

3. Does the Commission have any concerns about any Member State's export of tyres outside of the Community?

4. Has the Commission considered strengthening the current legislative framework on waste exports?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

The Commission has no indication that the UK, or any other Member State, is in breach of EU rules regarding the export for recovery of certain waste ([1]), such as waste pneumatic tyres, out of the EU. According to EU legislation, a recovery operation for waste, such as the recycling of waste tyres or their co-incineration in power plants, shall take place in a way that does not endanger human health and the environment and in an environmentally sound manner and in accordance with the waste hierarchy established in Article 4 of the Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC). Member States shall prohibit the export of waste to third countries if there is a reason to believe that this is not the case.

The Commission is considering possible legislative measures to reinforce requirements on waste shipment inspections under Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 on shipments of wastes, OJ L 190, 12.7.2006.; Regulation (EC) No 1418/2007, OJ L 316, 4.12.2007.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011551/12
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(18 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Securitatea instalațiilor pentru sporturi de iarnă

Problema securității turiștilor, indiferent de vârsta lor, este esențială în stațiunile cu sporturi de iarnă, mai ales la capitolul instalații pentru transportul acestora — telescaune, teleschi, teleferice etc.

Anual există accidente mai grave sau mai puțin grave datorate acestor instalații, fie pentru că ele sunt depășite tehnic, fie pentru că sunt suprasolicitate în sezonul de iarnă.

Are Comisia în vedere elaborarea unor norme europene de securitate pentru aceste instalații, luând în considerare și implicarea experienței asociațiilor din domeniu și colaborarea lor cu autoritățile locale și regionale?

Răspuns dat de dl Tajani în numele Comisiei
(15 februarie 2013)

Directiva 2000/9/CE privind instalațiile pe cablu care transportă persoane ([1]) stabilește cerințele de siguranță și cerințele privind protecția mediului și a consumatorului aplicabile instalațiilor pe cablu, subsistemelor și componentelor lor de siguranță. Aceasta este sprijinită de o serie de standarde armonizate care sunt actualizate în mod regulat pentru a ține seama de progresul tehnic, asigurând astfel un nivel înalt de protecție pentru utilizatorii transportului pe cablu.

Întreținerea și supravegherea instalațiilor este responsabilitatea proprietarului și a autorităților naționale de supraveghere. UE oferă cadrul juridic obligatoriu pentru a permite doar funcționarea unor instalații sigure.

Directiva a devenit aplicabilă la 3 mai 2004 și acoperă toate instalațiile pe cablu instalate după acea dată. Siguranța instalațiilor pe cablu existente înaintea acestei date este reglementată de legislația națională.

([1]) Directiva 2000/9/CE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 20 martie 2000 privind instalațiile pe cablu care transportă persoane, JO L 106 din 3.5.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011551/12
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Safety of winter sports facilities

The safety of tourists, regardless of their age, is a key issue at winter sports stations, especially when it comes to transport facilities for those tourists — chairlifts, draglifts and cable cars, etc.

Every year, minor and major accidents occur owing to those facilities, either because they are technically outmoded or because they are subject to excessive demand in the winter season.

Will the Commission draw up European safety rules for such facilities, taking into account the experience of organisations working in that field and their cooperation with the local and regional authorities?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2013)

Directive 2000/9/EC relating to cableway installations designed to carry persons ([1]) lays down safety requirements, environmental protection and consumer protection requirements applicable to cableway installations, subsystems and their safety components. It is supported by a body of harmonised standards that is regularly updated to technical progress ensuring a high level of protection for users of cableways.

Maintenance and supervision of the facilities is in the responsibility of the owner and national supervisory authorities. The EU provides for the binding legal framework to allow the operation of only safe facilities.

The directive became applicable on 3 May 2004 and covers all cableway installations installed after that date. The safety of cableway installations existing before this date is governed by national legislation.

([1]) Directive 2000/9/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 March 2000 relating to cableway installations designed to carry persons, OJ L 106, 3.5.2000.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011552/12
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(18 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Noi porturi pentru ambarcațiuni la nivel european

Numărul de ambarcațiuni de dimensiuni mai mici sau mai mari de la nivel european a crescut constant în ultimele decenii, fapt care a determinat înființarea de noi porturi specializate pentru adăpostirea acestora.

Ca atare, autoritățile locale și regionale se confruntă cu noi provocări pentru a permite dezvoltarea acestor porturi în condiții și la standarde europene, care să respecte legislația din diferite domenii — amenajare teritorială, protecția mediului etc.

Cum intenționează Comisia să sprijine eforturile acestor autorități pentru ca dezvoltarea de noi porturi să corespundă standardelor europene și să nu existe probleme, mai ales în ceea ce privește protecția mediului?

Cum intenționează Comisia să implice aceste autorități în procesul de elaborare de noi reglementări în domeniul protecției mediului în zonele portuare în curs de dezvoltare?

Răspuns dat de dl Kallas în numele Comisiei
(11 februarie 2013)

1. În noiembrie 2011, Comisia a adoptat o propunere de Orientări pentru dezvoltarea rețelei transeuropene de transport (TEN-T), însoțită de o propunere de instituire a mecanismului Conectarea Europei (MCE). Aceste măsuri vor furniza instrumente de planificare și de finanțare care să sprijine eforturile depuse de autoritățile locale și naționale în direcția adaptării porturilor TEN-T la problemele caracteristice sectorului, ținând cont în special de faptul că porturile TEN-T sunt conectate la rețelele de căi ferate și, în ceea ce privește porturile din rețeaua de bază, care să sprijine dezvoltarea infrastructurii care să permită alimentarea navelor cu carburanți curați. Aceste propuneri sunt analizate în prezent de către Parlamentul European și de către Consiliu ([1]). Comisia, în cadrul demersurilor de revizuire a politicii portuare, analizează de asemenea o serie de măsuri prin care să se creeze un cadru mai propice investițiilor în porturi ([2]).

2. Comisia a ajutat mult autoritățile locale să asigure o dezvoltare echilibrată a porturilor noi și existente, cu respectarea normelor de protecție a mediului. În legătură cu acest aspect, Comisia a publicat în 2011 o serie de documente de orientare: „Orientări privind punerea în aplicare a Directivelor Păsări și *Habitate* în cazul estuarelor și al zonelor costiere, acordând o atenție deosebită dezvoltării portuare și activităților de dragaj” și un document de lucru al serviciilor Comisiei, intitulat „Integrarea biodiversității și a protecției naturii în dezvoltarea portuară” ([3]).

([1]) Evoluția negocierilor TEN-T poate fi urmărită la următoarele adrese:.
http://ec.europa.eu/prelex/detail_dossier_real.cfm?CL=ro&DosId=201065 (propunerea inițială).
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2011/0294(COD) .
Evoluția negocierilor MCE poate fi urmărită la următoarele adrese:.
http://ec.europa.eu/prelex/detail_dossier_real.cfm?CL=ro&DosId=200951 (propunerea inițială) .
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2011/0302(COD) (situația negocierilor).

([2]) A se vedea: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/maritime/ports_en.htm

([3]) Documentele care conțin orientările menționate pot fi consultate la următoarele adrese: .
http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/maritime/doc/guidance_doc.pdf .
http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/maritime/doc/comm_sec_2011_0319.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011552/12
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: New harbours for vessels across Europe

The number of large and small vessels has increased steadily across Europe over the last 10 years, which has led to new harbours being constructed for them.

As such, local and regional authorities are faced with new challenges in enabling those harbours to be developed to European standards and in conditions that respect legislation in several fields, including regional planning and environmental protection, etc.

How does the Commission intend to support those authorities in their efforts to develop new harbours which meet European standards and to ensure there are no problems with this, especially as regards protecting the environment?

How will the Commission involve those authorities in the process of drawing up new rules to protect the environment in harbour areas now under development?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(11 February 2013)

1. The Commission has adopted in November 2011 a proposal on Guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network (TEN-T), accompanied by a proposal establishing the Connection Europe Facility (CEF). These measures will provide planning and financial tools to support the local and national authorities in their efforts to adapt the TEN-T ports to the challenges of the sector, notably that TEN-T ports are connected with railways, and as far as the ports of the core network are concerned to develop infrastructure to provide alternative clean fuels to ships. These proposals are currently examined by the European Parliament and the Council ([1]). As part of its review of the port policy, the Commission is also examining possible measures to create a framework more conducive to investments in ports ([2]).

2. The Commission has already done ample work to support local authorities in ensuring the balanced development of both new and existing ports in line with environmental protection. To this end, the Commission published in 2011 a series of guidance documents: one on 'The Implementation of the Birds and Habitats Directives in estuaries and coastal zones, with particular attention to port development and dredging' and another staff working document on 'Integrating biodiversity and nature protection into port development' ([3]).

([1]) The status of the TEN-T negotiations can be followed on the following links:
http://ec.europa.eu/prelex/detail_dossier_real.cfm?CL=en&DosId=201065 (original proposal)
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2011/0294(COD).
The status of the CEF negotiations can be followed on the following links:
http://ec.europa.eu/prelex/detail_dossier_real.cfm?CL=en&DosId=200951 (original proposal)
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2011/0302(COD) (state of play of the negotiations).

([2]) See http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/maritime/ports_en.htm

([3]) The documents mentioned before on the guidelines can be consulted on the following links:
http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/maritime/doc/guidance_doc.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/maritime/doc/comm_sec_2011_0319.pdf

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-011553/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(18. december 2012)

Om: Dobbeltbeskatning af pensioner i forhold til EU-retten

Spørgeren har modtaget en henvendelse fra en dansk pensionist, der i løbet af sit arbejdsliv har arbejdet i Tyskland, og som følge heraf får udbetalt en privat pension fra sit tidligere firma.

Denne pension har borgeren hele tiden betalt dansk skat af, men er nu blevet mødt af et krav fra de tyske skattemyndigheder om ligeledes at betale tysk skat af pensionen med tilbagevirkende kraft.

Vil Kommissionen på denne baggrund vurdere, hvorvidt det er i overensstemmelse med EU-retten således at kræve dobbeltbeskatning af en borger?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Algirdas Šemeta
(18. februar 2013)

Sameksistensen mellem de nationale skattesystemer kan medføre dobbeltbeskatning. Fjernelsen af dobbeltbeskatning bidrager til, at det indre marked fungerer mere gnidningsfrit, men medlemsstaterne er ikke forpligtede til at fjerne dobbeltbeskatning. På EU-rettens nuværende udviklingstrin kræves ikke en fjernelse af dobbeltbeskatning inden for EU, og der er endnu ikke vedtaget ensartede regler eller truffet harmoniseringsforanstaltninger på EU-plan. Heraf følger, at medlemsstaterne har en vis autonomi på dette område, for så vidt de efterlever EU-retten. De er altså ikke forpligtede til at tilpasse deres egne skattesystemer til de andre medlemsstaters skattesystemer for blandt andet at fjerne dobbeltbeskatning, der opstår som følge af medlemsstaternes parallelle udøvelse af deres suverænitet på skatteområdet. Dobbeltbeskatning udgør derfor ikke en restriktion, som er forbudt i henhold til traktaten.

I denne sammenhæng er der udarbejdet dobbeltbeskatningsoverenskomster med henblik på at fjerne eller mindske de negative indvirkninger på det indre markeds funktion, som skyldes den ovenfor beskrevne sameksistens mellem nationale skattesystemer. Hvis klageren har skattemæssigt hjemsted i Danmark, gælder artikel 18, stk. 1, i dobbeltbeskatningsoverenskomsten mellem Danmark og Tyskland, hvoraf fremgår at »(…) pensioner og lignende betalinger, der udbetales for tidligere personligt arbejde i tjenesteforhold til en person, der er hjemmehørende i en kontraherende stat, kun beskattes i denne stat.« Det betyder, at en privat pension, der udbetales til klageren fra Tyskland af den virksomhed, som klageren tidligere var ansat i, kun skal beskattes i Danmark. Hvis klageren derfor er i en situation, der er dækket af denne bestemmelse, bør han kontakte de tyske myndigheder og forelægge den relevante dokumentation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011553/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Double taxation of pensions in relation to EC law

The author has received a request from a Danish pensioner, who, during his working life, worked in Germany and as a consequence receives a private pension from his former company.

This citizen has always paid Danish tax on the pension, but has now received a demand from the German tax authorities to also pay German tax on the pension with retroactive effect.

In view of this, could the Commission assess whether such demands for double taxation from a citizen are in accordance with EC law?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

Double taxation may be brought about by the coexistence of national tax systems. The elimination of such double taxation facilitates the smooth functioning of the internal market, but there is no obligation on Member States to do so. EC law, in the current state of its development, does not require the elimination of such double taxation within the EU, and no uniform or harmonisation measure has yet been adopted at EU level. It follows from this, that the Member States enjoy a certain autonomy in this area, provided they comply with EC law. They are not obliged therefore to adapt their own tax systems to the different systems of taxation of the other Member States in order, *inter alia*, to eliminate the double taxation arising from the exercise in parallel by those States of their fiscal sovereignty. Therefore, such double taxation does not as such constitute a restriction prohibited by the Treaty.

In this regard, double taxation conventions are designed to eliminate or mitigate the negative effects on the functioning of the internal market resulting from the above described coexistence of national tax systems. If the complainant is a tax resident of Denmark, then according to Art. 18(1) of the Double Tax Convention between Denmark and Germany '(…) pensions and other similar remuneration paid to a resident of a Contracting State in consideration of past employment shall be taxable only in that State.' This implies that a German-sourced private pension paid to the complainant by his former German company should only be taxed once in Denmark. Accordingly, in case the complainant finds himself in a situation covered by this provision, he should contact the German authorities and present them with corresponding proof.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-011554/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(18. december 2012)

Om: Brug af kors og helgenglorier i EU

Spørgeren har bemærket, at Kommissionen over for Slovakiet har indskærpet, at kors og helgenglorier ikke må printes på landets euro-mønter. Det er en oprørende beslutning, som understreger Kommissionens anti-europæiske sindelag, herunder den væsentlige betydning som netop kristendommen har haft for vore landes udvikling.

Vil Kommissionen i den forbindelse oplyse, om den planlægger lignende tiltag over for andre medlemslande, herunder også i forbindelse med andet end mønter, eksempelvis på ID-papirer mv.?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Olli Rehn
(11. februar 2013)

I overensstemmelse med traktaterne bidrager Den Europæiske Union og dens institutioner til, at medlemsstaternes kulturer kan udfolde sig. Den Europæiske Union respekterer medlemsstaternes nationale og regionale mangfoldighed, samtidig med at den fremhæver den fælles kulturarv. På denne baggrund kan der ikke sås nogen som helst tvivl om biskop Cyrils og biskop Methodius' historiske betydning.

Når medlemsstaterne designer den nationale side af euromønterne, skal de imidlertid i henhold til Rådets forordning (EU) nr. 566/2012 tage højde for, at mønterne er i omløb i hele euroområdet. Designforslag sendes således på forhånd til de andre medlemsstater, så de har mulighed for at fremsætte relevante kommentarer. Europa-Kommissionen er opmærksom på, at nogle medlemsstater rejste indvendinger mod den foreslåede slovakiske jubilæumsmønt med den begrundelse, at Den Europæiske Union forholder sig neutral over for religiøse overbevisninger.

I mellemtiden har Slovakiet genindsendt designforslaget, og de oprindelige indvendinger er blevet trukket tilbage. Rådet har nu godkendt designet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011554/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Use of crosses and halos in the EU

The author notes that the Commission has advised Slovakia that crosses and halos must not be printed on the country's euro coins. This is an outrageous decision, which highlights the Commission's anti-European disposition, including with regard to the extremely important part that Christianity in particular has played in the development of our countries.

In this regard, can the Commission clarify whether it is planning similar measures in respect of other Member States, including in connection with items other than coins, for example identity documents etc.?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(11 February 2013)

In line with the Treaties, the Union and its institutions contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore. Against this background, the historic importance of Bishops Cyril and Methodius is uncontested.

However, under Council Regulation 566/2012, when designing the national side of a euro coin, Member States have to take into account the fact that the coins will circulate throughout the whole Eurozone. In that context, proposed designs are shared in advance with other Member States so that they can provide any comments they consider appropriate. The European Commission is aware of the objection made by some Member States on the proposed Slovakian commemorative euro coin on the grounds that the European Union is neutral with regard to religious beliefs.

Slovakia re-submitted meanwhile the proposed design and the original objections were withdrawn. The design has now been approved by the Council.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-011555/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(18. december 2012)

Om: Momsudligning ved salg af biler over grænser

Spørgeren anmoder på baggrund af en borgerhenvendelse Kommissionen om at afgive en principiel udtalelse om forståelsen af reglerne for momsligning mellem medlemsstaterne i forbindelse med salg af biler over grænser:

Når en bil sælges fra for eksempel Tyskland til Danmark, og der allerede i Tyskland er betalt fuld moms af bilen, bedes det oplyst, efter hvilke principper det da er tilladt for Danmark at opkræve moms?

Kan man kræve fuld dansk moms?

Kan sælger eller køber efterfølgende få tilbagebetalt den allerede indbetalte tyske moms?

Skal medlemslandenes skattemyndigheder selv udligne momsen?

Skal der kun betales moms af avancen eller på anden vis?

Vil Kommissionen endvidere oplyse, hvad retsvirkningen er af, at en medlemsstat har benyttet muligheden for at momsfritage hyrevogne, således som reglerne i 6. momsdirektiv artikel 28, stk. 3 litra b jf. bilag F, nr. 17 giver mulighed for?

Efter ovennævnte regler er blandt andet danske hyrevogne ikke momsregistreret, og har dermed ikke et EU-registreringsnummer, hvorved momsudligning er umulig. Hvordan skal der i disse tilfælde momsudlignes mellem køber og sælger i forbindelse med et salg?

Endelig bedes Kommissionen oplyse, hvor længe den finder det acceptabelt for en EU-borger at vente på et svar fra denne. Spørgeren er bekendt med en henvendelse fra 1997, som Kommissionen stadig ikke har besvaret. Finder Kommissionen dette rimeligt?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Algirdas Šemeta
(18. februar 2013)

Når en bil efter at være blevet solgt over grænsen til en ikke-momsregistreret person, som udfører personbefordring ([1]), og bilen anses for at være »ny« i henhold til momsdirektiv 2006/112/EC, eller den er blevet solgt af en momspligtig person til en ikke-momspligtig person, hvis indkøb i andre EU-lande overstiger 10 000 EUR ([2]), skal momsen betales i bestemmelsesmedlemsstaten (i dette tilfælde Danmark) af hele beløbet. Den særlige ordning for brugte biler, i henhold til hvilken der kun betales moms af fortjenstmarginen, kan ikke anvendes til nye biler ([3]).

Skattemyndighederne har ikke pligt til at refundere køber nogen form for moms, som uretmæssigt er blevet opkrævet af sælger (som foretager en afgiftsfri levering inden for EU) i oprindelsesmedlemsstaten (i dette tilfælde Tyskland). Dette er et civilretligt anliggende mellem de to parter. For at bevise, at sælger ikke skylder moms, kan køber især støtte sig selv til det bevis for betaling af moms, som udstedes i bestemmelsesmedlemsstaten. Ved hjælp af denne momsangivelse og efter at have berigtiget fakturaen, kan sælger betale den moms, der ikke skulle have været betalt, tilbage.

Når en medlemsstat fortsat undtager personbefordring ([4]), skal der ikke betales moms af sådanne transporttjenester, men transportselskabets fradragsret er som regel også begrænset ([5]). Sådanne begrænsninger vedrører også den moms, der udløses af selskabets afgiftspligtige køb af biler inden for EU (se ovenstående).

([1]) Se desuden arbejdsdokumentet fra Kommissionens tjenestegrene SWD(2012) 429 final) af 14. december 2012 for flere oplysninger om den afgiftsmæssige behandling af salg af biler inden for EU.
([2]) For Danmark 80 000 DKK.
([3]) Artikel 313, stk. 2, i momsdirektivet.
([4]) I henhold til undtagelsen i artikel 371 og bilag X, del B, nr. 1) i momsdirektivet.
([5]) Da fradrag af indgående moms var tilladt på det tidspunkt, da undtagelsen blev givet, kunne medlemsstaterne fortsætte med denne skattelettelse. I Danmark var personbefordring inden for landets grænser undtaget uden fradrag.

Kommissionen har tidligere modtaget klager i forbindelse med lignende spørgsmål og har givet hver klager svar. For så vidt angår den klage, som det ærede medlem hævder ikke er blevet besvaret, har Kommissionen brug for yderligere oplysninger (registreringsnummer og klagerens navn) for at kunne give et fyldestgørende svar.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011555/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: VAT compensation in connection with the cross-border sale of cars

Prompted by a request from a citizen, the author would like the Commission to issue a fundamental statement concerning its understanding of the rules for VAT compensation between the Member States in connection with the cross-border sale of cars.

When a car is sold in Germany to someone in Denmark, for example, and full VAT has already been paid on the car in Germany, according to what principles is it permissible for Denmark to charge VAT?

Is it possible to charge Danish VAT in full?

Can sellers or purchasers subsequently receive a refund of the German VAT that has already been paid?

Are the tax authorities of the Member States required to adjust the VAT themselves?

Is VAT only required to be paid on profits or is there a different system for this?

Could the Commission also explain what the legal effect is of a Member State having availed itself of the option of exempting taxis from VAT, as provided for in Article 28(3)(b), cf. Annex F item 17, of the Sixth VAT Directive?

Under the aforementioned rules, Danish taxis in particular are not registered for VAT and therefore do not have an EU registration number, making VAT compensation impossible. In such cases, how is VAT compensation between purchaser and seller to be provided in connection with a sale?

Lastly, could the Commission state what length of time it considers to be acceptable for an EU citizen to wait for its response? The author is aware of a request dating back to 1997 which the Commission has still not responded to. Does the Commission consider this to be reasonable?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

Where, upon a cross-border sale to non-registered persons carrying out passenger transport ([1]), a car qualifies as 'new' in the sense of the VAT Directive 2006/112/EC or is sold by a taxable person to a tax-exempt person whose intra-EU acquisitions is above the threshold of at least EUR 10 000 ([2]), VAT is due in the Member State of destination (here: DK) on the full consideration. The special second-hand scheme under which VAT is only paid on the margin cannot be applied to new cars ([3]).

Tax authorities do not have to reimburse the acquirer any VAT wrongly charged by the seller (who makes an exempt intra-Community supply) in the Member State of origin (here: DE). This is a civil law matter between the parties. To demonstrate that no VAT is owed by the seller, the acquirer may, in particular, rely on proof of VAT payment in the Member State of destination. Through his VAT return, and after correcting the invoice, the seller can adjust any VAT wrongly paid.

Where a Member State continues to exempt passenger transport ([4]), no VAT is due on such transport services, but also the right of deduction of the transport company is usually restricted ([5]). Such restrictions also concern the VAT triggered by a taxable intra-EU acquisition of cars by that company (see above).

([1]) See in greater detail on the tax treatment of intra-EU sales of cars also Staff Working Document SWD(2012) 429 final) of 14 December 2012.
([2]) For Denmark DKK 80 000.
([3]) Article 313(2) of the VAT Directive.
([4]) Pursuant to the derogation in Article 371 and Annex X, Part B, point (10) of the VAT Directive.
([5]) Where deduction of input VAT was allowed at the time the derogation was granted, Member States could continue this concession. In Denmark, domestic passenger transport was exempted without deduction.

The Commission has in the past received complaints on similar issues, and has responded to each complainant. As regards the complaint which the Honourable Member says has remained unanswered, the Commission would need additional details (registration number, complainant's name) to give an adequate answer.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-011556/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(18. december 2012)

Om: Manglende leverancer af livsfornødenheder til Grækenland

Det er for nyligt kommet frem, at græske cancerpatienter ikke længere kan få livsvigtig medicin, idet den tyske medicinalvirksomhed Merck har indstillet leverancerne af cancermedicinen Erbitux til græske sygehuse. Årsagen er euro-krisen og usikkerhed om den græske betalingsevne. Nedskæringerne rammer således nu de allersvageste og syge.

Vil Kommissionen på denne baggrund tilstille spørgeren en oversigt over leverancer af livsfornødenheder til Grækenland, som selskaber har indstillet som følge af den økonomiske krise, landet befinder sig i?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg
(8. februar 2013)

Under det økonomiske tilpasningsprogram har de græske myndigheder forpligtet sig til at forbedre deres sundhedssystems omkostningseffektivitet, samtidig med at de opretholder den universelle adgang og forbedrer plejeydelsernes kvalitet. Sundhedsreformen har til formål at tackle problemer i forbindelse med organisationen, finansieringen og leveringen af sundhedsplejen i Grækenland. Der er relaterede tiltag, som bl.a. omfatter reduktion af udgifterne til lægemidler via mere udbredt anvendelse af generiske lægemidler, bedre overvågning og patientsikkerhed og bedre risikodeling, ensartede bidragssatser og ensartede ydelser ved at fusionere socialsikringsfondene og oprette EOPYY ([1]).

Programmet omfatter endvidere bestemmelser om betaling af offentlige organers restancer. En løsning på restanceproblemet kan være med til at sikre, at situationer som dem, det ærede medlem henviser til, ikke opstår.

Kommissionen er ikke i besiddelse af en liste med en detaljeret oversigt over leverancer af livsfornødenheder til Grækenland, som selskaber skulle have indstillet som følge af den økonomiske krise.

([1]) Den nationale organisation for sundhedsydelser.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011556/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Disruption in the supply of essential items to Greece

It has recently emerged that Greek cancer patients can no longer get life-saving medicine, as the German pharmaceuticals company Merck has stopped deliveries of the cancer medicine Erbitux to Greek hospitals. The reason for this is the euro crisis and uncertainty regarding Greece's ability to pay. The cuts are therefore now affecting the very weakest and the sick.

In view of this, can the Commission provide an overview of the deliveries of essential items to Greece that companies have stopped as a result of the economic crisis that the country finds itself in?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(8 February 2013)

Under the Economic Adjustment Programme, Greek Authorities have committed to improving the cost-effectiveness of their health system, while maintaining universal access and improving the quality of care delivery. The healthcare reform aims to address problems in the organisation, financing and delivery of healthcare in Greece. Related measures include, among others, the reduction of pharmaceuticals spending through greater use of generic medicines, improved monitoring and patient safety, and better risk pooling, uniform contribution rates and uniform package of benefits through the merging of social security funds and the creation of EOPYY ([1]).

The Programme also includes provisions for the payment of arrears in payments by public bodies. Addressing arrears can help ensuring that situations, such as those the Honourable Member reports, do not develop.

The Commission has no detailed list giving an overview of the deliveries of essential items to Greece that companies would have stopped, as a result of the economic crisis.

([1]) National Organisation for Healthcare Provision.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-011557/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(18. december 2012)

Om: EU's regler for offentliggørelse af dokumenter

Spørgeren er blevet gjort bekendt med, at EU-Domstolen netop har afsagt dom om, at to centrale dokumenter, der kunne være med til at afdække, hvordan græsk økonomi kunne komme så tæt på en statsbankerot, som det er tilfældet, ikke må udleveres til offentligheden. Det ene dokument bærer titlen »The Impact on Government Deficit and Debt from off-market swaps: The Greek Case«.

Vil Kommissionen oplyse, efter hvilke regler EU's institutioner kan nægte at udlevere dokumenter til offentligheden?

Vil Kommissionen ligeledes oplyse, hvilke kvalitative krav der kan stilles til begrundelsen for ikke at udlevere dokumenter til en borger?

Vil Kommissionen endelig oplyse, hvordan den forventer, at almindelige borgere skal opretholde tiltroen til de europæiske myndigheder, når de tilbageholder oplysninger af en sådan karakter, som denne sag omhandler?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne Af Manuel Barroso
(7. februar 2013)

Kommissionen formoder, at det ærede medlem hentyder til Rettens dom af 29. november 2012 i sag T-590/10, Gabi Thesing og Bloomberg Finance LP mod Den Europæiske Centralbank.

Der kan gives afslag på aktindsigt i dokumenter af de årsager der er fastsat i artikel 4 i forordning (EF) nr. 1049/2001 om aktindsigt i Europa-Parlamentets, Rådets og Kommissionens dokumenter.

Den Europæiske Centralbank, der ikke er omfattet af denne forordning, har vedtaget afgørelse 2004/258 om aktindsigt i Bankens dokumenter, der her meget til fælles med dem i forordning 1049/2001.

EU-institutionernes regler vedrørende aktindsigt i deres dokumenter svarer til dem, der gælder på nationalt plan. I henhold til disse regler gives der aktindsigt i dokumenter, medmindre deres udbredelse vil være til skade for beskyttelsen af offentlighedens interesser som omhandlet i den relevante retsakt. Ethvert afslag på aktindsigt i et dokument skal begrundes. Borgerne har ret til at gøre indsigelse mod afslaget ved at indbringe sagen for Retten eller indgive en klage til Den Europæiske Ombudsmand. EU-institutionerne må ikke tilbageholde dokumenter fra offentligheden på et vilkårligt grundlag.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011557/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: EU rules for the publication of documents

The author has been made aware of the fact that the European Court of Justice has just delivered a judgment to the effect that two key documents that could help to establish how the Greek economy could get as close to bankruptcy as it has done must not be made public. One of the documents is entitled 'The impact on government deficit and debt from off-market swaps: the Greek case'.

Could the Commission clarify under which rules EU institutions can refuse to disclose documents to the public?

Could the Commission also clarify what qualitative requirements can justify refusal to disclose documents to a citizen?

Lastly, could the Commission explain how it expects ordinary citizens to retain their trust in the European authorities when these authorities are withholding information of this nature?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(7 February 2013)

The Commission assumes that the Honourable Member is referring to the judgment of the General Court of 29 November 2012 in case T-590/10, Gabi Thesing and Bloomberg Finance LP v European Central Bank.

The grounds on which access to documents can be refused are laid down in Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents.

The European Central Bank, which is not subject to this regulation, has adopted Decision 2004/258 laying down rules on access to its documents, which are very similar to those of Regulation 1049/2001.

The European institutions apply rules on access to their documents which are equivalent to those in force at national level. Under these rules, documents are to be released unless their disclosure would undermine the protection of one of the public or private interests mentioned in the applicable legal act. Any refusal to disclose a document must be reasoned. Citizens are entitled to challenge a refusal by bringing the case to the General Court or by making a complaint to the European Ombudsman. EU institutions cannot arbitrarily withhold documents from the public.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011558/12
to the Commission
John Stuart Agnew (EFD)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Meaning of 'free trade'

Will the Commission stop misleading people and business alike by using the term 'free trade agreements' to describe agreements which include tariffs, however low, and other administrative barriers and are therefore no such thing?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(5 February 2013)

The European Commission applies the definition of 'free trade' as stated by the World Trade Organisation and laid down in Article XXIV (b) of the GATT Agreement: 'A free-trade area shall be understood to mean a group of two or more customs territories in which the duties and other restrictive regulations of commerce (…) are eliminated on substantially all the trade between the constituent territories in products originating in such territories.'

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011559/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
John Stuart Agnew (EFD)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Apostasy and freedom

To what extent does the High Representative Baroness Ashton seek, in her work, to reduce or end laws against apostasy — bearing in mind that they are incompatible with religious freedom and freedom of expression?

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

In line with November 2009 and February 2011 Council conclusions on the issue, the EU strategic framework on human rights and its action plan adopted by the Foreign Affairs Council in June 2013 reaffirm that freedom of religion or belief (FoRB) is a priority for the EU in its external policy. This fundamental human right covers the right to have a religion or a belief (or chose not to have any), which includes the right to change one's religion or belief. Such a right is unconditionally protected under international human rights law, as recalled by the UN Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, Mr Bielefeldt in its August 2012 report focusing on the right of conversion. Under no circumstance can it be derogated from, even in times of public emergency, according to the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The EU has been constantly advocating, either bilaterally or in multilateral fora for compliance with such international norms and spared no effort to raise FoRB-related issues whenever deemed necessary, including in individual cases. HRVP Ashton notably raised publicly on numerous occasions the case of Iranian pastor Youcef Nadarkhani, who was facing death penalty in Iran on apostasy charges, and was ultimately released after wide EU and international mobilisation.

The EU will carry on defending and promoting freedom of religion or belief in all its components, and will further act in this regard by putting together EU guidelines on freedom of religion or belief. These guidelines will help EU staff at all levels to better assess and address violations of freedom of religion or belief, including in cases of apostasy.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011560/12
to the Commission
John Stuart Agnew (EFD)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: EU's egregious error

With reference to answer E-010045/2012 re the meaning of the word 'resignation', does the Commission understand that the fact that the wording is in a treaty signed by all the Heads of State and Government of the Member States does not make it correct, but rather means that the oxymoronic non-sense that has been drafted is all the more egregious an error?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

It is not for the Commission to change or contest the wording of the Treaty.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011561/12
to the Commission
John Stuart Agnew (EFD)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: EU acting 'ultra vires'

With reference to answer E-010045/2012 re the meaning of the word 'resignation', and as the meaning of the word is entirely clear, does the Commission accept that the linguistic error written into the Treaties may mean that Mr Barroso acted 'ultra vires' in his treatment of Mr Dalli?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(13 February 2013)

The Commission should like to recall that Mr Dalli resigned voluntarily as a member of the Commission on 16 October 2012, with immediate effect, after having agreed with the President of the Commission that his position had become politically untenable.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011563/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: State aid criteria

Does the Commission have any plans to modify the eligibility requirements under which a struggling industry and/or firm may receive financial support from a Member State?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2013)

Currently the rules on state aid to non-financial firms in difficulty are laid down in the Community guidelines on state aid for rescuing and restructuring firms in difficulty ([1]). The guidelines were due to expire and be replaced by new rules in October 2012. They were extended by the Commission ([2]) to allow sufficient time to align their review with the overall process of modernising state aid rules ([3]).

Therefore, the review is ongoing; a public consultation on a first draft is expected before the summer.

State aid to financial institutions in difficulty is subject to temporary crisis-related rules ([4]).

([1]) OJ C 244, 1.10.2004, p. 2.
([2]) OJ C 296, 2.10.2012, p.3.
([3]) COM(2012) 209 final.
([4]) OJ C 356, 6.12.2011, p. 7.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011564/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(18 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: La Commissione europea tuteli le denominazioni d'origine del camembert

Il «camembert di Normandia» è il solo ad aver ottenuto la certificazione DOP (in francese AOP) che protegge l'origine e la qualità del prodotto. Tuttavia attualmente molte catene alimentari europee offrono in vendita «camembert prodotto in Normandia», spesso fabbricato con latte tutt'altro che europeo, ma in gran parte cinese e neozelandese.

La Commissione non ritiene che tale dicitura sia ingannevole e pregiudichi anche la dicitura originale del prodotto DOP?

Quali forme di tutela intende promuovere per i prodotti DOP, spesso vittime di concorrenza sleale tramite diciture ingannevoli da parte di prodotti similari che non garantiscono però la tutela del prodotto e l'origine delle materie?

Risposta di Dacian Ciolos a nome della Commissione
(20 febbraio 2013)

Il «Camembert de Normandie» è registrato come denominazione di origine protetta ([1]). In virtù dell'articolo 13, paragrafo 1, del regolamento (UE) n. 1151/2012 sui regimi di qualità dei prodotti agricoli e alimentari, detto nome è protetto contro qualsiasi impiego commerciale diretto o indiretto per prodotti comparabili o qualora l'uso di tale nome consenta di sfruttare la notorietà del nome protetto; qualsiasi usurpazione, imitazione o evocazione ([2]); qualsiasi altra indicazione falsa o ingannevole relativa alla provenienza, all'origine, alla natura o alle qualità essenziali del prodotto; qualsiasi altra pratica che possa indurre in errore il consumatore sulla vera origine del prodotto.

All'interno del mercato UE, l'uso dell'espressione «Camembert prodotto in Normandia» per la commercializzazione di un formaggio non ottenuto conformemente al disciplinare relativo al «Camembert de Normandie», compreso l'uso di latte non proveniente dalla zona in esso indicata, può costituire una violazione di detto articolo 13, paragrafo 1. Spetta principalmente agli Stati membri designare l'autorità competente a far applicare e a verificare il rispetto di tali norme.

In Francia l'autorità competente è la «Direction Générale de la Concurrence, de la Consommation et de la Répression des Fraudes» (Direzione generale per la concorrenza, il consumo e la repressione delle frodi). In definitiva, spetta alla Corte europea di giustizia pronunciarsi sull'interpretazione e l'applicazione di dette norme.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1107/96 della Commissione (GU L 148 del 21.6.1996).
([2]) Articolo 13, paragrafo 1, del regolamento (UE) n. 1151/2012 (GU L 343 del 14.12.2012).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011564/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Call for the Commission to protect designations of origin for camembert

'Camembert from Normandy' is the only camembert to have received PDO certification (AOP in French), thereby protecting the origin and quality of the product. However, many European food chains are currently selling 'Camembert produced in Normandy', which is often made from milk that is anything but European, being mostly Chinese or from New Zealand.

Does the Commission not agree that such wording is misleading and is also to the detriment of the original wording of the PDO product?

What forms of protection will it promote for PDO products, which are often victims of unfair competition through misleading wording on similar products which, however, provide no guarantee of the protection of the product and the origin of the materials used?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2013)

'Camembert de Normandie' is registered as Protected Designation of Origin ([1]). By virtue of Article 13(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012 on quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs, this name is protected against any direct or indirect commercial use on comparable products or where using the name exploits the reputation of the protected name; any misuse, imitation and evocation ([2]); any other false or misleading information as to the provenance, origin, nature and essential qualities of the product; and any other practice liable to mislead the consumer.

On the EU market, the use of the words 'Camembert produced in Normandy' for marketing a cheese not produced in line with the product specifications for 'Camembert de Normandie', including milk not originating in the area indicated therein, could constitute a violation of said Article 13 (1). It is primarily for Member States to designate the competent authority which implement and control the respect of these rules.

In France, the competent authority is *la Direction Générale de la Concurrence, de la Consommation et de la Répression des Fraudes*. It is ultimately for the European Court of Justice to rule on the interpretation and application of these rules.

([1]) Commission Regulation No 1107/96 (OJ L 148 of 21.6.1996).
([2]) Article 13 (1) of Regulation (EC) No 1151/2012 (OJ L 343 of 14.12.2012).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011565/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(18 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: La Commissione vigili sugli sperperi del ponte sullo Stretto di Messina

In trent'anni il progetto per collegare la Sicilia alla terraferma è costato circa 300 milioni di euro, senza peraltro pervenire al minimo risultato. Al momento il governo Monti ha approvato un decreto legge che fissa in ulteriori due anni uno studio di fattibilità e, in caso di cancellazione definitiva del progetto, nel 2014 lo Stato dovrà pagare altri 10 milioni di euro, oltre i 6 milioni annui degli stipendi della società che gestisce il progetto.

Nel 2011 la Commissione europea ha deciso di escludere il progetto dalle linee strategiche sui corridoi europei.

La Commissione ha in qualche modo finora finanziato il progetto del ponte sullo Stretto di Messina?

La Commissione ha valutato se i soldi spesi finora siano stati oggetto di illeciti finanziari?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(20 febbraio 2013)

Conformemente alle informazioni fornite dall'autorità di gestione del programma Sicilia cofinanziato dal Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR) il progetto menzionato dall'onorevole deputato non è mai stato cofinanziato dal FESR, né è stato finanziato dal programma TEN-T. La Commissione non può pertanto pronunciarsi su eventuali illeciti finanziari.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011565/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Call for the Commission to monitor the waste involved in the bridge over the Straits of Messina

Over 30 years, the project to connect Sicily to the mainland has cost some EUR 300 million without managing to achieve anything at all. The Monti government has just adopted a decree-law to allow a feasibility study to be carried out over another two years and, if the project is cancelled once and for all, in 2014 the government will have to pay out another EUR 10 million, in addition to the over 6 million in annual salaries to the company that is managing the project.

In 2011, the Commission decided to exclude the project from its strategic guidelines on European corridors.

Has the Commission financed the project concerning the bridge over the Straits of Messina in any way?

Has the Commission assessed whether the money spent so far has been the subject of any financial impropriety?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2013)

According to the information provided by the managing authority of the programme for Sicilia co-funded by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the project mentioned by the Honourable Member has never been co-financed by the ERDF. It has not been financed by the TEN-T programme either. The Commission can therefore not comment on any alleged financial impropriety.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011566/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(18 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: La Commissione vigili sulle sostanze tossiche rilevate nei tè cinesi

La maggior parte dei tè cinesi, dalle analisi risultanti su campioni vari e differenziati eseguite da Greenpeace China, hanno rivelato tracce di pesticidi e di sostanze quali il metomil, illegali nell'UE. Secondo l'associazione cinese del tè, queste sostanze non sarebbero state polverizzate recentemente ma sarebbero presenti nel suolo. Alcuni tipi di tè, quali il tieguanyin, sono inoltre prodotti attraverso l'uso massiccio di concimi chimici e di pesticidi. Nel 2010, in Cina sono stati proibiti 42 prodotti chimici nella coltivazione del tè.

Quali tipologie di controlli impone la Commissione sui tè importati dalla Cina?

Quali tipologie di certificazioni sanitarie richiede e quali standard vengono applicati?

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

Il tè originario della Cina rientra nell'allegato I del regolamento (CE) n. 669/2009 ([1]), vale a dire nell'elenco dei mangimi e alimenti di origine non animale per i quali è richiesto un livello accresciuto di controlli ufficiali prima della loro introduzione nell'Unione europea.

Di conseguenza, le partite di tè provenienti dalla Cina devono entrare nel territorio dell'Unione europea attraverso punti d'entrata specifici designati dagli Stati membri (i cosiddetti «punti di entrata designati»), previa notifica della data stimata di arrivo fisico. Tali partite sono sottoposte a controlli documentari sistematici (100 %) nonché a controlli di identità e fisici, comprese analisi di laboratorio per individuare un'ampia gamma di residui di pesticidi ([2]), con una frequenza del 10 %, in un modo atto ad assicurare che non sia possibile prevedere se una determinata partita verrà sottoposta o meno a controllo. Non è richiesto nessun certificato sanitario, ma è possibile immettere in libera pratica le partite soltanto una volta che siano stati effettuati tutti i prescritti controlli e che i controlli fisici siano risultati favorevoli.

L'allegato I del regolamento (CE) n. 669/2009 è riveduto regolarmente, o almeno con cadenza trimestrale, al fine di tener conto delle nuove informazioni disponibili e/o dei rischi emergenti.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 669/2009 della Commissione, del 24 luglio 2009, recante modalità di applicazione del regolamento (CE) n. 882/2004 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativo al livello accresciuto di controlli ufficiali sulle importazioni di alcuni mangimi e alimenti di origine non animale e che modifica la decisione 2006/504/CE della Commissione, GU L 194 del 25.7.2009.

([2]) L'elenco delle principali sostanze per cui si effettuano analisi di laboratorio finalizzate all'individuazione dei pesticidi figura nella nota n. 10 dell'allegato I del regolamento (CE) n. 669/2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011566/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: The Commission should monitor toxic substances found in Chinese teas

According to tests on various different samples carried out by Greenpeace China, most Chinese teas show traces of pesticides and substances, such as methomyl, which are illegal in the EU. According to the China Tea Association, these substances were not ground recently but are present in the soil. Some types of tea such as Tieguanyin, moreover, are produced by the large-scale use of chemical fertilisers and pesticides. In 2010, China banned 42 chemicals in the cultivation of tea.

What type of controls is the Commission imposing on tea imported from China?

What kind of health certificates are required and what standards are being applied?

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

Tea originating from China is included in Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 669/2009 ([1]) i.e. the list of feed and food of non-animal origin for which an increased level of official controls prior to their introduction into the European Union territory is required.

As a consequence, consignments of tea from China are required to enter the territory of the European Union through specific points of entry designated by the Member States (so-called 'Designated Points of Entry'), following prior notification of the estimated date of physical arrival. They are subject to systematic (100%) documentary checks as well as to identity and physical checks, including laboratory analysis for a wide range of pesticide residues ([2]), at a frequency of 10%, in such a way that it is not possible to predict whether any particular consignment will undergo the controls. No health certificate is required but the release for free circulation of the consignments is only possible once all required controls have been carried out and favourable results from physical checks are known.

Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 669/2009 is reviewed on a regular basis, and at least quarterly, so as to take into account new available information and/or any emerging risks.

([1]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 669/2009 of 24 July 2009 implementing Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the Parliament and of the Council as regards the increased level of official controls on imports of certain feed and food of non-animal origin and amending Decision 2006/504/EC, OJ L 194, 25.7.2009.

([2]) The list of main substances for which laboratory analysis for pesticide residues are carried out is in endnote No 10 in Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 669/2009.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011567/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(18 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: Costo reale dei conti correnti nell'UE

Lo studio utilizzato dalla Commissione europea per stilare i dati statistici sui costi dei conti correnti nell'UE ha indicato come in Italia tale costo medio annuo si aggirasse intorno ai 250 euro, mentre la realtà indicata dalla Banca d'Italia è che il costo annuo medio dovrebbe essere di 114 euro.

Questa discrepanza sembrerebbe dovuta alla metodologia, che applica criteri non consoni alla realtà economica italiana, e ai servizi utilizzati nei vari Stati membri in modo differente, ma permane il dubbio che vi siano distorsioni del mercato interno nei prezzi offerti agli utenti dagli istituti bancari europei.

La Commissione non ritiene opportuno analizzare i dati tramite parametri più dettagliati e ampi, che non subiscano quindi le peculiarità dei mercati nei risultati?

Dato che l'analisi comparativa dei costi annui dei conti correnti potrebbe rivelare distorsioni di mercato, la Commissione ha considerato di approfondire meglio questa situazione e di provvedere al fine di eliminare tali distorsioni di mercato?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(7 febbraio 2013)

La Commissione riconosce che i risultati dello studio ([1]) cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato sono stati oggetto di critiche, soprattutto da parte del mondo finanziario.

Altri studi, compreso quello condotto dalla Banca d'Italia ([2]) indicano un'ampia gamma di valori medi per quanto concerne il costo annuale di un conto. Sebbene tali differenze non derivino necessariamente da carenze metodologiche, esse possono essere il risultato di diversi approcci metodologici. Lo studio della Commissione fornisce una fonte unica di informazioni comparabili sui prezzi dei conti correnti nell'UE e continua ad essere un'utile fonte di informazioni per il processo decisionale.

L'Atto per il mercato unico II adottato nell'ottobre 2012 identifica in un'iniziativa legislativa relativa ai conti bancari nell'UE una delle dodici azioni prioritarie. Obiettivo di questa iniziativa è, tra l'altro, assicurare che i costi dei conti bancari siano trasparenti e comparabili. Questa iniziativa dovrebbe portare a una maggiore concorrenza nei e tra i mercati nazionali dei servizi bancari al dettaglio e contribuire pertanto a ridurre le distorsioni del prezzo di tali servizi nell'UE. Le proposte della Commissione in questi ambiti sono previste per il primo trimestre del 2013.

([1]) Data collection for prices of current accounts provided to consumers, 2009, Van Dijk Management Consultants.
([2]) Indagine 2011 Sul Costo Dei Conti Correnti Bancari, Banca D'Italia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011567/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Real cost of current accounts in the EU

The study used by the Commission to compile statistical data on the costs of current accounts in the EU shows that in Italy the average annual cost of such an account is around EUR 250, while according to the Bank of Italy the average annual cost should be EUR 114.

This discrepancy appears to be due to the methodology used, which applies criteria that are not appropriate for the Italian economy, and to the services used in different ways in the various Member States. However, the doubt remains that there may be distortions in the internal market with regard to the prices offered to users of European banks.

Does the Commission not think it should analyse the data using more detailed and broader parameters, so that the results are not affected by the specific characteristics of different markets?

Since the comparative analysis of the annual costs of current accounts could reveal market distortions, has the Commission thought of looking into this matter further and taking action to eliminate such distortions?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(7 February 2013)

The Commission acknowledges that the results of the study ([1]) referred to by the Honorable Member have been met with criticism, mainly by the financial industry.

Other studies, including the one carried out by the Bank of Italy ([2]) report a wide range of average values for the annual cost of holding a payment account. While these differences do not necessarily result from methodological weaknesses, they may be the result of different methodological approaches. The Commission study provides a unique source of comparable information on current account prices across the EU and it continues to be a valuable source of information for policy-making.

The Single Market Act II adopted in October 2012 identified a legislative initiative on bank accounts in the EU as one of 12 priority actions. The aim of this initiative is *inter alia* to ensure bank account fees are transparent and comparable. This initiative should lead to more competition within and across national retail banking markets and thereby help reduce price distortions of retail financial services in the EU. The Commission's proposals in these areas are expected during the first quarter of 2013.

([1]) Data collection for prices of current accounts provided to consumers, 2009, Van Dijk Management Consultants.
([2]) Indagine 2011 Sul Costo Dei Conti Correnti Bancari, Banca D'Italia.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011568/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de diciembre de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — dos mujeres se enfrentan a una pena de cárcel en Camboya por defender el derecho a la vivienda

Según la información facilitada por Amnistía Internacional, el próximo 26 de diciembre se juzgará a dos camboyanas defensoras de los derechos humanos. Se enfrentan a penas de entre seis meses y cinco años de prisión. Yorm Bopha y Tim Sakmony son activistas que trabajan por el derecho a la vivienda y provienen de dos zonas de Nom Pen, la capital del país. Son presas de conciencia. Yorm Bopha fue arrestada el 4 de septiembre de 2012 y Tim Sakmony, al día siguiente, sin que existiera relación entre las dos detenciones. Se encuentran detenidas en la prisión Prey Sar (CC2) de Nom Pen y sus juicios están previstos para el 26 de diciembre a las 14.00 horas, en dos salas diferentes del Juzgado Municipal de Nom Pen. A Yorm Bopha se la acusa de «violencia deliberada con circunstancias agravantes», en virtud del artículo 218 del Código Penal camboyano. También su marido, Luos Sakhom, fue arrestado y acusado, pero quedó en libertad bajo fianza y no se ha comunicado aún ninguna fecha para su juicio. Ambos están acusados de agredir, alrededor de un mes antes del arresto, a una persona sospechosa de robar retrovisores exteriores de automóviles, hecho que los dos han negado. A Tim Sakmony, una abuela de sesenta y cinco años, se la acusa de haber «declarado en falso», según lo estipulado en el artículo 633 del Código Penal nacional. El asunto tiene su origen en la solicitud que presentó en nombre de su hijo discapacitado a Phanimex, la empresa encargada de reurbanizar la zona de Borei Kella, en Nom Pen, pidiendo uno de los apartamentos que la empresa había prometido tras el desalojo forzoso de la comunidad en enero de 2012.

El trabajo de ambas mujeres en la protesta contra los desalojos forzosos de sus comunidades ha sido especialmente destacado. Yorm Bopha protestó abiertamente durante la detención de otras trece activistas del lago Boeung Kak, condenadas a penas de hasta dos años y medio de cárcel en mayo de 2012. Tim Sakmony es una de las representantes de las ciento seis familias que se alojan ahora mismo en tiendas de campaña cerca del lugar donde se encontraba la comunidad Borei Kella, ahora demolida. Los cargos presentados por las autoridades contra estas dos mujeres por su destacado papel en la lucha pacífica por el derecho a viviendas adecuadas para sus comunidades parecen carecer de fundamento.

¿Se pondrá en contacto la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante con las autoridades camboyanas para solicitarles que liberen inmediata e incondicionalmente a las presas de conciencia Yorm Bopha y Tim Sakmony? ¿Les pedirá que cesen en el uso de la intimidación, las acciones legales y la violencia contra participantes en protestas pacíficas y defensores de los derechos humanos? Asimismo, ¿instará a las autoridades a que pongan fin a los desalojos forzosos en Camboya?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Sra. Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(18 de febrero de 2013)

Las dos activistas contra los desalojos de tierras Tim Sakmony y Yorm Bopha fueron detenidas y acusadas «de manera independiente», pero de forma simultánea, por delitos no relacionados. Un tribunal dictó sentencia los días 27 y 28 de diciembre y, mientras que Sakmony salió libre del tribunal, Bopha fue enviada de nuevo a prisión con una pena de 3 años y una multa de 7 500 USD. Ambas estaban encarceladas desde el pasado mes de septiembre. La Delegación de la UE en Phnom Penh asistió a todo el juicio de Yorm Bopha.

Las cuestiones relativas a los derechos humanos se discutieron al más alto nivel con las autoridades camboyanas cuando el Presidente del Consejo Europeo, el Sr. Van Rompuy, se reunió con el Primer Ministro camboyano Hun Sen durante su visita a Camboya del 2 al 4 de noviembre.

En dichas discusiones, la UE hizo un gran hincapié en la importancia del respeto de los Derechos Humanos y del Estado de Derecho, en concreto en el ámbito de la reforma agraria. Junto con su Delegación en Phnom Penh, la UE está estudiando la mejor manera de llevar a la práctica los resultados de estas discusiones, incluida una gestión diplomática por parte del Jefe de la Delegación de la UE cuando los asuntos mencionados con anterioridad puedan plantearse.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011568/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Women in Cambodia face jail for defending housing rights

According to information from Amnesty International, two female Cambodian human rights defenders are to be tried on 26 December 2012. They may be facing six months to five years in prison. Yorm Bopha and Tim Sakmony are housing-rights activists from two areas in the capital Phnom Penh. They are prisoners of conscience. Yorm Bopha was arrested on 4 September 2012 and Tim Sakmony the next day, in two separate cases. They are being detained in Prey Sar (CC2) prison in Phnom Penh. Their trials are scheduled for 2 p.m. on 26 December 2012 in different rooms of the Phnom Penh Municipal Court. Yorm Bopha is charged with 'intentional violence with aggravating circumstances' under Article 218 of Cambodia's Penal Code. Her husband, Luos Sakhorn, was also arrested and charged, but was released on bail. No date has been set for his trial. They are accused of assaulting a person suspected of stealing car wing mirrors, around a month before their arrest, which they have denied. Tim Sakmony, a 65-year-old grandmother, is charged with making a 'false declaration' under Article 633 of the Penal Code. This stems from a request she made on behalf of her disabled son to Phanimex, the company redeveloping the Borei Keila area in Phnom Penh, for one of the apartments it had promised after the community was forcibly evicted in January 2012.

Both women have been prominent in protesting against the forced evictions of their communities. Yorm Bopha was outspoken during the detention of 13 other Boeung Kak Lake female activists who were sentenced for up to two-and-a-half years' imprisonment in May 2012. Tim Sakmony is one of the representatives of the 106 families now living in tents next to the demolished site of the Borei Keila community. The authorities appear to have levelled baseless charges against the two women because of their leading roles in peacefully advocating for the right to adequate housing for their communities.

Will the VP/HR contact the Cambodian authorities to call for the immediate and unconditional release of prisoners of conscience Yorm Bopha and Tim Sakmony? Will she request the authorities to stop using intimidation, legal action and violence against peaceful protesters and human rights defenders? Furthermore, will the VP/HR ask the authorities to end forced evictions in Cambodia?

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

The two land evictions activists Tim Sakmony and Yorm Bopha were arrested and charged 'independently', but at the same time on non-related criminal offenses. A court passed judgment on 27th and 28th December. While Sakmony left the tribunal free, Bopha was sent back to jail with a sentence of 3 years and a fine of USD 7500. Both had been detained since last September. The EU Delegation in Phnom Penh attended the whole of Yorm Bopha's trial.

Human rights concerns have been discussed at the highest level with the Cambodian authorities, when the President of the European Council, Mr Van Rompuy met Cambodian Prime Minister Hun Sen during his visit to Cambodia on 2-4 November.

In those discussions, the EU strongly underlined the importance of respect for Human Rights and the rule of law, in particular in the context of land reform. Together with its Delegation in Phnom Penh, the EU is looking at the best way to follow-up on these discussions, including through a demarche by the EU Head of Delegation where these abovementioned cases may be raised.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011569/12
à la Commission
Françoise Castex (S&D)
(18 décembre 2012)

Objet: Abus des règles de distribution sélective

Un récent avis de l'Autorité française de la concurrence sur le fonctionnement du commerce électronique constate que les nouveaux acteurs tels que les places de marchés en ligne stimulent la concurrence en réduisant les barrières à l'entrée et en facilitant la comparaison des prix ([1]). Récemment, cette même autorité a sanctionné Bang & Olufsen pour des restrictions imposées à leurs distributeurs autorisés ([2]), après avoir alerté sur la tendance à l'utilisation abusive des règles de distribution sélective par les fabricants. La Commission aura également vu des rapports dans la presse allemande au sujet de certaines marques d'articles de sport interdisant à leurs distributeurs à travers l'Europe d'utiliser certaines places de marché en ligne. Ces pratiques sont, qui plus est, répandues sur de nombreux produits de grande consommation au sein du marché intérieur.

Quelles mesures la Commission envisage-t-elle de prendre afin que ces pratiques abusives, injustifiées et discriminatoires, mises en œuvre par des accords de distribution et restreignant gravement le développement du commerce électronique et mobile dans l'Union, soient sanctionnées?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(15 février 2013)

En 2010, la Commission a adopté le règlement 330/2010 ([3]) et les lignes directrices sur les restrictions verticales qui l'accompagnent ([4]). Ces nouvelles règles permettent de faciliter et de sécuriser les ventes sur internet. Les lignes directrices précisent que «tout distributeur doit être autorisé à utiliser internet pour vendre ses produits» ([5]).

Certes, ces nouvelles règles facilitent l'utilisation d'internet pour des distributeurs sélectionnés, mais cela ne signifie pas que tout distributeur doit être autorisé à vendre les produits de n'importe quel fabricant. Un fabricant peut avoir de bonnes raisons, bénéfiques pour les consommateurs, de restreindre son système de distribution.

Le règlement prévoit une zone de sécurité pour de tels accords de distribution uniquement si la part de marché du fournisseur et de l'acheteur ne dépasse pas 30 % ce qui rend peu probable l'apparition d'effets négatifs nets pour les consommateurs. En dehors de cette zone de sécurité, la Commission, les autorités nationales de concurrence et les juridictions nationales ont la possibilité d'appliquer directement l'article 101 du TFUE et d'interdire les accords restrictifs. En outre, la Commission et les autorités nationales de concurrence peuvent retirer le bénéfice de la zone de sécurité si l'accord a des effets négatifs nets pour les consommateurs. Par conséquent, les lignes directrices sur les restrictions verticales et le règlement offrent des possibilités appropriées et suffisantes pour intervenir si la concurrence ou les consommateurs sont susceptibles d'être lésés par des accords de distribution restrictifs. L'affaire française concernant Bang & Olufsen, mentionnée dans la question de l'Honorable Parlementaire est un bon exemple de la mise en application de ces règles ([6]).

La Commission surveille en permanence l'effet et l'application des règles de l'UE en matière de concurrence, dans le cadre des affaires qu'elle traite, de ses discussions avec les autorités nationales de concurrence au sein du Réseau européen de la concurrence et de discussions avec les parties prenantes de manière générale.

([1]) http://www.autoritedelaconcurrence.fr/user/standard.php?id_rub=417&id_article=1968.
([2]) http://www.autoritedelaconcurrence.fr/user/standard.php?id_rub=417&id_article=2010.
([3]) Règlement (UE) no 330/2010 de la Commission du 20 avril 2010 concernant l'application de l'article 101, paragraphe 3, du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne à des catégories d'accords verticaux et de pratiques concertées (JO L 102, du 23.4.2010, p. 1).
([4]) Lignes directrices sur les restrictions verticales (JO C 130 du 19.5.2010, p. 1).
([5]) Point 52 des lignes directrices. Cette politique n'est pas nouvelle, mais s'inscrit dans la continuité du règlement 2790/1999 et de ses lignes directrices, en vigueur de 2000 à 2010. On considère que ces règles ont été très efficaces et ont donné lieu à très peu de plaintes durant cette période.
([6]) La Cour de justice de l'Union européenne, dans l'arrêt Pierre Fabre, a également indiqué qu'à moins d'être justifiée de manière objective, une clause de restriction des ventes sur internet pour les distributeurs constitue une violation de l'article 101; voir l'affaire C-439/09, Pierre Fabre Dermo-Cosmétique SAS / Président de l'Autorité de la concurrence et Ministre de l'Économie, de l'Industrie et de l'Emploi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011569/12
to the Commission
Françoise Castex (S&D)
(18 December 2012)

Subject: Abuse of selective distribution rules

A recent opinion by the French competition authority on the functioning of electronic trade notes that new players such as online marketplaces spur on competition by reducing barriers to entry and making it easier to compare prices ([1]). This authority recently sanctioned Bang & Olufsen for imposing restrictions on their authorised distributors ([2]), after flagging up the trend towards abuse of selective distribution rules by the manufacturers. The Commission will also have seen reports in the German press on certain brands of sports goods which forbid their distributors throughout Europe to use some online marketplaces. These practices are common in respect of many staple products in the internal market.

What steps is the Commission considering taking to sanction these abusive, unjustified and discriminatory practices, which are implemented by means of distribution agreements and which seriously curtail the development of electronic and mobile trade in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2013)

In 2010 the Commission adopted Regulation 330/2010 ([3]) and the accompanying Guidelines on Vertical Restraints ([4]). The new rules facilitate and protect Internet sales. The Guidelines make it clear that 'every distributor must be allowed to use the Internet to sell products' ([5]).

While the new rules facilitate selected distributors to use the Internet, this does not mean that every distributor must be allowed to sell a manufacturer's products. A manufacturer may have good reasons, benefiting consumers, for restricting its distribution system.

The regulation provides a safe harbour for such distribution agreements only if both the supplier's and the buyer's market share do not exceed 30%, making it unlikely that net negative effects will result for consumers. Outside this safe harbour the Commission, the National Competition Authorities (NCAs) and the national courts can directly apply Article 101 TFEU and prohibit restrictive agreements. In addition, both the Commission and the NCAs can withdraw the safe harbour benefit if a particular agreement does have net negative effects for consumers. The regulation and Guidelines thus provide appropriate and sufficient possibilities to intervene if competition and consumers are likely to be harmed by restrictive distribution agreements. The French case concerning Bang & Olufsen, mentioned in the Honourable Member's question, is a good example of the application of these rules ([6]).

The Commission continuously monitors the effect and application of the EU competition rules, through its cases, through discussions with NCAs within the European Competition Network, and through discussions with stakeholders generally.

([1]) http://www.autoritedelaconcurrence.fr/user/standard.php?id_rub=417&id_article=1968.
([2]) http://www.autoritedelaconcurrence.fr/user/standard.php?id_rub=417&id_article=2010.
([3]) Commission Regulation (EU) No 330/210 of 20 April 2010 on the application of Article 101(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union to categories of vertical agreements and concerted practices, OJ L 102, 23.4.2010, p. 1.
([4]) Guidelines on Vertical Restraints, OJ C 130, 19.5.2010, p. 1.
([5]) Guidelines point 52. This is not new policy but a continuation of the policy that was started with the previous Regulation 2790/1999 and its Guidelines, which applied from 2000 to 2010. These rules are considered to have worked very well and led to very few complaints during this period.
([6]) The ECJ in Pierre Fabre has also indicated that, unless objectively justified, a clause preventing distributors from selling via the Internet represents a violation of Article 101; see Case C-439/09 *Pierre Fabre Dermo-Cosmétique SAS* v *Président de l'Autorité de la concurrence and Ministre de l'Économie, de l'Industrie et de l'Emploi*.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-011571/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(19 de diciembre de 2012)

Asunto: Explotación de los recursos naturales en el Sáhara Occidental

Ningún Estado del mundo ha reconocido la anexión ilegal del Sáhara Occidental por parte de Marruecos. Sin embargo, la UE está planteándose pagar cada año, a partir de 2013, millones de euros al Gobierno de Marruecos para permitir que los buques de la UE pesquen en las aguas costeras de ese territorio. Marruecos sigue negándose a cooperar en el proceso de descolonización del Sáhara Occidental, desafiando así más de cien resoluciones de las Naciones Unidas que insisten en el derecho a la autodeterminación del pueblo saharaui. Al mismo tiempo, las autoridades marroquíes están violando los derechos humanos de los saharauis que expresan sus opiniones políticas.

El enviado especial de las Naciones Unidas para el Sáhara Occidental ha puesto específicamente sobre la mesa de negociación el asunto de la gestión de los recursos naturales, a fin de encontrar una solución pacífica al conflicto. En este contexto, el hecho de cooperar con Marruecos en la explotación de los recursos naturales del Sáhara Occidental socava los esfuerzos de las Naciones Unidas en favor de la paz.

Según el Derecho internacional, los recursos naturales del Sáhara Occidental solo pueden explotarse de acuerdo con los deseos e intereses del pueblo de dicho territorio.

A pesar de ello, la UE tiene previsto ahora transferir el dinero de los contribuyentes europeos al Gobierno de Marruecos para poder acceder a las aguas del Sáhara Occidental, sin consultar aparentemente para ello al pueblo saharaui. Fue esta situación preocupante la que hizo que el Parlamento Europeo pusiera fin a la pesca de la UE en el Sáhara Occidental en 2011. El pueblo saharaui tiene derecho a ser escuchado. No debe llevarse a cabo ninguna actividad pesquera de la UE en el Sáhara Occidental hasta que se encuentre una solución pacífica al conflicto.

1. Por consiguiente, ¿cómo justifica la Comisión el que se siga adelante con los planes de renovación del acuerdo pesquero de la UE con Marruecos en aguas del Sáhara Occidental?

2. ¿No opina la Comisión que la UE debería trabajar dentro del marco de la paz internacional y apoyar los esfuerzos de las Naciones Unidas para negociar una solución al conflicto?

3. ¿Ha consultado la Comisión al pueblo saharaui y ha dado este su consentimiento para que se pesque en las aguas del Sáhara Occidental?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de febrero de 2013)

La Comisión Europea está negociando un nuevo protocolo del Acuerdo de colaboración en el sector pesquero con Marruecos conforme a las directrices del Consejo de febrero de 2012 ([1]) y teniendo presente la resolución del Parlamento Europeo sobre un futuro protocolo de dicho Acuerdo ([2]).

La Comisión Europea apoya completamente los esfuerzos que el Secretario General de las Naciones Unidas está llevando a cabo para encontrar una solución mutuamente aceptable conforme a los principios enunciados en las resoluciones del Consejo de Seguridad de esa organización: «lograr una solución política justa, duradera y mutuamente aceptable, que prevea la libre determinación del pueblo del Sáhara Occidental». En este contexto, la Comisión Europea ha mantenido contactos, en los foros y en los niveles apropiados, con todos los grupos que expresan su preocupación en relación con el citado acuerdo de pesca.

([1]) Decisión del Consejo por la que se autoriza a la Comisión a entablar negociaciones en nombre de la Unión Europea con vistas a un nuevo protocolo del Acuerdo de colaboración en el sector pesquero con el Reino de Marruecos.
([2]) Resolución del Parlamento Europeo de 14 de diciembre de 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011571/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Exploiting natural resources in Western Sahara

No state in the world has recognised the illegal Moroccan annexation of Western Sahara. However, the EU is considering, from 2013, paying millions of euros annually to the Government of Morocco to allow EU vessels to fish in the territory's offshore waters. Morocco continues to refuse to cooperate with the decolonisation process in Western Sahara, in defiance of more than one hundred (100) UN resolutions that insist on the Saharawi people's right to self-determination. Simultaneously, the Moroccan authorities are committing human rights violations against Sahrawis who voice their political views.

The UN special envoy to Western Sahara has specifically placed the management of natural resources on the negotiating table in order to find a peaceful solution to the conflict. In this context, cooperating with Morocco in exploiting Western Sahara's natural resources is undermining the UN's peace efforts.

According to international law, the natural resources in Western Sahara can only be exploited in accordance with the wishes and interests of the people of the territory.

Despite this, the EU is now planning to transfer European taxpayers' money to the Government of Morocco for access to Western Saharan waters, apparently without consulting the Saharawi people. It was because of these concerns that the European Parliament stopped EU fisheries in Western Sahara in 2011. The Saharawi people have the right to be heard. No further EU fisheries operations should take place in Western Sahara until a peaceful solution to the conflict has been found.

1. How, therefore, does the Commission justify going ahead with plans for renewing the EU fisheries agreement with Morocco for Western Saharan waters?

2. Does the Commission not think that the EU should work within the framework of international peace and should support the UN's efforts to negotiate a solution to the conflict?

3. Has the Commission consulted the Saharawi people and have they consented to fisheries in Western Saharan waters?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(6 February 2013)

The European Commission is negotiating a new Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) with Morocco following the directives of the Council from February 2012 ([1]) and taking into account the European Parliament's resolution on a future Protocol to the FPA with Morocco ([2]).

The European Commission entirely supports the efforts of the UN Secretary General to find a mutually acceptable solution according to the principles indicated by the UN Security Council's Resolutions: 'achieve a just, lasting and mutually acceptable political solution, which will provide for the self-determination of the people of Western Sahara'. In this context it has had contacts, in the appropriate fora and at appropriate levels, with all the groups that voice concern in the context of the FPA.

([1]) Council Decision authorising the Commission to open negotiations on behalf of the European Union for a new protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement with the Kingdom of Morocco.
([2]) EP resolution of 14 December 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011572/12
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Possible emergency measures to maintain technical conservation prohibition

The final plenary vote on the Gallagher report on the Technical Conservation Regulation ((EC) No 850/98) is yet to take place, and as a result there appears to be a gap whereby highly vulnerable deepwater sharks are potentially exposed to significant impact as bycatch within the deepwater gillnet fisheries.

The report contains a number of important closures in line with the EU's international commitments. Specifically from an elasmobranch perspective, it would make permanent the prohibitions on deepwater gill-netting (specifically to the west of Scotland and Ireland); this was prohibited under a transitional measure in 2005, but which is due to expire at the end of 2012.

Are there any possible routes to maintaining the prohibition until this matter is resolved?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(25 January 2013)

The Commission is aware of the potential threat to the conservation of sensitive stocks and vulnerable habitats caused by the delay in adopting the proposal ([1]) to amend the technical measures Regulation (Regulation (EC) No 850/98 ([2])) referred to by the Honourable Member.

Under Article 7 of Regulation (EC) No 2371/2002 ([3]) the Commission, at the substantiated request of a Member State or on its own initiative, may take emergency measures where there is the presence of a serious threat to conservation. It is important to note that these measures can only be adopted where there is documented evidence of an immediate threat existing and that this threat is caused by fishing activities. Emergency measures are time-limited to 6 months and can be extended by an additional 6 months.

The Commission is monitoring the situation closely, and urges the co-legislators to act quickly to remedy this legal vacuum and ensure the continuation of all measures included in the proposed amendment.

([1]) COM(2012) 298 final.
([2]) OJ L 125, 27.4.1998.
([3]) OJ L 358, 31.12.2002.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011573/12
à la Commission
Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(19 décembre 2012)

Objet: Réforme du marché de l'électricité au Royaume-Uni — aide d'État pour le nucléaire

Le 29 novembre 2012, le gouvernement du Royaume-Uni a soumis à la Chambre des communes le projet d'une nouvelle loi sur l'énergie. Il a notamment l'intention d'introduire une nouvelle forme statutaire de «Contrat de différence» (CfD) pour la «production d'électricité à faible émission de carbone», y compris d'électricité produite à l'aide de centrales nucléaires.

1. La Commission permettra-t-elle que l'on définisse l'énergie nucléaire comme étant une technologie émergente?

2. Juge-t-elle que les dispositions envisagées par le Royaume-Uni concernant le CfD doivent être soumises à un contrôle en vertu des règles de l'Union européenne régissant les aides d'État?

3. La Commission évaluera-t-elle le nouveau mécanisme du CfD concernant le nucléaire à l'aune des lignes directrices de l'Union relatives aux aides d'État dans le domaine de la protection de l'environnement?

4. Dans l'affirmative, comment la Commission explique-t-elle que ces lignes directrices soient applicables à l'énergie nucléaire compte tenu du règlement du Conseil (CE) nº 994/98 et du règlement de la Commission (CE) nº 1998/2006 et du risque de dépassement des pouvoirs délégués?

5. Quels motifs, s'il y en a, seraient susceptibles de justifier les dispositions prévues par le Royaume-Uni concernant le CfD, notamment au regard des lignes directrices de l'Union relatives aux aides d'État dans le domaine de la protection de l'environnement?

6. Quels critères la Commission appliquera-t-elle pour évaluer la nature d'aide d'État et la question des autorisations au regard, également, des règles du marché intérieur de l'énergie, de la concurrence d'autres technologies, en particulier des sources d'énergie renouvelables et du gaz dans ce domaine, et de la nécessité impérieuse d'internaliser entièrement les externalités comme éléments de l'évaluation des coûts de l'aide publique accordée au nucléaire dans le cadre du CfD?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(2 mars 2013)

Tout projet du gouvernement du Royaume-Uni visant à établir un cadre pour soutenir la production d'énergie nucléaire qui comporterait une aide d'État devrait être compatible avec les règles de l'Union européenne régissant les aides d'État et le marché intérieur. Le Royaume-Uni n'a pas encore adopté un point de vue définitif sur plusieurs caractéristiques essentielles du cadre. Les services de la Commission examinent actuellement ce dossier en collaboration avec les autorités britanniques.

Plus spécifiquement, la Commission n'a pas encore discuté ou pris position afin de définir le nucléaire comme une technologie arrivée à maturité ou autre. À ce stade, la Commission n'a reçu aucune notification et ignore si le Royaume-Uni a accordé une aide. En conséquence, elle n'a adopté aucune position définitive sur l'existence d'une aide ou sur le degré de conformité d'une telle aide au regard des règles régissant les aides d'État et/ou le marché intérieur. Les critères utilisés pour l'évaluation sont consacrés par la législation relative aux aides d'État, la jurisprudence et la pratique constante.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011573/12
to the Commission
Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: UK electricity market reform (EMR), state aid for nuclear

On 29 November 2012 the UK Government presented to the House of Commons the draft of a new Energy Bill. In particular, the UK Government intends to introduce a new statutory form of 'Contract for Difference' (CfD) for 'low carbon electricity generation', including electricity produced by nuclear power plants.

1. Will the Commission allow nuclear to be defined as an infant technology?

2. Does the Commission consider the planned UK provisions on CfD to be subject to scrutiny under EU state aid rules?

3. Will the Commission evaluate the new CfD mechanism in terms of nuclear under the Community guidelines on state aid for environmental protection?

4. If so, how does the Commission explain the applicability of these guidelines to nuclear in view of Council Regulation (EC) No 994/98, Commission Regulation (EC) No 1998/2006 and the risk of excess of delegated power?

5. On what grounds, if any, are the envisaged UK provisions on CfD justifiable, in particular in the light of the Community guidelines on state aid for environmental protection?

6. What will be the criteria for the Commission's evaluation of state aid status and the issue of authorisations, in view also of the internal energy market rules, competition with other technologies in this field, especially renewables and gas, and the strict need for complete internalisation of externalities as part of the evaluation of the cost of public support for nuclear under the CfD?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(2 March 2013)

Any plan by the UK Government to devise a framework in support of nuclear energy generation which involved state aid would need to be compatible with EU State aid rules and internal market rules. The UK does not yet have a definitive point of view on several key characteristics of framework. The Commission services are currently in discussion with the UK authorities on this file.

More specifically, no position has been discussed or taken on defining nuclear technology as mature or otherwise. The Commission has not received any notification at this stage and is not aware of the UK having granting aid, hence no definitive view has been reached on the existence of aid or the extent to which such aid might be justified under state aid and/or internal market rules. The criteria used for the assessment are enshrined in state aid law, jurisprudence and case practice.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-011575/12
до Комисията
Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(19 декември 2012 г.)

Относно: Методика на изчисляване на ставките за заплащане на участниците по програма „Учене през целия живот“ и „Хоризонт 2020“

Европейската комисия обедини своите образователни и обучителни инициативи в рамките на програмата „Учене през целия живот“ (www.ec.europa.eu/llp). Тази програма дава възможност на хора в различни етапи от своя житейски път да получат стимулиращи възможности за обучение в цяла Европа.

Заплащането на участниците по програма „Учене през целия живот“ става чрез фиксирани европейски ставки за труд. По данни на българското Министерство на образованието и науката максималното допустимо заплащане в евро по програма „Леонардо“ за 2013 г. за един изследовател в България е увеличено от 26 на 60 евро на ден, докато същата категория участници в Белгия получават 360 евро на ден.

Според българските учени подобни регулации влияят пряко върху конкурентоспособността на българските фирми, задълбочават последствията от икономическата криза и водят до постоянен дефицит на качествени експерти, учени и бизнесмени. Това от своя страна води до неизпълнение на поетите ангажименти, неусвояване на кохезионните фондове, корупция, санкции и т.н.

В този смисъл:

1. Има ли възможност за промяна в методиката на изчисляване на подобни ставки както по текущите, така и по бъдещите програми с цел по-справедливо разпределение на средствата за заплащане по програмата между участниците от различните страни членки?

2. Какви мерки ще предприеме Комисията, за да осигури това по-справедливо разпределение на средствата за заплащане по програмата между участниците от различните страни членки?

3. В частност, ще бъде ли по-равностойно и недискриминиращо заплащането на български организации и индивидуални експерти по програмата „Хоризонт 2020“?

4. Приемлива ли е практиката, при която три години след подписване на грантово споразумение с Европейската комисия се иска от проекти по Седма рамкова програма да връщат суми поради надвишаване на допустимите разходи за труд? Какво е взето предвид от Комисията за гарантиране на законосъобразността на направените разходи и какви са мотивите за прилагане на методика за определяне на допълнителните разходи за труд, въведена впоследствие и недостъпна за участниците в проектите?

5. Какви мерки ще предприема Комисията за осигуряване на максимална прозрачност на финансовите правила в бъдещите програми?

Отговор, даден от г-жа Vassiliouon от името на Комисията
(22 февруари 2013 г.)

„Максималният размер на дневната ставка за персонал“ за 2012 г. и 2013 г. във връзка с програмата „Учене през целия живот“ е определен въз основа на резултатите от статистическо проучване, проведено през 2011 г. Събирането на данните и методологията се основаваха на най-актуалните статистически данни на Евростат и данни, свързани с трудовия пазар.

Резултатите бяха приложени за първи път през 2012 г. За 2013 г. бе въведен нов механизъм за стабилизиране на разходите за персонала, който има за цел намаляване на колебанията в ставките и по-добро планиране от страна на участниците. С механизма за стабилизиране се ограничават разликите между годините до 20 %, като 2011 г. се използва за референтната стойност. Благодарение на него максималният допустим размер на дневната ставка за персонал за българските изследователи е нараснал от 26 EUR през 2012 г. на 60 EUR през 2013 г.

За бъдещата програма „Еразъм за всички“ Комисията разработва нови ставки съгласно разпоредбите на Финансовия регламент и Правилата за прилагането му.

В регулаторната рамка на „Хоризонт 2020“, която понастоящем е в процес на обсъждане ([1]), се предвижда възстановяване на реалните преки разходи. Също така Съветът предлага да могат да се добавят допълнителни плащания (бонуси) — до максимум 8000 EUR годишно на човек. Съгласно максималните ставки за възстановяване на разходи заплатата и бонусите, платени на изследователя, както е записано в счетоводните отчети, са допустими за финансиране.

Не е ясно дали споменатото връщане на суми е вследствие на одит. По време на одитната процедура на участниците се предоставя достатъчна възможност да представят аргументи и да обосноват факта, че разходите са допустими.

Що се отнася до програма „Хоризонт 2020“, финансова информация ще бъде разпространена чрез специализирани уебстраници, на редовните срещи с юридическите и финансовите лица за контакт на национално равнище, чрез информационната служба за изследвания, както и чрез обяснителните финансови насоки.

([1]) В Съвета и Европейския парламент.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011575/12
to the Commission
Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Method for calculating the rates of payment for participants in the Lifelong Learning Programme and Horizon 2020

The Commission has merged its education and training initiatives in the framework of the Lifelong Learning Programme (www.ec.europa.eu/llp). That programme offers people stimulating educational opportunities all over Europe at various stages in their lives.

The payments for participants in the Lifelong Learning Programme are based on fixed European labour rates. According to statistics from the Bulgarian Ministry of Education and Science, the maximum payment in euros that can be received under the Leonardo Programme for 2013 by a researcher in Bulgaria is between EUR 26 and EUR 60 per day while, in Belgium, the same category of participants receive EUR 360 per day.

According to the Bulgarian researchers, those rules are directly affecting the competitiveness of Bulgarian firms, exacerbating the effects of the economic crisis and are responsible for a permanent shortage of top-level experts, scientists and businessmen. This in turn results in non-fulfilment of commitments entered into, non-utilisation of cohesion funding, corruption and penalties, etc.

Can the Commission therefore state:

1. Whether the method used to calculate those rates under both current and future programmes can be adjusted with a view to a fairer distribution of payment resources under a programme between participants from the various Member States;

2. What measures it will take to ensure that fairer distribution of payment resources under a programme between participants from the various Member States;

3. Whether, in particular, payments to Bulgarian organisations and experts under the Horizon 2020 Programme will be more equitable and non-discriminatory in future;

4. Whether it considers acceptable the practice of requiring, three years after the signature of a grant agreement with the Commission, the repayment of amounts owing to eligible salary costs being exceeded in projects under the Seventh Framework Programme, what factors it takes into account to ensure the legality of the expenditure outlaid and what the reasons are for applying the method for determining excess salary costs, which is introduced subsequently and without project participant involvement?

5. What steps it will take to ensure maximum transparency in respect of the financing rules in future programmes?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2013)

For the Lifelong Learning Programme, the 'Maximum eligible daily rates for staff costs' for 2012 and 2013 are based on the results of a statistical study conducted in 2011. The data collection and methodology were based on the most recent Eurostat statistics and data related to the labour market.

The results were first applied in 2012. For 2013 a new stabilisation mechanism for staff costs has been introduced, in order to reduce fluctuations and improve predictability for participants. The stabilisation mechanism limits the fluctuations between years to 20% using 2011 as the base figure. Thanks to this mechanism the maximum eligible daily rates for staff costs for Bulgarian Researchers increased from EUR 26 in 2012 to EUR 60 in 2013.

For the future programme 'Erasmus for All', the Commission is developing new rates, according to the provisions of the Financial Regulation and its Rules of Application.

The Horizon 2020 regulatory framework which is currently under discussion ([1]) foresees that actual direct costs will be reimbursed. Moreover, the Council proposes that additional payments (bonuses) can be added up to a cap of 8000 EUR per year, per person. Whatever is paid to the researcher in terms of salary and bonuses, as recorded in the accounts, is eligible for funding according to the maximum reimbursement rates.

It is not clear whether the repayment mentioned was the result of an audit. In the audit procedure, participants are given ample opportunity to advance arguments and to substantiate the fact that the expenditure is eligible.

For Horizon 2020, financial information will be available via dedicated websites, regular meetings with the legal and financial national contact points, the research inquiry service, and explanatory financial guidelines.

([1]) in the Council and the European Parliament.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011576/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(19 de diciembre de 2012)

Asunto: Fracking o fractura hidráulica

En una Orden del 19 de mayo de 2010 del Departamento de Industria, Comercio y Turismo del Gobierno de Aragón se otorga el permiso de investigación de hidrocarburos denominado «Turbón» n° H22018, situado en la provincia de Huesca ([1]).

Para llevar a cabo esta investigación se utiliza la técnica del *fracking* o fractura hidráulica, prohibida en países como Francia, Canadá o Irlanda, que consiste en inyectar a la roca agua con sustancias químicas con el fin de conseguir que salgan a la superficie los hidrocarburos que existen y con la posibilidad de causar «afecciones como terremotos, contaminación de las aguas subterráneas, contaminación en las zonas de almacenamiento de residuos y en el trayecto seguido por los vehículos que accederían a las plantas de extracción, aumento de la incidencia del cáncer» según informan diferentes estudios y colectivos.

En Aragón, las zonas donde se conceden estos permisos se ubican en el Pirineo, un territorio frágil tanto desde el punto de vista demográfico como medioambiental con una gran riqueza tal como lo reflejan las numerosas zonas de especial protección para las aves (ZEPA) y lugares de importancia comunitaria (LIC) de la red Natura 2000. En la comarca de la Ribagorza existen dos permisos: el «Turbón» n° H22018, ya comentado anteriormente, y el denominado como «Graus». Ambos permisos afectan a la protección de aves como cernícalo primilla (Falco naumanni) y el quebrantahuesos (*Gypaetus barbatus*) y las zonas de nidificación del águila-azor perdicera (*Hieraaetus fasciatus*), el milano real (*Milvus milvus*) y el alimoche (*Neophron percnopterus*); también afectan a las ZEPA ES0000281 y Sierra de Sis, a los LIC ES2410059 LIC 40 ES2410069 Sierra de Esdolomada y Morrones de Güel ([2]), ES2410008 LIC Garganta de Obarra ES2410070 LIC Sierra del Castillo de Laguarres, ES2410055 LIC Sierra de Arro, y ES2410054 LIC Sierra Ferrera.

A la luz de lo anterior,

1. ¿Cree la Comisión que estas prácticas afectan o pueden afectar a la salud de sus ciudadanos y a la calidad de las aguas de estos territorios pirenaicos?

2. ¿Cree la Comisión que estas prácticas afectan o pueden afectar peligrosamente a la conservación de las especies en zonas protegidas por la red Natura 2000?

3. ¿Cuáles son los motivos de que en unos territorios se prohíban y en otros se realicen estas prácticas?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(22 de febrero de 2013)

La Comisión no sigue en detalle los proyectos de investigación de hidrocarburos en regiones concretas. Recientemente se ha llevado a cabo, en nombre de la Comisión, un estudio sobre los riesgos ambientales de las operaciones con hidrocarburos no convencionales que impliquen el uso de un volumen elevado de fracturación hidráulica, como es el caso del gas de esquisto. Ese estudio identifica los riesgos específicos asociados a dichas operaciones, como los riesgos de agotamiento y contaminación de los recursos hídricos y de perturbación de la biodiversidad. En el contexto de una iniciativa ([3]) prevista en el programa de trabajo de la Comisión de 2013 se estudiarán medidas para prevenir, reducir y gestionar esos riesgos.

([1]) https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B5ID6gGygl3TdkJoWG5NZUw4WG8/edit.
([2]) http://www.aragon.es/estaticos/ImportFiles/06/docs/%C3%81reas/Biodiversidad/RedNatura2000/LugaresImportanciaComunitaria/Mapa%20LIC%203/40_ES2410069_SIERRA_ESDOLOMADA_MORRONES_GUEL.pdf
([3]) El estudio sobre riesgos ambientales y más información sobre la iniciativa de 2013, a reserva de una evaluación de impacto, están disponibles en el sitio web de la DG ENV: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/unconventional_en.htm

Corresponde a los Estados miembros decidir si permiten la prospección, la exploración o la producción de hidrocarburos en su territorio. No obstante, deben garantizar que cualquier proyecto de esas características, en particular los que impliquen fracturación hidráulica, cumpla el actual ordenamiento jurídico de la UE y, en particular, sus disposiciones sobre la protección de la salud y el medio ambiente ([4]).

([4]) Para más información sobre el marco jurídico de la UE en materia de medio ambiente aplicable a los proyectos con hidrocarburos no convencionales que impliquen el uso de un volumen elevado de fracturación hidráulica, véase: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/pdf/legal_assessment.pdf Asimismo, en el sitio web de la DG ENV está disponible una nota orientativa sobre la aplicación de la Directiva 2011/92/UE, relativa a la evaluación de impacto ambiental, a los proyectos de exploración y explotación de hidrocarburos no convencionales: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/pdf/Annexe%202.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011576/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Fracking or hydraulic fracturing

In a Decree of 19 May 2010, the Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism of the Government of Aragón granted permission for a hydrocarbon prospecting project entitled 'Turbón' No. H22018, in the province of Huesca ([1]).

The process used to carry out this prospecting exercise is *fracking* or hydraulic fracturing, a process which is banned in countries such as France, Canada or Ireland. It involves injecting water and chemicals into the rock to bring any hydrocarbons to the surface. However, the process may cause other 'effects such as earthquakes, pollution of the groundwater, pollution of areas for storing waste or of the routes used for vehicles accessing the extraction units, or an increase in cancer rates' according to information from various groups and Studies.

In Aragón, the areas in which these permits have been granted are located in the Pyrenees, a vulnerable region in both demographic and environmental terms with a high risk level which is reflected in the numerous Special Protection Areas for birds (SPAs) and Sites of Community Importance (SCIs) set up as part of the Natura 2000 network. There are two permits for the Ribagorza district: the aforementioned 'Turbón' No. H22018, and another referred to as 'Graus'. Both permits impact on the protection of birds such as the lesser kestrel (*Falco naumanni*) and the bearded vulture (*Gypaetus barbatus*) and the nesting areas for Bonelli's eagle (*Hieraaetus fasciatus*), the red kite (*Milvus milvus*) and the Egyptian vulture (*Neophron percnopterus*); they also impact on the ES0000281 and Sierra de Sis SPAs, and on the following SCIs: ES2410059, 40 ES2410069 — Sierra de Esdolomada y Morrones de Güel ([2]), ES2410008 — Garganta de Obarra, ES2410070 — Sierra del Castillo de Laguarres, ES2410055 — Sierra de Arro and ES2410054 — Sierra Ferrera.

In the light of the above,

1. Does the Commission think that these practices are affecting or may affect the health of its citizens and the water quality in these areas of the Pyrenees?

2. Does the Commission think that these practices are having or may have a dangerous impact on the conservation of species in the areas protected by the Natura 2000 network?

3. Why are these practices banned in some areas but not in others?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2013)

The Commission does not follow in detail hydrocarbons prospecting projects in specific regions. A study on the environmental risks of unconventional hydrocarbons operations involving the use of high volume hydraulic fracturing (e.g shale gas) was recently carried out on behalf of the Commission. This study identifies specific risks associated with these operations, such as risks of water resource depletion and contamination, as well as disturbance to biodiversity. Measures to prevent, reduce and manage these risks will be examined in the context of an initiative ([3]) foreseen in the 2013 Commission Work Programme.

([1]) https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B5ID6gGygl3TdkJoWG5NZUw4WG8/edit.
([2]) http://www.aragon.es/estaticos/ImportFiles/06/docs/%C3%81reas/Biodiversidad/RedNatura2000/LugaresImportanciaComunitaria/Mapa%20LIC%203/40_ES2410069_SIERRA_ESDOLOMADA_MORRONES_GUEL.pdf
([3]) The study on environmental risks as well as more information on the 2013 initiative, subject to an impact assessment, are available on DG ENV's website:
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/unconventional_en.htm.

It falls to Member States to decide whether they will allow prospection, exploration and/or production of hydrocarbons on their territory. However, they have to ensure that any such project, including those involving hydraulic fracturing, complies with the existing EU legal framework, and notably its provisions on the protection of health and the environment ([4]).

([4]) For further information on the EU environmental legal framework applicable to unconventional hydrocarbons projects involving the use of high volume hydraulic fracturing, please refer to: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/pdf/legal_assessment.pdf A guidance note on the application of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive (2011/92/EU) to projects related to the exploration and exploitation of unconventional hydrocarbon is also available on DG ENV's website: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/pdf/Annexe%202.pdf

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-011578/12
til Kommissionen
Bendt Bendtsen (PPE)
(19. december 2012)

Om: Norske toldændringers konsekvenser for Norge og EU's eksport

I henhold til Kommissionens besvarelse af forespørgsel E-009410/2012 vedr. den norske regerings forslag om en omlægning fra specifik told til værditold på udvalgte landbrugsprodukter vil Kommissionen overveje alle muligheder for sanktioner eller gengældelsesforanstaltninger, såfremt ændringerne vedtages. Kommissionen henviser til, at ændringerne strider mod ånden i artikel 19 i EØS-aftalen.

Ændringerne blev vedtaget i det norske Storting den 12. december 2012. Dermed rammes europæiske producenter af hvide oste (med få undtagelser), oksekød og lammekød af en værditold på hhv. 277, 344 og 429 % pr. 1. januar 2013.

Kan Kommissionen sige noget mere konkret om, hvilke mulige sanktioner eller gengældelsesforanstaltninger der kan tages i brug? Kan ændringerne få konsekvenser for fremtidige forhandlinger om kvoter på landbrugs- og fiskeprodukter mellem Norge og EU?

Kan Kommissionen fremlægge konkrete beregninger på, hvad dette vil betyde for eksporten af hvid ost, oksekød og lammekød til Norge fra EU?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Dacian Cioloş
(26. februar 2013)

Kort tid efter, at Norge havde vedtaget den omlægning fra specifik told til værditold på bestemte oste, oksekød og lammekød, som det ærede medlem henviser til, indledte Kommissionens tjenestegrene en undersøgelse af, hvilke responsmuligheder der var adgang til. Dette arbejde pågår fortsat, så Kommissionen kan endnu ikke sige noget om resultatet.

Ifølge tallene fra Eurostat udgjorde eksporten af lammekød fra EU til Norge under de af omlægningen berørte toldpositioner 481 ton og 2,7 mio. EUR i 2011, mens eksporten af oksekød udgjorde 288 ton og 2,7 mio. EUR. Der findes ingen detaljerede tal for ost. Med hensyn til de handelsmæsige konsekvenser baseret på de foreliggende data og de mange forudsætninger, som virkningen af denne omlægning skal vurderes ud fra, er Kommissionen ikke i stand til forsyne det ærede medlem med specifikke og troværdige beregninger.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011578/12
to the Commission
Bendt Bendtsen (PPE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: The consequences of changes in Norwegian duties for Norway and for EU exports

According to the Commission's answer to Question E-009410/2012 concerning the Norwegian Government's proposal to change from specific duties to *ad valorem* duties for selected agricultural products, the Commission will consider all available options for sanctions or retaliatory measures should the changes be adopted. The Commission refers to the fact that the changes are contrary to the spirit of Article 19 of the European Economic Area (EEA) Agreement.

The changes were adopted in the Norwegian national assembly on 12 December 2012. As a result, European producers of white cheese (with a few exceptions), beef and lamb meat will face an *ad valorem* duty of 277%, 344% and 429%, respectively, from 1 January 2013.

Can the Commission comment in more detail on what potential sanctions or retaliatory measures could be used? Could the changes have consequences for future negotiations between Norway and the EU on quotas for agricultural and fishery products?

Can the Commission provide specific calculations in respect of what this will mean for exports of white cheese, beef and lamb meat to Norway from the EU?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 2013)

Shortly after the adoption by Norway of the change from specific to *ad valorem* duties for some cheese, beef and lamb meat that the Honourable Member is referring to, the Commission services launched an analysis of the legally available courses of response. This analysis is ongoing and the Commission is not at this stage of the procedure in a position to prejudge its outcome.

According to the Eurostat figures, exports in 2011 from the EU to Norway of lamb meat under the tariff lines concerned by the change amounted to 481 tons and EUR 2.7 million while exports of beef meat to 288 tons and EUR 2.7 million. Detailed data for cheese are not available. As regards the impact on trade, based on the available data and the numerous assumptions that would have to be made in order to estimate the impact of the above changes, the Commission is not in a position to provide the Honourable Member with specific and reliable calculations.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011579/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(19. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Sicherheitsbewertung kosmetischer Produkte — Interessen von Verbrauchern und KMU

In der GD SANCO Referat B-2 wurde der Entwurf einer Leitlinie zur Sicherheitsbewertung kosmetischer Produkte (Anhang-1-Leitlinie) vorgestellt; das Ziel besteht darin, den Verbraucherschutz zu verbessern. Tatsächlich gibt es aber Kritik aus betroffenen Kreisen, wonach Verbraucherinteressen verletzt und den KMU durch den Entwurf die Existenzgrundlage entzogen würde. Insbesondere wird eine gewisse Realitätsferne angeprangert, da die technischen Realitäten in den Mitgliedstaaten (GLP, NOAEL, Analysenzugänglichkeit, PAO-Irreführung, Vermeidbarkeitsdokumentation, schlicht fehlende Daten, Konsequenz aus MoS-Fehlen, TTC-Konzept …) weitgehend ignoriert würden. Zusätzliche Sicherheitsdokumente seien nicht der probate Weg zu einem tatsächlichen Mehr an Sicherheit. Zielführender seien Investitionen in hochwertige Rohstoffe und die Produktherstellung und nicht in neue bürokratische Formalitäten. Dabei könne es durch formalistische Hürden zum Verlust kleiner Unternehmen kommen. Außerdem befürchtet man das Ende purer Naturkosmetik aus Milch, Honig und Premium-Olivenöl vom Bauern, weil diese als Lebensmittel in Kosmetik eingearbeitet gelten und nach der Leitlinie der Kommission bei Hautkontakt als unsicher (keine Unterlagen = keine Sicherheit) eingestuft werden. Daraus resultiere der Verlust zahlreicher natürlicher Rohstoffe in Kosmetika, die von vielen Verbrauchern bevorzugt werden; stattdessen drohe ein Ersatz durch synthetische Petrochemikalien.

1. Wie steht die Kommission zu den Vorwürfen, wonach der durch die GD SANCO erarbeitete Vorschlag zur Sicherheitsbewertung kosmetischer Produkte zu einem massiven bürokratischen und kostenintensiven Mehraufwand für KMU führen würde?

2. Sieht der Entwurf der Kommission neben zusätzlichen bürokratischen Formalitäten auch Investitionen in hochwertige Rohstoffe und die qualitätsorientierte Produktherstellung vor? Wenn ja, in welcher Form?

3. Wurden bei der Erarbeitung des gegenständlichen Entwurfs Interessenvertreter von KMU aus der Kosmetikbranche mit einbezogen? Wenn ja, mit welchem Ergebnis?

4. Wie steht die Kommission zu der Befürchtung, dass der Vorschlag von DG SANCO das Aus für Naturkosmetik bedeuten könnte?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(11. Februar 2013)

Gemäß der Verordnung über kosmetische Mittel ([1]) muss die Sicherheit der in Verkehr gebrachten kosmetischen Mittel gewährleistet sein. Dies wird durch eine gestärkte Verantwortung der Hersteller und eine verbesserte Marktüberwachung erzielt.

In der Verordnung sind Mindestanforderungen für die Sicherheitsbewertung kosmetischer Mittel festgelegt ([2]). Da die zuvor geltende Richtlinie bereits eine Bewertung vorsah, sind nur denjenigen Unternehmen Kosten entstanden, die noch keine angemessene Sicherheitsbewertung ihrer Erzeugnisse eingerichtet hatten. Einige Kosten, wie zum Beispiel Verwaltungskosten für die Notifizierung, sind gesunken.

Im Leitfaden zu Anhang I wird Herstellern empfohlen, die von Lieferanten erteilten Auskünfte über höherwertige Rohstoffe heranzuziehen, zu deren Kauf sie aufgefordert werden. Grundsätzlich sollte die gute Herstellungspraxis eingehalten werden.

([1]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1223/2009 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 30. November 2009 über kosmetische Mittel, ABl. L 342 vom 22.12.2009, S. 59-209.

([2]) Arbeitspapier der Kommissionsdienststellen — Bericht über die Abschätzung der Folgen der Vereinfachung der „Kosmetikrichtlinie“ — Richtlinie 76/768/EWG — (KOM(2008)49 endg.) (SEK(2008)118).

Die KMU wurden durch UEAPME ([3]) in einer Expertengruppe vertreten, die der Kommission bei der Erstellung der Leitlinien zur Seite stand. Ihre Anregungen wurde berücksichtigt, insbesondere was die für sie erforderlichen Erläuterungen anbelangt. Außerdem flossen die Bedenken nationaler KMU-Zusammenschlüsse in die Erörterungen der Mitgliedstaaten ein. Da hinsichtlich der Sicherheit kosmetischer Mittel keine Kompromisse eingegangen werden können, sind KMU gezwungen, die Anforderungen in Anhang I zu erfüllen. Der Leitfaden wird den KMU ein nützliches Hilfsmittel sein, um von ihren Lieferanten die erforderlichen Informationen einzufordern und ihre Auftragnehmer, einschließlich des Sicherheitsbewerters, anzuleiten.

Naturkosmetika müssen den Anforderungen der Verordnung über kosmetische Mittel entsprechen. Der Leitfaden zu Anhang I verhindert das Inverkehrbringen sicherer Erzeugnisse nicht, sondern schreibt eine angemessene Sicherheitsbewertung durch einen qualifizierten Sicherheitsbewerter vor.

([3]) UEAPME steht für die Europäische Union des Handwerks und der Klein- und Mittelbetriebe und ist die Arbeitgeberorganisation, die sich auf europäischer Ebene für das Handwerk und die KMU einsetzt. Sie verfügt über ein Kosmetik-Forum und ist bereits Mitglied der Arbeitsgruppe zu kosmetischen Mitteln.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011579/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Assessment of product safety for cosmetics — Consumers' and SMEs' interests

In Unit B-2 of DG SANCO, draft guidelines have been submitted on the assessment of product safety for cosmetics (Guideline Annex-I); the aim is to improve consumer protection. There has however been criticism from the quarters concerned that the draft might be damaging to consumer interests and remove some SMEs' livelihood. In particular, there are complaints about the approach being somewhat unrealistic, since the technological realities in Member States (GLP, NOAEL, analysis accessibility, misleading PAO labelling, preventability documentation, completely missing data, consequences of MOS failures, TTC concept) have to a great extent been ignored. It has also been said that additional safety documents are not the tried and tested way to secure greater safety. It would be more useful to invest in higher-quality raw materials and product manufacturing, not in new bureaucratic formalities. Such bureaucratic hurdles can lead to the disappearance of small businesses. Moreover, there are fears that this will mean the end for pure natural cosmetics made from milk, honey and premium olive oil from farms, because these are deemed to be foodstuffs used in cosmetics and, under the Commission's guidelines, are classed as unsafe when brought into contact with skin (no documentary evidence = no safety). This would mean the disappearance of numerous natural raw materials from cosmetics, preferred by many consumers. There is a threat that synthetic petrochemicals might used in their place.

1. What is the Commission's response to the accusation that DG SANCO is drafting a proposal on safety assessment for cosmetic products which would generate a massive additional bureaucratic and cost-intensive burden for SMEs?

2. Does the Commission draft, alongside the additional bureaucratic formalities, also provide for investments in high-quality raw materials and quality-oriented product manufacturing methods? If so, in what form?

3. While this draft was being prepared, were parties representing the interests of SMEs in the cosmetics industry involved? If so, what has been the outcome of such involvement?

4. What is the Commission's stance on the concern that DG SANCO's proposal could mean the end for natural cosmetics?

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

The Cosmetics Regulation ([1]) requires that cosmetic products placed on the market are safe. This is achieved by a strengthened manufacturer's responsibility and improved market surveillance.

The regulation sets out minimum requirements for the cosmetics product safety assessment ([2]) (PSA). Given that the previous Directive required an assessment, costs have been encountered only for those companies which did not have an acceptable PSA previously. Some costs such as administrative costs for notification have been reduced.

The Guidelines on Annex I suggest that manufacturers use information provided by suppliers, inviting them to buy better quality raw materials for which the information is provided. As a general rule, good manufacturing practices should be respected.

SMEs were represented by UEAPME ([3]) in an expert group that assisted the Commission in preparing the Guidelines. Attention was paid to their suggestions, particularly as concerns explanations for SMEs. The concerns of national SME associations were channelled into the discussion by Member States. As no compromise can be made regarding the safety of cosmetic products, SMEs must follow the requirements of Annex I. The Guidelines will be a useful tool for SMEs to expect the necessary information from their suppliers and to instruct their contractors, including the safety assessor.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on cosmetic products, OJ L 342, 22.12.2009, p. 59-209.

([2]) Commission staff working paper — Impact assessment — Report on simplification of the 'Cosmetics Directive' — Directive 76/768/EEC (COM(2008)49 final) (SEC(2008)118).

([3]) UEAPME stands for Union Européenne de l'Artisanat et des Petites et Moyennes Entreprises. It is the employer's organisation representing the interests of European crafts, trades and SMEs at EU level, has a Cosmetics Forum and is already a member of the Working Group on Cosmetics.

Natural cosmetics must comply with the Cosmetics Regulation. The Guidelines on Annex I do not prevent any safe product from being placed on the market, but require that an accurate safety assessment is carried out by a qualified safety assessor.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011580/12
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Gibraltar on EU maps

Given that Gibraltar is a British overseas territory, why is it that, on the country maps that the general public can view on the European Union website, which is the responsibility of DG Communication, Gibraltar is absent from the United Kingdom map while the overseas territories of France, Spain and Portugal are all clearly marked?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

The map of the European Union published by the Commission on its website is for general information purposes. Gibraltar is shown in its geographical location. However, contrary to the outermost regions (referred to in Article 349 TFEU) which form part of respectively France, Spain and Portugal, Gibraltar does not form part of the United Kingdom; the EU treaties apply to Gibraltar, subject to the provisions of Article 28 of the 1972 Act of Accession, by virtue of Article 355(3) TFEU, as it is a European territory for whose external relations the United Kingdom is responsible.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011581/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(19. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Verhaftung vietnamesischer Bürger und Gewerkschaftsaktivisten

Seit Februar 2010 werden die vietnamesischen Staatsangehörigen und Gewerkschaftsaktivisten Doan Huy Chuong, Do Thi Minh Hang, und Nguyen Doan Quoc Hung aufgrund ihrer Aktivitäten bei der Mobilisierung von Arbeitern zu einer nicht dem Staat zugehörigen Gewerkschaft in einer Schuhfabrik in Vietnam willkürlich durch den vietnamesischen Staat in Haft gehalten. Beschäftigte der Schuhfabrik waren im Januar 2010 in den Streik getreten.

1. Sind die Vertreter der EU über die Festnahme, Verfolgung, Misshandlung und andauernde Inhaftierung von Doan Huy Chuong, Do Thi Minh Hang, und Nguyen Doan Quoc Hung im Bilde? Welche Schlussfolgerungen sind hinsichtlich der Rechtmäßigkeit ihrer Haft gezogen worden?

2. Haben Vertreter der EU die drei Arbeitsrechtler im Gefängnis besucht? Welche Haftbedingungen herrschen derzeit? Ist ihnen ein regelmäßiger Umgang mit der Familie gestattet?

3. Haben die Vertreter der EU untersucht, ob in der Schuhfabrik My Phong zum Zeitpunkt des Streiks Erzeugnisse für den europäischen Markt hergestellt worden sind?

4. Wird die Hohe Vertreterin die Schuldigsprechung und Inhaftierung von Doan Huy Chuong, Do Thi Minh Hang und Nguyen Doan Quoc Hung öffentlich missbilligen und Druck auf die vietnamesische Regierung ausüben, damit diese die drei Aktivisten freilässt und den Missbrauch von unklaren Gesetzen über staatliche Sicherheit beendet, in dessen Folge rechtmäßige Versammlungen und Meinungsäußerungen völkerrechtswidrig unter Strafe gestellt werden?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(8. März 2013)

Die EU verfolgt diese Fälle über ihre Delegation in Hanoi. Sie wurden in die EU-Liste besonders gefährdeter Menschen (Persons of Concern — POC) aufgenommen. Das neue Partnerschafts- und Kooperationsabkommen (PKA) zwischen der EU und Vietnam enthält wichtige Menschenrechtsklauseln, die eine Intensivierung des Dialogs und der Zusammenarbeit zur Förderung der Menschenrechte ermöglichen. Der im Rahmen des PKA aufgenommene verstärkte Menschenrechtsdialog bietet die Möglichkeit, alle in der POC-Liste aufgeführten Fälle zu erörtern.

Vertreter der EU waren bei der Gerichtsverhandlung nicht anwesend. Wiederholte Anträge der EU-Delegation, in der POC-Liste aufgeführte Personen besuchen zu können, wurden meist abgelehnt oder erst gar nicht beantwortet. Üblicherweise können Inhaftierte einmal im Monat Besuch von ihren Familien bekommen. Die EU hat immer wieder ihre Besorgnis über die Lage der Verfechter von Demokratie und Menschenrechten zum Ausdruck gebracht und Vietnam auf seine internationalen Verpflichtungen hingewiesen.

Die EU wird über ihre Delegation in Hanoi prüfen lassen, ob die Fabrik in die EU exportiert. Was die Arbeitnehmerrechte betrifft, so finanziert die EU entsprechende Projekte im Rahmen des Europäischen Instruments für Demokratie und Menschenrechte.

Die EU äußert ihre Besorgnis auch auf bilateralen Treffen wie vor kurzem bei den Gesprächen des Generalsekretärs der Kommunistischen Partei mit den Präsidenten des Europäischen Rates und der Kommission am 17. Januar 2013.

Vor dem Hintergrund dieser laufenden Tätigkeiten im Bereich der Menschenrechte wird eine öffentliche Verurteilung dieses spezifischen Falles zum gegenwärtigen Zeitpunkt nicht in Betracht gezogen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011581/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Arrest of Vietnamese citizens and labour activists

Since February 2010 Vietnamese citizens and labour activists Doan Huy Chuong, Do Thi Minh Hang, and Nguyen Doan Quoc Hung have been arbitrarily detained by the Vietnamese Government as a result of their activities in organising workers for a non-government-affiliated union at a shoe factory in Vietnam. Employees at the shoe factory went on strike in January 2010.

1. Have EU representatives monitored the arrest, prosecution, mistreatment, and continued imprisonment of Doan Huy Chuong, Do Thi Minh Hang, and Nguyen Doan Quoc Hung? What conclusions have been reached regarding the legality of their detention?

2. Have EU representatives visited the three labour organisers in prison? What are the current conditions of their detention and are they allowed regular access to family?

3. Have EU representatives inquired as to whether the My Phong shoe factory was producing products for the European market at the time of the strike?

4. Will the High Representative publicly condemn the conviction and imprisonment of Doan Huy Chuong, Do Thi Minh Hang, and Nguyen Doan Quoc Hung and press the Vietnamese Government to release the three activists and end its misuse of vague national security laws to punish legitimate associative and expressive activities in violation of international law?

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

The EU is monitoring these cases through its Delegation in Hanoi. They are included in the EU list of Persons of Concern (POC). The new EU-Vietnam Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA) includes significant clauses on human rights, allowing intensifying dialogue and cooperation aimed at promoting human rights. The enhanced Dialogue on Human Rights established under the PCA provides the opportunity to discuss all cases included on the POC list.

The EU did not attend the trial. Recurrent requests by the EU Delegation to visit persons on the POC list have mostly been declined or left unanswered. Standard access by family for people in detention is one visit per month. The EU has repeatedly expressed its concerns as regards the situation of pro-democracy and human rights activists, reminding Vietnam of its international obligations.

The EU will inquire through its Delegation in Hanoi whether the factory exports to the EU. On the issue of labour rights the EU is funding relevant projects under the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights.

The EU also raises its concerns in bilateral meetings, most recently during the meetings with the General-Secretary of the Communist Party and the Presidents of the European Council and of the Commission on 17 January 2013.

Against the background of these ongoing activities in the field of human rights, a public condemnation of this specific case is not envisaged at this stage.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011582/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(19 de diciembre de 2012)

Asunto: Excavación y nivelación de tierras en Parco dei Monti Simbruini (Parque del Monte Simbruini) en la región del Lazio, Italia

En 2004 se iniciaron los trabajos de excavación y movimiento de tierras, causando daños en los árboles, con vistas a construir una pista de esquí de fondo en el Parque del Monte Simbruini en la región del Lazio (creado por la ley regional n° 8 de 29 de enero de 1983) en la SPA IT60500008 «Simbruini y Ernici». Posteriormente, los ciudadanos y las asociaciones informaron de los trabajos en curso a las autoridades competentes. En noviembre de 2004 la Administración Forestal Nacional de Subiaco procedió a un embargo preventivo de conformidad con el artículo 321 del Código de Procedimiento Penal por:

— no haber informado a la Superintendencia del Patrimonio Natural del parecer *pro veritate* sobre las variantes de los trabajos realizados elaborado por el Parque Natural Regional del Monte Simbruini mediante nota n° 4721 de 14 de octubre de 2004, de conformidad con el artículo 146 del Decreto Legislativo n° 42 de 22 de enero de 2004;

— no haber solicitado una evaluación de impacto de conformidad con el artículo 5 del Decreto del Presidente de la República n° 357, de 8 de septiembre de 1997, «Reglamento por el que se aplica la Directiva 92/43/CEE relativa a la conservación de los hábitats naturales y de la fauna y flora silvestres»;

— daños y deterioro de la naturaleza de conformidad con el artículo 734 del Código de Procedimiento Penal;

No obstante, los procedimientos penales mencionados relativos al embargo del terreno emprendido en noviembre de 2004 ya han expirado a causa de ley de prescripción. El 2 de octubre de 2012 se reanudaron los trabajos, utilizando bulldozers y material mecánico, para la construcción y terminación de la pista de Campaegli Cervara en el municipio de Roma, en el Parque del Monte Simbruini de la región del Lazio y, en particular, en la SPA IT60500008 «Simbruini y Ernici». No obstante, no está claro si se han eliminado las irregularidades y las violaciones de la ley y de las directrices establecidas por la Administración Forestal Nacional en noviembre de 2004. Además, de conformidad con el artículo 6 de la Directiva del Consejo 92/43/CEE, de 21 de mayo de 1992, relativa a la conservación de los hábitats naturales y de la fauna y flora silvestres, debe realizarse una evaluación de impacto antes de que comiencen los trabajos en los lugares de Natura 2000.

¿Está la Comisión al corriente de estos hechos recientes?

¿Puede confirmar que los trabajos de construcción reanudados para terminar la pista en el Parque del Monte Simbruini, en la SPA IT60500008 «Simbruini y Ernici», se están realizando de conformidad con las directivas europeas relativas a la protección del medio ambiente de las zonas de protección especial (ZPE)?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(13 de febrero de 2013)

La Comisión no estaba al corriente de los trabajos de construcción de una pista de esquí de fondo en la zona especial de protección IT60500008, designada por Italia en virtud de la «Directiva sobre aves» ([1]). Ni esta Directiva ni la «Directiva sobre hábitats» ([2]) prohíben las pistas de esquí de fondo dentro de lugares designados.

Las autoridades nacionales competentes deben determinar, caso por caso, si un proyecto puede ocasionar efectos negativos importantes en las especies y hábitats de que se trate. Únicamente deben autorizarlo cuando tengan la seguridad de que no incidirá negativamente en la integridad del lugar. Si se estima que un proyecto va a incidir negativamente en un lugar, solo puede llevarse a cabo si se cumplen las condiciones de exención, recogidas en el artículo 6, apartado 4, de la Directiva sobre hábitats.

Los Estados miembros aplican y hacen cumplir la normativa de la UE primordialmente a través de sus autoridades administrativas y judiciales.

([1]) Directiva 2009/147/CE, DO L 20 de 26.1.2010.
([2]) Directiva 92/43/CEE, DO L 206 de 22.7.1992.

A la vista de la información disponible, la Comisión no constata ninguna posible infracción de las disposiciones anteriormente mencionadas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011582/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Excavation and earthmoving in Parco dei Monti Simbruini (Simbruini Mountain Park) in the Lazio region (Italy)

In 2004 excavation and earthmoving work, resulting in damage to trees, was begun with a view to building a cross-country ski slope in the Lazio Regional Simbruini Mountain Park (established by Regional Law No 8 of 29 January 1983) within SPA IT60500008 'Simbruini and Ernici'. Citizens and associations subsequently reported the work in progress to the competent authorities. In November 2004 the State Forestry Corps of Subiaco performed preventive seizure pursuant to Article 321 of the Criminal Procedure Code (PC) for:

— failure to inform the Superintendence of Environmental Heritage of the fairness opinion on the variants of the work performed issued by the Natural Regional Park of Simbruini Mountains by Note No 4721 of 14.10.2004, pursuant to Article 146 of Legislative Decree No 42 of 22 January 2004;

— failure to require an impact assessment pursuant to Article 5 of the Decree of the President of the Republic of September 8, 1997, 357 'Regulation for implementing Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora';

— damage and disfigurement of nature Article 734 of the PC;

However, the abovementioned criminal proceedings concerning the yard seizure of November 2004 were launched because the statute of limitations has now expired. On 2 October 2012 work resumed, using bulldozers and mechanical equipment, on the construction and completion of the trail in the plain of Campaegli Cervara in the Municipality of Rome, in the Lazio Regional Park of Simbruini Mountains and, in particular, in the SPA IT60500008 'Simbruini and Ernici.' It is not clear, however, whether the illegalities and violations of laws and guidelines laid down by the State Forestry Corps in November 2004 have been overcome. Furthermore, pursuant to Article 6 of Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, an impact assessment must be completed in advance for work to be carried out at Natura 2000 sites.

Is the Commission aware of these latest developments?

Can it confirm that the construction work which has been resumed on the completion of the trail in Parco dei Monti Simbruini in SPA IT60500008 'Simbruini and Ernici' is being carried out in accordance with the European directives on the protection of the environment of Special Protection Areas (SPAs)?

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

The Commission was not aware of works to build a cross-country ski piste in the Special Protection Area IT60500008, designated by Italy under the 'Birds Directive' ([1]). Neither this directive nor the 'Habitats' Directive ([2]) prohibit cross-country ski pistes within designated sites.

Competent national authorities have to assess, on a case-by-case basis, whether a project could cause significant negative effects on relevant species and habitats. They should only authorise it once certain that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the site. If a project is thought to adversely affect the site, then it may proceed only if the derogation conditions, set out in Article 6(4) of the Habitats Directive, are met.

Primarily, Member States implement and enforce EC law with their administrative and judicial authorities.

On the basis of the available information, the Commission cannot identify any potential breach of the abovementioned provisions.

([1]) Directive 2009/147/EC, OJ L 020, 26.1.2010.
([2]) Directive 92/43/EEC, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011583/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE) και Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(19 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ορθή μεταχείριση των εκτρεφόμενων ιχθύων

Η ΕΕ και τα κράτη μέλη έχουν ορισμένες υποχρεώσεις ως μέλη του Παγκόσμιου Οργανισμού για την Υγεία των Ζώων (OIE) και ως μέρη της Ευρωπαϊκής Σύμβασης για την προστασία των ζώων στις εκτροφές. Η Επιτροπή αναγνώρισε ότι οι συστάσεις που εγκρίθηκαν με βάση τη σύμβαση αυτή αποτελούν αναπόσπαστο τμήμα της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ. Η ΕΕ και τα κράτη μέλη είναι υποχρεωμένα να εφαρμόσουν τη σύσταση σχετικά με τους εκτρεφόμενους ιχθύς, η οποία εγκρίθηκε στο πλαίσιο της σύμβασης.

Η ΕΕ πρέπει επίσης να εφαρμόσει τις συστάσεις του OIE όσον αφορά την ορθή μεταχείριση των εκτρεφόμενων ιχθύων κατά τη μεταφορά τους και κατά τη σφαγή τους. Η Επιτροπή δήλωσε ότι πρόκειται για διεθνή πρότυπα ορθής μεταχείρισης που έχουν συμφωνηθεί μεταξύ των κρατών μελών του OIE αλλά δεν εμπεριέχουν νομική δέσμευση. Εντούτοις, είναι προφανές ότι, εφόσον η ΕΕ συμφώνησε να εγκρίνει ο OIE τις συστάσεις σχετικά με τους εκτρεφόμενους ιχθύς, σκόπευε, ως ένδειξη καλής πίστης, να τηρήσει και να εφαρμόσει τις συστάσεις αυτές.

Τι είδους μέτρα σκοπεύει να λάβει η Επιτροπή για να ενθαρρύνει τα κράτη μέλη να εφαρμόσουν τις εν λόγω συστάσεις σχετικά με τους εκτρεφόμενους ιχθύς, οι οποίες εγκρίθηκαν στο πλαίσιο της Ευρωπαϊκής Σύμβασης και από τον OIE;

Απάντηση του κ. Borg εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(18 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Όσον αφορά την ορθή μεταχείριση των εκτρεφόμενων ιχθύων κατά τη θανάτωσή τους, η Επιτροπή προγραμματίζει για τα έτη 2013 και 2014 να συλλέξει στοιχεία, σχετικά με τις τρέχουσες πρακτικές τις οποίες εφαρμόζουν τα κράτη μέλη για αυτό το ζήτημα. Συνεπώς, τα στοιχεία που διατίθενται επιδεικνύουν σε ποιό βαθμό το άρθρο 19 (θανάτωση έκτακτης ανάγκης) της σύστασης του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης και οι κατευθυντήριες γραμμές των δύο κεφαλαίων του Παγκόσμιου Οργανισμού για την Υγεία των Ζώων (OIE) με τίτλο «Πτυχές καλής μεταχείρισης που αφορούν την αναισθητοποίηση και θανάτωση εκτρεφόμενων ιχθύων που προορίζονται για ανθρώπινη κατανάλωση ([1])» και «Θανάτωση εκτρεφόμενων ιχθύων για σκοπούς καταπολέμησης ασθενειών ([2])», εφαρμόζονται στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ.

Το 2012 το Γραφείο Τροφίμων και Κτηνιατρικών Θεμάτων της Γενικής Διεύθυνσης Υγείας και Καταναλωτών της Επιτροπής, σε συνεργασία με τους ελεγκτές άλλων ζητημάτων, έλεγξαν το βαθμό εφαρμογής της σύστασης του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης, σχετικά με τους εκτρεφόμενους ιχθύς ([3]), σε επτά κράτη μέλη.

Τα δεδομένα αυτά θα αποτελέσουν μέρος του συνοδευτικού υλικού της έκθεσης ([4]), την οποία η Επιτροπή υποχρεούται να υποβάλει στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και το Συμβούλιο το αργότερο έως το τέλος του 2014, σχετικά με την αξιολόγηση της σκοπιμότητας εισαγωγής συγκεκριμένων απαιτήσεων, οι οποίες αφορούν την προστασία των ιχθύων κατά τη θανάτωσή τους, λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τις πτυχές της ορθής μεταχείρισης των ζώων, καθώς και τις κοινωνικοοικονομικές και περιβαλλοντικές επιπτώσεις.

([1]) http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171&L=0&htmfile=chapitre_1.7.3.htm
([2]) http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171&L=0&htmfile=chapitre_1.7.4.htm
([3]) http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal_affairs/legal_co-operation/biological_safety_and_use_of_animals/farming/Rec%20fish%20E.asp#TopOfPage.
([4]) Άρθρο 27 παράγραφος 1 του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1099/2009 του Συμβουλίου της 24ης Σεπτεμβρίου 2009 για την προστασία των ζώων κατά τη θανάτωσή τους, ΕΕ L 303 της 18.11.2009, σ. 1.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-011583/12
till kommissionen
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE) och Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(19 december 2012)

Angående: Djurskydd för odlad fisk

EU och medlemsstaterna har vissa skyldigheter i egenskap av medlemmar i Världsorganisationen för djurhälsa (OIE) och parter i den europeiska konventionen om skydd av animalieproduktionens djur. Kommissionen har fastslagit att rekommendationer som antagits i enlighet med konventionen är en del av EU:s lagstiftning. EU och medlemsstaterna är skyldiga att genomföra den rekommendation om odlad fisk som har antagits i enlighet med konventionen.

EU bör också verkställa de OIE-rekommendationer som rör djurskydd för odlad fisk under transport och vid slakt. Kommissionen har sagt att dessa rekommendationer utgör internationella djurskyddsnormer som OIE:s medlemsländer har enats om, men att de inte är rättsligt bindande i sig. När EU biföll OIE:s antagande av dessa rekommendationer om odlad fisk var avsikten dock säkerligen att respektera och genomdriva dem.

Vilka åtgärder vidtar kommissionen för att uppmuntra medlemsstaterna att verkställa ovannämnda rekommendationer om odlad fisk, antagna i enlighet med den europeiska konventionen och av OIE?

Svar från Tonio Borg på kommissionens vägnar
(18 februari 2013)

I fråga om djurskydd för odlad fisk vid tidpunkten för avlivning planerar kommissionen att under 2013 och 2014 samla in information om aktuell praxis i medlemsstaterna. Den information som då inkommer bör visa i vilken utsträckning EU-länderna tillämpar artikel 19 (nödslakt) i Europarådets rekommendation och de två vägledande kapitlen från Världsorganisationen för djurhälsa (OIE) om djurskyddsaspekter vid bedövning och avlivning av odlad fisk som är avsedd som livsmedel (Welfare aspects of stunning and killing of farmed fish for human consumption ([1])) och om avlivning av odlad fisk för sjukdomsbestämning (Killing of farmed fish for disease control purposes ([2])).

Under 2012 kontrollerade kontoret för livsmedels- och veterinärfrågor vid kommissionens generaldirektorat för hälso- och konsumentfrågor i samband med granskningar av andra frågor i vilken utsträckning Europarådets rekommendation om odlad fisk ([3]) hade genomförts i sju EU-länder.

Denna information kommer att utgöra en del av underlaget för den rapport ([4]) som kommissionen senast i slutet av 2014 ska lämna till Europaparlamentet och rådet om bedömningen av möjligheten att införa vissa krav när det gäller skydd av fisk vid tidpunkten för avlivning med hänsyn till djurskyddsaspekter, samhällsekonomisk inverkan och miljöpåverkan.

([1]) http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171&L=0&htmfile=chapitre_1.7.3.htm
([2]) http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171&L=0&htmfile=chapitre_1.7.4.htm
([3]) http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal_affairs/legal_co-operation/biological_safety_and_use_of_animals/farming/Rec%20fish%20E.asp#TopOfPage.
([4]) Artikel 27.1 i rådets förordning (EG) nr 1099/2009 av den 24 september 2009 om skydd av djur vid tidpunkten för avlivning (EUT L 303, 18.11.2009, s. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011583/12
to the Commission
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE) and Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Welfare of farmed fish

The EU and the Member States have certain obligations as members of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) and parties to the European Convention for the Protection of Animals kept for Farming Purposes. The Commission has recognised that Recommendations adopted under the Convention are an integral part of the body of EU legislation. The EU and the Member States are obliged to implement the recommendation concerning Farmed Fish that has been adopted under the Convention.

The EU should also give effect to the OIE Recommendations concerning the welfare of farmed fish during transport and at slaughter. The Commission has said that these are international welfare standards agreed between the OIE member countries, but that they are not legally binding as such. However, presumably when the EU agreed to the adoption by the OIE of its Recommendations on farmed fish, it intended, as a matter of good faith, to respect and give effect to them.

What steps is the Commission taking to encourage the Member States to give effect to the above Recommendations adopted under the European Convention and by the OIE concerning farmed fish?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

With regard to the welfare of farmed fish at the time of killing, the Commission plans for 2013 and 2014 to collect information on current practices in the Member States on this issue. The information thus provided should demonstrate to which extent Article 19 (emergency killing) of the Council of Europe recommendation and the two guideline chapters of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) 'Welfare aspects of stunning and killing of farmed fish for human consumption' ([1]) and 'Killing of farmed fish for disease control purposes' ([2]) are being applied in the EU Member States.

In 2012, the Food and Veterinary Office of the Commission's Health and Consumers Directorate General in combination with audits on other issues checked the degree of implementation of the Council of Europe recommendation concerning farmed fish ([3]) in seven Member States.

These data will form part of the background material in the report ([4]) the Commission is required to submit at the latest by end of 2014 to the European Parliament and to the Council on assessing the opportunity of introducing certain requirements regarding the protection of fish at time of killing taking into account animal welfare aspects as well as socioeconomic and environmental impacts.

([1]) http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171&L=0&htmfile=chapitre_1.7.3.htm
([2]) http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=171&L=0&htmfile=chapitre_1.7.4.htm
([3]) http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal_affairs/legal_cooperation/biological_safety_and_use_of_animals/farming/Rec%20fish%20E.asp#TopOfPage.
([4]) Article 27(1) Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 of 24 September 2009 on the protection of animals at time of killing, OJ L 303, 18.11.2009, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011585/12
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Animal welfare in Romania

In recent weeks I have received many letters from constituents in relation to cruelty to animals in Romania. What mechanisms are in place to ensure that EU animal welfare standards are observed in the Member States?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(1 February 2013)

Each Member State is responsible for the implementation of the Community legislation on animal welfare (adoption of implementing measures before a specified deadline, conformity and correct application) within its own legal system.

The Commission is responsible for ensuring that the EC law is correctly applied, and audits regularly Member States' compliance with the requirement of EU animal welfare legislation.

Where a Member State fails to comply with EC law, the Commission may start infringement proceedings against that Member State and, where necessary, refer the case to the European Court of Justice.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011586/12
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Ban on baby boxes

'Baby boxes', or boxes where parents can leave an unwanted baby, common in mediaeval Europe, have been making a comeback over the last 10 years. Supporters say a heated box, monitored by nurses, is better for babies than abandonment on the street — but the UN says it violates the rights of the child.

Does the Commission have any plans to ban 'baby boxes' in the European Union, given that there are nearly 200 currently in existence across many Member States?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(4 February 2013)

The question of the use of baby boxes or baby hatches, where parents can leave an unwanted baby, is a matter of individual Member State competence and the Commission has no plans to legislate in this area.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011588/12
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Impact of Croatian accession

In the spring of 2011 the European Commission launched plans to cut its administration costs by EUR 6 billion by 2020. This was in response to concerns raised by Member States and the European Parliament surrounding apparent inefficiencies. These proposals included a goal of cutting 1% of Commission staff each year for a total of five years. The plans also included a pledge not to create new jobs in this period.

Given the premise for these proposals — to practise greater efficiency at a time of global economic uncertainty — can the Commission provide a response to the following queries?

1. The accession of Croatia to the European Union is set to occur on 1 July 2013. What assurances can the Commission provide that the added administrative burden brought about by this development will not negatively impact the realisation of a 1% cut in staff in 2013?

2. Can the Commission provide specific estimates of the number of jobs that will be cut within its staff in each of the next three years, taking into account the Croatian accession? In doing so, can it state the total number of staff that will be employed at the beginning and the end of each year?

3. With reference to the next three years, can the Commission provide a breakdown of the location of the redundancies that are scheduled to take place within its organisation chart?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(11 February 2013)

1. The Commission proposed to reduce its staff by 5%, starting from 2012 staffing levels, without prejudice of reinforcements linked to the enlargement to Croatia. The corresponding needs — 384 full time equivalent jobs (FTEs), all staff categories included to be recruited between 2012 and 2014 — were communicated to the budgetary authority in the Amendment letter No 2 of the Draft Budget 2012. Details on these specific reinforcements and request for confirmation have been /are being presented to the Budget Authority in the framework of the annual budget procedures.

2. The savings corresponding to the announced staff cuts, more precisely the first 1% cut, have already being reflected in the draft budget presented for 2013 which included a reduction of 250 establishment plan posts and also a freeze of the appropriations for external staff. Taking into account the expected inflation rate, this freeze should represent a 1% decrease of the available Full time equivalent jobs (FTEs) for external personnel in real terms. Details for 2014 will be given in the Draft Budget which is expected to be adopted by the Commission in April and submitted to the Budget Authority afterwards.

3. The MFF 2014-2020 will have a major impact on the Commission's tasks and therefore on the organisation of its services. The position that the Council will adopt on this issue remains uncertain at this stage. Therefore, three year projections not taking into account the financial framework covering the period cannot lead to meaningful results.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011589/12
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Cross-compliance breaches

Would the Commission identify the number of cross-compliance breaches in each Member State in 2011 and indicate the reasons for each breach?

In addition, would the Commission identify the number of cross-compliance and land eligibility inspections carried out in each Member State in 2011?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(13 February 2013)

Concerning the information regarding on-the-spot-checks and breaches of the Cross-Compliance requirements in the Member States, the latest available statistics concerns financial year 2011 in respect of claim year 2010. Two tables are annexed one of which contains the number of claimants, the number of on-the-spot-checks and the number of claimants sanctioned (Annex I) and the other contains the total amount of aid paid to all claimants, to the claimants checked and the total amount of sanctions per Member State (Annex II). These sanctions are implemented through aid reductions.

Concerning the information regarding the on-the-spot-checks for land eligibility, it is also annexed as a table for financial year 2011 with the total amount of aid paid to all claimants, to the claimants checked and the total amount of sanctions per Member State (Annex III). These sanctions are implemented through aid reductions.

Annexes I and III can be found in the 2011 annual activity report of DG AGRI with an explanatory summary ([1]).

The same information for financial year 2012, claim year 2011, is currently being finalised and will be available in the 2012 annual activity report of DG AGRI.

([1]) Pages 98 and 116 of annexes and pages 39 and 46 of AAR 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011590/12
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Financial package for Egypt

The EU recently approved a EUR 6.4 bn financial package for Egypt. Whilst this is welcomed, ensuring that Egypt becomes a stable and democratic state, what is the substantial financial package going to be used for, and will there be checks and balances placed on the aid by the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

During the 13-14 November 2012 EU-Egypt Task Force meeting, EU and international financial institutions, including the European Investment Bank (EIB) and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) pledged EUR 5 billion over 2012 and 2013 to Egypt. In particular, the EIB and the EBRD are expected to offer the full bulk of the financing in the form of concessional loans.

Under this package the EU offered additional financial assistance of EUR 753 million in grants and loans, including EUR 90 million from the SPRING (Support for Partnership Reform and Inclusive Growth) programme., EUR 163 million from the Neighbourhood Investment Facility and up to EUR 500 million of Macro Financial Assistance (EUR 450 million as a loan with 50 million as a grant component).

EU support will be mainly directed to supporting the highly needed Government Socio-Economic Recovery Programme currently under negotiation with the IMF. The EIB and EBRD loan operations are intended to support infrastructure projects in the poorest areas for the provision of public services to citizens such as Water and Wastewater, Energy, Urban Transport, etc.

Furthermore, the additional financial assistance pledged by the Commission in the form of grants has to follow the new European Neighbourhood Policy principles and approach formulated in the aftermath of the Arab Spring and notably by applying its new incentive-based approach.

The checks and balances will be applied to the EU support component through the existing mechanisms put in place under the European Neighbourhood Policy (progress reports and political dialogue) and through EuropeAid's implementation, monitoring, accrediting and evaluation systems.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011591/12
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Erasmus programme

For decades the Erasmus programme has had a track record for enabling young people from across Europe to study in another country. Committing and investing in youth must continue to be a priority.

Will the European Union ensure that education and youth programmes are a priority in the budget negotiations under the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(13 February 2013)

The Commission fully agrees with the statement of the Honourable Member that investing in youth must continue to be a priority. For this reason, the Commission proposed an overall budget for 'Erasmus for All', the new EU programme in the area of education, training, youth and sport, of 17.4 billion Euros (in current prices) over the period 2014-2020, representing a 70% increase compared to current spending levels. The Commission will strongly defend the proposed budget for 'Erasmus for All' during the negotiations on the 2014-2020 Multiannual Financial Framework.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011592/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diane Dodds (NI)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Hamas attacks on Israel

Terrorist forces in Gaza have been pushing a very clear agenda to destabilise peace and heighten tension in the region. Hamas has no plans to engage with Israel towards a peace dividend or to improve the lives of the Palestinian people.

With an escalation in rocket attacks against the Israeli state, what does the EU plan to do to help with the pursuit of peace and to build confidence between the respective Israeli and Palestinian Governments?

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

Regarding Gaza, the EU is committed to consolidating the ceasefire. It is essential to continue working towards an unconditional opening of the crossings and to create a climate of security in the region which must include a stop to arms smuggling into Gaza. Work is ongoing to define options for concrete EU action.

The EU wants to see the development of an internationally supported framework for direct negotiations between the parties. We are working with our partners within the Quartet as well as in the region to create such a framework.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011593/12
à la Commission
Philippe Juvin (PPE)
(19 décembre 2012)

Objet: Recours collectifs

Le programme de travail 2012 de la Commission européenne prévoit la mise en place de règles communes sur les recours collectifs. Le Parlement européen, dans sa résolution de février 2012, a appelé de ses vœux un cadre juridiquement contraignant comprenant un ensemble de principes communs garantissant un accès uniforme à la justice au sein de l'Union par la voie du recours collectif, sous réserve de l'introduction de garanties solides afin d'éviter les recours abusifs (interdiction des dommages-intérêts punitifs, mise en place d'un système fondé sur l'«opt-in», etc.).

Après l'avoir annoncée fin 2011, la Commission a pris l'engagement de présenter une communication d'ici la fin de l'année 2012 ainsi qu'une proposition législative concernant les actions en dommages et intérêts pour infraction aux règles sur les ententes et abus de position dominante. Le nouveau commissaire à la santé et à la protection des consommateurs a par ailleurs souligné, lors de son processus de confirmation par le Parlement européen, qu'une priorité majeure de son mandat serait la mise en œuvre rapide de systèmes de recours efficaces, parmi lesquels les recours collectifs. Après nombre de consultations et travaux menés dans le domaine de la consommation et de la concurrence depuis des années, les modalités d'un recours efficace et encadré ont été assez débattues.

1. Étant donné l'absence de référence à la mise en place d'un mécanisme de recours collectif dans le programme de travail 2013 de la Commission présenté en octobre, la Commission compte-elle toujours présenter une communication et une proposition législative en la matière? Si tel est le cas, selon quel calendrier?

2. Si tel n'est pas le cas, quelles sont les raisons motivant cette décision?

Réponse donnée par Mme Reding au nom de la Commission
(1er mars 2013)

Nous informons l'Honorable Parlementaire que la Commission, conformément à son programme de travail 2012, poursuit ses travaux concernant les recours collectifs. Elle réfléchit actuellement à la meilleure approche à adopter, en tenant pleinement compte de la résolution du Parlement européen «Vers une approche européenne cohérente en matière de recours collectif».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011593/12
to the Commission
Philippe Juvin (PPE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Collective redress

The Commission's 2012 work programme provides for the creation of common rules on collective redress. In its resolution of February 2012 the European Parliament called for a legally binding framework comprising a body of common principles guaranteeing uniform access to justice within the EU by means of collective redress, subject to the introduction of strong safeguards in order to prevent abusive actions (prohibition of punitive damages, setting up an opt-in system, and so on).

After announcing it at the end of 2011, the Commission undertook to present a communication by the end of 2012 and a legislative proposal on actions for damages for infringement of the rules on agreements and abuse of a dominant position. The new Commissioner for Health and Consumer Policy stated at his hearing before the European Parliament that a major priority of his mandate would be to implement quickly effective systems of redress, including collective redress. After a great deal of consultations and work conducted in the field of consumers and competition over a number of years, the detailed rules in respect of effective and controlled redress have been sufficiently discussed.

1. Given the absence of any reference to the creation of a mechanism for collective redress in the Commission's 2013 work programme presented in October, does the Commission still intend to present a communication and a legislative proposal in this area? If so, what is the expected timetable for this?

2. If not, what are the reasons for that decision?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(1 March 2013)

The Honourable Member should be aware that in accordance with the Commission Work Programme 2012, the Commission continues its work on collective redress. It is presently considering the most appropriate course of action to be followed, taking full account of the resolution of the European Parliament 'Towards a coherent European approach to collective redress.'

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011594/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(19 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: Possibili finanziamenti per l'associazione ONLUS denominata Anagramma a sostegno delle persone diversamente abili

L'associazione ONLUS Anagramma è nata nel 2009 con l'obiettivo di promuovere principalmente iniziative sociali e culturali a sostegno delle persone diversamente abili. In particolare, l'associazione Anagramma, presente nel IV Municipio nel Comune di Roma, ha «sviluppato» insieme ad un istituto di vigilanza un particolare dispositivo elettronico che serve a rintracciare i diversamente abili che si trovano in stato di pericolo. Tale dispositivo elettronico permette alla persona di essere immediatamente soccorsa dalle pattuglie di vigilantes dislocate sul territorio, attivando con una semplice pressione un tasto che è collegato alla centrale operativa.

Si tratta di un progetto ideato con particolare riguardo alle categorie svantaggiate: persone diversamente abili, donne, anziani e bambini.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione:

1. far sapere se esistono possibili finanziamenti per il progetto suesposto;

2. indicare quali azioni o programmi sono previsti a tutela delle persone diversamente abili nella nuova Programmazione 2014-2020; e

3. fornire un quadro generale della situazione?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(19 febbraio 2013)

Come previsto dalla Strategia europea sulla disabilità 2010-2020, la Commissione attua politiche e azioni a livello unionale e sostiene gli sforzi compiuti a livello nazionale per promuovere l'inclusione e la piena partecipazione delle persone con disabilità in tutti gli aspetti della vita ([1]).

In questo contesto la Commissione sostiene anche la ricerca su tecnologie innovative, sia standard che abilitanti, in materia di accessibilità.

La Commissione non finanzia direttamente le attività di organizzazioni nazionali o locali quali ONLUS Anagramma. Tali associazioni possono però fruire dei contributi erogati dai Fondi strutturali europei, in particolare dal Fondo sociale europeo (FSE), partecipando a specifici inviti a presentare proposte nel quadro dei programmi operativi gestiti dall'autorità competente a livello regionale (in questo caso la Regione Lazio) o nazionale. Tra le priorità di investimento previste dalla proposta della Commissione concernente il regolamento relativo al Fondo sociale europeo per il periodo 2014-2020 figurano la «promozione dell'inclusione sociale e la lotta alla povertà».

L'associazione ONLUS Anagramma potrebbe essere ammessa a beneficiare del sostegno alla ricerca e all'innovazione. Gli attuali programmi di lavoro non contengono inviti a presentare proposte in questo specifico settore. Suggeriamo tuttavia agli interessati di seguire l'evoluzione del nuovo programma quadro dell'UE per la ricerca e l'innovazione per il periodo 2014-2020 (Orizzonte 2020) e del relativo invito a presentare proposte, di prossima pubblicazione.

Ulteriori possibilità di finanziamento potranno derivare da altri programmi dell'UE, come il programma per la «Salute» 2008-2013 ([2]), per il quale saranno prossimamente pubblicati inviti a presentare proposte ([3]).

([1]) «Un rinnovato impegno per un'Europa senza barriere», COM(2010)0636 definitivo: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:it:NOT e elenco delle azioni per il periodo 2010-2015, SEC(2010)1324 definitivo: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:IT:NOT.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/policy/2008-2013/index_en.htm

([3]) Un elenco dei settori di intervento può essere consultato al seguente indirizzo: http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/grants_it.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011594/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Possibility of funding for the ONLUS Anagramma association set up to support differently able persons

The ONLUS Anagramma association was set up in 2009 with the primary aim of promoting social and cultural measures to support differently able persons. In particular, the association, which works in the fourth district of the City of Rome, has 'developed' jointly with a monitoring centre an electronic device which can be used to trace differently able persons in danger. The persons in question receive immediate assistance from volunteers on patrol throughout the city. All they need to do is press a button linked to a central office.

This project is aimed in particular at disadvantaged groups: differently able persons, women, the elderly and children.

1. Can the Commission say whether funding could be made available for the project described above?

2. What actions or programmes are planned to support differently able persons during the new programming period (2014-2020)?

3. Can the Commission give an overview of the situation?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(19 February 2013)

As set out in the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020, the Commission carries out policies and actions at EU level and supports national efforts to promote the inclusion and full participation of persons with disabilities in all aspects of life ([1]).

In this context the Commission also supports research on new technologies for mainstream and assistive accessibility innovations.

The Commission does not directly fund the activities of national/local organisations such as ONLUS Anagramma. However, such associations could qualify for support from the European Structural Funds, in particular the European Social Fund (ESF), if they participate in specific Calls for Proposals within the operational programmes managed by the competent authority at regional (in this case the Lazio Region) or national level. The Commission proposal for the ESF regulation covering the 2014-20 period includes 'promoting social inclusion and combating poverty' among the investment priorities.

ONLUS Anagramma may be eligible for Research and Innovation support. There is no relevant Call for Proposals under current work programmes, but we encourage interested parties to follow the evolution of Horizon 2020, the EU's new framework programme for research and innovation for 2014-2020 and its relevant Call for Proposals, when published.

There may also be funding opportunities under other EU programmes, like the Health Programme 2008-2013 ([2]), via participation in Calls for Proposals when they are published ([3]).

([1]) 'A renewed commitment to a barrier-free Europe', COM(2010) 0636 final http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT and the list of actions for 2010-2015 SEC(2010)1324 final http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/policy/2008-2013/index_en.htm
([3]) A list fields of action is available for browsing at the following page: http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/grants_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011595/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(19 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: Possibili finanziamenti per la clown terapia

Con il termine «clownterapia» si definisce un tipo di assistenza, svolto in ambiente sanitario, basato sugli effetti benefici della risata. Si tratta più specificatamente di applicare un insieme di tecniche derivate dal circo e dal teatro di strada in contesti di disagio sociale o fisico, quali ospedali, case di riposo, case famiglia, orfanotrofi, centri diurni, centri di accoglienza ecc. La «clown-terapia» o «terapia del sorriso» ha dimostrato non solo di favorire la guarigione dei pazienti, soprattutto quella dei bambini, ma anche di essere una valida terapia nella cura di alcune patologie. Inoltre, un recente studio canadese ha scientificamente confermato che il buon umore difende dalle infezioni, determinando una minor riduzione dell'immunoglobulina A. Per di più, ridere stimola la produzione di *beta-endorfine* da parte delle ghiandole surrenali che producono cortisolo, un ormone che regola la risposta allo stress. Si tratta quindi di una terapia indolore, a costi bassissimi e senza effetti collaterali.

Ciò premesso può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se sono previsti all'interno della Programmazione 2014-2020 dei finanziamenti per la ricerca scientifica e per la promozione della clown terapia;

2. se intende attuare campagne di promozione di questa terapia all'interno dell'UE;

3. se vi sono progetti pilota o best practice in materia di clown terapia in altri Stati membri?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(18 febbraio 2013)

La Commissione è consapevole dell'impatto positivo che la clown-terapia può avere sul benessere psicologico dei bambini affetti da gravi malattie. Per questo motivo la clown-terapia è applicata al giorno d'oggi in diverse parti del mondo. Per il momento, la Commissione non prevede di finanziare la ricerca in questa forma di terapia o di condurre campagne per promuoverla. La Commissione non si è impegnata a identificare i progetti pilota o le migliori pratiche in questo ambito riscontrabili negli Stati membri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011595/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Possibility of funding for clown therapy

'Clown therapy' is defined as a type of care, carried out in a healthcare setting, based on the health benefits of laughter. More specifically, it applies a set of techniques derived from the circus and street theatre in situations of social or physical hardship, such as hospitals, nursing homes, foster homes, orphanages, day care centres, shelters, etc. Clown therapy, or 'smile therapy', has proven not only to promote healing in patients, especially children, but also to be an effective therapy in the treatment of certain diseases. Furthermore, a recent Canadian study has scientifically confirmed that good mood protects people from infection, resulting in a smaller reduction of immunoglobulin A. In addition, laughing stimulates the production of beta-endorphins by the adrenal glands, which produce cortisol — a hormone that regulates the stress response. It is therefore a painless therapy, which has a very low cost and no side effects.

Can the Commission therefore say:

1. whether the 2014-2020 programming period provides for funding for scientific research into, and the promotion of, clown therapy;

2. whether it will carry out campaigns to promote this therapy in the EU;

3. whether there are any pilot projects or best practices in the field of clown therapy in other Member States?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

The Commission is well aware of the positive impact which clown therapy can have on the psychological well-being of severely ill children. Clown therapy is therefore nowadays applied in many parts of the world. The Commission has at this stage no plans to fund research into this form of therapy or to carry out campaigns to promote it. The Commission has not engaged in the identification of pilot projects or best practices in this field in the Member States.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011597/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Piotr Borys (PPE)
(19 grudnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Nakaz aresztowania kolejnego polityka w związku z wydarzeniami w Zhanaozen i nasileniem represji wobec opozycyjnej partii „Alga!" w Kazachstanie

11 grudnia 2012 r. Sąd Miejski w Aktau wydał nakaz aresztowania Muratbeka Ketebayeva, czynnego działacza na rzecz praw człowieka i polityka opozycyjnego z Kazachstanu, przebywającego z powodów politycznych na emigracji w Polsce. Nakaz został wydany w oparciu o następujące oskarżenia:

— art. 235, pkt 1: Utworzenie i zarządzanie organizacją przestępczą w celu popełnienia jednego lub więcej przestępstw;

— art. 170, pkt 2: Wzywanie do obalenia porządku konstytucyjnego, popełnione za pomocą mediów lub zorganizowanej grupy;

— art. 164, pkt 3: Podżeganie do nienawiści społecznej, które doprowadziło do poważnych konsekwencji.

Muratbek Ketebayev pełni funkcję zastępcy przewodniczącego komitetu koordynacyjnego opozycyjnej partii „Alga!". Jest także założycielem i prezesem fundacji „Aktywność Obywatelska". W latach 2011-2012 wielokrotnie gościł w Parlamencie Europejskim, gdzie uczestniczył w wysłuchaniach publicznych (m.in. na forum DROI i DCAS) i konferencjach poświęconych prawom człowieka i wyzwaniom rozwojowym Kazachstanu, nad którymi obejmowałem osobisty patronat.

Postawione wobec niego oskarżenia są tożsame z oskarżeniami wysuniętymi wobec innych liderów opozycyjnych i działaczy społecznych z Kazachstanu, których polityczny charakter został potwierdzony oświadczeniami organizacji broniących praw człowieka (m.in. Freedom House, Human Rights Watch i Front Line Defenders) oraz oświadczeniem rzecznika Wysokiej Przedstawiciel z dnia 9 października 2012 r. i rezolucjami PE z dnia 15 marca 2012 r. i dnia 22 listopada 2012 r. Pomimo ww. apeli społeczności międzynarodowej lider głównej partii opozycyjnej w Kazachstanie Vladimir Kozlov został 8 października 2012 r. skazany na 7,5 r. więzienia i konfiskatę mienia. Obok politycznej motywacji procesowi towarzyszyły liczne naruszenia praw oskarżonego oraz przetrzymywanie w niehumanitarnych warunkach.

1. W jaki sposób sprawa uwięzienia Vladimira Kozlova była poruszona w trakcie ostatniej wizyty Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel w Kazachstanie?

2. Jakie działania zamierza podjąć Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel w związku z przytoczonymi faktami, kiedy podejmowane są próby pozbawienia wolności kolejnej osoby, aktywnej na forum instytucji UE, w związku z sytuacją w Kazachstanie i tragicznymi wydarzeniami w Zhanaozen?

3. Jakie zalecenia w sprawie spodziewanego wniosku o ekstradycję Muratbeka Ketebayeva zamierza Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel przedstawić kazachstańskim i polskim władzom?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(20 lutego 2013 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji Catherine Ashton wyraziła obawy Unii związane z kwestią praw człowieka, państwa prawa i demokratycznych reform w Kazachstanie podczas wszystkich spotkań w trakcie poprzedniej wizyty. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca podkreśliła również wagę wspierania społeczeństwa obywatelskiego i konieczność wykazania przez Kazachstan silnego zaangażowania na rzecz ochrony praw człowieka, wolności mediów oraz niezależności sądownictwa. Jeśli chodzi o niedawne włamanie do pomieszczeń gazety internetowej i organizacji pozarządowych oraz nowych spraw sądowych wobec działaczy opozycji i organizacji pozarządowych, przedstawiciele delegatury UE w Astanie spotkali się z przedstawicielami Ministerstwa Spraw Zagranicznych Kazachstanu w celu uzyskania bardziej szczegółowych informacji w sprawie oskarżeń oraz wyrażenia zaniepokojenia tymi wydarzeniami. Delegatura UE – przy współpracy z lokalnymi i międzynarodowymi organizacjami pozarządowymi – będzie nadal uważnie śledzić rozwój sytuacji, pozostając w kontakcie z władzami Kazachstanu.

Co się zaś tyczy sprawy Muratbeka Ketebayeva, służby podległe Wysokiej Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącej nie wiedzą o ewentualnym skierowaniu przez rząd kazachski formalnego wniosku o ekstradycję do władz polskich. Muratbek Ketebayev ubiega się o azyl w Polsce, lecz wniosek ten nie został jeszcze rozpatrzony. Udzielenie azylu lub decyzja o ekstradycji leżą w gestii właściwych organów w Polsce.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011597/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Piotr Borys (PPE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Arrest warrant issued against yet another politician in connection with the events in Zhanaozen and the intensified persecution of 'Alga!' party members in Kazakhstan

On 11 December 2012, the municipal court in Aktau, Kazakhstan, issued an arrest warrant against Muratbek Ketebayev, a human rights activist and opposition politician who is currently living in political exile in Poland. The warrant was issued on the basis of the following charges:

— Article 235(1): Establishing and running a criminal organisation with a view tocommitting one or more crimes;

— Article 170(2): Calling, through the media or an organised group, for the overthrow of theconstitutional order;

— Article 164(3): Incitement to social hatred with major consequences.

Muratbek Ketebayev serves as vice-chairman of the coordination committee of the 'Alga!' opposition party. He is also the founder and president of the 'Active Citizens' foundation. In 2011 and 2012, Mr Ketebayev was a frequent guest at the European Parliament, where he took part in public hearings — including the DROI and DCAS forum — and in conferences focusing on human rights and the developmental challenges facing Kazakhstan, events to which I gave my personal patronage.

The charges brought against him are the same ones brought against other opposition leaders and community activists in Kazakhstan, and their political nature has been corroborated by statements from organisations defending human rights, such as Freedom House, Human Rights Watch and Front Line Defenders. This has also been corroborated by the statement given by the spokesperson for the High Representative on 9 October 2012 and the EP resolutions of 15 March 2012 and 22 November 2012. Despite the protestations of the international community, the leader of the main opposition party, Vladimir Kozlov, was sentenced to seven-and-a-half years' imprisonment and confiscation of property on 8 October 2012. The politically motivated trial was accompanied by numerous violations of the rights of the accused, who was detained in inhumane conditions.

1. How did the Vice-President/High Representative broach the subject of Vladimir Kozlov's imprisonment during her last visit?

2. What steps does the VP/HR intend to take in this regard, given that attempts are beingmade to deprive yet another person who is active in the forum of the EU institutions ofhis freedom in connection with the tragic events of Zhanaozen?

3. What recommendations will the VP/HR make to the Kazakh and Polish Governmentsconcerning the expected extradition request for Muratbek Ketebayev?

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

HR/VP Ashton raised the EU's concerns about human rights, rule of law and democratic reforms in Kazakhstan in all meetings during her last visit. HR/VP also underlined the importance to support civil society and the need for Kazakhstan to demonstrate its strong commitment to protecting human rights and ensuring freedom of media and the independence of judiciary. With regard to the recent raid of the offices Internet outlets and NGOs, and new court cases against opposition and NGO activists, the EU Delegation in Astana met with the Kazakh Ministry of Foreign Affairs, asking for more detailed information behind the accusations and expressing concern about the developments. The EU Delegation will continue to closely follow the developments in collaboration with local and international NGOs and in contact with the Kazakh authorities.

On the case of Muratbek Ketebayev, the services of the HR/VP are not aware of a formal extradition request by the Kazakh government to the Polish authorities. Mr Ketebayev is seeking asylum in Poland, but this request is not yet answered by the Polish authorities. Granting of asylum or decision of extradition would be the decision of the competent bodies in Poland.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011598/12
do Komisji
Konrad Szymański (ECR)
(19 grudnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Nadmierne kontrole obywateli polskich na polsko-szwedzkiej granicy morskiej i ich zgodność z przepisami Schengen

W ostatnim czasie docierają do mnie sygnały o zdarzających się na polsko-szwedzkiej granicy morskiej przypadkach nieuzasadnionej i uciążliwej kontroli wykraczającej poza obowiązujące przepisy strefy Schengen. Dotyczy to kontroli obywateli polskich dokonywanej przez szwedzki urząd celno-graniczny TULL, zarówno w Karlskronie, jak i w Nynäshamn.

Wyrywkowa kontrola jest całkiem naturalna i usprawiedliwiona w strefie Schengen. Obywatele polscy są jednak notorycznie nękani pytaniami: „Dokąd jedziecie?", „W jakim celu?", „Na jak długo?", „Do kogo?", „Jaki jest cel waszej podróży?". Często nie są przy tym legitymowani, nie jest to więc dopuszczona prawem kontrola SIS.

Zdarzają się również szczegółowe kontrole samochodów zjeżdżających z promów, gdzie samochody są sprawdzane pod kątem przemytu narkotyków lub broni. Taka kontrola trwa minimum 2 godziny. Niekiedy celnicy każą przekraczającym granicę telefonować do krewnych w Szwecji, aby potwierdzić fakt odwiedzin.

W związku z tym pragnę zadać pytania:

1. Czy wskazane przykłady szczegółowych kontroli nie naruszają przepisów Schengen?

2. Czy do Komisji wpływały już skargi od obywateli polskich w tej sprawie, a jeśli tak, jakie było ich rozstrzygnięcie?

3. Czy Komisja zwracała się do władz szwedzkich z prośbą o wyjaśnienie sprawy i usunięcie ewentualnych naruszeń prawa europejskiego?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Cecilię Malmström w imieniu Komisji
(25 lutego 2013 r.)

W odniesieniu do kontroli osób zniesienie kontroli na granicach wewnętrznych nie wpływa na wykonywanie uprawnień policyjnych na mocy prawa krajowego na terytorium państw członkowskich, w tym w strefach przygranicznych, o ile wykonywanie tych uprawnień nie ma skutku równoważnego z odprawą graniczną ([1]). Kodeks graniczny Schengen zawiera niewyczerpujący wykaz kryteriów, które służą ocenie, czy wykonywanie uprawnień policyjnych jest równoważne odprawie granicznej, czy też nie.

Po otrzymaniu skargi w kwestii poruszonej przez Szanownego Pana Posła Komisja zwróciła się do Szwecji z prośbą o wyjaśnienia. Władze Szwecji odpowiedziały, że kontrole realizowane w portach Nynäshamn i Karlskrona są przeprowadzane zgodne z kodeksem, w oparciu o analizę ryzyka oraz informacje i doświadczenie zgromadzone przez policję. Szwecja dostarczyła danych statystycznych, zgodnie z którymi kontroli w tych portach podlega niewielki odsetek podróżnych. W odniesieniu do dyskryminacji obywateli polskich, Szwecja udzieliła odpowiedzi, że wybór celów w zakresie kontroli wyłącznie na podstawie pochodzenia jest nie tylko niezgodny ze szwedzkim ustawodawstwem, lecz także bezwartościowy z punktu widzenia kontroli.

W oparciu o informacje dostarczone przez Szwecję Komisja nie jest w stanie stwierdzić, że skutki kontroli przeprowadzanych na granicach Szwecji, w portach Nynäshamn i Karlskrona, są równoważne odprawie granicznej i że w związku z tym doszło do naruszenia dorobku Schengen.

([1]) Artykuł 21 lit. a) rozporządzenia (WE) nr 562/2006 ustanawiającego wspólnotowy kodeks zasad regulujących przepływ osób przez granice (kodeksu granicznego Schengen), Dz.U. L 105 z 13.4.2006, s. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011598/12
to the Commission
Konrad Szymański (ECR)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Excessive controls on Polish nationals at the Polish-Swedish maritime border and their compliance with Schengen provisions

I have recently been made aware of incidences of unjustified and burdensome controls taking place at the Polish-Swedish border which go beyond the Schengen rules in force. This concerns the controls on Polish nationals carried out by TULL, the Swedish customs and border agency, in both Karlskrona and Nynäshamn.

Random checks are perfectly natural and justified in the Schengen area. Polish nationals, however, are regularly subjected to persistent questioning: 'Where are you going?'; 'What for?'; 'For how long?', 'Who are you visiting?', 'What is the purpose of your trip?' Often their ID documents are not even checked, so this is not a matter of the SIS controls allowed by law.

Detailed checks are also made on cars leaving the ferry to check for smuggling of drugs or weapons. These checks last at least two hours. Sometimes the customs officers make people call relatives in Sweden to confirm that they are actually visiting someone.

In this connection I would like to ask:

1. Do these detailed checks violate Schengen provisions?

2. Has the Commission received complaints about such incidents from Polish citizens, and if so, what was the outcome?

3. Has the Commission been in contact with the Swedish authorities to seek clarification and an end to any potential violations of European law?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2013)

Regarding checks on persons, the abolition of internal border controls does not affect the exercise of police powers under national law within Member States' territories, including in the border zones, insofar as it does not have an effect equivalent to border checks ([1]). The Schengen Borders Code contains a non-exhaustive list of criteria to assess whether the exercise of police powers is equivalent to border checks or not.

After receiving a complaint on the issue raised by the Honourable Member, the Commission addressed Sweden requesting clarifications. The Swedish authorities replied that checks operated at the ports of Nynäshamn and Karlskrona are conducted in accordance with the Code, are based on risk analysis, police information and experience. Sweden provided statistical information, according to which a low percentage of travellers are checked at these ports. With regard the discrimination of Polish nationals, Sweden replied that the selection of targets for the purpose of checks on the sole basis of origin is not only incompatible with Swedish legislation but would also be of no value from a control point of view.

Based on the information provided by Sweden, the Commission cannot conclude that checks carried out at the Swedish borders at the ports of Nynäshamn and Karlskrona have an effect equivalent to border checks and would thus be in breach of the Schengen *acquis*.

([1]) Article 21(a) of Regulation (EC) N. 562/2006 establishing a Community Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders (Schengen Borders Code), OJ L 105 of 13.4.2006, p.1.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011599/12
do Komisji
Konrad Szymański (ECR)
(19 grudnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Zgodność polskich przepisów z dyrektywą Rady 2008/118/WE i Traktatem o Funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej

Biorąc pod uwagę formę nałożonego podatku akcyzowego w Polsce posiadającego cechy zharmonizowanej akcyzy na oleje smarowe (CN 2710 19 71 – 2710 19 99) oraz wymóg spełniania formalności związanych z chęcią wewnątrzwspólnotowego zakupu/nabycia olejów smarowych, które rodzą spory interpretacyjne odnoszące się do opodatkowania wyrobów energetycznych, uprasza się Komisję o odpowiedź:

1. Czy na gruncie polskich przepisów nakazujących opodatkowanie wewnątrzwspólnotowe nabycia olejów smarowych (wykorzystywanych do innych celów niż opałowe bądź napędowe) podatkiem posiadającym wszystkie cechy zharmonizowanego w UE podatku, łącznie z uznaniem olejów smarowych za wyroby akcyzowe jest zgodna z art. 110 TFUE i art. 1 ust 3 dyrektywy 2008/118/WE?

2. Czy warunki opodatkowania wewnątrzwspólnotowego nabycia olejów smarowych nałożone polską ustawą o podatku akcyzowym z dnia 6 grudnia 2008 r. na polskich przedsiębiorców jeszcze przed ich nabyciem/sprowadzeniem/zakupem do Polski, które przejawiają się faktycznym utrudnieniem na tzw. granicy, w tym w szczególności:

— zgłoszeniem do właściwego Naczelnika Urzędu Celnego o planowanym nabyciu olejów smarowych (przed ich nabyciem/zakupem),

— złożenie zabezpieczenia akcyzowego (przed zakupem/nabyciem) jest zgodne z art. 1 ust. 3 dyrektywy?

3. Czy Polska wprowadzając podatek akcyzowy w krajowych regulacjach na oleje smarowe z przeznaczeniem do innych celów niż opał bądź paliwo, powinna zastosować procedurę wynikającą z art. 20 ust. 2 dyrektywy Rady 2003/96/WE i czy taką procedurę zastosowała?

4. Czy i jakie ustalenia poczyniła Komisja w sprawie opisanego wyżej problemu?

5. Czy i jakie środki Komisja planuje przedsięwziąć przeciw wszelkim naruszeniom praw, by przepisy dotyczące wyrobów energetycznych wykorzystywanych na cele nieenergetyczne nie utrudniały legalnego obrotu między państwami oraz nie powodowały ograniczenia konkurencyjności wobec innych podmiotów w krajach UE?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Algirdasa Šemetę w imieniu Komisji
(8 lutego 2013 r.)

1. W nawiązaniu do odpowiedzi na E-011338/2011 ([1]) (w szczególności pytania 2, 3 i 4): Komisja nie ma informacji świadczących o tym, że Polska stosuje inne opodatkowanie w odniesieniu do krajowych produktów klasyfikowanych do kodów CN od 2710 19 71 to 2710 19 99, a inne wobec produktów z pozostałych państw członkowskich. Na tym etapie Komisja nie stwierdziła żadnego naruszenia art. 110 TFUE.

2. Opisane formalności nie wydają się stanowić „formalności związanych z przekraczaniem granic", a zatem a priori nie naruszają art. 1 ust. 3 dyrektywy 2008/118/WE. Wymogi w zakresie zapewnienia zgodności z polskim prawem podatkowym są analogiczne do wymogów nałożonych na polskich producentów, a zatem nie traktują odmiennie polskich i pozostałych unijnych producentów i przedsiębiorstw prowadzących handel tymi produktami.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/pl/parliamentary-questions.html

3, 4 oraz 5: Artykuł 20 ust. 2 dyrektywy 2003/96/WE stosowany jest tylko wtedy, gdy państwo członkowskie stwierdzi, że produkty energetyczne (jak te, o których mowa) są przeznaczone do wykorzystania, oferowane na sprzedaż lub wykorzystywane jako paliwo do ogrzewania lub paliwo silnikowe, a więc dochodzi do unikania podatków lub do nadużyć podatkowych. Polska wystąpiła o zastosowanie tej procedury w odniesieniu do kodu CN 2710 19 99 w 2008 r. oraz w odniesieniu do kodu CN 2710 19 91 w lipcu 2012 r. Komisja uważnie przeanalizowała te wnioski, między innymi z pomocą państw członkowskich UE, oraz skonsultowała się z Komitetem ds. Podatku Akcyzowego; ostatecznie jednak podjęcie działań w związku z tymi wnioskami okazało się niemożliwe. W efekcie art. 20 ust. 1 dyrektywy 2003/96/WE nie ma zastosowania do produktów objętych wspomnianymi kodami CN. Komisja otrzymała i oceniła skargi dotyczące polskich przepisów w sprawie opodatkowania olejów smarowych. Skarżący nie potrafili przedstawić dowodów świadczących o naruszeniu prawa UE i z tego względu zostali poinformowani, że Komisja nie podejmie żadnych działań. Komisja zamknęła tę sprawę w dniu 26 stycznia 2012 r.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011599/12
to the Commission
Konrad Szymański (ECR)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Compliance of Polish laws with Council Directive 2008/118/EC and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union

Given that the form of excise duty imposed in Poland on lubricating oils bearing codes CN 2710 19 71 — CN 2710 19 99 has the characteristics of a harmonised excise duty, and that formalities must be completed when seeking to carry out intra-Community purchases/acquisitions of lubricating oils which give rise to interpretative conflicts concerning the taxation of energy products, I should like to put the following questions to the Commission:

1. Are the Polish provisions requiring the intra-Community acquisition of lubricating oils (used for purposes other than transport or fuel) to be subject to a tax that has all the characteristics of a tax harmonised at EU level and the classification of lubricating oils as excise goods in accordance with Article 110 of the TFEU and Article 1(3) of Directive 2008/118/EC?

2. Are the conditions for the taxation of the intra-Community acquisition of lubricating oils imposed by the Polish Excise Duty Act of 6 December 2008 on Polish entrepreneurs prior to the acquisition/purchase/importation of lubricating oils into Poland, such conditions constituting a factual impediment at the so-called border and comprising, *inter alia*:

— notifying the director of the relevant customs office of the planned acquisition of lubricating oils prior to their acquisition/purchase,

— providing a customs guarantee prior to acquisition/purchase, in accordance with Article 1(3) of the directive?

3. Given the introduction into national legislation by Poland of an excise duty on lubricating oils used for purposes other than transport or fuel, should it apply the procedure laid down in Article 20(2) of Council Directive 2003/96/EC? If so, has it already applied this procedure?

4. Has the Commission made an assessment in the aforementioned matter? If so, what were its findings?

5. Is the Commission planning to take steps to combat all violations of the law in order toensure that the rules concerning energy products used for non-energy purposes do notimpose obstacles on the legal circulation of goods between countries or hamper thecompetitiveness of other entities in the Member States? If so, what will those steps be?

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

1. Reference is made to reply to E-011338/2011 ([1]) (in particular to questions 2, 3 and 4). The Commission has no information that Poland is taxing differently domestic products classified under CN codes 2710 19 71 to 2710 19 99 compared to products from other Member States and at this stage it has not identified any infringement of Article 110 of the TFEU.

2. The formalities described do not seem to constitute 'formalities connected to the crossing of frontiers' and hence are a priori not infringing on Article 1(3) of Directive 2008/118/EC. The requirements for ensuring compliance with Polish tax law are analogous to compliance requirements imposed on Polish producers and therefore do not discriminate between Polish and other EU producers and traders in these products.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

3, 4 and 5. Article 20(2) of Directive 2003/96/EC is used only if a Member State finds that energy products (such as the ones in question) are intended for use, offered for sale or used as heating or motor fuel thus giving rise to tax avoidance or abuse. Poland requested the application of this procedure for CN code 2710 19 99 in 2008 and for 2710 19 91 in July 2012. The Commission analysed the requests carefully, *inter alia* with the help of EU Member States and consulted the Committee on Excise Duty but finally it transpired that it was not possible to follow-up on these requests. Consequently Article 20(1) of Directive 2003/96/EC does not apply to the products under the CN codes mentioned. The Commission received and assessed complaints on the Polish legislation on taxation of lubricating oils. As complainants were not able to provide proof of infringement of EC law, they were informed that the Commission would not take any action. The Commission closed the case on 26 January 2012.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011600/12
à Comissão
Edite Estrela (S&D)
(19 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Lei do aborto na República da Irlanda

Tendo em conta que a República da Irlanda tem a lei mais restritiva de toda a União Europeia, autorizando apenas o aborto quando a vida da mulher estiver em risco, uma exceção que coloca todo o poder de decisão nos médicos num país em que a maioria deles são objetores de consciência e outros receiam agir alegando que não dispõem de linhas de orientação claras;

Tendo em conta a decisão do Tribunal Europeu dos Direitos Humanos, de 2010, que concluiu que o Estado irlandês está a falhar na aplicação da sua própria lei, não criando condições para que as mulheres em situação de risco tenham condições para interromper a gravidez em segurança e tempo útil;

Tendo em conta a morte de Savita Halappanavar, que, após diagnóstico médico, foi-lhe dito que não seria possível levar a gravidez até ao fim, mas disseram-lhe que «enquanto houvesse batimento cardíaco não podiam fazer nada» e que o médico lhe disse que era essa a lei e que «ela vivia num país católico»;

Pergunta à Comissão:

Apesar de a legislação em matéria de aborto ser uma competência dos Estados-Membros, casos há, como o supra referido, em que se entra no campo mais vasto dos direitos humanos e do respeito pela vida, por isso pergunto à Comissão, que tenciona fazer para que situações destas não voltem a acontecer?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(15 de fevereiro de 2013)

A Senhora Deputada recorda justamente que a legislação nacional em matéria de aborto não está abrangida pelo âmbito de aplicação do direito da UE. De acordo com o Tratado da União Europeia e o Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia, a UE não tem competência para adotar normas jurídicas neste domínio. Por conseguinte, tais normas são da competência exclusiva dos Estados-Membros.

A execução de acórdãos do Tribunal Europeu dos Direitos do Homem é da competência do Comité de Ministros do Conselho da Europa. Não cabe à Comissão apreciar o seguimento dado pelos Estados-Membros a tais acórdãos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011600/12
to the Commission
Edite Estrela (S&D)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Abortion law in the Republic of Ireland

The Republic of Ireland has the most restrictive law in the whole of the European Union, with abortion being permitted only where the woman's life is in danger. Under this exception, the power to take decisions rests entirely with doctors in a country where most doctors object on grounds of conscience and others are afraid to act, arguing that they do not have any clear guidelines.

The 2010 decision by the European Court of Human Rights, which concluded that the state was failing to implement its own law, did nothing to ensure that it would be possible for women at risk to terminate their pregnancies promptly and safely.

The issue has been brought into focus by the recent death of Savita Halappanavar, who was told following a medical diagnosis that she would not be able to continue her pregnancy to term but that nothing could be done while a foetal heartbeat was still present, with the doctor informing her that this was the law and that she was living 'in a Catholic country'.

Even though the law on abortion is a matter for the Member States, there are some cases, such as the one described above, which touch on the wider sphere of human rights and respect for life. That being so, what action will the Commission take to ensure that there will be no repeat of this type of situation?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2013)

The Honourable Member rightly recalls that national legislation on abortion falls outside the scope of EC law. According to the Treaty of the European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the EU has no powers to adopt legal rules governing abortion. Such rules therefore pertain to the exclusive competence of Member States.

The implementation of rulings of the European Court of Human Rights falls within the competences of the committee of ministers of the Council of Europe. It is not for the Commission to assess the follow-up of Member States of such judgments.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-011602/12
à Comissão
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL)
(19 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Privatização da ANA

O Governo português pretende privatizar a Empresa ANA — Aeroportos de Portugal, operação que pretende concretizar no próximo dia 27 de dezembro. Esta operação, a concretizar-se, abrangerá os 10 aeroportos situados em território nacional. Isso significará que Portugal se tornará no único país da UE a ter todos os aeroportos sob controlo de uma única entidade privada, que controlará 100 % da quota de mercado.

Considera a Comissão aceitável, à luz do Direito comunitário, nomeadamente sobre concorrência no mercado interno, que todos os serviços aeroportuários de um Estado-Membro possam ser controlados por um único operador privado, que deterá um monopólio completo desses serviços, facto único em toda a UE?

Resposta dada por Joaquín Almunia em nome da Comissão
(4 de fevereiro de 2013)

As regras de concorrência da UE não proíbem que todos os serviços aeroportuários de um Estado-Membro sejam controlados por um único operador privado, dando a esse operador um monopólio. A mera criação (ou transferência) de um monopólio não constitui uma infração às regras de concorrência da UE, que proíbem apenas o abuso de uma posição dominante por parte de uma empresa monopolista (artigo 102.° do TFUE).

Significa isto que um Estado-Membro que privatiza um monopólio de Estado não é obrigado a fragmentar a empresa e a vendê-la a mais do que um operador privado. As regras de concorrência da UE não impedem, pois, Portugal de vender a ANA-Aeroportos de Portugal a um único operador. Contudo, a Comissão ou a autoridade nacional da concorrência teriam competência para intervir, se o comprador da ANA-Aeroportos abusasse da sua posição dominante.

A Comissão salienta ainda que tal operação, assim como qualquer outra concentração, pode estar sujeita a regras da UE relativas ao controlo das concentrações (Regulamento (CE) n.° 139/2004 ([1])) ou a regras nacionais em matéria de concentrações, consoante as circunstâncias específicas, nomeadamente os limiares de notificação. Nesse caso, a Comissão ou a autoridade nacional da concorrência examinarão se a operação é compatível com as regras aplicáveis.

([1]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 139/2004 do Conselho, de 20 de janeiro de 2004, relativo ao controlo das concentrações de empresas («Regulamento das Concentrações»), JO L 24 de 29.1.2004, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011602/12
to the Commission
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Privatisation of Aeroportos de Portugal (ANA)

The Portuguese Government wishes to privatise the company ANA-Aeroportos de Portugal and intends to formalise the operation on 27 December 2012. If this action takes place, it will affect the 10 airports located in Portuguese territory. Portugal will thus become the only EU country with all its airports under the control of a single private body, which will control 100% of the market share.

Does the Commission consider it acceptable, in light of Community law governing competition on the internal market, for all the airport services of a Member State to be controlled by a single private operator, giving it a total monopoly of such services and contrary to practice in every other EU country?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(4 February 2013)

EU competition rules do not prohibit all the airport services of a Member State from being controlled by a single private operator, giving that operator a monopoly. The mere creation (or transfer) of a monopoly does not infringe EU competition rules, which only prohibit the abuse by a monoplist of such a dominant position (Article 102 TFEU).

This means that a Member State which is privatising a state monopoly is not required to break up the company and sell it to more than one private operator. So, EU competition rules do not prevent Portugal from selling ANA-Aeroportos de Portugal to a single operator. However, the Commission or the national competition authority would be able to intervene if the purchaser of ANA-Aeroportos abused its dominant position.

The Commission also notes that such a transaction, as any other concentration, may be subject to EU merger control rules (Regulation 139/2004 ([1])) or national merger rules depending on the specific circumstances, in particular the notification thresholds. In that case, the Commission or the national competition authority will examine whether the transaction is compatible with the applicable rules.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 of 20 January 2004 on the control of concentrations between undertakings (the EC Merger Regulation), OJ L 24, 29.01.2004, p. 1.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011603/12
a la Comisión
María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE)
(19 de diciembre de 2012)

Asunto: Implicación de las empresas en el proceso negociador del acuerdo de libre comercio UE-Japón

El 29 de noviembre el Consejo adoptó un mandato negociador para que la Comisión comience las negociaciones sobre un acuerdo de libre comercio de la UE con Japón.

Es cierto que la UE debe reforzar su posición en Asia y dichas negociaciones representan una gran oportunidad de crecimiento económico

Es también muy satisfactorio que el Comisario De Gucht haya manifestado que se ha negociado por adelantado un paquete de medidas dirigidas a erradicar las barreras no arancelarias y que la UE se reservará el derecho a suspender las negociaciones tras pasar un año si Japón no cumple sus compromisos a este respecto.

Pero, como ya se ha puesto de manifiesto desde el Parlamento Europeo, debemos asegurarnos de que los empresarios europeos tendrán oportunidades reales en Japón y de que exista una reciprocidad tangible.

Es muy importante que, durante las negociaciones, la Comisión escuche y tenga muy en cuenta las preocupaciones de la industria, en especial de los sectores sensibles como el del automóvil.

¿De qué instrumentos se valdrá la Comisión para mantener debidamente implicada a la industria en el proceso negociador? ¿Con qué periodicidad informará la Comisión al Parlamento Europeo sobre el progreso en la eliminación de las barreras no arancelarias?

Respuesta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión
(14 de febrero de 2013)

La Comisión comparte plenamente la opinión de que un acuerdo de libre comercio amplio y sustancial con Japón podría generar sustanciales beneficios económicos para Europa, fomentando el crecimiento y el empleo. La Comisión considera asimismo que el tratamiento de los obstáculos no arancelarios será de vital importancia, por lo que se propone establecer un paralelismo riguroso y claro entre la supresión de los derechos por parte de la UE y la eliminación de las barreras no arancelarias por parte de Japón, sin olvidar el carácter sensible de algunos sectores en Europa.

La Comisión coincide en que la industria tiene un papel muy importante que jugar en estas negociaciones y, en consecuencia, impulsará su participación a través de reuniones periódicas, ya sea en el marco existente de las reuniones con la sociedad civil, o a través de reuniones más específicas, como las que se llevan a cabo regularmente con Business Europe.

La Comisión también mantendrá informado al Parlamento sobre el desarrollo de las negociaciones, y transmitirá información a la Comisión de Comercio Internacional (INTA) sobre los progresos realizados tras cada ronda de negociación.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011603/12
to the Commission
María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Involvement of businesses in the negotiating process for the EU-Japan free trade agreement

On 29 November the Council adopted a negotiating mandate for the Commission to open negotiations on a free trade agreement between the EU and Japan.

The EU does indeed need to strengthen its position in Asia, and these negotiations offer a significant opportunity for economic growth.

It is also very satisfactory that Commissioner De Gucht has stated that a package of measures has been negotiated in advance with a view to removing non-tariff barriers, and that the EU is reserving the right to 'pull the plug' on negotiations after one year if Japan does not respect its commitments on this matter.

However, as the European Parliament has already pointed out, we must ensure that European businesses have real opportunities in Japan and that there is true reciprocity.

It is very important that, during the negotiations, the Commission pays careful attention to the concerns of industry, especially in sensitive sectors such as the automotive industry.

What instruments will the Commission use to keep industry duly involved in the negotiating process? How regularly will the Commission inform the European Parliament about progress on the removal of non-tariff barriers?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(14 February 2013)

The Commission fully shares the view that a deep and comprehensive Free Trade Agreement with Japan could generate considerable economic benefits for Europe by fostering growth and jobs. The Commission is also of the opinion that the treatment of non-tariff barriers will be of fundamental importance and it will therefore implement a strict and clear parallelism between the EU's elimination of duties and Japan's removal of non-tariff barriers, while at the same time taking into account the sensitivity of certain sectors in Europe.

The Commission agrees that industry has a very important role to play in this negotiation and therefore intends to keep it duly involved via regular meetings, either within the existing framework of the meetings with civil society or via more specific meetings such as the ones that take place on a regular basis with Business Europe.

The Commission will also keep Parliament regularly informed about the progress of the negotiation and will transmit information to the International Trade Committee (INTA) on the progress made after each round of negotiation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011604/12
to the Commission
George Lyon (ALDE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: UPDATE: Implementation of Directive 2008/120/EC on protection of pigs — Ban on individual sow stalls

On 21 November 2012, Commissioner Antonio Borg took over the Commission's health and consumer affairs portfolio, which is responsible for Council Directive 2008/120/EC laying down minimum standards for the protection of pigs.

From 1 December 2013, this directive will apply to all holdings in the EU. This legislation bans the use of individual sow stalls and requires that untethered sows be kept in groups for the first four weeks after insemination until the week before farrowing.

As the deadline passes, it seems that insufficient progress has been made to achieve the timely implementation of these requirements in some Member States.

Can the Commission confirm:

Which Member States have not complied with the legislation by the deadline of 31 December 2012, based on the figures the Commission has received?

Which Member States have replied with up-to-date figures?

Which Member States have complied with the legislation?

Furthermore, can the Commission:

— guarantee that Member States which have failed to ensure a timely phasing-out of individual sow stalls will not be granted an extension to the deadline?

— detail what enforcement steps the Commission has taken, and will take, against non-compliant Member States?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2013)

The requirement to keep sows in groups applies since 1 January 2013 in all pig holdings keeping 10 sows or more. According to the information available to the Commission to date, eleven Member States (Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden and the United Kingdom) confirmed that they are fully compliant with the group housing of sows. The Commission expects more Member States to fully comply with group housing of sows within the next coming months. To provide further indications on the state of compliance of particular Member States would at this time not be reliable because the situation is still in progress. The Commission presented an overview of the state of implementation on 28 January 2013 at the Council of the Ministers of Agriculture as well as at the meeting with stakeholders and Member States experts.

The Commission does not intend to make a legislative proposal granting any extension of the legal deadline to the Member States to implement group housing of sows.

Regarding enforcement measures, Member States are primarily responsible for the implementation of EU welfare legislation. In case of non-compliance, they have to take measures, and if necessary, sanctions against non-compliant operators so they correct the situation, as required by Articles 54 and 55 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on official controls ([1]).

The Commission intends to initiate infringement proceedings against those Member States which are not fully in compliance after the legal deadline.

([1]) OJ L 191, 28.5.2004, p.1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011605/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diane Dodds (NI)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Persecution of Christians in Syria

With the continuation of the Syrian uprising, there is growing concern from across the Christian world about the increase in the persecution of the Christian minority in Syria.

Christians in Syria have found themselves in a difficult situation: while many have denounced the brutal regime of President al-Assad, few see hope in an alternative government which they fear will be led by Islamists who will curtail their religious freedom.

What will the EU do to ensure that the Christian minority is not targeted in the uprising, and what efforts are being made to end the violence?

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

In its messages both to the regime and the opposition groups, the EU has continuously reiterated its call to uphold the principles of freedom of religion and belief and has requested all parties to refrain from sectarian and ethnic division.

The EU has urged the Syrian opposition to agree on a set of principles for working towards a Syria where all citizens enjoy equal rights regardless of their affiliations, ethnicities or beliefs and reaffirmed its support to the Syrian people and their aspirations for a democratic Syria respectful of the rights of all its communities.

The HR/VP has stressed the EU's solidarity with the Syrian people seeking the respect of fundamental rights for each individual regardless of religious belonging or belief and has condemned the violence and repression as well as all acts aimed at inciting interethnic and inter-confessional conflict.

Please be assured that the EU continues to follow closely the human rights situation and breaches of international humanitarian law in Syria.

The EU will continue to promote freedom of religion and belief, which is a fundamental right that needs to be ensured everywhere and for everyone.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011606/12
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Structural and cohesion policy

Throughout the duration of the 2007-2013 EU budget for structural and cohesion funds, it is estimated that the United Kingdom will contribute approximately GBP 29.5 billion, whilst only receiving back GBP 8.7 billion in such funds. This makes the UK the third-largest Member State net loser from this system.

In my region of the United Kingdom, Northern Ireland, we pay GBP 1.58 for every GBP 1 that we receive in structural and cohesion funds.

Is this system fit for purpose when there is no visible benefit to the UK taxpayer? Additionally, should there not be a reclassification of this procedure in time for the next policy covering the 2014-2020 period?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(13 February 2013)

The figures quoted by the Honourable Member are not from a Commission source; the Commission is therefore unable to comment on their validity.

EU regional policy is an investment policy, supporting the creation of jobs, increasing competitiveness, economic growth, improved quality of life and sustainable development. It also supports less developed countries and regions, as an expression of solidarity. It is therefore to be expected that all of the richer Member States (with few or no less developed regions) would contribute relatively more to the financing of regional policy.

It is also worth noticing that the affects of regional policy cannot be assessed exclusively in terms of net balance. On the one hand, regional policy supports the development of the internal market; growth in poorer regions leads to the purchase of goods and services from other, richer regions. It also allows to deliver throughout the EU the objective of Europe 2020. On the other hand, regional policy provides seed money to trigger private investment in areas which would not otherwise be financed (eneregy efficiency in residential housing, new innovation processes in firms, reneweble energes) particularly in time of crisis where financial resources at regional and local level are scarce.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011607/12
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Travel insurance

Constituents purchasing travel insurance within the United Kingdom who regularly depart from Dublin because of its vast selection of direct flights, ease of access and lower air passenger duty run the risk of not being covered due to departing from a non-UK airport.

Can the Commission give any clarity on this issue?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

The EU-Non Life Insurance Directives ([1]) do not lay down the precise content of travel or holiday insurance policies. Unless national law does not provide otherwise, insurers and consumers can agree on a variety of contractual terms and conditions. It may, therefore, very well be that a travel or holiday insurance policy taken out by a British citizen would not be invalidated if he/she departed from another Member State.

([1]) OJ L 228, 16.8.1973, p. 3-19; OJ L 172, 4.7.1988, p. 1-2; OJ L 228, 11.8.1992, p. 1-23.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011608/12
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Laser eye surgery

Increasing numbers of EU citizens are undergoing laser eye surgery. While this technique does have a success rate, evidence would suggest that some people are being given the surgery without being told that they will still need to wear glasses.

How does EU consumer legislation protect citizens who undergo this surgery, only to realise that they still need to wear glasses as a result of substandard surgery? Additionally, what action can the Commission take to ensure that the consumer rights of EU citizens are protected?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

According to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union Member States are responsible for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care.

However, for healthcare provided or prescribed in a Member State other than the Member State of affiliation, EU legislation ([1]) stipulates that, as from 25 October 2013, healthcare providers must make available relevant information to patients including on treatment options and on the availability, quality and safety of the healthcare they provide in the Member State of treatment.

There is also Union legislation which protects the economic interest of consumers against misleading advertising. Directive 2005/29/EC on Unfair Commercial Practices ([2]) requires traders to operate in accordance with professional diligence and not to mislead consumers, for instance, about the benefits, risks and results to be expected from a service offered. Furthermore, the directive provides a special protection to consumers who are vulnerable because of their age.or credulity.

Any alleged breach of the directive should be brought to the attention of national authorities and courts which are primarily responsible for the enforcement of this legislation. In this context, the directive provides that traders can be required by competent authorities to provide evidence supporting their claims.

([1]) Directive 2011/24/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 March 2011on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare.
([2]) OJ L 149, 11.6.2005.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011609/12
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Implications of changes to MOT testing

In July 2012, the Commission published proposals for amending EU policy on roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and trailers, roadside inspections of commercial vehicles and registration documents for vehicles.

The proposals would increase the number of agricultural and company-owned vehicles that are subject to roadworthiness testing and roadside inspections, potentially financially impacting owners in terms of compliance costs. Provisions included would also limit the capacity for car owners to modify their vehicles.

Can the Commission provide a response to the following queries:

1. Has the Commission conducted an assessment of the likely financial and logistical impact of the proposals upon (a) testing authorities, (b) SMEs and (c) farmers in Member States in regard to training and compliance? If so, can it provide an account of the results?

2. What assurances can the Commission provide that provisions currently in place in regions where national bodies conduct roadworthiness testing will be safeguarded under the proposals?

3. Can the Commission explain the rationale behind launching its proposals for amending roadworthiness testing in the form of a regulation and not a directive (which would allow Member States better flexibility in implementing the aims)?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(11 February 2013)

The Commission would like to draw the attention of the Honourable Member of the European Parliament to the impact assessment ([1]) accompanying the Commission's proposal which covers the aspects of costs related to testing authorities in regard to training. The cost is assessed at EUR 164.5 million for the whole Union. As regards SMEs using light duty vehicles below 3.5 tons, the costs are considered to be equivalent to those of private car owners with estimated costs per test of EUR 39. As vehicles used for agricultural purposes only are exempted according to the Commission proposal from mandatory roadworthiness testing, the impact on farmers is not further assessed.

The Commission's proposal does not affect the organisational arrangements within Member States for periodic roadworthiness testing. Instead, the Commission's proposal provides for harmonised test methods, test equipment, training of inspectors and supervision standards of test centres, as well as for a harmonised approach to the assessment of defects.

As regards the legal form of a regulation, this was considered to best reflect the nature of the legal obligations to be imposed.. Nevertheless, the Commission wishes to highlight that the proposed Regulation is drafted in such a way that it allows Member States who require higher standards of roadworthiness testing to maintain these standards, while requiring all Member States to comply with the set minimum levels.

([1]) SWD(2012)206 final. The Impact Assessment is available at http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/events-archive/2012_07_13_press_release_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011610/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 décembre 2012)

Objet: Royaume-Uni: une taxe sur la localisation du joueur et non de l'opérateur

Le Royaume-Uni souhaite revoir sa législation afin de corriger l'une des principales failles du *Gambling Act* de 2005. Si le nouveau projet de loi présenté le 3 décembre 2012 entre en vigueur, les 15 % de taxes sur les profits seront dus, non pas en fonction de la localisation de l'opérateur (comme c'est le cas aujourd'hui), mais en fonction de la localisation du joueur. Les opérateurs pointent du doigt la fuite inévitable des consommateurs britanniques vers une offre illégale si une telle loi était adoptée.

Quelle est la position de la Commission sur cette proposition britannique?

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(11 mars 2013)

Le Royaume-Uni a notifié des projets d'amendement de la loi de 2005 sur les jeux de hasard au titre de la procédure d'information ([1]) dans le but, selon les autorités britanniques, de protéger les consommateurs résidant dans ce pays face aux services de jeux de hasard en ligne. Conformément aux projets d'amendement annoncés, les opérateurs devront obtenir une autorisation des autorités compétentes pour pouvoir proposer ou promouvoir des services de jeux en ligne en Grande-Bretagne. La Commission analyse ces projets d'amendement à la lumière de la jurisprudence de la Cour de justice européenne sur la compatibilité des restrictions nationales dans le domaine des jeux de hasard avec les principes du marché intérieur. La Cour de justice européenne a notamment indiqué clairement que les mesures restrictives imposées par la législation nationale doivent répondre aux exigences de nécessité et de proportionnalité.

La Commission voudrait également rappeler que l'objectif principal des initiatives proposées dans la communication sur les jeux de hasard en ligne adoptée le 23 octobre 2012 est d'améliorer l'encadrement des jeux en ligne dans l'UE, et notamment d'assurer un niveau élevé de protection des citoyens et des consommateurs dans l'Union.

([1]) Directive 98/34/CE .

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011610/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: United Kingdom: tax on the location of the player and not of the operator

The United Kingdom intends to review its legislation in order to correct one of the main flaws of the 2005 Gambling Act. If the new draft submitted on 3 December 2012 comes into force, 15% of the income tax will be due not on the basis of the operator's location (as is the case currently) but on the basis of the player's location. Operators point out that British consumers will inevitably revert to illegal gambling if such a law is adopted.

What is the Commission's position in respect of the United Kingdom proposal?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(11 March 2013)

The UK has notifed draft amendments to the 2005 Gambling Act under the notification procedure ([1]) with the objective, according to the UK, of protecting British-based consumers of online gambling services. According to the notified draft amendments, operators will be required to apply for authorisation from the competent authority to offer or promote online gambling services in Great Britain. The Commission is duly assessing the notified draft amendments in view of the relevant case law of the European Court of Justice on the compatibility of national restrictions in the area of gambling with the internal market principles. The CJEU has in particular made clear that restrictive measures imposed by national legislation must satisfy the requirements of necessity and proportionality.

The Commission would also like to recall that an overarching objective of the initiatives proposed in the communication on online gambling adopted on 23 October 2012 is an improved framework for online gambling services in the EU, including a high level of protection of citizens and consumers in the EU.

([1]) Directive 98/34/EC.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011611/12
alla Commissione
Patrizia Toia (S&D)
(19 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: MUOS Niscemi, Caltanissetta

La Sughereta di Niscemi è un sito il cui valore in termini di patrimonio faunistico e di bio-diversità è indiscutibile, nel quale, in maniera arbitraria e senza sufficiente grado di trasparenza, è stata posizionata una struttura che rischia di danneggiare l'area protetta circostante.

Pur consapevoli del fatto che la direttiva 92/43/CEE relativa alla conservazione dell'habitat non vieta tout court la costruzione di infrastrutture satellitari all'interno o in prossimità di siti di importanza comunitaria (SIC) e lascia la valutazione della compatibilità alle caratteristiche di ogni singolo caso;

ricordando le accuse per la mancata diffusione di documenti essenziali per una corretta valutazione, quali: 1) la relazione paesaggistica, 2) la relazione faunistica, 3) la carta dei vincoli;

considerando che dal contenuto della valutazione di impatto ambientale, presentata tra l'altro con ritardo, emerge un resoconto incompleto e poco dettagliato di tutti gli impatti diretti e indiretti dell'intervento;

considerando che la valutazione in questione è stata effettuata in «una stagione particolarmente inadatta a permettere l'apprezzamento del valore naturalistico dell'area»;

considerando che il Parlamento europeo, nella sua risoluzione del 2 aprile 2009, ha esortato la Commissione a procedere alla revisione del fondamento scientifico e dell'adeguatezza dei limiti sui campi elettromagnetici fissati dalla raccomandazione 1999/519/CE;

considerando infine che le interazioni con l'avifauna in particolare possono essere significative dato il contesto territoriale e che gli effetti di queste frequenze sono stati valutati sugli esseri umani (es.: VECCHIA et al., 2009) mentre scarsi risultano ad oggi studi approfonditi sulla componente biotica;

premettendo che la Commissione stessa, tramite il precedente Commissario John Dalli, ha richiesto maggiori informazioni per essere in grado di avviare un'indagine;

non ritiene la Commissione che, vista l'attuale assenza di informazioni disponibili al pubblico, sia necessaria un'ulteriore indagine?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(11 febbraio 2013)

Per quanto riguarda la normativa ambientale dell'UE, la Commissione rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alle risposte fornite alle interrogazioni scritte E-007748/2012, presentata dagli onn. Roberta Angelilli e Giovanni La Via, ed E-007128/2012, presentata dall'on. Rita Borsellino, sullo stesso argomento.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011611/12
to the Commission
Patrizia Toia (S&D)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: MUOS in Niscemi, Caltanissetta

The cork forest ('La Sughereta') of Niscemi is a site the value of which, in terms of fauna and biodiversity, is indisputable, and in which — in an arbitrary manner and without a sufficient degree of transparency — facilities that are likely to damage the surrounding protected area have been installed.

We are aware that directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats does not prohibit outright the construction of satellite infrastructure in or near sites of Community importance (SCI) and allows compatibility to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

However, in this regard it is worth noting the following:

— accusations have been made that documents that are essential for a proper assessment have not been made widely available; these documents include: 1) the landscape report; 2) the wildlife report, and 3) the document listing environmental constraints;

— the environmental impact assessment — which, among other things, was submitted late — gives an incomplete picture, lacking in detail, of the total, direct and indirect, impact of the facilities in question;

— the assessment in question was made in a season that was particularly inappropriate for appreciating the natural value of the area;

— the European Parliament, in its resolution of 2 April 2009, urged the Commission to review the scientific basis and adequacy of the EMF limits set out in Recommendation 1999/519/EC;

— last but not least, interactions with birds, in particular, may be significant given the local context, while the effects of these frequencies have been assessed in human beings (e.g. VECCHIA et al., 2009), with few in-depth studies having been carried out to date on other living organisms.

Since the Commission itself, through former Commissioner John Dalli, has requested further information in order to be able to open an investigation, does it not agree that, given the current lack of publicly available information, a further investigation is necessary?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(11 February 2013)

In relation to EU environmental legislation, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-007748/2012 by Roberta Angelilli and Giovanni La Via and E-007128/2012 by Rita Borsellino on the same issue.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011612/12
alla Commissione
Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE)
(19 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: La gestione e l'impatto del tasso Euribor sui mutui variabili

L'Euribor, il tasso di cambio interbancario, incide profondamente sulla vita dei cittadini europei, poiché da esso dipende il mutuo variabile per la casa, così come la cedola di tante obbligazioni.

Verso la fine del 2008 l'Euribor a tre mesi arrivò fino a un tasso di 5,3 %, causando gravi difficoltà per i mutuatari variabili. Oggi invece questi ultimi beneficiano di un taglio ridottissimo del tasso a cui è agganciato il loro mutuo, soprattutto se la maggiorazione applicata dalla banca all'epoca della partenza del contratto era nell'ordine dell'1-1,5 %.

Nei prossimi mesi giudici e istituzioni europee stabiliranno se vi siano state manipolazioni da parte di questo o di quel grande gruppo bancario, impegnato a far soldi con i derivati, per avere un Euribor «addomesticato» agli interessi. Permangono difatti numerosi dubbi sul fatto che questi abbiano radicalmente cambiato i connotati del tasso a danno degli utilizzatori più deboli, tra cui in primis le famiglie con mutuo e bond.

Il caso dell'Euribor segue tra l'altro lo scandalo già noto accaduto in Gran Bretagna, dove il medesimo tasso inglese è stato tolto alla competenza della federazione bancaria inglese e affidato a un'autorità indipendente.

Sembra che anche la Commissione europea stia valutando la possibilità di togliere il controllo dell'Euribor alla Federazione bancaria europea e di affidarlo a un'autorità che faccia capo direttamente all'UE, formalmente esterna alla banche.

Alla luce di questi fatti, può la Commissione europea fornire maggiori chiarificazioni sulla sua posizione rispetto alla gestione degli ultimi anni dell'Euribor? Può inoltre la Commissione far sapere quali misure intende adottare per dare una risposta immediata ed efficace al problema dei mutui variabili, settore dove i cittadini europei hanno maggiormente risentito dei tassi molti alti dalla fine del 2008 in poi?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(19 marzo 2013)

La Commissione sta valutando possibili accordi di cartello riguardanti l'Euribor e la contrattazione di strumenti derivati. È compito della Commissione far applicare le norme UE antitrust, in particolare l'articolo 101 del trattato, e imporre sanzioni ove necessario.

La Commissione ha agito prontamente per garantire l'integrità degli indici e proteggere i consumatori, gli investitori e l'economia reale, prima di tutto con l'adozione di proposte modificate riguardanti un regolamento e una direttiva sugli abusi di mercato, per vietare in modo chiaro e considerare come un reato in tutta l'UE la manipolazione dei tassi di interesse di riferimento.

Il 29 novembre 2012 la Commissione ha completato una consultazione sulla regolamentazione dei parametri di riferimento in senso più generico. La Commissione sta attualmente esaminando le risposte e considera questa una questione prioritaria, con l'obiettivo di pubblicare una proposta nel secondo trimestre del 2013. Il Parlamento europeo sarà aggiornato sui progressi in questo senso.

Anche l'ABE e l'AESFEM hanno proceduto ad una revisione dell'Euribor e presentato una relazione e una lettera alla FBE formulando raccomandazioni specifiche su come tale processo possa essere migliorato ([1]). L'ABE ha anche formulato delle raccomandazioni alle autorità di vigilanza ([2]).

([1]) http://www.esma.europa.eu/news/ESMA-and-EBA-take-action-strengthen-Euribor-and-benchmark-rate-setting-processes.
([2]) http://www.esma.europa.eu/system/files/eba_bs_2013_005.pdf

Il 31 marzo 2011 la Commissione ha adottato una proposta di direttiva in merito ai contratti di credito relativi ad immobili residenziali che include l'obbligo di informazione per i mutui a tasso variabile e di illustrazione delle caratteristiche del credito ([3]). Prima della stipulazione del contratto il consumatore dovrebbe ricevere informazioni sulla natura del tasso, la frequenza delle sue variazioni, i limiti alla sua variabilità, la formula di revisione del tasso stesso e un avviso tempestivo nel caso in cui il tasso non rimanga fisso. La proposta prevede che i creditori considerino la capacità del consumatore di estinguere il mutuo. La proposta è attualmente discussa in sede di Parlamento europeo e di Consiglio.

([3]) COM(2011)142.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011612/12
to the Commission
Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: The management of the Euribor rate and its impact on variable-rate mortgages

Euribor, the interbank exchange rate, is having a major impact on the lives of European citizens, as variable-rate home loans are dependent on it, as are bond yields.

Towards the end of 2008, the three-month Euribor rate reached 5.3%, causing serious difficulties for borrowers with variable-rate mortgages. Today, however, they are enjoying highly reduced rates for their mortgages, especially if the mark-up applied by the bank at the start of the contract was around 1-1.5%.

In the coming months, EU institutions and the courts will determine whether there has been any manipulation by large banking groups involved in making money out of derivatives, to 'tame' the Euribor rate in their own self-interest. In fact, it is widely suspected that banks might have radically changed the rate at the expense of weaker users — first and foremost families with mortgages and bonds.

The Euribor case comes in the wake of the notorious UK scandal, where responsibility for the equivalent UK rate (Libor) was removed from the British Bankers' Association (BBA) and entrusted to an independent authority.

It would appear that the Commission is considering the possibility of removing the control of Euribor from the European Banking Federation and handing it over to an authority reporting directly to the EU, officially outside the banking sphere.

In the light of these facts, can the Commission provide further clarification on its position with regard to how Euribor has been managed over the last few years? Can the Commission say what action it intends to take to provide an immediate and effective response to the problem of variable mortgages, an area in which EU citizens have been the most strongly affected by very high interest rates since the end of 2008?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(19 March 2013)

The Commission is investigating possible cartel arrangements involving EURIBOR and trading in related derivatives. It is the Commission's responsibility to enforce EU antitrust rules, in particular Article 101 of the Treaty, and impose sanctions where necessary.

The Commission has acted promptly to ensure the integrity of indices and protect consumers, investors and the real economy, first by adopting amended proposals for a regulation and for a directive on market abuse, to clearly prohibit and criminalise throughout the EU the manipulation of interest rate benchmarks.

On 29 November 2012 the Commission completed a consultation on the regulation of benchmarks more broadly. The Commission is now examining the responses and considering this issue as a priority with the aim of publishing a proposal in Q2 2013. The European Parliament will be kept informed of progress.

The EBA and ESMA have also conducted a review of Euribor and issued a report and a letter to the EBF making some specific recommendations on how the process can be improved ([1]). The EBA has also issued recommendations to supervisors ([2]).

The Commission adopted a proposal for a directive on credit agreements relating to residential property on 31 March 2011 ([3]) which includes information obligations for variable interest loans and explanations of the characteristics of the credit. Before the contact the consumer should be provided with information on the nature of the rate, the frequency of changes, the limits to the rate variability, the formula to revise the rate and a risk warning about the rate not remaining fixed. The proposal foresees that creditors consider the consumer's ability to repay the loan. This proposal is currently subject to negotiations in the European Parliament and Council.

([1]) http://www.esma.europa.eu/news/ESMA-and-EBA-take-action-strengthen-Euribor-and-benchmark-rate-setting-processes.
([2]) http://www.esma.europa.eu/system/files/eba_bs_2013_005.pdf
([3]) COM(2011) 142.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011613/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diane Dodds (NI)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Further attacks in Nigeria

In light of the further recent attacks by the Boko Haram in Nigeria, in which suicide bombers attacked a church inside a military barracks in Kaduna state in northern Nigeria, killing 11 people and injuring 30, what further action is being taken by the Vice-President/High Representative in order to prevent more attacks in the future?

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

The escalating violence in parts of northern Nigeria are a growing cause of concern for those inside and outside the country and targets innocent civilians, both christians and muslims, and the institutions of the state. We are working with Nigeria to help it tackle the challenges of creating durable security and dealing with the factors conducive to radicalisation and violence, through both continuous political dialogue on appropriate approaches to the problems, as well as targeted aid interventions. A mission was recently in Nigeria to examine specific forms of support to fight terrorism. Our objective is to help the Nigerian authorities ensure the rule of law and the respect of human rights principles.

The EU already undertakes a number of programmes providing social assistance, e.g. through maternal care, and water resources in the North. We are considering, however, focusing more attention under the 11th EDF on integrated programmes that tackle the full range of economic and social challenges that give impetus to the violence.

In addition, in July 2012 the EU provided capacity building for mediation in one of the most fragile areas, using funds from a special initiative by the European Parliament (EEAS BL 2238). We are also preparing another project focusing on conflict prevention and youth employment for this area.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011614/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diane Dodds (NI)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Hezbollah

Could the Vice-President/High Representative explain why the European Union does not list Hezbollah as a terrorist organisation, even though it has been responsible for thousands of deaths over a 30-year period, including those of many EU citizens? Many EU countries classify Hezbollah as a terrorist organisation, including the Netherlands and the United Kingdom; in addition, New Zealand classified it as a terrorist organisation following its takeover of Beirut.

Should the EU not stop the validation of Hezbollah, which enables it to recruit and fundraise in Member States?

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

The possibility of including Hezbollah in the EU list of terrorist organisations was subject to discussion in the past. Until this point there has been no consensus among EU Member States with regard to whether Hezbollah can be designated as a terrorist organisation.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011615/12
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(19 december 2012)

Betreft: Duurzaamheidscriteria vaste biomassa

Momenteel komt volgens cijfers van Eurostat ([1]) ongeveer de helft van de Europese hernieuwbare energie van hout en houtafval. Aangezien er voor vaste biomassa nog steeds geen duurzaamheidscriteria voorhanden zijn, groeit de dreiging van grootschalige verdoken CO_2-uitstoot.

Eerder was gepland dat de duurzaamheidscriteria voor vaste biomassa zouden worden gepresenteerd in december 2012/januari 2013, intussen is er in het werkprogramma van de Commissie voor 2013 zelfs geen spoor meer van een initiatief in dezen.

Erkent de Commissie dat bij hernieuwbare energie uit vaste biomassa koolstofneutraliteit niet gegarandeerd is?

Is de Commissie van oordeel dat duurzaamheidscriteria voor vaste biomassa nodig zijn om het risico van verdoken CO_2 te vermijden?

Wat is de reden van het uitstel van het lanceren van een initiatief hieromtrent?

Wanneer mag een voorstel verwacht worden?

Welke aspecten zullen in het voorstel aan bod komen?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(15 februari 2013)

De Commissie is zeer goed op de hoogte van de discussie over de voordelen van vaste biomassa voor het tegengaan van de klimaatverandering en verwijst het geachte Parlementslid naar de antwoorden op vragen E-11113/2012 van de heer I. Belet en E-11224/2012 van de heer D. Casa. Het uitstel in dit proces is te wijten aan de complexiteit van het dossier en de behoefte aan meer overleg met de belanghebbenden.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_STAT-12-168_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011615/12
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Sustainability criteria for solid biomass

At present, according to figures compiled by Eurostat ([1]), approximately half of all renewable energy in Europe is derived from wood and wood waste. As there are still no sustainability criteria for solid biomass, there is a growing danger of large-scale concealed CO_2 emissions.

It was previously planned that the sustainability criteria for solid biomass should be presented in December 2012/January 2013, but now no trace of an initiative relating to this is even to be found in the Commission's work programme for 2013.

Does the Commission acknowledge that carbon neutrality is not guaranteed in connection with renewable energy from solid biomass?

Does the Commission consider that sustainability criteria for solid biomass are needed in order to avert the risk of concealed CO_2?

What is the reason for the delay in launching an initiative concerning this?

When can a proposal be expected?

What aspects will the proposal cover?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2013)

The Commission is well aware of the debate related to climate mitigation benefits of solid biomass and refers the Honourable Member to the answers provided to questions E-11113/2012 by M. I. Belet and E-11224/2012 by M. D. Casa. The delay in this process is due to the complexity of the file and the need to carry out wider stakeholder consultations.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_STAT-12-168_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-011616/12
à Comissão
Vital Moreira (S&D)
(19 de dezembro de 2012)

Assunto: Inquérito de salvaguarda aberto por Marrocos relativo às exportações de barras e varetas oriundas da UE

Em setembro de 2012, Marrocos abriu um inquérito de salvaguarda contra os exportadores de barras e varetas da UE. A Comissão tem conhecimento deste inquérito?

Que tipo de apoio pode ser prestado pela Comissão aos produtores de barras e varetas da UE?

Que está a ser feito pela Comissão para assegurar que o inquérito supra mencionado respeita plenamente as regras e obrigações existentes no quadro da OMC?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(28 de janeiro de 2013)

A Comissão tem conhecimento deste caso e das suas possíveis implicações para os exportadores da UE, em particular para Portugal e Espanha.

Tal como sucede noutros processos de defesa comercial iniciados por países terceiros contra exportadores europeus, a Comissão oferece a sua assistência à indústria em questão e, se for necessário, intervirá diretamente no âmbito do inquérito para garantir que as normas da Organização Mundial do Comércio são respeitadas.

Neste caso específico, a Comissão já discutiu a questão em Casablanca com as autoridades marroquinas alguns dias antes do início do inquérito e também se encontrou com a indústria das barras, assim como a associação pertinente, Eurofer, para identificar qualquer insuficiência do caso e definir uma estratégia comum.

Além disso, a Comissão registou-se como parte terceira no processo e enviou recentemente uma observação escrita às autoridades marroquinas. A Comissão garantirá o acompanhamento dos desenvolvimentos do caso e está preparada para intervir caso a situação o exija, em cooperação com a indústria e a administração dos Estados-Membros em questão.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011616/12
to the Commission
Vital Moreira (S&D)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Safeguard investigation initiated by Morocco on EU exports of bars and rods

In September 2012, Morocco initiated a safeguard investigation against EU exporters of bars and rods. Is the Commission aware of this investigation?

What kind of support can the Commission offer to EU producers of bars and rods?

What is the Commission doing to ensure that the abovementioned investigation is fully compliant with WTO rules and obligations?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(28 January 2013)

The Commission is aware of this case and its possible implications for EU exporters, in particular in Portugal and Spain.

As in any other Trade Defence proceedings initiated by a third country against EU exports, the Commission offers its assistance to the industry concerned and, if necessary, directly intervenes within the framework of the investigation in order to ensure that the World Trade Organisation rules are respected.

In this specific case, the Commission has already discussed the matter in Cassablanca with the Moroccan investigating authorities a few days after the initiation of the investigation and also subsequently met with the bars and rods industry as well as the relevant association, Eurofer, in order to identify any weaknesses of the case and define a common strategy.

Furthermore, the Commission has registered as a third party to the proceeding and recently sent a written submission to the Moroccan authorities. The Commission will continue monitoring the developments of the case and is ready to intervene should the situation require it, in cooperation with the industry and the administration of the Member States concerned.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011618/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(19. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Mögliche neue Verfassung in Ägypten

1. Wie bewertet die Kommission den neuen Verfassungsentwurf in Ägypten, der in der von den Muslimbrüdern beherrschten gesetzgebenden Versammlung beschlossen wurde, vor allem unter dem Gesichtspunkt der europäischen demokratischen Grundhaltung als auch im Hinblick auf eine Einschätzung der Auswirkungen auf die Europäische Union?

2. Welche Auswirkungen könn(t)en die Inhalte (unter anderem laut Darstellung der Opposition die Beschneidung der Frauenrechte und der Justiz sowie der Einfluss der Religionsgelehrten auf die Gesetzgebung) auf die politische Haltung der Europäischen Union gegenüber Ägypten haben?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(25. Februar 2013)

Die HV/VP teilt voll und ganz die Bedenken hinsichtlich der Entscheidung der ägyptischen Präsidentschaft, die zu dieser politischen Krise und tiefen Spaltungen zwischen den Anhängern von Mursi und der wichtigsten liberalen und säkularen Oppositionspartei, der Nationalen Heilsfront, geführt hat.

Die EU-Delegation in Kairo und die HV/VP waren seit dem Beginn der Ereignisse in ständigem Kontakt mit den wichtigsten politischen Akteuren, darunter Außenminister Amr, und haben unterstrichen, dass Schritte unternommen werden müssen, die zu einer Entschärfung der Lage und zur Versöhnung beitragen. Angesichts des Ausmaßes der Polarisierung zwischen den Parteien und der auf beiden Seiten bestehenden Empfindlichkeit gegenüber externem Eingreifen wurde dies als die bevorzugte Vorgehensweise erachtet. Am 5. Dezember gab die HV/VP eine öffentliche Erklärung ab, in der sie hervorhob, wie wichtig es ist, dass Ägypten seinen Übergang zur Demokratie fortsetzt, und einen Dialog mit allen Beteiligten forderte. Am 8. Dezember zog Präsident Mursi seine Verfassungserklärung zurück. Dennoch wurde das Referendum über den Verfassungsentwurf am 15. und 22. Dezember durchgeführt.

In der Stellungnahme, die die HV/VP am selben Tag abgab, bekräftigte sie angesichts der weiterhin bestehenden Notwendigkeit von Konsensbildung und Inklusion ihren Aufruf zum Dialog zwischen allen Parteien in Ägypten, damit weitere Fortschritte auf dem Weg zu einer tiefgreifenden und tragfähigen Demokratie erzielt werden können. Sie forderte die Betroffenen, insbesondere den Präsidenten, auf, die diesbezüglichen Bemühungen zu intensivieren, da es von größter Wichtigkeit ist, dass die Zuversicht und das Vertrauen aller Ägypter in den Prozess wiederhergestellt werden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011618/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Possible new Egyptian constitution

1. How does the Commission feel about the new draft Egyptian constitution adopted by the legislative assembly dominated by the Muslim Brotherhood, especially in view of fundamental European democratic values and the possible implications for the European Union?

2. What implications could the Constitution's provisions (for example, role of the opposition, curbs on women's rights and the judiciary, influence of religious leaders on the legislative authority) have on political relations between the European Union and Egypt?

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

The HR/VP fully shares the concerns regarding the decision of the Egyptian Presidency leading to this deeply divisive political crisis between pro-Morsi supporters and the main liberal, secular opposition, the National Salvation Front.

From the very beginning the HR/VP and the EU Delegation in Cairo were in constant touch with the main political protagonists, including Foreign Minister Amr, insisting on the need for de-escalation and conciliatory moves. This was judged the preferred course of action given the degree of polarisation between the parties and also the sensitivity on both sides about external interference. On 5 December, the HR/VP issued a public statement stressing the importance of Egypt continuing its democratic transition and calling for an inclusive dialogue. On 8 December, President Morsi rescinded the constitutional declaration. Notwithstanding, the referendum on the draft Constitution took place on 15 December and on 22 December.

In her statement of on the same day, and given the continuing need for consensus-building and inclusion, the HR/VP reiterated the previous calls for dialogue among all parties in Egypt in order to make further progress toward deep and sustainable democracy. She urged those concerned, in particular the President, to intensify efforts in this regard since it is of the utmost importance that the confidence and trust of all Egyptians in the process is restored.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011619/12
an die Kommission
Jorgo Chatzimarkakis (ALDE)
(19. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Nachgelagerte Handelshemmnisse in Europa bei nicht harmonisierten Teilen — im besonderen Autozubehör

Die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 764/2008 soll den Grundsatz der gegenseitigen Anerkennung für Produkte, die rechtmäßig in einem anderen Mitgliedstaat in Verkehr gebracht wurden, stärken und die Vermarktung nicht harmonisierter Erzeugnisse in den Mitgliedstaaten erleichtern.

In einem Bericht der Kommission (KOM(2012)0292 endg.) werden Schwächen bei der Anwendung der VO in Bezug auf technische Produkte bestätigt. Betroffen sind auch Zubehörteile für die Änderung in Verkehr befindlicher Fahrzeuge — auch die, die Prüfzeugnisse akkreditierter Technischer Dienste besitzen, welche nach der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 764/2008 (Erwägungsgrund 20) anerkannt werden sollten.

Die Richtlinie 2007/46/EG (Artikel 31 Absatz 12) erlaubt den Mitgliedstaaten die Anwendung nationaler Regelungen, solange für in Anhang VIII aufgelistete Teile noch keine gemeinschaftlichen Zulassungsstrukturen geschaffen wurden. Das Problem tritt bei solchen nicht harmonisierten Teilen auf.

Sollte einem Erzeugnis in seiner gegenwärtigen Form der Marktzugang im Einklang mit den Artikeln 28 und 30 AEUV nicht gewährt werden können, sind nach der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 764/2008 von den Behörden des Mitgliedstaates (Erwägungsgrund 21) für technische oder wissenschaftliche Nachweise zu erbringen. In Bezug auf Autozubehör- und Tuningteile liegen von keinem Mitgliedstaat derartige Nachweise vor.

Artikel 31 Absatz 12 der Richtlinie 2007/46/EG läuft den Zielen der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 764/2008 zuwider.

Beispiel Italien: Hier gilt die uneingeschränkte Anwendung nationaler Regelungen. Nach dem nationalen Zulassungsrecht sind für bestimmte Zubehörteile Freigaben der Fahrzeughersteller erforderlich. Die Fahrzeughersteller stehen mit Zubehöranbietern in unmittelbarem Wettbewerb! Nachweise der Behörden gemäß Erwägungsgrund 21 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 764/2008 liegen nicht vor. Bestimmte Anforderungen des italienischen Zulassungsrechtes für gewisse Zubehör- und Tuningteile wirken auf die Unternehmen als nachgelagerte Handelshemmnisse im Sinne der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 764/2008 (Erwägungsgrund 1) und der Dassonville-Formel.

Inwieweit kann die Kommission zur Lösung des Problems aktiv werden?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(19. Februar 2013)

Mit der Richtlinie 2007/46/EG ([1]) wurde ein Rahmen für die Genehmigung von Kraftfahrzeugen geschaffen, wobei die Kommission in Artikel 31 ermächtigt wird, Anforderungen für die Vorabgenehmigung von Teilen oder Ausrüstungen festzulegen, von denen ein erhebliches Risiko für das einwandfreie Funktionieren von Systemen ausgehen kann, die für die Sicherheit des Fahrzeugs oder für seine Umweltverträglichkeit von wesentlicher Bedeutung sind. Dieser Artikel ist jedoch lediglich auf Teile und Ausrüstungen anwendbar, die zuvor in eine Liste in Anhang XIII aufgenommen wurden, eine Liste, die bis heute jedoch nicht erstellt worden ist ([2]). Folglich steht es den Mitgliedstaaten frei, eigene Regelungen zu treffen.

([1]) Richtlinie 2007/46/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 5. September 2007 zur Schaffung eines Rahmens für die Genehmigung von Kraftfahrzeugen und Kraftfahrzeuganhängern sowie von Systemen, Bauteilen und selbstständigen technischen Einheiten für diese Fahrzeuge (Rahmenrichtlinie) (Text von Bedeutung für den EWR), ABl. L 263 vom 9.10.2007, S. 1-160.

([2]) In Artikel 31 Absatz 11 heißt es: „Dieser Artikel findet auf ein Teil oder eine Ausrüstung erst Anwendung, wenn das betreffende Teil oder die betreffende Ausrüstung in Anhang XIII aufgelistet ist." Aufgrund der mangelnden Unterstützung der Interessenträger und der Mitgliedstaaten für eine entsprechende Aktualisierung, enthält Anhang XIII jedoch bis heute keine Einträge.

Nationale Rechtsvorschriften, durch die der freie Warenverkehr eingeschränkt wird, stellen nicht zwangsläufig einen Verstoß gegen das EU-Recht dar, sofern sie durch einen der in Artikel 36 AEUV aufgeführten Gründe öffentlichen Interesses (z. B. Schutz der Gesundheit und des Lebens von Menschen) oder durch eines der vom Gerichtshof der Europäischen Union in seiner Rechtssprechung anerkannten zwingenden Gemeinwohlerfordernisse (wie Straßenverkehrssicherheit) gerechtfertigt sind. Solche Vorschriften müssen jedoch zur Erreichung eines oder mehrerer dieser legitimen Ziele erforderlich sein und dem Verhältnismäßigkeitsprinzip entsprechen, demzufolge stets die am wenigsten restriktive Maßnahme zu wählen ist. Somit kann Artikel 31 Absatz 12 der Richtlinie 2007/46/EG nicht als mit den Zielen der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 764/2008 ([3]) unvereinbar betrachtet werden.

Zudem können aus Gründen der Straßenverkehrssicherheit zwar nationale Maßnahmen erlassen werden, die gegen einen Wirtschaftsakteur gerichtet sind und durch die seinem Produkt der Marktzugang verweigert wird, jedoch ohne dass diese notwendigerweise auf Grundlage einer technischen Vorschrift getroffen werden. Handelt es sich beispielsweise um Verfahren zur Überprüfung der ordnungsgemäßen Installation von zertifizierten Produkten, fallen diese nicht unter die Verordnung über die gegenseitige Anerkennung, sofern die Installation selbst nicht bereits von der Behörde eines anderen Mitgliedstaats inspiziert wurde ([4]).

([3]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 764/2008 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 9. Juli 2008 zur Festlegung von Verfahren im Zusammenhang mit der Anwendung bestimmter nationaler technischer Vorschriften für Produkte, die in einem anderen Mitgliedstaat rechtmäßig in den Verkehr gebracht worden sind, und zur Aufhebung der Entscheidung Nr. 3052/95/EG (Text von Bedeutung für den EWR), ABl. L 218 vom 13.8.2008, S. 21-29.

([4]) In Erwägungsgrund 12 der Verordnung über die gegenseitige Anerkennung heißt es ferner: „Ein Erfordernis der Vorabgenehmigung für das Inverkehrbringen eines Produkts sollte als solches keine technische Vorschrift im Sinne dieser Verordnung darstellen, so dass eine Entscheidung, ein Erzeugnis allein mit der Begründung vom Markt auszuschließen oder vom Markt zu nehmen, dass es über keine gültige Vorabgenehmigung verfügt, keine Entscheidung darstellen sollte, auf die diese Verordnung [Verordnung (EG) Nr. 764/2008] anwendbar ist“.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011619/12
to the Commission
Jorgo Chatzimarkakis (ALDE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Upstream barriers to trade in Europe for non-harmonised products, particularly car parts

Regulation (EC) No 764/2008 is intended to strengthen the principle of mutual recognition for products which can be legitimately sold in another Member State, thus making it easier to sell non-harmonised products in other EU countries.

A Commission report (COM(2012)0292 final) identifies shortcomings in the application of the regulation to technical products. Among other things, this affects parts used to modify roadworthy vehicles — including parts certified by accredited conformity-assessment bodies, which under Regulation (EC) No 764/2008 (Recital 20) are entitled to approval.

Directive 2007/46/EC (Article 31(12)) allows Member States to apply national provisions until Community approval procedures have been established for the parts listed in Annex VIII. This problem concerns these non-harmonised parts.

If a product cannot be marketed in its current form under Articles 28 and 30 TFEU, Regulation (EC) No. 764/2008 (Recital 21) requires Member State authorities to indicate the technical or scientific grounds for denying access. No such grounds have been provided by any of the Member States for car accessories or tuning parts.

Article 31(12) of Directive 2007/46/EC is incompatible with the objectives of Regulation (EC) No 764/2008.

For example, in Italy national provisions are applied without restrictions. These require vehicle manufacturer approval for certain parts, even though these manufacturers are in direct competition with the manufacturers of the parts concerned! At the same time, authorities have not yet provided grounds as required by Recital 21 of Regulation (EC) No 764/2008. Certain provisions of Italian approval laws for particular car parts and tuning parts impact on business as upstream barriers to trade as prohibited by Regulation (EC) No 764/2008 (Recital 1) and the Dassonville Formula.

Can the Commission do anything to solve this problem?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(19 February 2013)

Directive 2007/46/EC ([1]) establishes a framework for the approval of motor vehicles and its Article 31 empowers the Commission to set up requirements for prior authorisation of parts or equipment which are capable of posing a significant risk to the correct functioning of systems that are essential for the vehicle's safety or its environmental performance. However, this Article is not applicable before the item is listed in Annex XIII, which remains empty to date ([2]). Hence Member States are entitled to regulate the issue.

A national rule posing legal barriers to the free movement of goods is not necessarily contrary to EC law if justified on one of the public interest grounds set out in Article 36 TFEU (protection of the health and life of humans) or by one of the overriding requirements of general public importance laid down by the case-law of the Court of Justice of the European Union, such as road safety. Such rules, however, must be necessary in order to attain one or more of the legitimate objectives, and in conformity with the principle of proportionality, whereby the least restrictive measure is to be used. Therefore, Article 31(12) of Directive 2007/46/EC cannot be deemed as incompatible with the objectives of Regulation (EC) No 764/2008 ([3]).

([1]) Directive 2007/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 September 2007 establishing a framework for the approval of motor vehicles and their trailers, and of systems, components and separate technical units intended for such vehicles (Framework Directive) (Text with EEA relevance); OJ L 263 of 9.10.2007, pp. 1-160.

([2]) According to Article 31(11): this Article shall not be applicable to a part or piece or equipment before it is listed in Annex XIII […]. Up to now Annex XIII has remained empty due to the lack of support of stakeholders and Member States to amend it.

([3]) Regulation (EC) No 764/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 July 2008 laying down procedures relating to the application of certain national technical rules to products lawfully marketed in another Member State and repealing Decision No 3052/95/EC (Text with EEA relevance); OJ L 218 of 13.8.2008, pp. 21–29.

Additionally, although national measures, addressed to an economic operator and denying the product's access to the market, might be adopted on the grounds of road safety, they are not necessarily taken on the basis of a technical rule. When they amount to procedures aimed at verifying the proper installation of certified products where this installation has not already been inspected by the authority of another Member State, they are not covered by the Mutual Recognition Regulation ([4]).

([4]) Recital 12 of the Mutual Recognition Regulation states that "A requirement that the placing of a product on the market be subject to prior authorisation should, as such, not constitute a technical rule, so that a decision to exclude or remove a product from the market exclusively on the grounds that it does not have valid prior authorisation should not constitute a decision to which [Regulation (EC) No 764/2008] applies."

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011620/12
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: The proximity of sewage plants to residential dwellings

Could the Commission outline whether there are European guidelines in place which stipulate the acceptable distance from a residential dwelling at which a sewage plant can be developed?

If such guidelines do not exist, will the Commission introduce some?

What does the Commission believe to be the acceptable distance from a residential dwelling at which a sewage plant can be developed?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2013)

There are no European Union guidelines on minimum distances to be respected between the construction of sewage plants and residential dwellings.

Establishing such minimum distances falls under town and country planning. In accordance with the subsidiarity principle, Member States are best placed to establish rules on such minimum distances, considering local circumstances.

Therefore, the Commission has no intention to establish guidelines with respect to this issue.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011621/12
a la Comisión
Emine Bozkurt (S&D) y Alejandro Cercas (S&D)
(19 de diciembre de 2012)

Asunto: Derechos en materia de seguridad social de los trabajadores turcos en la EU tras la adopción de la Decisión del Consejo de 6 de diciembre de 2012

El Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea dictaminó en lo relativo al caso C-485/07 que el párrafo primero del artículo 6, apartado 1, de la Decisión n° 3/80 tiene un efecto directo y que, por lo tanto, no se pueden retirar las prestaciones especiales en metálico de carácter no contributivo en el caso de aquellos trabajadores turcos que hayan regresado a Turquía tras haber perdido su derecho de residencia (residencia y permiso de trabajo) en el Estado miembro de acogida por haber sido declarados en situación de invalidez en él. El Tribunal dictaminó que, en el caso de los trabajadores turcos, el fallo no infringe el principio de igualdad de trato puesto que los trabajadores turcos no se encuentran en la misma situación jurídica que los ciudadanos de la UE ya que no se benefician de la libre circulación.

Sin embargo, el 6 de diciembre de 2012, el Consejo decidió adoptar la propuesta de Decisión COM(2012)0152 ([1]) relativa a la posición que la Unión Europea debería adoptar, y que deberá ser negociada con Turquía, con miras a sustituir a la Decisión n° 3/80 del Consejo de Asociación CEE-Turquía.

Aunque no sea posible en términos jurídicos, existe una gran preocupación por la posibilidad de que algunos Estados miembros aprovechen esta oportunidad para aplicar la legislación nacional o aprobar nuevas leyes de acuerdo con la nueva situación antes de que finalicen las negociaciones con Turquía.

1. ¿Qué piensa hacer la Comisión para evitar este escenario?

2. ¿Qué piensa hacer la Comisión para mejorar la situación de desigualdad en la que se encuentran los trabajadores turcos?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(21 de febrero de 2013)

Remitimos a Su Señoría a la respuesta de la Comisión a la pregunta escrita E-003882/2012 sobre la propuesta ([2]) de la Comisión de Decisión del Consejo relativa a la posición que deberá adoptarse en nombre de la Unión Europea en el seno del Consejo de Asociación establecido por el Acuerdo por el que se crea una asociación entre la Comunidad Económica Europea y Turquía con respecto a las disposiciones de coordinación de los sistemas de seguridad social.

La Decisión del Consejo basada en dicha propuesta se adoptó el 6 de diciembre de 2012 ([3]). En ella se resume la posición de la UE a efectos de las futuras negociaciones con Turquía con vistas a la adopción de una Decisión de Asociación UE-Turquía que sustituya a la Decisión 3/80. Aparte de explicar la posición negociadora de la UE, la Decisión no tiene ningún efecto vinculante en sí mismo sobre los derechos de las personas y no puede proporcionar una base ni una justificación para medidas nacionales que infrinjan la Decisión 3/80 actualmente en vigor. La Comisión se ha comprometido a cumplir con su deber de garantizar el respeto de la legislación de la UE.

([1]) Propuesta de Decisión del Consejo relativa a la posición que deberá adoptarse en nombre de la Unión Europea en el seno del Consejo de Asociación establecido por el Acuerdo por el que se crea una asociación entre la Comunidad Económica Europea y Turquía con respecto a las disposiciones de coordinación de los sistemas de seguridad social.

([2]) COM(2012) 152 final de 30 de marzo de 2012.

([3]) Decisión 2012/776/UE del Consejo, de 6 de diciembre de 2012, relativa a la posición que deberá adoptar la Unión Europea en el seno del Consejo de Asociación establecido por el Acuerdo por el que se crea una asociación entre la Comunidad Económica Europea y Turquía con respecto a la adopción de las disposiciones de coordinación de los sistemas de seguridad social, DO L 340 de 13.12.2012.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011621/12
aan de Commissie
Emine Bozkurt (S&D) en Alejandro Cercas (S&D)
(19 december 2012)

Betreft: De gevolgen het besluit van de Raad van 6 december 2012 voor de socialezekerheidsrechten van Turkse werknemers in de EU

Het Europees Hof van Justitie oordeelde in zaak C-485/07 dat de eerste alinea van artikel 6, lid 1, van besluit nr. 3/80 van de Associatieraad rechtstreeks toepasselijk is, en dat bijzondere, niet op premie- of bijdragebetaling berustende prestaties dus niet kunnen worden ingetrokken ten aanzien van Turkse werknemers die naar Turkije zijn teruggekeerd nadat zij het recht om in de ontvangende lidstaat te verblijven (in de vorm van een verblijfs- en arbeidsvergunning) hadden verloren omdat zij er arbeidsongeschikt waren geworden. Het Hof besloot voorts dat, in het geval van Turkse werknemers, de regelgeving geen inbreuk maakt op het beginsel van gelijke behandeling, aangezien Turkse werknemers niet over dezelfde juridische status beschikken als EU-burgers: zij genieten niet van het recht op vrij verkeer.

De Raad besloot op 6 december 2012 echter om zich voor de komende onderhandelingen met Turkije niet te beroepen op besluit nr. 3/80 van de Associatieraad EU-Turkije, maar om een nieuw Europees standpunt vast te stellen, met name COM(2012)0152 ([1]).

Hoewel er juridisch gezien geen grond voor bestaat, valt te vrezen dat sommige lidstaten het resultaat van de onderhandelingen met Turkije niet zullen afwachten om in overeenstemming met het nieuwe standpunt nationale wetten aan te nemen of ten uitvoer te leggen.

1. Wat zal de Commissie doen om dit te voorkomen?

2. Wat zal de Commissie doen om de ongelijke positie van Turkse werknemers te verbeteren?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(21 februari 2013)

Het geachte Parlementslid wordt verwezen naar het antwoord van de Commissie op schriftelijke vraag E-003882/2012, over het voorstel van de Commissie voor een besluit van de Raad betreffende het standpunt met betrekking tot de bepalingen voor de coördinatie van socialezekerheidsstelsels dat de Europese Unie zal innemen in de Associatieraad die is opgericht bij de overeenkomst waarbij een associatie tot stand wordt gebracht tussen de Europese Economische Gemeenschap en Turkije ([2]).

Het op dat voorstel gebaseerde besluit van de Raad is goedgekeurd op 6 december 2012 ([3]). Het geeft het standpunt van de EU weer voor de toekomstige onderhandelingen met Turkije, met het oog op de goedkeuring van een besluit van de Associatieraad EU-Turkije ter vervanging van Besluit nr. 3/80. Het besluit omschrijft nauwkeurig de onderhandelingspositie van de EU, maar is op zichzelf niet verbindend inzake de rechten van het individu en kan geen grond of rechtvaardiging opleveren voor nationale maatregelen die een schending inhouden van Besluit nr. 3/80, dat momenteel van kracht is. De Commissie is bereid om haar rol te vervullen bij het garanderen van de naleving van het EU-recht.

([1]) Voorstel voor een besluit van de Raad betreffende het standpunt met betrekking tot de bepalingen voor de coördinatie van socialezekerheidsstelsels dat de Europese Unie zal innemen in de Associatieraad die is opgericht bij de overeenkomst waarbij een associatie tot stand wordt gebracht tussen de Europese Economische Gemeenschap en Turkije.

([2]) COM(2012) 152 final van 30 maart 2012.

([3]) Besluit van de Raad 2012/776/EU van 6 december 2012 betreffende het standpunt met betrekking tot vaststelling van de bepalingen voor de coördinatie van socialezekerheidsstelsels dat namens de Europese Unie zal worden ingenomen in de Associatieraad die is opgericht bij de Overeenkomst waarbij een associatie tot stand wordt gebracht tussen de Europese Economische Gemeenschap en Turkije, PB L 340, 13.12.2012, blz. 19.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011621/12
to the Commission
Emine Bozkurt (S&D) and Alejandro Cercas (S&D)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Social security rights of Turkish workers in the EU following the Council Decision of 6 December 2012

The European Court of Justice decided in Case C 485/07 that the first subparagraph of Article 6(1) of Decision No 3/80 has direct effect, and that special, non-contributory cash benefits cannot therefore be withdrawn in the case of Turkish workers who have returned to Turkey after losing their right to remain (residence and work permit) in the host Member State because they became incapacitated in that Member State. The Court decided that, in the case of Turkish workers, the ruling does not violate the principle of equal treatment since Turkish workers do not have the same legal standing as EU nationals owing to the fact that they do not enjoy free movement.

The Council decided on 6 December 2012, however, to adopt — in place of EU-Turkey Association Council Decision 3/80 — COM(2012)0152 ([1]) as the European position, to be negotiated with Turkey.

Although it is not possible in legal terms, there is great concern that some Member States will use this opportunity to implement national law and/or pass new laws in accordance with the new position before the negotiations with Turkey are completed.

1. What will the Commission do to prevent this from happening?

2. What will the Commission do to improve the unequal situation of Turkish workers?

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

The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the Commission's answer to Written Question E-003882/2012 on the Commission proposal ([2]) for a Council decision on the position to be taken by the European Union within the Association Council set up by the Agreement establishing an association between the European Economic Community and Turkey with regard to the provisions on the coordination of social security systems.

The Council Decision based on that proposal was adopted on 6 December 2012 ([3]). It outlines the position of the EU for the purpose of future negotiations with Turkey with a view to the adoption of an EU-Turkey Association decision in place of Decision No 3/80. Apart from spelling out the EU negotiating position, the decision has no binding effect in itself on the rights of individuals and cannot provide a basis for or justify any measures at national level that breach Decision No 3/80 currently in force. The Commission is committed to playing its role in guaranteeing the respect of EC law.

([1]) Proposal for a Council Decision on the position to be taken on behalf of the European Union within the Association Council set up by the Agreement establishing an association between the European Economic Community and Turkey with regard to the provisions on the coordination of social security systems.

([2]) COM(2012) 152 final of 30 March 2012.

([3]) Council Decision 2012/776/EU of 6 December 2012 on the position to be taken on behalf of the European Union within the Association Council set up by the Agreement establishing an association between the European Economic Community and Turkey, with regard to the adoption of provisions on the coordination of social security systems, OJ L 340, 13.12.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011623/12
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Kidnappings and murders in Egypt

I have been contacted by a constituent who has been following the case of Philemon, who was reported by the BBC on 24 November 2012 to have left Eritrea to seek work before being kidnapped and held by criminal gangs in Sinai, which threatened to kill him unless a ransom of USD 20 000 was paid.

My constituent understands that such practices have resulted in the deaths of more than 2 000 people.

Will the Commission take up the matter with the Egyptian authorities and ask what action is being taken to stop Philemon and other kidnap victims being murdered?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

The EU is following the issue of human trafficking in Egypt very closely through its Delegation in Cairo which keeps regular contacts with the Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Interior as well as with the regional offices of the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR) and the International Organisation for Migration (IOM). EU concerns on human trafficking have been expressed on numerous occasions to the Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and to the Ministry of Interior. The EU will continue to urge the Egyptian authorities to ensure that the human rights of migrants and refugees are fully respected and that appropriate actions are taken to address human trafficking in the country. For instance, UNHCR should be given full possibility to implement its mandate on the entire territory of Egypt, including the Sinai region.

In Egypt under President Morsi, a dramatic reshuffle of the military hierarchy ending the military tutorship was carried out. However, without a thorough reform of the security sector and without additional means to fight trafficking and organised crime, it is unlikely that the security environment will improve. The EU stands ready in supporting the Egyptian authorities to fight traffickers and to control the borders in a more efficient manner while fulfilling their international human rights commitments.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011624/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(19 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: Calamità naturali: alluvioni e inondazioni, soluzioni innovative e studi avanzati dall'ingegneria ambientale

Calamità naturali come fiumi in piena, alluvioni e inondazioni sono catastrofi imprevedibili che, in pochi istanti, possono radere al suolo e ridurre in fango case, quartieri e città intere. Le piogge dalla portata devastante che hanno messo in ginocchio più di una volta Piemonte, Liguria e Toscana e che, ogni anno, non solo in Italia, mietono migliaia di vittime in ogni parte del mondo sono un problema a cui l'ingegneria ambientale cerca da diversi anni di dare una soluzione adeguata. La soluzione più innovativa e recente arriva dalla Gran Bretagna dove gli esperti dell'Architects Baca e dell'Agenzia per l'ambiente stanno sperimentando case anfibie sulle sponde del Tamigi: si tratta di costruzioni in grado di sollevarsi per non essere allagate in caso di emergenza. Una strategia di difesa che potrebbe rivelarsi fondamentale quando si rompono gli argini dei fiumi, soprattutto in paesi come l'Inghilterra dove per questo tipo d'interventi ci sono forti benefici assicurativi. Con questo tipo di struttura si riescono a limitare i danni alle abitazioni fino al 70 %. Una buona idea anche secondo gli esperti italiani che, tuttavia, prediligono soluzioni diverse e meno costose quali, ad esempio, il verde pensile, utilizzato come soluzione di copertura degli edifici. Si tratta di strati di vegetazione differenti sovrapposti e sistemati a inclinazioni variabili sui tetti per assorbire meglio l'acqua. Il tetto verde funziona infatti come una spugna ed è capace di immagazzinare fino all'80 % della pioggia di un acquazzone, restituendola in maniera graduale nelle fognature.

Considerato che:

— gli esperti consigliano di mettere a punto una strategia in funzione del territorio, in particolare nei luoghi in cui si verificano un insieme di fenomeni pericolosi, come terremoti, frane e alluvioni;

— tali fenomeni naturali possono essere arginati da alcune pratiche architettoniche chiamate *flood proofing*;

— solo in Italia le risorse a disposizione per questo tipo di problemi sono praticamente finite;

— è necessario investire su nuove misure di prevenzione e di sicurezza ancora poco agevolate sotto il profilo fiscale;

si chiede alla Commissione se intenda intraprendere un piano d'azione specifico volto alla definizione di studi comparati che consentano di utilizzare questi nuovi strumenti di ingegneria ambientale per la prevenzione di tali calamità naturali.

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(25 febbraio 2013)

La Commissione non ha in programma di istituire un piano d'azione allo scopo di indicare quali soluzioni ingegneristiche dovrebbero essere utilizzate per prevenire le catastrofi naturali. Ciò rientra nelle scelte discrezionali degli Stati membri. Ad esempio, in conformità della direttiva 2007/60/CE relativa alla valutazione e alla gestione dei rischi di alluvioni ([1]), gli Stati membri hanno il compito di elaborare piani di gestione del rischio di alluvioni e questi forniscono loro un quadro per scegliere gli strumenti più adeguati alle rispettive esigenze specifiche.

In questi piani possono rientrare la promozione di pratiche sostenibili di utilizzo del suolo, il miglioramento della ritenzione idrica e anche l'inondazione controllata di alcune aree in caso di fenomeni alluvionali. Gli Stati membri devono predisporre, completare e pubblicare piani di gestione dei rischi di alluvioni entro il 22 dicembre 2015.

([1]) GU L 288 del 6.11.2007, pag. 27.

La Commissione sta inoltre sostenendo gli Stati membri nello sviluppo di nuovi sistemi di allerta precoce, di prevenzione e di sicurezza nell'ambito di progetti finanziati dal settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico. I progetti di ricerca in collaborazione contribuiscono a migliorare la capacità di reazione e la gestione dei rischi in caso di fenomeni di piene improvvise e di erosione degli argini ([2]), a sviluppare tecnologie per un'efficace previsione delle piene improvvise ([3]), a comprendere meglio i modelli di prevenzione nelle zone urbane ([4]) e a sviluppare i relativi sistemi e strumenti intelligenti ([5]), a sviluppare tecnologie per la protezione efficace dell'ambiente edificato dalle inondazioni ([6]) e per una maggiore sicurezza delle coste europee ([7]). Le informazioni relative a tutti questi progetti sono regolarmente trasmesse ai rappresentanti degli Stati membri.

([2]) www.imprints-fp7.eu.
([3]) www.hydrate.tesaf.unipd.it.
([4]) www.corfu-fp7.eu.
([5]) www.floodresilience.eu.
([6]) www.FloodProbe.eu.
([7]) www.theseusproject.eu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011624/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Natural disasters: floods — innovative solutions and environmental engineering research

Natural disasters such as swollen rivers and floods are unpredictable events which, in just a few minutes, are able to totally destroy houses, neighbourhoods and entire towns and cities. The devastating rains that have, more than once, crippled Piedmont, Liguria and Tuscany and which, every year — and not only in Italy — kill thousands of people all over the world, are a problem which environmental engineers have been trying to solve for several years. The most innovative and recent solution has come from the United Kingdom, where experts from Baca Architects and the Environment Agency are testing amphibious houses on the banks of the River Thames. These houses are able to rise up and float, so that they are not flooded in case of emergency. It is a defence strategy that could prove vital when rivers break their banks, especially in countries such as the UK, where there are great insurance benefits for this type of work. This type of construction is able to limit damage to homes by up to 70%. It is a good idea also in the view of Italian experts, who, however, prefer different, less costly solutions, such as green roofs to cover buildings. These consist of various superimposed layers of vegetation that are set at variable inclinations on rooftops, in order better to absorb water. The green roof works like a sponge and is capable of storing up to 80% of rain in a downpour, which is then gradually drained off.

Given that:

— experts recommend developing a strategy in accordance with the territory concerned, especially in places where several dangerous events can occur at the same time, such as earthquakes, landslides and floods;

— such natural phenomena can be limited by architectural practices known as flood proofing;

— only in Italy have the resources available for this type of problem been virtually exhausted;

— investment is needed in new prevention and safety measures for which there are still few tax breaks;

can the Commission say whether it will implement a specific action plan with a view to carrying out comparative studies that enable these new environmental engineering tools to be used to prevent such natural disasters?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2013)

The Commission is not planning to set up an action plan to indicate which engineering tools should be used to prevent natural disasters. This belongs to Member States' discretionary choices. For instance, under the directive on the assessment and management of flood risks (2007/60/EC ([1])), Member States have to develop flood risk management plans which provide a framework for them to choose the most appropriate tools for their specific needs.

These plans may include the promotion of sustainable land use practices, improvement of water retention as well as the controlled flooding of certain areas in the case of flood events. Member States have to prepare, complete and publish flood risk management plans by 22 December 2015.

In addition, the Commission is supporting Member States in developing new early warning, prevention and safety tools within projects funded by the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development. Collaborative research projects contribute to improve preparedness and risk management for flash floods and debris flow events ([2]); to develop technologies for effective flash flood forecasting ([3]), to better understand flood resilience patterns in urban areas ([4]) and develop related smart systems and tools ([5]), to develop technologies for cost-effective flood protection of the built environment ([6]), and for safer European coasts ([7]). Information about all these projects is communicated on a regular basis to Member States' representatives.

([1]) OJ L 288, 06.11.2007.
([2]) www.imprints-fp7.eu.
([3]) www.hydrate.tesaf.unipd.it.
([4]) www.corfu-fp7.eu.
([5]) www.floodresilience.eu.
([6]) www.FloodProbe.eu.
([7]) www.theseusproject.eu.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011625/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(19 de diciembre de 2012)

Asunto: Seguimiento del MoU para el sector financiero español

El pasado mes de julio, la Comisión Europea, de común acuerdo con el Eurogrupo, el Banco Central Europeo y el FMI, firmó con el Estado español un *Memorandum of Understanding* (MoU) sobre el apoyo financiero al sector financiero español.

A este MoU se adjuntaba un anexo (el segundo) con la condicionalidad adherida. Esta condicionalidad está basada en una serie de cambios legislativos con fechas de aprobación muy claras.

A la luz de lo anterior,

¿Cuáles son las condiciones que aún no se han cumplido a pesar de haber superado la fecha indicada por el MoU?

¿Tiene prevista la Comisión algún tipo de medida de presión para que la condicionalidad sea respetada adecuadamente por el Gobierno español y las entidades financieras?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(14 de febrero de 2013)

El avance en la aplicación de la condicionalidad respecto al programa del sector financiero es objeto de un estrecho seguimiento por la Comisión y por el BCE, y también parcialmente por el MEDE y por la ABE. El FMI también participa en su seguimiento. La evaluación correspondiente al cumplimiento será hecha pública. La más reciente fue publicada a finales de enero y puede consultarse en:

http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2013/op126_en.htm

Dicha evaluación confirmó que el avance realizado en la aplicación, tanto de la condicionalidad específica para el sector bancario, como de la condicionalidad horizontal del programa sigue siendo correcto en líneas generales. También puso de relieve los retos pendientes para el cumplimiento de los objetivos del programa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011625/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Follow-up of the MoU for the Spanish financial sector

Last July, the European Commission, in agreement with the Eurogroup, the European Central Bank and the IMF, signed a memorandum of understanding (MoU) with the Spanish State on financial support for the Spanish financial sector.

An annex (the second) was attached to this MoU laying out the relevant conditions. These conditions are based on a series of legislative changes with very clear approval dates.

In the light of the above,

What conditions have yet to be met despite the fact that the date indicated in the MoU has passed?

Does the Commission intend to take any kind of measure to apply pressure on the Spanish Government and the financial bodies fully to respect the conditions?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(14 February 2013)

Progress with the conditionality for the financial sector programme is closely monitored by the Commission and the ECB, and partly by the ESM and EBA. The IMF is also involved. The relative assessments of compliance are made public. The most recent one was published at the end of January and can be found at http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2013/op126_en.htm

The assessment confirmed that progress with the implementation of both the bank-specific and the horizontal conditionality of the programme continues to be broadly on track. It also highlighted the remaining challenges to meeting the programme's objectives.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011626/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(19 de diciembre de 2012)

Asunto: Relación entre entidades bancarias y cajas de ahorros

La prensa ([1]) se ha hecho eco de la decisión de La Caixa, caja de ahorros que controla el 61 % de CaixaBank, de vender el 12 % de sus acciones para así cumplir con las normas impuestas por el *Memorandum of Understanding* del rescate al sector bancario español. En el anexo 2 del citado *Memorandum*, la condición número 20 pone de manifiesto que las cajas de ahorro no puedan tener una posición accionarial mayoritaria en las entidades bancarias que les han sucedido.

Esta medida, tiene mucho sentido para aquellas entidades que han requerido de ayudas públicas como resultado de su mala gestión y excesiva exposición al riesgo inmobiliario. En cambio, para las entidades del grupo 0 como CaixaBank, esta medida resulta arbitraria y discriminatoria. Las cajas de ahorros existentes en distintos países de la UE han respondido históricamente a la necesidad social de que las entidades financieras tengan fuertes lazos con la sociedad civil y con el territorio en el que trabajan.

A la luz de lo anterior,

¿Por qué se aplica esta medida a una entidad bancaria que no ha requerido en ningún momento ayudas públicas?

¿Por qué la Comisión persigue en el Estado español disminuir el peso de las cajas de ahorro en las entidades bancarias y no hace lo mismo en otros países de la UE?

¿Significa esta medida que la Comisión considera que las fundaciones de las cajas de ahorros que controlan a los bancos son de por sí malos gestores? ¿Por qué motivos?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(8 de febrero de 2013)

El Memorando de Entendimiento (ME) sobre condiciones de Política Sectorial Financiera, firmado por la Comisión en nombre de los Estados miembros prestadores, por una parte, y España, por otra, establece las condiciones que acompañan al programa con el fin de reforzar la estabilidad financiera en España. El objetivo de las medidas 18 y 20 del anexo 2 del ME es promover una gobernanza y un funcionamiento adecuados de las «Cajas de Ahorros».

Las «Cajas de Ahorros» son instituciones crediticias sujetas a la misma normativa bancaria que las demás instituciones de ese género. La configuración especial de sus órganos de gobierno las ha hecho especialmente vulnerables a la deficiencia de los sistemas de control a medida que se ha ido afianzando la crisis. Este fenómeno ha adquirido proporciones diferentes en las distintas Cajas en función de su gama de actividades y de la importancia de sus actividades predominantes no guiadas exclusivamente por intereses estrictamente comerciales.

Tras varias enmiendas legislativas dirigidas a subsanar algunas de las deficiencias de la gobernanza y el modelo de empresa de las Cajas, el Gobierno español decidió intensificar las obligaciones recogidas en el ME y establecer un nuevo marco general para la reorganización del sector de las «Cajas de Ahorro» como entidades de interés primordialmente social, completamente diferenciadas respecto de las demás instituciones «puramente» crediticias. El proyecto de ley respeta el carácter social de las Cajas, limitando su ámbito de actuación como instituciones puramente crediticias cuyos objetivos son, por naturaleza, diferentes.

Los problemas derivados de la actividad de las «Cajas de Ahorros» como entidades de crédito especiales se han presentado también en otros países con instituciones de características similares. Las soluciones aplicadas han variado en función de los marcos reguladores respectivos de esas entidades, pero siempre han tenido en cuenta su carácter social y, por lo tanto, han restringido su ámbito de actuación como instituciones puramente crediticias.

([1]) http://www.ara.cat/premium/economia/Caixa-accepta-reduir-participacio-CaixaBank_0_831516912.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011626/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Relation between banking institutions and savings banks

The press ([1]) has reported the decision taken by La Caixa (the savings bank which controls 61% of CaixaBank) to sell 12% of its shares in order to comply with the rules laid down in the memorandum of understanding for the bailout of the Spanish banking sector. Condition No 20 in Annex 2 to the Memorandum makes it clear that savings banks may not be majority shareholders in the banking institutions which have succeeded them.

This is a very sensible measure for those institutions which have required public aid because of mismanagement and excessive exposure to property risk. However, for Group 0 banks such as CaixaBank, such a measure is arbitrary and discriminatory. Savings banks in various EU countries have traditionally met the social need for financial institutions to have close links with civil society and with the region in which they operate.

In light of the above,

Why is this measure being applied to a banking institution which at no time has required public support?

Why is the Commission seeking to reduce the influence of the savings banks in banking institutions in Spain and not doing the same in other EU countries?

Does this measure mean that the Commission considers that the foundations of savings banks which control the banks are intrinsically bad managers? On what grounds?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(8 February 2013)

The Memorandum of Understanding on Financial Sector Conditionality (MoU) signed by the Commission on behalf of the Lending Member States and Spain establishes the policy conditions accompanying the programme with the aim of reinforcing financial stability in Spain. The objective of measures 18 and 20 of Annex 2 of the MoU is to enhance the proper governance and working of 'Cajas de Ahorros'.

'Cajas de Ahorros' are credit institutions subject to the same banking regulation as other credit institutions. The special configuration of their governing bodies made them particularly sensitive to weak risk control systems as the crisis unfolded. This has materialised to different extent across 'Cajas' depending on the scope of their activities and on the degree of predominant activities that were not exclusively guided by proper commercial interests.

After several legislative changes to correct some shortcomings of the governance and business model of 'Cajas', the Spanish Government decided to go beyond the obligations under the MoU and to develop a new general framework to reorganise the sector of 'Cajas de Ahorros' as institutions which have a prime social interest, completely different from other 'pure' credit institutions. The draft law respects the social nature of 'Cajas' limiting their scope as 'pure' credit institutions whose objectives by nature are different.

The problems derived from the working of 'Cajas de Ahorros' as special credit institutions have arisen in other countries with institutions of a similar nature. Different solutions have been implemented depending on the respective regulatory framework, but always taking into account their social nature and, therefore, trying to limit their scope as pure credit institutions.

([1]) http://www.ara.cat/premium/economia/Caixa-accepta-reduir-participacio-CaixaBank_0_831516912.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011627/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(19 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Prosecuzione dell'assedio alle strutture sanitarie di Camp Liberty e tortura psicologica degli abitanti

Negli ultimi giorni le forze repressive irachene, sotto la direzione dell'ufficio del primo ministro, hanno inasprito l'assedio alle strutture sanitarie e la persecuzione di pazienti e feriti presso Camp Liberty, utilizzando le strutture come mezzo per esercitare tortura psicologica sugli abitanti dell'area. Con svariati pretesti, le forze di sicurezza insultano i pazienti che si recano negli ospedali di Baghdad e li trattengono generalmente più del dovuto, facendo spesso annullare la maggior parte degli appuntamenti per le visite mediche. Gli agenti effettuano perquisizioni sui pazienti con metodi degradanti e medievali, confiscano i loro effetti personali, addirittura il cibo, e interferiscono continuamente con l'erogazione delle cure mediche, impedendo ai medici iracheni di esercitare la loro attività attraverso l'imposizione di un clima di paura.

Sabato 16 dicembre, un agente dell'ufficio del primo ministro ha impedito a un paziente ferito durante l'attacco del 9 aprile 2011 ad Ashraf di recarsi alla seduta di fisioterapia che gli era stata prescritta da un medico iracheno.

In un altro caso, dopo che uno specialista aveva richiesto un intervento chirurgico per un paziente ferito, un agente iracheno si è rivolto ad altri medici affinché certificassero che l'operazione non era necessaria. Nel caso di un altro paziente, un agente iracheno ha impedito l'acquisto dei medicinali prescritti dal medico e ha obbligato il paziente a tornare a Camp Liberty.

Durante la visita specialistica di una paziente, due agenti di sicurezza hanno fatto irruzione nello studio, malgrado le accese proteste della paziente e del medico.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, quali misure intende adottare il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante per condannare il crudele assedio e il trattamento disumano, che senza dubbio costituiscono una violazione dei diritti umani nonché del diritto umanitario europeo e internazionale? Quale azione immediata verrà intrapresa per porre fine alla tortura psicologica e all'assedio alle strutture sanitarie che perdurano da quattro anni e che hanno finora provocato il lento decesso di 14 pazienti, tra malati e feriti?

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

L'UE segue con attenzione la questione del reinsediamento dei residenti di Camp New Iraq (ex Camp Ashraf). Trattandosi di una questione umanitaria, è necessario che la comunità internazionale faccia tutto il possibile per aiutare il governo iracheno a trovare una soluzione pacifica ed ordinata.

Per questo motivo l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha espresso ripetutamente il suo pieno sostegno al processo in corso sotto l'egida delle Nazioni Unite e al Rappresentante speciale del Segretario generale Martin Kobler. L'UE ha destinato 12 milioni di euro al sostegno di questo processo. L'Alto commissariato delle Nazioni unite per i rifugiati sta procedendo come previsto alla verifica e alla «determinazione dello status di rifugiato» dei residenti che sono arrivati nel sito temporaneo di Camp Hurriya, in attesa di reinsediamento.

Le difficoltà verificatesi durante e dopo i trasferimenti dei residenti da Camp New Iraq a Camp Hurriya dimostrano ulteriormente quanto sia importante sostenere tali sforzi. Secondo la dichiarazione degli osservatori delle Nazioni unite, i servizi necessari alla vita, come l'erogazione di acqua ed elettricità e le derrate alimentari continuano ad essere forniti ben al di sopra degli standard umanitari fondamentali. I residenti e il governo dell'Iraq devono cercare di colmare eventuali divergenze attraverso il dialogo. Il Rappresentante speciale del Segretario generale dell'ONU, Martin Kobler, e i suoi collaboratori stanno facendo tutto il possibile per facilitare questo processo e per aiutare le parti a risolvere i problemi in maniera costruttiva.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011627/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Continuation of medical siege at Camp Liberty and psychological torture of residents

In recent days the repressive Iraqi force under the direction of the Prime Minister's office has stepped up its medical siege and its persecution of patients and wounded at Camp Liberty, and used medical facilities as a means of psychologically torturing residents. The security forces insult patients who go to Baghdad hospitals, under various pretexts, and usually delay their departure with the result that in many cases all or the majority of their medical appointments are cancelled. These agents body-search patients in a degrading, mediaeval way, confiscate their personal belongings, including even their food, and constantly interfere in their medical treatment, preventing Iraqi doctors from doing their job by creating an atmosphere of fear.

On Saturday, 16 December, when an Iraqi physician prescribed physiotherapy for a person wounded during the 9 April 2011 attack on Ashraf, an agent of the Prime Minister's office prevented the patient from visiting the physiotherapist.

In another case, when a specialist ordered surgery for one of the wounded, an Iraqi agent asked other physicians to certify that the patient did not need surgery. In the case of another patient an Iraqi agent prevented purchase of the medication prescribed by the physician and forced the patient to return to Liberty.

During examination of a female patient by a specialist, two security agents entered the office, despite the strong protests of the patient and physician.

This being the case, what measures does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to take to condemn this cruel siege and inhumane treatment, which certainly constitute a violation of human rights and European and international humanitarian law, and what will be the next immediate action taken to end the psychological torture and medical siege that has gone on for four years and has so far caused the slow death of 14 sick and wounded patients?

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

The EU follows the issue of resettlement of the residents of Camp New Iraq (formerly known as Camp Ashraf) very closely. As a humanitarian issue, it requires that the international community do what it can to help the Government of Iraq to pursue a peaceful and orderly solution.

This is why the High Representative/Vice-President has repeatedly stressed her full support to the ongoing process facilitated by the United Nations and to Martin Kobler, the Special Representative of the Secretary General. The EU has provided 12 million euro to support this process. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees is proceeding as foreseen with the verification and 'refugee status determination' of the residents who have arrived at the temporary transit location — Camp Hurriya — pending resettlement.

The challenges arising during and after the moves of residents from Camp New Iraq to Camp Hurriya serve only to underline the importance of supporting these efforts. According to the assessment made by the United Nations monitors, the provision of life support systems, such as water, electricity and food supply continues to be well in excess of basic humanitarian standards. The residents and the government of Iraq must seek to bridge any differences through dialogue. UN SRSG Kobler and his staff have been doing all they can to facilitate this, and to help the parties to resolve problems in a constructive manner.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011628/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)
(19 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ενίσχυση από την ΕΕ των οργανώσεων της κοινωνίας των πολιτών

Έχει υποπέσει στην αντίληψή μου το γεγονός ότι ορισμένοι κανόνες του μηχανισμού προενταξιακής βοήθειας (IPA) για τις μη επιλέξιμες δαπάνες δημιουργούν σύγχυση. Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 34 των κανόνων εφαρμογής του IPA, σχετικά με τον τρόπο διαχείρισης των πόρων του IPA, χαρακτηρίζονται ως μη επιλέξιμες δαπάνες οι δαπάνες για την αγορά, μίσθωση ή χρηματοδοτική μίσθωση γαιών και υφιστάμενων ακινήτων καθώς και τα λειτουργικά έξοδα.

Ως εκ τούτου, η Επιτροπή, στις κατευθυντήριες γραμμές της για την τελευταία πρόσκληση υποβολής προτάσεων για συμφωνία-πλαίσιο εταιρικής σχέσης (EuropeAid/132438/C/ACT/Multi), χαρακτηρίζει αυτού του είδους τις δαπάνες μη επιλέξιμες. Σε άλλες προσκλήσεις υποβολής προτάσεων, η Επιτροπή επέτρεψε την κατά περίπτωση αξιολόγηση των δαπανών αλλά στην προκείμενη περίπτωση δεν ακολούθησε αυτή την προσέγγιση, μολονότι γίνεται ένα είδος παρουσίασής της με τις απαντήσεις στις «συχνές ερωτήσεις». Αντί αυτού, κατά τη διάρκεια της διαδικασίας σύναψης συμβάσεων και σε σχέση με το άρθρο 34 των κανόνων εφαρμογής του IPA, η Επιτροπή ζητεί από τους αιτούντες να διαγράψουν τις δαπάνες μίσθωσης από τις προτάσεις τους.

Αντιλαμβάνομαι ότι η Επιτροπή δεν επιθυμεί να καλύψει παρόμοια έξοδα στο πλαίσιο εθνικών προγραμμάτων που συμφωνήθηκαν μεταξύ ΕΕ και δικαιούχων χωρών αλλά δεν νομίζω ότι είναι παράλογο να εντάσσονται τα έξοδα των οργανώσεων της κοινωνίας των πολιτών για την αναγκαία μίσθωση χώρων γραφείου ή τα λειτουργικά έξοδα που εκ των πραγμάτων απορρέουν από τις δραστηριότητές τους στις επιλέξιμες δαπάνες.

1. Μπορεί η Επιτροπή να εξηγήσει με ποιο τρόπο διαφέρει η αντιμετώπιση παρόμοιων δαπανών στο πλαίσιο του IPA και στο πλαίσιο άλλων χρηματοδοτικών μέσων;

2. Συμφωνεί άραγε η Επιτροπή ότι σκοπός του IPA είναι να καθορίσει μάλλον την σχέση μεταξύ ΕΕ και δικαιούχων χωρών παρά την σχέση μεταξύ ΕΕ και τελικών δικαιούχων των επιχορηγήσεων;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(20 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Εφόσον κάθε χρηματοδοτικό μέσο επιδιώκει τους ειδικούς στόχους του, οι κανόνες για την επιλεξιμότητα των δαπανών δεν είναι κατ'ανάγκη οι ίδιοι. Οι διατάξεις για την επιλεξιμότητα των δαπανών δυνάμει του μηχανισμού προενταξιακής βοήθειας (ΜΠΒ-IPA) αποβλέπουν στην καλύτερη δυνατή εξυπηρέτηση του συνολικού στόχου της προετοιμασίας των δικαιούχων χωρών προς ένταξη.

Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, όσον αφορά την επιλεξιμότητα των δαπανών για συμβάσεις επιχορήγησης δυνάμει της πρόσκλησης υποβολής προτάσεων (EuropeAid/132438/C/ACT/Multi), εφαρμόζεται η γενική διάταξη του άρθρου άρθρου 34 παράγραφος 3 του εκτελεστικού κανονισμού ΜΒΠ ([1]), σύμφωνα με την οποία η μίσθωση υφιστάμενων ακινήτων και τα έξοδα λειτουργίας (εκτός αν προβλέπεται διαφορετικά σε συμφωνία πλαίσιο με διεθνή οργανισμό) δεν αποτελούν επιλέξιμες δαπάνες, εκτός αν ορίζεται κάτι διαφορετικό στις ειδικές διατάξεις δυνάμει κάθε επιμέρους συνιστώσας ΜΠΒ.

Δυνάμει της συνιστώσας Ι (στην οποία εμπίπτει η ανωτέρω πρόσκληση υποβολής προτάσεων), η ειδική διάταξη του άρθρου 66 παράγραφος 3 του εκτελεστικού κανονισμού ΜΒΠ προβλέπει — κατά παρέκκλιση από το προαναφερθέν άρθρο 34 παράγραφος 3 — την επιλεξιμότητα των λειτουργικών εξόδων περιλαμβανομένων των εξόδων μίσθωσης, τα οποία συνδέονται αποκλειστικά με την περίοδο συγχρηματοδότησης της ενέργειας· η επιλεξιμότητα αποφασίζεται κατά περίπτωση. Η παρέκκλιση αυτή δεν προβλεπόταν ρητά στο τμήμα 2.1.4 των κατευθυντήριων γραμμών της πρόσκλησης υποβολής προτάσεων, μολονότι στις «Ερωτήσεις και Απαντήσεις» γινόταν γενική αναφορά σε κατά περίπτωση αξιολόγηση.

Σκοπός του κανονισμού ΜΠΒ και του εκτελεστικού του κανονισμού δεν είναι η ρύθμιση των σχέσεων μεταξύ της ΕΕ και των δικαιούχων χωρών αλλά και ο καθορισμός των κανόνων για τη διαχείριση της προενταξιακής βοήθειας. Οι δύο κανονισμοί περιέχουν, συνεπώς, διατάξεις σχετικά με τη βοήθεια που παρέχεται στις τελικές αποδέκτριες χώρες μέσω επιχορηγήσεων.

([1]) Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 718/2007 της Επιτροπής, της 12ης Ιουνίου 2007, για την εφαρμογή του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1085/2006 του Συμβουλίου για τη θέσπιση μηχανισμού προενταξιακής βοήθειας (ΜΠΒ), ΕΕ L 170 της 29.6.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011628/12
to the Commission
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: EU assistance to civil society organisations

It has come to my attention that certain rules under the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) concerning ineligible costs are confusing. In the IPA implementing rules, which govern the way IPA funds are managed, Article 34 lists among ineligible costs 'purchase, rent or leasing of land and existing buildings' and 'operating costs'.

As a result, in its guidelines for the last Framework Partnership Call for Proposals (EuropeAid/132438/C/ACT/Multi), the Commission declared such costs to be ineligible. In other calls for proposals, the Commission has allowed for such costs on a case-by-case basis, but this approach was not followed in this call for proposal, even though it is introduced to some extent in the answers to the 'Frequently Asked Questions'. Instead, the Commission requested at the contracting stage, with reference to Article 34 of the IPA Implementing Rules, that applicants remove rental costs from their submissions.

I can understand that the Commission does not wish to finance such costs under national programmes agreed between the EU and the beneficiary countries, but surely if civil society organisations need to rent office space, and if they accrue operating costs in the course of their activities, then such costs should be considered eligible.

1. Could the Commission explain the differences in treatment of such costs under the IPA and other financial instruments?

2. Does the Commission not agree that the purpose of the IPA Regulation is to govern the relationship between the EU and the beneficiary countries providing financial assistance, and not between the EU and the final beneficiaries of grants?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2013)

Since each financial instrument pursues its specific objectives, the rules concerning eligibility of costs are not necessarily the same. The provisions for eligibility of expenditure under IPA are targeted to best respond to the overall aim of preparing beneficiary countries for accession.

In that context, as regards eligibility of expenditure for grant contracts under the Call for Proposals (EuropeAid/132438/C/ACT/Multi), the general provision of Art. 34(3) IPA IR ([1]) applies, according to which rent of existing buildings and operating costs (except under framework agreement with an international organisation) are not eligible unless otherwise provided for under the specific provisions for each IPA component.

Under component I (under which the above Call for Proposal falls), the specific provision of Art. 66(3) IPA IR allows — by way of derogation from above Art. 34(3) — for eligibility of operating costs, including rental costs, exclusively related to the period of co-financing of the operation on a case by case basis. Such derogation was not explicitly provided for in Section 2.1.4 of the Guidelines to the Call for Proposals, although a general reference to an assessment on a case by case basis was mentioned in Questions and Answers.

The purpose of the IPA Regulation and of the IPA IR is not only to govern the relationship between the EU and the beneficiary countries, but to set the rules for managing pre-accession assistance. The two Regulations therefore also contain provisions on assistance provided to final beneficiaries by means of grants.

([1]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 718/2007 of 12 June 2007 implementing Council Regulation (EC) No 1085/2006 establishing an instrument for pre-accession assistance (IPA) OJ L 170, 29.6.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011630/12
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Clean air targets in London

When figures for 2012 air quality in the EU are reported next year, London will be in breach of the limits on some of the most dangerous pollutants listed in the Air Quality Directive. It will also have exceeded the postponement of these limits which it was granted in 2009. It will be one of the worst offenders with regard to the Air Quality Directive.

It is estimated in a report commissioned by the Mayor of London himself that pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide and the fine dust particles PM10 and PM2.5 contribute to the premature deaths of 4 300 Londoners per year. Polluted air has been linked to 30% of childhood asthma cases.

The Commission has described PM2.5 as 'the real bad guy, the big killer'. According to the DG for the Environment, fine dust particles caused 370 000 deaths a year before the implementation of this directive.

The Mayor of London's solution to this has been to target pollution hotspots in London by spraying adhesive to the roads in order to lower pollution readings temporarily. Scientists and environmental groups have condemned this action as a waste of money.

There is a clear and present danger to the public health of Londoners, and yet the Mayor of London has not proposed a single serious policy measure to address the problem.

Given this, can the Commission:

— confirm that spraying adhesive to tackle air pollution is an ineffective and unacceptable way of addressing the serious and life-threatening public health issue of air pollution in cities?

— say whether it plans to launch infraction proceedings against the UK for breaching the annual mean limit value for nitrogen dioxide in London and 15 other zones or agglomerations, with no plan to achieve compliance before 2020 or, in the case of London, 2025?

— state what action it will take to prevent the Mayor of London from making superficial attempts to circumvent the limits laid down in the Air Quality Directive and ensure that he meets EU air quality limits by initiating serious programmes to tackle the root causes of air pollution in London?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(11 February 2013)

The competence to decide on the measures for achieving compliance with the EU legislation on air quality lies entirely with the Member States. Therefore the Commission cannot make comments on the use of dust binding agents. The Commission is informed however that dust binding agents (e.g. Calcium Magnesium Acetate, Calcium Chloride etc.) are one of the measures frequently used in Nordic and other countries (e.g Austria).

Should the UK notify again a postponement of the NO_2 limit values, the Commission could only accept it if there are new elements showing that the conditions listed in Article 22 of Directive 2008/50/EC ([1]) are now fulfilled in London and/or other zones. In the absence of an agreed postponement, the Commission may consider an infringement procedure against the UK.

([1]) OJ L 152, 11.6.2008.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011631/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(19 grudnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Przypadki naruszania wolności religijnej w stanie Czin (Birma/Mjanma)

We wrześniu 2012 r. organizacja pozarządowa *Chin Human Rights Organisation* opublikowała obszerne sprawozdanie pt. „Zagrożenia dla naszego istnienia: prześladowanie chrześcijan należących do mniejszości etnicznej Czinów w Birmie", dotyczące przypadków naruszania wolności religijnej w stanie Czin w zachodniej części Birmy/Mjanmy. W sprawozdaniu tym szczegółowo opisano ograniczenia dotyczące budowy infrastruktury dla chrześcijan, zniszczenie czterech wielkich krzyży chrześcijańskich w stanie Czin, a także wiele innych przypadków naruszania wolności religijnej, do jakich doszło od marca 2011 r., kiedy to władzę objął rząd prezydenta Theina Seina. Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel proszona jest o udzielenie odpowiedzi na poniższe pytania.

1. Jaka jest odpowiedź Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel na doniesienia i zalecenia przedstawione w wyżej wymienionym sprawozdaniu?

2. Kiedy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel zamierza przekazać rządowi Birmy/Mjanmy zaniepokojenie ograniczeniami w budowie infrastruktury dla chrześcijan oraz rozkazami zburzenia wielkich krzyży chrześcijańskich w stanie Czin, a także wezwać ten rząd do zapewnienia chrześcijanom z grupy etnicznej Czin wolności religijnej zgodnie z art. 18 Powszechnej Deklaracji Praw Człowieka?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(20 lutego 2013 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca śledzi uważnie zmiany w Mjanmie/Birmie, mając na uwadze, że wdrożenie reform i uzyskanie rezultatów wymaga czasu. Przy każdej okazji Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji zachęcała rząd do czynienia dalszych postępów w sprawie ochrony praw człowieka i utrzymania rządów prawa, szczególnie na obszarach, gdzie występują problemy etniczne, i nadal będzie to czynić.

W ubiegłym roku jako główny sponsor UE ponownie odgrywała wiodącą rolę w ramach Organizacji Narodów Zjednoczonych w pracach nad rezolucją w sprawie sytuacji w zakresie praw człowieka w Mjanmie/Birmie. Fakt, że rezolucja ta została przyjęta po raz pierwszy w drodze konsensusu obrazuje stopień wzajemnej zgodności wspólnoty międzynarodowej i rządu Mjanmy/Birmy w kwestii poczynionych postępów i przyszłych wyzwań. Rezolucja wzywa do zbadania wszystkich doniesień o naruszeniu praw człowieka i do ratyfikacji instrumentów prawa międzynarodowego.

Wprawdzie sprawozdanie birmańskiej organizacji praw człowieka Chin Human Rights Organisation obejmuje długi okres, jest jednak raczej oczywiste, że najpoważniejsze naruszenia zostały zgłoszone w okresie poprzedzającym kwiecień 2011 r., kiedy rozpoczął się obecny proces reform. Sprawozdanie jest cennym źródłem informacji na temat pozostałych naruszeń, które wystąpiły w tym kraju i którymi należy się zająć.

UE zapewnia już finansowanie powołanej niedawno krajowej komisji praw człowieka. Planujemy wzmocnić nasze wsparcie w kolejnych miesiącach, aby komisja ta dysponowała środkami do rozpatrywania rosnącej liczby spraw.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011631/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Religious freedom violations in Chin State, Burma/Myanmar

In September 2012, the Chin Human Rights Organisation published a comprehensive report on religious freedom violations in Chin State, western Burma/Myanmar, entitled 'Threats to our Existence: Persecution of Ethnic Chin Christians in Burma'. The report details restrictions on the building of Christian infrastructure, and the destruction of four large Christian crosses in Chin State since President Thein Sein's Government took office in March 2011, as well as many other violations of religious freedom. Could the Vice-President/High Representative clarify the following points:

1. What is the Vice-President/High Representative's response to the evidence and recommendations presented in the abovementioned report?

2. When does the Vice-President/High Representative plan to raise concerns with the Government of Burma/Myanmar regarding restrictions on building Christian infrastructure and orders for the destruction of large Christian crosses in Chin State, and to urge the Government to ensure that Chin Christians have full freedom of religion in accordance with Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights?

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

The HR/VP is following with close attention the changes in Myanmar/Burma while recognising that reforms will need time to implement and bear fruit. On every occasion, the HR/VP has encouraged the government to make further progress on the protection of human rights and the preservation of the rule of law, especially in the ethnic areas, and will continue to do so.

As the main sponsor, the EU was again in the lead last year, in the framework of the United Nations, for a Resolution on the Situation of Human Rights in Myanmar/Burma. The fact that the resolution was adopted by consensus for the first time shows the degree of the common understanding of the international community and the Government of Myanmar/Burma of the progress made and the challenges ahead. The resolution calls for investigating all reports of violations of human rights and for the ratification of international law instruments.

While the report of the Chin Human Rights Organisation covers a long period, it is rather evident that most serious violations are reported in the period before April, 2011 when the current reform process began. The report is a valuable source of information for remaining violations in the country that need to be addressed.

The EU is already providing funding for the recently-established national Human Rights Commission. We plan to step-up our support in the following months so that the Commission is equipped with the means to deal with an increasing number of cases.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011633/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(19 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: Procedimento penale contro l'opposizione in Russia

Le autorità russe hanno avviato questa settimana una seconda indagine penale contro Alexey Navalny, protagonista di una crociata contro la corruzione, blogger e leader dell'opposizione. L'annuncio dell'avvio dell'indagine è stato dato il giorno prima di quello in cui egli avrebbe guidato migliaia di persone in una manifestazione di protesta contro il Cremlino. Gli investigatori russi accusano Navalny, insieme a suo fratello Oleg, di aver rubato a una società commerciale 55 milioni di rubli. Non è la prima indagine penale avviata contro Navalny, ma è la prima volta che viene coinvolto anche un suo familiare.

Alla luce di quanto precede, prego la Commissione di rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È al corrente la Commissione di questa nuova indagine contro Alexey Navalny e un suo familiare? Quale analisi della vicenda è in grado di fornire?

2. Teme che il procedimento possa avere motivazioni politiche, considerando che è stato avviato il giorno precedente quello in cui era in programma una protesta, o ritiene che si tratti di una coincidenza?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è a conoscenza di questa e di altre indagini avviate nei confronti dell'attivista anticorruzione Alexey Navalny. Come ha già fatto presente nella dichiarazione del 12 giugno 2012, l'AR/VP nutre preoccupazione per i tentativi di intimidire i leader della protesta e di impedire loro di partecipare alle manifestazioni cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato. In dichiarazioni successive, l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha sottolineato che l'aumento di intimidazioni di matrice politica e il perseguimento giudiziario di attivisti dell'opposizione nella Federazione russa destano grave e crescente allarme nell'UE. Nell'agenda del vertice UE-Russia, svoltosi il 21 dicembre 2012, i recenti sviluppi politici e legislativi nella Federazione russa sono stati un tema prioritario, affrontato in dettaglio anche nel corso dell'ultima tornata di consultazioni UE-Russia sui diritti umani tenutasi il 7 dicembre 2012. Il Servizio europeo per l'azione esterna continuerà a seguire da vicino questo e altri casi di intimidazione, sia da Bruxelles che per il tramite della delegazione dell'UE a Mosca.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011633/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Criminal case against Russia's opposition

This week Russia opened a second criminal investigation of anti-corruption crusader, blogger and opposition leader Alexey Navalny. The investigation was announced one day before he was due to lead thousands in an anti-Kremlin protest. Russian investigators have accused Navalny, along with his brother Oleg, of stealing RUB 55 million from a trading company. This is not the first criminal investigation to be launched against Navalny but this is the first time a member of his family has also been targeted.

In light of the above, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Is the Commission aware of this new investigation against Alexey Navalny and a member of his family? What analysis can it provide?

2. Does the Commission have any concerns that the case might be politically motivated, considering that it was launched just a day before a planned protest, or does the Commission regard the timing as coincidental?

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

The HR/VP is well aware of this, and other, cases opened against the anti-corruption activist Alexey Navalny. As HR/VP has noted in her statement issued on 12 June, 2012, she is concerned about the attempts to intimidate protest leaders and prevent them from taking part in the protests the Honourable Member is referring to. In her later statements the HR/VP stressed that the recent upsurge in politically motivated intimidation and prosecution of opposition activists in the Russian Federation was of serious and growing concern to the EU. The recent political and legislative developments in the Russian Federation were high on the agenda of the EU-Russia Summit, which took place on 21 December, 2012. They have also been addressed in detail at the most recent round of the EU-Russia human rights consultations, which took place on 7 December, 2012. The European External Action Service will keep on following this and other cases of intimidation closely, both from Headquarters as well as via the EU Delegation in Moscow.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011634/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(19 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: 2012 — l'anno più funesto per i giornalisti di tutto il mondo

Secondo l'International Press Institute (IPI) e l'organo di controllo della stampa Reporter senza frontiere (RSF), con sede a Parigi, per i giornalisti il 2012 è stato l'anno più funesto mai registrato. Anche se le statistiche fornite dalle due organizzazioni non sono uguali, in quanto si sono avvalse di criteri diversi, la triste realtà appare comunque chiara.

Stando all'RSF hanno perso la vita 88 giornalisti (un incremento del 33 % rispetto al 2011) inviati di guerra o testimoni di bombardamenti, o sono stati uccisi da gruppi legati alla criminalità organizzata (anche nell'ambito del traffico di stupefacenti), da milizie islamiche o su ordine di funzionari corrotti. Sono state inoltre uccise 47 persone definite «internauti e giornalisti-cittadini», nonché sei «assistenti di mezzi d'informazione», portando il totale a 141.

Oltre al numero dei giornalisti assassinati, nel 2012 si registrano altri dati preoccupanti: 879 giornalisti arrestati (più 144 tra blogger e internauti), 1 993 giornalisti minacciati e aggrediti fisicamente, 38 giornalisti rapiti e 73 giornalisti fuggiti dal proprio paese.

Il Medio Oriente e l'Africa settentrionale sono state le regioni più pericolose, seguite da Asia e Africa subsahariana. Soltanto nell'emisfero occidentale si è registrata una diminuzione del numero di giornalisti uccisi. Si tratta dei dati peggiori da quando l'RSF ha iniziato nel 1995 a effettuare una raccolta annuale dei dati.

L'uccisione di giornalisti, contestualmente alla loro esposizione ad arresti e minacce, fatti che impediscono loro di esercitare la propria professione, continua a essere una delle principali minacce alla libertà di espressione nel mondo odierno.

Alla luce delle considerazioni sopraesposte, l'interrogante chiede alla Commissione di rispondere ai quesiti di seguito riportati:

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza delle difficoltà cui sono stati esposti i giornalisti nel 2012? In caso affermativo, come valuta le statistiche citate per quanto concerne il loro significato in termini di ostacolo alla libertà di espressione?

2. Nonostante in occidente sia diminuito il numero dei corrispondenti uccisi, i giornalisti inEuropa continuano a incontrare ostacoli nel loro lavoro, che consiste nel fornireinformazioni ai cittadini dell'UE. È la Commissione a conoscenza di quali siano iprincipali ostacoli per i giornalisti che cercano in Europa di promuovere la libertà diespressione? Può inoltre illustrare in quali ambiti tali ostacoli sono più diffusi?

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

L'UE segue con attenzione il fenomeno preoccupante degli atti di violenza contro i giornalisti. Nel corso del 2012, l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha condannato nelle sue dichiarazioni pubbliche le minacce contro i mezzi d'informazione indipendenti e gli atti di violenza contro i giornalisti (ad esempio, il 2 febbraio, dopo l'assassinio in Somalia del giornalista professionista Hassan Osman Abdi).

L'UE si impegna fortemente, con tutti gli strumenti disponibili, a sostenere il rispetto della libertà di espressione per qualsiasi mezzo di informazione. In particolare, affronta tale questione bilateralmente con i paesi terzi nel quadro dei dialoghi e delle consultazioni in materia di diritti umani. A livello multilaterale, l'UE si sforza sempre di più per coinvolgere, nel sostegno alla protezione dei giornalisti, i congressi internazionali come le Nazioni Unite, il Consiglio d'Europa e l'OSCE. Ad esempio, durante la riunione della terza commissione delle Nazioni Unite (diritti umani) del 6 dicembre 2012 a New York, l'UE ha denunciato la censura e le vessazioni nei confronti dei blogger.

L'UE si adopera inoltre per la protezione dei giornalisti e ha finanziato diversi progetti in passato grazie al programma per il sostegno ai difensori dei diritti umani. Nell'ambito dell'iniziativa europea per la democrazia e i diritti umani (EIDHR) del 2012, sono state finanziate per la prima volta azioni che mirano a combattere la censura sulla rete e a promuovere la sicurezza e la libertà digitale.

Per quanto riguarda la situazione dei giornalisti all'interno dell'UE, si ricorda che la libertà di espressione costituisce uno dei cardini delle società democratiche, come sancito dall'articolo 11 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea. La Carta, tuttavia, si applica agli Stati membri solo nell'attuazione della normativa UE. Laddove gli Stati membri agiscano al di fuori dell'attuazione del diritto dell'UE, spetta alle autorità nazionali garantire il rispetto degli obblighi in materia di diritti fondamentali derivanti da accordi internazionali e dalla legislazione nazionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011634/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: 2012 — the deadliest year for journalists worldwide

According to both the International Press Institute (IPI) and the Paris-based press watchdog Reporters Without Borders (RSF), 2012 has been the deadliest year for journalists on record. Owing to the use of different criteria, the statistics produced by the two organisations are not identical, but despite this the grim reality is clear.

RSF found that 88 journalists were killed (an increase of 33% over 2011) while covering wars or bombings, or were murdered by groups linked to organised crime (including drug trafficking), by Islamist militias or on the orders of corrupt officials. A further 47 people described as 'netizens and citizen journalists' were killed, as well as six 'media assistants', making a total of 141.

Aside from the number of journalists killed, other figures for 2012 are also worrying. Eight hundred and seventy-nine journalists were arrested (plus a further 144 bloggers and 'netizens'), 1 993 journalists were threatened or physically attacked, 38 journalists were kidnapped, and 73 journalists fled their homelands.

The most dangerous regions were the Middle East and northern Africa, followed by Asia and sub-Saharan Africa. Only the western hemisphere registered a fall in the number of journalists killed. This is the worst set of figures since RSF began producing an annual round-up in 1995.

The killing of journalists, along with fact that they continue to face arrests and threats, hindering them in the practice of their profession, continues to be one of the greatest threats to freedom of expression in the world today.

In light of the above, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Is the Commission aware of the difficulties faced by journalists in 2012? If so, what analysis of these statistics can it offer as regards their significance in terms of obstacles to freedom of expression?

2. Despite the fact that the number of journalists killed in the West has fallen, journalists in Europe continue to face obstacles in their job of providing EU citizens with information. Is the Commission aware of what the greatest obstacles are for journalists in Europe seeking to promote freedom of expression, and can it say where these obstacles are most prevalent?

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

The EU is closely following the worrying trend of attacks against journalists. During 2012, the HR/VP condemned threats against free media and attacks against journalists through public statements (e.g. on 2 February, after the assassination of Hassan Osman Abdi, senior journalist in Somalia).

The EU is strongly committed to the respect of freedom of expression whatever the media and uses all the instruments at its disposal. It raises the issue bilaterally with third countries notably in the framework of Human Rights Dialogues and Consultations. At the multilateral level the EU is increasing its efforts to engage in international fora such as the UN, the Council of Europe and the OSCE in promoting the protection of journalists. E.g. in the UN Third Committee (Human Rights) meeting on 6 December 2012 in New York, the EU denounced the trend towards censorship and harassment of bloggers.

The EU is also active in the protection of journalists, through the Human Rights Defenders Scheme has funded various projects in the past. For the first time, actions to fight cyber censorship and promoting digital freedom and security have been financed under the 2012 EIDHR call of proposals.

As concerns the situation of journalists within the EU, it is recalled that the freedom of expression constitutes one of the essential foundations of democratic societies, enshrined in Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU. The Charter, however, only applies to Member States when they are implementing the EC law. Where Member States act outside the implementation of EC law, it is for the national authorities to ensure that their obligations regarding fundamental rights — as resulting from international agreements and from internal legislation — are respected.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011635/12
à la Commission
Dominique Riquet (PPE)
(19 décembre 2012)

Objet: Transport de voyageurs par chemin de fer: modalités de la définition d'une obligation de service public

Les services publics de transport de voyageurs par chemin de fer et par route sont encadrés par le règlement (CE) nº 1370/2007. Ce dernier permet aux autorités compétentes d'octroyer, dans le cadre d'un contrat de service public, un droit exclusif et/ou une compensation à l'opérateur de son choix en contrepartie de la réalisation d'obligations de service public.

Cela implique, dans le domaine du transport ferroviaire, que l'autorité compétente définisse dans chaque cas le périmètre des services requis et vérifie que ces services sont bien d'intérêt général, c'est à dire non rentables et requérant une compensation.

Le règlement (CE) nº 1370/2007 ne précise pas comment la vérification du caractère non rentable de ces services doit être menée, mais se contente dans son annexe de préciser que la compensation ne peut excéder l'incidence financière nette du respect de l'obligation de service public.

1. La Commission peut-elle confirmer que la vérification du caractère de service public dans le transport ferroviaire doit se baser sur le résultat financier annuel de l'ensemble des services considérés?

2. En particulier, la Commission peut-elle confirmer qu'il est possible d'inclure dans le périmètre d'une obligation de service public, sans en altérer la nature, des services qui peuvent ponctuellement être profitables — par exemple aux heures de pointe?

3. Que par conséquent, la totalité des coûts d'investissements nécessaires tels que le matériel roulant sont dès lors éligibles à une aide consentie par l'autorité compétente comme le prévoit l'article 4, paragraphe 1, point c), du règlement (CE) nº 1370/2007?

4. Enfin, est-il clairement établi que l'obligation de service public ne peut être découpée en services profitables et services non rentables qui peuvent être de surcroît appréciés différemment au fil du temps?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(19 février 2013)

Conformément à l'article 2, point e), du règlement (CE) nº 1370/2007 ([1]), on entend par obligations de service public, «l'exigence définie ou déterminée par une autorité compétente en vue de garantir des services d'intérêt général de transports de voyageurs qu'un opérateur, s'il considérait son propre intérêt commercial, n'assumerait pas ou n'assumerait pas dans la même mesure ou dans les mêmes conditions sans contrepartie».

Les services susceptibles d'être rentables pendant certaines périodes peuvent entrer dans le champ d'application de l'obligation de service public.

Il est possible d'intégrer les coûts d'investissement en matériel roulant neuf dans le calcul des coûts liés à la prestation de services sous contrat de service public, pour autant que certaines conditions soient remplies. Il faut par exemple, entre autres conditions, que l'achat de matériel de roulage neuf soit une conséquence directe des obligations de service public définies dans le contrat, que le matériel de roulage ne soit utilisé que pour les services de transport contractuels et que toutes les dispositions du règlement (CE) nº 1370/2007 (notamment celles qui concernent la compensation) et d'autres instruments législatifs de l'UE (en particulier ceux qui concernent l'interopérabilité du rail) soient respectées.

L'évaluation de la rentabilité des services de transport peut effectivement changer avec le temps dans la mesure où cette rentabilité dépend d'un certain nombre de variables évolutives, comme par exemple, le niveau des redevances d'accès aux services ferroviaires concernés, la modification du volume et de la fréquentation des services de desserte, ainsi que de variables économiques externes, telles que la croissance du PIB, qui affectent la demande de transport.

([1]) Règlement (CE) nº 1370/2007 du Parlement européen et du Conseil, du 23 octobre 2007, relatif aux services publics de transport de voyageurs par chemin de fer et par route, et abrogeant les règlements (CEE) nº 1191/69 et (CEE) nº 1107/70 du Conseil, JO L 315 du 3.12.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011635/12
to the Commission
Dominique Riquet (PPE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Passenger transport by rail: detailed rules for establishing a public service obligation

Public passenger transport services by rail and road are governed by Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007. This allows the competent authorities to grant, within the framework of a public service contract, an exclusive right and/or compensation to the operator of its choice in return for the discharge of public service obligations.

In respect of transport by rail, this means that the competent authority should define in each case the scope of the services required and verify that those services are really in the general interest, that is, unprofitable and requiring compensation.

Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 does not specify how the non-profitable nature of those services is to be verified, but merely states in its annex that the compensation may not exceed the net financial effect of compliance with the public service obligation.

1. Can the Commission confirm that verification of the public service nature in respect of rail transport should be based on the annual financial result of the entirety of the services concerned?

2. In particular, can the Commission confirm that services which may be profitable from time to time — for example at peak times — may be included within the scope of the public service obligation without changing its nature?

3. As a result, are all the costs of necessary investments such as rolling stock eligible for aid granted by the competent authority as provided for by Article 4(1)(c) of Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007?

4. Finally, is it clearly established that the public service obligation may not be divided into profitable services and non-profitable services which may, moreover, be assessed differently over time?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(19 February 2013)

Article 2(e) of Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 ([1]) defines Public Service Obligations as 'a requirement defined or determined by a competent authority in order to ensure public passenger transport services in the general interest that an operator, if it were considering its own commercial interests, would not assume or would not assume to the same extent or under the same conditions without reward.'

Services which may be profitable from time to time can be included within the scope of the public service obligation.

Investment costs of new rolling stock are eligible to be included in the calculation of costs connected with the provision of the services under Public Service Contract provided that a number of conditions are fulfilled. Such conditions are, for instance, the purchase of new rolling stock is a direct consequence of the Public Service Obligations defined in the contract, the rolling stock is only used for the transport services under contract and all provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 (especially on compensation) and other EU legislation (especially on rail interoperability) are respected.

The assessment of profitability of transport services may indeed alter over time as it is dependent on a number of variables that may change over time such as, for instance, the level of track access charges due for rail services concerned, modification of the volume and ridership of feeder services as well as external economic variables such as GDP growth having an effect on transport demand.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 on public passenger transport services by rail and by road and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) Nos 1191/69 and 1107/70, OJ L 315, 3.12.2007.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011637/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(19 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: Prendersi cura dell'altro: la rete di supporto ai familiari

Assistere una persona con disabilità, non autosufficiente o affetta da malattia cronico-degenerativa, comporta un dispendio di energie personali e risorse economiche ingenti; spesso questa realtà viene vissuta in prima linea dai familiari, in particolare donne over 65 che tendono a farsi carico, da sole, degli aspetti assistenziali. In Italia i caregiver di famiglia svolgono, gratuitamente, un lavoro di cura invisibile; il modello italiano di welfare, per persone non autosufficienti, si fonda sul ruolo della famiglia che sempre più riceve un limitato supporto da parte dei servizi che potrebbero e dovrebbero garantire migliore assistenza e autonomia ai disabili. La sentenza Coleman ha stabilito che il divieto di discriminazione per ragioni di disabilità si applica alla persona interessata e anche a chi l'assiste. Questo principio viene affermato anche nella direttiva 2000/78/CE del Consiglio del 27 novembre 2000, recepita in Italia nel 2003. Ad oggi, la realtà italiana si discosta molto da quella di altri paesi europei come Spagna, Germania e Regno Unito che, nonostante la crisi economica, prevedono strumenti di tutela che riconoscono a livello giuridico il valore di questo impegno familiare e comunitario, nonché predispongono benefit economici in base al reddito, contributi previdenziali e accordi personalizzati con i datori di lavoro per tutelare il posto di lavoro e permettere ai lavoratori di fornire l'assistenza necessaria ai propri cari.

Considerato che:

— in molti Paesi europei c'è una maggiore attenzione, da parte degli orientamenti giuridici, per il «prendersi cura dell'altro» e questo viene riconosciuto come valore morale, economico e sociale;

— solitamente sono i caregiver donna a sobbarcarsi il carico assistenziale, che le predispone, inevitabilmente, a stress, problemi psicologici e di salute che riducono l'aspettativa di vita dai 9 ai 17 anni;

si chiede alla Commissione se intenda proporre linee guida per una riorganizzazione delle reti di supporto alle famiglie dal punto di vista legislativo, medico, assistenziale e psicologico al fine di non lasciare senza tutela migliaia di persone che quotidianamente e ininterrottamente curano chi non è più o non è mai stato autosufficiente.

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(21 febbraio 2013)

L'assistenza di lungo termine, compreso il sostegno a coloro che si occupano di familiari non autosufficienti, rientra nella responsabilità degli Stati membri. Essi hanno però concordato di definire obiettivi comuni non vincolanti sul piano legale in merito all'accessibilità, alla qualità e alla sostenibilità finanziaria dell'assistenza di lungo periodo nel contesto del metodo di coordinamento aperto e delle attività correlate in seno al Comitato per la protezione sociale.

Per quanto concerne la situazione specifica menzionata dall'onorevole deputato, la Commissione lo rinvia al pacchetto Occupazione del 18 aprile 2012 (COM(2012)173 final) e in particolare al documento di lavoro dei servizi della Commissione «Sfruttare il potenziale di occupazione offerto dai servizi per la persona e la famiglia» (SWD(2012)95 final).

La Commissione prevede di adottare nel febbraio 2013 un pacchetto di investimenti sociali. Il pacchetto dovrebbe comprendere un documento di lavoro dei servizi della Commissione sull'assistenza di lungo periodo che affronterà anche la questione del sostegno a coloro che si occupano di familiari non autonomi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011637/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Taking care of others: family support networks

Assisting a person with disabilities, one who is not self-sufficient or who suffers from a chronic degenerative disease, involves expenditure of personal energy and considerable financial resources. It is often family members, and in particular women over the age of 65, who — alone — have to take care of those concerned. In Italy, family carers do an invisible job that is free of charge. The Italian welfare model for dependent persons is based on the role of the family, which receives ever less support from services which could and should provide better assistance to people with disabilities and ensure they have greater autonomy.

The Coleman judgment ruled that the prohibition of discrimination on grounds of disability applies to the person concerned and also to their carer. This principle has been affirmed also in Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000, transposed in Italy in 2003. To date, however, the situation in Italy is very different from that of other European countries such as Spain, Germany and the UK. These countries, despite the economic crisis, have protective instruments which legally recognise the value of such a family and community commitment and provide means-tested financial benefits, social security contributions and personal agreements with employers to protect carers' jobs and enable workers to provide the necessary assistance to their loved ones.

In many European countries, the law pays greater attention to 'caring for others', which is recognised as a moral, economic and social value.

Usually, it is women carers who shoulder the burden of care, which, inevitably, makes them fall prey to stress and to psychological or physical health problems that reduce their life expectancy by between 9 and 17 years.

Can the Commission therefore say whether it intends to propose guidelines with a view to reorganising family support networks from a legal, medical, caring and psychological point of view, in order to make sure that the thousands of people who, every day, ceaselessly care for those who are no longer (or have never been) self-sufficient, are not left unprotected?

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

Long-term care provision, including the support given to family carers is a responsibility of Member States. These have, however, agreed a set of legally not binding common objectives on the accessibility, quality and financial sustainability of long-term care in the context of the open method of coordination and the related activities in the Social Protection Committee.

With regard to the specific situation as described by the Honourable Members, the Commission would like to refer to the Employment Package of 18 April 2012 (COM(2012) 173 final) and in particular the Staff Working Document on 'Exploiting the employment potential of the personal and household services' (SWD(2012) 95 final).

The Commission is planning to adopt a Social Investment Package in February 2013. The package should include a Commission Staff Working Document on long-term care which will also address the question of support to family carers.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011638/12
alla Commissione
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(19 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: Italian Sounding

Il fenomeno dell'imitazione dei prodotti agroalimentari italiani, noto anche con il nome di *Italian Sounding*, genera annualmente un volume d'affari stimabile in circa 60 miliardi di EUR. Se si considera che l'export agroalimentare italiano ha raggiunto nel 2011 i 30 miliardi di EUR, è facile dedurre che, tra i prodotti a denominazione italiana venduti nel mondo, due su tre non sono veri «Made in Italy» nonostante il consumatore che li acquista li percepisca come tali.

L'andamento sui mercati internazionali potrebbe ulteriormente migliorare con una più efficace tutela nei confronti dell'agropirateria internazionale, che utilizza in maniera impropria parole, colori, località, immagini, denominazioni e ricette che si richiamano all'Italia per prodotti che non hanno nulla a che vedere con la realtà del paese. Analizzando il fenomeno per aree geografiche si scopre che l'*Italian Sounding* genera profitti anche all'interno dell'Unione europea, dove il volume d'affari raggiunge i 26 miliardi di EUR (quasi la metà del totale mondiale).

Considerando che:

— i prodotti che ne imitano altri regolarmente registrati con marchi europei, anche soltanto attraverso una semplice evocazione del nome, non potrebbero circolare;

— l'*Italian Sounding* costituisce una forma di concorrenza sleale nei confronti delle imprese italiane;

— le pratiche commerciali ingannevoli in questione non solo rischiano di indurre in errore i consumatori finali, minando la fiducia nei confronti dei veri prodotti «Made in Italy» e offuscandone la vera immagine, ma, soprattutto, causano grosse perdite economiche per l'Italia,

si chiede:

— quali strumenti sono previsti all'interno degli accordi bilaterali per la tutela dei prodotti italiani?

— Inoltre, al di là degli accordi bilaterali, in che modo si adopera la Commissione per la tutela dei marchi in seno all'Organizzazione mondiale del commercio (OMC)?

— Infine, è possibile intensificare ulteriormente all'interno dell'Unione europea l'azione di contrasto dell'agropirateria e delle frodi agroalimentari, al fine di arginare un fenomeno ancora troppo diffuso come quello descritto?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(11 febbraio 2013)

La Commissione attribuisce grande importanza all'efficace protezione e all'enforcement dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale (DPI) degli operatori europei, sia nell'UE che a livello internazionale.

Il capitolo dedicato alla proprietà intellettuale nei numerosi accordi bilaterali sottoscritti dall'Unione europea comprende di norma una sezione specifica consacrata all'enforcement dei diritti ivi tutelati. Queste disposizioni assicurano che siano disponibili certe misure, procedure e vie di ricorso per consentire di intervenire efficacemente contro le violazioni dei DPI. In caso di violazione sistematica ciò assicura anche che l'UE possa avvalersi dei meccanismi di composizione delle controversie previsti negli accordi bilaterali.

Per quanto concerne la protezione dei DPI nel contesto commerciale multilaterale, in particolare in relazione al problema della «pirateria alimentare» internazionale sollevato dall'onorevole deputato, l'UE persegue, nel contesto degli attuali negoziati per il ciclo di Doha nel quadro dell'OMC, l'obiettivo di incoraggiare la protezione delle indicazioni geografiche. L'estensione del livello più elevato di protezione che era garantito soltanto per le indicazioni geografiche dei vini e delle bevande alcoliche anche alle indicazioni geografiche relative a tutti i prodotti e la costituzione di un registro multilaterale di indicazioni geografiche rappresenterebbero un progresso importantissimo verso una protezione efficace delle denominazioni alimentari europee a livello internazionale.

Per il resto, la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato alla propria risposta alle interrogazioni scritte E-11638/12, E-9302/12, E-8527/12, E-7133/12, E-1061/12, E-847/12, E-8667/12, E-3995/11, E-2007/2012 e E-1061/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011638/12
to the Commission
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: 'Italian sounding' products

The imitation of Italian food products, also known as the 'Italian sounding' phenomenon, has an annual turnover estimated at about EUR 60 billion. Considering that in 2011 Italian food exports reached EUR 30 billion, it is easy to deduce that, of the Italian named products sold worldwide, two out of three were not really 'Made in Italy', even though the consumers that buy them perceive them to be such.

This international market trend could improve even more if there were more effective protection against international 'food piracy', which improperly uses words, colours, places, pictures, names and recipes that refer to Italy, for products that have nothing to do with the reality of the country. When we analyse the phenomenon by geographical area, we find that Italian-sounding products generate profits even within the European Union, with a turnover as high as EUR 26 billion (almost half of the world total).

Given that:

— products that imitate others, which are duly registered with European brand names, even by merely mentioning the name, are not allowed to circulate;

— the 'Italian sounding' phenomenon is a form of unfair competition against Italian firms;

— the misleading trade practices in question are not only likely to mislead consumers, undermining confidence in real Italian-made products and tarnishing their image, but, above all, are the cause of major economic losses for Italy;

can the Commission answer the following:

— What tools are available under bilateral agreements for the protection of Italian products?

— Over and beyond bilateral agreements, what action is the Commission taking to protect trademarks within the World Trade Organisation (WTO)?

— Lastly, would it be possible to step up action in the EU to combat food piracy and food-related fraud, in order to curb the phenomenon described above, which is still all too widespread?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(11 February 2013)

The Commission attaches great importance to the effective protection and enforcement of European operators' intellectual property rights (IPRs) in the EU and at international level.

The chapter dedicated to intellectual property in the numerous bilateral agreements established by the European Union usually establishes a specific section devoted to the enforcement of the rights therein protected. These provisions ensure that certain measures, procedures and remedies are available to permit effective action against acts of infringement of IPRs. In case of systematic violations this also ensures that the EU can avail itself of the dispute settlement mechanisms provided for in the bilateral agreements.

As regards the protection of IPRs in the multilateral trading context, in particular in relation to the problem of international 'food piracy' raised by the Honourable Member, the EU is pursuing, in the framework of the current WTO Doha Round negotiations, the objective of facilitating the protection of Geographical Indications. The extension of the higher level of protection now only granted to GIs for wines and spirits to GIs for all products and the creation of a multilateral register of GIs would constitute a fundamental step towards a more effective protection of European food names at international level.

For the rest, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written questions E-11638/12, E-9302/12, E-8527/12, E-7133/12, E-1061/12, E-847/12, E-8667/12, E-3995/11, E-2007/2012 and E-1061/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011639/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(19 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: Opportunità di completare il canale idroviario Padova-mare al fine di scongiurare il rischio di alluvioni nella pianura veneta, in linea con la direttiva 2007/60/CE

L'idrovia «Padova-mare», detta anche «Padova-Venezia», è un canale idroviario lungo 27,5 km, attualmente realizzato solo in parte, che una volta terminato collegherebbe Padova al Mar Adriatico. Ad oggi, il completamento dell'opera non risulta previsto dal Piano Territoriale Regionale di Coordinamento (PTRC) della Regione Veneto. L'idrovia in questione figura come via navigabile non ancora esistente nell'Accord Européen sur les Grandes Voies Navigables d'Importance Internationale (AGN) ([1]) e come opera in via di costruzione nel *Blue Book* del 2012, l'inventario dei principali standard e parametri della rete di vie navigabili redatto dalla Commissione economica per l'Europa delle Nazioni Unite ([2]). Anche l'Unione europea fa peraltro riferimento all'AGN e al *Blue Book* come basi per lo sviluppo di una rete coerente di vie navigabili interne nell'ambito del progetto PLATINA, piattaforma per la realizzazione del programma NAIADES (*Navigation and Inland Waterway Action and Development in Europe*).

Come sottolineato anche dal commissario europeo per i trasporti Siim Kallas in occasione della presentazione delle nuove linee guida relative a navigazione interna e alla protezione della natura (*Guidance document on Inland waterway transport and Natura 2000)* ([3]), è opportuno ricordare che quello idroviario è un settore dei trasporti considerato sicuro, efficiente sul piano energetico e più ecocompatibile di altri modi di trasporto ([4]).

L'idrovia Padova-mare, inoltre, con una portata di 350-400 metri cubi al secondo dovrebbe costituire un importantissimo strumento di sicurezza idraulica contro il rischio di alluvioni e impedire il ripetersi di esondazioni come quella particolarmente gravosa che ha colpito il Veneto nel 2010, per la quale sono stati stanziati 16 908 925,00 EUR a titolo del Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea ([5]).

Può la Commissione precisare l'ammontare complessivo dei danni causati dall'alluvione che nel 2010 ha colpito il Veneto e ha interessato pesantemente la provincia di Padova? Potrebbe la Commissione far sapere se ha stanziato o prevede di stanziare dei fondi per la realizzazione dell'importante idrovia in oggetto? Non ritiene la Commissione che sia opportuno intervenire presso le autorità italiane competenti per fare in modo che sia portata a termine un'opera potenzialmente in grado di contribuire a scongiurare il pericolo alluvioni, in linea con la direttiva 2007/60/CE relativa alla valutazione e alla gestione dei rischi di alluvioni, onde evitare in futuro di ricorrere ulteriormente al Fondo di solidarietà dell'UE?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(18 febbraio 2013)

Nel gennaio 2011 le autorità italiane hanno richiesto l'assistenza finanziaria del Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea per le inondazioni che hanno colpito il Veneto nell'ottobre 2010. Vaste aree del Veneto hanno subito danni, tuttavia solo nella zona più severamente colpita, lungo il bacino del fiume Bacchiglione, sono risultate soddisfatte le condizioni per la mobilitazione del Fondo di solidarietà. Per quanto riguarda questa zona la Commissione ha riconosciuto danni diretti per 676 milioni di EUR e ha concesso aiuti per 16,9 milioni di EUR. Gli aiuti del Fondo di solidarietà possono essere utilizzati solo per interventi di emergenza. Non è ammesso il finanziamento di nuovi progetti infrastrutturali.

Per quanto riguarda possibili stanziamenti del Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR) a favore della via navigabile in questione, il programma per il Veneto 2007-2013 cofinanziato dal FESR non prevede la possibilità di finanziare progetti finalizzati a migliorare il trasporto per via navigabile. Piani per il finanziamento di questa via navigabile non sono inclusi nel programma per la rete transeuropea dei trasporti (TEN-T) ([6]).

([1]) L'opera è indicata con il nome di Canal Padova-Venezia alla voce 91-03 dell'allegato I di detto accordo, sottoscritto a Ginevra il 19 gennaio 1996, ratificato dall'Italia ed entrato in vigore il 3 luglio 2000 (http://www.admin.ch/ch/f/rs/i7/0.747.207.fr.pdf).
([2]) http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2012/sc3wp3/ECE-TRANS-SC3-144rev2e.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/IWT_BHD_Guidelines.pdf
([4]) Cfr. comunicato stampa della Commissione del 18/10/2012: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-1114_it.htm
([5]) http://www.venetoalluvionato.it/index.php/notizie/199-contributo-al-commissario-dall-unione-europea.
([6]) Di cui al regolamento (CE) n. 680/2007 che stabilisce i principi generali per la concessione di un contributo finanziario della Comunità nel settore delle reti transeuropee dei trasporti e dell'energia.

Se le autorità italiane decideranno di finanziare tale progetto ciò richiederà l'applicazione delle disposizioni della normativa ambientale dell'UE comprese la direttiva sulla valutazione dell'impatto ambientale e la direttiva quadro sulle acque.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011639/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Completion of the waterway between Padua and the sea to avert the risk of flooding on the Veneto plain, in keeping with Directive 2007/60/EC

The 'Padua-sea' waterway, also called the 'Padua-Venice' waterway, is a 27.5 km long canal, which has currently been only partially built, and which, once completed, would connect Padua to the Adriatic Sea. To date, the completion of the work has not been included in the Regional Territorial Coordination Plan (PTRC) of the Veneto Region. The waterway in question is listed in the European Agreement on Main Inland Waterways of International Importance (AGN) ([1]) as a waterway that does not yet exist and as a work under construction in the 2012 Blue Book — the inventory of main standards and parameters of the E waterway network, drawn up by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) ([2]). Even the European Union refers to the AGN and the Blue Book as the basis for the development of a coherent network of inland waterways under the PLATINA project — a platform for the completion of the NAIADES programme (Navigation and Inland Waterway Action and Development in Europe).

As pointed out also by the European Commissioner for Transport, Siim Kallas, at the presentation of the new guidelines for inland navigation and the protection of nature (Guidance document on Inland waterway transport and Natura 2000 ([3])), inland waterway transport is considered to be safe, energy efficient and more environmentally friendly than other transport modes ([4]).

The Padua-sea waterway, moreover, having a capacity of 350-400 cubic metres per second, should be a key safety tool to protect against the risk of flooding and prevent the recurrence of floods, such as the particularly serious one that struck Veneto in 2010, for which EUR 16 908 925 were allocated from the European Union Solidarity Fund ([5]).

Can the Commission indicate the total amount of damage caused by the flooding that hit the Veneto region in 2010 and badly affected the province of Padua? Can the Commission say whether it has allocated, or plans to allocate, any funds for the completion of the important waterway in question? Does the Commission not think it should make representations to the Italian authorities responsible to ensure that this work, which might avert the danger of floods, is completed, in keeping with Directive 2007/60/EC on the assessment and management of flood risks, to avoid further use of the EU Solidarity Fund in the future?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

In January 2011 the Italian authorities applied for financial assistance from the EU Solidarity Fund for the flooding disaster in Veneto of October 2010. While damages were suffered throughout large parts of Veneto, the conditions for mobilising the Solidarity Fund were only met for the most severely hit area, essentially along the Bacchiglione river basin. For this area, the Commission could accept EUR 676 million in direct damage and granted EUR 16.9 million in aid. Solidarity Fund aid may only be used for emergency operations. The financing of new infrastructure projects is excluded.

With respect to possible allocations in favour of the waterway at issue, as far as the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) is concerned, the ERDF co-funded 2007-2013 Veneto programme does not provide for the possibility to finance projects improving waterway transport. Plans for financing this waterway are not included in the Trans-European Network for Transport (TEN-T) programme ([6]).

Should the Italian authorities decide to finance such project, relevant EU environmental legislation would need to be applied including the Environmental Impact Assessment and Water Framework Directives.

([1]) The work is listed under the name 'Padova-Venezia canal', number 91-03, in Annex I to the agreement, which was signed in Geneva on 19 January 1996 and ratified by Italy on 3 July 2000, entering into force on the same date (http://www.admin.ch/ch/f/rs/i7/0.747.207.fr.pdf).
([2]) http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2012/sc3wp3/ECE-TRANS-SC3-144rev2e.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/IWT_BHD_Guidelines.pdf
([4]) See Commission press release of 18/10/2012: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-1114_en.htm
([5]) http://www.venetoalluvionato.it/index.php/notizie/199-contributo-al-commissario-dall-unione-europea.
([6]) As referred to in Regulation (EC) No 680/2007 laying down general rules for the granting of Community financial aid in the field of the trans-European transport and energy networks.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011640/12
do Komisji
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(19 grudnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: VAT na e-booki

Zgodnie z dyrektywą 2006/112/WE państwa mogą stosować obniżoną stawkę VAT wobec książek zapisanych na wszystkich nośnikach fizycznych, dzienników i periodyków. Przepisy te nie przewidują takiej możliwości wobec usług świadczonych drogą elektroniczną, czyli e-booków i e-gazet.

Książki elektroniczne spełniają identyczne funkcje jak książki drukowane, różnią się jedynie nośnikiem, który w wypadku klasycznych książek jest nieekologiczny. Jednak nośnik nie powinien definiować, co jest książką, a co nią nie jest, lecz jej treść.

W związku z tym zwracam się z zapytaniem:

1. Czy Komisja planuje wprowadzić rozwiązania, które umożliwią bądź zobligują państwa członkowskie do traktowania książek elektronicznych i drukowanych identycznie pod kątem fiskalnym?

2. Jeżeli powyższe rozwiązania są planowane, to na czym szczegółowo będą one polegać i jaki będzie terminarz ich wprowadzania?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Algirdasa Šemetę w imieniu Komisji
(31 stycznia 2013 r.)

Szanownego Pana Posła odsyła się do odpowiedzi Komisji na pytania wymagające odpowiedzi na piśmie: E-009612/2012 Pani E. Costello i E-010597/2012 Pana M. Tarabellego ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html#sidesForm.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011640/12
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: VAT on e-books

Under Directive 2006/112/EC, Member States may apply a reduced rate of VAT vis-à-vis books, newspapers and periodicals recorded on any physical medium. This directive, however, does not provide for the possibility of services being provided electronically, such as e-books or e-newspapers.

Electronic books perform exactly the same functions as printed books. They only differ in terms of medium, with the traditional printed book being a non-environmentally friendly medium. The medium should not define what is and is not a book, but rather the content.

Given this, I should like to ask the following questions:

1. Is the Commission planning to take steps to enable or to oblige the Member States to treat electronic and printed books identically in terms of taxation?

2. If such steps are planned, what form will they take and when will they be introduced?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Šemeta au nom de la Commission
(31 janvier 2013)

L'Honorable Parlementaire voudra bien se reporter aux réponses données par la Commission aux questions écrites E-009612/2012 de Mme E. Costello et E-010597/2012 de M. Tarabella ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html#sidesForm.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-011641/12
komissiolle
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(19. joulukuuta 2012)

Aihe: Fatahin logo ja lippu

Palestiinalaisen Fatah-järjestön logossa ja lipussa on kuvattuna Israelin valtion alue. Tämä ei ole hyväksyttävää, koska Israel on suvereeni, itsenäinen valtio, jonka koskemattomuuden vaaliminen on myös yksi EU:n keskeisistä tavoitteista. Israelin valtion alueen kartan näkyminen Fatahin käyttämässä logossa on Fatahin puolelta provokatiivinen ele, joka on tähdätty Israelia vastaan. Viittaus Israelin valtion alueeseen Fatahin logossa ei ole ongelmaton myöskään EU:n kannalta, koska EU on sitoutunut Israelin turvallisuuden takaamiseen mutta tukee samalla myös Palestiinan autonomiaa ja pyrkii osaltaan rakentamaan edellytyksiä kahden valtion mallin toteutumiselle. Tämän vuoksi Fatahin lipun ja logon välittämä viesti on ristiriidassa EU:n toimien ja tavoitteitten kanssa.

1. Onko komission tietoinen Fatahin logon ja lipun olemassaolosta ja niiden aihesisällöstä?

2. Onko komissio antanut palautetta Fatahin logosta ja lipusta, joiden viesti on päinvastainen niiden tavoitteiden kanssa, joihin EU on sitoutunut mm. Oslon sopimuksessa?

3. Millä tavoin komissio ja sen korkea edustaja on ottanut asian esille palestiinalaisten ja Fatahin johdon kanssa?

Korkean edustajan, varapuheenjohtaja Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(13. maaliskuuta 2013)

EU on tietoinen Fatahin logosta ja lipusta.

EU arvioi Fatahia sen johtajien, erityisesti Palestiinan presidentin Mahmud Abbasin, toimien perusteella. Presidentti Abbas on toistuvasti osoittanut yksiselitteisen sitoutumisensa kahden valtion malliin sekä neuvotteluteitse haettavaan ratkaisuun Israelin ja Palestiinan väliseen konfliktiin.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011641/12
to the Commission
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Fatah's logo and flag

The logo and flag of the Palestinian organisation Fatah depict the territory of the State of Israel. This is unacceptable, as Israel is a sovereign, independent State, the preservation of whose inviolability is also one of the main objectives of the EU. The depiction of the territory of the State of Israel in the logo used by Fatah is a provocative gesture on Fatah's part, directed against Israel. The reference to the territory of the State of Israel in Fatah's logo is not unproblematic from the EU's point of view, either, as the EU has committed itself to guaranteeing Israel's security but at the same time also supports the autonomy of Palestine and is contributing to efforts to create the preconditions for the implementation of a two-State solution. For this reason, the message sent by Fatah's flag and logo is contrary to the EU's actions and objectives.

1. Is the Commission aware of the existence of Fatah's logo and flag and their content?

2. Has the Commission provided any feedback concerning Fatah's logo and flag, whose message flagrantly contradicts the objectives to which the EU has committed itself, *inter alia* in the Oslo Accords?

3. How have the Commission and its High Representative raised this issue with the Palestinians and Fatah's leadership?

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

The EU is aware of the logo and the flag of Fatah.

The EU judges Fatah by the actions of its leadership, notably Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas, who has repeatedly demonstrated his unequivocal commitment to the two-state solution and to a negotiated settlement to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011642/12
an die Kommission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(19. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Zielkonflikt des OLAF-Generaldirektors bei persönlicher Beteiligung an Untersuchungen

Nach Presseberichten hat der OLAF-Generaldirektor selbst direkt an den OLAF-Untersuchungen im Fall des ehemaligen Kommissionsmitglieds Dalli teilgenommen.

1. An wie vielen anderen Untersuchungen hat der OLAF-Generaldirektor selbst teilgenommen?

2. Um welche Untersuchungen handelte es sich dabei?

3. Was waren die Gründe für das persönliche Engagement des Generaldirektors in diesen Fällen?

4. Nach Artikel 90a des Personalstatuts können sich EU-Bedienstete im Zusammenhang mit Untersuchungen des Amtes mit einer Beschwerde an den Generaldirektor wenden. Wie geht das OLAF mit Fällen einer direkten Beteiligung des Genraldirektors um?

5. Wie geht das OLAF im Fall Dalli mit Artikel 90 a um?

6. Der Generaldirektor nimmt die Stellungnahmen des OLAF-Überwachungsausschusses entgegen. Wie geht er mit dem Ziel-/Interessenkonflikt in diesen Fällen um?

7. Wie bewertet die Kommission die Möglichkeit von Ziel-/Interessenkonflikten in diesen Fällen?

8. Welche Vorkehrungen werden getroffen, um solcherlei Ziel-/Interessenkonflikte zu vermeiden?

Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission
(8. März 2013)

Das Europäische Amt für Betrugsbekämpfung (OLAF) ist in seiner Untersuchungstätigkeit unabhängig. Daher überwacht die Kommission nicht die Funktionsweise von OLAF-Untersuchungen. Der Überwachungsausschuss kontrolliert regelmäßig die Ausübung der Untersuchungstätigkeit ([1]).

1.-3. Der OLAF-Generaldirektor ist an allen Untersuchungen beteiligt. Nach der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1073/1999 ([2]) beschließt er die Einleitung von Untersuchungen und leitet diese. Über den im jeweiligen Fall erforderlichen Grad seiner Beteiligung entscheidet der Generaldirektor selbst.

4. Artikel 90a des Beamtenstatuts gibt dem OLAF die Möglichkeit, seine eigenen Handlungen zu überprüfen und, wo dies erforderlich ist, ausgehend von den Einwänden des Beschwerdeführers etwaige Fehler zu berichtigen. Sämtliche Beschwerden nach Artikel 90a werden unabhängig vom Grad der Beteiligung des OLAF-Generaldirektors auf dieselbe Art und Weise behandelt. Die Entscheidungen des OLAF bezüglich dieser Beschwerden sind gerichtlich nachprüfbar.

5. Im Rahmen interner Untersuchungen mitgeteilte oder eingeholte Informationen unterliegen notwendigerweise dem Berufsgeheimnis und genießen den Schutz, der durch die für die EU-Organe geltenden einschlägigen Bestimmungen gewährleistet ist ([3]). Einzelheiten zu allen Verfahren nach Artikel 90a, die eine OLAF-Untersuchung betreffen, dürfen ebenso wenig offengelegt werden.

([1]) Artikel 11 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1073/1999 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 25. Mai 1999 über die Untersuchungen des Europäischen Amtes für Betrugsbekämpfung (OLAF), ABl. L 136 vom 31.5.1999.
([2]) Artikel 5 und 6 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1073/1999.
([3]) Artikel 8 der Verordnung Nr. 1073/1999.

6.-8. Der Überwachungsausschuss gibt an den OLAF-Generaldirektor gerichtete, nicht verbindliche Stellungnahmen ab ([4]), die hauptsächlich systembezogene Aspekte der Ausübung der Untersuchungstätigkeit des OLAF betreffen, und ist gehalten, nicht in den Ablauf von Untersuchungen einzugreifen. Auch wenn die Stellungnahmen dieses Ausschusses lediglich beratenden Charakter haben, prüft der OLAF-Generaldirektor sie eingehend, um sicherzustellen, dass ihnen angemessen Folge geleistet wird. Ein Interessenkonflikt sollte im Zusammenhang mit diesen Stellungnahmen nicht entstehen können.

([4]) Nach Artikel 11 Absatz 1 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1073/1999: „Der Überwachungsausschuss gibt von sich aus oder auf Ersuchen des Direktors an diesen gerichtete Stellungnahmen zu den Tätigkeiten des Amtes ab, greift jedoch nicht in den Ablauf der Untersuchungen ein".

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011642/12
to the Commission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Conflict of objectives in relation to personal involvement of the OLAF Director-General in investigations

According to the press the Director-General of OLAF has been directly involved in investigations of ex-Commissioner Dalli.

1. How many other investigations has he been personally involved in?

2. Which investigations were they?

3. What were the reasons for personal involvement of the Director-General in these cases?

4. Article 90a of the EU Staff Regulation provides for EU officials to submit a complaint to the Director-General in the case of an OLAF investigation. How does OLAF deal with cases directly involving the Director-General?

5. How is OLAF dealing with Article 90 in the Dalli case?

6. Opinions of OLAF's Supervisory Committee are submitted to the Director-General. How does he manage conflicts of interest/objectives in such cases?

7. In the Commission's view, could conflicts of interest/objectives arise in such cases?

8. Which steps have been taken to prevent such conflicts of interest/objectives?

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

The European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) is independent in its investigative functions. Therefore, the Commission does not supervise the functioning of OLAF investigations. The Supervisory Committee shall regularly monitor the implementation of the investigative function ([1]).

1-3. The OLAF Director-General is involved in all investigations. According to Regulation 1073/1999 ([2]) he shall open investigations and direct the conduct of them. It is for the Director-General to decide about the degree of his involvement that the specific case requires.

4. Article 90a of the Staff Regulations provides OLAF with the opportunity to review its own actions and, where appropriate, correct any errors on the basis of the objections of the complainant. Any Article 90a complaints are treated in the same way regardless of the degree of involvement of the OLAF Director-General. The decisions taken by OLAF on these complaints are subject to judicial review.

5. Information forwarded or obtained in the course of internal investigations are necessarily subject to professional secrecy and shall enjoy the protection given by the provisions applicable to the EU institutions ([3]). Details of any Article 90a procedure concerning an OLAF investigation cannot be revealed, either.

6-8. The Supervisory Committee delivers non-binding opinions to the OLAF Director-General ([4]) which focus on systemic aspects of the implementation of OLAF's investigative function, and should not interfere with the conduct of investigations in progress. Even if the opinions of this Committee are of an advisory nature, they are thoroughly examined by the OLAF Director-General to ensure follow-up as appropriate. The possibility of a conflict of interest should not arise in relation to those opinions.

([1]) Article 11 of Regulation (EC) No 1073/1999 of Parliament and of the Council of 25 May 1999 concerning investigations conducted by the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF), OJ L 136, 31.5.1999.
([2]) Articles 5 and 6 of Regulation No 1073/1999.
([3]) Article 8 of Regulation 1073/1999.
([4]) Under Article 11(1) Regulation (EC) No 1073/1999: "At the request of the Director or on its own initiative, the committee shall deliver opinions to the Director concerning the activities of the Office, without however interfering with the conduct of investigations in progress.".

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011643/12
an die Kommission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(19. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Treffen der Kommission mit Vertretern der Tabakindustrie

In den Antworten auf Anträge auf Zugang zu Dokumenten gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1049/2001 und in den Antworten auf 154 Fragen von Migliedern des Haushaltskontrollausschusses des Europäischen Parlaments im Hinblick auf den Fall des ehemaligen Kommissionsmitglieds John Dalli hat die Kommission offengelegt, dass sich hochrangige Bedienstete des Generalsekretariats mit Vertretern der Tabakindustrie getroffen hatten.

1. Wie schätzt die Kommission die Vereinbarkeit dieser Treffen mit Artikel 5 Absatz 3 der WHO-Rahmenkonvention zur Tabakkontrolle ein?

2. Inwiefern sind diese Treffen mit den Leitlinien zu Artikel 5 Absatz 3 der WHO-Rahmenkonvention zur Tabakkontrolle vereinbar?

3. Welche disziplinarischen Konsequenzen zieht die Kommission bei Verstößen gegen die Rahmenkonvention?

4. Welche disziplinarischen Konsequenzen zieht die Kommission bei Verstößen gegen die Leitlinien zur Rahmenkonvention?

5. Welche disziplinarischen Maßnahmen wurden in den von der Kommission offengelegten Fällen ergriffen?

Antwort von Herrn Barroso im Namen der Kommission
(4. März 2013)

Artikel 5 Absatz 3 des Übereinkommens besagt Folgendes: „Bei der Festlegung und Durchführung ihrer gesundheitspolitischen Maßnahmen in Bezug auf die Eindämmung des Tabakgebrauchs schützen die Vertragsparteien diese Maßnahmen in Übereinstimmung mit innerstaatlichem Recht vor den kommerziellen und sonstigen berechtigten Interessen der Tabakindustrie“. Die Konferenz der Vertragsparteien hat Leitlinien für die Umsetzung von Artikel 5 Absatz 3 des Übereinkommens verabschiedet ([1]). Die Vertragsparteien sollten diese Leitlinien nach Maßgabe ihres innerstaatlichen Rechts so weit wie möglich umsetzen. Diese Leitlinien sind nicht verbindlich und sollten in einer mit der Rechts- und Verwaltungspraxis vereinbaren Weise umgesetzt werden. Die Kommission ist der Auffassung, dass die Treffen zwischen Bediensteten des Generalsekretariats und Vertretern der Tabakindustrie mit diesen nicht verbindlichen Leitlinien vereinbar sind.

Nach Kenntnis der Kommission sind die ethischen Grundsätze für die Kommissionsmitglieder und die Bediensteten ebenso wie die Vorschriften und Instrumente zur Transparenz und Interessenvertretung uneingeschränkt mit diesen nicht verbindlichen Maßnahmen vereinbar. Da keine Verstöße gegen das Statut oder andere verbindliche Verwaltungsvorschriften durch Bedienstete vorliegen, sind keine disziplinarischen Maßnahmen zu ergreifen.

([1]) Beschluss FCTC/COP3(7).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011643/12
to the Commission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Commission meeting with representatives of the tobacco industry

In the response to requests for access to documents under Regulation (EC) Nr. 1049/2001 and in the answers to the 154 questions from members of the European Parliament's Committee on Budgetary Control about the case of former commissioner, John Dalli, the Commission disclosed that high-ranking staff of the Secretariat-General had met with representatives of the tobacco industry.

1. How does the Commission judge the compatibility of these meetings with Article 5(3) of the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control?

2. To what extent are these meetings compatible with Article 5(3) of the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control?

3. What disciplinary action does the Commission take in response to infringements of the framework convention?

4. What disciplinary action does the Commission take in response to infringements of the guidelines on the framework convention?

5. What disciplinary measures were taken by the Commission in the disclosed cases?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2013)

Article 5.3 of the Convention foresees that 'In setting and implementing their public health policies with respect to tobacco control, Parties shall act to protect these policies from commercial and other vested interests of the tobacco industry in accordance with national law'. The Conference of the Parties adopted guidelines for implementation of Article 5.3 of the Convention ([1]). Parties are encouraged to implement these guidelines to the extent possible, in accordance with their national law. These guidelines are not binding in themselves and should be implemented in ways that are compatible with legal and administrative practice. The Commission considers that meetings between the staff of the Secretariat General and representatives of the tobacco industry were compatible with these non-binding guidelines.

The Commission has been advised that the Ethical framework applicable to Commissioners and staff, as well as the rules and instruments concerning transparency and lobbying are fully compatible with these non-binding measures. There have not been any infringements by its staff of the Staff Regulations or other binding administrative provision, so the question of disciplinary measures has not arisen.

([1]) Decision FCTC/COP3(7).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011644/12
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Phenylbutazone and food producing animals

Specific legislation protects consumers from exposure to potentially harmful residues of veterinary medicines, pesticides and environmental contaminants in food of animal origin.

Can the Commission confirm whether the anti-inflammatory drug phenylbutazone is prohibited from ever being administered to animals destined for human consumption?

For example, can the Commission clarify the measures that are in place to ensure that animals which are not originally intended for human consumption, but which thereafter are sent for slaughter, do not find their way in to the food chain?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(8 February 2013)

In accordance with Regulation (EC) No 470/2009 ([1]), only pharmacologically active substances for which a maximum residue limit has been established may be administered to food producing animals, provided that such administration is in accordance with Directive 2001/82/EC ([2]) on the Community code relating to veterinary medicinal products. Within the EU the veterinary medicinal product phenylbutazone is not authorised for the administration to food-producing animals.

There is a cascade of security mechanisms installed to protect consumers of food of animal origin from exposure to residues of unauthorised veterinary medicines.

For example, horses born in the EU are considered by default as intended for the food chain, unless individual animals are, according to Article 10(2) of Directive 2001/82/EC, declared as not being intended for slaughter for human consumption in Section IX of the identification document (the 'horse passport') set up by Commission Regulation (EC) No 504/2008 on the methods for the identification of equidae.

That identification document is part of the food chain information which the slaughterhouse operator, under the supervision of the official veterinarian, is to receive, check and act upon in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 ([3]) laying down specific hygiene rules for food of animal origin.

([1]) OJ L 152/11, 16.6.2009.
([2]) OJ L 311/1, 28.11.2001.
([3]) OJ L 139/5, 530.4.2004.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011645/12
aan de Commissie
Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)
(19 december 2012)

Betreft: Implementatie richtlijn energieprestatie gebouwen

Artikel 7 van richtlijn 2002/91/EG betreffende de energieprestatie van gebouwen verplicht lidstaten erop toe te zien dat er een energieprestatiecertificaat wordt verstrekt bij de bouw, verkoop of verhuur van een gebouw. Nederland heeft dit nooit gedaan door publiekelijk te verklaren dat er geen sanctie staat op niet-naleving van deze verplichting.

1. Is de Commissie ervan op de hoogte dat Nederland de verplichte afgifte van certificaten volgens artikel 7 van richtlijn 2002/91/EG tot op heden niet heeft ingevoerd, omdat men tegelijkertijd met de implementatie bekend heeft gemaakt dat er geen sancties staat op niet-naleving van deze verplichting? Zo ja, heeft de Commissie hier sinds 2006 adequate actie op ondernemen en op welke manier?

2. Zijn er andere richtlijnen waarvan de verplichtingen op deze manier worden ondermijnd in Nederland of in andere lidstaten? Zo ja, wordt daar actie op ondernomen of moeten deze richtlijnen ook herzien worden met een expliciete verplichting tot sancties, zoals in de herziene richtlijn energieprestatie gebouwen 2010/31/EU is gebeurd in artikel 27?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(25 februari 2013)

1. De Commissie is op de hoogte van het beweerde verzuim van Nederland om de eisen van Richtlijn 2002/91/EG betreffende de energieprestaties van gebouwen ([1]) (REPG) wat de energieprestatiecertificaten betreft, volledig ten uitvoer te leggen. Na de Nederlandse wetgeving en de situatie op de markt te hebben onderzocht, heeft de Commissie Nederland in april 2011 in gebreke gesteld voor de slechte uitvoering van artikel 7 van Richtlijn 2002/91/EG, juist omdat Nederland geen passende maatregelen had genomen om de afgifte van energieprestatiecertificaten te garanderen. Op 9 juli 2010 is de herschikking van de REPG ([2]) in werking getreden. Op grond van artikel 27 van die herschikking worden aan de lidstaten specifieke eisen gesteld ten aanzien van het vaststellen van sancties om de uitvoering van de nationale wetgeving ter omzetting van de richtlijn af te dwingen. Op 21 september 2012 heeft de Commissie Nederland in gebreke gesteld vanwege het verzuim de herschikte REPG om te zetten. Wanneer omzetting van de richtlijn nog langer uitblijft, ontvangen de Nederlandse autoriteiten als volgende formele stap in de procedure een met redenen omkleed advies.

2. Het is reeds gangbare praktijk van de EU-wetgevers en de Commissie om in richtlijnen een specifieke bepaling op te nemen op grond waarvan de lidstaten doeltreffende, evenredige en afschrikkende sancties moeten vaststellen die van toepassing zijn op overtredingen van de nationale bepalingen ter uitvoering van EU-richtlijnen (bv. de Richtlijnen 2010/30/EG, 2009/119/EG, 2009/125/EG en 2012/27/EU) als manier om de afdwingbaarheid van de nationale omzettingswetgeving te verbeteren. Zelfs wanneer de richtlijnen niet in dergelijke sancties voorzien, wordt de lidstaten op grond van het VWEU echter een algemene verplichting opgelegd om te zorgen voor de effectieve uitvoering van de EU-wetgeving.

([1]) PB L 65 van 4.1.2003, blz. 1.
([2]) PB L 153 van 18.6.2010, blz. 13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011645/12
to the Commission
Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)
(19 December 2012)

Subject: Implementation of the directive on the energy performance of buildings

Article 7 of Directive 2002/91/EC on the energy performance of buildings requires Member States to ensure that an energy performance certificate is issued when buildings are constructed, sold or rented out. The Netherlands has never effectively transposed this requirement, as it has publicly stated that there is no penalty for non-compliance with it.

1. Is the Commission aware that the Netherlands has still not introduced a requirement to issue certificates in accordance with Article 7 of Directive 2002/91/EC, because at the same time as transposing the directive it announced that there would be no penalty for non-compliance with the requirement? If so, has the Commission taken appropriate action in response to this since 2006, and how?

2. Are there any other directives whose requirements are being undermined in this way in the Netherlands or other Member States? If so, is action taken in response, or should these directives also be revised to include an explicit requirement to institute penalties, as has been done in Article 27 of the revised Directive on the energy performance of buildings, 2010/31/EU?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2013)

1. The Commission is aware of the alleged failure of the Netherlands to fully implement the requirements of Directive 2002/91/EC ([1]) on the energy performance of buildings (EPBD) as regards energy performance certificates. After examining the Dutch legislation and the situation on the market, the Commission issued in April 2011 a letter of formal notice to the Netherlands on a bad application of Article 7 of Directive 2002/91/EC, precisely for not having adopted appropriate measures that ensure the delivery of energy performance certificates. On 09 July 2010 the recast EPBD ([2]) entered into force. Its Article 27 includes specific requirements on MS as regards the establishment of penalties to ensure the implementation of the transposed national legislation. On 21 September 2012 the Commission sent to the Netherlands a letter of formal notice for the failure to transpose the recast EBPD. In case of further non-transposition the next step in the formal process would be to address to the Dutch authorities a reasoned opinion.

2. As a way to improve enforceability of national transposition legislation there is already a general practice of the EU-legislators and the Commission to foresee in the directives a specific provision requiring Member States to set up effective, proportionate and dissuasive penalties applicable to infringements of the national provisions implementing the EU-Directive (e.g. Directives 2010/30/EC, 2009/119/EC, 2009/125/EC, 2012/27/EU). However, even when Directives do not provide for such penalties, the TFEU imposes a general obligation on Member States to ensure the effective implementation of EC law.

([1]) OJ L 65 of 4.1.2003, p.1.
([2]) OJ L 153, 18.6.2010, p. 13.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011646/12
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(20 de diciembre de 2012)

Asunto: Fiscalidad de la cogeneración en España

La Directiva 2012/27/UE de eficiencia energética está en estos momentos en proceso de transposición en los Estados miembros. Pero, desde su entrada en vigor, entiende este Diputado que obliga a los mismos a no adoptar medidas contrarias a sus efectos.

A la vista de su contenido y a la vista del Proyecto de Ley de Medidas Fiscales para la sostenibilidad energética que se vota definitivamente el jueves 20 de diciembre de 2012 en el Congreso español de los Diputados,

¿Conoce la Comisión las medidas que se están proponiendo en España en materia de fiscalidad energética y que están amenazando la viabilidad del sector de la cogeneración?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(13 de febrero de 2013)

La Comisión sigue atentamente la reforma del sector español de la energía, incluida la adopción de la nueva Ley de medidas fiscales 15/2012 sobre sostenibilidad energética, publicada el 28 de diciembre de 2012. La Comisión está examinando actualmente si la nueva ley plantea problemas de compatibilidad con el Derecho de la UE. En este contexto, se está evaluando detenidamente la incidencia de la Ley 15/2012 sobre el desarrollo de la cogeneración en España y sobre la aplicación de la Directiva 2012/27/UE ([1]). En caso de detectarse alguna incompatiblidad, la Comisión intervendrá rápidamente para garantizar la compatibilidad y la adecuación a la normativa de la UE sobre cogeneración.

([1]) Directiva 2012/27/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 25 de octubre de 2012 , relativa a la eficiencia energética, por la que se modifican las Directivas 2009/125/CE y 2010/30/UE, y por la que se derogan las Directivas 2004/8/CE y 2006/32/CE , DO L 315 de 2012, de 14.11.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011646/12
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Taxation of the Spanish cogeneration sector

Directive 2012/27/EU on energy efficiency is currently being transposed into national law. However, my understanding is that the directive, once it has entered into force, prohibits Member States from adopting any measures inconsistent with its legal effects.

The Spanish Parliament will be holding its final vote on the draft tax law concerning energy sustainability on Thursday, 20 December 2012.

In the light of the above, is the Commission aware of the energy taxation measures that Spain is proposing to adopt which could undermine the viability of the cogeneration sector?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(13 February 2013)

The Commission is closely following the Spanish energy sector reform, including the adoption of the new tax Law n° 15/2012 on energy sustainability published on 28 December 2012. The Commission is currently analysing whether the new law raises issues of compatibility with EC law. In this context, the impact of Law n° 15/2012 on the development of cogeneration in Spain and on the implementation of energy efficiency Directive 2012/27/EU ([1]) is carefully assessed. If conflicts are revealed, the Commission will take swift action to ensure compatibility and alignment with EC law on cogeneration.

([1]) Directive 2012/27/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 on energy efficiency, amending Directives 2009/125/EC and 2010/30/EU and repealing Directives 2004/8/EC and 2006/32/EC — OJ 2012, 315, 14.11.2012.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011647/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(20. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Verfahren zur Vergabe der bulgarischen Staatsbürgerschaft

Medienberichten zufolge hat das bulgarische Parlament einer Gesetzesnovelle zugestimmt, nach der Personen, die mehr als eine Million Lewa in Bulgarien investieren und sich außerdem ein Jahr lang in Bulgarien aufhalten, die bulgarische Staatsbürgerschaft erhalten können. Bulgarien strebt derzeit den Beitritt zum Schengen-Raum an.

1. Ist die neue rechtliche Lage mit den derzeit gültigen Regelungen des Schengener Abkommens sowie mit denen des auch Schengen 3 genannten Prümer Vertrages vereinbar?

2. Wie beurteilt die Kommission mit Blick auf diese Gesetzesnovelle den Beitritt Bulgariens zum Schengener Abkommen?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(21. Februar 2013)

Die Voraussetzungen für die Erlangung und den Verlust der Staatsangehörigkeit eines Mitgliedstaates werden durch das jeweilige innerstaatliche Recht geregelt. Die Festlegung der Voraussetzungen für den Erwerb der Staatsangehörigkeit eines Mitgliedstaats fällt nicht unter EU-Recht. Hinsichtlich der vom Herrn Abgeordneten angesprochenen nationalen Maßnahmen verfügt die Kommission über keinerlei Kompetenzen.

Weder der Schengen-Besitzstand noch der Prümer Vertrag enthalten Bestimmungen zum Erwerb der Staatsangehörigkeit eines Mitgliedstaates.

Über den Beitritt Bulgariens (und Rumäniens) zum Schengen-Raum entscheidet der Rat nach Anhörung des Europäischen Parlaments.

Das Europäische Parlament hat in der legislativen Entschließung vom 8. Juni 2011 mit großer Mehrheit der Aufnahme Rumäniens und Bulgariens zugestimmt. Der Rat Justiz und Inneres kam am 9. Juni 2011 zu dem Schluss, dass sowohl Rumänien als auch Bulgarien die Schengen-Kriterien erfüllen. Allerdings ist die erforderliche Einstimmigkeit im Rat für einen Beschluss zur Aufhebung der Kontrollen an den Binnengrenzen noch nicht erreicht worden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011647/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Procedure for acquiring Bulgarian citizenship

According to the media the Bulgarian parliament has adopted a new law under which anybody who invests over one million lev in Bulgaria as well as spending a year in the country can acquire Bulgarian citizenship. At the same time, Bulgaria is applying to join Schengen.

1. Is this new legal situation compatible with the current provisions of the Schengen agreement and with those of the Prüm Treaty (also known as Schengen 3)?

2. In view of this new legislation, what does the Commission think about Bulgarian accession to the Schengen agreement?

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

The conditions for obtaining and forfeiting citizenship of a Member State are regulated under the national laws of the individual Member State. Issues ensuing from the definition by a Member State of the conditions for the acquisition of its nationality do not fall within the ambit of European Union law. The Commission has no competence regarding the national measures referred to by the Honourable Member.

There are no provisions in the Schengen *acquis* or in the Prüm Treaty provisions related to the acquisition of citizenship in a Member State.

As for the membership of Bulgaria (and Romania) in the Schengen area, the decision is taken by the Council, after consultation of the European Parliament.

The European Parliament adopted its legislative resolution approving the accession of Romania and Bulgaria by a large majority on 8 June 2011. The Justice and Home Affairs Council of 9 June 2011 concluded that both Romania and Bulgaria fulfil the Schengen criteria. However, the necessary unanimity in Council for a decision on the lifting of internal border control has not yet been reached.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011648/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(20. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Finanzierung der europäischen Verkehrsinfrastruktur

In ihrer Pressemitteilung IP/12/1281 vom 29. November 2012 kündigte die Europäische Kommission an, mehr als 1,2 Mrd. EUR für die Finanzierung wichtiger TEN-V-Vorhaben bereitstellen zu wollen.

Welcher Anteil der angekündigten Investitionen in die europäische Verkehrsinfrastruktur wird in Projekte in Österreich fließen?

Welche konkreten Projekte in Österreich werden im Rahmen der angekündigten Finanzierung mit welchem Betrag gefördert?

Welcher Anteil der angekündigten Investitionen wird in grenzüberschreitende Projekte mit österreichischer Beteiligung fließen und um welche konkreten Projekte handelt es sich dabei?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(26. Februar 2013)

Über die konkrete Verteilung der Mittel in Höhe von insgesamt 1,2 Mrd. EUR im Rahmen der Aufforderungen zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen der TEN-V-Arbeitsprogramme 2012 wird nach einem Auswahl- und Bewertungsverfahren entschieden, bei dem sämtliche Vorschläge, die von den Mitgliedstaaten eingereicht werden, beurteilt werden.

Das TEN-V-Programm sieht keine Aufteilung der Finanzmittel nach Mitgliedstaaten vor.

Das Auswahl- und Bewertungsverfahren wird im September 2013 abgeschlossen sein. Erst dann werden die statistischen Daten vorliegen, anhand deren die Fragen des Herrn Abgeordneten beantwortet werden können.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011648/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Funding for European transport infrastructure

In its press release IP/12/1281 of 29 November 2012 the European Commission announced its intention of providing over EUR 1.2 billion funding for key TEN-T projects.

How much of this planned European transport infrastructure investment will go to projects in Austria?

Specifically, which Austrian projects will benefit from this, and how much funding will they get?

How much of the planned investment will go to cross-border projects involving Austria, and which specific projects will this concern?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(26 février 2013)

L'allocation des crédits de 1,2 milliard d'euros dans le cadre des appels à propositions des programmes de travail RTE-T du 2012, sera déterminée après une procédure de sélection et d'évaluation de toutes les propositions qui seront soumises par les États membres.

Le programme RTE-T ne prévoit pas une répartition de l'enveloppe financière par État membre.

La procédure de sélection et d'évaluation sera finalisée en septembre 2013 et c'est à ce moment que des données statistiques seront disponibles pour répondre aux questions de l'Honorable Parlementaire.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011649/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(20. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Entwicklungshilfe und Bekämpfung der Hungersnot im Südsudan

Der Hohe Flüchtlingskommissar der Vereinten Nationen (UNHCR) berichtet ebenso wie die Hilfsorganisation Ärzte ohne Grenzen über eine erneute Hungersnot im Südsudan, die zum wiederholten Male auch ein Flüchtlingsproblem mit sich bringt. Die EU ist weltweit einer der größten Geldgeber für Entwicklungs-, Hunger- und Nothilfe.

1. Finanziert die EU derzeit Hilfsprojekte im Südsudan, bzw. leistet sie dort auf anderem Wege Hilfe?

2. Plant die Kommission auf die aktuelle Flüchtlings- und Hungerkrise in dem Land zu reagieren und etwa weitere Hilfsprogramme zu starten und/oder bestehende Projekte, wie die UNHCR-Nothilfe zu unterstützen?

3. Beteiligt sich die Europäische Union an der Ausstattung und Versorgung von Flüchtlingslagern in den betroffenen Gebieten?

Antwort von Frau Georgieva im Namen der Kommission
(1. März 2013)

1. Derzeit stellt die EU knapp 110 Mio. EUR zur Finanzierung von humanitärer Hilfe in Süd-Sudan bereit. Darüber hinaus hat die EU für den Zeitraum 2011-2013 Mittel des Europäischen Entwicklungsfonds in Höhe von insgesamt 285 Mio. EUR für Maßnahmen zugunsten der bedürftigsten Bevölkerungsgruppen u. a. in den Bereichen Bildung, Gesundheit und Ernährungssicherheit zur Verfügung gestellt.

2. Vom oben genannten Betrag für die humanitäre Hilfe fließen knapp 50 Mio. EUR in die Bewältigung der Flüchtlingskrise in Südsudan, wovon 10 Mio. EUR in die Unterstützung der Soforthilfemaßnahmen des Flüchtlingshilfswerks der Vereinten Nationen (UNHCR). Die EU-Mittel für die Bewältigung dieser Krise wurden entsprechend der steigenden Zahl der Flüchtlinge aufgestockt.

3. Mit diesen Mitteln wird ein unmittelbarer Beitrag zur Ausrüstung und Belieferung der Flüchtlingslager in den betroffenen Gebieten geleistet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011649/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Development aid and combating famine in South Sudan

Both the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and Doctors Without Borders are warning of a new famine in South Sudan, resulting once again in refugee problems. The EU is one of the world's largest donors of development aid, emergency aid and famine relief.

1. Is the EU currently financing any aid projects in South Sudan, or is it providing some other form of aid there?

2. Is the Commission planning a response to the country's current refugee crisis and famine, for example by launching new aid programmes and/or supporting existing projects such as the UNHCR's emergency relief activities?

3. Is the European Union involved in equipping and supplying refugee camps in the areas concerned?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(1 March 2013)

1. The EU is currently funding close to EUR 110 million worth in humanitarian assistance in South Sudan. In addition, for the period 2011-2013, the EU has allocated a total of EUR 285 million in European Development Funds to South Sudan, which aim at implementing, amongst other things, education, health and food security activities that directly target the most vulnerable population.

2. Close to EUR 50 million of the amount referred to above for humanitarian assistance, is being allocated to the refugee crisis in South Sudan, EUR 10 million of which for United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees' (UNHCR) emergency relief activities. EU funding for this crisis has been increasing, as the number of refugees has grown.

3. These funds contribute directly to equipping and supplying refugee camps in the areas concerned.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011651/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(20. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Klarstellung in Bezug auf den Austausch von Fluggastdatensätzen mit den USA durch die Mitgliedstaaten

In ihrem Siebten Bericht über die Aufrechterhaltung der Visumpflicht bei Nichtbeachtung des Grundsatzes der Gegenseitigkeit durch bestimmte Drittländer (KOM(2012)0681) stellt die Kommission fest: „Einigen der bilateralen Abkommen zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten und den USA mangelt es an einer eindeutigen Zweckbindung sowie strengen Kriterien für die Weiterverarbeitung der übermittelten Daten".

Die Kommission wird um Klarstellung folgender Punkte gebeten:

1. Bestehen die Fluggastdatensätze (Passenger Name Records — PNR), die durch die Mitgliedstaaten mit den USA ausgetauscht werden und auf Abkommen, denen es an einer Zweckbindung mangelt, beruhen, ausschließlich aus Daten, die von dem Mitgliedstaat, der den Datenaustausch vornimmt, gesammelt werden, oder betreffen diese auch Daten, die von anderen Mitgliedstaaten gesammelt werden und zwischen EU-Mitgliedstaaten durch interne Abkommen zur gemeinsamen Nutzung von Daten ausgetauscht werden?

2. Welches bilaterale Abkommen eines Mitgliedstaats mit den USA ist für jeden Fluggast gültig: das Abkommen (a) des Mitgliedstaats, in dem die Reise gebucht wird, (b) des Mitgliedstaats, in dem sich der Sitz der Buchungsstelle oder der Fluggesellschaft befindet, (c) des Mitgliedstaats, in dem die An- oder Abreise mit dem Flugzeug stattfindet bzw. die Reise beginnt oder endet, (d) des Mitgliedstaats, dessen Staatsbürgerschaft der oder die Reisende besitzt, (e) alle oder mehrere der oben genannten, oder (f) eine andere Option?

3. Gibt es Mitgliedstaaten, von denen bekannt ist oder vermutet wird, dass diese Fluggastdatensätze austauschen, unabhängig davon, ob der Flug oder der Fluggast im Hinblick auf die Richtung eine unmittelbare Verbindung zu diesem Mitgliedstaat hat (d. h. unabhängig davon, ob der Fluggast die Staatsbürgerschaft dieses Mitgliedstaats besitzt, ob die Buchungsstelle oder Fluggesellschaft ihren Sitz in diesem Mitgliedstaat hat, usw.)?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(28. Februar 2013)

Zwar bezogen sich zwischen den Vereinigten Staaten und mehreren Mitgliedstaaten unterzeichnete Vereinbarungen auf die Übermittlung von Daten von Personen, die zwischen dem betreffenden Mitgliedstaat und wichtigen Drittstaaten reisen, diese Vereinbarungen waren aber keine Rechtsgrundlage für den Datenaustausch zwischen den zwei Ländern sondern lediglich Ausdruck des Wunsches der beiden Parteien nach spezifischen Vereinbarungen/Abkommen für die Steuerung des Datenaustauschs. In keinem der zwischen den Vereinigten Staaten und den Mitgliedstaaten geschlossenen spezifischen Abkommen ist der Austausch der genannten Informationen vorgesehen. Daher kann die Kommission bestätigen, dass im Rahmen dieser Abkommen und Vereinbarungen zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten und den Vereinigten Staaten keine Fluggastdaten ausgetauscht werden.

Die Vereinigten Staaten haben mit der Kommission vereinbart, dass sie unabhängig vom Wortlaut der Vereinbarungen keine bilateralen Durchführungsvereinbarungen mit den Mitgliedstaaten über den Austausch von Fluggastdaten treffen werden, da dies eine Angelegenheit ist, die dem PNR-Abkommen zwischen der EU und den USA zufolge in die Zuständigkeit der EU fällt. Der Austausch von Fluggastdaten erfolgt nur im Rahmen des PNR-Abkommens zwischen der EU und den USA.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011651/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Clarification regarding passenger name record data sharing with the US by Member States

In its 'Seventh report on certain third countries' maintenance of visa requirements in breach of the principle of reciprocity' (COM(2012)0681), the Commission states: 'some of the bilateral agreements between Member States and the U.S. are missing a clear purpose limitation and strict criteria qualifying the cases for further processing of the transferred data'.

Can the Commission clarify:

1. whether the passenger name record (PNR) data shared by Member States with the US and covered by agreements lacking a purpose limitation consist solely of data collected by the Member State sharing the data, or whether this also affects data collected by other Member States that are shared among EU countries through internal data sharing agreements?

2. which Member State's bilateral agreement with the US is valid for each passenger: the agreement of (a) the Member State in which the travel is booked, (b) the Member State in which the booking agency or airline is based, (c) any Member State from which the flight or an itinerary departs or in which it lands, (d) the Member State of which the traveller is a citizen, (e) all or several of the above, or (f) another option?

3. whether any Member States are known or suspected to share PNR data irrespective of whether the flight or passenger has any direction connection to that Member State (i.e. irrespective of whether or not the passenger is a citizen of that Member State, whether or not the booking agency or airline is based in that Member State, and so on)?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

Even though Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) signed between the US and several Member States referred to the transfer of data about persons travelling between the relevant Member State and third countries of interest, these MoUs were not a legal basis for the exchange of data between the two countries, but merely expressed the intention of the two parties to have specific arrangements/agreements to govern the exchange of data. None of the specific agreements actually concluded between the US and the Member States provide for the exchange of such information. Therefore, the Commission can confirm that there is no exchange of PNR data being carried out between Member States and the US under these various agreements and MoUs.

The US agreed with the Commission, irrespective of the wording of the MoUs, not to request bilateral implementing arrangements with the Member States on the exchange of PNR data, since this was a matter falling within the EU's remit under the relevant EU-US PNR agreement. The exchange of PNR data takes place only under the EU-US PNR Agreement.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011653/12
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(20 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Achizițiile publice și investigarea corupției

Instituțiile europene investesc eforturi și resurse financiare în eradicarea sau atenuarea unor fenomene precum corupția, frauda și conflictele de interese în Uniunea Europeană, inclusiv prin atribuirea unor contracte și comandarea unor analize privind această problemă.

1. Câte contracte legate de investigarea fraudelor, corupției și conflictelor de interese a atribuit Comisia din 2009?

2. Pentru fiecare contract atribuit, vă rugăm să oferiți informații detaliate privind data, perioada de executare, valoarea, contractantul/contractanții și subcontractantul/subcontractanții, precum și tipul exact de atribuire utilizat.

3. Care sunt rezultatele fiecărui proiect? Sunt accesibile public și gratuit bazele de date create pentru aceste proiecte sau în timpul realizării lor?

Răspuns dat de dna Malmström în numele Comisiei
(2 aprilie 2013)

Au fost atribuite șase contracte ([1]).

Consolidarea luptei împotriva corupției la nivelul UE, contract-cadru semnat cu GHK la 3 februarie 2010, durata 9 luni, valoare 120 300 EUR. Acesta a servit ca bază pentru a se evalua impactul Pachetului UE privind combaterea corupției ([2]).

Corespondenții locali pentru rețeaua anticorupție, contract semnat cu PricewaterhouseCoopers ([3]) la 12 iulie 2012, durata 24 de luni (valoare 1,95 milioane EUR), licitație deschisă. Acesta oferă un suport pentru Raportul UE privind combaterea corupției.

Corupția în sectorul sănătății, contract semnat cu ECORYS la 19 decembrie 2012, durata 8 luni, valoare 240 645 EUR, licitație deschisă. Se analizează practicile de corupție și politicile de combatere a corupției din sistemele de sănătate ale statelor membre. Datele obținute vor contribui la identificarea unor eventuale acțiuni viitoare ale UE în acest domeniu.

Dezvoltarea unui mecanism al UE de evaluare în domeniul combaterii corupției; contract semnat la 12 martie 2012 cu un consorțiu, realizat de către PwC și ECORYS. Subcontractanții sunt Universitatea din Utrecht, School of Economics și Rețeaua academică de drept penal european (European Criminal Law Academic Network), precum și patru experți. Se va încheia la jumătatea anului 2013 (valoare 1, 349 milioane EUR), licitație deschisă.

Cadrul juridic pentru protecția intereselor financiare ale UE prin intermediul dreptului penal ([4]), contract-cadru semnat cu GHK la 26 august 2011, durata 6 luni (valoare 189 475 EUR). Acesta a servit drept bază pentru a se evalua impactul propunerii de directivă privind protecția intereselor financiare ale Uniunii prin intermediul dreptului penal.

Politicile anticorupție revizuite. Tendințele globale și răspunsurile europene la provocarea pe care o reprezintă corupția (ANTICORRP). Contractul a demarat în martie 2012, durata 60 de luni (valoare 7 999 182 EUR), licitație deschisă (grant). Coordonator: Universitatea din Gothenburg. Obiectivul este explicarea factorilor care promovează sau blochează derularea unor politici anticorupție eficace și existența unor instituții guvernamentale imparțiale.

Ca regulă generală, Comisia publică studiile. Nu există o bază de date publică.

([1]) Au existat, de asemenea, două sondaje Eurobarometru privind corupția, finalizate în perioada respectivă: .
(1) Sondaj Eurobarometru privind corupția, semnat cu TNS Opinion și The European Omnibus Survey la 25 august 2009, durata 4 luni, valoare 167 435 EUR (Contractul-cadru interinstituțional PO/2008-15/A3). http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_325_en.pdf
(2) Sondaj Eurobarometru privind corupția, semnat cu TNS Opinion și The European Omnibus Survey la 28 iulie 2011, durata 4 luni, valoare 255 433 EUR (Contractul-cadru interinstituțional PO/2008-15/A). http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_374_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2011/sec_2011_0660_en.pdf
([3]) PwC.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/criminal/files/study-protection-of-eu-financial-interests_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011653/12
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Public procurement and research on corruption

European institutions invest effort and financial resources in circumventing and mitigating phenomena such as corruption, fraud and conflicts of interest in the European Union, including through the commissioning of contracts and studies on the issue.

1. How many contracts relating to research on fraud, corruption and conflicts of interest has the Commission awarded since 2009?

2. For each of the contracts awarded, please provide detailed information on its date, its period of execution, its value, the contractor(s) and subcontractor(s) and the specific award type used.

3. What are the outcomes of each project? Are the databases established for/during the completion of these projects publicly and freely available?

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

Six contracts have been awarded ([1]).

Strengthening the fight against corruption at EU level, signed with GHK on 3 February 2010, 9 months, EUR 120 300, Framework Contract. It served as a basis for the impact assessment of the EU anti-corruption package ([2]).

Local Correspondents for the anti-corruption network, signed with PriceWaterhouseCoopers ([3]) on 12 July 2012, 24 months (EUR 1.95 million), open procedure. It provides support for the EU Anti-Corruption Report.

Corruption in the health sector, signed with ECORYS on 19 December 2012, 8 months, EUR 240 645, open procedure. It analyses corruption patterns and anti-corruption policies in the Member States' healthcare systems. It will help identify possible future EU action in this area.

Development of an EU Evaluation Mechanism in the area of Anti-Corruption; signed on 12 March 2012 with a consortium made by PwC and ECORYS. The subcontractors are the University of Utrecht, School of Economics, and the European Criminal Law Academic Network and four experts. To end by mid-2013 (EUR 1.349 million), open procedure.

Legal framework for the protection of EU financial interests by criminal law ([4]), signed with GHK on 26 August 2011, 6 months (EUR 189 475), Framework Contract. It served as a basis for the impact assessment of the proposal for a directive on the protection of the Union's financial interests by means of criminal law.

Anticorruption Policies Revisited. Global Trends and European Responses to the Challenge of Corruption (ANTICORRP). It started in March 2012 and lasts for 60 months (EUR 7 999 182) open procedure (grant). Coordinator: University of Gothenburg. It aims to explain factors that promote or hinder effective anticorruption policies and impartial government institutions.

As a rule, the Commission publishes the studies. No public database exists.

([1]) There were also two Eurobarometer surveys on corruption completed during the period: (1) Eurobarometer survey on corruption, signed with TNS opinion and The European Omnibus Survey on 25 August 2009, duration 4 months, EUR 167 435 (Inter-Institutional Framework Contract PO/2008-15/A3). http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_325_en.pdf (2) Eurobarometer survey on corruption, signed with TNS opinion and The European Omnibus Survey on 28 July 2011, duration 4 months, EUR 255 433 (Inter-Institutional Framework Contract PO/2008-15/A). http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_374_en.pdf

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2011/sec_2011_0660_en.pdf

([3]) PwC.

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/criminal/files/study-protection-of-eu-financial-interests_en.pdf

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011654/12
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(20 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Calitatea datelor din TED

Analizele datelor din jurnalul european al achizițiilor publice, *Tenders Electronic Daily* (TED) evidențiază sistematic probleme majore de calitate legate de informațiile publicate în TED. De exemplu, în documentul său de lucru din 2010, intitulat „Indicatorii achizițiilor publice în 2008", Comisia afirmă că „datele privind valoarea contractelor sunt precizate doar în aproximativ 80% din anunțurile publicate privind contractele atribuite".

1. A evaluat Comisia sistematic calitatea și fiabilitatea datelor publicate în TED de la crearea acestuia? Dacă a făcut acest lucru, vă rugăm să comunicați datele exacte ale evaluărilor și concluziile fiecăreia dintre acestea.

2. Ce măsuri a luat Comisia de la publicarea „Indicatorilor achizițiilor publice 2008" pentru a se asigura că deficiențele grave constatate în privința calității datelor sunt remediate corespunzător, pentru a garanta o transparență suficientă a cheltuielilor publice, în special în această perioadă de austeritate?

Răspuns dat de dl Barnier în numele Comisiei
(15 februarie 2013)

În contextul pregătirii semestrului european anual, serviciile Comisiei revizuiesc calitatea datelor pe care autoritățile și entitățile contractante le publică în TED (*Tenders Electronic Daily*). Se revizuiește, în special, disponibilitatea datelor referitoare la valorile contractuale menționate în anunțurile de atribuire a contractelor pentru a evalua conformitatea cu cerințele de transparență prevăzute în directivele privind achizițiile publice. Rezultatul acestei revizuiri este unul dintre elementele luate în considerare pentru a formula propunerile Comisiei de recomandări specifice fiecărei țări în domeniul achizițiilor publice. Cea mai recentă situație bazată pe datele privind anul 2011 este inclusă în anexă.

Comisia întreprinde o serie de măsuri destinate îmbunătățirii calității datelor pe care autoritățile și entitățile contractante le publică în TED. Comisia a propus statelor membre ca proporția de anunțuri de atribuire a contractelor care conțin date privind valorile contractelor să facă obiectul unui proces de evaluare comparativă în vederea identificării celor mai bune practici. Vor fi întreprinse acțiuni ulterioare în cadrul Comitetului consultativ pentru achizițiile publice și al rețelei de achiziții publice ([1]). Oficiul pentru Publicații al Uniunii Europene evaluează, de asemenea, măsuri tehnice pentru a garanta îmbunătățirea calității datelor publicate în TED, inclusiv controale automatizate în etapa depunerii anunțurilor.

([1]) http://www.publicprocurementnetwork.org/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011654/12
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Data quality of TED

Systematic analyses of the data provided by the European public procurement journal *Tenders Electronic Daily* (TED) reveal serious quality issues with regard to the information published in TED. For instance, in its 2010 working document 'Public Procurement Indicators 2008' the Commission states that 'data on the value of contracts is only provided in about 80% of published Contract Award Notices'.

1. Has the Commission systematically assessed the quality and reliability of the data published in TED since its creation? If so, please indicate the exact dates of such assessments and the findings for each.

2. What measures has the Commission taken since the publication of 'Public Procurement Indicators 2008' to ensure that the serious weaknesses observed in data quality are properly addressed with a view to guaranteeing adequate transparency of public spending, in particular in times of austerity?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2013)

As part of the preparation of the annual European Semester, the Commission's services review the quality of data that Contracting Authorities and Entities (CAEs) publish in TED. In particular, the availability of data on contract values in Contract Award Notices (CANs) is reviewed to assess compliance with transparency requirements set-out in the public procurement directives. The outcome of this review is one of the elements taken into account to formulate the Commission's proposals for Country-Specific Recommendations in the field of public procurement. The latest situation based on 2011 data is included in the annex.

The Commission is undertaking several measures to improve the quality of data that CAEs publish in TED. The Commission has proposed to the Member States that the proportion of CANs that contain data on contract values should be subject to a benchmarking process intended to identify best practices. Follow-up work will be undertaken in the context of the Advisory Committee on Public Contracts and of the Public Procurement Network ([1]). The Publications Office of the European Union is also evaluating technical measures to ensure that the quality of data published in TED is improved, including automated checks at the submission stage.

([1]) http://www.publicprocurementnetwork.org/.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011655/12
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(20 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: O mai mare transparență în accesarea datelor din TED

Deși portalul internet al jurnalului european al achizițiilor publice *Tenders Electronic Daily* (TED) permite oricui să caute și să consulte gratuit anunțurile individuale de licitații publice, informațiile pe care se bazează anunțurile nu sunt accesibile public. Acest lucru limitează posibilitățile cetățenilor UE de a monitoriza cheltuielile publice. De exemplu, în 2010, Comisia a atribuit un contract în valoarea de 549 904 EUR pentru „Achizițiile publice în Europa. Costuri și eficiență" (anunțul privind atribuirea contractului 2010/S 157-242012). Contractul a condus la crearea unei baze de date care structurează informațiile brute din anunțurile TED. Cu toate acestea, baza de date nu a fost pusă la dispoziția publicului, iar accesul este încă limitat la câteva companii, cum ar fi PwC, London Economics și Ecorys.

1. De ce nu este în prezent posibilă accesarea datelor actualizate zilnic din TED într-un format de bază de date precum cel care a fost creat în Slovacia ([1])?

2. Ce măsuri va lua Comisia pentru ca TED să devină pe deplin transparent în viitorul apropiat, și în cât timp?

3. Având în vedere că au fost folosite fonduri UE pentru a finanța crearea bazei de date privind achizițiile publice din 2010, pe ce se întemeiază decizia de a nu permite accesul public la aceasta?

4. De ce nu toate bazele de date create cu banii contribuabililor sunt accesibile publicului în mod gratuit?

Răspuns dat de dl Barnier în numele Comisiei
(15 februarie 2013)

TED (*Tenders Electronic Daily*) poate fi consultat prin diverse modalități, de exemplu, actualizări prin e-mail, o interfață de căutare avansată, căutări în baza de date HTML, precum și fluxuri RSS implicite sau personalizate ([2]). Pot fi accesate atât anunțurile de achiziții publice curente, cât și anunțurile arhivate din ultimii cinci ani. Accesul la datele mai vechi se acordă pe baza unei cereri adresate Oficiului pentru Publicații al Uniunii Europene.

Serviciile Comisiei (DG Piața Internă și Servicii) mențin o bază de date separată care conține datele TED într-un format structurat care să faciliteze analiza statistică a acestora. De exemplu, această bază de date este utilizată pentru elaborarea indicatorilor anuali privind achizițiile publice, menționați într-o altă întrebare prezentată de către distinsul membru (E-0011654/2012) și pentru pregătirea Raportului anual al Comisiei privind punerea în aplicare a achizițiilor publice ([3]). La cerere, serviciile Comisiei pot acorda accesul la seturi de date specifice extrase din această bază de date unor persoane care efectuează studii și care desfășoară alte activități de cercetare, cum ar fi consultanții menționați de către distinsul membru și alte părți externe.

Serviciile Comisiei și Oficiul pentru Publicații evaluează în prezent modalități de a furniza publicului un acces liber suplimentar la datele conținute în TED, în conformitate cu principiile politicii Comisiei privind datele deschise, în special cu prevederile Deciziei 2011/833/UE ([4]) a Comisiei din 12 decembrie 2011 privind reutilizarea documentelor Comisiei ([5]). Baza de date elaborată în Slovacia, menționată de distinsul membru, va fi examinată cu atenție în acest context.

([1]) http://tender.sme.sk/en/.
([2]) Detalii suplimentare cu privire la funcționalitățile site-ului internet al TED sunt disponibile la adresa: http://ted.europa.eu/TED/misc/helpPage.do?helpPageId=expertSearch.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/implementation/index_en.htm
([4]) JO L 330, 14.12.2011 p. 39.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/policy/psi/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011655/12
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Greater transparency in access to TED data

While the Internet portal of the European public procurement journal *Tenders Electronic Daily* (TED) lets anyone search and view individual public procurement announcements free of charge, the data underlying the announcements are not publicly accessible. This limits the ability of EU citizens to monitor public spending. For instance, in 2010 the Commission awarded a contract to the value of EUR 549 904 for 'Public procurement in Europe. Cost and effectiveness' (contract award notice 2010/S 157-242012). The contract resulted in the creation of a database structuring the raw data given in TED announcements. However, the database has not been made publicly available, and access is still limited to a few companies such as PwC, London Economics and Ecorys.

1. Why is it not currently possible to access daily updates of TED data in a database format such as the one that has been developed in Slovakia ([1])?

2. What measures will the Commission take to make TED fully transparent in the near future, and in what time frame?

3. Given that EU funds were used to finance the creation of the 2010 public procurement database, on what grounds was it decided not to make it publicly available?

4. Why are all databases created with the taxpayers' money not freely available to the public?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2013)

TED can be queried through several mechanisms, e.g. email updates, an expert search interface, HTML database requests and off-the-peg or customised RSS feeds ([2]). Access is possible both to current procurement notices and to archived notices covering the last five years. Access to older data is granted upon request to the Publications Office of the European Union.

The Commission's services (DG Internal Market and Services) maintain a separate database containing TED data in a structured format that facilitates statistical analysis. This database is for example used to produce the annual public procurement indicators referred to in a separate question submitted by the Honourable Member (E-0011654/2012) and to prepare the Commission's Annual Public Procurement Implementation Review ([3]). Upon request, the Commission's services may provide access to tailored datasets extracted from this database to persons carrying out studies and other research work, such as the consultants referred to by the Honourable Member and other external parties.

The Commission services and the Publications Office are currently assessing means to provide further free access to the data contained in TED to the public, consistent with the principles of the Commission's Open Data policy and in particular with the provisions of Decision 2011/833/EU ([4]) of 12 December 2011 on reuse of Commission documents ([5]). The database developed in Slovakia referred to by the Honourable Member will be carefully examined in this context.

([1]) http://tender.sme.sk/en/.
([2]) Further details about the functionality of the TED website are available at http://ted.europa.eu/TED/misc/helpPage.do?helpPageId=expertSearch.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/implementation/index_en.htm
([4]) OJ L 330,14.12.2011 p.39.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/policy/psi/index_en.htm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011656/12
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(20 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Informații despre proiecte de cercetare — achiziții și rezultate

Reforma normelor UE în materie de achiziții publice este în curs de dezbatere. Acțiunile întreprinse de toate instituțiile europene pentru îmbunătățirea normelor UE în materie de achiziții publice se bazează, printre altele, pe atribuirea unor contracte și comandarea unor studii privind această chestiune.

1. Câte contracte de servicii pentru cercetări legate de achiziții a atribuit Comisia din 2009?

2. Pentru fiecare contract atribuit, vă rugăm să oferiți informații detaliate privind data, perioada de executare, valoarea, contractantul/contractanții și subcontractantul/subcontractanții, precum și tipul exact de atribuire utilizat.

3. Care sunt rezultatele fiecărui proiect? Pentru fiecare proiect, vă rugăm să furnizați fie linkuri la toate publicațiile și datele rezultate din documentație/studiu, în cazul în care aceasta/acesta a fost finalizat(ă), sau data preconizată a publicării, dacă aceasta/acesta mai este în curs de derulare.

4. Sunt accesibile public și gratuit bazele de date create pentru aceste proiecte sau în timpul derulării lor?

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011657/12
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(20 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Informații despre proiecte de cercetare — achiziții și rezultate

Reforma normelor UE în materie de achiziții publice este în curs de dezbatere. Acțiunile întreprinse de toate instituțiile europene pentru îmbunătățirea normelor UE în materie de achiziții publice se bazează, printre altele, pe atribuirea unor contracte și comandarea unor studii privind această chestiune.

1. Câte contracte de servicii pentru cercetări și acțiuni de sensibilizare legate de achiziții în cadrul cărora se utilizează fonduri UE au atribuit Comisia și fiecare dintre direcțiile generale ale acesteia din 2009?

2. Pentru fiecare contract atribuit, vă rugăm să oferiți informații detaliate privind data, perioada de executare, valoarea, contractantul/contractanții și subcontractantul/subcontractanții, precum și tipul exact de atribuire utilizat.

3. Care sunt rezultatele fiecărui proiect? Pentru fiecare proiect, vă rugăm să furnizați fie linkuri la toate publicațiile și datele rezultate din documentație/studiu, în cazul în care aceasta/acesta a fost finalizat(ă), sau data preconizată a publicării, dacă aceasta/acesta mai este în curs de derulare.

4. Sunt accesibile public și gratuit bazele de date create pentru aceste proiecte sau în timpul derulării lor?

Răspuns comun dat de dl Barnier în numele Comisiei
(18 februarie 2013)

Din 2009, Comisia a atribuit 16 contracte de servicii pentru cercetarea în domeniul achizițiilor publice. Informațiile detaliate solicitate de distinsul membru sunt prezentate în anexă.

În cazul în care studiile necesită analiza de date cu privire la contractele de achiziții publice atribuite în temeiul directivelor privind achizițiile publice, Comisia se bazează pe date extrase din *Tenders Electronic Daily* (TED). Pentru detalii suplimentare privind disponibilitatea publică a datelor TED, Comisia dorește să reamintească distinsului membru răspunsul său la întrebarea E-11655/2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011656/12
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Information about research projects — procurement and outcomes

The reform of EU public procurement rules is currently under discussion. Actions undertaken by all European institutions to improve EU public procurement rules are based *inter alia* on the commissioning of contracts and studies on the issue.

1. How many service contracts for research on procurement has the Commission awarded since 2009?

2. For each contract awarded, please provide detailed information on its date, period of execution, value, the contractor(s) and sub-contractor(s), and the specific award type used.

3. What are the outcomes of each project? For each project, please provide either the links to all publications and data resulting from the documentation/study, if already concluded, or the expected publication date, if still ongoing.

4. Are the databases established for — and in the course of — these projects publicly and freely available?

Question for written answer E-011657/12
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Information about research projects — procurement and outcomes

The reform of EU public procurement rules is currently under discussion. Actions undertaken by all European institutions to improve EU public procurement rules are based *inter alia* on the commissioning of contracts and studies on the issue.

1. How many service contracts for research and awareness-raising on procurement involving EU funds have the Commission and each of its Directorates-General awarded since 2009?

2. For each contract awarded, please provide detailed information on its date, period of execution, value, the contractor(s) and sub-contractor(s), and the specific award type used.

3. What are the outcomes of each project? For each project, please provide either the links to all publications and data resulting from the documentation/study, if already concluded, or the expected publication date, if still ongoing.

4. Are the databases established for — and in the course of — these projects publicly and freely available?

Joint answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

The Commission has awarded 16 service contracts for research on procurement since 2009. The detailed information requested by the Honourable Member is set out in the annex.

Where studies require the analysis of data about procurement contracts awarded under the public procurement directives, the Commission relies on data extracted from Tenders Electronic Daily (TED). The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to E-11655/2012 for further details concerning the public availability of TED data.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011658/12
to the Commission
Martin Callanan (ECR)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: European Commission communication budget — cost and tendering process for banners hung on the Berlaymont building

The European Commission has a large budget for communication. Some of this budget is spent on banners which are hung on the outside of the Commission's Berlaymont building. These banners are almost the height of the Berlaymont itself, a building of 14 floors.

Numerous citizens have expressed concern to me about the cost of these banners.

Can the Commission:

1. explain the process by which the contracts for the design, printing, delivery and installation of these banners are put out to tender;

2. state the number of bids that were received for the design, printing, delivery and installation of the last five banners, and the prices quoted in these submissions;

3. give the exact cost (broken down into the cost of design, printing, delivery and installation) of each of the last five banners;

4. state the budget line under which the design, printing, delivery and installation of these banners are funded.

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2013)

The design, printing, delivery and installation of the banners on the Berlaymont building are subject of a framework contract with a single contractor. This contract was signed following a full international tender on 22 June 2011 for an initial duration of 2 years.

The Commission changed the management of the banner space at the Berlaymont building at the end of 2010 to reduce the number of banners and make them more targeted to key policy initiatives on one of the most prominent places in the EU quarter of Brussels which is also a favourite place for TV transmissions from Brussels. The banners therefore have strong visibility even beyond the Schuman Square.

While there were 15 banners in 2008 and 16 banners in 2009, there were only 10 new banners in 2011 and four in 2012. This means a saving of nearly 75% compared to previous years. The average cost of a banner is EUR 14.000.

The most recent banners were on the European Year of Citizens (2013), a key initiative with strong support from the European Parliament, the Nobel Peace Prize (2012) on which Parliament, Council and the Commission communicated together, on the Economic and Monetary Union (2012) and on Europe Day (2012) which is shared by all institutions.

The banners are paid from the communication budget of the relevant activity or policy area.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011659/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Famagusta — die „Geisterstadt"

Die Erhaltung unseres — europäischen — Kulturerbes ist integraler Bestandteil unserer europäischen Werte.

Ein Teil der Altstadt Famagustas befindet sich im besetzen Teil Zyperns und ist seit 39 Jahren durch einen Zaun der türkischen Streitkräfte abgetrennt. Er ist vollkommen verfallen und wird als „Geisterstadt" bezeichnet.

1. Beabsichtigt die Kommission, einen Teil der 31 Millionen Euro, die nach der Finanzhilfeverordnung für die Wiederherstellung der vorgenannten „Geisterstadt" zugewiesen sind, zu verwenden, um unser europäisches Kulturerbe zu bewahren? (Es wird um eine detaillierte Erläuterung sowie eine detaillierte Übersicht über die Pläne gebeten.)

Gemäß der Resolution 550 (1984) des UN-Sicherheitsrates sollte die Stadt nach dem Wiederaufbau von Famagusta an ihre rechtmäßigen Bewohner zurückgegeben werden.

2. Welche Schritte unternimmt die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang bei ihren türkischen Ansprechpartnern? (Es wird um eine detaillierte Übersicht gebeten.)

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(27. Februar 2013)

Die Kommission misst der Erhaltung des kulturellen Erbes in Zypern große Bedeutung bei. Der bikommunale technische Ausschuss für das kulturelle Erbe, der unter Schirmherrschaft der Vereinten Nationen (VN) tätig ist, hat von der Gesamtliste von 40 Denkmälern, auf die sich die Führer beider Gemeinschaften geeinigt haben, bereits elf vorrangige sakrale und profane Denkmäler — einschließlich der alten Stadtmauer von Famagusta — ausgewählt. Diese Auswahl wird von beiden Gemeinschaften unterstützt. Keine dieser Stätten ist von den Militärkräften abgesperrt worden. Dank EU-Förderung werden dringend notwendige Instandsetzungsarbeiten am Othello-Turm in Famagusta durchgeführt.

Im gesperrten Stadtteil Varoscha werden derzeit keine Arbeiten von der EU finanziert. Die Lage in Varoscha wird in den unter VN-Schirmherrschaft laufenden Verhandlungen über eine umfassende Lösung der Zypernfrage erörtert.

In ihrer im Oktober 2012 veröffentlichten Mitteilung über die Erweiterungsstrategie und die wichtigsten Herausforderungen für den Zeitraum 2012-2013 hat die Kommission hervorgehoben, dass die Verhandlungen wiederaufgenommen werden müssen, um sie aufbauend auf den bisher erzielten Fortschritten zu einem raschen Abschluss zu bringen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011659/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Famagusta — the 'ghost town'

The maintenance of our — European — cultural heritage is an integral part of our European values.

Part of the old town of Famagusta, in the occupied area of Cyprus, has been fenced off by Turkish military forces for the past 39 years. It is in total neglect and is referred to as the 'ghost town'.

1. Does the Commission intend to spend part of the EUR 31 million allocated under the Financial Aid Regulation on the restoration of the aforementioned 'ghost town' in order to maintain our European cultural heritage? (Please give a detailed explanation, as well as a detailed outline of the plans.)

In order to be in line with UN Security Council Resolution 550 (1984), the restoration of Famagusta should then be accompanied by the return of the town to its lawful inhabitants.

2. What is the Commission doing in this connection in its contacts with Turkey? (Please give a detailed outline.)

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(27 February 2013)

The Commission attributes great importance to the preservation of cultural heritage in Cyprus. The bi-communal Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage, operating under United Nations (UN) auspices, has already identified a list of 11 priority religious and non-religious monuments, including the old city walls of Famagusta, for support in both communities which are part of the wider list of 40 monuments agreed by both community leaders. None of these sites are fenced off by military forces. Thanks to EU funding, emergency conservation work will be undertaken on the Othello Tower in Famagusta.

No EU funded activity is currently underway in the fenced-off city of Varosha. The situation in Varosha is part of the ongoing negotiations on a comprehensive Cyprus settlement under the auspices of the UN.

In its October 2012 Communication on the Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2012-2013, the Commission underlined the necessity to re-launch the negotiations with the aim of reaching a swift conclusion of the talks, building on the progress achieved to date.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011660/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Haushaltslinie 22 02 07 03 für 2013

Als Antwort auf die Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-008848/2012 erwähnte Kommissionsmitglied Füle unter anderem, dass — im Hinblick auf die Zuweisung der Mittel an den Ausschuss für die Vermissten in Zypern (CPM) und den Technischen Ausschuss für das kulturelle Erbe — die Programmierungsphase für 2013 erst nach endgültiger Feststellung des Haushaltsplans 2013 beginnen könne.

Inzwischen ist über den Haushalt 2013 entschieden worden und angesichts der hohen Dringlichkeit dieses humanitären Problems und der beträchtlichen Finanzmittel, die nötig sind, um das Vorhaben voranzubringen, stellt sich die Frage: In welcher Höhe gedenkt die Kommission Mittel für die Tätigkeit des Ausschusses für die Vermissten in Zypern bereitzustellen?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(13. Februar 2013)

Die Programmierungsphase 2013 läuft derzeit, allerdings wurden die Mittelzuweisungen für den Technischen Ausschuss für das kulturelle Erbe und den Ausschuss für die Vermissten in Zypern (CMP) noch nicht festgelegt. Die Kommission bemüht sich darum, diesen Bedarf unter Beachtung der Absorptionskapazitäten der beiden Programme zu berücksichtigen. Ohnehin verfügen die beiden Projekte bereits über ausreichende Mittel, um die Tätigkeit vor Ort während des gesamten Jahres 2013 zu finanzieren. Gleichzeitig bereitet die Kommission den Finanzierungsbeschluss für den (im späteren Jahresverlauf zu verabschiedenden) EU-Haushalt 2013 vor, mit dem die weitere Finanzierung der Projekte im Jahr 2014 sichergestellt wird.

Die Kommission teilt die Auffassung, dass für eine wirksame Fortsetzung dieser Tätigkeiten das Niveau der Finanzierung vorhersehbar sein muss. Wie unlängst vom Rechnungshof in seinem Sonderbericht über die Unterstützung der türkischen Gemeinschaft Zyperns hervorgehoben, ist eine mehrjährige Perspektive für eine bessere Planung, Umsetzung und Nachhaltigkeit der Maßnahmen im Rahmen des Programms ausschlaggebend. Die Kommission würde es daher begrüßen, wenn das Europäische Parlament diesem Punkt auch im Hinblick auf den bevorstehenden mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens Aufmerksamkeit schenken könnte.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011660/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Budget line 22 02 07 03 for 2013

In answer to Written Question P-008848/2012, Commissioner Füle mentioned, *inter alia*, that the 'programming phase for 2013 will only be able to begin after the final decision on the 2013 budget' with regard to the allocation of funds to the Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus (CMP) and the Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage.

Given that the 2013 budget has now been agreed, and bearing in mind the great urgency of this humanitarian issue and the significant funds needed in order for the process to move forward, can the Commission specify the amounts it intends to allocate for the work of the Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(13 February 2013)

The 2013 programming exercise is underway but the allocations for the Technical Committee for cultural heritage protection (CH) and the Committee on Missing Persons (CMP) are not yet set.The Commission is endeavouring to address these needs taking into account the capacity of the two programmes to absorb funding. Meanwhile, both projects already have sufficient funding to operate in the field during the whole of 2013. The Commission is in the meantime preparing the financing decision for the EU budget 2013 (to be adopted later in the year), which will ensure the continuation of financing of the projects in 2014.

The Commission agrees that a predictable level of funding is necessary to keep these operations running efficiently. As recently highlighted by the Court of Auditors in its Special Report on assistance to the Turkish Cypriot community, a multiannual perspective is essential to ensure better planning, implementation and sustainability of actions under the Programme. The Commission would therefore appreciate the European Parliament's attention to this point also with the prospect of the forthcoming Multiannual Financial Framework.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011666/12
a la Comisión
Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Tanja Fajon (S&D), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Monika Hohlmeier (PPE), Ioan Enciu (S&D), Bill Newton Dunn (ALDE), Edit Herczog (S&D), Simon Busuttil (PPE) y Kinga Göncz (S&D)
(20 de diciembre de 2012)

Asunto: Formación de las fuerzas policiales de la UE — Mantenimiento de la agencia CEPOL independiente

Establecida por el Tratado de Amsterdam en 1997, la Unión Europea tiene como objetivo mantener y desarrollar un espacio de libertad, seguridad y justicia. Aprobado el 11 de diciembre de 2009, el Programa de Estocolmo establece la seguridad como una prioridad clave de la UE.

En este contexto, la Escuela Europea de Policía (CEPOL), una de las agencias de la Unión Europea, ha logrado avances significativos en los últimos tres años. Así, el número de participantes en cursos de formación organizados por la CEPOL se ha incrementado de los 2 300 en 2009 a unos 4 300 en 2011 y llegará a los 5 000 en 2012. El número de participantes en el programa de intercambio dentro de la policía europea ha pasado de 50 en 2009 a 299 en 2011. La agencia también desarrolla nuevos métodos de formación en línea con objeto de proponer una formación al mayor número de representantes de las fuerzas policiales. Esta formación ha contado con 3 016 participantes.

Gracias a la Comisión Europea, que concedió dos puestos adicionales para la agencia, la CEPOL ha llevado a cabo dos nuevas contrataciones en 2012. De hecho, es una señal de reconocimiento de la agencia y de la experiencia que ha desarrollado en el ámbito de la formación con un presupuesto limitado a 8 451 000 euros en 2012. La CEPOL también ha racionalizado su funcionamiento con un enfoque basado en los resultados.

Por otra parte, mientras que a Europol se le ha asignado la gestión del Centro Europeo de Ciberdelincuencia, de reciente creación, la agencia no ha recibido los recursos necesarios en términos de presupuesto y personal para desempeñar estas nuevas funciones. Asimismo, aunque la formación no figura entre los objetivos de Europol, según se definen en la base jurídica de la agencia, en el Programa de Estocolmo, por el contrario, se menciona explícitamente a la CEPOL como la agencia que debe «desempeñar un papel fundamental en la formación de funcionarios de policía».

En este contexto, ¿considera la Comisión que una organización creada para luchar contra el terrorismo y la delincuencia organizada puede desempeñar de manera eficaz las necesidades de formación en otro ámbito?

¿Piensa la Comisión que, desde el punto de vista de la eficacia, es el momento adecuado para reorganizar nuevamente una agencia cuyo modo de funcionamiento acaba de reformarse de manera importante?

Por otro lado, tanto los grupos políticos mayoritarios como otros grupos del Parlamento Europeo se han pronunciado en contra de la propuesta de fusión de la CEPOL y Europol, y en favor del mantenimiento de la CEPOL como agencia independiente. ¿Cuál es la posición oficial de la Comisión sobre este asunto?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de febrero de 2013)

Es necesario formar de manera coordinada a los agentes de policía de toda la UE para familiarizarlos con la dimensión europea del mantenimiento del orden público, de modo que la UE pueda hacer frente con eficacia a los problemas de la delincuencia transfronteriza. Por consiguiente, la Comisión presentará en breve una Comunicación sobre un programa europeo de formación de las fuerzas de orden público.

La Comisión comparte la opinión de Sus Señorías de que la CEPOL ha progresado considerablemente en los tres últimos años, al aumentar su oferta de formación y racionalizar su funcionamiento. Para una plena aplicación del programa de formación sería, no obstante, preciso modificar la base jurídica de la CEPOL: el mandato de la agencia tendría que ampliarse para englobar a todos los agentes pertinentes de las fuerzas policiales y la agencia necesitaría recursos adicionales para asumir nuevas funciones. El *statu quo* no satisfaría las necesidades de formación de las fuerzas policiales de la UE.

Actualmente, la Comisión está estudiando distintas opciones de cara a la organización de las necesidades de formación de las fuerzas policiales de la UE y presentará las oportunas propuestas en las próximas semanas.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011666/12
an die Kommission
Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Tanja Fajon (S&D), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Monika Hohlmeier (PPE), Ioan Enciu (S&D), Bill Newton Dunn (ALDE), Edit Herczog (S&D), Simon Busuttil (PPE) und Kinga Göncz (S&D)
(20. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Weiterbildung der Polizeikräfte der Europäischen Union — Erhaltung der unabhängigen Agentur CEPOL

Seit dem Vertrag von Amsterdam aus dem Jahr 1997 hat die Union das Ziel, einen Raum der Freiheit, der Sicherheit und des Rechts zu bewahren und weiterzuentwickeln. Das Stockholmer Programm, das am 11. Dezember 2009 angenommen wurde, legt die Sicherheit als hohe Priorität der Union fest.

In diesem Zusammenhang hat die Europäische Polizeiakademie, eine Agentur der Europäischen Union, im Laufe der letzten drei Jahre bedeutende Fortschritte erzielt. So ist die Zahl der Teilnehmer an den Schulungen, die CEPOL organisiert hat, von 2 300 im Jahr 2009 auf 4 300 im Jahr 2011 gestiegen und wird 2012 fast 5 000 betragen. Am Austauschprogramm der europäischen Polizeikräfte nahmen 299 Teilnehmer im Jahr 2011 — gegenüber 50 Teilnehmern im Jahr 2009 teil. Die Agentur entwickelt darüber hinaus neue Online-Schulungsmethoden, um die Schulungen einem größeren Kreis an Vertretern der Polizeikräfte zugänglich zu machen; hieran haben bis zu 3 016 Personen teilgenommen.

Da die Europäische Kommission der Agentur zwei zusätzliche Stellen bewilligt hat, konnte CEPOL im Jahr 2012 zwei neue Kollegen einstellen. Dies ist ein Zeichen der Anerkennung der Agentur und des Fachwissens, das sie mit einem Haushalt, der 2012 auf 8 451 000 Euro beschränkt war, im Bereich der Aus- und Fortbildung entwickelt hat. CEPOL hat seine Arbeitsweise darüber hinaus durch einen ergebnisorientierten Ansatz rationalisiert.

Darüber hinaus wurde Europol das Management des kürzlich gegründeten Europäischen Zentrums zur Bekämpfung der Cyberkriminalität übertragen; eine Agentur, die im Hinblick auf Haushalt und Personal nicht über die erforderlichen Ressourcen verfügt, um diese neuen Aufgaben erfüllen zu können. Schließlich wird CEPOL, obwohl die Aus- und Weiterbildung an sich nicht zu den Aufgaben von Europol gehört, die in der Rechtsgrundlage der Agentur festgelegt sind, sogar im Stockholmer Programm explizit als die Agentur benannt, die bei Aus- und Fortbildung der Ordnungskräfte eine zentrale Rolle spielen sollte.

Ist die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang der Ansicht, dass eine Einrichtung, die zur Bekämpfung des Terrorismus und des organisierten Verbrechens geschaffen wurde, dem Aus- und Fortbildungsbedarf in einem anderen Bereich in effizienter Form gerecht werden kann?

Ist sie der Auffassung, dass es mit Blick auf die Effizienz heute angezeigt ist, erneut eine Agentur umzustrukturieren, die ihre Funktionsweise gerade erst umfassend reformiert hat?

Auf der anderen Seite haben sich die großen Fraktionen und andere Gruppierungen des Europäischen Parlaments gegen den Vorschlag ausgesprochen, CEPOL und EUROPOL zugunsten von CEPOL als unabhängige Agentur zu fusionieren. Wie lautet die diesbezügliche offizielle Position der Kommission?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(27. Februar 2013)

Polizeibeamte müssen EU-weit in der europäischen Strafverfolgung ausgebildet werden, damit die EU den Herausforderungen der grenzüberschreitenden Kriminalität wirksam begegnen kann. Die Kommission wird daher in Kürze eine Mitteilung über ein Schulungsprogramm im Bereich Strafverfolgung in der EU vorlegen.

Die Kommission ist ebenso wie die Damen und Herren Abgeordneten der Auffassung, dass die Europäische Polizeiakademie (CEPOL) in den vergangenen drei Jahren beträchtliche Fortschritte sowohl hinsichtlich des Volumens der angebotenen Schulungen als auch der vorgenommenen Anpassungen erzielt hat. Die vollständige Durchführung des Schulungsprogramms würde allerdings Änderungen an der Rechtsgrundlage von CEPOL erfordern: Das Mandat der Agentur müsste ausgeweitet werden, um alle Strafverfolgungsbeamte der EU zu erfassen; ferner müsste die Agentur für die Wahrnehmung neuer Aufgaben mit zusätzlichen Mitteln ausgestattet werden. Ohne diese Änderungen kann die Agentur dem Schulungsbedarf der Strafverfolgungsbeamten der EU nicht gerecht werden.

Die Kommission prüft derzeit unterschiedliche Möglichkeiten, wie dem Schulungsbedarf im Bereich Strafverfolgung in der EU entsprochen werden kann. Sie wird in den kommenden Wochen entsprechende Vorschläge vorlegen.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011666/12
à la Commission
Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Tanja Fajon (S&D), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Monika Hohlmeier (PPE), Ioan Enciu (S&D), Bill Newton Dunn (ALDE), Edit Herczog (S&D), Simon Busuttil (PPE) et Kinga Göncz (S&D)
(20 décembre 2012)

Objet: Formation des forces de police de l'Union européenne — Maintien de l'agence indépendante CEPOL

Instaurée par le traité d'Amsterdam de 1997, l'Union européenne a pour objectif de maintenir et de développer un espace de liberté, de sécurité et de justice. Approuvé le 11 décembre 2009, le programme de Stockholm fixe la sécurité comme priorité essentielle de l'Union.

Dans ce contexte, le Collège européen de police, agence de l'Union européenne, a accompli des progrès importants au cours des trois dernières années. Ainsi, le nombre des participants aux formations organisées par le CEPOL a augmenté de 2 300 en 2009 à 4 300 en 2011 et sera proche de 5 000 en 2012. Le programme d'échange au sein de la police européenne a augmenté de 50 participants en 2009 à 299 participants en 2011. L'agence développe également de nouvelles méthodes de formation en ligne afin de proposer une formation au plus grand nombre de représentants des forces de police, à laquelle ont participé jusqu'à 3 016 personnes.

Grâce à la Commission européenne, qui a octroyé deux postes supplémentaires à l'agence, le CEPOL a procédé à ces deux recrutements en 2012. Il s'agit bien d'une marque de reconnaissance de l'agence et de l'expertise qu'elle a développée dans le domaine de la formation, avec un budget limité à 8 451 000 euros en 2012. Le CEPOL a également rationalisé son fonctionnement avec une approche fondée sur les résultats.

Par ailleurs, alors qu'Europol s'est vu attribuer la gestion du centre européen de lutte contre la cybercriminalité, nouvellement créé, l'agence n'a pas reçu les ressources nécessaires en termes de budget et de personnel afin de remplir ces nouvelles fonctions. Enfin, bien que la formation ne figure pas parmi les objectifs d'Europol, tels que définis dans la base juridique de l'agence, le CEPOL est au contraire nommé explicitement par le programme de Stockholm comme l'agence qui devrait «jouer un rôle clé dans la formation des forces de l'ordre».

Dans ce contexte, la Commission pense-t-elle qu'une organisation établie pour lutter contre le terrorisme et le crime organisé peut remplir de manière efficace les besoins de formation dans un autre domaine?

Pense-t-elle que, du point de vue de l'efficacité, il est aujourd'hui opportun de réorganiser à nouveau une agence qui vient de réformer significativement son mode de fonctionnement?

D'autre part, les groupes politiques majoritaires et d'autres groupes du Parlement européen se sont exprimés contre la proposition de fusion de CEPOL et d'Europol, et en faveur du maintien du CEPOL en tant qu'agence indépendante. Quelle est la position officielle de la Commission sur cette question?

Réponse donnée par Mme Malmström au nom de la Commission
(27 février 2013)

Dans toute l'Union européenne, les fonctionnaires de police doivent être formés, d'une manière coordonnée, à la dimension européenne des activités répressives, de sorte que l'Union puisse s'attaquer efficacement aux défis que pose la criminalité transfrontière. C'est pourquoi la Commission présentera bientôt une communication relative à un programme européen de formation des services répressifs.

La Commission convient avec les Honorables Parlementaires que le CEPOL a accompli des progrès considérables ces trois dernières années, à la fois en augmentant son offre de formation et en rationalisant son fonctionnement. La pleine mise en œuvre du programme européen de formation exigerait cependant une modification de la base juridique du CEPOL: il faudrait élargir le mandat de l'agence pour englober tous les fonctionnaires de police concernés et doter celle-ci de ressources supplémentaires pour lui permettre d'assurer de nouvelles missions. Un statu quo ne permettrait pas de répondre aux besoins de formation des forces de police dans l'UE.

La Commission examine actuellement plusieurs options pour organiser la formation des services répressifs dans l'Union et présentera ses propositions dans les prochaines semaines.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011666/12
alla Commissione
Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Tanja Fajon (S&D), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Monika Hohlmeier (PPE), Ioan Enciu (S&D), Bill Newton Dunn (ALDE), Edit Herczog (S&D), Simon Busuttil (PPE) e Kinga Göncz (S&D)
(20 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: Formazione delle forze di polizia dell'UE — Mantenimento dell'agenzia indipendente CEPOL

Instaurata dal Trattato di Amsterdam del 1997, l'Unione europea si prefigge di mantenere e sviluppare uno spazio di libertà, di sicurezza e di giustizia. Approvato l'11 dicembre 2009, il programma di Stoccolma fissa la sicurezza come priorità essenziale dell'UE.

In questo contesto, l'Accademia europea di polizia, agenzia dell'Unione europea, ha compiuto progressi importanti nel corso degli ultimi tre anni. Così, il numero dei partecipanti alle formazioni organizzate dal CEPOL è aumentato da 2300 nel 2009 a 4300 nel 2011 e sarà vicino ai 5000 nel 2012. Il programma di scambio in seno alla polizia europea è aumentato da 50 partecipanti nel 2009 a 299 partecipanti nel 2011. L'agenzia sviluppa parimenti nuovi metodi di formazione on line onde proporre una formazione al maggior numero di rappresentanti delle forze di polizia, la cui partecipazione ha raggiunto i 3016 partecipanti.

Grazie alla Commissione europea, che ha concesso 2 posti supplementari all'agenzia, il CEPOL ha proceduto a questi due reclutamenti nel 2012. Si tratta di un segno di riconoscimento dell'agenzia e dell'esperienza che essa ha sviluppato nel campo della formazione, con un bilancio limitato a 8 451 000 euro nel 2012. Il CEPOL ha ugualmente razionalizzato il suo funzionamento con un approccio fondato sui risultati.

Per di più, nel momento in cui Europol si è vista attribuire la gestione del centro europeo per la lotta contro la cybercriminalità, di nuova creazione, l'agenzia non ha ricevuto le risorse necessarie in termini di bilancio e di personale per poter adempiere a queste nuove funzioni. Infine, sebbene la formazione non figuri tra gli obiettivi di Europol, così come definiti nella base giuridica dell'agenzia, il CEPOL invece è nominato esplicitamente dal programma di Stoccolma come l'agenzia che dovrebbe «svolgere un ruolo chiave nella formazione delle forze dell'ordine».

In questo contesto, pensa la Commissione che un'organizzazione creata per lottare contro il terrorismo e il crimine organizzato possa adempiere in modo efficace a bisogni di formazione in un altro settore?

Può la Commissione pensare che dal punto di vista dell'efficienza è il momento buono per riorganizzare di nuovo un'agenzia che ha appena riformato in modo significativo il suo funzionamento?

D'altra parte, i gruppi politici maggioritari e altri gruppi del Parlamento europeo si sono espressi contro la proposta di fusione di CEPOL e EUROPOL e in favore del mantenimento del CEPOL come agenzia indipendente. Qual è la posizione ufficiale della Commissione a questo proposito?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(27 febbraio 2013)

Affinché l'Unione europea possa far fronte efficacemente ai problemi posti dalla criminalità transfrontaliera, è necessario che i funzionari delle forze di polizia di tutta l'UE ricevano una formazione coordinata sulla dimensione europea delle autorità di contrasto. A tal fine, la Commissione presenterà a breve una comunicazione su un programma europeo di formazione delle autorità di contrasto.

La Commissione concorda con gli onorevoli parlamentari sui notevoli progressi che l'Accademia europea di polizia (CEPOL) ha compiuto negli ultimi tre anni, da un lato ampliando l'offerta formativa e dall'altro razionalizzando la sua attività. Tuttavia, per attuare appieno il programma di formazione sarebbero necessarie modifiche della base giuridica del CEPOL. Si dovrebbe infatti estendere il mandato dell'agenzia a tutti i funzionari delle forze di polizia coinvolti e accrescerne le risorse per lo svolgimento dei nuovi compiti. Mantenere lo status quo non permetterebbe di soddisfare le esigenze di formazione delle autorità di contrasto dell'UE.

La Commissione sta esaminando diverse alternative per organizzare le esigenze di formazione delle autorità di contrasto dell'UE e presenterà nelle prossime settimane le sue proposte al riguardo.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-011666/12
a Bizottság számára
Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Bauer Edit (PPE), Tanja Fajon (S&D), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Gál Kinga (PPE), Monika Hohlmeier (PPE), Ioan Enciu (S&D), Bill Newton Dunn (ALDE), Herczog Edit (S&D), Simon Busuttil (PPE) és Göncz Kinga (S&D)
(2012. december 20.)

Tárgy: Az Európai Unió rendőri erejének képzése – A CEPOL független ügynökségként való fenntartása

Az Európai Unió célja az Amszterdami Szerződés által 1997-ben bevezetett, a szabadságon, a biztonságon és a jog érvényesülésén alapuló térség fenntartása és kibontakoztatása. A 2009. december 11-én elfogadott Stockholmi Program a biztonságot az Unió alapvető prioritásaként állapítja meg.

Ebben az összefüggésben az Európai Unió ügynöksége, az Európai Rendőrakadémia (CEPOL) jelentős előrelépéseket ért el az elmúlt három év folyamán. A CEPOL által szervezett képzések résztvevőinek száma a 2009. évi 2300-ról 2011-ben 4300-ra, 2012-ben pedig megközelítőleg 5000-re emelkedett. Az európai rendőri erőkön belül a csereprogramokban részt vevők száma pedig a 2009. évi 50-ről 2011-ben 299-re emelkedett. Az ügynökség új e-képzési módszereket is kifejlesztett annak érdekében, hogy a rendőri erők kötelékében dolgozók még nagyobb számban részt vehessenek a képzéseken, amelyeken eddig 3016 fő vett részt.

Az Európai Bizottság két további álláshelyet is engedélyezett az ügynökség számára, ennek köszönhetően a CEPOL 2012-ben el tudta indítani e két felvételi eljárást. A Bizottság ezzel a lépéssel elismerését fejezte ki az ügynökség, valamint az ügynökség szakértelme iránt, amelyet 2012-ben 8 451 000 eurós korlátozott költségvetéssel a képzések terén fejlesztett ki. Teljesítményalapú megközelítés alkalmazása révén a CEPOL még működését is racionalizálni tudta.

Egyébiránt meg kell jegyezni, hogy míg az Europol elnyerte a számítástechnikai bűnözés elleni újonnan létrehozott európai központ irányítását, a CEPOL nem kapta meg az új feladatai ellátásához szükséges költségvetési és személyzeti forrásokat. Végezetül, míg a képzés az ügynökség jogalapjában meghatározottak alapján nem szerepel az Europol célkitűzései között, a Stockholmi Program a CEPOL-t kifejezetten olyan ügynökségként határozta meg, amelynek „központi szerepet kell játszania a rendészeti személyzet képzésében”.

Ebben az összefüggésben úgy gondolja-e a Bizottság, hogy a terrorizmus és a szervezett bűnözés elleni küzdelem érdekében létrehozott szervezet hatékonyan el tudja látni a képzéseket egy másik területen?

Úgy gondolja-e, hogy a hatékonyság szempontjából célszerű most újra átszervezni azt az ügynökséget, amelyik éppen most fejezte be működési módjának jelentős megújítását?

Másrészt a többségi képviselőcsoportok és az Európai Parlament más csoportjai is a CEPOL és az Europol fúziójára irányuló javaslat ellen és a CEPOL független ügynökségként való fenntartása érdekében foglaltak állást. Mi a Bizottság hivatalos álláspontja ezzel kapcsolatosan?

Cecilia Malmström válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. február 27.)

Ahhoz, hogy az EU képes legyen hatékonyan fellépni a határokon átnyúló bűnözés támasztotta kihívásokkal szemben, a rendőröknek EU-szerte koordinált képzést kell biztosítani a bűnüldözés európai dimenziójáról. A Bizottság ezért rövidesen előterjeszti az európai bűnüldözési képzési rendszerről szóló közleményét.

A Bizottság egyetért a tisztelt képviselőkkel abban, hogy a CEPOL jelentős előrelépéseket ért el az elmúlt három év folyamán, ami megmutatkozik képzési kínálatának bővülésében, illetve működésének egyszerűsödésében egyaránt. A képzési rendszer maradéktalan végrehajtása érdekében azonban fontos lenne módosítani a CEPOL jogalapját: az ügynökség megbízatását ki kellene terjeszteni a bűnüldöző szervek valamennyi érintett tagjára, míg az ügynökségnek többletforrásokat kellene biztosítani új feladatainak ellátásához. Ha nem változik semmi a fennálló helyzeten, a jövőben nem lehet kielégíteni a bűnüldözési képzéssel kapcsolatos uniós szükségleteket.

A Bizottság jelenleg különböző megoldásokat mérlegel az európai uniós bűnüldözési képzés iránti igények megszervezését illetően, és az elkövetkező hetekben előterjeszti a vonatkozó javaslatokat.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-011666/12
lill-Kummissjoni
Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Tanja Fajon (S&D), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Monika Hohlmeier (PPE), Ioan Enciu (S&D), Bill Newton Dunn (ALDE), Edit Herczog (S&D), Simon Busuttil (PPE) u Kinga Göncz (S&D)
(20 ta' Diċembru 2012)

Suġġett: It-taħriġ tal-forzi tal-pulizija tal-Unjoni Ewropea — Iż-żamma tal-aġenzija indipendenti tas-CEPOL

Imwaqqfa fit-Trattat ta' Amsterdam fl-1997, l-Unjoni Ewropea għandha l-għan li żżomm u tiżviluppa spazju ta' libertà, sigurtà u ġustizzja. Il-Programm ta' Stokkolma, li ġie approvat fil-11 ta' Diċembru 2009, jistabbilixxi s-sigurtà bħala prijorità essenzjali tal-Unjoni.

F'dan il-kuntest, il-Kulleġġ Ewropew tal-Pulizija, li huwa aġenzija tal-Unjoni Ewropea, kiseb progress kbir tul dawn l-aħħar tliet snin. In-numru ta' nies li ħadu sehem f'taħriġ organizzat mis-CEPOL kiber minn 2 300 fl-2009 għal 4 300 fl-2011 u qed joqrob il-5 000 fl-2012. Il-programm ta' skambju fi ħdan il-pulizija Ewropea kiber minn 50 parteċipant fl-2009 għal 299 parteċipant fl-2011. L-aġenzija tiżviluppa wkoll metodi ġodda ta' taħriġ onlajn bil-għan li toffri taħriġ lill-ikbar għadd possibbli ta' rappreżentanti tal-forzi tal-pulizija, taħriġ li fih ħadu sehem sa 3 016 persuna.

Bis-saħħa tal-Kummissjoni Ewropea, li żiedet żewġ postijiet tax-xogħol oħra lill-aġenzija, is-CEPOL wettaq dawn iż-żewġ reklutaġġi fl-2012. Dan jixhed tassew ir-rikonoxximent tal-aġenzija u tal-għarfien espert li żviluppat fil-qafas tat-taħriġ, b'baġit limitat għal EUR 8 451 000 fl-2012. Is-CEPOL irrazzjonalizza wjoll il-funzjonament tiegħu permezz ta' approċċ iffukat fuq ir-riżultati.

Barra minn hekk, filwaqt li l-Europol ġie fdat bil-ġestjoni taċ-Ċentru Ewropew taċ-Ċiberkriminalità li għadu kif inħoloq, l-aġenzija ma rċevietx ir-riżorsi meħtieġa f'termini ta' baġit u ta' persunal biex tkun tista' twettaq dawn il-funzjonijiet ġodda tagħha. Fl-aħħar nett, għad li t-taħriġ mhuwiex wieħed mill-objettivi tal-Europol, kif definiti fil-bażi legali tal-aġenzija, is-CEPOL bil-maqlub huwa espliċitament, skont il-Programm ta' Stokkolma, l-aġenzija li għandha taqdi "rwol ċentrali fit-taħriġ tal-persunal tal-infurzar tal-liġi".

F'dan il-kuntest, taħseb il-Kummissjoni li organizzazzjoni mwaqqfa biex tiġġieled kontra t-terroriżmu u l-kriminalità organizzata tista' tissodisfa b'mod effikaċi l-ħtiġijiet ta' taħriġ f'qasam ieħor?

Taħseb li, mil-lat tal-effikaċja, illum huwa opportun li tiġi riorganizzata aġenzija li għadha kif irriformat il-mod ta' funzjonament tagħha b'mod sinifikanti?

Min-naħa l-oħra, il-gruppi politiċi ewlenin u gruppi oħrajn tal-Parlament Ewropew esprimew ruħhom kontra l-proposta ta' fużjoni tas-CEPOL u l-EUROPOOL, u huma favur iż-żamma tas-CEPOL bħala aġenzija indipendenti. X'inhi l-pożizzjoni uffiċjali tal-Kummissjoni dwar din il-kwistjoni?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Malmström f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(27 ta' Frar 2013)

L-uffiċjali tal-pulizija madwar l-UE jeħtieġ li jkunu mħarrġa fid-dimensjoni Ewropea tal-infurzar tal-liġi, b'mod koordinat, sabiex l-UE tkun tista' tittratta b'mod effettiv l-isfidi tal-kriminalità transkonfinali. Il-Kummissjoni għalhekk sejra tippreżenta dalwaqt Komunikazzjoni dwar l-Iskema Ewropea tat-Taħriġ għall-Infurzar tal-Liġi.

Il-Kummissjoni taqbel mal-Onorevoli Membri li s-CEPOL għamlet progress sinifikanti matul l-aħħar tliet snin, kemm fiż-żieda tal-ammont ta' taħriġ li hija toffri kif ukoll fit-twittija tal-operat tagħha. L-implimentazzjoni sħiħa tal-Iskema tat-Taħriġ madanakollu tkun teħtieġ tibdiliet għall-bażi legali tas-CEPOL: il-mandat tal-aġenzija jkun irid jiġi estiż biex ikopri l-uffiċjali tal-infurzar tal-liġi relevanti kollha u l-aġenzija tkun teħtieġ riżorsi addizzjonali biex tkopri kompiti ġodda. L-istatus quo mhux se jilħaq il-ħtiġijiet tat-taħriġ tal-infurzar tal-liġi tal-UE.

Il-Kummissjoni qiegħda bħalissa tikkonsidra għażliet differenti rigward l-organizzazzjoni tal-ħtiġijiet tat-taħriġ tal-infurzar tal-liġi tal-UE u se tressaq il-proposti relevanti fil-ġimgħat li ġejjin.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011666/12
adresată Comisiei
Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Tanja Fajon (S&D), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Monika Hohlmeier (PPE), Ioan Enciu (S&D), Bill Newton Dunn (ALDE), Edit Herczog (S&D), Simon Busuttil (PPE) şi Kinga Göncz (S&D)
(20 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Pregătirea forțelor de poliție ale Uniunii Europene — Menținerea CEPOL ca agenție independentă

Fondată prin Tratatul de la Amsterdam din 1997, Uniunea Europeană are drept obiectiv menținerea și dezvoltarea unui spațiu de libertate, securitate și justiție. Prin Programul de la Stockholm, aprobat la 11 decembrie 2009, securitatea este definită ca o prioritate esențială a Uniunii Europene.

În acest context, Colegiul European de Poliție, agenție a UE, a realizat progrese importate pe parcursul ultimilor trei ani. Astfel, numărul de participanți la cursurile de formare organizate de CEPOL a crescut de la 2 300 în 2009, la 4 300 în 2011, și va fi aproape 5 000 în 2012. Programul de schimb din cadrul poliției europene a crescut de la 50 de participanți în 2009, la 299 în 2011. De asemenea, agenția a elaborat metode noi de pregătire online cu scopul de a oferi cursuri de formare unui cât mai mare număr de reprezentanți ai forțelor de poliție, la care au participat aproximativ 3 016 persoane.

Datorită Comisiei Europene, care a oferit agenției două posturi suplimentare, CEPOL a putut face cele două recrutări în 2012. Acest fapt s-a datorat recunoașterii meritelor și expertizei agenției, reflectate în domeniul formării, care a avut un buget limitat la 8 451 000 € în 2012. CEPOL a adoptat o abordare raționalizată în ceea ce privește funcționarea, bazată pe rezultate.

În plus, deși agenției i s-a atribuit gestionarea Centrului european de combatere a criminalității informatice, nou creat, agenția nu a primit resursele bugetare și de personal necesare pentru îndeplinirea acestor noi atribuții. Și, deși agenția nu figurează printre obiectivele Europolului, astfel cum sunt definite în baza juridică a agenției, CEPOL este dimpotrivă menționat explicit în Programul de la Stockholm ca agenția care ar trebui să „joace un rol fundamental în pregătirea forțelor de ordine".

În acest context, consideră Comisia că o organizație înființată pentru combaterea terorismului și crimei organizate poate îndeplini în mod eficient nevoile de formare într-un alt domeniu?

Crede Comisia că, din perspectiva eficacității, este azi oportună reorganizarea totală a unei agenții, care va modifica fundamental modul său de funcționare?

Pe de altă parte, grupurile politice majoritare și celelalte grupuri din Parlamentul European s-au declarat împotriva propunerii de comasare a CEPOL și EUROPOL, fiind în favoarea menținerii CEPOL ca agenție independentă. Care este poziția oficială a Comisiei în această privință?

Răspuns dat de dna Malmström în numele Comisiei
(27 februarie 2013)

În întreaga Uniune Europeană, agenții de poliție trebuie să beneficieze, într-o manieră coordonată, de formare în dimensiunea europeană a aplicării legii, în așa fel încât UE să poată aborda în mod eficient provocările pe care le prezintă criminalitatea transfrontalieră. Prin urmare, Comisia urmează să prezinte, în curând, o comunicare privind programul european de formare în materie de asigurare a respectării legii.

Comisia este de acord cu opinia distinșilor membri conform căreia CEPOL a înregistrat progrese importante în ultimii trei ani atât prin îmbunătățirea ofertei sale de formare, cât și prin raționalizarea modului său de funcționare. Cu toate acestea, punerea în aplicare integrală a programului de formare ar necesita schimbarea bazei juridice a CEPOL: ar trebui extins mandatul agenției pentru a acoperi toți agenții de poliție în cauză, iar resursele agenției ar trebui suplimentate pentru a îndeplini noi sarcini. Menținerea situației actuale nu ar face posibilă asigurarea necesarului de formare în domeniul aplicării legii la nivelul UE.

În prezent, Comisia analizează diferite opțiuni privind organizarea necesarului de formare a serviciilor de aplicare a legii și va prezenta propunerile relevante în următoarele săptămâni.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-011666/12
za Komisijo
Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Tanja Fajon (S&D), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Monika Hohlmeier (PPE), Ioan Enciu (S&D), Bill Newton Dunn (ALDE), Edit Herczog (S&D), Simon Busuttil (PPE) in Kinga Göncz (S&D)
(20. december 2012)

Zadeva: Ustanovitev policijskih enot Evropske unije – Ohranitev samostojne agencije CEPOL

Cilj Evropske unije, ustanovljene z Amsterdamsko pogodbo leta 1997, je ohranjanje in razvijanje območja svobode, varnosti in pravice. Stockholmski program, potrjen 11. decembra 2009, določa varnost kot bistveno prednostno nalogo Unije.

V zvezi s tem je Evropska policijska akademija, agencija Evropske unije, v zadnjih treh letih zelo napredovala. Število sodelujočih pri usposabljanju, ki ga je organizirala CEPOL, se je povečalo z 2300 v letu 2009 na 4300 v letu 2011 ter se približalo številu 5000 v letu 2012. Število sodelujočih v programu izmenjave evropske policije se je od 50 v letu 2009 povečalo na 299 v letu 2011. Agencija razvija tudi nove metode usposabljanja na spletu, da bi dosegla čim večje število predstavnikov policijskih sil, do sedaj pa je pri tem sodelovalo 3016 ljudi.

Zahvaljujoč se Evropski komisiji, ki je agenciji odobrila dve dodatni mesti, je CEPOL v letu 2012 zaposlila dve novi osebi. Gre torej za priznanje agenciji in njeni strokovnosti, ki jo je razvila na področju usposabljanja, z omejenim proračunom 8 451 000 € v letu 2012. CEPOL je racionalizirala svoje delovanje s pristopom, ki temelji na rezultatih.

Medtem ko je Europol dobil upravljanje na novo ustanovljenega evropskega centra za boj proti kibernetskemu kriminalu, pa agencija ni dobila potrebnih proračunskih sredstev in osebja za opravljanje svojih novih nalog. Čeprav usposabljanje ne šteje med cilje Europola, kot so bili določeni v pravni podlagi agencije, je stockholmski program izrecno imenoval CEPOL za agencijo, ki bi morala imeti ključno vlogo pri usposabljanju policijskih sil.

Glede na to ali Komisija meni, da lahko organizacija, ki je bila ustanovljena za boj proti terorizmu in organiziranemu kriminalu, učinkovito zadosti potrebam po usposabljanju na drugem področju?

Ali z vidika učinkovitosti Komisija meni, da je treba na novo organizirati agencijo, ki je že pomembno spremenila svoj način delovanja?

Poleg tega se so največje politične skupine in druge skupine Evropskega parlamenta izjasnile proti predlogu za združitev CEPOL in Europol ter v prid ohranitve CEPOL kot samostojne agencije. Kakšno je uradno stališče Komisije o tej zadevi?

Odgovor Cecilie Malmström v imenu Komisije
(27. februar 2013)

Policisti po vsej Evropski uniji potrebujejo usklajeno usposabljanje glede evropske razsežnosti kazenskega pregona, da se bo Evropska unija lahko učinkovito soočala z izzivi čezmejne kriminalitete. Zato bo Komisija kmalu predstavila Sporočilo o evropskem programu usposabljanja za organe kazenskega pregona.

Komisija se strinja s spoštovanimi poslanci, da je Evropska policijska akademija (CEPOL) v zadnjih treh letih bistveno napredovala, kar pomeni, da je povečala obseg usposabljanja, ki ga zagotavlja, hkrati pa racionalizirala svoje delovanje. Vendar pa bi izvajanje celotnega programa usposabljanja zahtevalo spremembe v pravni podlagi za CEPOL: pooblastila agencije bi bilo treba razširiti, da bi zajela vse relevantne uslužbence organov kazenskega pregona, agencija pa bi potrebovala dodatne vire, da bi lahko opravljala nove naloge. Obstoječe stanje ne bi zadostovalo potrebam usposabljanja na področju kazenskega pregona v Uniji.

Komisija trenutno preučuje različne možnosti v zvezi z organizacijo usposabljanja za organe kazenskega pregona v EU in bo ustrezne predloge predložila v naslednjih tednih.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011666/12
to the Commission
Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Tanja Fajon (S&D), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Monika Hohlmeier (PPE), Ioan Enciu (S&D), Bill Newton Dunn (ALDE), Edit Herczog (S&D), Simon Busuttil (PPE) and Kinga Göncz (S&D)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Training of police forces in the European Union — Maintaining the CEPOL independent agency

The Treaty of Amsterdam of 1997 introduced the objective of the European Union to maintain and develop an area of freedom, security and justice. The Stockholm Programme approved on 11 December 2009 sets security as a key priority of the EU.

Against that background, the European Police College, an agency of the European Union, has made significant progress over the last three years. Accordingly, the number of participants in training courses organised by CEPOL increased from 2 300 in 2009 to 4 300 in 2011 and will be close to 5000 in 2012. The European police exchange programme increased from 50 participants in 2009 to 299 participants in 2011. The agency is also developing new methods of online training in order to provide training to as many police force representatives as possible, in which up to 3 016 people participated.

Thanks to the European Commission, which granted two additional posts to the agency, CEPOL made two recruitments in 2012. This is indeed an indication of the agency's recognition and the expertise it has developed in the field of training, with a budget limited to EUR 8 451 000 in 2012. CEPOL also streamlined its operation with a results-based approach.

Furthermore, when Europol was given the task of managing the newly-created European Cybercrime Centre, the agency did not receive the necessary resources in terms of budget or staff to perform those new functions. Finally, although training is not one of Europol's objectives as set out in its legal basis, CEPOL is, on the other hand, expressly named by the Stockholm Programme as the agency which should 'play a key role in training of law enforcement personnel'.

In that context, does the Commission think that an organisation set up to fight against terrorism and organised crime can effectively fulfill training needs in another field?

Does the Commission think, from the point of view of effectiveness, that it is now appropriate once more to reorganise an agency which has just significantly overhauled it mode of operation?

On the other hand, the majority political groups and other groups in the European Parliament have spoken out against the proposed merger of CEPOL and Europol, and in favour of maintaining CEPOL as an independent agency. What is the official position of the Commission on this issue?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(27 February 2013)

Police officers across the EU need to be trained in the European dimension of law enforcement, in a coordinated way, so that the EU can tackle effectively the challenges of cross-border criminality. The Commission will therefore soon be presenting a communication on a European Law Enforcement Training Scheme.

The Commission agrees with the Honourable Members that CEPOL has made significant progress over the last three years, both increasing the amount of training it offers and streamlining its operation. Full implementation of the Training Scheme would however require changes to CEPOL's legal basis: the agency's mandate would need to be extended to cover all relevant law enforcement officers and the agency would need additional resources to cover new tasks. The status quo would not meet EC law enforcement training needs.

The Commission is currently considering different options concerning the organisation of EC law enforcement training needs and will table the relevant proposals in the coming weeks.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-011667/12
til Kommissionen
Søren Bo Søndergaard (GUE/NGL)
(20. december 2012)

Om: Fordele og ulemper ved brugen af europæisk sommertid

Kommissionen bedes oplyse, om den har kendskab til nyere undersøgelser om fordele og ulemper ved overgang til sommertid på europæiske plan. Hvis det ikke er tilfældet, bedes Kommissionen oplyse, om den vil tage initiativ til en sådan undersøgelse.

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Siim Kallas
(11. februar 2013)

Kommissionen er ikke bekendt med nogen nyere, repræsentative undersøgelser, der kunne give anledning til konklusioner om fordelene og ulemperne ved sommertid for EU som helhed.

Kommissionen finder, at resultaterne og konklusionen i rapporten ([1]) om sommertid fra 2007 stadig er aktuelle.

([1]) Meddelelse fra Kommissionen til Rådet, Europa-Parlamentet og det Europæiske Økonomiske og Sociale Udvalg i henhold til artikel 5 i direktiv (EF) nr. 84/2000 om bestemmelser vedrørende sommertid (KOM(2007)0739 endelig).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011667/12
to the Commission
Søren Bo Søndergaard (GUE/NGL)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Benefits and inconveniences of using European Summer Time

Is the Commission aware of any recent studies on the benefits and inconveniences of the switch to Summer Time at European level? If not, will it be taking the initiative to carry out such a study?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(11 February 2013)

The Commission is not aware of any recent representative study which would allow conclusions about the benefits and shortcomings of summertime for the EU as a whole.

The Commission considers that the findings and conclusion outlined in its report ([1]) on summertime of 2007 are still valid.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament and the European Economic and Social Committee under Article 5 of Directive 2000/84/EC on Summer-Time Arrangements, COM(2007) 739 final.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-011668/12
til Kommissionen
Søren Bo Søndergaard (GUE/NGL)
(20. december 2012)

Om: Bekæmpelse af ulovlig børnearbejde og trafficking

På baggrund af dokumentaren »Lyssky chocolade/Shady chocolate«, som havde premiere den 9. december på den danske public service kanal DR1 ([1]), og som blev bragt 17. december på tyske ARD, bedes Kommissionen forholde sig til problemet om ulovlig børnearbejde i chokolade-industrien.

Dokumentaren viser hvordan, ulovligt børnearbejde og trafficking indgår i chokolade-industriens produktionskæde, og at virksomhedernes sociale ansvar blot begrænser sig til marketing- og brandingstrategier.

I 2010 tiltrådte EU den internationale kakaooverenskomst under FN, der sigter mod at skabe betingelser for en mere retfærdig og bæredygtig global handel med kakao.

Aftalen er blevet kritiseret af blandt andet EU-Parlamentet for ikke at indeholde klare bestemmelser om forbud mod børnearbejde i kakaosektoren. Derfor vedtog EU-Parlamentet den 14. marts 2012 en resolution, som opfordrer EU-kommissionen til at forelægge et lovforslag til en effektiv kontrolmekanisme for varer produceret ved hjælp af tvunget børnearbejde (P7_TA(2012)0080).

EU er verdens største forbruger og importør af kakao (40 pct. af verdens kakao landes og forbruges i EU) og har derfor et stort ansvar for bekæmpelsen af ulovligt børnearbejde i kakao sektoren.

Agter Kommissionen at indføre strammere kontrolmekanismer, som kan afdække og forbyde varer produceret ved børnearbejde — samt indføre strammere krav til chokolade industrien om dokumentation af og gennemsigtighed i deres kakaoforsyningskæde?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Karel De Gucht
(20. februar 2013)

Kommissionen går stærkt ind for afskaffelse af ulovligt børnearbejde, navnlig når det drejer sig om de værste former for børnearbejde og farligt arbejde (Den Internationale Arbejdsorganisations konvention nr. 182).

Hvad angår spørgsmålet om en sporbarhedsmekanisme for produkter fremstillet af børnearbejdere generelt, henviser Kommissionen det ærede medlem til svaret på skriftlig forespørgsel E4045/12 ([2]). Der vil opstå en række problemer ved indførelsen af et specifikt sporbarhedssystem inden for kakaoproduktion såsom:

1. For at gennemføre en myndighedsforanstaltning skal EU overholde WTO-reglerne om ikkeforskelsbehandling og skulle dermed anvende systemet over for alle de lande, der producerer (eller kunne producere) produktet.

2. For at være effektiv ville alle de lande, som køber produktet (eller kunne gøre det) i væsentlige mængder, skulle deltage i ordningen, da handelsstrømmene ellers blot ville ændres fra lande, der kræver sporbarhed, til lande, der ikke gør.

3. Endelig ville omkostningerne ved certificerings- og kontrolsystemerne blive store og virkelig udfordrende for de lande, hvor de værste former for børnearbejde eksisterer: de mindst udviklede lande og andre fattige økonomier.

([1]) http://www.dr.dk/tv/se/lyssky-chokolade/lyssky-chokolade.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011668/12
to the Commission
Søren Bo Søndergaard (GUE/NGL)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Action to combat illegal child labour and trafficking

In the light of the documentary entitled 'Lyssky chocolade' (Shady chocolate), first shown on 9 December 2012 on the Danish public service channel DR1 ([1]), and then on 17 December on the German channel ARD, can the Commission state its position on the issue of illegal child labour in the chocolate industry?

The documentary showed how illegal child labour and trafficking form part of the production chain in the chocolate industry, and demonstrated that corporate social responsibility is confined solely to marketing and branding strategies.

In 2010 the EU acceded to the UN's International Cocoa Agreement, which seeks to create the conditions for a fairer and more sustainable global trade in cocoa.

The agreement was criticised, by the European Parliament among others, for not containing clear rules banning child labour in the cocoa industry. Accordingly, on 14 March 2012, the European Parliament adopted a resolution calling on the Commission to submit a legislative proposal on an effective traceability mechanism for goods produced by means of forced child labour (P7_TA(2012)0080).

The EU is the world's largest consumer and importer of cocoa (40% of the world's cocoa goes to the EU and is consumed there) and therefore has a great responsibility for combating illegal child labour in the cocoa sector.

Does the Commission propose to introduce more stringent traceability mechanisms whereby goods produced using child labour can be detected and banned, as well as stricter requirements for the chocolate industry concerning documentation and transparency in its cocoa supply chain?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2013)

The Commisison is strongly committed to the elimination of illegal child labour, particularly when it comes to the Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL) and Hazardous Work (International Work Organisation Convention 182).

As to the issue of a traceability mechanism for goods produced by means of child labour in general, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the answer to Written Question E4045/12 ([2]). To apply a working traceability system on cocoa production in particular would face a number of difficulties, for example:

1. To implement a top-down measure the EU would need to respect WTO rules on non-discrimination and therefore apply the system to all countries in the world which produce (or could produce) the product.

2. In order to be effective, all countries which buy the product (or could do so) in significant quantities would have to participate in the scheme, otherwise trade flows would simply shift away from countries requiring traceability to others that do not.

3. Finally, the cost of certification and control systems would be exhaustive and most challenging in the countries where WFCL is most present: Least Developed Countries and other poor economies.

([1]) http://www.dr.dk/tv/se/lyssky-chokolade/lyssky-chokolade.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN .

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011669/12
an die Kommission
Hubert Pirker (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE) und Dominique Riquet (PPE)
(20. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Stellungnahme der Europäischen Agentur für Flugsicherheit zu Flugzeitbeschränkungen für Flugzeugbesatzungen

Die Europäische Agentur für Flugsicherheit (EASA) gab am 1. Oktober 2012 ihre Stellungnahme zu den Flugzeitbeschränkungen für Flugzeugbesatzungen (FTL) ab. Mit Blick auf das Interesse der Bürger Europas an einem sicheren Luftverkehr wird die Kommission um folgende Mitteilungen ersucht:

Kann sie

1. bestätigen, dass der EU-OPS-Grundsatz der Sicherung des Schutzniveaus („non-regression") auch in der künftigen FTL-Verordnung beibehalten wird, so dass die Mitgliedstaaten die Möglichkeit haben, strengere FTL-Bestimmungen beizubehalten oder einzuführen;

2. die Bereiche erläutern, in denen die wissenschaftlichen Empfehlungen aus den vier Berichten im Auftrag der EASA 2009 und 2011 befolgt wurden und für die Bereiche, in denen sie nicht befolgt wurden, darlegen, ob und warum ihres Erachtens die nach diesen Bestimmungen ergriffenen Maßnahmen nachweislich sicher sind;

3. erläutern, ob und warum sie die Beschränkung der Nachtflugzeit von 11-12,5 Stunden für nachweislich sicher hält, obwohl gemäß wissenschaftlichen Empfehlungen Nachtflüge auf bis zu 10 Stunden beschränkt sein sollten;

4. erläutern, ob und warum ihrer Ansicht nach Arbeitstage von 22 Stunden (d.h. 8 Stunden Bereitschaftsdienst + 14 Stunden Flugdienst) nachweislich sicher sind, zumal die Vereinigten Staaten eine Obergrenze von 16 Stunden für Bereitschafts- und Flugdienst eingeführt haben;

5. die Logik und die Begründung hinsichtlich Sicherheit in dem Vorschlag der EASA erläutern, wonach sich alle Mitgliedstaaten als „early types" anstelle von „late types" erklären können? Hierdurch werden die Fluggesellschaften aus „early-type"-Ländern in die Lage versetzt, bei einigen ihrer frühen Starts die in der Stellungnahme enthaltenen Beschränkungen zu umgehen und damit gegen die wissenschaftlichen Empfehlungen zu verstoßen, in denen festgelegt ist, was als „früher Abflug" (early start) zu betrachten ist.

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(18. Februar 2013)

1. & 2. Die Gewährleistung der Sicherheit ist für die Kommission ein absolut vorrangiges Ziel, und sie hat nicht die Absicht, ein System einzuführen, das mit diesem Grundsatz unvereinbar sein könnte.

Die Kommission unterzieht derzeit den Vorschlag der EASA einer umfassenden Bewertung und hat noch keine Entscheidung zu spezifischen Aspekten der Flugzeitbeschränkungen getroffen.

Die Kommission verweist die Herren Abgeordneten außerdem auf ihre Antworten zu folgenden schriftlichen Anfragen: P-011515/2012, E-009003/2012 und E-011134/2012 ([1]).

Weitere Erläuterungen zu Frage 2 sind der Stellungnahme der EASA zu entnehmen, die auf der EASA-Website ([2]) abgerufen werden kann.

3. Die Kommission weist darauf hin, dass viele Mitgliedstaaten derzeit für Nachtflüge 11 Stunden oder mehr als sicheren Betrieb zulassen, und dass die EASA eine Kombination verschiedener ausgleichender Maßnahmen für den Nachtbetrieb vorschlägt, um ein hohes Sicherheitsniveau zu gewährleisten.

4. Neben Obergrenzen für Dienstzeiten enthalten die derzeitigen Flugzeitbeschränkungen in der EU zwingende Verpflichtungen für Mitgliedstaaten, Luftfahrtunternehmen und Besatzungsmitglieder, um realistische und sichere Flugpläne zu gewährleisten.

([1]) Abrufbar unter: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) https://www.easa.europa.eu/agency-measures/opinions.php.

Die Kommission hat die EASA aufgefordert, vor der Fertigstellung ihrer Vorschläge zum Bereitschaftsdienst weitere Informationen zu sammeln.

5. Der EASA-Vorschlag sieht die Ausdehnung einer im Vereinigten Königreich geltenden Bestimmung auf die EU vor, wodurch die Ruhezeiten verlängert würden. Nach wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnissen sollte die Definition des Vereinigten Königreichs für „early start“ (früher Abflug) angesichts der unterschiedlichen Zeitraster in anderen Mitgliedstaaten angepasst werden. Die EASA hat dies in ihrer Stellungnahme erläutert, die über die EASA-Website abgerufen werden kann.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011669/12
à la Commission
Hubert Pirker (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE) et Dominique Riquet (PPE)
(20 décembre 2012)

Objet: Avis de l'Agence européenne de la sécurité aérienne sur la limitation du temps de vol du personnel navigant

Le 1er octobre 2012, l'Agence européenne de la sécurité aérienne (AESA) a rendu son avis sur la limitation du temps de vol du personnel navigant. Compte tenu de l'intérêt des citoyens européens à disposer de services de transport aérien sûrs, la Commission peut-elle:

1. confirmer que le principe de «non-régression» des EU-OPS sera préservé dans la future réglementation sur la limitation du temps de vol, les États membres étant autorisés à conserver ou à introduire des règles de sécurité plus strictes en matière de limitation du temps de vol?

2. fournir un aperçu des secteurs dans lesquels ont été suivis les conseils scientifiques figurant dans quatre rapports commandés par l'AESA en 2009 et en 2011 et, lorsque ces conseils n'ont pas été suivis, expliquer si elle considère que les activités menées en vertu de telles dispositions sont manifestement sûres et, dans l'affirmative, pour quelles raisons?

3. expliquer si elle considère que la limitation du temps de vol de nuit de l'AESE, à savoir 11 à 12,5 heures, est manifestement sûre, étant donné que, selon les avis scientifiques, les vols de nuit devraient être limités à 10 heures et, dans l'affirmative, pour quelles raisons?

4. expliquer si elle considérerait des journées de service de 22 heures (soit 8 heures en attente + 14 heures de service de vol) comme manifestement sûres, étant donné que les États-Unis ont «plafonné» à 16 heures le service d'attente et de vol, et, dans l'affirmative, pour quelles raisons?

5. expliquer la logique et les arguments de sécurité qui sous-tendent la proposition de l'AESE de permettre aux États membres de se définir comme des États à «horaires précoces» («early types») plutôt qu'à «horaires tardifs» («late types»)? Cela permettra aux compagnies aériennes d'un pays à «horaires précoces» d'échapper aux limitations en matière d'«horaires contraignants» mentionnées dans l'avis pour certains de leurs départs précoces et de contrevenir aux avis scientifiques quant à ce qu'il y a lieu de considérer comme un «départ précoce».

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(18 février 2013)

1 et 2. La Commission est très attachée à la sécurité, qu'elle juge essentielle, et n'a pas l'intention de mettre en place un système susceptible d'aller à l'encontre de ce principe.

Elle étudie actuellement en détail la proposition de l'AESA et n'a encore pris de décision sur aucun aspect spécifique de la limitation du temps de vol.

La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à se référer à ses réponses aux questions écrites P-011515/2012, E-009003/2012 et E-011134/2012 ([1]).

L'avis de l'AESA, publié sur le site de celle-ci ([2]), fournit des explications supplémentaires en ce qui concerne la question 2.

3. La Commission signale que de nombreux États membres autorisent actuellement une durée de service de nuit d'au moins 11 heures et que l'AESÀ propose une combinaison de mesures d'atténuation pour les services de nuit visant à garantir un niveau de sécurité élevé.

4. En plus des limitations de la durée maximale du service, les règles de l'UE en matière de limitation du temps de vol imposent des obligations inconditionnelles aux États membres, aux compagnies aériennes et aux membres d'équipage de sorte à permettre une répartition des services réaliste qui garantisse une sécurité maximale.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) https://www.easa.europa.eu/agency-measures/opinions.php.

La Commission a demandé à l'AESA de collecter des informations supplémentaires avant d'établir ses propositions relatives à la réserve.

5. La proposition de l'AESA vise à étendre à l'UE une disposition du Royaume-Uni qui augmenterait le temps de repos. Selon certains scientifiques, la définition donnée par le Royaume-Uni au «service qui débute tôt» devrait être adaptée en fonction des différentes organisations du temps de service dans les autres États membres. L'AESA fournit des explications à ce sujet dans son avis, consultable sur son site.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011669/12
to the Commission
Hubert Pirker (PPE), Georges Bach (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE) and Dominique Riquet (PPE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: European Aviation Safety Agency opinion on flight-time limitations for air crew

On 1 October 2012, the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) issued its opinion on air crew flight-time limitations (FTL). Keeping in mind the interest of European citizens in safe air transport services, can the Commission:

1. confirm that the EU-OPS 'non-regression' principle will be retained in the future FTL regulation, allowing Member States to maintain or introduce stricter FTL safety requirements?

2. provide an overview of the areas in which the scientific advice contained in four reports commissioned by the EASA in 2009 and 2011 has been followed and, where it has not been followed, provide an explanation as to whether it considers operations carried out under such provisions to be demonstrably safe and, if so, why?

3. explain whether it considers the EASA's night flight-time limit of 11-12.5 hours to be demonstrably safe, given that according to scientific advice night flights should be limited to 10 hours, and, if so, why?

4. explain whether it would consider duty days of 22 hours (i.e. 8 hours standby + 14 hours flight duty) to be demonstrably safe, given that the USA has put a 'cap' of 16 hours on standby and flight duty, and, if so, why?

5. explain the logic and safety justification behind the EASA's proposal to allow Member States to declare themselves as 'early types' instead of 'late types'? This will allow airlines from an 'early type' country to escape the 'disruptive schedule' limitations mentioned in the opinion for some of their early starts, and contravenes scientific advice on what must be considered as an 'early start'?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

1 and 2. The Commission is committed to safety, which is paramount, and does not intend to put in place any system which might go against this principle.

The Commission is currently assessing in detail the EASA proposal and has not yet taken a decision on any specific aspect of FTL.

The Commission further refers the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions P-011515/2012, E-009003/2012 and E-011134/2012 ([1]).

Further explanations on question 2 can be found in EASA's Opinion, which is available on the EASA website ([2]).

3. The Commission notes that many Member States allow to operate safely 11 hours or more at night currently, and that EASA proposes a combination of various mitigating measures for overnight duties that aim at ensuring a high safety level.

4. In addition to the maximum duty limits, current EU FTL rules put unconditional obligations on Member States, airlines and aircrew members to ensure realistic and safe rosters.

The Commission has asked EASA to gather additional information before finalising its proposals concerning standby duty.

5. The EASA proposal aims at extending to the EU a UK provision that would increase rest time. According to scientific views, the UK definition of 'early start' should be adapted in light of the different time patterns in other Member States. EASA has explained this in its Opinion, which is available on the EASA website.

([1]) Available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) https://www.easa.europa.eu/agency-measures/opinions.php.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011670/12
à la Commission
Brice Hortefeux (PPE)
(20 décembre 2012)

Objet: Soutien de l'Union européenne à l'éradication de la poliomyélite dans le monde

La lutte pour l'éradication de la poliomyélite a permis de réduire de 99 % le nombre de personnes infectées depuis 1988, passant de plus de 350 000 dans 125 pays à 650 cas notifiés en 2011.

En 2012, l'endémie persiste seulement dans quelques régions de trois pays dans le monde: l'Afghanistan, le Nigeria et le Pakistan.

Ce succès spectaculaire repose notamment sur l'action conjuguée de l'OMS, du Rotary International et de l'Unicef dans le cadre de l'Initiative mondiale pour l'éradication de la poliomyélite (IMEP).

Seulement, l'éradication de ce virus nécessite des moyens financiers importants. L'IMEP a en effet élaboré un plan stratégique sur cinq ans qui permettrait d'atteindre l'objectif d'éradication. Ce plan nécessiterait un budget de 4 244 000 000 euros pour couvrir la période de l'après 2013.

Si les financements ne sont pas au rendez-vous, le nombre des nouveaux cas dans le monde pourrait de nouveau atteindre 200 000 par an d'ici 10 ans.

L'Union européenne apporte son soutien à cette initiative dans le cadre du Fonds européen de développement (FED) pour le Nigeria.

La Commission peut-elle nous indiquer si l'Union va poursuivre ce soutien dans le cadre du 11e FED pour la période 2014-2020 dans le cas du Nigeria et mobiliser des financements au moyen de l'Instrument pour la coopération au développement dans les cas de l'Afghanistan et du Pakistan?

Dans l'hypothèse d'un financement de l'objectif de lutte contre cette pandémie, quelle allocation financière compte-t-elle verser pour chacun de ces trois pays?

Réponse donnée par M. Piebalgs au nom de la Commission
(20 février 2013)

Le succès remarquable des efforts déployés pour réduire la transmission de la poliomyélite, auquel ont contribué de nombreux donateurs internationaux ainsi que l'Initiative mondiale pour l'éradication de la poliomyélite (IMEP), est essentiellement dû à la volonté constante des pouvoirs publics et des prestataires de soins de santé des pays où la maladie est endémique de garantir une large couverture vaccinale au moyen de programmes de vaccination et d'améliorer les conditions sanitaires et d'hygiène. L'appui global de la Commission au secteur de la santé contribue à la capacité des pays à parvenir à un taux de vaccination élevé, au même titre que le soutien qu'elle apporte à l'Alliance mondiale pour les vaccins et la vaccination (GAVI).

Le principe de concentration sur trois secteurs appliqué à la programmation par pays sur la période 2014-2020 ne permettra peut-être pas de soutenir le secteur de la santé dans tous les pays où la poliomyélite est endémique, et il faudra attendre la fin de la programmation postérieure à 2013 pour pouvoir fournir une réponse définitive à ce sujet. Dans ce contexte, un soutien au secteur de la santé de l'Afghanistan et du Nigeria est en cours de discussion. Ce processus se poursuivant à l'heure actuelle, il n'est pas encore possible de communiquer des montants précis.

La Commission espère que la perspective d'une éradication de la poliomyélite favorisera la mobilisation de fonds supplémentaires non liés à l'aide publique au développement, ce qui permettrait à l'aide au développement de couvrir une part croissante du déficit de financement du soutien global aux systèmes de santé.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011670/12
to the Commission
Brice Hortefeux (PPE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: European Union support for the worldwide eradication of polio

Eradication measures have reduced the number of people infected with polio by 99% since 1988, the number of notified cases falling from over 350 000 in 125 countries to 650 in 2011.

In 2012, polio remained endemic only in a few regions in three countries of the world: Afghanistan, Nigeria and Pakistan.

This remarkable success is mainly due to the combined action of the WHO, Rotary International and Unicef under the Global Polio Eradication Initiative (GPEI).

However, the eradication of this virus requires considerable funding. The GPEI drew up a five-year strategic plan to achieve the objective of eradication. It would require a budget of 4 244 000 000 EUR to cover the post-2013 period.

If funding is not provided in time, within 10 years the number of new cases worldwide could again amount to 200 000 a year.

The European Union is providing support for this initiative for Nigeria through the European Development Fund (EDF).

Can the Commission state whether the European Union is going to continue its support for Nigeria under the eleventh EDF for the 2014-2020 period and whether it will provide funding for Afghanistan and Pakistan through the Financing instrument for development cooperation?

Assuming funding is provided to combat this pandemic, how much does the Commission intend to allocate to each of these three countries?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2013)

The remarkable success in bringing down polio transmission, to which many international donors and the specialised GPEI (Global Polio Eradication Initiative) have contributed, is essentially due to the persistent readiness of governments and healthcare providers in endemic countries, to ensure high coverage through routine polio immunisation services, and to improve hygiene and sanitation. The Commission's comprehensive health sector support contributes to countries' ability to provide high routine immunization coverage, as does the Commission's support to the GAVI Alliance (Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation).

The principle of concentration on 3 sectors being followed for country programming for 2014-2020 may not allow for support to the health sector in all polio-endemic countries, and a definitive answer can only be given once post-2013 programming has been finalised. In this context health sector support to Afghanistan and Nigeria is currently being discussed; since this is an ongoing process, specific amounts cannot yet be indicated.

The Commission hopes that the prospect of polio-eradication will galvanise the mobilisation of additional non-official development assistance financing, allowing development aid to cover an increasing part of the funding gap for comprehensive health systems support.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011671/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(20 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: Richiesta di chiarimenti sui costi dell'applicazione «Puzzled by Policy»

«Puzzled by Policy» ([1]) è un progetto cofinanziato dalla Commissione europea e, come si legge in alcune note di stampa, ha lo scopo di informare i cittadini sulle leggi relative all'immigrazione e stimolare il dibattito online su questo tema.

Inoltre, consente di conoscere la propria affinità politica rispondendo a una serie di domande sul tema della migrazione, ad esempio sull'opportunità di rendere le norme più restrittive e di richiedere agli immigrati extracomunitari di accettare la cultura e i valori europei. Alla fine del quiz, l'utente è guidato in forum di discussione su specifici argomenti come «l'immigrazione per motivi di studio» o «l'immigrazione irregolare in Europa», dove può partecipare direttamente o indirettamente al dibattito online. ONG, organizzazioni, università e think-tank stanno utilizzando questo *widget* per coinvolgere le loro comunità.

La Commissione può comunicare a quanto ammontano i costi sostenuti per la realizzazione di questo progetto?

La Commissione ha potuto valutare l'utilità di tale iniziativa?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(13 febbraio 2013)

Il costo totale del progetto «Puzzled by Policy» ammonta a 3 891 550 euro e il contributo della Commissione è di 1 945 774 euro ([2]).

Il progetto mira a rafforzare le tecnologie di e-Partecipazione nell'ambito delle politiche di immigrazione fornendo ai cittadini una piattaforma accattivante e facile da utilizzare per interagire con i responsabili politici.

Per quanto riguarda la sua valutazione, il progetto finora ha mostrato buoni risultati nei programmi pilota lanciati recentemente in quattro Stati membri.

Nel secondo riesame annuo, il progetto è stato rivisto da due esperti esterni indipendenti secondo cui il progetto ha compiuto progressi importanti nell'individuazione delle questioni critiche delle politiche di immigrazione. Gli esperti hanno rilevato che il progetto coinvolge un numero crescente di utenti e si sono detti fiduciosi della strategia adottata per stabilire collaborazioni a livello locale sia con i responsabili politici che con le ONG a sostegno degli immigrati. Hanno inoltre constatato che il consorzio ha dimostrato di capire realmente i problemi degli immigrati, sa come conquistarne la fiducia e si impegna per assicurare il successo della piattaforma. Hanno infine concordato che i progressi raggiunti durante il secondo anno provano la competenza e la buona sinergia dei membri del consorzio.

Sulla base della relazione degli esperti, la Commissione ha deciso di permettere la continuazione del progetto e ha raccomandato al consorzio di coinvolgere più responsabili decisionali a tutti i livelli.

Gli impatti finali del progetto saranno valutati al termine del programma durante l'ultimo riesame che verrà effettuato nei prossimi mesi.

([1]) Applicazione del sito web http://join.puzzledbypolicy.eu.
([2]) http://www.puzzledbypolicy.eu/Overview/Scope.aspx. Il progetto è stato lanciato nel quadro dell'obiettivo 3.1 sull'e-Partecipazione del programma di lavoro PSP CIP TIC del 2009 creato su richiesta del Parlamento europeo come risultato dell'azione preparatoria e-Partecipazione (2006-2008).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011671/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Request for clarification on the costs of the 'Puzzled by Policy' application

'Puzzled by Policy' ([1]) is a project that is co-funded by the Commission and, as stated in some press releases, has the aim of informing citizens about immigration laws and stimulating online debate on this issue.

It also lets people know their political affinity by getting them to answer a series of questions on the topic of migration, such as whether or not the rules should be made more restrictive and whether non-EU immigrants should be required to accept European culture and values. At the end of the quiz, users are guided into discussion forums on specific topics such as 'immigration for study purposes' or 'irregular immigration in Europe', where they can participate directly or indirectly in the online debate. NGOs, organisations, universities and think-tanks are using this widget to engage their communities.

Can the Commission say how much this project cost?

Has the Commission been able to assess the usefulness of such an initiative?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(13 February 2013)

The 'Puzzled by Policy' project's total cost is EUR 3.891.550 while the Commission contribution is EUR 1.945.774. More information can be found on the project website ([2]).

The project aims to validate eParticipation technologies in the area of Immigration Policy by providing citizens with an engaging and easy-to-use platform to interact with policy-makers.

Regarding its assessment, the project has shown good results so far through the pilots recently started in 4 Member States.

The project was reviewed by two external and independent experts at the second annual review and they concluded that the project has made significant strides forward in identifying critical leas and issues of policy making in the domain of immigration. They noticed that it has involved an increasing number of users and were convinced by the strategy followed to establish local collaboration both with policy-makers and with NGOs supporting immigrants. They noticed that there is evidence that the consortium understands the real issues of immigrants and that it knows how to build up trust among immigrants and that it is committed to establish success for its platform. They agreed that the resulting progress achieved in the second year demonstrates the competence and good synergy of the members of the consortium.

Based on the experts' report the Commission has decided to allow the project to continue and has recommended to the consortium to involve more policy-makers at all levels.

The final impacts of the project will be assessed upon its completion at the last project review to be held later this year.

([1]) Application on website: http://join.puzzledbypolicy.eu.
([2]) http://www.puzzledbypolicy.eu/Overview/Scope.aspx. The project has been launched in the framework of the 2009 CIP ICT PSP work programme objective 3.1 on eParticipation which was developed at the request of the European Parliament as a follow on action of the eParticipation Preparatory Action (2006 — 2008).

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011672/12
do Komisji
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(20 grudnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Ustanowienie 25 maja Dniem Bohaterów Walki z Totalitaryzmem

W odpowiedzi z 8 grudnia 2010 r. dotyczącej możliwości ustanowienia 25 maja Dniem Bohaterów Walki z Totalitaryzmem, Komisja Europejska odpowiedziała, iż zbiorowym obowiązkiem Europejczyków jest pamiętać nie tylko o tych, którzy stali się ofiarami zbrodni reżimów totalitarnych, ale również o tych, którzy z nimi walczyli.

22 grudnia 2010 r. KE opublikowała również sprawozdanie dotyczące pamięci o zbrodniach popełnionych przez reżimy totalitarne, w którym podkreśla, iż istotne jest zachowanie i propagowanie pamięci o zbrodniach popełnionych przez reżimy totalitarne, w szczególności ze względu na potrzebę informowania młodszych pokoleń, a także wymienia szereg programów, które mogłyby się do tego przyczynić. W dniu 16 czerwca Rada do Spraw Ogólnych w swoich konkluzjach uznała, że „aby zwiększyć świadomość Europejczyków na temat zbrodni popełnionych przez reżimy totalitarne, należy zachować pamięć o burzliwej przeszłości Europy". Wreszcie w rezolucji z 2 kwietnia 2009 r. PE wezwał do upamiętnienia również tych, którzy aktywnie walczyli z totalitaryzmem. W tym kierunku działa też szereg oddolnych inicjatyw obywatelskich i organizacji pozarządowych.

W związku z powyższym chciałbym zadać następujące pytania:

1. Czy Komisja włączy się w promowanie idei upamiętnienia osób walczących z totalitaryzmem i utworzenia poświęconego im święta?

2. Czy Komisja powróci do tematu ustanowienia 25 maja Europejskim Dniem Bohaterów Walki z Totalitaryzmem?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Viviane Reding w imieniu Komisji
(12 lutego 2013 r.)

W sprawozdaniu dotyczącym pamięci o zbrodniach popełnionych przez reżimy totalitarne ([1]), Komisja podkreśliła swoje zaangażowanie na rzecz wspierania pamięci o zbrodniach popełnionych przez reżimy totalitarne w Europie. W tym celu Komisja zobowiązała się do korzystania z instrumentów, jakimi dysponuje, w szczególności z programów finansowych, takich jak działanie „Aktywna pamięć europejska" w ramach programu „Europa dla obywateli".

W sprawozdaniu Komisja zachęcała również państwa członkowskie do zbadania możliwości ustanowienia dnia 23 sierpnia ([2]) ogólnoeuropejskim dniem pamięci o zbrodniach popełnionych przez reżimy totalitarne z uwzględnieniem ich własnej historii i specyficznych uwarunkowań.

([1]) „Pamięć o zbrodniach popełnionych przez reżimy totalitarne w Europie", COM (2010) 783 final.
([2]) Rezolucja Parlamentu Europejskiego z dnia 2 kwietnia 2009 r. w sprawie świadomości europejskiej i totalitaryzmu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011672/12
to the Commission
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Declaring 25 May the European Day honouring the Heroes of the Fight against Totalitarianism

In its answer of 8 December 2010 regarding the possibility of declaring 25 May the European Day honouring the Heroes of the Fight against Totalitarianism, the Commission said that it is the collective duty of Europeans to preserve the memory not only of the victims of totalitarian regimes' crimes, but also of the people who fought such regimes.

On 22 December 2010, the Commission also published a report entitled 'The memory of crimes committed by totalitarian regimes in Europe', which stressed the importance of preserving and promoting the memory of the crimes committed by totalitarian regimes, in particular with a view to educating younger generations. It also mentioned a series of programmes that could help achieve this aim. On 16 June 2009, the General Affairs Council adopted conclusions stating that 'in order to strengthen European awareness of crimes committed by totalitarian regimes, the memory of Europe's troubled past must be preserved, as reconciliation would be difficult without remembrance'. Finally, with its resolution of 2 April 2009, Parliament called for those who actively fought against totalitarianism to be commemorated. A series of bottom-up citizens' initiatives and NGOs are also taking action to this end.

Given the above:

1. Will the Commission play a role in promoting the idea of commemorating those who fought against totalitarianism and declaring a holiday dedicated to them?

2. Will it return to the issue of declaring 25 May the European Day honouring the Heroes ofthe Fight against Totalitarianism?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(12 February 2013)

In its report on memory of totalitarian crimes ([1]), the Commission underlined its commitment to support the memory of the crimes committed by totalitarian regimes. The Commission is committed to use the instruments at its disposal in order to do so, in particular its financial programmes such as the Action 'Active European Remembrance' of the Europe for Citizens programme.

The report also encouraged the Member States to examine the possibility to recognise the 23 August ([2]) as a Europe-wide Day of Remembrance of the crimes committed by totalitarian regimes, in the light of their own history and specificities.

([1]) 'The memory of the crimes committed by totalitarian regimes in Europe', COM(2010) 783 final.
([2]) European Parliament resolution of 2 April 2009 on European conscience and totalitarianism.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011673/12
a la Comisión
Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE)
(20 de diciembre de 2012)

Asunto: Espacio para los países mediterráneos

El pasado mes de septiembre, la Agencia Espacial Europea y el Banco Europeo de Inversiones pusieron en marcha la iniciativa «Espacio para los países mediterráneos» con el fin de potenciar el uso de satélites en materias tales como la gestión del agua, la energía o el transporte. Este programa cuenta con una red de plataformas embajadoras, una de ellas, la de energías renovables, está liderada por el CENER (Centro Nacional de Energías Renovables).

¿Puede la Comisión informar de cuáles serán los proyectos que en materia de energías renovables tiene previsto poner en marcha a lo largo de 2013 en el marco del proyecto «Espacio para los países mediterráneos»?

¿Puede informar la Comisión de cuáles serán las cantidades asignadas dentro de la iniciativa «Espacio para los países mediterráneos» a los programas relacionados con fuentes de energías renovables?

Respuesta del Sr. Tajani en nombre de la Comisión
(22 de febrero de 2013)

La Comisión no participa en la iniciativa «Espacio para los países mediterráneos» y, por tanto, no va a poner en marcha ningún proyecto.

La Comisión sugiere a Su Señoría que se ponga en contacto con la Dirección de Asuntos Exteriores de la Agencia Espacial Europea para más información sobre esa iniciativa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011673/12
to the Commission
Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Space for Mediterranean Countries Initiative

In September 2012, the European Space Agency and the European Investment Bank launched the Space for Mediterranean Countries Initiative in order to promote the use of satellites in the fields of water management, energy and transport, among others. The programme has a network of ambassador platforms, one of which, focusing on renewable energy, is being led by the National Renewable Energy Centre (CENER).

Can the Commission indicate what renewable energy projects it plans to implement in 2013 as part of the Space for Mediterranean Countries Initiative?

How much money will be allocated under the Space for Mediterranean Countries Initiative to programmes relating to renewable energy sources?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2013)

The Commission is not involved in the Space for Mediterranean Countries Initiative and, therefore, is not implementing any project under it.

The Commission would suggest the Honourable Member to contact the European Space Agency's Directorate of External Relations for further information on this initiative.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011674/12
a la Comisión
Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE)
(20 de diciembre de 2012)

Asunto: Sector resinero español

En el marco del proyecto de cooperación territorial «Resina y Biomasa» que finalizará el año 2013 se ha llevado a cabo la elaboración de un documento de conclusiones con el compromiso de revitalizar la actividad resinera en los bosques de España recuperando así el sector resinero como una fuente de riqueza y empleo en el medio rural.

¿Tiene voluntad la Comisión de impulsar la concesión de ayudas financieras al objeto de relanzar el sector resinero en las regiones forestales españolas?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(21 de febrero de 2013)

El Feader ([1]) ofrece apoyo a medidas forestales a través de los programas de desarrollo rural correspondientes al período 2007-2013. Los Estados miembros pueden elegir diferentes medidas para potenciar el papel de los bosques. La Comisión ha propuesto un nuevo Reglamento sobre Desarrollo Rural, que actualmente se está negociando con el Consejo y el Parlamento Europeo ([2]) y que incluye medidas de formación, medidas de fomento de las inversiones en infraestructuras, nuevas tecnologías forestales, transformación y comercialización de productos forestales, y medidas de mejora de la resistencia de los bosques. También contempla la creación de nuevos sistemas forestales o agroforestales, la creación de agrupaciones de productores, la cooperación y actividades «Leader» de apoyo a la producción sostenible de resina de pino de alta calidad.

Durante el período 2007-2013, el Feader ([3]) proporciona apoyo, entre otras cosas, a las inversiones productivas que contribuyen a la creación o el mantenimiento de empleos, a través de ayudas directas a la inversión y otras medidas para el desarrollo regional y local. Dichas inversiones, financiadas mediante programas operativos diseñados por los Estados miembros y aprobados por la Comisión, pueden contribuir al desarrollo de diferentes sectores productivos (incluido el de la resina) en coordinación con aquellos sectores que ya reciben financiación a través de los programas de desarrollo rural.

En cuanto al posible apoyo al sector industrial resinero, pueden existir posibilidades con la ejecución de Horizonte 2020, el programa de trabajo relativo a la investigación e innovación propuesto por la UE para el período 2014-2020. En concreto, la prioridad 2 (retos sociales) incluye un capítulo relacionado con la agricultura sostenible y la bioeconomía que podría ofrecer espacio a los proyectos en este ámbito.

([1]) Reglamento (CE) n° 1698/2005 del Consejo, de 20 de septiembre de 2005, relativo a la ayuda al desarrollo rural a través del Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Desarrollo Rural (Feader), DO L 277 de 21.10.2005.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/legal-proposals/index_en.htm
([3]) Reglamento (CE) n° 1080/2006 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 5 de julio de 2006, relativo al Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional y por el que se deroga el Reglamento (CE) n° 1783/1999, DO L 210 de 31.7.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011674/12
to the Commission
Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Spanish resin production

In a position paper drawn up as part of the 'Resin and Biomass' regional cooperation project that will come to an end in 2013, a commitment was made to revitalise resin production in Spain's forests with a view to boosting the economy and creating jobs in rural areas.

Does the Commission intend to encourage the provision of financial support to help revitalise the resin sector in Spain's forest regions?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(21 February 2013)

The EAFRD ([1]) provides support for forestry measures through the rural development (RD) programmes for 2007-2013. Measures can be chosen by the Member States (MS) to enhance the role of forests. The Commission proposed a new RD regulation, currently being negotiated with the Council and the European Parliament ([2]), which includes measures for training, investments in infrastructure, in new forest technologies, in processing and marketing of forest products, and for improving the resilience of forests. It also allows for the creation of new forests or agroforestry systems, setting up of producer groups, cooperation, and Leader activities that could provide support for sustainable production of high quality pine resin.

During the 2007-2013, EFRD ([3]) provides support *inter alia* to productive investments that contribute to creating or maintaining jobs, through direct aid to the investments, and through measures that support regional and local development. These investments, financed through the operational programmes designed by the MS and approved by the Commission, can contribute to the development of the different production sectors (including resin) in coordination with what is being financed through the RD programmes.

As regards potential support for the industrial processing of resin, there may be possibilities within the implementation of Horizon 2020, the proposed EU's research and innovation framework programme for 2014-2020. In particular, under its Priority 2 (Societal Challenges), the theme which includes Sustainable Agriculture & the Bio-economy could offer scope for projects.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 of 20 September 2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD), OJ L 277 of 21.10.2005.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/legal-proposals/index_en.htm
([3]) Regulation (EC) No 1080/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 on the European Regional Development Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1783/1999, OJ L 210, 31.7.2006.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-011675/12
til Kommissionen
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(20. december 2012)

Om: EU's regler for økologiske fødevarer

Med vedtagelse af EU's fælles regler for økologisk husdyrproduktion i 1999, vedtog man en ordning, der tillod medlemsstater at indføre strengere krav til økologiske fødevarer end de fælles EU-regler (forordning (EØF) nr. 1804/99, betragtning 24). Denne ordning blev imidlertid fjernet med ikrafttrædelsen af Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 834/2007 og regler for implementering i Kommissionens forordning (EF) nr. 889/2008.

I praksis medfører dette, at lande med megen erfaring indenfor økologi forhindres i at videreudvikle kravene til økologiske fødevarer. Dette vil have alvorlige negative konsekvenser for økologiske fødevarers fremtid. Vi risikerer dermed, at økologi med tiden mister sin betydning for forbrugeren og sin værdi som miljøpolitisk redskab.

På baggrund af det ovenstående vil jeg derfor gerne stille følgende spørgsmål til Kommissionen:

Planlægger Kommissionen at foreslå regler, der muliggør, at medlemsstater kan fastsætte nationale regler med højere standarder for økologiske fødevarer sammenlignet med de nuværende fælles EU-regler, forudsat at sådanne regler i de enkelte medlemsstater hverken må forstyrre den frie grænseoverskridende handel i EU eller muligheden for europæiske producenter til at anvende den europæiske mærkningsordning for økologiske fødevarer?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Dacian Cioloş on
(13. februar 2013)

Kommissionens arbejdsprogram for 2013 omfatter en revision af de nuværende politiske og lovgivningsmæssige rammer for økologisk produktion, herunder af Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 834/2007 ([1]).

Til det formål er der indledt konsekvensvurdering, i forbindelse med hvilken mere end 90 interessenter er blevet interviewet, og der er iværksat en offentlig høring ([2]).

Kommissionen vil gennemgå resultaterne af disse konsultationer omhyggeligt. Den vil vurdere, hvilke muligheder der er for at opretholde høje EU-standarder for økologisk produktion og sikre gode og troværdige EU-rammer for både erhvervsdrivende i den økologiske sektor og forbrugere, der køber økologiske produkter.

([1]) Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 834/2007 af 28. juni 2007 om økologisk produktion og mærkning af økologiske produkter (EUT L 189 af 20.7.2007).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/consultations/organic/2013_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011675/12
to the Commission
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: EU rules on organic foodstuffs

With the adoption of the EU's common rules on organic livestock production in 1999, a system was in place which allowed Member States to apply stricter rules on organic foodstuffs than the common EU rules (Regulation (EEC) No 1804/99, Recital 24). However, that system was abolished by the entry into force of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 and the implementing rules in Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008.

In practice this means that countries with much experience in organic farming are prevented from raising the standards for organic foodstuffs. This will have a serious adverse impact on the future of such foodstuffs, and entails the risk that the 'organic' label will gradually lose its meaning for the consumer and its value as a tool of environmental policy.

In the light of the above, I should like to ask the following question:

Does the Commission intend to propose rules enabling Member States to set national rules imposing higher standards for organic foodstuffs as compared with the current common EU rules, provided that such rules in the individual Member States neither distort free cross-border trade within the EU nor hinder European producers from using the European labelling system for organic foodstuffs?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(13 February 2013)

The Commission work programme for 2013 includes a review of the current political and legislative framework for organic production in particular Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 ([1]).

To that end, an impact assessment has been initiated in the context of which more than 90 stakeholders have been interviewed and a public consultation has been launched ([2]).

The Commission will carefully analyse the results of the consultations. It will assess possible options to maintain a high EU organic production standard and to ensure a strong and credible EU framework for organic operators as well as consumers of organic products.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products (OJ L 189, 20.07.2007).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/consultations/organic/2013_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011676/12
an die Kommission
Anja Weisgerber (PPE)
(20. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Abgrenzung zwischen Kosmetikprodukt und Medizinprodukt bei Zahnbleichmitteln

Zahnbleichmittel werden zur kosmetischen Aufhellung verfärbter Zähne eingesetzt, wobei beispielsweise nach deutschem Recht und entsprechender deutscher Rechtsprechung Verfärbungen an Zähnen als Krankheit angesehen werden. Nach geltender Rechtslage ist für Hersteller, zuständige Behörden und benannte Stellen unklar, ob Zahnbleichmittel mit bis zu 6 Prozent Wasserstoffperoxid als Medizinprodukt im Sinn der Richtlinie 93/42/EG oder als Kosmetikprodukt im Sinn der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1223/2009 anzusehen sind.

Auf die zum gleichen Themenkomplex gestellte Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-1348/05 antwortete der damals zuständige Industriekommissar Verheugen, dass es den Mitgliedstaaten auf der Grundlage des Gemeinschaftsrechts obliege, festzulegen, ob die Medizinprodukte-Richtlinie oder aber die Rechtsvorschriften über Kosmetikprodukte anzuwenden sind. Seitdem ist jedoch die Richtlinie 2011/84/EU verabschiedet worden, wodurch sich gegebenenfalls die Rechtslage ändert.

1. Hat sich die Rechtslage durch das Inkrafttreten der Richtlinie 2011/84/EU am 31. Oktober 2012 geändert, da die Richtlinie explizit Einschränkungen und Anforderungen an den Einsatz von Zahnbleichmitteln mit einem Wasserstoffperoxidgehalt zwischen 0,1 und 6 % vorsieht?

2. Können Zahnbleichmittel mit einem Wasserstoffperoxidgehalt zwischen 0,1 und 6 % und einem bestimmungsgemäßen medizinischen Gebrauch aufgrund der Richtlinie 93/42/EG in den Verkehr gebracht werden?

3. Falls es durch die Richtlinie 2011/84/EU in den Augen der Kommission nicht mehr Klarheit über die Einstufung von Zahnbleichmitteln gibt: Wird die derzeit stattfindende Überarbeitung der Rechtsvorschriften über Medizinprodukte Einfluss auf die Einstufung von Zahnbleichmitteln haben?

4. Welcher Richtlinie werden Zahnbleichmittel mit einem Wasserstoffperoxidgehalt von mehr als 6 % zugeordnet?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(7. Februar 2013)

Zur Einstufung von Zahnbleichmitteln verweist die Kommission die Frau Abgeordnete auf die Antworten, die die Kommission zu den vorangegangenen schriftlichen Anfragen E-3629/95, E-1655/04, E-1594/04, E-2744/04 und E-1348/05 gegeben hat ([1]). Nach der Richtlinie 2011/84/EU ([2]) vom 20. September 2011 fallen Zahnaufheller und -bleichmittel in die Kategorie „Kosmetische Mittel".

Darüber hinaus wurden die für Medizinprodukte zuständigen nationalen Behörden kürzlich zur Einstufung der in Rede stehenden Produkte konsultiert, und sie haben erneut bestätigt, dass Zahnbleichmittel nicht als Medizinprodukte eingestuft werden können ([3]). Es war nicht die Absicht der Kommission, von diesem Ansatz abzuweichen, als sie ihren Vorschlag zur Änderung des EU-Rechtsrahmens für Medizinprodukte angenommen hat ([4]).

Da die zulässige Höchstkonzentration von Wasserstoffperoxid, die in Zahnaufhellern und -bleichmitteln enthalten sind oder daraus freigesetzt werden, nach der Kosmetik-Richtlinie ([5]) 6 % nicht überschreiten darf, sind Mittel, die diese Grenze überschreiten, auf dem EU-Binnenmarkt verboten.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Richtlinie 2011/84/EU des Rates vom 20. September 2011 zur Anpassung des Anhangs III der Richtlinie 76/768/EWG über kosmetische Mittel an den technischen Fortschritt (ABl. L 283 vom 29.10.2011, S. 36).
([3]) Leitfaden für Grenzfälle und Klassifizierung im EU-Rechtsrahmen für Medizinprodukte, Ausgabe 1.13: Manual on Borderline and Classification in the Community Regulatory Framework for Medical Devices, Version 1.13:. http://ec.europa.eu/health/medical-devices/files/wg_minutes_member_lists/borderline_manual_ol_en.pdf
([4]) KOM(2012)542 endg. vom 26. September 2012.
([5]) Richtlinie 76/768/EWG des Rates vom 27. Juli 1976 zur Angleichung der Rechtsvorschriften der Mitgliedstaaten über kosmetische Mittel (ABl. L 262 vom 27.9.1976, S. 169).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011676/12
to the Commission
Anja Weisgerber (PPE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Distinction between cosmetic products and medical devices in the case of tooth-bleaching products

Tooth-bleaching products are used to cosmetically brighten discoloured teeth, and the discolouration of teeth is, for example, considered a disease under German law and corresponding German jurisprudence. Under current law, it is not clear for manufacturers, competent authorities and notified bodies whether tooth-bleaching products containing up to 6% hydrogen peroxide should be considered as medical devices under Directive 93/42/EC or as cosmetic products within the meaning of Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009.

In his answer to Written Question E-1348/05 on the same topic, Mr Verheugen, who was Commissioner for Industry at the time, replied that it was for the Member States to establish on the basis of Community legislation whether the Medical Devices Directive or the provisions of the Cosmetics Directive should apply. The legal position may, however, have changed with the subsequent adoption of Directive 2011/84/EU.

1. Has the legal position changed with the entry into force of Directive 2011/84/EU on 31 October 2012, as the directive makes explicit provision for restrictions and requirements concerning the use of tooth-bleaching products containing between 0.1 and 6% hydrogen peroxide?

2. Can tooth-bleaching products that contain between 0.1 and 6% hydrogen peroxide and are intended for medical use on the basis of Directive 93/42/EC be placed on the market?

3. If the Commission should consider that directive 2011/84/EU provides no greater clarity about the classification of tooth-bleaching products, will the current review of the legislation on medical devices influence the classification of tooth-bleaching products?

4. Which Directive covers tooth-bleaching products containing over 6% hydrogen peroxide?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(7 February 2013)

For its position in relation to the qualification of tooth whitening products, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its replies to previous written questions E-3629/95, E-1655/04, E-1594/04, E-2744/04, and E-1348/05 ([1]). Directive 2011/84/EU ([2]), adopted on 20 September 2011, confirmed that tooth whitening or bleaching products belong to the category of cosmetic products.

Moreover, national competent authorities in the field of medical devices were recently consulted on the qualification of the products in question and confirmed, once again, that tooth-whitening products cannot be qualified as medical devices ([3]). The Commission had no intention to depart from this approach when adopting its proposal to revise the medical device legislation ([4]).

Considering that under the Cosmetics Directive ([5]) the maximum allowed limit of hydrogen peroxide, present or released, in tooth whitening or bleaching products is 6%, products containing more than this limit are prohibited on the European market.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Council Directive 2011/84/EU of 20 September 2011 amending Directive 76/768/EEC, concerning cosmetic products, for the purpose of adapting Annex III thereto to technical progress, OJ L 283, 29.10.2011, p. 36.
([3]) Manual on Borderline and Classification in the Community Regulatory Framework for Medical Devices, Version 1.13 (http://ec.europa.eu/health/medical-devices/files/wg_minutes_member_lists/borderline_manual_ol_en.pdf).
([4]) COM(2012) 542 final adopted on 26 September 2012.
([5]) Council Directive 76/768/EEC of 27 July 1976 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products, OJ L 262, 27.9.1976, p. 169.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011677/12
an die Kommission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(20. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Rolle eines nationalen schwedischen Sachverständigen bei von OLAF durchgeführten Untersuchungen

In der Angelegenheit Dalli hat ein schwedisches Unternehmen eine Beschwerde gegen Kommissionsmitglied Dalli eingereicht. Dieses Unternehmen gibt an, im Zusammenhang mit dem Fall Kontakte zur schwedischen Regierung gehabt zu haben.

1. Worin bestand die Aufgabe des zu OLAF abgeordneten nationalen schwedischen Sachverständigen, der an den Gesprächen mit den betreffenden Personen teilnahm?

2. Weshalb war der nationale schwedische Sachverständige, der damals für OLAF arbeitete, bei den Gesprächen mit den betreffenden Personen anwesend?

3. Von welcher Position in der schwedischen Regierung war der nationale Sachverständige zu OLAF abgeordnet?

Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission
(31. Mai 2013)

1./2. Ein abgeordneter schwedischer Sachverständiger gehörte dem Team an, das mit der Untersuchung der Sache beauftragt war. Er hat allerdings nicht an Gesprächen mit betroffenen Personen teilgenommen.

3. Seit 2011 ist ein nationaler schwedischer Sachverständiger an das OLAF abgeordnet. Er war vorher bei der Schwedischen Behörde für Wirtschaftskriminalität als Staatsanwalt tätig.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011677/12
to the Commission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Role of a Swedish national expert in OLAF investigations

In the Dalli case a Swedish company launched a complaint against Commissioner Dalli. This company declares that it had contact with the Swedish Government in relation to the case.

1. What was the role of the Swedish national expert seconded to OLAF who took part in interviews with the persons concerned?

2. Why was the Swedish national expert, who was working for OLAF at the time, present during interviews with the persons concerned?

3. From which position in the Swedish Government was the national expert seconded to OLAF?

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

1 and 2. A Swedish seconded national expert was one of the associated investigators of the team to which the case was assigned. Nevertheless, he did not participate in any of the interviews with the persons concerned.

3. A Swedish National Expert has been seconded to OLAF since 2011. He comes from the Swedish economic crime Authority where he was a prosecutor.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011678/12
aan de Commissie
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)
(20 december 2012)

Betreft: Misbruik van EU-middelen in Tsjechië

Op 20 december 2012 heeft het Nederlandse dagblad *Trouw* op zijn voorpagina bericht over het ernstige misbruik van EU-middelen in de Tsjechische Republiek. In het artikel wordt vermeld dat de Commissie de fondsen voor Tsjechië met 450 miljoen EUR heeft gekort wegens de tekortkomingen van de betaal- en controlesystemen in de Tsjechische Republiek. Voorts wordt er uitgeweid over speciale verslagen van de Commissie en de Europese Rekenkamer waarin de slechte werking van de betaal- en controleorganen in de Tsjechische Republiek gedetailleerder wordt geanalyseerd. Er worden specifieke terug te vorderen bedragen en gevallen van fraude vermeld.

1. Zal de Commissie naast de tijdens de hoorzitting met de viceminister voor Financiën van de Tsjechische Republiek, de heer Miroslav Matej, van 27 november 2012 in de Commissie begrotingscontrole ingewonnen informatie en de informatie in de jaarlijkse activiteitenverslagen van de Commissie haar speciale onderzoeken en verslagen over het misbruik van EU-middelen in Tsjechië beschikbaar stellen?

2. Kan de Commissie de exacte bedragen geven die gecorrigeerd worden en de bedragen die van de Tsjechische Republiek teruggevorderd worden en zeggen voor welke programma's en of deze bedragen in nieuwe projecten worden geïnvesteerd?

3. Heeft de Commissie fraude ontdekt bij het misbruik van EU-gelden in Tsjechië en, zo ja, om welke bedragen gaat het?

4. Kan de Commissie ook informatie verschaffen over de relevante bevindingen van de Europese Rekenkamer, die blijkbaar heeft vastgesteld dat de foutenmarge in de Tsjechische Republiek in sommige gevallen 100 % bedroeg?

5. Welke maatregelen zal de Commissie in samenwerking met de Tsjechische autoriteiten nemen om deze praktijk een halt toe te roepen?

6. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat met dit Tsjechisch geval eens te meer wordt aangetoond dat de lidstaten de controlesystemen steeds meer ondermijnen door de misbruiken van EU-middelen te verhullen?

Antwoord van de heer Hahn namens de Commissie
(26 februari 2013)

1. De Commissie brengt geen geheime verslagen uit maar normale controleverslagen die vertrouwelijk worden behandeld totdat de follow-up van de contradictoire procedure is afgerond. Daarna kunnen ze in overeenstemming met Verordening (EG) nr. 1049/2001 ([1]) worden geraadpleegd.

2. De financiële correctie bedraagt voor de programma's Vervoer en Milieu circa 450 miljoen EUR. De gecorrigeerde bedragen kunnen binnen dezelfde programma's worden geïnvesteerd in nieuwe projecten waar geen sprake is van onregelmatigheden.

3. De vastgestelde onregelmatigheden houden geen verband met fraude.

4. In sommige gevallen stelde de Europese Rekenkamer in door haar gecontroleerde afzonderlijke projecten een foutenpercentage van 100 % vast. Bij de vaststelling van de met de Tsjechische autoriteiten overeengekomen correcties op programmaniveau is met deze bevindingen rekening gehouden.

5. In aanvulling op de tenuitvoerlegging van de correcties hebben de Commissie en de Tsjechische autoriteiten overeenstemming bereikt over een aantal verbeteringen van het functioneren van het Tsjechische beheers- en controlesysteem. De Tsjechische autoriteiten hebben deze verbeteringen in de loop van 2012 naar behoren doorgevoerd, waardoor de Commissie de betalingen voor de meeste programma's kon hervatten. De Commissie zal doorgaan met het toezicht houden op, en het evalueren en controleren van de voortgang van de uitvoering van de programma's in Tsjechië, zoals zij dit in alle lidstaten doet.

([1]) Verordening (EG) nr. 1049/2001 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 30 mei 2001 inzake de toegang van het publiek tot documenten van het Europees Parlement, de Raad en de Commissie, PB L 145 van 31.5.2001.

6. De Commissie is het er niet mee eens dat er sprake is geweest van enige verhulling. Er waren echter tekortkomingen in de beheers- en controlesystemen met betrekking tot de opsporing en behandeling van onregelmatigheden. De geconstateerde fouten zijn gecorrigeerd en de controlesystemen zijn versterkt om herhaling te voorkomen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011678/12
to the Commission
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Misuse of EU funds in the Czech Republic

On 20 December 2012, the Dutch newspaper *Trouw* carried a front-page report on the severe misuse of EU funds in the Czech Republic. The report states that EUR 450 million is being held back by the Commission as a result of the malfunctioning of payment and control systems in the Czech Republic. It further elaborates on special reports by the Commission and the European Court of Auditors which analyse in more detail the malfunctioning of payment and control agencies in the Czech Republic. It mentions specific amounts to be recovered as well as cases of fraud.

1. In addition to the information gained during the hearing of 27 November 2012 in the Committee on Budgetary Control with the Deputy Minister of Finance of the Czech Republic, Miroslav Matej, and the information contained in the Commission's annual activity reports, will the Commission make available its special investigations and reports on the misuse of EU funds in the Czech Republic?

2. Can the Commission state the exact amounts that are being corrected and recovered from the Czech Republic, and for which programmes, and whether these amounts will be invested in new projects?

3. Did the Commission find fraud to be part of the misuse of EU funds in the Czech Republic and, if so, what are the amounts involved?

4. Can the Commission also provide information about the relevant findings of the European Court of Auditors, which apparently established that the error rate in the Czech Republic may have been as high as 100% in some cases?

5. What measures will the Commission take in conjunction with the Czech authorities in order to stop this practice?

6. Does the Commission agree that the Czech case shows once again that Member States are increasingly undermining control systems by covering up misuses of EU funds?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 2013)

1. The Commission does not issue secret reports but ordinary audit reports which are treated as confidential until the follow up of the contradictory procedure is finalised. They can then be accessed in line with the regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 ([1]).

2. EUR 450 million is the approximate amount of the financial correction for the Transport and Environment programmes. The corrected amounts can be invested in new projects in the same programmes which are not affected by irregularities.

3. The irregularities detected are not related to fraud.

4. In some cases, the ECA quantified errors at 100% in relation to public procurement irregularities for individual projects which the Court audited. These findings have been taken into account when establishing the programme-level corrections that have been agreed with the Czech authorities.

5. In addition to the corrections being implemented, the Commission and the Czech authorities agreed on a series of improvements to be made to the functioning of the Czech management and control system. The Czech authorities implemented these improvements satisfactorily in the course of 2012, allowing the Commission to restart payments to most programmes. The Commission will continue to monitor, check and audit progress of programme implementation in the Czech Republic, as it does for all Member States.

6. The Commission does not agree that there was any cover up. Instead, there were deficiencies in the management and control systems in terms of detecting and treating irregularities. The errors identified have been corrected and the control systems have been strengthened to prevent a repeat.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents, OJ L 145, 31.5.2001.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011679/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(20 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: Sostegno alla Tunisia

L'UE ha deciso lo stanziamento di 107 milioni di euro al governo tunisino come contributo a sostegno del programma di sviluppo che dovrebbe permettere, insieme ai prestiti di 500 milioni di euro ciascuno della Banca mondiale e della Banca africana di sviluppo, di far quadrare i conti pubblici di quest'anno.

Questo programma — afferma il comunicato diffuso — aiuta il governo a intraprendere riforme per stimolare l'economia e creare istituzioni democratiche, nonché il consolidamento dello Stato di diritto. È indubbio che queste finalità sono ottime e rappresentano un valido traguardo per la realizzazione di quella che è stata chiamata la «primavera araba».

Può la Commissione far sapere

1. chi eserciterà una funzione di monitoraggio e di controllo sulle finalità previste per lo sviluppo della democrazia;

2. se lo stanziamento del contributo prevede anche un limite temporale per il raggiungimento di questo obiettivo;

3. se, in caso d'inadempienza, sono previste clausole alternative?

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

1. e 2. L'interrogazione riguarda l'importo destinato alla Tunisia nell'ambito di un programma di sostegno al bilancio istituito nel 2011, dopo la rivoluzione, e prorogato nel 2012, volto a promuovere la ripresa economica nel paese. Come per tutte le operazioni di sostegno al bilancio, la convenzione di finanziamento firmata con le autorità specifica un certo numero di misure che le autorità devono adottare per consentire l'esborso delle tranche finanziarie corrispondenti; l'accordo contiene anche una serie di indicatori e un calendario per l'attuazione delle varie misure. In questo caso specifico, le misure concordate devono essere attuate entro 48 mesi. I progressi del governo tunisino nell'attuazione del programma sono monitorati congiuntamente dall'UE, dalla Banca mondiale e dalla Banca africana di sviluppo.

3. Qualora le misure non siano realizzate correttamente entro il termine stabilito, il pagamento della tranche finanziaria corrispondente viene ritardato fino alla loro attuazione. Nel frattempo si continua a dialogare con le autorità per garantire la corretta attuazione delle misure concordate. In caso di mancata attuazione delle misure prima dello scadere della convenzione di finanziamento, il pagamento corrispondente non sarà eseguito.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011679/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Support for Tunisia

The EU has decided to grant EUR 107 million to the Tunisian Government as a contribution in support of its development programme, which, together with the loans of EUR 500 million each granted by the World Bank and the African Development Bank, should enable the country to balance its books this year.

According to the press release, this programme will help the government to undertake reforms to stimulate the economy and establish democratic institutions, as well as to consolidate the rule of law. These aims are undoubtedly excellent and constitute a valid goal for what has been called the 'Arab Spring'.

1. Can the Commission say who will monitor the stated aims relating to the development of democracy?

2. Does the allocation of the grant also provide for a time limit within which this goal has to be achieved?

3. Should the country fail to fulfil its obligations, has any provision been made for alternative clauses?

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

1 and 2. The question concerns the amount allocated to Tunisia in the framework of a budget support programme, put into place in 2011, after the Revolution, and renewed in 2012, with the objective of supporting economic recovery in Tunisia. As for each budget support operation, the financing agreement signed with the authorities specifies a number of measures which the authorities are committed to take to enable the disbursement of the relevant financial tranches; the agreement also includes a certain number of indicators and a timetable for the implementation of the different measures. In this specific case, the measures agreed have to be implemented within 48 months. Monitoring of progress made by the Tunisian Government in implementing this programme is done jointly by the EU, the World Bank and the African Development Bank.

3. If the measures are not satisfactory taken by the agreed deadline, the payment of the relevant financial tranche is delayed until the measures are met. In the meantime, the dialogue with the authorities continues, with the objective of ensuring a proper implementation of the agreed measures. If the measures are not taken by the end of the duration of the financing agreement, the corresponding payment will not be executed.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011680/12
to the Commission
Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Implementation of the Floods Directive

Can the Commission clarify what impact the full implementation of the Floods Directive (2007/60/EC) after 2015 would have on the situation of petitioner Noeleen McManus (Petition 0385-11 to the European Parliament), where a high-density building project is due to be built in an acknowledged flood risk area? Can the Commission also clarify what extra obligations will apply to Ireland in this case? Is there any further EU legislation that would impact on the decision to grant planning permission, and could the Commission intervene in any way, even in an advisory role?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

The Commission does not comment on individual petitions in the context of replies to parliamentary questions.

Insofar as general implications for Member States are concerned, the Floods Directive requires that flood hazard and flood risk maps are published by 22 December 2013, indicating clearly the different flood scenarios in areas of potentially significant flood risk. By 22 December 2015, Member States must prepare and publish flood risk management plans. Although construction in potentially floodable areas is not prohibited by the directive, such areas need to be identified in publicly available flood hazard and risk maps. The directive furthermore requires Member States to ensure a strategy is in place and measures are taken in order to reduce adverse consequences of floods for human health, economic activities, the environment and cultural heritage in those areas. A requirement that may be additional in some Member States is to consult interested parties, such as the public, on flood risk management plans.

The directive on 'Environmental Impact Assessment' (2011/92/EC) ([1]) may be applicable for certain public or private projects, and the directive on 'Strategic Environmental Assessment' (2001/42/EC) ([2]), for certain plans and programmes. If the built project can influence the status of a water body, Article 4.7 of Directive 2000/60/EC may also apply ([3]). Planning permissions are matters of national competence; it belongs to the Member States to ensure that the selected and approved plans and projects comply with the applicable EU environmental legislation. The Commission has in principle no competence to intervene, unless there is a breach of EC law.

([1]) OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.
([2]) OJ L 197, 21.7.2001.
([3]) OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011681/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 décembre 2012)

Objet: Classification des substances chimiques dangereuses pour le consommateur: quid du panel?

Un projet de réglementation européenne pour évaluer et classifier des substances chimiques potentiellement toxiques et suspectées de perturber le système hormonal est en route.

Après un premier rapport en janvier 2012 de la direction générale chargée de l'environnement, c'est l'EFSA, sous la tutelle de la direction générale de la santé et du consommateur (DG SANCO), qui s'empare de la délicate mission d'établir une définition et une ébauche de classification des perturbateurs endocriniens.

À terme, cela pourrait signifier l'interdiction de nombreuses substances utilisées dans l'industrie au-delà du cadre strictement alimentaire.

Le débat scientifique entourant la caractérisation des perturbateurs endocriniens est fondamental pour l'évolution des normes liées à la toxicité des produits de consommation. Les perturbateurs endocriniens (PE) sont des molécules xénobiotiques, des polluants chimiques interférant avec le système hormonal humain. Leurs effets toxiques, en particulier à très faible dose, sont étudiés depuis les années 90.

1. Quelle est la position de la Commission sur l'hypothèse des endocrinologues qui affirment que ces substances jouent un rôle majeur dans le développement de maladies comme le diabète, l'obésité ou encore certains cancers?

2. Comment est composé le panel chargé de statuer sur la classification des perturbateurs endocriniens et leurs risques?

3. La journaliste indépendante Stéphane Horel affirme, dans son article, que huit des experts sur les dix-huit du groupe sont en conflits d'intérêts pour leurs liens avec l'industrie, dont trois avec le lobby agroalimentaire ILSI. Toujours selon ce même article, seulement quatre experts ont une expérience significative dans le domaine des perturbateurs endocriniens, et d'après le réseau *Pesticides action Europe*, quinze de ces experts sont considérés comme «non actifs» pour n'avoir publié que très peu d'articles scientifiques ces cinq dernières années. Qu'en est-il?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(13 février 2013)

1. La Commission a financé une importante étude intitulée «State of the Art of the Assessment of Endocrine Disruptors» ([1]) (dernières avancées en matière d'évaluation des perturbateurs endocriniens) afin d'examiner, entre autres, les preuves scientifiques les plus récentes d'une corrélation entre l'exposition à des perturbateurs endocriniens et des effets néfastes pour la santé humaine et l'environnement. La Commission a organisé une conférence de l'Union européenne sur les perturbateurs endocriniens ([2]) pour discuter de l'état des connaissances scientifiques et fixer des objectifs politiques appropriés. La Commission est actuellement en train de réexaminer et de réviser la stratégie communautaire existante concernant les perturbateurs endocriniens ([3]) pour qu'elle reflète les derniers progrès scientifiques et les modifications récentes du cadre réglementaire.

2. Conformément au règlement concernant les produits phytopharmaceutiques et au règlement relatif aux produits biocides, il appartient à la Commission de spécifier les critères scientifiques pour la détermination des propriétés perturbant le système endocrinien. Afin d'offrir un contexte d'échange d'informations ouvert et transparent et de bénéficier d'orientations sur divers aspects relatifs aux perturbateurs endocriniens (notamment les critères à fixer), la Commission a mis en place deux groupes de consultation. L'un cible les questions politiques, l'autre les questions techniques et scientifiques. Les groupes sont composés de représentants politiques et techniques des services compétents de la Commission, des agences européennes, des États membres, des associations sectorielles et des organisations non gouvernementales. En outre, la Commission a demandé à l'EFSA de rendre, en collaboration avec l'Agence européenne des médicaments et avec les comités scientifiques de la Commission, un avis sur les risques que posent les perturbateurs endocriniens pour la santé humaine et l'environnement.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/endocrine/documents/studies_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/endocrine/index_en.htm
([3]) COM(1999)706.

3. L'Honorable Parlementaire est invité à consulter la réponse de la Commission à la question écrite nº P 011702/2012 ([4]).

([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011681/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Classification of substances which are dangerous for the consumer: concerns regarding the panel

Plans are under way for a European regulation to evaluate and classify potentially toxic chemicals suspected of disrupting the hormonal system.

Following an initial report in January 2012 by the Directorate-General for the Environment, the EFSA, which is attached to the Directorate-General for Health and Consumers (DG SANCO), has taken over the delicate task of establishing a definition and an outline for classification of endocrine disruptors.

This could ultimately lead to a ban on many substances used in the industry outside the strict context of food.

The scientific debate surrounding the characterisation of endocrine disruptors is crucial to the development of standards for the toxicity of consumer products. Endocrine disruptors (EDs) are xenobiotic molecules, chemical pollutants which interfere with the human hormonal system. Their toxic effects, particularly in very low doses, have been studied since the 1990s.

1. What is the Commission's position as regards the hypothesis put forward by endocrinologists claiming that these substances play a major role in the development of illnesses such as diabetes, obesity or even some cancers?

2. What is the composition of the panel responsible for deciding on the classification of endocrine disruptors and the risks they pose?

3. The freelance journalist Stéphane Horel has written an article claiming that eight of the eighteen experts in the group have a conflict of interest because of their ties with the industry, including three who are involved with the agri-food lobby ILSI. According to this same article, only four of the experts have any significant experience in the area of endocrine disruptors, and according to the network *Pesticides action Europe* fifteen of these experts are no longer considered to be actively involved in the field because they have published only very few scientific articles in the last five years. What is the situation?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(13 February 2013)

1. The Commission financed a major study entitled 'State of the art of the assessment of endocrine disruptors' ([1]) to review, *inter alia*, the latest scientific evidence for associations between exposure to endocrine disruptors and adverse effects to human health and the environment. The Commission organised an EU conference on endocrine disruptors ([2]) to discuss the state of the science and to identify appropriate policy objectives. The Commission is currently reviewing and revising the existing Community Strategy for Endocrine Disruptors ([3]) with a view to adapting the strategy to reflect the latest scientific progress and changes in regulatory framework.

2. Pursuant to the regulation for Plant Protection Products and the regulation for Biocidal Products, it is the Commission who is required to develop the scientific criteria for the determination of endocrine disrupting properties. In order to provide an open and transparent forum for information exchange and get orientation on various aspects of endocrine disruptors, including the criteria, the Commission established two consultation groups. One is focused on policy issues and the other on technical and scientific issues. The groups are comprised of policy and technical representatives of relevant Commission services, European Agencies, Member States, industry associations and non-governmental organisations. In addition, the Commission has requested EFSA, in collaboration with the European Medicines Agency (EMA) and the Commission Scientific Committees, to provide an opinion on the human-health and environmental risks of endocrine disruptors.

3. The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the Commission's reply to Written Question P-011702/2012 ([4]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/endocrine/documents/studies_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/endocrine/index_en.htm
([3]) COM(1999) 706.
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011682/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 décembre 2012)

Objet: Accord commercial entre l'Union européenne et la Palestine

L'Europe se lie commercialement avec divers pays ou groupes de pays à travers le monde. Ces dernières semaines, elle s'est engagée avec Israël, la Russie, le Pérou, la Colombie, la Corée entre autres et compte le faire avec le Canada et le Japon d'ici peu.

Un accord commercial avec la Palestine est-il envisagé par la Commission?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(5 février 2013)

Un accord d'association euro-méditerranéen intérimaire de commerce et de coopération a été conclu en 1997 entre l'Union européenne et l'Organisation de libération de la Palestine (OLP), au nom de l'Autorité palestinienne. Cet accord prévoit l'accès en franchise de droits des produits industriels palestiniens aux marchés de l'Union et un démantèlement tarifaire des exportations de celle-ci à destination de la Palestine, démantèlement échelonné sur une période de cinq ans. Un accord visant à renforcer la libéralisation des produits agricoles, produits agricoles transformés, poissons et produits de la pêche est entré en vigueur le 1er janvier 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011682/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Trade agreement between the European Union and Palestine

The European Union has trade links with various countries or groups of countries throughout the world. In recent weeks it has signed agreements with, for example, Israel, Russia, Peru, Colombia and Korea and it is intending to do so with Canada and Japan in the near future.

Is the Commission considering a trade agreement with Palestine?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(5 February 2013)

An Interim Association Agreement on Trade and Cooperation was concluded between the EU and the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) on behalf of the Palestinian Authority in 1997. The agreement provides for duty-free access to EU markets for Palestinian industrial goods, and a phase-out of tariffs on EU exports to Palestine over five years. An Agreement for further liberalisation of agricultural products, processed agricultural products and fish and fishery products entered into force on 1 January 2012.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011683/12
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(20 décembre 2012)

Objet: Pour un mécanisme d'inclusion carbone aux frontières de l'Union européenne

L'Europe doit conserver le leadership des efforts de réduction des émissions. Mais elle ne le fera pas en avançant seule contre tous. Elle le fera en structurant un véritable marché mondial à cette fin, avec des solutions novatrices et adaptées aux besoins de tous.

En effet, si l'Europe s'engage seule dans la lutte contre les émissions, c'est son industrie et sa compétitivité qu'elle met en péril. Sans efforts comparables de la part de ses partenaires, elle risque de voir ses produits perdre en compétitivité sur le marché mondial, voire ses emplois se délocaliser. Ce serait une double peine: pour les emplois européens, et pour ses objectifs de lutte contre le changement climatique.

L'objectif du système d'échange des quotas d'émissions est de limiter les émissions globales de gaz à effet de serre, pas de taxer les entreprises européennes. L'Europe doit concentrer son action sur la réduction des émissions globales et empêcher ses concurrents de tirer avantage de leur refus de participer à ce système. Le mécanisme d'inclusion carbone, plus communément connu sous le nom de taxe carbone aux frontières, doit rétablir un équilibre et inciter nos partenaires à réduire leurs émissions.

Très concrètement, il doit permettre à nos produits de jouer à armes égales avec les produits importés de pays moins vertueux. Le Parlement européen s'est exprimé en faveur de ce mécanisme à deux reprises en 2010 et en 2011.

La Commission a déjà exprimé des réticences à ce sujet. Mais cette position n'est plus tenable. Elle doit aujourd'hui prendre des mesures fortes pour faire respecter nos exigences en termes de réciprocité. Envisage-t-elle de lancer une réflexion et des actions concrètes vers la mise en œuvre d'un mécanisme d'inclusion carbone aux frontières européennes?

Réponse donnée par Mme Hedegaard au nom de la Commission
(20 février 2013)

L'Union européenne a opté pour l'utilisation de quotas gratuits et l'accès aux crédits internationaux afin de réduire le risque de fuite de carbone pour ses industries à forte consommation d'énergie. Elle aurait en effet également pu envisager d'inclure, dans le système européen d'échange de quotas d'émission, les importations dans l'Union de biens à forte intensité d'énergie. La Commission a étudié cette option et a conclu qu'une telle taxe carbone aux frontières ne serait pas compatible avec le système d'allocation à titre gratuit, car elle entraînerait une double protection et des effets d'aubaine abusifs.

Des mesures visant à mettre en place une taxe carbone aux frontières soulèveraient en outre un certain nombre de questions pratiques (par exemple, concernant le mode de calcul du nombre de quotas que les importateurs auraient à acheter, la manière de rembourser les exportateurs pour l'achat de quotas ou la façon de contrôler/vérifier le procédé de fabrication dans les pays tiers).

L'analyse a aussi montré que des mesures aux frontières, telles que la taxe carbone aux frontières, pourraient se révéler incompatibles avec les règles de l'OMC et pourraient être perçues par certains comme contraires au principe des responsabilités communes mais différenciées de la Convention-cadre des Nations unies sur les changements climatiques. Par conséquent, dans le contexte d'une taxe carbone aux frontières, le risque de représailles et de conflits commerciaux avec les pays tiers sont également à prendre en considération.

La mise en œuvre des mesures prévues par le législateur dans le paquet «Climat et énergie», à savoir l'allocation à titre gratuit, se poursuit. La Commission continuera cependant à veiller au caractère adéquat du système actuel d'allocation à titre gratuit, tout en conservant la possibilité d'instaurer une taxe carbone aux frontières parmi les outils à sa disposition.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011683/12
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Carbon inclusion mechanism at the borders of the European Union

Europe must continue to lead the way in reducing emissions. But it cannot do so by forging ahead alone. It can achieve this goal by structuring a truly global market for this purpose, with innovative solutions designed to suit the needs of all.

If Europe attempts to tackle emissions alone, it will be putting its industry and its competitiveness at risk. Without comparable efforts from its partners, Europe's products could become less competitive on the global market and its jobs could even be relocated. Europe would then suffer on two fronts: its jobs and its climate change objectives.

The objective of the emissions trading scheme is to limit global greenhouse gas emissions, not to tax European businesses. Europe must focus on reducing global emissions and ensuring that its competitors do not benefit from refusing to participate in this scheme. The carbon inclusion mechanism, more commonly known as a carbon border tax, needs to redress the balance and motivate our partners to reduce their emissions.

Specifically, it must ensure that our products can compete on a level playing field with products imported from less virtuous countries. The European Parliament has twice expressed its support for this mechanism, in 2010 and in 2011.

The Commission has already expressed reservations concerning this issue. However, this position is no longer tenable. The Commission must take strong action right away to ensure compliance with our requirements in terms of reciprocity. Is it considering initiating discussions and specific steps towards implementing a carbon inclusion mechanism at Europe's borders?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2013)

The EU has opted for the use of free allowances and access to international credits as measures to reduce the risk of carbon leakage for its energy intensive industry. A further option could indeed have been to also include, in the EU ETS, imports of energy intensive goods into the EU. The Commission studied this option and found out that such a carbon border tax would not be compatible with the system of free allocation as it would lead to double protection and unjustified windfall profits.

Carbon border tax measures would also pose a number of practical issues (e.g. how to calculate the amount of allowances that the importers would need to purchase, or how to reimburse exporters for buying allowances, or how to monitor/verify the manufacturing process in third countries).

The analysis also showed that border measures, such as the carbon border tax are in potential conflict with the WTO rulebook and could be perceived by some as contrary to the UNFCCC principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. Therefore in the context of a carbon border tax, the risk of retaliation and trade conflicts with third countries shall also be considered.

The implementation of the measures foreseen by the legislator in the climate and energy package, namely free allocation, continues. The Commission will however keep monitoring the adequacy of the current system of free allocation, while retaining the possibility of border carbon tax as one of the available possible options/tools in the toolbox.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011684/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(20 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: Utilizzo di armamenti radioattivi in attività militari e rischio per la salute umana nell'Unione europea

Nel mese di dicembre hanno perso la vita il Tenente Colonnello Gianluca Tessari, di Motta di Livenza (TV), appena quarantenne, malato di leucemia, e il Primo Maresciallo Paolo Marchi, cinquantenne originario di Rimini ma in servizio a Villafranca (VR), afflitto da tumore al pancreas; entrambi appartenevano all'Aeronautica Militare Italiana e avevano prestato servizio in passato nelle missioni militari italiane compiute nei territori dell'ex Jugoslavia, nel corso delle quali sono stati notoriamente impiegati armamenti all'uranio impoverito.

Secondo quanto riferito dall'associazione italiana Anavafaf ([1]), a partire dal 1991 i casi accertati di contaminazione di militari italiani da uranio impoverito e altri agenti patogeni sarebbero 3761, dei quali ben 698 relativi a personale che ha partecipato a missioni all'estero, mentre nella maggior parte dei restanti casi i militari avrebbero operato in poligoni italiani ove si svolgono attività di sperimentazione sugli armamenti.

Le attività di tali poligoni, inoltre, potrebbero essere fonte di rischio di contaminazione radioattiva anche per la popolazione civile residente nei relativi territori.

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

1. se è a conoscenza del numero dei decessi di militari e civili italiani, e degli altri Stati membri, che potrebbero essere legati a contaminazione radioattiva dovuta all'uso di armamenti militari;

2. se non ritiene utile monitorare le decisioni e i provvedimenti adottati dai servizi sanitari dei singoli Stati membri, in relazione ai casi citati, a tutela della salute degli addetti delle Forze Armate;

3. se non ritiene opportuno monitorare e studiare l'impatto che le attività svolte nei poligoni militari dell'Unione europea potrebbero avere sulla salute umana e animale, sulla falda acquifera sotterranea e sull'ambiente circostante;

4. se ha effettuato una mappatura dei siti dell'Unione europea contaminati da radiazioni per cause diverse da quelle dovute alla produzione di energia elettrica tramite centrali nucleari?

Risposta di Joe Borg a nome della Commissione
(25 febbraio 2013)

Il trattato che istituisce la Comunità europea dell'energia atomica (Euratom) e il diritto derivato non si applicano ad attività e pratiche di natura militare ([2]).

Il monitoraggio del grado di radioattività dell'atmosfera, delle acque e del suolo è responsabilità nazionale. Spetta parimente agli Stati membri garantire la conformità alle norme di sicurezza in vigore ([3]), consentire il monitoraggio e fornire l'assistenza appropriata ai civili nazionali e al personale militare esposti.

Gli Stati membri informano la Commissione in merito ai livelli di radioattività ambientale a norma dell'articolo 36 del trattato Euratom. I dati contenuti nella banca dati della Commissione relativa al monitoraggio della radioattività ambientale non indicano la presenza di contaminazione radioattiva diversa da quella associata alle attività di produzione di energia negli impianti nucleari.

Analogamente sono di competenza degli Stati membri il recepimento, l'attuazione e l'esecuzione delle disposizioni finalizzate a tutelare i lavoratori contro i rischi sul posto di lavoro, segnatamente in ottemperanza alla direttiva 89/391/CEE ([4]). Il campo d'applicazione di tale direttiva comporta peraltro eccezioni di portata limitata in relazione ad alcune attività specifiche nel pubblico impiego.

([1]) Associazione Nazionale Assistenza Vittime Arruolate nelle Forze Armate.
([2]) Causa C-65/04 del 9 marzo 2006, Commissione contro Regno Unito.
([3]) Articolo 35 del trattato Euratom.
([4]) Direttiva 89/391/CEE del Consiglio, del 12 giugno 1989, concernente l'attuazione di misure volte a promuovere il miglioramento della sicurezza e della salute dei lavoratori durante il lavoro (GU L 183 del 29.6.1989).

Per quanto riguarda le munizioni contenenti uranio impoverito, è in corso un dibattito sulla loro presunta incidenza sulla salute umana e sull'ambiente. In base agli studi finora effettuati da agenzie specializzate internazionali non è ancora stato scientificamente provato un collegamento tra l'uso dell'uranio impoverito nei teatri operativi ed eventuali danni per la salute umana. Alcune relazioni ed altri studi autorevoli hanno tuttavia sottolineato la necessità di continuare a monitorare gli effetti a lungo termine dell'uranio impoverito sugli gli esseri umani e sull'ambiente.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011684/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Use of radioactive weapons in military activities and risk to human health in the EU

In December, 40-year-old Lieutenant Colonel Gianluca Tessari, from Motta di Livenza (TV), died of leukaemia and 50-year-old First Marshal Paolo Marchi, from Rimini but serving in Villafranca (VR), died of pancreatic cancer. Both men had been members of the Italian Air Force and had served in Italian military missions carried out in the territories of the former Yugoslavia, during which depleted uranium (DU) weapons were notoriously used.

As reported by the Italian association *Anavafaf* ([1]), since 1991 there have apparently been 3 761 confirmed cases of Italian soldiers being contaminated by depleted uranium and other pathogens, 698 of which relating to personnel who had taken part in missions abroad, while in most of the remaining cases, the soldiers had been operating on Italian firing ranges where arms tests are carried out.

The activities of these firing ranges could also pose a risk of radioactive contamination of the local civilian population.

Can the Commission therefore answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of the number of deaths of soldiers and civilians in Italy and the other Member States which could be related to radioactive contamination resulting from the use of military arms?

2. Does it not think it should monitor the decisions and measures taken by the health services of each Member State in relation to the cases mentioned above, to protect the health of those working for the Armed Forces?

3. Does it not agree that it might be appropriate to monitor and study the impact that activities carried out on EU military firing ranges might have on human and animal health, groundwater and the surrounding environment?

4. Has it mapped all the sites in the EU that have been contaminated by radiation for reasons other than those due to the production of electricity from nuclear power plants?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2013)

The European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) Treaty and its secondary legislation do not apply to activities or practices of military nature ([2]).

The monitoring of the level of radioactivity in the air, water and soil is a national responsibility. It is also the responsibility of the Member States to ensure compliance with the applicable safety standards ([3]), and to secure the monitoring, and appropriate care of the national civilians and military personnel exposed.

Under Article 36 of the Euratom Treaty, the Commission is informed by Member States on the levels of radioactivity in the environment. The data in the Commission's Radiological Environmental Monitoring database give no indication of radioactive contamination other than that associated with the energy generating activities at nuclear installations.

Equally, the transposition, implementation and enforcement respect of provisions aimed at protecting workers from any workplace risks, namely as provided for Directive 89/391/EEC ([4]) is the responsibility of Member States. This directive contains however a limited exception to its scope of application in relation to certain specific public service activities.

([1]) National Association of Assistance to Victims enlisted in the Armed Forces.
([2]) Case C-65/04 of 9 March 2006, *Commission* v *UK*.
([3]) Article 35 of the Euratom Treaty.
([4]) Council Directive 89/391/EEC of 12 June 1989 on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of workers at work, OJ L 183, 29.6.1989.

As far as depleted uranium ammunition is concerned, there is an ongoing debate on its alleged impact on human health and environment. On the basis of studies conducted by specialised international agencies so far, there is still no scientifically demonstrated link between the use of depleted uranium in operational theatres and damage to human health. However, some of these reports and other authoritative studies have underlined the need to continue to monitor the long-term effects of depleted uranium on human beings and the environment.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011685/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Phil Bennion (ALDE)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Corruption in South Asia

Given the findings of the annual Corruption Perceptions Index published by Transparency International in December 2012 and of the investigative report by Pakistani journalist Umar Cheema entitled 'Representation without Taxation', can the High Representative answer the following points:

1. Is the EU able to assist in the reform and strengthening of anti-corruption authorities and tax revenue collection agencies, for example by providing training courses for civil servants and sharing best practice, thereby ensuring that tax collection is improved in South Asia?

2. What pressure can the High Representative bring to bear on the Pakistani leadership and parliamentarians to ensure that they pay their taxes in full and that the practice of placing assets in relatives' names is appropriately scrutinised in order to ensure fair play? Has the High Representative or any of her staff raised this issue in discussions with Pakistani leaders?

3. What steps are being taken by the EU to ensure that development aid to countries in South Asia, especially for public-sector projects, is properly monitored so as to ensure that the funds reach the right places?

4. As part of improving good governance and ensuring accountability, is the EU providing — or can it provide — training or support to NGOs, investigative journalists and think tanks in the region in order to make sure that they are able to carry out investigations without intimidation or threat?

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

1. The EU supports the fight against corruption in South Asia. This takes the form of direct support to anti-corruption and tax collection authorities or to reinforce PFM ([1]) systems to make them more resistant against abuse of public funds. As an example the Commission is funding the 'Public Financial Management Support Programme' for Pakistan that will contribute to improving public financial management by assisting the Provincial Government of Sindh and the Federal Government in setting a roadmap for reform directly impacting the decision-making process in better allocating budget resources and improving revenue collection, in coordination with a GIZ ([2])-funded intervention to support the Country's tax reform. Another example in South Asia is the EU support in Bangladesh on taxation issues via the IMF ([3]) Topical Trust Fund on Tax Policy and Administration.

2. The EU promotes taxation systems that are fair and comprehensive and do not allow undue tax exemptions or illegal practices. This issue is repeatedly brought up in the political dialogue with the Government in Pakistan. These discussions do not focus on individual cases of politicians but refer to the taxation system as a whole.

3. Concerning the monitoring of EU funds, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to point 3 of the answer to previous Written Question E-008878/2011 ([4]).

4. The EU provides training or support to NGOs ([5]), investigative journalists and think tanks in some countries in the region, e.g. in Bangladesh. Furthermore, the new budget transparency eligibility criterion for budget support requires that a minimum level of public transparency and scrutiny exists and is continuously improved; therefore support to NGOs in this domain will be continued in the future.

([1]) PFM = Public Finance Management.
([2]) Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH.
([3]) IMF = International Monetary Fund.
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html
([5]) NGO = Non-governmental Organisations.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011686/12
adresată Comisiei
Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D)
(20 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Raport privind impactul creșterii cererii de biocarburanți

Conform articolului 17 alineatul (7) din Directiva 2009/28/CE privind promovarea utilizării energiei din surse regenerabile, Comisia trebuie să prezinte în anul 2012 un raport privind impactul creșterii cererii de biocarburanți asupra durabilității sociale în Comunitate și în țările terțe, precum și impactul politicii comunitare în domeniul biocarburanților asupra disponibilității produselor alimentare la un preț acceptabil, în special pentru populația din țările în curs de dezvoltare, precum și alte aspecte mai cuprinzătoare referitoare la dezvoltare.

De asemenea, Comisia poate propune, după caz, luarea de măsuri corective, în special dacă există elemente care atestă că producția de biocarburanți are un impact considerabil asupra prețurilor produselor alimentare.

Aș dori să întreb Comisia care este stadiul de elaborare al acestui raport, dacă sunt elemente care să ateste că producția de biocarburanți are un impact considerabil asupra prețurilor produselor alimentare și dacă intenționează să propună măsuri corective?

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

Comisia dorește să invite distinsa membră a Parlamentului European să consulte răspunsurile sale la întrebările scrise E-011266/2012 și E-009442/2012 formulate de dl Feio Diogo.

În primăvara acestui an, Comisia intenționează să publice un raport care rezumă progresele realizate de statele membre în direcția atingerii obiectivelor privind energia din surse regenerabile. Acest raport va aborda mai multe alte cerințe de raportare prevăzute de Directiva privind energia din surse regenerabile, inclusiv în ceea ce privește impactul social și de mediu al biocarburanților, care include chestiunea prețurilor produselor alimentare.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011686/12
to the Commission
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Report on the impact of increased demand for biofuels

Under Article 17(7) of Directive 2009/28/EC on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources, the Commission is required to submit a report in 2012 on the impact on social sustainability in the Community and in third countries of increased demand for biofuel, on the impact of Community biofuel policy on the availability of foodstuffs at affordable prices, in particular for people living in developing countries, and on wider development issues.

The Commission may also if appropriate propose corrective action, in particular if evidence shows that biofuel production is having a significant impact on food prices.

Can the Commission say what progress has been made in drawing up this report, whether there is any evidence to suggest that biofuel production is having a significant impact on food prices and whether it intends to propose corrective measures?

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

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its replies to Written Questions E-011266/2012 and E-009442/2012 by Mr Diogo Feio.

In spring this year, the Commission intends to publish a report summarising the progress made by Member States towards the renewable energy targets. This report will cover several other reporting requirements of the Renewable Energy Directive including on the environmental and social impacts of biofuels, which incorporates the matter of food prices.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011687/12
adresată Comisiei
Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D)
(20 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Raport privind funcționarea metodei de verificare prevăzute la articolul 18 alineatul (2) din Directiva 2009/28/CE privind promovarea utilizării energiei din surse regenerabile

Conform articolului 18 alineatul (2) din Directiva 2009/28/CE privind promovarea utilizării energiei din surse regenerabile, Comisia trebuie să prezinte în anul 2012 un raport privind funcționarea metodei de verificare a echilibrării masei, care: (a) permite ca loturile de materii prime sau biocarburant cu caracteristici de durabilitate diferite să fie amestecate; (b) prevede ca informațiile cu privire la caracteristicile de durabilitate și mărimea loturilor menționate la litera (a) să rămână valabile pentru amestec; și (c) prevede ca suma tuturor loturilor retrase din amestec să fie descrisă ca având aceleași caracteristici de durabilitate, în aceleași cantități, ca suma tuturor loturilor adăugate la amestec. De asemenea, raportul trebuie să prezinte potențialul metodei de a permite utilizarea altor metode de verificare referitoare la unele tipuri sau la toate tipurile de materii prime, biocarburanți sau biolichide.

În evaluarea sa, Comisia ia în considerare acele metode de verificare în cadrul cărora informațiile referitoare la caracteristicile de durabilitate nu trebuie să fie asociate în continuare anumitor loturi sau amestecuri. Evaluarea ia în considerare necesitatea menținerii integrității și eficienței sistemului de verificare, simultan cu evitarea impunerii unei sarcini nerezonabile asupra industriei. Acest raport va fi însoțit, după caz, de propuneri adresate Parlamentului European și Consiliului privind utilizarea altor metode de verificare.

Aș dori să întreb Comisia în ce stadiu se află elaborarea raportului mai sus menționat și dacă vor fi propuse și alte metode de verificare.

Răspuns dat de dl Oettinger în numele Comisiei
(6 februarie 2013)

Până în primăvara acestui an, Comisia intenționează să publice un raport, aflat actualmente în curs de finalizare, care rezumă progresele realizate de statele membre în vederea atingerii obiectivelor privind energia din surse regenerabile. Comisia intenționează să utilizeze acest raport pentru a îndeplini o serie de cerințe de raportare în temeiul Directivei privind energia din surse regenerabile ([1]), inclusiv în ceea ce privește funcționarea sistemului de echilibrare a masei.

([1]) Directiva 2009/28/CE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 23 aprilie 2009 privind promovarea utilizării energiei din surse regenerabile, de modificare și ulterior de abrogare a Directivelor 2001/77/CE și 2003/30/CE, JO L140 2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011687/12
to the Commission
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Report on the functioning of the verification method referred to in Article 18(2) of Directive 2009/28/EC on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources

Under Article 18(2) of Directive 2009/28/EC on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources, the Commission is required to submit in 2012 a report on the operation of a mass verification method which: (a) allows consignments of raw material or biofuel with differing sustainability characteristics to be mixed; (b) requires information about the sustainability characteristics and the sizes of the consignments referred to in point (a) to remain assigned to the mixture; and (c) provides for the sum of all consignments withdrawn from the mixture to be described as having the same sustainability characteristics, in the same quantities, as the sum of all consignments added to the mixture. It must also indicate the potential for allowing for other verification methods in relation to some or all types of raw material, biofuel or bioliquids.

In its assessment, the Commission is required to consider those verification methods in which information about sustainability characteristics need not remain physically assigned to particular consignments or mixtures. The assessment must take into account the need to maintain the integrity and effectiveness of the verification system while avoiding the imposition of an unreasonable burden on industry. The report must be accompanied, where appropriate, by proposals to the European Parliament and to the Council concerning the use of other verification methods.

Can the Commission say what progress has been made with regard to this report and whether other verification methods will be proposed?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(6 February 2013)

The Commission intends to publish a report, currently being completed, by spring this year summarising the progress made by the Member States towards the renewable energy targets. It intends to use this report to fulfil a number of reporting requirements under the Renewable Energy Directive ([1]), including on the operation of the mass balance system.

([1]) Directive 2009/28/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources and amending and subsequently repealing Directives 2001/77/EC and 2003/30/EC, OJ L140 2009.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011688/12
adresată Comisiei
Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D)
(20 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Energie durabilă pentru toți

În cadrul Conferinței Națiunilor Unite privind dezvoltarea durabilă, ce a avut loc la Rio de Janeiro, Brazilia, în perioada 20-22 iunie 2012, a fost adoptată Rezoluția „Viitorul pe care ni-l dorim".

În cadrul acestei rezoluții, la capitolul „Energie", se recunoaște rolul critic pe care îl joacă energia în procesul de dezvoltare. Accesul la servicii energetice durabile moderne contribuie la eradicarea sărăciei, la salvarea de vieți, la îmbunătățirea sănătății și asigură nevoile de bază ale omului. De asemenea, se subliniază faptul că aceste servicii sunt esențiale pentru incluziunea socială și egalitatea de gen.

Rezoluția susține punerea în aplicare a unor politici și strategii bazate pe circumstanțele naționale specifice, folosind un mix energetic adecvat pentru a satisface nevoile de dezvoltare. De asemenea, sunt susținute utilizarea sporită a surselor de energie regenerabile și a tehnologiilor ecoeficiente, utilizarea mai eficientă a energiei, precum și utilizarea durabilă a resurselor energetice tradiționale.

Aș dori să întreb Comisia dacă are în vedere participarea la elaborarea unei strategii internaționale și a unui plan de acțiuni privind o energie durabilă pentru toți, astfel încât, prin aceasta, să se contribuie la eradicarea sărăciei, la dezvoltare durabilă și la prosperitate globală?

Răspuns dat de dl Piebalgs în numele Comisiei
(13 februarie 2013)

Energia durabilă este una dintre condițiile prealabile esențiale pentru scoaterea populației din sărăcie și pentru dezvoltarea durabilă. În lipsa energiei, țările în curs de dezvoltare se află, pur și simplu, în imposibilitatea de a asigura cetățenilor lor accesul la apă potabilă, la educație de calitate și la servicii medicale de bază.

În urmă cu zece ani, Uniunea Europeană a lansat Inițiativa UE în domeniul energiei pentru eradicarea sărăciei și dezvoltarea durabilă (IUEE). Mai recent, Agenda UE pentru schimbare a scos în evidență faptul că energia durabilă este un motor esențial pentru creșterea durabilă și favorabilă incluziunii.

În 2011, Secretarul General al ONU, Ban Ki-moon, a lansat inițiativa „Energie durabilă pentru toți". Triplul obiectiv al acestei inițiative — realizarea accesului universal la servicii energetice moderne, dublarea ratei globale de îmbunătățire a eficienței energetice și dublarea ponderii energiei regenerabile în cadrul mixului energetic global până în 2030 — reprezintă o provocare extraordinară care necesită eforturi concertate din partea tuturor părților interesate.

Această inițiativă a beneficiat încă de la început de susținerea Comisiei, susținere care continuă să fie la fel de fermă și în prezent. În acest sens, cu ocazia reuniunii la nivel înalt a UE privind „Energia durabilă pentru toți" din aprilie 2012, Uniunea Europeană a propus obiectivul ambițios de a sprijini țările în curs de dezvoltare ca, până în 2030, să ofere acces unui număr de 500 de milioane de persoane la servicii energetice durabile.

Pentru a transpune în practică acest obiectiv, Comisia mobilizează o sumă în valoare de aproape 500 de milioane EUR pentru a-și intensifica fără întârziere sprijinul în favoarea energiei durabile.

Pe termen mai lung, începând cu 2014, ne putem aștepta ca, odată cu punerea în aplicare a Agendei UE pentru schimbare, acestei sume să i se adauge volume financiare semnificative.

UE va rămâne un actor constructiv și activ pentru a asigura că activitățile pe care le întreprindem împreună cu partenerii noștri în acest domeniu vor conduce la beneficii semnificative, cu un impact decisiv asupra vieții a milioane de persoane din țările în curs de dezvoltare.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011688/12
to the Commission
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(20 December 2012)

Subject: Sustainable energy for all

The UN Conference on Sustainable Development held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from 20 to 22 June 2012 adopted a resolution entitled 'The future we want'.

Its 'Energy' chapter refers to the critical role played by energy in the development process, acknowledging that access to sustainable modern energy services contributes to poverty eradication, saves lives, improves health and helps provide for basic human needs and stressing that these services are essential to social inclusion and gender equality.

The resolution reaffirms support for the implementation of policies and strategies based on individual national circumstances, using an appropriate energy mix to meet developmental needs, as well as the increased use of renewable energy sources and low- emission technologies, greater energy efficiency and the sustainable use of traditional energy resources.

Does the Commission intend to participate in the development of an international strategy and a plan of action concerning sustainable energy for all, thereby contributing to poverty eradication, sustainable development and global prosperity?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(13 February 2013)

Sustainable energy is one of the key pre-conditions for moving people out of poverty and for sustainable development. Without energy it is simply not possible for developing countries to ensure access to clean water, good education and basic healthcare to their citizens.

Ten years ago, the EU launched the EU Energy Initiative for Poverty Eradication and Sustainable Development (EUEI). More recently, the EU's Agenda for Change pinpointed sustainable energy as a key driver for inclusive and sustainable growth.

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon launched in 2011 the Sustainable Energy for All initiative. Its triple aim of achieving universal access to modern energy services, doubling the global rate of improvement in energy efficiency and doubling the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix by 2030 is a formidable challenge requiring concerted efforts from all stakeholders.

This initiative has been supported by the Commission from the very outset and that support has never waned. Indeed, at the EU Summit on Sustainable Energy for All in April 2012, the EU has proposed the ambitious objective of helping developing countries to provide 500 million people with access to sustainable energy services by 2030.

In order to turn this goal into reality the Commission is mobilising almost EUR 500 million to immediately scale-up its support for sustainable energy.

Over the longer term, from 2014 onwards, with the implementation of our Agenda for Change we can expect to add significant financial volumes to this amount.

The EU will remain a constructive and active actor to ensure that the work we undertake with our partners in this field will lead to significant benefits, decisively impacting the lives of millions of people in the developing world.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011689/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(21 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Καλές πρακτικές για την αντιμετώπιση της πρόωρης σχολικής εγκατάλειψης

Τον Δεκέμβριο του 2011 συστάθηκε μία θεματική ομάδα εργασίας για το ζήτημα της πρόωρης σχολικής εγκατάλειψης στην ΕΕ η οποία αποτελείται από πολιτικούς και εκπαιδευτικούς. Σκοπός της ομάδας είναι η συλλογή στοιχείων και ιδίως καλών πρακτικών προκειμένου να διευκολυνθεί η ανταλλαγή πολιτικών στην ΕΕ για την αντιμετώπιση του φαινομένου.

Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή για τα συμπεράσματα της ομάδας εργασίας;

Μπορεί να μου παραθέσει καλές πρακτικές που διαπιστώθηκε πως μπορούν να εφαρμοστούν και σε άλλα κράτη της ΕΕ;

Απάντηση της κ. Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Η θεματική ομάδα εργασίας σχετικά με την πρόωρη εγκατάλειψη του σχολείου (ΠΕΣ) συστάθηκε τον Δεκέμβριο του 2011 και έχει συνεδριάσει τέσσερις φορές μέχρι στιγμής. Η ομάδα αποτελείται από εκπροσώπους, οι οποίοι προέρχονται σχεδόν από όλα τα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ, καθώς και από τις υποψήφιες χώρες για προσχώρηση στην ΕΕ. Ο βασικός στόχος της εν λόγω ομάδας είναι να βοηθήσει τα κράτη μέλη στην ανάπτυξη και εφαρμογή αποδοτικών και αποτελεσματικών πολιτικών ενάντια στην πρόωρη εγκατάλειψη του σχολείου.

Για τον σκοπό αυτό, η ομάδα έχει συγκεντρώσει πληροφορίες σχετικά με τις εθνικές προσεγγίσεις για την ανάλυση των δεδομένων που αφορούν την ΠΕΣ· χρησιμοποιεί συστήματα για να εντοπίζει τους νέους που διατρέχουν τον κίνδυνο να εγκαταλείψουν πρόωρα το σχολείο· και υπολογίζει την σχέση κόστους-αποτελεσματικότητας των ισχυόντων μέτρων, με σκοπό την μείωση της πρόωρης εγκατάλειψης του σχολείου. Επιπλέον, τα μέλη της ομάδας πραγματοποίησαν μια δραστηριότητα εκπαίδευσης ομοτίμων στις Κάτω Χώρες, προκειμένου να δουν ποια γενικά συμπεράσματα θα μπορούσαν να συναχθούν από την ολλανδική προσέγγιση πολιτικής, ώστε να μειωθεί η πρόωρη εγκατάλειψη του σχολείου.

Η ομάδα εστιάζει επί του παρόντος στην εκπαίδευση «δεύτερης ευκαιρίας», σε καινοτόμους μορφές διδασκαλίας και μάθησης, με σκοπό να παρακινήσουν τους νέους που έχουν εγκαταλείψει το σχολείο, καθώς και σε τρόπους υποστήριξης της διατομεακής συνεργασίας για την αντιμετώπιση της ΠΕΣ. Επιπλέον, θα πραγματοποιήσει επιπρόσθετες δραστηριότητες εκπαίδευσης ομοτίμων και μία αξιολόγηση των εθνικών πολιτικών ενάντια στην ΠΕΣ από ομοτίμους. Η πρόωρη εγκατάλειψη του σχολείου στην επαγγελματική εκπαίδευση και κατάρτιση θα αποτελεί ένα άλλο σημαντικό θέμα για το 2013.

Η πρώτη έκθεση αναμένεται να δημοσιευθεί το καλοκαίρι του 2013 και θα περιέχει παραδείγματα ορθών πρακτικών και στοχοθετημένων συστάσεων για τη βελτίωση των δραστηριοτήτων των κρατών μελών που στοχεύουν στην μείωση της ΠΕΣ. Η εν λόγω έκθεση θα διανεμηθεί ευρέως και θα διατεθεί επίσης στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011689/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(21 December 2012)

Subject: Good practices for tackling the school drop-out rate

In December 2011, a thematic working group of politicians and educators was set up to consider the issue of the school drop-out rate. The purpose of the group is to collect data and in particular best practices to facilitate exchanges of policies in the EU to address this phenomenon.

Can the Commission report on the conclusions of this working group?

Can it enclose good practices from individual Member States that could be implemented in others?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(5 February 2013)

The Thematic Working Group on Early School Leaving (ESL) was set up in December 2011 and has met four times so far. The group consists of representatives of nearly all EU Member States and Candidate Countries. Its main aim is to help Member States to develop and implement efficient and effective policies against early school leaving.

For this purpose, the group has collected information on national approaches towards the analysis of data on ESL; systems to identify young people at risk of early school leaving; and existing cost-benefit calculations of measures to reduce early school leaving. Group members also conducted a peer learning activity in the Netherlands to see what general lessons could be learned from the Dutch policy approach to reduce early school leaving.

The group is currently looking at second chance education, innovative forms of teaching and learning to better motivate disengaged young people, and ways to support cross-sectoral cooperation in tackling ESL. It will conduct additional peer learning activities and a peer review of national policies against ESL. Early school leaving in vocational education and training will be another important topic in 2013.

A first report is expected for summer 2013. The report will contain good practice examples and targeted recommendations to improve Member States' activities in reducing ESL. It will be disseminated widely and also made available to the European Parliament.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011690/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(21 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Πόροι από το ΕΚΤ και ΕΤΠΑ για την απασχόληση των νέων

Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατη ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής, ήδη 10 δις ευρώ (από το ΕΚΤ και το ΕΤΠΑ) κατευθύνονται στα κράτη μέλη προκειμένου να συμβάλουν στην προσπάθεια των κρατών μελών για την αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας των νέων με επωφελούμενους περίπου 658 000 νέους ανθρώπους.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει για το χρηματικό ύψος των δράσεων που θα κατευθυνθούν προς την Ελλάδα; Διαθέτει εκτιμήσεις για τον αριθμό των νέων Ελλήνων που θα επωφεληθούν;

2. Ποιος είναι ο προγραμματισμός που υπάρχει για την αξιοποίηση και των υπολοίπων 20 δις ευρώ από το ΕΚΤ για αυτό τον σκοπό, δεδομένου ότι το 2013 είναι το τελευταίο έτος του δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου 2007-2013;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(21 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

1. Το σχέδιο δράσης για την Ελλάδα, το οποίο εγκρίθηκε τον Ιανουάριο του 2013 με σκοπό την ενίσχυση της απασχόλησης και της επιχειρηματικότητας των νέων, προβλέπει τη διάθεση χρηματοδοτικού κονδυλίου ύψους 600 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ από τους πόρους του ΕΚΤ και του ΕΤΠΑ, για την προώθηση των μέτρων ενίσχυσης για την νεολαία, από τα οποία αναμένεται να επωφεληθούν 350 000 νέοι.

2. Έως τον Ιανουάριο του 2013, περίπου 16 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ από τις χρηματοδοτήσεις της ΕΕ προορίζονταν για ταχύτερη διανομή ή ανακατανομή μέσω της ομαδικής πρωτοβουλίας δράσης για τους νέους, υπέρ περίπου 780 000 νέων και 55 000 ΜΜΕ. Ενώ ποσό ίσο με 14 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ περίπου παραμένει να δεσμευθεί νομικά σε συγκεκριμένα σχέδια, τα κράτη μέλη έχουν ήδη προγραμματίσει να διαθέσουν αυτά τα κονδύλια σε μέτρα που περιλαμβάνουν την υποστήριξη των νέων. Επομένως, το πεδίο εφαρμογής για περαιτέρω επαναπρογραμματισμό μέσω της εργασίας των ομάδων δράσης είναι περιορισμένο. Αντ' αυτού, το επίκεντρο για το υπόλοιπο διάστημα της τρέχουσας περιόδου προγραμματισμού θα αφορά την αποτελεσματική εφαρμογή τους, έτσι ώστε να διασφαλιστεί η επιτυχία των συγκεκριμένων σχεδίων, τα οποία υποστηρίζουν τους νέους και τις ΜΜΕ, καθώς και την πλήρη επίτευξη των αναμενόμενων οφελών.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011690/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(21 December 2012)

Subject: ESF and ERDF resources for youth employment

According to a recent announcement by the Commission, EUR 10 billion (from the ESF and ERDF) are already being channelled to Member States to contribute to their efforts to tackle youth unemployment, and some 658 000 young people are benefiting.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What level of funding will be provided for actions in Greece? Do any estimates exist about the number of young Greeks who will benefit?

2. What plans exist also to use the remaining EUR 20 billion from the ESF for this purpose, given that 2013 is the last year of the 2007-2013 Financial Framework?

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

1. The action plan for Greece adopted in January 2013 with a view to stimulating employment and entrepreneurship among young people earmarks a financial envelope of EUR 600 million of ESF and ERDF resources for the promotion of youth-related assistance measures which are expected to benefit 350 000 young people..

2. By January 2013, about EUR 16 billion of EU financing has been targeted for accelerated delivery or reallocation through the youth action team initiative, with around 780 000 young people and 55 000 SMEs likely to benefit. While around EUR 14 billion remains to be legally committed to specific projects, Member States have already programmed these funds under measures including support for young people. The scope for further reprogramming through the work of the action teams is therefore limited. The focus for the remainder of the current programming period will instead be on effective implementation so as to ensure that the identified projects supporting young people and SMEs are a success and the estimated benefits realised in full.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011691/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(21 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ebook

Το ηλεκτρονικό βιβλίο αποτελεί μια δυναμική και διαρκώς αυξανόμενη αγορά η οποία προσφέρει αρκετές οικονομικές ευκαιρίες για την ΕΕ και τα κράτη μέλη. Ωστόσο πολλοί διεθνείς εκδοτικοί οίκοι εφαρμόζουν περιοριστικές πολιτικές στον τομέα αυτό δημιουργώντας σοβαρές διαφορές στις τιμές και στην διαθεσιμότητα των βιβλίων τους μεταξύ των κρατών μελών και όντας σε αντίθεση με τους κανόνες της ενιαίας αγοράς.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει για τις πρωτοβουλίες για την εξάλειψη του παραπάνω φαινομένου;

2. Μπορεί να μου παραθέσει στοιχεία αναφορικά με το ποσοστό που κατέχει το ηλεκτρονικό βιβλίο σε σχέση με του παραδοσιακού τύπου στην ΕΕ; Σε ποιες χώρες παρατηρούνται τα υψηλότερα ποσοστά χρήσης του και ποια η περίπτωση της Ελλάδας;

Απάντηση της κ. Kroes εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(18 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Στην ανακοίνωσή της για το ηλεκτρονικό εμπόριο, που εκδόθηκε στις 11 Ιανουαρίου 2012, η Επιτροπή αναγνώρισε το δυναμικό της αγοράς ηλεκτρονικών βιβλίων και την ανάγκη να ξεκινήσουν συζητήσεις με τα κράτη μέλη και τους ενδιαφερόμενους σχετικά με την τάση ψηφιοποίησης των βιβλίων στην Ενιαία Αγορά, καθώς και σχετικά με τα εμπόδια που παρεμβάλλονται στην ανάπτυξη του εν λόγω μέσου.

Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο, η αντιπρόεδρος κ. Kroes διοργάνωσε στις 26 Ιουνίου 2012 στρογγυλή τράπεζα για τα ηλεκτρονικά βιβλία σε επίπεδο διευθυνόντων συμβούλων, προκειμένου να διερευνηθούν σε βάθος τα ζητήματα που αφορούν την αγορά των ηλεκτρονικών βιβλίων.

1. Όσον αφορά τα ηλεκτρονικά βιβλία, οι εκδότες εκχωρούν πολύ συχνά τα δικαιώματά τους ανά γλώσσα, δηλαδή σε πολυεδαφική (ή ακόμη και σε παγκόσμια) βάση. Ο λόγος για τον περιορισμό των πωλήσεων ηλεκτρονικών βιβλίων, για παράδειγμα όταν ένας διανομέας (π.χ. ένα κατάστημα ηλεκτρονικής λιανικής πώλησης) αρνείται να πωλήσει ηλεκτρονικά βιβλία σε πελάτες στο εξωτερικό, μπορεί να είναι εμπορικός μάλλον παρά να σχετίζεται με ζητήματα πνευματικών δικαιωμάτων. Το θέμα που θέτει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος είναι κυρίως ζήτημα εμπορικών αποφάσεων και οργάνωσης της αγοράς. Σε τέτοιου είδους ζητήματα, η Επιτροπή δεν αναλαμβάνει συγκεκριμένες νομοθετικές πρωτοβουλίες. Μπορεί ωστόσο, να εξετάσει το ενδεχόμενο στοχευμένων μέτρων υποστήριξης. Η Επιτροπή θα συνεχίσει να παρακολουθεί την αγορά και να εξασφαλίζει την τήρηση των κανόνων περί ανταγωνισμού στον κλάδο των ηλεκτρονικών βιβλίων. Έλαβε επίσης την πρώτη προς τούτο απόφασή της στις 13 Δεκεμβρίου 2012 ([1]).

2. Στην ΕΕ, τα ηλεκτρονικά βιβλία κατέχουν το μεγαλύτερο μερίδιο αγοράς στο Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο (12,9% της συνολικής αγοράς βιβλίου το πρώτο εξάμηνο του 2012). Το 2011, σε σχέση με το σύνολο των πωλήσεων βιβλίων, τα ηλεκτρονικά βιβλία κατείχαν μερίδιο 2% στην Γερμανία, 1,8% στη Γαλλία και από 1 έως 2% στην Δανία και τις Κάτω Χώρες αντίστοιχα ([2]). Για την Ελλάδα δεν διατίθενται στοιχεία.

([1]) Υπόθεση COMP/39.847/E-BOOKS.
([2]) Πηγή: The global e-book market, Current Conditions & Future Projections — O'Reilly Media.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011691/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(21 December 2012)

Subject: e-books

The e-book is a dynamic and growing market that offers many economic opportunities for the EU and Member States. However, many international publishers are pursuing restrictive policies in this area, creating substantial differences in the prices and availability of their products between Member States, in breach of the rules of the single market.

Will the Commission say:

1. What initiatives are being taken to tackle this problem?

2. Can it provide figures on the share held by the e-book compared to the traditional book in the EU? Which countries have the greatest percentage of ebook users and how does Greece fare in this connection?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

In its e-commerce communication adopted on 11 January 2012, the Commission recognised the potential of the eBook market and the necessity to engage in discussions with both Member States and stakeholders on the trend towards digitalising books in the single market as well as on obstacles hindering the development of this medium.

In that context, Vice-President Kroes held a CEO-level e-book roundtable on 26 June 2012 in order to drill down into issues in the eBook market.

1. As far as eBooks are concerned, publishers most often license their rights by language, i.e. on a multi-territorial (or even worldwide) basis. The reason for a sales restriction of eBooks, for instance when a distributor (e.g. an e-retailer) declines to sell eBooks to customers abroad, may be commercial rather than copyright-related. The issue raised by the Honourable Member is mainly a matter of commercial decisions and market organisation. The Commission does not take specific legislative initiatives in this respect. It may, however, consider targeted support actions. The Commission will continue to monitor the market and ensure the application of competition rules in the eBook sector. It also took its first decision to this end on 13 December 2012 ([1]).

2. In the EU, eBooks have by large the biggest market share in the UK (12.9% of the overall book market in first half of 2012). E-books had in 2011 a 2% share in Germany, 1.8% in France and between 1 and 2% in Denmark and the Netherlands respectively of total books sales ([2]). Figures for Greece are not available.

([1]) Case COMP/39.847/E-BOOKS.
([2]) The global e-book market, Current Conditions and Future Projections — O'Reilly Media.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011692/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(21 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Εγκατάσταση βιολογικού καθαρισμού στην περιοχή Κόκκινα-Μαρμαριές στο νησί Τήνος

Έντονες αντιδράσεις έχει προκαλέσει σε κατοίκους και φορείς του νησιού της Τήνου η προωθούμενη εγκατάσταση βιολογικού καθαρισμού στην περιοχή Κόκκινα-Μαρμαριές της νήσου Τήνου. Όπως καταγγέλλουν οι κάτοικοι, η περιβαλλοντική μελέτη που έγινε είναι ελλιπής και ανακριβής, δεν αποτυπώνεται ακριβώς και με τα πραγματικά στοιχεία η περιοχή που έχει επιλεγεί για την εγκατάσταση του βιολογικού καθαρισμού. Στη συνέχεια της καταγγελίας τους επισημαίνουν ότι η τοποθεσία του βιολογικού καθαρισμού είναι σε περιοχή Ζώνης Οικιστικού Ελέγχου (ΖΟΕ), ο χώρος που έχει επιλεγεί βρίσκεται εντός κατοικημένης ζώνης και σε μόλις 150 μέτρα απόσταση από κατοικίες και τα τέσσερα επίγεια αντλιοστάσια μεγάλης ισχύος ρεύματος για συλλογή και μεταφορά των λυμάτων θα βρίσκονται μέσα στην πόλη της Τήνου.

Με δεδομένα τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι σε γνώση της Επιτροπής η προωθούμενη εγκατάσταση βιολογικού καθαρισμού στο νησί της Τήνου; Γνωρίζει τις ανησυχίες και αντιδράσεις των κατοίκων του νησιού για το εν λόγω έργο;

2. Όφειλε η Μελέτη Περιβαλλοντικών Επιπτώσεων να συνεκτιμήσει εναλλακτικές θέσεις για την εγκατάσταση της εν λόγω μονάδας βιολογικού καθαρισμού προκειμένου να μην προκαλείται «όχληση» στο αστικό περιβάλλον; Τι προτίθεται να κάνει η Επιτροπή προκειμένου να εξεταστεί το αίτημα των κατοίκων;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή δεν είναι ενήμερη για τις ανησυχίες που έχει προκαλέσει στους κατοίκους η κατασκευή εγκατάστασης βιολογικού καθαρισμού λυμάτων στην περιοχή Μαρμαριές-Κόκκινα της νήσου Τήνου. Σύμφωνα με την αρχή της επιμερισμένης διαχείρισης, η οποία τηρείται στην πολιτική για τη συνοχή, αρμόδιες για την επιλογή και την υλοποίηση των επιλέξιμων για ενωσιακή συγχρηματοδότηση έργων είναι οι εθνικές και περιφερειακές αρχές. Τα κράτη μέλη δεν υποχρεούνται να διαβιβάζουν στην Επιτροπή πληροφορίες σχετικά με τα ζητήματα προγραμματισμού και έγκρισης των δημοσίων και ιδιωτικών έργων, εκτός εάν πρόκειται για συγχρηματοδοτούμενα μεγάλα έργα που προβλέπονται στον κανονισμό (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 του Συμβουλίου ([1]).

Παρόλα αυτά, οι ελληνικές αρχές γνωστοποίησαν στην Επιτροπή την ένταξη του έργου «Εγκατάσταση επεξεργασίας λυμάτων και έργα διάθεσης πόλης Τήνου», με προϋπολογισμό δημόσιας δαπάνης 8 079 862,66 ευρώ, στο επιχειρησιακό πρόγραμμα «Περιβάλλον και Αειφόρος Ανάπτυξη 2007-2013».

Σύμφωνα με την ελληνική νομοθεσία περί ενσωμάτωσης της οδηγίας 2011/92/ΕΕ ([2]) στην εθνική έννομη τάξη, για τις εγκαταστάσεις βιολογικού καθαρισμού λυμάτων πρέπει να διενεργείται εκτίμηση περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων (μελέτη ΕΠΕ). Κατά τη διάρκεια της διαδικασίας ΕΠΕ θα πρέπει να παρέχεται σε όλες τις σχετικές αρχές, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των αρμοδίων για το περιβάλλον, καθώς και στους ενδιαφερόμενους πολίτες η δυνατότητα να διατυπώνουν παρατηρήσεις, τις οποίες θα πρέπει να λαμβάνουν υπόψη οι αρμόδιες εθνικές αρχές στη χορήγηση των αδειών.

Η Επιτροπή μπορεί να παρεμβαίνει μόνον εφόσον στοιχειοθετείται επαρκώς παράβαση των διατάξεων της οδηγίας 2011/92/ΕΕ.

([1]) ΕΕ L 49 της 31.7.2007.
([2]) ΕΕ L 26 της 28.1.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011692/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(21 December 2012)

Subject: Construction of a biological purification plant in the Marmaries — Kokkina area of the island of Tinos

Plans to construct a biological purification plant in the Marmaries — Kokkina area of the island of Tinos have met with vociferous protests from residents and organisations on the island of Tinos. Residents complain that the environmental impact study was incomplete and inaccurate, and the site chosen for the plant is not precisely indicated with the actual features. They go on to point out that the site selected for the plant is in a restricted development zone, and is located within a residential area only 150 metres from homes and that the four high-power terrestrial pumping plants for the collection and transportation of waste are located within the town of Tinos.

Given the above, will the Commission say:

1. Is it aware of plans to construct a biological purification plant on the island of Tinos? Is it aware of residents' concerns about and reactions to this project?

2. Should the environmental impact study also consider alternative sites for the construction of the biological purification plant in order not to cause a nuisance in the urban environment? What does it intend do to ensure that residents' demands are considered?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2013)

The Commission is not aware of residents' concerns, as regards the construction of a biological purification plant in the Marmaries — Kokkina area of the island of Tinos. In line with the principle of shared management in cohesion policy, national and regional authorities are responsible for the selection and the implementation of eligible projects to receive EU co-financing. Member States are not obliged to send information on planning and development issues of public and private projects to the Commission, unless these are co-funded Major Projects as foreseen under Council Regulation 1083/2006 ([1]).

Nevertheless the Greek authorities informed the Commission that a project entitled 'Waste water treatment plant and waste water disposal works for the town of Tinos' has been approved by the programme 'Environment & Sustainable Development 2007-2013' with a public budget of EUR 8.079.862,66.

According to the Greek legislation transposing Directive 2011/92/EU ([2]), biological purification plants should be made subject to an environmental impact assessment (EIA). During the EIA process, all relevant authorities, including the environmental ones, and the public concerned should have the opportunity to express their comments, which should be taken into account by the competent national authorities in the development consent.

The Commission can only intervene if there is sufficient evidence that the requirements of Directive 2011/92/EU have been breached.

([1]) OJ L 49, 31.07.2007.
([2]) OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011693/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Überführung des Prümer Vertrags in EU-Recht

Mit dem Beschluss 2008/615/JI des Rates vom 23. Juni 2008 „zur Vertiefung der grenzüberschreitenden Zusammenarbeit, insbesondere zur Bekämpfung des Terrorismus und der grenzüberschreitenden Kriminalität" sollte der Inhalt des zwischenstaatlichen Prümer Vertrags vom 27. Mai 2005 in den Rechtsrahmen der EU überführt werden. Dazu verabschiedete der Rat auch den Beschluss 2008/616/JHA, um die technischen Bestimmungen für diese Überführung aufzuführen.

1. Welche Elemente des Prümer Vertrags beziehungsweise des Beschlusses 2008/615/JI sind bereits vollständig in EU-Recht überführt worden?

2. Welche Elemente des Prümer Vertrags beziehungsweise des Beschlusses 2008/615/JI sind bisher nur teilweise in EU-Recht überführt worden?

3. Für die Überführung welcher noch nicht in EU-Recht überführten (Teil-)Elemente des Prümer Vertrags beziehungsweise des Beschlusses 2008/615/JI gibt es bereits einen konkreten Zeitplan oder konkrete Vorschläge zur Überführung?

4. Die Überführung welcher Elemente stagniert oder wird von einem Mitgliedstaat oder einer EU-Institution blockiert? Aus welchem Grund stagnieren diese Elemente beziehungsweise von welcher Partei werden sie blockiert?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(22. Februar 2013)

Der „Beschluss des Rates zur Vertiefung der grenzüberschreitenden Zusammenarbeit, insbesondere zur Bekämpfung des Terrorismus und der grenzüberschreitenden Kriminalität" („Prümer Beschluss", 2008/615/JI) erstreckt sich auf alle Elemente des „Vertrags über die Vertiefung der grenzüberschreitenden Zusammenarbeit, insbesondere zur Bekämpfung des Terrorismus, der grenzüberschreitenden Kriminalität und der illegalen Migration" („Prümer Vertrag") mit Ausnahme der folgenden Teile des Vertrags: (1) Flugsicherheitsbegleiter, Artikel 17 und 18; (2) Maßnahmen zur Bekämpfung der illegalen Migration, Artikel 20 bis 23; (3) Maßnahmen bei gegenwärtiger Gefahr, Artikel 25; (4) Zusammenarbeit auf Ersuchen, Artikel 27.

Alle Bestimmungen des Vertrags, die der Prümer Beschluss abdeckt, wurden mit Erlass dieses Beschlusses in den Rechtsrahmen der Europäischen Union überführt. Im Bereich der polizeilichen Zusammenarbeit wird derzeit nicht beabsichtigt, weitere Elemente des „Prümer Vertrags" in den Rechtsrahmen der Europäischen Union zu überführen.

Nach Einbeziehung des Inhalts des Vertrags in den Prümer Beschluss traten dem Vertrag weitere Mitgliedstaaten bei. Vertragsparteien sind derzeit: Österreich, Belgien, Bulgarien, Deutschland, Estland, Spanien, Finnland, Frankreich, Ungarn, Luxemburg, die Niederlande, Rumänien, Slowenien und die Slowakei.

Die Umsetzung der Beschlüsse 2008/615/JI und 2008/616/JI ist noch nicht abgeschlossen. Am 7. Dezember 2012 veröffentlichte die Kommission einen Durchführungsbericht, in dem im Einzelnen dargelegt wird, welche Mitgliedstaaten die Bestimmungen der „Prümer Beschlüsse" noch nicht vollständig umgesetzt haben. ([1])

([1]) Bericht der Kommission an das Europäische Parlament und den Rat zur Durchführung des Beschlusses 2008/615/JI vom 23. Juni 2008 zur Vertiefung der grenzüberschreitenden Zusammenarbeit, insbesondere zur Bekämpfung des Terrorismus und der grenzüberschreitenden Kriminalität („Prümer Beschluss"), ABl. L 210 vom 6.8.2008, S. 1-11.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011693/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21 December 2012)

Subject: Integration of the Prüm Convention into EU legislation

By Council Decision 2008/615/JHA of 23 June 2008 on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and cross-border crime, the substance of the international Prüm Convention of 27 May 2005 was to be integrated into the legislative framework of the EU. To that end the Council also adopted Decision 2008/616/JHA setting out implementing provisions for the Convention's integration.

1. Which elements of the Prüm Convention and/or Decision 2008/615/JHA have already been fully integrated into EU legislation?

2. Which elements of the Prüm Convention and/or Decision 2008/615/JHA have as yet been only partly integrated into EU legislation?

3. In respect of which elements, or parts thereof, of the Prüm Convention and/or Decision 2008/615/JHA which have not yet been integrated into EU legislation is there already a timetable or concrete proposals for their integration?

4. In respect of which elements is there an impasse concerning integration, or blocking of integration by a Member State or EU institution? For what reason are these elements in an impasse, or by which party are they being blocked?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2013)

The 'Council Decision on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and cross-border crime' ('Prüm Decision', 2008/615/JHA) covers all elements of the 'Convention on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism, cross-border crime and illegal migration' ('Prüm Convention') except for the following parts of the Convention (1) air marshals, Article 17 and 18; (2) measures to combat illegal migration, Article 20 to 23; (3) measures in the event of imminent danger, Art. 25; (4) cooperation upon request, Art. 27.

All provisions of the Convention covered by the Prüm Decision were incorporated into the legal framework of the European Union with the adoption of the Prüm Decision. In the area of police cooperation, there is currently no intention to incorporate further elements of the 'Prüm Convention' into the legal framework of the European Union.

Following the incorporation of the substance of the Convention into the Prüm Decision, further Member States have acceded to the Convention. The contracting parties to the Convention are now: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Germany, Estonia, Spain, Finland, France, Hungary, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Romania, Slovenia and Slovakia.

The implementation of Decisions 2008/615/JHA and 2008/616/JHA is ongoing. The Commission published an implementation report on 7 December 2012 which sets out in detail which Member States have not yet fully implemented the provisions of the 'Prüm Decisions' ([1]).

([1]) Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation of Council Decision 2008/615/JHA of 23 June 2008 on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and crossborder crime (the 'Prüm Decision'), OJ L 210, 6.8.2008, p.1-11.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011694/12
à la Commission
Sophie Auconie (PPE)
(21 décembre 2012)

Objet: Éligibilité du sport au titre du FEDER

Depuis le traité de Lisbonne, l'Union européenne s'est vu confier une compétence spécifique en matière de soutien, de coordination et de développement dans le domaine du sport, appelant à une action en vue de développer la dimension européenne du sport (article 165 TFUE).

Dans sa communication intitulée «Développer la dimension européenne du sport» (COM(2011)0012), la Commission européenne explique que «le sport a une capacité énorme à favoriser une croissance intelligente, durable et inclusive et la création d'emplois par ses effets positifs sur l'inclusion sociale, l'éducation, la formation et la santé publique».

L'étude sur la contribution du sport à l'économie et à l'emploi dans l'Union, publiée en novembre 2012 sur commande de la Commission, conclut que la part du PIB européen liée au sport s'élève à 1,76 %, voire à 2,98 % si l'on inclut les effets indirects. Elle évalue la part du sport à 2,12 % de l'emploi dans l'Union.

Convaincu des effets bénéfiques du sport sur la croissance et l'emploi, le Parlement s'est prononcé pour une inclusion du sport au titre du Fonds européen de développement régional (FEDER), qui vise précisément à soutenir les investissements en faveur de la croissance et de l'emploi. L'éligibilité du sport n'était en effet pas prévue par le projet initial de la Commission.

Pour quelles raisons la Commission n'avait-elle pas inclus le sport dans le règlement FEDER malgré les éléments cités ci-dessus? Soutient-elle la position du Parlement visant à rendre le sport éligible aux dépenses du FEDER?

Réponse donnée par M. Hahn au nom de la Commission
(25 février 2013)

La Commission reconnaît que le sport est fortement susceptible de contribuer à une croissance intelligente, durable et inclusive et à la création de nouveaux emplois par ses effets positifs sur l'inclusion sociale, l'éducation, la formation et la santé publique.

L'article 3 de la proposition de la Commission concernant le nouveau règlement FEDER (2014-2020) prévoit que les actions de soutien en faveur du sport relèveront du champ d'application du Fonds européen de développement régional (FEDER), permettant ainsi de soutenir les investissements dans les infrastructures éducatives, sociales et de santé, ainsi que les investissements dans les équipements et les infrastructures à petite échelle qui contribuent au développement du potentiel endogène.

Par ailleurs, des projets sportifs pourraient être cofinancés par le FEDER et par le Fonds social européen (FSE) à condition qu'ils contribuent aux objectifs thématiques établis à l'article 9 de la proposition de la Commission concernant le règlement portant dispositions communes, aux priorités en matière d'investissement et aux domaines prioritaires fixés dans les propositions de règlements particuliers à chaque Fonds. Le FSE, en particulier, devrait cofinancer les priorités en matière d'investissement portant sur un vieillissement actif et en bonne santé et sur l'accès aux services, y compris les soins de santé et les services sociaux d'intérêt général.

Les infrastructures sportives accessibles au public pourraient également être cofinancées au titre du Fonds européen agricole pour le développement rural pendant la période en cours et pour la nouvelle période, pour autant qu'elles contribuent à la réalisation des objectifs et des priorités de la politique de développement rural.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011694/12
to the Commission
Sophie Auconie (PPE)
(21 December 2012)

Subject: Eligibility of sports projects for ERDF funding

The Lisbon Treaty confers on the EU specific powers to take support, coordination and development measures in the area of sport, with the overall aim of developing the European dimension in sport (Article 165 TFEU).

In its communication on 'Developing the European Dimension in Sport' (COM(2011)0012), the Commission noted that 'sport has a strong potential to contribute to smart, sustainable and inclusive growth and new jobs through its positive effects on social inclusion, education and training, and public health'.

The study on the contribution of sport to economic growth and employment in the EU, ordered by the Commission and published in November 2012, concludes that the share of EU GDP generated by sport is 1.76%, and as much as 2.98% if the indirect effects are also taken into account. It estimates that sport accounts for 2.12% of jobs in the EU.

Convinced of the positive contribution that sport makes to growth and employment, Parliament has called for sports projects to be made eligible for funding from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), which is designed to support investments that stimulate growth and employment. The Commission's initial proposal for the ERDF Regulation did not, however, make provision for the funding of sports projects.

Why did the Commission not include sport in the scope of the ERDF Regulation, despite its positive contribution to growth and employment? Does the Commission share Parliament's view that sports projects should be made eligible for ERDF funding?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2013)

The Commission recognises that sport offers strong potential to contribute to smart, sustainable and inclusive growth and new jobs creation, through its positive effects on social inclusion, education and training, and public health.

Support for sport would fall within the scope of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) in accordance with Article 3 of the Commission's proposal for the new ERDF Regulation (2014-2020), which would allow for investments in social, health and educational infrastructure as well as investment in equipment and small-scale infrastructure contributing to the development of endogenous potential.

Furthemore, sports projects would be co-financed by the ERDF as well as by the European Social Fund (ESF) provided that they contribute to the thematic objectives set out in Article 9 of the Commission's proposal for the Common Provisions Regulation and the investment priorities and focus areas in the proposed Fund-specific Regulations. The ESF in particular should co-finance investment priorities on active and healthy ageing and on access to services, including healthcare and social services of general interest.

Publicly accessible sport infrastructure could also be co-financed under the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development in the current and in the new period, provided that it contributes to the objectives and priorities of the rural development policy.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011695/12
an die Kommission
Thomas Mann (PPE)
(21. Dezember 2012)

Betrifft: Spanisches Küstenschutzgesetz

Den bei Mitgliedern des Europäischen Parlaments nach wie vor eingehenden Beschwerden zufolge sind Fragen im Zusammenhang mit der Anwendung des spanischen Küstenschutzgesetzes (Ley de Costas) noch immer nicht hinlänglich geklärt. Für Haus- und Grundstücksbesitzer besteht weiterhin die Gefahr einer entschädigungslosen Enteignung.

Laut den beim Verfasser der Anfrage eingegangenen Informationen zur Neuregelung des Küstenschutzes in Spanien sehen die neuen Regelungen Folgendes vor:

— Die rückwirkende Anwendung des Gesetzes bleibt (Enteignung).

— Einen Rechtsanspruch auf Entschädigung für den Eigentumsverlust gibt es nicht.

— Die Kosten der Enteignung trägt der Anlieger.

In den bisherigen Antworten auf parlamentarische Anfragen teilte die EU-Kommission stets mit, sie werde die Situation genau beobachten und Kontakt zu den spanischen Behörden aufnehmen. Liegen mittlerweile neue Informationen vor, die zur Klärung der Lage beitragen oder inzwischen ein Einschreiten auf EU-Ebene rechtfertigen würden?

Das spanische Verfassungsgericht hat die rückwirkende Anwendung des Gesetzes als verfassungskonform beurteilt. Der Verfasser ist der Auffassung, dass die entschädigungslose Enteignung gegen das in Artikel 17 der Charta der Grundrechte der EU verankerte Eigentumsrecht verstößt.

Kann die Kommission diese Interpretation bestätigen? Wird sie gegen die entschädigungslose Enteignung von Unionsbürgern erneut bei den zuständigen spanischen Stellen intervenieren und sich dafür einsetzen, dass diese Missstände beseitigt werden?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(28. Februar 2013)

Die Europäische Kommission kann nur in Angelegenheiten tätig werden, bei denen ein Bezug zum EU-Recht besteht.

Da kein hinreichender Bezug zum EU-Recht hergestellt werden kann, obliegt es den Mitgliedstaaten, einschließlich ihrer Justizbehörden, zu gewährleisten, dass die Grundrechte im Einklang mit den einzelstaatlichen Rechtsvorschriften sowie mit den internationalen Verpflichtungen im Bereich der Menschenrechte wirksam gewahrt und geschützt werden. Die Frage, ob die Art der Entschädigung, die die spanischen Behörden anbieten, mit dem spanischen Verfassungsrecht und der Rechtsprechung des Europäischen Gerichtshofs für Menschenrechte vereinbar ist, ist zunächst von nationalen Gerichten und nach Ausschöpfung aller innerstaatlichen Rechtsmittel vom Gerichtshof selbst zu klären. Nach Kenntnis der Kommission sind Klagen gegen das Gesetz beim Europäischen Gerichtshof für Menschenrechte anhängig.

Die Europäische Kommission hat das Thema bereits mehrfach mit den spanischen Behörden erörtert, nachdem sich zahlreiche spanische Staatsbürger, aber auch andere EU-Bürger, die Immobilien an der spanischen Küste haben, beschwert hatten. Im August 2012 begrüßte die Kommission die Absicht Spaniens, die Rechtssicherheit für Immobilienbesitzer, die durch das Küstengesetz in ihren Rechten beeinträchtigt werden, zu verbessern und gleichzeitig den Umweltschutz zu gewährleisten. Sie forderte die Bürger zur Teilnahme an der öffentlichen Konsultation auf, die die spanischen Behörden organisierten.

Der neue Gesetzentwurf sieht eine Verlängerung des Zeitraums für die bereits erteilten Konzessionen für die Nutzung von Immobilien im Schutzgebiet von 30 auf 75 Jahre vor. Darüber hinaus ist die Eintragung der endgültigen und der vorläufigen Begrenzungslinie in das Grundbuch vorgesehen, damit potenzielle Käufer wissen, ob die Immobilie sich im Schutzgebiet befindet und sich über die genaue Lage und Fläche dieses Gebiets informieren können.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011695/12
to the Commission
Thomas Mann (PPE)
(21 December 2012)

Subject: Spain's coastal protection law

The complaints still being received by Members of the European Parliament show that the issues surrounding the application of Spain's coastal protection law (Ley de Costas) have still not received sufficient clarification. House and land owners continue to face the threat of expropriation without compensation.

According to the information on the new law on coastal protection in Spain which has reached the author of this question, the new regulations provide for the following:

— Retrospective application of the law remains (expropriation).

— There is no possibility of making a legal claim for compensation for loss of property.

— The cost of the expropriation must be paid by the inhabitant.

In previous replies to parliamentary questions, the Commission has always said that it would monitor the situation carefully and contact the Spanish authorities. Has any new information come to light which would help clarify the situation or justify action at EU level?

Spain's constitutional court has deemed the retrospective application of the law to be in conformity with the constitution. The author believes that expropriation without compensation contravenes the right of property ownership contained in Article 17 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU.

Can the Commission confirm this interpretation? Will it again take action against the relevant Spanish authorities in the matter of the expropriation without compensation of EU citizens and ensure that these abuses do not continue?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

The European Commission can only intervene in cases where the matter concerns the implementation of Union law.

As a sufficient connection with EC law has not been identified from the question, it is for Member States, including their judicial authorities, to ensure that fundamental rights are effectively respected and protected in accordance with their national legislation and international obligations. The question whether the form of compensation offered by the Spanish authorities is in line with Spanish constitutional law and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) has therefore to be examined by the national courts and, after having exhausted domestic legal remedies, by the ECtHR. The Commission understands that actions have been filed against the law before the ECtHR.

The European Commission has been in contact with the Spanish authorities on several occasions after receiving a large number of complaints from both Spanish and other EU citizens who have properties in the affected areas. In August 2012, the Commission welcomed Spain's declared intention to improve legal certainty for property owners affected by the Coastal Law while ensuring environmental protection and called upon citizens to participate in the public consultation organised by the Spanish authorities.

This new draft law would extend the period of the existing concession to enjoy possession of properties built in the protected zone from 30 years to 75 years. In addition, the public administration will be obliged to register the definitive and provisional demarcation line in the property register, so that purchasers will be better informed about whether the property is situated in a protected area and the exact location and extension of this area.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011697/12
adresată Comisiei
Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D)
(21 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Interconectarea registrelor electronice naționale ale întreprinderilor de transport rutier

Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1071/2009 de stabilire a unor norme comune privind condițiile care trebuie îndeplinite pentru exercitarea ocupației de operator de transport rutier stabilește la articolul 16 obligația statelor membre de a păstra un registru electronic național al întreprinderilor de transport rutier care au primit din partea unei autorități competente desemnate de respectivul stat membru autorizația de exercitare a ocupației de operator de transport rutier. Statele membre au obligația de a asigura interconectarea registrelor electronice naționale până la 31 decembrie 2012, în așa fel încât autoritatea competentă a oricărui stat membru să poată consulta registrul electronic național al oricărui stat membru.

Aș dori să întreb Comisia care este stadiul interconectării sistemelor electronice naționale ale întreprinderilor de transport rutier care au primit autorizația de exercitare a ocupației de operator de transport rutier.

Răspuns dat de domnul Kallas în numele Comisiei
(11 februarie 2013)

În ciuda unui sprijin consistent furnizat de Comisie statelor membre (ateliere IT, reuniuni ale grupurilor de lucru ERRU, crearea de căsuțe poștale electronice funcționale pentru a facilita abordarea aspectelor problematice etc.), un singur stat membru (Bulgaria) a reușit să finalizeze interconectarea la ERRU până la termenul limită: 31 decembrie 2012.

În prezent, un stat membru (Țările de Jos) este în etapa finală de interconectare. Alte cinci state membre (Danemarca, Estonia, Letonia, Slovacia, Spania) și Norvegia se află în faza de testare, finalizarea procesului de interconectare fiind prevăzută pentru primul trimestru al anului 2013.

Comisia a inițiat de curând 26 de cazuri EU-Pilot (o etapă obligatorie anterioară procedurii în constatarea încălcării) împotriva tuturor celor 26 de state membre care nu s-au interconectat la ERRU până la termenul stabilit în Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1071/2009 ([1]).

([1]) Regulamentul nr. 1071/2009 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 21 octombrie 2009 de stabilire a unor norme comune privind condițiile care trebuie îndeplinite pentru exercitarea ocupației de operator de transport rutier și de abrogare a Directivei 96/26/CE a Consiliului JO L 300, 14.11. 2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011697/12
to the Commission
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(21 December 2012)

Subject: Interconnection of national electronic registers of road transport undertakings

Regulation (EC) No 1071/2009 establishing common rules concerning the conditions to be complied with to pursue the occupation of road transport operator requires (in Article 16) that each Member State keep a national electronic register of road transport undertakings which have been authorised by a competent authority designated by it to engage in the occupation of road transport operator. The Member States were to interconnect those national electronic registers by 31 December 2012, in such a way that a competent authority of any Member State could consult the national electronic register of any other Member State.

What is the state of play as regards the interconnection of the national electronic registers of road transport undertakings authorised to engage in the occupation of road transport operator?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(11 February 2013)

Despite an extensive support provided by the Commission to Member States (IT workshops, ERRU working group meetings, functional mailboxes established to deal with problematic issues, etc.), one Member State only (Bulgaria) managed to finalise the interconnection to ERRU by the deadline of 31 December 2012.

Currently, the Netherlands is at the final stage of interconnection. Five other Member States (DK, EE, LV, SK, ES) and Norway are at the testing stage with a view to finalising the interconnection process in the first quarter of 2013.

The Commission has just launched 26 EU-Pilot cases (a mandatory pre-infringement phase) against all those 26 Member States who failed to interconnect to ERRU by the deadline set in the regulation (EC) No 1071/2009 ([1]).

([1]) Regulation No 1071/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 establishing common rules concerning the conditions to be complied with to pursue the occupation of road transport operators and repealing Council Directives 96/26/EC; OJ L 300, 14.11. 2009.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011698/12
adresată Comisiei
Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D)
(21 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Interoperabilitatea sistemelor de taxare rutieră electronică

Directiva 2004/52/CE stabilește condițiile necesare asigurării interoperabilității sistemelor de taxare rutieră electronică în cadrul Comunității. Toate sistemele de taxare electronică noi, date în exploatare la sau după data de 1 ianuarie 2007 utilizează, în scopul efectuării de tranzacții de taxare electronică, una sau mai multe din următoarele tehnologii: (a) localizarea prin satelit; (b) comunicațiile mobile în conformitate cu standardul GSM-GPRS (standardul de referință GSM TS 03.60/23.060); (c) tehnologia cu microunde cu frecvența de 5,8 GHz. Prin Directiva 2004/52/CE se creează un serviciu european de taxare electronică care înglobează întreaga rețea rutieră comunitară în care taxele rutiere sau de utilizare a rețelei de drumuri sunt încasate electronic. Acest serviciu, care este complementar serviciilor naționale de taxare electronică ale statelor membre, asigură interoperabilitatea pe ansamblul teritoriului comunitar pentru utilizatorii sistemelor de taxare electronică deja introduse în statele membre sau care urmează să fie introduse în viitor. Sistemele de taxare electronică ar trebui să fie interoperabile și să se bazeze pe standarde deschise și publice și trebuie să fie disponibile pentru toți furnizorii de sisteme fără discriminare.

În scopul punerii în aplicare a Deciziei 2009/750/CE privind definirea serviciului european de taxare rutieră electronică și a elementelor tehnice ale acestuia, fiecare stat membru păstrează un registru electronic național, care este actualizat și corect și care trebuie să fie accesibil publicului pe cale electronică până la 1 iulie 2010. De asemenea, conform articolului 21 al Deciziei 2009/750/CE, Comisia trebuia să întocmească un raport asupra progreselor înregistrate în ceea ce privește utilizarea SETRE.

Aș dori să întreb Comisia dacă a întocmit raportul mai sus menționat, unde poate fi acesta accesat, precum și care este stadiul interoperabilității sistemelor electronice de taxare rutieră?

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

Articlolul 3 alineatul (4) din Directiva 2004/52/CE ([1]) prevede că Serviciul european de taxare rutieră electronică (SETRE) trebuie să devină disponibil mai întâi pentru vehiculele mai grele, în termen de cel mult trei ani de la definirea SETRE. Decizia 2009/750/CE ([2]) prin care este definit SETRE a intrat în vigoare la 8 octombrie 2009. Data-limită de 8 octombrie 2012 nu a fost respectată, deoarece majoritatea statelor membre nu și-au îndeplinit obligațiile. În prezent sunt lansate proceduri de constatare a neîndeplinirii obligațiilor împotriva statelor membre în cauză.

În urma unei discuții desfășurate în cadrul reuniunii Consiliului Transporturi din 7 iunie 2012, Comisia a transmis o comunicare ([3]) către Parlamentul European și Consiliu la 30 august 2012 pentru a le atrage atenția asupra consecințelor și asupra acțiunilor posibile în vederea remedierii acestora. În același timp, Comisia promovează o abordare graduală cu aplicare la nivel regional transfrontalier în statele membre cu volum important de trafic. Un proiect cu aplicare regională poate fi extins, într-o etapă ulterioară, la nivelul tuturor infrastructurilor rutiere cu sisteme de taxare electronică din UE.

În prezent, există câteva exemple de interoperabilitate limitată și fragmentară a sistemelor de taxare rutieră, cum ar fi între Danemarca, Suedia, Norvegia și Austria ([4]), între Germania și Austria ([5]) sau unitatea unică interoperabilă de bord, care acoperă Franța, Spania și Belgia, oferită de mai mulți furnizori de servicii de taxare rutieră.

([1]) Directiva 2004/52/CE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 29 aprilie 2004 privind interoperabilitatea sistemelor de taxare rutieră electronică în cadrul Comunității, JO L 166, 30.4.2004.
([2]) 2009/750/CE: Decizia Comisiei din 6 octombrie 2009 privind definirea serviciului european de taxare rutieră electronică și a elementelor tehnice ale acestuia [notificată cu numărul C(2009) 7547], JO L 268, 13.10.2009.
([3]) COM(2012) 0474.
([4]) Sistemul de taxare rutieră „EasyGo+".
([5]) Sistemul TOLL2GO permite unităților germane de bord să funcționeze în Austria.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011698/12
to the Commission
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(21 December 2012)

Subject: Interoperability of electronic road toll systems

Directive 2004/52/EC sets out the conditions ensuring the interoperability of electronic road toll systems in the Community. All new electronic road toll systems deployed on or after 1 January 2007 must, for carrying out electronic toll transactions, use one or more of the following technologies: (a) satellite positioning; (b) mobile communications using the GSM-GPRS standard (reference GSM TS 03.60/23.060); (c) 5,8 GHz microwave technology. Directive 2004/52/EC creates a European electronic toll service (EETS) that covers the whole Community road network on which road tolls or road use charges are collected electronically. That service, which is an adjunct to the national electronic toll services of the Member States, ensures the interoperability throughout the Community of the electronic toll systems already in operation in the Member States and those to be introduced in the future, in the interests of the users of those systems. Those electronic toll systems should be interoperable and based on open, public standards, and must be available for use by all systems providers, on a non-discriminatory basis.

For the purposes of the implementation of Decision 2009/750/EC on the definition of the European Electronic Toll Service and its technical elements, every Member State had to have in place, by 1 July 2010, an up-to-date and accurate national electronic register accessible to the public. Similarly, under Article 21 of that Decision, the Commission had to draw up a report on the state of advancement of EETS deployment.

Has the Commission drawn up that report, where can it be accessed, and what is the state of play as regards the interoperability of electronic road toll systems?

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

Article 3(4) of Directive 2004/52/EC ([1]) stipulates that European Electronic Toll Service (EETS) must first become available for heavier vehicles at the latest three years after EETS has been defined. Decision 2009/750/EC ([2]) defining EETS entered into force on 8 October 2009. The deadline of 8 October 2012 was not respected as most Member States have not fulfilled their obligations. Infringement procedures are being launched against those Member States.

Following a discussion at the Transport Council of 7 June 2012, the Commission addressed a communication ([3]) to the European Parliament and the Council on 30 August 2012 in order to draw their attention to the consequences and to the possible actions to remedy them. At the same time the Commission promotes a stepwise approach with a deployment at cross-border regional level in Member States with significant volume of traffic. A regional deployment project can be extended to cover all the electronically tolled road infrastructures in the EU at a later stage.

There are currently a few examples of limited and fragmented interoperability of road tolling systems, such as between Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Austria ([4]), Germany and Austria ([5]) or the single interoperable on-board unit covering France, Spain and Belgium offered by several toll service providers.

([1]) Directive 2004/52/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the interoperability of electronic road toll systems in the Community, OJ L 166, 30.4.2004.
([2]) 2009/750/EC: Commission decision of 6 October 2009 on the definition of the European Electronic Toll Service and its technical elements (notified under document C(2009) 7547), OJ L 268,13.10.2009.
([3]) COM(2012) 0474.
([4]) The tolling system 'EasyGo+'.
([5]) The system TOLL2GO allows German on-board units to operate in Austria.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-011699/12
adresată Consiliului
Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D)
(21 decembrie 2012)

Subiect: Președinția irlandeză a UE — ridicarea barierelor pentru lucrătorii români și bulgari

Tratatele de aderare nu conferă Consiliului sau Președinției competența de a lua inițiativa în vederea extinderii accesului lucrătorilor români și bulgari la piețele forței de muncă ale statelor membre. Cu toate acestea, Consiliul poate invita statele membre care continuă să aplice restricții în temeiul măsurilor tranzitorii prevăzute în tratatele de aderare să ridice restricțiile în cea de a treia etapă, dacă nu se poate determina că există perturbări grave ale piețelor forței de muncă ale statelor membre în cauză sau amenințarea unor astfel de perturbări.

Aș dori să întreb președinția irlandeză a Consiliului care sunt măsurile concrete pe care le are în vedere pentru asigurarea liberei circulații a forței de muncă în cadrul UE și în special pentru ridicarea barierelor privind lucrătorii români și bulgari?

Răspuns
(4 februarie 2013)

Consiliul nu are nimic de adăugat la răspunsul său la întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000174/12.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011699/12
to the Council
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(21 December 2012)

Subject: Irish Presidency of the EU — lifting barriers for Romanian and Bulgarian workers

The Accession Treaties do not empower the Council or the Presidency to take any initiatives aimed at extending access for Romanian and Bulgarian workers to Member States' labour markets. However, the Council may call on those Member States which continue to apply restrictions under the transitional arrangements set out in the Accession Treaties to lift restrictions in the third phase if serious disturbances to the labour markets of the Member States concerned, or a threat of such disturbances, cannot be established.

Can the Irish Presidency of the Council say what specific measures it intends to take to guarantee freedom of movement for workers in the EU, and in particular to lift the barriers for Romanian and Bulgarian workers?

Reply
(4 February 2013)

The Council has nothing to add to its reply to Written Question E-000174/12.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011700/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(21 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: Pale eoliche a Farini

Nel comune di Farini, frazione di Nicelli, sull'Appennino piacentino, sarà realizzato a breve un parco eolico. Da qualche tempo, infatti, è stata installata una pala eolica alla quale dovrebbero aggiungersene altre sei che per la loro altezza cambierebbero la fisionomia del paesaggio incontaminato dell'Arisei (è questo il nome del tratto appenninico in questione).

La zona, però, non sembra essere soggetta a venti particolarmente forti tali da giustificare l'esistenza di un parco eolico e quindi gli abitanti non trarrebbero grandi benefici. Inoltre, tutto il territorio, in molti tratti scosceso (caratteristica degli Appennini che sono la seconda grande area montuosa italiana dopo le Alpi) e argilloso, difficilmente sopporterebbe i piloni di cemento, senza dimenticare che le strade sulle quali dovrebbero transitare i grossi camion carichi di materiale sono molto strette. Contro l'installazione delle pale da qualche mese è nato un comitato che cerca di far sentire le ragioni del suo «NO» al parco eolico, che, conti alla mano, non farebbe neanche risparmiare tanto sui consumi energetici.

Può la Commissione far sapere se

1. è a conoscenza di questo progetto?

2. ritiene necessario verificare l'effettiva idoneità dei siti scelti alla luce dei benefici che le energie alternative apportano in molte aree e del fatto che l'eolico si è rivelato spesso una fonte non necessaria?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(12 febbraio 2013)

La Commissione non è a conoscenza di questo progetto specifico. In base al principio di sussidiarietà, gli Stati membri sono responsabili della pianificazione del territorio e della concessione di licenze per progetti di sviluppo delle risorse eoliche. Tali progetti devono rispettare la legislazione dell'UE e di norma anche i progetti eolici, in funzione della loro portata, sono soggetti a una valutazione d'impatto ambientale ([1]), intesa ad affrontare eventuali problemi ambientali.

([1]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE, GU L 26 del 28.1.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011700/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(21 December 2012)

Subject: Wind turbines in Farini

In the Nicelli district of the municipality of Farini, in the Apennines near Piacenza, a wind farm is shortly to be built. Some time ago, a wind turbine was installed and another six are expected to be added. Because of their height, this would change the unspoiled landscape of the Arisei area (this is the name of the Apennine section in question).

The area, however, does not seem to be one of particularly high winds, sufficient to justify the existence of a wind farm; the local inhabitants would therefore not derive any great benefit. In addition, the entire area is, in many parts, steep (which is typical of the Apennines, being the second largest mountain area in Italy after the Alps) and argillaceous, which would make it difficult for the earth to support concrete pillars, not to mention the fact that the roads to be used by the material-laden trucks are very narrow. A few months ago, a committee against the installation of the wind turbines was set up. It is seeking to make its voice heard and explain why it is against this wind farm, which, financially speaking, would not even save that much on energy consumption.

Can the Commission say whether:

1. it is aware of this project;

2. it does not agree that it should check the real suitability of the sites chosen, in the light of the benefits that alternative energy sources bring to many areas and the fact that wind power has often turned out to be an unnecessary source?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(12 February 2013)

The Commission is not aware of this specific project. In accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, Member States are responsible for land planning and permitting for developments such as the development of wind energy resources. Such developments must occur in accordance with EC law, and depending on their size, wind energy projects are usually subject to Environmental Impact Assessments ([1]) which are meant to address possible environmental impacts.

([1]) Directive 2011/92/EU, OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-011701/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(21 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Φόρος μεταβίβασης των ακινήτων της ΑΤΕ στην Τράπεζα Πειραιώς

Στις 27.7.2012 πωλήθηκε η Αγροτική Τράπεζα (ΑΤΕ) στην Τράπεζα Πειραιώς μαζί μεταβιβάστηκε και σημαντική ακίνητη περιουσία της πρώτης στη δεύτερη.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή: σε τι ποσό ανέρχεται ο φόρος μεταβίβασης των ακινήτων της ΑΤΕ στην Πειραιώς; Καταβλήθηκε το ποσό αυτό από την τράπεζα Πειραιώς στο ελληνικό κράτος; Αν όχι, γιατί;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Ο φορολογικός χειρισμός των μεταβιβάσεων ακίνητης περιουσίας στο πλαίσια της εξυγίανσης τραπεζών εμπίπτει στην αρμοδιότητα των ελληνικών φορολογικών αρχών. Το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου μπορεί να αποταθεί απευθείας στις ελληνικές φορολογικές αρχές για το θέμα αυτό.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011701/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(21 December 2012)

Subject: Tax on transfer of real estate from ATEbank to Piraeus Bank

On 27 July 2012 the Agricultural Bank (ATEbank) was sold to Piraeus Bank, and substantial real estate was also transferred from the former to the latter.

Will the Commission say: how much is the tax on the transfer of ATEbank's real estate to Piraeus Bank? Has that amount been paid by Piraeus Bank to the Greek state? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(12 February 2013)

Tax treatment of real estate transfers under resolution scenarios falls under the responsibility of Hellenic tax authorities. The Honourable Member may address a query directly to the Hellenic tax authorities.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-011702/12
à la Commission
Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)
(21 décembre 2012)

Objet: Composition du groupe de travail de l'EFSA sur les perturbateurs endocriniens

La DG SANCO a saisi l'EFSA dans le cadre du travail de la Commission sur les perturbateurs endocriniens. Alors qu'un groupe de travail — dont les résultats sont attendus pour le début 2013 — consacré à cette problématique existe déjà au sein de la DG Environnement, l'EFSA doit également rendre, d'ici mars 2013, un avis scientifique sur les risques liés à la présence de perturbateurs endocriniens dans la chaîne alimentaire. La composition du groupe de travail de l'EFSÀ mandaté pour établir cet avis a été rendue publique le lundi 3 décembre 2012.

Parmi les dix-huit experts de ce groupe, onze n'ont déclaré aucune expérience dans le domaine du fonctionnement hormonal. Seuls quatre ont mené des recherches scientifiques sur les perturbateurs endocriniens, mais uniquement en endocrinologie animale. Or, l'avis demandé à l'EFSA concerne non seulement les effets sur l'environnement, mais aussi sur la santé. Par ailleurs, huit experts ont affirmé collaborer avec l'industrie et/ou le secteur privé, dont trois avec l'Institut international des sciences de la vie (ILSI), le lobby de l'industrie agroalimentaire. Trois autres experts appartiennent aux agences nationales allemande (BfR) ou britannique (HSE). Or, dans un document conjoint de l'Allemagne et de la Grande-Bretagne, qui porte le logo de l'Institut fédéral allemand pour l'évaluation des risques (BfR), ces deux pays énoncent explicitement que leur point de départ est l'impact commercial d'une identification. Cette approche biaisée et non scientifique les mène à se prononcer en faveur de l'adoption de critères de sélection basés sur des seuils de puissance pour limiter l'identification des perturbateurs endocriniens.

N'y a-t-il pas des risques de doublon entre le groupe de travail de l'EFSA et celui de la DG Environnement et, sinon, quels sont les objectifs précis de chacun des groupes? La Commission considère-t-elle qu'elle peut recevoir un avis adéquat sur l'identification des perturbateurs endocriniens d'un groupe qui ne contient aucun expert en endocrinologie humaine? Estime-t-elle qu'il y a conflit d'intérêts pour les experts qui ont déclaré des collaborations avec l'industrie et, si oui, quelles conséquences en tire-t-elle? Comment la Commission justifie-t-elle l'inclusion dans ce groupe d'experts de représentants d'agences liés par la position officielle de leur gouvernement, elle-même basée sur des considérations commerciales?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(24 janvier 2013)

Le mandat donné par la Commission à l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) pour l'établissement d'un avis scientifique sur les perturbateurs endocriniens repose sur la nécessité d'obtenir une opinion scientifique indépendante en vue de l'élaboration de critères relatifs aux produits phytosanitaires d'ici fin 2013.

En tant qu'agence indépendante de l'UE, l'EFSA est responsable d'organiser les travaux qu'elle mène pour l'établissement d'un avis sur les perturbateurs endocriniens conformément au mandat de la Commission.

S'agissant de la question du conflit d'intérêts, la Commission renvoie l'Honorable Parlementaire à sa réponse à la question écrite E-04782/2011 de M. Obermayr ([1]), qui porte sur l'indépendance et les conflits d'intérêts. Les nouvelles modalités de mise en œuvre récemment adoptées par le conseil d'administration de l'EFSA renforcent les procédures en place et peuvent être consultées sur son site internet.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011702/12
to the Commission
Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)
(21 December 2012)

Subject: Composition of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) working group on endocrine disruptors

The Commission's Directorate-General for Health and Consumers (DG SANCO) has called on the services of the EFSA in connection with the Commission's work on endocrine disruptors. Although an internal DG Environment working group is already looking into this problem, and is expected to report its findings early in 2013, the EFSA has also been asked to deliver a scientific opinion, by March 2013, on the risks associated with the possible presence of endocrine disruptors in the food chain. The composition of the EFSA working group tasked with drawing up the opinion was announced on Monday, 3 December 2012.

11 of the 18 experts appointed to the working group have no declared experience in the field of hormone function. Four members of the working group have carried out scientific research on endocrine disruptors, but only in the field of animal endocrinology. Yet the EFSA has been asked to deliver an opinion which covers health implications as well as the impact on the environment. Moreover, eight of the experts stated that they have worked in the industry and/or the private sector, of whom three were members of the International Life Sciences Institute (ILSI), a lobby group for the agro-food industry. Three other experts belong to German or British Government agencies, the BfR (Federal Institute for Risk Assessment) and the HSE (Health and Safety Executive) respectively. However, a joint British/German proposal bearing the logo of the German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment explicitly states that the two countries' starting point is the 'commercial impact' of identifying substances as endocrine disruptors. This biased and unscientific approach results in their advocating the adoption of criteria based on potency-based thresholds in order to limit the identification of substances as endocrine disruptors.

Is there not a risk of duplication of effort on the part of the EFSA and the DG Environment working groups and, if not, what are the precise objectives of each working group? Does the Commission believe that it is possible to obtain an adequate opinion on the identification of endocrine disruptors from a group which does not include a single expert on human endocrinology? Does the Commission consider that there is a potential conflict of interest in the case of experts who have declared that they have collaborated with the industry and, if so, what conclusions does it draw? How can the Commission justify the inclusion in the group of experts of representatives of government agencies who are bound by the official position taken by their respective governments on the basis of commercial considerations?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(24 January 2013)

The Commission's mandate to the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) for a scientific opinion on endocrine disruptors stems from the requirement for independent scientific advice in order to prepare criteria for plant protection products by the end of 2013.

EFSA as an independent EU agency is responsible for organising its work to deliver an opinion on endocrine disruptors in accordance with the Commission's mandate.

With regard to the issue of conflict of interest, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-04782/2011 by Mr Obermayr ([1]) which deals with independence and conflict of interest. The new Implementing Rules recently adopted by the EFSA Management Board strengthen the procedures in place and can be consulted on the EFSA website.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-011703/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(21 dicembre 2012)

Oggetto: Sicurezza dei cittadini europei e misura cautelare dell'ordinamento italiano dell'obbligo di dimora — il caso di Tezze sul Brenta (VI)

Il 22 novembre 2012 un'ordinanza della Corte di Appello di Venezia ha deciso il trasferimento nel Comune di Tezze sul Brenta, in provincia di Vicenza, di un pregiudicato sottoposto alla misura cautelare di obbligo di dimora ex art. 283 del Codice di procedura penale italiano. Di questo provvedimento non è stata data al Comune nessuna comunicazione preventiva. Il sindaco e la giunta comunale ne sono venuti a conoscenza solo a trasferimento concluso, grazie ad un fax spedito dal Comune di Fontaniva, in provincia di Padova, dove il soggetto era domiciliato in precedenza. Il pregiudicato non ha legami parentali o lavorativi con il territorio e vive in una roulotte che il Tribunale ha stabilito fosse collocata in una zona industriale già degradata. La scelta del luogo di stazionamento della roulotte è stata presa senza consultare il Comune, né fornire spiegazioni sulla scelta di Tezze quale nuovo domicilio coatto del pregiudicato. Considerato che:

— la scelta del luogo di stazionamento non favorisce la riabilitazione del soggetto, giacché perturbata da una situazione di emarginazione sociale, disagio e delinquenza diffusa;

— con la risoluzione P7_TA(2009)0090, il Parlamento, in tema di una strategia coerente di sicurezza a più livelli per un'Europa che protegge i propri cittadini, «*esorta la Commissione e gli Stati membri a garantire che la futura azione dell'Unione europea in questo settore rispetti pienamente l'importanza basilare dei diritti e delle libertà fondamentali e consegua il giusto equilibrio tra sicurezza e libertà*» e promuove «*la tutela […] dei diritti fondamentali […] base della democrazia in Europa*»;

— il trattato dell'UE, dopo le modifiche del 2009, riconosce come vincolante la Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea, il cui art. 3 stabilisce che «*ogni individuo ha diritto alla propria integrità fisica e psichica*», quindi anche i cittadini di Tezze;

la Commissione non ritiene che la costruzione di una cultura della giustizia europea debba fondarsi sul dialogo tra i cittadini, la società civile organizzata e le autorità locali?

Nei casi come quello sopra descritto, la Commissione non considera necessaria una procedura di consultazione della popolazione locale e delle sue autorità per tutelare i diritti delle vittime riconosciuti dalla decisione quadro del Consiglio 2001/220/GAI?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(14 febbraio 2013)

L'articolo 6, paragrafo 1, del trattato sull'Unione europea recita: «le disposizioni della Carta non estendono in alcun modo le competenze dell'Unione definite nei trattati». In virtù del suo articolo 51, paragrafo 1, la Carta dei diritti fondamentali si applica agli Stati membri esclusivamente nell'attuazione del diritto dell'Unione.

Nei casi che esulano dal diritto dell'UE spetta a ciascuno Stato membro garantire ai propri cittadini il rispetto e la tutela effettivi dei diritti fondamentali in base alla normativa nazionale e in ottemperanza degli obblighi internazionali in materia di diritti umani.

La direttiva 2012/29/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 25 ottobre 2012, che istituisce norme minime in materia di diritti, assistenza e protezione delle vittime di reato ([1]) sancisce il diritto della vittima del reato di essere informata, se lo desidera, della scarcerazione degli autori. Esorta altresì gli Stati membri ad assicurare, nel prestare alla vittima un'assistenza adeguata, che i servizi pubblici operino in maniera coordinata e intervengano a tutti i livelli amministrativi per tutelarne le esigenze. Tuttavia, il legislatore europeo non ha incluso il diritto delle vittime, o delle collettività o autorità locali, ad essere consultate sulle decisioni di libertà vigilata cui rimanda l'onorevole deputato.

([1]) Direttiva che sostituisce la decisione quadro 2001/220/GAI.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011703/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(21 December 2012)

Subject: Safety of European citizens and precautionary measures under Italian law imposing an obligation to stay in a specified place: the case of Tezze sul Brenta (Province of Vicenza)

On 22 November 2012 the Venice Court of Appeal ordered the transfer to the municipality of Tezze sul Brenta, in the Province of Vicenza, of a convicted offender subject to a 'precautionary measure' requiring him to stay in a specified place pursuant to Article 283 of the Italian Code of Criminal Procedure. The municipal authorities received no prior notification of this measure. The mayor and municipal council were informed of the transfer only after it had taken place, by means of a fax sent by the municipality of Fontaniva, in the Province of Padua, where the person in question had previously resided. The convicted offender has no family or work connections with the area and lives in a caravan which, the Court ascertained, was situated in a run-down industrial area. The location of the caravan was chosen without consulting the municipality, and no reasons were given for choosing Tezze to be the convicted offender's new mandatory place of residence.

The chosen location is not conducive to the rehabilitation of an individual who is already suffering the unsettling effects of social exclusion, deprivation and a criminal lifestyle.

In the section of its resolution P7_TA(2009)0090 dealing with 'a coherent multi-layered security strategy' for 'a Europe which protects its citizens', Parliament 'urges the Commission and the Member States to ensure that future EU action in this field fully respects the core importance of fundamental rights and freedoms and strikes the right balance between security and freedom', and considers that the 'protection and promotion of fundamental rights form the basis of democracy in Europe'.

The Treaty on European Union, as amended in 2009, recognises as binding the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, Article 3 of which stipulates that 'Everyone has the right to respect for his or her physical and mental integrity' — a provision which also applies to the citizens of Tezze.

Does the Commission agree that the process of developing a culture of European justice should be based on three-way discussions between citizens, civil society organisations and local authorities?

In cases such as the one outlined above, does the Commission agree that a procedure for consulting the local community and local authorities is required to protect the rights of victims, which are recognised in the Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA?

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

Article 6(1) of the Treaty of the European Union states that 'the provisions of the Charter shall not extend in any way the competences of the Union as defined in the Treaties'. According to Article 51(1), the Charter of Fundamental Rights applies to Member States only when they are implementing European Union law.

In cases where EC law is not at stake it is for Member States to ensure that the fundamental rights of their citizens are effectively respected and protected in accordance with their national legislation and international human rights obligations.

Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime ([1]) requires that victims are notified of the release of offenders if they so wish. It also encourages Member States, while providing the proper degree of assistance to the victim, to ensure that public services work in a coordinated manner and are involved at all administrative levels to safeguard the needs of victims. However, the European legislator did not include the right of victims, or local communities and authorities, to be consulted in the probation decision, as suggested in the question of the Honourable Member.

([1]) Replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-011704/12
do Komisji
Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(21 grudnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Rozporządzenie Rady (WE) NR 1099/2009 z dnia 24 września 2009 r. w sprawie ochrony zwierząt podczas ich uśmiercania

Artykuł 4 ustęp 4 dopuszcza stosowanie uboju rytualnego wyłącznie na potrzeby społeczności religijnej w danym kraju. Czy też dopuszcza te metody w stosunku do zwierząt ubijanych w celu produkcji mięsa na eksport?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(4 lutego 2013 r.)

W art. 4 ust. 4 rozporządzenia (WE) nr 1099/2009 ([1]) w sprawie ochrony zwierząt podczas ich uśmiercania przewidziano odstępstwo od ogólnej zasady, że zwierzęta są uśmiercane wyłącznie po uprzednim ogłuszeniu, w przypadku zwierząt poddawanych ubojowi według szczególnych metod wymaganych przez obrzędy religijne, pod warunkiem że ubój ma miejsce w rzeźni.

Wywóz wołowiny ze zwierząt, które zostały uśmiercone metodą uboju wymaganą przez obrzędy religijne, nie jest zakazany na mocy powyższego rozporządzenia. Jednak art. 4 ust. 4, jak wszelkie odstępstwa, należy interpretować wąsko, biorąc pod uwagę cele rozporządzenia, które są zgodne z art. 13 Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej, jak również wolność religii oraz prawo do uzewnętrzniania religii lub przekonań poprzez uprawianie kultu, nauczanie, praktykowanie i uczestniczenie w obrzędach, co zapisano w art. 10 Karty praw podstawowych Unii Europejskiej.

([1]) Dz.U. L 303 z 18.11.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011704/12
to the Commission
Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(21 December 2012)

Subject: Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 of 24 September 2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing

Article 4(4) of the regulation permits ritual slaughter only when it is prescribed by a religious community in a given country. Is ritual slaughter also permissible in cases where animals are killed to produce meat for export?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(4 February 2013)

Article 4(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 ([1]) on the protection of animals at the time of killing foresees a derogation from the general principle that animals shall only be killed after stunning, for animals subject to particular methods of slaughter prescribed by religious rites provided that the slaughter takes place in a slaughterhouse.

The export of meat of animals having been killed according to a method of slaughter prescribed by religious rites is not prohibited by the regulation. However, like any derogation, Article 4(4) has to be interpreted in a narrow way taking into account the objectives of the regulation, which are in line with Article 13 TFEU, as well as the freedom of religion and the right to manifest religion or belief in worship, teaching, practice and observance, as enshrined in Article 10 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

([1]) OJ L 303, 18.11.2009.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000001/13
do Komisji
Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(3 stycznia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Sprawa CHAP(2012)02494

Proszę o informację, jaki jest stan postępowania w sprawie CHAP(2012)02494.

Czy postępowanie w tej sprawie jest zakończone i jeśli to możliwe, to jakie są w tej sprawie ustalenia i wnioski Komisji?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Daciana Cioloşa w imieniu Komisji
(19 lutego 2013 r.)

W dniu 16 sierpnia 2012 r. Komisja otrzymała pismo w sprawie domniemanych nieprawidłowości związanych z budową chodnika popełnionych przez Urząd Gminy i Miasta Raszków podczas realizacji projektu „Restrukturyzacja i modernizacja sektora żywnościowego oraz rozwój obszarów wiejskich w latach 2004-2006", które zostało zarejestrowane jako skarga pod numerem CHAP(2012)2494.

Badanie skargi nie zostało dotychczas zakończone, gdyż w dniach 1 października i 27 grudnia 2012 r. skarżący przedstawił Komisji dodatkowe informacje.

Należy jednak zauważyć, że na mocy umów regulujących funkcjonowanie wspólnej polityki rolnej (WPR), państwa członkowskie są odpowiedzialne za wykonanie przepisów WPR, a w szczególności wdrażanie krajowych programów rozwoju obszarów wiejskich.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000001/13
to the Commission
Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: CHAP(2012)02494 case

What is the state of proceedings in the CHAP(2012)02494 case?

Have proceedings been concluded, and what conclusions and arrangements did the Commission reach in the case?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(19 February 2013)

On 16 August 2012 the Commission received a letter concerning alleged irregularities related to the construction of pavement by Raszków Town and Commune Office during the implementation of the project 'Restructuring and Modernisation of the Food Sector and Rural Development 2004-2006' which was registered as complaint with the number CHAP(2012)2494.

At this moment the examination of the complaint is not completed because the complainant submitted additional information to the Commission on 1 October and 27 December 2012.

However, it should be noted that, under the arrangements governing the functioning of the common agricultural policy (CAP), since the beginning, the Member States have been responsible for the execution of rules of the CAP and, particularly, the implementation of the National Rural Development Programmes.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000002/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(3 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ανισορροπίες μεταξύ κρατών μελών στην ανεργία των νέων και μέτρα για την αντιμετώπισή τους

Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατα στοιχεία της Eurostat τα ποσοστά ανεργίας των νέων (κάτω των 25 ετών) έφθασαν στο 23,4% στην ΕΕ και στο 23,9% στην ευρωζώνη, σε σχέση με 21,9% και 21,2% αντίστοιχα τον Οκτώβριο του 2011. Σημαντικές διαφορές παρατηρούνται μεταξύ κρατών μελών με τα χαμηλότερα ποσοστά στη Γερμανία (8,1%), την Αυστρία (8,5%) και την Ολλανδία (9,8%) και τα υψηλότερα στην Ελλάδα (57,0%, τον Αύγουστο 2012) και την Ισπανία (55,9%) ([1]). Επιπροσθέτως, η λειτουργία της αγοράς εργασίας επηρεάζεται από την χαμηλή κινητικότητα του εργατικού δυναμικού δεδομένου ότι μόλις το 2,8% των πολιτών της ΕΕ σε ηλικία εργασίας (15-64 ετών) διαμένουν σε κράτος μέλος διαφορετικό από αυτό της εθνικότητάς τους ([2]). Παράλληλα, το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο στα συμπεράσματα της πρόσφατης συνόδου του (13/14 Δεκεμβρίου 2012), καλεί την Επιτροπή να θεσπίσει τη «συμμαχία για τις περιόδους πρακτικής άσκησης» (Alliance for Apprenticeships), να υποβάλει πρόταση για τον νέο κανονισμό EURES καθώς και να συνεχίσει να παρακολουθεί την πορεία της ανακοίνωσης «Ανασχεδιασμός των εκπαιδευτικών συστημάτων» (Rethinking Education) ([3]).

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή ερωτάται:

1. Διαθέτει στοιχεία για την εργασιακή κινητικότητα των νέων στην ΕΕ; Πώς θα ενθαρρυνθεί η διασυνοριακή κινητικότητα για να συμβάλλει στην βελτίωση της λειτουργίας και της ευελιξίας της αγοράς εργασίας και την άμβλυνση των ανισοτήτων μεταξύ κρατών μελών όσον αφορά την απασχόληση των νέων;

2. Θεωρεί ότι μέτρα όπως το ποιοτικό πλαίσιο για περιόδους πρακτικής άσκησης και η «συμμαχία για τις περιόδους πρακτικής άσκησης» (Alliance for Apprenticeships) επαρκούν για τη μείωση της ανεργίας των νέων; Ποιο περιεχόμενο θα δώσει στην πρωτοβουλία αυτή και με ποιά μέτρα θα το συνοδεύσει;

3. Ποιες οι αντιδράσεις των κρατών μελών, των εκπαιδευτικών ιδρυμάτων και άλλων φορέων όσον αφορά τις προτάσεις της για «Ανασχεδιασμό των εκπαιδευτικών συστημάτων»; Ποιες άλλες πρωτοβουλίες σχεδιάζει για καλύτερη αντιστοιχία μεταξύ δεξιοτήτων και θέσεων εργασίας;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(26 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

1. Η ενισχυμένη κινητικότητα στην εργασία των νέων εντός της Ευρώπης είναι μια από τις πρωτοβουλίες που περιλαμβάνονται στη Δέσμη μέτρων για την απασχόληση των νέων (ΥΕΡ) ([4]). Το 2012, η Επιτροπή δρομολόγησε την προπαρασκευαστική ενέργεια «Η πρώτη σου εργασία μέσω του EURES», ένα πρόγραμμα κινητικότητας για τους νέους. Από το 2013 το πρόγραμμα θα επεκταθεί επίσης στην πρακτική άσκηση και στη μαθητεία. Τα διδάγματα που αντλούνται από το πρόγραμμα αυτό θα χρησιμοποιηθούν για το μελλοντικό «Πρόγραμμα απασχόλησης για νέους EURES», για το οποίο ανακοινώθηκε στην ΥΕΡ μια διαβούλευση με τους ενδιαφερόμενους φορείς.

2. Η αύξηση της προσφοράς ποιοτικών περιόδων άσκησης και μαθητείας θα διευκολύνει τις συχνά δύσκολες μεταβάσεις από το σχολείο στην εργασία. Όπως σκιαγραφείται στην ΥΕΡ, αυτό πρέπει να συμπληρώνει τα άλλα μέτρα προκειμένου να εξετασθούν τα διάφορα βραχυπρόθεσμα και διαρθρωτικά προβλήματα πίσω από την κρίση στον τομέα της απασχόλησης των νέων, όπως η θέσπιση νέων προγραμμάτων εγγύησης για τους νέους ή η εφαρμογή συστάσεων ειδικών ανά χώρα στο πλαίσιο του Ευρωπαϊκού Εξαμήνου.

Τα επόμενα βήματα για την κατάρτιση ενός ποιοτικού πλαισίου για τις περιόδους πρακτικής άσκησης σκιαγραφούνται στο ΥΕΡ, οι στόχοι της ευρωπαϊκής συμμαχίας για θέσεις μαθητείας παρουσιάζονται στο ΥΕΡ και στον «Ανασχεδιασμό της εκπαίδευσης» ([5]). Η συμμαχία θα στηριχθεί στις υπάρχουσες ορθές πρακτικές και διμερείς πρωτοβουλίες για την προώθηση των οφελών από τα επιτυχή προγράμματα μαθητείας και θα προσπαθήσει να κάνει έξυπνη χρήση της χρηματοδότησης της ΕΕ για τη δημιουργία νέων προγραμμάτων ή τη βελτίωση των ήδη υφιστάμενων. Για παράδειγμα, ένα γραφείο υποστήριξης του ΕΚΤ είναι υπό σύσταση για το θέμα αυτό.

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/3-30112012-BP/EN/3-30112012-BP-EN.PDF
([2]) ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7624&langId=en
([3]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/134353.pdf
([4]) COM(2012)727-728-729 τελικό της 5 Δεκεμβρίου 2012.
([5]) COM(2012)669 τελικό της 20 Νοεμβρίου 2012.

3. Υπάρχει σημαντικό ενδιαφέρον και υποστήριξη για «τον ανασχεδιασμό της εκπαίδευσης» από όλους τους βασικούς ενδιαφερομένους. Μεταξύ των ενεργειών που τίθενται σε εφαρμογή τώρα με στόχο τη βελτίωση της αντιστοίχισης δεξιοτήτων και θέσεων εργασίας, αξίζει να σημειωθούν το «Πανόραμα δεξιοτήτων της ΕΕ» ([6]) και οι ESCO ([7]) (Ευρωπαϊκές δεξιότητες, ικανότητες και επαγγέλματα (ESCO European Skills, Competencies and Occupations).

([6]) http://euskillspanorama.ec.europa.eu
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1042&langId=en

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000002/13
to the Commission
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Imbalances between Member States as regards youth unemployment and measures to address them

According to recent Eurostat figures, unemployment rates among young people (under 25 years of age) are 23.4% in the EU and 23.9% in the eurozone, compared to 21.9% and 21.2%, respectively, in October 2011. Significant differences exist between Member States with the lowest rates, namely Germany (8.1%), Austria (8.5%) and the Netherlands (9.8%) and the highest rates, namely Greece (57.0% in August 2012) and Spain (55.9%) ([1]). In addition, the operation of the labour market is affected by low labour mobility since only 2.8% of EU citizens of working age (15-64 years old) reside in a Member State other than that of which they are nationals ([2]). At the same time, in the conclusions of the recent European Council (13/14 December 2012), the European Council calls upon the Commission to adopt the 'Alliance for Apprenticeships', to submit a proposal for the new EURES regulation and to continue to monitor the progress of the communication 'Rethinking Education' ([3]).

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it have any information on the job mobility of young people in the EU? How will it encourage cross-border mobility in order to help improve the functioning and flexibility of labour markets and reduce disparities between Member States as regards youth employment?

2. Does it believe that measures such as the quality framework for traineeships and the 'Alliance for Apprenticeships' are sufficient to reduce youth unemployment? What substance will it give to this initiative and what flanking measures will it take?

3. What are the reactions of Member States, educational institutions and other stakeholders as regards the proposals for a 'Rethinking Education'? What other initiatives is it planning in order to achieve a better match between skills and jobs?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 2013)

1. Enhanced job mobility of young people within Europe is one of the initiatives included in the Youth Employment Package (YEP) ([4]). In 2012 the Commission launched the preparatory action 'Your first EURES job', a mobility scheme for young people. As from 2013 it will also be extended to traineeships and apprenticeships. Lessons learnt from this scheme will be used for the future 'EURES jobs for young people programme', for which a stakeholder consultation was announced in the YEP.

2. Increasing the supply of quality traineeships and apprenticeships will ease the often difficult school-to-work transitions. As outlined in the YEP, this has to be complementary to other measures in order to address the different short-term and structural problems behind the youth employment crisis, such as the establishment of youth guarantee schemes or the implementation of country-specific recommendations within the European Semester.

The next steps towards a Quality Framework for Traineeships are outlined in the YEP, the aims of the European Alliance for Apprenticeships are presented in the YEP and 'Rethinking Education' ([5]). The Alliance will build on existing good practices and bilateral initiatives to promote the benefits of successful apprenticeship schemes and seek to make smart use of EU funding for setting up new schemes or improving existing ones. By way of example, an ESF helpdesk is currently being established in this regard.

3. There has been significant interest and support for 'Rethinking Education' from all main stakeholders. Among actions now being implemented to target better matching between skills and jobs, it is worth noting the EU Skills Panorama ([6]) and ESCO ([7]).

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/3-30112012-BP/EN/3-30112012-BP-EN.PDF
([2]) ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7624&langId=en
([3]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/134353.pdf
([4]) COM(2012) 727-728 — 729 final of 5 December 2012.
([5]) COM(2012) 669 final of 20 November 2012.
([6]) http://euskillspanorama.ec.europa.eu
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1042&langId=en

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000003/13
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος)
Charalampos Angourakis (GUE/NGL)
(3 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Με αίμα χωρίζονται οι νέες ιμπεριαλιστικές ζώνες επιρροής

Τραγικό τέλος βρήκαν 21 μετανάστες το Σάββατο 15.12.2012, οι οποίοι πνίγηκαν και τους εξέβρασε η θάλασσα στην ακτή, στην προσπάθειά τους να μπουν στην Ελλάδα, για να φτάσουν στον «παράδεισο» της ΕΕ όπως τους προπαγανδίζουν στην χώρα τους. Σύμφωνα με την μαρτυρία επιζώντα, η λέμβος στην οποία επέβαιναν τα 28 άτομα ξεκίνησε από τουρκική ακτή με προορισμό την Μυτιλήνη. Στους αγνοούμενους είναι και 4 παιδιά από 3 έως 10 ετών.

Γι' αυτό, όπως και για άλλα παρόμοια εγκλήματα, δεν ευθύνονται μόνο οι δουλέμποροι. Συνυπεύθυνοι είναι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, οι ΗΠΑ, οι ιμπεριαλιστικοί οργανισμοί, οι κυβερνήσεις και τα αστικά κόμματα, που, είτε με τους ιμπεριαλιστικούς πολέμους, είτε με την ιμπεριαλιστική ειρήνη καταδικάζουν στην φτώχια και στην εξαθλίωση τους λαούς. Στο όνομα των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων που οι ίδιοι τσαλαπατούν, εξαπολύουν ιμπεριαλιστικές επεμβάσεις στην Γιουγκοσλαβία, στην Λιβύη, στο Ιράκ, στο Ιράν, στο Αφγανιστάν και τώρα στην Συρία, οδηγώντας τον λαό στον ξεριζωμό και στην προσφυγιά.

Εντείνεται η συνεργασία γαλλικών, βρετανικών και αμερικανικών στρατιωτικών δυνάμεων με δυνάμεις των ανταρτών στο Συριακό έδαφος και η κάθε είδους ενίσχυση τους σε οικονομικό και στρατιωτικό επίπεδο, ενώ πρόσφατα η ΕΕ αναγνώρισε την οργάνωση της «Εθνικής Συμμαχίας». Με δηλώσεις του ο Γάλλος Υπουργός Εξωτερικών τόνισε ότι θα παράσχει όπλα στην «Εθνική Συμμαχία» για αμυντικούς σκοπούς, και ο ΓΓ του ΝΑΤΟ, Αντερς Φογκ Ράσμουσεν, ότι «το καθεστώς Άσαντ καταρρέει».

Πώς τοποθετείται η Επιτροπή απέναντι στην ανοιχτή ιμπεριαλιστική επέμβαση της ΕΕ και κρατών μελών της, των ΗΠΑ και του ΝΑΤΟ, στην Συρία και την ευρύτερη περιοχή, την ενίσχυση της δράσης του «Ελεύθερου συριακού Στρατού» και της «Εθνικής Συμμαχίας» που οδηγούν στην σφαγή του συριακού λαού και στην διόγκωση του μεταναστευτικού ρεύματος;

Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(8 Μαρτίου 2013)

Στις επίσημες δηλώσεις της, όπως στα συμπεράσματα του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου της 14ης Δεκεμβρίου 2012 ή στα συμπεράσματα του Συμβουλίου Εξωτερικών Υποθέσεων της 10ης Δεκεμβρίου 2012, η ΕΕ δήλωσε σαφώς ότι συνεχίζει να υποστηρίζει την αποστολή του κοινού ειδικού απεσταλμένου L. Brahimi και καλεί το Συμβούλιο Ασφαλείας των Ηνωμένων Εθνών (ΣΑΗΕ) να αναλάβει τις ευθύνες του. Η ΕΕ δεν έχει εκδώσει δηλώσεις σχετικά με τις δράσεις του Οργανισμού του Βορειοατλαντικού Συμφώνου (ΝΑΤΟ) ή των μεμονωμένων κρατών μελών του.

Η ΕΕ αποδέχθηκε τον Συριακό Αντιπολιτευτικό Συνασπισμό ως τον νόμιμο εκπρόσωπο του συριακού λαού και το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο ανέθεσε στο Συμβούλιο Εξωτερικών Υποθέσεων να εξετάσει τις εναλλακτικές επιλογές για την παροχή στήριξης στην αντίσταση και για τη μεγαλύτερη προστασία των πολιτών. Εν τω μεταξύ, η ΕΕ ηγήθηκε των διεθνών προσπαθειών για τη χορήγηση βοήθειας στους σύριους πρόσφυγες, καθώς και στους Σύριους στο εσωτερικό της χώρας.

Η ΕΕ είναι στην πρώτη γραμμή των ανθρωπιστικών προσπαθειών που καταβάλλονται στη Συρία και στις γειτονικές χώρες. Στην απόκρισή της στην κατάσταση στη Συρία, η ΕΕ έλαβε υπόψη τις ανθρωπιστικές ανάγκες και παρακολούθησε στενά την κατάσταση επιτόπου, προκειμένου να προσαρμόσει τη χρηματοδότησή της στην επιδείνωση της κατάστασης. Προς το παρόν, η ΕΕ είναι ο κύριος χορηγός ανθρωπιστικής βοήθειας σε αυτήν την κρίση. Η συνολική συλλογική ανθρωπιστική συμβολή της ΕΕ ανέρχεται σε 416,8 εκατομμύρια ευρώ (216,8 εκατομμύρια ευρώ από τα κράτη μέλη + 200 εκατομμύρια ευρώ από τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ). Επιπλέον, με τις πρόσφατες ύψους 172 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ συνεισφορές των κρατών μελών στη Διάσκεψη των χορηγών στο Κουβέιτ, τον Ιανουάριο του 2013, το συνολικό ποσό ανέρχεται σε 588 εκατομμύρια ευρώ. Εξάλλου, η ΕΕ επικεντρώθηκε στη διασφάλιση του συντονισμού της διεθνούς ανθρωπιστικής απάντησης ανεξαρτήτως του πολιτικού σκέλους και με βάση τις ανθρωπιστικές αρχές. Όσον αφορά αυτό το θέμα, η Επιτροπή συνεχίζει να διαδραματίζει ισχυρό ρόλο ως συν-διαμεσολαβητής του συριακού ανθρωπιστικού φόρουμ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000003/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Charalampos Angourakis (GUE/NGL)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — The new imperialist spheres of influence drawn in blood

On Saturday 15.12.2012, 21 immigrants met a tragic end when they drowned and were later washed ashore in an attempt to enter Greece to reach 'paradise', as the EU is presented in their country of origin. According to the testimony of a survivor, the boarding craft on which 28 persons had embarked had set off from the Turkish coast in the direction of Mytilini, Lesbos. Among the missing persons are 4 children aged from 3 to 10.

But is not only the traffickers who are responsible for this and other similar crimes. A share of responsibility lies also with the European Union, the US, imperialist organisations, governments and bourgeois parties which, both by imperialist wars and by imperialist peace, condemn peoples to poverty and misery. In the name of the very human rights that they themselves trample underfoot, they have launched imperialist interventions in Yugoslavia, Libya, Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan and now in Syria, uprooting the people and turning them into refugees.

Cooperation between French, British and American armed forces and the guerrilla forces on Syrian territory and all kinds of economic and military assistance for the rebels are intensifying, while the EU has recently recognised the organisation of a 'National Alliance'. The French Foreign Minister has issued statements stressing that he would provide weapons to the 'National Alliance' for defensive purposes, and the NATO Secretary General, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, has said that the Assad regime is collapsing.

What is the Commission's position vis-à-vis the openly imperialist intervention of the EU and its Member States and the US and NATO in Syria and in the broader region and the assistance granted to the actions of the 'Free Syrian Army' and the 'National Alliance' which are leading to the slaughter of the Syrian people and an increase in migrant flows?

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

The EU in its official statements such as the European Council conclusions of 14 December 2012 or the Foreign Affairs Council conclusions of 10 December 2012, clearly stated that it continues to support the mission of Joint Special Representative L. Brahimi and calls on the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) to uphold its responsibilities. The EU has not issued any statements concerning actions of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) or its individual member states.

The EU accepted the Syrian Opposition Coalition as legitimate representatives of the Syrian people and the European Council has tasked the Foreign Affairs Council to work on options of support to the opposition and towards greater protection of civilians. In the meantime, the EU has led international efforts on aid to Syrian refugees and Syrians inside the country.

The EU has been at the forefront of humanitarian efforts in Syria and neighbouring countries. The EU's response has addressed humanitarian needs and has closely monitored the situation on the ground in order to adjust its funding to the deterioration of the situation. At the moment, the EU is the main humanitarian donor in this crisis. The EU's total collective humanitarian contribution is EUR 416.8 million (EUR 216.8 million from the Member States (MS) + EUR 200 million from the EU budget). Adding to this the recent contributions by MS of EUR 172 million at the donors conference in Kuwait in January 2013, the total amounts to EUR 588 million. Additionally, the EU has focused on ensuring a coordinated international humanitarian response separate from the political track and based on humanitarian principles. In this respect, the Commission continues to play a strong role as co-facilitator of the Syrian Humanitarian Forum.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000004/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(3 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Δημοπρασία του ελληνικού Δημοσίου για επέκταση του Μετρό Θεσσαλονίκης

Η Επιτροπή σε απάντησή της σε ερώτημα μου (E-009120/2012) για τις καθυστερήσεις στην υλοποίηση του Μετρό Θεσσαλονίκης, με ενημέρωσε ότι δεν έχει υποβληθεί από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση επίσημη αίτηση συγχρηματοδότησης για την περίοδο 2007-2013, αλλά και ότι θεωρεί πως «η λειτουργικότητα του έργου για την επέκταση του μετρό της Θεσσαλονίκης είναι άμεσα συνδεδεμένη με την εφαρμογή και τη λειτουργικότητα της κύριας γραμμής και συνεπώς, τα δύο έργα θεωρούνται αλληλένδετα».

Ωστόσο, στις 27.12.2012 ανακοινώθηκε ο προσωρινός ανάδοχος του έργου «Μελέτη, κατασκευή και θέση σε λειτουργία της επέκτασης του Μετρό Θεσσαλονίκης προς Καλαμαριά», επένδυση συνολικού τιμήματος 518 000 000 ευρώ. Η υπογραφή της σύμβασης αναμένεται στις αρχές του νέου έτους και προβλέπεται να ολοκληρωθεί σε 5 χρόνια.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Πως κρίνει την απόφαση της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης να σπεύσει να δημοπρατήσει την επέκταση του Μετρό Θεσσαλονίκης, του «αλληλένδετου» με το κυρίως τμήμα του έργου, ενώ το κυρίως τμήμα όχι μόνο δεν έχει ολοκληρωθεί αλλά σημειώνει και σημαντικές καθυστερήσεις; Υπάρχει ενδεχόμενο, εξαιτίας και μόνο αυτού του λόγου, η Επιτροπή να αρνηθεί τη συγχρηματοδότηση της επέκτασης, αν υπάρξει σχετικό αίτημα;

Υπάρχουν ποινικές ρήτρες στην ανωτέρω σύμβαση, που μπορεί να ενεργοποιηθούν σε βάρος του ελληνικού Δημοσίου, αν δεν έχει επιτευχθεί η λειτουργικότητα της κύριας γραμμής;

Μπορεί να υπάρξει αδυναμία εκμετάλλευσης του συνόλου του έργου (κύριο και επέκταση) αν δεν μπορέσει να επιτευχθεί έγκαιρα η λειτουργικότητα της κύριας γραμμής;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(26 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

1. Το μεγάλο έργο «Μελέτη, κατασκευή και θέση σε λειτουργία του μετρό Θεσσαλονίκης», το οποίο αφορά την κύρια γραμμή του μετρό, συνιστά ένα έργο το οποίο ξεκίνησε την περίοδο 2000-2006 και συνεχίζεται και την περίοδο 2007-2013. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή δεν έχει λάβει μέχρι στιγμής καμία αίτηση για μεγάλο έργο για την περίοδο 2007-2013, είτε όσον αφορά την κύρια γραμμή ή την επέκτασή της προς την Καλαμαριά. Όταν αυτές οι δύο αιτήσεις υποβληθούν για έγκριση, η Επιτροπή θα τις εξετάσει σύμφωνα με τις σχετικές κανονιστικές απαιτήσεις και θα λάβει την κατάλληλη απόφαση. Παρόλα αυτά, εναπόκειται στις εθνικές αρχές να σχεδιάσουν, με την δέουσα επιμέλεια, την υλοποίηση του έργου, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της δημοπράτησής του, σύμφωνα με τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ περί δημόσιων συμβάσεων.

2. Η Επιτροπή δεν γνωρίζει τους όρους της σύμβασης και τις ποινικές ρήτρες της, για τις οποίες είναι αρμόδια τα κράτη μέλη.

3. Όλα τα έργα, τα οποία έχουν εγκριθεί για συγχρηματοδότηση από την ΕΕ βάσει του εθνικού στρατηγικού πλαισίου αναφοράς για την περίοδο 2007-2013, συμπεριλαμβανομένων της κύριας γραμμής και της επέκτασης του μετρό της Θεσσαλονίκης (εάν ληφθούν οι εν λόγω αποφάσεις), πρέπει να έχουν ολοκληρωθεί και τεθεί σε λειτουργία έως τις 31 Δεκεμβρίου 2015.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000004/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Greek state auction for Thessaloniki metro extension project

In its answer to my Question E-009120/2012 about delays in completing the Thessaloniki metro, the Commission informed me that the Greek Government had not submitted an official application for co-funding for the period 2007-2013, but considers that 'the functionality of the Thessaloniki metro extension project is directly related to the implementation and functionality of the main line and therefore the two projects are considered to be interlinked'.

However, on 27.12.2012 the temporary contractor was announced for the project 'Study, construction and function of Thessaloniki metro extension to Kalamaria', with a total investment of EUR 518 000 000. The contract is expected to be signed early next year and is scheduled to be completed within 5 years.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

How does it view the Greek government's decision to rush to auction off the Thessaloniki metro extension project, which is interlinked with the main section of the project, while the main section has not only not been completed, but is significantly delayed? Is there any possibility that, for that reason alone, the Commission may refuse to co-finance the extension, if requested to do so?

Are there any penalty clauses in the above contract which may be activated against the Greek state, if the main line does not function in time?

Is there any possibility that the entire project (main section and extension) may be jeopardised if the main line does not function in time?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 2013)

1. The major project 'Study, construction and function of Thessaloniki metro' regarding the main line of the metro is a project which started in the 2000-2006 period and continues in the 2007-2013 period. However, the Commission has so far not received any major project application for the 2007-2013 period, either for the main line or for the extension to Kalamaria. Once these two applications are submitted for approval, the Commission will appraise them in the light of the relevant regulatory requirements and take the appropriate decision. Nevertheless, it is up to the national authorities to design, with due diligence, the implementation of a project, including its tendering, in line with the EU procurement legislation.

2. The Commission is not aware of the contract and its clauses, which are the responsibility of the Member State.

3. All the projects approved for EU co-financing under the 2007-2013 National Strategic Reference Framework, including the main line and the extension of the Thessaloniki metro (if such decisions are taken) have to be completed and operational by 31 December 2015.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000005/13
à la Commission
Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)
(3 janvier 2013)

Objet: Enregistrement des cancers de la peau

Le cancer de la peau est la forme de cancer la plus répandue en Europe ([1]). En moyenne, un Européen sur six sera atteint d'un cancer de la peau au cours de sa vie ([2]). Étant donné le vieillissement de la population européenne, il est probable que le nombre de tumeurs cutanées continuera à augmenter au cours des prochaines années ou décennies ([3]). Cela a d'importantes répercussions sociales et économiques pour les gouvernements européens.

À l'heure actuelle, il est difficile d'évaluer l'ampleur exacte de ce problème en Europe en raison d'un manque de politiques cohérentes en matière de recensement et d'enregistrement des différentes formes de cancers de la peau dans les États membres ([4]). Les données sont limitées notamment en ce qui concerne les cancers cutanés non mélanomateux — la forme la plus répandue de cancer de la peau ([5]).

Des efforts sont entrepris au niveau européen pour encourager les échanges d'informations et le partage des meilleures pratiques entre les registres des cancers grâce à des initiatives telles que le Réseau européen des registres des cancers, Eurocourse et le Partenariat européen pour la lutte contre le cancer. Cependant, le manque actuel d'orientations communes en matière d'enregistrement des cancers cutanés mélanomateux et non mélanomateux entrave la mise en place de politiques efficaces visant à lutter contre le fléau du cancer de la peau en Europe.

Compte tenu de cette situation, qu'entreprend la Commission pour encourager et faciliter un enregistrement plus uniforme de tous les types de cancers de la peau au niveau des États membres? Des mesures supplémentaires peuvent-elles être prises pour encourager les pays et les régions à mettre en place un registre basé sur la population? Quelles modifications peuvent être apportées aux registres actuels afin que ceux-ci incluent toutes les formes de cancers de la peau?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(14 février 2013)

Un des objectifs mis en avant dans la communication de la Commission intitulée «Lutte contre le cancer: un partenariat européen» ([6]) est de garantir l'obtention de données exactes et comparables sur l'incidence du cancer, sa prévalence, la mortalité liée à cette maladie, ainsi que la guérison et la survie des patients dans l'Union européenne.

Celle-ci a soutenu maints projets d'information sur le cancer qui visent notamment à encourager l'utilisation de normes de qualité, à définir des protocoles communs de traitement des données et à mettre en réseau des registres des cancers. Pour contribuer encore au développement d'un système durable et global d'information sur les cancers à l'échelon de l'Union, la Commission a demandé au Centre commun de recherche (CCR), qui est son service scientifique interne, de mettre au point un tel système, en s'appuyant sur l'expérience acquise et en utilisant et consolidant les plus de deux cents registres nationaux et régionaux des cancers qui composent le réseau européen des registres des cancers.

En septembre 2012, le secrétariat de ce réseau a été transféré au CCR. Ce dernier, en étroite collaboration avec le comité de pilotage du réseau, planifie maintenant une série d'activités destinées à améliorer la fiabilité, la qualité, la comparabilité et l'utilisation des données européennes sur les cancers, de l'élaboration et de la diffusion de recueils de données et de protocoles de traitement à la formation et au développement des compétences.

Des données harmonisées et des normes agréées pour les métadonnées revêtent une importance fondamentale pour une comparaison précise des données en Europe, de même que pour la prévision, puis le suivi des interventions de l'Union en matière de lutte contre le cancer.

([1]) Trakatelli, M., et al., «Epidemiology of nonmelanoma skin cancer (NMSC) in Europe: accurate and comparable data are need for effective public health monitoring and interventions», British Journal of Dermatology, nº 156 (supplément 3), 2007, pp. 1-7.
([2]) de Vries, E., Nijsten, T., Louwman, M.W. et Coebergh, J.W., «Huidkankerepidemie in Nederland», Ned Tijdschr Geneeskd, nº 153, 2009, p. A768.
([3]) Tiré de Stockfleth, E. et Kerl, H., European Journal of Dermatology, nº 16, pp. 599-606.
([4]) Lomas, A., et al., «A systematic review of worldwide incidence of non-melanoma skin cancer», nº 166, 2012, pp. 1069-1080.
([5]) Tiré du dossier de presse relatif à la conférence sur le cancer de la peau organisée au Parlement européen et intitulée: «Description de différents types de cancers de la peau et règle A-B-C-D-E».
([6]) Disponible à l'adresse suivante: http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_information/dissemination/diseases/docs/com_2009_291_fr.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000005/13
to the Commission
Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Registration of skin cancer

Skin cancer is the most commonly occurring cancer in Europe ([1]). On average, one in every six Europeans will be diagnosed with skin cancer during his or her lifetime ([2]). With an ageing EU population, the incidence of skin cancer is likely to continue to increase in the coming years and decades ([3]). This has significant societal and economic implications for European governments.

At present it is difficult to assess the exact magnitude of this problem in Europe owing to a lack of consistent registration and reporting of different forms of skin cancer across Member States ([4]). Data is particularly limited in relation to non-melanoma skin cancer — the most common form of skin cancer ([5]).

Efforts are being made at European level to encourage exchanges of information and the sharing of best practice among cancer registries through initiatives such as the European Network of Cancer Registries, EUROCOURSE and the European Partnership for Action against Cancer. However, the current lack of common guidelines on the registration of melanoma and non-melanoma skin cancer is an obstacle to developing effective policies to address the burden of skin cancer in Europe.

In light of this situation, what is the Commission doing to encourage and facilitate more uniform registration of all forms of skin cancer at Member State level? Can something more be done to encourage countries or regions to install a population-based registry? How can existing registries be modified in order to register all types of skin cancer?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 February 2013)

One of the objectives put forward in the Commission Communication on Action Against Cancer: European Partnership ([6]) is to ensure accurate and comparable data on cancer incidence, prevalence, cure, survival and mortality in the EU.

The EU has supported many cancer information projects, including encouraging high quality standards, common data-treatment protocols and networking of cancer registries. To further help develop a sustainable and comprehensive EU cancer information system, the Commission has asked the Joint Research Centre (JRC), its in-house science service, to develop such a cancer information system, building upon existing experience and working with and supporting the over 200 national and regional cancer registries represented through the European Network of Cancer Registries.

In September 2012, the secretariat of this network was moved to the JRC. In close collaboration with the network's Steering Committee, the JRC is now planning a range of activities to improve the reliability, quality, comparability and use of European cancer data — ranging from developing and disseminating data collection and treatment protocols to training and competence building.

Harmonised data and agreed metadata standards are fundamental for accurate comparisons of data across Europe and will prove fundamental for anticipating and monitoring EU cancer policy interventions.

([1]) Trakatelli, M. et al., 2007, 'Epidemiology of nonmelanoma skin cancer (NMSC) in Europe: accurate and comparable data are need for effective public health monitoring and interventions', British Journal of Dermatology, 156 (Supplement 3), pp. 1-7.
([2]) de Vries, E., Nijsten, T., Louwman, M.W. and Coebergh, J.W., 'Zuidkankerepidemie in Nederland' [Skin cancer epidemic in the Netherlands], Ned Tijdschr Geneeskd, 2009, 153, p. A768.
([3]) Taken from Stockfleth, E. and Kerl, H., European Journal of Dermatology, 2006, 16, pp. 599-606.
([4]) Lomas, A. et al., 2012, 'A systematic review of worldwide incidence of non-melanoma skin cancer', 166, pp. 1069-1080.
([5]) Taken from the press pack of the lecture on skin cancer held in the European Parliament: 'Description of different kinds of skin cancer and the A-B-C-D-E rule'.
([6]) Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_information/dissemination/diseases/docs/com_2009_291_en.pdf

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000006/13
lill-Kummissjoni
Louis Grech (S&D)
(3 ta' Jannar 2013)

Suġġett: Programm ta' Azzjoni Ambjentali (EAP)

Il-Kummissjoni riċentement ippubblikat il-proposta tagħha għal Programm ta' Azzjoni Ambjentali (EAP), dokument li jistabbilixxi l-politika tal-UE dwar l-ambjent sal-2020.

Il-Kummissjoni tagħmilha ċara li s-suċċess jew le ta' dan il-pjan jiddependi minn kull Stat Membru, kemm meta jaġixxi waħdu kif ukoll meta jaħdem biex jimplimenta l-programm b'mod konġunt mal-Istati l-oħrajn tal-UE.

Kemm hu differenti dan il-pjan minn proposti li saru fl-imgħoddi dwar il-politika ambjentali tal-UE?

Il-programm tal-Kummissjoni jwieġeb li jindirizza l-ħolqien tal-impjiegi. Dan l-għan kif u b'liema mod se jorbot mal-pjan ta' azzjoni tal-Kummissjoni?

Tista' l-Kummissjoni tassigurana li dan mhuwiex se jkun pjan "wieħed għal kulħadd" iżda wieħed li huwa mfassal biex jakkomoda l-ħtiġijiet u r-realtajiet differenti tal-Istati Membri individwali?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Potočnik f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(21 ta' Frar 2013)

Il-proposta għal Programm ta' Azzjoni Ambjentali ġdid (EAP) tipprevedi qafas ġenerali għal inizjattivi politiċi riċenti dwar l-ambjent, waqt li tiffoka fuq l-implimentazzjoni aħjar tal-politiki eżistenti u timmira biex tħaffef it-tranżizzjoni għal ekonomija b'użu effiċjenti tar-riżorsi u b'emissjonijiet baxxi ta' karbonju, li fiha l-kapital naturali jiġi protett u mtejjeb, u s-saħħa u l-benesseri taċ-ċittadini jiġu ssalvagwardjati.

Il-Programm ta' Azzjoni Ambjentali ġdid propost huwa marbut sew mal-Aġenda Ewropa 2020. Il-mixja lejn ekonomija b'livell baxx ta' karbonju li tuża r-riżorsi b'effiċjenza hija kruċjali biex tinżamm u tittejjeb il-kompetittività tal-Ewropa u b'hekk jintlaħqu l-għanijiet tat-tkabbir u l-impjiegi tal-UE 2020.

Il-Programm ta' Azzjoni Ambjentali ġdid se jiġi adottat permezz tal-proċedura leġiżlattiva ordinarja, biex b'hekk jiġi żgurat l-impenn tal-istituzzjonijiet kollha tal-UE għal aġenda komuni ta' azzjoni politika ambjentali sal-2020. Ir-responsabbiltà għall-ksib tal-għanijiet tal-UE se tinqasam bejn l-UE u l-Istati Membri tagħha. Dan ifisser li se tikkonsisti minn responsabbiltà konġunta sabiex jintlaħqu l-għanijiet tal-programm permezz ta' azzjonijiet fil-livell xieraq, skont il-prinċipju tas-sussidjarjetà.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000006/13
to the Commission
Louis Grech (S&D)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Environment Action Programme (EAP)

The Commission recently published its proposal for an Environment Action Programme (EAP), a paper which sets out EU environmental policy up to 2020.

The Commission makes it clear that the success or otherwise of this programme depends on each Member State, both when acting alone and when working to implement it jointly with the other Member States.

How is this programme different from past proposals concerning EU environmental policy?

The Commission's work programme promises to tackle job creation. How, and to what extent, will this goal tie in with the EAP?

Can the Commission assure us that this will not be a one-size-fits-all programme, but one which is tailored to accommodate the different needs and realities of the individual Member States?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(21 February 2013)

The proposal for a new Environmental Action Program (EAP) provides an overarching framework for recent environment policy initiatives, focusing on better implementation of existing policies and aiming to step up the transition towards a resource-efficient, low-carbon economy in which natural capital is protected and enhanced, and the health and well-being of citizens is safeguarded.

The proposed new EAP is firmly linked to the Europe 2020 agenda. Moving towards a resource-efficient low carbon economy is key for maintaining and improving Europe's competitiveness and thus delivering on the EU 2020 jobs and growth objectives.

The new EAP will be adopted through the ordinary legislative procedure, thus securing the commitment of all EU institutions to a common agenda for environment policy action up to 2020. Responsibility for achieving the EU goals will be shared by the EU and its Member States. This means a shared responsibility to deliver on the objectives of the programme by taking actions at the appropriate level, in line with the principle of subsidiarity.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-000007/13
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(3 januari 2013)

Angående: Tydliggörande av upphovsrätten i samband med kommissionens undersökning om strukturen inom kultursektorn och den kreativa sektorn inom EU

I syfte att få en bättre bild av marknadspotentialen avseende en garantifacilitet för kultursektorn och den kreativa sektorn har kommissionen gett i uppdrag åt IDEA Consult att, i samarbete med Ecorys NL, samla in data om strukturen inom kultursektorn och den kreativa sektorn inom EU, finansieringsbehovet hos de organisationer som verkar inom dessa sektorer samt bankers utlåningsbeteende inom detta område.

Undersökningen är dock upphovsrättsskyddad, enligt information på undersökningens webbsida.

Kan kommissionen med säkerhet fastställa att EU-medborgare och andra enheter i samtliga medlemsstater har rätt att lägga ut länkar till undersökningen på kommersiella och icke-kommersiella webbsidor utan förhandstillstånd från kommissionens uppdragstagare, IDEA Consult och Ecorys?

Kan kommissionen med säkerhet fastställa att EU-medborgare och andra enheter i samtliga medlemsstater har rätt att lägga ut kommentarer om undersökningen, inbegripet kopior av undersökningstexten och information om undersökningen, utan att göra sig skyldiga till brott mot upphovsrätten?

Om så inte är fallet, kan kommissionen omgående införa ett rättighetsklareringssystem för de EU-medborgare och EU-enheter som önskar delta i undersökningen?

Svar från AndroullaVassiliou på kommissionens vägnar
(26 februari 2013)

Det stämmer att kommissionen, efter förslaget om en ny lånegaranti för små och medelstora företag inom kultursektorn och den kreativa sektorn i EU, har gett IDEA Consult i uppdrag att samla in uppgifter om företagens finansieringsbehov. För att underlätta arbetet kommer man att påbörja en undersökning inom kort där dessa organisationer ombeds att svara på en webbenkät.

IDEA Consult har skapat en webbplats ([1]) för att få aktörer, företag, branschorganisationer och finansinstitut att sprida information om undersökningen så att fler ska delta.

Texten ”alla rättigheter förbehållna” på denna webbplats lade webbdesignern enbart till för att skydda upphovsrätten till logotypen för ”EU for creativity” och utformningen av denna webbplats. Denna text har nu tagits bort för att undvika förvirring.

Alla kan alltså länka till undersökningen utan att först be om tillstånd, skapa kommentarer till undersökningen och även kopiera undersökningens text, utan att göra sig skyldiga till brott mot upphovsrätten. Det är också något vi uppmuntrar alla att göra.

Kommissionen hoppas verkligen på många svar som ger tillförlitlig och målinriktad information om organisationernas finansieringsbehov. Tack vare sådan information kan kommissionen utforma en lånegaranti för kultursektorn och den kreativa sektorn som är anpassad till dessa organisationers specifika behov och begränsningar.

Slutrapporten med resultaten av undersökningen kommer att offentliggöras före sommaren på Mediaprogrammets sida på europa.eu.

([1]) http://eu-for-creativity.eu

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000007/13
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Clarification of the copyright situation regarding the survey initiated by the Commission on the structure of the cultural and creative sectors in Europe

In order to gain a more accurate view of the market potential of a guarantee facility for the cultural and creative sectors, the Commission has commissioned IDEA Consult, in collaboration with Ecorys NL, to collect data on the structure of the cultural and creative sectors in Europe, the financing needs of organisations operating in those sectors and banks' lending behaviour in this area.

However, the survey is subject to 'all rights reserved' copyright protection, as stipulated on the associated webpage.

Can the Commission establish definitively that EU citizens and other entities in all Member States are allowed to post links to the survey on commercial and non-commercial webpages without asking prior permission from the Commission's contractors, IDEA Consult and Ecorys?

Can the Commission establish definitively that EU citizens and other entities in all Member States are allowed to create commentary on the survey, including copies of the survey text and information about the survey itself, without being liable for copyright infringement?

If not, can the Commission speedily make available a rights clearance system for EU citizens and entities wishing to participate in the survey?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 2013)

Following the proposal for a new guarantee facility for SMEs operating in the European cultural and creative sectors, the Commission has indeed commissioned IDEA Consult to collect data on their financing needs. To facilitate this task a survey will be launched shortly inviting these organisations to respond to an online questionnaire.

A website ([1]) has been created by IDEA Consult to invite operators, companies, professional associations and financial institutions to circulate this information with the aim of increasing the response rate to the survey.

In fact the mention 'all rights reserved' on this web page was added by the web designer simply to protect the copyright of the 'EU-for-creativity' logo and the design of this particular webpage. This reference has now been withdrawn to avoid any confusion.

Everyone is allowed and greatly encouraged to post links to the survey without prior permission and to create commentary on the survey, including copies of the survey text, without being liable for copyright infringement.

The Commission is indeed hoping for a high response rate which will provide accurate and targeted information on the needs of these organisations in terms of access to finance, thereby allowing the Commission to design a Cultural and Creative Sectors Guarantee Facility tailored to their specific needs and constraints.

The final report including the results of the survey will be published on the MEDIA Programme page of the Europa website before the summer.

([1]) http://eu-for-creativity.eu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000008/13
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Access to rail transport for wheelchair passengers in the EU

I have been contacted by a constituent who has experienced great difficulties, and a great diversity in assistance, when travelling as a wheelchair passenger on rail transport across the EU. I summarise below some of the difficulties and inconsistencies he faced on a recent train journey from London to Split via Munich. He intends to travel to Venice shortly.

A free ticket was offered to his companion from Paris to Split, but will not be offered in Italy.

When travelling in Germany, Deutsche Bahn provided a single point of contact, whereas for his journey through Italy he has had to contact each individual station in order for ramps to be arranged. Not all stations have responded to his request for assistance.

He has been refused travel on the Paris-Venice overnight train as Rail Europe say it is inaccessible for wheelchair users. He must therefore travel separately from his group and stay overnight in Zurich at additional cost.

His ticket from Paris to Zurich for a dedicated wheelchair space cost three times as much as the cheapest standard ticket available at the time.

He has been unable to find any information about how to purchase a ticket for the dedicated carriage for wheelchair users on the Milan to Venice train.

It would appear that the Third Railway Package is not being applied consistently across the EU. Do these actions constitute a breach of EU Regulation (EC) No 1371/2007 on rail passengers' rights and obligations, in particular the right for disabled passengers to have the same opportunities for rail travel as other citizens and not to have to pay any extra charges, and the requirement to provide accessible rolling stock and to accept all requests for assistance at train stations?

What actions is the Commission taking to remedy these inconsistencies for wheelchair passengers using rail transport in the EU?

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

Regulation (CE) No 1371/2007 ([1]) imposes requirements on the rail travel industry ([2]) to offer equal travel opportunities to disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility. The Honourable Member will find hereafter a legal analysis of the examples given:

1. This regulation does not oblige undertakings to carry for free persons accompanying disabled passengers.

2. Article 24(a) provides that for multiple journeys, one notification to the carrier or ticket vendor shall be sufficient, notification to station managers is not necessary.

3. Under Article 19(1) non-discriminatory access rules must be in place; under Article 20(1) railway undertakings must provide information on the accessibility of rolling stock. Compliance with PRM TSI ([3]) will progressively lead to more accessibility.

4. Under Article 19(2) disabled persons should be able to buy tickets without extra charges. The practice observed by Honourable Member between Paris and Zurich as regards wheelchairs would therefore be illegal.

([1]) Regulation (EC) 1371/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 on rail passengers' rights and obligations, OJ L 315, 3.12.2007.
([2]) station managers, railway undertakings, tour operators and ticket vendors.
([3]) Commission decision of 21 December 2007 concerning the technical specification of interoperability relating to 'persons with reduced mobility' in the trans-European conventional and high-speed rail system.

5. Under Articles 8 and 20(1) the regulation requires carriers to provide pre-journey information including on access conditions for persons with reduced mobility. This is also a requirement in the TAP TSI ([4]).

National enforcement bodies (NEBs) must ensure compliance and handle complaints from passengers if their rights have not been respected. The constituent should therefore be encouraged to complain to the concerned travel office and if necessary thereafter to the Italian and French NEBs ([5]). The Commission published a study on the application and enforcement of this regulation ([6]) and is preparing an implementation report to be published in 2013. Pre-infringement investigations have been launched against several Member States regarding those issues.

([4]) Commission Regulation (EU) No 454/2011 of 5 May 2011 on the technical specification for interoperability relating to the subsystem 'telematics applications for passenger services' of the trans-European rail system.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/passengers/rail/doc/2007_1371_national_enforcement_bodies.pdf
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/passengers/rail/index_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000009/13
au Conseil
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(3 janvier 2013)

Objet: Trois scénarios pour l'Union de 2030

Des experts américains envisagent trois scénarios pour l'Union en 2030, selon son futur degré d'intégration économique et monétaire: le déclin, l'effondrement ou la renaissance.

Une agence du gouvernement américain (National Intelligence Council) a fait un travail de prospective et présenté un document de 160 pages intitulé «Tendances globales 2030: des mondes alternatifs».

Selon les auteurs du rapport, l'approfondissement de l'Europe, nécessaire pour remédier au problème de la dette, conduira à un transfert massif de souveraineté aux autorités centrales, au détriment de l'autonomie des territoires. Des décisions qui risquent de la rendre encore plus impopulaire, fait observer le document. L'Union devra réagir à certaines tendances de fond, comme la hausse, d'ici 2030, d'au mois 35 % de la demande en denrées alimentaires et de 40 % en eau, qui frapperont d'abord les pays les plus fragiles.

À partir de ces données, les experts explorent trois scénarios, selon le degré de réformes des institutions européennes.

— Le scénario catastrophe, celui de l'effondrement, est jugé peu probable. Mais il pourrait avoir lieu si la Grèce sortait de la zone euro. Selon les experts, les dommages seraient 8 fois plus importants que ceux qui ont suivi la faillite de la banque Lehman Brothers, en 2008. Cette situation provoquerait très certainement une récession mondiale, voire une «Grande dépression» à l'américaine.

— Le scénario du déclin avance l'hypothèse que l'Europe parviendra à sortir de la crise monétaire mais n'entreprendra pas les réformes structurelles nécessaires pour réformer son économie. Pour les experts américains, l'euro ne pourrait alors rivaliser avec le dollar ou le yen. En conséquence, la présence de l'Union sur la scène internationale sera diminuée, au profit des États qui renationaliseront leur politique étrangère.

— Troisième possibilité: l'Union fait un «saut fédéral». Ce scénario de la «renaissance» permettrait à l'Europe d'augmenter son pouvoir sur la scène internationale. «Avec le temps, et malgré l'existence d'une Europe à plusieurs vitesses, le marché unique sera achevé, la politique étrangère de l'Union sera plus unifiée grâce aux mécanismes démocratiques européens» dit encore le rapport.

1. Quelles sont les réponses avancées par le Conseil pour répondre aux arguments de ce rapport et aux scénarios énoncés?

2. Sur quels points le Conseil rejoint-il le rapport et sur quels points s'en dissocie-t-il?

Réponse
(18 février 2013)

Le Conseil n'a pas examiné cette question.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000009/13
to the Council
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Three scenarios for the Union in 2030

US experts envisage three scenarios for the Union in 2030, depending on the extent of its future economic and monetary integration: decline, collapse or renaissance.

One US Government agency (the National Intelligence Council) has carried out a forward-looking study and presented a 160-page document entitled 'Global Trends 2030: Alternative Worlds'.

The report's authors maintain that strengthening Europe, which is needed to solve the debt problem, will lead to a huge transfer of sovereignty to the central authorities, at the expense of regional autonomy. As the document points out, such decisions are liable to make the EU even more unpopular. It will have to react to certain underlying trends, such as the increase in demand, between now and 2030, by at least 35 % for foodstuffs and by 40 % for water, a situation that will primarily affect the most vulnerable countries.

Armed with this data, the experts explore three scenarios, depending on the extent of the European institutions' reforms.

— The worst-case scenario — collapse — is considered unlikely. However, it could happen if Greece were to leave the euro area. According to the experts, the damage would be eight times greater than that which followed the collapse of Lehman Brothers in 2008. Such a situation would undoubtedly cause a global recession, or even a US-style 'Great Depression'.

— The scenario of a decline is based on the assumption that Europe will overcome the monetary crisis but will fail to undertake the structural reforms necessary to reform its economy. In the US experts' view, the euro could not, therefore, compete with the dollar or the yen. Consequently, the Union will carry less weight on the international stage, prompting Member States to renationalise their foreign policy.

— The third possibility is that the Union will make a 'federalist leap'. This 'renaissance' scenario would enable Europe to become more powerful on the international stage. The report goes on to say that 'over time, despite the existence of a multispeed Europe, the single market would still be completed and a more united foreign and security policy agreed upon with enhanced elements of European democracy.'

1. What is the Council's response to the arguments made in this report and to the scenarios put forward?

2. On which points does the Council agree with the report and on which does it disagree?

Reply
(18 February 2013)

The Council has not discussed the issue.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000010/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(3 janvier 2013)

Objet: Trois scénarios pour l'Union de 2030

Des experts américains envisagent trois scénarios pour l'Union en 2030, selon son futur degré d'intégration économique et monétaire: le déclin, l'effondrement ou la renaissance.

Une agence du gouvernement américain (National Intelligence Council) a fait un travail de prospective et présenté un document de 160 pages intitulé «Tendances globales 2030: des mondes alternatifs».

Selon les auteurs du rapport, l'approfondissement de l'Europe, nécessaire pour remédier au problème de la dette, conduira à un transfert massif de souveraineté aux autorités centrales, au détriment de l'autonomie des territoires. Des décisions qui risquent de la rendre encore plus impopulaire, fait observer le document. L'Union devra réagir à certaines tendances de fond, comme la hausse, d'ici 2030, d'au mois 35 % de la demande en denrées alimentaires et de 40 % en eau, qui frapperont d'abord les pays les plus fragiles.

À partir de ces données, les experts explorent trois scénarios, selon le degré de réformes des institutions européennes.

— Le scénario catastrophe, celui de l'effondrement, est jugé peu probable. Mais il pourrait avoir lieu si la Grèce sortait de la zone euro. Selon les experts, les dommages seraient 8 fois plus importants que ceux qui ont suivi la faillite de la banque Lehman Brothers, en 2008. Cette situation provoquerait très certainement une récession mondiale, voire une «Grande dépression» à l'américaine.

— Le scénario du déclin avance l'hypothèse que l'Europe parviendra à sortir de la crise monétaire mais n'entreprendra pas les réformes structurelles nécessaires pour réformer son économie. Pour les experts américains, l'euro ne pourrait alors rivaliser avec le dollar ou le yen. En conséquence, la présence de l'Union sur la scène internationale sera diminuée, au profit des États qui renationaliseront leur politique étrangère.

— Troisième possibilité: l'Union fait un «saut fédéral». Ce scénario de la «renaissance» permettrait à l'Europe d'augmenter son pouvoir sur la scène internationale. «Avec le temps, et malgré l'existence d'une Europe à plusieurs vitesses, le marché unique sera achevé, la politique étrangère de l'Union sera plus unifiée grâce aux mécanismes démocratiques européens» dit encore le rapport.

1. Quelles sont les réponses avancées par la Commission pour répondre aux arguments de ce rapport et aux scénarios énoncés?

2. Sur quels points la Commission rejoint-elle le rapport et sur quels points s'en dissocie-t-elle?

Réponse donnée par M. Rehn au nom de la Commission
(8 février 2013)

La Commission ne commente pas les questions politiques à l'aune de rapports publiés dans la presse.

Depuis le début de la crise, la Commission a proposé des actions et des mesures législatives dans le but de permettre à l'Europe de sortir de la crise. De nombreuses décisions courageuses ont été prises, nécessaires pour garantir l'unité et la viabilité de l'euro, et la zone euro a démontré sa résistance politique en 2012 face à de redoutables défis. Des efforts supplémentaires doivent toutefois être fournis et il est capital de continuer à rééquilibrer et à réformer nos économies avec une détermination sans faille.

La Commission a explicité sa vision de l'avenir de l'UE dans sa communication «Projet détaillé pour une Union économique et monétaire véritable et approfondie» ([1]). Celle-ci comporte une feuille de route assortie d'actions à court, moyen et long terme visant à mettre en place une véritable UEM et à adapter son cadre institutionnel à l'avenir. Le projet détaille les outils et instruments disponibles et pointe notamment des modifications qu'il serait éventuellement nécessaire d'apporter aux traités.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/archives/2012/11/pdf/blueprint_fr.pdf

Une intégration accrue entraîne logiquement un partage accru de la souveraineté. Il est de la plus haute importance que toute intégration approfondie de la réglementation financière, des politiques budgétaire et économique et des instruments correspondants s'accompagne d'une légitimité, d'une responsabilité et d'un contrôle démocratiques renforcés. Le projet de la Commission contient également des suggestions concrètes en la matière.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000010/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Three scenarios for the Union in 2030

US experts envisage three scenarios for the Union in 2030, depending on the extent of its future economic and monetary integration: decline, collapse or renaissance.

One US Government agency (the National Intelligence Council) has carried out a forward-looking study and presented a 160-page document entitled 'Global Trends 2030: Alternative Worlds'.

The report's authors maintain that strengthening Europe, which is needed to solve the debt problem, will lead to a huge transfer of sovereignty to the central authorities, at the expense of regional autonomy. As the document points out, such decisions are liable to make the EU even more unpopular. It will have to react to certain underlying trends, such as the increase in demand, between now and 2030, by at least 35 % for foodstuffs and by 40 % for water, a situation that will primarily affect the most vulnerable countries.

Armed with this data, the experts explore three scenarios, depending on the extent of the European institutions' reforms.

— The worst-case scenario — collapse — is considered unlikely. However, it could happen if Greece were to leave the euro area. According to the experts, the damage would be eight times greater than that which followed the collapse of Lehman Brothers in 2008. Such a situation would undoubtedly cause a global recession, or even a US-style 'Great Depression'.

— The scenario of a decline is based on the assumption that Europe will overcome the monetary crisis but will fail to undertake the structural reforms necessary to reform its economy. In the US experts' view, the euro could not, therefore, compete with the dollar or the yen. Consequently, the Union will carry less weight on the international stage, prompting Member States to renationalise their foreign policy.

— The third possibility is that the Union will make a 'federalist leap'. This 'renaissance' scenario would enable Europe to become more powerful on the international stage. The report goes on to say that 'over time, despite the existence of a multispeed Europe, the single market would still be completed and a more united foreign and security policy agreed upon with enhanced elements of European democracy.'

1. What is the Commission's response to the arguments made in this report and to the scenarios put forward?

2. On which points does the Commission agree with the report and on which does it disagree?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(8 February 2013)

The Commission does not comment on policy issues on the basis of reports in the press.

Since the onset of the crisis, the Commission has initiated policy action and legislation with a view to ensuring Europe's successful emergence from the crisis. Many necessary bold decisions to ensure the unity and the sustainability of the euro have been taken, and the Eurozone has proved its political resilience in 2012 in the face of daunting challenges. However, more is needed and it is important to continue to pursue the rebalancing and reforms of our economies with consistent determination.

The Commission has set out its vision for a future EU in its communication 'A blueprint for a deep and genuine economic and monetary union' ([1]). It contains a detailed roadmap with actions for the short-, medium-, and long term to bring about a genuine EMU, and adapt the institutional setup for the future. The blueprint details the tools and instruments, including identifying possible needs for Treaty changes.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/archives/2012/11/pdf/blueprint_en.pdf

Further integration naturally implies a further pooling of sovereignty. It is of utmost importance that any deeper integration of financial regulation, fiscal and economic policy and corresponding instruments is accompanied by increased democratic legitimacy, accountability and scrutiny. The Commission's blueprint also contains concrete suggestions in this area.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000011/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(3 janvier 2013)

Objet: Situation critique dans le Caucase

La situation dans le Caucase du Nord demeure très préoccupante à bien des égards.

Dans un rapport très fouillé, le centre indépendant de réflexion Crisis Group, basé à Bruxelles, a récemment tiré une sonnette d'alarme à propos du Caucase du Nord. La guerre a fait 750 morts en 2011, et plus de 500 morts lors des huit premiers mois de 2012. Le conflit se caractérise par deux facteurs: la radicalisation d'une partie de la jeunesse musulmane attirée par l'idéologie salafiste en réaction aux violences des forces de l'ordre — tortures, disparitions forcées —; et la montée, à travers toute la région, de revendications ethniques et territoriales, qui posent un défi de taille à l'État russe.

Au Daghestan, les pouvoirs locaux ont bien tenté, depuis 2010, une politique de dialogue plus intelligente, visant à combler le fossé entre les communautés salafistes et les chefs de l'islam traditionnel soufi. Mais cet effort, constate Crisis Group, a été saboté à la fois par les milieux insurgés et par les structures militaires russes — tels des alliés objectifs dans la spirale du pire. La violence d'État et la violence de la rébellion armée se nourrissent l'une l'autre. Moscou n'a pas de stratégie probante pour arrêter cet engrenage.

L'Europe, qui se veut être un «soft power» et qui vient de recevoir, lundi 10 décembre, le prix Nobel de la paix, a un rôle à jouer.

1. Est-ce que la question est évoquée, voire débattue, lors des nombreuses rencontres entre les représentants de la Commission et les représentants russes?

2. La Commission envisage-t-elle de suggérer un plan d'action pour aider les différentes parties à la pacification car ce sont la sécurité et la stabilité du continent qui se jouent aussi dans le Caucase?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(19 février 2013)

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante suit de très près l'évolution de la situation dans le Caucase du Nord. À plusieurs occasions, il a été proposé à la Russie d'entamer des discussions concernant des questions exclusivement liées au conflit dans le Caucase du Nord, mais cette proposition a été déclinée à chaque fois. Il n'en reste pas moins que ce thème est abordé en permanence lors des consultations menées sur les Droits de l'homme entre l'Union européenne et la Russie. En tant que telle, l'évolution inquiétante de la situation a été débattue en détail lors du cycle de consultations le plus récent, qui a eu lieu le 7 décembre 2012.

L'Union européenne apporte aussi un soutien financier aux organisations non gouvernementales qui œuvrent dans le Caucase du Nord, y compris dans les zones où règnent la paix, la sécurité et la stabilité. En décembre 2012, l'Union européenne a achevé un projet d'une durée de 12 mois et d'un montant de 120 000 euros en collaboration avec l'ONG Memorial, visant à observer les violations des Droits de l'homme, l'assistance juridique aux victimes, la sensibilisation et le lobbying à l'échelle internationale. À la fin de l'année 2011, la délégation de l'Union européenne a clôturé un projet d'une durée de trois ans et d'un montant de 960 000 euros, dont le but était de fournir une assistance au personnel pénitentiaire et aux forces de police pour les aider à surmonter des expériences négatives liées à la violence, à la torture et à la cruauté durant des conflits armés. D'autres projets financés par l'UE ont été consacrés à la prévention des conflits et à l'amélioration des relations interethniques en Ossétie du Nord grâce à une stabilisation économique, à un travail sur la tolérance interethnique et à un soutien à la construction d'un centre de réadaptation pour les victimes de la torture.

L'UE n'a pas l'intention de proposer un plan d'action pour remédier à la situation au Caucase du Nord.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000011/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Critical situation in the Caucasus

The situation in the North Caucasus remains very worrying on a number of counts.

The Brussels-based independent think tank Crisis Group has recently published a very detailed report in which it sounds the alarm about the North Caucasus. War was responsible for 750 deaths in 2011, and for more than 500 deaths in the first eight months of 2012. The conflict is characterised by two factors: the radicalisation of some young Muslims, who are drawn to the Salafist ideology as a reaction to police violence, including torture and enforced disappearances; and the rise, throughout the region, of ethnic and territorial claims, which present a major challenge to Russia.

Since 2010, the local authorities in Dagestan have been pursuing a more intelligent policy of dialogue, with the aim of bringing the Salafist communities and the heads of the traditional Sufi branch of Islam closer together. Crisis Group notes, however, that this effort has been sabotaged both by the rebel groups and by the Russian military forces, as de facto allies in the downward spiral. The violence by the State and the violence by the armed rebels are fuelling one another. Moscow lacks a convincing strategy for ending this cycle.

Europe, which is meant to be a 'soft power' and which received the Nobel Peace Prize on Monday 10 December 2012, has a role to play.

1. Is the matter raised, or indeed discussed, during the numerous meetings between the representatives of the Commission and of Russia?

2. Does the Commission intend to propose an action plan to help the various parties achieve peace, because the security and stability of the continent are also at stake in the Caucasus?

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

The HR/VP is following the situation in the North Caucasus very closely. A discussion focused on the issues relating to the North Caucasus alone has been proposed to the Russian side on a number of occassions, but repeatedly declined. However, this is a standing topic of the EU-Russia human rights consultations. As such, the worrying development in the regions were discussed in great detail at the most recent round of the consultations, which took place on 7 December 2012.

The EU also provides financial support to non-governmental organisations (NGOs) for their work in the North Caucasus, including in the areas of peace, security and stability. In December 2012 the EU completed a 12 month, EUR 120 000 project with NGO Memorial to monitor human rights violations, legal assistance to victims, advocacy and lobbying at international level. End of 2011 the EU Delegation finished a three year project, worth EUR 960 000, aimed at providing assistance to prison staff and police in overcoming negative experience of violence, torture and cruelty during armed conflicts. Other projects financed by the EU addressed conflict prevention and improvement of interethnic relations in North Ossetia through economic stabilisation and interethnic tolerance building and support for development of a rehabilitation centre for victims of torture.

The EU does not intend to propose an action plan to address the situation in the North Caucasus.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000012/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(3 janvier 2013)

Objet: Instagram et droits du consommateur

En décidant de s'offrir la possibilité de vendre les photos de ses utilisateurs, Instagram, l'application vedette rachetée par Facebook, a choqué les internautes. L'application, qui revendique plus de 100 millions d'utilisateurs dans le monde, permet de prendre des photos depuis son téléphone portable, de les retoucher avec une série de filtres leur donnant le plus souvent un aspect «rétro», puis de les mettre en ligne. L'actualisation des conditions d'utilisation d'Instagram intervient quelques mois après ce rachat et ouvre la voie à une éventuelle monétisation de cette application.

Ces nouvelles conditions d'utilisation doivent permettre, dans les grandes lignes, de croiser les données recueillies auprès de ses utilisateurs avec celles obtenues par sa maison mère, le réseau social Facebook.

Dans les conditions générales, il est mentionné des passages pour le moins choquants: «Vous acceptez qu'une entreprise ou toute autre entité puisse nous payer pour afficher votre nom et profil d'utilisateur, vos photos (…) en lien avec des contenus payants ou sponsorisés, sans que cela ne vous donne droit à une compensation».

Même si Instagram a, depuis, fait quelque peu marche arrière face au déchainement médiatique, cet épisode mérite bien que l'on s'interroge dans l'intérêt du consommateur:

1. Comment se positionne la Commission devant une telle stratégie, qui n'a finalement pour objectif que de profiter d'utilisateurs moyennement vigilants?

2. La Commission estime-t-elle que les conditions d'utilisation, ces longs et fastidieux textes au ton juridique, qui sont généralement ignorés par les utilisateurs, quels que soient l'application, le service ou le réseau social, sont des canaux suffisants pour informer le consommateur sur des changements d'une telle importance?

3. La Commission envisage-t-elle d'ouvrir un dossier d'information, voire une enquête, afin de s'assurer que toute cette procédure est légale et que le consommateur est parfaitement protégé?

4. Le fait qu'Instagram s'octroie une licence «non exclusive, libre de redevance, transférable et mondiale» sur les photos postées par les utilisateurs n'est-il pas préjudiciable ou, en tout cas, n'ouvre-t-il pas dangereusement la porte à des violations de droits d'auteur? Comment la Commission se positionne-t-elle, et que suggère-t-elle à ce sujet?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission
(14 mars 2013)

En matière de traitement des données à caractère personnel, Facebook et ses filiales sont tenus de se conformer aux dispositions législatives nationales transposant la directive 95/46/CE. Facebook doit examiner attentivement les règles de protection des données avant d'introduire de nouveaux avis sur la protection de la vie privée ou de nouvelles modalités et conditions, et doit informer ses utilisateurs de manière adéquate. Le droit de l'Union sur la protection des données impose au responsable du traitement de données les obligations clés de transparence et d'information en vue de garantir l'équité et la licéité du traitement.

De plus, le droit européen de la consommation vise à lutter contre les pratiques déloyales et peut être applicable au cas d'espèce. La directive 93/13/CEE interdit les clauses contractuelles types qui créent un déséquilibre significatif au détriment du consommateur. La directive 2005/29/CE impose aux professionnels de faire preuve de diligence professionnelle et d'informer suffisamment le consommateur des principales caractéristiques et conditions de leurs services.

Ces dispositions du droit de l'Union sont mises en œuvre principalement par les États membres dans des cas concrets. Les associations de consommateurs peuvent apporter leur contribution en engageant une action en cessation.

La Commission reconnaît que des mesures doivent être prises pour assurer la bonne application du droit européen de la consommation, en particulier dans les cas concernant plusieurs États membres — tels que l'affaire Apple relative à la publicité mensongère sur les garanties. Cette question de l'application du droit sera le thème principal du prochain sommet des consommateurs, qui se tiendra les 18 et 19 mars.

La Commission partage l'avis de l'Honorable Parlementaire selon lequel il arrive trop souvent que des informations essentielles soient mal communiquées aux consommateurs de produits numériques. Des travaux sont en cours pour faire en sorte que l'information des consommateurs, sur la base notamment de la directive 2011/83/CE, soit présentée d'une façon plus claire et plus visible.

En ce qui concerne la question de la violation des droits d'auteur, la Commission ne peut pas se prononcer sur la base des informations qui lui sont présentées.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000012/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Instagram and consumer rights

Instagram, the flagship application bought by Facebook, has shocked Internet users by taking the decision to sell its users' photographs. The application, which has over 100 million users worldwide, enables people to take photos on their mobile phones, retouch them with a set of filters that usually gives them a 'retro' appearance, and then post them online. The update to Instagram's terms of use comes several months after that buyout, and paves the way for the application to become a moneymaking venture.

These new terms of use should, broadly speaking, enable the information collected from its users to be linked to that obtained by its parent company, the social network Facebook.

The general terms and conditions include passages that are shocking to say the least: 'You agree that a business or other entity may pay us to display your username, likeness, photos (…) in connection with paid or sponsored content, without any compensation to you.'

Although Instagram has since backed down somewhat amid the media storm, this episode calls for the following questions to be asked in the interests of consumers:

1. What is the Commission's position on such a strategy, the ultimate aim of which is simply to profit from less vigilant users?

2. Does the Commission believe that terms of use, those long, tedious, legal-style texts, which are generally ignored by users, whatever the application, service or social network, are a sufficient means of informing consumers about such important changes?

3. Does the Commission plan to open an information dossier, or even an inquiry, in order to ensure that this entire procedure is legal and that consumers are fully protected?

4. Is it not a prejudicial act on the part of Instagram to grant itself a 'non-exclusive, royalty-free, transferable and worldwide' licence over photos posted by users or, at any rate, does it not leave the door dangerously open to copyright violations? What is the Commission's position, and what does it suggest in this regard?

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

National laws implementing Directive 95/46/CE are applicable to the processing of personal data by Facebook and its subsidiaries. Facebook should consider data protection rules carefully before introducing new privacy notices, new terms and conditions, and inform appropriately users. Under EU data protection law, transparency and information are key obligations of the controller to ensure fair and lawful processing.

In addition, EU consumer law provides means to counter unfair practices and may be applicable to the case in question. Directive 93/13/EEC prohibits standard contract terms causing a significant imbalance to the detriment of consumers. Directive 2005/29/EC requires traders to behave with professional diligence and to adequately inform consumers about the key features and conditions of the services offered.

These EC law provisions are enforced primarily by Member States in concrete cases. Consumer organisations can help by initiating injunction procedures.

The Commission recognises that action is needed to ensure effective enforcement of EU consumer law, in particular for cases affecting several Member States — such as the Apple case on misleading marketing of guarantees. Enforcement will be the main theme of the next Consumer Summit on 18-19 March.

The Commission agrees with the Honourable Member that too often essential information is not appropriately communicated to consumers of digital products. Work is ongoing to ensure that consumer information, stemming e.g. from Directive 2011/83/EC, is presented in a clearer and more prominent manner.

As regards the copyright aspects, on the basis of the information submitted, the Commission cannot assess whether copyright violations are at stake.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000013/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(3 janvier 2013)

Objet: Santé mentale et boissons énergisantes: méchant cocktail

Les boissons énergisantes sont dans la ligne de mire des autorités de santé publique pour leurs effets potentiellement dangereux sur la santé physique. Pire, une consommation excessive de ces boissons pourrait avoir des effets insoupçonnés sur la santé mentale.

Les boissons énergisantes sont contre-indiquées pour les enfants, les femmes enceintes et les personnes sensibles aux effets de la caféine. Depuis quelques années, des experts commencent à s'inquiéter d'un autre cocktail: la consommation excessive de boissons énergisantes par les personnes aux prises avec des problèmes de santé mentale ou de toxicomanie. La recherche est encore embryonnaire mais, sur le terrain, des cliniciens commencent à observer les effets néfastes d'une consommation démesurée de boissons énergisantes chez les personnes plus vulnérables.

L'agence de santé publique américaine, la Food and Drug Administration (FDA), a entre les mains des rapports selon lesquels la boisson énergisante 5-Hour Energy Shot pourrait être en cause dans la mort de 13 personnes et avoir entraîné des effets secondaires graves chez 30 personnes, notamment des arrêts cardiaques, des convulsions et un avortement spontané. D'autres rapports associent la consommation de la boisson Monster Energy à cinq morts.

La Commission compte-t-elle charger l'EFSA d'un nouveau rapport d'évaluation sur les boissons énergisantes afin de garantir que la consommation de celles-ci ne comporte aucun danger pour les citoyens?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(1er février 2013)

La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à prendre connaissance de sa réponse à la question écrite P-11316/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000013/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Mental health and energy drinks: a dangerous cocktail

Public health authorities are targeting energy drinks due to their potentially harmful effects on physical health. What is worse, excessive consumption of these drinks could have unexpected consequences for mental health.

Energy drinks are not recommended for children, pregnant women or people sensitive to caffeine. In recent years, experts have begun to express concern about a different kind of cocktail: the excessive consumption of energy drinks by people with mental health problems and drug addicts. Research is still in the early stages, but clinicians in the field are beginning to observe the adverse effects on more vulnerable individuals of consuming too many energy drinks.

The US public health body, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), has reports showing that the '5-Hour Energy Shot' energy drink could be a factor in the deaths of 13 people and could have produced serious side effects — specifically, cardiac arrests, convulsions and one instance of miscarriage — in a further 30 people. Other reports have linked consumption of the drink 'Monster Energy' to five deaths.

Does the Commission intend to have the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) carry out a new assessment report on energy drinks in order to ensure that they are safe for consumers to drink?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(1 February 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-11316/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000014/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(3 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Approvazione del piano urbanistico attuativo di Ca' Roman in comune di Venezia in mancanza della valutazione ambientale strategica (VAS) di cui alla direttiva 2001/42/CE

Il 31 maggio 2012 il comune di Venezia ha approvato un piano urbanistico consistente in nuovi interventi edilizi ([1]) nell'ex Colonia di Ca' Roman situata nell'isola di Pellestrina, tra il mare Adriatico e la laguna di Venezia, area adiacente a un SIC e a una ZPS ([2]).

Per detto intervento è stata effettuata solo la VINCA (Valutazione di Incidenza Ambientale) a norma della direttiva 92/43/CEE, ma non la VAS (Valutazione Ambientale Strategica) a norma della direttiva 2001/42/CE.

La mancanza di un'adeguata valutazione ambientale circa la sostenibilità del piano rispetto alla valenza paesaggistica e naturalistica dell'area ([3]) era stata rilevata dal CAAL (Coordinamento delle Associazioni Ambientaliste del Lido), sia nella fase delle «osservazioni» alla proposta di piano, sia in un'istanza di annullamento del piano urbanistico presentata alla Provincia di Venezia.

Il CAAL si è rivolto anche al ministero dell'Ambiente e alla Regione Veneto in quanto autorità competenti per la VAS.

Il ministero ha risposto ([4]) sottolineando l'obbligatorietà della VAS ed evidenziando una possibile procedura d'infrazione comunitaria e che una norma di legge regionale nel frattempo sopravvenuta ed invocata dall'amministrazione comunale a sostegno della non necessità di sottoporre il piano a VAS era stata impugnata dal governo in quanto ritenuta contrastante con la disciplina statale attuativa della direttiva 2001/42/CE.

Il ministero ha anche sollecitato il comune di Venezia a fornire chiarimenti «anche alla luce di un'eventuale procedura d'infrazione che l'Unione europea intendesse avviare».

L'intervento edilizio potrebbe essere realizzato a breve, con irrimediabile e grave perdita dei valori ambientali tutelati.

Può la Commissione far sapere se intende intervenire sia in ordine all'inosservanza della direttiva 2001/42/CE, sia in ordine alla tutela degli ambiti della Rete Natura 2000 direttamente interessati?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(11 febbraio 2013)

La Commissione chiederà alle autorità italiane maggiori informazioni riguardo all'applicazione della direttiva sulla valutazione ambientale strategica ([5]) al piano di sviluppo di Ca' Roman. In seguito verrà data una risposta complementare all'onorevole parlamentare.

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

La Commissione è stata informata che l'autorità competente (Regione Veneto), a seguito di una richiesta di approvazione presentata dal promotore del progetto, sta considerando la necessità di screening per il «Piano di Recupero ex colonia di Cà Roman». La conferma della decisione da parte della Regione Veneto è attesa a breve.

Di conseguenza, sulla base delle informazioni disponibili, la Commissione non è in grado di riscontrare alcuna violazione della direttiva 2001/42/CE (nota come direttiva sulla valutazione ambientale strategica o direttiva VAS) ([6]).

([1]) In particolare sono previste 42 ville bifamiliari delle quali ben 11 ubicate in un'area mai edificata e di alto valore naturalistico e paesaggistico.
([2]) Sito di interesse comunitario IT3250030 «Laguna media inferiore di Venezia» e zona di protezione speciale IT3250046 «Laguna di Venezia».
([3]) Nell'area sono presenti le specie Bufo viridis (allegato IV della direttiva Habitat 92/43/CE), Egretta garzetta (allegato I della direttiva Uccelli 79/409/CEE), lungo la sponda lagunare si trova l'Habitat 1140 «distese fangose o sabbiose emergenti durante la bassa marea» e sono presenti praterie di Cymodocea nodosa (elemento di qualità biologica ai sensi della direttiva 60/2000/CEE).
([4]) Lettera del ministero dell'Ambiente prot. n. 0017525 del 19 luglio 2012.
([5]) Direttiva VAS 2001/42/CE, GU L 197 del 21.7.2001, pag. 30.
([6]) GU L 197 del 21.7.2001, pag. 30.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000014/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Approval of the implementing development plan for Ca' Roman in the municipality of Venice in the absence of the strategic environmental assessment (SEA) referred to in Directive 2001/42/EC

On 31 May 2012 the municipality of Venice approved a development plan consisting of new building projects ([1]) in the former settlement of Ca' Roman, situated on the island of Pellestrina, between the Adriatic Sea and the Venice lagoon, an area adjacent to a site of Community importance (SCI) and a special protection area (SPA) ([2]).

Only an environmental impact assessment (EIA), pursuant to Directive 92/43/EEC, has been carried out for this project and no strategic environmental assessment (SEA), pursuant to Directive 2001/42/EEC.

The lack of a proper environmental assessment of the plan's sustainability with regard to the precious landscape and nature in the area ([3]) had been raised by the *Coordinamento delle Associazioni Ambientaliste del Lido* [Group of Environmental Associations for the Lido], both when 'observations' were made regarding the draft plan and in an application to abolish the development plan presented to the Province of Venice.

The Group also applied to the Ministry of the Environment and the Region of Veneto as the authorities responsible for the SEA.

The Ministry replied ([4]) by stressing that the SEA was compulsory. It also mentioned the possibility of an EU infringement procedure and the fact that a regional law that the municipal authorities had, in the meantime, cited and applied as justification for not carrying out an SEA on the plan had been challenged by the government as it was considered to be at odds with the state legislation implementing Directive 2001/42/EC.

The Ministry also called for the municipality of Venice to provide clarification also in view of a possible infringement procedure that the European Union might choose to initiate.

The building project could be carried out in the near future, with the serious, irretrievable loss of the protected environmental assets.

Can the Commission say whether it intends to take action both with regard to the failure to comply with Directive 2001/42/EC and with regard to safeguarding those areas of the Natura 2000 network that are directly affected?

Preliminary answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(11 February 2013)

The Commission will ask the Italian authorities for more information on the application of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive ([5]) to the development plan for Ca' Roman. Subsequently, a supplementary answer will be provided to the Honourable Member.

Supplementary answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

The Commission has been informed that the competent authority (Veneto Region), following a request from the promoter to carry out its project, is considering the need for screening for the 'Recuperation Plan former Cà Roman colony' (Piano di Recupero ex colonia di Cà Roman). Confirmation of the decision of the Veneto Region is expected shortly.

([1]) In particular, the plan includes 42 semi-detached houses of which no fewer than 11 will be located on a site that has never been built on and whose nature and landscape are of great value.

([2]) Site of Community importance IT3250030 'Laguna medio inferiore di Venezia' ['lower-middle Venice lagoon'] and special protection area IT3250046 'Laguna di Venezia' ['Venice lagoon'].

([3]) Species found in the area include Bufo viridis (Annex IV to Directive 92/43/EEC (Habitats Directive)) and Egretta garzetta (Annex I to Directive 79/409/EEC (Birds Directive)), while Habitat 1140 'Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide' can be found along the lagoon bank, together with Cymodocea nodosa grasslands (biological quality element pursuant to Directive 60/2000/EEC).

([4]) Letter No 0017525 of 19 July 2012 from the Ministry of the Environment.

([5]) SEA Directive 2001/42/EC, OJ L 197, 21.7.2001, p.30.

Hence, on the basis of the available information, the Commission cannot identify any breach of Directive 2001/42/EC (known as the Strategic Environmental Assessment or SEA Directive) ([6]).

([6]) OJ L 197, 21.7.2001, p.30.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000015/13
aan de Commissie
Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL)
(3 januari 2013)

Betreft: Handel in op dieren geteste cosmetica

1. De Commissie geeft in haar antwoord E-00592/2012 op schriftelijke vragen aan dat ze overweegt om fabrikanten de mogelijkheid te bieden om per geval, onder strikte voorwaarden, een afwijking van het verbod op handel in op dieren geteste cosmetica en de daarin gebruikte ingrediënten (dat vanaf 11 maart 2013 geldt) toe te staan. Tijdens de hearing in het Europese Parlement met de nieuwe eurocommissaris gaf deze aan het verbod onverkort te willen handhaven. Is dit de mening van de Commissie als geheel?

2. Indien de Commissie kiest voor uitzonderingen, kan zij toelichten wat zij onder strikte voorwaarden verstaat?

3. Kan de Commissie, naast de uitzonderingsgronden, aangeven via welke procedure en door wie er tot uitzondering besloten wordt? Wordt er met externe experts gewerkt en indien dit het geval is, hoe wordt de onafhankelijkheid gewaarborgd van deze externe deskundigen?

4. Ziet de Commissie cosmetica, waarin ingrediënten zitten die na 11 maart 2013 onder andere wetgeving (chemie, geneesmiddelen) op dieren worden getest, als cosmetica waarop het handelsverbod van toepassing is? Zo niet, is de Commissie bereid om te kijken naar mogelijkheden om bestaande wetgeving aan te scherpen met een daaraan gekoppelde tijdslijn en zo te komen tot een totaalverbod op handel in op dieren geteste cosmetica evenals de daarin gebruikte ingrediënten?

5. De Commissie geeft in haar antwoord E-00592/2012 aan dat, indien zij kiest voor uitzonderingen, „Europese burgers van geval tot geval de mogelijkheid wordt geboden toegang te krijgen tot innovatieve cosmetische producten met aanzienlijke voordelen", wat zijn deze aanzienlijke voordelen en hoe worden deze aangetoond? Ziet de Commissie geen probleem in de ontwikkeling van producten die onder zowel de cosmeticawetgeving alswel de geneesmiddelenwetgeving zouden kunnen komen te vallen (denk aan terreinen als botox of middelen tegen kaalheid)?

6. Zijn er door lidstaten uitzondering aangevraagd op basis van artikel 18.2(6) Verordening (EG) nr. 1223/2009 die leiden tot het voortbestaan van de verkoop van op dieren geteste cosmetica?

Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(25 maart 2013)

Met betrekking tot de vragen 1, 2, 3, en 5: de Commissie heeft door middel van een mededeling ([1]) bevestigd dat zij niet van plan is een voorstel in te dienen inzake de termijn voor het verkoopverbod uit Verordening (EG) nr. 1223/2009 betreffende cosmetische producten ([2]).

In de mededeling beschrijft de Commissie eveneens haar interpretatie van het toepassingsgebied van het verkoopverbod waarnaar in vraag 4 wordt verwezen. Bijgevolg is de Commissie van oordeel dat wanneer dierproeven met ingrediënten duidelijk werden uitgevoerd in naleving van wettelijke kaders die geen verband houden met cosmetische producten, de resulterende informatie vervolgens kan worden gebruikt in de veiligheidsbeoordeling van cosmetische producten zonder dat het verkoopverbod in werking treedt.

De Commissie overweegt niet om een tijdslimiet te introduceren met betrekking tot dergelijke informatie die in naleving van andere wettelijke kaders is verkregen. Of gegevens die zijn verkregen uit dierproeven nog steeds nodig zijn uit hoofde van andere wettelijke kaders, hangt af van de respectieve kaders. Het is niet mogelijk om een duidelijke indicatie te geven van het moment waarop dierproeven in andere bedrijfstakken volledig kunnen worden vervangen ([3]).

Met betrekking tot vraag 6: tot dusver heeft de Commissie één vrijstellingsverzoek ontvangen. De beoordeling van dit verzoek is nog gaande.

([1]) Mededeling van de Commissie betreffende het verbod op dierproeven en het verbod op in de handel brengen en betreffende de stand van zaken met betrekking tot alternatieve methoden op het gebied van cosmetische producten, 11.3.2013, COM(2013) 135.
([2]) PB L 342 van 22.12.2009.
([3]) „Alternative (non-animal) methods for cosmetics testing: current status and future prospects-2010" (Alternatieve methoden (geen dierproeven) voor het testen van cosmetische producten — huidige situatie en vooruitzichten-2010), http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/sectors/cosmetics/files/pdf/animal_testing/final_report_at_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000015/13
to the Commission
Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Trade in animal-tested cosmetics

1. The Commission states in its reply E-00592/2012 to the written questions that it is considering offering manufacturers the possibility of derogation, on a case by case basis and under strict conditions, from the ban on trade in animal-tested cosmetics and the ingredients used therein (which applies from 11 March 2013). During the new Commissioner's hearing in the European Parliament he indicated that he wanted to maintain the ban in full. Does the Commission as a whole share this opinion?

2. If the Commission opts for derogation, can it explain what it means by strict conditions?

3. Can the Commission indicate, besides the grounds for derogation, through which procedure and by whom the derogation will be decided? Is it working with external experts and, if that is the case, how is the independence of these external experts guaranteed?

4. Does the Commission consider cosmetics which contain ingredients that are tested on animals after 11 March 2013 under other legislation (chemistry, pharmaceuticals) to be products covered by the trade ban? If not, is the Commission prepared to examine possibilities of tightening existing legislation with a timeline linked thereto and thus arrive at a total ban on trade in animal-tested cosmetics as well as the ingredients used therein?

5. In its reply E-00592/2012 the Commission states that, if it opts for derogation, it will 'on a case-by-case basis, permit European citizens access to innovative cosmetics with significant benefits'. What are these significant benefits and how will they be demonstrated? Does the Commission not see a problem in the development of products that might fall under both cosmetics legislation and pharmaceutical legislation (cf. areas such as botox or anti-hair loss products)?

6. Have Member States requested derogations under Article 18(2)(6) of Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 that will result in the continued sale of animal-tested cosmetics?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2013)

On questions 1, 2, 3 and 5 the Commission has confirmed by means of a communication ([1]) that it does not intend to make a proposal in relation to the 2013 marketing ban deadline Regulation 1223/2009/EC on cosmetic products ([2]).

This communication also sets out the Commission's understanding of the scope of the marketing ban as addressed in question 4. Accordingly, the Commission considers that when animal testing on ingredients has clearly been motivated by compliance with non-cosmetics related legislative frameworks, the resulting data could subsequently be relied on in the cosmetics safety assessment without triggering the marketing ban.

The Commission is not considering introducing a time limit in relation to such data generated for other legislative frameworks. Whether or not animal data is still necessary under other legal frameworks depends on the respective frameworks. It is not possible to give a clear indication as to when full replacement of animal testing in other sectors will be possible ([3]).

On question 6, the Commission has received one derogation request up to now. The examination of this derogation request is still pending.

([1]) Commission Communication on the animal testing and marketing ban and on the state of play in relation to alternative methods in the field of cosmetics, 11.3.2013, COM(2013) 135.
([2]) OJ L 342, 22.12.2009, p. 59.
([3]) 'Alternative (non-animal) methods for cosmetics testing: current. status and future prospects-2010', http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/sectors/cosmetics/files/pdf/animal_testing/final_report_at_en.pdf

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000016/13
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(3 januari 2013)

Betreft: Benoeming tabakslobbyist in Ethisch Comité inzake lobbyen

Deze week benoemde de Commissie de Franse jurist Michel Petite in het Ethisch Comité inzake lobbyen ([1]). Deze jurist werkt voor de tabaksindustrie in dienst van het Engelse advocatenkantoor Clifford Chance. Op dit moment is nog steeds de kwestie rondom het ontslag c.q. opstappen van de heer Dalli actueel. In deze zaak kwam ook de naam van Michel Petite voor. In dat kader de volgende vragen:

1. Vindt de Commissie het verstandig om de persoon Michel Petite te benoemen in een ethisch comité rondom lobbyen, terwijl diezelfde persoon kort tevoren genoemd is in een nog lopende en bepaald niet onomstreden kwestie van een (voormalig) eurocommissaris waarbij die zaak nu juist precies draaide rondom de invloed van tabakslobbyisten?

2. Vindt de Commissie het überhaupt verstandig om een lobbyist voor sigarettenproducent Philip Morris zitting te laten nemen in een ethisch comité inzake lobbyen? Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat dit wel heel erg riekt naar „de slager zijn eigen vlees laten keuren"?

3. De heer Petite blijkt tot 2007 tevens juridisch adviseur van voorzitter Barroso te zijn geweest. Vindt de Commissie dit feit met de PVV van voldoende belang om de ernstige belangenverstrengeling van de heer Petite en de Commissie in te zien en de heer Petite per direct van zijn werkzaamheden in dit Ethisch Comité inzake lobbyen te ontheffen?

Antwoord van de heer Barroso namens de Commissie
(31 mei 2013)

1. Het is de opdracht van de ethische commissie ad hoc (AHEC) om de Europese Commissie te adviseren over de verenigbaarheid met artikel 245 van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie, van beroepen die voormalige leden van de Europese Commissie na hun ambtsperiode wensen op te nemen. Daarnaast kan de AHEC op verzoek van de voorzitter van de Commissie eveneens adviezen formuleren over algemene ethische vragen met betrekking tot de interpretatie van de gedragscode voor de leden van de Europese Commissie.

Het mandaat van de drie leden van de AHEC, met inbegrip van dat van de heer Petite, is op 12 december 2012 verlengd omdat de Europese Commissie hun bijdrage en de onafhankelijkheid waarvan zij in die rol blijk hebben gegeven, als bijzonder waardevol beschouwt. De leden van de AHEC moeten onafhankelijk en van onbesproken professioneel gedrag zijn en een degelijke kennis van het bestaande rechtskader en van de werkmethoden van de Europese Commissie hebben ([2]). De heer Petite voldoet nog steeds aan deze vereisten.

Bij de door het geachte Parlementslid aangehaalde zaak zijn geen leden van de AHEC betrokken.

2. Na zijn uittreding uit de Europese Commissie in 2007 heeft de heer Petite de toestemming gekregen om onder bepaalde voorwaarden een nieuwe functie als advocaat op te nemen. Er werd op dat ogenblik aan alle voorwaarden voldaan en dat is nog steeds het geval voor zover de voorwaarden nog van toepassing zijn.

Wanneer de heer Petite in zijn hoedanigheid van lid van de AHEC samen met de andere leden bijdraagt aan adviezen ten behoeve van de Commissie, handelt hij volledig onafhankelijk. Dat was het geval voor de acht adviezen die de AHEC heeft uitgebracht.

3. Voormalige ambtenaren zijn ook na afloop van hun ambtsperiode gehouden betamelijkheid en kiesheid te betrachten. Er is geen sprake van een belangenconflict tussen de opdrachten van de heer Petite vóór en na zijn uittreding uit de Commissie, noch tussen de huidige functie van de heer Petite als onafhankelijk lid van de AHEC en zijn professionele activiteiten als advocaat bij Clifford Chance.

([1]) http://euobserver.com/institutional/118621.

([2]) Bij haar oprichting in 2004, bestond de ethische commissie ad hoc uit twee voormalige leden van de Europese Commissie (de heren Pandolfi en Van Miert) en een extern lid (de heer Murray, voormalig lid van het Hof van Justitie). In 2009 heeft de Commissie beslist om een meerderheid van externe leden (een voormalig lid van het Europees Parlement en een voormalig rechter) aan te wijzen om de onafhankelijkheid van de leden van de commissie te versterken. De heer Petite is toen verkozen omdat het noodzakelijk bleek dat ten minste één lid van de AHEC over een grondige kennis van de structuur en werkmethoden van de Europese Commissie beschikt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000016/13
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Appointment of a tobacco lobbyist to the Ethics Committee on Lobbying

This week the Commission appointed the French lawyer Michel Petite to the Ethics Committee on Lobbying ([1]). This lawyer works for the tobacco industry in the pay of the English law firm Clifford Chance. At the moment, the issue surrounding the dismissal or resignation of Mr Dalli is still topical. In this case the name of Michel Petite also came to the fore. In this context I would like to ask the following questions:

1. Does the Commission find it sensible to appoint Michel Petite to an ethics committee on lobbying while this individual's name is being mentioned in an ongoing and by no means uncontroversial case of a (former) European Commissioner which was to do precisely with the influence of tobacco lobbyists?

2. Does the Commission consider it at all wise to allow a lobbyist for a cigarette manufacturer Philip Morris to take a seat on an ethics committee on lobbying? Does the Commission agree with the Dutch Freedom Party (PVV) that this really smacks of the fox guarding its own chickens?

3. Mr Petite also appears to have been legal adviser to President Barroso until 2007. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that this fact is of sufficient importance highlight the serious conflicts of interest of Mr Petite and the Commission and to immediately strip Mr Petite of his duties in this Ethics Committee on Lobbying?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(31 May 2013)

1. The mandate of the Ad hoc Ethical Committee (AHEC) is to advise the Commission on the compatibility of occupations that former Commissioners propose to take up after they leave the Commission with Article 245 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. In addition, if requested by the President of the Commission, the AHEC can also deliver opinion(s) on any general ethical question regarding the interpretation of the Code of Conduct for Commissioners.

All three members of the AHEC, including Mr Petite, had their mandate renewed on 12 December 2012 because the Commission highly valued their contribution and their previous demonstration of independence in that role. The members of the Committee are required to be independent and have an impeccable record of professional behaviour as well as a sound knowledge of the existing legal framework and working methods of the Commission ([2]). Mr Petite continues to fulfil these requirements.

No member of this Committee is concerned by the case mentioned by the honourable member.

2. Upon his retirement from the Commission in 2007, Mr Petite was authorised to engage in a new professional assignment as a lawyer subject to conditions which were fulfilled at that time and have been continuing to be fulfilled to the extent they are still applicable.

When acting as a member of the AHEC and contributing with the other members to opinions to be delivered to the Commission, Mr Petite is acting in full independence. It was the case for the eight opinions delivered by this Committee.

3. Former officials continue to be bound by the duty to behave with integrity and discretion. There is no conflict of interest between Mr Petite's assignments before and after retiring from the Commission nor between Mr Petite's current independent assignment as a member of the AHEC and his professional activities as a lawyer with Clifford Chance.

([1]) http://euobserver.com/institutional/118621.

([2]) Upon its setting up in 2004 the Ad hoc Ethical Committee was composed of two former Commissioners (Messrs Pandolfi and Van Miert) and an external member (Mr Murray, former member of the Court of Justice). In 2009, in order to enhance the independence of the members of the Committee, the Commission decided to nominate a majority of external members (one former MEP, and one former judge. Mr Petite was chosen as it proved necessary that, at least, one member of the Committee should have an in-depth knowledge of the Commission's structure and working methods. .

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-000017/13
til Kommissionen
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(3. januar 2013)

Om: Værdier for tjære, nikotin og kulilte i det nye forslag til revision af tobaksdirektivet

I det netop fremlagte forslag til revision af tobaksdirektivet fastholdes de makimalt tilladte værdier for tjære, nikotin og kulilte. Målemetoderne forbliver de samme som i dag.

I det gældende direktiv lægges der ellers op til, at det skal undersøges yderligere, om værdierne skal nedsættes.

Mit spørgsmål er derfor:

Har Kommissionen undersøgt muligheden for at nedsætte værdierne og udvikle nye og bedre målemetoder til at tjekke indholdet af ingredienser i tobaksvarer?

Hvad er begrundelsen i bekræftende fald for, at det ikke sker i det nye forslag til direktivet? Hvad er forklaringen i benægtende fald?

Er det Kommissionens vurdering, at niveauerne af tjære, nikotin og andre ingredienser i dag er acceptable?

Hvem har rådgivet Kommissionen i spørgsmålet om niveauerne for ingredienser?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg
(18. februar 2013)

Kommissionen har ikke foreslået nogen ændringer til de maksimale værdier for tjære, nikotin og kulilte, der regulerer tobaksvarers toksicitet og vanedannende virkning, og som fortsat er relevante.

Kommissionens forslag sænker ikke de maksimale værdier for tjære, nikotin og kulilte, men giver mulighed for en indsats mod stoffer, der øger toksiciteten eller den vanedannende virkning af tobaksvarer. Dermed vil Kommissionen kunne fastsætte grænser for visse emissioner på grundlag af nye videnskabelige oplysninger. For at kunne reagere hurtigt over for den tekniske og videnskabelige udvikling er der i direktivforslaget fastsat mulighed for gennemførelsesbeføjelser og delegerede retsakter.

I betragtning af at alle tobaksvarer er giftige og vanedannende, er fokus for den regulerende indsats vedrørende tobaksvarer desuden i stigende grad flyttet fra toksicitet og vanedannende virkning til produkternes tiltrækningskraft. Denne indfaldsvinkel afspejles også i retningslinjerne vedrørende artikel 9 og 10 i rammekonventionen om tobakskontrol, hvor man understreger behovet for at regulere produkternes tiltrækningskraft. På denne baggrund har Kommissionen foreslået at forbyde tobaksvarer med en kendetegnende aroma, f.eks. mentol, vanilje eller chokolade.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000017/13
to the Commission
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Values for tar, nicotine and carbon monoxide in the new proposal for a revision of the Tobacco Products Directive

The recently submitted proposal for revision of the Tobacco Products Directive maintains the maximum permitted levels of tar, nicotine and carbon monoxide. The measurement methodologies remain the same as those currently in use.

There is however a provision in the current directive that it ought to be considered at a later date whether the levels should be reduced.

Has the Commission considered the possibility of reducing the levels and developing new and better measurement methodologies for checking the contents of ingredients in tobacco products?

If so, what are the reasons for this not being done in the new proposal for a directive? If not, what is the explanation for not doing so?

Does the Commission consider that the levels of tar, nicotine and other ingredients are currently acceptable?

Who advised the Commission on the levels for these ingredients?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

The Commission did not propose to change the maximum values for tar, nicotine and carbon monoxides which regulate the toxicity and addictiveness of tobacco products and which are still relevant.

While the Commission proposal does not lower the maximum values for tar, nicotine and carbon, it allows for action against substances increasing the toxicity or addictiveness of tobacco products. It would also allow the Commission to set limits for certain emissions in the light of emerging scientific evidence. In order to be able to react in a speedy manner to technical and scientific progress, implementing powers and delegated acts are foreseen in the draft Directive.

In addition, taking into account that all tobacco products are toxic and addictive, the focus of regulatory action on tobacco products has increasingly shifted from toxicity and addictiveness towards attractiveness. This approach is also reflected in the guidelines on Articles 9 and 10 of the framework Convention on Tobacco Control, which emphasise the need to regulate attractiveness. In this light, the Commission has proposed to prohibit tobacco products which have a characterising flavour such as menthol, vanilla or chocolate.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-000018/13
till kommissionen
Christian Engström (Verts/ALE)
(3 januari 2013)

Angående: Handelsavtalet om åtgärder mot immaterialrättsintrång (Acta-avtalet) och EU-domstolens fråga till kommissionen

Efter ett uttalande från kommissionen i december 2012 ([1]), ställde EU-domstolen en fråga till kommissionen gällande kommissionens hänskjutande av handelsavtalet om åtgärder mot immaterialrättsintrång (Acta-avtalet) till domstolen i maj 2012 ([2]).

1. När kommer kommissionen att offentliggöra frågan som ställts av EU-domstolen?

2. När kommer kommissionen att offentliggöra sitt svar på frågan?

3. Anser kommissionen att domstolens fråga och kommissionens svar bör offentliggöras? Om så är fallet, i enlighet med vilken artikel, lag eller princip? Om så inte är fallet, varför inte?

Svar från José Manuel Barroso på kommissionens vägnar
(5 februari 2013)

”Kommissionen har genom en skrivelse av den 20 december 2012 dragit tillbaka sin begäran om ett yttrande från EU-domstolen om det planerade handelsavtalet om åtgärder mot immaterialrättsintrång (Acta-avtalet) är förenligt med fördragen och i synnerhet med stadgan om Europeiska unionens grundläggande rättigheter (mål A-1/12). Målet har dock ännu inte borttagits från domstolens register. Eftersom Europaparlamentet självt har inlämnat skriftliga synpunkter i mål A-1/12 har både frågan som ställts av domstolen och kommissionens skrivelse av den 20 december 2012 även delgivits Europaparlamentet.”

([1]) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VCBTFh3IhQY.
([2]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/press/index.cfm?id=799.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000018/13
to the Commission
Christian Engström (Verts/ALE)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) — what did the Court ask the Commission?

Following a statement made by the Commission in December 2012 ([1]), the Court of Justice has asked the Commission a question regarding its referral of the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) to the Court in May 2012 ([2]).

1. When will the Commission make public the question raised by the Court of Justice?

2. When will the Commission make public its answer to that question?

3. Is the Commission of the opinion that the Court's question and the Commission's answer should be made public? If so, on the basis of which rule, law or principle? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(5 February 2013)

'By letter of 20 December 2012 the Commission has withdrawn its request for an opinion of the Court of Justice on the compatibility of the envisaged Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) with the Treaties and in particular with the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (case A-1/12). Until now, the case has however not yet been removed from the register of the Court. The European Parliament having itself submitted written observations in case A-1/12 the question asked by the Court of Justice as well as the letter of the Commission of 20 December 2012 have been served also on the European Parliament.'

([1]) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VCBTFh3IhQY.
([2]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/press/index.cfm?id=799.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000019/13
aan de Commissie
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(3 januari 2013)

Betreft: Privatisering van drinkwater

Volgens het Duitse TV-programma „Monitor" werkt de Europese Commissie heimelijk aan de privatisering van drinkwater. In de reportage „Geheimoperation Wasser: Wie die EU-Kommission Wasser zur Handelsware machen will" ([1]) wordt duidelijk dat de Europese Commissie drinkwatervoorziening stap voor stap tot een commercieel product omvormt.

In de reportage komen ook de resultaten aan de orde van een studie van de Universiteit van Barcelona, waaruit blijkt dat dergelijke privatiseringen de consument meer kwaad dan goed doen.

Daarnaast wordt water door de Verenigde Naties als een mensenrecht beschouwd.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met de reportage „Geheimoperation Wasser: Wie die EU-Kommission Wasser zur Handelsware machen will"?

2. Deelt de Commissie de mening van de PVV dat drinkwatervoorziening een nationale aangelegenheid is?

3. Is de Commissie bekend met het feit dat in de meeste EU-landen, waaronder Nederland, de drinkwatervoorziening een publieke aangelegenheid dan wel een overheidstaak is?

4. Kan de Commissie aangeven waarom zij een zo essentieel en daarom publieksrechtelijk georganiseerd product als drinkwatervoorziening in commerciële handen wil zien? Deelt de Commissie de mening van de PVV dat drinkwatervoorziening nooit een commercieel belang mag dienen? Is de Commissie bereid de tot nu toe ondernomen stappen op dat terrein terug te draaien en verdere beleidsvoorbereiding onmiddellijk stop te zetten? Zo nee, waarom niet?

5. Kan de Commissie aangeven, mede in het licht van de conclusies van de Universiteit van Barcelona, waarom watervoorziening in private handen beter voor de EU-burgers zou zijn dan watervoorziening in publieke handen?

Antwoord van de heer Barnier namens de Commissie
(18 februari 2013)

De Commissie is op de hoogte van een aantal verslagen in de Duitse en Oostenrijkse media, waarin ten onrechte wordt beweerd dat de Commissie van plan is om de drinkwaterdistributie te privatiseren. Dit is een gevolg van een onjuiste lezing van het wetgevingsvoorstel voor de gunning van concessieopdrachten. De Commissie wijst dergelijke beweringen van de hand en stelt duidelijk dat ze geen privatisering van de drinkwatervoorziening voorstelt noch van enige andere diensten in de lidstaten. Overheden dwingen zulke diensten te privatiseren, zou in strijd zijn met de wetgeving van de EU.

De Commissie erkent dat water een essentieel openbaar goed voor de burger is en dat het beheer van drinkwatervoorraden onder de bevoegdheid van de lidstaten valt. Gezien het belang van water heeft de Commissie ervoor gezorgd dat in haar voorstel voor een richtlijn betreffende de gunning van concessieopdrachten, de onafhankelijkheid van lokale overheden ten volle wordt erkend en ondersteund wat betreft het aanbod en de organisatie van diensten van algemeen economisch belang, inclusief water. Overheidsinstanties zullen altijd de mogelijkheid behouden om te kiezen of zij deze diensten rechtstreeks aanbieden of via een derde, met name een particuliere onderneming.

De Commissie is van mening dat, in het geval een overheid ervoor kiest diensten aan te bieden via een particuliere onderneming, de voorgestelde regels zullen bijdragen tot de transparantie en effectiviteit waarmee belastinggeld wordt besteed, doordat overheden betere keuzes kunnen maken.

De voorgestelde richtlijn zal daarom in geen geval leiden tot een gedwongen privatisering van waterdiensten.

([1]) http://www.wdr.de/tv/monitor/sendungen/2012/1213/wasser.php5.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000019/13
to the Commission
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Privatisation of drinking water

According to the German TV programme 'Monitor', the European Commission is secretly working on the privatisation of drinking water. It is clear from the report entitled: 'Secret operation Water: How the European Commission wants to make water into a commodity' ([1]) that the European Commission is gradually transforming the supply of drinking water into a commercial product.

The report also discusses the results of a study by the University of Barcelona which show that such privatisation does the consumer more harm than good.

In addition, water is considered to be a human right by the United Nations.

1. Is the Commission aware of the report 'Secret operation Water: How the European Commission wants to make water into a commodity'?

2. Does the Commission agree with the Dutch Freedom Party (PVV) that the supply of drinking water is a national concern?

3. Is the Commission aware of the fact that in most EU Member States, including the Netherlands, the supply of drinking water is a public concern or a public duty?

4. Can the Commission explain why it wants to see such an essential product, which is therefore subject to public law, as the drinking water supply, fall into commercial hands? Does the Commission agree with the PVV that the drinking water supply should never serve a commercial interest? Is the Commission prepared to reverse the steps taken so far in this field and put an immediate stop to further policymaking? If not, why not?

5. Can the Commission explain, in the light of the conclusions of the University of Barcelona, why water supply in private hands would be better for EU citizens than water supply in public hands?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

The Commission is aware of several reports in German and Austria media, wrongly alleging that the Commission intends to privatise the distribution of water, following an erroneous reading of the legislative proposal on the award of concession contracts. The Commission rejects such allegations and makes it clear that it does not propose privatisation of water provision services or of any other services in Member States. Imposing privatisation of such services on public authorities would be contrary to EC law.

The Commission recognises that water is a public good which is vital to citizens and that the management of water resources is a competence of Member States. Acknowledging the importance of water, the Commission made sure that its proposal for a directive on the award of concession contracts fully recognises and supports the autonomy of local authorities regarding the provision and organisation of services of general economic interest, including water. Public authorities will, at all times, remain free to choose whether they provide the services directly or via a third party, notably a private economic operator.

In cases where a public authority decides to provide services through a private economic operator, the Commission considers that the proposed rules will contribute to the transparency and effectiveness in the spending of public money by enabling public authorities to make better choices.

The proposed Directive will therefore not lead, under any circumstances, to forced privatisation of water services.

([1]) http://www.wdr.de/tv/monitor/sendungen/2012/1213/wasser.php5.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000020/13
aan de Commissie
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(3 januari 2013)

Betreft: Verplichting douchespaarkoppen

Volgens De Standaard van 28 december is de Europese Commissie voornemens om douchespaarkoppen voortaan verplicht te stellen ([1]). Dit is slechts een van een lange reeks aan regels die de Commissie kennelijk wil invoeren in het kader van een fictief klimaatprobleem.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht in De Standaard van vrijdag 28 december dat de Europese Commissie voornemens is om douchespaarkoppen voortaan verplicht te stellen?

2. Is het waar dat de Commissie van plan is om douchespaarkoppen in de toekomst te gaan verplichten zoals vermeld in De Standaard?

3. Hoe oordeelt de Commissie over het principe van een vrije markt met keuze voor consumenten?

4. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat als de douchespaarkoppen een significante verbetering zijn voor de consument, deze in een vrije markt door middel van vraag en aanbod vanzelf geproduceerd en verkocht zullen worden? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Potočnik namens de Commissie
(28 februari 2013)

De Commissie kent de onjuiste artikelen in de pers waarin wordt beweerd dat zij van plan is om waterbesparende douchekoppen verplicht te stellen of om inefficiënte modellen te „verbieden". Waarschijnlijk vinden deze artikelen hun oorsprong in de opname van „watergerelateerde producten" (bijv. kranen en douches) in het onlangs goedgekeurde werkplan 2012-2014 van de richtlijn inzake ecologisch ontwerp ([2]). Lezing van het plan zal de kwestie verduidelijken en het geachte Parlementslid geruststellen.

Naar aanleiding van de opname van deze producten in het plan zal de Commissie nu voorbereidende studies starten om te onderzoeken hoe de duurzaamheid van deze producten kan worden verbeterd, vooral ten aanzien van efficiënt energie- en watergebruik. Hierbij worden feiten en suggesties van belanghebbenden verzameld om tot een advies voor de beste beleidsmix te komen (ecologisch ontwerp en/of etikettering en/of zelfregulering/vrijwillige maatregelen), als deze bestaat. Deelname aan de studies staat open voor alle geïnteresseerde partijen, inclusief burgers, ondernemingen en ngo's. Indien de Commissie vervolgens aan de hand hiervan voorstellen doet voor wetgeving of vrijwillige afspraken zullen deze — zoals gewoonlijk — worden vergezeld van een passende effectbeoordeling waarin de voordelen en kosten van het voorstel en de marktbelemmeringen voor efficiëntere watergerelateerde producten worden uiteengezet.

De richtlijn inzake ecologisch ontwerp rechtvaardigt de vaststelling van minimale vereisten voor producten om hun milieuprestaties te verbeteren, zoals de besparing van energie en de vermindering van CO2-uitstoot. Wetgeving inzake ecologisch ontwerp en energie-etikettering stimuleert fabrikanten om nieuwe efficiëntere producten te ontwikkelen teneinde het aanbod van producten geleidelijk te veranderen in de richting van efficiëntere producten; dit leidt in dit geval tot mogelijk aanzienlijke besparingen in de water- en energierekeningen van de consument.

([1]) http://www.standaard.be/artikel/detail.aspx?artikelid=DMF20121227_00415928.
([2]) 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-000020/13
to the Commission
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(3 January 2013)

Subject: Compulsory water-saving shower heads

According to *De Standaard* of 28 December 2012, the European Commission intends to make water-saving shower heads compulsory from now on ([1]). This is just one of a long list of rules which the Commission apparently wants to introduce in the context of a fictional climate problem.

1. Is the Commission aware of the report in *De Standaard* of Friday 28 December 2012 that the European Commission intends to make water-saving shower heads compulsory from now on?

2. Is it true that the Commission is planning to make water-saving shower heads compulsory in future, as reported in *De Standaard*?

3. What is the Commission's position on the principle of a free market in which consumers have a choice?

4. Does the Commission agree with the Dutch Freedom Party (PVV) that, if water-saving shower heads are a significant improvement for the consumer, they will be produced and sold in a free market through supply and demand as a matter of course? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

The Commission is aware of inaccurate press articles reporting that it intends to make water-saving shower heads compulsory or 'ban' inefficient ones. These presumably stem from the inclusion of 'water related products' (e.g. taps and showers) in the recently adopted 2012-2014 working plan of the Ecodesign Directive ([2]). Reading the plan should clarify the issue and reassure the right Honourable Member.

Inclusion of these products in the plan means that the Commission will now launch preparatory studies to examine how their sustainability could be improved, notably in terms of energy and water efficiency. The studies will collect evidence and stakeholder input in order to recommend the best policy mix (ecodesign and/or labelling and/or self-regulation/voluntary measures), if any. The study process is open to the participation of all interested parties, including citizens, businesses and NGOs. If regulatory and/or voluntary proposals are subsequently made by the Commission, they will — as usual — be accompanied by an appropriate Impact Assessment explaining the benefits and costs of the proposal and of the market barriers for more efficient water related products.

The Ecodesign Directive justifies setting minimum requirements for products in order to improve their environmental performance, for example saving energy and reducing CO_2 emissions. Ecodesign and Energy Labelling regulations encourage manufacturers to develop new more efficient products, thus shifting the range of available products in the market gradually towards more efficient products, in this case resulting in potentially substantial savings in water and energy bills for householders.

([1]) http://www.standaard.be/artikel/detail.aspx?artikelid=DMF20121227_00415928.
([2]) 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-000021/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(4 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: La libertà di religione

Nel 2012, nel mondo, le vittime dell'odio contro i cristiani di ogni confessione sono state 105.000. Quando l'anno scorso a Budapest, in un convegno internazionale organizzato dall'Unione europea, il sociologo rappresentante dell'OSCE ha ricordato che in media ogni anno sono oltre 100.000 i cristiani uccisi nel mondo per la loro fede, vi sono state reazioni di incredulità e di rifiuto. Ora la cifra è stata confermata da altre fonti, fra le quali il Ministero degli Affari esteri italiano. Le stragi, come riportano alcune cronache isolate, vengono compiute addirittura nelle chiese, oltre che nei villaggi in cui i cristiani abitano. Le autorità locali non reagiscono e i colpevoli non vengono mai sottoposti a processo. Queste stragi sono preoccupanti anche perché avvengono in ogni parte del mondo. Pare che la questione non possa essere relegata soltanto nell'inadempienza rispetto ai diritti umani. La violenza degli avvenimenti, l'accanimento contro la croce, simbolo della passione di Cristo, e il non rispetto della libertà di religione, che non riguarda certo ogni cristiano ma ogni uomo, perché è un diritto che va riconosciuto come diritto naturale quale che sia la propria prospettiva religiosa, fanno pensare piuttosto a una nuova specie di razzismo che è più diffuso di quel che non si pensi. Anche gli ebrei, nei paesi del Nord Europa, non escono più con la kippah in testa e con la croce di Davide al collo temendo reazioni violente, come già è accaduto e molti fatti confermano. Ci si chiede che cosa stia succedendo in questa Europa «civilizzata» e che tipo di cultura nutra e alimenti queste manifestazioni intolleranti e razzistiche.

1. Ciò premesso, è la Commissione in grado di fornire una sua interpretazione?

2. Non crede che, oltre alle reazioni di comprensione espresse in occasione di atti provocatori compiuti da ragazze russe contro i credenti in una chiesa di Mosca, forse sarebbe più congruo reagire fermamente contro le atroci e cruente stragi dei cristiani e contro l'intolleranza nei confronti degli ebrei?

3. Quando capirà che la lotta unidirezionale al razzismo non contribuisce a stabilire rapporti pacifici tra i popoli, ma può alimentare campagne d'odio contro i credenti di alcune religioni?

4. Intende continuare la sua politica in Medio Oriente e in Nord Africa, che ha travolto anche governi e culture che tentavano di mettere in atto una lettura del Corano più pacifica e aperta?

5. Cosa intende fare con i paesi con i quali ha in corso negoziati e nei quali avvengono stragi di cristiani che non accennano a diminuire?

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

Ai sensi della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea, ogni persona ha diritto alla libertà di pensiero, di coscienza e di religione e l'Unione rispetta le diversità culturali e religiose. Nelle conclusioni del 2011, il Consiglio ha espresso «profonda preoccupazione per il numero crescente di atti d'intolleranza e discriminazione religiosa» nel mondo, condannandoli fermamente.

L'Unione europea sta elaborando delle linee guida sulla libertà fondamentale di religione o di credo che aiuteranno l'Unione e gli Stati membri ad affrontare in modo più efficace la questione nell'ambito della PESC ([1]) e ad intervenire presso i paesi terzi partner ogni qualvolta si riveli necessario.

Quanto alla primavera araba, nelle conclusioni dell'8 febbraio 2013, il Consiglio ha esplicitato che il processo di transizione verso la democrazia «deve fondarsi in modo chiaro sulla promozione e sulla protezione dei diritti umani, delle libertà fondamentali e dello stato di diritto». L'impegno dell'Unione europea nei confronti dei vicini continua a basarsi sul principio del «*more for more*» (maggiori aiuti a fronte di un maggiore impegno) e della «responsabilità reciproca», come indicato nelle due comunicazioni congiunte dell'8 marzo ([2]) e del 25 maggio ([3]) 2011.

([1]) PESC: politica estera e di sicurezza comune.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/fule/docs/news/joint_communication-a_partnership_for_democracy_and_shared_prosperity_with_south_med_en.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/com_11_303_en.pdf

Sul piano interno all'Unione europea, la decisione quadro 2008/913/GAI ([4]) obbliga gli Stati membri a rendere passibile di sanzione penale l'istigazione pubblica volontaria alla violenza o all'odio in riferimento alla razza, al colore, alla religione, all'ascendenza o all'origine nazionale o etnica e la Commissione ne verifica da vicino il recepimento e l'applicazione. I risultati delle valutazioni sull'osservanza da parte degli Stati membri saranno presentati in una relazione nel corso del 2013. Fino al 1° dicembre 2014 la Commissione non è autorizzata ad avviare procedure di infrazione ai sensi della decisione quadro. Spetta alle autorità giudiziarie e di polizia nazionali esaminare i casi concreti e stabilire se si configuri una fattispecie di istigazione alla violenza o all'odio.

([4]) Decisione quadro 2008/913/GAI del 28 novembre 2008 sulla lotta contro talune forme ed espressioni di razzismo e xenofobia mediante il diritto penale, GU L 328 del 6.12.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000021/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(4 January 2013)

Subject: Freedom of religion

In 2012, there were 105 000 victims of hate crimes against Christians of all denominations worldwide. When, during an international convention organised by the European Union last year in Budapest, the sociologist representing the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) pointed out that, on average, more than 100 000 Christians are killed each year across the world because of their faith, the reaction was one of disbelief and denial. Today the figure has been confirmed by other sources, including the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. According to a few isolated news reports, the massacres are even being carried out in churches, as well as in villages where Christians live. The local authorities are doing nothing about it and the perpetrators are never tried. These massacres are worrying, not least because they are happening in every corner of the globe. It would seem that dismissing the issue only undermines human rights. The violent nature of the events, the hatred shown towards the cross — the symbol of the passion of Christ — and the failure to respect freedom of religion, which most certainly concerns all human beings, not just Christians, because it is a right that must be recognised as an inherent right, regardless of one's own religious views, are somewhat indicative of a new form of racism that is more widespread than one might think. Even Jews, in the countries of northern European, no longer go out wearing the kippa on their head or the Star of David around their neck because they fear violent reactions, which have already occurred and which many reports confirm. One wonders what is happening in this 'civilised' Europe and what kind of culture fosters and encourages these expressions of intolerance and racism.

1. With this in mind, can the Commission offer its interpretation?

2. Does it not think that, above and beyond the sympathy shown in response to provocative acts by some Russian girls against worshippers in a Moscow church, it might be more appropriate to react firmly against the terrible and bloody massacres of Christians and against the intolerance towards Jews?

3. When will it realise that the one-way fight against racism is not helping to establish peaceful relations between peoples, but may fuel hate campaigns against believers of certain religions?

4. Does it intend to continue its policy in the Middle East and North Africa, one which has also ridden roughshod over governments and cultures that were trying to establish a more peaceful and open interpretation of the Koran?

5. What does it intend to do with those countries with which it is currently negotiating and in which Christians are being massacred with no sign of a let-up?

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

According to the Charter of Fundamental Rights in the EU, everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, and the Union shall respect cultural and religious diversity. In its 2011 Conclusions the Council expressed its 'profound concern about the increasing number of acts of religious intolerance and discrimination across the world' and condemned them.

The EU is elaborating guidelines on freedom of religion or belief, which will help the EU and Member States (MS) to better address in the CFSP ([1]) this fundamental freedom and engage with third country partners whenever necessary.

Regarding the Arab Spring, the Council made clear in its 8 February 2013 conclusions that the process of transition towards democracy 'needs to be clearly based on the promotion and protection of human rights, fundamental freedoms and the rule of law'. EU engagement with its neighbours remains grounded on the basis of the 'more for more' principle and on 'mutual accountability' as set out in the two joint Communications of 2011 issued on 8 March ([2]) and on 25 May ([3]).

([1]) CFSP = Common Foreign and Security Policy.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/fule/docs/news/joint_communication-a_partnership_for_democracy_and_shared_prosperity_with_south_med_en.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/com_11_303_en.pdf

On the internal EU side, Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA ([4]) obliges MS to make punishable by criminal penalties intentional public incitements to violence or hatred defined by reference to race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin. The Commission is closely monitoring its transposition and implementation. It will present its assessment of MS' compliance in a report during 2013. The Commission is not authorised to launch infringement proceedings on the basis of the framework Decision until 1 December 2014. It is for national law enforcement and judicial authorities to investigate concrete situations and determine whether such situations represent incitement to violence or hatred.

([4]) 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.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000022/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(4 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Guerra al bergamotto?

Alcune cronache giornalistiche affermano che ci risiamo. Le lobby di alcune industrie chimiche dichiarano, tramite l'Unione europea, che tra l'1 e il 3 per cento della popolazione europea è «potenzialmente» allergica ad alcune componenti presenti nei profumi. La proposta di restringere la concentrazione degli oli essenziali dal 12 % allo 0,01 % significherebbe decretare la fine del bergamotto e la scomparsa di questa tipica produzione dalla Calabria, la sola regione al mondo in grado di produrre questo agrume dal quale si ricavano gli oli che sono alla base di molti profumi. Verrebbe voglia di dire: «ci risiamo!». È stato tentato in passato, con motivazioni di carattere sanitario, di eliminare la cottura delle pizze nei forni a legna. È stato tentato anche di colpire la produzione di ovetti di cioccolato contenenti la «sorpresa», stavolta per motivi inerenti la sicurezza dei bambini, che avrebbero potuto ingoiare gli oggettini che compongono le «sorprese». Ora si ritenterebbe con una produzione naturale unica al mondo e concentrata in una fascia costiera, lunga un'ottantina di chilometri e profonda una decina, della regione Calabria. Ciò significa 650 aziende agricole coinvolte, 7.000 addetti e 1.300 ettari interessati dalla coltivazione, per non parlare delle numerose aziende di profumo che utilizzano l'essenza del bergamotto per fissare il bouquet aromatico. L'industria vorrebbe soppiantare questa produzione naturale e sostituirla con una produzione sintetica, che ovviamente non ha nulla a che vedere con l'agrume denominato *Citrus Bergamia Risso*, meglio conosciuto come bergamotto.

1. Ciò premesso, può la Commissione confermare se la notizia corrisponde al vero?

2. Ha veramente intenzione di sostenere le ragioni di alcuni industriali chimici, contro una produzione naturale che alimenta l'industria dei profumi da secoli senza aver mai provocato danni alla salute?

3. Può indicare se l'essenza di bergamotto è brevettata o riconosciuta dalla varie formule dell'UE per il riconoscimento di origine protetta?

4. Non ritiene che anche l'industria del tè ne rimarrebbe compromessa, dato che la scorza del bergamotto serve per la qualità aromatizzata denominata *Earl Grey*?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(14 febbraio 2013)

La Commissione desidera chiarire, in risposta al primo quesito, che nel giugno 2012 il Comitato scientifico della sicurezza dei consumatori (SCCS) ha emanato un parere sulle fragranze allergizzanti nei prodotti cosmetici. Questo parere aggiorna l'elenco delle fragranze allergizzanti (compresi gli estratti naturali) che rivestono un interesse per i consumatori, confermando nel contempo che le 26 fragranze allergizzanti già disciplinate nella direttiva Cosmetici ([1]) presentano ancora criticità.

La Commissione riflette attualmente su come attuare questo parere per far sì che esso contribuisca all'informazione e alla sicurezza dei consumatori nel modo più adeguato e proporzionato, mantenendo nel contempo l'innovazione e la competitività del settore dei cosmetici. A tal fine, la Commissione sta valutando a fondo gli impatti sociali (in termini di protezione dei consumatori, disponibilità dei prodotti e occupazione) ed economici delle possibili opzioni, tenendo conto anche dei dati di vigilanza e di elementi addizionali che interessano l'esposizione dei consumatori.

Per quanto concerne il terzo quesito, il «Bergamotto di Reggio Calabria — Olio essenziale» è registrato a livello di UE quale denominazione di origine protetta nel gruppo degli oli essenziali ([2]).

([1]) Direttiva 76/768/CEE del Consiglio, del 27 luglio 1976, concernente l'avvicinamento delle legislazioni degli Stati membri relative ai prodotti cosmetici, GU L 262 del 27.9.1976, pag. 169.

([2]) Regolamento (CE) n. 509/2001 della Commissione, del 15 marzo 2001, che completa l'allegato del regolamento (CE) n. 2400/96 relativo all'iscrizione di alcune denominazioni nel «Registro delle denominazioni di origine protetta e delle indicazioni geografiche protette» di cui al regolamento (CEE) n. 2081/92 relativo alla protezione delle indicazioni geografiche e delle denominazioni di origine dei prodotti agricoli e alimentari, GU L 76 del 16.3.2001, pag. 7.

In relazione al quarto quesito, la Commissione è consapevole che certi additivi alimentari, se usati quali fragranze nei cosmetici, possono avere un effetto sensibilizzante per la pelle. Tuttavia, non vi sono in generale preoccupazioni per una reazione allergica da esposizione orale. La Commissione non ritiene pertanto che l'industria del tè rischi un pregiudizio.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000022/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(4 January 2013)

Subject: A bergamot-tinged war?

Here we go again, according to some newspaper reports. The lobbies of certain chemical industries are declaring, via the European Union, that between 1% and 3% of the European population are 'potentially' allergic to some ingredients found in perfumes. The proposal to reduce the concentration of essential oils from 12% to 0.01% would sound the death knell for bergamot and would see this traditional product disappear from Calabria, the only region in the world that is able to produce this citrus fruit, from which the oils that form the base of many perfumes are extracted. One is tempted to say: 'Here we go again!' There was an attempt, in the past, to stop pizzas from being cooked in wood-fired ovens, for health reasons. There was also an attempt to harm the production of chocolate eggs containing a 'surprise', this time for reasons to do with the safety of children, who could have swallowed the small 'surprise' objects. Now another attempt is being made with a natural production process that is unique in the world and concentrated along a coastal strip, around 80 km long and 10 km wide, in the region of Calabria. That means that 650 farms, 7 000 workers and 1 300 hectares used for plant production are affected, not to mention the numerous perfume houses that use bergamot essence to establish a fragrance's bouquet. The industry would like to replace this natural product with a synthetic product, which obviously has nothing to do with the Citrus Bergamia Risso citrus fruit, better known as bergamot.

1. Can the Commission confirm whether the news is true?

2. Does it really intend to support the arguments put forward by certain chemical manufacturers, against a natural product that has kept the perfume industry going for centuries without ever being harmful to health?

3. Can it say whether bergamot essence is patented or recognised by the various EU arrangements for recognising protected origin?

4. Does it not believe that the tea industry will also be compromised, given that bergamot peel is used for the aromatic Earl Grey blend?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 February 2013)

The Commission would like to clarify, in response to the first question, that an opinion on fragrance allergens in cosmetic products was issued in June 2012 by the Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety (SCCS). This opinion updates the list of fragrance allergens (including natural extracts) relevant to consumers, while confirming that the 26 fragrance allergens already regulated in the Cosmetics Directive ([1]) are still of concern.

The Commission is currently reflecting on how to implement this opinion so that it contributes to consumer information and safety in the most adequate and proportionate way, while maintaining innovation and the competitiveness of the cosmetics sector. To this end, it is thoroughly assessing the social (in terms of protection of consumers, availability of products and employment) and economic impacts of possible options, taking into account also vigilance data and additional elements of consumer exposure.

As for the third question, 'Bergamotto di Reggio Calabria — Olio essenziale' is registered at EU level as a Protected Designation of Origin in the group of essential oils ([2]).

In relation to the fourth question, the Commission is aware that some food flavourings when used as fragrances in cosmetics may be dermal sensitizers. However, there is generally no concern on allergic reaction via oral exposure. The Commission does not therefore believe that the tea industry risks to be compromised.

([1]) Council Directive 76/768/EEC of 27 July 1976 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products, OJ L 262, 27.9.1976, p. 169.

([2]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 509/2001 of 15 March 2001 supplementing the annex to Regulation (EC) No 2400/96 on the entry of certain names in the 'Register of protected designations or origin and protected geographical indications' provided for in Council Regulation (EEC) No 2081/92 on the protection of geographical indications and designations of origin for agricultural products and foodstuffs, OJ L 76, 16.3.2001, p. 7.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000023/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Carbon monoxide

In response to the Commission's answer to Written Question E-000116/2012, can it please outline whether it has consulted Member States at a General Product Safety Directive (GPSD) Committee meeting with a view to reforming Standard EN 50291 in order to ensure that each carbon monoxide detector has an end-of-life indicator and to provide for mandatory third-party certification for each device?

How does the Commission intend to proceed in order to ensure that a harmonised EU standard exists for carbon monoxide detectors, requiring mandatory end-of-life indicators and third-party certification for all detectors present on the EU market?

What steps will the Commission take to ensure increased EU-wide awareness of the dangers of carbon monoxide and the need to install carbon monoxide detectors?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 February 2013)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Question E-10563/2012 ([1]).

Furthermore, the Commission recently discussed with the Standing Committee under the Construction Products Regulation ([2]) a possible future harmonised European standard for self-standing battery operated carbon monoxide (CO) detectors. The Committee agreed that CO detectors should undergo third-party product certification, in order to ensure their good functioning. The revised standard EN 50291 containing this requirement as well as a requirement for an end-of-life indicator is expected to be delivered by CEN (European Committee for Standardisation) in 2015 at the latest.

The Commission does not intend to proceed to an EU-wide awareness campaign, as information campaigns exist in several Member States.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Regulation (EU) No 305/2011. OJ L 88, 4.4.2011, p. 5.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-000024/13
aan de Commissie
Toine Manders (ALDE)
(7 januari 2013)

Betreft: Europees classificatiesysteem voor geneesmiddelen op basis van risico's op verminderde rijgeschiktheid

DRUID, Driving under the Influence of Drugs, Alcohol and Medicines (www.druid-project.eu ([1])), heeft een aantal wetenschappelijk onderbouwde aanbevelingen geschreven voor het verbeteren van informatie in medicijnbijsluiters voor patiënten die rijgevaarlijke medicijnen gebruiken en aan het verkeer wensen deel te nemen.

Deze zijn ontwikkeld na gesprekken met de PharmacoVigilance Working Party van EMA, de Europese registratie autoriteit van het Europees Medicijnen Agentschap. De uitkomsten van de onderzoeken bieden een solide basis om te komen tot een geharmoniseerd, EU-breed kader voor informatievoorziening omtrent rijden onder invloed van medicijnen, nemen wetenschappelijk bewijs en best-practices van de lidstaten in ogenschouw, als ook de benodigde informatie voor patiënten via bijsluiters en aan voorschrijvers en apothekers.

De werkgroep, bestaande uit wetenschappelijke onderzoekers van gerenommeerde universiteiten en instituties uit meer dan 20 lidstaten, heeft diverse labellingsystemen in de lidstaten onderzocht, en van daaruit een raamwerk ontwikkeld met gestandaardiseerde bewoordingen voor bijsluiters, waarschuwingsniveaus, symbolen en pictogrammen. De aanbevelingen bevatten een classificatie voor medicijnen met een labellingsysteem voor de indeling van risico's van verminderde rijgeschiktheid.

Inmiddels blijkt dat meer instanties vragen hebben over het uitblijven van een goede implementatie van Europese categorie-indeling. Een verbond van landelijke geneesmiddeldatabases uit diverse lidstaten heeft aangegeven dat implementatie in alle lidstaten zou moeten volgen om de gegevens voor heel Europa toe te kunnen passen en actuale informatie over nieuwe en bestaande geneesmiddelen bij te houden.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het DRUID-project en de samenwerking met EMA ten aanzien van de ontwikkeling van een Europese classificatie van medicijnen die de rijgeschiktheid beïnvloeden? Zo nee, waarom niet?

2. Waarom vallen dergelijke initiatieven als die van DRUID niet onder DG SANCO maar onder DG MOVE van de Commissie, aangezien het Europese volksgezondheidsaspect hier duidelijk een grotere rol speelt dan de Europese verkeersveiligheid?

3. Overweegt de Commissie het voorstel voor Europese harmonisatie van de classificatie van medicijnen die de rijgeschiktheid beïnvloeden over te nemen? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(5 februari 2013)

De Commissie is niet alleen bekend met het DRUID (Driving Under the Influence of Drugs)-project, maar heeft het zelfs medegefinancierd uit de middelen voor oppervlaktevervoer (verkeersveiligheid) in het kader van het zesde kaderprogramma voor onderzoek en ontwikkeling.

De diensten van de Commissie werken, binnen hun respectieve bevoegdheden, samen om de veiligheid in het wegverkeer naar een hoger plan te tillen. Dit project werd geleid door DG MOVE, aangezien dit directoraat-generaal gaat over het desbetreffende financieringsprogramma.

([1]) http://www.druid-project.eu/cln_031/nn_107548/Druid/EN/deliverables-list/downloads/Deliverable__4__2__1,templateId=raw,property=publicationFile.pdf/Deliverable_4_2_1.pdf — Deliverable 4.2.1.

Na de herziening van de EU-geneesmiddelenwetgeving ([2]) heeft de Commissie opdracht gegeven voor een evaluatiestudie naar de leesbaarheid van bijsluiters. De consultant die deze studie heeft uitgevoerd, is uitdrukkelijk verzocht om rekening te houden met de resultaten van het DRUID-project, aangezien die van belang kunnen zijn met het oog op geneesmiddelen die de rijgeschiktheid kunnen beïnvloeden. Op basis van deze studie zal de Commissie medio 2013 verslag uitbrengen aan het Europees Parlement en de Raad ([3]).

([2]) Richtlijn 2001/83/EG, zoals gewijzigd bij Richtlijn 2010/84/EU (PB L 348 van 31.12.2010, blz. 74).

([3]) Artikel 59, lid 4, van Richtlijn 2001/83/EG bepaalt: „Vóór 1 januari 2013 legt de Commissie aan het Europees Parlement en de Raad een beoordelingsrapport voor over de tekortkomingen in de samenvattingen van de productkenmerken en de bijsluiters die zich op dat moment voordoen en over de manier waarop deze kunnen worden gecorrigeerd opdat beter wordt voldaan aan de behoeften van patiënten en beroepsbeoefenaren in de gezondheidszorg. Zo nodig dient de Commissie op de grondslag van het verslag en in overleg met de desbetreffende belanghebbenden voorstellen in ter verbetering van leesbaarheid, opmaak en inhoud van deze documenten."

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000024/13
to the Commission
Toine Manders (ALDE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: European classification system for medicines based on risks of impairment of driving ability

DRUID, Driving under the Influence of Drugs, Alcohol and Medicines (www.druid-project.eu ([1])), has issued a number of scientifically based recommendations for improving information in medicine package leaflets for patients who are taking medicines that impair driving ability but who wish to drive.

They were compiled after discussions with the PharmacoVigilance Working Party of the EMA, the European registration authority of the European Medicines Agency. The findings from the studies constitute a sound basis for establishing a harmonised, EU-wide framework for providing information on driving under the influence of medicines; they also consider scientific evidence and best practices in the Member States and look at the information which patients should receive in medicine package leaflets and which should be given to prescribers and pharmacists.

The working party, consisting of researchers from renowned universities and institutions in more than 20 Member States, examined various labelling systems in the Member States, taking this as a basis for devising a framework with standardised wordings for package leaflets, warning levels, symbols and pictograms. The recommendations comprise a classification system for medicines with a labelling system for the classification of risks of impairment of driving ability.

It has now emerged that other bodies too are asking questions about the failure to implement a European classification system properly. An association of national medicines databases from various Member States has indicated that implementation is necessary in all Member States in order to be able to apply the data for the whole of Europe and keep up-to-date information on both new and existing medicines.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the DRUID project and the cooperation with the EMA to develop a European classification system for medicines which affect driving ability? If not, why not?

2. Why do initiatives such as DRUID fall not under DG SANCO but under DG MOVE at the Commission, bearing in mind that the European public health aspect clearly plays a greater role in them than European road safety?

3. Will the Commission consider adopting the proposal for European harmonisation of the classification of medicines which affect driving ability? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(5 February 2013)

The Commission is not only familiar with the DRUID project Driving Under the Influence of Drugs, it has even co-funded it under the scheme of the 6th Research and Development Framework Programme Surface Transport budget (road safety).

Commission services are working jointly towards an enhanced safety level in road traffic, according to their respective competences. The above project was managed by DG MOVE as it is in charge of the relevant funding programme.

Following the review of the EU pharmaceutical legislation ([2]), the Commission commissioned a study on the assessment of the readability of the package leaflet. The consultant carrying this study was explicitly asked to take into account the outcome of the DRUID project as it could be of relevance regarding medicines which may have an influence on driving ability. On the basis of this study the Commission will present a report by mid 2013 to the European Parliament and the Council ([3]).

([1]) http://www.druid-project.eu/cln_031/nn_107548/Druid/EN/deliverables-list/downloads/Deliverable__4__2__1,templateId=raw,property=publicationFile.pdf/Deliverable_4_2_1.pdf — Deliverable 4.2.1

([2]) Directive 2001/83/EC as amended by Directive 2010/84/EU, OJ L 348, 31.12.2010, p. 74.

([3]) Article 59.4 of Directive 2001/83/EC 'By 1 January 2013, the Commission shall present to the European Parliament and the Council an assessment report on current shortcomings in the summary of product characteristics and the package leaflet and how they could be improved in order to better meet the needs of patients and healthcare professionals. The Commission shall, if appropriate, and on the basis of the report, and consultation with appropriate stakeholders, present proposals in order to improve the readability, layout and content of these documents'.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000025/13
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος)
Charalampos Angourakis (GUE/NGL)
(7 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Επίθεση από τον στρατό ενάντια στους FARC-EP

Αιματηρή επίθεση με 13 νεκρούς πραγματοποιήθηκε από τον στρατό της Κολομβίας ενάντια στην αντάρτικη οργάνωση FARC-EP, λίγες μέρες μετά την υπογραφή, με την έγκριση από την πλειοψηφία του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, της «Συμφωνίας Εμπορίου ΕΕ-Κολομβίας-Περού», με την αιτιολογία ότι η Κυβέρνηση της Κολομβίας «προωθεί την ειρήνη και σέβεται τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα». Ταυτόχρονα, η εξαθλίωση του λαού της χώρας βαθαίνει, οι δολοφονίες συνδικαλιστών και κομμουνιστών από παραστρατιωτικούς συνεχίζονται και οι φτωχοί αγρότες ξεκληρίζονται ως συνέπεια της πολιτικής της Κυβέρνησης της Κολομβίας.

Η αεροπορική στρατιωτική επιχείρηση πραγματοποιήθηκε στις 31.12.2012, δύο μέρες μετά την δήλωση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου της ΕΕ ότι: «Λαμβάνει υπόψη της την υιοθέτηση της συνταγματικής μεταρρύθμισης σχετικά με την στρατιωτική νομοθεσία στην Κολομβία» και την εκτίμηση ότι «Η ΕΕ περιμένει ότι θα διαλυθούν οι όποιες ανησυχίες μετά και την εφαρμογή της νομοθεσίας». Η νέα δολοφονική επίθεση σημειώνεται σε περίοδο ανακωχής που έχουν κηρύξει οι FARC-EP για να διευκολυνθούν οι συνομιλίες ειρήνευσης.

Με ποιον τρόπο θα καταδικάσει η Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος για την Εξωτερική Πολιτική της ΕΕ, τις δολοφονικές ενέργειες της Κυβέρνησης της Κολομβίας;

Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Η Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος/Αντιπρόεδρος σημειώνει ότι η «γενική συμφωνία για τη λήξη της σύγκρουσης και τη δημιουργία σταθερής και διαρκούς ειρήνης» που υπογράφηκε από την κολομβιανή κυβέρνηση και την FARC [1] στις 26 Αυγούστου 2012 ορίζει έξι σημεία για τις ειρηνευτικές διαπραγματεύσεις. Ένα από αυτά είναι ο «τερματισμός της σύγκρουσης», που θα ξεκινήσει με διμερή κατάπαυση του πυρός. Η συμφωνία προβλέπει επίσης ότι «οι συνομιλίες θα διεξαχθούν βάσει της αρχής ότι τίποτα δεν θεωρείται συμφωνημένο έως ότου επιτευχθεί συνολική συμφωνία».

Η άρνηση της Κολομβιανής Κυβέρνησης για τη διμερή κατάπαυση του πυρός συνάδει απόλυτα με τη συμφωνία αυτή, ενώ βρίσκονται σε εξέλιξη οι διαπραγματεύσεις και η κυβέρνηση συνεχίζει τις στρατιωτικές της επιχειρήσεις έναντι της FARC, μιας οργάνωσης που έχει περιληφθεί και εξακολουθεί να περιλαμβάνεται μέχρι σήμερα στον κατάλογο της ΕΕ για τις τρομοκρατικές οργανώσεις.

[1] Οι ένοπλες επαναστατικές δυνάμεις της Κολομβίας — Λαϊκός Στρατός.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000025/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Charalampos Angourakis (GUE/NGL)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Military attack on FARC-EP

A few days after the signing of a trade agreement between the European Union, Columbia and Peru, which was approved by a majority vote in the European Parliament, noting that the Columbian Government was working towards peace and respecting human rights, the Columbian military launched a lethal assault on the FARC-EP rebel organisation claiming 13 lives. At the same time, the Columbian people are sinking deeper into poverty, the paramilitary is continuing to murder trade unions and communists and indigent farmers are being robbed of their livelihood as a result of Columbian Government policy.

The deadly air attack was launched on 31 December 2012, two days after an announcement by the EU High Representative that she had 'taken note of the adoption of the constitutional reform regarding the military jurisdiction in Columbia', adding 'the EU expects that remaining concerns will be assuaged by the forthcoming implementing legislation' and coincided with the ceasefire announced by the FARC-EP with a view to facilitating peace talks.

In what way will the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy make known her condemnation of this use of deadly force by the Columbian Government?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President notes that the 'General agreement for the termination of the conflict and the construction of a stable and lasting peace' that was signed by the Colombian Government and the FARC ([1]) on 26 August 2012 defines a six-point agenda for the peace negotiations. 'Ending the conflict', starting with a bilateral ceasefire and an end to hostilities, is one of the agenda points. The agreement also provides that 'the talks will be held under the principle that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed'.

It is in full consistency with this agreement that the Colombian Government has refused to countenance a bilateral ceasefire while the negotiations are ongoing, and is continuing its military operations against the FARC, an organisation that has been included in, and to this day remains on, the EU's list of terrorist organisations.

([1]) The Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia — People's Army.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000026/13
to the Commission
Derek Vaughan (S&D)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Tackling racism in football

Has the Commission entered into any discussion with the Union of European Football Associations (UEFA) on the subject of tackling racism in football?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2013)

The Commission is in regular contact with the Union of European Football Associations (UEFA) on various topics, with the fight against racism in international competitions and at major sport events being one of them. Racism in football and in sport in general is one of the concerns the Commission shares with UEFA.

Actions of the FARE (Fight Against Racism in Europe) network have been supported by UEFA and discussed with the Commission. The Commission monitors developments in the Member States and, in October 2010, the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights launched a study on Racism, ethnic discrimination and the exclusion of migrants and minorities in sport.

The Commission has provided financial support to preventive and educational projects in the sectors of sport and education involving supporters, schools and clubs on the fight against racism, xenophobia and antisemitism. This has been done within the framework of the 2010 and 2011 Preparatory Actions in the field of sport, the Lifelong Learning Programme and the Fundamental Rights and Citizenship Programme.

In addition, the Commission proposal for 'Erasmus for All', the future programme for education, training, youth and sport, includes a Sport Chapter, the objectives of which are, amongst others, to tackle transnational threats to sport, such as doping, match fixing, violence, racism and intolerance.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000027/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Caso di sottrazione internazionale di minori in Russia

L'Ufficio del Mediatore del Parlamento europeo per i casi di sottrazione internazionale di minori ha ricevuto una richiesta in merito al caso di una sottrazione internazionale di tre minori.

Fornendo una serie di informazioni e documentazione tra cui la denuncia per sottrazione internazionale di minori e le sentenze dei tribunali di Taranto e del distretto Lefortovo di Mosca, il padre ha esposto i seguenti fatti.

Nel settembre 2004 un uomo italiano ha sposato una donna russa. La coppia ha fissato la propria residenza in Italia e ha avuto tre figli che ora hanno 9, 6 e 4 anni.

Il matrimonio è poi entrato irrimediabilmente in crisi e nel luglio 2011 la madre ha portato i figli in Russia, senza fare più ritorno in Italia.

Dal settembre al dicembre 2011 al padre è stato negato ogni tipo di contatto con i suoi figli e ogni tentativo di riconciliazione è fallito: è seguita la denuncia per reato di sottrazione internazionale di minori.

Nel maggio 2012, la donna ha ottenuto dal giudice di pace del tribunale del distretto Lefortovo di Mosca lo scioglimento del matrimonio e l'affidamento dei figli.

L'uomo ha intentato allora il giudizio di annullamento della sentenza per l'affidamento dei figli perché il giudice di pace russo non può pronunciarsi in materia.

Nel marzo 2012 la sentenza provvisoria di separazione giudiziale (emessa dal tribunale di Taranto) ha previsto l'affidamento esclusivo dei minori al padre.

È seguita l'ordinanza di appello del settembre 2012 secondo cui il tribunale distrettuale di Lefortovo della Città di Mosca annulla la sentenza del giudice di pace nella determinazione della residenza dei minori.

L'uomo dichiara che l'udienza di separazione è prevista nel mese di febbraio 2013 e quella relativa alla patria potestà nell'aprile 2013.

Il padre non vede i suoi figli da circa sei mesi.

Non trovando applicazione la Convenzione dell'Aja del 1980 sulla sottrazione di minori, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se è possibile adottare misure per assicurare il pieno rispetto del diritto dei bambini a mantenere contatti con entrambi i genitori?

2. in quale modo è possibile intervenire per agevolare la cooperazione diplomatica necessaria nella risoluzione di questo caso?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(26 febbraio 2013)

La Commissione non è competente ad intervenire nei casi specifici che non presentano alcun collegamento con il diritto dell'Unione. Attualmente non esistono strumenti legislativi dell'Unione in materia di sottrazione internazionale di minori in Russia.

La convenzione dell'Aia del 1980 sugli aspetti civili della sottrazione internazionale di minori non è applicabile, in quanto l'Italia, nell'interesse dell'Unione europea, non ha ancora accettato l'adesione della Russia a tale convenzione.

La Commissione non è a conoscenza dell'esistenza di un qualche trattato bilaterale tra l'Italia e la Russia in materia di responsabilità genitoriale e sottrazione di minori. Quandanche un tale strumento esistesse, eventuali questioni su conseguenti obblighi giuridici dovrebbero essere risolte dalle autorità italiane e russe competenti.

Sembra pertanto che non vigano norme di diritto internazionale che impediscano ai due Stati di esercitare la loro giurisdizione ai sensi dei rispettivi diritti nazionali. Potrebbero quindi essere pronunciate decisioni contrastanti e questo sottolinea l'importanza della cooperazione giudiziaria, che permette di evitare situazioni di questo tipo.

È questo motivo che la Commissione ha presentato, nel dicembre 2011, un pacchetto di proposte ([1]) per l'accettazione dell'adesione alla convenzione di otto nuove parti contraenti, tra cui la Russia, al fine di garantire che tutti gli Stati membri dell'UE possano avvalersi del meccanismo dell'Aia nell'interesse superiore del minore e nel pieno rispetto del principio dell'unità della rappresentanza esterna dell'Unione. Purtroppo le proposte sono attualmente bloccate in sede di Consiglio. La questione è stata discussa dal Parlamento europeo nella seduta plenaria del novembre 2012 e il 22 novembre 2012 è stata adottata una risoluzione ([2]). La Commissione sta valutando l'opportunità di chiedere il parere della Corte di giustizia al riguardo.

([1]) COM(2011)904, 908, 909, 911, 912, 915, 916 e 917, adottate il 21 dicembre 2011.
([2]) P7_TA(2012) 0450.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000027/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Case of international abduction of minors to Russia

The office of the European Parliament Mediator for International Parental Child Abduction has received a request regarding a case of international abduction of three minors.

The father has supplied various items of information and documentation, including the report of international abduction of minors and the rulings by the courts of Taranto and the judicial circuit of Lefortovo in Moscow. He has set out the following facts.

In September 2004 an Italian man married a Russian woman. The couple made their home in Italy and had three children, who are now aged nine, six and four.

The marriage then broke down irrevocably and in July 2011 the mother took the children to Russia, without any plans to return to Italy.

From September to December 2011 the father was denied any type of contact with his children and all attempts at reconciliation failed. An allegation of the offence of international abduction of minors followed.

In May 2012, the mother obtained dissolution of the marriage and custody of the children from the justice of the peace of the court of the Lefortovo judicial circuit in Moscow.

The father then brought a case for annulment of the ruling on custody of the children on the grounds that the Russian justice of the peace does not have jurisdiction in the matter.

In March 2012 the interim judgment on legal separation (issued by the court of Taranto) gave the father exclusive custody of the minors.

This was followed, in September 2012, by the appeal ruling under which the district court of Lefortovo in the city of Moscow annulled the ruling by the justice of the peace determining the residence of the minors.

The father states that the separation hearing is scheduled for February 2013, and the hearing relating to parental rights for April 2013.

The father has not seen his children for about six months.

Since the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction does not apply, can the Commission:

1. say whether it is possible to take measures to guarantee full respect for the children's rights to maintain contact with both parents?

2. say how it is possible to intervene to facilitate the diplomatic cooperation that is required in order to resolve this case?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 2013)

The Commission has no power to deal with specific cases which have no link with European Union law. Currently, there is no EU legislation dealing with international child abduction to Russia.

The Hague 1980 Convention on Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction is not of application, as Italy, in the interest of the European Union, has not yet accepted Russia's accession to the Convention.

The Commission is not aware of any bilateral treaty between Italy and Russia on parental responsibility and child abduction. Even if such a treaty existed, any obligation arising under it would be a bilateral matter to be resolved between the relevant Italian and Russian authorities.

There would therefore seem to be no rules of international law preventing either state from exercising their jurisdiction under their respective national law. This may lead to conflicting decisions and highlights the importance of judicial cooperation to avoid such situations.

This is why the Commission presented in December 2011 ([1]) a package of proposals for the EU's acceptance of the accession of eight new Contracting Parties to the Convention, including Russia, aiming at ensuring that all EU Member States have the possibility to use the Hague mechanism in the best interest of EU children and in full respect of the principle of the unity in external representation of the EU. Unfortunately, the proposals are currently blocked in the Council. The issue was discussed in the European Parliament in the plenary session of November 2012 and a resolution adopted on 22 November 2012 ([2]). The Commission is assessing the possibility to ask the opinion of the European Court of Justice on this issue.

([1]) COM(2011) 904, 908, 909, 911, 912, 915, 916, 917 adopted on 21.12.2011.
([2]) P7_TA (2012) 0450.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000028/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Caso di sottrazione internazionale di minori in Russia

L'Ufficio del Mediatore del Parlamento europeo per i casi di sottrazione internazionale di minori ha ricevuto una richiesta in merito al caso di sottrazione internazionale di minori.

Fornendo una serie di informazioni, il padre denuncia quanto segue.

Dall'unione di un cittadino spagnolo e di una donna con doppia nazionalità russa-spagnola sono nati due bambini che oggi hanno 10 e 6 anni.

Il matrimonio, celebrato nel 2000, è entrato in crisi e nel 2009 si è avuta la sentenza di divorzio che ha stabilito la custodia congiunta dei due figli con domicilio presso l'abitazione della madre.

A febbraio 2011 il padre ha denunciato la scomparsa dei figli.

Una telefonata dalla Russia ha chiarito che i bambini erano stati lì portati dalla madre e che non sarebbero più tornati in Spagna.

Così, la denuncia per scomparsa è stata convertita in una denuncia per sottrazione di minori.

Il padre non ha modo di mantenere un contatto con i suoi bambini.

Non trovando applicazione la Convenzione dell'Aja del 1980 sulla sottrazione di minori, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. quali misure è possibile adottare per assicurare il ristabilimento della relazione tra il padre e i suoi figli;

2. in quale modo è possibile intervenire per agevolare la cooperazione diplomatica necessaria nella risoluzione di questo caso;

3. il quadro generale della situazione?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(4 marzo 2013)

L'onorevole deputato ha sottoposto alla Commissione un caso di sottrazione internazionale di minori che vede coinvolte Spagna e Russia, chiedendo informazioni su come risolverlo.

Va sottolineato che il quadro giuridico vigente non conferisce alla Commissione il potere di occuparsi di casi specifici che non hanno alcun collegamento con il diritto dell'Unione.

Attualmente non esiste una normativa UE sulla sottrazione internazionale di minori verso la Russia.

Il regolamento (CE) n. 2201/2003 del Consiglio ([1]) ha introdotto norme sulla sottrazione di minori ad opera di un genitore, che però si applicano alle relazioni tra gli Stati membri solo a decorrere dal 1° marzo 2005.

Al caso descritto dall'onorevole deputato si applica tuttavia la convenzione dell'Aia del 1980 sugli aspetti civili della sottrazione internazionale di minori.

Poiché l'adesione della Russia alla convenzione è stata accettata dalla Spagna l'11 dicembre 2012, la convenzione entrerà in vigore tra Spagna e Russia il 1° marzo 2013.

([1]) GU L 338 del 23.12.2003, pag. 1.

La Commissione fa notare tuttavia che l'azione unilaterale della Spagna non rispetta la competenza esterna dell'Unione. Nel dicembre 2011 ([2]) la Commissione ha presentato un pacchetto di proposte relative all'accettazione, da parte dell'UE, dell'adesione alla convenzione di otto nuove parti contraenti, tra cui la Russia, per consentire a tutti gli Stati membri di utilizzare il meccanismo della convenzione nell'interesse superiore del minore e nel pieno rispetto del principio della rappresentazione unitaria dell'Unione. Purtroppo le proposte sono attualmente bloccate al Consiglio. La Commissione sta valutando la possibilità di chiedere il parere della Corte di giustizia in proposito.

([2]) COM (2011) 904, 908, 909, 911, 912, 915, 916 e 917, adottati il 21.12.2011. .

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000028/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Case of international abduction of minors to Russia

The office of the European Parliament Mediator for International Parental Child Abduction has received a request regarding a case of international abduction of minors.

The father has supplied various items of information, and makes the following allegations.

A couple, comprised of a man who is a Spanish citizen and woman with dual Russian-Spanish nationality, had two children, currently aged 10 and 6.

The couple married in 2000, but the marriage broke down and in 2009 the divorce ruling was issued. This gave joint custody of the two children, who were to live at the mother's home.

In February 2011 the father reported that the children had disappeared.

A telephone call from Russia explained that the children had been taken there by the mother, and that they would not be returning to Spain.

Thus, the report of disappearance became a report of the abduction of minors.

The father has no way of maintaining contact with his children.

Since the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction does not apply, can the Commission:

1. explain what measures can be taken to bring about the re-establishment of the relationship between the father and his children;

2. say how it is possible to intervene to facilitate the diplomatic cooperation that is required in order to resolve this case;

3. provide an overview of the matter?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2013)

The Honourable Member has submitted to the Commission a case of international abduction of minors involving Spain and Russia, asking information on how to solve it.

It has to be pointed out that the Commission does not have the power, under the existing legal framework, to deal with specific cases which have no link with European Union law.

Currently, there is no EU legislation dealing with international child abduction to Russia.

Council Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 ([1]) has introduced rules on parental child abduction, but it applies only to relationships between Member States from 1 March 2005.

The Hague 1980 Convention on Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction is however of application in the case described by the Honourable Member.

Indeed, Spain has accepted on 11 December 2012 Russia's accession to the 1980 Hague Convention. Therefore, the Convention will enter into force between Spain and Russia on 1 March 2013.

([1]) OJ L 338, 23.12.2003, p. 1.

Nevertheless, the Commission points out that the unilateral Spanish action does not respect the EU's external competence. The Commission has presented in December 2011 ([2]) a package of proposals for the EU's acceptance of the accession of eight new Contracting Parties to the Convention, including Russia, aiming at ensuring that all EU Member States have the possibility to use the Hague mechanism in the best interests of EU children and in full respect of the principle of the unity in external representation of the EU. Unfortunately, the proposals are currently blocked in the Council. The Commission is considering the possibility to ask an opinion of the European Court of Justice on this issue.

([2]) COM(2011) 904, 908, 909, 911, 912, 915, 916, 917 adopted on 21/12/2011 .

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000029/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Caso di sottrazione internazionale di minore in Russia

L'Ufficio del Mediatore del Parlamento europeo per i casi di sottrazione internazionale di minori ha ricevuto una richiesta in merito al caso di sottrazione internazionale di un bambino.

Fornendo una serie di informazioni e documentazione, tra cui la denuncia di sparizione del minore, la «solicitud de medidas cautelares previas» e le lettere inviate al Ministero della Giustizia spagnolo, il padre dichiara quanto segue.

Dall'unione di un cittadino spagnolo e una cittadina russa è nato un bambino che oggi ha 6 anni.

La relazione è entrata in crisi nel dicembre 2010 e la madre, all'insaputa dell'uomo, ha portato il figlio in Russia, di fatto abbandonando la Spagna.

Sono seguite denunce, rigettate sotto il profilo penale dal Juzgado de Instrucción 4 de Roquetas de Mar (17.1.2011) e dall'Audiencia Provincial (19.1.2011) sulla base del fatto che «a nessuno dei genitori è riconosciuto giuridicamente il diritto di custodia esclusiva sul minore».

A ottobre 2011, l'uomo ha sollecitato al Juzgado 1 de Roquetas de Mar l'adozione di misure per regolare la relazione padre-figlio.

Nel mese di febbraio 2012 il Ministero di Giustizia spagnolo ha inviato alle autorità russe una «comisión rogatoria» per notificare la sentenza prevista per il 17 gennaio 2013 in cui si richiede l'affidamento del minore o un ampio regime di visite.

Tuttavia non è stata ricevuta alcuna risposta ufficiale in merito a tale notifica.

La Convenzione dell'Aja del 1980 sugli aspetti civili della sottrazione internazionale di minori non trova applicazione tra la Russia e la Spagna.

Ad oggi sono due anni che il padre non vede il suo bambino e ogni contatto risulta impossibile.

Secondo le autorità russe la donna si trova nella città di Rostov a Mosca, anche se non è stato individuato un preciso indirizzo.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. quali misure è possibile adottare per assicurare il ristabilimento della relazione tra il bambino e suo padre;

2. in quale modo è possibile intervenire per agevolare la cooperazione diplomatica necessaria nella risoluzione di questo caso;

3. il quadro generale della situazione?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(4 marzo 2013)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla sua risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-00028/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000029/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Case of international abduction of a minor to Russia

The office of the European Parliament Mediator for International Parental Child Abduction has received a request regarding a case of international abduction of a child.

The father has supplied various items of information and documentation, including the report of a missing child, the *solicitud de medidas cautelares previas* (request for interim measures) and the letters sent to the Spanish Ministry of Justice. He makes the following declarations.

A couple, comprised of a man who is a Spanish citizen and a woman who is a Russian citizen, had a child, who is now six years old.

The relationship broke down in December 2010 and the mother, unknown to the father, took the child to Russia, and in fact left Spain permanently.

Accusations followed, which were rejected in terms of the criminal law by the *Juzgado de Instrucción 4 de Roquetas de Mar* (on 17 January 2011) and by the *Audiencia Provincial* (on 19 January 2011) on the basis of the fact that neither of the parents had been given exclusive custody of the child by a court.

In October 2011, the father asked the *Juzgado 1 de Roquetas de Mar* to take measures to regulate the relationship between father and son.

In February 2012, the Spanish Ministry of Justice sent the Russian authorities a *comisión rogatoria* (letters rogatory) advising them of the ruling planned for 17 January 2013, requesting that the father be given custody of the minor or extensive visiting times.

No official reply has, however, been received to this notification.

The 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction does not apply between Russia and Spain.

To date, the father has not seen his child for two years, and any contact is impossible.

According to the Russian authorities the mother is in Rostov, near Moscow, but an exact address has not been given.

Could the Commission:

1. explain what measures can be taken to bring about the re-establishment of the relationship between the child and his father;

2. say how it is possible to intervene to facilitate the diplomatic cooperation that is required in order to resolve this case;

3. provide an overview of the matter?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to written question E-00028/2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000030/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Caso di sottrazione internazionale di minore in Russia

L'Ufficio del Mediatore del Parlamento europeo per i casi di sottrazione internazionale di minori ha ricevuto una richiesta in merito al caso di sottrazione internazionale di un minore.

Fornendo una serie di informazioni e documentazione, tra cui molti atti del «Juzgado de Primera Instancia» di Granada, il padre denuncia quanto segue.

Dall'unione di un cittadino spagnolo e di una donna di nazionalità russa è nato un bambino, che oggi ha 7 anni e la cui nazionalità è spagnola.

Il matrimonio, celebrato nel 2006, è entrato in crisi e nel 2008 si è avuta la sentenza di divorzio.

Tale sentenza ha affidato il figlio al padre stabilendo un programma preciso per i diritti di visita della madre e il divieto di lasciare la Spagna con il figlio senza autorizzazione giudiziaria.

Le autorità russe hanno sempre negato il riconoscimento e l'esecuzione della sentenza (comisión rogatoria).

La madre ha portato illegalmente il bambino in Russia e dall'agosto 2008 il padre non lo sente e non lo vede.

Nel maggio 2009 il padre ha denunciato la ex moglie per sottrazione internazionale di minori, denuncia ritirata nel maggio 2012 per tentare di facilitare il riavvicinamento a suo figlio.

La madre rifiuta di collaborare via il Consolato spagnolo a Mosca.

Non trovando applicazione la Convenzione dell'Aja del 1980 sulla sottrazione di minori, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. quali misure è possibile adottare per assicurare il ristabilimento della relazione tra il bambino e suo padre;

2. in quale modo è possibile intervenire per agevolare la cooperazione diplomatica necessaria nella risoluzione di questo caso;

3. il quadro generale della situazione?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(4 marzo 2013)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-00028/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000030/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Case of international abduction of a minor to Russia

The office of the European Parliament Mediator for International Parental Child Abduction has received a request regarding a case of international abduction of a minor.

The father has supplied various items of information and documentation, including many legal documents from the *Juzgado de Primera Instancia* (court of first instance) of Granada, and makes the following allegations.

A couple, comprised of a man who is a Spanish citizen and a Russian woman, had a child. He is now seven years old, and is a Spanish national.

The couple married in 2006, but the marriage broke down and in 2008 the divorce ruling was issued.

This ruling gave the father custody of the child, laying down a precise programme for the mother's rights of access and a prohibition on her leaving Spain with the child without court authorisation.

The Russian authorities have always refused to acknowledge or enforce the ruling (letters rogatory).

The mother took the child to Russia unlawfully and since August 2008 the father has not seen or heard him.

In May 2009 the father accused his ex-wife of international abduction of a minor, but withdrew the accusation in May 2012 in an attempt to facilitate reconciliation with his son.

The mother refuses to collaborate through the Spanish consulate in Moscow.

Since the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction does not apply, can the Commission:

1. explain what measures can be taken to bring about the re-establishment of the relationship between the child and his father;

2. say how it is possible to intervene to facilitate the diplomatic cooperation that is required in order to resolve this case;

3. provide an overview of the matter?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-00028/2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000031/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Caso di sottrazione internazionale di minori in Francia

L'Ufficio del Mediatore del Parlamento europeo per i casi di sottrazione internazionale di minori ha ricevuto una richiesta in merito al caso di una sottrazione internazionale di tre bambini.

Fornendo una serie di informazioni e documenti, tra cui una sentenza del tribunale di primo grado di Bruxelles, il padre denuncia quanto segue.

Dal matrimonio tra un uomo britannico e una cittadina francese sono nati tre figli che oggi hanno 12, 7 e 6 anni.

La coppia ha fissato il suo domicilio in Belgio.

Nel mese di novembre 2012 la donna ha lasciato il Belgio portando con sé i bambini, cancellando l'iscrizione alla scuola da loro regolarmente frequentata, per trasferirsi presso l'abitazione dei propri genitori in Francia.

La donna ha anche avviato una procedura in Francia per ottenere l'affidamento esclusivo dei figli.

Il tribunale di prima istanza di Bruxelles, tribunale competente in base all'articolo 8, paragrafo 1, del regolamento (CE) n. 2201/2003, in data 23 novembre 2012, ha ordinato in via cautelare il rientro immediato dei bambini in Belgio. Ha inoltre dichiarato l'affidamento congiunto, ordinando tuttavia il reinserimento dei bambini nella scuola frequentata abitualmente e fissando il domicilio presso l'abitazione del padre.

In base alla giurisprudenza della Corte di giustizia (causa C-523/07), per «residenza abituale», ai sensi dell'articolo 8, paragrafo 1, del regolamento (CE) n. 2201/2003, deve intendersi il luogo che denota una certa integrazione del minore in un ambiente sociale e familiare. A tal fine, si deve in particolare tenere conto della durata, della regolarità, delle condizioni e delle ragioni del soggiorno nel territorio di uno Stato membro e del trasloco della famiglia in tale Stato, della cittadinanza del minore, del luogo e delle condizioni della frequenza scolastica, delle conoscenze linguistiche, nonché delle relazioni familiari e sociali del minore in detto Stato.

Alla luce di quanto sopra esposto, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. quali misure si possono adottare per dare esecuzione alla sentenza di primo grado, in base al regolamento (CE) n. 2201/2003;

2. in quale modo è possibile intervenire per agevolare la cooperazione diplomatica necessaria alla risoluzione di questo caso;

3. il quadro generale della situazione?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(1º marzo 2013)

Nel settore del diritto di famiglia, il regolamento (CE) n. 2201/2003 ([1]) («regolamento Bruxelles II bis») dispone il riconoscimento e l'esecuzione delle decisioni in materia di responsabilità genitoriale in uno Stato membro diverso da quello di emissione e prevede disposizioni uniformi sulla sottrazione transfrontaliera di minori ad opera di uno dei genitori nell'UE. Detto regolamento disciplina anche la cooperazione amministrativa fra autorità centrali in materia di responsabilità genitoriale, compreso in caso di sottrazione transfrontaliera di minori ad opera di uno dei genitori. Per quanto riguarda il caso dei tre minori, la Commissione si rammarica di non disporre di informazioni sufficienti per poter rispondere alle domande. Tuttavia la Commissione è pronta ad esaminare il caso in questione. Per poterlo fare, essa necessita di informazioni dettagliate riguardo alle decisioni principali e di altri estratti pertinenti del fascicolo.

([1]) GU L 338 del 23.12.2003, pag. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000031/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Case of international abduction of minors to France

The office of the European Parliament Mediator for International Parental Child Abduction has received a request regarding a case of international abduction of three minors.

The father has supplied various items of information and documentation, including a ruling by the Court of First Instance in Brussels, and makes the following claims.

The marriage between a British man and a French woman produced three children, who are today aged 12, 7 and 6.

The couple set up home in Belgium.

In November 2012 the woman left Belgium and took the children with her, removing them from the school they regularly attended, in order to move into her parents' home in France.

The woman also began legal proceedings in France to obtain sole custody of the children.

On 23 November 2012, the Brussels Court of First Instance, the court having jurisdiction under Article 8(1) of Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003, ruled, as a precautionary measure, that the children should return to Belgium immediately. It also granted the parents joint custody, but ordered the children to be placed back in the school they regularly attended and established the father's house as their place of residence.

According to Court of Justice case law (Case C-523/07), 'habitual residence', under Article 8(1) of Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003, shall mean the place which reflects some degree of integration by the child in a social and family environment. To that end, in particular the duration, regularity, conditions and reasons for the stay on the territory of a Member State and the family's move to that State, the child's nationality, the place and conditions of attendance at school, linguistic knowledge and the family and social relationships of the child in that State must be taken into consideration.

1. Can the Commission say what measures can be taken to implement the Court of First Instance's ruling, under Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003?

2. Can it say what action can be taken to facilitate the diplomatic cooperation necessary to resolve this case?

3. Can it provide an overview of the situation?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(1 March 2013)

In the area of family law, Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 ([1]) ('the Brussels IIa regulation') provides for recognition and enforcement of judgments in matters of parental responsibility in another Member State and lays down uniform rules on the subject of cross-border parental child abduction in the EU. Another area covered by the Brussels IIa regulation is that of administrative cooperation between central authorities on cases specific to parental responsibility, including cross-border parental child abduction. As far as the case involving the three minors is concerned, the Commission regrets that it does not have sufficient information to be able to answer the questions. However, the Commission stands ready to examine the case of the three minors. To assess their case, it would need details of the principal decisions and other relevant extracts from the case file.

([1]) OJ L 338, 23.12.2003, p. 1.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000032/13
aan de Commissie
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(7 januari 2013)

Betreft: Misstanden bij Ryanair

De Vereniging van Nederlandse Verkeersvliegers wil een diepgaand onderzoek naar vermeende misstanden bij luchtvaartmaatschappij Ryanair. Deze prijsvechter zou de veiligheid van vluchten willens en wetens in gevaar brengen, onder meer door met (financiële) druk van bovenaf piloten ertoe te bewegen de financiën voorrang te geven boven de veiligheid. Bijvoorbeeld door een minimum aan brandstof mee te nemen of door te vliegen op momenten dat zij daar eigenlijk niet fit genoeg voor zijn. Deze en andere misstanden blijken uit de KRO-reportage „Mayday".

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Piloten muiten tegen top van Ryanair" ([1]) en de KRO-reportage in twee delen getiteld „Mayday" ([2])?

2. Herkent de Commissie de genoemde problemen? Komen deze ook voor bij andere vliegtuigmaatschappijen die binnen de EU vliegen?

3. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat veiligheid in de luchtvaart voorop moet staan, en dat de symptomatische incidenten die de ondervraagde piloten beschrijven uitermate zorgwekkend zijn voor wat betreft de veiligheid?

4. Herkent de Commissie de door de piloten en ex-piloot geschetste kwesties ten aanzien van de bestuurscultuur, het personeelsbeleid en de angstcultuur bij Ryanair? Komen deze ook voor bij andere vliegtuigmaatschappijen die binnen de EU vliegen? Wat vindt de Commissie van de geschetste misstanden? Vindt de Commissie de geschetste zaken voorbeelden van maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemerschap?

5. Wat vindt de Commissie van het concept „level playing field" voor ondernemingen binnen dezelfde branche en binnen de EU-markt? Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat het nemen van bewuste veiligheidsrisico's om financieel gewin te halen daar niet aan bijdraagt, maar juist de spelers voor wie veiligheid wel voorop staat benadeelt?

6. In de reportage wordt de Ierse toezichthouder IAA als incompetent en niet-objectief neergezet. Hoe oordeelt de Commissie daarover en heeft zij reeds meer signalen gehad die in die richting wijzen?

7. Is het denkbaar, mede in het licht van de geschetste incompetentie van de toezichthouder, dat Ryanair in plaats van nipt binnen de regels, ook wel eens in strijd met de regels handelt? Zijn er bij de Commissie signalen en/of feiten bekend die in die richting wijzen?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-000042/13
aan de Commissie
Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D)
(7 januari 2013)

Betreft: Ryanair toestellen vliegen met te weinig kerosine aan boord

In de media zijn verscheidene berichten verschenen die de eerdere geruchten bevestigen dat de Ierse lagekostenmaatschappij Ryanair druk uitoefent op zijn piloten om te vliegen met te weinig kerosine aan boord. Dit zou een grote impact hebben op de veiligheid van het Europese luchtruim.

De eindverantwoordelijkheid voor de hoeveelheid kerosine aan boord ligt bij de boordcommandant van het toestel. Ryanair zou deze belangrijke beslissing van de piloot in kwestie trachten te beïnvloeden. Hierdoor besparen ze kosten, maar dit kan leiden tot zeer gevaarlijke situaties. Anonieme getuigenissen van piloten beschrijven dat er gedreigd wordt met overplaatsing, uitgestelde promoties en zelfs ontslag. Daarenboven zou de maatschappij ook zieke piloten verplichten te vliegen. Deze situatie is onhoudbaar en vergt een onmiddellijke reactie van de Europese Commissie.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van deze inbreuken op de veiligheid door de lagekostenmaatschappij Ryanair?

([1]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/reiskrant/21185380/__Piloten_muiten_tegen_top_van_Ryanair__.html
([2]) http://reporter.kro.nl/seizoenen/2012/afleveringen/28-12-2012 enhttp://reporter.kro.nl/seizoenen/2013/afleveringen/03-01-2013.

2. Is de Commissie en/of EASA van plan de situatie verder te onderzoeken en indien nodig verdere stappen te ondernemen zodat de veiligheid van ons luchtruim kan gegarandeerd worden?

3. Indien ja, welke acties zal de Commissie en/of EASA ondernemen en wat is de verwachte timing hiervan?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000054/13
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(7 januari 2013)

Betreft: Onveilige vluchten bij Ryanair door beperkte hoeveelheid brandstof

In het Nederlandse KRO programma Reporter getuigen vier piloten van Ryanair anoniem dat ze geregeld met minder brandstof moeten vliegen, waardoor de veiligheid in het gedrang zou kunnen komen bij slechte weersomstandigheden.

Eind juli moesten in Valencia drie vliegtuigen van Ryanair een noodlanding maken wegens een brandstoftekort.

Verschillende beroepsverenigingen hebben aangedrongen op een diepgaand onderzoek.

Aangezien het bedrijf in verschillende EU lidstaten actief is, lijkt actie op Europees niveau aangewezen.

Is de Commissie op de hoogte van dergelijke klachten?

Is de Commissie bereid een onderzoek op te starten of te coördineren?

Welke maatregelen kan de Commissie treffen om aan dergelijke praktijken een einde te maken en te voorkomen dat andere maatschappijen dezelfde weg opgaan?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(27 februari 2013)

In 2012 heeft de Irish Civil Aviation Authority een onderzoek gevoerd naar de incidenten in Spanje. De resultaten daarvan zijn gepubliceerd en staan op de volgende website: http://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/435951/iaa-report-on-ryanair.pdf. De conclusie van het rapport luidt dat Ryanair de regels inzake brandstof heeft nageleefd en dat zijn bemanning overeenkomstig de standaardwerkvoorschriften heeft gehandeld. De Commissie beschikt niet over aanwijzingen waaruit zou blijken dat het door de Irish aviation authority (IAA) gevoerde onderzoek niet objectief was of niet op professionele wijze is gevoerd.

Op grond van de EU-luchtvaartregelgeving dienen de nationale luchtvaartautoriteiten voortdurend toezicht uit te oefenen op de luchtvaart en de naleving van de veiligheidsnormen door de luchtvaartmaatschappijen. Zij beschikken over de bevoegdheid om onmiddellijk op te treden bij een potentiële of reële inbreuk op de normen en, indien zij dat gerechtvaardigd achten, maatregelen op te leggen om passagiers en derden te beschermen.

Middels een continu standaardiseringsproces moet de EASA tekortkomingen bij het onderzoek van onveilige situaties door de nationale luchtvaartautoriteiten aan het licht brengen en zo nodig maatregelen treffen.

Ten slotte wijzen wij erop dat in het voorstel van de Commissie inzake de melding van voorvallen in de burgerluchtvaart ([3]) (door de Commissie aangenomen op 18 december 2012 en op dit moment in onderhandeling met de medewetgevers) nieuwe eisen zijn opgenomen om de uitwisseling van informatie tussen de lidstaten te versterken en dat dit voorstel alle lidstaten de mogelijkheid zal bieden om alle gegevens te ontvangen die noodzakelijk zijn voor de uitoefening van omvattend veiligheidstoezicht.

([3]) COM(2012) 776 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000032/13
to the Commission
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Nefarious practices at Ryanair

The Dutch Air Line Pilots Association wishes to see a thorough investigation of alleged misconduct at the airline Ryanair. This low-cost airline is said to be consciously endangering the safety of flights, *inter alia* by bringing pressure (financially and otherwise) to bear on pilots to induce them to prioritise financial issues over safety. For example, they are encouraged to take the minimum quantity of fuel on board or to fly at times when they are not genuinely fit enough. These and other nefarious practices are described in KRO Television's report 'Mayday'.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the report 'Piloten muiten tegen top van Ryanair' [Pilots mutiny against Ryanair management] ([1]) and KRO Television's two-part report entitled 'Mayday' ([2])?

2. Does the Commission recognise the problems referred to? Do they also arise at other airlines operating within the EU?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that, in aviation, safety must be the priority, and that the symptomatic incidents described by the pilots who have been interviewed are extremely worrying from the safety angle?

4. Does the Commission recognise the issues raised by the pilots and an ex-pilot with regard to the management culture, personnel policy and reign of fear at Ryanair? Do these also prevail at other airlines operating within the EU? What view does the Commission take of the conduct described? Does the Commission consider the practices which have been described to be examples of socially responsible business management?

5. What view does the Commission take of the concept of the 'level playing field' for undertakings within the same industry and within the EU market? Does the Commission agree with the PVV that deliberately incurring safety risks for purposes of financial gain does not help to achieve it, but on the contrary places operators who prioritise safety at a disadvantage?

6. The report describes the Irish supervisory authority IAA as incompetent and lacking objectivity. What view does the Commission take of this, and has it received similar information from elsewhere?

7. Is it conceivable, *inter alia* in the light of the apparent incompetence of the supervisory authority, that Ryanair, rather than only just abiding by the rules, also sometimes breaches them? Has the Commission received any indications and/or does it know of any facts which suggest this?

Question for written answer P-000042/13
to the Commission
Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Ryanair aircraft flying with too little fuel on board

Various reports have appeared in the media confirming previous rumours that the Irish low-cost airline Ryanair puts pressure on its pilots to fly with too little kerosene on board. This is said to have a big impact on the safety of European airspace.

Ultimate responsibility for the quantity of fuel on board rests with an aircraft's captain. Ryanair is said to be trying to influence this important decision by the pilot in question. This cuts the airline's costs, but can give rise to very dangerous situations. According to anonymous testimony from pilots, they are threatened with transfer, delays in promotion and even dismissal. Moreover, the airline apparently also requires sick pilots to fly. This situation is untenable and calls for an immediate response from the Commission.

1. Is the Commission aware of these breaches of safety standards by the low-cost airline Ryanair?

([1]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/reiskrant/21185380/__Piloten_muiten_tegen_top_van_Ryanair__.html
([2]) http://reporter.kro.nl/seizoenen/2012/afleveringen/28-12-2012 enhttp://reporter.kro.nl/seizoenen/2013/afleveringen/03-01-2013.

2. Does the Commission and/or EASA intend to investigate the situation further and if necessary take further steps, so that the safety of our airspace can be guaranteed?

3. If so, what action will the Commission and/or EASA take, and what is the anticipated time-frame for this?

Question for written answer E-000054/13
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Safety issues raised by limited quantities of fuel carried on Ryanair flights

On the 'Reporter' programme aired by the Dutch Catholic broadcasting association (KRO), four Ryanair pilots have anonymously testified that they are regularly required to fly with minimum quantities of fuel, creating a potentially dangerous situation should they encounter adverse weather conditions.

At the end of July, three Ryanair aircraft were forced by insufficient fuel to make emergency landings in Valencia.

A number of professional organisations have now been calling for an in-depth investigation into the matter.

Given that Ryanair operates in a number of EU Member States, action at European level would appear to be necessary.

Is the Commission aware of these allegations?

Is it Commission prepared to launch or coordinate an inquiry?

What measures can it take to end such practices and prevent them from being adopted by other airlines?

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(27 February 2013)

In 2012 the Irish Civil Aviation Authority carried out an investigation of the incidents in Spain. The results have been published and can be consulted by the Honourable Member on the following webpage: http://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/435951/iaa-report-on-ryanair.pdf. The report concludes that Ryanair was compliant with the rules on fuel and that its crews acted in accordance with sound Standard Operating Procedures. The Commission has no indications that the investigation carried out by the Irish aviation authority (IAA) lacked objectivity or was done in an incompetent manner.

EU legislation in the field of aviation requires national aviation authorities of the Member States to carry out constant surveillance of aircraft operations and monitor airlines' compliance with safety standards. These authorities are empowered to react immediately to any potential or actual breach of the standards and to impose such measures as they deem justified to protect passengers and third parties.

Through a continuous process of standardisation, EASA's role is to identify any failure of national aviation authorities to investigate unsafe situations or take measures when such situations arise.

Finally, it should be noted that the Commission's proposal on occurrence reporting in civil aviation ([3]) (adopted by the Commission on 18 December 2012 and currently under discussion with the co-legislators) proposes new requirements which will further strengthen the exchange of information between Member States and which will allow every Member State to receive all necessary data for ensuring comprehensive safety oversight.

([3]) COM(2012)776 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000033/13
aan de Commissie
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(7 januari 2013)

Betreft: Misplaatste landbouwsubsidies

Met 55 miljard euro is het gemeenschappelijk landbouwbeleid van de EU goed voor 42 % van het EU-subsidiebudget. Het is het grootste landbouwhulpprogramma ter wereld.

Zoals ook te zien is in de uitzending van Nieuwsuur van 2 januari 20131 gaat het meeste geld uit het GLB niet naar gewone boeren, maar naar multinationals en voedingsmiddelenconcerns die niets van doen hebben met traditionele landbouw.

Frankrijk ontvangt van alle EU-lidstaten verreweg het meeste geld, bijna 11 miljard euro per jaar oftewel 20 % van het totaal. Bovenaan de lijst van Franse ontvangers staat het concern Doux dat alleen al in 2011 bijna 55 miljoen euro kreeg. Doux is de grootste pluimveefirma in Europa die ten behoeve van de export naar Afrika een half miljoen plofkippen per dag verwerkt.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met de uitzending van het televisieprogramma „Nieuwsuur" d.d. 2 januari 2013 ([1])?

2. Op basis van welke criteria wordt bepaald aan wie of aan welke onderneming subsidie uit de middelen voor gemeenschappelijk landbouwbeleid wordt toegekend en de hoogte van het bedrag?

3. Op welke wijze controleert de Commissie of het verstrekte geld op de juiste plaats terecht komt en of het correct wordt besteed?

4. Waarom gaat het meeste geld uit het gemeenschappelijk landbouwbeleid naar multinationals en voedingsmiddelenconcerns, die in tegenstelling tot gewone boeren niets van doen hebben met traditionele landbouw? Deelt de Commissie de mening van de PVV dat dit voorbij gaat aan het oorspronkelijke doel van het gemeenschappelijk landbouwbeleid: „financiering voor plattelandsontwikkeling draagt bij tot het concurrentievermogen van de land- en bosbouw, de bescherming van milieu en platteland, de levenskwaliteit en economische diversificatie van de plattelandsgebieden, en ondersteunt daarnaast de lokale aanpak van de plattelandsontwikkeling" ([2])?

5. Waarom schenkt de EU maar liefst 54 miljoen euro per jaar aan het Franse Doux, een concern dat bijna failliet is èn bovendien plofkippen verwerkt? Erkent de Commissie dat dit weggegooid geld is? Erkent de Commissie bovendien dat de handel in plofkippen in strijd is met art. 13 VWEU? Is de Commissie bereid Doux vanaf nu geen eurocent subsidie meer te verstrekken? Zo neen, waarom niet?

6. Is de Commissie het eens met de PVV dat het systeem van landbouwsubsidies niet meer van deze tijd is? Is de Commissie bereid om het systeem van EU-landbouwsubsidies af te schaffen, het landbouwbeleid te renationaliseren en alle met landbouwbeleid samenhangende middelen terug te geven aan de bijdragende lidstaten?

Antwoord van de heer Cioloş namens de Commissie
(15 februari 2013)

Het door het geachte Parlementslid genoemde bedrijf ontvangt geen directe betalingen in het kader van het landbouwbeleid, maar uitvoerrestituties.

De verdeling van de uitvoerrestituties voor pluimveevlees wordt beheerd op basis van de aanvragen en de jaarlijks vastgestelde kwantitatieve en financiële GATT-maxima. De jongste jaren beliepen de uitgaven voor deze restituties 78 miljoen EUR in 2011-2012 en 75 miljoen EUR in het daaraan voorafgaande GATT-jaar; de overeenkomstige hoeveelheden bedroegen respectievelijk 240 000 t en 230 000 t. Bij de bepaling van het restitutieniveau wordt rekening gehouden met een hele reeks variabelen, waaronder met name de prijzen in de EU en op de wereldmarkt, de prijs van het diervoeder, de marges voor de producent en het exportniveau zonder restituties.

([1]) http://nieuwsuur.nl/archief/2013-01-02/.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/grants/index_nl.htm

De tenuitvoerlegging van de EU-steunregelingen in het kader van het GLB is toevertrouwd aan de lidstaten, die verantwoordelijk zijn voor de toepassing van de GLB-regelgeving en inzonderheid voor de betalingen aan de begunstigden. Het zijn derhalve de lidstaten die alle nodige maatregelen moeten nemen om ervoor te zorgen dat de subsidies correct worden toegekend en onregelmatigheden worden voorkomen en aangepakt.

Overigens staat momenteel een belangrijke hervorming van het GLB in de steigers, die erop gericht is een beleid tot stand te brengen dat billijker is en duurzame landbouw bevordert. Zo voorziet het voorstel van de Commissie tot hervorming van de directe betalingen in een rechtvaardiger verdeling van de steun, zowel door versterkte convergentie van de directe betalingen tussen de lidstaten en tussen landbouwers als door de vaststelling van een bovengrens voor de bedragen die aan grootontvangers worden uitgekeerd. Daarnaast is voorzien in een betaling aan landbouwers die klimaat- en milieuvriendelijke landbouwpraktijken toepassen. Voorts behelst het voorstel de invoering van een steunmechanisme voor jonge landbouwers, subsidies voor landbouwers die bedrijvig zijn in gebieden waar specifieke natuurlijke omstandigheden de landbouw bemoeilijken en een vereenvoudigde regeling voor kleine landbouwbedrijven.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000033/13
to the Commission
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Inappropriate farm subsidies

At EUR 55 billion, the EU's common agricultural policy accounts for 42% of the EU subsidy budget. It is the largest farm subsidy programme in the world.

As the 'Nieuwsuur' TV programme of 2 January 2013 showed, most of the money from the CAP is not paid to ordinary farmers but to multinationals and large food companies which have nothing to do with traditional farming.

Of all the EU Member States, France receives by far the most money, nearly EUR 11 billion per annum, or 20% of the total. The list of recipients in France is headed by Doux, a large company which in 2011 alone received nearly EUR 55 m. Doux is the largest poultry firm in Europe, processing half a million quick-fattening broiler chickens per day for export to Africa.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the instalment of the 'Nieuwsuur' TV programme broadcast on 2 January 2013? ([1])

2. On the basis of what criteria is it decided who or what undertaking should receive subsidies from the common agricultural policy and the amount they are to be given?

3. How does the Commission check whether the money provided reaches the intended recipient and whether it is spent correctly?

4. Why does most of the funding from the CAP go to multinationals and large food companies which, unlike ordinary farmers, have nothing to do with traditional farming? Does the Commission agree with the PVV that this disregards the original purpose of the CAP: 'Rural Development funding helps to improve competitiveness for farming and forestry, to protect the environment and the countryside, to improve the quality of life and diversification of the rural economy and to support locally based approaches to rural development' ([2])?

5. Why does the EU give the princely sum of EUR 54 m per annum to Doux in France, a large company which is virtually bankrupt and moreover processes quick-fattening broiler chickens? Does the Commission acknowledge that this is a waste of money? Does the Commission recognise furthermore that trade in quick-fattening broiler chickens contravenes Article 13 TFEU? Will the Commission cease to give Doux a single cent in subsidy? If not, why not?

6. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that the farm subsidies system is outdated? Will the Commission abolish the EU farm subsidies system, renationalise agricultural policy and return all agricultural policy funds to the Member States which have contributed them?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2013)

The firm mentioned by the Honourable Member does not receive agricultural direct payments but export refunds.

The distribution of export refunds for poultrymeat is managed on the basis of applications and the annual GATT quantitative and financial ceilings. In the recent years, the amount spent on these refunds has been 78 million EUR in 2011-2012 and 75 million the previous GATT year for the quantities of 240 000 t and 230 000 t respectively. The level of refunds is calculated taking into account a number of variables, in particular internal and international prices, feed cost, producer margins and level of exports without refunds.

The implementation of the EU support schemes in the framework of the CAP has been delegated to Member States who have the responsibility to execute the rules of the CAP and particularly the payments to beneficiaries. It is therefore for the Member States to take all measures necessary to ensure that subsidies are granted correctly and to prevent and deal with irregularities.

([1]) http://nieuwsuur.nl/archief/2013-01-02/.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/grants/index_nl.htm

Moreover, an important reform of the CAP is currently under way, with a view to achieve a policy that is fairer and promotes sustainable agriculture. For example, the Commission reform proposal of direct payments provides for a more equitable distribution of support by making direct payments converge between MS and farmers and by capping the payments of the biggest beneficiaries. A payment is foreseen for farmers to follow agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment. Besides, the proposal also sets a scheme to help young farmers, a payment for farmers active in areas facing specific natural constraints and a simplified scheme for small farmers.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000034/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Food security and food education

On average, over 30 % of all food purchased in the EU is binned. With an ever-increasing world population, currently seven billion, food security is a very serious issue. What steps will the Commission take to tackle the EU-wide problem of food wastage?

In Ireland alone obesity costs EUR 400 million per annum. Inability to cook and general lack of food awareness are primary causes of obesity. What steps will the Commission take to ensure that Member States take steps to introduce mandatory cookery classes during second-level education?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(13 February 2013)

The Commission is analysing in close cooperation with stakeholders how to reduce food waste and is discussing possible EU actions. The next meeting of the Working Group on Food Waste in the context of the Advisory Group on the Food Chain, Animal and Plant Health (8 February 2013) will focus on specific topics such as: donation of surplus food to food banks, date labelling, feed, short food supply chains, bio-energy, etc. In parallel, the Commission is disseminating information via its dedicated website ([1]): a viral clip on food waste, '10 tips to reduce food waste' in all EU languages, clarification of 'best before' and 'use by' labels. The Commission is also compiling good practices in a user-friendly way, which will soon be available on the website.

Introducing mandatory cookery classes during second-level education is a matter which falls under the responsibility of Member States. The Commission is promoting EU action as set out in the strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health issues ([2]). Children are among the priority groups in the EU Strategy. By working on responsible advertising and marketing to children, by improving consumer information, and by working to make healthier options easily available, the Commission contributes to help families choose a healthier lifestyle. For instance, through the EU School Fruit Scheme ([3]), the Commission contributes to establishing healthier eating habits in children. Furthermore, under the Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health the food industry has committed to improve the nutritional balance of its confectionery products, reduce the portion sizes and reduce the average calories per portion. This initiative runs from 2006 to 2013 and it covers all Member States.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/sustainability/index_en.htm
([2]) COM(2007) 279.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000035/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(7 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Condizioni rigidamente controllate nell'esercizio delle deroghe previste dall'articolo 9, lettera c), della direttiva Uccelli 2009/147/CE

L'articolo 9, lettera c), della direttiva 2009/147/CE prevede che le deroghe, quando esercitabili, debbano essere effettuate «in condizioni rigidamente controllate».

La Regione Lombardia, che nelle autorizzazioni degli impianti di cattura di uccelli concede l'uso di reti (vietate in via generale dalla predetta direttiva), individua in via preventiva un ridottissimo numero di controlli sugli impianti. Ad esempio, per i 25 impianti della Provincia di Bergamo (circa 2 250 giornate complessive di funzionamento nel 2012) i controlli obbligatori sono 40, pari allo 0,017 % delle giornate di funzionamento, mentre per i 21 impianti della Provincia di Brescia (circa 1 890 giornate complessive di funzionamento nel 2012) i controlli obbligatori sono 84, pari allo 0,043 % delle giornate di funzionamento.

La Regione Veneto per le autorizzazioni in deroga addirittura non indica alcun numero minimo di controlli.

Al fine di assicurare che la deroga sia praticata in «condizioni rigidamente controllate», l'atto che autorizza il ricorso alla deroga dovrebbe indicare un numero adeguato di controlli, al fine di accertare preventivamente se sussistano le condizioni per l'esercizio della deroga medesima; quindi, dovrebbero essere indicati non soltanto i soggetti competenti, ma anche il numero minimo di controlli, adeguato alla durata di funzionamento degli impianti di cattura, che dovranno essere effettuati durante il periodo di apertura degli impianti.

Non ritiene la Commissione che l'esercizio della deroga possa essere autorizzato solo se siano prima verificati i presupposti per il suo esercizio, tra i quali appunto il fatto che la deroga sia esercitata in condizioni rigidamente controllate?

Non ritiene la Commissione che negli atti autorizzativi delle deroghe in merito alle condizioni rigidamente controllate debbano essere elencati, oltre agli addetti alla vigilanza, anche la tipologia e il numero, congruo ed elevato, di controlli minimi che dovranno essere effettuati affinché si possa preventivamente accertare che la deroga sia esercitata «in condizioni rigidamente controllate»?

Ritiene la Commissione che i controlli sugli impianti di cattura che non superano l'1 % delle giornate di funzionamento degli impianti possano essere considerati adeguati alla prescrizione della direttiva che impone «condizioni rigidamente controllate»?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(28 febbraio 2013)

Ogni deroga concessa dalle autorità nazionali a norma dell'articolo 9, paragrafo 1, lettera c), della direttiva Uccelli ([1]) è permessa solo se esercitata in condizioni rigidamente controllate. Tutte le deroghe devono inoltre specificare i controlli da svolgere e indicare l'autorità competente a dichiarare il rispetto delle condizioni richieste. La Commissione, nella *Guida alla disciplina della caccia nell'ambito della direttiva «Uccelli selvatici»* ([2]), ha precisato che per soddisfare queste condizioni occorre compiere rigorosi controlli territoriali, temporali e personali.

Le autorità nazionali possono concedere deroghe solo dopo avere accertato il rispetto di tutti gli obblighi e tutte le condizioni previste dall'articolo 9, ivi comprese le condizioni rigidamente controllate relative alle deroghe di cui al paragrafo 1, lettera c), del suddetto articolo.

Per quanto concerne tali condizioni rigidamente controllate, gli atti amministrativi nazionali che autorizzano le deroghe devono specificare, oltre agli organi di vigilanza, il tipo e il numero — congruo ed elevato — di controlli minimi da effettuarsi. Un numero esiguo di controlli come quello menzionato dall'onorevole deputato può non essere sufficiente a garantire il livello richiesto di controlli rigorosi.

([1]) Direttiva 2009/147/CE, GU L 20 del 26.1.2010.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/hunting/docs/hunting_guide_it.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000035/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Strictly supervised conditions in respect of the application of the derogations laid down in Article 9(c) of Directive 2009/147/EC (Birds Directive)

Under Article 9(c) of Directive 2009/147/EC, derogations, where permitted, must be applied 'under strictly supervised conditions'.

The Region of Lombardy, which allows the use of nets (generally prohibited by the aforesaid directive) under its permits for bird-capture devices, requires very few precautionary checks to be performed on those devices. For example, for the 25 devices used in the Province of Bergamo (around 2 250 full days of use in 2012) 40 checks, equivalent to 0.017 % of the days of use, are mandatory, while for the 21 devices used in the Province of Brescia (around 1 890 full days of use in 2012) 84 checks, equivalent to 0.043 % of the days of use, are mandatory.

The Region of Veneto does not even specify a minimum number of checks for permits covered by the derogations.

To ensure that the derogations are applied under 'strictly supervised conditions', the act authorising their use should specify an appropriate number of checks, in order to establish in advance whether the conditions for applying them exist; therefore, not only should the competent stakeholders be specified, but also the minimum number of checks, which should be commensurate with the length of time that the capture devices are used. The checks should be carried out during the period in which the devices are open.

Does the Commission not believe that authorisation to apply the derogations should be granted only if the requirements for their application — including, in particular, the fact that they must be applied under strictly supervised conditions — are verified first?

Does it not think that the acts authorising the derogations in respect of the strictly supervised conditions should list, in addition to the inspection bodies, the type and number — a suitably large number — of minimum checks that should be carried out in order to establish in advance that the derogations are applied 'under strictly supervised conditions'?

Does it believe that checks on capture devices that do not exceed 1 % of the days when the devices are used can be deemed proportionate to the directive's requirement for 'strictly supervised conditions'?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

Any derogation granted by national authorities under Article 9.1 (c) of the Birds Directive ([1]) is permitted only under strictly supervised conditions. Moreover, all derogations must specify the controls to be carried out and identify the authority empowered to declare that the required conditions have been met. In its guidance document on sustainable hunting ([2]) under the Birds Directive, the Commission underlines the need for strict territorial, temporal and personal controls in order to fulfil these conditions.

National authorities should authorise derogations only after having ensured that all the requirements and conditions set by Article 9 are fulfilled, including the strictly supervised conditions for derogations under letter (c) of Article 9.1.

In relation to these strictly supervised conditions, national administrative acts authorising derogations should specify, in addition to the inspection bodies, the type and number — a suitably large number — of minimum checks that should be carried out. A proportion of checks as low as the one mentioned by the Honourable Member may not be sufficient to ensure the required level of strict controls.

([1]) Directive 2009/147/EC, OJ L 020, 26.1.2010.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/hunting/docs/hunting_guide_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000036/13
alla Commissione
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(7 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Situazione delle carceri in Italia e fondi disponibili per l'integrazione dei detenuti e per le famiglie

L'Italia risulta essere, ad oggi, il paese con le carceri più sovraffollate dell'Unione europea. I dati parlano di 140 detenuti ogni cento posti, mentre nel resto d'Europa il tasso d'affollamento medio è del 99,6 %. In totale i detenuti negli istituti italiani sono 66 685. Tale dato dimostra come rispetto al gennaio 2010, anno in cui fu decretato lo stato d'emergenza per il sovraffollamento carcerario, si contino ben 1 894 detenuti in più. Infine, un dato ancor più allarmante, è costituito dall'alto numero delle morti avvenute in carcere, le quali ad oggi ammontano a ben 93, di cui 50 per suicidio. Nonostante questo quadro desolante, i tagli alla spesa dell'amministrazione penitenziaria non si sono fermati, e anzi, negli ultimi 10 anni sono stati pari al 22 % del bilancio complessivo.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, può la Commissione far sapere quanto segue:

Poiché il Libro verde della Commissione menziona l'Italia fra i paesi con il maggior sovraffollamento carcerario, non crede la Commissione che dovrebbero essere prese finalmente misure adeguate in merito?

Non crede la Commissione che ci sia la necessità di offrire ai detenuti prossimi alla fine della carcerazione programmi di reinserimento nella società adeguati e tentare cosi di ridurre il rischio di recidiva? In particolare quali azioni e fondi l'Unione europea ha messo in campo per la formazione personale e lavorativa dei detenuti?

Non crede la Commissione che bisognerebbe promuovere progetti volti ad offrire ai detenuti un percorso di riflessione su uno degli aspetti più importanti della vita, ossia il mondo degli affetti familiari? Non crede inoltre che debba essere garantito il diritto alla genitorialità dei genitori detenuti nei confronti dei propri figli in età minore? Quali azioni sono in questa prospettiva finanziabili?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(26 febbraio 2013)

La Commissione attribuisce grande importanza al rispetto dei diritti fondamentali dei detenuti nell'Unione europea. Le condizioni di detenzione e i programmi di reinserimento sociale rientrano tuttavia fra le competenze degli Stati membri. Ciononostante, lo scorso anno la Commissione ha pubblicato un libro verde sul rafforzamento della fiducia reciproca nel settore della detenzione ([1]) e ha messo a disposizione sul suo sito web una sintesi delle risposte alle questioni in esso sollevate ([2]), da cui emerge che, sebbene esista un ampio consenso sui problemi connessi all'eccessivo uso della custodia cautelare, la maggior parte degli Stati membri non è favorevole ad un intervento legislativo forte a livello di Unione.

Sulla base dell'esito del libro verde la Commissione, prima di sviluppare nuove proposte legislative, intende concentrarsi sulla corretta attuazione degli attuali strumenti di riconoscimento reciproco adottati nel settore della detenzione ([3]) e pubblicherà una relazione sull'attuazione delle tre decisioni quadro entro la metà del 2013.

A questo proposito, la Commissione desidera sottolineare che l'obiettivo della decisione quadro 2008/909/GAI è di aumentare la possibilità di reinserimento sociale, consentendo alla persona condannata di ritornare nel paese d'origine così da poter stare vicino alla propria famiglia.

([1]) «Rafforzare la fiducia reciproca nello spazio giudiziario europeo — Libro verde sull'applicazione della normativa dell'UE sulla giustizia penale nel settore della detenzione» (COM(2011)327 def.).

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/criminal/opinion/110614_en.htm

([3]) Decisione quadro 2008/909/GAI del Consiglio, del 27 novembre 2008, relativa all'applicazione del principio del reciproco riconoscimento alle sentenze penali che irrogano pene detentive o misure privative della libertà personale, ai fini della loro esecuzione nell'Unione europea (GU L 327 del 5.12.2008, pag. 27); decisione quadro 2008/947/GAI del Consiglio, del 27 novembre 2008, relativa all'applicazione del principio del reciproco riconoscimento alle sentenze e alle decisioni di sospensione condizionale in vista della sorveglianza delle misure di sospensione condizionale e delle sanzioni sostitutive (GU L 337 del 16.12.2008, pag. 102); e decisione quadro 2009/829/GAI del Consiglio, del 23 ottobre 2009, sull'applicazione tra gli Stati membri dell'Unione europea del principio del reciproco riconoscimento alle decisioni sulle misure alternative alla detenzione cautelare (GU L 294 dell'11.11.2009, pag. 20).

Attraverso i programmi Grundtvig e Leonardo da Vinci, la Commissione ha costantemente finanziato progetti dell'UE riguardanti l'istruzione e la formazione in carcere. I singoli Stati membri hanno anche utilizzato le risorse del Fondo sociale europeo per finanziare progetti in materia di formazione dei detenuti. Inoltre, nel 2012 la Commissione ha svolto un'indagine sull'istruzione e la formazione in carcere in Europa (http://ec.europa.eu/education/adult/studies_en.htm), che illustra l'attuale situazione a livello nazionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000036/13
to the Commission
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Situation of Italian prisons and funding available for integrating prisoners and for families

To this day, Italy is the country with the most overcrowded prisons in the European Union. The statistics show that there are 140 prisoners for every 100 prison places, while in the rest of Europe the average overcrowding rate is 99.6 %. In total, there are 66 685 inmates in Italian prisons. This figure shows that there are 1 894 more inmates than in January 2010, the year in which a state of emergency was declared due to prison overcrowding. Finally, an even more alarming statistic is the large number of deaths that have occurred in prison: no fewer than 93 to date, including 50 suicides. Despite this bleak picture, prison service cutbacks have not stopped; rather, they have amounted to some 22 % of the total budget over the last 10 years.

With this in mind, can the Commission comment on the following:

Since the Commission Green Paper names Italy among the countries with the most overcrowded prisons, does the Commission not believe that appropriate measures should at last be taken on this issue?

Does it not believe that there is a need to offer inmates nearing the end of their prison term suitable programmes for reintegrating into society and hence to try and reduce the risk of them reoffending? In particular, what measures and funds has the European Union implemented for inmates' personal development and job training?

Does the Commission not think it necessary to promote projects enabling inmates to reflect on one of the most important aspects of life, namely family bonds? Moreover, does it not believe that imprisoned parents' parental rights over their young children should be guaranteed? What measures can be financed in this regard?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 2013)

The Commission attaches great importance to the respect of the fundamental rights of persons that are in detention in the EU. However, detention conditions and social rehabilitation programmes come under the competence of Member States. Nevertheless, last year the Commission published a Green Paper on strengthening mutual trust in the field of detention ([1]). A summary of the replies has been published on the website ([2]). It follows from these replies that although there is a broad consensus on the problems related to excessive pre-trial detention, most Member States do not support strong legislative intervention at EU level.

Based on the outcome of the Green Paper, the Commission intends to focus on the proper implementation of the existing mutual recognition instruments adopted in the field of detention ([3]) before developing any new legislative proposals and will publish an implementation report on the three Framework Decisions by mid-2013.

In this respect, the Commission would like to emphasise that the aim of Framework Decision 2008/909/JHA is to enhance the possibility of social rehabilitation by allowing the sentenced person to return to his home country to be close to his family.

The Commission has continuously funded EU projects related to prison education and training through the Grundtvig and the Leonardo da Vinci programmes. Individual Member States have also used the ESF funding to support projects relating to inmates training. In addition in 2012, the Commission has undertaken a survey on prison education and training in Europe (http://ec.europa.eu/education/adult/studies_en.htm), which illustrates the current state-of-play at national level.

([1]) Green Paper Strengthening mutual trust in the European judicial area — A Green Paper on the application of EU criminal justice legislation in the field of detention, COM/2011/0327 final.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/criminal/opinion/110614_en.htm

([3]) The framework Decision 2008/909/JHA of 27 November 2008 on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to judgments in criminal matters imposing custodial sentences or measures involving deprivation of liberty for the purpose of their enforcement in the European Union, OJ 5.12.2008, L 327/27, the framework Decision 2008/947/JHA of 27 November 2008 on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to judgments and probation decisions with a view to the supervision of probation measures and alternative sanctions, OJ 16.12.2008, L 337/102, and the framework Decision 2009/829/JHA of 23 October 2009 on the application, between Member States of the European Union, of the principle of mutual recognition to decisions on supervision measures as an alternative to provisional detention, OJ 11.11.2009, L 294/20.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000037/13
aan de Commissie
Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)
(7 januari 2013)

Betreft: Ouderdomspensioenopbouw grensarbeiders België

Op 6 januari 2011 stelde ik een vraag inzake het recht op ouderdomspensioenopbouw van in België wonende voormalige grensarbeiders met een arbeidsongeschiktheidspensioen (E-010916/2010). Personen die in België wonen en in Nederland gewerkt hebben ontvangen bij arbeidsongeschiktheid een Nederlandse arbeidsongeschiktheidspensioen. In een aantal gevallen hebben personen die laatstelijk in Nederland sociaal verzekerd waren recht op een Nederlandse én Belgische pro-rata-pensioen.

In het geval van in België wonende voormalige grensarbeiders met recht op een Nederlandse én Belgische pro-rata-pensioen worden deze personen door bevoegde Belgische autoriteiten behandeld alsof zij alleen een Belgisch arbeidsongeschiktheidspensioen ontvangen. Dit leidt er toe dat deze groep *zonder* betaling van bijdragen Belgisch rustpensioen opbouwt over de pro-rata-pensioenen. En dit ongeacht de hoogte van het Belgische pro-rata arbeidsongeschiktheidspensioen.

Wanneer een in België wonende voormalige grensarbeider slechts een Nederlands arbeidsongeschiktheidspensioen ontvangen, dan kunnen zij alleen tegen *betaling* van bijdragen een Belgisch rustpensioen opbouwen.

Is dit onderscheid tussen in België wonende voormalige grensarbeiders, die wel en geen pro-rata-arbeidsongeschiktheidspensioen ontvangen, niet in strijd met beginsel van gelijke behandeling resp. in strijd met artikel 5 van Vo (EG) Nr. 883/2004?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(28 februari 2013)

In het geval van een persoon die in België woont en alleen van Nederland een arbeidsongeschiktheidsuitkering ontvangt, verplicht het beginsel van gelijkstelling — zoals vastgelegd in artikel 5 van Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004 — België niet om de tijdvakken waarin een persoon een Nederlandse arbeidsongeschiktheidsuitkering ontvangt automatisch als nationale verzekeringstijdvakken te erkennen.

Zoals vermeld in het antwoord van de Commissie op vraag E 10916/2010 mag het beginsel van gelijkstelling niet worden gebruikt om tijdvakken van verzekering tot stand te brengen. Alleen bestaande krachtens de wetgeving van een andere lidstaat vervulde tijdvakken kunnen in overweging worden genomen door toepassing van het beginsel van samentelling van artikel 6 van Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004.

Artikel 56, lid 1, onder c), van Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004 houdt een speciale bepaling in voor de berekening van invaliditeits-, ouderdoms- en nabestaandenuitkeringen. Dit artikel stelt vast dat indien de wetgeving van een lidstaat (i.c. België) bepaalt dat voor de berekening van de uitkeringen wordt uitgegaan van de inkomsten, bijdragen of premies, verhogingen, verdiensten, andere bedragen of een combinatie daarvan, deze uitkeringen uitsluitend worden bepaald op basis van de tijdvakken die zijn vervuld in die lidstaat (i.c. België). Dit punt bepaalt verder dat indien de tijdvakken van verzekering zijn vervuld krachtens de wetgeving van andere lidstaten (i.c. Nederland), er rekening moet worden gehouden met dezelfde elementen als voor de nationale tijdvakken in België.

De Nederlandse tijdvakken kunnen dus enkel door België in aanmerking worden genomen indien zij volgens de Nederlandse wetgeving worden beschouwd als tijdvakken van verzekering ([1]). In dit verband wijst de Commissie op de prejudiciële beslissing in zaak C-548/11 (*Mulders*) met betrekking tot de samentelling van tijdvakken van arbeidsongeschiktheid in de berekening van een ouderdomspensioen.

([1]) Zie artikel 1, onder t), van Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000037/13
to the Commission
Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Accumulation of pension entitlements by frontier workers in Belgium

On 6 January 2011, I tabled a question concerning the right for former frontier workers resident in Belgium who were drawing disability pensions to acquire old-age pension entitlements (E-010916/2010). People living in Belgium who used to work in the Netherlands receive a Dutch disability pension if they are unfit for work. In a number of cases, people who last had social insurance cover in the Netherlands are entitled to both a Dutch and a Belgian pension pro rata.

Former frontier workers resident in Belgium who are entitled to both Dutch and Belgian pensions pro rata are treated by the competent authorities in Belgium as if they were only receiving a Belgian disability pension. As a result, such people — without paying any contributions — accumulate Belgian retirement pension entitlements on the pro rata pensions. This is the case irrespective of the size of the Belgian pro rata disability pension.

If former frontier workers living in Belgium only receive a Dutch disability pension, they can only accumulate Belgian retirement pension entitlements by paying contributions.

Does not this difference in treatment between former frontier workers living in Belgium, based on whether or not they are receiving pro rata disability pensions, breach the principle of equal treatment or Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

In the situation of a person residing in Belgium and receiving a disability benefit from the Netherlands only, the principle of assimilation as laid down in Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 does not oblige Belgium to automatically recognise the periods during which a person is in receipt of a Dutch disability benefit as national insurance periods.

As stated in the answer of the Commission to Question E 10916/2010, the principle of assimilation may not be used for the creation of periods of insurance. Only existing periods that are completed under the legislation of another Member State can be taken into account by applying the principle of aggregation in Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004.

Article 56(1)(c) of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 contains a special rule for the calculation of invalidity, old age and survivors' benefits. This provision determines that if the legislation of a Member State (i.e. Belgium) provides that the benefits are to be calculated on the basis of incomes, contributions, increases, earnings, other amounts or a combination of more than one of them, these benefits are only determined on the basis of the periods which were fulfilled in that Member State (i.e. Belgium). This section further provides that if periods of insurance are completed under the legislation of other Member States (i.e. the Netherlands), the same elements as for the national periods in Belgium have to be taken into account.

The Dutch periods can therefore only be taken into account by Belgium if under the Dutch legislation they count as periods of insurance ([1]). In this respect, the Commission refers to the preliminary ruling in Case C-548/11 (*Mulders*), concerning the aggregation of periods of incapacity for work in the calculation of an old-age pension.

([1]) see Article 1(t) of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-000038/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(7 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Libertà di circolazione dei capitali

Il giornale economico Handelsblatt di giovedì 3 gennaio — ripreso da Le Monde economique online e da AFP — annuncia che è in corso un'inchiesta da parte dell'Unione europea per verificare se l'Autorità tedesca di controllo dei mercati finanziari ha violato le regole del mercato unico, limitando la libertà di circolazione dei capitali verso l'estero. Si suppone che l'Autorità in questione abbia favorito indirettamente le banche tedesche, vietando alle filiali di banche straniere installate in Germania di trasferire forti somme alle loro case madri. Pare che una certa inquietudine in proposito serpeggi presso banche svizzere e banche italiane.

Alla luce di quanto esposto:

1. Può la Commissione confermare l'informazione?

2. In caso affermativo, non ritiene la Commissione che la limitazione di trasferimenti importanti di capitali renda più difficile per una banca straniera la redditività di certe operazioni in Germania, come ad esempio la raccolta del risparmio?

3. Non sembra inoltre grottesco alla Commissione che — in caso affermativo — la patria dei controlli alle finanze di tutti gli Stati membri si esponga così platealmente a violazioni di regole che ha preteso di imporre a tutti?

4. Sempre in caso affermativo, quali potrebbero essere le conseguenze che ne deriverebbero?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(15 febbraio 2013)

La Commissione è al corrente delle notizie stampa relative alle misure di «protezione» (ring-fencing) che le autorità di vigilanza finanziaria di alcuni Stati membri avrebbero preso per contenere il flusso di capitali oltrefrontiera. Tali misure, anche se presumibilmente dettate da preoccupazioni di stabilità finanziaria dovute alla crisi del debito sovrano, potrebbero potenzialmente limitare la libera circolazione dei capitali e rendere meno attraenti le operazioni bancarie transnazionali. Per essere giustificate nella loro eccezionalità, misure di questo tipo richiedono motivazioni prudenziali solide, uno stretto coordinamento tra autorità di vigilanza e, nel caso, un'agevolazione dall'ABE ([1]).

La Commissione è seriamente preoccupata per queste misure, che rischiano di comportare una frammentazione del mercato unico. La Commissione segue attentamente la situazione in stretta collaborazione con l'ABE, ed è recentissimo un suo intervento diretto presso le autorità di vigilanza nazionali. Il 2 febbraio 2013 la Commissione ha scritto a tutte le autorità nazionali di vigilanza bancaria per ricordare loro le regole dell'UE sulla libera circolazione dei capitali e sull'uso di misure prudenziali per le banche. Ha altresì chiesto a tutte le autorità nazionali di vigilanza bancaria di fornire informazioni ([2]) sulle rispettive pratiche di vigilanza correnti, in modo da disporre di un quadro completo ed esauriente delle misure e procedure adottate. La Commissione esaminerà con attenzione le informazioni ricevute, in base alle quali stabilirà gli interventi del caso.

La Commissione valuterà l'opportunità di intervenire a fronte di prove sufficienti di violazioni del diritto dell'Unione nell'esercizio della vigilanza da parte delle autorità competenti.

([1]) Autorità bancaria europea.
([2]) Entro febbraio 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000038/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Free movement of capital

A report appearing in the *Handelsblatt* business journal of Thursday 3 January and published in *Le Monde économique* online and by AFP indicates that the German financial supervisory authority is under investigation by the European Union for possible infringement of single market rules by restricting the free movement of capital abroad. It appears that the authority has been guilty of indirect discrimination in favour of German banks by prohibiting foreign banks from effecting major transfers out of their German subsidiaries, causing stirrings of unease among Swiss and Italian banks.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission confirm the reports?

2. If so, does the Commission not take the view that restrictions on major transfers of funds make certain operations in Germany, involving savings deposits for example, less attractive to foreign banks?

3. In this case, does the Commission not consider it grotesque for the homeland of financial supervision to infringe so blatantly the rules it is seeking to impose on all the Member States?

4. If the reports are true, what might be the repercussions?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2013)

The Commission is aware of the press reports concerning so-called 'ring-fencing' measures allegedly taken by the financial supervisory authorities of some Member States with a view to restricting capital flows across borders. Such measures, even if claimed to have been taken in reply to financial stability concerns triggered by the sovereign crisis, on their face could potentially restrict the free movement of capital and make cross-border banking transactions less attractive. For them to be exceptionally justified measures of this kind require duly substantiated prudential reasoning and close coordination amongst supervisory authorities, and where appropriate facilitated by the EBA ([1]).

The Commission is deeply concerned about the measures in question because they could bear the risk of fragmentation of the single market. The Commission is closely monitoring the developments in close cooperation with the EBA and most recently intervened with the national supervisory authorities directly. On 2 February 2013, the Commission wrote to all national banking supervisors to remind them about EU rules on the free movement of capital and on the use of prudential measures for banks. The Commission has also requested all national banking supervisors to provide information ([2]) about their current supervisory practices, in order to have a full and complete picture of the measures taken, and the procedures followed. The Commission will carefully consider this information and determine any possible further steps as appropriate.

The Commission will consider whether to take appropriate action should there be sufficiently clear evidence that any of the competent authorities have breached EC law when exercising their supervisory powers.

([1]) European Banking Authority.
([2]) By the end of February 2013.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-000039/13
aan de Commissie
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(7 januari 2013)

Betreft: De zaak Dalli en de lobby van de tabaksindustrie

Er is nog steeds onvoldoende openheid over de achtergrond van het gedwongen aftreden van de heer Dalli als lid van de Europese Commissie en de nieuwe tabaksrichtlijn die uiteindelijk op 19 december 2012 is ingediend. De Commissie begrotingscontrole heeft een lijst met vragen gestuurd aan de Europese Commissie om hierover opheldering te krijgen. Op bladzijde 36 van de antwoorden van de Europese Commissie op de 154 vragen van de leden van de Commissie begrotingscontrole staat in antwoord op vraag nr. 15 dat „twee korte gesprekken hebben plaatsgevonden tussen ambtenaren van de Juridische Dienst en de heer Michel Petite (directeur-generaal van de Juridische Dienst tot 2007 en thans advocaat in Parijs)" en „de heer Petite verklaarde dat zijn advocatenkantoor juridisch advies verleende aan een tabaksfabrikant (Philip Morris International) en heeft zijn standpunten uiteengezet over enkele juridische kwesties in verband met de tabakswetgeving. Na op de hoogte te zijn gesteld over deze gesprekken heeft directeur-generaal Luis Romero verzocht om door de heer Petite persoonlijk te worden geïnformeerd over zijn juridische adviesverlening op dit gebied. Deze bijeenkomst vond plaats op 14 november 2012."

1. Erkent de Commissie dat de heer Petite rechtstreeks betrokken was bij de op 9 juli 2004 met Philip Morris gesloten overeenkomst? Erkent de Commissie dat deze overeenkomst een beëindigingsclausule bevat?

2. Nieuwe wetgeving van de EU kan gevolgen hebben voor deze overeenkomst met Philip Morris. Heeft het uitstel door mevrouw Catherine Day in juli 2012 van het overleg tussen de diensten over de nieuwe tabaksrichtlijn iets van doen met deze beëindigingsclausule?

3. Welke redenen zijn aan te wijzen voor de contacten tussen de heer Petite en directeur-generaal Luis Romero in de herfst van 2012?

4. Zijn er nog lopende onderhandelingen tussen de Commissie en R. J. Reynolds? Heeft de nieuwe tabaksrichtlijn een rol gespeeld tijdens deze onderhandelingen?

Antwoord van de heer Barroso namens de Commissie
(15 mei 2013)

1. In zijn hoedanigheid van directeur-generaal van de Juridische Dienst was Michel Petite betrokken bij de onderhandelingen over de met Philip Morris gesloten overeenkomst. De voorwaarden voor de beëindiging van de overeenkomst zijn vastgelegd in hoofdstuk 11.01 van de samenwerkingsovereenkomst ([1]).

2. Neen.

3. De contacten tussen de heer Petite en de Juridische Dienst van de Commissie in het najaar van 2012 zijn reeds toegelicht op 30 november 2012 in de antwoorden op de vragen 14 en 15 van de 154 vragen in de brief van 21 november 2012 van de voorzitter van de Commissie begrotingscontrole.

4. Er lopen geen onderhandelingen tussen de Commissie en R. J. Reynolds.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/cigarette-smugg-2004/agreement_2004.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000039/13
to the Commission
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: The Dalli case and lobbying by the tobacco industry

There remains a lack of transparency on the background to the forced resignation of Mr John Dalli as Commissioner and the new Tobacco Directive, which was finally introduced on 19 December 2012. The European Parliament's Committee on Budgetary Control (CONT) has sent a list of questions to the Commission to get things clarified. On page 36 of its answers to the 154 questions submitted recently by CONT MEPs, the Commission states in reply to Question 15 that 'two brief conversations took place between Legal Service officials and Mr Michel Petite (former Director-General of the Legal Service until 2007, and now an Avocat in Paris)' and that 'Mr Petite mentioned that his law firm provided legal advice to a tobacco company (Philip Morris International) and set out his views on some legal issues of tobacco legislation. After having been informed about these conversations, Director-General Luis Romero asked to be personally updated by Mr Petite of his legal counsel activities in this area. That meeting took place on 14 November 2012.'

1. Does the Commission acknowledge that Mr Petite was directly involved in the agreement with Philip Morris, signed on 9 July 2004? Does the Commission acknowledge that this agreement has a 'termination' clause?

2. New legislation by the EU could influence this agreement with Philip Morris. Has the fact that Mrs Catherine Day postponed the start of inter-service consultation on the new Tobacco Directive in July 2012 anything to do with this termination clause?

3. Why were there contacts between Mr Petite and Director-General Luis Romero in autumn 2012?

4. Are there still negotiations going on between the Commission and RJ Reynolds? Has the new Tobacco Directive played a role in these negotiations?

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

1. In his capacity as Director General of the Legal Service, Michel Petite was involved in the negotiation of the agreement with Philip Morris. The conditions under the agreement shall terminate are set out in Section 11.01 of the cooperation agreement ([1]).

2. No.

3. The contacts between Mr Petite and the Legal Service of the Commission in autumn 2012 were explained on 30 November 2012 in the answers to questions 14 and 15 from amongst the 154 questions with the letter of the President of the CONT Committee dated 21 November 2012.

4. There are no negotiations going on between the Commission and RJ Reynolds.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/cigarette-smugg-2004/agreement_2004.pdf

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000040/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(7 januari 2013)

Betreft: Turkse minister: „Christendom is geen religie meer"

De Turkse minister Bayraktar heeft gesteld dat het christendom niet langer een religie is, maar uitgegroeid zou zijn tot een „cultuur".

Bayraktar: „Er zijn 2,5 miljard christenen ter wereld. Het christendom is niet langer een religie. Het is nu een „cultuur". Zo hoort een religie niet te zijn. Een religie is „onderwijzend"; het is een levenswijze die vrede en geluk brengt." Volgens Bayraktar willen christenen dat ook de islam een „cultuur" wordt.

Hebben de uitspraken van minister Bayraktar gevolgen voor de toetredingsonderhandelingen van de EU met Turkije? Deelt de Commissie de mening dat het anti-christelijke Turkije niet in de EU, met haar christelijke traditie en historie, thuishoort? Is de Commissie derhalve ertoe bereid de toetredingsonderhandelingen met Turkije te verbreken?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(28 februari 2013)

Turkije is een kandidaat-lidstaat die met de EU over toetreding onderhandelt en moet derhalve voor al zijn burgers, ook de christenen, de mensenrechten waarborgen, met inbegrip van het recht op vrijheid van gedachte, geweten en godsdienst, zoals bepaald in het Europees Verdrag tot bescherming van de rechten van de mens en de jurisprudentie van het Europees Hof voor de rechten van de mens. De Commissie volgt de ontwikkelingen van nabij.

De Commissie acht het niet nuttig of gepast om commentaar te geven op elke verklaring die in Turkije wordt afgelegd.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000040/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Turkish Minister: 'Christianity is no longer a religion'

Minister Bayraktar of Turkey has stated that Christianity is no longer a religion but has developed into a 'culture'.

Bayraktar: 'There are 2.5 billion Christians in the world. Christianity is no longer a religion. It's a culture now. But that is not what a religion is like. A religion teaches; it is a form of life that gives one peace and happiness.' According to Bayraktar, Christians also want Islam to become a 'culture'.

Will the statements by Minister Bayraktar have any impact on the EU's accession negotiations with Turkey? Does the Commission agree that Turkey, which is anti-Christian, does not belong in the EU with its Christian tradition and history? Will the Commission therefore break off the accession negotiations with Turkey?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

Turkey, as a country negotiating its accession to the EU, needs to guarantee human rights, including the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, according to the European Convention of Human Rights and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights for all its citizens, including those of Christian faith. The Commission follows developments closely.

The Commission does not deem it necessary or appropriate to comment on each and every statement made in Turkey.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-000041/13
à la Commission
Isabelle Thomas (S&D)
(7 janvier 2013)

Objet: Élaboration du Plan d'action pour la région atlantique

La volonté de la Commission d'élaborer une stratégie pour l'Atlantique en concertation avec les différentes parties prenantes a été approuvée et soutenue avec enthousiasme par tous les partenaires concernés. À cette occasion, de nombreuses remarques et suggestions ont été apportées par les parties prenantes.

À l'instar des propositions de la commission Arc Atlantique ou du Parlement européen, de nombreux acteurs ont mis en avant les points qui leur semblaient essentiels. Parmi ceux-ci figurent notamment le désenclavement des régions atlantiques à travers des investissements prioritaires dans les transports, la mise en œuvre d'une politique industrielle appropriée et une gouvernance de mise en œuvre de cette stratégie.

1. Quelle est la position de la Commission concernant la suite réservée à ces propositions des parties prenantes, à leur priorisation et au rôle des différents acteurs au sein de cette stratégie?

2. En particulier, ces propositions portées par des acteurs politiques, institutionnels ou professionnels seront-elles prises en compte dans le Plan d'action?

3. La Commission peut-elle indiquer le calendrier et les modalités de concertation et de finalisation du plan d'action?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Damanaki au nom de la Commission
(19 février 2013)

1. Dans le cadre du forum de l'Atlantique, la Commission a reçu un certain nombre de contributions des États membres et d'autres parties prenantes. La Commission se félicite de la participation active de toutes les parties prenantes (régions, localités, secteur privé), élément essentiel pour assurer le succès du forum de l'Atlantique et une large acceptation du futur plan d'action.

2. Ces propositions, y compris celles qui ont été faites par la commission Arc Atlantique et le Parlement européen, seront prises en considération en fonction de la valeur ajoutée qu'elles apportent à l'échelle de l'UE, des possibilités offertes en matière de coopération territoriale, des économies d'échelle et des contributions potentielles à la croissance et à la création d'emplois, l'idée étant d'intégrer les plus intéressantes d'entre elles dans le plan d'action.

3. La Commission devrait adopter le plan d'action pour l'Atlantique au cours du deuxième trimestre de 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000041/13
to the Commission
Isabelle Thomas (S&D)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Drawing up the action plan for the Atlantic region

The Commission's plan to draw up a strategy for the Atlantic in cooperation with the parties involved has received the enthusiastic approval and support of all partners concerned. A number of comments and suggestions have been made by the parties involved.

Along the lines of proposals made by the Atlantic Arc Commission and the European Parliament, a number of actors have put forward ideas which they consider crucial. These include, in particular, opening up the Atlantic regions by prioritising investment in transport, implementing a suitable industrial policy and proper governance of the implementation of the strategy.

1. What is the Commission's position regarding the future of these proposals by the parties involved in terms of their prioritisation and the role of the various actors within the strategy?

2. In particular, will the proposals made by political, institutional and professional actors be taken into account in the action plan?

3. Will the Commission state what the timetable and procedures for consultation and finalisation of the action plan will be?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(19 February 2013)

1. In the context of the Atlantic Forum, the Commission has so far received a number of contributions from Member States, as well as from other stakeholders. The Commission welcomes the active involvement of all stakeholders (regions, localities, private sector), which is crucial for the success of the Atlantic Forum and the wide acceptance of the future Action Plan.

2. Proposals — including those made by the Atlantic Arc Commission and the European Parliament — will be duly taken into account based on their EU added value, scope for territorial cooperation and scale effects and potential contribution to growth and jobs with a view to include the most relevant of them in the action plan.

3. The Atlantic Action Plan is due for adoption by the Commission during the second quarter of 2013.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000043/13
aan de Commissie
Emine Bozkurt (S&D)
(7 januari 2013)

Betreft: Gebruik van Europees Sociaal Fonds in Polen

Uit berichtgeving in de Nederlandse media blijkt dat het Europees Sociaal Fonds (ESF) dat bedoeld is voor „het versterken van kennis en vaardigheden van werknemers van ondernemingen, vooral in het midden- en kleinbedrijf" in Polen vooral gebruikt zijn voor grote multinationals als ING, Unilever, Philips, Mercedes Benz, BMW, Renault, Heinz, EDF, Nestlé, Deutsche Bank en Pepsi Cola. Deze bedrijven gebruikten in Polen de miljoenen uit EU-fondsen, bedoeld om werkgelegenheid in arme regio's te stimuleren, o.a. voor cursussen en bijscholing voor managers.

Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat van de ongeveer 300 miljoen euro subsidie uit het ESF die tot nu toe is uitbetaald in Polen, minstens de helft naar scholingen voor beursgenoteerde bedrijven en multinationals is gegaan?

Kan de Commissie aangegeven op welke manier deze miljoenen subsidie heeft bijgedragen aan het bevorderen van de werkgelegenheid in de Europese Unie?

Is de Commissie van mening dat deze bestedingen het kerndoel van de ESF dienen en conform de regels zijn?

Zo nee, is de Commissie van plan stappen richting Polen te ondernemen? En eventueel het geld terug te vorderen?

En is de Commissie van plan om regelgeving te evalueren en indien nodig aan te passen?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(27 februari 2013)

Grote ondernemingen zijn niet van ESF-steun uitgesloten en ze kunnen van alle fondsen gebruikmaken overeenkomstig de intensiteitsplafonds die in de regels inzake staatssteun uit de betreffende wetgeving zijn vastgelegd. Ze vertegenwoordigen slechts 3 % van de 134 000 bedrijven die tot dusver hebben geprofiteerd van het operationele programma menselijk potentieel van het ESF. Voor de periode 2007-2013 bedraagt de totale ESF-toewijzing aan prioriteiten gericht op bedrijfsondersteuning (voornamelijk kmo's) 2 127,67 miljoen euro.

De Commissie kan het bedrag aan subsidies dat vermeendelijk aan de genoemde grote ondernemingen is besteed niet bevestigen. Volgens de Poolse autoriteiten hebben slechts vijf van de genoemde bedrijven contracten afgesloten ter waarde van 4,65 miljoen euro; de overige zes ondernemingen konden niet worden geïdentificeerd als projectbegunstigden.

De cursussen voor de personeelsleden van grote ondernemingen hebben niet alleen bijgedragen aan de succesvolle besteding van buitenlandse investeringen door middel van het aanpakken van lacunes in opleiding en vaardigheden onder Poolse werknemers, maar hebben ook geholpen bij het vergroten van het mobiliteitspotentieel van werknemers en leidinggevenden.

Na de tussentijdse evaluatie van het operationele programma menselijk potentieel in 2010, gericht op de aanpassing van de doelstellingen van het programma aan de veranderende sociaal-economische context, werden de doelstellingen van de steun aan grote ondernemingen herzien. Deze worden gewoonlijk uitgesloten, maar in bijzondere gevallen met betrekking tot herstructureringsprocessen (bijv. outplacement of beroepsheroriëntatie) kan er een beperkte ESF-steun worden verleend.

De lidstaat is verantwoordelijk voor de selectie van projecten overeenkomstig de regels van het gedeeld beheer. De Commissie neemt echter alle noodzakelijke maatregelen om correcte bestedingen in het kader van het ESF te waarborgen. In het geval van onregelmatigheden worden corrigerende maatregelen genomen en wordt de follow-up verzekerd.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000043/13
to the Commission
Emine Bozkurt (S&D)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Use of the European Social Fund in Poland

It has been reported in the Dutch media that, in Poland, the European Social Fund (ESF), which is intended to 'enhance the knowledge and skills of employees of undertakings, particularly SMEs', is mainly being used for such large multinationals as ING, Unilever, Philips, Mercedes Benz, BMW, Renault, Heinz, EDF, Nestlé, Deutsche Bank and Pepsi Cola. In Poland these businesses have received millions from EU funds intended to promote employment in poor regions and used them *inter alia* to pay for courses and in-service training for managers.

Can the Commission confirm that, of the approximately EUR 300 m in subsidies from the ESF which have so far been paid out in Poland, at least half has been spent on training for listed companies and multinationals?

Can the Commission indicate how these millions in subsidies have helped to promote employment in the European Union?

Does the Commission consider that this expenditure serves the principal objective of the ESF and accords with the rules?

If not, will the Commission take action with regard to Poland? Might it demand that the money be refunded?

And does the Commission intend to assess legislation and, if necessary, amend it?

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

Big enterprises are not excluded from ESF assistance and can benefit from all Funds according to intensity ceilings defined by State Aid rules in relevant regulations. They represent only 3% among 134.000 companies which have benefited so far from the ESF Human Capital Operational Programmes (HC OP). The total ESF allocation in priorities dedicated to business support (mainly SMEs) is EUR 2 127.67 million for the 2007-13.

The Commission cannot confirm the amount of subsidies allegedly spent on big companies indicated in the question. According to the Polish authorities only 5 companies among those enumerated, have signed contracts for EUR 4.65 million, while the remaining 6 companies cannot be identified as project beneficiaries.

Training provided to staff of big companies contributed not only to successful instalment of foreign investment through addressing gaps in education and skills among Polish workers, but also helped in improving mobility potential of employees and managers.

Further to the mid-term review of the HC OP in 2010 which aimed at adaptation of the programme's objectives to the changing socioeconomic context, objectives of support to big enterprises were redefined. They are excluded as a general rule, but, in exceptional cases of restructuring processes (i.e. outplacement, vocational reorientation), a punctual ESF assistance may be provided.

According to the rules of shared management, the selection of projects is the responsibility of the Member State. However, the Commission takes all the necessary measures to ensure correct spending of the ESF. In case of irregularity, the corrective measures are introduced and the follow-up assured.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000044/13
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Schmallenberg virus

Following my Written Question (P-002477/2012) to the Commission last March regarding the Schmallenberg outbreak, I would like to ask what further action the Commission has taken to combat the virus, and whether any further inroads have been made in producing a vaccine?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(30 January 2013)

The Commission has closely followed the occurrence and evolution of the Schmallenberg virus (SBV) in order to ensure a coordinated response in the EU, working together with the scientific community and Member States experts.

All available scientific findings confirm that this virus does not affect humans and has a limited impact on animal health.

Nevertheless, the Commission has requested the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) to collect data and provide updates on the epidemiological situation of SBV in the EU. Following this request EFSA issued a series of epidemiological reports ([1]).

The Commission continues to provide information on a regular basis and share the latest scientific data and risk management options with stakeholders, international organisations and third countries.

Moreover, the Commission has earmarked almost EUR 3 million to support scientific studies aiming to gather further information on SBV. 14 projects have been selected based on commonly agreed priorities aiming to fill the SBV knowledge gap in three main areas: pathogenesis, epidemiology, as well as the development of suitable analytical methods allowing large-scale testing.

These ongoing scientific studies are expected to provide the required scientific basis for the possible development of a vaccine.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/sbv.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000046/13
to the Commission
Marian Harkin (ALDE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Good Samaritan law

Can the Commission state whether there are any proposals to introduce guidelines recommending a 'good Samaritan law'-type framework for the EU?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(11 February 2013)

The answer to the question of the Honourable Member is No.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000047/13
to the Commission
Sajjad Karim (ECR)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Dutch diving regulations — recognition of professional qualifications

I understand that the Netherlands has recently changed its laws governing the licensing of commercial divers working for Dutch companies or in Dutch waters. These changes require commercial divers to undertake extensive further training with the Netherlands Diving Centre (NDC) in order to obtain the necessary certificate. This training has been made obligatory, even where the trainee already holds a diving qualification which is recognised throughout the EU.

As of 1 July 2012, Dutch laws NEN EN ISO 17021 and 17024 require all divers holding a certificate awarded in another country to convert their qualification. Therefore, a British citizen in possession of an internationally recognised Health and Safety Executive (HSE) / International Marine Contractors Association certificate must pay thousands of euros in additional training fees in order to obtain the Dutch certificate.

I understand that the roles of diver, diving supervisor and diver medical technician are classed as regulated professions in the EU. It would therefore appear that certificates awarded by the HSE and recognised by the International Marine Contractors Association should indeed be recognised under EU Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications.

I ask the Commission to look into the non-compliance of the Dutch ruling with EC law, as it is inhibiting the movement of fully qualified and competent commercial divers across the free market.

Preliminary answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

On 1 July 2012 the Netherlands changed its regulations applicable to the diving sector and introduced a new system of accreditation and certification based on NEN EN ISO 17021 (system) and 17024 (person) norms.

The recognition of professional qualifications of divers, diving supervisors and divers medical in an intra-EU context is governed by Directive 2005/36/EC ([1]). As a consequence, holders of foreign commercial diver certificates who want to pursue the activity of professional diver in the Netherlands must now have their certificates assessed by a certifying institution so designated by the Dutch Minister of Social Affairs and Labour, i.e. the Netherlands Diving Centre Foundation.

Under the new regulations, holders of commercial diver certificates obtained in another EU or EEA Member State wishing to exercise their profession in the Netherlands have apparently two options. Either they can apply for a Statement of Equivalence (temporary licence) valid for one year or seek a Dutch recognised certificate valid for four years.

Against this background, the Commission services will request further information from the Dutch authorities and thereafter inform the Honourable Member about the follow-up.

Supplementary answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(26 April 2013)

The Commission has sent an information request to the Dutch authorities (EU Pilot 4641/13/MARK). Once the Commission receives a response, the Honourable Member will be informed directly by the Commission services about the findings in the case in issue.

([1]) OJ L 255, 30.9.2005, p. 22.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000048/13
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: EU humanitarian aid to Burma

In his recent visit to Burma in November 2012 the President of the European Commission announced the facilitation of EUR 78 million in development aid to the Burmese Government, headed by President Thein Sein.

It is reported that during his visit Mr Barroso, in conversation with religious leaders, expressed concerns over the religious conflict taking place between the Rohingyas and Buddhist communities in the state of Rakhine, which has caused the displacement of more than 100 000 people. The Rohingyas — who have been denied citizenship rights in Burma since 1982 — are, according to the UN, one of the most persecuted groups in the world.

Did Mr Barroso also raise his concerns over this conflict with Burmese Government officials during his visit?

Furthermore, in light of the persecution taking place against Rohingyas, is the Commission planning to make the aid it provides to the Burmese Government, and any upgrade in trade relations, conditional on the efforts the state makes to resolve the conflict and provide citizenship rights to the Rohingyas?

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

During his visit to the country, President Barroso did indeed refer to a package of development assistance of EUR 150 million allocated for the years 2012 and 2013, to support the peace process, progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and improve livelihoods.

Concerning the inter-ethnic conflict in Rakhine State, President Barroso urged the authorities to stop the violence, provide for secured access for humanitarian assistance and address the root causes of the conflict, including the status of the Rohingya population.

Virtually all of the EU's aid, including that to the Rakhine State, supports the population directly with funds channelled via international organisations and non-governmental organisations to deliver health, education and livelihoods services. In the meetings with the Burmese authorities it was underlined that this aid could only be effective if unimpeded access would be given to humanitarian partners to the all the country's regions.

The EU continues to engage with the authorities and with other stakeholders at all levels to look for long-term solutions to address the underlying causes of the tensions between the different communities in Rakhine State. Although more needs to be done, the EU is encouraged by the Government's first step to examine the issue of citizenship for the Rohingya population.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000049/13
aan de Commissie
Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D)
(7 januari 2013)

Betreft: Mogelijke schending van de regels met betrekking tot het gemeenschappelijk heffingenstelsel voor luchtvaartnavigatiediensten

Het algemene kader van het gemeenschappelijke Europese luchtruim wordt aangevuld met verscheidene uitvoeringsregels, zoals Verordening (EG) nr. 1794/2006 van de Commissie van 6 december 2006 tot vaststelling van een gemeenschappelijk heffingenstelsel voor luchtvaartnavigatiediensten. Het heffingenstelsel dient ertoe doorzichtigheid te garanderen alsook raadpleging over hoe de kosten van de luchtvaartnavigatiediensten zijn berekend en verdeeld onder de verschillende diensten. Ik heb vernomen dat de goedkope luchtvaartmaatschappij Ryanair ten eigen voordele misbruik heeft gemaakt van deze regels.

De „en route"-diensteenheden worden berekend aan de hand van de gevlogen afstand en het gewicht van het desbetreffende vliegtuig. Vermoedelijk heeft Ryanair de waarden voor het gecertificeerde maximale startgewicht van de gebruikte vliegtuigen vervalst. Indien dit het geval is, heeft de luchtvaartmaatschappij miljoenen euro's te weinig betaald voor luchtvaartnavigatiediensten in de EU.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van enig bedrog door Ryanair met betrekking tot het maximale startgewicht? Zo ja, is de Commissie zich ervan bewust welk bedrag hiermee gemoeid is?

2. Heeft de Commissie klachten ontvangen van lidstaten of andere betrokken partijen?

3. Is de Commissie van plan om in deze kwestie juridische of andere stappen te ondernemen tegen Ryanair?

4. Zullen andere luchtvaartmaatschappijen een vergoeding krijgen indien ze via het systeem ter dekking van de kosten te veel hebben betaald doordat een luchtvaartmaatschappij haar aandeel in de kosten ontduikt?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(21 februari 2013)

1. De Commissie is op de hoogte van het door het geachte Parlementslid geschetste probleem. Uit de informatie van het Central Route Charges Office (CRCO) van Eurocontrol, dat namens de Eurocontrol-lidstaten de heffingen int, blijkt dat verschillende luchtvaartmaatschappijen maximale startgewichten (MTOW — maximum take-off weights) hebben opgegeven die in strijd zijn met de geldende regelgeving. In bijlage IV bij Verordening (EG) nr. 1794/2006 van de Commissie tot vaststelling van een gemeenschappelijk heffingenstelsel voor luchtvaartnavigatiediensten is beschreven hoe de factor „gewicht" wordt gebruikt voor de berekening van de „en route"-heffingen.

2. De Commissie heeft hierover geen klachten ontvangen.

3. De Commissie pleegt overleg met het CRCO van Eurcontrol om een beeld te krijgen van de oorzaken en de omvang van het probleem. Zij heeft vernomen dat het CRCO op dit moment de MTOW-gegevens in de vlootaangiftes van alle maatschappijen analyseert.

Binnen de EU dienen de lidstaten erop toe te zien dat het heffingsstelsel volledig en correct wordt toegepast. De Commissie vindt het belangrijk dat de concurrentievoorwaarden voor alle gebruikers van het luchtruim identiek zijn. Zij zal het probleem onder de aandacht van de lidstaten brengen en hen verzoeken erop toe te zien dat aan het CRCO correcte MTOW-waarden worden meegedeeld.

4. Het bevoegde comité van Eurocontrol bespreekt in maart het probleem van de door sommige gebruikers te weinig betaalde bedragen. De lidstaten worden verzocht binnen het gemeenschappelijk stelsel van „en route"-heffingen oplossingen te zoeken. Op basis van de resultaten van dit proces zal de Commissie bekijken of verdere maatregelen op EU-niveau nodig zijn.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000049/13
to the Commission
Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Possible breach of rules concerning the common charging scheme for air navigation services

The general framework of the Single European Sky is supplemented by several implementing rules, such as Commission Regulation (EC) No 1794/2006 of 6 December 2006 laying down a common charging scheme for air navigation services. The charging scheme is designed to ensure transparency and consultation on how costs for providing air navigation services are calculated and split between the various services. It has come to my attention that the low-cost airline Ryanair has misused these rules to its advantage.

The en-route service unit is calculated on the basis of the route distance and the weight of the aircraft concerned. Ryanair seems to have falsified the maximum certificated take-off weights of the aircraft used. If so, the airline has underpaid for air navigation services across the EU by several million euros.

1. Is the Commission aware of any deception by Ryanair concerning maximum take-off weights? If so, does the Commission know how much money is involved?

2. Has the Commission received any complaints from Member States or from other parties involved?

3. Does the Commission plan to take any action, legal or other, towards Ryanair regarding this issue?

4. Will other airlines be compensated for having overpaid through the cost recovery system as a result of one airline evading its share of fees?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(21 February 2013)

1. The Commission is aware of the situation described by the Honourable Member. Based on information received from Eurocontrol's Central Route Charges Office (CRCO), which has the responsibility to collect charges on behalf of Eurocontrol's Member States, it seems that several airlines would have declared maximum take-off weights (MTOW) values which are not consistent with the applicable rules. Annex IV of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1794/2006 laying down a common charging scheme for air navigation services describes how the weight factor value is used with respect to the calculation of route charges.

2. The Commission has not received any complaint.

3. The Commission is in contact with Eurocontrol's CRCO to understand the size of the problem and its cause. The Commission is informed that the CRCO is currently reviewing the fleet declaration of all airlines with respect to provision of MTOW data.

Within the EU, it is the responsibility of Member States to ensure the full and correct implementation of the charging scheme. For the Commission it is important that a level playing field between airspace users is guaranteed. It will draw the issue to the attention of Member States and invite them to make sure that the correct values of MTOW are communicated to the CRCO.

4. The matter of underpayment by certain users is on the agenda of the relevant Committee of Eurocontrol in March. Member States are invited to find a solution within the route charges system. Depending on the outcome of this process, the Commission will assess the need for further action within the EU.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000050/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(7 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ανησυχίες λόγω συγκέντρωσης αρσενικού σε μετάλλευμα σε σχεδιαζόμενη εξόρυξη στο Κρούμοβγκραντ της Βουλγαρίας

Η βουλγαρική κυβέρνηση χορήγησε παραχώρηση εκμετάλλευσης για 30 έτη στην Dundee Precious Metals, μια εταιρεία με έδρα τον Καναδά, και στη θυγατρική της στη Βουλγαρία Balkan Minerals and Mining, για εξόρυξη χρυσού στο Αντά Τεπέ, κοντά στο Κρούμοβγκραντ. Η παραχώρηση εκμετάλλευσης χορηγήθηκε χωρίς εκτίμηση περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων και χωρίς εκτίμηση της συμμόρφωσης του σχεδιαζόμενου χρυσωρυχείου με την οδηγία για τους οικότοπους, γεγονός που συνιστά παραβίαση του δικαίου της ΕΕ. Έπειτα, τον Νοέμβριο του 2011, το βουλγαρικό Υπουργείο Περιβάλλοντος και Υδάτων ενέκρινε την ΕΠΕ για εξόρυξη χρυσού στο Αντά Τεπέ του Κρούμοβγκραντ, παρά την έντονη αντίθεση της τοπικής κοινότητας. Οι δοκιμές της εταιρείας έχουν δείξει ότι το μετάλλευμα στο Κρούμοβγκραντ περιέχει ιδιαίτερα υψηλά επίπεδα αρσενικού. Βουλγαρικές περιβαλλοντικές ΜΚΟ έχουν υποβάλει καταγγελίες στο Ανώτατο Διοικητικό Δικαστήριο κατά της ΕΠΕ. Απαντώντας σε ερωτήσεις των ΜΚΟ, οι δικαστικοί πραγματογνώμονες δήλωσαν ότι «το μεγαλύτερο μέρος» των 1 057 τόνων αρσενικού που περιέχεται στο μετάλλευμα που σχεδιάζεται να εξορυχθεί θα παραμείνει στο εμπλουτισμένο μετάλλευμα μετά τη διαδικασία επίπλευσης. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι οι δικαστικοί πραγματογνώμονες συμφωνούν ότι το εν λόγω εμπλουτισμένο μετάλλευμα θα περιέχει πάνω από 528 τόνους αρσενικού, αλλά η ΕΠΕ δεν απαντά στο ερώτημα πού και πώς θα πραγματοποιηθεί η επεξεργασία προκειμένου να εξαχθεί ο χρυσός και να διαχωριστεί το αρσενικό, πώς θα πραγματοποιηθεί η μεταφορά στον τόπο επεξεργασίας και ποια θα είναι η διαχείριση των αποβλήτων που περιέχουν αρσενικό.

1. Απαντώντας σε γραπτή ερώτηση του βουλευτή του ΕΚ Μιχάλη Τρεμόπουλου (Πράσινοι/ΕΕΣ) σχετικά με την υπόθεση αυτή (E-012211/2011), η Επιτροπή δήλωση ότι «διερευνά επί του παρόντος» το σχέδιο για το κοίτασμα χρυσού «Χαν Κρουμ» και την ορθή εφαρμογή της σχετικής περιβαλλοντικής νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ. Ποια είναι τα αποτελέσματα της έρευνας αυτής;

2. Ποια μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει η Επιτροπή σχετικά με αυτές τις παραβάσεις της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ από τις βουλγαρικές αρχές, λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τις ελλείψεις της ΕΠΕ και το γεγονός ότι δεν παρέχει επαρκείς απαντήσεις σχετικά με τη διαχείριση του αρσενικού και των αποβλήτων;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(20 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή απηύθυνε δύο φορές αιτήσεις παροχής πληροφοριών στις βουλγαρικές αρχές όσον αφορά το έργο για το κοίτασμα χρυσού Khan Krum και την ορθή εφαρμογή της σχετικής περιβαλλοντικής νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ.

Αν και αληθεύει ότι η κυβερνητική απόφαση για τη παραχώρηση μεταλλευτικών δικαιωμάτων εκδόθηκε πριν από την απόφαση για την εκτίμηση περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων (ΕΠΕ), ρητή διάταξη στην απόφαση παραχώρησης ορίζει ότι αυτή θα αρχίσει να παράγει αποτελέσματα κατά την ημερομηνία έναρξης ισχύος θετικής απόφασης ΕΠΕ, έπειτα από, μεταξύ άλλων, κατάλληλη εκτίμηση των επιπτώσεων στην περιοχή που προστατεύεται δυνάμει της οδηγίας για τους οικοτόπους ([1]).

Το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου γνωρίζει ότι υποβλήθηκε αίτηση αναίρεσης στα βουλγαρικά δικαστήρια κατά της θετικής απόφασης ΕΠΕ που εξέδωσε το Υπουργείο Περιβάλλοντος και Υδάτων. Το Πρωτοδικείο επικύρωσε την απόφαση ΕΠΕ, αλλά η απόφασή του προσβλήθηκε ενώπιον ανώτερου δικαστηρίου το οποίο δεν έχει ακόμη αποφανθεί. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι στην ουσία δεν υφίσταται επί του παρόντος απόφαση ΕΠΕ και ότι, επομένως, η απόφαση παραχώρησης δεν ισχύει ακόμη.

Μεγάλο μέρος των πληροφοριών σχετικά με τα ειδικά τεχνικά ζητήματα του έργου λήφθηκε κατά την πρώτη εβδομάδα του Ιανουαρίου 2013 και βρίσκεται ακόμη υπό εξέταση από την Επιτροπή. Θα αναληφθεί ενδεχομένως δράση για να δοθεί συνέχεια στην υπόθεση.

([1]) ΕΕ L 206 της 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000050/13
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Concerns due to arsenic concentrations in ore that is planned to be extracted at Krumovgrad, Bulgaria

The Bulgarian Government has granted a 30-year concession to Dundee Precious Metals, a Canadian-based company and to its Bulgarian branch, Balkan Minerals and Mining, for extraction of gold at Ada Tepe, near Krumovgrad. The concession was granted without an environmental impact assessment (EIA) and without any assessment of the planned gold mine's compliance with the Habitats Directive, a fact which constitutes a violation of EC law. Subsequently, in November 2011, the Bulgarian Ministry of Environment and Water approved the EIA for gold mining at Ada Tepe, Krumovgrad, despite serious opposition from the local community. Company testing has shown that the Krumovgrad ore contains very high levels of arsenic. Bulgarian environmental NGOs have lodged complaints with the High Administrative Court against the EIA. Answering questions from the NGOs, court experts stated that 'the greater part' of the 1 057 tonnes of arsenic contained in the ore planned for extraction will stay in the concentrate after the flotation process. This means that the court experts agree that this concentrate will contain more than 528 tonnes of arsenic, but the EIA does not provide any answer as to where and how it will be treated in order to extract the gold and separate the arsenic, how it will be transported to the place of treatment and where and how the arsenic-containing wastes will be kept.

1. In answer to a written question from Michail Tremopoulos MEP (Greens/EFA) on this case (E-012211/2011), the Commission stated that it is 'currently investigating' the project for the Khan Krum gold deposit and the proper implementation of the relevant EU environmental legislation. What are the results of this investigation?

2. What measures will be undertaken by the Commission regarding these breaches of EU legislation by the Bulgarian authorities, taking into account that the EIA is insufficient and does not provide adequate answers concerning the management of arsenic and waste?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2013)

The Commission has twice sent requests for information on the Khan Krum gold deposit project and the proper implementation of the relevant EU environment legislation to the Bulgarian authorities.

While it is correct that the concession-granting Government decision was issued before the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) decision, there is an explicit provision in the concession decision, which states that it shall take effect on the date of entry into force of a positive EIA decision following, *inter alia*, an appropriate assessment of effects on the area protected under the Habitats Directive ([1]).

The Honourable Member is aware that the positive EIA decision issued by the Minister of Environment and Water has been appealed to the Bulgarian courts. The court of first instance upheld the EIA decision, but this was appealed to a higher court, which has not yet decided on the case. This means that there is currently no effective EIA decision and that the concession decision is therefore not yet in force.

A large part of the information on the specific technical issues of the project was received in the first week of January 2013 and is still being assessed by the Commission. Follow-up action will be taken as appropriate.

([1]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000051/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(7 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Παράνομη χορήγηση παραχώρησης εκμετάλλευσης χωρίς πρόσκληση υποβολής προσφορών ή εκτίμηση περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων στο Κρούμοβγκραντ της Βουλγαρίας

Η βουλγαρική κυβέρνηση χορήγησε παραχώρηση εκμετάλλευσης για 30 έτη στην Dundee Precious Metals, μια εταιρεία με έδρα τον Καναδά, και στη θυγατρική της στη Βουλγαρία Balkan Minerals and Mining, για εξόρυξη χρυσού στο Αντά Τεπέ, κοντά στο Κρούμοβγκραντ.

Η παραχώρηση εκμετάλλευσης χορηγήθηκε χωρίς εκτίμηση περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων και χωρίς εκτίμηση της συμμόρφωσης του σχεδιαζόμενου χρυσωρυχείου με την οδηγία για τους οικότοπους.

Ο δήμος του Κρούμοβγκραντ και βουλγαρικές περιβαλλοντικές ΜΚΟ υπέβαλαν καταγγελίες στο Ανώτατο Διοικητικό Δικαστήριο κατά της παράνομης χορήγησης παραχώρησης. Το δικαστήριο αποφάσισε ότι ο δήμος και οι ΜΚΟ δεν έχουν δικαίωμα υποβολής καταγγελιών, και ότι μόνο ο εισαγγελέας έχει το δικαίωμα αυτό. Βάσει αυτού του «επιχειρήματος» το δικαστήριο απέρριψε τις καταγγελίες.

Επιπλέον, η παραχώρηση εκμετάλλευσης χορηγήθηκε από τη βουλγαρική κυβέρνηση χωρίς πρόσκληση υποβολής προσφορών, παρά το γεγονός ότι η ύπαρξη μεταλλευμάτων χρυσού στο Αντά Τεπέ ήταν γνωστή εδώ και 3 000 χρόνια, και τα μεταλλεύματα αυτά ανακαλύφθηκαν ξανά από αρχαιολόγους. Δεν υπάρχουν ενδείξεις ότι τα ανακάλυψε πρώτη η Dundee.

1. Συμφωνεί η Επιτροπή ότι στην περίπτωση αυτή παρασχέθηκε μη ελεγχόμενη κρατική ενίσχυση στην εν λόγω εταιρεία;

2. Συμφωνεί η Επιτροπή ότι υπήρξαν πολλές παραβάσεις της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ σχετικά με τις συμβάσεις παραχώρησης, τις μελέτες περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων και τις κρατικές ενισχύσεις; Αν ναι, ποια μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει;

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Μαρτίου 2013)

1. Καταρχήν, όταν το Δημόσιο πωλεί ή παρέχει το συμβατικό δικαίωμα χρήσης ενός περιουσιακού στοιχείου σε τιμή χαμηλότερη της αγοραίας αξίας, η πράξη αυτή ενέχει πλεονέκτημα υπέρ του αγοραστή, γεγονός το οποίο συνιστά, ενδεχομένως, κρατική ενίσχυση. Αντίθετα, όταν ένα περιουσιακό στοιχείο πωλείται ή παραχωρείται κατόπιν ανοικτού, διαφανούς και άνευ διακρίσεων διαγωνισμού, ή, ελλείψει διαδικασίας ανοικτού, διαφανούς και άνευ διακρίσεων διαγωνισμού, όταν πωλείται μέσω απευθείας πώλησης, όπου η τιμή και οι όροι καθορίζονται με βάση μια αξιόπιστη, ανεξάρτητη αποτίμηση, η κρατική ενίσχυση μπορεί καταρχήν να αποκλειστεί.

2. Με βάση τις πληροφορίες που υπέβαλε το Αξιότιμο Μέλος, δεν είναι δυνατόν να κριθεί κατά πόσον έγιναν παραβιάσεις της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ.

Σχετικά με την εικαζόμενη παραβίαση της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ για τις αξιολογήσεις των περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων, το θέμα καλύπτεται ήδη από την απάντηση της Επιτροπής στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-50/13 ([1]) που αφορούσε την αξιολόγηση των περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων για το ίδιο έργο.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000051/13
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Illegally granted mining concession without tender or environmental impact assessment at Krumovgrad, Bulgaria

The Bulgarian Government has granted a concession for 30 years to Dundee Precious Metals, a Canadian-based company, and to its Bulgarian branch Balkan Minerals and Mining, for extraction of gold at Ada Tepe, near Krumovgrad.

The concession has been granted without an environmental impact assessment and without assessment of the planned gold mine for compliance with the Habitats Directive.

The municipality of Krumovgrad and Bulgarian environmental NGOs lodged complaints with the Supreme Administrative Court against the illegal granting of the concession. The court decided that the municipality and the NGOs do not have the right to lodge such complaints with it and that only the public prosecutor has this right. Based on this 'argument' the court rejected the complaints.

Furthermore, the mining concession was granted by the Bulgarian Government without a tender, despite the fact that the existence of gold ore in Ada Tepe has been known about for 3 000 years, and was rediscovered by archaeologists. There is no evidence that Dundee discovered it first.

1. Does the Commission agree that in this case there has been unregulated state aid to this company?

2. Does the Commission agree that there have been several breaches of the EU legislation on concessions, environmental impact assessments and state aid? If so, what measures will it take?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2013)

1. In principle, where the State sells or grants the contractual right of use of an asset at a price below market value, this entails an advantage to the buyer which may constitute state aid. Conversely, when an asset is sold or conceded following an open, transparent and non-discriminatory tender, or, in the absence of an open, transparent and non-discriminatory tender, when it is sold through a direct sale where the price and terms are determined on the basis of a reliable independent valuation, State aid can in principle be excluded.

2. On the basis of the information submitted by the Honourable Member, it is not possible to comment whether breaches of EU legislation have taken place.

Regarding the alleged breach of EU legislation on environmental impact assessments, the issue is already covered by the Commission's reply to Written Question E-50/13 ([1]) which concerned the environmental impact assessment of the same project.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000052/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(7 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ρύπανση από εγκαταστάσεις εξόρυξης στη Βουλγαρία

Υπάρχουν τρεις εγκαταλελειμμένες δεξαμενές υγρών αποβλήτων στο κλειστό ορυχείο μόλυβδου και ψευδάργυρου του Οσόγκοβο κοντά στο Κιουστεντίλ της Βουλγαρίας. Ο τοπικός πληθυσμός αναφέρει υψηλή συχνότητα εμφάνισης καρκίνου στην περιοχή. Μια άλλη εγκαταλελειμμένη εγκατάσταση εξόρυξης είναι η δεξαμενή υγρών αποβλήτων του μεταλλουργείου Κρεμίκοβτσι κοντά στη Σόφια. Οι κάτοικοι διαμαρτύρονται για οφθαλμικές παθήσεις οι οποίες, όπως αναφέρουν, οφείλονται στα βαρέα μέταλλα που μεταφέρουν οι άνεμοι από τη δεξαμενή υγρών αποβλήτων. Ο ποταμός Μεντέτσκα (ή Μπουκόβιτσα) στην οροσειρά Σρέντνα Γκόρα ρέει δίπλα από τις εγκαταστάσεις αποβλήτων του κλειστού κρατικού ορυχείου χαλκού MOK Medet. Έχει καταγραφεί και αναφερθεί η διαρροή ρυπογόνων ουσιών — χαλκού και μαγγανίου — από το κλειστό ορυχείο στον ποταμό. Τα μέταλλα αυτά αποτελούν κίνδυνο για τη βιοποικιλότητα του ποταμού και τη δημόσια υγεία. Επιπλέον, σύμφωνα με τοπικά δημοσιεύματα άλλα δύο εγκαταλελειμμένα ορυχεία (Οτέτσεστβο και Ιζντρεμέτς, και τα δύο κοντά στη Σόφια), ρυπαίνουν το πόσιμο νερό που χρησιμοποιεί ο τοπικός πληθυσμός. Υπάρχει επίσης ένα συνεχιζόμενο πρόβλημα με τη μόλυνση του ποταμού Μάλακ Ίσκαρ από την εταιρεία εξόρυξης χαλκού «Elazite Med» στη Βουλγαρία.

1. Γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή αν η κυβέρνηση της Βουλγαρίας έχει προγραμματίσει τη λήψη συγκεκριμένων μέτρων προκειμένου να αποτραπεί η επιβάρυνση της υγείας των τοπικών πληθυσμών;

2. Ποια μέτρα εξετάζει η Επιτροπή προκειμένου να διασφαλίσει τη συμμόρφωση της βουλγαρικής κυβέρνησης με τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ (ιδίως με την οδηγία 2006/21/ΕΚ σχετικά με τη διαχείριση των αποβλήτων της εξορυκτικής βιομηχανίας);

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(1 Μαρτίου 2013)

1. Η Επιτροπή δεν γνωρίζει κατά πόσον η κυβέρνηση της Βουλγαρίας έχει προγραμματίσει συγκεκριμένα μέτρα πρόληψης των κινδύνων για την ανθρώπινη υγεία στις τοποθεσίες των εγκαταλελειμμένων ορυχείων που αναφέρει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου.

2. Σύμφωνα με την οδηγία σχετικά με τη διαχείριση των αποβλήτων της εξορυκτικής βιομηχανίας ([1]), τα κράτη μέλη οφείλουν «να λαμβάνουν τα απαραίτητα μέτρα για να διασφαλίζεται ότι η διαχείριση των εξορυκτικών αποβλήτων γίνεται με τρόπο που δεν θέτει σε κίνδυνο την ανθρώπινη υγεία». Ως εκ τούτου, η Επιτροπή ζήτησε από τις βουλγαρικές αρχές συμπληρωματικές πληροφορίες σχετικά με τις προθέσεις της στην εν λόγω υπόθεση.

([1]) Οδηγία 2006/21/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 15ης Μαρτίου 2006, σχετικά με τη διαχείριση των αποβλήτων της εξορυκτικής βιομηχανίας και την τροποποίηση της οδηγίας 2004/35/ΕΚ, ΕΕ L 102 της 11.4.2006, σ. 15.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000052/13
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Pollution from mining facilities in Bulgaria

There are three abandoned tailing ponds at the closed Osogovo lead and zinc mine near the town of Kyustendil in Bulgaria. Local people report a high incidence of cancer in the area. Another abandoned mining facility is the tailing pond of the Kremikovzi smelter near Sofia. Local residents complain of eye ailments reportedly caused by heavy metals brought by winds from the tailing pond. The river Medetska (or Bukovitza) in the Sredna Gora mountains flows past the waste facilities of the closed, state-owned MOK Medet copper mine. Pollutants in the form of copper and manganese leaking into the river from the closed mine have been recorded and reported. These metals represent a danger to river biodiversity and to public health. Furthermore, according to local reports two other abandoned mines (Otechestvo and Izdremez, both near Sofia), are polluting the drinking water used by the local population. There is also an ongoing problem with pollution of the river Malak Iskar by the Elazite Med copper mining company in Bulgaria.

1. Does the Commission know if the Government of Bulgaria has planned any concrete measures to prevent damage to the health of the people living in these areas?

2. What measures is the Commission considering to ensure that the Bulgarian Government complies with EU legislation (notably Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of waste from the extractive industries)?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(1 March 2013)

1. The Commission is not aware of specific measures planned by the Government of Bulgaria to prevent risks to human health at the location of the abandoned mining sites mentioned by the Honourable Member.

2. According to the directive on the management of waste from extractive industries ([1]), Member States are required 'to take the necessary measures to ensure that extractive waste is managed without endangering human health'. Therefore the Commission has asked the Bulgarian authorities for additional information on their intentions in this case.

([1]) Directive 2006/21/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2006 on the management of waste from extractive industries and amending Directive 2004/35/EC, OJ L 102, 11.4.2006, p.15.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000053/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(7 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Μόλυνση με αρσενικό από βιομηχανία εξόρυξης μετάλλων στην τεχνητή λίμνη Topolnitsa στη Βουλγαρία

Η Topolnitsa είναι ένας υδατοταμιευτήρας στο όρος Sredna Gora, στη δυτική Βουλγαρία. Η κατασκευή του ύψους 78 μέτρων φράγματος στον ποταμό Topolnitsa τελείωσε το 1963. Ο μέγιστος όγκος ανέρχεται σε 137 000 000 m^3. Οι λεκάνες απορροής του φράγματος είναι 1 381 km^2. Κύριος σκοπός του φράγματος ήταν η άρδευση γεωργικών εκτάσεων της Άνω Θρακικής Πεδιάδας, αλλά μετά την κατασκευή του σημειώθηκε ρύπανση με αρσενικό, χαλκό και άλλα βαρέα μέταλλα, συνέπεια των ορυχείων χρυσού και χαλκού και του χυτηρίου που βρίσκονται στη λεκάνη απορροής του.

Το 2008, σύμφωνα με μια μελέτη του βουλγαρικού Εθνικού Κέντρου για την Προστασία της Δημόσιας Υγείας, η συγκέντρωση αρσενικού στα νερά του ποταμού Topolnitsa στην πόλη Koprivshtitza (λίγο πριν από τα ορυχεία και το χυτήριο) ήταν 0,25 μικρογραμμάρια ανά λίτρο, στο χωριό Poibrene (ακριβώς πριν το ταμιευτήρα) ήταν 14,0 μικρογραμμάρια ανά λίτρο, στο δε τοίχωμα του ταμιευτήρα 24,00 μικρογραμμάρια ανά λίτρο. Το 2009, η ευρωβουλευτής Dushana Zdravkova διοργάνωσε δημόσια ακρόαση σχετικά με το πρόβλημα και σε απάντηση το βουλγαρικό Υπουργείο Περιβάλλοντος και Υδάτων υποσχέθηκε να λάβει μέτρα για την πρόληψη της μόλυνσης μέσω του ελέγχου των ιδιωτικών επιχειρήσεων εξόρυξης μεταλλευμάτων και του χυτηρίου που λειτουργούν στην περιοχή της λεκάνης, καθώς και για τον καθαρισμό του υδατοταμιευτήρα από ιζήματα αρσενικού, κάνοντας επενδύσεις για τη λήψη μέτρων καθαρισμού. Μέχρι σήμερα κανένα από τα μέτρα αυτά δεν τέθηκαν σε εφαρμογή και δεν έχουν επενδυθεί ούτε εθνικά κεφάλαια ούτε κεφάλαια της ΕΕ για το σκοπό αυτό. Τα ύδατα της τεχνητής λίμνης χρησιμοποιούνται για την άρδευση γεωργικών εκτάσεων της Άνω Θρακικής Πεδιάδας και ρέουν από τους ποταμούς Topolnitsa και Maritsa στην Ελλάδα και την Τουρκία.

Ποια μέτρα θα λάβει η Επιτροπή για να σταματήσει και να αποτρέψει τη ζημία της δημόσιας υγείας των πολιτών της Βουλγαρίας, της Ελλάδας και της Τουρκίας;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(1 Μαρτίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή δεν ήταν ενήμερη για τη δημόσια ακρόαση, ούτε για τις υποσχέσεις του βουλγαρικού Υπουργείου Περιβάλλοντος και Υδάτων. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή έχει λάβει και άλλες πληροφορίες σχετικά με την εικαζόμενη μόλυνση της λεκάνης απορροής του ποταμού Topolnitsa από τη βιομηχανία εξόρυξης και επεξεργασίας μετάλλων στην περιοχή.

Για τον λόγο αυτό, η Επιτροπή επικοινώνησε με τις βουλγαρικές αρχές, ζητώντας πληροφορίες όσον αφορά τις πιθανές πηγές μόλυνσης του ποταμού αφενός, και την ορθή εφαρμογή της σχετικής περιβαλλοντικής νομοθεσίας, αφετέρου.

Μόλις λάβει την απάντηση των βουλγαρικών αρχών, θα την αξιολογήσει και θα προβεί στις απαιτούμενες ενέργειες, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της ενδεχόμενης διαβούλευσης με τις αρχές που είναι αρμόδιες για τη δημόσια υγεία στα κράτη μέλη, αν κριθεί ότι πρόκειται για σοβαρή διασυνοριακή απειλή κατά της υγείας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000053/13
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Arsenic contamination of Topolnitsa reservoir (Bulgaria) by the mining industry

Topolnitsa is a reservoir in the Sredna Gora mountain range, in western Bulgaria. Construction of the 78 metre high dam on the Topolnitsa River was finished in 1963. The dam has a maximum volume of 137 million cubic metres.and a catchment area of 1 381 km^2. The main purpose of the dam was to irrigate agricultural lands in the Upper Thracian plain, but it was polluted after construction with arsenic, copper and other heavy metals from the gold and copper mines and smelter located in its catchment area.

In 2008, according to a study by the Bulgarian National Centre for the Protection of Public Health, the concentration of arsenic in the waters of the Topolnitsa River at the town of Koprivshtitza (just upstream from the mines and the smelter) was 0.25 microgrammess per litre, while at the village of Poibrene (just before the reservoir) it was 14.0 microgrammes per litre, and in the reservoir wall 24.00 microgrammes per litre. In 2009, MEP Dushana Zdravkova organised a public hearing on the problem. In response, the Bulgarian Ministry of Environment and Water promised to take steps to prevent contamination by controlling the private mining companies and the smelter operating in the catchment area and to remove the arsenic sediment from the reservoir through investing in clean-up measures. So far, none of these measures have been implemented, nor have any national or EU funds been allocated for the purpose. Water from the reservoir is used to irrigate agricultural lands in the Upper Thracian plain and flows through the Topolnitsa and Maritsa rivers to Greece and Turkey.

What steps will the Commission take to stop and to prevent harm being caused to the public health of Bulgarian, Greek and Turkish citizens?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(1 March 2013)

The Commission was not aware of the public hearing, nor of the actions promised by the Bulgarian Ministry of Environment and Water. However, the Commission has received other information about the alleged contamination of the Topolnitsa river basin by the mining and processing industry in the region.

The Commission has therefore contacted the Bulgarian authorities requesting information both on the possible sources of contamination of the river and the proper implementation of the relevant environmental law.

As soon as the answer is received, it will be assessed and actions taken as appropriate, including possible consultation with the public health authorities in Member States if the event will be defined as a serious cross-border threat to health.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000055/13
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(7 stycznia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Kolejne śledztwa przeciwko rosyjskiemu opozycjoniście

24 grudnia 2012 r. Komitet Śledczy Federacji Rosyjskiej wszczął kolejne śledztwo przeciwko jednemu z liderów opozycji Aleksiejowi Nawalnemu. Należącej do Nawalnego firmie Ałłekt, zarzuca się zagarnięcie 100 mln rubli na szkodę partii Sojusz Sił Prawicy.

Jest to już co najmniej trzecie dochodzenie, które Komitet Śledczy prowadzi przeciwko Nawalnemu. 20 grudnia postawił on opozycjoniście zarzuty oszustw finansowych i prania pieniędzy. Aleksiej Nawalny i jego brat Oleg są podejrzani o zagarnięcie 55 mln rubli należących do jednej z zachodnich firm kurierskich.

Natomiast w lipcu Komitet Śledczy przedstawił opozycjoniście zarzut spowodowania strat materialnych w przedsiębiorstwie Kirowles, gdzie w swoim czasie Nawalny był społecznym doradcą gubernatora Nikity Biełycha. Ponadto podejrzewa się go, że jako doradca Biełycha może mieć związek ze sprzedażą po zaniżonej cenie jednej z gorzelni w obwodzie kirowskim. Dochodzenie w tej sprawie Komitet Śledczy wszczął 18 grudnia.

Niewątpliwie sprawy seryjnie wszczynane przeciwko Nawalnemu mają charakter polityczny. Demaskator skorumpowanych urzędników i lider rosyjskiej opozycji stał się w ocenie Kremla groźnym przeciwnikiem, którego należy osłabić, zniszczyć jego reputację i wyeliminować go z gry politycznej.

W związku z tymi doniesieniami zwracam się z zapytaniem, czy Komisja ma zamiar podjąć interwencję w sprawie kolejnych śledztw wszczynanych przeciwko Aleksiejowi Nawalnemu i wyrazić zdecydowany sprzeciw wobec prześladowania tego lidera rosyjskiej opozycji?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(2 maja 2013 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca jest poinformowana o postępowaniach wszczętych przeciwko działaczowi antykorupcyjnemu Aleksiejowi Nawalnemu. W oświadczeniu wydanym 12 czerwca 2012 r. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca wyraziła zaniepokojenie próbami zastraszania przywódców protestu oraz uniemożliwiania im uczestnictwa w protestach, o których wspomina szanowny Pan Poseł. W kolejnych oświadczeniach Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca podkreśliła, że ostatnie nasilenie się politycznie umotywowanego zastraszania oraz prześladowania działaczy opozycyjnych w Federacji Rosyjskiej jest źródłem poważnego i rosnącego niepokoju UE. Ostatnie wydarzenia w sferze politycznej i zmiany ustawodawcze w Federacji Rosyjskiej były jednym z priorytetów szczytu UE-Rosja, który odbył się 21 grudnia 2012 r. Były one także szczegółowo omówione podczas najnowszej rundy konsultacji między UE a Rosją w dziedzinie praw człowieka, 7 grudnia 2012 r. Europejska Służba Działań Zewnętrznych będzie w dalszym ciągu uważnie śledzić tę oraz pozostałe kwestie, zarówno w głównej siedzibie, jak i za pośrednictwem delegatury UE w Moskwie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000055/13
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Investigation into Russian opposition activist

On 24 December 2012, the Investigative Committee of the Russian Federation launched the latest in a number of investigations into opposition leader Alexey Navalny. Allekt, a company owned by Navalny, is accused of defrauding the 'Union of Rightist Forces' party of RUB 100 million.

The Investigative Committee is now conducting at least three investigations into Navalny. On 20 December 2012, it accused him of embezzlement and money laundering. Alexey and his brother Oleg are suspected of having defrauded RUB 55 million from a western courier company.

Furthermore, in July 2012, the Investigative Committee accused the opposition activist of causing material losses to the KirovLes company, which is based in the Kirov Oblast, where Navalny had once served as social advisor to the Governor, Nikita Belykh. He is also suspected of having been involved in the sale at reduced price of a distillery in the Kirov Oblast while acting as advisor to Governor Belykh. An investigation into this matter was launched by the Investigative Committee on 18 December 2012.

There can be no doubt that this series of cases brought against Navalny has a political character. As a whistle-blower on corrupt officials and the leader of the Russian opposition, he has become a dangerous opponent in the Kremlin's eyes, and as such he must be weakened, removed from the political arena, and his reputation destroyed.

Given the above, does the Commission intend to make representations concerning the series of investigations brought against Alexey Navalny and express its opposition to the persecution of this Russian opposition leader?

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

The HR/VP is well aware of the cases opened against the anti-corruption activist Alexey Navalny. As HR/VP noted in her statement issued on 12 June 2012, she was concerned about the attempts to intimidate protest leaders and prevent them from taking part in the protests the Honourable Member was referring to. In her later statements the HR/VP stressed that the recent upsurge in politically motivated intimidation and prosecution of opposition activists in the Russian Federation was of serious and growing concern to the EU. The recent political and legislative developments in the Russian Federation were high on the agenda of the EU-Russia Summit, which took place on 21 December, 2012. They were also addressed in detail at the most recent round of the EU-Russia human rights consultations, which took place on 7 December 2012. The European External Action Service will keep on following these and other cases closely, both from Headquarters as well as via the EU Delegation in Moscow.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000056/13
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(7 stycznia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Zatrudnienie na stanowiskach kierowniczych w unijnych instytucjach

Według doniesień medialnych, w instytucjach Unii Europejskiej nie jest zachowana równowaga geograficzna przy obsadzaniu stanowisk kierowniczych. Przykładowo na szczeblach od AD9 do AD11 jest zatrudnionych 46 Polaków i 272 Hiszpanów (pomimo że Hiszpanię zamieszkuje 47 milionów ludzi, a Polskę tylko 9 milionów mniej). Na wyższych szczeblach (dyrektorskich) Polaków jest 38, zaś Francuzów 650, Niemców 591, Włochów 528, Hiszpanów 468, a Brytyjczyków 438.

Z informacji medialnych wynika również, że rzecznik komisarza Maroša Šefčoviča, który nadzoruje sprawy administracyjne i kadrowe w Komisji Europejskiej, odmówił podania szczegółowych danych dotyczących tego, ilu Polaków sprawuje funkcje kierownicze w unijnych urzędach.

W związku z tym pragnę zapytać:

1. Jak wygląda rozkład narodowościowy na stanowiskach kierowniczych w instytucjach w randze kierowników działów, dyrektorów i dyrektorów generalnych? Proszę Komisję o podanie konkretnych danych liczbowych.

2. Jakie są przyczyny dużych dysproporcji w obsadzie stanowisk kierowniczych – pod kątem klucza geograficznego?

3. Czy Komisja zamierza podjąć działania zmierzające do zmniejszenia dysproporcji liczbowej przedstawicieli krajów członkowskich podczas doboru na stanowiska kierownicze w instytucjach europejskich? Jeśli tak – jakie to będą działania?

4. Jakimi przesłankami kierował się rzecznik komisarza Šefčoviča odmawiając podania danych o proporcjach zatrudnienia w instytucjach unijnych?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Maroša Šefčoviča w imieniu Komisji
(5 marca 2013 r.)

Jeżeli chodzi o rozkład pracowników Komisji według narodowości i grup zaszeregowania, Komisja odwołuje się do załączonego dokumentu.

Niezależnie od działań preferencyjnych podjętych w celu zatrudniania pracowników z nowych państw członkowskich, istnieją naturalnie różnice w odniesieniu do podziału według grup zaszeregowania. Polska przystąpiła do Unii dopiero w 2004 r. i urzędnicy z konieczności zatrudniani byli w bazowych grupach zaszeregowania. Liczba urzędników polskich przynależących do wyższych grup zaszeregowania będzie w nadchodzących latach rosła. Ponadto Komisja planuje uruchomić ograniczoną liczbę konkursów wewnętrznych, które będą neutralne pod względem budżetowym i które stanowić będą szansę szybkiego awansu dla pracowników wykazujących się najlepszymi osiągnięciami.

Artykuł 27 regulaminu pracowniczego stanowi, że „przy zatrudnianiu dąży się do pozyskania do służby urzędników spełniających najwyższe wymogi w zakresie kwalifikacji, wydajności i uczciwości, rekrutowanych spośród obywateli państw członkowskich Wspólnot z uwzględnieniem możliwie szerokiego zasięgu geograficznego". W artykule tym zapisano również, że „żadne stanowiska nie mogą być rezerwowane dla obywateli określonego państwa członkowskiego".

Ma to zastosowanie również do rekrutacji na stanowiska kierownicze, która musi – odpowiednio – opierać się na wynikach. Stosownie do orzecznictwa, dana instytucja może uczynić kryterium narodowościowe kryterium nadrzędnym w celu zachowania lub przywrócenia równowagi geograficznej jedynie w sytuacjach, w których kwalifikacje kandydatów są zasadniczo takie same. Komisja podjęła tę kwestię w swoim wniosku w sprawie rozporządzenia zmieniającego regulamin pracowniczy (COM(2011) 890), w którym zawarto nowy przepis dotyczący ewentualnych środków korekcyjnych w następstwie długotrwałej i znaczącej nierównowagi co do obywatelstwa urzędników.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000056/13
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Employment in management posts in EU institutions

According to media reports, a geographical balance is not observed in the filling of management posts in the institutions of the European Union. For example, there are 46 Poles employed at grades AD9 to AD11, compared with 272 Spaniards (even though Spain's population of 47 million is only 9 million more than that of Poland). At the higher levels (director posts) there are just 38 Poles, compared with 650 from France, 591 from Germany, 528 from Italy, 468 from Spain and 438 from the UK.

The media reports also indicate that the spokesperson for Commissioner Maroš Šefčovič, who is in charge of administrative and personnel affairs in the European Commission, declined to give details of how many Poles are employed in management posts in EU offices.

In light of the above:

1. What is the breakdown by nationality of management posts in the institutions at the level of head of unit, director and director-general? Can the Commission please provide specific figures?

2. What are the causes of the substantial disparities in management staff from a geographical point of view?

3. Does the Commission intend to take action to reduce the numerical disparities between representatives of Member States during selection procedures for management posts in the European institutions? If so, what action would that be?

4. What were the reasons for Commissioner Šefčovič's spokesperson declining to provide information about employment proportions in the EU institutions?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2013)

As regards the distribution of Commission staff by nationality and grade, the Commission refers to the enclosed document.

Notwithstanding the preferential measures taken to recruit staff from new Member States, there are naturally differences as regards the distribution by grade. Poland joined the Union only in 2004 and officials are necessarily recruited at entry grades. The number of Polish officials in higher grades will increase in the coming years. Furthermore, the Commission intends to launch a limited number of internal competitions which, while being budgetary neutral, will give the best performing staff a chance for fast-track promotions.

Article 27 of the Staff Regulations of Officials stipulates that '*recruitment shall be directed to securing for the institution the services of officials of the highest standard of ability, efficiency and integrity, recruited on the broadest possible geographical basis from among nationals of Member States of the Union*'. This Article also provides that '*no posts shall be reserved for nationals of any specific Member State*'.

This also applies to management appointments which, accordingly, must be based on merit. According to case-law, it is possible for an institution to make nationality the overriding criterion in order to maintain or re-establish geographical balance only in cases where the candidates' qualifications are substantially the same. The Commission addressed the issue in its proposal for a regulation amending the Staff Regulations (COM(2011) 890) which includes a new provision on possible corrective measures following a long lasting and significant imbalance between nationalities.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-000057/13
до Комисията
Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(7 януари 2013 г.)

Относно: Предвидени от ЕК законодателни промени в началото на 2013 г., които намаляват или забраняват използването на натурални съставки в парфюмите

Вземайки предвид становището относно алергенните ароматни вещества в козметичните продукти на Научния комитет по безопасност на потребителите (SCCS), в началото на 2013 г., ЕК предвижда законодателни промени, които да намалят или дори да забранят натуралните съставки в парфюмите. Приемането на подобни мерки ще повлияе негативно на световна индустрия и ще засегне производителите на натуралните съставки.

Според горепосоченото становище сред алергенните ароматни вещества са линалоолът и линалин ацетатът — основни съставки на лавандуловото масло, и гераниолът, който е сред основните съставки на розовото масло.

Моята страна, България, държи 40 % от износа в световен мащаб на розово масло и е първа по експорт на лавандула — две от традиционните съставки на стотици реномирани парфюми.

В този смисъл:

1. Какви мерки ще предприеме ЕК по отношение на производителите на натурални съставки, за голяма част от които това е основен поминък?

2. Има ли алтернативно предложение от страна на ЕК за засяване на други култури, които да бъдат използвани в парфюмерийната индустрия?

3. Ще бъдат ли засегнатите производители финансово компенсирани по някакъв начин?

4. Разполага ли ЕК с оценка на въздействието за това, как ще се отразят тези промени на парфюмерийната индустрия и селското стопанство в ЕС?

Отговор, даден от г-н Борг от името на Комисията
(25 февруари 2013 г.)

Комисията обмисля как да отговори на становището на Научния комитет по безопасност на потребителите относно алергенните ароматни вещества в козметичните продукти, оповестено през юни 2012 г. Бихме искали да допринесем за информирането на потребителите и за безопасността им по най-подходящия и целесъобразен начин, като същевременно подпомагаме иновациите и предпазваме конкурентоспособността на сектора на козметичните продукти. Все още не са предложени никакви мерки.

Преди да бъдат предложени такива, би било преждевременно да се спекулира дали ще се наложи въвеждането на алтернативни култури за използване в парфюмерийното производство или на финансови компенсации за производителите на естествени екстракти.

Както посочва в своя отговор на предишен писмен въпрос (E-000022/2013 ([1])), Комисията ще отдели специално внимание на потенциалното въздействие на каквито и да било мерки върху производителите на естествени екстракти, например розово масло.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000057/13
to the Commission
Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Legislative amendments envisaged by the Commission for early 2013 which reduce or prohibit the use of natural ingredients in perfumes

In view of the opinion on fragrance allergens in cosmetic products issued by the Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety (SCCS) at the start of 2013, the Commission envisages introducing legislative amendments which reduce or even prohibit the use of natural products in perfumes. The adoption of those measures will adversely affect the industry worldwide and be prejudicial to the producers of natural ingredients.

According to the aforementioned opinion, these fragrance allergens include linalool and linalyl acetate, which are basic components of lavender oil, and geraniol, which is one of the basic components of rose oil.

Bulgaria accounts for 40% of world exports of rose oil and is the leading exporter of lavender, which are two of the traditional ingredients in hundreds of fine perfumes.

Can the Commission therefore state:

1. what measures it will adopt in relation to producers of natural ingredients, for many of whom this is the main means of making a living;

2. whether it has any alternative proposals on the introduction of other crops for use in the perfume industry;

3. whether the producers affected will be financially compensated in any way;

4. whether it has at its disposal any assessment of the impact that these amendments will have on the perfume industry and agriculture in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2013)

The Commission is currently considering how to respond to the opinion on fragrance allergens in cosmetic products, issued in June 2012 by the Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety, in order to contribute to consumer information and safety in the most appropriate and proportionate way, while supporting innovation and maintaining the competitiveness of the cosmetics sector. No measures have yet been proposed.

Before it is proposed, it would be premature to speculate as to whether the introduction of alternative crops for use in the perfume industry, or of financial compensations for producers of natural extracts, will be necessary.

As its reply to previous Written Question E-000022/2013 ([1]) states, the Commission will pay close attention to the potential impacts of any measures on the producers of natural extracts, such as rose oil.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-000058/13
til Kommissionen
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(7. januar 2013)

Om: Problemer vedrørende implementering af EU's transportregler

Ifølge den Internationale Transportunion (IRU) er der registreret problemer med implementeringen af EU's transportregler. Der er ifølge IRU inkonsistens i sanktionsprocedurer EU-landene imellem, samt forskellige fortolkninger af lovgivning om køre- og hviletidsregler. Dette underminerer de fælles rammebestemmelser, trafiksikkerhed, fair konkurrence samt gode arbejdsforhold .

Problemerne opstår for eksempel i forbindelse med vognmænd, der kører turistbusser. Her har der ifølge IRU været eksempler på, at chaufførerer er blevet afkrævet aktivitetserklæringer for ordinære daglige eller ugentlige hvileperioder, selvom dette ikke er et krav ifølge det fælles regelsæt.

Således fremgår det eksplicit af EU-Kommissionens vejledningsnotat 5 til forordning 561/2006: »Der må imidlertid ikke forlanges nogen form for formular vedrørende ordinære daglige eller ugentlige hvileperioder«. Alligevel er der eksempler på, at nationale myndigheder har udstedt uretmæssige bøder til vognmænd for eksempelvis mangel på formular for ordinære hvileperioder.

Hvad vil Kommissionen gøre for at fremme harmoniseringen af sanktionsprocedurer og fortolkningen af lovgivning om køre- og hviletidsregler? Hvad vil Kommissionen gøre for at hjælpe de busvognmænd, der allerede er blevet opkrævet bøder på et uretmæssigt grundlag?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Siim Kallas
(28. februar 2013)

Kommissionen har siden vedtagelsen af EU's køre- og hviletidsregler for vejtransport i 2006 ([1]) samarbejdet med medlemsstaterne og andre EU-aktører, herunder IRU, om at udarbejde og fremme en fælles tilgang til anvendelsen af disse regler. Reglerne er desuden gældende for overensstemmelseskontroller og anvendelsen af fartskrivere.

De lovgivende myndigheder har imidlertid ikke givet Kommissionen beføjelse til at vedtage andre gennemførelsesretsakter end dem, der indeholder retningslinjer og henstillinger. Derfor er soft law-initiativer vedrørende harmonisering (som f.eks. vejledninger, henstillinger osv.) ikke retligt bindende, og det er op til medlemsstaternes myndigheder at anvende dem med henblik på at skabe en ensartet håndhævelse i hele EU.

Kommissionen vil i 2013 udarbejde en meddelelse om håndhævelse samt de sociale aspekter inden for vejtransport, som vil ledsage en revision af reglerne for adgang til markedet ([2]). Meddelelsen vil indlede en debat om muligheden for at fremme en mere ensartet og omkostningseffektiv håndhævelsespolitik, som i højere grad er baseret på teknologi, målrettede kontroller, informationsudveksling og en harmoniseret klassificering af overtrædelser og sanktioner.

([1]) Forordning (EF) nr. 561/2006 om harmonisering af visse sociale bestemmelser inden for vejtransport, EUT L 102 af 11.4.2006.
([2]) Forordning (EF) nr. 1072/2009 om fælles regler for adgang til markedet for international godskørsel, EUT L 300 af 14.11.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000058/13
to the Commission
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Problems concerning the implementation of EU transport rules

According to the International Road Transport Union (IRU), problems have been recorded with the implementation of EU transport rules. According to the IRU, there are inconsistencies between EU Member States with regard to penalty procedures and different interpretations of legislation on rules for driving times and rest periods. This undermines the common framework, road safety, fair competition and good working conditions.

The problems arise, for example, in connection with transport operators operating coaches for tourists. According to the IRU, there have been examples here of drivers being asked to provide activity declarations for ordinary daily or weekly rest periods, even though this is not a requirement under the common rules.

The Commission's Guidance Note 5 to Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 explicitly states: 'However, no form of any type shall be requested concerning ordinary daily or weekly rest periods'. Nevertheless, there are examples of national authorities having imposed unlawful fines on transport operators for failure to provide forms concerning ordinary rest periods, for example.

What will the Commission do to promote the harmonisation of penalty procedures and the interpretation of legislation on rules for driving times and rest periods? What will the Commission do to help those bus operators who have already had fines imposed on them unduly?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

Since the adoption of the EU rules on driving times and rest periods for road transport in 2006 ([1]), the Commission has been working together with Member States and EU stakeholders, including IRU, on establishing and promoting a common approach to the application of these rules. These rules also provide for compliance checks and the use of the tachograph.

The legislators did however not confer on the Commission the power to adopt implementing acts other than those providing for guidelines and recommendations. Consequently — harmonisation 'soft law' initiatives (such as guidance notes, Commission's recommendations, etc.) are not legally binding and it is up to the Member States' authorities to apply them with a view to creating a uniform enforcement space throughout the EU.

In 2013 the Commission intends to present a communication on enforcement and on social aspects in road transport, which will accompany the revision of the rules on access to the market ([2]). The communication will launch a debate on ways to further promote more uniform and cost-effective enforcement policies relying more on technologies, targeted checks, exchange of information and harmonised classification of infringements and sanctions.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 on the harmonisation of certain social legislation relating to road transport, OJ L 102, 11.4.2006.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 1072/2009 on common rules for access to the international road haulage market, OJ L 300, 14.11.2009.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000059/13
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(7 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Politiche comunitarie a contrasto dell'immigrazione illegale

L'Europa è meta di numerosi stranieri, che cercano di arrivarvi con ogni mezzo, legale o illegale che sia. La ragione per cui queste persone continuano a cercare di raggiungere l'Europa è data dalla mancanza di regole certe in merito al rimpatrio degli immigrati che approdano sulle nostre coste.

La correlazione fra disoccupazione ed immigrazione è molto forte. Il migrante che viene in Europa è spesso accompagnato dai propri familiari, il che significa che ogni membro della sua famiglia beneficerà dell'assistenza sociale, sanitaria e scolastica del Paese ospitante, benché la maggior parte di essi non contribuisca in alcun modo allo sviluppo economico ed al benessere del Paese in cui si stabilisce.

L'immigrazione illegale comporta pesanti oneri per lo Stato, in termini di denaro, tempo e risorse, a discapito dei cittadini contribuenti. Inoltre la presenza in massa di immigrati illegali, che accettano lavori sottopagati, in aperta violazione di ogni legge in materia fiscale e pensionistica, mina pesantemente l'equilibrio del mercato del lavoro. Le conseguenze di questi comportamenti ricadono direttamente sui comuni cittadini, che già versano in una situazione di incertezza economica generalizzata e patiscono gli effetti di un tasso di disoccupazione elevato.

È altrettanto noto che il tasso di criminalità fra gli immigrati è molto più alto rispetto a quello riscontrabile tra i cittadini europei. Per tutte queste ragioni ogni immigrato illegale deve essere ricondotto direttamente al suo Paese di origine, e gli oneri connessi al rimpatrio vanno posti a carico di detto Paese.

Alla luce dei fatti presentati, può dire la Commissione quali politiche possono essere attuate a livello europeo per arrestare il pernicioso fenomeno dell'immigrazione illegale?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(26 febbraio 2013)

Nel quadro della sua strategia generale di gestione della migrazione, l'Unione europea cerca di prevenire e ridurre la migrazione irregolare in vari modi: fra l'altro, provvedendo a un'efficace politica di rimpatrio ([1]), sanzionando i datori di lavoro che impiegano immigrati irregolari ([2]), combattendo la tratta di esseri umani ([3]), rafforzando la gestione delle frontiere esterne e potenziando la cooperazione con i paesi terzi. La Commissione sostiene l'«Azione dell'UE sulle pressioni migratorie — Una risposta strategica» ([4]), che contiene politiche e azioni strategiche dirette a ridurre la migrazione illegale. Di concerto con gli Stati membri e sotto gli auspici delle presidenze del Consiglio, la Commissione prosegue attivamente questa strategia, garantendo così un'applicazione coerente delle politiche di lotta alla migrazione irregolare.

([1]) Direttiva 2008/115/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 16 dicembre 2008, recante norme e procedure comuni applicabili negli Stati membri al rimpatrio di cittadini di paesi terzi il cui soggiorno è irregolare, GU L 168 del 3.6.2009.

([2]) Direttiva 2009/52/CE che introduce norme minime relative a sanzioni e a provvedimenti nei confronti di datori di lavoro che impiegano cittadini di paesi terzi il cui soggiorno è irregolare, GU L 168 del 30.6.2009.

([3]) Direttiva 2011/36/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 5 aprile 2011, concernente la prevenzione e la repressione della tratta di esseri umani e la protezione delle vittime, e che sostituisce la decisione quadro del Consiglio 2002/629/GAI, GU L 101 del 15.4.2011.

([4]) Azione dell'UE sulle pressioni migratorie — Una risposta strategica (documento 8714/1/12 REV 1), adottata dal Consiglio GAI del 26 e 27 aprile 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000059/13
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: EU policies to tackle illegal immigration

Europe is a destination for many foreigners, who try to get here by any means, whether legal or illegal. These people keep trying to reach Europe because there are no definite rules on repatriation of immigrants who arrive on our shores.

There is a very strong link between unemployment and immigration. Migrants who come to Europe are often accompanied by their family, which means that each family member will receive welfare, healthcare and education from the host country, while most of them contribute absolutely nothing to the economic development and prosperity of the country in which they settle.

Illegal immigration is very costly for the state in terms of money, time and resources, to the detriment of taxpayers. Moreover, the presence of large numbers of illegal immigrants, who accept underpaid jobs, in clear breach of any tax or pension legislation, poses a serious threat to the balance of the labour market. These trends have direct consequences for ordinary citizens, who are already facing widespread economic uncertainty and suffering the effects of high unemployment.

It is equally common knowledge that the rate of criminality among immigrants is much higher than that among European citizens. For all these reasons, every illegal immigrant should be returned directly to their country of origin and the repatriation costs should be borne by that country.

In view of the above, can the Commission say what policies can be implemented at EU level to put a stop to the pernicious phenomenon of illegal immigration?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 2013)

As part of its overall migration management strategy, the EU seeks to prevent and reduce irregular migration in several ways, including by ensuring an effective return policy ([1]), sanctioning employers of irregular migrants ([2]), combatting trafficking in human beings ([3]), enhancing the border management at the external border and strengthening cooperation with third countries. The Commission supports the 'EU Action on Migratory Pressures — A Strategic Response' ([4]) which contains strategic policies and actions to reduce irregular migration. The Commission, along with the Member States under the auspices of each Council Presidency, actively follows up on this strategy thereby ensuring a coherent implementation of policies to address irregular migration.

([1]) Directive 2008/115/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on common standards and procedures in Member States for returning illegally staying third-country nationals, OJ L 168, 3.6.2009.
([2]) Directive 2009/52/EC providing for minimum standards on sanctions and measures against employers of illegally staying third-country nationals, OJ L 168, 30.6.2009.
([3]) Directive 2011/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA, OJ L 101, 15.4.2011.
([4]) EU Action on Migratory Pressures — A Strategic Response, 8714/1/12 REV 1. Adopted by the JHA Council on 26-27 April 2012.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000060/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Caso di sottrazione di un minore in Romania

L'Ufficio del Mediatore del Parlamento europeo per i casi di sottrazione internazionale di minori ha ricevuto una richiesta in merito al caso di una sottrazione internazionale di una bambina.

Fornendo una serie di informazioni e documentazione, tra cui la sentenza di divorzio e la denuncia di scomparsa, il padre dichiara quanto segue.

In seguito alla separazione di due cittadini rumeni, il tribunale di Maramures ha stabilito, nel febbraio 2012, che il domicilio della loro figlia di otto anni coincidesse con quello della madre e ha redatto un piano dettagliato per permettere al padre di vedere la figlia.

Il padre, tuttavia, sostiene che tale programma di visite non sia stato rispettato dalla madre della piccola e si è quindi rivolto ad un ufficiale giudiziario per far sì che la decisione del tribunale venisse applicata nel rispetto dei diritti genitoriali.

Dal 27 luglio 2012, il padre non ha alcuna notizia della bambina, risultando impossibile contattare la madre.

Pur avendo la custodia esclusiva sulla figlia, la madre avrebbe dovuto comunicare per iscritto un cambio di residenza per assicurare al padre il diritto di visita.

La polizia rumena ha inserito la bambina sul sito delle persone scomparse.

Le indagini portano a ricercare la bimba in Italia, paese del nuovo compagno della madre.

Può far sapere la Commissione:

1. quali misure è possibile adottare per accertare la cooperazione al fine di rintracciare la bambina?

2. In quale modo è possibile intervenire per agevolare la cooperazione diplomatica necessaria nella risoluzione di questo caso?

3. Il quadro generale della situazione?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(19 febbraio 2013)

In caso di sparizione o sottrazione di minori, è attiva in 22 Stati membri dell'UE, tra cui la Romania, la linea telefonica diretta per i bambini scomparsi che risponde al numero 116000, creata per rispondere alle esigenze immediate dei genitori o dei minori coinvolti. Per il 2013-2014 la Commissione ha accantonato finanziamenti UE per 4,5 milioni di EUR da destinare alla creazione delle restanti linee telefoniche e al miglioramento dei servizi offerti da quelle esistenti. Per i casi in cui si considera che la sottrazione metta a repentaglio la vita del minore, la Commissione ha inoltre promosso l'istituzione di meccanismi di allerta sulla sottrazione di minori, tra l'altro mettendo a disposizione a tal fine finanziamenti per 600 000 EUR nel 2012, confermati per il 2013.

Il regolamento (CE) n. 2201/2003 ([1]) («regolamento Bruxelles II *bis*») dispone il riconoscimento e l'esecuzione delle decisioni in materia di responsabilità genitoriale in uno Stato membro diverso da quello di emissione e prevede disposizioni uniformi sulla sottrazione transfrontaliera di minori ad opera di uno dei genitori nell'UE. Instaura altresì una cooperazione amministrativa fra autorità centrali in materia di responsabilità genitoriale, compreso in caso di sottrazione transfrontaliera di minori ad opera di uno dei genitori.

Le informazioni fornite dall'onorevole deputato non consentono alla Commissione di stabilire se il regolamento Bruxelles II *bis* sia applicabile al caso del minore rumeno.

([1]) GU L 338 del 23.12.2003, pag. 1.

La Commissione non è quindi in grado di pronunciarsi sugli eventuali interventi da attuare per risolvere il caso di specie né sull'impostazione generale da seguire al riguardo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000060/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(7 January 2013)

Subject: Abduction of a minor in Romania

The European Parliament Mediator for International Parental Child Abduction has been contacted in regard to the international abduction of a young girl.

The father has furnished a range of information and documents, including the divorce degree and the report of the child's disappearance. The facts are as follows.

Following the separation of two Romanian citizens, the Court in Maramures ruled in February 2012 that their 8-year old daughter should reside with her mother and drew up a detailed schedule to allow the father to see his daughter.

The father however maintains that the mother of the young girl did not keep to this visiting schedule. He therefore applied to a bailiff for the court order on parental rights to be enforced.

The father has not had any news of his daughter since 27 July 2012 as it has proved impossible to contact the mother.

As she has sole custody of her daughter, the mother should have notified any change of address in writing, to protect the father's visiting rights.

The Romanian police have registered the girl on the missing persons website.

Investigations are focusing on finding the girl in Italy, where her mother's new partner comes from.

1. Can the Commission advise what measures may be adopted to ensure cooperation in tracing the young girl?

2. What action can be taken to facilitate the diplomatic cooperation needed to resolve this case?

3. What is the general position in a case like this?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(19 February 2013)

In cases of missing children or child abductions the 116000 EU hotline for missing children has been set up in 22 EU Member States (including Romania) to address the immediate needs of parents or children involved. The Commission has set aside EU funding of EUR 4.5 million for 2013-2014 to set up the remaining hotlines as well as improve the services of existing ones. In addition to this, in cases of abductions where the life of the child is deemed at risk, the Commission has promoted the establishment of child abduction alert mechanisms, including through funding made available for their creation, amounting to EUR 600 000 in 2012 which has been continued for 2013.

Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 ([1]) ('the Brussels IIa regulation') provides for recognition and enforcement of judgments in matters of parental responsibility in another Member State and contains uniform rules on cross-border parental child abduction in the EU. Furthermore, the Brussels IIa regulation establishes administrative cooperation between central authorities on cases specific to parental responsibility, including cross-border parental child abduction.

On the basis of the information provided by the Honourable Member, the Commission is not in a position to establish whether the Brussels IIa regulation is applicable in the case of the Romanian minor.

The Commission is therefore not in a position to advise on actions that could be taken to resolve the case in point or the general position in a case like this.

([1]) OJ L 338, 23.12.2003, p. 1.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-000061/13
an die Kommission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(8. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: EASA-Stellungnahme 04/2012 zu Flugdienstzeitbeschränkungen

Am 1. Oktober 2012 hat die Europäische Agentur für Flugsicherheit (EASA) ihre Stellungnahme 04/2012 zu den Regeln über Flugdienstzeitbeschränkungen für Piloten und Kabinenpersonal veröffentlicht. Dazu frage ich die Kommission, mit Bitte um einzelne Beantwortung:

1. Beabsichtigt die Kommission, auch zukünftig an der Wahrung des Schutzniveaus („Regressionsverbot", „principle of non-regression") festzuhalten? Wenn nein: warum nicht?

2. Wird die Kommission bei der Überarbeitung der geltenden Regeln die Vorschläge der EASA durch wissenschaftliche Experten bewerten lassen, um den Standards der EU und der ICAO zu genügen und dem Parlament eine solide Entscheidungsgrundlage zu liefern? Wenn nein: warum nicht?

3. Auf welche Weise wird die Kommission die Anwendung des Vorsorgeprinzips im Rahmen der Überarbeitung der Regeln sicherstellen, vor allem in Bezug auf den Flugdienst während der Nachtstunden?

4. Warum hat die Kommission entschieden, wichtige Bestandteile der Regeln nur noch in Form von Zertifizierungsspezifikationen zu definieren? Wie wird die Beteiligung des Europäischen Parlaments als Mitgesetzgeber berücksichtigt?

5. Wertet die Kommission Dienstzeiten, bei denen das Personal auf Abruf bereitstehen muss („Reserve"), als Bereitschaftsdienst? Wenn nein: warum nicht?

6. Wie bewertet die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang das Urteil des Europäischen Gerichtshofs vom 9. September 2003 in der Rechtssache C 151/02, in dem Bereitschaftsdienste von Ärzten als Arbeitszeit angesehen werden?

7. Wie bewertet es die Kommission unter Sicherheitsgesichtspunkten, dass Piloten nach den Plänen der EASA noch nach einer ununterbrochenen Dienstzeit von bis zu 22 Stunden (inklusive Dienst auf Abruf) Flugzeuge landen könnten?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(19. Februar 2013)

1. 2. 3. Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antworten auf die schriftlichen Anfragen P-011515/2012, E-009003/2012, E-011134/2012 und E-11669/12.

4. Die Kommission erklärt, dass sie noch nicht über den Vorschlag der EASA entschieden hat. Sie weist jedoch darauf hin, dass die von der EASA vorgeschlagene Aufteilung in verbindliche und nicht verbindliche Regelungen den derzeitigen EU-Vorschriften für die Begrenzung der Flugdienstzeit (FTL) vergleichbar ist.

5. Die Reserve (Dienst auf Abruf) wird nach den geltenden Vorschriften bereits als Dienstzeit gewertet.

6. Den Schlussfolgerungen des vom Herrn Abgeordneten erwähnten Urteils wird bereits durch die derzeitigen Bestimmungen zur Flugdienstzeitbegrenzung entsprochen.

7. Zusätzlich zur Begrenzung der maximalen Dienstzeit enthalten die derzeitigen EU-Bestimmungen zur Flugdienstzeitbegrenzung bereits nicht an Bedingungen geknüpfte Verpflichtungen für Mitgliedstaaten, Luftfahrtunternehmen und Flugbesatzungen, um realistische und sichere Dienstpläne zu gewährleisten.

Die Kommission hat die EASA ersucht, vor Abschluss ihrer Vorschläge zum Bereitschaftsdienst zusätzliche Informationen zu sammeln.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000061/13
to the Commission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(8 January 2013)

Subject: EASA opinion 04/2012 on flight time limitations

On 1 October 2012 the European Air Safety Agency (EASA) published its opinion 04/2012 on rules on flight time limitations for pilots and cabin crew. Could the Commission please provide a separate answer to each of the following questions:

1. Does the Commission intend in future to continue adhering to the principle of maintaining the level of protection (principle of non-regression)? If not, why not?

2. Will the Commission, when revising the current rules, have EASA's proposals evaluated by scientific experts in order to ensure that the EU and ICAO standards are met and provide Parliament with a solid basis for a decision? If not, why not?

3. How will the Commission ensure that the precautionary principle is applied when revising the rules, particularly as regards flying during the hours of darkness?

4. Why has the Commission decided that important elements of the rules should in future be defined only in the form of certification specifications? How does this take into account the participation of the European Parliament as co-legislator?

5. Does the Commission consider periods during which staff are required to be available for duty (on reserve) to be equivalent to on-call service? If not, why not?

6. With that in mind, what is the Commission's view of the judgment of the European Court of Justice of 9 September 2003 in Case C-151/02, in which periods of on-call service were deemed to be working time?

7. From a safety point of view, what is the Commission's view of the fact that, under the EASA plans, pilots might still land aircraft after an uninterrupted period of 22 hours' service (including periods on reserve)?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(19 February 2013)

1, 2, 3. The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Questions P-011515/2012, E-009003/2012, E-011134/2012 and E-11669/12.

4. The Commission would like to point out that it has not yet decided on the EASA proposal. It however observes that distribution between hard and soft law as proposed by EASA is similar to current EU rules on Flight Time Limitations (FTL).

5. Reserve is already considered as duty under the current rules.

6. The conclusions of the ruling mentioned by the Honourable Member are already followed through current EU FTL rules.

7. In addition to the maximum duty limits, current EU FTL rules put unconditional obligations on Member States, airlines and aircrew members to ensure realistic and safe rosters.

The Commission has asked EASA to gather additional information before finalising its proposals concerning standby duty.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000062/13
to the Commission
Emma McClarkin (ECR)
(8 January 2013)

Subject: European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR)

I have been informed of a disturbing development in the distribution of grants through the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR). In 2008 the Aegis Trust, the world's leading genocide prevention organisation, successfully applied for a grant of EUR 750 000 over a three-year period. Unfortunately the final amount due, EUR 54 458, has not been paid for a number of months despite the fact that the Aegis Trust has, on a number of occasions, requested this amount. Having contacted the relevant unit within the Commission I have been informed that the payment could not be finalised before the end of 2012 due to a lack of available payment appropriations against the EIDHR budget line during the last part of the year.

Does the Commission believe that it is appropriate for a small charity, which is already most of the way through its grant contract, to be put through this kind of scenario?

Can the Commission explain whether this is normal practice in such circumstances?

Is the Commission able to provide any information on when the charity is likely to receive its final payment?

Can the Commission assure me that this kind of shortfall in funding for grant contracts already underway will not happen in the future?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(7 February 2013)

In accordance with Art. 15 of the General Conditions applicable to grant contracts, the Commission disposes of a total of 90 days to approve the technical and financial report and execute the final payment. This final report has been received by the Commission on 25 October 2012 and approved on 9 December 2012, but regrettably the payment could not be executed before the end of year due to the lack of available payment appropriations and the fact that no further reinforcement of the budget line was at that time possible. The final payment has been approved by the Commission on 18 January 2013, i.e. as soon as the accounting system allowed its execution on the 2013 budget.

Despite the fact that the payment has finally been executed within the contractual deadline, the Commission regrets that this delay may have caused difficulties to the organisation and assures that all efforts are deployed to optimise the financial implementation of the different programmes through an improved forecasting of the expenditures and the execution of transfers between the different budget lines.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000063/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(8 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Deuda y gasto del Ministerio de Defensa del Estado español

El Ministerio de Defensa del Estado español tiene en estos momentos una deuda de 31 631 millones de euros debido a los compromisos que ha contraído durante la última década. Esta cantidad, que significa el 3 % del PIB del Estado español, supone una rémora para sus finanzas, y el mismo ministro ya ha empezado a apuntar que esta problemática debe ser resuelta en los próximos tiempos ([1]).

Cabe tener en cuenta, además, la pobre aportación que hace el sector de la defensa a la recuperación económica y que, por ejemplo, el gasto militar en la misión en Afganistán ha sido de más de 400 millones de euros este 2012, con un total acumulado de 3 000 millones de euros ([2]).

El *Annual Growth Survey* de la Comisión Europea así como las recomendaciones específicas para cada Estado miembro tienen como misión coordinar las políticas presupuestarias con tal de cumplir los objetivos de la Estrategia 2020 y el Pacto de Estabilidad y Crecimiento. Por otro lado, para el año 2013, y a pesar de los anuncios de disminución del gasto equivalente al 8 % en el gasto del Gobierno español en políticas de defensa, algunos centros son críticos con este análisis y sitúan el gasto militar en más de 16 000 millones de euros para 2013 ([3]).

Según la OECD, el PIB del Estado español disminuirá en un 1,4 % en 2013, reduciendo los ingresos del Gobierno ([4]).

A la luz de lo anterior:

¿Piensa la Comisión hacer recomendaciones para las políticas de defensa en el marco del Semestre Europeo al Estado español con el objetivo de hacer más sostenibles sus finanzas y cumplir con el Pacto de Estabilidad y Crecimiento?

¿No cree que el factor multiplicador sobre la economía del gasto militar es mucho menor que la inversión en otros campos como la educación, la sanidad o la investigación civil y que, por lo tanto, el gasto en políticas de defensa hace más complicada la consecución de los objetivos de la Estrategia 2020?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(14 de febrero de 2013)

Todavía no se han elaborado las recomendaciones específicas por país, que la Comisión tiene previsto publicar en el «semestre europeo» de 2013.

Cabe suponer que el gasto en educación, sanidad o investigación civil tiene un impacto positivo en el crecimiento más duradero que el gasto en defensa. Sin embargo, esto debe ponderarse con los objetivos del gasto en defensa nacional, tema que queda fuera del ámbito de competencia de la supervisión económica de la UE.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/politica/20130107/54358670114/pedro-morenes-habla-pascua-militar-absurdas-provocaciones-catalunya.html
([2]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/espana/2012/07/16/espana-gastara-en-afganistan-3000-millones-y-entregara-una-base-en-qalainaw-que-costo-44-102009/
([3]) http://www.centredelas.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=965:las-trampas-del-presupuesto-militar-del-ano-2013&catid=42:economia-de-defensa&Itemid=63&lang=es
([4]) http://www.oecd.org/eco/economicoutlookanalysisandforecasts/spaineconomicforecastsummary.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000063/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(8 January 2013)

Subject: Spanish Ministry of Defence debt and expenditure

The Spanish Ministry of Defence is currently running a debt of EUR 31.631 billion because of the defence commitments that it has made during the last decade. This figure, which amounts to 3 % of Spain's GDP, imposes a constraint on public finances, and the Minister for Defence himself has now started to suggest that this issue must be resolved in the immediate future ([1]).

It is also worth considering that the defence sector is making only a small contribution to Spain's economic recovery, while military spending on the mission in Afghanistan amounted to EUR 400 million in 2012, with the total amount spent on this mission standing at EUR 3 billion ([2]).

The Commission's Annual Growth Survey and the specific recommendations issued to each Member State are aimed at coordinating budgetary policies with a view to meeting the 2020 strategy targets and complying with the Stability and Growth Pact. Although the Spanish Government has announced a reduction of 8 % in defence spending, some bodies have criticised these estimates and calculate that military spending in 2013 will exceed EUR 16 billion ([3]).

According to the OECD, Spanish GDP will fall by 1.4 % in 2013, resulting in reduced income for the government ([4]).

Does the Commission intend to issue defence policy recommendations to Spain under the European Semester, with the aim of making its financial situation more sustainable and assisting its compliance with the Stability and Growth Pact?

Does the Commission believe that the multiplier effect of military spending on the economy is much smaller than that resulting from investment in sectors such as education, health or civil research and that, therefore, defence spending is an obstacle to achieving the 2020 strategy targets?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(14 February 2013)

The country-specific recommendations that the Commission will issue under the 2013 European Semester have not yet been elaborated.

It is plausible to assume that expenditures on education, health or civil research have a more lasting positive impact on growth than defence expenditures. However, this has to be weighed against the objectives of national defence expenditures — a matter that is outside the remit of EU economic surveillance.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/politica/20130107/54358670114/pedro-morenes-habla-pascua-militar-absurdas-provocaciones-catalunya.html
([2]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/espana/2012/07/16/espana-gastara-en-afganistan-3000-millones-y-entregara-una-base-en-qalainaw-que-costo-44-102009/.
([3]) http://www.centredelas.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=965:las-trampas-del-presupuesto-militar-del-ano-2013&catid=42:economia-de-defensa&Itemid=63&lang=es.
([4]) http://www.oecd.org/eco/economicoutlookanalysisandforecasts/spaineconomicforecastsummary.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000064/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(8 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ανακεφαλαιοποίηση των κυπριακών τραπεζών

Πώς σκέφτεται η ΕΕ να βοηθήσει την Κύπρο ώστε να αντιμετωπίσει το άμεσο πρόβλημα ανακεφαλαιοποίησης των κυπριακών τραπεζών, λόγω της έκθεσής τους σε τοξικά ομόλογα στην Ελλάδα;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(18 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Στις 25 Ιουνίου 2012, η Κυπριακή κυβέρνηση ζήτησε επίσημα από τα κράτη μέλη της ζώνης του ευρώ εξωτερική χρηματοδοτική συνδρομή από το ΕΤΧΣ/ΕΜΣ (EFSF/ESM). Η Επιτροπή, από κοινού με την ΕΚΤ και το ΔΝΤ, συνεργάζεται με τις κυπριακές αρχές για την ολοκλήρωση του προγράμματος μακροοικονομικής χρηματοδοτικής συνδρομής, σύμφωνα με την εντολή που δόθηκε από την ευρωομάδα (Eurogroup).

Το έργο της ανάλυσης με τη δέουσα επιμέλεια των κεφαλαιακών αναγκών του κυπριακού χρηματοπιστωτικού τομέα ολοκληρώνεται από ανεξάρτητο εξωτερικό σύμβουλο (PIMCO). Η τελική έκθεση αναμένεται να δημοσιευθεί μόλις υπογραφεί το Μνημόνιο Συνεννόησης.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000064/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(8 January 2013)

Subject: Recapitalisation of banks in Cyprus

How does the EU intend to help Cyprus address the immediate problem of recapitalising the banks of Cyprus, given their exposure to toxic Greek bonds?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

The Government of Cyprus officially requested from the euro area Member States on 25 June 2012 external financial assistance from the EFSF/ESM. The Commission is working together with the ECB and the IMF to finalise the macro-financial assistance programme with the Cypriot authorities in line with the mandate given by the Eurogroup.

The due dilligence exercise on the capital needs of the Cypriot financial sector is being finalised by an independent external consultant (PIMCO).The final report is expected to be published as soon as the Memorandeum of Understanding would be signed.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000065/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(8 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Άνεργοι και προγράμματα στήριξης

Τι προγράμματα και ποια οικονομική βοήθεια παρέχει η ΕΕ στα κράτη μέλη της όσον αφορά την επανένταξη πολιτών που κρίθηκαν εκούσια άνεργοι, ώστε να επιστρέψουν στην αγορά εργασίας, όταν η πολιτεία αναγκαστικά διακόπτει την παροχή δημοσίου βοηθήματος προς αυτούς λόγω οικονομικής κρίσης;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Προκειμένου να επιτευχθεί η επανένταξη των πολιτών, οι οποίοι κρίθηκαν εκούσια άνεργοι στην αγορά εργασίας, πρέπει να καθορίζονται οι παροχές ανεργίας με τέτοιο τρόπο, ώστε να παρέχονται τα σωστά κίνητρα για εργασία. Πρέπει να σημειωθεί ότι οι παροχές ανεργίας δεν μπορούν να εξεταστούν ξεχωριστά, καθώς αποτελούν μέρος του ευρύτερου πλαισίου κοινωνικής ασφάλισης μιας χώρας.

Αυτό σημαίνει ότι οι παροχές ανεργίας (επίπεδο, διάρκεια κ.λπ.) πρέπει να υπολογίζονται — μεταξύ άλλων — σε σχέση με το επίπεδο της νομοθεσίας για την προστασία της απασχόλησης και το βαθμό της ενεργητικής πολιτικής για την αγορά εργασίας. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, η προθεσμία για τις παροχές ανεργίας πρέπει να συμβαδίζει με τις υπηρεσίες ενεργοποίησης και υποστήριξης για την εύρεση εργασίας, τις οποίες λαμβάνει ο άνεργος από τις δημόσιες υπηρεσίες απασχόλησης. Μια τέτοια στρατηγική βρίσκεται στο επίκεντρο του προτύπου της ευελιξίας με ασφάλεια.

Κατά την εφαρμογή των πολιτικών για την αγορά εργασίας, τα κράτη μέλη μπορούν να αντλούν πόρους από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο για να διευκολύνονται, συνεπώς, στην τήρηση των δημοσιονομικών υποχρεώσεών τους.

Η Επιτροπή προωθεί δραστήρια την ανταλλαγή απόψεων και εμπειριών, με σκοπό την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας μεταξύ των κρατών μελών, για παράδειγμα, μέσω του προγράμματος αμοιβαίας μάθησης, στο πλαίσιο της ευρωπαϊκής στρατηγικής για την απασχόληση ([1]).

Γενικότερα, η Επιτροπή αποδίδει ιδιαίτερη σημασία στην απασχόληση και τις κοινωνικές πολιτικές των κρατών μελών, με διάφορους τρόπους, όπως η κοινωνική ανοικτή μέθοδος συντονισμού ή το Ευρωπαϊκό Εξάμηνο, μέσω των οποίων προτείνει συγκεκριμένες συστάσεις για τα εν λόγω πεδία, όταν κρίνεται αναγκαίο.

([1]) http://www.mutual-learning-employment.net/thematic-review-seminars

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000065/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(8 January 2013)

Subject: Support programmes for the unemployed

What programmes and financial assistance does the EU provide for its Member States to help reintegrate those citizens who are deemed to be voluntarily unemployed so that they return to the labour market when the state is forced to stop paying them benefits due to the economic crisis?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

In order to reintegrate citizens in voluntary unemployment into the labour market, unemployment benefits could be set in a way to provide the right incentives to work. It should be noted that unemployment benefits cannot be considered in isolation as they are part of a country's broader institutional framework.

This means that unemployment benefits (level, duration etc.) have to be assessed — amongst others — against the level of employment protection legislation and the extent of active labour market policy. More concretely, the time-limiting of unemployment benefits has to go hand in hand with activation and job support services that the unemployed receive from public employment services. Such a strategy is at the heart of the flexicurity paradigm.

In implementing their labour market policies, Member States can draw from the European Social Fund thereby easing their budgetary engagements.

The Commission does actively promote the exchange of views and experiences to fight unemployment between Member States, for example through the Mutual Learning Programme under the European Employment Strategy ([1]).

More broadly, the Commission also pays great attention to the Member States' employment and social policies through various channels such as the social open method of coordination or the European Semester where it makes specific recommendations in these areas when necessary.

([1]) http://www.mutual-learning-employment.net/thematic-review-seminars.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000066/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(8 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Απάτες ΦΠΑ

Ποια μέτρα προτείνει η ΕΕ για εντοπισμό και πρόληψη του υψηλού κινδύνου από απάτες ΦΠΑ (Φόρος Προστιθέμενης Αξίας) στις χώρες μέλη της ΕΕ;

Πώς διασφαλίζει την έμπρακτη εφαρμογή τους;

Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(11 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Στις 6 Δεκεμβρίου 2012, η Επιτροπή ενέκρινε σχέδιο δράσης ([1]) για την ενίσχυση της καταπολέμησης της φορολογικής απάτης και της φοροδιαφυγής. Στο εν λόγω σχέδιο δράσης, η Επιτροπή εκθέτει πρακτικά μέτρα που θα βοηθήσουν τα κράτη μέλη να επιτύχουν συγκεκριμένα αποτελέσματα στον τομέα της καταπολέμησης της ης φορολογικής απάτης και της φοροδιαφυγής. Ορισμένα από τα μέτρα αυτά είναι γενικά και αφορούν διάφορους φόρους, ενώ άλλα εστιάζονται ειδικά στην καταπολέμηση της απάτης στον τομέα του ΦΠΑ.

Στην ομάδα ειδικών μέτρων για την αντιμετώπιση της απάτης στον τομέα του ΦΠΑ περιλαμβάνονται τα εξής: δημιουργία μηχανισμού ταχείας αντίδρασης για την αντιμετώπιση αιφνιδίων και μαζικών φαινομένων απάτης στον τομέα του ΦΠΑ, επέκταση της προαιρετικής εφαρμογής του μηχανισμού αντιστροφής της επιβάρυνσης ΦΠΑ για τις παραδόσεις ορισμένων αγαθών και την παροχή υπηρεσιών που είναι πιθανό να αποτελέσουν αντικείμενο απάτης, σύμφωνα με την πρόταση που υποβλήθηκε από την Επιτροπή ([2]), το 2009, δημιουργία του φόρουμ της ΕΕ για τον ΦΠΑ, και εξασφάλιση εξουσιοδότησης από το Συμβούλιο για την έναρξη διαπραγματεύσεων με τρίτες χώρες με σκοπό τη σύναψη διμερών συμφωνιών διοικητικής συνεργασίας στον τομέα του ΦΠΑ.

Η αξιολόγηση της αποτελεσματικής εφαρμογής των μέτρων που περιλαμβάνονται στο σχέδιο δράσης θα γίνει, μεταξύ άλλων, στο πλαίσιο του ευρωπαϊκού εξαμήνου, ιδίως για τα κράτη μέλη στα οποία έχουν απευθυνθεί ιδιαίτερες συστάσεις ανά χώρα σχετικά με την ανάγκη ενίσχυσης της είσπραξης των φόρων. Η Επιτροπή υπέγραψε επίσης σύμβαση επικαιροποίησης της μελέτης για την εκτίμηση του ελλείμματος ΦΠΑ στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ, και προτίθεται να χρησιμοποιήσει τις μελλοντικές επικαιροποιήσεις των εκτιμηθέντων ελλειμμάτων ΦΠΑ ως δείκτη της αποτελεσματικότητας της εφαρμογής των μέτρων για την αντιμετώπιση της απάτης στον τομέα του ΦΠΑ.

([1]) COM(2012)722 τελικό της 6.12.2012.
([2]) COM(2009)511 τελικό της 29.9.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000066/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(8 January 2013)

Subject: VAT fraud

Given the high risk of fraud involving VAT in EU Member States, what measures does the EU propose to detect and prevent such fraud?

How will it ensure the effective implementation of such measures?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(11 February 2013)

The Commission adopted on 6 December 2012 an Action Plan ([1]) to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion. In this Action Plan, the Commission lists practical measures to help Member States to achieve concrete results in the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion. Some of these measures are general and involve several taxes, while others specifically target VAT fraud.

The group of specific measures to address VAT fraud include: setting up a Quick Reaction Mechanism against sudden and massive VAT Fraud; extending the optional application of the VAT reverse charge mechanism to supplies of certain goods and services susceptible to fraud, in line with the proposal presented in 2009 by the Commission ([2]); creating the EU VAT forum; and obtaining an authorisation from Council to start negotiations with third countries for bilateral agreements on administrative cooperation in the field of VAT.

The assessment of the effective implementation of the measures mentioned in the action plan will be done, *inter alia*, in the context of the European Semester exercise, especially for the Member States to whom Country Specific Recommendations on the need to strengthen tax collection have been addressed. The Commission has also contracted an update to the study that estimated the VAT gap in the EU Member States, and intends to use future updates of the assessed VAT gaps as an indicator of the effectiveness of the implementation of the measures to tackle VAT fraud.

([1]) COM(2012) 722 final of 6.12.2012.
([2]) COM(2009) 511 final of 29.9.2009.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000067/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(8 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Δημόσια βοηθήματα και κοινωνικές παροχές

Δικαιούνται δημοσίων βοηθημάτων και κοινωνικών παροχών εργαζόμενοι και άτομα που δεν συνεισφέρουν στο σύστημα κοινωνικών ασφαλίσεων των χωρών μελών της ΕΕ;

1. Τι πρεσβεύει η ΕΕ για το θέμα;

2. Τι πράττουν οι χώρες μέλη της ΕΕ;

3. Ποιες κατευθυντήριες ευρωπαϊκές οδηγίες και καλές πρακτικές υπάρχουν, ώστε να διασφαλίζεται πως όλοι οι εργαζόμενοι έχουν δικαιώματα αλλά και υποχρεώσεις, ώστε τα κράτη μέλη να έχουν σωστές εθνικές πολιτικές για θέματα απασχολησιμότητας δημοσίων βοηθημάτων και ωφελημάτων;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Οι εργαζόμενοι που μετακινούνται διαμέσου των συνόρων υπόκεινται συνήθως στη νομοθεσία κοινωνικής ασφάλισης του κράτους μέλους στο οποίο εργάζονται. Επιπλέον, έχουν τα ίδια δικαιώματα και υποχρεώσεις, όπως οι υπήκοοι του εν λόγω κράτους, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της υποχρέωσης καταβολής εισφορών. Η ευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία ([1]) προβλέπει τον συντονισμό, και όχι την εναρμόνιση, των συστημάτων κοινωνικής ασφάλισης: αυτό σημαίνει ότι οι μη εργαζόμενοι πολίτες της Ένωσης, οι οποίοι μετακινούνται σε άλλο κράτος μέλος δικαιούνται παροχές κοινωνικής ασφάλισης στο εν λόγω κράτος μέλος, μόνο όταν ορίσουν το σύνηθες κέντρο των ενδιαφερόντων τους σ' αυτό και, συνεπώς, θεωρείται ότι διαμένουν συνήθως εκεί. Επομένως, το δικαίωμα παροχών κοινωνικής ασφάλισης δεν αποκτάται αυτόματα.

Η οδηγία ([2]) σχετικά με το δικαίωμα των πολιτών της Ένωσης και των μελών της οικογένειάς τους να κυκλοφορούν και να διαμένουν ελεύθερα στην επικράτεια των κρατών μελών, ορίζει ότι οι μη εργαζόμενοι πολίτες της Ένωσης δεν δικαιούνται κοινωνική αρωγή κατά τη διάρκεια των πρώτων τριών μηνών της παρουσίας τους σε ένα κράτος μέλος υποδοχής. Για να διαμείνουν σε ένα κράτος μέλος υποδοχής για περισσότερους από τρεις μήνες, οι μη εργαζόμενοι πολίτες της Ένωσης πρέπει να διαβεβαιώσουν ότι έχουν επαρκείς πόρους, ώστε να μην επιβαρύνουν το σύστημα κοινωνικής πρόνοιας του εν λόγω κράτους μέλους.

Η ευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία παρέχει τις εγγυήσεις που εμποδίζουν να απαιτηθεί από τα κράτη μέλη να χορηγήσουν παροχές κοινωνικής ασφάλισης σε άτομα που φτάνουν με μοναδικό σκοπό να απαιτήσουν τέτοιες παροχές. Η ευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία δεν ενθαρρύνει ούτε και διευκολύνει πρακτικές απάτης ή κατάχρησης.

([1]) Συγκεκριμένα, ο κανονισμός (ΕΚ) Νο 883/2004 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 29ης Απριλίου 2004, για τον συντονισμό των συστημάτων κοινωνικής ασφάλισης (ΕΕ L 166 της 30.4.2004, σ. 1) και ο κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 987/2009 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 16ης Σεπτεμβρίου 2009, για τον καθορισμό της διαδικασίας εφαρμογής του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 883/2004 για τον συντονισμό συστημάτων κοινωνικής ασφάλισης (ΕΕ L 284 της 30.10.2009).

([2]) Οδηγία 2004/38/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 29ης Απριλίου 2004, σχετικά με το δικαίωμα των πολιτών της Ένωσης και των μελών των οικογενειών τους να κυκλοφορούν και να διαμένουν ελεύθερα στην επικράτεια των κρατών μελών, για την τροποποίηση του κανονισμού (ΕΟΚ) αριθ. 1612/68 και την κατάργηση των οδηγιών 64/221/ΕΟΚ, 68/360/ΕΟΚ, 72/194/ΕΟΚ, 73/148/ΕΟΚ, 75/34/ΕΟΚ, 75/35/ΕΟΚ, 90/364/ΕΟΚ, 90/365/ΕΟΚ και 93/96/ΕΟΚ, ΕΕ L 158 της 30.4.2004.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000067/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(8 January 2013)

Subject: State benefits and welfare entitlements

Are workers and persons who do not contribute to EU Member States' social security systems entitled to State benefits and welfare entitlements?

1. Where does the EU stand on the issue?

2. What is the practice of EU Member States?

3. What EU guideline directives and good practices exist to ensure that all workers have rights but also obligations and that Member States pursue correct national policies on employability issues and State benefits and welfare entitlements?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

Workers who move across borders are usually subject to the social security legislation of the Member State in which they work. They enjoy the same rights and obligations as nationals of that State, including the obligation to pay contributions. EC law ([1]) provides for the coordination, and not the harmonisation, of social security schemes: this means that non-active Union citizens who move to another Member State are entitled to social security benefits in that Member State only once they have established their habitual centre of interest in it and are thus considered to habitually reside there. Entitlement to social security benefits is therefore not automatic.

The directive ([2]) on the right of Union citizens and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States provides that non-active Union citizens are not entitled to social assistance during the first three months of their presence in a host Member State. In order to reside in a host Member State for longer than three months, non-active Union citizens have to show that they have sufficient resources to avoid becoming a burden on the social assistance system of that Member State.

EC law provides for safeguards against requiring the Member States to grant social security benefits to persons arriving with the sole intention of claiming such benefits. EC law neither encourages nor facilitates fraudulent practices or abuse.

([1]) In particular, Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems (OJ L 166, 30.4.2004, p. 1) and Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems (OJ L 284, 30.10.2009).

([2]) 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 amending Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68 and repealing Directives 64/221/EEC, 68/360/EEC, 72/194/EEC, 73/148/EEC, 75/34/EEC, 75/35/EEC, 90/364/EEC, 90/365/EEC and 93/96/EEC, OJ L 158, 30.4.2004.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000068/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(8 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Διεθνής Διάσκεψη και Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία

Ο Τούρκος Υπουργός, αρμόδιος για Ευρωπαϊκά Θέματα, κ. Μπαγίς προτείνει Διεθνή Διάσκεψη με τη συμμετοχή: Ε/Κ, Τ/Κ, Ελλάδας, Τουρκίας χωρίς τη συμμετοχή της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας.

Ποια η θέση της ΕΕ και της αρμόδιας επιτρόπου εξωτερικών θεμάτων κ. Άστον επί του θέματος;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(18 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Το θέμα που εγείρει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος εντάσσεται στο πλαίσιο των διαπραγματεύσεων για μια συνολική διευθέτηση του κυπριακού ζητήματος υπό την αιγίδα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών. Οι ηγέτες της ελληνοκυπριακής και της τουρκοκυπριακής κοινότητας δεν είναι αρμόδιοι να αποφασίσουν για τη μορφή των συνομιλιών.

Η Επιτροπή, στην ανακοίνωσή της τον Οκτώβριο του 2012 για τη στρατηγική διεύρυνσης και τις κυριότερες προκλήσεις για την περίοδο 2012-2013, υπογράμμισε την ανάγκη για εκ νέου δρομολόγηση των διαπραγματεύσεων με στόχο την ταχεία κατάληξη των συνομιλιών, με την αξιοποίηση της μέχρι τώρα επιτευχθείσας προόδου.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000068/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(8 January 2013)

Subject: International Conference and the Republic of Cyprus

The Turkish Minister for EU Affairs, Mr Egemen Bağış, has proposed holding an international conference involving Greek Cypriots, Turkish Cypriots, Greece and Turkey, but without the Republic of Cyprus.

What is the position of the EU and Baroness Ashton, Commission Vice-President and High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, on this matter?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

The issue raised by the Honourable Member is part of the negotiations on a comprehensive Cyprus settlement under the auspices of the United Nations. It is for the leaders of both the Greek Cypriot and the Turkish Cypriot communities to agree on the format of the talks.

In its October 2012 Communication on the Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2012-2013, the Commission underlined the necessity to re-launch the negotiations with the aim of reaching a swift conclusion of the talks, building on the progress achieved to date.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000069/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(8 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Κυπριακό χρέος

1. Υπάρχει δυνατότητα απευθείας στήριξης των κυπριακών τραπεζών εντός του 2014 από τον Ευρωπαϊκό Μηχανισμό Στήριξης;

2. Ποιες επιλογές εξετάζουν οι Υπουργοί Οικονομικών της Ευρωζώνης σχετικά με την προοπτική επιστροφής του κυπριακού χρέους σε βιώσιμα επίπεδα;

3. Γιατί το τοπίο στην Ευρώπη για το Κυπριακό πρόγραμμα στήριξης παραμένει θολό, παρά την έγκαιρη και σχεδόν ομόφωνη ψήφιση των μνημονιακών νομοσχεδίων από τη Βουλή των Αντιπροσώπων;

4. Ποιες χώρες αντιδρούν και γιατί, όσον αφορά τη βιωσιμότητα του Κυπριακού χρέους και τι αντιπροτείνουν;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(18 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

1. Η Επιτροπή συνεργάζεται στενά με τις κυπριακές αρχές, την ΕΚΤ και το ΔΝΤ για την ολοκλήρωση του προγράμματος χρηματοδοτικής συνδρομής. Το έργο της διερεύνησης με τη δέουσα επιμέλεια των κεφαλαιακών αναγκών του κυπριακού χρηματοπιστωτικού τομέα οριστικοποιείται από ανεξάρτητο εξωτερικό σύμβουλο. Η τελική έκθεση αναμένεται να δημοσιευθεί το συντομότερο, μόλις θα υπογραφεί το Μνημόνιο Συνεννόησης.

Οι εργασίες για την ανάπτυξη ενός μέσου άμεσης ανακεφαλαιοποίησης στο πλαίσιο του ΕΜΣ συνεχίζονται, σύμφωνα με τα συμπεράσματα του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου της 29ης Ιουνίου και της 14ης Δεκεμβρίου 2012.

2. Οι απόψεις των κρατών μελών της ζώνης του ευρώ για την Κύπρο αντικατοπτρίζονται στη δήλωση της Ευρωομάδας της 13ης Δεκεμβρίου 2012. Η Ευρωομάδα της 21ης Ιανουαρίου 2013 χαιρέτισε επίσης την πρόοδο που έχει ήδη σημειώσει η Κύπρος κατά την εφαρμογή ορισμένων από τα σημαντικότερα μέτρα για τα οποία έχουν συμφωνήσει η Τρόικα και οι κυπριακές αρχές.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000069/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(8 January 2013)

Subject: Cyprus' debt

1. Is there any possibility of direct support by the European Support Mechanism for Cypriot banks by 2014?

2. What options are the Eurozone finance ministers considering with a view to restoring Cyprus' debt to viable levels?

3. Why is the outlook in Europe for the Cyprus support programme still uncertain despite the expeditious and virtually unanimous adoption of the memorandum bills by the House of Representatives?

4. Which countries do not believe that Cyprus's debt is viable, and why? What counter-proposals do they have?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

1. The Commission is working closely with the Cypriot authorities, the ECB and the IMF to finalise a financial assistance programme. The due diligence exercise on the capital needs of the Cypriot financial sector is being finalised by an independent external consultant. The final report is expected to be published as soon as the memorandum of understanding would be signed.

Work on the development of a direct recapitalisation instrument within the ESM, in line with the European Council Conclusions of 29 June and 14 December 2012, is ongoing.

2. The views of the euro area Member States on Cyprus are reflected in the Eurogroup statement of 13 December 2012. The Eurogroup of 21 January 2013 has also welcomed the progress Cyprus has already been making in implementing some of the important measures about which the Troika and the Cypriot authorities are in agreement.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000070/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(8 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Μετανάστευση

Πώς γίνεται σε ένα νησί, όπως είναι η Κύπρος, με 380 000 νόμιμα εργαζομένους υπό ομαλές συνθήκες, να συντηρούνται επιπρόσθετα εκτός από αυτούς και 200 000 ξένοι μετανάστες, παράνομοι και μη, από μια μικρή οικονομία, ιδιαίτερα μάλιστα σε περιόδους οικονομικής κρίσης και ύφεσης;

Με δεδομένο το θεμελιώδες δικαίωμα της ελεύθερης διακίνησης, εγκατάστασης και εργασίας Ευρωπαίων πολιτών σε όλη την επικράτεια της ΕΕ, αλλά και τις ιδιαιτερότητες και αντοχές της εθνικής οικονομίας κάθε κράτους μέλους της ΕΕ, δεν θα έπρεπε να υπάρχει ένα ανώτατο όριο αποδοχής ευρωπαίων και ξένων μεταναστών, παρανόμων και μη, ώστε να μπορεί η εθνική οικονομία να αντιμετωπίσει την κατάσταση που δημιουργείται στη αγορά εργασίας με τη διαρκή μετακίνηση εργαζομένων λόγω της κρίσης;

Απάντηση της κ. Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(14 Μαρτίου 2013)

Δεδομένων των προκλήσεων που θέτει ο γηράσκων πληθυσμός της ΕΕ και των διαρκών ελλείψεων δεξιοτήτων σε διάφορους τομείς της αγοράς εργασίας της ΕΕ, η μετανάστευση θα πρέπει να θεωρείται μέρος μιας ισορροπημένης, μακροπρόθεσμης πολιτικής απάντησης. Ωστόσο, τα κράτη μέλη διατηρούν το δικαίωμα να καθορίζουν τον όγκο των εισερχομένων υπηκόων τρίτων χωρών, προερχομένων από τρίτες χώρες, στο έδαφός τους με σκοπό την αναζήτηση μισθωτής ή μη μισθωτής εργασίας, όπως ορίζεται στο άρθρο 79 παράγραφος 5 της Συνθήκης για τη λειτουργία της ΕΕ.

Η ΕΕ έχει χαράξει πολιτικές που αποσκοπούν στην καταπολέμηση των καταχρήσεων. Για παράδειγμα, η οδηγία περί επιβολής κυρώσεων σε εργοδότες θεσπίζει ελάχιστα πρότυπα όσον αφορά τις κυρώσεις και τα μέτρα κατά των εργοδοτών υπηκόων τρίτων χωρών που διαμένουν παράνομα στην ΕΕ.

Η παράνομη μετανάστευση πρέπει να αντιμετωπιστεί τόσο σε εθνικό όσο και σε ενωσιακό επίπεδο, αλλά δεν πρέπει να θέτει υπό αμφισβήτηση τη θετική συμβολή των νόμιμων μεταναστών. Οι περισσότεροι μετανάστες είναι καθαροί συνεισφέροντες των φορολογικών και κοινωνικών ασφαλίσεων, ενισχύουν τον δυναμισμό και την πολυμορφία, που οδηγούν στην καινοτομία και την ανάπτυξη. Στο εσωτερικό της ΕΕ, η ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία των εργαζομένων είναι μία από τις τέσσερις θεμελιώδεις ελευθερίες στις οποίες βασίζεται η ενιαία αγορά. Το άρθρο 45 της ΣΛΕΕ κατοχυρώνει το δικαίωμα των πολιτών της ΕΕ να μετακινούνται σε άλλο κράτος μέλος για λόγους εργασίας ώστε να βελτιώνουν τις πιθανότητές τους για εύρεση εργασίας. Αυτό συμβάλλει στη βελτίωση της αντιστοιχίας μεταξύ δεξιοτήτων και θέσεων απασχόλησης στην αγορά εργασίας.

Γενικότερα, το θεμελιώδες δικαίωμα των πολιτών της Ένωσης για ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία και διαμονή τονώνει την οικονομική ανάπτυξη στο κράτος μέλος υποδοχής καθιστώντας δυνατή ή ενθαρρύνοντας την άσκηση εκ μέρους των πολιτών ενός ευρέως φάσματος οικονομικών δραστηριοτήτων, ως καταναλωτές, τουρίστες, αποδέκτες υπηρεσιών κ.λπ. Ταυτόχρονα, οι κανόνες της ΕΕ για την ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία παρέχουν επαρκείς εγγυήσεις ώστε να διασφαλίζεται ότι η άσκηση εκ μέρους των πολιτών της Ένωσης του δικαιώματός τους για ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία να μην οδηγεί σε αδικαιολόγητη επιβάρυνση των εθνικών προϋπολογισμών.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000070/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(8 January 2013)

Subject: Immigration

How is it possible that the small economy of an island like Cyprus, which has 380 000 registered workers working legally, manages to support a further 200 000 foreign immigrants, both legal and illegal, especially in times of economic crisis and recession?

Given the fundamental right of freedom of movement, settlement and employment of European citizens throughout the EU, but also the features and capacity of the national economy of each EU Member State, should there not be an upper limit for accepting European and foreign migrants, both legal and illegal, so as to enable each national economy to address the situation created in its labour market with the continuous movement of workers because of the crisis?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2013)

Given the challenges of an ageing EU population and enduring skills shortages in several sectors of the EU labour market, immigration should be considered as part of a balanced, long-term policy response. Nevertheless, Member States retain the right to determine volumes of admission of third-country nationals coming from third countries to their territory in order to seek work, as stated in Art 79(5) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU.

The EU has put in place policies aimed at fighting abuses. For example, the Employer Sanctions Directive establishes minimum standards on sanctions and measures against employers of irregularly-staying third-country nationals.

Irregular migration must be tackled at both national and EU level, but it should not detract from the positive contribution made by legal migrants. Most migrants are net contributors of tax and social insurance, and bring dynamism and diversity, leading to innovation and growth.

Within the EU, freedom of movement for workers is one of the four fundamental freedoms on which the Single Market is based. Article 45 TFEU enshrines the right of EU citizens to move to another Member States for work purposes, to improve their chance of finding work. This contributes to better matching of skills and jobs in the labour market.

More generally, the fundamental right of EU citizens to free movement and residence stimulates economic growth in the host Member State by enabling or encouraging the exercise by citizens of a broad range of economic activities, as consumers, tourists, recipients of services etc. At the same time, EU rules on free movement provide sufficient safeguards to ensure that citizens' exercise of their right to free movement does not result in undue burdens on national budgets.

Portal EUR-Lex (http://new.eur-lex.europa.eu) zapewnia bezpośredni i bezpłatny dostęp do prawodawstwa Unii Europejskiej. EUR-Lex umożliwia dostęp do *Dziennika Urzędowego Unii Europejskiej* oraz traktatów, aktów prawnych, orzecznictwa i aktów przygotowawczych.

Dodatkowe informacje o Unii Europejskiej znajdują się na stronie: http://europa.eu

Urząd Publikacji Unii Europejskiej
2985 Luksemburg
LUKSEMBURG

PL