IV

(Informări)

INFORMĂRI PROVENIND DE LA INSTITUȚIILE, ORGANELE ȘI ORGANISMELE UNIUNII EUROPENE

PARLAMENTUL EUROPEAN

ÎNTREBĂRI SCRISE CU SOLICITARE DE RĂSPUNS

Întrebări scrise adresate de deputații în Parlamentul European și răspunsurile oferite de instituțiile Uniunii Europene

(2014/C 48 E/01)

Cuprins **Pagina**

E-004788/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Social responsibility of European companies in Bangladesh
Versión española 29
English version 31

P-004922/13 by Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: CSR/Rana Plaza factory collapse in Bangladesh
English version 31

E-004552/13 by Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: Labour standards/corporate social responsibility (CSR) in Bangladesh
English version 31

E-004583/13 by Juozas Imbrasas to the Commission
Subject: Possible violations in Vilnius in relation to biomass power plant construction plans
Tekstas lietuvių kalba 33
English version 35

E-004584/13 by Juozas Imbrasas to the Commission
Subject: Possible infringements in Vilnius in relation to plans to construct a municipal waste mechanical biological treatment installation
Tekstas lietuvių kalba 33
English version 35

P-004604/13 by Véronique Mathieu Houillon to the Commission
Subject: Water waste management in Prague
Version française 37
English version 38

E-004909/13 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: Waste water management in Prague
English version 38

E-004612/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Humanitarian situation in Syria
Versione italiana 39
English version 41

E-004613/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Humanitarian situation in Syria
Versione italiana 39
English version 41

E-005353/13 by Matteo Salvini, Mara Bizzotto, Lorenzo Fontana, Oreste Rossi, Fiorello Provera, Francesco Enrico Speroni, Claudio Morganti, Giancarlo Scottà, Mario Borghezio, Lara Comi, Paweł Zalewski, Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid and Dimitar Stoyanov to the Commission
Subject: EU-US Free Trade Agreement and protection of European audiovisual production
българска версия 43
Version française 45
Versione italiana 47
Wersja polska 49
English version 53

E-004907/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: European cinema and EU-US trade negotiations
Ελληνική έκδοση 44
English version 52

E-004700/13 by Philippe Boulland to the Commission
Subject: The cultural exception of European cinema
Version française 45
English version 52

E-005133/13 by Malika Benarab-Attou, Robert Rochefort, Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid, Isabelle Thomas, Marie-Christine Vergiat and Silvia Costa to the Commission
Subject: Transatlantic trade and investment partnership between the EU and the United States of America
Version française 45
Versione italiana 47
English version 53

E-005607/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Audiovisual — free trade agreement with the US
Versão portuguesa 50
English version 54

E-005806/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Cultural exception for European films and audiovisual works
Versão portuguesa 50
English version 54

E-004765/13 by Anna Rosbach to the Commission
Subject: Medical devices and translation
Dansk udgave 56
English version 58

E-004767/13 by Anna Rosbach to the Commission
Subject: Translation of information on medical devices
Dansk udgave 56
English version 58

E-004775/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Results of the Croatian elections
Versão portuguesa 60
English version 61

E-005109/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Low turnout at the polls in Croatia
Versão portuguesa 60
English version 61

E-004809/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Council
Subject: Six million unemployed in Spain
Versión española 62
English version 64

E-004811/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Council
Subject: Emergency plan for youth unemployment
Versión española 62
English version 64

E-004863/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: New government in Iceland
Deutsche Fassung 66
English version 68

E-005105/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: State of play with regard to Iceland's accession to the EU
Versão portuguesa 67
English version 68

E-005492/13 by James Nicholson to the Commission
Subject: Accession talks with Iceland
English version 68

E-004864/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Brain disorders and the rising costs
Deutsche Fassung 70
English version 72

E-004865/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Mental health in Europe and its costs
Deutsche Fassung 70
English version 72

E-004885/13 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission
Subject: Special hazardous waste abandoned in a disused landfill in Padernello di Paese (province of Treviso), contaminating the underlying aquifer
Versione italiana 74
English version 76

E-004886/13 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission
Subject: Environmental rehabilitation of a confiscated plant containing special hazardous waste, located between Marcon (province of Venice) and Mogliano Veneto (province of Treviso), in jeopardy
Versione italiana 75
English version 76

E-004953/13 by Zbigniew Ziobro to the Commission
Subject: Decision by China to suspend its contract with Airbus
Wersja polska 78
English version 79

E-004954/13 by Zbigniew Ziobro to the Commission
Subject: India's boycott of EU restrictions on emissions of CO_2 from aircraft
Wersja polska 78
English version 79

P-004970/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission
Subject: Irregularities in the financing of Polish agriculture
Wersja polska 80
English version 82

P-004971/13 by Janusz Wojciechowski to the Commission
Subject: Information on plans to claim back EUR 79.9 million in rural development expenditure from Poland
Wersja polska 80
English version 82

E-004976/13 by Marek Henryk Migalski to the Commission
Subject: Repayment of rural development funding by Poland
Wersja polska 81
English version 83

E-005189/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Kidnapping of Orthodox Bishops in Syria
Ελληνική έκδοση 84
English version 87

E-004995/13 by Zbigniew Ziobro to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Kidnapping of bishops in Syria
Wersja polska 85
English version 87

E-005081/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Syria: kidnapping of bishops
Versão portuguesa 86
English version 87

E-005469/13 by Takis Hadjigeorgiou to the Commission
Subject: Safety at work in European companies
Ελληνική έκδοση 89
English version 93

E-005082/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Bangladesh — Rana Plaza
Versão portuguesa 90
English version 92

E-005364/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission
Subject: The tragedy in Bangladesh and working conditions in companies supplying the EU market
Versão portuguesa 90
English version 92

E-005176/13 by Ismail Ertug to the Commission
Subject: Ban on neonicotinoids
Deutsche Fassung 94
English version 96

E-005617/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Neonicotinoids — Impact on bees
Versão portuguesa 95
English version 96

P-005884/13 by Olga Sehnalová to the Commission
Subject: Problems faced by European Health Insurance Card holders abroad
České znění 97
English version 98

E-005193/13 by Marina Yannakoudakis to the Commission
Subject: Medical establishments and refusal to accept the European Health Insurance Card (EHIC)
English version 98

E-005203/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission
Subject: Environmental rehabilitation in S. Pedro da Cova
Versão portuguesa 99
English version 101

E-005204/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission
Subject: Hazardous waste in slag heaps at the disused São Pedro da Cova mines
Versão portuguesa 99
English version 101

E-005228/13 by Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission
Subject: Reclassification of NUTS III regions: Lisbon and the Setúbal Peninsula
Versão portuguesa 103
English version 105

E-005249/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission
Subject: Setúbal Peninsula — NUTS 2 and NUTS 3 reclassification
Versão portuguesa 103
English version 105

E-005275/13 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission
Subject: Serious problem of spring poaching affecting the young of the song thrush and other migratory birds in the Italian provinces of Trento and Bolzano
Versione italiana 107
English version 109

E-005299/13 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission
Subject: Serious issue of springtime poaching of rare Bonelli's eagle chicks
Versione italiana 107
English version 109

E-005322/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Health checks on imports of hazelnuts from Turkey
Versión española 111
English version 113

E-005323/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Food safety
Versión española 111
English version 113

E-005382/13 by Antonio Cancian to the Commission
Subject: Protection of the Prosecco designation
Versione italiana 115
English version 117

P-006141/13 by Giancarlo Scottà to the Commission
Subject: Protection of Prosecco wine CDO
Versione italiana 115
English version 117

P-006147/13 by Lorenzo Fontana to the Commission
Subject: Protection of Prosecco wine CDO
Versione italiana 116
English version 118

E-005414/13 by Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra to the Commission
Subject: Food waste
Versión española 119
English version 120

E-005415/13 by Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra to the Commission
Subject: Food waste and the environment
Versión española 119
English version 120

E-005454/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Wasting of European funds in the Canary Islands
Versión española 121
English version 123

E-005885/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Wasting of European funds in Murcia
Versión española 121
English version 123

E-006360/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Waste of European funds in Castile-La Mancha
Versión española 122
English version 124

P-005753/13 by Fiorello Provera to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Attack against a fishing vessel in the waters between Taiwan and the Philippines
Versione italiana 125
English version 128

E-005500/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Philippine vessel fires shots at Taiwanese boat
Wersja polska 126
English version 128

P-005693/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — EEAS assessment of act of aggression by Philippine Coast Guard
Wersja polska 126
English version 128

E-005586/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — People trafficking — Ban Ki-moon's statements
Versão portuguesa 130
English version 132

E-005633/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Human trafficking — Ban Ki-moon's statements
Versão portuguesa 130
English version 132

E-005662/13 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission
Subject: Consumer protection — olive oil in restaurants and the EU's standing
Deutsche Fassung 133
English version 138

E-005702/13 by Ismail Ertug to the Commission
Subject: Ban on refillable olive oil vessels in restaurants
Deutsche Fassung 133
English version 139

E-005703/13 by Ismail Ertug to the Commission
Subject: Consumer protection relating to olive oil, vinegar and other seasonings in restaurants
Deutsche Fassung 134
English version 139

E-005705/13 by Elisabeth Köstinger to the Commission
Subject: Amendment of the marketing standards for olive oil in restaurants
Deutsche Fassung 134
English version 139

P-005717/13 by Gaston Franco to the Commission
Subject: Serving olive oil in restaurants, hotels and cafes
Version française 135
English version 140

E-005599/13 by Patricia van der Kammen to the Commission
Subject: EU is going to ban olive oil in jugs
Nederlandse versie 136
English version 138

E-005752/13 by Bart Staes to the Commission
Subject: Olive oil in recyclable bottles
Nederlandse versie 136
English version 140

E-005805/13 by Åsa Westlund to the Commission
Subject: Banning olive oil in refillable vessels
Svensk version 137
English version 141

E-005631/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Collapsed building in Bangladesh
Versão portuguesa 142
English version 144

E-005674/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Accident in Bangladesh
Versão portuguesa 142
English version 144

E-005812/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Bangladesh — agreement with European clothing brands
Versão portuguesa 142
English version 144

E-005666/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Banking union
Versão portuguesa 146
English version 147

E-005667/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: European banking union
Versão portuguesa 146
English version 147

E-005742/13 by Ana Miranda to the Commission
Subject: Hydraulic fracturing in Aragón (I)
Versión española 148
English version 151

E-005743/13 by Ana Miranda to the Commission
Subject: Hydraulic fracturing in Aragón (II)
Versión española 148
English version 151

E-005744/13 by Ana Miranda to the Commission
Subject: Hydraulic fracturing in Aragón (III)
Versión española 148
English version 151

E-005745/13 by Ana Miranda to the Commission
Subject: Hydraulic fracturing in Aragón (IV)
Versión española 149
English version 152

E-005746/13 by Ana Miranda to the Commission
Subject: Hydraulic fracturing in Aragón (V)
Versión española 149
English version 152

E-005785/13 by Patricia van der Kammen to the Commission
Subject: Follow-up question concerning nefarious practices at Ryanair
Nederlandse versie 154
English version 156

E-005925/13 by Patricia van der Kammen to the Commission
Subject: Nefarious practices by Ryanair affecting aviation safety
Nederlandse versie 154
English version 156

E-006523/13 by Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Iratxe García Pérez and Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission
Subject: Investigation of exports of European wine to China
Versión española 158
English version 163

P-006601/13 by Esther Herranz García to the Commission
Subject: Chinese threat to impose restrictions on European wines
Versión española 158
English version 164

P-006726/13 by María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora to the Commission
Subject: China's announcement of restrictions on imports of European wine
Versión española 158
English version 164

E-006727/13 by Pablo Zalba Bidegain to the Commission
Subject: China's announcement of restrictions on imports of European wine
Versión española 159
English version 164

E-005790/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Anti-dumping investigation by China regarding exports of European wines
Versione italiana 160
English version 163

E-006592/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Wine exports to China
Versão portuguesa 161
English version 163

E-006910/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: The Chinese threat to EU wine exports
Versão portuguesa 161
English version 165

E-005844/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Anders Fogh Rasmussen: European 'soft power' is not enough
Versão portuguesa 166
English version 168

E-005845/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Anders Fogh Rasmussen: European 'soft power' is not enough
Versão portuguesa 166
English version 168

P-005847/13 by Elena Băsescu to the Commission
Subject: Extension of Romania's reverse charge mechanism for cereals
Versiunea în limba română 170
English version 172

E-006428/13 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Reverse charge mechanism for cereal crops in Romania
Versiunea în limba română 170
English version 172

E-005908/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Threats by India in relation to its refusal to pay carbon tax
Version française 174
English version 176

E-005909/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: China's refusal to pay the carbon tax
Version française 174
English version 176

E-005983/13 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission
Subject: Fisheries agreement between the Islamic Republic of Mauritania and the Russian Federation
Versión española 178
English version 180

E-006031/13 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission
Subject: Application of EU-Mauritania Fisheries Protocol to hake fleets
Versión española 178
English version 180

E-006051/13 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo, Juan Fernando López Aguilar and Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo to the Commission
Subject: Consequences for the Canary Islands of the EU-Mauritania Fisheries Protocol
Versión española 178
English version 180

E-006476/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Criticism of the Amendment to Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012
Deutsche Fassung 182
English version 192

E-006477/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Hygiene questions concerning olive oil containers in food establishments
Deutsche Fassung 182
English version 192

E-006478/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Consumer protection in relation to olive oil in catering establishments
Deutsche Fassung 183
English version 192

E-006504/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Contact with lobbyists since the publication of the Implementing Regulation on marketing standards for olive oil
Deutsche Fassung 183
English version 193

E-006569/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Comments on the amendment to the Implementing Regulation on marketing standards for olive oil
Deutsche Fassung 183
English version 193

E-006571/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Reasons for amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012
Deutsche Fassung 184
English version 193

E-006573/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Involvement of the Commission's Directorates-General in the amendment of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012
Deutsche Fassung 184
English version 194

E-006574/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Impact of the amendment to Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil
Deutsche Fassung 184
English version 194

E-006576/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Amendment to the Implementing Regulation on marketing standards for olive oil
Deutsche Fassung 185
English version 194

E-006605/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Disclosure of the meeting of the Management Committee that voted on the amendment to the Implementing Regulation on marketing standards for olive oil
Deutsche Fassung 185
English version 195

E-006921/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Withdrawal of amending Regulation on the protection of olive oil
Ελληνική έκδοση 187
English version 196

E-006093/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Amendment to Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil
Versione italiana 188
English version 191

E-006641/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Olive oil regulation
Versione italiana 188
English version 195

E-006734/13 by Aldo Patriciello to the Commission
Subject: Food fraud and adulteration in the olive oil sector
Versione italiana 189
English version 196

E-006004/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission
Subject: Commission decision on the use of olive oil jugs in restaurants
Versão portuguesa 190
English version 191

P-006022/13 by Edite Estrela to the Commission
Subject: Block on European Investment Bank funding for small and medium-sized enterprises in Portugal
Versão portuguesa 198
English version 201

P-006029/13 by António Fernando Correia de Campos to the Commission
Subject: Block on European Investment Bank funding for small and medium-sized enterprises in Portugal
Versão portuguesa 198
English version 201

E-006285/13 by Carlos Coelho and José Manuel Fernandes to the Commission
Subject: Delay in European Investment Bank funding for Portuguese SMEs
Versão portuguesa 198
English version 201

E-006944/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Block on EIB lending to Portugal — 2
Versão portuguesa 199
English version 202

E-006945/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Block on EIB lending to Portugal — 1
Versão portuguesa 199
English version 202

E-006320/13 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission
Subject: Possible repercussions for the European canning sector of the Free Trade Agreement between the EU and Thailand
Versión española ... 204
English version ... 206

E-006040/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Impact on the canned tuna sector of the EU-Thailand free trade agreement
Versão portuguesa ... 205
English version ... 206

E-006063/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Multinational list for European elections
Version française ... 208
English version ... 210

E-006064/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Information on European ballot papers
Version française ... 208
English version ... 210

E-006065/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: 2014 elections: election of the President of the Commission by EU citizens
Version française ... 208
English version ... 210

P-006105/13 by Ivailo Kalfin to the Commission
Subject: Commissioner Günter Oettinger's comments about Bulgaria
българска версия ... 212
English version ... 215

E-006436/13 by David Casa to the Commission
Subject: Concern over Bulgaria, Italy and Romania
Verżjoni Maltija ... 213
English version ... 215

E-006358/13 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Romania — an ungovernable country
Versiunea în limba română ... 214
English version ... 215

E-006403/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: The chaotic situation in Turkey
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 217
English version ... 229

E-006922/13 by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Situation in Turkey
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 217
English version ... 230

E-007238/13 by Kyriacos Triantaphyllides to the Commission
Subject: Recent developments in Turkey
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 217
English version ... 231

E-006721/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Turkey — Scandalous use of excessive force by police in Istanbul
Version française ... 219
English version ... 229

P-006302/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Trees and civil rights in Turkey
Versione italiana ... 220
English version ... 228

E-006891/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Turkish protesters arrested by the Government for using social networks
Versione italiana 220
English version 230

E-007259/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Use of violence by Turkish police towards foreign journalists
Versione italiana 221
English version 232

E-006193/13 by Philip Claeys to the Commission
Subject: Systematic use of tear gas by Turkish police
Nederlandse versie 222
English version 228

E-007093/13 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission
Subject: Turkey threatens to deploy army against demonstrators
Nederlandse versie 222
English version 231

E-007260/13 by Philip Claeys to the Commission
Subject: Erdoğan: use of tear gas in *acquis communautaire*
Nederlandse versie 222
English version 232

E-007264/13 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission
Subject: Fines for critical TV stations in Turkey
Nederlandse versie 223
English version 233

E-007265/13 by Philip Claeys to the Commission
Subject: Use of chemicals in water for water cannon in Turkey
Nederlandse versie 223
English version 233

E-006871/13 by Paweł Zalewski to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Situation in Turkey
Wersja polska 225
English version 229

E-007036/13 by Filip Kaczmarek to the Commission
Subject: Demonstrations in Turkey
Wersja polska 225
English version 231

E-007023/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Protests in Turkey
Versão portuguesa 227
English version 230

E-006218/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Tax evasion in the EU
Versão portuguesa 235
English version 236

E-006586/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: EU loses EUR 1 trillion annually to the black economy
Versão portuguesa 235
English version 236

E-006402/13 by Ole Christensen to the Commission
Subject: Hairdressing sector agreement
Dansk udgave 237
English version 239

E-006346/13 by Ivo Belet to the Commission
Subject: European framework agreement on health and safety in hairdressing sector
Nederlandse versie 238
English version 239

E-006373/13 by Gabriel Mato Adrover to the Commission
Subject: Fisheries agreement with Mauritania
Versión española 241
English version 243

E-006597/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: EU-Mauritania fisheries partnership agreement rejected by Parliament
Versão portuguesa 242
English version 243

E-006378/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Repression in Turkey
Versión española 245
English version 248

E-006507/13 by Takis Hadjigeorgiou to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Harsh clampdown on peaceful protestors in Turkey
Ελληνική έκδοση 246
English version 249

E-006390/13 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Protests in Turkey
Nederlandse versie 247
English version 248

E-006616/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Lung cancer vaccine
Versão portuguesa 250
English version 252

E-006651/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: New lung cancer drug
Versão portuguesa 250
English version 252

E-006630/13 by Isabella Lövin, Raül Romeva i Rueda, Norbert Neuser, Marco Scurria, Ivo Vajgl, Willy Meyer, Åsa Westlund, Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón, Francisco Sosa Wagner and Jill Evans to the Commission
Subject: EU monitoring of human rights in Western Sahara
Versión española 254
Deutsche Fassung 256
Versione italiana 258
Slovenska različica 260
Svensk version 262
English version 264

E-006631/13 by Isabella Lövin, Raül Romeva i Rueda, Norbert Neuser, Marco Scurria, Ivo Vajgl, Willy Meyer, Åsa Westlund, Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón, Francisco Sosa Wagner and Jill Evans to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — EU monitoring of human rights in Western Sahara
Versión española 254
Deutsche Fassung 256
Versione italiana 258
Slovenska različica 260
Svensk version 262
English version 264

E-006691/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Wasting of EU funds in Extremadura
Versión española 266
English version 269

E-007043/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Wasting of European funds in Andalusia
Versión española ... 266
English version ... 269

E-007662/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: European money wasted in Valencia
Versión española ... 267
English version ... 270

E-008153/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Wasting of European funds in Madrid
Versión española ... 267
English version ... 270

E-006715/13 by Baroness Sarah Ludford to the Commission
Subject: Kurdish political settlement
English version ... 272

E-006716/13 by Baroness Sarah Ludford to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Kurdish political settlement
English version ... 272

E-006841/13 by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission
Subject: Objectives of Greek stabilisation programme
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 273
English version ... 278

E-006929/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: IMF admits mistakes concerning austerity measures in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 273
English version ... 279

E-006794/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: IMF report damning on the Commission's management of Greek debt
Version française ... 275
English version ... 278

E-006981/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: The International Monetary Fund (IMF) admits to mistakes in gauging the impact of austerity policies III
Versão portuguesa ... 277
English version ... 279

E-006799/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Bank resolution fund I
Versão portuguesa ... 280
English version ... 283

E-006800/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Bank resolution fund II
Versão portuguesa ... 280
English version ... 283

E-006801/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Bank resolution fund III
Versão portuguesa ... 280
English version ... 283

E-006802/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Bank resolution fund IV
Versão portuguesa ... 281
English version ... 283

E-006803/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Bank resolution fund V
Versão portuguesa 281
English version 284

E-006804/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Bank resolution fund VI
Versão portuguesa 281
English version 284

E-006920/13 by Søren Bo Søndergaard to the Commission
Subject: Closure of ERT in Greece
Dansk udgave 285
English version 295

E-006955/13 by Rebecca Harms to the Commission
Subject: Abolition of public radio and television in Greece
Deutsche Fassung 286
English version 296

E-006986/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Austerity in Greece
Deutsche Fassung 286
English version 296

E-006815/13 by Maria Eleni Koppa, Nikos Chrysogelos, Spyros Danellis and Anni Podimata to the Commission
Subject: Greek State radio and TV pulled off the air
Ελληνική έκδοση 288
English version 294

E-006826/13 by Sylvana Rapti, Spyros Danellis, Dimitrios Droutsas, Maria Eleni Koppa, Chrysoula Paliadeli, Anni Podimata, Georgios Stavrakakis and Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission
Subject: European Commission involvement in closure of Greek National Radio and Television Foundation
Ελληνική έκδοση 288
English version 294

E-006924/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: The closure of ERT, the Greek State broadcaster
Ελληνική έκδοση 289
English version 295

E-007171/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Greece shuts down its state broadcasting company
Version française 290
English version 296

E-007241/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Closure of Greek state TV
Versione italiana 291
English version 297

E-007274/13 by Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission
Subject: Closure of the ERT channel
Versão portuguesa 292
English version 297

E-006912/13 by Silvia-Adriana Ţicău to the Commission
Subject: Role of public television and radio services in the EU
Versiunea în limba română 293
English version 295

E-006821/13 by Carlo Fidanza to the Commission
Subject: Ending visa requirements between the EU and Russia
Versione italiana 299
English version 301

E-006822/13 by Carlo Fidanza to the Commission
Subject: Fitting audible alarms to child restraint systems in motor vehicles
Versione italiana 303
English version 304

E-006823/13 by Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo to the Commission
Subject: Women's role in the fisheries sector
Versión española 305
English version 306

E-006824/13 by Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2010/41/EU in the fisheries sector
Versión española 307
English version 308

E-006825/13 by Eva Ortiz Vilella and Salvador Garriga Polledo to the Commission
Subject: Raising the *de minimis* aid threshold
Versión española 309
English version 310

E-006827/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Commissioner Rehn's statement on Franco-German proposals for the euro area
Versão portuguesa 311
English version 312

E-006828/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2011/71/EU — wood preservatives containing creosote
Versão portuguesa 313
English version 317

E-006829/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2011/12/EU — biocidal products used as wood preservatives and containing fenoxycarb
Versão portuguesa 313
English version 317

E-006830/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2011/11/EU — biocidal products used as attractants
Versão portuguesa 314
English version 317

E-006831/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2011/10/EU — biocidal products used as wood preservatives and containing bifenthrin
Versão portuguesa 314
English version 318

E-006832/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2011/13/EU — biocidal products used as repellents and containing nonanoic acid
Versão portuguesa 315
English version 318

E-006833/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2011/67/EU — biocidal products used as insecticides, acaricides and products to control other arthropods and containing abamectin
Versão portuguesa 315
English version 319

E-006834/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2011/66/EU — biocides containing 4,5-Dichloro-2-octyl-2H-isothiazol-3-one used as wood preservatives
Versão portuguesa 316
English version 319

P-006835/13 by Iratxe García Pérez to the Commission
Subject: Delegated act concerning the optional quality term 'product from my farm'
Versión española 321
English version 322

P-006836/13 by Rebecca Harms to the Commission
Subject: Second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol
Deutsche Fassung 323
English version 324

E-006837/13 by Andrés Perelló Rodríguez to the Commission
Subject: Retroactive application of anti-dumping measures to imports of preserved mandarin oranges from the People's Republic of China
Versión española 325
English version 326

E-006838/13 by Christel Schaldemose to the Commission
Subject: Roaming charges in Europe
Dansk udgave 327
English version 328

E-006839/13 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission
Subject: Abolition of the Greek Land Registry and Mapping Agency and transfer of responsibilities to Ktimatologio SA
Ελληνική έκδοση 329
English version 330

E-006840/13 by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission
Subject: Take-up of NSRF resources
Ελληνική έκδοση 331
English version 332

E-006842/13 by Marta Andreasen to the Commission
Subject: Financial transaction tax (FTT)
English version 333

E-006843/13 by Marta Andreasen to the Commission
Subject: European Union pension scheme
English version 334

E-006844/13 by Aldo Patriciello to the Commission
Subject: Homogenising EU directives on product placement in audiovisual works
Versione italiana 335
English version 336

E-006845/13 by David Casa to the Commission
Subject: Overfishing
Verżjoni Maltija 337
English version 338

E-006846/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Kenya's leaders should be held to account
Version française 339
English version 340

E-006847/13 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission
Subject: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and youth unemployment rates in Europe
Version française 341
English version 343

E-006848/13 by Crescenzio Rivellini to the Commission
Subject: Investigations into the America's Cup and EU funding
Versione italiana 344
English version 345

E-006849/13 by Aldo Patriciello to the Commission
Subject: Renewable energies
Versione italiana 346
English version 348

E-006850/13 by Wim van de Camp to the Commission
Subject: Use of 3D printers
Nederlandse versie 349
English version 350

P-006851/13 by Daniel Cohn-Bendit to the Commission
Subject: Commission's involvement in the closing of the Greek national broadcaster ERT
Deutsche Fassung 351
English version 352

E-006852/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2009/15/EC — common rules and standards for ship inspection and survey organisations
Versão portuguesa 353
English version 354

E-006853/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2010/61/EU — inland transport of dangerous goods
Versão portuguesa 355
English version 356

E-006854/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2009/20/EC — insurance of shipowners for maritime claims
Versão portuguesa 357
English version 358

E-006855/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2009/71/Euratom — safety of nuclear installations
Versão portuguesa 359
English version 360

E-006856/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2011/98/EU — third-country nationals residing in the EU
Versão portuguesa 361
English version 362

E-006857/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2008/115/EC — returning illegally staying third-country nationals
Versão portuguesa 363
English version 364

E-006858/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2009/21/EC — maritime transport: compliance with flag State requirements
Versão portuguesa 365
English version 366

E-006859/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2011/88/EU — engines placed on the market under the flexibility scheme
Versão portuguesa 367
English version 368

E-006860/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2010/45/EU — VAT: rules on invoicing
Versão portuguesa 369
English version 370

E-006861/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Internet: Alleged US espionage
Versão portuguesa 371
English version 372

E-006862/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2010/47/EU — technical inspection of commercial vehicles
Versão portuguesa 373
English version 374

E-006863/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2009/50/EC — entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly qualified employment
Versão portuguesa 375
English version 376

E-006864/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2009/52/CE — sanctions and measures against employers of illegally-staying third-country nationals
Versão portuguesa 377
English version 378

E-006865/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2011/51/EU — rights of beneficiaries of international protection
Versão portuguesa 379
English version 380

E-006866/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2009/136/EC — electronic communications networks and services: universal service and users' rights
Versão portuguesa 381
English version 382

E-006867/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2010/24/EU — mutual assistance for the recovery of claims
Versão portuguesa 383
English version 384

E-006868/13 by Eider Gardiazábal Rubial and María Irigoyen Pérez to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of the structural and cohesion funds
Versión española 385
English version 386

E-006870/13 by Nessa Childers, Bas Eickhout, Sven Giegold, Monica Luisa Macovei and Sylvie Goulard to the Commission
Subject: EU Platform for Tax Good Governance
Deutsche Fassung 387
Version française 388
Nederlandse versie 389
Versiunea în limba română 390
English version 391

E-006872/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Monitoring of air passengers' rights
Version française 392
English version 393

E-006873/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Council
Subject: Wildlife trafficking
Version française 394
English version 395

E-006874/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Wildlife trafficking
Version française 396
English version 397

E-006875/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Legislative proposal on Europol
Version française 398
English version 399

E-006876/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: European programme to protect informants
Version française 400
English version 401

E-006877/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Responsibility of legal persons in fraud cases
Version française 402
English version 403

E-006878/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Roadmap for judicial and police cooperation
Version française 404
English version 405

E-006879/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: EU charter for victims of human trafficking
Version française 406
English version 407

E-006880/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Council
Subject: EU list of criminal organisations
Version française 408
English version 409

E-006881/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Article 18 of the Trafficking in Human Beings (THB) Directive
Version française 410
English version 411

E-006882/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Definition of 'self-laundering'
Version française 412
English version 413

E-006883/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Council
Subject: Definition of organised crime
Version française 414
English version 415

E-006884/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Comparative study of special investigative techniques
Version française 416
English version 417

P-006885/13 by Jacky Hénin to the Commission
Subject: MyFerryLink
Version française 418
English version 419

P-006886/13 by Ivo Belet to the Commission
Subject: Delegated acts under the regulation concerning harmonised conditions for the marketing of construction products
Nederlandse versie 420
English version 421

E-006887/13 by Marian Harkin to the Commission
Subject: Medical card entitlements for those aged over 70
English version 422

E-006888/13 by Francesco De Angelis to the Commission
Subject: Dangers of ionising radiation and transposition of EU legislation in Italy
Versione italiana ... 423
English version ... 424

E-006889/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Damage to European citizens arising from the relocation of telephone companies
Versione italiana ... 425
English version ... 426

E-006890/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Handling personal data of European passengers on flights to Russia
Versione italiana ... 427
English version ... 428

E-007649/13 by James Nicholson to the Commission
Subject: Air passenger data
English version ... 428

E-006892/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: New attack on Italian products: counterfeit Sambuca
Versione italiana ... 429
English version ... 430

E-006893/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Violation of European citizens' right to privacy and personal data protection
Versione italiana ... 431
English version ... 432

E-006894/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Stopping speculation on agricultural products
Versione italiana ... 433
English version ... 434

E-006895/13 by Silvia-Adriana Țicău to the Commission
Subject: Assistance provided to Member States affected by flooding in June 2013
Versiunea în limba română ... 435
English version ... 436

P-006896/13 by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission
Subject: Suspension of Greek State TV broadcasting
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 437
English version ... 438

P-006897/13 by Johannes Cornelis van Baalen to the Commission
Subject: Liberalisation of cross-border passenger transport by rail
Nederlandse versie ... 439
English version ... 441

E-006898/13 by Rosa Estaràs Ferragut to the Commission
Subject: Statistics on the situation of children and women with disabilities in relation to violence
Versión española ... 443
English version ... 445

E-006899/13 by Rosa Estaràs Ferragut to the Commission
Subject: Coordinating holidays in the Member States
Versión española ... 447
English version ... 448

E-006900/13 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission
Subject: New restructuring plan of Banco CEISS
Versión española ... 449
English version ... 450

E-006901/13 by Spyros Danellis to the Commission
Subject: Services of general economic interest in island areas
Ελληνική έκδοση 451
English version 453

E-006902/13 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission
Subject: The recovery and resolution directive: how to cause a flood of bankruptcies
Nederlandse versie 454
English version 456

E-006903/13 by Matteo Salvini to the Commission
Subject: Unnecessarily violent tactics being employed by the Turkish Government in response to protests
Versione italiana 458
English version 459

E-006905/13 by Fabrizio Bertot to the Commission
Subject: Preventing the destabilisation of Libyan democracy
Versione italiana 460
English version 461

E-006906/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Co.Ve.Ri landfill in Casale sul Sile, Treviso
Versione italiana 462
English version 463

E-006907/13 by Vilija Blinkevičiūtė to the Commission
Subject: Representation of the EU Member States at the Joint G20 Finance and Labour Ministers Meeting
Tekstas lietuvių kalba 464
English version 465

E-006908/13 by Kathleen Van Brempt to the Commission
Subject: Possible conflict between the Renewable Energy Directive and the principle of free movement of goods
Nederlandse versie 466
English version 467

E-006909/13 by Kathleen Van Brempt to the Commission
Subject: Protection of the harbour porpoise
Nederlandse versie 468
English version 469

E-006911/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: The Chinese threat to Portuguese wine exports
Versão portuguesa 470
English version 471

P-006913/13 by Gerard Batten to the Commission
Subject: Right to legal aid for migrant workers under Council Directive 2003/8/EC
English version 472

E-006914/13 by Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė to the Commission
Subject: Possible EU funding for the rehabilitation of Freedom Square in Vilnius
Tekstas lietuvių kalba 473
English version 474

E-006915/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: EU investigation into alleged manipulation of oil prices
English version 475

E-006916/13 by Louis Michel and Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Funding for the European strategy for a Better Internet for Children under the 'Connecting Europe Facility 2014-2020' programme
Version française 476
English version 477

P-006917/13 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission
Subject: Closure of Greek State TV station
Version française 478
English version 479

P-006918/13 by Åsa Westlund to the Commission
Subject: Ban on bisphenol A in contact with food
Svensk version 480
English version 481

E-006919/13 by Morten Løkkegaard to the Commission
Subject: EU Patent Court
Dansk udgave 482
English version 483

E-006925/13 by Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou to the Commission
Subject: Corporate Social Responsibility in the EU and the world
Ελληνική έκδοση 484
English version 486

E-006926/13 by Niki Tzavela to the Commission
Subject: Accession of Turkey: opening of negotiations on Chapters 23 and 24
Ελληνική έκδοση 487
English version 488

E-006927/13 by Niki Tzavela to the Commission
Subject: Spillover in Turkey from Syrian conflict
Ελληνική έκδοση 489
English version 490

E-006928/13 by Paweł Robert Kowal to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Situation in Syria
Wersja polska 491
English version 492

E-006930/13 by David Martin to the Commission
Subject: Arctic Council permanent observer status
English version 493

E-006931/13 by David Martin to the Commission
Subject: Implications of Swiss trade agreements with third countries
English version 494

E-006932/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: US lobbying the Commission to inspect personal data
Versione italiana 495
English version 496

E-006933/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Including disabled students in evaluation of the education system
Versione italiana 497
English version 498

E-006934/13 by Cristiana Muscardini, Roberta Angelilli, Patrizia Toia and Niccolò Rinaldi to the Commission
Subject: Anti-dumping blackmail by China
Versione italiana 499
English version 500

E-006935/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: New EUR 5 banknotes not accepted by vending machines
Versione italiana 501
English version 502

E-006936/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Equitalia and debt collection companies: Italian households and individuals reduced to poverty
Versione italiana 503
English version 505

E-006937/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Debt unblocking decree favours local administrations in southern Italy
Versione italiana 506
English version 508

E-006938/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Ketamine, a narcotic medication: future prospects of research to find new treatments for serious illnesses?
Versione italiana 510
English version 511

E-006939/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Measures to encourage the reuse of waste oil
Versione italiana 512
English version 513

E-006941/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Resistance to some antimicrobials in Salmonella and Campylobacter in Europe
Versione italiana 514
English version 515

E-006942/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Situation of animal rights in Serbia
Versione italiana 516
English version 517

E-006946/13 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Slowdown in agricultural production growth rate
Versiunea în limba română 518
English version 519

E-006947/13 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Impact of the flooding in Central Europe on agriculture
Versiunea în limba română 520
English version 521

E-006948/13 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Regulating the use of the product Rotenone in agriculture
Versiunea în limba română 522
English version 523

E-006949/13 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Regulating the use of copper-based products in agriculture
Versiunea în limba română 524
English version 525

E-006950/13 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Returning to the question for a written answer E-004398/2013
Versiunea în limba română 526
English version 527

E-006952/13 by Rosa Estaràs Ferragut to the Commission
Subject: Environmentally friendly tourism
Versión española 528
English version 529

E-006953/13 by Rosa Estaràs Ferragut to the Commission
Subject: Website to help disabled persons understand their rights
Versión española 530
English version 532

E-006954/13 by Andrés Perelló Rodríguez to the Commission
Subject: Spanish law on protection and use of the shoreline and amending the Coasts Act: compatibility with EU legislation
Versión española 534
English version 535

E-006956/13 by David Martin to the Commission
Subject: EU-Malaysia trade
English version 536

E-006957/13 by David Martin to the Commission
Subject: Civil society monitoring committees under the Association Agreement with Central America
English version 537

E-006958/13 by David Martin to the Commission
Subject: Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership issues
English version 538

E-006959/13 by Niccolò Rinaldi to the Commission
Subject: Electronic cigarettes: heavy metals found in e-liquids
Versione italiana 539
English version 540

E-006960/13 by Johannes Cornelis van Baalen to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Storming of city hall in Skopje-Centre (FYROM)
Nederlandse versie 541
English version 542

E-006961/13 by Karin Kadenbach and Jörg Leichtfried to the Commission
Subject: EU-wide ban on genetically modified animals
Deutsche Fassung 543
English version 544

E-006962/13 by Daciana Octavia Sârbu to the Commission
Subject: Honey in supermarkets
Versiunea în limba română 545
English version 546

E-006963/13 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission
Subject: Slaughter of animals in Cyprus under illegal conditions
Ελληνική έκδοση 547
English version 548

E-006964/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: EU support for first-time home-buyers
English version 549

E-006965/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Payday lenders
English version 550

E-006966/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Use of waste packaging for heating in schools
English version 551

E-006967/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Cervical cancer rates
English version 552

E-006969/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Eliminating leprosy in India
English version 553

E-006970/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Meningitis B vaccine
English version ... 554

E-006971/13 by Agnès Le Brun to the Commission
Subject: Chinese solar panels
Version française ... 555
English version ... 556

E-006972/13 by Elena Băsescu to the Commission
Subject: Combating youth unemployment
Versiunea în limba română ... 557
English version ... 558

E-006973/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Organised crime in Marseilles
Versão portuguesa ... 559
English version ... 560

E-006974/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Commission funding of projects in Mozambique
Versão portuguesa ... 561
English version ... 562

E-006975/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: European Investment Bank (EIB) loans to Portugal
Versão portuguesa ... 563
English version ... 564

E-006976/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: United States' direct access to Google, Facebook and Apple users' data
Versão portuguesa ... 565
English version ... 566

E-006977/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: David Cameron demands that Google remove child pornography from the Internet
Versão portuguesa ... 567
English version ... 568

E-006978/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: The Troika's forecasts at the start of the Portuguese programme compared with the reality in 2013
Versão portuguesa ... 569
English version ... 570

E-006979/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: The International Monetary Fund (IMF) admits to mistakes in gauging the impact of austerity policies I
Versão portuguesa ... 571
English version ... 572

E-006980/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: The International Monetary Fund (IMF) admits to mistakes in gauging the impact of austerity policies II
Versão portuguesa ... 573
English version ... 574

E-006982/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Floating rubbish patch in the western Pacific
Versão portuguesa ... 575
English version ... 576

E-006983/13 by Rosa Estaràs Ferragut to the Commission
Subject: Number of people with disabilities working at the European institutions
Versión española ... 577
English version ... 578

E-006984/13 by Rosa Estaràs Ferragut to the Commission
Subject: Industrial heritage tourism
Versión española ... 579
English version ... 580

E-006985/13 by Rosa Estaràs Ferragut to the Commission
Subject: Bicycle tourism
Versión española ... 581
English version ... 582

E-006987/13 by Michael Gahler to the Commission
Subject: Opening of the European Commission's Emergency Response Centre (ERC)
Deutsche Fassung ... 583
English version ... 584

E-006988/13 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: Cross-border healthcare
English version ... 585

E-006989/13 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: European Patent Organisation and the Biotechnology Directive
English version ... 586

E-006990/13 by Emma McClarkin to the Commission
Subject: Rural broadband
English version ... 587

E-006991/13 by Syed Kamall to the Commission
Subject: Industrial farming and conservation
English version ... 588

E-006993/13 by Ana Gomes to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Human rights in Bahrain
Versão portuguesa ... 589
English version ... 590

E-006994/13 by Nicole Sinclaire to the Commission
Subject: 10th European Development Fund — UK contribution
English version ... 591

E-006995/13 by Nicole Sinclaire to the Commission
Subject: 11th European Development Fund — UK contribution
English version ... 592

E-006997/13 by Véronique Mathieu Houillon to the Commission
Subject: Fixed rate for royalties
Version française ... 593
English version ... 594

E-006998/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information on the deployment of the European Gendarmerie Force, Eurogendfor
Versione italiana ... 595
English version ... 596

E-006999/13 by Lorenzo Fontana to the Commission
Subject: Alleged infringements in the call for proposals for the award of Tempus IV funds (EACEA/35/2012)
Versione italiana ... 597
English version ... 598

E-007000/13 by Claudio Morganti to the Commission
Subject: Difficulties in EU-China trade relations
Versione italiana ... 599
English version ... 600

E-007003/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: 7 000 teachers will lose their job in Poland
Wersja polska ... 601
English version ... 602

E-007004/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: Central Europe's worst flooding in over a decade
Wersja polska ... 603
English version ... 604

E-007005/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Discrimination and violence against Dalit women
Wersja polska ... 605
English version ... 606

E-007006/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: Germany's vocational-education systems in other Member States
Wersja polska ... 607
English version ... 608

E-007007/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Centralised monitoring by the Indian government
Wersja polska ... 609
English version ... 610

E-007008/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Activists prosecuted by Malaysian authorities
Wersja polska ... 611
English version ... 612

E-007009/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: Slowest growth rate in Poland since 2001 in the first quarter of 2013
Wersja polska ... 613
English version ... 614

E-007010/13 by Ryszard Antoni Legutko to the Commission
Subject: Eligibility of VAT in connection with EU funding under the new EU budget
Wersja polska ... 615
English version ... 616

E-007011/13 by Gaston Franco to the Commission
Subject: Two-year ban on three neonicotinoid-based pesticides
Version française ... 617
English version ... 618

E-007012/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Nuclear bombs in EU territory
Versão portuguesa ... 619
English version ... 621

E-007021/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Nuclear bombs in EU territory
Versão portuguesa ... 619
English version ... 621

E-007013/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Use of sarin gas in Syria
Versão portuguesa ... 623
English version ... 624

E-007014/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — North Koreans deported from Laos
Versão portuguesa ... 625
English version ... 626

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004788/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(29 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Responsabilidad social de compañías europeas en Bangladés

El pasado 25 de abril, sucedió un trágico accidente al colapsar un taller de costura en Daca, la capital de Bangladés, que ha costado la vida a más de 370 personas y, de nuevo, ha puesto de relieve las pésimas condiciones de higiene y seguridad laboral en las que subcontratan las empresas textiles europeas. El taller desplomado ha resultado ser propiedad de un empresario español que se encuentra en búsqueda y captura. Bangladés es el segundo exportador mundial del sector textil por el bajísimo coste de su mano de obra. Este accidente es una clara consecuencia de las condiciones en las que se producen los tejidos que después venderán las compañías europeas. En concreto, un empresario español aparece como copropietario del inmueble siniestrado y se encuentra en paradero desconocido.

Con motivo del incendio de otro taller textil en Daca el pasado 24 de noviembre de 2012, el Parlamento Europeo aprobó la Resolución de 17 de enero de 2013 en la que se insta a numerosos actores a asumir responsabilidad con respecto al sector textil ([1]). Entre ellos se pide a la Comisión que promueva «activamente una conducta empresarial responsable obligatoria» entre las compañías europeas que subcontratan talleres textiles en el país asiático. Dicha resolución, surgida al calor de un accidente que costó la vida a 112 personas, supone un paso adelante para señalar las responsabilidad de las empresas europeas que subcontratan en dicho país para maximizar su beneficio, siendo totalmente conscientes del *dumping* social y laboral que realizan cuyas consecuencias se miden en la pérdida de las vidas de los trabajadores. Estas compañías europeas venden en el mercado interior sus productos y realizan sus beneficios en plena normalidad, pese a saberse criminales y responsables de tantísimas muertes. En varias respuestas que la Comisión dio a anteriores preguntas, se limita a recalcar que la responsabilidad social corporativa es un mecanismo de adhesión voluntaria que la empresa cumple a su antojo. Tal falta de atención a las denuncias sobre el sector textil en Bangladés ha provocado que continúe estas prácticas de auténtico «terrorismo empresarial».

Ante esto, ¿iniciará la Comisión una investigación sobre las empresas textiles europeas que subcontratan talleres en Bangladés? ¿No considera demostrado una vez más que los instrumentos de responsabilidad social en empresas, expresada en su Comunicación ([2]), son de una efectividad nula? ¿Piensa legislar para dotarse de instrumentos legales vinculantes que permitan un control efectivo de las condiciones laborales de subcontratación en terceros países por parte de empresas europeas? ¿Podría detallar cómo ha «promovido activamente una conducta empresarial responsable obligatoria» en Bangladés?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de junio de 2013)

La Comisión Europea reconoce la gravedad del derrumbamiento de la fábrica Rana Plaza ocurrido en Bangladesh.

Los aspectos internacionales de la responsabilidad social de las empresas ocupan un lugar destacado en la comunicación de 2011 de la Comisión, que lleva por título «Estrategia renovada de la UE para 2011-2014 sobre la responsabilidad social de las empresas».

La Comisión siempre recomienda a las empresas que se ajusten a las directrices internacionalmente aceptadas en materia de responsabilidad social de las empresas, concretamente las directrices de la OCDE sobre empresas multinacionales, la Declaración tripartita de la OIT sobre las empresas multinacionales y los Principios Rectores de las Naciones Unidas sobre Empresas y Derechos Humanos.

Por lo que se refiere a las relaciones con otros países y regiones, cabe decir que la Comisión ha incorporado una referencia a la responsabilidad social de las empresas en diversos acuerdos comerciales y que cada vez está trabajando más con el sector privado en materia de cooperación para el desarrollo.

Las directrices en materia de responsabilidad social de las empresas exigen que exista un control permanente de la salud, de la seguridad y de las condiciones de trabajo de los empleados de las cadenas de suministro de las empresas. La Comisión apoya regularmente este tipo de enfoque y presenta sus propias iniciativas al respecto.

([1]) P7_TA-PROV(2013)0027.
([2]) COM(2011)0681.

La UE respalda la aplicación de acuerdos tripartitos en Bangladesh bajo los auspicios de la OIT, inclusive mediante un cambio de legislación que evite más tragedias, el fomento de la seguridad estructural y antiincendios de todas las fábricas textiles dedicadas a la exportación, y la aplicación y ampliación del Plan de Acción Tripartito Nacional sobre seguridad antiincendios.

La OIT y el organismo alemán GiZ (Agencia Alemana de Desarrollo), las autoridades de Bangladesh, los correspondientes interlocutores sociales y la UE están estudiando nuevas iniciativas en materia de responsabilidad social de las cadenas de suministro.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004552/13
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Labour standards/corporate social responsibility (CSR) in Bangladesh

Following the Commission's action plan on corporate social responsibility published in 2011, what progress has been made on the Commission's commitments to improve the CSR conduct of European companies operating outside of the EU?

Question for written answer E-004788/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Social responsibility of European companies in Bangladesh

On 25 April 2013, there was a tragic accident when a clothing factory collapsed in Dhaka, the capital of Bangladesh, taking the lives of over 370 people and, once again, highlighting the terrible health and safety conditions in workplaces that European textile companies subcontract to. The collapsed factory was owned by a Spanish entrepreneur who is being hunted down. Bangladesh is the second largest exporter in the world in the textile sector, because of its very low labour costs. This accident is a clear consequence of the conditions in which the textiles are produced, which are then sold by European companies. Specifically, a Spanish entrepreneur is apparently co-owner of the wrecked building, and he cannot be located.

On the basis of a fire in another textile factory in Dhaka on 24 November 2012, the European Parliament adopted a resolution on 17 January 2013 urging various operators involved to take responsibility with regard to the textiles sector ([1]). In the resolution, Parliament asks the Commission 'actively to promote mandatory responsible business conduct' among European companies subcontracting to textile factories in the Asian country. That resolution, which was prompted by an accident that cost the lives of 112 people, represents an advance in pointing out the responsibilities of European businesses that subcontract to companies in Bangladesh in order to maximise their profits, in full awareness of the adverse social and employment effects. The consequences of this can be measured in loss of workers' lives. These European companies sell their products and make their profits in the internal market with the semblance of complete normality, despite knowing that they are criminals, responsible for huge numbers of deaths. In various answers given by the Commission to previous questions, it restricts itself to stressing that corporate social responsibility is a voluntary mechanism that businesses may choose to comply with. Such failure to respond to complaints about the textile sector in Bangladesh has led to a continuation in these practices of out and out 'business terrorism'.

In view of this, will the Commission initiate an investigation into European textile companies that subcontract to factories in Bangladesh? Does it not consider that once again it has been shown that the corporate social responsibility instruments expressed in its communication ([2]) are ineffective? Does it intend to legislate to provide itself with binding legal instruments for the effective control of working conditions in subcontractors in non-EU countries with which European companies deal? Could it provide details of how it has 'actively promoted mandatory responsible business conduct' in Bangladesh?

Question for written answer P-004922/13
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(3 May 2013)

Subject: CSR/Rana Plaza factory collapse in Bangladesh

On 24 April another factory complex in Dhaka, Bangladesh, collapsed, with the death toll expected to rise significantly above 300. Local media reported large cracks appearing in the building days before, and Bangladeshi Home Minister Muhiuddin Khan Alamgir has claimed that the building violated construction codes.

([1]) P7_TA-PROV(2013)0027.
([2]) COM(2011) 0681.

The Rana Plaza complex building housed factories that produced clothes for well-known European high-street retail chains. The high-profile news reporting of dangerous labour conditions for Bangladeshi workers over the past few months has not escaped the notice of EU companies operating in that country. And yet the supply chains of major European companies have clearly not been checked and investigated with enough rigour to reveal the serious safety issues which have led to this tragic accident.

Given the above, will the Commission commit to developing its 2011 action plan on corporate social responsibility in order to include substantial provisions relating to European companies operating outside the EU?

Can the Commission give details of how it intends to strengthen its proposals to encourage greater and wider CSR among European companies, which will lead to proper checks on supply chains and an assessment of health, safety and labour conditions as regards workers manufacturing products on behalf of EU retailers?

Will the Commission make a statement on the social obligations that European companies have with regard to developing and maintaining health, safety and labour standards in terms not merely of meeting legal criteria, but as far as possible of addressing problem areas to ensure the safety and security of their own workforces and workers in their supply chains?

Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

The European Commission recognises the seriousness of the Rana Plaza Factory collapse in Bangladesh.

The international aspects of corporate social responsibility have a prominent place in the Commission's 2011 Communication 'A renewed EU strategy 2011-2014 for Corporate Social Responsibility'.

The Commission recommends companies to adhere to internationally-recognised CSR guidelines, including the OECD Guidelines on Multinational Enterprises, the ILO Tripartite Declaration on Multinational Enterprises, and the UN Guiding Principles on business and human rights.

Concerning relationships with other countries and regions, it has incorporated reference to CSR in certain trade agreements and is working increasingly with the private sector in development cooperation.

Following international CSR guidelines means that indirect support is continuously given to checks of health, safety and labour conditions in companies' supply chains. The Commission regularly publicly endorses these approaches, and publicly presents its own initiatives in these areas.

The EU supports the implementation of tripartite agreements in Bangladesh under the ILO's auspices, including preventing further tragedies through a change in legislation; structural and fire safety of all export oriented garment factories; and the implementation and extension of the National Tripartite Plan of Action on fire safety.

The ILO and GiZ (German Development Agency), the Bangladeshi authorities, relevant social partners, and the EU are considering new initiatives on responsible supply chains.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-004583/13
Komisijai
Juozas Imbrasas (EFD)
(2013 m. balandžio 24 d.)

Tema: Dėl galimų pažeidimų Vilniuje planuojant statyti biomase kūrenamą jėgainę

Lietuvos Respublikos (toliau – LR) Vilniaus regiono aplinkos apsaugos departamentas 2012 m. spalio 22 d. priėmė galutinę atrankos išvadą Nr. (38-4)-VR-1.7-1525 dėl biomase kūrenamos jėgainės statybos. Priimtoje galutinėje išvadoje nurodoma, kad planuojamai ūkinei veiklai (toliau – PŪV) poveikio aplinkai vertinimas (toliau – PAV) yra neprivalomas. PŪV pavadinimas – „Biomase kūrenamos jėgainės statyba". Numatoma PŪV vieta: Jočionių g. 13b, Vilnius.

Pagal LR PŪV PAV įstatymo (2005.06.21 Nr. X-258) 3 straipsnio 1 punktą, 2 punkto 1, 2 ir 3 dalis bei 3 straipsnio 3 punktą, taip pat LR PŪV PAV įstatymo 1 priedo 9.6 punktą biomase kūrenamos jėgainės statybai, mano nuomone, PAV turėtų būti privalomas.

Pagal LR teisės aktus sąvoka „biomasė" nėra aiškiai reglamentuota, todėl yra galimybė deginti įvairias nerūšiuotas, pavojingų frakcijų turinčias atliekas. Tai sukeltų didelį pavojų ir realią taršą Vilniaus mieste, kuris išsidėstęs dauboje, pavėjinėje zonoje nuo taršos šaltinio ir yra tankiai apgyvendintas.

Ar Komisija nemano, kad šis atvejis yra galimas 2008 m. sausio 15 d. Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos direktyvos 2008/1/EB dėl taršos integruotos prevencijos ir kontrolės (TIPK direktyva), 2000 m. gruodžio 4 d. Parlamento ir Tarybos direktyvos 2000/76/EB dėl atliekų deginimo, 2008 m. lapkričio 19 d. Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos direktyvos 2008/98/EB dėl atliekų ir panaikinančios kai kurias direktyvas, 1985 m. birželio 27 d. Tarybos direktyvos 1985/337/EEB dėl tam tikrų valstybės ir privačių projektų poveikio aplinkai vertinimo ir kitų Europos lygmens aktų bei Buveinių bei Paukščių direktyvų nuostatų, bei Orhuso konvencijos pažeidimų pavyzdys?

Aš, kaip ir 11 000 šalia PŪV objekto gyvenančių Vilniaus miesto gyventojų, esu susirūpinęs dėl šio PŪV objekto statybos galimo neigiamo poveikio aplinkai, ypač tokiose tankiai apgyvendintose teritorijose kaip Vilniaus miestas.

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-004584/13
Komisijai
Juozas Imbrasas (EFD)
(2013 m. balandžio 24 d.)

Tema: Dėl galimų pažeidimų Vilniuje planuojant statyti komunalinių atliekų mechaninio biologinio apdorojimo įrenginį

Lietuvos Respublikos (toliau – LR) Vilniaus regiono aplinkos apsaugos departamentas 2012 m. lapkričio 21 d. priėmė Galutinę atrankos išvadą Nr. (38-4)-VR-1.7-1973 dėl komunalinių atliekų mechaninio biologinio apdorojimo įrenginių (toliau – KAMBAĮ) statybos ir eksploatacijos poveikio aplinkai vertinimo (toliau – PAV). Priimtoje galutinėje išvadoje nurodoma, kad planuojamai ūkinei veiklai (toliau – PŪV) PAV yra neprivalomas. Planuojamos ūkinės veiklos pavadinimas: „Komunalinių atliekų mechaninio biologinio apdorojimo įrenginių statyba ir eksploatacija". Numatoma planuojamos ūkinės veiklos vieta: Jočionių g. 13, Vilnius.

Vadovaujantis LR PŪV PAV įstatymo (2005-06-21 Nr. X-258) 3 straipsnio 1 punktu; 2 punkto 1, 2, 3 dalimis bei 3 straipsnio 3 punktu, taip pat LR PAV įstatymo 1 priedo 6. 1; 9.5; 9. 6 punktais KAMBAĮ PAV, mano įsitikinimu, turėtų būti privalomas.

Pagal planuojamą veiklą numatoma į Vilnių iš aplinkinių rajonų suvežti per metus iki 250 tūkst. tonų nerūšiuotų, su pavojingomis frakcijomis, nenustatytos sudėties atliekų siekiant jas toliau apdoroti. Tai gresia miestui bakteriologiniu, virusologiniu, cheminiu ir kitokiu pavojingu antropologiniu užterštumu.

Ar Komisija nemano, kad šis atvejis yra galimas 2008 m. sausio 15 d. Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos direktyvos 2008/1/EB dėl taršos integruotos prevencijos ir kontrolės (TIPK direktyva), 2008 m. lapkričio 19 d. Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos direktyvos 2008/98/EB dėl atliekų ir panaikinančios kai kurias direktyvas, 1985 m. birželio 27 d. Tarybos direktyvos 1985/337/EEB dėl tam tikrų valstybės ir privačių projektų poveikio aplinkai vertinimo ir Buveinių bei Paukščių direktyvų nuostatų bei Orhuso konvencijos pažeidimų pavyzdys?

Aš esu susirūpinęs, kaip ir 11 000 šalia PŪV objekto gyvenančių Vilniaus miesto gyventojų, dėl šio PŪV objekto statybos galimo neigiamo poveikio aplinkai, ypač tokiose tankiai apgyvendintose teritorijose kaip Vilniaus miestas.

Bendras atsakymas, J. Potočnik atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2013 m. liepos 5 d.)

Klausime dėl dviejų projektų pateiktos informacijos neužtenka, kad būtų galima nustatyti galimą ES teisės pažeidimą.

Vis dėlto, remiantis iš kitų šaltinių gauta informacija, galėtų būti tam tikrų aspektų, kuriuos reikėtų paaiškinti, o projektai galėtų būti susiję su tam tikromis ES lėšomis. Todėl Komisija prašys, kad Lietuvos valdžios institucijos pateiktų atitinkamos informacijos apie abu projektus.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004583/13
to the Commission
Juozas Imbrasas (EFD)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Possible violations in Vilnius in relation to biomass power plant construction plans

On 22 October 2012, the Vilnius Regional Environmental Protection Department of the Republic of Lithuania (hereinafter RL) adopted the Final Selection Conclusion No (38-4)-VR-1.7-1525 on the construction of a biomass power plant. The adopted Final Conclusion indicates that an environmental impact assessment (hereinafter EIA) is not compulsory for planned economic activities (hereinafter PEA). The PEA is entitled 'the Construction of a Biomass Power Plant'. Jočionių g. 13b, Vilnius is the planned site.

On the basis of Article 3(1), (2) parts 1, 2 and 3 and Article 3(3) of the PEA EIA Law of the RL (2005-06-21 Nr. X-258), as well as Annexe 1 (9.6) of the PEA EIA Law of the RL, I believe an EIA should be compulsory for the construction of the biomass power plant.

In Lithuanian legislation, the concept of 'biomass' is not clearly regulated and there is therefore a possibility to burn various unsorted waste containing dangerous groups. This would cause great danger and real pollution in Vilnius, which is spread out in a valley downwind from the pollution source and is densely populated.

Does the Commission not feel that this case potentially violates the provisions of Directive 2008/1/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 January 2008 concerning integrated pollution prevention and control (IPPC Directive), Directive 2000/76/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 December 2000 on the incineration of waste, Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste and repealing certain Directives, Council Directive 85/337/EEC of 27 June 1985 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, as well as other European legislation, the Birds and Habitats Directives and the Aarhus Convention?

Along with the 11 000 Vilnius residents living near the PEA object, I am concerned about the possible negative environmental impact of the construction of this PEA object, particularly in such densely populated territories as Vilnius.

Question for written answer E-004584/13
to the Commission
Juozas Imbrasas (EFD)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Possible infringements in Vilnius in relation to plans to construct a municipal waste mechanical biological treatment installation

On 21 November 2012, the Vilnius Regional Environmental Protection Department of the Republic of Lithuania (hereinafter RL) adopted the Final Selection Conclusion No (38-4)-VR-1.7-1973 on the environmental impact assessment (hereinafter EIA) of the construction and operation of municipal waste mechanical biological treatment installations (hereinafter MWMBTI). The Final Conclusion adopted indicates that an EIA is not compulsory for planned economic activities (hereinafter PEA). The PEA is entitled 'the Construction and Operation of Municipal Waste Mechanical Biological Treatment Installations'. Jočionių g. 13, Vilnius is the planned site.

On the basis of Article 3(1), (2) parts 1, 2 and 3 and Article 3(3) of the PEA EIA Law of the RL (2005-06-21 Nr. X-258), as well as Annexe 1 (6.1), 9.5; 9. (9.5) and (9.6) of the EIA Law of the RL, I believe that an EIA of MWMBTI should be compulsory.

The planned activities envisage transporting 250 000 tonnes of unsorted waste of unknown composition with dangerous groups annually to Vilnius from surrounding regions for further processing. This threatens the city with bacteriological, virusological, chemical and other dangerous anthropological pollution.

Does the Commission not feel that this case potentially violates the provisions of Directive 2008/1/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 January 2008 concerning integrated pollution prevention and control (IPPC Directive), Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste and repealing certain Directives, Council Directive 85/337/EEC of 27 June 1985 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, as well as the Birds and Habitats Directives and the Aarhus Convention?

Along with the 11 000 Vilnius residents living near the PEA object, I am concerned about the possible negative environmental impact of the construction of this PEA object, particularly in such densely populated territories as Vilnius.

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission

(5 July 2013)

The information provided in the question on the two projects is insufficient to identify possible breach of EC law.

Nevertheless the information available through other sources shows that there could be some issues requiring clarification and that some EU funding might be involved. Therefore the Commission will seek clarification from Lithuanian authorities on the two projects.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-004604/13
à la Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(24 avril 2013)

Objet: Gestion des eaux résiduaires à Prague

L'article 4 de la directive 91/271/CEE du Conseil (mai 1991), en ce qui concerne le traitement des eaux urbaines résiduaires, indique clairement que les eaux résiduaires, avant de pénétrer dans les systèmes de collecte des eaux comme le fleuve Vltava, doivent être soumises à un traitement pour respecter les normes de propreté obligatoires.

En dépit de tous les efforts entrepris aux niveaux ministériel et gouvernemental, la ville de Prague ne s'est pas conformée à ces normes. Au lieu de cela, les eaux résiduaires de Prague dépassent de 250 % le niveau maximal de contamination autorisé.

Au mois d'avril 2013, la ville de Prague n'avait toujours pas mis en place les infrastructures requises indispensables pour nettoyer de manière appropriée les eaux qu'elle rejette. Qui plus est, elle n'a pas encore entamé la construction de ces installations.

La Commission a-t-elle l'intention, conformément à l'article 258 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne, de remédier à cette situation inacceptable?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(13 juin 2013)

La Commission est informée de la situation concernant la station d'épuration des eaux urbaines résiduaires de Prague dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre de la directive sur le traitement des eaux urbaines résiduaires ([1]) et a bien l'intention de contacter les autorités tchèques à ce sujet.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31991L0271:FR:NOT

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004604/13
to the Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Water waste management in Prague

Article 4 of Council Directive 91/271/EEC (May 1991), on the issue of urban waste water treatment clearly states that waste water, before entering collective water systems such as the river Vitava, must be treated to bring it to mandatory standards of cleanliness.

The City of Prague has, despite best efforts at ministerial and governmental level, failed to comply with these standards. Instead, Prague waste waters are 250% above the maximum allowed level of contamination.

As of April 2013, the City of Prague still has not put in place the required infrastructure necessary to clean its water properly. Furthermore, it has not even begun construction.

Will the Commission, acting under Article 258 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, seek to address this unacceptable situation?

Question for written answer E-004909/13
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(2 May 2013)

Subject: Waste water management in Prague

Article 4 of Council Directive 91/271/EEC of 1 May 1991 concerning urban waste water treatment clearly states that waste water must be treated in order to bring it up to mandatory cleanliness standards before it enters collective water systems — such as the river Vltava, the longest river in the Czech Republic.

The City of Prague has negotiated a derogation from the implementation of the abovementioned article until 31 December 2010. It has, despite best efforts at the ministerial and governmental level, failed to comply with these standards. Instead, they are 250% above the maximum allowed level of contamination.

As of April 2013, the City of Prague still has not ensured the required infrastructure necessary to properly clean its water. Indeed, it has not even begun construction.

1. Is the Commission aware of the situation?

2. Will the Commission consider pursuing this situation, acting under Article 258 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union?

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

The Commission is aware of the situation of the Prague urban waste water treatment plant in the context of the implementation of the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive [1] and intends to contact the Czech authorities in this regard.

---

[1] http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31991L0271:EN:NOT.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004612/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(24 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Situazione umanitaria in Siria

Durante il Consiglio Affari esteri dell'Unione europea del 22 aprile, presieduto dall'alto rappresentate per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza UE, è stata approvata la deroga parziale all'embargo sul petrolio della Siria (imposto dall'Unione europea nel 2011), come aiuto per l'opposizione siriana.

Al tempo stesso, alcuni governi europei, Francia e Regno Unito in primis, chiedono di rivedere anche l'embargo sulle armi, in quanto favorevoli all'idea di dare assistenza militare all'opposizione, mentre altri Stati non intendono contribuire a un'ulteriore militarizzazione del conflitto.

Numerosi sono gli appelli lanciati dal Comitato Internazionale della Croce Rossa, dalla Croce Rossa Italiana e dalla Mezzaluna Rossa Siriana per porre fine alle sofferenze causate alla popolazione civile.

Infatti, sono più di un milione i siriani che hanno cercato rifugio nei paesi limitrofi e i morti sono oltre 70 mila, tra cui migliaia di bambini.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. Quali ulteriori misure intende adottare per risolvere/alleviare la disastrosa situazione umanitaria nel paese e per far fronte alla drammatica condizione nella quale sono costretti a vivere gli sfollati interni e i profughi siriani?

2. Quali ulteriori misure intende adottare per proteggere i volontari impegnati in loco, dato che nei giorni scorsi un altro volontario della Mezzaluna Rossa Siriana è stato ucciso, portando a 18 il numero dei volontari uccisi dall'inizio del conflitto?

3. Quali misure possono essere messe in campo per richiamare le parti in conflitto al rispetto dei soccorritori e del diritto internazionale umanitario, al fine di permettere ai volontari l'accesso a tutte le zone e la creazione di corridoi umanitari?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004613/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(24 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Situazione umanitaria in Siria

Durante il Consiglio Affari esteri dell'Unione europea del 22 aprile, presieduto dall'Alto Rappresentante per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza dell'UE, è stata approvata la deroga parziale all'embargo sul petrolio della Siria (imposto dall'Unione europea nel 2011), come aiuto per l'opposizione siriana.

Al tempo stesso, alcuni governi europei, Francia e Regno Unito in primis, chiedono di rivedere anche l'embargo sulle armi, in quanto favorevoli all'idea di dare assistenza militare all'opposizione, mentre altri Stati non intendono contribuire a un'ulteriore militarizzazione del conflitto.

Numerosi sono gli appelli lanciati dal Comitato Internazionale della Croce Rossa, dalla Croce Rossa Italiana e dalla Mezzaluna Rossa Siriana per porre fine alle sofferenze causate alla popolazione civile.

Infatti, sono più di un milione i siriani che hanno cercato rifugio nei paesi limitrofi e i morti sono oltre 70 mila, tra cui migliaia di bambini.

Si chiede all'Alto Rappresentante di rispondere ai requisiti di seguito riportati.

1. Quali ulteriori misure intende adottare per risolvere/alleviare la disastrosa situazione umanitaria nel paese e per far fronte alla drammatica condizione in cui sono costretti a vivere gli sfollati interni e i profughi siriani?

2. Quali ulteriori misure intende adottare per proteggere i volontari impegnati in loco, dato che nei giorni scorsi un altro volontario della Mezzaluna Rossa Siriana è stato ucciso, portando a 18 il numero dei volontari uccisi dall'inizio del conflitto?

3. Quali misure possono essere messe in campo per richiamare le parti in conflitto al rispetto dei soccorritori e del diritto internazionale umanitario, al fine di permettere ai volontari l'accesso a tutte le zone e la creazione di corridoi umanitari?

Risposta congiunta di Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(28 giugno 2013)

La Commissione sta prestando assistenza sempre maggiore alla popolazione siriana. Finora sono stati mobilitati 265 milioni di EUR per l'assistenza umanitaria alle persone bisognose sia in Siria ([1]) che nei paesi limitrofi ([2]). Questi fondi sono stati distribuiti prevalentemente tramite diverse agenzie delle Nazioni Unite, la Croce Rossa e la Mezzaluna Rossa e le organizzazioni non governative (ONG) partner. L'UE ha rinnovato il proprio impegno a soddisfare i bisogni umanitari in Siria e nei paesi limitrofi esortando tutti i donatori a rispettare gli impegni assunti durante la conferenza del Kuwait ([3]) e a fornire ulteriore sostegno ai bisognosi.

L'UE ha ripetutamente ribadito il suo invito a tutte le parti in conflitto a garantire la neutralità degli aiuti umanitari, a rispettare l'obbligo di protezione dei civili e, soprattutto, a garantire la tutela delle strutture e del personale medico. La Commissione sostiene una proposta di risoluzione del Consiglio di sicurezza delle Nazioni Unite (UNSC) che invita al rispetto della sicurezza degli operatori umanitari, attraverso un libero accesso a tutte le aree del paese, e al rispetto del diritto umanitario internazionale.

La Commissione sollecita il regime a consentire l'assistenza al di là dei confini e degli schieramenti, perché l'assistenza umanitaria possa raggiungere tutto il territorio della Siria.

L'idea dei corridoi umanitari, che richiederebbero molto probabilmente protezione militare, potrebbe sembrare allettante. Tuttavia, la Commissione ritiene che sia difficile da attuare in un paese di oltre 180 000 chilometri quadrati in cui le ostilità sono diffuse su tutto il territorio e non rappresenterebbe, dunque, l'opzione migliore per garantire la sicurezza della popolazione. La Commissione sostiene il rispetto del diritto umanitario internazionale e continuerà a ricorrere alle negoziazioni con tutte le parti per rendere possibile l'accesso agli aiuti umanitari.

([1]) Il 46 % dei fondi.
([2]) Libano, Giordania, Turchia e Iraq.
([3]) Conferenza umanitaria del 31 gennaio.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004612/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Humanitarian situation in Syria

At the EU Foreign Affairs Council of 22 April 2013, chaired by the EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, a partial lifting of the oil embargo on Syria (imposed by the EU in 2011) was approved, to help the Syrian opposition.

At the same time, some European governments, primarily France and the UK, are calling for the arms embargo to be reviewed too, as they are in favour of giving the opposition military assistance, while other Member States want no part in the further militarisation of the conflict.

The International Committee of the Red Cross, the Italian Red Cross and the Syrian Arab Red Crescent have called many times for an end to the suffering inflicted on the civilian population.

Over 1 million Syrians have sought refuge in neighbouring countries and over 70 000 have been killed, including thousands of children.

1. What further action will the Commission take to resolve/alleviate the humanitarian disaster in Syria and to deal with the tragic conditions in which internally displaced persons and Syrian refugees are forced to live?

2. What further action will it take to protect volunteers on the ground, given that yet another volunteer from the Syrian Arab Red Crescent has been killed recently, bringing the total number of volunteers killed since the start of the conflict to 18?

3. What action can be taken to call on the warring parties to respect emergency aid workers and international humanitarian law, in order to allow volunteers access to all areas and the creation of humanitarian corridors?

Question for written answer E-004613/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Humanitarian situation in Syria

At the EU Foreign Affairs Council of 22 April 2013, chaired by the EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, a partial lifting of the oil embargo on Syria (imposed by the EU in 2011) was approved, to help the Syrian opposition.

At the same time, some European governments, primarily France and the UK, are calling for the arms embargo to be reviewed too, as they are in favour of giving the opposition military assistance, while other Member States want no part in the further militarisation of the conflict.

The International Committee of the Red Cross, the Italian Red Cross and the Syrian Arab Red Crescent have called many times for an end to the suffering inflicted on the civilian population.

Over 1 million Syrians have sought refuge in neighbouring countries and over 70 000 have been killed, including thousands of children.

1. What further action will the Vice-President/High Representative take to resolve/alleviate the humanitarian disaster in Syria and to deal with the tragic conditions in which internally displaced persons and Syrian refugees are forced to live?

2. What further action will she take to protect volunteers on the ground, given that yet another volunteer from the Syrian Arab Red Crescent has been killed recently, bringing the total number of volunteers killed since the start of the conflict to 18?

3. What action can be taken to call on the warring parties to respect emergency aid workers and international humanitarian law, in order to allow volunteers access to all areas and the creation of humanitarian corridors?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2013)

The Commission is regularly scaling up its assistance to the Syrian people. To date, the Commission has mobilised EUR 265 million for humanitarian assistance to persons in need, both inside Syria ([1]) and in the neighbouring countries ([2]). These funds are channelled through several UN-Agencies, the Red Cross/Red Crescent and NGO partner organisations. The EU has renewed its commitment to respond to humanitarian needs in Syria and neighbouring countries and called on all donors to fulfil their pledges made at the Kuwait conference ([3]) and to commit to provide further support to those in need.

The EU repeatedly reiterate its call on all parties to the conflict to ensure the neutrality of humanitarian aid and to respect their obligations to protect civilians; to ensure, in particular, the protection of medical personnel and facilities. The Commission supports a proposal for a UNSC resolution calling for respect of the safety of humanitarian workers, allowing unimpeded humanitarian access to all areas of Syria and calling for respect of the International Humanitarian Law.

The Commission urges the regime to allow for cross-border and cross-lines assistance to ensure the access of the humanitarian assistance to the whole Syrian territory.

The idea of humanitarian corridors is intuitively attractive. Such corridors would most likely require military protection. The Commission considers that applying corridors in a country with more than 180 000 km^2 and hostilities spread over the entire country would be difficult and is not the best option for the safety of the population. The Commission privileges the advocacy for respect of international humanitarian law and continuous negotiations will all parties to render humanitarian access possible.

([1]) 46% of the funds.
([2]) Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey and Iraq.
([3]) Humanitarian Conference of 31 January.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-005353/13
до Комисията
Matteo Salvini (EFD), Mara Bizzotto (EFD), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Oreste Rossi (EFD), Fiorello Provera (EFD), Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD), Claudio Morganti (EFD), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Mario Borghezio (EFD), Lara Comi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE) и Dimitar Stoyanov (NI)
(14 май 2013 г.)

Относно: Споразумение за свободна търговия между ЕС и САЩ и защита на европейската аудиовизуална продукция

Мандатът на члена на Комисията Карел де Гухт относно ново споразумение за свободна търговия между Европейския съюз и Съединените американски щати не включва специално освобождаване или изключване по отношение на аудиовизуалните продукти и услуги. Споразумение за свободна търговия, уреждащо свободната търговия с аудиовизуални продукти и услуги между ЕС и САЩ, би довело до конфликт със съществуващото европейско и национално законодателство, което съдържа няколко мерки за насърчаване на националната и европейската филмова индустрия.

Понастоящем съществуват закони, които налагат квоти за излъчване на европейски произведения и национални телевизионни канали и осигуряват икономическа подкрепа на местната и европейската филмова индустрия.

Отмяната на тези закони би нанесла смъртоносен удар на европейската аудиовизуална продукция, като се има предвид, че без защита и финансова помощ тя не може да се конкурира с широкомащабната аудиовизуална индустрия в САЩ и на други места по света.

Тъй като филмите и аудиовизуалните продукти са неделима част и важен израз на културите, които ги създават, трябва да посочим, че европейската аудиовизуална продукция играе ключова роля за защита и насърчаване на културата, идентичността и традициите на държавите членки. Те допринасят и за процеса на европейска интеграция, като насърчават по-задълбоченото познаване на специфичните характеристики на всяка държава членка сред народите на Европа.

С оглед на това:

— Включени ли са наистина аудиовизуалните продукти и услуги в споразумението за свободна търговия, за което членът на Комисията де Гухт получи мандат за преговори?

— Ако е така, какво планира Комисията да направи, за да защити европейската филмова индустрия и да избегне ситуация, при която аудиовизуалният пазар в Европа трябва да занижи своите стандарти, за да отрази прилаганите такива на пазара в Северна Америка?

Съвместен отговор, даден от De Gucht от името на Комисията
(24 юни 2013 г.)

Културното многообразие, залегнало в член 167, параграф 4 от Договора за функционирането на Европейския съюз и в Конвенцията на ЮНЕСКО за опазване и насърчаване на многообразието от форми на културно изразяване, е ръководещ принцип за Комисията в нейните действия, включително в областта на търговията. Предложеният проект за насоки в преговорите за сключване на Трансатлантическо споразумение за търговия и инвестиции (TTIP) е съобразен изцяло с тази политика. При такива условия Комисията и Съветът обсъждат понастоящем как насоките за водене на преговорите да бъдат правилно балансирани като, от една страна, отдават дължимото на чувствителния като тематика аудиовизуален сектор и, от друга страна, преследват постигането на поставената цел, а именно провеждането на широкообхватни и амбициозни преговори.

Становището на Комисията е, че решението следва да е съобразено със следните принципи: ЕС и неговите държави членки ще запазят възможността да прилагат съществуващото законодателство, включително директивите на ЕС и програмата МЕДИА; субсидиите от държавите членки ще останат встрани от какъвто и да е договорен ангажимент и преговорите по TIPP и резултатите от тях следва да запазят необходимата свобода за провеждане на политики и регулиране на равнище ЕС с цел адаптирането на политиките на ЕС към технологичния напредък в аудиовизуалния сектор.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004907/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(2 Μαΐου 2013)

Θέμα: Ευρωπαϊκός κινηματογράφος και εμπορικές διαπραγματεύσεις ΕΕ-ΗΠΑ

Στις 22 Απριλίου 2013, ευρωπαίοι σκηνοθέτες υπέγραψαν μία αναφορά με την οποία ζητούν από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή τη ρητή και κατηγορηματική εξαίρεση του κινηματογράφου και του οπτικοακουστικού τομέα από τις εμπορικές διαπραγματεύσεις ΕΕ-ΗΠΑ.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι:

— η ΕΕ έχει υπογράψει τη σύμβαση της Unesco για την προστασία και προώθηση της πολυμορφίας της πολιτιστικής έκφρασης και είχε εξασφαλίσει «πολιτιστική εξαίρεση» από τους κανόνες ελεύθερων συναλλαγών του Παγκόσμιου Οργανισμού Εμπορίου,

— ο ευρωπαϊκός κινηματογράφος έχει καθοριστικό ρόλο ως μέσο αμοιβαίας γνωριμίας των λαών και συμβάλλει στην ενίσχυση της ευρωπαϊκής ταυτότητας μέσω της προβολής της ευρωπαϊκής πολιτιστικής πολυμορφίας,

— η πολιτιστική βιομηχανία διαδραματίζει αποφασιστικό οικονομικό και εμπορικό ρόλο και κατέχει, σύμφωνα με την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, το 4,5% του συνολικού ευρωπαϊκού ΑΕΠ απασχολώντας 8,5 εκατομμύρια ανθρώπους σε τομείς, όπως ο κινηματογράφος, ο οπτικοακουστικός τομέας, ο τύπος, οι τέχνες και η μουσική,

— το άρθρο 207 της Συνθήκης ΕΕ κατά το οποίο «το Συμβούλιο αποφασίζει ομόφωνα για τη διαπραγμάτευση και τη σύναψη συμφωνιών στον τομέα του εμπορίου των πολιτιστικών και οπτικοακουστικών υπηρεσιών, όταν υπάρχει κίνδυνος οι συμφωνίες αυτές να θίξουν την πολιτιστική και γλωσσική πολυμορφία της Ένωσης»,

ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει εγκρίνει ημερήσια διάταξη για τις εμπορικές διαπραγματεύσεις με τις ΗΠΑ, στην οποία περιλαμβάνεται και ο οπτικοακουστικός τομέας;

2. Συμμερίζεται τις ανησυχίες και ευαισθησίες των φορέων του οπτικοακουστικού τομέα;

3. Δεσμεύεται να μη συμπεριλάβει τον οπτικοακουστικό τομέα στον διάλογο για το ελεύθερο εμπόριο με τις ΗΠΑ;

4. Μπορούν τα κράτη μέλη να συνεχίσουν να στηρίζουν αυτούς τους τομείς μέσω ποσοστώσεων και επιδοτήσεων, προκειμένου να εξακολουθούν να προστατεύουν τη δική τους πολιτιστική πολυμορφία και να προωθούν τις τοπικές παραγωγές;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. De Gucht εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(24 Ιουνίου 2013)

Η πολιτιστική πολυμορφία, όπως κατοχυρώνεται στο άρθρο 167 παράγραφος 4 της συνθήκης για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και στη σύμβαση της Unesco για την προστασία και την προώθηση της πολυμορφίας της πολιτιστικής έκφρασης, συνιστά κατευθυντήρια αρχή των δράσεων της Επιτροπής, μεταξύ άλλων, στον εμπορικό τομέα. Το προτεινόμενο σχέδιο οδηγιών διαπραγμάτευσης για μια διατλαντική συμφωνία εμπορίου και επενδύσεων (TTIP) σέβεται απόλυτα την εν λόγω πολιτική. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, η Επιτροπή και το Συμβούλιο συζητούν επί του παρόντος τρόπους τήρησης των σωστών ισορροπιών στις οδηγίες διαπραγμάτευσης μεταξύ, αφενός, της ευαισθησίας του οπτικοακουστικού τομέα και, αφετέρου, του στόχου των ευρέων και φιλόδοξων διαπραγματεύσεων.

Κατά την άποψη της Επιτροπής, οποιαδήποτε λύση βρεθεί θα πρέπει να σέβεται τα εξής: Η ΕΕ και τα κράτη μέλη θα είναι σε θέση να συνεχίσουν να εφαρμόζουν την υφιστάμενη νομοθεσία, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των οδηγιών της ΕΕ και του προγράμματος MEDIA, οι επιδοτήσεις από τα κράτη μέλη θα εξαιρούνται από οποιαδήποτε δέσμευση και οι διαπραγματεύσεις TIIP θα διατηρήσουν τα αναγκαία περιθώρια άσκησης πολιτικής σε επίπεδο ΕΕ και μετά τις διαπραγματεύσεις TIIP, προκειμένου να προσαρμοσθούν οι πολιτικές της ΕΕ στις τεχνολογικές εξελίξεις του τομέα των οπτικοακουστικών μέσων.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004700/13
à la Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(26 avril 2013)

Objet: L'exception culturelle du cinéma européen

L'Union européenne va entamer, au mois de juin, des négociations en vue de conclure un accord de libre-échange avec les États-Unis. Cet accord vise à recréer une dynamique économique pour l'Union européenne, qui s'est dit prête à ouvrir l'audiovisuel et le cinéma à la concurrence dans le but d'obtenir des contreparties dans d'autres domaines.

L'audiovisuel en Europe est subventionné par des aides dans chaque État membre afin d'encourager la production de films et autres supports audiovisuels et de cultiver les spécificités de chaque culture.

La Commission compte-t-elle vraiment inclure le système de l'audiovisuel et du cinéma dans le mandat de négociation?

L'exception culturelle des États membres de l'Union européenne ne devrait-elle pas être préservée? Les États membres pourraient-ils maintenir leurs mécanismes de subventions et de quotas afin de préserver les particularités du cinéma européen?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005133/13
à la Commission
Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE), Robert Rochefort (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Isabelle Thomas (S&D), Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL) et Silvia Costa (S&D)
(8 mai 2013)

Objet: Partenariat transatlantique de commerce et d'investissement entre l'Union européenne et les États-Unis d'Amérique

En refusant d'exclure explicitement les services culturels et audiovisuels du projet de mandat de négociation de la Commission européenne concernant un accord global sur le commerce et l'investissement, intitulé «Partenariat transatlantique de commerce et d'investissement, entre l'Union européenne et les États-Unis d'Amérique», le vote intervenu le 12 mars 2013 au sein du collège des commissaires sur ce mandat de négociation n'a pas permis de prendre pleinement en compte la protection et la promotion de l'exception culturelle européenne.

Le 24 avril dernier, la commission du commerce international du Parlement européen a voté en faveur d'un projet de résolution sur les négociations en matière de commerce et d'investissement entre l'Union européenne et les États-Unis d'Amérique dans lequel elle demande l'exclusion des secteurs de la culture et de l'audiovisuel du champ de la future négociation de l'accord de libre-échange.

La Commission entend-elle suivre cette recommandation afin d'assurer la pérennité de l'industrie cinématographique et audiovisuelle européenne, en particulier dans l'environnement numérique?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005353/13
à la Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD), Mara Bizzotto (EFD), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Oreste Rossi (EFD), Fiorello Provera (EFD), Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD), Claudio Morganti (EFD), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Mario Borghezio (EFD), Lara Comi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE) et Dimitar Stoyanov (NI)
(14 mai 2013)

Objet: Accord de libre-échange entre l'Union européenne et les États-Unis et protection de la production audiovisuelle européenne

Le mandat du commissaire Karel de Gucht portant sur un nouvel accord de libre-échange entre l'Union européenne et les États-Unis d'Amérique ne comprend pas d'exemption ou d'exclusion spécifique en ce qui concerne les produits et services audiovisuels. Un accord de libre-échange portant sur les produits et services audiovisuels entre l'Union européenne et les États-Unis créerait un conflit avec la législation européenne et nationale en vigueur, contenant plusieurs dispositions visant à promouvoir l'industrie cinématographique nationale et européenne.

Aujourd'hui, il existe des lois imposant des quotas de diffusion pour les œuvres européennes et les chaînes de télévision nationales et apportant un soutien économique à l'industrie cinématographique locale et européenne.

L'abrogation de ces lois apporterait de facto un coup mortel aux productions audiovisuelles européennes, étant donné que sans protection ni aides financières, elles ne peuvent pas soutenir la concurrence avec l'industrie audiovisuelle des États-Unis et du reste du monde.

Étant donné que les films et les produits audiovisuels font partie intégrante des cultures qui les produisent et en sont une expression importante, nous tenons à préciser que les productions audiovisuelles européennes ont un rôle clé à jouer dans la protection et la promotion de la culture, de l'identité et des traditions des États membres. Elles contribuent également au processus d'intégration européenne, en permettant aux citoyens européens de mieux connaître les particularités de chaque État membre.

Dans ce contexte, la Commission pourrait-elle répondre aux questions suivantes:

— Les produits et services audiovisuels sont-ils réellement inclus dans l'accord de libre-échange pour lequel le commissaire De Gucht a reçu un mandat de négociation?

— Dans l'affirmative, quelles mesures la Commission entend-elle prendre pour protéger l'industrie cinématographique européenne et éviter une situation au sein de laquelle le marché audiovisuel européen doit abaisser ses normes au niveau de celles qui sont appliquées au sein du marché nord-américain?

Réponse commune donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(24 juin 2013)

La diversité culturelle, inscrite à l'article 167, paragraphe 4, du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne et dans la Convention de l'Unesco sur la protection et la promotion de la diversité des expressions culturelles, est un des principes directeurs de l'action de la Commission, y compris de sa politique commerciale. Les projets de directives de négociation proposés en vue de la conclusion d'un partenariat transatlantique de commerce et d'investissement respectent pleinement cette ligne de conduite. C'est dans cet esprit que la Commission et les États membres discutent actuellement des moyens d'introduire dans les directives de négociation un juste équilibre entre, d'une part, la sensibilité du secteur de l'audiovisuel et, d'autre part, l'objectif de mener des négociations larges et ambitieuses.

Selon la Commission, quelle que soit la solution, celle-ci devrait respecter les principes suivants: l'UE et ses États membres pourront continuer à appliquer la législation existante, y compris les directives européennes et le programme MEDIA; les subventions attribuées par les États membres seront exclues de tout engagement; les négociations relatives au partenariat transatlantique devront laisser une marge de manœuvre suffisante en matière de réglementation européenne, y compris après ces négociations, afin que les politiques de l'Union puissent être adaptées aux progrès technologiques réalisés dans le secteur de l'audiovisuel.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005133/13
alla Commissione
Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE), Robert Rochefort (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Isabelle Thomas (S&D), Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL) e Silvia Costa (S&D)
(8 maggio 2013)

Oggetto: Partenariato transatlantico sul commercio e gli investimenti tra l'Unione europea e gli Stati Uniti d'America

Respingendo l'esclusione esplicita dei servizi culturali e audiovisivi dal progetto di mandato negoziale della Commissione per un accordo globale in materia di commercio e investimenti dal titolo «Partenariato transatlantico sul commercio e gli investimenti tra l'Unione europea e gli Stati Uniti d'America», la votazione su tale mandato svoltasi il 12 marzo 2013 in seno al collegio dei Commissari non ha consentito di tenere pienamente conto della protezione e della promozione dell'eccezione culturale europea.

Il 24 aprile scorso, la commissione per il commercio internazionale del Parlamento europeo ha votato a favore di un progetto di risoluzione sui negoziati in materia di commercio e di investimenti tra l'Unione europea e gli Stati Uniti d'America, in cui chiede l'esclusione dei settori della cultura e dell'audiovisivo dall'ambito dei futuri negoziati sull'accordo di libero scambio.

Intende la Commissione seguire tale raccomandazione al fine di garantire la vitalità dell'industria cinematografica e audiovisiva europea, in particolare nell'ambiente digitale?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005353/13
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD), Mara Bizzotto (EFD), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Oreste Rossi (EFD), Fiorello Provera (EFD), Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD), Claudio Morganti (EFD), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Mario Borghezio (EFD), Lara Comi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE) e Dimitar Stoyanov (NI)
(14 maggio 2013)

Oggetto: Accordo di libero scambio UE-USA e tutela della produzione audiovisiva europea

Il mandato del Commissario Karel de Gucht, per un nuovo accordo di libero scambio tra l'Unione europea e gli Stati Uniti d'America non comprende alcuna esenzione o esclusione specifica dei prodotti e servizi audiovisivi. Un accordo di libero scambio che disciplini il libero commercio di prodotti e di servizi audiovisivi tra l'UE e gli USA creerebbe un conflitto con la vigente legislazione europea e nazionale, che contiene una serie di misure per promuovere le industrie cinematografiche nazionali ed europee.

Oggi ci sono leggi che impongono quote di trasmissione per le opere europee e i canali televisivi nazionali, e di fornire sostegno economico alle industrie cinematografiche locali ed europee.

L'abrogazione di queste leggi infliggerebbe un colpo mortale alla produzione audiovisiva europea, dato che, senza protezione e aiuti finanziari non può competere con le industrie audiovisive degli Stati Uniti e di altri paesi che operano su larga scala.

Siccome i film e i prodotti audiovisivi sono parte integrante ed espressione importante delle culture che li generano, dobbiamo sottolineare che le produzioni audiovisive europee hanno un ruolo chiave nella protezione e nella promozione della cultura, identità e tradizioni degli Stati membri e contribuiscono anche al processo di integrazione europea, promuovendo una più profonda conoscenza delle specificità di ciascun Stato membro tra i popoli d'Europa.

Ciò detto:

1. I prodotti e servizi audiovisivi sono effettivamente compresi nell'Accordo di libero scambio per il quale il Commissario De Gucht ha ricevuto il mandato a negoziare?

2. In caso affermativo che cosa intende fare la Commissione per proteggere l'industria cinematografica europea ed evitare una situazione in cui il mercato audiovisivo in Europea debba abbassare i propri standard per rispecchiare quelli che si applicano nel mercato nord americano?

Risposta congiunta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione

(24 giugno 2013)

Come sancito dall'articolo 167, paragrafo 4, del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea e dalla convenzione UNESCO sulla protezione e la promozione della diversità delle espressioni culturali, la diversità culturale è un valore di riferimento per le iniziative della Commissione, ivi comprese quelle perseguite nell'ambito commerciale. Il progetto delle direttive di negoziato dell'accordo transatlantico in materia di scambi commerciali ed investimenti (*Transatlantic Trade and Investment Agreement*) rispetta pienamente tale politica. In tale contesto la Commissione e il Consiglio stanno discutendo del modo per garantire, nell'ambito delle direttive di negoziato, il giusto equilibrio tra la delicatezza del settore audiovisivo da un lato e il perseguimento di negoziati ampi e ambiziosi dall'altro.

Secondo la Commissione la soluzione elaborata dovrebbe rispettare i seguenti principi: l'Unione e gli Stati membri saranno in grado di continuare ad applicare la legislazione esistente, tra cui le direttive dell'UE e il programma MEDIA; le sovvenzioni ricevute dagli Stati membri esuleranno dall'ambito di ogni impegno; i negoziati dell'accordo transatlantico in materia di scambi commerciali ed investimenti dovrebbero garantire anche per il periodo successivo ai negoziati dell'accordo sopra menzionato un margine di manovra sufficiente ai regolamenti di portata europea, per poter allineare le politiche europee agli sviluppi tecnologici nel settore audiovisivo.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005353/13
do Komisji
Matteo Salvini (EFD), Mara Bizzotto (EFD), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Oreste Rossi (EFD), Fiorello Provera (EFD), Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD), Claudio Morganti (EFD), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Mario Borghezio (EFD), Lara Comi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE) oraz Dimitar Stoyanov (NI)
(14 maja 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Umowa o wolnym handlu między UE a USA i ochrona europejskiej produkcji audiowizualnej

Mandat komisarza Karela de Guchta dotyczący nowej umowy o wolnym handlu między Unią Europejską a Stanami Zjednoczonymi nie przewiduje żadnego zwolnienia ani wykluczenia odnośnie do produktów i usług audiowizualnych. Umowa o wolnym handlu określająca zasady wolnego handlu produktami i usługami audiowizualnymi między UE a USA mogłaby kolidować z istniejącym ustawodawstwem europejskim i krajowym, które zawiera szereg środków na rzecz wspierania krajowego i europejskiego przemysłu filmowego.

Obecnie obowiązujące przepisy określają limity transmisji europejskich dzieł i kanałów telewizji krajowej oraz zapewniają wsparcie gospodarcze lokalnemu i europejskiemu przemysłowi filmowemu.

Biorąc pod uwagę, że pozbawiona ochrony i wsparcia finansowego branża europejskiej produkcji audiowizualnej nie mogłaby konkurować z działającym na szeroką skalę przemysłem audiowizualnym w USA i na świecie, zniesienie tych przepisów byłoby dla europejskiej produkcji audiowizualnej zabójczym ciosem.

Filmy i produkty audiowizualne stanowią nieodłączną część kultur, które je wytwarzają, oraz są ich istotnym wyrazem. Dlatego należy zaznaczyć, iż europejskie produkcje audiowizualne mają kluczowe znaczenie dla ochrony i promowania kultury oraz tożsamości i tradycji państw członkowskich. Pogłębiają one także proces integracji europejskiej, szerząc wśród obywateli europejskich wiedzę na temat charakterystycznych cech każdego państwa członkowskiego.

W związku z powyższym nasuwają się następujące pytania:

— Czy umowa o wolnym handlu, do której negocjowania upoważniony jest komisarz De Gucht, rzeczywiście obejmuje produkty i usługi audiowizualne?

— Jeśli tak, jakie kroki zamierza przedsięwziąć Komisja, aby chronić europejską branżę filmową i uniknąć sytuacji, w której rynek audiowizualny w Europie będzie zmuszony obniżyć swoje standardy, aby dostosować je do poziomu charakterystycznego dla rynku Ameryki Północnej?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Karela De Guchta w imieniu Komisji
(24 czerwca 2013 r.)

Różnorodność kulturowa, zgodnie z tym co zapisano w art. 167 ust. 4 Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej oraz w Konwencji UNESCO w sprawie ochrony i promowania różnorodności form wyrazu kulturowego, jest zasadą przewodnią działań Komisji, w tym w dziedzinie handlu. Zaproponowany projekt wytycznych negocjacyjnych dotyczących transatlantyckiej umowy o handlu i inwestycjach w pełni respektuje tę politykę. W związku z powyższym Komisja i Rada dyskutują obecnie na temat tego, w jaki sposób odzwierciedlić w wytycznych negocjacyjnych właściwą równowagę między wrażliwością sektora audiowizualnego a celem, jakim są zakrojone na dużą skalę i ambitne negocjacje.

Zdaniem Komisji każde znalezione rozwiązanie powinno spełniać następujące wymagania: UE i jej państwa członkowskie będą mogły w dalszym ciągu wdrażać obowiązujące prawodawstwo, w tym dyrektywy UE oraz program Media; dotacje udzielane przez państwa członkowskie będą wyłączone z jakichkolwiek zobowiązań oraz negocjacje w sprawie umowy powinny zachowywać niezbędną przestrzeń polityczną dla uregulowań na szczeblu UE, również po negocjacjach, tak aby możliwe było dostosowywanie polityki UE do rozwoju technologicznego w sektorze audiowizualnym.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005607/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(21 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Audiovisual — Acordo de comércio livre com os EUA

Considerando que:

— O acordo de comércio livre com os EUA, que será uma das maiores zonas de comércio do mundo, tem como grande objetivo suavizar as diferenças de regulação que têm prejudicado o comércio entre as duas regiões em áreas como a agricultura, os químicos, os produtos farmacêuticos ou os automóveis;

— A União Europeia sempre excluiu, quer no seio da Organização Mundial do Comércio quer nas negociações bilaterais, os serviços audiovisuais de qualquer compromisso de liberalização comercial;

— Na sequência das negociações transatlânticas, que ainda não foram formalmente iniciadas, catorze países europeus, entre os quais Portugal, a França, a Alemanha, a Espanha e a Itália, exigem a exclusão do setor audiovisual do acordo de comércio livre a negociar entre os Estados Unidos e a União Europeia;

— Vários realizadores de renome, na sua maioria europeus, lançaram uma petição para que a indústria do audiovisual fique de fora do novo acordo de comércio livre, argumentando que «a liberalização do setor do audiovisual e do cinema levará à destruição de tudo o que até agora protegeu, promoveu e ajudou a desenvolver as culturas europeias».

Pergunto à Comissão:

Como avalia a posição dos referidos países, tendo em conta o estatuto específico para as obras audiovisuais?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005806/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Exceção cultural para audiovisual e cinema europeus

Centenas de figuras do setor cultural europeu têm feito apelo à exclusão do cinema e do audiovisual das futuras negociações entre EUA e União Europeia sobre a liberalização do comércio.

Em causa estão as futuras negociações transatlânticas com vista à criação de uma das maiores zonas de comércio livre do mundo. Diversos Estados-Membros da União partilham a posição de que este setor fique protegido e não seja incluído nessas negociações.

Uma petição em idêntico sentido foi assinada por mais de cinco mil pessoas, incluindo dezenas de realizadores europeus.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Tem conhecimento destes factos?

— Que avaliação faz dos mesmos?

— Qual a sua posição quanto a esta questão?

— Comunicou-a às autoridades norte-americanas? Que acolhimento obteve?

Resposta conjunta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão

(24 de junho de 2013)

A diversidade cultural, consagrada no artigo 167.°, no n.° 4, do Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia e na Convenção da Unesco sobre a Proteção e a Promoção da Diversidade das Expressões Culturais, constitui um princípio orientador das ações da Comissão, em especial no domínio comercial. O projeto de orientações de negociação proposto para uma Parceria Transatlântica de Comércio e Investimento (TTIP) respeita plenamente este princípio. Neste contexto, a Comissão e o Conselho estão, neste momento, a discutir formas de estabelecer no âmbito das diretrizes de negociação, o equilíbrio justo entre, por um lado, a sensibilidade do setor audiovisual e, por outro, o objetivo de levar a cabo negociações abrangentes e ambiciosas.

Na opinião da Comissão, qualquer solução encontrada deverá respeitar o seguinte: a UE e os seus Estados-Membros deverão poder continuar a aplicar a legislação em vigor, incluindo as diretivas da UE e o programa MEDIA; os subsídios concedidos pelos Estados-Membros serão excluídos de qualquer compromisso e as negociações TTIP deverão preservar a margem política necessária para a regulamentação a nível da UE, mesmo após as negociações TTIP, de modo a se possível adaptar as políticas da UE às evoluções tecnológicas no setor audiovisual.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004700/13
to the Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: The cultural exception of European cinema

In June, the European Union will enter into negotiations to conclude a free trade agreement with the United States. This agreement aims to revive economic growth for the European Union, which is said to be ready to open up the audiovisual and cinema sector to competition with a view to obtaining similar agreements in other areas.

The audiovisual sector in Europe is subsidised by aid in each Member State to encourage the production of films and other audiovisual material and to promote the distinctive features of each culture.

Does the Commission really intend to include the audiovisual and cinema system in the negotiating mandate?

Should the cultural exception of EU Member States not be preserved? Could Member States retain their subsidy and quota mechanisms so as to preserve the distinctive characteristics of European cinema?

Question for written answer E-004907/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(2 May 2013)

Subject: European cinema and EU-US trade negotiations

On 22 April 2013, European filmmakers signed a petition calling on the Commission explicitly and categorically to exclude the cinema and the audiovisual sector from EU-US trade negotiations.

Bearing in mind that:

— The EU has signed the Unesco Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions and had secured a 'cultural exception' from the World Trade Organisation's free trade rules,

— European cinema has a key role to play as a means of mutual understanding between peoples and contributes to strengthening European identity by promoting European cultural diversity,

— The cultural industry plays a crucial economic and commercial role and, according to the Commission, accounts for 4.5% of total EU GDP, employing 8.5 million people in areas such as the cinema, the audiovisual sector, the press, and the arts and music,

— Article 207 of the EU Treaty which provides that: 'The Council shall also act unanimously for the negotiation and conclusion of agreements: (a) in the field of trade in cultural and audiovisual services, where these agreements risk prejudicing the Union's cultural and linguistic diversity;'

Will the Commission say:

1. Has it adopted an agenda for trade negotiations with the US that also covers the audiovisual sector?

2. Does it share the concerns and sensitivities of audiovisual operators?

3. Will it undertake not to include the audiovisual sector in the free trade talks with the US?

4. Can Member States continue to support these areas through quotas and subsidies in order to continue to protect their own cultural diversity and promote local productions?

Question for written answer E-005133/13
to the Commission
Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE), Robert Rochefort (ALDE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE), Isabelle Thomas (S&D), Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL) and Silvia Costa (S&D)
(8 May 2013)

Subject: Transatlantic trade and investment partnership between the EU and the United States of America

By not specifically excluding cultural and audiovisual services from the Commission's draft negotiating mandate for a comprehensive international agreement on trade and investment, entitled 'Transatlantic trade and investment partnership between the EU and the USA', which it adopted on 12 March 2013, the College of Commissioners failed to fully protect and foster the European cultural exception.

On 24 April 2013, Parliament's Committee on International Trade adopted a draft resolution on trade and investment negotiations between the EU and the USA, which calls for the cultural and audiovisual industries to be excluded from the scope of the negotiations on the future free trade agreement.

Does the Commission intend to follow this advice to safeguard the future of European film and audiovisual industries, particularly in the new digital environment?

Question for written answer E-005353/13
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD), Mara Bizzotto (EFD), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Oreste Rossi (EFD), Fiorello Provera (EFD), Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD), Claudio Morganti (EFD), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Mario Borghezio (EFD), Lara Comi (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE) and Dimitar Stoyanov (NI)
(14 May 2013)

Subject: EU-US Free Trade Agreement and protection of European audiovisual production

Commissioner Karel de Gucht's mandate concerning a new FTA between the European Union and the United States of America does not include any specific exemption or exclusion regarding audiovisual products and services. A free trade agreement governing free trade in audiovisual products and services between the EU and the USA would create a conflict with the existing European and national legislation, which contains several measures to promote national and European film industries.

Today there are laws imposing broadcasting quotas for European works and national TV channels, and providing economic support to local and European film industries.

The abrogation of these laws would inflict a deadly blow on European audiovisual production, considering that, without protection and financial aid, it cannot compete with the large-scale audiovisual industries in the USA and elsewhere.

As movies and audiovisual products are an integral part and an important expression of the cultures that generate them, we must point out that European audiovisual productions have a key role in protecting and promoting the culture, identity and traditions of Member States. They also contribute to the European integration process, promoting a deeper knowledge of the specific characteristics of each Member State among the people of Europe.

With this in mind:

— Are audiovisual products and services really included in the FTA for which Commissioner De Gucht received a mandate to negotiate ?

— If so, what does the Commission plan to do to protect the European film industry and to avoid a situation in which the audiovisual market in Europe has to lower its standards to mirror those that apply in the North American market?

Question for written answer E-005607/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(21 May 2013)

Subject: Audiovisual — free trade agreement with the US

In view of the following:

— the fact that the main objective of the free trade agreement with the US, which will create one of the largest free trade areas in the world, is to smooth over the regulatory differences that have been damaging trade between the two regions in areas such as farming, chemicals, pharmaceuticals and motor vehicles;

— whether, in the World Trade Organisation or in bilateral negotiations, the EU has always excluded audiovisual services from any free trade commitment;

— the fact that following transatlantic negotiations, which have yet to formally begin, 14 European countries — including Portugal, France, Germany, Spain and Italy — have demanded that the audiovisual sector be excluded from the EU-US free trade agreement being negotiated;

— the fact that several renowned directors, mainly Europeans, have launched a petition for the audiovisual industry to be excluded from the new free trade agreement, arguing that 'the liberalisation of the audiovisual and film sector will lead to the destruction of everything that has hitherto protected, promoted and helped develop European cultures'.

Can the Commission state:

What is its view of the position of the aforementioned countries, in view of the specific status of audiovisual works?

Question for written answer E-005806/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 May 2013)

Subject: Cultural exception for European films and audiovisual works

Hundreds of figures from Europe's cultural sector have called for films and audiovisual works to be excluded from future trade liberalisation negotiations between the United States and the EU.

The appeal concerns future transatlantic negotiations which will aim to create one of the largest free trade zones in the world. Several EU Member States agree that this sector should be protected and excluded from these negotiations.

A petition to this end has been signed by more than 5 000 people, including dozens of European filmmakers.

— Is the Commission aware of these facts?

— What is its assessment of them?

— What is its stance on this issue?

— Has it expressed its view to the US authorities? How was it received?

Joint answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2013)

Cultural diversity, as enshrined in Article 167 (paragraph 4) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and the Unesco Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, is a guiding principle of the Commission's actions, including in the trade area. The proposed draft negotiating directives for a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Agreement (TTIP) fully respect this policy. Against this background, the Commission and Council are currently discussing ways of how to reflect in the negotiating directives the right balance between, on the one hand, the sensitivity of the audiovisual sector and, on the other hand, the objective of broad and ambitious negotiations.

In the view of the Commission, any solution found should respect the following: The EU and its Member States will be able to continue implementing existing legislation, including EU directives and the MEDIA programme; subsidies by Member States will be excluded from any commitment and; TTIP negotiations should preserve the necessary policy space for EU-wide regulation, also after the TTIP negotiations, in order to adapt EU policies to the technological evolutions in the audiovisual sector.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004765/13
til Kommissionen
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(29. april 2013)

Om: Medicinsk udstyr og oversættelser

Den europæiske lovgivning om medicinsk udstyr har hidtil været præget af store forskelle mellem, hvordan landene har gennemført den, og mellem hvilke krav der findes i de enkelte medlemsstater.

Et af de områder, hvor kravene er forskellige, er oversættelser. Visse lande accepterer at få brugsanvisninger på engelsk, mens andre kræver, at disse er oversat til det eller de lokale sprog. Det samme gælder for de mærkater, der sidder enten uden på emballagen til medicinsk udstyr eller inden i/på selve udstyret.

Kommissionen anmodes i denne forbindelse om at besvare følgende:

1. Hvilke sproglige krav er der til brugsanvisninger for medicinsk udstyr til patienter — i de forskellige medlemsstater?

2. Hvilke sproglige krav er der til brugsanvisninger for medicinsk udstyr til sundhedspersonale — i de forskellige medlemsstater?

3. Hvilke sproglige krav er der til mærkning af mediciske udstyr — i de forskellige medlemsstater? Og er der nogen forskelle mellem mærkningskravene for mærkning inden i og uden på emballagen? Og i så fald hvilke?

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004767/13
til Kommissionen
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(29. april 2013)

Om: Oversættelse af oplysninger om medicinsk udstyr

Den Europæiske Unions lovgivning om medicinsk udstyr er præget af forskelle mellem hvilke krav, der findes i de enkelte medlemsstater, og hvordan landene har gennemført den.

Kommissionen anmodes i denne forbindelse om at besvare følgende:

1. Hvad er reglerne for oversættelse af software til brug med eller som del af medicinsk udstyr — i de enkelte medlemslande?

2. Forudser Kommissionen nogen ændringer på dette område?

Samlet svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg
(17. juni 2013)

I henhold til direktiv 93/42/EØF ([1]) kan medlemsstaterne kræve, at fabrikantens oplysninger affattes på deres nationale sprog eller på et andet fællesskabssprog, uanset om dette sker med henblik på professionel eller anden anvendelse. Ovennævnte bestemmelser vedrører både oplysningerne i brugsanvisningen og på emballagen.

Der gælder de samme sprogkrav for oplysningerne inden i og uden på udstyrets emballage.

Der gælder de samme regler for sprogkrav gælder for stand alone-software, som i sig selv er et medicinsk udstyr, og for software til brug med eller som del af medicinsk udstyr.

([1]) EFT L 169 af 12.7.1993, s. 1.

De foreslåede forordninger om medicinsk udstyr og medicinsk udstyr til in vitro-diagnostik ([2]), som Kommissionen vedtog den 26. september 2012, medfører ikke nogen væsentlig ændring af disse regler. De tydeliggør producenternes forpligtelse til at sikre, at de oplysninger, der skal gives på etiketten eller i brugsanvisningen foreligger på et officielt EU-sprog, som er let at forstå for den tilsigtede bruger eller patient. Det bestemmes ved lov i de medlemsstater, hvor udstyret gøres tilgængeligt for brugeren eller patienten, hvilke(t) sprog fabrikantens oplysninger skal foreligge på.

([2]) KOM(2012)0542 endelig, KOM(2012)0541 endelig.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004765/13
to the Commission
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Medical devices and translation

EU legislation on medical devices has so far been marked by great differences between how Member States have implemented that legislation and between the requirements which exist in individual Member States.

One of the ways in which these requirements differ is in relation to translation. Some countries believe it to be acceptable for instructions to be written in English alone, while others require that these be translated into the native language(s). The same principle applies for the labels that either go outside or inside the packaging of medical devices or on the device itself.

In light of the above, could the Commission answer the following:

1. What language requirements are applicable to instructions for medical devices for patients in each Member State?

2. What language requirements are applicable to instructions for medical devices for healthcare practitioners in each Member State?

3. What language requirements are applicable to the labelling of medical devices in each Member State? Also, are there differences between the requirements for labelling which appears inside the packaging and that which appears outside? If so, what are they?

Question for written answer E-004767/13
to the Commission
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Translation of information on medical devices

EU medical devices legislation is marked by differences between the requirements that exist in individual Member States and in how each Member State implements the legislation.

In light of the above, could the Commission answer the following:

1. What are the rules governing the translation of software for use with, or forming part of, medical devices in each Member State?

2. Does the Commission foresee any changes to these rules?

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

According to Directive 93/42/EEC ([1]), Member States may require that the information supplied by the manufacturer is provided in their national language(s) or in another Community language, regardless of whether it is for professional or other use. The abovementioned provision refers to both the information appearing in the instructions for use and on the label.

No differences exist as regards the language requirements between the labelling information appearing inside the packaging and the one visible on the outer package of the device.

The same rules as to the language requirements apply to standalone software which is a medical device as such, as well as to software for use with, or forming part of, medical devices.

([1]) OJ L 169, 12.7.1993, p. 1.

The proposed Regulations on medical devices and on *in vitro* diagnostic medical devices [2], adopted by the Commission on 26.09.2012, do not introduce any substantial change to these rules. They clarify the obligation for manufacturers to ensure that the information to be supplied on the label or in the instructions for use shall be provided in an official Union language and shall be easily understood by the intended user or patient. The language(s) of the information to be supplied by the manufacturer may be determined by the law of the Member State where the device is made available to the user or patient.

---

[2] COM(2012) 542 final, COM(2012) 541 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004775/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(29 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Resultado das eleições na Croácia

A sensivelmente dois meses e meio da adesão oficial da Croácia à União Europeia, o resultado das eleições que elegeram os primeiros eurodeputados ficou aquém das expectativas em termos de participação dos cidadãos croatas. A participação na referida eleição rondou os 20 %, o que mostra um claro afastamento dos Croatas em relação à adesão ao projeto comunitário.

Pergunto à Comissão:

De que forma interpreta a fraca adesão dos eleitores croatas nas recentes eleições europeias?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005109/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(7 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Croácia — baixa taxa de afluência às urnas

As primeiras eleições para o Parlamento Europeu na Croácia saldaram-se por uma taxa de participação eleitoral de apenas 21 %.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que comentário lhe merece esta baixíssima taxa de afluência às urnas?

— Que motivos aponta para a mesma?

Resposta conjunta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(12 de julho de 2013)

Nos últimos anos, a taxa de participação nos diferentes tipos de eleições, incluindo nas eleições para o Parlamento Europeu, tornou-se um problema para as democracias europeias. Em 2009, a taxa de participação geral nas eleições europeias atingiu apenas 43 %, registando cerca de 20 % em alguns Estados-Membros, à semelhança do sucedido nas últimas eleições europeias na Croácia. Por conseguinte, encorajar a participação dos cidadãos da União na vida democrática constitui um aspeto prioritário para a Comissão.

Tal como indicado no relatório sobre a cidadania da UE de 2013 intitulado «Cidadãos europeus — os seus direitos, o seu futuro» ([1]), a participação nas eleições europeias constitui o principal meio de os cidadãos contribuírem para a definição das políticas da UE e o fundamento da democracia representativa na União Europeia. Esta é a razão pela qual a Comissão propôs recentemente medidas para facilitar a participação dos cidadãos nas eleições europeias e reforçar a dimensão europeia dessas eleições. Tais iniciativas incluem uma comunicação ([2]) e uma recomendação ([3]) para reforçar a eficácia do processo eleitoral democrático tendo em vista a preparação das eleições europeias, bem como a recente Diretiva 2013/1/UE ([4]), adotada sob proposta da Comissão, que torna mais fácil que os cidadãos se apresentem como candidatos às eleições para o Parlamento Europeu no Estado-Membro da sua residência.

No relatório sobre a cidadania acima referido, a Comissão anunciou que promoverá a sensibilização dos cidadãos da UE para os seus direitos de cidadania e, em especial, os seus direitos eleitorais, mediante a publicação de um guia, numa linguagem clara e simples, sobre os direitos na União.

([1]) COM(2013) 269.
([2]) C (2013) 1303.
([3]) JO L79 de 21.3.2013, p. 29.
([4]) JO L 26 de 26.1.2013, p. 27.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004775/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Results of the Croatian elections

Voter turnout for Croatia's first MEP elections was much lower than expected, around two and a half months before the country's official accession to the European Union. Only 20% of the country's eligible voters took part in the ballot, which shows a clear disengagement with the Community project.

What is the Commission's opinion of the weak turnout by Croatian voters in the recent European elections?

Question for written answer E-005109/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(7 May 2013)

Subject: Low turnout at the polls in Croatia

The first European Parliament elections in Croatia saw a voter turnout of just 21%.

— What does the Commission have to say about this very low turnout?

— What does it think are the reasons behind it?

Joint answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(12 July 2013)

In recent years, turnout in the different types of elections, including European elections, has become a challenge for European democracies. In the 2009 European elections general turnout reached only 43%, with a turnout of around 20% in some of the Member States, similarly to the recent European elections in Croatia. Therefore, encouraging the participation of EU citizens in democratic life is a high priority for the Commission.

As stated in the 2013 *EU Citizenship Report 'EU citizens: your rights, your future'* ([1]), participation in European elections is the primary way for citizens to contribute to the shaping of EU policy and constitutes the bedrock of representative democracy in the European Union. This is why the Commission recently proposed measures to facilitate citizens' participation in the European elections and strengthen the European dimension of these elections. Initiatives notably include a communication ([2]) and a recommendation ([3]) *for further enhancing the democratic and efficient conduct of the European elections,* and the recent Directive 2013/1/EU ([4]), adopted on a proposal from the Commission, which makes it easier for people to stand as candidates in the elections to the European Parliament in the Member State where they reside.

In its *2013 EU Citizenship Report*, the Commission announced that it will further promote EU citizens' awareness of their EU citizenship rights and in particular their electoral rights in particular by producing a handbook presenting those EU rights in clear and simple language.

([1]) COM(2013)269.
([2]) C(2013)1303.
([3]) OJ L 79, 21.3.2013, p. 29.
([4]) OJ L 26, 26.1.2013, p. 27.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004809/13
al Consejo
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(29 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Seis millones de parados en España

El día 25 de abril de 2013 se hizo pública la Encuesta de Población Activa (EPA) del mercado laboral español para 2013, así como los datos del Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE). La EPA indica que el desempleo aumentó en 237 400 personas, superando los seis millones de parados en el primer trimestre y situándose la tasa de paro en el 27,16 %.

Los datos del INE reflejan que la ocupación sigue bajando ya que 322 300 personas se quedaron sin empleo en el primer trimestre de 2013, unas 3 500 al día, lo que redujo la ocupación a 16 634 700, su nivel más bajo desde 2003. De la misma forma, el desempleo entre personas de entre 16 y 24 años ha aumentado hasta el 57,2 %. En suma, durante el último año se ha reducido el empleo en 708 500 personas, incrementándose el número de parados en 563 200 personas.

Ya en el Programa de Estabilidad 2012-2015 de España, adoptado por el Consejo en junio de 2012 ([1]), se indica como prioritario la lucha contra el desempleo, con especial incidencia en los grupos con riesgo de exclusión y la población juvenil. Sin embargo, la obsesión de los objetivos de déficit y deuda pública parece priorizarse por parte de la UE, avalando reformas estructurales como la reforma laboral española que ha contribuido a agravar la terrible situación social y económica en España. En otras palabras, aumenta un desequilibrio macroeconómico fundamental como es el desempleo con la falsa excusa de reducir otros.

¿Continúa considerando que se debe flexibilizar aún más el mercado laboral español? ¿No cree que la reforma laboral ya ha demostrado que esa no es la buena dirección? ¿Otorgará prioridad a las recomendaciones de creación de empleo, mayor protección social y lucha contra la pobreza? ¿Reconoce el Consejo la corresponsabilidad política de la realidad sufrida por la población en España? ¿Seguirá el Consejo abogando por las políticas injustas de austeridad?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004811/13
al Consejo
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(29 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Plan de choque contra el desempleo juvenil

El 25 de abril de 2013 se publicaron la Encuesta de Población Activa (EPA) correspondiente a 2013 y los datos del Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE). La EPA indica que el desempleo juvenil se sitúa ya en el 57,2 %, lo que supone alrededor de un millón de parados y representa una situación dramática, ya que implica un aumento de más del doble del número de desempleados desde 2008 (24,6 %).

En reiteradas ocasiones, tanto el Presidente de la Comisión como el del Consejo han mostrado su preocupación con respecto al desempleo juvenil en el sur de Europa y en España en particular. Recientemente, el Consejo ha dado luz verde a la Garantía de la Juventud, un instrumento de financiación dotado con sólo seis millones de euros para los 28 Estados miembros durante un periodo de siete años cuyo objetivo es reducir el desempleo juvenil. Este instrumento estará cofinanciado por los Estados miembros, lo que no podrá realizarse sin una flexibilización del calendario para el cumplimiento de los objetivos en materia de déficit y de deuda pública, tal y como ha indicado el propio Comisario L. Andor.

Sin embargo, y con el beneplácito de las instituciones europeas, se han profundizado las medidas de austeridad injustas que dificultan la emancipación juvenil (recortes en la salud, en la educación, en las ayudas a la vivienda, etc.) y se ha optado por una reforma del mercado laboral que precariza aún más a los trabajadores y a las trabajadoras.

([1]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st11/st11273.en12.pdf

¿Qué opinión merecen al Consejo las políticas de juventud y empleo juvenil adoptadas por el Gobierno español? ¿Qué recomendaciones concretas hará el Consejo en relación con la situación en materia de desempleo juvenil en España de cara al próximo semestre europeo? ¿Aceptaría el Consejo que se posponga un año el cumplimiento de los objetivos en materia de déficit y de deuda a cambio de un plan de choque contra el desempleo juvenil de un año de duración que implique la creación de medio millón de puestos de trabajo destinados a los jóvenes?

Respuesta conjunta

(22 de julio de 2013)

Su Señoría puede consultar las respuestas del Consejo a las preguntas escritas 784/13 y 785/13 formuladas por Su Señoría.

Además, el Consejo recuerda que, en el contexto del proceso del Semestre Europeo de 2013, la Comisión publicó, el 29 de mayo 2013, una Recomendación de Recomendación del Consejo encaminada a poner fin a la situación de déficit público excesivo en España ([2]) y una Recomendación de Recomendación del Consejo relativa al programa nacional de reformas de 2013 de España y se emite un dictamen del Consejo sobre el programa de estabilidad de España para 2012-2016 ([3]).

Están en curso en el Consejo los debates sobre estas recomendaciones.

(2) 10484/13.
(3) 10025/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004809/13
to the Council
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Six million unemployed in Spain

On 25 April 2013, the Labour Force Survey (EPA) on the Spanish labour market for 2013 and data from the Spanish National Statistics Institute (INE) were published. The EPA shows that unemployment increased by 237 400 people, surpassing the 6 million mark in the first quarter and placing the unemployment rate at 27.16%.

The INE data show that employment levels are still falling, as 322 300 people — some 3 500 per day — became unemployed in the first quarter of 2013, which reduced the number of people in employment to 16 634 700, the lowest it has been since 2003. Similarly, unemployment among 16 to 24 year olds rose to 57.2%. In summary, in the last year the number of people in employment has fallen by 708 500 people, the number of unemployed people having increased by 563 200.

The Stability Programme for Spain, 2012-2015, adopted by the Council in June 2012 ([1]), already states that tackling unemployment, particularly among groups at risk of exclusion and young people, is a priority. However, the obsession with the deficit and public debt targets seems to be the EU's priority, as it endorses structural reforms such as the Spanish labour reform, which has contributed to aggravating the terrible social and economic situation in Spain. In other words, it increases one fundamental macroeconomic imbalance — that of unemployment — under the false pretext of reducing others.

Does the Council continue to believe that the Spanish labour market should be made even more flexible? Does it not believe that labour reform has already shown that this is not the right way to go? Will it give priority to recommendations for creating jobs, better social protection and combating poverty? Does the Council recognise political co-responsibility for the reality faced by Spain's population? Will the Council continue to support unfair austerity policies?

Question for written answer E-004811/13
to the Council
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Emergency plan for youth unemployment

On 25 April 2013, the Labour Force Survey (EPA) for 2013 and data from the Spanish National Statistics Institute (INE) were published. The EPA shows that youth unemployment is now at 57.2%, which accounts for around one million unemployed people and represents a dramatic situation, as it implies that the number of unemployed people has more than doubled since 2008 (24.6%).

On numerous occasions, both the President of the Commission and the President of the Council have shown their concern with regard to youth unemployment in southern Europe and in Spain in particular. Recently, the Council has given the green light for the Youth Guarantee, a financing instrument with a budget of just EUR 6 million for the 28 Member States for a period of seven years, with the objective of reducing youth unemployment. This instrument will be co-financed by the Member States, which can only happen if there is greater flexibility in the time frame for meeting the deficit and public debt targets, as Commissioner Andor has said himself.

However, with the consent of the European institutions, unfair austerity measures which make it difficult for young people to gain independence (cuts to health, education, housing benefits, etc.) have been deepened, and a reform of the labour market has been opted for that puts workers in an even more vulnerable position.

([1]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st11/st11273.en12.pdf

What is the Council's opinion of the youth and youth employment policies adopted by the Spanish Government? What concrete recommendations will the Council make with regard to the youth unemployment situation in Spain for the next European semester? Would the Council accept postponing by one year the deadline for meeting the deficit and debt targets in exchange for a one-year emergency plan for youth unemployment that will create half a million jobs for young people?

Joint reply

(22 July 2013)

The Honourable Member is kindly invited to refer to the Council's replies to written questions 784/13 and 785/13 put by the Honourable Member.

In addition, the Council recalls that, in the context of the 2013 European Semester process, the Commission published on 29 May 2013 a recommendation for a Council Recommendation with a view to bringing an end to the situation of an excessive government deficit in Spain ([2]) and a recommendation for a Council Recommendation on Spain's 2013 national reform programme and delivering a Council opinion on Spain's stability programme for 2012-2016 ([3]).

The discussion on these Recommendations in the Council is ongoing.

([2]) 10484/13.

([3]) 10025/13.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004863/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30. April 2013)

Betrifft: Neue Regierung in Island

Die neue Regierung Islands wird wahrscheinlich aus einem Mitte-Rechts-Bündnis gebildet werden, das nicht unbedingt pro-europäische Tendenzen aufweist.

Der jüngst im Parlament diskutierte Fortschrittsbericht 2012 zu Island konstatiert gute Fortschritte für einen möglichen EU-Beitritt. Die Zustimmung in Island zu einem EU-Beitritt scheint eher gering zu sein, und die neue Regierung stellt ein erneutes Referendum über den Beitritt in Aussicht.

1. Wie bewertet die Kommission die politische Lage sowie die „Europa-Entwicklung" im Land angesichts eines möglichen Mitte-Rechts-Bündnisses?

2. Welche Vorgehensweise ist für die künftigen politischen Beziehungen zwischen Island und der EU denkbar in dem Fall, dass ein mögliches Referendum über einen EU-Beitritt negativ ausfällt beziehungsweise dass sich die neue Regierung dazu entschließt, die Verhandlungen überhaupt abzubrechen?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(28. Juni 2013)

Bei den Parlamentswahlen vom 27. April 2013 gewann die Fortschrittspartei gemeinsam mit der Unabhängigkeitspartei die Mehrheit von 38 von 63 Sitzen im Parlament.

Nach Koalitionsgesprächen unter Führung des Vorsitzenden der Fortschrittspartei, Sigmundur Davíð Gunnlaugsson, bildeten die beiden Parteien eine Koalitionsregierung, die am 23. Mai 2013 vereidigt wurde.

Der Regierungsplattform zufolge werden die Beitrittsverhandlungen zwischen Island und der EU ausgesetzt und es wird eine Bilanz der Verhandlungen und der Entwicklungen innerhalb der EU gezogen, die dem Parlament unterbreitet wird. Auf der Plattform heißt es auch, dass bis zu einem Referendum keine weiteren Schritte in den Beitrittsverhandlungen unternommen werden. Die isländische Regierung hat bisher keinen Zeitplan für die Bewertung und das Referendum genannt.

Die Kommission hat das von der neuen isländischen Regierung angekündigte Konzept für die Beitrittsverhandlungen mit der EU zur Kenntnis genommen und ist bereit, konkrete Absichten und Pläne der isländischen Regierung detaillierter zu erörtern. Die Kommission ist entschlossen, die privilegierte Zusammenarbeiten mit Island in allen Bereichen von gemeinsamem Interesse im Rahmen der bisherigen Partnerschaft auf der Grundlage des Abkommens über den Europäischen Wirtschaftsraum und sonstiger Kooperationsgrundlagen fortzusetzen.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005105/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(7 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Islândia — adesão à UE — ponto da situação

As eleições legislativas na Islândia realizaram-se no passado dia 27 de abril e do seu resultado poderia depender a retoma das negociações tendentes à adesão daquele país à União Europeia.

O Partido da Independência venceu as referidas eleições legislativas na Islândia, derrotando a coligação de esquerda, e é provável a constituição de uma aliança de centro-direita com o Partido Progressista.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Foi contactada pelo novo executivo islandês acerca da retoma ou manutenção da suspensão do processo tendente à adesão do país à União Europeia?

— Considera que as posições anteriormente expressas pelos partidos vencedores quanto à entrada na União colocam em causa a convergência da Islândia com a União?

— Considera benéfica para a Islândia a sua adesão à União Europeia?

Resposta conjunta dada por Štefan Füle em nome da Comissão
(28 de junho de 2013)

Nas eleições legislativas de 27 de abril de 2013, o Partido Progressista em conjunto com o Partido da Independência conquistou a maioria com 38 dos 63 lugares no Parlamento.

Na sequência das conversações para o estabelecimento de uma coligação conduzidas pelo líder do Partido Progressista, Sigmundur Davíð Gunnlaugsson, os dois partidos formaram um governo de coligação que tomou posse em 23 de maio de 2013.

A plataforma governamental revela que as negociações de adesão da Islândia à UE serão suspensas e que será realizada uma avaliação sobre o ponto da situação das negociações e dos desenvolvimentos a nível da UE, que será apresentada ao Parlamento. A plataforma revela também que qualquer avanço nas negociações de adesão dependerá da realização de um referendo nacional. O governo islandês ainda não indicou qual o calendário relativo à avaliação e ao referendo.

A Comissão tomou conhecimento da abordagem anunciada pelo novo governo islandês relativa ao processo de negociação da adesão à UE e está preparada para debater as intenções e os projetos do governo islandês de forma mais aprofundada. A Comissão compromete-se a continuar a envidar esforços no sentido de estabelecer uma cooperação privilegiada com a Islândia em áreas de interesse mútuo através da tradicional parceria no âmbito do Acordo sobre o Espaço Económico Europeu, bem como através de outros quadros de cooperação em curso.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004863/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: New government in Iceland

It is likely that Iceland's new government will take the form of a centre-right coalition whose policies will not necessarily be pro-European.

The Iceland Progress Report 2012, which was recently debated in Parliament, notes the good progress made towards a possible EU accession. There appears to be little public support in Iceland for joining the EU, however, and the new government has promised another referendum on accession.

1. Given this possibility of a centre-right coalition, what is the Commission's assessment of the political situation and 'European developments' in the country?

2. What approach could be taken to future political relations between Iceland and the EU in the event of a negative outcome to a possible referendum on EU accession, or a decision by the new government to break off negotiations altogether?

Question for written answer E-005105/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(7 May 2013)

Subject: State of play with regard to Iceland's accession to the EU

Legislative elections were held in Iceland on 27 April 2013 and their outcome could dictate whether or not negotiations on Iceland's accession to the European Union are resumed.

The Independence Party won the aforementioned legislative elections in Iceland, defeating the coalition of the left, and it is likely that it will form a centre-right alliance with the Progressive Party.

— Has the Commission been contacted by the new Icelandic Government about whether the country's EU accession process will resume or remain on hold?

— Does it believe that the positions previously expressed by the winning parties with regard to joining the European Union put Iceland's EU membership at risk?

— Does it believe that EU membership will be beneficial to Iceland?

Question for written answer E-005492/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(17 May 2013)

Subject: Accession talks with Iceland

Have the recent elections in Iceland affected any ongoing negotiations regarding potential accession to the EU?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2013)

With the parliamentary elections on 27 April 2013, the Progressive Party together with the Independence Party won a majority of 38 of the 63 seats in parliament.

Following coalition talks led by the leader of the Progressive Party, Mr Sigmundur Davíð Gunnlaugsson, the two parties formed a coalition government that was sworn in on 23 May 2013.

The governmental platform indicates that Iceland's EU accession negotiations will be put on hold and an assessment will be made on the state of play of the negotiations and developments within the EU, which will be presented to the parliament. The platform also indicates that no further steps will be taken in the accession negotiations until after a national referendum. No timing has yet been indicated by the Icelandic Government as regards the assessment and the referendum.

The Commission has taken note of the approach that the new Icelandic Government has announced with regard to the EU accession negotiation process and is ready to discuss the concrete intentions and plans of the Icelandic Government in further detail. The Commission is committed to further pursue the privileged cooperation with Iceland in all areas of mutual interest through its traditional partnership within the framework of the European Economic Area Agreement, as well as through other ongoing cooperation frameworks.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004864/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30. April 2013)

Betrifft: Steigende Kosten durch Erkrankungen des Gehirns

In der EU werden jedes Jahr 800 Milliarden EUR für die Behandlung von Erkrankungen des Gehirns ausgegeben.

Die Bevölkerung der Union altert zunehmend, und es ist absehbar, dass ein Drittel der Unionsbürger künftig an einer Erkrankung des Gehirns leiden wird.

1. Ist die Kommission über die Kosten im Zusammenhang mit Erkrankungen des Gehirns und psychischen Erkrankungen im Bilde? Falls ja, welche Strategien verfolgt die Kommission in Bezug auf die Beratung der Mitgliedstaaten zur Senkung dieser Kosten?

2. Welche Programme wird die Kommission einrichten, um zu erreichen, dass ein Schwerpunkt auf die Präventivmedizin gelegt wird?

3. Welchen Beitrag leistet die Europäische Union, um diese Kosten zu decken, und welche Haushaltslinien werden dafür verwendet?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004865/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30. April 2013)

Betrifft: Kosten psychischer Erkrankungen in der EU

Die Behandlung psychischer Erkrankungen kostet in der EU pro Minute 1,5 Millionen EUR.

1. Ist die Kommission über die Kosten im Zusammenhang mit psychischen Erkrankungen in der EU im Bilde? Falls ja, welche Strategien verfolgt die Kommission in Bezug auf die Beratung der Mitgliedstaaten zur Senkung dieser Kosten?

2. Was kann bzw. könnte auf der Ebene der EU getan werden, um Menschen dabei zu unterstützen, einen gesünderen Lebensstil zu führen, wodurch viele psychische Erkrankungen verhindert werden könnten?

3. Welchen Beitrag leistet die Europäische Union, um diese Kosten zu decken, und welche Haushaltslinien werden dafür verwendet?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(26. Juni 2013)

Der Kommission ist die Studie „Cost of disorders of the brain in Europe 2010“ von A. Gustavsson et al. [1] bekannt, der zufolge sich die Kosten für Erkrankungen des Gehirns (einschl. psychischer, neurologischer und neurodegenerativer Erkrankungen) 2010 auf insgesamt 798 Mrd. EUR beliefen.

Der Mai 2013 war von der Kommission zum Europäischen Monat des Gehirns ausgerufen worden, der einen Rahmen für Fragen der Hirnforschung und der Gesundheitsversorgung bieten sollte. Er sollte insbesondere dazu dienen, die von der EU geförderten Ergebnisse sowie künftige Forschungsprojekte und politische Strategien zu präsentieren und die Mitgliedstaaten und assoziierten Länder dazu zu bringen, die Ressourcen für die Hirnforschung und die Gesundheitsversorgung besser zu koordinieren und ihre Verwendung zu optimieren.

[1] European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, S. 718 ff.

Entsprechend der EU-Gesundheitspolitik setzen die Kommission und die Mitgliedstaaten die europäische Initiative zur Alzheimer-Krankheit und zu anderen Demenzerkrankungen [2] und den Europäischen Pakt für psychische Gesundheit und Wohlbefinden (2008) [3] gemeinsam um. Im Rahmen des Paktes wurde im Februar 2013 eine Gemeinsame Aktion für psychische Gesundheit und Wohlbefinden gestartet. Die damit verbundenen Maßnahmen sollen Investitionen von Ressourcen in die Krankheitsvorsorge und die Gesundheitsfürsorge anregen.

Zwischen 2008 und 2013 wurden aus dem EU-Gesundheitsprogramm 2008-2013 rund 17,5 Mio. EUR in verschiedene Maßnahmen (Projekte, Studien, Konferenzen, Gemeinsame Aktionen im Zusammenhang mit psychischer Gesundheit und Demenz) investiert.

Die EU unterstützte die Hirnforschung mit erheblichen Beiträgen aus dem Siebten Forschungsrahmenprogramm (FP7, 2007-2013). Aus dem FP7 wurden mehr als 1,9 Mrd. EUR für 1 268 Hirnforschungsprojekte mit insgesamt 4 321 Teilnahmen von 1 515 Einrichtungen [4] ausgeschüttet.

---

[2] Mitteilung der Kommission an das Europäische Parlament und den Rat über eine europäische Initiative zur Alzheimer-Krankheit und anderen Demenzerkrankungen, KOM(2009)380 endg. vom 22. Juli 2009.

[3] http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/policy/index_de.htm

[4] http://ec.europa.eu/research/conferences/2013/brain-month/pdf/publication_emob.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004864/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Brain disorders and the rising costs

EUR 800 billion is the amount paid in Europe every year to treat brain disorders.

Europe's population is ageing and it is expected that one in three Europeans will suffer from a brain disorder.

1. Is the Commission aware of these costs related to brain disorders and mental health? If so, what strategies does it have to advise the Member States on reducing such costs?

2. What programmes does the Commission intend to install to focus on preventive medicine?

3. What is the European Union's contribution to covering these costs? Please specify what budget lines are involved.

Question for written answer E-004865/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Mental health in Europe and its costs

EUR 1.5 m is paid per minute for mental health in Europe.

1. Is the Commission aware of these costs related to mental health in Europe? If so, what strategies does the Commission have to advise the Member States on decreasing these costs?

2. What can and could be done at European level to help people lead healthier lifestyles in order to prevent many psychological disorders?

3. What is the European Union's contribution to covering these costs? Please specify what budget lines are involved.

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2013)

The Commission is aware of the study 'Cost of disorders of the brain in Europe 2010' by A. Gustavsson et al. ([1]), which estimated that the total costs of disorders of the brain, including mental, neurological and neurodegenerative disorders, accounted to EUR 798 billion in 2010.

In May 2013, the Commission promoted the European Month of the Brain, to provide a framework to address brain research and healthcare issues. In particular, it aimed at showcasing EU-supported achievements and outlining foresight research and policy, mobilising Member States and Associated Countries to better coordinate and optimise resources allocated to brain research and healthcare.

Under the EU health policy, the Commission works with Member States to implement the European initiative on Alzheimer's disease and other dementias ([2]) and the European Pact for Mental Health and Well-being (2008) ([3]). The latter included the launch, in February 2013, of a Joint Action on Mental Health and Well-being. These activities encourage investing resources into disease prevention and health promotion.

Between 2008 and 2013, about EUR 17.5 million were invested from the EU-Health Programme 2008-2013 into various activities such as projects, studies, conferences, Joint Actions on mental health and dementia.

([1]) European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, 718-79.
([2]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on a European initiative on Alzheimer's disease and other dementias COM(2009) 380 final of 22 July 2009.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/policy/index_en.htm

The EU provided significant support for brain research from the Seventh Framework Programme for Research (FP7, 2007-2013). FP7 allocated more than EUR 1.9 billion for 1 268 projects involving 4 312 participations of 1 515 institutions to brain research ([4]).

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/conferences/2013/brain-month/pdf/publication_emob.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004885/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(30 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Rifiuti speciali pericolosi abbandonati in una discarica dismessa di Padernello di Paese (TV), causa di contaminazione della sottostante falda acquifera

A Padernello di Paese (in provincia di Treviso, in sigla TV), in via Veccelli, si trova una discarica dismessa, gestita in passato dalla SEV (Servizi Ecologici Veneti) S.r.l., ora fallita ([1]). Tale impianto era classificato in origine come discarica per rifiuti inerti; alla Società, tuttavia, veniva in prosieguo di tempo altresì rilasciata l'autorizzazione allo smaltimento di rifiuti di origine cementizia/resinoide contenenti amianto, poi sospesa nel 2001 per irregolarità gestionali, ma ripristinata poco dopo dalla Provincia di Treviso nonostante il permanere delle irregolarità stesse ([2]). Grazie allo svolgimento di un'indagine relativa alla struttura ora denominata «ex Nuova ESA», sita tra Marcon (in provincia di Venezia) e Mogliano Veneto (TV) — altro impianto caratterizzato da irregolarità nella gestione dei rifiuti — il CFS (Corpo Forestale dello Stato) scopriva l'illecito conferimento tramite mezzi pesanti di rifiuti non conformi, in parte tossico-nocivi (ora definiti rifiuti speciali pericolosi ai sensi del Decreto legislativo 3.4.2006, n. 152, cosiddetto Codice dell'Ambiente), da parte di questa alla succitata discarica di via Veccelli; il numero dei conferimenti effettuati è pari a circa 700, per un totale di 25.000 metri cubi di rifiuti, in un arco di tempo che va dall'autunno del 2001 all'aprile del 2002 ([3]). Successivamente, all'esito di campionamenti effettuati dall'ARPAV (Agenzia regionale per la Prevenzione e Protezione Ambientale del Veneto) sulle acque della falda acquifera sottostante la discarica, emergevano dati anomali in relazione a temperatura, conducibilità, presenza di solfati, cloruri, ferro, manganese e boro ([4]). Dalla chiusura della procedura fallimentare della Società, datata 9.12.2010, con debiti impagati per EUR 15 000 000, nulla è stato fatto da alcuna Autorità al fine di provvedere alla bonifica dei rifiuti del sito. L'intera vicenda ha suscitato grande preoccupazione e indignazione nei cittadini residenti a Paese (TV); l'associazione ambientalista Paeseambiente, in particolare, è intervenuta presentando un esposto al NOE (Nucleo Operativo Ecologico) dei Carabinieri di Treviso.

Tutto ciò premesso, la Commissione:

1. non ritiene opportuno contattare le Autorità locali al fine di verificare eventuali violazioni della normativa UE di settore nella vicenda in esame? Non intende in particolare verificare il rispetto di quelle norme che si richiamano al principio «chi inquina paga» di cui all'articolo 191 del TFUE?

2. Può chiarire le ragioni del mancato inserimento della discarica in esame tra quelle prese in considerazione ai fini del deferimento, in data 24.10.2012, dell'Italia alla Corte di giustizia UE (procedura di infrazione 2003/2077) per la mancata attuazione della sentenza della Corte stessa del 26.4.2007 (causa C-135/05 ([5]))?

([1]) A oggi, l'allora Amministratore Delegato della società è stato condannato a scontare 7 anni di reclusione in carcere per frode fiscale e bancarotta fraudolenta in un'altra vicenda di fallimento di una società di Bergamo.
Cfr. http://goo.gl/YAgZG.
([2]) La S.E.V. S.r.l., inoltre, gestiva altre due discariche nel medesimo comune grazie a una complessa fusione societaria.
([3]) Come accertato dalla sentenza del Tribunale di Venezia — Prima Sezione Penale — 7.2.2008, n. 11.
([4]) In base a quanto riassunto nelle lettere dell'8.2.2005 (protocollo 2105) e 21.6.2004 (protocollo 9982), di accompagnamento dei referti analitici relativi al monitoraggio compiuto, inviate dall'ARPAV alla Provincia di Treviso e al Comune di Paese.
([5]) http://curia.europa.eu/juris/showPdf.jsf?text=&docid=61312&pageIndex=0&doclang=it&mode=doc&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=16599.

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004886/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(30 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Ripristino ambientale a rischio di un impianto sequestrato, contenente rifiuti speciali pericolosi, ubicato tra Marcon (VE) e Mogliano Veneto (TV)

Tra le province di Venezia (in sigla VE) e Treviso (in sigla TV), ubicata per la maggior parte nel territorio del comune di Marcon (VE) e, in misura minore, in quello di Mogliano Veneto (TV), si trova la struttura denominata «Ex Nuova ESA», ex impianto di trattamento di rifiuti oggetto di sequestro dall'anno 2004 a seguito di vicende giudiziarie relative a operazioni di illecito smaltimento, che hanno coinvolto i vertici dell'allora società di gestione. A oggi, risultano essere ancora stipate nel sito circa 5.800 tonnellate di rifiuti speciali in parte pericolosi non catalogati, stoccati con modalità tali da essere fonte di elevato rischio ambientale, come risulta da una relazione predisposta congiuntamente dal Comando Provinciale dei Vigili del Fuoco di Venezia e dall'ARPAV (Agenzia regionale per la Prevenzione e Protezione Ambientale del Veneto) ([6]): viene segnalata, in particolare, la presenza (in un'area a rischio idraulico) di circa 180 fusti di pentasolfuro di fosforo, sostanza pericolosissima perché a contatto con l'acqua sprigiona gas altamente infiammabili, e di terre di bonifica (provenienti cioè da siti inquinati) genericamente coperte da un semplice telo di plastica. La società acquirente del residuale ramo d'azienda, infatti, si è resa inadempiente (tranne che per una minima parte) all'obbligo di smaltimento dei rifiuti irregolari; in ragione di ciò e su richiesta dei Comuni succitati, la Regione Veneto subentrava in sostituzione nell'intervento di ripristino ambientale (non ancora iniziato) stanziando all'uopo EUR 2.000.000 ([7]). Secondo stime effettuate, tale contributo è del tutto insufficiente a garantire le necessarie attività di messa in sicurezza: l'analisi, l'asporto e il conferimento dei rifiuti presso impianti specializzati richiederebbero un importo pari a circa EUR 6.000.000, come dichiarato dal Sindaco di Marcon (VE) Andrea Follini alla stampa locale ([8]) . La permanenza di tali rifiuti in un sito sostanzialmente abbandonato cagiona grande preoccupazione nella popolazione residente: in data 27.6.2012, in seguito a un incendio prodottosi nell'impianto, si sprigionava una densa colonna di fumo, che costringeva i Comuni citati a verificare la possibile contaminazione ambientale (fortunatamente non accaduta) ([9]). Lo stabilimento — adiacente a un'area SIC-ZPS di Rete Natura 2000 ([10]) — è ubicato a ridosso del fiume Zero, che confluisce nel fiume Dese quasi in corrispondenza della sua foce nella laguna di Venezia.

Sulla base di quanto esposto, la Commissione non ritiene opportuno approfondire le ragioni per le quali la Regione Veneto ha stanziato un contributo ritenuto insufficiente a risolvere l'emergenza ambientale ed eliminare per sempre i rischi di contaminazione?

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

La Commissione non è informata sulla discarica dismessa in Via Veccelli, nel comune di Padernello di Paese (in provincia di Treviso). Questo è il motivo per cui per cui la suddetta discarica non rientra nella procedura di infrazione n. 2003/2077, riguardante numerose discariche abusive in tutta Italia. La Commissione chiederà al governo italiano di fornire informazioni sulla discarica in modo da assicurare l'osservanza del diritto UE applicabile.

Per quanto riguarda la struttura ora denominata «ex Nuova ESA», sita tra Marcon (in provincia di Venezia) e Mogliano Veneto (in provincia di Treviso), la Commissione chiederà inoltre di ricevere informazioni sulle misure intraprese per bonificare l'area.

([6]) Relazione trasmessa alla Regione Veneto dal Comune di Marcon (VE) con nota n. 19003 del 14.8.2012.
([7]) Con deliberazione della Giunta Regionale n. 1858 del 18.9.2012, che ha individuato nella partecipata Veneto Acque S.p.A. il soggetto attuatore degli interventi. Nel successivo relativo bando di gara, in particolare, vengono precisate la quantità e la pericolosità del pentasolfuro di fosforo, cfr. http://goo.gl/Pa66e.
([8]) Cfr. articolo del quotidiano locale «La Nuova» di Venezia: Cfr. link http://goo.gl/Wrles.
([9]) La cittadinanza, inoltre, ritiene di non ricevere sufficienti informazioni sulla vicenda. Cfr. link http://goo.gl/l1gfb.
([10]) SIC-ZPS IT3250016 «Cave di Gaggio» (ai sensi delle direttive «Habitat» 92/43/CEE e «Uccelli» 2009/147/CE); l'area, inoltre, è in parte classificata quale Oasi protetta dalla LIPU (Lega Italiana Protezione Uccelli).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004885/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Special hazardous waste abandoned in a disused landfill in Padernello di Paese (province of Treviso), contaminating the underlying aquifer

On Via Veccelli in Padernello di Paese (in the province of Treviso), there is a disused landfill, previously run by Servizi Ecologici Veneti (SEV) S.r.l, which has since gone bankrupt ([1]). The landfill was originally classified as a landfill for inert waste. SEV, however, was later granted a licence to dispose of cement/resin waste containing asbestos. The licence was later suspended in 2001 due to mismanagement at the site, but was reinstated shortly after by the Treviso provincial authorities, despite the mismanagement not having been resolved ([2]). In an investigation carried out on the site now known as 'ex Nuova ESA', located between Marcon (in the province of Venice) and Mogliano Veneto (province of Treviso) — another plant where there was mismanagement of waste — the State Forestry Corps discovered that heavy goods vehicles were illegally taking non-compliant waste, some of which was toxic and hazardous (now defined as special hazardous waste under Legislative Decree No 152 of 3 April 2006, the 'Environmental Code'), from that site and dumping it at the aforementioned landfill on Via Veccelli. Around 700 loads were dumped, amounting to 25 000 cubic metres of waste, between autumn 2001 and April 2002 ([3]). Water samples subsequently taken by the Veneto Regional Environmental Protection Agency (ARPAV) from the aquifer beneath the landfill revealed irregularities in temperature, conductivity and sulphate, chloride, iron, manganese and boron levels ([4]). Since the settlement of SEV's bankruptcy proceedings on 9 December 2010, with outstanding debts of EUR 15 million, no authority has done anything to clean up the waste on the site. The whole affair has caused great concern and anger among the residents of Paese (province of Treviso). The environmental association Paeseambiente, in particular, has submitted a complaint to the environmental unit of the Treviso military police.

1. Does the Commission not think it should contact the local authorities in order to determine whether applicable EU legislation is being breached in the case in question? In particular, will it not check that rules relating to the 'polluter pays' principle referred to in Article 191 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union are being complied with?

2. Can it clarify why the landfill in question was not included among those taken into consideration when Italy was referred, on 24 October 2012, to the Court of Justice of the European Union (infringement proceeding 2003/2077), for failing to implement the judgment of the Court of 26 April 2007 (Case C-135/05 ([5]))?

Question for written answer E-004886/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Environmental rehabilitation of a confiscated plant containing special hazardous waste, located between Marcon (province of Venice) and Mogliano Veneto (province of Treviso), in jeopardy

Between the provinces of Venice and Treviso, located mainly in the municipality of Marcon (province of Venice) and, to a smaller extent, in the municipality of Mogliano Veneto (province of Treviso), is the 'Ex Nuova ESA' plant. It is a former waste treatment plant that was confiscated in 2004 following legal proceedings over illegal dumping, which involved the senior management of the company then running the plant. There are currently around 5 800 tonnes of hazardous and unclassified special waste, some of which is hazardous, crammed into the site, stored in conditions that pose a great environmental risk, according to a report drawn up by the Venice Provincial Fire Brigade in cooperation with the Veneto Regional Environmental Protection Agency (ARPAV) ([6]).

([1]) The then Managing Director of the company has since been sentenced to seven years' imprisonment for tax fraud and fraudulent bankruptcy in another case involving the bankruptcy of a Bergamo-based company. See http://goo.gl/YAgZG.
([2]) Furthermore, SEV S.r.l. ran two other landfills in the same municipality as the result of a complex company merger.
([3]) As found by the judgment of the Venice Court — First Criminal Chamber — 7 February 2008, No 11.
([4]) Based on the content of the letters of 8 February 2005 (ref. 2105) and 21 June 2004 (ref. 9982), accompanying the analysis reports on the monitoring carried out, sent by ARPAV to the Treviso provincial authorities and the Paese municipal authorities.
([5]) http://curia.europa.eu/juris/showPdf.jsf?text=&docid=61312&pageIndex=0&doclang=it&mode=doc&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=16599.
([6]) Report sent to the Veneto regional authorities by the Marcon (province of Veneto) municipal authorities with note No 19003 of 14 August 2012.

In particular, the report mentions that (in a water risk area) there are around 180 drums of phosphorus pentasulphide, a substance that is extremely hazardous because it releases highly flammable gas on contact with water, and reclaimed soil (from polluted sites) covered in a perfunctory manner with plastic sheeting. The company that purchased the remaining branch of the company has only been doing the bare minimum to comply with the obligation to dispose of non-standard waste. In view of that and at the request of the abovementioned municipalities, the Veneto regional authorities took over the environmental rehabilitation (which has not yet begun), setting aside EUR 2 million for the purpose ([7]). According to estimates, this amount is nowhere near enough for carrying out the work required to make the site safe. Analysis, removal and transfer of waste to specialised plants would cost around EUR 6 million, as Andrea Follini, the Mayor of Marcon (province of Veneto), told local reporters ([8]). The presence of this waste on an essentially abandoned site is a cause for great concern for local residents: on 27 June 2012, a fire at the plant caused a thick column of smoke to rise up, forcing the abovementioned municipal authorities to check for possible environmental contamination (fortunately there was none) ([9]). The plant, which is adjacent to a Natura 2000 Site of Community Interest-Special Protection Area ([10]), is located close to the River Zero, which flows into the River Dese almost at the point where it flows into the Venice lagoon.

In view of the above, does the Commission not think that it should look in detail into why the Veneto regional authorities have set aside an inadequate sum to resolve the environmental emergency and to get rid of contamination risks once and for all?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2013)

The Commission has no information on the disused landfill in Via Veccelli in the municipality of Padernello di Paese (province of Treviso). This is why the above landfill is not covered by infringement procedure 2003/2077 concerning numerous illegal landfills in the whole of Italy. The Commission will ask the Italian Government to provide information on the above landfill, so as to ensure that the applicable EC law is complied with.

As concerns the 'Ex Nuova ESA' landfill between the municipality of Marcon (province of Venice) and the municipality of Mogliano Veneto (province of Treviso), the Commission will also ask the Italian Government to provide information on the measures taken to clean up the site.

([7]) By Decision of the Regional Council No 1858 of 18 September 2012, which named the subsidiary Veneto Acque S.p.A. as the party to carry out the work. In particular, the quantities and the hazardous nature of phosphorus pentasulphide are detailed in the subsequent call to tender, see http://goo.gl/Pa66e.
([8]) See article in the Venetian local newspaper La Nuova: See http://goo.gl/Wrles.
([9]) Moreover, local residents do not feel they have received enough information on the matter. See http://goo.gl/llgfb.
([10]) Site of Community Interest-Special Protection Area IT3250016 'Cave di Gaggio' (under the 'Habitats' Directive 92/43/EEC and the 'Birds' Directive 2009/147/EC); the area is also partly classified as a protected sanctuary by the Italian League for the Protection of Birds (LIPU).

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004953/13
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(6 maja 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Chiny wydają decyzję o zawieszeniu kontraktu z Airbusem

W Chinach wydano decyzję o zawieszeniu kontraktu na zakup samolotów Airbus o wartości 12 mld dol. Decyzja ta jest motywowana niezmiennym stanowiskiem Komisji Europejskiej wobec objęcia podatkiem od emisji CO_2 chińskich linii lotniczych.

1. Jakie koszty pośrednie ponosi Europa ze względu na wprowadzenie podatku od emisji dla branży lotniczej?

2. Czy Komisja wie o sprawie Airbusa?

3. Jakie Komisja planuje podjąć kroki w stosunku do Chin? Czy temat ten zostanie poruszony na najbliższym szczycie UE-Chiny?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004954/13
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(6 maja 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Bojkot Indii wobec europejskich limitów CO_2 dla samolotów

Indie dołączyły do USA, Chin, Brazylii i Rosji w bojkocie europejskich limitów na emisję CO_2 z samolotów. Międzynarodowe Zrzeszenie Przewoźników Powietrznych oszacowało, że roczne koszty ETS dla branży lotniczej wyniosą w br. 900 mln euro, a w 2020 – 2,8 mld euro. Tak znaczne koszty wywołały niezadowolenie USA, Chin, Rosji oraz Brazylii. Do grona tych państw dołączyły Indie.

1. Jakie działania planuje Komisja wobec bojkotu ze strony kolejnych państw?

2. Czy Komisja zamierza zweryfikować swoje stanowisko dotyczące ETS wobec branży lotniczej?

3. Jak Komisja planuje zabezpieczyć interesy europejskich linii lotniczych wobec konkurencji z innych krajów?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Connie Hedegaard w imieniu Komisji
(3 lipca 2013 r.)

Komisja nie może potwierdzić stanowiska Szanownego Pana Posła, według którego Chiny wydały decyzję o zawieszeniu kontraktu na zakup samolotów Airbus ze względu na zobowiązania chińskich przewoźników lotniczych wynikające z systemu EU ETS.

Komisja jest w pełni zaangażowana w prowadzone w ramach ICAO negocjacje dotyczące globalnego porozumienia mającego na celu uzyskanie stosownego wkładu sektora lotnictwa w ograniczanie emisji oraz zapewnienie równych warunków konkurencji w sektorze. W ramach tego procesu Komisja na bieżąco prowadzi rozmowy z branżą w UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004953/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(6 May 2013)

Subject: Decision by China to suspend its contract with Airbus

China has decided to suspend its order with Airbus for aircraft worth USD 12 billion on the grounds that the Commission is maintaining its position on the need for Chinese airlines to pay the CO_2 emissions tax.

1. What are the indirect costs that will be incurred by the EU in connection with the introduction of the aviation emissions tax?

2. Is the Commission aware of the Airbus issue?

3. What steps is the Commission planning to take in relation to China? Will this issue be raised at the next EU-China summit?

Question for written answer E-004954/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(6 May 2013)

Subject: India's boycott of EU restrictions on emissions of CO_2 from aircraft

India has joined the USA, China, Brazil and Russia in boycotting the restrictions placed by the EU on emissions of CO_2 from aircraft. The International Air Carrier Association estimates that the ETS will mean an annual cost to the aviation industry of EUR 900 million in 2013 and EUR 2.8 billion in 2020. The USA, China, Russia and Brazil are unhappy at the magnitude of these costs, and they have now been joined by India.

1. What action is the Commission planning to take in response to the fact that more countries have now imposed a boycott?

2. Is the Commission planning to review its position towards the aviation industry in respect of the ETS?

3. How is the Commission planning to protect the interests of European airlines against competition from other countries?

Joint answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(3 July 2013)

The Commission cannot confirm the Honourable Member's assertion that 'China has suspended orders for Airbus aircraft because of the EU ETS obligations for Chinese airlines'.

The Commission is fully involved in the ICAO negotiations for a global agreement to achieve an appropriate contribution by the aviation sector to emission reductions and to ensure fair competition within the sector. In this process the Commission also remains in dialog with the relevant EU's industry.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-004970/13
do Komisji
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(6 maja 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Nieprawidłowości w finansowaniu polskiego rolnictwa

Komisja Europejska obciążyła Polskę kwotą 79,9 mln euro w następstwie procedury rozliczenia rachunków dotyczących funduszy w ramach Wspólnej Polityki Rolnej. Decyzja tłumaczona jest niedociągnięciami w kontrolach wstępnych wniosków i zatwierdzaniu planów operacyjnych w przypadku środków dla gospodarstw niskotowarowych.

W imieniu polskich rolników zaniepokojonych powyższą decyzją administracyjną, zwracam się z prośbą o udzielenie odpowiedzi na następujące pytania:

1. Proszę wskazać, jakiego okresu finansowania dotyczy przedmiotowy wniosek Komisji?

2. Jakie konkretnie niedociągnięcia w kontrolach wniosków zostały ujawnione w wyniku audytu Komisji?

3. Jakie procedury odwoławcze przysługują polskim władzom w tej sprawie i jakie są przewidywane terminy odwołań?

4. Czy udokumentowane błędy są następstwem zaniedbań wyłącznie władz krajowych, czy też samorządowych (regionalnych), bądź organizacji rolniczych?

5. Czy i w jaki sposób ewentualne uprawomocnienie się powyższej kary finansowej może obciążyć bezpośrednio polskich rolników? Komisja stwierdza bowiem, że środki otrzymali także rolnicy „nieuprawnieni".

6. W wypadku uprawomocnienia się kary, w jakim terminie Polska zmuszona będzie do zwrotu wskazanej kwoty?

7. Czy i w jaki sposób powyższa sprawa skutkować może w bieżącym procesie finansowania polskiego rolnictwa w ramach Wspólnej Polityki Rolnej?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-004971/13
do Komisji
Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(6 maja 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Informacje o planowanym wyłączeniu wobec Polski kwoty 79,9 milionów euro z wydatków na Rozwój Obszarów Wiejskich

W związku z informacją o planowanym wyłączeniu wobec Polski kwoty 79,9 milionów euro z wydatków na Rozwój Obszarów Wiejskich, proszę o odpowiedź na następujące pytania:

1. Dlaczego Komisja uważa, że ze strony Polski nastąpiła niewystarczająca kontrola wniosków o unijne wsparcie w ramach Wspólnej Polityki Rolnej, w sytuacji gdy Polska corocznie z nadwyżką spełnia wymóg kontrolowania 5 % ogółu beneficjentów? Jakich dodatkowych wymogów kontroli Polska nie spełniła?

2. Na jakiej podstawie Komisja zarzuca Polsce zatwierdzenie mało ambitnych biznesplanów? Czy Komisja wskazała jakieś wytyczne pozwalające na obiektywne odróżnienie mało ambitnych od wystarczająco ambitnych biznesplanów?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004976/13
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(7 maja 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Zwrot przez Polskę funduszy na rozwój obszarów wiejskich

Komisja Europejska zażądała od Polski zwrotu 79,9 mln euro z funduszy na rozwój obszarów wiejskich. Decyzja ta uzasadniana jest niewystarczającymi kontrolami wniosków o unijne wsparcie w ramach Wspólnej Polityki Rolnej. Premier Donald Tusk ogłosił w minionym tygodniu na jednym z portali społecznościowych, że kara odnosi się do pomocy uzyskanej w latach 2004-2006.

Odnosząc się do powyższych informacji pragnę prosić Komisję o odpowiedź na pytanie, jakiego okresu dotyczą zaniedbania, w związku z którymi Komisja żąda zwrotu funduszy.

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Daciana Cioloşa w imieniu Komisji
(11 czerwca 2013 r.)

Działanie „Wsparcie dla gospodarstw niskotowarowych w trakcie restrukturyzacji" zostało wdrożone w Polsce w okresie programowania 2004-2006. Wszystkie projekty rolników przypadają na lata 2005 i 2006. Płatności na rzecz tych projektów zostały dokonane w okresie pięciu lat.

Niedociągnięcia stwierdzone przez Komisję pochodzą z okresu 2004-2006. Odnoszą się do:

— nieprawidłowości w zakresie kontroli wstępnego wniosku: przy zatwierdzaniu wniosku o wsparcie w roku 2005 lub 2006, nie sprawdzono w sposób prawidłowy spełnienia przez wnioskodawców kryteriów kwalifikowalności.

— nieprawidłowości w zakresie zatwierdzania planów operacyjnych: władze polskie zatwierdziły w latach 2005 i 2006, plany operacyjne, które nie spełniały wymogów prawnych. Plany operacyjne nie były wystarczająco ambitne, lub nie było odpowiednich powiązań pomiędzy celami wyznaczonymi w planie operacyjnym a niezbędną restrukturyzacją gospodarstwa.

Skutkiem błędów było zatwierdzenie projektów, które nie kwalifikują się do finansowania przez UE. Płatności dokonane na rzecz takich projektów nie mogą zostać objęte finansowaniem UE. Korekta finansowa dotyczy płatności dokonanych w latach 2007-2010.

Decyzje w sprawie rozliczenia rachunków określają kwoty, które mają zostać wyłączone z finansowania unijnego. Nie określają one, czy kwota musi zostać przez beneficjentów zwrócona. Decyzja w tym zakresie należy do państw członkowskich.

Kwota korekty finansowej zostanie odzyskana od Polski w drugiej połowie 2013 r. Polska może odwołać się od decyzji Komisji do Trybunału Sprawiedliwości w terminie dwóch miesięcy od daty niniejszego powiadomienia. Środki budżetowe związane z kwotą wyłączoną z finansowania unijnego nie mogą być ponownie wykorzystane przez państwo członkowskie na rzecz innych projektów.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004970/13
to the Commission
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(6 May 2013)

Subject: Irregularities in the financing of Polish agriculture

The Commission has called on Poland to pay back EUR 79.9 million after a clearance of accounts procedure was carried out in respect of funding provided under the common agricultural policy. The grounds given for this decision are irregularities in the initial checking of applications and in the validation of operational plans concerning funding for semi-subsistence farms.

On behalf of Polish farmers, who are deeply concerned by this decision, I should like to put the following questions:

1. What financing period does the Commission's decision concern?

2. What specific irregularities in the checking of applications were uncovered by the Commission's audit?

3. What appeal procedures may the Polish authorities pursue against this decision, and what are the time limits for appeals?

4. Are the documented errors exclusively the result of the national government's negligence, or are they also the result of negligence on the part of local (regional) governments or agricultural organisations?

5. Will Polish farmers have to assume the burden of the aforementioned fine? If so, how? As the Commission points out, farmers who had no entitlement also received funds.

6. If the fine is imposed, within what time frame will Poland be required to pay back the indicated amount?

7. Will this case have consequences for the current funding of Polish agriculture under thecommon agricultural policy? If so, what will these consequences be?

Question for written answer P-004971/13
to the Commission
Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(6 May 2013)

Subject: Information on plans to claim back EUR 79.9 million in rural development expenditure from Poland

In view of the plans to claim back EUR 79.9 million in rural development expenditure from Poland, I should like to put the following questions:

1. Why does the Commission feel that Poland did not adequately check applications for EU support under the common agricultural policy, given that Poland more than fulfils the requirement to audit 5% of all beneficiaries each year? What additional audit requirements did Poland fail to fulfil?

2. On what grounds does the Commission accuse Poland of approving business plans whichlacked ambition? Has the Commission set out guidelines on how to distinguish, in anobjective manner, business plans that lack ambition from those that are sufficientlyambitious?

Question for written answer E-004976/13
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(7 May 2013)

Subject: Repayment of rural development funding by Poland

The Commission has asked Poland to pay back EUR 79.9 million in rural development funding on the grounds that inadequate checks were carried out on applications for EU funding under the common agricultural policy. The Polish Prime Minister, Donald Tusk, announced last week on a social networking site that the fine relates to aid granted between 2004 and 2006.

In view of the above, can the Commission please indicate the period of occurrence of the instances of negligence giving rise to the repayment request.

Joint answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

The measure 'Semi-subsistence farms undergoing restructuring' has been implemented in Poland during the programming period 2004-2006. All projects of the farmers date from the years 2005 and 2006. The payments for these projects have been made during five years.

The weaknesses found by the Commission date back to the 2004-2006 period. They relate to:

— deficiencies in the check of the initial application: when approving the application for support in 2005 or 2006, the fulfilment of the eligibility criteria of the applicants has not been checked correctly;

— deficiencies in the approval of the business plan: the Polish authorities approved, in 2005 and 2006, business plans which did not fulfil the legal requirements. The business plans were not ambitious enough or there was no correct relation between the objectives fixed in the business plan and the necessary restructuring of the farm.

The errors resulted in approving projects which are not eligible for an EU financing. The payments made for such projects have to be refused from EU financing. The financial correction concerns payments made in the years 2007-2010.

Clearance of accounts decisions fix the amounts to be refused from EU financing. They do not determine if any amount has to be recovered from the beneficiaries. This is the task of the Member States.

The amount of the financial correction will be recovered from Poland in the second half of 2013. Poland may challenge the Commission decision before the Court of Justice within two months of its notification. The budget appropriations related to the amount refused from EU financing cannot be reused by the Member State for other projects.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005189/13
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος)
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(13 Μαΐου 2013)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Απαγωγή Ορθόδοξων Μητροπολιτών στη Συρία

Στο σκοτάδι παραμένουν οι έρευνες για την τύχη των δύο Μητροπολιτών Χαλεπίου, οι οποίες γίνονται στη ευρύτερη περιοχή των συροτουρκικών συνόρων. Η πρόσφατη απαγωγή του Ελληνορθόδοξου Μητροπολίτη Παύλου και του Συρο-Ιακωβίτη Μητροπολίτη, φαίνεται να έχει βαθύτερες προεκτάσεις και, ενδεχομένως, σκοτεινά κίνητρα στην ευρύτερη περιοχή της Συρίας, με απώτερο στόχο την εξάλειψη της χριστιανικής παρουσίας. Δεν είναι άλλωστε τυχαίο που, το τελευταίο διάστημα, οι Χριστιανοί δέχονται συνεχώς επιθέσεις από ακραία μουσουλμανικά στοιχεία, ίσως για να γενικευτεί η σύρραξη μεταξύ Χριστιανών και Μουσουλμάνων με ιδιαίτερα αρνητικές συνέπειες για τους πρώτους, αφού οι αντίπαλοι είναι αριθμητικά υπερδιπλάσιοι.

Αν πάντως το σενάριο αυτό έχει βάση, τότε συνιστά μια απίστευτα επικίνδυνη εξέλιξη με προεκτάσεις που κανείς δεν μπορεί να υπολογίσει. Ερωτάται λοιπόν η Επίτροπος Εξωτερικών Υποθέσεων της ΕΕ, Λαίδη Άστον:

— Σε ποιες ενέργειες έχει προβεί, ή προτίθεται να προβεί, για τον εντοπισμό και την απελευθέρωση των δύο απαχθέντων Μητροπολιτών στη Συρία;

— Διαθέτει η ΕΕ μηχανισμό διαχείρισης κρίσεων και, εάν ναι, ενεργοποιήθηκε άμεσα αυτός ο μηχανισμός για να συλλέξει κάθε διαθέσιμη πληροφορία που μπορεί να συμβάλει στον εντοπισμό των δύο ιεραρχών;

— Βρίσκεται σε επικοινωνία με τις ευρωπαϊκές πρεσβείες στη Μέση Ανατολή και τις κατά τόπους κυβερνήσεις, καθώς και με άλλους παράγοντες της Συρίας για συντονισμό των προσπαθειών διάσωσης των δύο Μητροπολιτών;

Κοινή απάντηση της 'Υπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(3 Ιουλίου 2013)

Η 'Υπατη Εκπρόσωπος/Αντιπρόεδρος εκφράζει την ανησυχία της σχετικά με την άγνωστη ακόμη τύχη των δύο Επισκόπων και έχει ζητήσει την άμεση απελευθέρωσή τους σε δήλωση της 26ης Απριλίου 2013 ([1]).

Η ΕΕ έχει καταδικάσει επανειλημμένως όλες τις αξιόποινες πράξεις σε βάρος πολιτών, ανεξαρτήτως του θρησκευτικού και εθνοτικού τους υπόβαθρου, σε πολλά συμπεράσματα του Συμβουλίου και σε δηλώσεις της ΥΕ/ΑΠ.

Σε όλες τις επαφές με την αντιπολίτευση, η ΕΕ θίγει το ζήτημα να καταστεί ο Εθνικός Συνασπισμός της Συρίας πιο συμμετοχικός. Η έκκληση αυτή επαναλήφθηκε στα συμπεράσματα του Συμβουλίου Εξωτερικών Υποθέσεων της 27ης Μαΐου 2013.

Η ΕΕ υποστηρίζει το έργο της διεθνούς ανεξάρτητης εξεταστικής επιτροπής, η οποία στην πρόσφατη έκθεσή της κατάδειξε πολυάριθμες καταχρήσεις σε βάρος των θρησκευτικών μειονοτήτων στη Συρία.

Εάν δεν υπάρξει ταχεία πολιτική διευθέτηση της διένεξης, η θρησκευτική βία θα συνεχιστεί. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχει στηρίξει αδιαλείπτως το όραμα πολιτικής διευθέτησης που περιγράφεται στο ανακοινωθέν της Γενεύης. Η ΥΕ/ΑΠ εξέφρασε επίσημα την πλήρη υποστήριξή της προς την κοινή έκκληση του Υπουργού Εξωτερικών των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών κ. Kerry και του Ρώσου Υπουργού Εξωτερικών κ. Lavrov για σύγκληση διεθνούς ειρηνευτικής διάσκεψης σχετικά με τη Συρία το συντομότερο δυνατόν, προκειμένου να δοθεί συνέχεια στη διάσκεψη της Γενεύης του Ιουνίου του 2012. Η διατήρηση της δυνατότητας πολιτικής διευθέτησης της διένεξης είναι υψίστης σημασίας για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

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

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004995/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(7 maja 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Porwanie biskupów w Syrii

W dniu 22 kwietnia w regionie Aleppo, w wiosce Kfar Dael, uprowadzono dwóch arcybiskupów Gregoriosa Ibrahima i Boulosa Yazigiego. Są to najwyżsi rangą przedstawiciele kościoła porwani przez syryjskich rebeliantów w ciągu dwóch lat wojny.

1. Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel wie o sprawie porwania?

2. Jakie podjęła działania w celu uwolnienia Gregoriosa Ibrahima i Boulosa Yazigiego?

3. Dlaczego Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel nie potępiła oficjalnie syryjskich rebeliantów za zbrodnie dokonywane na chrześcijanach zamieszkujących Syrię?

4. Czy temat sytuacji chrześcijan w Syrii oraz porwania arcybiskupów był już poruszany w rozmowach z Narodową Radą Syryjską oraz jej przewodniczącym Georgiem Sabrą?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji
(3 lipca 2013 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca jest zaniepokojona losem dwóch porwanych biskupów i wezwała do ich natychmiastowego uwolnienia w oświadczeniu z 26 kwietnia 2013 r. ([1])

UE wielokrotnie potępiała wszelkie przestępstwa popełniane w stosunku do cywilów, bez względu na ich wyznanie lub pochodzenie w licznych konkluzjach Rady i oświadczeniach Wysokiej Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącej.

Podczas wszystkich kontaktów z przedstawicielami opozycji UE zwraca uwagę na konieczność szerszego otwarcia Narodowej Koalicji Syryjskiej na całe społeczeństwo. Wezwanie to powtórzono w konkluzjach Rady do Spraw Zagranicznych z 27 maja 2013 r.

UE wspiera działalność Niezależnej Międzynarodowej Komisji Dochodzeniowej, która w swoim ostatnim raporcie udokumentowała liczne przypadki prześladowań mniejszości religijnych w Syrii.

Jeżeli konflikt syryjski nie zostanie niezwłocznie rozwiązany na poziomie politycznym, w dalszym ciągu będziemy mieli do czynienia z prześladowaniami na tle religijnym. Unia Europejska niezmiennie wspiera wizję porozumienia politycznego nakreślonego w komunikacie z Genewy. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca oficjalnie wyraziła swoje pełne wsparcie dla wspólnego oświadczenia wystosowanego przez amerykańskiego sekretarza stanu Johna Kerry'ego i rosyjskiego ministra spraw zagranicznych Siergieja Ławrowa, którzy wezwali do jak najszybszego zwołania międzynarodowej konferencji pokojowej na temat Syrii, będącej kontynuacją konferencji genewskiej z czerwca 2012 r. Dalsze rozwiązywanie sporów na poziomie politycznym jest sprawą najwyższej wagi dla Unii Europejskiej.

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

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005081/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(7 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Síria — rapto de bispos

A Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante manifestou publicamente a sua consternação face ao rapto dos bispos sírios Boulos Yazigi e Yohanna Ibrahim e exigiu a sua libertação imediata.

Assim, pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

1. Dispõe de informações acerca do seu paradeiro e de quem poderá ser o autor do rapto?

2. Quantos casos conhece de perseguição a minorias religiosas na Síria?

3. Vislumbra alguma possibilidade de melhoria desta situação?

Resposta conjunta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Ashton em nome da Comissão
(3 de julho de 2013)

A AR/VP está preocupada com o destino dos dois bispos e, numa declaração de 26 de abril de 2013, apelou à sua libertação imediata ([1]).

Em inúmeras conclusões do Conselho e em declarações da AR/VP, a UE tem condenado repetidamente todos os crimes cometidos contra civis independentemente da sua religião e etnia.

Em todos os contactos com a oposição, a UE levanta a questão da necessidade de tornar a Coligação Nacional Síria mais inclusiva. Este apelo foi repetido nas Conclusões do Conselho dos Negócios Estrangeiros de 27 de maio de 2013.

A UE apoia o trabalho da Comissão de Inquérito Internacional Independente, que, no seu recente relatório, mencionou diversos abusos cometidos contra minorias religiosas na Síria.

Sem uma resolução política rápida do conflito, a violência sectária continuará. A União Europeia tem apoiado consistentemente a visão de uma solução política delineada no Comunicado de Genebra. A AR/VP exprimiu oficialmente o seu inteiro apoio ao pedido conjunto do Secretário de Estado norte-americano John Kerry e do Ministro dos Negócios Estrangeiros Sergey Lavrov para a realização, o mais rapidamente possível, de uma conferência de paz internacional sobre a Síria que dê seguimento à conferência de Genebra de junho de 2012. Manter em aberto a via política é fundamental para a União Europeia.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004995/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(7 May 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Kidnapping of bishops in Syria

Two archbishops, Gregorios Ibrahim and Boulos Yazigi, were kidnapped on 22 April 2013 in the village of Kfar Dael in the Aleppo region. They are the highest-ranking representatives of the Church to be kidnapped by Syrian rebels over the course of the two-year war.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the kidnapping?

2. What action has she taken to secure the release of Gregorios Ibrahim and Boulos Yazigi?

3. Why has the Vice-President/High Representative not officially condemned the Syrian rebels for the crimes they have committed against Christians living in Syria?

4. Has there been any discussion of the situation of Christians in Syria and the kidnapping of the archbishops during the talks held with the Syrian National Council and its leader, George Sabra?

Question for written answer E-005081/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(7 May 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Syria: kidnapping of bishops

The Vice-President/High Representative has publicly expressed her dismay over the kidnapping of Syrian bishops Boulos Yazigi and Yohanna Ibrahim and has called for their immediate release.

1. Does the Vice-President/High Representative have any information regarding the bishops' whereabouts and who might be responsible for the kidnapping?

2. How many cases involving the persecution of religious minorities in Syria is she aware of?

3. Does she see any chance of this situation improving?

Question for written answer E-005189/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(13 May 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Kidnapping of Orthodox Bishops in Syria

Searches underway in the wider Syria-Turkish border have yet to shed any light on the fate of the two Aleppo Bishops. The recent kidnapping of Greek Orthodox Bishop Paul and the Syro-Jacobite Bishop appears to have deeper ramifications and, possibly, hidden motivations in the wider Syrian area with the ultimate aim of eradicating Christianity. Moreover, it is no accident that, lately, Christians have been regularly attacked by Muslim extremists, in order, perhaps, to generalise the conflict between Christians and Muslims, with particularly negative consequences for the former, as their opponents outnumber them by more than double.

If, however, this scenario can be proven, then it is an unbelievably dangerous development with incalculable consequences. Will the EU Commissioner for Foreign Affairs, Baroness Ashton, answer the following:

— What actions has the Commission taken or what actions does it intend to take to deal with this problem and free the two kidnapped Bishops in Syria?

— Does the EU have a crisis management mechanism and, if so, was this mechanism activated immediately to gather any piece of useful information that could help to find the two bishops?

— Is it in contact with the European embassies in the Middle East and the local governments as well as other Syrian agents for the coordination of efforts to rescue the two Bishops?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(3 July 2013)

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

The EU has repeatedly condemned all crimes inflicted on civilians regardless of their religious and ethnic backgrounds in numerous Council conclusions and statements by the HR/VP.

In all contacts with the opposition, the EU raises the issue of making the Syrian National Coalition more inclusive. This call was repeated in the Foreign Affairs Council Conclusions of 27 May 2013.

The EU supports the work of the International Independent Commission of Inquiry, which in its recent report has documented numerous abuses of religious minorities in Syria.

Without a swift political settlement of the conflict, sectarian violence will continue. The European Union has consistently supported the vision of a political settlement outlined in the Geneva Communiqué. The HR/VP has officially expressed her full support for the joint call made by United States Secretary of State Kerry and Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov to convene an international peace conference on Syria as soon as possible as a follow-up to the Geneva Conference of June 2012. Keeping the political track alive is paramount for the European Union.

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005469/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(16 Μαΐου 2013)

Θέμα: Η ασφάλεια των εργαζομένων στις ευρωπαικές εταιρείες

Τα ατυχήματα κατά την διάρκεια της εργασίας είναι ένα σύνηθες φαινόμενο, ιδιαίτερα στις τρίτες χώρες. Πολλές φορές μάλιστα οι εργάτες πληρώνουν με την ίδια τους τη ζωή τις ανεπαρκείς συνθήκες ασφαλείας, όπως συνέβη πρόσφατα στο Μπαγκλαντές. Μετά την κατάρρευση του κτιρίου στα περίχωρα της Ντάκα και τον θάνατο χιλίων ανασφάλιστων εργαζομένων, πολλές πολυεθνικές της Ευρώπης θυμήθηκαν να εκφράσουν την πρόθεσή τους να υπογράψουν σύμφωνο συνεργασίας ώστε να βελτιωθούν οι συνθήκες ασφάλειας στα εργοστάσια στο Μπαγκλαντές. Η κατάσταση όμως παραμένει εξίσου τραγική, τόσο στο Μπαγκλαντές όσο και στις υπόλοιπες χώρες εκτός ΕΕ.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή: Δεν θα έπρεπε οι ευρωπαϊκές εταιρείες που δραστηριοποιούνται σε χώρες εκτός της ΕΕ να υποχρεούνται να αποδεικνύουν ότι οι συνθήκες ασφάλειας και υγιεινής των εργαζομένων ανταποκρίνονται στα ευρωπαϊκά επίπεδα ασφάλειας; Σε ποια μέτρα έχει προβεί η ΕΕ προκειμένου να προστατεύσει τους εργαζόμενους που δουλεύουν σε ευρωπαϊκές εταιρείες, οι οποίες δραστηριοποιούνται σε χώρες που δεν είναι κράτη μέλη; Δεν θα έπρεπε η ΕΕ να διασφαλίσει ότι όλοι οι εργαζόμενοι που δουλεύουν σε ευρωπαϊκές εταιρείες, ανεξαρτήτως της χώρας στην οποία βρίσκονται, έχουν συλλογικές συμβάσεις;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(9 Ιουλίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον κ. βουλευτή στις απαντήσεις σε προηγούμενες ερωτήσεις ([1]) και στη δήλωση της Επιτροπής στο Κοινοβούλιο στις 23 Μαΐου.

Η ΕΕ υποστηρίζει την κύρωση και την αποτελεσματική εφαρμογή των διεθνών προτύπων εργασίας, όπως ορίζονται στις συμβάσεις της ΔΟΕ, από το Μπανγκλαντές και άλλες τρίτες χώρες. Η ΔΟΕ είναι σε θέση να προωθήσει τη βελτίωση των προτύπων εργασίας, καθώς και την υγεία και την ασφάλεια στην εργασία. Η έγκριση της κοινής δήλωσης της τριμερούς συνεργασίας και της ΔΟΕ στις 4 Μαΐου αποτελεί καλό εφαλτήριο. Η μεταρρύθμισης της εργατικής νομοθεσίας για την ελευθερία του συνεταιρίζεσθαι και το δικαίωμα συλλογικής διαπραγμάτευσης είναι υπό συζήτηση στο Κοινοβούλιο του Μπαγκλαντές. Η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει τις εν λόγω προσπάθειες και διερευνά τον τρόπο με τον οποίο η ΕΕ και οι ενδιαφερόμενοι μπορούν να βοηθήσουν τη ΔΟΕ να ολοκληρώσει και να εφαρμόσει έναν χάρτη πορείας για την ασφάλεια στην εργασία από κοινού με την κυβέρνηση του Μπαγκλαντές και τους κοινωνικούς εταίρους. Η Επιτροπή εξετάζει επίσης τον τρόπο με τον οποίο η βοήθεια στο Μπανγκλαντές μπορεί να αξιοποιηθεί για την περαιτέρω εξασφάλιση της τήρησης των προτύπων εργασίας.

Μια άλλη σημαντική διάσταση είναι η προώθηση των αρχών ([2]) της ΕΚΕ ([3]). Στόχος της Επιτροπής είναι να διασφαλίσει ότι οι επιχειρήσεις ικανοποιούν παρόμοιες απαιτήσεις αναφορικά με τα πρότυπα εργασίας εντός και εκτός της ΕΕ, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του σεβασμού της υγείας και της ασφάλειας στην εργασία. Η Επιτροπή ενθαρρύνει επίσης τις εταιρείες που εδρεύουν στην ΕΕ για την προώθηση των προτύπων για την υγεία και την ασφάλεια και τον κοινωνικό διάλογο όσον αφορά την αλυσίδα εφοδιασμού.

Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει λεπτομερείς πληροφορίες σχετικά με εταιρείες υπεργολαβίας παραγωγής κλωστοϋφαντουργικών προϊόντων στο Μπαγκλαντές. Ωστόσο, παρακολουθεί στενά τις πρωτοβουλίες που συγκεντρώνουν τους κυριότερους ευρωπαίους φορείς λιανικής διάθεσης και σήματα υπεργολαβίας στο Μπαγκλαντές, συμπεριλαμβανομένης συμφωνίας που υπέγραψαν πάνω από 40 μεγάλες εταιρείες λιανικής και ενδυμάτων με την οποία δεσμεύονται να διεξάγουν επιθεωρήσεις και δραστηριότητες κατάρτισης.

([1]) E-004552/13, E-004788/13 E-004847/13 και P-004922/13.

([2]) Κατευθυντήριες γραμμές του ΟΟΣΑ για τις πολυεθνικές επιχειρήσεις, την τριμερή διακήρυξη της ΔΟΕ για τις πολυεθνικές επιχειρήσεις, και τις κατευθυντήριες αρχές των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για τις επιχειρήσεις και τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα.

([3]) Εταιρική κοινωνική ευθύνη.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005082/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(7 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Bangladesh — Rana Plaza

De acordo com informações recentes, no prédio Rana Plaza que ruiu no Bangladesh existiriam empresas que forneciam multinacionais europeias do vestuário e que empregavam mão-de-obra local a muito baixo custo.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Dispõe de informações quanto ao relacionamento entre as empresas europeias e aquelas que operavam no edifício Rana Plaza?

2. Que apreciação faz do uso indireto de mão-de-obra barata por parte das empresas europeias em detrimento dos trabalhadores europeus do setor?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005364/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(14 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Tragédia no Bangladesh e condições de trabalho em empresas que abastecem o mercado europeu

A tragédia ocorrida no Bangladesh, com o colapso de um edifício industrial nos arredores de Daca e a morte de centenas de pessoas, vem avivar o problema, há muito conhecido, das condições de trabalho desumanas e da exploração extrema a que estão sujeitos os trabalhadores de empresas que abastecem o mercado europeu.

O Bangladesh é o segundo maior produtor têxtil a nível mundial. O setor é responsável por 80 % das exportações do país e por cerca de 15 mil milhões de euros anuais. Os arredores de Daca foram reconfigurados pela proliferação e concentração de unidades fabris que operam em espaços insalubres, em regime de subcontratação praticando salários miseráveis de 30 euros/mês, negando os mais elementares direitos laborais e gozando da complacência das autoridades, que para as cerca de 100 mil fábricas existentes na área da capital contam com pouco mais de duas dezenas de inspetores do trabalho. As multas são de tal forma baixas que o crime compensa.

Estima-se que, desde 2005, derrocadas e incêndios em fábricas no Bangladesh tenham provocado a morte a 500 pessoas. Em novembro do ano passado, 112 operários morreram carbonizados numa unidade situada na zona industrial de Ashulia. O subúrbio próximo de Daca foi, em abril de 2012, palco de uma greve histórica por melhores salários e condições laborais.

Quase 90 por cento dos artigos «made in Bangladesh» têm como destino a Europa, os EUA e o Canadá. Na UE destacam-se multinacionais italianas, espanholas ou britânicas entre outras.

Em face do exposto, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que medidas pensa adotar para impedir que empresas que abastecem o mercado da UE sujeitem os seus trabalhadores a condições de trabalho desumanas e a uma exploração extrema?

2. Considera a possibilidade de acionar mecanismos especiais (como a imposição de taxas ou mesmo a proibição) face a importações de produtos com esta origem?

3. Que medidas pensa adotar face às empresas que lucram com a persistência desta situação?

Resposta conjunta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(9 de julho de 2013)

A Comissão remete os Senhores Deputados para as respostas a perguntas anteriores ([1]) e para a declaração proferida pela Comissão perante o Parlamento Europeu em 23 de maio.

A UE apoia a ratificação e a aplicação efetiva das normas internacionais do trabalho consagradas nas convenções da OIT pelo Bangladeche e outros países terceiros. A OIT está em boa posição para promover a realização de progressos nas normas laborais, bem como a saúde e nível da segurança no trabalho. A adoção da Declaração Conjunta dos parceiros tripartidos com a OIT, em 4 de maio, constitui um bom ponto de partida. A reforma do direito do trabalho, que prevê a liberdade de associação e o direito à negociação coletiva, está em discussão no Parlamento do Bangladeche. A Comissão apoia esses esforços e está a estudar de que modo a UE e as partes interessadas poderão auxiliar a OIT a finalizar e a implementar um roteiro para a segurança no trabalho com o Governo do Bangladeche e os parceiros sociais. A Comissão pondera igualmente de que modo a assistência ao Bangladeche pode ser utilizada para prosseguir a aplicação das normas laborais.

Uma outra dimensão importante é a promoção dos princípios ([2]) de RSE ([3]) A Comissão pretende garantir que as empresas cumprem requisitos semelhantes em matéria de normas laborais, dentro e fora da UE, incluindo o respeito pela saúde e pela segurança no trabalho. A Comissão também incentiva as empresas sediadas na UE a promoverem normas de saúde e segurança, bem como o diálogo social nas suas cadeias de abastecimento.

A Comissão não dispõe de informações pormenorizadas sobre as empresas que subcontratam produção têxtil no Bangladeche. Contudo, segue de perto as iniciativas que reúnem os principais retalhistas europeus e as marcas que subcontratam no Bangladesh, incluindo um acordo assinado por mais de 40 grandes marcas de retalho e de vestuário, em que estas se comprometem a organizar inspeções e atividades de formação.

([1]) E-004552/13, E-004788/13, E-004847/13 e P-004922/13.
([2]) As orientações da OCDE para as empresas multinacionais, a Declaração Tripartida da OIT sobre Empresas Multinacionais e os princípios orientadores das Nações Unidas sobre empresas e direitos humanos.
([3]) Responsabilidade social das empresas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005082/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(7 May 2013)

Subject: Bangladesh — Rana Plaza

According to recent reports, the Rana Plaza building that collapsed in Bangladesh housed companies which supplied clothing to European multinationals and which employed local labour at a very low cost.

1. Does the Commission have any information regarding the relationship between European companies and those operating in the Rana Plaza building?

2. What is its assessment of European companies' indirect use of cheap labour at the expense of European workers in the sector?

Question for written answer E-005364/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(14 May 2013)

Subject: The tragedy in Bangladesh and working conditions in companies supplying the EU market

The tragic collapse of a factory in the outskirts of Dhaka, Bangladesh, which killed hundreds of people, has drawn attention to the long-known problem of workers being subjected to inhumane working conditions and extreme exploitation in factories supplying the EU market.

Bangladesh is the world's second largest producer of textiles. The industry accounts for 80% of the country's exports and is worth approximately EUR 15 billion per year. The outskirts of Dhaka have been transformed as factories have proliferated. These are concentrated in unhealthy locations and operate as part of a subcontracting system that pays pitiful salaries of just EUR 30/month and denies the most basic employment rights, while benefiting from the complacency of the authorities, which have only around 20 officers to inspect working conditions in the approximately 100 000 factories in the capital. Fines are so low that crime pays.

It is estimated that 500 people have been killed in factory collapses and fires in Bangladesh since 2005. In November last year, 112 workers burned to death in a factory located in the Ashulia industrial zone. This Dhaka suburb was the site of a historic strike for better salaries and employment conditions in April 2012.

Approximately 90% of articles that are 'Made in Bangladesh' are destined for the EU, USA and Canada. Principal customers in the EU are multinational companies, Italian, Spanish or British among others.

1. What measures will the Commission adopt to prevent companies supplying the EU market from subjecting their workers to inhumane working conditions and extreme exploitation?

2. Are there any special mechanisms that can be activated (such as imposing taxes or even bans) to tackle imports produced in this way?

3. What measures will the Commission take regarding companies that persistently profit from this situation?

Question for written answer E-005469/13
to the Commission
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(16 May 2013)

Subject: Safety at work in European companies

Accidents at work are a common occurrence, especially in third countries. Often workers pay for inadequate safety measures with their life, as happened recently in Bangladesh. Following the collapse of the building on the outskirts of Dhaka and the death of thousands of uninsured workers, numerous multinationals in Europe suddenly remembered that they wanted to sign a cooperation agreement, in order to improve safety conditions in factories in Bangladesh. However, the situation is still as tragic as ever, both in Bangladesh and in other non-EU countries.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Should European companies working in non-EU countries be obliged to prove that their health and safety conditions at work meet European safety standards? What measures has the EU taken to protect workers working for European companies in countries which are not Member States? Should the EU not ensure that all workers working for European companies have collective agreements, regardless of the country in which they are located?

Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Members to answers to previous questions ([1]) and to the Statement by the Commission at the EP on 23 May.

The EU supports ratification and effective implementation of international labour standards, as enshrined in the ILO conventions, by Bangladesh and other third countries. The ILO is well placed to promote progress on labour standards as well as health and safety at work. The adoption of the Joint Statement by Tripartite Partners with the ILO on 4 May provides a good starting point. Labour law reform to provide for freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining is discussed in the Bangladeshi parliament. The Commission supports those efforts and is exploring how the EU and stakeholders can help the ILO to finalise and implement a roadmap for safety at work with the Bangladeshi Government and social partners. The Commission is also reflecting on how assistance to Bangladesh can be used to further address implementation of labour standards.

Another important dimension is the promotion of CSR ([2]) principles ([3]). The Commission aims to ensure that enterprises meet similar requirements regarding labour standards within and outside the EU, including respect for health and safety at work. The Commission also encourages EU-based companies to promote health and safety standards and social dialogue in their supply chains.

The Commission does not have detailed information on companies subcontracting textile production in Bangladesh. However it closely follows initiatives bringing together major European retailers and brands subcontracting in Bangladesh, including an agreement signed by more than 40 major garment and retail brands committing them to organise inspections and training activities.

([1]) E-004552/13, E-004788/13, E-004847/13 and P-004922/13.
([2]) Corporate Social Responsibility.
([3]) OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, the ILO Tripartite Declaration on Multinational Enterprises, and the UN's Guiding Principles on business and human rights.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005176/13
an die Kommission
Ismail Ertug (S&D)
(8. Mai 2013)

Betrifft: Verbot von Neonicotinoiden

Pflanzenschutzmittel, die Wirkstoffe aus der Gruppe der Neonicotinoide enthalten, wurden aus Gründen des Bienenschutzes von der GD Sanco verboten. An der Grundlage dieser Entscheidung, einer Studie der Europäischen Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit vom 16. Januar 2013, wird aktuell kritisiert, dass zum Beispiel die zugrundeliegende EFSA-Studie die Ergebnisse des Bienenmonitorings in Deutschland nicht berücksichtigt habe.

Außerdem wird kritisiert, die Studie sei unter reinen Laborbedingungen und nicht aufgrund von Praxiserfahrungen entstanden. Zuletzt wird behauptet, der Einsatz von gebeiztem Rapssaatgut und die Ausbringung von Santana stellten kein unverhältnismäßiges Risiko für Bienenvölker dar.

1. Ist der Kommission diese Kritik bekannt?

2. Welche Stellung bezieht die Kommission zu den einzelnen Kritikpunkten?

3. Welche Alternativen der Schädlingsbekämpfung sieht die Kommission beispielsweise für Rapsbauern vor, für deren Felder aktuell nur Neonicotinoide zur Schädlingsbekämpfung genutzt werden?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(1. Juli 2013)

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-004858/2013 ([1]).

Die Europäische Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit (EFSA) führte auf Ersuchen der Kommission die Bewertung des von drei Neonicotinoiden (Clothianidin, Thiamethoxam und Imidacloprid) möglicherweise ausgehenden Risikos für Bienen durch und veröffentlichte ihre Schlussfolgerungen am 16. Januar 2013. Die EFSA wurde von der Kommission gebeten, die auf EU-Ebene und auf Ebene der Mitgliedstaaten vorgelegten Daten hinsichtlich der Genehmigung und der Zulassung von Pflanzenschutzmitteln sowie alle anderen Daten aus Studien, Forschung und Überwachung zu berücksichtigen, die für die fraglichen Anwendungen relevant sind. Dazu zählen nicht nur Studien, die unter Laborbedingungen durchgeführt wurden, sondern auch Semifeld- und Feldversuche sowie Überwachungsdaten.

Ferner wird die Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 485/2013 der Kommission ([2]) vom 24. Mai 2013 zur Änderung der Bedingungen für die Genehmigung dieser drei Wirkstoffe ab dem 1. Dezember 2013 in vollem Umfang gelten. Somit wird das behandelte Saatgut für die kommende Rapsanbausaison noch zur Verfügung stehen.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) ABl. L 139 vom 25.5.2013.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005617/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(21 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Neonicotinóides — Impacto nas abelhas

Segundo informações obtidas pelo COPA-Cogeca, as conclusões a que a EFSA chegou relativas ao impacto derivado do uso de neonicotinóides sobre as abelhas, não permite fundamentar uma restrição drástica da sua aplicação, sendo esta também a perspetiva de um parecer científico elaborado na Alemanha, no qual também se argumenta o facto de não estar devidamente fundamentado, para efeitos de avaliação de risco sobre o impacto nestes insetos.

Que posição irá a Comissão tomar relativamente a esta matéria?

Resposta conjunta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(1 de julho de 2013)

A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta dada à pergunta escrita E-004858/2013 ([1]).

No seguimento de um pedido da Comissão, a Autoridade Europeia para a Segurança dos Alimentos (AESA) procedeu à avaliação dos riscos, para as abelhas, de três neonicotinóides (nomeadamente clotianidina, tiametoxame e imidaclopride), e publicou as suas Conclusões AESA em 16 de janeiro de 2013. A Comissão solicitou à AESA que tivesse em conta os dados existentes apresentados a nível da UE e ao nível dos Estados-Membros para a aprovação e a autorização de produtos fitofarmacêuticos, bem como quaisquer outros dados de estudos, e atividades de investigação e de monitorização pertinentes para as utilizações em causa. Estes incluíam não apenas estudos realizados em condições laboratoriais mas, também, em condições de semicampo e campo, e dados da monitorização.

Além disso, o Regulamento de Execução (UE) n.° 485/2013 ([2]), de 24 de maio de 2013, que altera as condições de aprovação destas três substâncias, será plenamente aplicável a partir de 1 de dezembro de 2013. Por conseguinte, no próximo período vegetativo da colza, as sementes tratadas ainda estarão disponíveis.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) JO L 139 de 25.5.2013, p. 12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005176/13
to the Commission
Ismail Ertug (S&D)
(8 May 2013)

Subject: Ban on neonicotinoids

Plant protection products containing active substances from the neonicotinoid group were banned by the Directorate General for Health and Consumers for reasons relating to the protection of bees. The basis for this decision, a study by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) of 16 January 2013, is currently subject to criticism for the fact, for example, that this underlying EFSA study did not take into account the results of bee monitoring in Germany.

The study is also being criticised for having been carried out purely under laboratory conditions and not on the basis of experience in practice. Lastly, it is claimed that the use of treated rape seed and the application of Santana poses no disproportionate risk to bee colonies.

1. Is the Commission aware of this criticism?

2. What is its position with regard to these individual points of criticism?

3. What alternative methods of pest control does it envisage for rape growers who currently only use neonicotinoids for pest control on their fields?

Question for written answer E-005617/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(21 May 2013)

Subject: Neonicotinoids — Impact on bees

According to information obtained by the Committee of Professional Agricultural Organisations (COPA) and the General Confederation of Agricultural Cooperatives (COGECA), the conclusions of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) regarding the impact of neonicotinoid use on bees cannot be used as the basis for drastically curtailing their application. A scientific opinion formulated in Germany shares that opinion, also arguing that there is not enough evidence on which to base an assessment of their impact on these insects.

What stance will the Commission adopt on this issue?

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(1 July 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answer to Written Question E-004858/2013 ([1]).

The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), following a request of the Commission, performed the risk assessment for bees of three neonicotinoids (namely clothianidin, thiamethoxam and imidacloprid) and published its EFSA Conclusions on 16 January 2013. EFSA was asked by the Commission to take into account the existing data submitted at EU level and at Member State level for the approval and the authorisation of plant protection products and any other data from studies, research and monitoring activities that are relevant to the uses under consideration. These included not only studies conducted under laboratory conditions, but also in semi-field and field conditions and monitoring data.

Furthermore, Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 485/2013 ([2]) of 24 May 2013 amending the conditions of approval of these 3 substances will be fully applicable as of 1 December 2013. Therefore, for the forthcoming rape growing season the treated seeds will be still available.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) OJ L 139, 25.5.2013.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení P-005884/13
Komisi
Olga Sehnalová (S&D)
(27. května 2013)

Předmět: Problémy držitelů Evropského průkazu zdravotního pojištění v zahraničí

Již v průběhu roku 2012 Komise informovala, že zaznamenala velký počet případů, kdy v některých oblastech Španělska bylo turistům odepřeno bez uhrazení urgentní ošetření ve veřejných nemocnicích, ačkoliv se prokázali Evropským průkazem zdravotního pojištění (EHIC), který dle EU legislativy garantuje ošetření za stejných podmínek a stejnou cenu, jako by turisté byli občany dané země. Na základě těchto poznatků Komise slibovala detailní prozkoumání celé situace. Dle posledních dostupných informací Komise stále zaznamenává podobné případy a objevují se informace i o dalších členských státech, kde mělo dojít k podobnému upření práv vyplývajících z držení EHIC.

— Kolik zaznamenaných případů výše uvedeného jednání Komise eviduje a kdy zveřejní výsledky slibovaného detailního prozkoumání vzniklé situace?

— Jaké kroky a kdy Komise plánuje přijmout za účelem garantování práv držitelů EHIC před nastávající letní sezonou, která bude provázena zvýšeným počtem turistů do Španělska a dalších zemí?

— Má Komise konkrétní informace o tom, zda se odepření urgentního ošetření držitelům EHIC týká i dalších členských států?

— 1. července vstoupí do EU Chorvatsko. Budou moci evropští občané od tohoto data automaticky při návštěvě Chorvatska v případě potřeby uplatňovat EHIC a za jakých podmínek?

Odpověď komisaře Andora jménem Komise
(24. června 2013)

Dne 30. května 2013 zaslala Komise Španělsku výzvu [1], v níž požádala o informace ohledně přetrvávajících stížnostech na to, že některé nemocnice ve Španělsku nepřijímají evropský průkaz zdravotního pojištění. Uvedená výzva byla zaslána na základě šetření „EU Pilot" uvedeného v odpovědi Komise na otázku č. E-8406/2012. Výsledky vyšetřování „EU-Pilot" se nezveřejňují.

Stížnosti, jimiž se momentálně Komise zabývá, se týkají odmítání evropského průkazu zdravotního pojištění, které podalo 27 občanů ve Španělsku, pět pojišťoven a tři organizace zabývající se pomocí turistům. Stížnosti, že evropský průkaz zdravotního pojištění nepřijímají ani některé státní nemocnice v Portugalsku, jsou předmětem šetření. Komisi je rovněž známo tvrzení, že evropský průkaz zdravotního pojištění nepřijímají nemocnice v Řecku, avšak Komise dosud neobdržela žádné stížnosti na jeho podporu.

Evropský průkaz zdravotního pojištění lze od 1. července 2013 využít i v Chorvatsku.

Průkaz opravňuje jeho držitele ke státem zajišťované zdravotní péči, která je z lékařského hlediska nezbytná během dočasného pobytu v jakékoli zemi EHS nebo Švýcarsku. Jestliže nemocnice průkaz nepřijme, měl by se jeho držitel ujistit, že je ošetřován v rámci státní (nikoli soukromé) zdravotní péče. Dále by si měl uschovat všechny účtenky za provedenou léčbu. Následně je možné podat žádost o navrácení nákladů (ve výši, která platí v zemi pobytu) u příslušného zdravotního orgánu buď v zemi pobytu nebo v zemi, která průkaz vydala. Aplikace evropského průkazu zdravotního pojištění pro chytré telefony a internetová stránka Komise pro tyto průkazy uvádí kontaktní údaje těchto orgánů.

---

[1] Viz tisková zpráva IP/13/474 na stránkách: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-474_en.htm?locale=en

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005193/13
to the Commission
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)
(13 May 2013)

Subject: Medical establishments and refusal to accept the European Health Insurance Card (EHIC)

Can the Commission please comment on reports in the British press that the European Health Insurance card (EHIC) is routinely rejected by Spanish and Portuguese hospitals and medical practitioners?

Can the Commission outline how it is addressing the problem and how it intends to sanction the countries concerned?

Can the Commission please offer my constituents advice on how to deal with medical establishments which refuse to accept the EHIC?

Question for written answer P-005884/13
to the Commission
Olga Sehnalová (S&D)
(27 May 2013)

Subject: Problems faced by European Health Insurance Card holders abroad

In 2012, the Commission stated that it had documented a large number of cases in which tourists in some regions of Spain were refused urgent medical treatment in public hospitals without compensation, in spite of the fact that they were in possession of European Health Insurance Cards (EHICs). European legislation guarantees tourists who hold EHICs medical treatment subject to the same conditions and for the same price as for local citizens. In view of this information, the Commission promised to carry out a thorough investigation of this issue. According to the latest information, the Commission is still documenting similar cases. Moreover, there are signs that EHIC holders are also having their rights denied in other Member States.

— How many cases of EHIC holders being refused treatment has the Commission documented, and when will it publish the conclusions of the promised investigation?

— What steps does the Commission plan to take — and when — in order to ensure that EHIC holders' rights are respected before the forthcoming summer season, when an increased number of tourists will visit Spain and other countries?

— Does the Commission have specific information on whether EHIC holders are being refused treatment in other Member States?

— On 1 July 2013, Croatia will enter the European Union. Will EU citizens visiting Croatia from that date automatically be able to use their EHIC cards? If so, subject to what conditions?

Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2013)

On 30 May 2013 the Commission sent a letter of formal notice ([1]) to Spain requesting information on persistent complaints that certain Spanish hospitals were refusing to accept the European Health Insurance Card (EHIC). That letter was sent following the EU-Pilot investigation referred to in the Commission's answer to Question E-8406/2012. The results of such EU-Pilot investigations are not published.

Complaints currently pending with the Commission concerning refusals to accept the EHIC are 27 from citizens in Spain, five from insurance companies and three from holiday assistance organisations. Complaints that the EHIC is being refused by certain public hospitals in Portugal are under investigation. The Commission is aware of claims that the EHIC is being refused by hospitals in Greece, but to date has received no complaints backing them up.

The EHIC can be used in Croatia as from 1 July 2013.

The EHIC gives the holder access to State-provided healthcare that is medically necessary during a temporary stay in any EEA country or Switzerland. If the EHIC is refused, citizens should ensure the care they are given is public (not private) healthcare. They should keep all receipts for payment of the treatment. An application for reimbursement of the cost (at the rate applicable in the country of stay) can then be made to the competent health institution in either the country of stay or the country which issued the EHIC. The EHIC smartphone application and the Commission's EHIC website give contact details for these bodies.

([1]) See Press Release IP/13/474 at: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-474_en.htm?locale=en

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005203/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(13 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Reabilitação do passivo ambiental de S. Pedro da Cova

Na sequência de uma visita recente à freguesia de S. Pedro da Cova, no concelho de Gondomar, confirmámos a persistência de um pesado passivo ambiental, que afeta a população daquela freguesia desde há vários anos.

Para além do problema maior dos depósitos de dezenas de milhares de toneladas de resíduos perigosos (referidas em perguntas anteriores: E-9232/2010 e E-003617/2011), outras intervenções no terreno, associadas à atividade mineira, nomeadamente aterros, escavações e terraplanagens, alteraram significativamente o relevo, a rede de drenagem natural e o coberto vegetal primitivos. Persiste também incerteza quanto a uma possível contaminação dos recursos hídricos, suscetível de afetar a saúde das populações.

Solicitamos à Comissão que nos informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Tem conhecimento de algum(ns) projeto(s) destinado(s) a compensar a população da freguesia pelo passivo ambiental criado ao longo dos anos e visando a sua resolução?

2. Que programas e medidas da UE podem apoiar um projeto com estas características?

3. Tendo em conta a resposta da Comissão à pergunta escrita E-9232/2010 e a referência aí feita às informações contidas na pergunta E-1988/10, quais os resultados dos contactos com as autoridades portuguesas sobre o sítio Natura 2000 «Valongo»?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005204/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(13 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Resíduos perigosos nas escombreiras das antigas minas de S. Pedro da Cova

Em janeiro de 2011, em resposta à pergunta E-9232/2010, a Comissão Europeia afirma que «pediu recentemente esclarecimentos às autoridades portuguesas sobre uma operação de eliminação de resíduos provenientes das antigas instalações da Siderurgia Nacional», acrescentando que «as informações transmitidas pelas autoridades portuguesas estão a ser analisadas pelos serviços da Comissão».

Nesse mesmo ano, estudos do Laboratório Nacional de Engenharia Civil confirmaram que nas escombreiras das antigas minas de S. Pedro da Cova existiam cerca de 50 000 metros cúbicos, ou seja, cerca de 88 000 toneladas de resíduos perigosos vindos da Siderurgia Nacional, que ali foram depositados em 2001 (conforme referido na pergunta E-003617/2011).

Recentemente, numa visita ao local, pudemos constatar que não foi ainda iniciada qualquer intervenção de remoção dos resíduos perigosos.

Em face do exposto, perguntamos à Comissão qual o resultado da análise feita às informações transmitidas pelas autoridades portuguesas.

Dispõe a Comissão de informação relativa a:

— Análises efetuadas aos resíduos perigosos?

— Eventual contaminação das águas subterrâneas e sua monitorização?

— Requalificação e proteção ambiental do lugar do aterro, incluindo sobre a quota de terreno a repor?

Resposta conjunta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão
(9 de julho de 2013)

Ambas as questões abordam aspetos diferentes relacionadas com o depósito ilegal de resíduos produzidos pelas antigas minas de S. Pedro da Cova, em Gondomar, Portugal.

No seguimento de uma avaliação da situação, a Comissão deu início a um processo de infração com base em várias disposições CE ([1]), nomeadamente relativas ao tratamento dos resíduos e proteção das águas subterrâneas (processo 2011/2003).

Entretanto, Portugal informou a Comissão, no quadro do processo por infração, que foi adotado um programa de recuperação em 29 de outubro de 2012 que envolve a limpeza dos sítios, a remoção de resíduos, o seu tratamento adequado em instalações especializadas e a monitorização das águas subterrâneas da zona. O programa será cofinanciado pela UE, ao abrigo do programa operacional «Valorização do Território (POVT)». O concurso público para a realização dos trabalhos foi publicado no Jornal Oficial (Diário da República, de 19 de dezembro de 2012.

A execução do programa deve apoiar a proteção do sítio «Valongo» da Natura 2000 contra qualquer efeito eventual da deposição ilegal de resíduos das minas.

Por último, é de assinalar que a responsabilidade civil não é abrangida pelo âmbito de aplicação da diretiva 2004/35/CE ([2]). No entanto, a legislação portuguesa (Decreto-Lei n.° 147/2008, de 29 de julho de 2008) vai mais longe do que a diretiva e faz referência à responsabilidade civil objetiva e subjetiva, ligada a atividades suscetíveis de prejudicar o ambiente.

([1]) Diretiva 2008/98/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 19 de novembro de 2008, relativa aos resíduos e que revoga certas diretivas (JO L 312 de 22.11.2008, p.3).
Diretiva 80/68/CEE do Conselho, de 17 de dezembro de 1979, relativa à proteção das águas subterrâneas contra a poluição causada por certas substâncias perigosas (JO L 20 de 26.1.1980, p. 43).
Diretiva 2006/118/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 12 de dezembro de 2006, relativa à proteção das águas subterrâneas contra a poluição e a deterioração (JO L 372 de 27.12.2006, p. 19).

([2]) Diretiva 2004/35/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 21 de abril de 2004, relativa à responsabilidade ambiental em termos de prevenção e reparação de danos ambientais (JO L 143 de 30.4.2004, p. 56).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005203/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(13 May 2013)

Subject: Environmental rehabilitation in S. Pedro da Cova

On a recent visit to the parish of S. Pedro da Cova, in the municipality of Gondomar (Portugal), we confirmed that heavy environmental damage, which has been affecting the population of the parish for some years, continues.

In addition to the main problem of the dumping of tens of thousands of tonnes of hazardous waste, as mentioned in past questions (E-9232/2010 and E-003617/2011), other mining earthworks, excavations and embankments have significantly altered the original topography, natural drainage network and plant cover. There are also concerns about possible contamination of water resources, which could affect people's health.

1. Is the Commission aware of any projects intended to compensate the population of the parish for the environmental damage caused over the years and to counter this?

2. What EU programmes and measures could be used to support such a project?

3. Given the Commission's answer to written question E-9232/2010 and the reference made therein to the information given in question E-1988/10, what has come about as a result of contacting the Portuguese authorities in connection with the 'Valonga' Natura 2000 site?

Question for written answer E-005204/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(13 May 2013)

Subject: Hazardous waste in slag heaps at the disused São Pedro da Cova mines

In January 2011, in answer to Written Question E-9232/2010, the Commission said that it had recently requested clarification from the Portuguese authorities regarding the disposal of waste from the former Siderurgia Nacional steelworks, adding that the information provided by the Portuguese authorities was being examined by the Commission.

In the same year, studies by the National Civil Engineering Laboratory confirmed that slag heaps at the disused São Pedro da Cova mines contained around 50 000 cubic metres, or around 88 000 tonnes, of hazardous waste from the Siderurgia Nacional plant which was dumped there in 2001 (as stated in Written Question E-003617/2011).

In a recent visit to the site, we found that no work had begun to remove the hazardous waste.

In view of this, what is the outcome of the Commission's examination of the information provided by the Portuguese authorities?

Does the Commission have information on:

— analyses conducted on the hazardous waste;

— possible groundwater contamination and the monitoring thereof;

— regeneration and environmental protection of the landfill site, including the amount of land to be regenerated?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 2013)

Both questions address different aspects of the illegal dumping of waste originated by a steel-mill on the old mines of S. Pedro da Cova in Gondomar, Portugal.

Following an assessment of the situation, the Commission initiated an infringement procedure based on several EC provisions ([1]), namely related to waste treatment and ground-waters protection (case 2011/2003).

Meanwhile Portugal has informed the Commission, in the framework of the infringement file, that a recovery programme was adopted on 29 October 2012, which involves the cleaning of the sites, the removal of waste, their adequate treatment by a specialised plant and the monitoring of the ground-waters of the area. The programme will be co-funded by the EU under the 'Programa Operacional Valorização do Território (POVT)'. The public tender for the works has been published on the official journal (Diário da República) of 19 December 2012.

The implementation of the recovery programme should support the protection of the Natura 2000 site 'Valongo' against any potential effect of the illegal dumping of waste on the mines.

Finally it should be noted that civil liability is not covered by the scope of Directive 2004/35/EC ([2]). However the Portuguese Law (Decree-Law 147/2008 of 29 July 2008) goes beyond the directive and refers to objective and subjective civil liability linked to activities that may harm the environment.

([1]) Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste and repealing certain Directives (OJ L 312, 22.11.2008, p. 3-30).
Directive 80/68/EEC of 17 December 1979 on the protection of groundwater against pollution caused by certain dangerous substances (OJ L 20, 26.1.1980, p. 43-48).
Directive 2006/118/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 on the protection of groundwater against pollution and deterioration (OJ L 372, 27.12.2006, p. 19-31).

([2]) Directive 2004/35/CE of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 April 2004 on environmental liability with regard to the prevention and remedying of environmental damage (OJ L 143, 30.4.2004, p. 56-75).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005228/13
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(13 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Reclassificação das NUTS III de Lisboa e da Península de Setúbal

Segundo informações recentes, o governo português, no quadro da reclassificação das NUTS, está a ponderar proceder à reclassificação das NUTS III de Lisboa e da Península de Setúbal numa só, passando a coincidir com a NUTS II da Grande Lisboa. Com esta agregação, esta «nova» NUTS passaria a contabilizar 2 750 000 residentes. Por outro lado, é importante referir que estas duas sub-regiões NUTS III têm realidades muito diferenciadas do ponto de vista económico e social, sendo que o número de trabalhadores, de empresas e o volume de impostos recolhidos é superior em Lisboa em relação à Península de Setúbal.

Desta forma, questiono a Comissão:

— Que informações tem sobre este processo de reclassificação?

— A confirmar-se esta perspetiva, tal reclassificação estaria de acordo com o Regulamento (UE) n.° 1046/2012 da Comissão e com o Regulamento (CE) n.° 1059/2003)?

— Conhece algum estudo realizado sobre os possíveis impactos sociais e económicos desta reclassificação?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005249/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(13 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Península de Setúbal — reclassificação de NUT2 e NUT3

Diversos agentes económicos, autarquias e organizações não governamentais da Península de Setúbal têm vindo a expressar a sua preocupação relativamente às consequências da integração da região numa unidade estatística — NUT2 — com profundas disparidades internas ao nível de indicadores de desenvolvimento económico.

Esta preocupação aumenta perante a possibilidade aventada de alterar a classificação estatística ao nível da NUT3, acabando com a atual NUT3 Península de Setúbal e criando uma NUT3 Área Metropolitana de Lisboa, que agregaria a Península de Setúbal.

Em face do exposto, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Foi-lhe apresentada, até ao momento, alguma proposta de reclassificação das NUT2 e NUT3 acima referidas? Em caso afirmativo, qual o ponto de situação do processo?

2. Tendo em conta as disparidades ao nível de indicadores de desenvolvimento económico acima mencionadas, considera a possibilidade de apoiar a criação de um Programa Operacional específico para a Península de Setúbal, caso o mesmo venha a ser proposto pelo governo português, visando uma discriminação positiva desta região, que passe, por exemplo, por taxas de financiamento para projetos diferenciadas e visando apoiar objetivos de coesão interna da região da Área Metropolitana de Lisboa?

Resposta conjunta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão
(2 de julho de 2013)

No decurso da ronda de revisões da NUTS de 2013, Portugal enviou à Comissão um pedido oficial de alteração da NUTS em consonância com a sua proposta de reforma administrativa. Contudo, em 11 de junho de 2013, Portugal retirou oficialmente a proposta na sequência da conclusão do Tribunal Constitucional português de que o ato jurídico correspondente era incompatível com a Constituição da República Portuguesa.

Por razões de transparência, saliente-se que a proposta visava unicamente regiões NUTS 3 e incluía a fusão da região da Grande Lisboa (PT171) com a região da Península de Setúbal (PT172). A fusão teria dado origem, a partir de 1 de janeiro de 2015, ou seja, da data prevista de entrada em aplicação da nova classificação NUTS (NUTS 2013), à região NUTS 2 de Lisboa/Área Metropolitana de Lisboa (PT17), compreendendo apenas uma região NUTS 3. A proposta tinha sido considerada totalmente conforme com a legislação da UE ([1]).

As estruturas administrativas nos Estados-Membros resultam da legislação nacional e constituem o primeiro critério utilizado para definir os níveis NUTS. No que se refere à classificação NUTS, a Comissão não tem possibilidade de considerar as disparidades socioeconómicas existentes entre regiões administrativas.

Relativamente ao âmbito geográfico dos programas operacionais, a Comissão propôs que, «Salvo acordo em contrário entre a Comissão e o Estado-Membro, os programas operacionais abrangidos pelo FEDER e o FSE devem ter um âmbito geográfico adequado e corresponder, no mínimo, ao nível NUTS 2, em conformidade com o sistema institucional específico do Estado-Membro em causa» ([2]). As autoridades de gestão continuarão a ter a possibilidade de focalizar os esforços desenvolvidos no âmbito dos programas NUTS 2 em áreas específicas.

([1]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 1059/2003 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 26 de maio de 2003, relativo à instituição de uma Nomenclatura Comum das Unidades Territoriais Estatísticas (NUTS), JO L 154 de 21.6.2003.

([2]) Artigo 89.° da proposta de regulamento que estabelece disposições comuns.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005228/13
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(13 May 2013)

Subject: Reclassification of NUTS III regions: Lisbon and the Setúbal Peninsula

According to recent reports, as part of the reclassification of NUTS regions, the Portuguese Government is considering merging two NUTS III regions — Lisbon and the Setúbal Peninsula — into one NUTS II region of Greater Lisbon. This agglomeration would lead to a 'new' NUTS region accounting for 2 750 000 residents. These two NUTS III sub-regions have marked economic and social differences, with Lisbon having more workers, more businesses and a higher tax revenue than the Setúbal Peninsula.

— What information does the Commission have regarding this reclassification process?

— Should the Government wish to proceed, would this reclassification comply with Commission Regulation (EU) No 1046/2012 and Regulation (EC) No 1059/2003?

— Is the Commission aware of any studies carried out on the possible social and economic impacts of this reclassification?

Question for written answer E-005249/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(13 May 2013)

Subject: Setúbal Peninsula — NUTS 2 and NUTS 3 reclassification

Various economic bodies, local authorities and non-governmental organisations in the Setúbal Peninsula have voiced their concerns over the consequences of including the region in the NUTS 2 national territorial unit for statistics, which has substantial internal differences between economic development indicators.

These concerns have been exacerbated by the possibility of changes to the statistical classification at NUTS 3 level, bringing the current Setúbal Peninsula NUTS 3 to an end and creating a Lisbon Metropolitan Area NUTS 3, which would encompass the Setúbal Peninsula.

1. Has the Commission received any proposal regarding the NUTS 2 and NUTS 3 reclassification described above? If so, what stage has this process reached?

2. Given the disparity between the economic development indicators referred to above, will the Commission support the creation of an operational programme specific to the Setúbal Peninsula, if this is proposed by the Portuguese Government, to positively discriminate in favour of this region, so as to provide more favourable co-financing rates for projects, for example, and to support the internal cohesion goals for the region covered by the Lisbon Metropolitan Area?

Joint answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 2013)

In the course of the NUTS 2013 revision round, Portugal sent the Commission an official request for NUTS amendments in line with its proposal for administrative reform. On 11 June 2013, however, Portugal officially withdrew the proposal following the Portuguese Constitutional Court's finding that the corresponding legal act was incompatible with the Portuguese Constitution.

For the sake of transparency, it should be noted that the proposal concerned solely NUTS level 3 regions and included the merger of the Grande Lisboa (PT171) and Península de Setúbal (PT172) regions. The merger would have resulted as of 1 January 2015, i.e. the planned starting date for application of the new NUTS classification (NUTS 2013), in the Lisboa/Área Metropolitana de Lisboa (PT17) NUTS level 2 region comprising only one NUTS level 3 region. The proposal had been found to be fully compliant with EU legislation ([1]).

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1059/2003 of the European Parliament and the Council of 26 May 2003 on the establishment of a common classification of territorial units for statistics (NUTS), OJ L 154, 21.6.2003.

The administrative structures within Member States are a matter of national legislation and constitute the first criterion used to define NUTS levels. As for the NUTS classification, the Commission has no means of taking account of socioeconomic disparities between administrative regions.

On the geographical scope of operational programmes, the Commission has proposed that 'unless otherwise agreed between the Commission and the Member State, operational programmes for the ERDF and the ESF shall be drawn up at the appropriate geographical level and at least at NUTS level 2, in accordance with the institutional system specific to the Member State' ([2]). It will still be possible for managing authorities to focus efforts under NUTS-2-based programmes on particular areas.

([2]) Article 89 of the draft Common Provisions Regulation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005275/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(13 maggio 2013)

Oggetto: Grave fenomeno del bracconaggio primaverile a danno dei piccoli di tordo bottaccio e altri uccelli migratori nelle province italiane di Trento e Bolzano

Ogni anno, in particolare durante la primavera, nelle province italiane di Trento e Bolzano si manifesta un grave fenomeno di bracconaggio nei confronti dei pulcini di uccelli selvatici, in particolare delle specie di tordo (*Turdus philomelos*) e cesena (*Turdus pilaris*).

I bracconieri, che provengono da diverse regioni italiane, prelevano i nidi prevalentemente dagli alberi dei boschi o dalle piante delle coltivazioni di melo, compiendo un saccheggio sistematico e organizzato dopo viaggi di centinaia di chilometri. Gli uccelli così catturati vengono poi allevati a mano con la cosiddetta tecnica dello stecco, ovvero alimentati dall'uomo con insetti e mangimi artificiali per poi essere immessi sia sul mercato clandestino sia e soprattutto su quello legale, grazie all'apposizione di un anello identificativo nel tarso di una zampa ([1]). Detti uccelli svezzati vengono poi venduti anche a 150/300 euro cadauno come richiami vivi, soprattutto a cacciatori. Accade infatti che molti dei bracconieri fermati dal Corpo Forestale dello Stato (CFS) e dai Carabinieri siano in possesso di autorizzazioni di allevamento di associazioni e federazioni ornitologiche o delle amministrazioni provinciali, che forniscono loro gli anelli da apporre ai pulcini nati legalmente in gabbia ma che poi vengono utilizzati per inanellare e rendere lecita la detenzione dei pulcini rubati nei nidi di uccelli selvatici.

Solo negli ultimi giorni sono stati denunciati ad Appiano (BZ) dal CFS un cittadino della Lombardia in possesso di 123 pulcini prevalentemente di tordo bottaccio, a Caldaro (BZ) dai Carabinieri due cittadini dell'Emilia Romagna con 16 nidi con 34 pulcini di tordo bottaccio, 16 pulcini di fringuello e nidi con uova di fanello e verzellino, a Dambel (TN) dal CFS due cittadini della Lombardia con 25 pulcini di tordo bottaccio e cesena, a Nalles (BZ) dai Carabinieri e dal CFS tre cittadini marocchini residenti in Toscana con 29 pulcini di tordo bottaccio. Questi episodi sono solo la punta di un enorme iceberg.

Può la Commissione indicare se è al corrente di questo grave fenomeno di bracconaggio?

Come intende la Commissione intervenire per porre fine a questo fenomeno, che vede esemplari di uccelli migratori viventi naturalmente allo stato selvatico nel territorio europeo degli Stati membri ([2]) sottratti alla natura e a tutta la Comunità europea per diventare proprietà privata di pochi a soli fini di lucro?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005299/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(14 maggio 2013)

Oggetto: Grave fenomeno di bracconaggio primaverile a danno dei piccoli della rara aquila del Bonelli

Mercoledì 8 maggio 2013 due aquilotti di circa cinquanta giorni di età della specie di aquila del Bonelli (*Hieraaetus fasciatus*), un raro rapace, sono stati rubati dal nido nella provincia siciliana di Agrigento da ignoti bracconieri. Si tratta di uno degli oltre 20 siti di nidificazione monitorati continuamente dai protezionisti del Coordinamento per la tutela dei rapaci in Sicilia, a cui partecipano molti volontari di ONG quali CABS, EBN Italia, FIR, FSN, LIPU Birdlife Italia, MAN, WWF ([3]).

Due anni fa il nido oggetto di bracconaggio era già stato oggetto di furto e, grazie a delle indagini della Sezione Investigativa CITES del Corpo forestale dello Stato, era stato possibile ricostruire i percorsi degli aquilotti depredati rilevando un lucroso traffico di uccelli rapaci che coinvolgeva numerosi paesi europei dove questi rari uccelli, riciclati con documenti falsi, tornavano in alcuni casi proprio in Sicilia.

Nel 2012 nell'intera isola sono state censite 33 coppie residenti e 26 coppie riproduttive che hanno incrementato la popolazione di 32 nuove giovani aquile.

([1]) Cfr. interrogazione E-010206/2012 dell'8 novembre 2012 e risposta del 15 gennaio 2013.
([2]) Cfr. articolo 1 della direttiva 2009/147/CE.
([3]) http://www.ebnitalia.it/easyNews/NewsLeggi.asp?NewsID=111.

Purtroppo, la vigilanza ai siti di nidificazione viene effettuata esclusivamente da volontari che, in quanto tali, non possono garantire dei controlli sistematici e contemporanei a tutti i siti di nidificazione di questo raro uccello.

Va evidenziato come un soggetto di aquila del Bonelli nel mercato dell'ornitologia amatoriale e della falconeria arrivi a costare addirittura dai 10 000 ai 15 000 euro.

Purtroppo, la mancanza di controlli puntuali e costanti delle autorità locali nei confronti degli allevatori e dei falconieri che utilizzano questa rara specie porta a incrementare il mercato illegale di questi uccelli e il loro conseguente prelievo illecito al nido.

La Commissione è al corrente di questo grave fenomeno di bracconaggio e del commercio illecito in essere? Non ritiene utile intervenire affinché le autorità locali effettuino i dovuti e necessari controlli di prevenzione e repressione di questi illeciti? Nell'ambito del piano di azione rivolto alle specie di uccelli prioritarie può riferire quali sono le azioni adottate finora per la tutela dell'aquila del Bonelli ([4])?S

Risposta congiunta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(8 luglio 2013)

La Commissione non è al corrente delle specifiche circostanze riferite dall'onorevole deputato. Al fine di affrontare la questione generale delle pratiche illegali che interessano le popolazioni di uccelli, la Commissione ha elaborato, di concerto con gli Stati membri e con le parti interessate, una tabella di marcia che comprende un elenco di azioni specifiche per affrontare i diversi aspetti, tra cui il controllo delle attività illegali, lo scambio di informazioni e la sensibilizzazione, il miglioramento della prevenzione e delle attività di controllo del rispetto della normativa.

La Commissione ricorda che spetta innanzitutto alle autorità nazionali di contrasto, compresi i tribunali, garantire la corretta applicazione della relativa normativa dell'Unione europea sulla protezione della natura e indagare adeguatamente sulle violazioni delle norme passibili di azioni penali e condanne.

Per quanto riguarda l'interrogazione sul piano d'azione per l'aquila del Bonelli, sul sito web della Commissione ([5]) è disponibile un riesame della sua attuazione, nonché dei piani d'azione per altre specie.

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/action_plans/docs/hieraaetus_fasciatus.pdf — European Union Action Plans for 8 Priority Birds Species — Bonelli's Eagle.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/action_plans/docs/Final%20report%20BirdLife%20review%20SAPs.pdf http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/action_plans/docs/annex.zip.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005275/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(13 May 2013)

Subject: Serious problem of spring poaching affecting the young of the song thrush and other migratory birds in the Italian provinces of Trento and Bolzano

Every year, particularly in spring, the chicks of wild birds are poached in the Italian provinces of Trento and Bolzano. This serious problem affects species of thrush (*Turdus philomelos*) and fieldfares (*Turdus pilaris*) in particular.

The poachers, who come from various Italian regions, take nests mainly from woodland trees or from apple orchard plants. They travel hundreds of kilometres to carry out their systematic and organised raids. The birds captured in this way are then hand-reared using the 'stick technique'; in other words, they are fed by hand with insects and artificial feed before being released either on to the illegal market or, in the majority of cases, on to the legal market, which is possible once an identifying ring has been attached to the tarsus of one leg ([1]). These weaned birds are then sold for EUR 150-300 each as live decoys, mainly to hunters. It turns out, in fact, that many of the poachers arrested by the State Forestry Police and the Italian military police hold rearing licences from ornithological associations and federations or provincial administrations, which provide them with rings to be placed on chicks that are lawfully born in cages. However, the poachers then use those rings on chicks that have been stolen from wild bird nests, so that they are kept legally.

In the last few days alone, the following have been charged: a resident of Lombardy in possession of 123 chicks, mainly song thrushes, in Appiano (Bolzano) by the State Forestry Police; two residents of Emilia Romagna in possession of 16 nests with 34 song thrush chicks, 16 finch chicks and nests with linnet and serin eggs in Caldaro (Bolzano) by the military police; two residents of Lombardy in possession of 25 song thrush and fieldfare chicks in Dambel (Trento) by the State Forestry Police; and three Moroccan citizens resident in Tuscany in possession of 29 song thrush chicks in Nalles (Bolzano) by the military police and the State Forestry Police. These events are just the tip of an enormous iceberg.

Can the Commission say whether it is aware of this serious poaching problem?

What action will the Commission take to end this problem of migratory bird species living naturally in the wild in the European territory of the Member States ([2]) being taken out of the wild throughout the European Union to become the private property of a few, solely for the purposes of profit?

Question for written answer E-005299/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(14 May 2013)

Subject: Serious issue of springtime poaching of rare Bonelli's eagle chicks

On Wednesday, 8 May 2013, two 50-day-old Bonelli's eagle chicks (*Hieraaetus fasciatus*), a rare bird of prey, were stolen from their nest in the Sicilian province of Agrigento, by unknown poachers. The nest is one of more than 20 nesting sites constantly monitored by guards from the Sicilian centre for the protection of birds of prey, in which many volunteers from non-governmental organisations such as CABS, EBN Italia, FIR, FSN, LIPU Birdlife Italia, MAN, and WWF ([3]) participate.

The nest from which the chicks were poached had already been raided two years ago and investigations by the CITES (Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora) investigative division of the State Forestry Corps, made it possible to reconstruct the movements of the poached eagle chicks, revealing a lucrative trade in birds of prey involving several EU countries, and which involved, in some cases, these rare birds, reprocessed with false documents, returning to Sicily.

In 2012, 33 resident pairs and 26 breeding pairs, which increased the population by 32 new eagle chicks, were recorded throughout Sicily.

([1]) See Question E-010206/2012 of 8 November 2012 and answer of 15 January 2013.
([2]) See Article 1 of Directive 2009/147/EC.
([3]) http://www.ebnitalia.it/easyNews/NewsLeggi.asp?NewsID=111.

Unfortunately, nesting sites are monitored exclusively by volunteers who, as such, cannot systematically and simultaneously check all the nesting sites of this rare bird.

A single Bonelli's eagle would fetch between EUR 10 000 and 15 000 on the ornithology collectors' and falconry market.

Unfortunately, the lack of spot checks and continuous monitoring by local authorities of breeders and falconers who use this rare species causes the illegal market in these birds to grow and, as a result, increased thefts from nests.

Is the Commission aware of this serious issue of poaching and the illegal trade that exists? Does it not think it should call on local authorities to carry out the proper and necessary checks to prevent and curb these illegal acts? Under the action plan for priority bird species, can the Commission say what steps have been taken up to now to protect Bonelli's eagle ([4])?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission

(8 July 2013)

The Commission is not aware of the specific episodes mentioned by the Honourable Member. In order to address the general issue of illegal practices affecting bird populations, the Commission has developed, in consultation with Member States and stakeholders, a roadmap including a list of specific actions to address the problems, covering areas such as monitoring of illegal activities, information exchange and awareness-raising, prevention and enforcement improvements.

The Commission recalls that it is primarily the responsibility of the national law enforcement authorities, including courts of law, to ensure that the relevant EU nature protection laws are properly enforced, and that violations of these laws are properly investigated to lead to prosecutions and convictions.

As regards the question on the action plan for the Bonelli's eagle, a review of its implementation, as well as of other species action plans, is available on the Commission's webpage ([5]).

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/action_plans/docs/hieraaetus_fasciatus.pdf — European Union Action Plans for 8 Priority Birds Species — Bonelli's Eagle.

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/action_plans/docs/Final%20report%20BirdLife%20review%20SAPs.pdf http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/action_plans/docs/annex.zip

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005322/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(14 de mayo de 2013)

Asunto: Controles sanitarios en la importación de avellana procedente de Turquía

El 23 de enero de 2012, se formuló por escrito una pregunta parlamentaria a la Comisión (E-000419/2012) sobre las pruebas de control que verifican la ausencia de plaguicidas en las avellanas turcas importadas en los países de la Unión Europea. En la respuesta, de 28 de febrero de 2012, la Comisión manifiesta que los controles se realizan a través de puntos de importación designados. Asimismo, revela que los Estados miembros deben mantener y publicar una lista actualizada de los puntos de importación designados. La lista completa de dichos puntos de importación está disponible en el Anexo V del «Documento de orientación para las autoridades competentes en materia de control del cumplimiento de la legislación de la UE sobre aflatoxinas», de noviembre de 2010, vinculado con el Reglamento (CE) n° 1152/2009. Se considera, asimismo, que los mismos puntos de importación designados, que tienen instalaciones para muestrear las avellanas en busca de aflatoxinas, también pueden llevar a cabo muestras para detectar la presencia de residuos de plaguicidas.

Con posterioridad a dicha respuesta hemos enviado requerimientos de información a los laboratorios que figuran en la lista de Alemania, refiriéndonos a las importaciones de avellana turca y los plaguicidas analizados. En las respuestas facilitadas por los laboratorios alemanes constatamos que en ninguno de ellos se han realizado análisis de plaguicidas. De hecho, en muchas de las respuestas dadas nos comunican que la Ley no les obliga a efectuar dichos controles, sino que exige únicamente el control de aflatoxinas.

A la luz de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta que en la Respuesta E-003950/2012 del Sr. Dalli del 21 de junio de 2012 se establece que las muestras de vigilancia fueron tomadas, entre otros países, en Alemania.

1. ¿Qué medidas tiene previsto adoptar la Comisión Europea para garantizar que no se superan los limites máximos de residuos de productos plaguicidas en la avellana turca importada por Alemania?

2. ¿Qué nivel de análisis mínimo deben recoger los programas nacionales de control plurianuales para los residuos de plaguicidas, para considerarse estadísticamente significativos en relación a la producción de avellana importada, y garantizar la seguridad alimentaria?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005323/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(14 de mayo de 2013)

Asunto: Seguridad alimentaria

En la respuesta a la pregunta E-000419/2012, la Comisión manifiesta que los controles se realizan a través de puntos de importación designados. Asimismo, revela que los Estados miembros deben mantener y publicar una lista actualizada de los puntos de importación designados. La lista completa de dichos puntos de importación está disponible en el anexo V del «Documento de orientación para las autoridades competentes en materia de control del cumplimiento de la legislación de la UE sobre aflatoxinas», de noviembre de 2010, vinculado con el Reglamento (CE) n° 1152/2009. Se considera, asimismo, que los mismos puntos de importación designados, que tienen instalaciones para muestrear las avellanas en busca de aflatoxinas, también pueden recoger muestras para detectar la presencia de residuos de plaguicidas.

Con posterioridad a dicha respuesta, hemos enviado requerimientos de información a los laboratorios que figuran en la lista de Alemania, refiriéndonos a las importaciones de avellana turca y los plaguicidas analizados. En las respuestas facilitadas por los laboratorios alemanes constatamos que en ninguno de ellos se han realizado análisis de plaguicidas. De hecho, en muchas de las respuestas dadas nos comunican que la ley no les obliga a efectuar dichos controles, sino que exige únicamente el control de aflatoxinas.

Teniendo en cuenta que la no realización de los controles de verificación de los límites máximos de residuos de plaguicidas por parte de las autoridades competentes de un país miembro puede suponer un riesgo cierto para la salud y la seguridad alimentaria de los ciudadanos de la Unión Europea; teniendo en cuenta que en la respuesta E-003950/2012 se establece que las muestras de vigilancia fueron tomadas, entre otros países, en Alemania,

¿qué medidas podemos tomar los restantes países miembros ante la sospecha fundamentada de negligencias graves en los controles?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión

(26 de junio de 2013)

1. Remitimos a Su Señoría a la respuesta de la Comisión a las preguntas escritas E-000418, E-000419 y E-000420/2012 ([1]).

A nivel de la UE, los controles obligatorios de las avellanas turcas solo están previstos en el Reglamento (CE) n° 1152/2009 de la Comisión ([2]), por el que se establecen condiciones específicas para la importación de determinados productos alimenticios debido al riesgo de contaminación de dichos productos por aflatoxinas. En consecuencia, aproximadamente el 10 % de los envíos de avellanas procedentes de Turquía se somete a una toma de muestras en el momento de la importación, debido a la posible presencia de aflatoxinas.

Por ahora, la Comisión no ha recibido ninguna notificación a través del sistema de alerta rápida para alimentos y piensos (RASFF) en relación con la presencia de otros riesgos (incluidos los residuos de los plaguicidas) en las avellanas procedentes de Turquía, ni ninguna otra información en la que se señale un riesgo emergente en relación con este producto. Si así fuera, se examinaría la conveniencia de incluir las avellanas procedentes de Turquía en el anexo I del Reglamento (CE) n° 669/2009 ([3]) en lo que respecta a la intensificación de los controles oficiales de las importaciones de determinados piensos y alimentos de origen no animal.

2. Al no haber una frecuencia mínima de los controles oficiales a nivel europeo, se pide a los Estados miembros que organicen y efectúen controles oficiales para verificar el cumplimiento de la legislación relativa a la cadena agroalimentaria (incluidos los límites de residuos de plaguicidas), de conformidad con el artículo 15 del Reglamento (CE) n° 882/2004 ([4]) y sobre la base del riesgo.

La Directiva 2002/63/CE de la Comisión ([5]) establece los métodos comunitarios de muestreo para el control oficial de los plaguicidas en los productos alimenticios, a fin de garantizar la uniformidad y representatividad de los muestreos efectuados por los Estados miembros.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/es/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) DO L 313 de 28.11.2009.
([3]) DO L 194 de 25.7.2009.
([4]) DO L 165 de 30.4.2004.
([5]) DO L 187 de 16.7.2002.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005322/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(14 May 2013)

Subject: Health checks on imports of hazelnuts from Turkey

On 23 January 2012, a written parliamentary question was presented to the Commission (E-000419/2012) on tests to verify the absence of pesticides in Turkish hazelnuts imported into European Union countries. In its reply, dated 28 February 2012, the Commission states that checks are carried out at designated points of import. It also states that the Member States have to maintain and make publicly available the list of designated points of import. The complete list of designated points of import is available in Annex V of the 'Guidance document for competent authorities for the control of compliance with EU legislation on aflatoxins' of November 2010, relating to Regulation (EC) No 1152/2009. The same designated points of import that have facilities to sample hazelnuts for aflatoxins are also considered to be in a position to sample for pesticide residues.

Following this reply, we sent information requests to the laboratories included in the German list, referring to imports of Turkish hazelnuts and the pesticides analysed. In the responses provided by the German laboratories, we note that none of them has carried out a pesticide analysis. In fact, many of the responses provided stated that the law does not require them to carry out these checks but only to check for aflatoxins.

In view of the above, and bearing in mind that Answer E-003950/2012 by Mr Dalli of 21 June 2012 states that surveillance samples were taken in Germany, among other countries,

1. What measures does the Commission plan to adopt to ensure that the maximum residue limits (MRLs) for pesticide products in Turkish hazelnuts imported by Germany are not exceeded?

2. What is the minimum level of analysis that should be required by national multiannual control programmes for pesticide residues to be considered statistically significant with regard to the production of imported hazelnuts and to ensure food safety?

Question for written answer E-005323/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(14 May 2013)

Subject: Food safety

In its reply to Question E-000419/2012, the Commission states that checks are carried out at designated points of import. It also states that the Member States have to maintain and make publicly available the list of designated points of import. The complete list of designated points of import is available in Annex V of the 'Guidance document for competent authorities for the control of compliance with EU legislation on aflatoxins' of November 2010, relating to Regulation (EC) No 1152/2009. The same designated points of import that have facilities to sample hazelnuts for aflatoxins are also considered to be in a position to sample for pesticide residues.

Following this reply, we sent information requests to the laboratories included in the German list, referring to imports of Turkish hazelnuts and the pesticides analysed. In the responses provided by the German laboratories, we note that none of them has carried out a pesticide analysis. In fact, many of the responses provided stated that the law does not require them to carry out these checks but only to check for aflatoxins.

Bearing in mind that the failure to carry out checks to verify maximum residue limits (MRLs) of pesticides by the competent authorities of a Member State could constitute a definite risk to the health and food safety of EU citizens; bearing in mind that Answer E-003950/2012 states that surveillance samples were taken in Germany, among other countries,

what measures can the rest of the Member States take in view of the reasonable suspicion that exists of gross negligence in performing the checks?

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(26 June 2013)

1. The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the Commission's reply to Written Questions E-000418, E-000419 and E-000420/2012 [1].

At EU level, mandatory controls on Turkish hazelnuts are only provided for by Regulation (EC) No 1152/2009 [2], imposing special conditions governing the import of certain foodstuffs due to contamination risk by aflatoxins. Accordingly, approximately 10% of hazelnut consignments from Turkey are being sampled at importation for the possible presence of aflatoxins.

At present the Commission has not received any notifications through the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF) related to the presence of other hazards (including pesticide residues) in hazelnuts from Turkey, nor any other information pointing at an emerging risk in relation to this commodity. Would that be the case, consideration would be given to the inclusion of hazelnuts from Turkey into Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 669/2009 [3] as regards the increased level of official controls on imports of certain feed and food of non-animal origin.

2. In the absence of an established minimum frequency of official controls at EU level, Member States are required to organise and carry out official controls to verify compliance with agri-food chain legislation (including with residues limits for pesticides) in accordance with Article 15 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 [4] and on the basis of the risk.

Commission Directive 2002/63/EC [5] establishes Community methods of sampling for the official control of pesticides in foodstuffs in order to ensure that sampling carried out by the Member States is carried out in a representative and uniform way.

---

(1) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
(2) OJ L 313, 28.11.2009.
(3) OJ L 194, 25.7.2009.
(4) OJ L 165, 30.4.2004.
(5) OJ L 187, 16.7.2002.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005382/13
alla Commissione
Antonio Cancian (PPE)
(15 maggio 2013)

Oggetto: Tutela della denominazione Prosecco

Al termine del negoziato di adesione della Croazia all'UE sembra si sia aperta, da parte croata, una vertenza relativa alla denominazione Prosek per un vino croato, che il governo croato vorrebbe poter conservare anche dopo l'ingresso nell'UE.

Si apprende dai mezzi di informazione che il mantenimento di questo nome, molto simile a quello del vino italiano Prosecco, sarebbe stato giustamente negato dalla Commissione.

Può la Commissione confermare che non vi sono le condizioni per l'utilizzo da parte della Croazia del nome Prosek?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-006141/13
alla Commissione
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(31 maggio 2013)

Oggetto: Tutela del vino Prosecco DOC

Secondo recenti notizie diffuse a mezzo stampa, i viticoltori croati lamentano che dal primo di luglio 2013, con l'entrata nell'Unione europea della Croazia, non potranno più commerciare il loro prodotto tipico con il nome di «Prošek» a causa della somiglianza con il nome del noto Prosecco, vino tutelato con marchio DOC.

Allo stato attuale nell'elenco delle denominazioni dei Paesi terzi riconosciute a livello comunitario, non risultano essere presenti denominazioni croate riconosciute.

Appare quindi evidente la mancanza di uno dei requisiti fondamentali della definizione di «menzioni tradizionali», previsti dall'art. 118 duovicies del regolamento (CE) n. 1234/2007. Esso, infatti, reca: «Per menzione tradizionale si intende l'espressione usata tradizionalmente negli Stati membri, in relazione ai prodotti di cui all'art. 118 bis, par. 1, per indicare: (…) b) il metodo di produzione o di invecchiamento oppure la qualità, il colore, il tipo di luogo o ancora un evento particolare legato alla storia del prodotto a denominazione di origine protetta o a indicazione geografica protetta (…)». L'articolo in oggetto, in relazione alle «menzioni tradizionali», fa esplicito riferimento a prodotti a denominazione o indicazione protetta, fattispecie mancante nel caso del «Prošek».

Fermo restando tale presupposto, si ritiene che ai sensi dell'art. 42 del regolamento (CE) n. 607/2009, la menzione tradizionale «Prošek» non sarebbe comunque registrabile in quanto, essendo parzialmente omonima alla denominazione protetta Prosecco, induce in errore il consumatore circa la natura, la qualità o la vera origine del prodotto.

Ciò premesso può la Commissione precisare:

1. come intende agire di fronte ad un'eventuale inadempienza delle disposizioni comunitarie in materia di protezione dei prodotti DOC da parte dei viticoltori croati, che hanno già minacciato di rivolgersi ad un tribunale continentale per far valere i loro diritti sul nome «Prošek»;

2. nel caso in cui il suddetto prodotto rimanga sul mercato, quali sono, in concreto, le misure che intende adottare per eliminare la commercializzazione delle bottiglie recanti il nome «Prošek» nel mercato interno e in quello dei paesi terzi?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-006147/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(31 maggio 2013)

Oggetto: Tutela del vino Prosecco DOC

Secondo recenti notizie diffuse a mezzo stampa, i viticoltori croati lamentano che dal primo di luglio 2013, con l'entrata nell'Unione europea della Croazia, non potranno più commerciare il loro prodotto tipico con il nome di «Prošek» a causa della somiglianza con il nome del noto Prosecco, vino tutelato con marchio DOC.

Allo stato attuale nell'elenco delle denominazioni dei Paesi terzi riconosciute a livello comunitario, non risultano essere presenti denominazioni croate riconosciute.

Appare quindi evidente la mancanza di uno dei requisiti fondamentali della definizione di «menzioni tradizionali», previsti dall'art. 118 duovicies del regolamento (CE) n. 1234/2007. Esso, infatti, reca: «Per menzione tradizionale si intende l'espressione usata tradizionalmente negli Stati membri, in relazione ai prodotti di cui all'art. 118 bis, par. 1, per indicare: (…) b) il metodo di produzione o di invecchiamento oppure la qualità, il colore, il tipo di luogo o ancora un evento particolare legato alla storia del prodotto a denominazione di origine protetta o a indicazione geografica protetta (…)». L'articolo in oggetto, in relazione alle «menzioni tradizionali», fa esplicito riferimento a prodotti a denominazione o indicazione protetta, fattispecie mancante nel caso del «Prošek».

Fermo restando tale presupposto, si ritiene che ai sensi dell'art. 42 del regolamento (CE) n. 607/2009, la menzione tradizionale «Prošek» non sarebbe comunque registrabile in quanto, essendo parzialmente omonima alla denominazione protetta Prosecco, induce in errore il consumatore circa la natura, la qualità o la vera origine del prodotto.

Ciò premesso può la Commissione precisare:

1. come intende agire di fronte ad un'eventuale inadempienza delle disposizioni comunitarie in materia di protezione dei prodotti DOC da parte dei viticoltori croati, che hanno già minacciato di rivolgersi ad un tribunale continentale per far valere i loro diritti sul nome «Prošek»;

2. nel caso in cui il suddetto prodotto rimanga sul mercato, quali sono, in concreto, le misure che intende adottare per eliminare la commercializzazione delle bottiglie recanti il nome «Prošek» nel mercato interno e in quello dei paesi terzi?

Risposta congiunta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione
(8 luglio 2013)

L'uso del termine «PROSEK» per indicare prodotti vitivinicoli nell'UE non è contemplato nel trattato di adesione della Croazia. La Commissione non ha ricevuto alcuna richiesta specifica da parte della Croazia per quanto riguarda l'uso di detta denominazione. In tale contesto, l'impiego del termine in questione a fini commerciali potrebbe sollevare questioni giuridiche nella misura in cui rientra nel campo d'applicazione dell'articolo 118 *quaterdecies* del regolamento (CE) n. 1234/2007 ([1]), poiché la denominazione croata potrebbe entrare in conflitto con la protezione della DOP ([2]) italiana «Prosecco».

Spetta alle autorità competenti degli Stati membri garantire l'applicazione di tale protezione nel mercato interno. L'UE ha inoltre negoziato accordi bilaterali con numerosi paesi terzi per garantire anche nei loro territori alti livelli di protezione delle DOP dell'Unione europea, tra cui della DOP «Prosecco».

Ciononostante, se dopo il 1º luglio 2013 dovesse essere presentata una domanda di protezione per «Prosek» in quanto IGP ([3]), DOP o menzione tradizionale, saranno applicate le disposizioni relative alla presentazione delle domande e le norme relative all'esame da parte della Commissione previste nella sezione I *bis* del capo I del titolo II del regolamento (CE) n. 1234/2007, nonché le disposizioni di cui al capo II e al capo III del regolamento (CE) n. 607/2009 ([4]). Nella fase d'esame che precede la decisione di concessione o di rifiuto della protezione sono prese in considerazione eventuali denominazioni di vini omonimi già registrati. Ad oggi la Commissione non ha ricevuto alcuna domanda.

([1]) GU L 299 del 16.11.2007.
([2]) Denominazione di origine protetta.
([3]) Indicazione geografica protetta.
([4]) GU L 193 del 24.7.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005382/13
to the Commission
Antonio Cancian (PPE)
(15 May 2013)

Subject: Protection of the Prosecco designation

At the close of negotiations for Croatia's accession to the EU, it seems that the Croatians have opened up a dispute regarding the designation 'Prosek' for a Croatian wine, which the Croatian Government would like to be able to retain even after the country has joined the EU.

According to sources, the Commission has rightly refused to allow this name, which is very similar to that of the Italian wine 'Prosecco', to be retained.

Can the Commission confirm that, as things stand, Croatia will not be permitted to use the name 'Prosek'?

Question for written answer P-006141/13
to the Commission
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(31 May 2013)

Subject: Protection of Prosecco wine CDO

According to recent press reports, Croatian winegrowers are complaining that from 1 July 2013, when Croatia joins the European Union, they will no longer be able to market the wine they typically produce with the name 'Prošek' owing to it sounding similar to the renowned Prosecco, which has CDO protection.

At present, the list of third country designations recognised in the EU does not contain any recognised Croatian designations.

It therefore seems clear that one of the fundamental requirements for the definition 'traditional term' provided for in Article 118 (u) of Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 is not being fulfilled. That clause sets out that: 'Traditional term' shall mean a term traditionally used in Member States for products referred to in Article 118a(1) to designate: (…) b) the production or ageing method or the quality, colour, type of place, or a particular event linked to the history of the product with a protected designation of origin or a protected geographical indication." The article in question explicitly refers to 'traditional terms' as relating to products of protected designation or indication, which is not the case with 'Prošek'.

On that basis, it could be considered that, under Article 42 of Regulation (EC) No 607/2009, it should not be possible for the traditional term 'Prošek' to be registered since it sounds somewhat like 'Prosecco', which is a protected designation wine, and could mislead consumers as to the nature, quality or true origin of the product.

In the light of the above, can the Commission state:

1. what it will do in the event of Croatian winegrowers not fulfilling EU provisions on the protection of CDO products, since they have already threatened to apply to a European court to uphold their right to use the name 'Prošek';

2. should that product remain on the market, what concrete measures will the Commission take to prevent the marketing of bottles bearing the name 'Prošek' on the internal market and in third country markets?

Question for written answer P-006147/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(31 May 2013)

Subject: Protection of Prosecco wine CDO

According to recent press reports, Croatian winegrowers are complaining that from 1 July 2013, when Croatia joins the European Union, they will no longer be able to market the wine they typically produce with the name 'Prošek' owing to it sounding similar to the renowned Prosecco, which has CDO protection.

At present, the list of third country designations recognised in the EU does not contain any recognised Croatian designations.

It therefore seems clear that one of the fundamental requirements for the definition 'traditional term' provided for in Article 118 (k) of Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 is not being fulfilled. That clause sets out that: 'Traditional term' shall mean a term traditionally used in Member States for products referred to in Article 118a(1) to designate: (…) b) the production or ageing method or the quality, colour, type of place, or a particular event linked to the history of the product with a protected designation of origin or a protected geographical indication." The article in question explicitly refers to 'traditional terms' as relating to products of protected designation or indication, which is not the case with 'Prošek'.

On that basis, it could be considered that, under Article 42 of Regulation (EC) No 607/2009, it should not be possible for the traditional term 'Prošek' to be registered since it sounds somewhat like 'Prosecco', which is a protected designation wine, and could mislead consumers as to the nature, quality or true origin of the product.

In the light of the above, can the Commission state:

1. what it will do in the event of Croatian winegrowers not fulfilling EU provisions on the protection of CDO products, since they have already threatened to apply to a European court to uphold their right to use the name 'Prošek';

2. should that product remain on the market, what concrete measures will the Commission take to prevent the marketing of bottles bearing the name 'Prošek' on the internal market and in third country markets?

Joint answer given by M.Cioloș on behalf of the Commission
(8 July 2013)

The use of the term 'PROSEK' for wine products in the EU is not part of the Accession Treaty of Croatia. No specific Croatian request has been received by the Commission concerning the use of this denomination. In this context, the use in trade of the term in question may raise legal problems as far as it may fall under the scope of Article 118m of Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 ([1]), since it could conflict with the protection of the Italian PDO ([2]) 'Prosecco'.

The enforcement of that protection is ensured in the internal market by the competent authorities of the Member States. Furthermore, the EU has negotiated bilateral agreements with several third countries to ensure a high level of protection of EU PDO in those countries, including for the PDO 'Prosecco'.

Nevertheless, if an application for the protection of 'PROSEK' as PGI ([3]) or PDO or as a traditional term was received after 1 July 2013, the requirements concerning the submission of applications and the rules concerning the scrutiny by the Commission would apply, as foreseen in Section Ia of Chapter I of Title II of Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 as well as the detailed provisions set out in Chapters II and III of Regulation (EC) No 607/2009 ([4]). Such scrutiny, preceding the decision of protection or refusal of protection, includes the consideration of eventual homonymous wines names already registered. However, until this date no application was received by the Commission.

([1]) OJ L 299, 16.11.2007.
([2]) Protected Designation of Origin.
([3]) Protected Geographical Indication.
([4]) OJ L 193, 24.7.2009.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005414/13
a la Comisión
Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE)
(16 de mayo de 2013)

Asunto: Desperdicio alimentario

La FAO estima que en el mundo se pierden o desperdician anualmente en torno a 1 300 millones de toneladas de alimentos, lo que supone un tercio de la producción. En Europa esta cifra se sitúa en 89 millones de toneladas al año, lo que significa 179 kilos por habitante. Es decir, entre un 30 % y un 50 % de alimentos sanos y comestibles se convierten en residuos. De esos 89 millones, el 42 % se produce en los hogares (del cual, el 60 % sería evitable), el 39 % en los procesos de fabricación, el 5 % en la distribución y el 14 % en los servicios de restauración y catering.

El 19 de enero de 2012 el Parlamento Europeo adoptó el informe sobre «Cómo evitar el desperdicio de alimentos: estrategias para mejorar la eficiencia de la cadena alimentaria en la EU», en el que se recogían algunas recomendaciones para mejorar esta situación. Las medidas puestas en marcha, así como la designación del año 2014 como Año Europeo contra el Desperdicio Alimentario, parecen no ser suficientes para evitar el agravamiento de este problema.

¿Podría la Comisión explicar qué medidas tiene pensadas tomar en el año 2014 y en el periodo posterior, para luchar contra el desperdicio alimentario?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005415/13
a la Comisión
Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE)
(16 de mayo de 2013)

Asunto: Desperdicio alimentario y medio ambiente

La FAO estima que en el mundo se pierden o desperdician anualmente en torno a 1 300 millones de toneladas de alimentos, lo que supone un tercio de la producción. En Europa esta cifra se sitúa en 89 millones de toneladas al año.

El desperdicio alimentario es un problema desde el punto de vista social, pero también medioambiental. Debemos tener en cuenta que para producir un kilo de alimentos se emiten a la atmósfera 4,5 kilos de CO_2, lo que genera 170 millones de toneladas equivalentes de CO_2 al año, repartidas entre la industria alimentaria (59 millones de toneladas), el consumo doméstico (78 millones de toneladas) y otros (33 millones de toneladas). También es destacable el impacto que tiene sobre los recursos hídricos del planeta, ya que la producción del 30 % de los alimentos que se quedan sin consumir supone el uso de un 50 % más de recursos hídricos para el riego.

Es necesario acabar con el despilfarro alimentario y sus añadidos efectos medioambientales, fomentando una cultura científica y cívica orientada por los principios de sostenibilidad y solidaridad.

El 19 de enero de 2012 el Parlamento Europeo adoptó el informe sobre «Cómo evitar el desperdicio de alimentos: estrategias para mejorar la eficiencia de la cadena alimentaria en la EU», en el que ya se recogían estas preocupaciones medioambientales así como algunas recomendaciones para mejorar esta situación. Las medidas puestas en marcha, así como la designación del año 2014 como Año Europeo contra el Desperdicio Alimentario, parecen no ser suficientes para evitar el agravamiento de este problema.

¿Podría la Comisión explicar qué medidas tiene pensadas tomar en el año 2014 y en el periodo posterior, para luchar contra los efectos medioambientales que genera el desperdicio alimentario?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(1 de julio de 2013)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a la respuesta dada a la pregunta escrita E-4861/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005414/13
to the Commission
Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE)
(16 May 2013)

Subject: Food waste

The FAO estimates that approximately 1.3 billion tonnes of food are lost or wasted each year worldwide, which accounts for one third of production. In Europe, this figure totals 89 million tonnes per year, which represents 179 kilograms per capita. In other words, between 30% and 50% of healthy, edible food goes to waste. Of those 89 million tonnes of waste, 42% is produced in households (60% of which could be avoided), 39% in manufacturing processes, 5% in distribution and 14% in restaurant and catering services.

On 19 January 2012, Parliament adopted the report on 'How to avoid food wastage: strategies for a more efficient food chain in the EU', which outlined recommendations to improve the situation. The measures implemented, and the designation of 2014 as the European Year against Food Waste, do not seem to be enough to prevent this problem from getting worse.

Can the Commission explain what measures it plans to take in 2014 and in the period thereafter to combat food waste?

Question for written answer E-005415/13
to the Commission
Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE)
(16 May 2013)

Subject: Food waste and the environment

The FAO estimates that approximately 1.3 billion tonnes of food are lost or wasted each year worldwide, which accounts for one third of production. In Europe, this figure totals 89 million tonnes per year.

Food waste is a problem from both a social and an environmental point of view. It is worth bearing in mind that in order to produce one kilogram of food, 4.5 kilograms of CO_2 are emitted into the atmosphere, which generates the equivalent of 170 million tonnes of CO_2 per year, divided between the food industry (59 million tonnes), domestic consumption (78 million tonnes) and other sources (33 million tonnes). This also has a significant impact on the planet's water resources, as the production of 30% of the food which goes uneaten represents the use of 50% more water resources for irrigation.

We must put a stop to food waste and its added effects on the environment by developing a scientific and civic culture guided by the principles of sustainability and solidarity.

On 19 January 2012, Parliament adopted the report on 'How to avoid food wastage: strategies for a more efficient food chain in the EU', which outlined these environmental concerns, along with recommendations to improve the situation. The measures implemented, and the designation of 2014 as the European Year against Food Waste, do not seem to be enough to prevent this problem from getting worse.

Can the Commission explain what measures it plans to take in 2014 and in the period thereafter to combat the environmental effects caused by food waste?

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(1 July 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-4861/2013 [1].

---

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

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005454/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(16 de mayo de 2013)

Asunto: Despilfarro de fondos europeos en Canarias

El pasado 13 de mayo, László Ándor, Comisario de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales, participó en un debate celebrado por la Fundación Fuhem donde afirmó que España ha despilfarrado los fondos europeos de cohesión al haber desarrollado políticas poco inteligentes.

El Comisario ha llegado a sostener que este despilfarro se encuentra en la base de los problemas de competitividad que lleva arrastrando la economía española. Los fondos de cohesión en España se han despilfarrado en la construcción de infraestructuras inútiles o duplicadas que no han mejorado en nada la competitividad. Estas infraestructuras tan solo han beneficiado a las grandes compañías de la construcción que, en última instancia, han sido las grandes perceptoras de los fondos europeos.

Durante años estos fondos se han estado empleando para beneficiar a las citadas empresas, y en la actualidad ha aparecido información sobre los supuestos pagos que dichas compañías realizaban a la cúpula del partido que gestionaba los proyectos. Esto podría explicar la lógica con la que las autoridades españolas han estado elaborando los proyectos financiados con fondos europeos; por ello resulta necesario recabar la mayor información posible sobre la evaluación que la Comisión ha realizado de dichos proyectos.

A la vista de las críticas lanzadas por el Comisario sobre la ejecución de dichos fondos, consideramos necesario conocer qué proyectos, a la luz de las evaluaciones que la Comisión ha debido realizar, son considerados como «poco inteligentes» y cuáles son las alternativas que la Comisión Europea entiende que podrían haber sido ejecutadas en su lugar. Las Islas Canarias es una de las regiones europeas con mayor desempleo y por eso urge conocer cómo evalúa el Comisario los proyectos realizados en la región.

¿Qué proyectos financiados con los fondos de cohesión suponen para la Comisión proyectos que no han servido para el impulso económico de las Islas Canarias y un despilfarro de los fondos europeos?

¿Qué alternativas considera que habrían podido ser financiadas en Canarias para generar un incremento de la actividad económica y un descenso del desempleo?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005885/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(27 de mayo de 2013)

Asunto: Despilfarro de fondos europeos en Murcia

El pasado 13 de mayo László Ándor, Comisario de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales, participó en un debate celebrado por la Fundación Fuhem donde afirmó que España ha despilfarrado los fondos europeos de cohesión al haber desarrollado políticas poco inteligentes.

El Comisario ha llegado a sostener que este despilfarro se encuentra en la base de los problemas de competitividad que lleva arrastrando la economía española. Los fondos de cohesión en España se han despilfarrado en la construcción de infraestructuras inútiles o duplicadas que no han mejorado en nada la competitividad. Estas infraestructuras tan solo han beneficiado a las grandes compañías de la construcción que, en últimas instancia, han sido las grandes perceptoras de los fondos europeos.

Durante años, estos fondos se han estado empleado para beneficiar a las citadas empresas y en la actualidad ha aparecido información sobre los supuestos pagos que dichas compañías realizaban a la cúpula del partido que gestionaba los proyectos. Esto podría explicar la lógica con la que las autoridades españolas han estado elaborando los proyectos financiados con fondos europeos. Por ello resulta necesario recabar la mayor información posible sobre la evaluación que la Comisión ha realizado de dichos proyectos.

A la vista de las críticas lanzadas por el Comisario sobre la ejecución de dichos fondos, consideramos necesario conocer qué proyectos, a la luz de las evaluaciones que la Comisión ha debido realizar, son considerados como «poco inteligentes» y cuáles son las alternativas que la Comisión Europea entiende que podrían haber sido ejecutadas en su lugar. Murcia es una de las regiones europeas con mayor desempleo y por eso urge conocer cómo evalúa el Comisario los proyectos realizados en la región.

¿Qué proyectos financiados con los fondos de cohesión suponen para la Comisión proyectos que no han servido para el impulso económico de la Región de Murcia y un despilfarro de los fondos europeos?

¿Qué alternativas considera que habrían podido ser financiadas en Murcia para generar un incremento de la actividad económica y un descenso del desempleo?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006360/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(4 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Despilfarro de los fondos europeos en Castilla-La Mancha

El pasado 13 de mayo László Ándor, Comisario de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales, participó en un debate celebrado por la Fundación Fuhem donde ha afirmado que España ha despilfarrado los fondos europeos de cohesión al haber desarrollado políticas poco inteligentes.

El Comisario ha llegado a sostener que este despilfarro se encuentra en la base de los problemas de competitividad que lleva arrastrando la economía española. Los fondos de cohesión en España se han despilfarrado en la construcción de infraestructuras inútiles o duplicadas que no han mejorado en nada la competitividad. Estas infraestructuras tan solo han beneficiado a las grandes compañías de la construcción que, en última instancia, han sido las grandes perceptoras de los fondos europeos.

Durante años estos fondos se han estado empleando para beneficiar a las citadas empresas y en la actualidad ha aparecido información sobre los supuestos pagos que dichas compañías realizaban a la cúpula del partido que gestionaba los proyectos. Esto podría explicar la lógica con la que las autoridades españolas han estado elaborando los proyectos financiados con fondos europeos; por eso resulta necesario recabar la mayor información posible sobre la evaluación que la Comisión ha realizado de dichos proyectos.

A la vista de las críticas lanzadas por el Comisario, sobre la ejecución de dichos fondos consideramos necesario conocer qué proyectos, a la luz de las evaluaciones que la Comisión ha debido realizar, son considerados como «poco inteligentes» y cuáles son las alternativas que la Comisión Europea entiende que podrían haber sido ejecutadas en su lugar. Castilla-La Mancha es una de las regiones europeas con mayor desempleo y por eso urge conocer cómo evalúa el Comisario los proyectos realizados en la región.

— ¿Qué proyectos financiados con los fondos de cohesión suponen para la Comisión proyectos que no han servido para el impulso económico de Castilla-La Mancha y un despilfarro de los fondos europeos?

— ¿Qué alternativas considera que habrían podido ser financiadas en Castilla-La Mancha para generar un incremento de la actividad económica y un descenso del desempleo?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(15 de julio de 2013)

El 13 de mayo de 2013 el Sr. László Andor, Comisario de Empleo, Asuntos Sociales e Inclusión, participó en un debate en el que indicó que algunos fondos regionales de la UE se habían desaprovechado.

La Comisión desea dejar claro que las observaciones del Sr. Andor sobre el desaprovechamiento de los recursos del Fondo de Cohesión probablemente se malentendieron por problemas de interpretación. El Sr. Andor se refería a algunos importantes proyectos de infraestructuras que no siempre se han utilizado en el pasado de la mejor manera posible.

Por otra parte, las observaciones del Sr. Andor no se centraban en regiones concretas. Los estudios de evaluación muestran que, en conjunto, los fondos de la UE han contribuido significativamente al desarrollo de las economías y, por lo tanto, han contribuido a reducir las diferencias con otras regiones de la UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005454/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(16 May 2013)

Subject: Wasting of European funds in the Canary Islands

On 13 May 2013, László Andor, Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, took part in a debate held by the FUHEM Foundation in which he stated that Spain had wasted European cohesion funds by developing policies that were not very smart.

The Commissioner even claimed that such waste was at the root of the competitiveness problems hanging over the Spanish economy. In Spain, cohesion funds have been wasted on building useless or duplicated infrastructure that has not led to any improvement in competitiveness at all. Such infrastructure has only benefited the large construction companies, which ultimately have been the main recipients of European funds.

These funds have been used to benefit these companies for years, and information has recently come to light on the alleged payments that they have made to the leaders of the party administering the projects. That could account for the thinking behind the way the Spanish authorities have been drafting projects funded with European money; it is vital, therefore, to gather as much information as possible on the Commission's evaluation of those projects.

In light of the Commissioner's scathing remarks about the use of said funds, we believe we should be told which projects are regarded as not very smart, based on the evaluations that the Commission must have carried out, and what alternatives the Commission thinks could have been put into practice instead. The Canary Islands are among the regions with the highest unemployment in Europe, and we therefore need to know how the Commissioner rates the projects carried out in the region.

Which projects financed from cohesion funds does the Commission believe have not helped to boost the Canary Islands' economy and have been a waste of European funds?

What alternatives does it think could have been financed in the Canary Islands so as to increase economic activity and cut unemployment?

Question for written answer E-005885/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(27 May 2013)

Subject: Wasting of European funds in Murcia

On 13 May 2013, László Andor, the Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, took part in a debate held by the FUHEM Foundation in which he stated that Spain had wasted European cohesion funds by developing policies that were not very smart.

The Commissioner even claimed that such waste was at the root of the competitiveness problems hanging over the Spanish economy. In Spain, cohesion funds have been wasted on building useless or duplicated infrastructure that has not led to any improvement in competitiveness at all. Such infrastructure has only benefited the large construction companies, which ultimately have been the main recipients of European funds.

These funds have been used to benefit these companies for years, and information has recently come to light on the alleged payments that they have made to the leaders of the party administering the projects. That could account for the thinking behind the way the Spanish authorities have been drafting projects funded with European money. It is vital, therefore, to gather as much information as possible on the Commission's evaluation of those projects.

In the light of the Commissioner's scathing remarks about the use of said funds, we believe we should be told which projects are regarded as not very smart, based on the evaluations that the Commission must have carried out, and what alternatives the Commission thinks could have been put into practice instead. Murcia is among the regions with the highest unemployment in Europe and we therefore need to know how the Commissioner rates the projects carried out in the region.

Which projects financed from cohesion funds does the Commission believe have not helped to boost Murcia's economy and have been a waste of European funds?

What alternatives does it think could have been financed in Murcia so as to increase economic activity and cut unemployment?

Question for written answer E-006360/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(4 June 2013)

Subject: Waste of European funds in Castile-La Mancha

On 13 May 2013, László Andor, the Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, took part in a debate held by the FUHEM Foundation in which he stated that Spain had wasted European cohesion funds by developing policies that were not very smart.

The Commissioner even claimed that the competitiveness problems hanging over the Spanish economy stemmed from this very waste. In Spain, cohesion funds have been squandered on building useless or duplicated infrastructure that has not improved competitiveness in any way. Such infrastructure has only benefited the large construction companies, which ultimately have been the main recipients of European funds.

These funds have been used to benefit such companies for years, and information has recently come to light on the alleged payments they have made to the leaders of the party administering the projects. This may account for the logic applied by the Spanish authorities to drafting projects funded with European money; it is vital, therefore, to gather as much information as possible on the Commission's assessment of these projects.

In light of the Commissioner's scathing remarks about the use of said funds, we believe we should be told which projects, based on the Commission's assessments, are considered not to be smart, and what alternatives the Commission thinks could have been put into practice instead. Castile-La Mancha has one of the highest unemployment rates in Europe, so we need to know how the Commissioner rates the projects carried out in the region.

— Which projects financed from cohesion funds does the Commission believe have failed to boost Castile-La Mancha's economy and wasted European funds?

— What alternatives does it think could have been financed in Castile-La Mancha to increase economic activity and cut unemployment?

Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(15 July 2013)

On 13 May 2013 Mr László Andor, the member of the Commission for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, took part in a debate in which he stated that some EU regional funds had been wasted.

The Commission wishes to make it clear that Mr Andor's remarks on any waste of Cohesion Fund resources were probably misconstrued owing to difficulties of interpretation. He was referring to some major projects where infrastructure had not always been used in the smartest way in the past.

Moreover, the focus of Mr Andor's remarks was not on specific regions. Evaluation studies show that, as a whole, EU funds have contributed significantly to the development of the economies there and have consequently helped to narrow the gap with other EU regions.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-005753/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(22 maggio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Attacco contro un peschereccio nelle acque situate fra Taiwan e le Filippine

Il 9 maggio 2013 un guardacoste filippino ha attaccato un peschereccio taiwanese, provocando la morte di un pescatore di 65 anni. Sulla nave sono stati ritrovati oltre 50 fori di proiettile.

L'incidente è avvenuto in un'area in cui le zone economiche esclusive di Taiwan e delle Filippine si sovrappongono.

— È il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante a conoscenza di questo incidente?

— Intende il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante qualificare il ricorso alla forza armata contro un peschereccio nelle acque contese fra Taiwan e le Filippine quale violazione del diritto internazionale?

— Intende il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante sollevare la questione nell'ambito delle sue relazioni con le autorità filippine e condannarla quale atto suscettibile di compromettere la stabilità della regione?

Risposta congiunta dell'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(12 luglio 2013)

Sono a conoscenza del sinistro marittimo avvenuto il 9 maggio 2013 nelle acque situate tra le Filippine e Taiwan ed esprimo profondo rammarico per il decesso del sig. Hung Shih-Cheng, pescatore di Taiwan.

L'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha seguito da vicino gli sviluppi della controversia tra le Filippine e Taiwan grazie alle informazioni dettagliate raccolte dalla nostra delegazione a Manila e dal nostro ufficio a Taipei.

Le parti interessate stanno indagando sulla controversia in questione; riteniamo che entrambe debbano continuare ad agire con moderazione e impegnarsi per ridurre la tensione nell'area.

Il mare della Cina meridionale ha un'importanza cruciale non solo per i trasporti marittimi e per gli scambi commerciali, ma anche per la pesca; si tratta infatti di un'area fondamentale per le comunità costiere di vari paesi, che è altresì ricca di risorse minerarie. Il sinistro del 9 maggio 2013 è purtroppo l'ennesimo esempio di controversia dovuta alle numerose rivendicazioni territoriali sul mare della Cina meridionale.

Di conseguenza, sono da lungo tempo dell'opinione, formulata anche nella mia dichiarazione del 25 settembre 2012, che è opportuno incoraggiare tutte le parti interessate a collaborare e a cercare soluzioni pacifiche, nel rispetto del diritto internazionale, compresa la convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sul diritto del mare. L'UE ha esortato ripetutamente tutte le parti interessate a chiarire le ragioni delle rispettive rivendicazioni, nonché ad astenersi da qualsiasi pratica aggressiva o dall'uso della forza. Attenendosi a tali misure e basandosi sul rispetto reciproco, ritengo che si favorirebbe la creazione nel mare della Cina meridionale di un ambiente pacifico e di cooperazione caratterizzato da iniziative e soluzioni condivise.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005500/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 maja 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Filipiński statek ostrzeliwuje tajwańską łódź

Filipiny przyznały, że jeden ze statków straży przybrzeżnej tego kraju ostrzelał tajwańską łódź rybacką, czego skutkiem była śmierć 65-letniego mężczyzny oraz poważne uszkodzenie statku. Według rzecznika filipińskiej straży przybrzeżnej Armanda Balilo do incydentu doszło na filipińskich wodach terytorialnych i załoga statku po prostu wykonywała swoje obowiązki. Jednak według relacji opublikowanych przez tajwańskie media kapitan łodzi twierdzi, że nie wpłynął na wody filipińskie.

Tajwan od dawna stara się rozwiązywać spory terytorialne w odpowiedzialny i rozsądny sposób. Ten akt przemocy ze strony wojska filipińskiego przeciwko nieuzbrojonemu statkowi spowodował nie tylko ludzką tragedię, lecz przyczynił się też do wzrostu napięcia w regionie.

Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel zbadała tę sprawę?

Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel mogłaby przedstawić informacje dotyczące wód terytorialnych, na których doszło do wyżej opisanego incydentu?

Jaka jest opinia Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel w sprawie tego incydentu?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-005693/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(21 maja 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Ocena aktu agresji, którego dopuściła się filipińska straż przybrzeżna, ESDZ

W dniu 9 maja 2013 r. zarejestrowany w Republice Chińskiej (Tajwan) kuter rybacki o nazwie *Guang Da Xing nr 28* został ostrzelany przez statek filipińskiej straży przybrzeżnej (MCS3001). Do incydentu doszło 164 mile morskie na południowy-wschód od Przylądka Eluan Bi – miejsca, gdzie zachodzą na siebie wody tajwańskie i filipińskie – i 5 mil morskich od tymczasowej linii prawnego podziału. Wskutek tego zdarzenia członek załogi kutra rybackiego Hong Shi-cheng został postrzelony i zginął. Po incydencie filipiński statek rządowy odpłynął, nie oferując żadnej pomocy, co stanowiło naruszenie prawa międzynarodowego i stało wbrew zasadzie humanitaryzmu.

Od tego fatalnego w skutkach aktu agresji upłynęły już niemal dwa tygodnie, a Biuro Wysokiej Przedstawiciel nie wystosowało jeszcze żadnej reakcji. Wobec tego zwracam się do ESDZ o udzielenie odpowiedzi na następujące pytania:

1. Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel została poinformowana o tym incydencie i jego okolicznościach, w tym o śmierci Hong Shi-chenga oraz o fakcie, że statek filipiński po ataku odpłynął, nie oferując żadnej pomocy?

2. Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel zgadza się z twierdzeniem, że ten fatalny ostrzał w kierunku nieuzbrojonego cywila był „nieumyślnym spowodowaniem śmierci” i „aktem samoobrony”?

3. Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel jest zdania, że załoga statku filipińskiej straży przybrzeżnej złamała prawo międzynarodowe?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel i Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(12 lipca 2013 r.)

Dotarła do mnie informacja o incydencie morskim pomiędzy Filipinami i Tajwanem z dnia 9 maja 2013 r. i z wielkim żalem przyjęłam wiadomość o śmierci tajwańskiego rybaka Hung Shih-Chenga.

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca z uwagą obserwuje rozwój sporu, który wynikł pomiędzy Filipinami a Tajwanem, opierając się m.in. na szczegółowych informacjach zebranych przez Delegaturę Komisji w Manili i Biuro w Tajpej.

Śledztwa prowadzone przez strony są w toku i naszym zdaniem wszystkie strony powinny zachowywać powściągliwość i działać na rzecz uspokojenia sytuacji.

Morze Południowochińskie jest nie tylko obszarem ważnym dla transportu morskiego i handlu, ale również terenem połowowym, od którego uzależnione są społeczności zamieszkujące wybrzeża różnych krajów. Znajdują się tam również potencjalnie duże złoża zasobów mineralnych. Incydent z 9 maja 2013 r. to kolejny tragiczny przykład możliwych konsekwencji licznych pokrywających się roszczeń terytorialnych na Morzu Południowochińskim.

Dlatego też od dawna zajmuję w tej sprawie stanowisko – które wyraziłam w szczególności w oświadczeniu z dnia 25 września 2012 r. – polegające na zachęcaniu wszystkich zaangażowanych stron do poszukiwania pokojowych rozwiązań opierających się na współpracy, zgodnych z prawem międzynarodowym, a w szczególności z Konwencją Narodów Zjednoczonych o prawie morza. UE konsekwentnie apeluje do wszystkich stron o jasne przedstawienie podstaw wysuwanych roszczeń oraz o powstrzymanie się od agresywnych gestów i stosowania siły. Uważam, że przestrzeganie tych zasad w duchu wzajemnego szacunku przyczyniłoby się do stworzenia pokojowych warunków sprzyjających współpracy i wspólnym wysiłkom na rzecz rozwiązania sytuacji na Morzu Południowochińskim.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005500/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 May 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Philippine vessel fires shots at Taiwanese boat

The Philippines has admitted that one of its coastguard vessels shot at a Taiwanese fishing boat, leaving a 65-year-old man dead and badly damaging the ship. According to Philippines coastguard spokesman Armand Balilo, the incident took place in Philippines territorial waters and the coastguard crew was just doing its job. However, according to reports published in Taiwanese media, the boat's captain claims he did not enter Philippines waters.

Taiwan has a long record of approaching territorial disputes in a responsible and moderate manner. This act of violence by the Philippines military against an unarmed vessel has not only resulted in a human tragedy, but also raised tensions in the region.

Has the Vice-President/High Representative investigated this matter?

Could the Vice-President/High Representative provide information as regards the territorial waters in which this incident occurred?

What is the Vice-President/High Representative's view on the incident?

Question for written answer P-005693/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(21 May 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EEAS assessment of act of aggression by Philippine Coast Guard

On 9 May 2013, a fishing boat registered in the Republic of China (Taiwan), the *Guang Da Xing No 28*, was shot at by Philippine Coast Guard vessel MCS3001. The incident occurred 164 nautical miles south-east of Cape Eluanbi — where the waters of Taiwan and the Philippines overlap — and within 5 nautical miles of the temporary enforcement line. As a result, a member of the fishing boat's crew, Hong Shi-cheng, was shot and killed. After the incident, the Philippine government vessel sailed away without offering any assistance, in violation of international law and without showing any humanitarian spirit.

Almost two weeks have already passed since this fatal act of aggression took place, and there has been no reaction from the High Representative's office. I would therefore like the EEAS to answer the following questions:

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the incident and the circumstances surrounding it, including the death of Hong Shi-cheng, and the fact that the Philippine vessel sailed away without offering any assistance after the attack?

2. Does the Vice-President/High Representative agree with the claim that this fatal shooting of an unarmed civilian was an 'unintended killing' and an 'act of self-defence'?

3. Is the Vice-President/High Representative of the opinion that the Philippine Coast Guard crew violated international law?

Question for written answer P-005753/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(22 May 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Attack against a fishing vessel in the waters between Taiwan and the Philippines

On 9 May 2013 a Taiwanese fishing vessel was attacked by a Philippine Government vessel, resulting in the death of a 65-year-old fisherman. More than 50 bullet holes were found on the ship.

The incident took place in an area where the respective exclusive economic zones of Taiwan and the Philippines overlap.

— Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this incident?

— Will the Vice-President/High Representative qualify the use of armed force against a fishing vessel in the disputed waters between Taiwan and the Philippines as a violation of international law?

— Will the Vice-President/High Representative raise this issue in her dealings with the Philippine authorities and condemn it as an act that could compromise the stability of the region?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(12 July 2013)

I am aware of the maritime incident of 9th May 2013 between the Philippines and Taiwan, and very much regret the resulting loss of life of Mr Hung Shih-Cheng, a Taiwanese fisherman.

The HR/VP has been monitoring closely the development of the ensuing dispute between the Philippines and Taiwan, including through detailed information gathered by our Delegation in Manila and Office in Taipei.

Investigations by the parties are underway and we believe all sides should continue to exercise restraint and work towards de-escalating the situation.

The South China Sea is not a only crucial shipping and trading area but also a fishing ground which coastal communities from different countries depend on. It also potentially holds significant mineral resources. The incident of 9 May 2013 is yet another unfortunate example of the consequence of the many overlapping territorial claims in the South China Sea.

Therefore my long-held view on this issue, expressed notably in my statement of 25 September 2012, has been to encourage all parties concerned to seek peaceful and cooperative solutions in accordance with international law, including the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. The EU has been consistent in encouraging all parties to clarify the basis for their claims, refrain from any aggressive posturing or use of force. I believe that if these measures are observed, based on mutual respect, they would contribute to the creation of a peaceful and cooperative environment conducive to joint efforts and solutions in the South China Sea.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005586/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(20 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Tráfico de pessoas — declarações de Ban Ki-moon

Considerando que:

— O tráfico de seres humanos é um negócio que movimenta mais de 24 mil milhões de euros, do qual são vítimas mais de 2,4 milhões de pessoas por ano;

— Em declarações recentes, o Secretário-Geral das Nações Unidas, Ban Ki-moon, apelou aos países para que sejam «generosos» e aumentem as suas contribuições para o fundo voluntário das Nações Unidas destinado a prestar proteção e ajuda às vítimas do tráfico de seres humanos;

Pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

Qual a posição da UE relativamente a esta matéria?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005633/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(21 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Tráfico de pessoas — declarações de Ban Ki-moon

O tráfico de seres humanos é um negócio que movimenta mais de 24 mil milhões de euros e do qual são vítimas mais de 2,4 milhões de pessoas por ano.

Em declarações recentes, o secretário-geral das Nações Unidas, Ban Ki-moon, apelou aos países para que sejam «generosos» e aumentem as suas contribuições para o fundo voluntário das Nações Unidas destinado a prestar proteção e ajuda a vítimas do tráfico de seres humanos.

Pergunto à Comissão:

A UE tem apoiado ou prevê apoiar as Nações Unidas no que diz respeito ao tráfico de pessoas?

Resposta conjunta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão
(18 de julho de 2013)

A erradicação do tráfico de seres humanos é uma prioridade da UE desde há vários anos. Na sequência do documento de orientação do Conselho, de 2009, sobre o reforço da dimensão externa da luta contra o tráfico de seres humanos, foi adotada a Diretiva 2011/36/UE relativa à prevenção e luta contra o tráfico de seres humanos e à proteção das vítimas, bem como a estratégia da União Europeia para a erradicação do tráfico de seres humanos (2012-2016).

A UE aborda as questões relacionadas com o tráfico de seres humanos no quadro do diálogo e da cooperação com os países terceiros seus parceiros. A Comissão financiou muitos projetos nesta área tanto na UE como nas regiões e países terceiros. Estes projetos podem ser consultados em:
http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking

A UE apoia desde há muito os programas e projetos das Nações Unidas relacionados com o tráfico de seres humanos. O UNODC é um parceiro fundamental neste contexto. Mais de 13 milhões de euros foram disponibilizados ao UNODC para apoio a projetos de cooperação externa sobre o tráfico de seres humanos, nomeadamente o programa mundial contra o tráfico de pessoas. A UE também tem parcerias com o fim de erradicar o tráfico de seres humanos com outras entidades das Nações Unidas, como a OIT, a Unicef e o ACNUR.

A UE tenciona manter este apoio no futuro. Tendo em conta os instrumentos de apoio externo, o tráfico de seres humanos continuará a ser abordado no quadro do Instrumento de Cooperação para o Desenvolvimento (ICD) e do Instrumento Europeu para a Democracia e os Direitos Humanos (IEDDH). A Comissão considera a possibilidade de contribuir, no futuro, para o fundo das Nações Unidas de apoio às vítimas do tráfico de seres humanos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005586/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(20 May 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — People trafficking — Ban Ki-moon's statements

In view of the following:

— the fact that human trafficking is a business worth in excess of EUR 24 billion, with over 2.4 million victims every year;

— the fact that the Secretary-General of the UN, Ban Ki-moon, has called on countries to be 'generous' and to increase their contributions to the voluntary UN fund aimed at protecting and helping victims of people trafficking.

Can the Vice-President/High Representative state:

What is the EU's stance on this issue?

Question for written answer E-005633/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(21 May 2013)

Subject: Human trafficking — Ban Ki-moon's statements

Human trafficking is a business worth over EUR 24 billion, with in excess of 2.4 million victims every year.

The Secretary-General of the UN, Ban Ki-moon, has called on countries to be 'generous' and to increase their contributions to the voluntary UN fund aimed at protecting and helping victims of human trafficking.

Has the EU been supporting, or does it intend to support, the UN as regards human trafficking?

Joint answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2013)

Working towards eradicating trafficking in human beings (THB) has been an EU priority for several years. Following the Council's 2009 Action Oriented Paper on strengthening the external dimension of actions against trafficking in human beings, Directive 2011/36/EU on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims was adopted, as well as the EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings (2012-2016).

The EU is raising THB-related issues in the different formats of dialogue and cooperation it has established with third partners. The Commission has funded many different projects addressing THB within the EU and in third countries and regions. A compilation of these projects is available at http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking.

The EU is a long standing supporter of UN programmes and projects on THB. UNODC is a key partner. Over EUR 13 million have been provided to UNODC for the implementation of external cooperation actions on THB, including support to its Global Programme against Trafficking in Persons. The EU has also partnered with other UN entities to eradicate human trafficking, such as ILO, Unicef and UNHCR.

The EU intends to continue this support in the future. Regarding external funding instruments, THB will continue to be addressed under the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) and European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR). The Commission is considering the possibility of contributing to the UN Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Human Trafficking in the future.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005662/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(21. Mai 2013)

Betrifft: Verbraucherschutz — Olivenöl in Restaurants und Ansehen der EU

Laut Pressemitteilungen plant die Kommission eine Regelung zum Verbot von offenen Olivenölgefäßen in Restaurants. Sämtliches Olivenöl soll dort nur noch in Einweg-Plastikflaschen zur Verfügung gestellt werden. Dies dient laut Bekanntmachung vornehmlich dem Verbraucherschutz mit Blick auf die Produkttransparenz. Vielerorts sorgt diese Ankündigung für Unverständnis bei den Bürgern für diesen absurden Sachverhalt.

Gleichzeitig belegen neueste EU-weite Umfragen sich rapide verschlechternde Akzeptanzwerte der EU bei ihren Bürgern — insbesondere durch ihre mangelnde Bürgernähe. Daraus ergeben sich eine Reihe von Fragen:

1. Aufgrund welcher Studie(n) ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass offene Olivenölgefäße zu betrügerischen Aktivitäten gegen EU-Bürger verwendet werden?

2. Gibt es statistische Erkenntnisse darüber, wie viele Bürger jährlich diesem gemeinen Betrug erliegen? Wie hoch ist die hochgerechnete Dunkelziffer, entsprechend der Stichprobenwahl? Gibt es gesundheitliche Auswirkungen?

3. Wenn erwiesenermaßen der Großteil der Konsumententäuschung durch Vermengung von Olivenöl bereits bei der Herstellung erfolgt, welchen Zweck/Nutzen sieht die Kommission in dieser Regelung eines Verbots einer (vermuteten) vereinzelten späteren nochmaligen Vermengung am Restauranttisch?

4. Wie setzt sich angesichts der EU-weiten jährlichen Anzahl von Besuchen der EU-Bürger in Restaurants die der Initiative zugrunde liegende Kosten-Nutzen-Analyse der Kommission konkret zusammen?

5. Umfasst diese Kosten-Nutzen-Analyse auch die Kosten des entstehenden Plastikmülls, den Ansehensverlust und Spott für die EU bei ihren Bürgern sowie deren Verdacht und Vorwurf bezüglich Lobbyismus?

6. Welchen Einfluss hatte die Wirtschafts- und Schuldenkrise der Mitgliedstaaten, welche die Hauptproduzenten von Olivenöl sind, auf die Wahl des Olivenöls durch die Kommission als derzeit primäre Bedrohung am Restauranttisch?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005702/13
an die Kommission
Ismail Ertug (S&D)
(22. Mai 2013)

Betrifft: Verbot von Mehrweggefäßen für Olivenöl in Restaurants

Im Zuge der Reform der Durchführungsverordnung mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl plant die Kommission, mit einer Verordnung ab dem 1. Januar 2014 Mehrweggefäße für Olivenöl in Restaurants zu verbieten. Stattdessen sollen nur noch Einwegverpackungen verwendet werden dürfen. Dies solle der Lebensmittelsicherheit dienen und Verbraucher vor gepanschtem Olivenöl schützen.

Bei der Verwendung von Einwegbehältnissen besteht die große Gefahr, dass große Mengen an Olivenöl einfach weggeworfen werden, da die Verpackungen nicht komplett entleert werden. Wie will die Kommission sicherstellen, dass es hier nicht zu Lebensmittelverschwendung in großem Stil kommt?

Plant die Kommission, die Größen der neuen Einwegverpackungen vorzugeben, so dass eine möglichst kleine Menge an die Verbraucher gegeben wird?

Wie gedenkt die Kommission das Problem der Müllvermeidung anzugehen, wenn Einwegverpackungen eingesetzt werden?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005703/13
an die Kommission
Ismail Ertug (S&D)
(22. Mai 2013)

Betrifft: Verbraucherschutz bei Olivenöl, Essig und anderen Gewürzen in Restaurants

Im Zuge der Reform der Durchführungsverordnung mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl plant die Kommission mit einer Verordnung ab dem 1. Januar 2014 Mehrweggefäße für Olivenöl in Restaurants zu verbieten. Stattdessen sollen nur noch Einwegverpackungen verwendet werden dürfen. Dies solle der Lebensmittelsicherheit dienen und Verbraucher vor gepanschtem Olivenöl schützen.

Liegen der Kommission Erkenntnisse vor darüber, in welchem Ausmaß in Restaurants Olivenöl gepanscht und Verbraucher somit getäuscht wurden?

Warum wird nur Olivenöl erfasst, nicht aber Essig, Salz, Pfeffer, Zucker oder andere Würzmittel? Plant die Kommission, diese Vorschrift auch auf Essig auszuweiten? Soll das Verbot von wiederbefüllbaren Mehrwegbehältnissen auch auf Zucker-, Salz- und Pfefferstreuer erweitert werden?

Wie plant die Kommission mit sonstigen Würzmitteln umzugehen, die in wiederbefüllbaren Gefäßen in Restaurants serviert werden?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005705/13
an die Kommission
Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE)
(22. Mai 2013)

Betrifft: Änderung der Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl in der Gastronomie

Durch die Änderung der Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012 mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl soll laut Kommission eine Verschärfung der Olivenöl-Kontrollbestimmungen erfolgen. Es soll der Verbraucherschutz sichergestellt werden und die Konsumentinnen und Konsumenten sollen durch etikettiertes Olivenöl korrekt informiert werden. Erstmals soll die Anwendung der Olivenöl-Vermarktungsnormen auf den Gastronomiesektor erstreckt werden. Der Vorschlag sieht laut Kommission vor, dass in der Gastronomie Einweggebinde zu verwenden sind, bei denen ein Nachfüllen nicht möglich ist. Es wird folglich in Zukunft nicht mehr möglich sein, dass Olivenöl dem Gast auf dem Tisch oder in Karaffen zur Verfügung gestellt wird.

Liegen dem Entschluss der Kommission Erhebungen zugrunde, ob und welche Kosten diese Umstellung den betroffenen Akteuren der Wertschöpfungskette entstehen?

Welche ökonomischen Konsequenzen ergeben sich durch diese Regelung für den Olivenölsektor und ist dieser Maßnahme des Aktionsplans für den Olivenölsektor eine Folgenabschätzung vorangegangen?

Stellt der Vorschlag eine Ungleichbehandlung in Bezug auf andere hochwertige Pflanzenöle dar, da diese Bestimmung nur für Olivenöl, aber nicht für andere Öle gilt?

Könnte es durch diese Regelung zu einem verstärkten Wegwerfen von Lebensmitteln und zu mehr Abfall kommen? Wurde eine Folgenabschätzung in Hinblick auf die Verschwendung von Lebensmitteln und in Hinblick auf die Abfallproblematik unternommen?

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

Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage P-5718/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-005717/13
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(22 mai 2013)

Objet: Présentation de l'huile d'olive dans la restauration, l'hôtellerie et les cafés

Le 14 mai dernier, lors de la réunion du Comité de gestion de l'organisation commune des marchés agricoles, il a été décidé d'obliger les établissements de l'hôtellerie, de la restauration et des cafés à utiliser des bouteilles d'huile munies d'un système d'ouverture qui perd son intégrité après la première utilisation et d'un système de protection empêchant leur utilisation après épuisement du contenu indiqué sur l'étiquette. Ces établissements ne pourront donc plus proposer à leurs clients de l'huile d'olive dans de petites jarres en verre ou dans des bols.

Cette mesure, dont l'objectif est une meilleure protection des consommateurs, semble excessive et disproportionnée au regard des coûts et des bénéfices attendus.

En effet, les petits artisans et les PME fabricant de l'huile, bien souvent d'excellente qualité, n'auront pas les moyens financiers de conditionner l'huile selon ces critères et seront donc privés d'une clientèle importante.

La mise en place d'un tel conditionnement engendrera un coût supplémentaire également pour les grandes entreprises, qui sera répercuté sur le restaurateur et, en définitive, sur le consommateur.

Afin de régler le problème de l'information et de l'origine, il aurait été préférable d'augmenter les contrôles dans la restauration sur ce point, comme le prévoit le règlement d'exécution concerné dans d'autres domaines.

Dans ce contexte:

— La Commission a-t-elle évalué l'impact financier de cette mesure pour les consommateurs et les restaurateurs dans un contexte de crise et de baisse du pouvoir d'achat?

— La Commission a-t-elle évalué l'impact sur l'artisanat et les PME, alors même qu'elle s'est engagée à faire appliquer le principe de la «priorité aux PME»?

— La Commission souhaite-t-elle aller au bout de sa démarche, alors que les citoyens s'opposent à cette mesure, la raillent, et que l'Union est confrontée à une crise de défiance de la part de la population?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(28 juin 2013)

La Commission renvoie l'Honorable Parlementaire à sa réponse à la question écrite P-5718/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005599/13
aan de Commissie
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(21 mei 2013)

Betreft: EU gaat olijfolie in kannetjes verbieden

Volgens een bericht op de website van Elsevier [1] wil de Europese Commissie vanaf 1 januari 2014 olijfolie in kannetjes in restaurants verbieden.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Brussel verbiedt olijfoliekannetjes in restaurants"[1]?

2. Klopt het dat de Commissie voornemens is een verbod in te stellen op olijfoliekannetjes in restaurants, en dat enkel gesloten gelabelde flesjes olijfolie nog zijn toegestaan?

3. Kan de Commissie met bewijs onderbouwd aangeven hoeveel mensen er de afgelopen 30 jaar zijn overleden ten gevolge van olie in kannetjes in restaurants?

4. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat dit het zoveelste voorbeeld is van volstrekt doorgeslagen en overbodige consumentenbetutteling en regelverslaving van de Commissie?

5. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat voorbeelden als deze het failliet van de EU in het algemeen en het volstrekt falen van de Commissie in het bijzonder aantonen? Zo nee, waarom niet?

6. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat dit soort absurde plannen aantonen dat er te veel ambtenaren bij de Commissie werkzaam zijn? Zo nee, waarom niet?

7. Is de Commissie bereid om 75 % van de ongeveer 33 000 Commissieambtenaren naar huis te sturen? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005752/13
aan de Commissie
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(22 mei 2013)

Betreft: Olijfolie in hernieuwbare flessen

Klopt het dat de Commissie een voorstel heeft ingediend om Uitvoeringsverordening (EU) nr. 29/2012 betreffende de handelsnormen voor olijfolie aan te passen waarbij „olie die bedoeld is voor de eindgebruiker in hotels, bars en restaurants verpakt moet zijn in flessen die niet opnieuw verzegeld, noch hervuld kunnen worden"?

— Kan de Commissie aangeven welke ratio hierachter schuilt? Is dit geen verregaande betutteling?

— Welke besluitvormingsprocedure werd in deze gevolgd en wie nam het uiteindelijke besluit?

— Is er een afweging gemaakt inzake proportionaliteit?

— Hoe denkt de Commissie deze maatregel te controleren?

Antwoord van de heer Cioloş namens de Commissie
(28 juni 2013)

De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid naar haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag P-5718/2013 [2].

---

[1] http://www.elsevier.nl/Europese-Unie/nieuws/2013/5/Brussel-verbiedt-olijfoliekannetjes-in-restaurants-1259043W/.
[2] http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/nl/parliamentary-questions.html

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-005805/13
till kommissionen
Åsa Westlund (S&D)
(23 maj 2013)

Angående: Om förbud mot olivolja i påfyllbara förpackningar

De senaste dagarna har det rapporterats flitigt i svenska och utländska medier om ett nytt EU-beslut om krav på märkning av olivoljeförpackningar och förbud mot påfyllningsbara behållare på restauranger.

Beslutet har väckt stor uppmärksamhet och även skepsis mot vad som bör anses som EU-kompetens. Kritiken känns berättigad. Självklart bör konsumentens bästa vara i fokus och jag välkomnar naturligtvis tydligare livsmedelsmärkningar, men detta beslut tycks gå för långt.

Med anledning av detta vill jag ställa följande frågor till kommissionen:

— Vilka kostnader räknar kommissionen med att implementeringen av beslutet kommer att kosta? Både för tillverkare av olivolja, krögare och myndigheters övervakning av beslutets efterlevnad?

— Vilka miljökonsekvenser räknar kommissionen med då möjligheten till refill-behållare försvinner och med hänsyn till framtagande av nya förpackningar?

— I flera EU-direktiv som rör miljö och avfallshantering ses återanvändning som något positivt. Behållare och material som är möjliga att använda upprepade gånger har hittills betraktats som eftersträvansvärt. Bör det nya beslutet ses som ett skifte i EU:s syn på återanvändning?

Samlat svar från Dacian Cioloş på kommissionens vägnar
(28 juni 2013)

Kommissionen ber att få hänvisa parlamentsledamoten till sitt svar på den skriftliga frågan P-5718/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/sv/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005599/13
to the Commission
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(21 May 2013)

Subject: EU is going to ban olive oil in jugs

Following a report which appeared on the Elsevier website ([1]), the Commission wants to ban olive oil being served in jugs in restaurants from 1 January 2014.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the report 'Brussel verbiedt olijfoliekannetjes in restaurants' [Brussels bans olive oil jugs in restaurants]?

2. Is it true that the Commission intends to ban the use of olive oil jugs in restaurants and to only still allow the use of closed, labelled bottles of olive oil?

3. Can the Commission provide proof indicating how many people have died from oil served in jugs in restaurants over the last 30 years?

4. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that this is the latest example of the Commission adopting a completely excessive, unnecessary 'nanny-state' approach to consumers and being obsessed by regulations?

5. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that such examples highlight that, in general, the EU is a failure and, in particular, the Commission is a complete flop? If not, why not?

6. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that such absurd plans prove that there are too many officials employed by the Commission? If not, why not?

7. Is the Commission prepared to send home 75% of its 33 000 or so officials? If not, why not?

Question for written answer E-005662/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(21 May 2013)

Subject: Consumer protection — olive oil in restaurants and the EU's standing

According to press releases, the Commission is planning a regulation banning the use of open jugs of olive oil in restaurants. All olive oil served in restaurants will have to be in disposable plastic bottles. According to the press release, the main purpose of this is to protect consumers from the point of view of product transparency. Citizens all over the EU are perplexed by this absurd announcement.

At the same time, according to recent EU-wide surveys, the EU is rapidly losing acceptance among the public, mainly because it is out of touch with ordinary people. This gives rise to a series of questions:

1. Based on what studies does the Commission take the view that olive oil is being served in jugs in order to deceive EU citizens?

2. Are there any annual statistics on the number of citizens subject to this dastardly deception? How big is the estimated number of unreported cases, based on the sample selected? Are there any health implications?

3. Given that it has been proven that most consumer fraud takes place at manufacturing level, when olive oil is mixed, what — in the Commission's view — is the point of banning (suspected) further mixing thereafter in restaurants?

4. Based on the number of times a year citizens throughout the EU visit restaurants, how does the Commission's cost-benefit analysis on which the initiative is based break down?

([1]) http://www.elsevier.nl/Europese-Unie/nieuws/2013/5/Brussel-verbiedt-olijfoliekannetjes-in-restaurants-1259043W/

5. Does that cost-benefit analysis also include the cost of the plastic waste generated and the ridicule and loss of standing of the EU among the public and their suspicions and complaints concerning lobbying?

6. What influence did the economic and debt crisis of the Member States which are the main producers of olive oil have on the Commission's choice of olive oil as the main threat in restaurants at the present time.

Question for written answer E-005702/13
to the Commission
Ismail Ertug (S&D)
(22 May 2013)

Subject: Ban on refillable olive oil vessels in restaurants

As part of the reform of the Implementing Regulation on marketing standards for olive oil, the Commission is planning to prohibit refillable vessels for olive oil in restaurants by means of a regulation taking effect on 1 January 2014. The idea is to replace such vessels with disposable containers. This is intended to promote food safety and protect consumers against the adulteration of olive oil.

If disposable containers are used, there is a great risk that large amounts of olive oil will simply be thrown away as containers will not be emptied completely. How will the Commission ensure that this does not lead to large-scale food waste?

Is the Commission planning to specify the sizes of the new disposable packaging so that the smallest possible amount is given to the consumer?

How will the Commission tackle the issue of waste prevention if disposable packaging is used?

Question for written answer E-005703/13
to the Commission
Ismail Ertug (S&D)
(22 May 2013)

Subject: Consumer protection relating to olive oil, vinegar and other seasonings in restaurants

As part of the reform of the Implementing Regulation on marketing standards for olive oil, the Commission is planning to prohibit refillable vessels for olive oil in restaurants by means of a regulation taking effect on 1 January 2014. The idea is to replace such vessels with disposable containers. This is intended to promote food safety and protect consumers against the adulteration of olive oil.

Does the Commission have any information as to the prevalence of adulterated olive oil in restaurants and the extent to which consumers are thus misled?

Why is only olive oil covered and not vinegar, salt, pepper, sugar or other seasonings? Is the Commission planning to extend this rule to vinegar, too? Should the ban on refillable reusable containers also be extended to sugar, salt and pepper shakers?

How does the Commission plan to deal with other seasonings that are served in refillable containers in restaurants?

Question for written answer E-005705/13
to the Commission
Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE)
(22 May 2013)

Subject: Amendment of the marketing standards for olive oil in restaurants

According to the Commission, the amendment of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil should lead to the tightening up of control regulations for olive oil. This is intended to protect consumers and to provide them with correct information through the labelling of olive oil. The application of olive oil marketing standards is to be extended to cover the catering sector for the first time. The Commission proposal provides for the use of non-refillable disposable containers in the restaurant trade. In the future it will thus no longer be possible to make olive oil available to guests at the table or in carafes.

Is the Commission's decision based on surveys as to whether this change will result in any costs for the relevant parties in the value chain and, if so, what will these costs be?

What economic implications will this have for the olive oil sector, and was this action plan for the olive oil sector preceded by an impact assessment?

Does this proposal treat olive oil differently in relation to other high-quality vegetable oils, since this provision applies only to olive oil and not to other oils?

Is this regulation likely to lead to more food being thrown away and more waste? Has an impact assessment been carried with regard to food waste and the waste problem?

Question for written answer P-005717/13
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(22 May 2013)

Subject: Serving olive oil in restaurants, hotels and cafes

On 14 May 2013, at a meeting of the Management Committee for the Common Organisation of Agricultural Markets, a decision was made to require hotels, restaurants and cafes to serve olive oil in bottles which cannot be resealed or refilled and which have to be thrown away once the contents indicated on the label have been used up. As a result, the establishments in question will no longer be able to serve their customers olive oil in small glass jugs and dipping bowls.

This measure, which is designed to improve consumer protection, seems unnecessarily stringent and the cost of implementing it would far outweigh the expected benefits to consumers.

SMEs and small, local producers of what is often high-quality olive oil will not be able to afford to bottle their oil in accordance with these criteria and will lose many customers as a result.

The introduction of these bottling requirements will also result in higher production costs for larger companies, which will be passed on to restaurant owners and, ultimately, to consumers.

The problems concerning the labelling of oil could have been dealt with more effectively by increasing the number of on-site checks at establishments serving food, as provided for by the implementing regulation concerned in other areas.

— Has the Commission assessed the financial implications for consumers and restaurant owners of this measure at this time of economic crisis when people have less money to spend?

— Given its commitment to the 'Think Small First' principle, has the Commission assessed how this measure is likely to affect local producers and SMEs?

— Does the Commission intend to push on with its plans, despite the widespread criticism and ridicule they have provoked at a time when the EU is facing a crisis of public confidence?

Question for written answer E-005752/13
to the Commission
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(22 May 2013)

Subject: Olive oil in recyclable bottles

Is it true that the Commission has submitted a proposal to adapt Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil, whereby 'oil intended for end consumers in hotels, bars and restaurants must be packed in non-resealable, non-refillable bottles'?

— Can the Commission explain the reasoning behind this? Is this not excessive 'nannying'?

— What decision-making procedure was followed in this process, and who made the ultimate decision?

— Has any consideration been given to proportionality?

— How is the Commission thinking of monitoring this measure?

Question for written answer E-005805/13
to the Commission
Åsa Westlund (S&D)
(23 May 2013)

Subject: Banning olive oil in refillable vessels

There have been extensive reports in recent days in the Swedish and foreign media concerning a new EU decision on labelling requirements for olive oil packaging and a ban on refillable vessels in restaurants.

The decision has attracted widespread attention and even scepticism as to what should be considered an EU competence. This criticism seems justified. Whilst the focus should obviously be on what is best for the consumer and I can only welcome clearer food labelling, this decision seems to go too far.

— What is the Commission's estimated cost of implementing this decision — for olive oil manufacturers, restaurateurs and the authorities monitoring compliance with the decision?

— What is the Commission's calculation of the environmental impact of banning refillable vessels and developing new forms of packaging?

— Many EU directives concerning the environment and waste management see recycling as a good thing, and containers and materials that can be used many times have hitherto been regarded as desirable. Does this new decision represent a shift in the EU's approach to recycling?

Joint answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-5718/2013 [2].

---

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

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005631/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(21 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Desabamento de edifício no Bangladeche

Considerando que:

— A empresa sueca H&M e o grupo espanhol Inditex (que detém a Zara) vão assinar um acordo juridicamente vinculativo sobre a proteção contra incêndios e a segurança dos edifícios onde são fabricados os seus produtos no Bangladeche;

— Esta iniciativa aparece três semanas após o desabamento de um edifício onde funcionava uma fábrica, em Daca, que provocou a morte de 1 100 pessoas;

— Que a UE deveria criar mecanismos destinados a evitar práticas comerciais com empresas dos mercados emergentes que violem regras básicas de proteção no trabalho ou de proteção social dos trabalhadores, que recorram a práticas lesivas do meio ambiente ou que constituam risco para a saúde pública;

— Para além de motivos de princípio, acresce o facto de estas práticas redundarem em consequências lesivas das suas regras de mercado, promovendo o *dumping*, que afeta o tecido produtivo Europeu.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

O que pensa sobre a criação dos mecanismos enunciados no terceiro considerando?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005674/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(21 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Acidente no Bangladeche

Um acidente industrial no Bangladeche, a derrocada de um edifício de nove andares onde operavam cinco fábricas e trabalhavam 3 000 pessoas, provocou até agora cerca de 650 mortos e dezenas de desaparecidos. Essas fábricas forneciam conhecidas marcas ocidentais, algumas delas europeias.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Não considera que o recurso, nestas condições, a empresas de países emergentes, só para satisfazer expectativas de margens de lucro de empresas e comerciantes europeus, potencia num ciclo interminável as más condições, principalmente do ponto de vista social, em que aquelas empresas laboram?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005812/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Bangladeche — acordo com marcas europeias de roupa

Os fabricantes do setor têxtil no Bangladeche elogiaram nesta quarta-feira o acordo anunciado por várias grandes marcas europeias de roupa para melhorar a segurança das fábricas do país, após a morte de 1 127 trabalhadores no desabamento de um edifício, em 24 abril, perto de Daca.

A italiana Benetton, as espanholas Zara e Mango, a britânica Marks and Spencer e a sueca H&M assinaram um protocolo que prevê, entre outras coisas, que as inspeções das fábricas e unidades do setor têxtil sejam feitas por pessoas independentes para garantir que a segurança é fiável e eficaz.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Tem conhecimento deste acordo?

— Como o avalia?

— Crê que o mesmo constitui um bom exemplo e uma prática a seguir pelas empresas europeias que operam em países em desenvolvimento?

— Que falhas lhe aponta?

Resposta conjunta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(9 de julho de 2013)

A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para as respostas dadas a perguntas anteriores ([1]).

A Comissão congratula-se com o Acordo sobre a Segurança dos Edifícios e a Segurança em caso de Incêndio no Bangladeche, que foi assinado por mais de 40 das principais marcas de moda e venda a retalho de vestuário, na sua grande maioria europeias, que produzem no Bangladeche e incentiva outras a fazer o mesmo. O acordo visa estabelecer um programa de segurança em caso de incêndio e de segurança dos edifícios no Bangladeche, por um período de cinco anos. Entre as medidas previstas contam-se inspeções de segurança, despoluição e formação em matéria de segurança contra incêndios nas instalações. Os signatários pretendem que a Organização Internacional do Trabalho (OIT) assuma um papel preponderante de apoio à execução do acordo.

Além disso, tanto a Comissão como o SEAE estão em contacto com a OIT e com o Governo do Bangladeche para decidir a melhor forma de resolver estas questões e de garantir os direitos dos trabalhadores, incluindo a liberdade de associação e a saúde e segurança no trabalho. Estamos a refletir em conjunto sobre a melhor forma de utilizar a assistência da UE ao Bangladeche para alicerçar os progressos e enfrentar os problemas subjacentes.

([1]) E-004552, E-004788, E-004847, E-005364, E-005082 e E-005469.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005631/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(21 May 2013)

Subject: Collapsed building in Bangladesh

In view of the fact that:

— the Swedish company H&M and the Spanish Inditex group (owner of Zara) are going to sign a legally binding agreement on fire protection and the safety of buildings where their products are manufactured in Bangladesh;

— this initiative appeared three weeks after a building housing a factory collapsed in Dhaka, killing 1 100 people;

— the EU should create mechanisms aimed at preventing companies in emerging markets from using commercial practices that breach basic rules governing worker protection in the workplace and society, that use environmentally unfriendly practices, or that constitute a public health risk;

— reasons of principle aside, the consequences of these practices are harmful to EU market rules because they promote dumping, which affects European industry.

Can the Commission state:

What is its view of the mechanisms set out in my third point?

Question for written answer E-005674/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(21 May 2013)

Subject: Accident in Bangladesh

An industrial accident in Bangladesh has destroyed a nine-storey building, in which five factories were operated and 3 000 people worked. To date, 650 people have died and dozens disappeared. These factories supplied clothes for Western brands, some of them European.

Does the Commission agree that using companies in emerging countries that operate in these conditions simply to meet the profit-margin expectations of European companies and traders feeds into the interminable cycle of poor conditions, especially from a social point of view, in which these companies operate?

Question for written answer E-005812/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 May 2013)

Subject: Bangladesh — agreement with European clothing brands

On Wednesday, manufacturers in Bangladesh's textile industry welcomed an agreement announced by several major European clothing brands designed to improve safety in the country's factories, following the death of 1 127 workers in a building collapse near Dhaka on 24 April.

The Italian company Benetton, Spanish firms Zara and Mango, British retailer Marks and Spencer and Swedish giant H&M signed a protocol which establishes, among other things, that independent professionals are to carry out inspections of textile factories and production units to ensure that reliable and effective safety standards are being met.

— Is the Commission aware of this agreement?

— What is its assessment of it?

— Does it believe that this is a good example and a practice that European companies operating in developing countries should follow?

— What shortcomings does it highlight?

Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Members to answers given to previous questions ([1]).

The Commission welcomes the Accord on Fire and Building Safety in Bangladesh, which has been signed by over 40, mainly European, major fashion and retail brands sourcing garments from Bangladesh and encourages more to do so. The Accord aims to establish a fire and building safety programme in Bangladesh for a period of five years. Planned measures include safety inspections, remediation and fire safety training at facilities. The signatories welcome a strong role for the International Labour Organisation (ILO) to assist implementation.

In addition, both the Commission and the EEAS are in contact with the ILO and the Government of Bangladesh to see how to best address these issues and how best to ensure workers' rights, including freedom of association and health and safety at work. We are jointly reflecting on how best to use EU assistance to Bangladesh to underpin progress and address the underlying problems.

([1]) E-004552, E-004788, E-004847, E-005364, E-005082, E-005469.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005666/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(21 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: União bancária

Considerando que:

Segundo Wolfgang Schäuble, ministro das Finanças alemão, para se realizar uma união bancária a UE necessitaria de mudar os tratados.

Pergunta-se:

Também considera necessário a alteração dos tratados para que se realize a união bancária?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005667/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(21 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: União Bancária Europeia

O ministro das Finanças alemão, Wolfgang Schäuble, defendeu num artigo publicado no *Financial Times* a criação de uma união bancária «em dois tempos», argumentando que os atuais tratados europeus não conferem à União Europeia competências para que se possa «ancorar de forma inabalável uma nova e forte autoridade central de resolução».

Concorda a Comissão com a visão do ministro das Finanças europeu de que é necessária uma alteração dos tratados europeus para que se consiga uma verdadeira união bancária europeia supranacional?

Resposta conjunta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão
(9 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão adotou, em 10 de julho de 2013, uma proposta de regulamento relativo a um mecanismo único de resolução (MUR). A base jurídica do regulamento proposto é o artigo 114.° do TFUE. As medidas adotadas com esta base visam a aproximação das disposições legislativas, regulamentares e administrativas dos Estados-Membros e o estabelecimento ou o melhor funcionamento do mercado interno. A Comissão considera que a proposta relativa ao MUR respeita ambos os critérios.

Em primeiro lugar, a proposta estabelece regras e procedimentos uniformes em todo o mercado interno para a resolução das crises bancárias abrangidas pelo âmbito de aplicação do regulamento do Conselho que confere ao BCE atribuições específicas no que diz respeito às políticas de supervisão prudencial das instituições de crédito. A recente crise veio evidenciar que a falência de bancos num Estado-Membro pode comprometer a estabilidade dos mercados financeiros de toda a União.

Em segundo lugar, a proposta melhorará o funcionamento do mercado interno através da eliminação da desvantagem que os bancos da área do euro sofrem devido à divergência entre os níveis em que a supervisão e a resolução são realizadas. Um mecanismo de resolução centralizado para todos os bancos que operam nos Estados-Membros da área do euro é, por conseguinte, essencial para alinhar a supervisão e a resolução, que estão inextrincavelmente ligadas. Eliminará também as disparidades a nível do funcionamento dos mercados bancários em função da solidez financeira dos Estados.

O processo de tomada de decisões no âmbito do MUR, tal como proposto, não exige uma alteração do Tratado e assegura o equilíbrio institucional apropriado e a base jurídica para complementar o MUS com um quadro eficiente para a resolução de crises bancárias, em conformidade com as conclusões do Conselho Europeu de dezembro de 2012 e junho de 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005666/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(21 May 2013)

Subject: Banking union

Wolfgang Schäuble, Germany's Finance Minister, has stated that EU banking union will require Treaty change.

Does the Commission also consider Treaty change necessary if we are to have banking union?

Question for written answer E-005667/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(21 May 2013)

Subject: European banking union

In a *Financial Times* article, Wolfgang Schäuble, Germany's Finance Minister, has advocated the creation of a 'two-step' banking union, arguing that the current European Treaties do not give the EU powers to 'to anchor beyond doubt a new and strong central resolution authority'.

Does the Commission agree with this European finance minister that European Treaty change is necessary if we are to achieve a genuine supranational banking union?

Joint answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

The Commission has adopted on 10 July 2013 a proposal for a regulation on a Single Resolution Mechanism (SRM). The legal basis for the proposed regulation is Article 114 TFEU. Measures adopted on that basis aim at the approximation of the provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in Member States and the establishment or better functioning of the internal market. The Commission considers that the SRM proposal fulfils both criteria.

First, the proposal lays down uniform rules and a uniform procedure within the whole internal market for the resolution of banks which fall within the scope of Council Regulation conferring specific tasks on the ECB concerning policies relating to the prudential supervision of credit institutions. The recent crisis highlighted that the failure of banks in one Member State may affect the stability of the financial markets of the whole Union.

Second, the proposal will improve the functioning of the internal market by removing the disadvantage that banks in the Euro area suffer because of the misalignment between the levels at which supervision and resolution are conducted. A centralised resolution mechanism for all banks operating in the Euro area Member States is therefore essential to align supervision and resolution which are inextricably interrelated. It will also remove disparities in the functioning of banking markets function depending on the strength of the sovereign.

The decision making process within the SRM, as proposed, does not require a Treaty change and it ensures the appropriate institutional balance and legal underpinning to complement the SSM with an efficient framework for bank resolution, in line with the conclusions of the European Council of December 2012 and June 2013.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005742/13
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(22 de mayo de 2013)

Asunto: Fractura hidráulica en Aragón (I)

Los estudios sobre repercusiones de la extracción de gas y petróleo de esquisto mediante fractura hidráulica «*fracking*» en el medio ambiente y la salud humana ponen de manifiesto los elevados riesgos que comporta esta técnica minera, dada su toxicidad, potencial sismicidad y limitada capacidad técnica existente para la prevención de tales riesgos. Sin embargo, y a pesar de ello, en Aragón se está tramitando la autorización de permiso de investigación para un campo de explotación en las comarcas del Maestrazgo y Gúdar-Javalambre con diferentes afecciones potenciales para la Red Natura 2000. Se trata del campo denominado «Platón», que afectaría a la ZEPA Río Guadalope-Maestrazgo y a los LICs Muelas y Estrechos del río Guadalope, Rambla de las Truchas y Maestrazgo y Sierra de Gúdar.

¿Cree la Comisión que estos proyectos son compatibles con la legislación europea en materia de aguas, con la preservación de la Red Natura 2000, con las actividades económicas (ganadería, agricultura, etc.) existentes en esa zona y con la preservación de la seguridad y la salud humanas?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005743/13
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(22 de mayo de 2013)

Asunto: Fractura hidráulica en Aragón (II)

Los estudios sobre repercusiones de la extracción de gas y petróleo de esquisto mediante fractura hidráulica «*fracking*» en el medio ambiente y la salud humana ponen de manifiesto los elevados riesgos que comporta esta técnica minera, dada su toxicidad, potencial sismicidad y limitada capacidad técnica existente para la prevención de tales riesgos. Sin embargo, y a pesar de ello, en Aragón se está tramitando la solicitud de autorización de varios campos de explotación al norte y al sur de la ciudad de Fraga, con diferentes afecciones potenciales para la Red Natura 2000: el campo «Perseo» afectaría a la ZEPA Embalse del Pas y Santa Rita y al LIC Río Cinca y Alcanadre; el campo «Prometeo» a la ZEPA Valcuerna, Serreta Negra y Liberola y El Basal, Las Menorcas y Llanos de Cardiel y al LIC Basal de Ballobar y Balsalet de Don Juan; el campo «Atlas» también afectaría al LIC Basal de Ballobar y Balsalet de Don Juan, al Serreta Negra y al Liberola-Serreta Negra, y a las ZEPAs La Retuerta y Saladas de Sástago y Valcuerna, Serreta Negra y Liberola; por último, el campo «Helios» alcanza a las ZEPAs La Retuerta y Saladas de Sástago y Matarraña-Aiguabarreix, así como a los LICs Río Guadalope, Val de Fabara y Val de Pilas, Efesa de la Villa, Río Matarranya y Río Algars.

¿Cree la Comisión que estos proyectos son compatibles con la legislación europea en materia de aguas, con la preservación de la Red Natura 2000, con las actividades económicas (ganadería, agricultura, etc.) existentes en esas zonas y con la preservación de la seguridad y la salud humanas?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005744/13
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(22 de mayo de 2013)

Asunto: Fractura hidráulica en Aragón (III)

Los estudios sobre repercusiones de la extracción de gas y petróleo de esquisto mediante fractura hidráulica «*fracking*» en el medio ambiente y la salud humana ponen de manifiesto los elevados riesgos que comporta esta técnica minera, dada su toxicidad, potencial sismicidad y limitada capacidad técnica existente para la prevención de tales riesgos. Sin embargo, y a pesar de ello, en Aragón se está tramitando la solicitud de autorización de investigación para varios campos de explotación en las inmediaciones de la ciudad de Zaragoza, en concreto el denominado «Kepler», que afectaría a las ZEPAs Estepas de Monegrillo y Pina y Sierra de), así como a los LICs Sotos y mejanas del Ebro, Bajo Gállego, Montes de Alfajarín-Saso de Osera Alcubierre y Galachos de la Alfranca de Pastriz, La Cartuja y El Burgo de Ebro) y el denominado «Copérnico» (que abarca la ZEPA Estepas de Belchite-El Planerón-La Lomaza y el LIC Planas y estepas de la margen derecha del Ebro).

¿Cree la Comisión que estos proyectos son compatibles con la legislación europea en materia de aguas, con la preservación de la Red Natura 2000, con las actividades económicas existentes en esas zonas y con la preservación de la seguridad y la salud humanas?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005745/13
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(22 de mayo de 2013)

Asunto: Fractura hidráulica en Aragón (IV)

Los estudios sobre repercusiones de la extracción de gas y petróleo de esquisto mediante fractura hidráulica («fracking») en el medio ambiente y la salud humana ponen de manifiesto los elevados riesgos que comporta esta técnica minera, dada su toxicidad, potencial sismicidad y limitada capacidad técnica existente para la prevención de tales riesgos. Sin embargo, y a pesar de ello, en Aragón se ha concedido un permiso de investigación para un campo de explotación (denominado «Aquiles») en la zona donde se ubica el embalse de La Loteta, que se construyó con ayuda financiera de la Unión Europea dentro de un proyecto para el suministro de agua potable para la ciudad de Zaragoza y 22 municipios de su entorno (821 000 habitantes), infraestructura que podría verse afectada por posibles filtraciones y fugas tóxicas provenientes de este tipo de explotación. También están expuestas a estas posibles afecciones tres LICs de la Red Natura 2000: Monte Alto y Siete Cabezos, Laguna de Plantados y laguna de Agón y Sotos y Mejanas del Ebro.

¿Cree la Comisión que el proyecto para el que se ha autorizado dicha investigación en esta zona es compatible con la legislación europea en materia de aguas, con la preservación de la Red Natura 2000, con las actividades económicas (agricultura, ganadería, etc.) existentes en esa zona y con la preservación de la seguridad y la salud humanas?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005746/13
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(22 de mayo de 2013)

Asunto: Fractura hidráulica en Aragón (V)

Los estudios sobre repercusiones de la extracción de gas y petróleo de esquisto mediante fractura hidráulica («fracking») en el medio ambiente y la salud humana ponen de manifiesto los elevados riesgos que comporta esta técnica minera, dada su toxicidad, potencial sismicidad y limitada capacidad técnica existente para la prevención de tales riesgos. Sin embargo, y a pesar de ello, en Aragón se está tramitando la autorización de investigación para varios campos de explotación en la zona pirenaica que comportan afecciones a diferentes espacios protegidos de la Red Natura 2000: el denominado «Berdún» (que afecta a las ZEPAs de Salvatierra-Foces de Fago y Biniés-Barranco del Infierno, los sotos y carrizales del río Aragón y Sierras de Leyre y Orba y los LICs Río Aragón — Canal de Berdún, San Juan de la Peña y Oroel, Río Aragón (Jaca), Río Aragón — Canal de Berdún, Río Veral, San Juan de la Peña, Foz de Salvatierra y Sierras de Leyre y Orba), el «Plácido» (con afecciones al Parque Nacional de Ordesa y su área de influencia y la ZEPA Sierra de Canciás-Silves, Río Ara-Valle de Broto), el «Biescas» (ZEPA Viñamala y LICs Telera — Acumuer, Puerto de Otal — Cotefablo, Sobrepuerto y Río Gállego (Ribera de Biescas)), «Ainsa» (ZEPA Sierra de Canciás-Silves y LICs Cueva de los Moros, Cuenca del río Yesa, Cuenca del río Airés, Santa María de Ascaso, Silves, Parque Natural Sierra y Cañones de Guara y Guara Norte), «Carlota» (LICs Sierra de Arro, Sierra Ferrera y Sierra de Esdolomada y Morrones de Güel) y el «Turbón» (ZEPAs de El Turbón y Sierra de Sis y LICs El Turbón, Sierra de Esdolomada y Morrones de Güel, Río Isábena, Garganta de Obarra, Congosto de Sopeira, Sierra del Castillo de Laguarres) así como fuentes termales como las de Tiermas y el balneario de Vilas del Turbón.

¿Cree la Comisión que estos proyectos son compatibles con la legislación europea en materia de aguas, con la preservación de la Red Natura 2000, con las actividades económicas (turismo, termalismo, ganadería, agricultura, etc.) existentes en esas zonas y con la preservación de la seguridad y la salud humanas?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de julio de 2013)

La Comisión no sigue de cerca en concreto ninguna operación de explotación de gas esquisto en zonas o regiones específicas. Corresponde a los Estados miembros velar —mediante la realización de evaluaciones adecuadas y de actividades de seguimiento, así como a través de la concesión de permisos— por que cualquier investigación o explotación de fuentes de energía, incluida la fractura hidráulica, cumpla los requisitos del marco jurídico vigente en la EU, en particular en materia de evaluaciones de impacto ambiental y participación del público ([1]), de protección de las aguas superficiales y subterráneas ([2]), de gestión de residuos ([3]) y de conservación de los hábitats naturales ([4]).

([1]) Directiva 2011/92/UE, relativa a la evaluación de las repercusiones de determinados proyectos públicos y privados sobre el medio ambiente (DO L 26 de 28.1.2012, p. 1).

([2]) Directiva 2000/60/CE, por la que se establece un marco comunitario de actuación en el ámbito de la política de aguas (DO L 327 de 22.12.2000, p. 1) y Directiva 2006/118/CE, relativa a la protección de las aguas subterráneas contra la contaminación y el deterioro (DO L 372 de 27.12.2006, p. 19).

([3]) Directiva 2006/21/CE, sobre la gestión de los residuos de industrias extractivas y por la que se modifica la Directiva 2004/35/CE (DO L 102 de 11.4.2006, p. 15).

([4]) Directiva 92/43/CE, relativa a la conservación de los hábitats naturales y de la fauna y flora silvestres (DO L 206 de 22.7.1992, p. 7).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005742/13
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(22 May 2013)

Subject: Hydraulic fracturing in Aragón (I)

Studies on the impact on the environment and on human health of extracting gas and oil from shale using hydraulic fracturing ('fracking') show the high risks involved in this mining technique, given its toxicity, potential seismicity and the limited technical capacity currently available to prevent such risks. However, despite this, the process is under way in Aragón to authorise exploration of an extraction field in the districts of Maestrazgo and Gúdar-Javalambre, with several potential adverse effects on the Red Natura 2000 network. The field in question, the so-called 'Platón' field, would affect the Río Guadalope-Maestrazgo SPA and the SCIs named Muelas y Estrechos del río Guadalope, Rambla de las Truchas and Maestrazgo y Sierra de Gúdar.

Does the Commission believe these projects to be compatible with European legislation on waters, with conservation of the Natura 2000 network, with the economic activities (livestock, agriculture, etc.) existing in this area, and with preservation of human health and safety?

Question for written answer E-005743/13
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(22 May 2013)

Subject: Hydraulic fracturing in Aragón (II)

Studies on the impact of extracting gas and oil from shale using hydraulic fracturing ('fracking') on the environment and on human health show the high risks involved in this mining technique, given its toxicity, potential seismicity and the limited technical ability that exists to prevent such risks. However, despite this, the process is under way in Aragón to authorise exploration of various extraction fields to the north and south of the city of Fraga, with several potential adverse effects on the Natura 2000 network: the 'Perseo' field would affect the Embalse del Pas y Santa Rita SPA and the Río Cinca y Alcanadre SCI; the 'Prometeo' field would affect the name Valcuerna, Serreta Negra y Liberola and El Basal, Las Menorcas y Llanos de Cardiel SPAs and the Basal de Ballobar y Balsalet de Don Juan SCI; the 'Atlas' filed would also affect the Basal de Ballobar y Balsalet de Don Juan, Serreta Negra and Liberola-Serreta Negra SCIs, and the La Retuerta y Saladas de Sástago and Valcuerna, Serreta Negra y Liberola SPAs; lastly, the 'Helios' field affects the La Retuerta y Saladas de Sástago and Matarraña-Aiguabarreix SPAs and the named Río Guadalope, Val de Fabara y Val de Pilas, Efesa de la Villa, Río Matarranya and Río Algars SCIs.

Does the Commission believe these projects to be compatible with European water legislation, with conservation of the Natura 2000 network, with the economic activities (livestock, agriculture, etc.) existing in these areas, and with the preservation of human health and safety?

Question for written answer E-005744/13
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(22 May 2013)

Subject: Hydraulic fracturing in Aragón (III)

Studies on the impact of extracting gas and oil from shale using hydraulic fracturing ('fracking') on the environment and on human health show the high risks involved in this mining technique, given its toxicity, potential seismicity and the limited technical ability that exists to prevent such risks. However, despite this, the process is under way in Aragon to authorise exploration of several extraction fields in the area surrounding the city of Zaragoza, specifically in the so-called 'Kepler' field, which would affect the Estepas de Monegrillo y Pina and Sierra de Alcubierre) SPAs, as well as the Sotos y Mejanas del Ebro, Bajo Gállego, Montes de Alfajarín-Saso de Osera Alcubierre and Galachos de la Alfranca de Pastriz, La Cartuja and El Burgo de Ebro SCIs and the so-called 'Copérnico' field (which takes in the Estepas de Belchite-El Planerón-La Lomaza SPA and the Planas SCI and plains on the right bank of the Ebro).

Does the Commission believe these projects to be compatible with European water legislation, with conservation of the Natura 2000 network, with the economic activities existing in these areas, and with the preservation of human health and safety?

Question for written answer E-005745/13
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(22 May 2013)

Subject: Hydraulic fracturing in Aragón (IV)

Studies on the impact of extracting gas and oil from shale using hydraulic fracturing ('fracking') on the environment and on human health show the high risks involved in this mining technique, given its toxicity, potential seismicity and the limited technical ability that exists to prevent such risks. However, despite this, a permit has been granted in Aragón to explore a fuel extraction field (called 'Achilles') in an area close to the Loteta reservoir, which was built with financial aid from the European Union, as part of a project to supply drinking water to the city of Zaragoza and 22 surrounding municipalities (821 000 inhabitants). The infrastructure could be affected by possible infiltrations and toxic leaks from this type of extraction. Three SCIs in the Red Natura 2000 network are also exposed to these potential adverse effects: Monte Alto y Siete Cabezos, Laguna de Plantados y Laguna de Agón and Sotos y Mejanas del Ebro.

Does the Commission believe that the project for which this exploration has been authorised is compatible with European water legislation, with conservation of the Natura 2000 network, with the economic activities (agriculture, livestock, etc.) existing in this area, and with the preservation of human health and safety?

Question for written answer E-005746/13
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(22 May 2013)

Subject: Hydraulic fracturing in Aragón (V)

Studies on the impact on the environment and on human health of extracting gas and oil from shale using hydraulic fracturing ('fracking') show the high risks involved in this mining technique, given its toxicity, potential seismicity and the limited technical capacity currently available to prevent such risks. However, despite this, the process is under way in Aragón to authorise exploration of various fuel extraction fields in the Pyrenees region, with adverse effects on several protected sites in the Natura 2000 network: the so-called 'Berdún' field (affecting the SPAs named Salvatierra-Foces de Fago and Biniés-Barranco del Infierno, the groves and reed beds of the Aragón River, the Leyre and Orba mountains and the SCIs named Río Aragón — Canal de Berdún, San Juan de la Peña y Oroel, Río Aragón (Jaca), Río Aragón — Canal de Berdún, Río Veral, San Juan de la Peña, Foz de Salvatierra and Sierras de Leyre y Orba), the 'Plácido' field (with adverse effects for the Ordesa National Park and its catchment area and the SPA named Sierra de Canciás-Silves, the SCI named Río Ara-Valle de Broto), the 'Biescas' field (the Viñamala SPA and the SCIs named Telera — Acumuer, Puerto de Otal — Cotefablo, Sobrepuerto and Río Gállego (Ribera de Biescas)), the 'Ainsa' field (the Sierra de Canciás-Silves SPA and the SCIs named Cueva de los Moros, Cuenca del río Yesa, Cuenca del río Airés, Santa María de Ascaso, Silves, Parque Natural Sierra y Cañones de Guara and Guara Norte), the 'Carlota' field (SCIs named Sierra de Arro, Sierra Ferrera and Sierra de Esdolomada y Morrones de Güel) and the 'Turbón' field (affecting the SPAs named El Turbón and Sierra de Sis and the SCIs named El Turbón, Sierra de Esdolomada y Morrones de Güel, Río Isábena, Garganta de Obarra, Congosto de Sopeira and Sierra del Castillo de Laguarres), as well as thermal springs such as Tiermas and the Vilas del Turbón spa.

Does the Commission believe these projects to be compatible with European legislation on waters, with conservation of the Natura 2000 network, with the economic activities (tourism, spa tourism, livestock, agriculture, etc.) existing in these areas, and with preservation of human health and safety?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission

(10 July 2013)

The Commission does not follow in detail specific shale gas exploitation operations in individual locations or regions. It is the responsibility of the Member States to ensure — via appropriate assessments, permitting regimes and monitoring activities — that any exploration or exploitation of energy sources, including those using hydraulic fracturing, complies with the requirements of the existing legal framework in the EU. This includes, *inter alia*, provisions on environmental impact assessments and public participation ([1]), the protection of surface and groundwater ([2]), on waste management ([3]) and on the conservation of natural habitats ([4]).

([1]) Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on environment (OJ L 26/1, 28.01.2012).

([2]) Directive 2000/60/EC establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy (OJ L 327, 22.12.2000, p. 1) and Directive 2006/118/EC on the protection of groundwater against pollution and deterioration (OJ L372/19, 27.12.2006).

([3]) Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of waste from extractive industries and amending Directive 2004/35/EC (OJ L 102, 11.4.2006, p. 15).

([4]) Directive 92/43/EC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (OJ L 206, 22.7.1992, p. 7).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005785/13
aan de Commissie
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(23 mei 2013)

Betreft: Vervolgvragen over de misstanden bij Ryanair

Op 27 februari 2013 heeft de heer Kallas namens de Commissie schriftelijke vraag E-000032/2013 over misstanden bij Ryanair beantwoord. Helaas heeft de Commissie diverse vragen onbeantwoord gelaten. Aanleiding voor de vragen was zorgwekkende berichtgeving over waargenomen misstanden in de bedrijfscultuur en het personeelsbeleid van Ryanair ([1]). Dergelijke misstanden en het creëren van een angstcultuur kunnen verstorend werken op de keten van ervaringsgebaseerd leren, die mede wordt gevoed door een open en transparante veiligheidscultuur. Ook diverse andere mediabronnen wijzen in de richting van zorgwekkende toestanden, zoals de veelheid aan incidenten bij Ryanair ([2]), of de dreiging met ontslag ([3]).

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van de resultaten van het onderzoek dat vorig jaar september in de Spaanse krant El Mundo werd gepubliceerd ([2]), waarbij o.a. 15 „zeer ernstige" incidenten zouden zijn voorgevallen bij Ryanair? Zo ja, wat is de mening van de Commissie over deze opstapeling van incidenten? Hoe oordeelt de Commissie over zaken als weigering om mee te werken bij onaangekondigde inspecties door luchtveiligheidsdiensten?

2. Wat vindt de Commissie van de door drie piloten en een ex-piloot in de reportage „Mayday Mayday" — van het KRO-programma Reporter — geschetste kwesties ([1]) ten aanzien van de bedrijfscultuur, het personeelsbeleid en de angstcultuur bij Ryanair? Komen deze kwesties ook voor bij andere vliegtuigmaatschappijen die binnen de EU vliegen? Vindt de Commissie de geschetste zaken voorbeelden van maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemerschap?

3. Wat vindt de Commissie van de dreiging met ontslag voor piloten die hun zorg over de veiligheidscultuur kenbaar willen maken bij de autoriteiten?

4. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat piloten incidenten onafhankelijk en zonder „druk van bovenaf" moeten kunnen melden? Is de Commissie het eens met de PVV dat wanneer dit niet het geval is, de veiligheid in het geding is? Zo nee, waarom niet?

5. Is de Commissie, gezien al het bovenstaande en gezien de opstapeling van incidenten, met de PVV van mening dat Ryanair met haar bedrijfs- en angstcultuur de veiligheid in het geding laat komen en de IAA nalatigheid kan worden verweten door op geen enkele wijze kritisch en in samenhang onderzoek te doen naar de incidenten? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005925/13
aan de Commissie
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(28 mei 2013)

Betreft: Misstanden Ryanair — veiligheid in de luchtvaart

Op 27 februari 2013 heeft de heer Kallas namens de Commissie schriftelijke vraag E-000032/2013 over misstanden bij Ryanair beantwoord. Aanleiding voor de vragen was zorgwekkende berichtgeving over waargenomen misstanden in de bestuurscultuur en het personeelsbeleid van Ryanair ([4]). Ook andere mediabronnen wijzen in de richting van zorgwekkende toestanden ([5]).

Dergelijke misstanden en het creëren van een angstcultuur kunnen verstorend werken op de keten van ervaringsgebaseerd leren, die mede wordt gevoed door een open en transparante veiligheidscultuur.

([1]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/reiskrant/21185380/__Piloten_muiten_tegen_top_van_Ryanair__.html en http://reporter.kro.nl/seizoenen/2012/afleveringen/28-12-2012 en http://reporter.kro.nl/seizoenen/2013/afleveringen/03-01-2013.
([2]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/reiskrant/20885422/__1201_incidenten_Ryanair__.html
([3]) http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/you-thought-ryanairs-attendants-had-it-bad-wait-til-you-hear-about-their-pilots-8621681.html
([4]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/reiskrant/21185380/__Piloten_muiten_tegen_top_van_Ryanair__.html en http://reporter.kro.nl/seizoenen/2012/afleveringen/28-12-2012 en http://reporter.kro.nl/seizoenen/2013/afleveringen/03-01-2013.
([5]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/reiskrant/20885422/__1201_incidenten_Ryanair__.html

De European Cockpit Association (ECA) reageerde op de beantwoording met een brief (3 april 2013) aan de Commissie. In de brief wordt de Commissie onder meer geattendeerd op het feit dat de Irish Aviation Authority (IAA) vier noodoproepen („Mayday calls”) in Valencia en Boedapest niet in samenhang heeft onderzocht.

1. De IAA heeft vier noodoproepen in Valencia en Boedapest niet in samenhang onderzocht. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat incidenten van gelijke aard en met eenzelfde patroon altijd in samenhang en tot op de bodem dienen te worden onderzocht? Zo nee, waarom niet? Hoe oordeelt de Commissie over het feit dat de IAA de incidenten niet in samenhang heeft onderzocht?

2. Wat vindt de Commissie van de stelling dat een robuust en goed functionerend incidentenrapporteringssysteem dat is gebaseerd op „Just Culture” een fundamentele pijler is om hoge luchtvaartveiligheidsstandaarden te handhaven?

3. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat het absoluut wenselijk is dat piloten incidenten altijd onafhankelijk en zonder „druk van bovenaf” kunnen melden? Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat wanneer zoiets niet het geval is, de luchtvaartveiligheid in het geding is? Zo nee, waarom niet?

4. Is de Commissie, gezien al het bovenstaande en gezien de opstapeling van incidenten zoals blijkt uit de diverse berichtgeving, met de PVV van mening dat Ryanair met haar bestuurs- en angstcultuur de veiligheid in het geding laat komen en dat de IAA nalatigheid kan worden verweten door op geen enkele wijze kritisch en in samenhang onderzoek te doen naar de incidenten? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie

(8 juli 2013)

De Commissie is geen onderzoeksinstantie in de zin van Verordening (EU) nr. 996/2010 ([6]). Op grond van deze verordening zijn door de EU-lidstaten ingestelde onderzoeksinstanties bevoegd voor veiligheidsonderzoeken. Daarnaast is de Commissie niet gemachtigd om de toezichtstaken van de bevoegde autoriteiten van de lidstaten over te nemen.

De Commissie heeft geen aanwijzingen dat de Irish Aviation Authority (IAA) tekortschiet in zijn verplichtingen met betrekking tot onderzoek en veiligheidstoezicht.

De Commissie volgt nauwlettend alle veiligheidsincidenten, inclusief de incidenten die u noemt. Volgens het verantwoordelijke onderzoeksorgaan in Ierland vereisten deze gevallen geen formeel veiligheidsonderzoek in de zin van Verordening nr. 996/2010 en zijn er ook geen overtredingen van de veiligheidsvoorschriften vastgesteld.

De Commissie bevordert een „cultuur van billijkheid” in alle lidstaten en heeft in haar voorstel voor een „Verordening inzake de melding van voorvallen in de burgerluchtvaart” ([7]) een aantal eisen opgesteld om de bescherming van luchtvaartpersoneel in het kader van de huidige regelgeving te versterken. Deze bepalingen zijn erop gericht een klimaat te scheppen waarin mensen erop kunnen vertrouwen dat ze veiligheidsincidenten kunnen melden zonder dat ze het risico lopen een berisping te krijgen of ontslagen te worden vanwege het kenbaar maken van geconstateerde gebreken of fouten. Dit voorstel ligt momenteel bij de Raad en het Parlement.

([6]) PB L 295 van 12.11.2010.
([7]) COM(2012) 776 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005785/13
to the Commission
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(23 May 2013)

Subject: Follow-up question concerning nefarious practices at Ryanair

On 27 February 2013, Mr Kallas, on behalf of the Commission, answered Written Question E-000032/2013 concerning nefarious practices at Ryanair. Regrettably, the Commission neglected to answer several parts of the question. The question was prompted by worrying reports about unacceptable practices which had been observed in the corporate culture and staff policy of Ryanair ([1]). Such practices and the reign of fear established within the company could disrupt the chain of experience-based learning, which is partly dependent on an open and transparent safety culture. Various other media sources also indicate that there is cause for concern, reporting for example on numerous incidents which have occurred at Ryanair ([2]) or threats of dismissal ([3]).

1. Is the Commission aware of the findings of the investigation published in the Spanish newspaper *El Mundo* last September which mentioned, *inter alia*, 15 'very serious' incidents said to have occurred at Ryanair? If so, what view does the Commission take of this succession of incidents? What view does the Commission take of such occurrences as refusal to cooperate with unannounced inspections by air safety services?

2. What does the Commission think about the questions raised by three pilots and one former pilot in the report 'Mayday Mayday' in KRO television's 'Reporter' series regarding the corporate culture, staff policy and the reign of fear at Ryanair? Are there similar doubts about other airlines operating within the EU? Does the Commission consider the phenomena outlined here to be examples of socially responsible enterprise?

3. What view does the Commission take of the threat to dismiss pilots who wish to report to the authorities their concern about the safety culture?

4. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that pilots should be able to report incidents independently and without 'pressure from above'? Does the Commission agree with the PVV that if this is not the case, safety is jeopardised? If not, why not?

5. In view of all the above points and the succession of incidents, does the Commission agree with the PVV that Ryanair is endangering safety through its corporate culture and use of fear to control staff and that the IAA can be accused of negligence for failing to institute any critical and coordinated investigation into the incidents? If not, why not?

Question for written answer E-005925/13
to the Commission
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(28 May 2013)

Subject: Nefarious practices by Ryanair affecting aviation safety

On 27 February 2013 Mr Kallas replied on behalf of the Commission to Written Question E-000032/2013 about the nefarious practices at Ryanair. The questions were submitted due to an alarming report about the nefarious practices observed in the management culture and HR policy at Ryanair ([4]). Other media sources also highlight worrying situations ([5]).

Such nefarious practices and creation of a culture of fear can have a disruptive effect on the experience-based learning chain, which is also nurtured by an open, transparent safety culture.

([1]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/reiskrant/21185380/__Piloten_muiten_tegen_top_van_Ryanair__.html and http://reporter.kro.nl/seizoenen/2012/afleveringen/28-12-2012 en http://reporter.kro.nl/seizoenen/2013/afleveringen/03-01-2013
([2]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/reiskrant/20885422/__1201_incidenten_Ryanair__.html
([3]) http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/you-thought-ryanairs-attendants-had-it-bad-wait-til-you-hear-about-their-pilots-8621681.html
([4]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/reiskrant/21185380/__Piloten_muiten_tegen_top_van_Ryanair__.html and http://reporter.kro.nl/seizoenen/2012/afleveringen/28-12-2012 and http://reporter.kro.nl/seizoenen/2013/afleveringen/03-01-2013
([5]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/reiskrant/20885422/__1201_incidenten_Ryanair__.html

The European Cockpit Association (ECA) responded to the answer by sending a letter (3 April 2013) to the Commission. One of the points in the letter drawn to the Commission's attention is that the Irish Aviation Authority (IAA) has not investigated four Mayday calls in Valencia and Budapest in connection with each other.

1. The IAA has not investigated four Mayday calls in Valencia and Budapest in connection with each other. Does the Commission agree with the Party for Freedom (PVV) that incidents of this nature, following the same pattern, should always be thoroughly investigated in connection with each other? If not, why not? How does the Commission view the fact that the IAA has not investigated the incidents in connection with each other?

2. What does it think of the assertion that a robust, efficiently operating incident-reporting system based on 'Just Culture' principles is an essential pillar in the effort to maintain high aviation safety standards?

3. Does it agree with the PVV that it is absolutely essential for pilots to be able to report incidents at any time, off their own bat and without being subjected to 'pressure from above'? Does it concur with the PVV that when this is not the case, aviation safety is at stake? If not, why not?

4. In view of everything stated above and of the accumulation of incidents evident from the various reports, does the Commission agree with the PVV that Ryanair, with its management style and culture of fear, is allowing safety to be undermined and that the IAA's laxity can be reproached for its failure to conduct any kind of critical investigation into the incidents in connection with each other? If not, why not?

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission

(8 July 2013)

The Commission is not an investigating body within the meaning of Regulation (EU) No 996/2010 [6]. Under this regulation this function is vested in appropriate investigation authorities established by EU Member States. Also, the Commission is not mandated to replace the competent authorities of the Member States in their surveillance functions.

The Commission has no indications that the Irish aviation authority (IAA) is neglecting its obligations with regard to investigation and safety oversight.

The Commission carefully follows all safety related incidents, including those that you mention. According to the responsible investigation body in Ireland the cases did not require formal safety investigation in the sense of Regulation No 996/2010 nor were violations of safety rules recorded.

The Commission strongly promotes a high level of 'Just Culture' across all Member States, and has introduced, in its proposal for a 'Regulation on occurrence reporting in civil aviation' [7], a number of requirements reinforcing the protection granted to aviation professionals under the current rules. These provisions aim at ensuring an environment in which individuals feel confident to report safety occurrences without risking to be blamed or even dismissed for having reported the deficiencies or errors identified. This proposal is currently under discussion in the Council and Parliament.

---

(6) OJ L 295, 12.11.2010.
(7) COM(2012) 776.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006523/13
a la Comisión
Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D) y Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(6 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Investigación de las exportaciones de vino europeo a China

En estos días hemos conocido la noticia de que las autoridades chinas han iniciado una investigación sobre el vino europeo por *dumping*, hecho que se produce tras los aranceles impuestos por la Unión Europea a los paneles solares chinos.

Las exportaciones al país asiático estaban siendo muy favorables en un momento en que el sector vitivinícola necesita estabilidad debido a la incertidumbre que existe ante la falta de concreción sobre el mantenimiento de los derechos de plantación del viñedo y la inestabilidad de precios de las últimas campañas.

¿Qué actuaciones prevé la Comisión llevar a cabo frente al incremento de aranceles anunciado para el sector vitivinícola europeo?

En el caso de que se confirmen ¿qué medidas compensatorias va a establecer para el sector?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-006601/13
a la Comisión
Esther Herranz García (PPE)
(7 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Amenaza china de restricción de vino europeo

En los últimos días el Gobierno chino ha amenazado con emprender una investigación por «dumping» sobre los vinos procedentes de la Unión Europea, lo que abriría el camino a la imposición de elevados aranceles. La postura del Gobierno de Pekín es en realidad un contraataque a Bruselas por los aranceles que Europa ha decretado a los paneles solares chinos. Para el sector vitivinícola esta decisión por parte del Gobierno de China genera una gran preocupación e impotencia por los efectos y graves perjuicios que pueden provocar en el mismo y particularmente en los tres principales exportadores de vino a China, Francia, España e Italia. China también ha amenazado con adoptar medidas contra las exportaciones de aceite de oliva.

¿Qué medidas piensa adoptar la Comisión para impedir que se imponga una restricción china cuando sabemos que la Unión Europea y España cumplen con toda la legislación comercial establecida?

¿Cómo puede la UE proteger al sector vitivinícola y aceitero de una decisión de tal envergadura que generaría gravísimos perjuicios a estos sectores?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-006726/13
a la Comisión
María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE)
(11 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Anuncio de medidas restrictivas a la importación de vino europeo por parte de China

El pasado martes 4 de junio, la Comisión impuso un arancel temporal del 11,8 % a las importaciones de paneles solares de China como penalización por sus presuntas prácticas de comercio desleal en este campo.

Como respuesta y a modo de represalia, China ha amenazado con adoptar medidas para restringir las importaciones de vino procedentes de la Unión Europea. China representa actualmente uno de los mercados de mayor crecimiento para las exportaciones españolas, por lo que la aplicación de medidas de este tipo podría causar graves perjuicios a esos sectores. En el caso concreto del vino, el crecimiento en términos globales de las exportaciones europeas compensa con creces la bajada año tras año del consumo europeo, lo que ha contribuido a un fuerte saneamiento del mercado vitivinícola. Debería, por lo tanto, evitarse la pérdida de un mercado, como el chino, en fuerte expansión.

¿Tiene intención la Comisión de emprender alguna iniciativa diplomática ante el Gobierno chino para evitar un conflicto comercial e impedir que este país adopte medidas restrictivas en contra de las exportaciones europeas? En el caso de que China hiciera efectiva su amenaza, ¿qué tipo de acciones podría emprender la Comisión ante la Organización Mundial del Comercio?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006727/13
a la Comisión
Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE)
(11 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Anuncio de medidas restrictivas a la importación de vino europeo por parte de China

El pasado martes 4 de junio, la Comisión Europea impuso un arancel temporal del 11,8 % a las importaciones de paneles solares de China como penalización por sus presuntas prácticas de comercio desleal en este campo.

Como respuesta y a modo de represalia, China ha amenazado con adoptar medidas para restringir las importaciones de vino procedentes de la Unión Europea. China representa actualmente uno de los mercados de mayor crecimiento para las exportaciones españolas, por lo que la aplicación de medidas de este tipo podría causar graves perjuicios a esos sectores. En el caso concreto del vino, el crecimiento en términos globales de las exportaciones europeas compensa con creces la bajada año tras año del consumo europeo, lo que ha contribuido a un fuerte saneamiento del mercado vitivinícola. Debería, por lo tanto, evitarse la pérdida de un mercado, como el chino, en fuerte expansión.

¿Tiene intención la Comisión de emprender alguna iniciativa diplomática ante el Gobierno chino para evitar un conflicto comercial e impedir que este país adopte medidas restrictivas en contra de las exportaciones europeas? En el caso de que China hiciera efectiva su amenaza, ¿qué tipo de acciones podría emprender la Comisión ante la Organización Mundial del Comercio?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de julio de 2013)

China ha notificado a la Comisión que ha recibido y aceptado la denuncia presentada por la industria vitivinícola china, en la que alega que el sector se ve afectado por las importaciones desleales de la Unión Europea.

En su calidad de miembro de la Organización Mundial del Comercio (OMC), China está en su derecho de iniciar una investigación de defensa comercial, aunque con arreglo a las normas de la OMC, debe informar antes a la UE. El 17 de junio, la UE y China celebraron consultas y la Comisión mantiene un estrecho contacto con la autoridades del país asiático.

La Comisión es consciente de la importancia que reviste esta cuestión para la industria vitivinícola de la UE. Desde 2008, las exportaciones a China se han quintuplicado y, en 2012, su valor ascendió a 764 millones de euros (sin contar las exportaciones a Hong Kong), lo que le sitúa en el tercer mercado más importante para los productos vitivinícolas después de los EE.UU. y Rusia. Por todo ello, la Comisión supervisará de cerca dicha investigación e intervendrá cuando lo considere oportuno a fin de garantizar el respeto de todas las normas pertinentes. La Comisión no dudará en tomar las medidas adecuadas si llega a la conclusión de que China no cumple estrictamente las normas aplicables. No obstante, las posibles medidas no consistirían en restricciones similares a las importaciones de productos chinos. La adopción de medidas injustificadas solo podría hacerse mediante el recurso al Órgano de Solución de Diferencias de la OMC.

Mientras tanto, la Comisión ayudará en la medida de lo posible al sector vitivinícola de la UE a que defienda sus intereses.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005790/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(23 maggio 2013)

Oggetto: Indagine antidumping da parte della Cina sulle esportazioni di vini europei

I produttori di vino cinese associati nella «China Alcoholic Drinks Association» (CADA) hanno chiesto al governo cinese di aprire una procedura di indagine sulle importazioni di vini provenienti dall'Europa.

Secondo l'associazione CADA, i vini provenienti dall'Europa vengono immessi nel mercato interno cinese a prezzi estremamente competitivi rispetto ai propri, a causa delle presunte eccessive sovvenzioni che ricevono dall'UE, danneggiando così i produttori cinesi.

La Commissione:

— È a conoscenza di tale indagine?

— Può riferire in merito ad essa?

— Ha aperto un dialogo su di essa con le autorità cinesi?

— Ha valutato i danni che l'eventuale decisione del governo cinese di avvallare le ipotesi alla base dell'indagine aperta arrecheranno al settore europeo?

— Intende applicare eventuali identiche misure restrittive sull'importazione dei prodotti cinesi immessi nel mercato europeo, che costantemente violano le norme di sicurezza previste dai disposti dell'Unione o per la realizzazione dei quali è stata impiegata manodopera in violazione dei diritti umani?

— Può fornire i dati relativi alle esportazioni dall'UE verso la Cina di vino e uva da vino?

Risposta congiunta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(12 luglio 2013)

La Cina ha notificato alla Commissione la ricezione e l'accettazione di una denuncia presentata dall'industria vinicola cinese in cui si afferma che il settore risente delle importazioni sleali dall'Unione europea.

La Cina, come qualsiasi altro membro dell'Organizzazione mondiale del commercio (OMC), ha diritto ad avviare un'inchiesta di difesa commerciale in forza delle regole dell'OMC. Conformemente a tali regole la Cina deve inviare una notifica all'UE prima di avviare l'inchiesta. Il 17 giugno si sono svolte consultazioni tra l'UE e la Cina e la Commissione rimane a stretto contatto con le autorità cinesi. Successivamente, il 1° luglio 2013, è stata avviata un'inchiesta comune antidumping e antisussidi su tale base.

La Commissione è consapevole dell'importanza della questione per l'industria vinicola dell'UE. Dal 2008 le esportazioni verso la Cina sono più che quintuplicate e nel 2012 le esportazioni di vino verso la Cina hanno totalizzato 764 milioni di euro (escluse le esportazioni a Hong Kong), facendo di tale paese il terzo più grande mercato d'esportazione, in termini di volume, per i vini dell'UE dopo gli USA e la Russia. Per tali motivi la Commissione seguirà da vicino l'inchiesta e interverrà, se del caso, per assicurare il rispetto delle regole pertinenti. Se la Commissione giungesse alla conclusione che la Cina non ha aderito rigorosamente alle regole vigenti, essa non esiterà a tutelare gli interessi dell'Unione europea. Tuttavia, un'eventuale azione non potrebbe consistere nell'applicare alle importazioni di prodotti cinesi restrizioni identiche. È possibile chiamare in causa misure indebite soltanto ricorrendo all'organismo di composizione delle controversie dell'OMC.

Nel frattempo, la Commissione presterà assistenza e consulenza all'industria vinicola dell'UE nella difesa dei suoi interessi in relazione a questa inchiesta.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006592/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(7 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Exportação de vinho para a China

A China lançou uma investigação às exportações europeias de vinho, numa aparente retaliação às tarifas aduaneiras propostas pela União Europeia para sancionar as suspeitas de «dumping» na produção de painéis solares. Segundo noticia o *Financial Times*, o Ministério chinês do Comércio anunciou que abriu uma investigação a medidas que considera estarem a tornar artificialmente competitivas as exportações europeias de vinho.

1. Tem a Comissão conhecimento desta situação?

2. Como a avalia a Comissão?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006910/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Ameaça da China à exportação do vinho europeu

Considerando que:

A China reagiu recentemente às novas taxas europeias contra as suas exportações de painéis solares com o anúncio de uma investigação que poderá levar ao agravamento dos direitos de entrada dos vinhos europeus no seu território;

A reação chinesa, através da sua possível retaliação comercial, poderá afetar a exportação dos vinhos europeus, e nomeadamente dos vinhos portugueses, num momento em que a faturação das exportações para a China duplicou em apenas dois anos e em que a China representa cerca de 11 milhões de euros por ano;

A UE exportou em 2012 para a China 257,4 milhões de litros, o que representa cerca de 11 % das exportações totais dos produtores europeus e um valor global de 763 milhões de euros, podendo este mercado ser considerado significativo e com potencial;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual o ponto de situação quanto à ameaça de retaliação da China quanto ao agravamento dos direitos de entrada dos vinhos europeus no seu mercado?

2. Quais os desenvolvimentos futuros que antevê quanto a esta situação?

3. Qual a estratégia da União Europeia quanto à posição e à perspetiva da China no que respeita às questões comerciais?

Resposta conjunta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(12 de julho de 2013)

A China notificou a Comissão da receção e aceitação de uma queixa apresentada pela indústria vinícola chinesa, alegando que as importações efetuadas em condições desleais a partir da União Europeia estão a prejudicar o setor.

A China, tal como qualquer outro membro da Organização Mundial do Comércio (OMC), tem o direito de dar início a um inquérito em matéria de defesa comercial ao abrigo das regras da OMC. De acordo com essas regras, a China tem de notificar a UE antes de iniciar um inquérito. As consultas entre a UE e a China tiveram lugar em 17 de junho, mantendo-se a Comissão em contacto com as autoridades chinesas. Posteriormente, um inquérito *anti-dumping* e antissubvenções foi aberto nessa base.

A Comissão está ciente da importância desta questão para a indústria vinícola da UE. Desde 2008, as exportações para a China mais do que quintuplicaram e, em 2012, as exportações de vinho para a China atingiram 764 milhões de euros (excluindo as exportações para Hong Kong), o que faz dela o terceiro maior mercado de exportação de vinhos da UE em termos de volume, depois dos EUA e da Rússia. Por estes motivos, a Comissão irá acompanhar de perto o inquérito e intervir adequadamente, sempre que necessário, a fim de garantir o cumprimento das regras pertinentes. Caso viesse a concluir que a China não tinha cumprido escrupulosamente as regras aplicáveis, a Comissão não hesitaria em defender os interesses da União Europeia. No entanto, estas ações não poderiam consistir em aplicar restrições idênticas à importação de produtos chineses. A contestação de medidas injustificadas só poderia ser feita mediante recurso perante o Órgão de Resolução de Litígios da OMC.

Entretanto, a Comissão presta assistência e aconselhamento à indústria vinícola europeia no tocante à defesa dos seus interesses no âmbito do inquérito.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005790/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(23 May 2013)

Subject: Anti-dumping investigation by China regarding exports of European wines

Chinese wine producers who are members of the China Alcoholic Drinks Association (CADA) have asked the Chinese Government to open an investigation into wine imports from Europe.

According to the CADA, wines from Europe are being put onto the Chinese domestic market at very competitive prices compared to domestic wines, due to the allegedly excessive subsidies they receive from the EU, thereby harming Chinese producers.

— Is the Commission aware of this investigation?

— Can it report on it?

— Has it initiated a dialogue with the Chinese authorities on this issue?

— Has it evaluated the damage that any decision by the Chinese Government to endorse the complaints made by CADA will do to the European sector?

— Will it, if necessary, apply identical restrictions to the import of Chinese products placed on the EU market, which constantly infringe EU safety regulations or for which labour in violation of human rights has been used to make?

— Can it provide any data on exports of wine and wine grapes from the EU to China?

Question for written answer E-006523/13
to the Commission
Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D) and Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(6 June 2013)

Subject: Investigation of exports of European wine to China

We have recently learned that the Chinese authorities have started to investigate into the dumping of European wine. This development follows the European Union's decision to impose tariffs on Chinese solar panels.

Exports to China had been very favourable at a time when the wine sector needs stability, given the uncertainty it faces in regard to the security of vine planting rights and the instability of prices during the most recent marketing years.

How does the Commission plan to respond to the announced tariff increase for the European wine sector?

If the tariff increase is confirmed, what compensatory measures will it establish for the sector?

Question for written answer E-006592/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(7 June 2013)

Subject: Wine exports to China

China has launched an investigation into European wine exports, in an apparent response to the customs tariffs proposed by the EU to sanction suspected 'dumping' in connection with solar panel production. According to the *Financial Times*, the Chinese Ministry of Commerce has announced that it has launched an investigation into measures that it believes make European wine exports artificially competitive.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. What is its assessment of it?

Question for written answer P-006601/13
to the Commission
Esther Herranz García (PPE)
(7 June 2013)

Subject: Chinese threat to impose restrictions on European wines

In the last few days, the Chinese Government has threatened to launch an investigation of the alleged dumping of wines from Europe, which would open the way to higher tariffs being imposed. The Chinese Government's stance is in fact a retaliatory move towards Brussels for Europe's application of tariffs applied to Chinese solar panels. The Chinese Government's decision has generated great concern in the wine growing and producing sector, which feels powerless to prevent the impact and severe damage it may cause, particularly in France, Spain and Italy, which are the three main exporters of wine to China. China has also threatened to adopt measures against imports of olive oil.

What steps does the Commission intend to take to prevent China from imposing such restrictions, given that we know that the EU and Spain comply with all current trade laws?

How can the EU protect the wine and olive oil sectors from a decision of these dimensions, which is likely to cause them immense damage?

Question for written answer P-006726/13
to the Commission
María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE)
(11 June 2013)

Subject: China's announcement of restrictions on imports of European wine

On Tuesday, 4 June 2013 the Commission imposed a temporary duty of 11.8% on imports of solar panels from China as a penalty for its alleged unfair trade practices in this area.

In a tit-for-tat response, China has threatened to impose restrictions on wine imports from the European Union. China is currently one of the fastest growing markets for Spanish exports, and the application of such a measure could cause serious damage to the sectors concerned. In the specific case of wine, the global rise in European exports is more than making up for the fact that European consumption has been falling year by year, and this has helped revitalise the wine market. Care therefore needs to be taken to avoid losing a key expanding market such as the Chinese market.

Will the Commission take any diplomatic initiatives vis-à-vis the Chinese Government to avoid a trade dispute and dissuade China from imposing restrictions on European exports? If China carries out its threat, what type of action could the Commission take in the World Trade Organisation?

Question for written answer E-006727/13
to the Commission
Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE)
(11 June 2013)

Subject: China's announcement of restrictions on imports of European wine

On Tuesday, 4 June 2013 the Commission imposed a temporary duty of 11.8% on imports of solar panels from China as a penalty for its alleged unfair trade practices in this area.

In a tit-for-tat response, China has threatened to impose restrictions on wine imports from the European Union. China is currently one of the fastest growing markets for Spanish exports, and the application of such a measure could cause serious damage to the sectors concerned. In the specific case of wine, the global rise in European exports is more than making up for the fact that European consumption has been falling year by year, and this has helped revitalise the wine market. Care therefore needs to be taken to avoid losing a key expanding market such as the Chinese market.

Will the Commission take any diplomatic initiatives vis-à-vis the Chinese Government to avoid a trade dispute and dissuade China from imposing restrictions on European exports? If China carries out its threat, what type of action could the Commission take in the World Trade Organisation?

Question for written answer E-006910/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: The Chinese threat to EU wine exports

Recently China reacted to new EU taxes applied to its solar panel exports by announcing an investigation that could lead to barriers to EU wines entering its territory.

The possible trade retaliation by China could affect the export of EU wines, and particularly Portuguese wines, just as income from exports to China has doubled in only two years to about EUR 11 million per year.

In 2012, the EU exported 257.4 million litres to China, representing about 11% of the total exports by EU producers and a total value of EUR 763 million, which shows this market is significant and has potential.

1. What is the current situation regarding China's threat to retaliate by erecting barriers to EU wines entering its market?

2. How does the Commission foresee this situation developing?

3. What is the EU's strategy with regard to China's position and perspective on trade issues?

Joint answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(12 July 2013)

China has notified the Commission of the receipt and acceptance of a complaint lodged by the Chinese wine industry alleging that the sector suffers from unfairly traded imports from the European Union.

China, as any other Member of the World Trade Organisation (WTO), has the right to launch a trade defence investigation under the WTO rules. According to these rules, China has to notify the EU before proceeding to initiate an investigation. Consultations between the EU and China took place on 17 June and the Commission remains in close contact with the Chinese authorities.

Subsequently a joint anti-dumping and anti-subsidy investigation has been initiated on that basis on 1st July 2013.

The Commission is aware of the importance of this issue for the EU wine industry. Since 2008 the exports to China increased by more than five times, and in 2012 the wine exports to China reached 764 million Euro (excluding exports to Hong Kong), making it the third largest export market for EU wines in volume after USA and Russia. For these reasons it will closely monitor the investigation and duly intervene where necessary in order to ensure that the relevant rules are respected. If the Commission reached a conclusion that China did not strictly comply with the applicable rules, the Commission would not hesitate to defend the interest of the European Union. However, any type of action could not consist of identical restrictions to the imports of Chinese products. Challenging unwarranted measures could only be done by having recourse to the WTO dispute settlement body.

In the meantime, the Commission assists and advises EU wine industry in the defense of its interests concerned by the investigation.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005844/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(24 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Anders Fogh Rasmussen: insuficiência do «soft power» europeu

O Secretário-Geral da NATO, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, declarou durante uma audição na Comissão Parlamentar de Assuntos Externos do Parlamento Europeu, no dia 6 de maio de 2013, que «nós, europeus, temos que compreender que apenas "soft power" na realidade significa poder nenhum. Sem capacidades "duras" que apoiem a nossa diplomacia, a Europa carecerá de credibilidade e de influência». Rasmussen declarou também que, «se as nações europeias não fizerem um compromisso firme de investirem na segurança e na defesa, então toda a retórica acerca de uma política de segurança e de defesa fortalecida não passará de ar quente».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que apreciação faz destas declarações do Secretário-Geral da NATO?

— Concorda com elas? Nomeadamente, crê que a credibilidade e a influência europeias se ressentem da falta de argumentos militares que a sustentem?

— Que passos concretos devem ser dados no tocante a esta questão?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005845/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(24 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Anders Fogh Rasmussen: insuficiência do «soft power» europeu

O Secretário-Geral da NATO, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, declarou durante uma audição na Comissão Parlamentar de Assuntos Externos do Parlamento Europeu, no dia 6 de maio de 2013, que «nós, europeus, temos que compreender que apenas "soft power" na realidade significa poder nenhum. Sem capacidades "duras" que apoiem a nossa diplomacia, a Europa carecerá de credibilidade e de influência». Rasmussen declarou também que, «se as nações europeias não fizerem um compromisso firme de investirem na segurança e na defesa, então toda a retórica acerca de uma política de segurança e de defesa fortalecida não passará de ar quente».

Assim, pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

— Que apreciação faz destas declarações do Secretário-Geral da NATO?

— Concorda com elas? Nomeadamente, crê que a credibilidade e a influência europeias se ressentem da falta de argumentos militares que a sustentem?

— Que passos concretos devem ser dados no tocante a esta questão?

Resposta conjunta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(18 de setembro de 2013)

Em outubro de 2012, nas suas conclusões sobre o desenvolvimento de capacidades militares, o Conselho reiterou «o seu apelo a que sejam mantidas e desenvolvidas as capacidades militares necessárias para apoiar e reforçar a PCSD», uma vez que é nelas que «assenta a capacidade da UE para atuar como garante da segurança». Recordou igualmente a necessidade de uma indústria da defesa europeia forte e menos fragmentada para reforçar as capacidades militares da Europa e a capacidade de ação autónoma da UE.

O Conselho continua empenhado em reforçar a cooperação europeia em matéria de defesa, nomeadamente através da comunitarização e partilha de capacidades militares, incluindo para maximizar a eficácia das despesas de defesa da Europa. Está a ser aplicada uma abordagem dual para o desenvolvimento de projetos em regime de colaboração (por exemplo, progressos em algumas das principais áreas de capacidade, incluindo o reabastecimento em voo, as comunicações por satélite e a assistência médica), ao mesmo tempo que se torna a cooperação para a defesa europeia mais sistemática e sustentável a longo prazo, com a Agência Europeia de Defesa (AED) a apoiar ativamente os esforços dos Estados-Membros.

Reforçar as capacidades de defesa é uma das prioridades da Comissão Europeia em matéria de segurança e defesa no próximo mês de dezembro. Em dezembro passado, nas suas conclusões sobre a PCSD, o Conselho Europeu salientou que os Estados-Membros da UE devem estar dispostos a providenciar capacidades de defesa orientadas para o futuro e a suprir as lacunas críticas, incluindo as detetadas nas operações mais recentes. No relatório da AR/VP sobre a PCSD serão ainda desenvolvidas as propostas e ações para reforçar este domínio e melhorar a disponibilidade das capacidades militares requeridas tendo em vista o Conselho Europeu de dezembro. Paralelamente, a Comissão Europeia está também a preparar uma contribuição (sob a forma de comunicação) no sentido de reforçar o setor da segurança e da defesa na Europa, que será essencial para o reforço das capacidades europeias.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005844/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(24 May 2013)

Subject: Anders Fogh Rasmussen: European 'soft power' is not enough

During a hearing in the European Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs on 6 May 2013, the Secretary-General of NATO, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, said that 'We Europeans must understand that soft power alone is really no power at all. Without hard capabilities to back up its diplomacy, Europe will lack credibility and influence'. He went on to say that 'If European nations do not make a firm commitment to invest in security and defence, then all talk about a strengthened European defence and security policy will just be hot air'.

— What is the Commission's assessment of the NATO Secretary-General's remarks?

— Does it agree with them? In particular, does it believe that Europe's credibility and influence suffer due to a lack of military capabilities to back up its diplomacy?

— What tangible steps must be taken as far as this issue is concerned?

Question for written answer E-005845/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(24 May 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Anders Fogh Rasmussen: European 'soft power' is not enough

During a hearing in the European Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs on 6 May 2013, the Secretary-General of NATO, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, said that 'We Europeans must understand that soft power alone is really no power at all. Without hard capabilities to back up its diplomacy, Europe will lack credibility and influence'. He went on to say that 'If European nations do not make a firm commitment to invest in security and defence, then all talk about a strengthened European defence and security policy will just be hot air'.

— What is the Vice-President/High Representative's assessment of the NATO Secretary-General's remarks?

— Does she agree with them? In particular, does she believe that Europe's credibility and influence suffer due to a lack of military capabilities to back up its diplomacy?

— What tangible steps must be taken as far as this issue is concerned?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(18 September 2013)

In October 2012 in its Conclusions on Military Capability Development the Council reiterated 'its call to retain and further develop military capabilities for sustaining and enhancing the CSDP', which 'underpin the EU's ability to act as a security provider'. It also recalled the need for a strong and less fragmented European defence industry to enhance Europe's military capabilities and the EU's capacity for autonomous action.

The Council remains committed to enhance European defence cooperation including through the pooling and sharing of military capabilities, also to maximise the effectiveness of Europe's defence expenditure. A twin-track approach is being implemented for developing collaborative projects (e.g. progress in a number of key capability areas, including air-to-air refuelling, satellite communications, medical support) while making European defence cooperation more systematic and sustainable in the long run, with the active support of the EDA to Member Sates' efforts.

Enhancing defence capabilities is one of the priorities for the EC on security and defence next December. Last December in its Conclusions on CSDP the European Council underlined that EU Member States must be ready to provide future-oriented defence capabilities and fill the critical gaps, including those identified in recent operations. Proposals and actions to strengthen CSDP and improve the availability of the required military capabilities will be further developed in the HR/VP Report on CSDP in view of the December EC. In parallel, the European Commission is also preparing a contribution (in the form of a communication) towards strengthening the security and defence sector in Europe, which will be key to the reinforcement of European capabilities.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-005847/13
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(24 mai 2013)

Subiect: Prelungirea taxării inverse la cereale pentru România

În luna aprilie Comisia a respins solicitarea formulată de autoritățile române privind prelungirea termenului de aplicare a taxării inverse la cereale.

Cererea fusese formulată în 2012, iar prin intermediul acesteia se solicita prelungirea până în 2015 a termenului de aplicare a taxării inverse, care în mod normal expiră la sfârșitul lunii mai 2013.

Cu toate acestea, Camera Deputaților din România a aprobat recent unele modificări în cazul unei ordonanțe de completare a Codului Fiscal, prin care taxarea inversă la cereale este prelungită până la 31 mai 2014.

Pe de altă parte, Comisia a aprobat în data de 31 iulie 2012 o propunere de modificare a Directivei 2006/112/CE privind sistemul comun al taxei pe valoarea adăugată în ceea ce privește un mecanism de reacție rapidă împotriva fraudelor în materie de TVA.

Astfel, propunerea Comisiei prevede că pot fi adoptate acte de punere în aplicare prin care se autorizează orice stat membru să introducă următoarele măsuri speciale, prin derogare de la prezenta directivă, cu scopul de a combate formele bruște și masive de fraudă fiscală în materie de TVA, care ar putea duce la pierderi financiare considerabile și ireparabile.

Astfel, solicitarea autorităților române făcută în octombrie anul trecut ar putea intra sub incidența acestor prevederi, în momentul în care propunerea de modificare a directivei va fi aprobată.

— În ce măsură consideră Comisia că România ar putea fi eligibilă pentru obținerea unei derogări conform propunerii de directivă aflate în prezent în procedură legislativă?

— De asemenea, în cazul în care autoritățile române ar continua să aplice taxarea inversă la cereale (în baza modificărilor legislative operate de Camera Deputaților), care ar fi efectele unei astfel de decizii?

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006428/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(5 iunie 2013)

Subiect: Taxarea inversă la cereale în România

Autoritățile române au decis prelungirea cu încă un an a taxării inverse la cereale, în ciuda respingerii de către Comisie a solicitării României pentru extinderea regimului cu încă 12 luni.

Comisia este rugată să își exprime punctul de vedere cu privire la această decizie.

Răspuns comun dat de dl Šemeta în numele Comisiei

(2 iulie 2013)

În primul rând, trebuie menționat faptul că adoptarea formală a Mecanismului de reacție rapidă (MRR), ca parte a pachetului de măsuri privind combaterea fraudei în domeniul TVA, trebuie să respecte acordul politic la care s-a ajuns în cadrul ECOFIN, la 21 iunie. În al doilea rând, viitoarele cereri de derogare în temeiul MRR vor fi evaluate în funcție de temeinicia lor, pe baza informațiilor furnizate de statul membru în cauză. Prin urmare, Comisia nu este în măsură să ofere distinsului membru o declarație formală cu privire la o ipotetică cerere referitoare la Mecanismul de reacție rapidă.

În vederea aplicării procedurii de taxare inversă, este obligatoriu ca un stat membru să fie autorizat în acest sens de Consiliu, în conformitate cu procedura și condițiile prevăzute la articolul 395 din Directiva 2006/112/CE sau ca bunurile ori serviciile în cauză să figureze la articolul 199 din directiva menționată anterior (propunerea de modificare a acestei directive face parte din pachetul de măsuri privind combaterea fraudei). În cazul în care un stat membru nu respectă legislația Uniunii Europene, Comisia are dreptul de a iniția o procedură privind încălcarea dreptului UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005847/13
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(24 May 2013)

Subject: Extension of Romania's reverse charge mechanism for cereals

In April 2013 the Commission rejected the Romanian authorities' request to extend the application of the reverse charge mechanism for cereals.

The request had been made in 2012 with the aim of obtaining authorisation for the reverse charge mechanism for cereals, which would normally expire at the end of May 2013, to be extended until 2015.

The Romanian Chamber of Deputies recently adopted a number of amendments in a supplementary order to the tax code under which the reverse charge mechanism for cereals is extended until 31 May 2014.

On 31 July 2012 the Commission adopted a proposal amending Directive 2006/112/EC on the common system of value added tax as regards a quick-reaction mechanism against VAT fraud.

That Commission proposal provides that implementing acts may be adopted authorising any Member State to introduce special measures by derogation from this directive, in order to combat sudden and massive forms of tax fraud in the field of VAT which could lead to considerable and irreparable financial losses.

The request made by the Romanian authorities in October 2012 could thus be covered by these provisions when the proposal amending the directive is adopted.

— To what extent does the Commission consider that Romania could be eligible for a derogation in accordance with the proposal for a directive for which the legislative procedure is now underway?

— What will the consequences be if the Romanian authorities continue to apply the reverse charge mechanism for cereals on the basis of the legislative amendments adopted by the Chamber of Deputies?

Question for written answer E-006428/13
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(5 June 2013)

Subject: Reverse charge mechanism for cereal crops in Romania

The Romanian authorities have decided to extend the reverse charge mechanism for cereal crops by an additional year, despite the Commission having rejected Romania's request to extend the mechanism for that period.

How does the Commission view that decision?

Joint answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission

(2 July 2013)

It should first be pointed out that the formal adoption of the Quick Reaction Mechanism (QRM), as part of the VAT anti-fraud package, still has to follow the political agreement reached at the Ecofin of 21 June. Secondly, any future request for a derogation under the QRM would be assessed on its own merits on the basis of information provided by the Member State concerned. The Commission is therefore not in position to provide the Honourable Member with a formal statement regarding a hypothetical request in relation to the Quick Reaction Mechanism.

In order to apply the reverse charge system, it is a requirement that a Member State is duly authorised by the Council in accordance with the procedure and the conditions set out in Article 395 of Directive 2006/112/EC or that the goods or services concerned are listed in Article 199 of the said Directive (whose proposed modification is part of the abovementioned anti-fraud package). Where a Member State fails to comply with EU legislation, the Commission has the right to initiate an infringement procedure.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005908/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 mai 2013)

Objet: Menaces et refus de l'Inde de payer la taxe carbone

Le gouvernement indien a menacé d'interdire aux compagnies aériennes européennes d'opérer sur son territoire si l'Union européenne prenait les mêmes mesures à l'égard des compagnies indiennes, qui s'opposent à la nouvelle taxe carbone mise en place par l'Union européenne.

La législation européenne oblige les compagnies opérant dans l'Union à payer, quelle que soit leur nationalité, à compter du printemps 2013, une taxe de CO_2 pour l'équivalent de 15 % de leurs émissions, soit 32 millions de tonnes. À la mi-mai, l'Union a donné à la Chine et à l'Inde un mois supplémentaire pour communiquer le montant des émissions de CO_2 de leurs compagnies aériennes. «Nous prendrons des mesures de représailles face aux mesures prises par l'Union européenne. Si l'Europe interdit nos transporteurs, nous interdirons les siens», a déclaré un responsable du gouvernement indien.

Même si elles sont d'un montant dérisoire face à celles de leurs homologues chinoises, les autorités indiennes ont à nouveau fait savoir il y a une semaine qu'elles ne payeront pas.

1. Comment la Commission réagit-elle à ces menaces?

2. Ne devraient-elles pas être passibles d'une amende de 100 euros par tonne de CO_2 émise?

3. Quels moyens la Commission compte-t-elle mettre en œuvre pour faire valoir nos droits?

4. Pourrait-on interdire notre espace aérien aux compagnies hors-la-loi?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005909/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 mai 2013)

Objet: Refus de la Chine de payer la taxe carbone

La Chine n'acceptera pas de payer pour les émissions de CO_2 de ses avions à l'intérieur de l'Union européenne, a indiqué un responsable de son aviation civile (CAAC) cité samedi par le journal China Daily.

La deuxième puissance économique mondiale dit ne pas accepter des mesures de marché unilatérales et contraignantes. Elle argue également que les compagnies aériennes des pays en développement devraient recevoir une aide financière et technologique dans leurs efforts pour affronter les effets du changement climatique. Les huit compagnies chinoises ont émis 24 500 tonnes de CO_2 durant ces vols intracommunautaires en 2012.

1. Ces compagnies ne devraient-elles pas être passibles d'une amende de 100 euros par tonne de CO_2 émise, soit un montant total de la pénalité s'élevant à 2,4 millions d'euros?

2. Quels moyens la Commission compte-t-elle mettre en œuvre pour faire valoir nos droits?

3. Est-il possible d'interdire notre espace aérien aux compagnies hors-la-loi?

4. Que pense la Commission du fait qu'il serait plus simple qu'une autorité européenne se charge du recouvrement plutôt que de laisser à chaque État de l'Union au départ duquel ces compagnies effectuent les vols le soin de contacter les compagnies et de lancer les procédures pour recouvrer les amendes?

Réponse commune donnée par Mme Hedegaard au nom de la Commission

(18 juillet 2013)

Les exploitants d'aéronefs sont tenus de respecter la législation de l'UE, qui ne méconnaît ni le droit international ni le principe de la souveraineté des États, selon l'arrêt du 21 décembre 2011 ([1]) de la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne.

Les exploitants d'aéronefs responsables de 98 % des émissions provenant des vols effectués au sein de l'Europe, soit la quasi-totalité des grands exploitants d'aéronefs, ont respecté la législation relative au système d'échange de quotas d'émission (SEQE).

L'UE travaille activement, en collaboration avec ses partenaires internationaux, en vue d'aboutir à un résultat positif au cours de la prochaine assemblée de l'OACI, en 2013. D'ici là, l'UE a pris la décision d'interrompre le dispositif dans une tentative de donner un nouveau souffle aux négociations au sein de l'OACI, et nous invitons la Chine et l'Inde à adopter à leur tour une approche constructive.

([1]) Affaire C-366/10.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005908/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 May 2013)

Subject: Threats by India in relation to its refusal to pay carbon tax

The Indian Government has threatened to ban European airlines from operating on its territory if the European Union takes measures of that kind against Indian carriers which oppose the new carbon tax introduced by the European Union.

Since Spring 2013 companies operating in the European Union, regardless of their nationality, have been required by European law to pay a CO_2 tax in respect of 15% of their carbon emissions, i.e. 32 million tonnes. In mid-May, the Union gave China and India a further month in which to inform it of the amount of their airlines' CO_2 emissions. An Indian government official announced that it would take retaliatory measures in response to the action taken by the European Union, and that if the EU banned Indian carriers, India would ban European airlines.

A week ago the Indian authorities again insisted that they would not pay any fines imposed, even if they are minimal compared to those faced by the Chinese authorities.

1. What is the Commission's response to these threats?

2. Should the Indian authorities not be liable to pay a fine of EUR 100 per tonne of CO_2 emitted?

3. What measures does the Commission intend to take with a view to enforcing the Union's rights?

4. Would it be possible to refuse access to our airspace for companies flouting the law?

Question for written answer E-005909/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 May 2013)

Subject: China's refusal to pay the carbon tax

A representative of the Chinese civil aviation authority (CAAC) was quoted by *China Daily* last Saturday as saying that China would not pay for its aircrafts' CO_2 emissions in the EU.

The world's second leading economic power is saying that it will not agree to unilateral binding market measures. China also argues that airline companies from developing countries should receive financial and technological assistance in their efforts to address the effects of climate change. China's eight airline companies emitted 24 500 tonnes of CO_2 during internal EU flights in 2012.

1. Does the Commission not feel that those companies should be liable to pay a fine of EUR 100 per tonne of CO_2 emitted, making the total penalty one of EUR 2.4 million?

2. What will the Commission do to uphold the EU's rights?

3. Is it possible to ban companies acting outside the law from using EU airspace?

4. Does the Commission not feel that it would be easier for a single European authority to recover the amounts unpaid, rather than leaving it to each individual EU Member State from which those airline companies fly to contact them and launch fine collection proceedings?

Joint answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission

(18 July 2013)

Aircraft operators must respect the EU legislation, which is fully compatible with international law including the principle of state sovereignty as also confirmed by the European Court of Justice in its judgment of 21 December 2011 ([1]).

Aircraft operators responsible for over 98% of the 2012 emissions from flights within Europe have complied with the EU ETS legislation. That covers almost all major aircraft operators.

In the meantime, the EU, together with its international partners, is working actively to secure a positive outcome at the 2013 ICAO Assembly. With the 'stop the clock' decision the EU has tried to add momentum to the negotiations at ICAO and we are encouraging both China and India to take a similarly constructive approach.

([1]) Case C-366/10.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005983/13
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(29 de mayo de 2013)

Asunto: Acuerdo de pesca entre la República Islámica de Mauritania y la Federación de Rusia

Según ciertas informaciones que hemos conocido en el día de hoy, la República Islámica de Mauritania ha firmado un acuerdo de pesca con la Federación de Rusia para su flota pelágica. Según el Protocolo de Pesca UE-Mauritania, todo tercer Estado debe estar sujeto a las mismas condiciones establecidas para la flota de la UE. Ahora bien, la cuota establecida para la flota pelágica en el Protocolo UE-Mauritania es de 325 $ mientras que, según estas mismas fuentes, la cantidad prevista ahora para Rusia es de 180 $.

Se trata, en definitiva, de un nuevo incumplimiento al nuevo Protocolo firmado entre la UE y Mauritania por el que toda flota que faene en aguas mauritanas debe hacerlo en condiciones de igualdad con la de la UE que, a su vez, dispone de acceso preferencial sobre los recursos excedentarios en aguas mauritanas.

¿Puede la Comisión confirmar si son ciertas estas informaciones? ¿Se ajustan estos hechos a los compromisos adquiridos en el Protocolo de Pesca entre la UE y Mauritania? ¿Conoce el impacto del Acuerdo con Rusia sobre las oportunidades de pesca de la UE? ¿Considera que existe trato discriminatorio para la flota de la UE?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006031/13
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(30 de mayo de 2013)

Asunto: Aplicación del Protocolo de Pesca UE-Mauritania a la flota merlucera

En la reunión técnica UE-Mauritania del pasado 24 de mayo en Bruselas, relativa al Protocolo de Pesca suscrito en julio del año pasado entre la UE y Mauritania, estaba previsto tratar en el punto 2 del orden del día los cánones de las categorías 1 (marisqueros) y 2 (merluceros).

El canon sobre la pesca merlucera, sorprendentemente, no fue planteado por la parte europea a la que correspondía ponerlo formalmente sobre la mesa. La cuestión no figura en las conclusiones de la reunión. La flota afectada ha expresado su desconcierto y preocupación por esta situación.

¿Puede confirmar la Comisión que no ha planteado la reducción del canon aplicable a las capturas de merluza en la reunión técnica UE-Mauritania del pasado 24 de mayo en Bruselas? ¿Le ha sido transmitida esta preocupación por los Estados miembros afectados? ¿Va a hacerlo próximamente, antes de que culmine el procedimiento de ratificación o no del Protocolo?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006051/13
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D), Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D) y Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)
(30 de mayo de 2013)

Asunto: Repercusiones para las Islas Canarias del Protocolo de Pesca UE-Mauritania

El nuevo Protocolo de Pesca entre la UE y Mauritania, suscrito por la Comisión en julio de 2012, establece una serie de cambios sustanciales en la actividad y el control de distintas flotas que faenan con base en Canarias o que operan en el puerto de Las Palmas.

Desde el punto de vista de la economía de las islas, las dos flotas más importantes son la cefalopodera y la de grandes arrastreros pelágicos. La primera ha cesado sus actividades desde la firma del nuevo protocolo y la segunda vió modificadas sus condiciones técnicas y económicas, por lo que no ha aprovechado las oportunidades pesqueras del nuevo protocolo, al igual que la flota marisquera, que también experimentó cambios en sus condiciones de acceso.

Las informaciones procedentes de diversas fuentes, entre ellas operadores canarios y participantes en la reciente delegación a la zona de la Comisión de Pesca del Parlamento Europeo, coinciden en señalar que el protocolo tendrá un importante impacto en Canarias, planteando problemas en términos de empleos a bordo y asociado a la actividad pesquera. El puerto de Las Palmas ha visto cómo descendía su actividad y se reducía el tráfico de mercancías pesqueras de forma significativa.

¿Dispone la Comisión de datos relativos al impacto socioeconómico, en particular en el empleo, del nuevo Protocolo de Pesca entre la UE y Mauritania para el puerto de Las Palmas y, en general, para las Islas Canarias? ¿Han sido tenidas en cuentas estas circunstancias durante la negociación del Protocolo? ¿Va a adoptar alguna medida la Comisión para subsanar los efectos previstos e incluso las consecuencias indeseadas a causa de la puesta en marcha del Protocolo?

Respuesta conjunta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(16 de septiembre de 2013)

Según la información de que dispone la Comisión, hasta la fecha no se ha firmado ningún acuerdo de pesca entre Rusia y Mauritania. No obstante, la Comisión indagará la cuestión y se cerciorará de que se respetan las disposiciones del Protocolo en lo que se refiere a la igualdad de trato.

Por lo que concierne a la cláusula de no discriminación contenida en el Protocolo, la Comisión ruega a Sus Señorías se remitan a su respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-005802/2013 ([1]).

En lo que respecta a la Categoría 2 (merluza negra), Mauritania aceptó, a petición de la Unión Europea, incrementar la cuota de 4 000 a 5 000 toneladas. La Comisión no ha recibido ninguna petición oficial de los Estados miembros en relación con la reducción de los cánones de las licencias.

Dado que el puerto de Nuadhibu no está dotado de instalaciones de transformación para la industria demersal y para las especies pelágicas frescas, las capturas se desembarcan y vuelven a embarcarse para su posterior transformación en Las Palmas, donde la industria pelágica posee una base logística, o, si así lo requiere la estrategia del sector, se transportan directamente en camiones hacia Europa. Se espera que Las Palmas siga siendo una base logística en el futuro. La previsible mejora del nivel de utilización de las categorías demersal y pelágica del Protocolo debería redundar en un incremento de las actividades portuarias y, por consiguiente, beneficiar de forma positiva y directa al puerto de Las Palmas.

La preservación de los intereses socioeconómicos de las flotas de la Unión es un elemento crucial que la Comisión tiene en cuenta sistemáticamente cuando negocia un acuerdo de colaboración en el sector pesquero.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005983/13
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(29 May 2013)

Subject: Fisheries agreement between the Islamic Republic of Mauritania and the Russian Federation

According to reports that have come to light today, the Islamic Republic of Mauritania has signed a fisheries agreement with the Russian Federation for its pelagic fleet. According to the EU-Mauritania Fisheries Protocol, any third country has to be subject to the same conditions as the EU fleet. However, the fee set for the pelagic fleet in the EU-Mauritania Protocol is USD 325, while, according to the same sources, the fee now set for Russia is USD 180.

This is ultimately a further breach of the new protocol signed between the EU and Mauritania under which any fleet fishing in Mauritanian waters must do so on an equal footing with the EU's fleet which, in turn, has preferential access to surplus resources in Mauritanian waters.

Can the Commission confirm whether this information is correct? Are these facts in keeping with the commitments made in the Fisheries Protocol between the EU and Mauritania? Does the Commission know what impact the agreement with Russia will have on the EU's fishing opportunities? Does it think that the EU's fleet is being discriminated against?

Question for written answer E-006031/13
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(30 May 2013)

Subject: Application of EU-Mauritania Fisheries Protocol to hake fleets

At the EU-Mauritania technical meeting of 24 May 2013 in Brussels concerning the EU-Mauritania Fisheries Protocol of July 2012, item 2 of the agenda concerned fishing licence fees for categories 1 (shellfish) and 2 (hake).

Surprisingly, licence fees for hake fisheries, a question which should have been raised by the European delegates, was not discussed and no reference was made to it in the conclusions of the meeting. The affected fleet representatives have expressed surprise and concern at this situation.

Can the Commission confirm that it did not raise the question of licence fee reductions for hake catches at the EU-Mauritania technical meeting of 24 May 2013 in Brussels? Has it been made aware of the concerns of the Member States affected? Will it raise this question in the near future before the protocol ratification procedure is concluded?

Question for written answer E-006051/13
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D), Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D) and Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)
(30 May 2013)

Subject: Consequences for the Canary Islands of the EU-Mauritania Fisheries Protocol

The new Fisheries Protocol between the EU and Mauritania was signed by the Commission in July 2012. It has brought about a series of substantial changes to the operations and control of various fleets fishing out of the Canary Islands or operating in the port of Las Palmas.

The two fishing fleets that are most important to the islands' economy are the cephalopod fleet and the fleet of large pelargic trawlers. The former has stopped fishing since the signing of the new protocol while the latter has not taken advantage of the fishing opportunities under the new protocol owing to changes made to its technical and economic conditions. The same applies to the shellfish fleet, which also suffered changes to its conditions for fishing access.

Information obtained from various sources, including operators in the Canary Islands and the members of a delegation from Parliament's Committee on Fisheries who recently visited the area, all points to the protocol having a major impact on the Canary Islands, creating problems in terms of both onboard and fisheries-related jobs. The port of Las Palmas has seen its business decline and trade in fishing merchandise has fallen significantly.

Does the Commission have data on the socioeconomic impact of the new EU-Mauritania Fisheries Protocol for the port of Las Palmas and the Canary Islands in general, particularly in regard to employment? Were these circumstances taken into account during negotiations on the Protocol? Will the Commission take measures to rectify the anticipated effects and even undesirable consequences of this Protocol being implemented?

Joint answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission

(16 September 2013)

According to the information available to the Commission, no fisheries agreement between Russia and Mauritania has been signed to date. However, the Commission will further enquire on this issue and make sure that the provisions of the Protocol as to equal treatment are respected.

Regarding the issue of the non-discrimination clause contained in the protocol, the Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answer to Written Question E-005802/2013 ([1]).

Regarding Category C (Black hake), Mauritania accepted the increase of the quota from 4 000 to 5 000 tonnes on the request of the European Union. The Commission has not received any formal request from the Member States for reduction of the licence fees.

Given the fact that there are no processing facilities for the demersal industry and the fresh pelagics in the port of Nouadhibou, catches are landed and re-embarked for further processing in Las Palmas, where the pelagic industry has a logistic base or, if it corresponds to the strategy of the industry, shipped directly by lorries towards Europe. Las Palmas is expected to continue to be a logistical base for in the future. The expected improvement of the level of utilization for the demersal and pelagic categories of the protocol should lead to an increase of at-port activities and, therefore, should positively and directly benefit to the Port of Las Palmas.

Preservation of socioeconomic interests of EU fleets is a fundamental element that the Commission systematically takes into account when negotiating a Fishery Partnership Agreement.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006476/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(6. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Kritik an der Änderung der Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012

Im Januar 2012 wurde die Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012 der Kommission mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl im Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union veröffentlicht. Im Mai 2013 stimmte ein Expertengremium der Mitgliedstaaten dem Vorschlag der Kommission für eine Änderung der Verordnung zu. In zahlreichen europäischen Medien wurde ein Absatz des Änderungsvorschlags, der die Verwendung von nicht-wiederbefüllbaren Behältern für Olivenöl in gastronomischen Einrichtungen vorschreibt, kritisiert. Der Zwang zu Einwegbehältern kann Kritikern zufolge den gastronomischen Einrichtungen und Verbrauchern in Europa hohe Kosten verursachen. Mitte Mai 2013 verkündete die Kommission, sie werde den Änderungsvorschlag aufgrund der Kritik überarbeiten.

1. Werden dieselben Personen, die auch die erste Fassung des Änderungsvorschlags ausgearbeitet haben, an der Ausarbeitung des neuen Änderungsvorschlags beteiligt sein?

2. Wird die neue Fassung des Änderungsvorschlags weiterhin die kritisierte Einweg-Behälter-Pflicht enthalten?

3. Wird die neue Fassung des Änderungsvorschlags weiterhin Regelungen zur Tischpräsentation von Olivenöl in gastronomischen Einrichtungen enthalten?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006477/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(6. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Hygiene von Olivenölbehältern in gastronomischen Einrichtungen

Im Januar 2012 wurde die Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012 der Kommission mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl im Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union veröffentlicht. Im Mai 2013 stimmte ein Expertengremium der Mitgliedstaaten dem Vorschlag der Kommission für eine Änderung der Verordnung zu. In vielen europäischen Medien wurde ein Absatz des Änderungsvorschlags, der die Verwendung von nicht-wiederbefüllbaren Behältern für Olivenöl in gastronomischen Einrichtungen vorschreibt, kritisiert. Der Zwang zu Einwegbehältern könnte Kritikern zufolge den gastronomischen Einrichtungen und Verbrauchern in Europa hohe Kosten verursachen. Ein Sprecher der Kommission nannte in einer Pressekonferenz „Hygiene“ und „Verbraucherschutz“ als Gründe für die entsprechende Passage des Änderungsvorschlags.

1. Welche spezifischen Befürchtungen zur „Hygiene“ von wiederbefüllbaren Olivenölbehältern wie Flaschen oder Schalen hat die Kommission?

2. In welchen Mitgliedstaaten schützen bestehende Hygienerichtlinien für gastronomische Einrichtungen die Verbraucher nach Ansicht der Kommission noch nicht ausreichend vor unhygienischen Olivenölbehältern?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006478/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(6. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Verbraucherschutz bei Olivenöl in gastronomischen Einrichtungen

Im Januar 2012 wurde die Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012 der Kommission mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl im Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union veröffentlicht. Im Mai 2013 stimmte ein Expertengremium der Mitgliedstaaten dem Vorschlag der Kommission für eine Änderung der Verordnung zu. In vielen europäischen Medien wurde ein Absatz des Änderungsvorschlags, der die Verwendung von nicht-wiederbefüllbaren Behältern für Olivenöl in gastronomischen Einrichtungen vorschreibt, kritisiert. Der Zwang zu Einwegbehältern könnte Kritikern zufolge den gastronomischen Einrichtungen und Verbrauchern in Europa hohe Kosten verursachen. Ein Sprecher der Kommission nannte in einer Pressekonferenz „Hygiene" und „Verbraucherschutz" als Gründe für die entsprechende Passage des Änderungsvorschlags.

In welchen Mitgliedstaaten schützen bestehende Richtlinien zum Verbraucherschutz nach Ansicht der Kommission die Kunden nicht ausreichend vor am Tisch präsentiertem und falsch gekennzeichnetem Olivenöl?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006504/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(6. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Lobbykontakte seit Veröffentlichung der Durchführungsverordnung mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl

Im Januar 2012 wurde die Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012 der Kommission mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl im Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union veröffentlicht.

1. Welche Personen, Interessengruppen, Organisationen, Behörden oder Regierungsvertreter traten seit Veröffentlichung des ersten Entwurfs der Durchführungsverordnung zu Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl im Zusammenhang mit dieser Verordnung mit der Kommission oder einer ihrer Agenturen in Kontakt?

2. Welche Akteure traten dafür ein, gastronomischen Einrichtungen die Nutzung nicht wieder verwendbarer Behälter für Olivenöl vorzuschreiben?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006569/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(7. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Bemerkungen zur Änderung der Durchführungsverordnung mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl

Im Januar 2012 wurde die Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012 der Kommission mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl im Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union veröffentlicht. Im Februar 2013 bat die Generaldirektion Unternehmen und Industrie der Europäischen Kommission in der Notifizierung G/TBT/N/EU/95 um Bemerkungen zu einem Änderungsvorschlag betreffend die Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012.

1. Welche Behörden, Organisationen, Staaten oder sonstigen Akteure übermittelten eine formelle „Bemerkung" als Reaktion auf die Notifizierung der Kommission?

2. Welche Organisationen vermerkten Bedenken zur verbindlichen Nutzung von nicht-widerverwendbaren Behältern in gastronomischen Einrichtungen?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006571/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(7. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Gründe für die Änderung der Durchführungsverordnung (UE) Nr. 29/2012

Im Januar 2012 wurde die Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012 der Kommission mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl im Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union veröffentlicht. Im Mai 2013 stimmte ein Expertengremium der Mitgliedstaaten dem Kommissionsvorschlag zu einer Änderung der Verordnung zu. In Medien aller europäischen Länder wurde ein Absatz des Änderungsvorschlags, der die Verwendung von nicht-wiederbefüllbaren Behältern für Olivenöl in gastronomischen Einrichtungen vorschreibt, kritisiert. Der Zwang zu Einwegbehältern kann Kritikern zufolge den europäischen gastronomischen Einrichtungen und Verbrauchern hohe Kosten verursachen. Mitte Mai 2013 verkündete die Kommission, sie werde den Vorschlag aufgrund der Kritik überarbeiten.

1. Warum wurde überhaupt eine Änderung der noch jungen Verordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012 vorgeschlagen?

2. Wäre es statt eine Neufassung des Änderungsvorschlags zu verfassen nicht effizienter und kostensparender, die Verordnung in ihrer jetzigen Form zu belassen?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006573/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(7. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Beteiligung der Generaldirektionen der Kommission an der Änderung der Durchführungsverordnung (UE) Nr.29/2012

Im Januar 2012 wurde die Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012 der Kommission mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl im Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union veröffentlicht. Im Mai 2013 stimmte ein Expertengremium der Mitgliedstaaten dem Kommissionsvorschlag zu einer Änderung der Verordnung zu. In Medien aller europäischen Länder wurde ein Absatz des Änderungsvorschlags, der die Verwendung von nicht-wiederbefüllbaren Behältern für Olivenöl in gastronomischen Einrichtungen vorschreibt, kritisiert. Der Zwang zu Einwegbehältern kann Kritikern zufolge den europäischen gastronomischen Einrichtungen und Verbrauchern hohe Kosten verursachen. Mitte Mai 2013 verkündete die Kommission, sie werde den Vorschlag aufgrund der Kritik überarbeiten.

1. Welche Generaldirektionen und Kommissare waren an der Formulierung der Änderung der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012 beteiligt?

2. Welcher Kommissar oder welche Generaldirektion beschloss nach der öffentlichen Kritik, den Vorschlag zu überarbeiten?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006574/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(7. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Auswirkungen der Änderung der Durchführungsverordnung (UE) Nr. 29/2012 mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl

Im Januar 2012 wurde die Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012 der Kommission mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl im Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union veröffentlicht. Im Mai 2013 stimmte ein Expertengremium der Mitgliedstaaten dem Kommissionsvorschlag zu einer Änderung der Verordnung zu. Nach öffentlicher Kritik zog die Kommission ihren Vorschlag zurück. In vielen europäischen Medien wurde ein Absatz des Änderungsvorschlags, der die Verwendung von nicht-wiederbefüllbaren Behältern für Olivenöl in gastronomischen Einrichtungen vorschreibt, kritisiert. Der Zwang zu Einwegbehältern könnte der Kritik zufolge europäischen gastronomischen Einrichtungen und Verbrauchern hohe Kosten verursachen.

1. Hat die Kommission vor Veröffentlichung ihres Änderungsvorschlags Berechnungen beziehungsweise Untersuchungen durchgeführt oder verfügt sie über Schätzungen darüber:

— Wie viele gastronomische Einrichtungen von der Änderung betroffen wären?

— Welche Kosten die Verpflichtung zum Kauf von Einweg-Olivenölflaschen für die Tischpräsentation für die europäischen gastronomischen Einrichtungen insgesamt verursachen würde?

— Wie viele der europäischen Olivenölproduzenten in der Lage wären, solche Einweg-Olivenölbehälter zu produzieren und vermarkten?

— Welcher Anteil der europäischen Olivenölproduzenten nicht in der Lage wäre, solche Einweg-Olivenölbehälter zu produzieren und vermarkten?

— Welche Auswirkungen diese Änderung auf kleine und nichtindustrielle Olivenölproduzenten und deren Verkaufs- und Vermarktungsmöglichkeiten haben würde?

2. Falls die Kommission zu einem oder mehreren der genannten Punkte nicht über Berechnungen, Untersuchungen oder Schätzungen verfügt, warum wurde dieser Punkt nicht vor dem Erstellen des Änderungsvorschlags untersucht?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006576/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(7. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Änderung der Durchführungsverordnung mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl

1. Warum wurde nach nur einem Jahr eine Änderung der Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012 vom 13. Januar 2012 vorgeschlagen?

2. Welches Individuum, welche Arbeitsgruppe, welche Generaldirektion, welcher nichtstaatliche Akteur oder welcher Mitgliedstaat ersuchten um eine Änderung der Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012? Wann wurde diese Bitte vermerkt?

3. Wer entschied zu welchem Zeitpunkt, die Änderung einzuleiten?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006605/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(7. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Offenlegung der Sitzung des Verwaltungsausschusses, welcher über die Änderung der Durchführungsverordnung mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl abstimmte

Im Januar 2012 wurde die Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012 der Kommission mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl im Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union veröffentlicht. Im Mai 2013 stimmte ein Expertengremium der Mitgliedstaaten dem Kommissionsvorschlag für eine Änderung der Verordnung zu. In zahlreichen europäischen Medien wurde ein Absatz des Änderungsvorschlags, der die Verwendung von nicht-wiederbefüllbaren Behältern für Olivenöl in gastronomischen Einrichtungen vorschreibt, kritisiert. Der Zwang zu Einwegbehältern kann Kritikern zufolge den europäischen gastronomischen Einrichtungen und Verbrauchern hohe Kosten verursachen. Mitte Mai 2013 kündigte die Kommission an, sie werde aufgrund der Kritik den Änderungsvorschlag überarbeiten.

Aufgrund der Auswirkungen auf Verbraucher, gastronomische Einrichtungen und möglicherweise andere Organisationen wird die Kommission um sofortige Offenlegung folgender Unterlagen ersucht:

1. der Namensliste aller Personen, die bei der Sitzung des „Einheitlichen Verwaltungsausschuss Obst und Gemüse" anwesend waren, in der über die Änderung der Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012 abgestimmt wurde;

2. einer Auflistung, welche Behörden der Mitgliedstaaten diese Personen jeweils entsandten;

3. einer Abstimmungsliste, die zeigt, wie jeder dieser Vertreter abstimmte;

4. aller schriftlichen Protokolle sowie aller audio- oder videotechnischen oder sonstigen Aufzeichnungen der betreffenden Sitzung des Verwaltungsausschusses (es wird darauf hingewiesen, dass auch für die Simultanübersetzung der Sitzung erstellte Aufnahmen von Interesse sind).

Falls die Offenlegung von Teilen oder der gesamten geforderten Informationen aufgrund von Bedenken im Zusammenhang mit den Personen und Datenschutz oder aus sonstigen Gründen nicht erfolgen kann, wird die Kommission um eine baldmögliche Übermittlung der genannten Informationen an das Brüsseler Büro des Fragestellers ersucht.

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Cioloş im Namen der Kommission
(15. Juli 2013)

Der Entwurf einer Durchführungsverordnung zur Änderung der Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 29/2012 mit Vermarktungsvorschriften für Olivenöl sah unter anderem die Maßnahme vor, dass dem Endverbraucher in Betrieben des Hotel- und Gaststättengewerbes Olivenöl in Flaschen bereitgestellt werden muss, die nicht wieder befüllt werden können.

Dieser vorgelegte Änderungsentwurf hat nicht die Unterstützung einer qualifizierten Mehrheit der Mitgliedstaaten gefunden und ist daher zurückgezogen worden.

In den nächsten Monaten wird die Kommission ihre Arbeiten fortsetzen, bei denen genauer ermittelt werden soll, inwieweit auf europäischer Ebene Maßnahmen erforderlich sind, um den Bedürfnissen aller Akteure des Olivenölsektors gerecht zu werden.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006921/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(14 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ανάκληση τροποποίησης κανονισμού για την προστασία του ελαιολάδου

Στη Σύνοδο Κορυφής της 22/5/2013, αποφασίστηκε η ανάκληση της πρότασης της Επιτροπής για την τροποποίηση του Κανονισμού (ΕΕ) αριθ. 29/2012, που αφορούσε στα πρότυπα εμπορίας λαδιού.

Ανάμεσα στους στόχους της αποσυρθείσας τροποποίησης ήταν μεταξύ άλλων, η «προστασία και ενημέρωση του καταναλωτή», μέσω της «διασφάλισης της ποιότητας και γνησιότητας του παρεχόμενου στους καταναλωτές ελαιολάδου», στους χώρους εστίασης.

Με την απόφαση αυτή, η προστασία μέσω της τυποποίησης των μεσογειακών προϊόντων και ιδιαίτερα προϊόντων ιδιαίτερης θρεπτικής αξίας,όπως το έξτρα παρθένο ελαιόλαδο, παραμένουν απροστάτευτα, διαιωνίζοντας την ασυδοσία που επικρατεί στην αγορά ελαιολάδου.

Καθώς η απόφαση απόσυρσης του τροποποιητικού κανονισμού του (ΕΕ) 29/2012, εγείρει πολλά ερωτήματα ως προς τη σκοπιμότητα και τα συμφέροντα που εξυπηρετεί,

ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Ποιοι ήταν οι πραγματικοί λόγοι που την οδήγησαν στην ανάκληση της τροποποίησης του Κανονισμού (ΕΕ) αριθ. 29/2012, όταν στη σύνοδο κορυφής της 22/5/2013, 15 κράτη μέλη από τα 27 υπερψήφισαν την πρόταση (ψήφοι 195 υπέρ, 94 κατά, 53 αποχές);

Με ποιον τρόπο πιστεύει ότι συμβάλλει η απόφαση ανάκλησης στη βελτίωση της ανταγωνιστικότητας του ευρωπαϊκού ελαιολάδου και ιδιαίτερα του έξτρα παρθένου, αλλά και στην προώθηση των μεσογειακών προϊόντων γενικότερα;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Cioloş εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Ιουλίου 2013)

Το σχέδιο εκτελεστικού κανονισμού για την τροποποίηση του εκτελεστικού κανονισμού (ΕΕ) αριθ. 29/2012 για τα πρότυπα εμπορίας του ελαιολάδου προέβλεπε, μεταξύ άλλων, το μέτρο της διάθεσής του στον τελικό καταναλωτή μέσα στα ξενοδοχεία, στα εστιατόρια και στα μπαρ σε φιάλες μιας χρήσης.

Το εν λόγω σχέδιο κειμένου δεν έχει λάβει τη στήριξη της ειδικής πλειοψηφίας των κρατών μελών και αποσύρθηκε.

Τους προσεχείς μήνες, η Επιτροπή θα ξαναρχίσει τις εργασίες της προκειμένου να διευκρινισθεί εάν πρέπει να αναληφθούν δράσεις σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο ώστε να καλυφθούν οι ανάγκες όλων των ενδιαφερόμενων φορέων στον ελαιοκομικό τομέα.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006093/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(30 maggio 2013)

Oggetto: Modifica del regolamento (UE) n. 29/2012 relativo alle norme di commercializzazione dell'olio d'oliva

La Commissione aveva annunciato la modifica del regolamento di esecuzione (UE) n. 29/2012 relativo alle norme di commercializzazione dell'olio d'oliva che prevedeva il divieto di servire in tavola, nei pubblici esercizi, olio proveniente da bottiglie originali dotate di tappo «anti-rabbocco».

Il 23 maggio scorso il Commissario europeo per l'agricoltura e lo sviluppo rurale Ciolos ha dichiarato che, in seguito al dibattito suscitato in alcuni Stati membri, si è deciso di ritirare la proposta di modifica del regolamento sopra citato.

1. Conferma la Commissione le dichiarazioni del Commissario Ciolos?

2. Intende essa ripresentare delle proposte di modifica dell'attuale normativa?

3. Aveva valutato l'impatto a livello economico sia sui ristoratori sia sui clienti finali dei nuovi disposti, in seguito stralciati?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006641/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(10 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Regolamento antioliere

L'improvvisa marcia indietro dell'UE, dopo una sola settimana dall'annuncio del provvedimento, in merito al regolamento antioliere segna una netta sconfitta nei confronti della tutela dei consumatori e della promozione della qualità dell'olio d'oliva che si attendeva da anni. L'obbligo sancito dal regolamento in questione di utilizzare nei ristoranti solo bottiglie di olio etichettate, sigillate con tappi antirabbocco e non riutilizzabili, rappresentava infatti una norma contro le frodi e gli imbrogli e in difesa degli oli italiani e europei di qualità.

1. Perché la Commissione ha sospeso questa norma, permettendo quindi ai ristoratori di servire ai tavoli olio sfuso, in bottiglie prive di etichetta e non sigillate, che si prestano a frodi di ogni genere, consentendo l'uso di oli di bassa qualità all'insaputa dei clienti e inibendo in questo modo la valorizzazione degli oli di qualità?

2. Se il ritiro del provvedimento è dovuto a un semplice rapporto di forze tra paesi del Sud e del Nord Europa, può la Commissione spiegare quali sarebbero i vantaggi dei consumatori nell'uso di pratiche che non garantiscono probità e sincerità in ordine al prodotto alimentare olio, che viene loro offerto al ristorante?

3. In che cosa consisterebbe in questo caso la continua asserzione della necessità della sicurezza alimentare, della genuinità dei prodotti e della loro origine?

4. Una realpolitik di tale fatta non contravviene a una serie di principi sbandierati e sanciti dalla Commissione in tante occasioni, quali la trasparenza, l'etichettatura veritiera sull'origine e sulla composizione dei prodotti, sull'igiene degli stessi e sull'opportunità di garantire una sempre maggiore qualità a difesa della salute e come incentivo per dare impulso all'export?

5. Quali sono i motivi veri che hanno spinto la Commissione a refutare l'opinione del coordinamento europeo del mondo produttivo agricolo (Copa-Cogeca), secondo il quale «la misura era di fondamentale importanza per i paesi produttori e per assicurare un prodotto di buona qualità per i consumatori»?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006734/13
alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(11 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Frodi e sofisticazioni alimentari nel comparto olivicolo

Nel corso degli anni si è diffusa la pratica di miscelare oli comunitari con oli extracomunitari ingannando il consumatore finale circa la provenienza, la qualità e le caratteristiche organolettiche del prodotto.

L'UE, nel suo complesso, detiene l'80 % della produzione mondiale di olio di oliva e l'olivicoltura ha una grande importanza non solo per l'economia rurale, ma anche per il patrimonio culturale e ambientale.

Nel settore lavorano approssimativamente 2,5 milioni di produttori, circa un terzo degli agricoltori dell'UE, e in talune regioni l'olivicoltura è la principale attività agricola sia in termini di occupati che di percentuale di superficie coltivata.

Mediante gli articoli 114 e 169 il Trattato di Lisbona tutela i consumatori attraverso il diritto all'informazione e un livello elevato di protezione contro i rischi e le minacce alla sicurezza e ai loro interessi economici.

Proprio in virtù dei principi precedentemente esposti, lo scorso mese di maggio l'UE aveva proposto il divieto di portare in tavola olio di oliva sfuso, perché considerato poco igienico e soprattutto in quanto potenziale veicolo per compiere frodi ai danni del consumatore.

La proposta era stata sostenuta da ben quindici Stati membri su ventisette e avrebbe permesso, se approvata, al consumatore di prendere conoscenza dell'origine e della denominazione del prodotto.

L'approvazione prima e la revoca poi di tale proposta ha permesso ai ristoratori di continuare a servire ai tavoli olio in bottiglie prive di etichetta e non sigillate che si prestano a frodi di ogni genere, ingannando il consumatore, da un lato, e inibendo la valorizzazione degli oli europei di qualità, dall'altro.

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. come giustifica il ritiro di tale proposta normativa;

2. se ritiene di dover elaborare una nuova proposta di regolamento a tutela della qualità, della trasparenza e della sicurezza dell'olio d'oliva, al fine di rafforzare la posizione sui mercati mondiali, incoraggiando una produzione di alta qualità di cui possano beneficiare coltivatori, trasformatori, commercianti e consumatori europei?

Risposta congiunta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(15 luglio 2013)

Il progetto di regolamento di esecuzione recante modifica al regolamento di esecuzione (UE) n. 29/2012 relativo alle norme di commercializzazione dell'olio d'oliva prevedeva, tra l'altro, l'obbligo di servire l'olio al consumatore finale dell'industria alberghiera, della ristorazione e dei bar in bottiglie che non possono essere riempite più di una volta.

Questa proposta di emendamento non ha ricevuto l'appoggio di una maggioranza qualificata degli Stati membri ed è stata ritirata.

Nei prossimi mesi la Commissione riprenderà i lavori con lo scopo di rilevare se a livello europeo sia necessario adottare delle misure per rispondere ai bisogni di tutti i soggetti della filiera oleicola.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006004/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(29 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Decisão da Comissão Europeia sobre a utilização de galheteiros na restauração

Associações de agricultores, produtores e embaladores de azeite criticaram a decisão recente da Comissão Europeia de recuar na obrigatoriedade da comercialização de azeite em embalagens invioláveis na restauração e hotelaria, à semelhança do que já acontece em Portugal e na Grécia.

Esta medida é referida como uma forma de garantir a segurança alimentar do azeite servido nos hotéis, restaurantes e cafés (o chamado canal Horeca) e prevenir a fraude que, a verificar-se, prejudica a imagem do azeite como produto de grande qualidade, que contribui de forma cada vez mais significativa para as exportações nacionais de países como Portugal.

Esta decisão da Comissão Europeia é descrita como defraudando as expectativas dos países europeus produtores de azeite, que cumprem, por vezes com grande esforço, todas as regras de qualidade e segurança alimentar impostas pela União Europeia. Ademais, considera-se que estamos perante uma cedência da Comissão aos interesses e pressões dos países do Norte, que não produzem e que pouco consomem azeite.

Em face do exposto, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Como justifica a sua decisão?

2. Que países se opuseram e que países apoiaram esta decisão?

3. Que medidas pensa tomar a este respeito no futuro?

Resposta conjunta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(15 de julho de 2013)

O projeto de regulamento de execução que altera o Regulamento de Execução (UE) n.° 29/2012, relativo às normas de comercialização do azeite, previa, entre outras medidas, a obrigação de servir o azeite ao consumidor final do setor da hotelaria e restauração (setor Horeca) em garrafas que não possam ser enchidas mais de uma vez.

Esta proposta de alteração não obteve o apoio de uma maioria qualificada de Estados-Membros e foi retirada.

Durante os próximos meses, a Comissão retomará os trabalhos com vista a determinar se são necessárias medidas a nível europeu para dar resposta às necessidades de todos os intervenientes do setor oleícola.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006004/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(29 May 2013)

Subject: Commission decision on the use of olive oil jugs in restaurants

Associations of farmers and olive oil producers and packagers have criticised the Commission's recent u-turn on the requirement that oil be presented in sealed containers in restaurants, as is already the case in Portugal.

The measure was presented as a means of guaranteeing the quality of olive oil served in hotels, restaurants and bars and of preventing fraud from damaging olive oil's reputation as a high-quality product, which is an increasingly important national export in countries such as Portugal.

The Commission's decision is seen as disappointing the expectations of Europe's oil-producing countries which comply, often with great effort, with all the quality and food safety rules imposed by the EU. The Commission also appears to be giving way to the interests of and pressure from the northern European countries, which neither produce nor substantially consume olive oil.

In light of the above, can the Commission answer the following:

1. How does it justify its decision?

2. Which countries opposed the decision and which supported it?

3. What measures does it intend to apply in the future in this field?

Question for written answer E-006093/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(30 May 2013)

Subject: Amendment to Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil

Previously, the Commission announced it was going to amend Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil, introducing a ban on serving oil from original bottles equipped with an anti-refill stopper at tables in public establishments.

On 23 May 2013 Mr Cioloş, European Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural Development, stated that, following debates in some Member States, a decision had been taken to withdraw the proposal to amend the above regulation.

1. Can the Commission confirm the statement by Mr Cioloş?

2. Does it intend to resubmit proposals to amend the legislation in force?

3. Did it assess the financial impact of the new provisions, which were subsequently withdrawn, on both restaurants and end consumers?

Question for written answer E-006476/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(6 June 2013)

Subject: Criticism of the Amendment to Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012

Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil was published by the Commission in the *Official Journal of the European Union* in January 2012. In May 2013, an expert body from the Member States agreed to the Commission's proposal for an amendment to the regulation. One paragraph of the proposed amendment that prescribes the use of non-refillable olive oil containers in catering establishments met with widespread criticism in the European media. According to the critics, the required use of disposable containers may result in high costs for catering establishments and consumers in Europe. In mid-May 2013, the Commission announced it would revise the proposed amendment because of the criticisms expressed.

1. Will the same persons who drafted the first version of the proposed amendment also be involved in drawing up the newly revised proposal?

2. Will the new version of the proposed amendment still contain the much-criticised disposable container requirement?

3. Will the new version of the proposed amendment still contain regulations concerning the presentation of olive oil on the table in catering establishments?

Question for written answer E-006477/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(6 June 2013)

Subject: Hygiene questions concerning olive oil containers in food establishments

In January 2012, Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil was published in the *Official Journal of the European Union*. In May 2013, a panel of experts from the Member States approved a Commission proposal to amend the regulation. One paragraph in the proposal banning the use of non-refillable olive oil containers in food establishments received media criticism throughout Europe. According to critics, the insistence on single-use containers would impose a considerable financial burden on food establishments and consumers in Europe. At a press conference, a Commission spokesperson gave 'hygiene' and 'consumer protection' as the reasons for this part of the proposal.

1. What specific hygiene concerns does the Commission have concerning refillable olive oil containers such as bottles or bowls?

2. In the Commission's view, in which Member States do the existing hygiene directives for food establishments provide consumers with insufficient protection from unhygienic olive oil containers?

Question for written answer E-006478/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(6 June 2013)

Subject: Consumer protection in relation to olive oil in catering establishments

Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil was published by the Commission in the *Official Journal of the European Union* in January 2012. In May 2013, an expert body from the Member States agreed to the Commission proposal for an amendment to the regulation. One paragraph of the proposed amendment that prescribes the use of non-refillable olive oil containers in catering establishments met with widespread criticism in the European media. According to the critics, the required use of disposable containers would result in high costs for catering establishments and consumers in Europe. In a press conference, a spokesman for the Commission pointed to 'hygiene' and 'consumer protection' as the reasons for the relevant passage in the proposed amendment.

In the view of the Commission, which Member States have consumer protection provisions that do not adequately protect customers from incorrectly labelled olive oil being presented at the table?

Question for written answer E-006504/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(6 June 2013)

Subject: Contact with lobbyists since the publication of the Implementing Regulation on marketing standards for olive oil

Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil was published in the *Official Journal of the European Union* in January 2012.

1. Which individuals, lobbies, organisations, authorities and government representatives have contacted the Commission or one of its agencies about the Implementing Regulation on marketing standards for olive oil since the first draft of this regulation was published?

2. Who was in favour of provisions which would prevent restaurants from using reusable receptacles for olive oil?

Question for written answer E-006569/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(7 June 2013)

Subject: Comments on the amendment to the Implementing Regulation on marketing standards for olive oil

Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil was published in the *Official Journal of the European Union* in January 2012. In February 2013, the Commission's Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry asked, in notification G/TBT/N/EU/95, for comments on a proposal for an amendment to Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012.

1. Which authorities, organisations, states or other players submitted a formal 'comment' in response to the Commission's notification?

2. Which organisations expressed concerns in relation to the mandatory use of non-reusable containers in food-serving outlets?

Question for written answer E-006571/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(7 June 2013)

Subject: Reasons for amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012

Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil was published in the *Official Journal of the European Union* in January 2012. In May 2013, an expert body from the Member States approved the Commission proposal for an amendment to the regulation. One paragraph of the proposed amendment, which prescribes the use of non-reusable olive oil containers in food-serving outlets, has been criticised in the media in all EU Member States. According to the critics, the required use of disposable containers may result in high costs for European food-serving outlets and consumers. In mid-May 2013, the Commission announced that it would revise the proposal on account of the criticism expressed.

1. Why was an amendment to Regulation (EU) No 29/2012, which was only recently adopted, proposed at all?

2. Would it not be more efficient and cost-effective to leave the regulation as it currently stands, rather than drafting a new version of the proposal for an amendment?

Question for written answer E-006573/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(7 June 2013)

Subject: Involvement of the Commission's Directorates-General in the amendment of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012

Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil was published in the *Official Journal of the European Union* in January 2012. In May 2013, a panel of experts from the Member States agreed to the Commission proposal to amend the Implementing Regulation. One of the paragraphs of the Commission proposal, requiring the use of non-reusable olive oil bottles in restaurants, was criticised in the media in every EU Member State. The critics claimed that the required use of disposable containers would potentially entail high costs for restaurants and for consumers in the European Union. In mid-May 2013 the Commission announced that it was going to revise the proposal because of the criticism.

1. Which Directorates-General and Commissioners were involved in formulating the amendment to Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012?

2. Which Commissioner or Directorate-General decided to revise the proposal following the public criticism?

Question for written answer E-006574/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(7 June 2013)

Subject: Impact of the amendment to Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil

Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil was published in the *Official Journal of the European Union* in January 2012. In May 2013, a panel of experts from the Member States agreed to the Commission proposal to amend the Implementing Regulation. Following public criticism, the Commission withdrew its proposal. One of the paragraphs of the Commission proposal, requiring the use of non-reusable olive oil bottles in restaurants, was widely criticised in the European media. The critics claimed that the required use of disposable containers would potentially entail high costs for restaurants and for consumers in the European Union.

1. Did the Commission perform calculations or studies prior to publication of its proposed amendment or does it have estimates to hand with regard to the following:

How many restaurants would be affected by the amendment;

What total costs would result for restaurants in the European Union if required to buy non-refillable olive oil bottles for presenting at restaurant tables;

How many European Union olive oil producers would be capable of producing and marketing such non-reusable olive oil containers;

What proportion of European Union olive oil producers would not be capable of producing and marketing such non-reusable olive-oil containers;

What impact this amendment would have on small-scale and non-industrial olive oil producers and their sales and marketing opportunities?

2. If the Commission does not have calculations, studies or estimates to hand for one or more of the above points then why was this aspect not investigated before the proposed amendment was issued?

Question for written answer E-006576/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(7 June 2013)

Subject: Amendment to the Implementing Regulation on marketing standards for olive oil

1. Why was an amendment to Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 of 13 January 2012 tabled after just one year?

2. Which individual, working group, Directorate-General, non-state actor or Member State sought an amendment to Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012? When was this request recorded?

3. Who decided to introduce the amendment and when?

Question for written answer E-006605/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(7 June 2013)

Subject: Disclosure of the meeting of the Management Committee that voted on the amendment to the Implementing Regulation on marketing standards for olive oil

Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil was published in the *Official Journal of the European Union* in January 2012. In May 2013, an expert body from the Member States agreed to the Commission proposal for an amendment to the regulation. One paragraph of the proposed amendment, which prescribes the use of non-reusable olive oil containers in food-serving outlets, met with criticism in the media in numerous EU Member States. According to the critics, the required use of disposable containers may result in high costs for European food-serving outlets and consumers. In mid-May 2013, the Commission announced that, on account of the criticism expressed, it would revise the proposed amendment.

On account of the impact on consumers, food-serving outlets and possibly other organisations, too, I would ask the Commission to disclose the following documents immediately:

1. the list of the names of everyone who attended the meeting of the Management Committee for Fresh Fruit and Vegetables, in which the amendment to the Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 was voted on;

2. a list of the national authorities that each of these people were representing;

3. a voting list indicating how each of these representatives voted;

4. all written records and all audio, video or other recordings relating to the meeting of the Management Committee (it is important to note that the recordings made of the simultaneous interpretation for the meeting are also of interest).

If the disclosure of parts or all of the requested information is not possible on account of concerns to do with the people or with data protection or for any other reason, I would ask the Commission to send the information in question to my Brussels office as soon as possible.

Question for written answer E-006641/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(10 June 2013)

Subject: Olive oil regulation

The EU's sudden U-turn on the olive oil regulation only a week after the measure was announced is a real setback for consumer protection and the long-awaited promotion of olive oil quality. The regulation in question would have required restaurants to use only labelled, single-use bottles of oil sealed with non-refillable caps. This measure would have prevented fraud and deception and protected high-quality Italian and European oils.

1. Why has the Commission dropped this regulation, thereby enabling restaurants to serve bulk oil at their tables in unlabelled and unsealed bottles that lend themselves to all kinds of fraud, allowing low-quality oils to be used without the customer's knowledge, and thus inhibiting the promotion of quality oils?

2. If the measure was withdrawn because of the power relations between the southern and northern countries of Europe, can the Commission explain how consumers might benefit from practices that do not ensure honesty and sincerity with regard to the table oil they are served in a restaurant?

3. Where does this leave the constant assertion of the need for food safety and assurances that products and their origins are genuine?

4. Does this kind of Realpolitik not run counter to a number of principles that the Commission has so often trumpeted and upheld, such as transparency, truthful labelling about a product's origin and composition, product wholesomeness, and the need to raise quality standards all the time to protect people's health and as a way of boosting exports?

5. What are the real reasons that led the Commission to reject the opinion of the European farming coordination body (Copa-Cogeca), which was that the measure was fundamentally important for producer countries and to ensure a good-quality product for consumers?

Question for written answer E-006734/13
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(11 June 2013)

Subject: Food fraud and adulteration in the olive oil sector

Over the years, it has become common practice to mix oils produced in the EU with oils produced outside the EU, misleading the final consumer as to the provenance, quality and organoleptic characteristics of the product.

The EU as a whole accounts for 80% of global olive oil production and olive growing is vitally important for the rural economy and for cultural and environmental heritage.

Some 2.5 million producers, around one third of farmers in the EU, work in the sector and olive growing is the main agricultural activity in some regions, both in terms of jobs and in terms of the proportion of the area under cultivation.

Articles 114 and 169 of the Treaty of Lisbon safeguard consumers by means of the right to information and a high level of protection against risks and threats to their safety and economic interests.

Under the principles set out above, in May 2013 the EU proposed a ban on serving bulk olive oil because it was considered unhygienic and, above all, a potential way of defrauding consumers.

The proposal was supported by some 15 of the 27 Member States and, had it been approved, would have allowed consumers to find out the origin and name of the product.

The initial approval and subsequent withdrawal of this proposal has enabled restaurants to go on serving oil at their tables in unlabelled and unsealed bottles that lend themselves to all kinds of fraud, misleading the consumer and inhibiting the promotion of quality EU oils.

1. How can the Commission justify withdrawing this legislative proposal?

2. Does it think it should draft a new proposal for a regulation to safeguard the quality, transparency and safety of olive oil, so as to strengthen its position on the world markets, encouraging high-quality production which could benefit growers, processers, traders and consumers in the EU?

Question for written answer E-006921/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Withdrawal of amending Regulation on the protection of olive oil

At the summit meeting of 22 May 2013, it was decided to withdraw the proposal from the Commission amending Regulation (EC) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil.

One of the objectives of the amending regulation that was withdrawn was 'to better protect and inform the consumer' by ensuring 'the quality and authenticity of oils sold to the final consumer in hotels, restaurants and pubs and bars,'

Due to this decision, the protection afforded by the standardisation of Mediterranean products, in particular products of special nutritional value, such as extra virgin olive oil, will be removed, perpetuating the state of impunity that exists in the olive oil market.

Since the decision to withdraw amending Regulation (EC) 29/2012 raises many questions (is it advisable? Whose interests does it serve?), will the Commission say:

What were the real reasons that prompted it to withdraw amending Regulation (EC) No 29/2012, even though at the summit of 22 May 2013, 15 Member States out of 27 had voted in favour of the proposal (195 votes in favour, 94 against, 53 abstentions)?

How does it believe the decision to withdraw this amending Regulation will help boost the competitiveness of European olive oil, in particular extra virgin olive oil, and promote Mediterranean products in general?

Joint answer given by Mr Cioloș on behalf of the Commission

(15 July 2013)

The draft Implementing Regulation amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No 29/2012 on marketing standards for olive oil included the measure of providing final consumers with non-refillable bottles in hotels, restaurants and bars.

The draft text failed to receive the support of a qualified majority of Member States and was withdrawn.

Over the coming months the Commission will resume its work on clarifying whether action must be taken at European level to meet the needs of all stakeholders in the olive oil sector.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-006022/13
à Comissão
Edite Estrela (S&D)
(29 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Bloqueio de financiamento do Banco Europeu de Investimento para pequenas e médias empresas portuguesas

Considerando as notícias contraditórias relativas a um pretenso bloqueio de novas linhas de crédito do Banco Europeu de Investimento (BEI) para financiar as pequenas e médias empresas (PME) portuguesas;

Considerando a troca de acusações entre o presidente do BEI e representantes da Comissão Europeia relativamente às razões que estão na origem deste atraso, tendo inclusive Werner Hoyer afirmado que o BEI já assinou «um contrato que está travado na Comissão»;

Considerando que mais de mil milhões de euros «poderiam ser desembolsados de um dia para o outro se a Comissão concordasse» para serem utilizados pelas PME portuguesas, e assim contribuírem para o crescimento económico e a criação de emprego em Portugal, nesta fase crítica que o país atravessa;

Perante a gravidade da situação, solicito à Comissão que urgentemente esclareça, de forma inequívoca, o que se passa, quais as razões deste atraso e para quando prevê que esta a linha de crédito possa ser aplicada?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-006029/13
à Comissão
António Fernando Correia de Campos (S&D)
(30 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Bloqueio de financiamento do Banco Europeu de Investimento para Pequenas e Médias Empresas portuguesas

Considerando as notícias contraditórias relativas a um pretenso bloqueio de novas linhas de crédito do Banco Europeu de Investimento (BEI) para financiar as Pequenas e Médias Empresas (PME) portuguesas;

Considerando a troca de acusações entre o presidente do BEI e representantes da Comissão Europeia relativamente às razões que estão na origem deste atraso, tendo inclusive Werner Hoyer afirmado que o BEI já assinou «um contrato que está travado na Comissão»;

Considerando que mais de mil milhões de euros «poderiam ser desembolsados de um dia para o outro se a Comissão concordasse» para serem utilizados pelas PME portuguesas, e assim contribuírem para o crescimento económico e a criação de emprego em Portugal, nesta fase crítica que o país atravessa;

Perante a gravidade da situação, solicito à Comissão que urgentemente esclareça, de forma inequívoca, o que se passa, quais as razões deste atraso e para quando prevê que esta linha de crédito possa ser aplicada?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006285/13
à Comissão
Carlos Coelho (PPE) e José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)
(3 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Atraso na linha de crédito do BEI para as PME portuguesas

Numa altura em que a escassez de crédito às empresas portuguesas é uma das principais razões para o comprometimento da sua atividade económica e para a subida do desemprego em Portugal, foi tornado público pelo presidente do Banco Europeu de Investimentos (BEI), Werner Hoyer, que uma linha de crédito no valor de mil milhões de euros, acordada o ano passado com Portugal, não poderia ser desbloqueada uma vez que faltaria, para tal, a aprovação da Comissão Europeia.

Segundo declarações do Presidente do BEI, o atraso na concessão da referida linha de crédito às Pequenas e Médias Empresas (PME) portuguesas prende-se com questões de concorrência, mas em circunstâncias extraordinárias essas preocupações poderão ser ultrapassadas, desde que haja «sentido de urgência» e «boa vontade» por parte da Comissão.

Por sua vez, o Comissário Joaquín Almunia afirma que a referida linha de crédito se encontra atrasada, uma vez que o BEI não concede novos empréstimos até que os créditos existentes respeitem os requisitos mais exigentes do banco (as regras comunitárias em termos de ajudas de Estado poderão não estar a ser respeitadas pelas garantias concedidas pelo Governo Português).

Neste sentido, solicitamos à Comissão os seguintes esclarecimentos:

1. Qual a razão pela qual a linha de crédito está bloqueada?

2. Haverá algum mecanismo de ação rápida previsto nos Tratados que permita em «circunstâncias extraordinárias» e mesmo «com eventuais distorções de concorrência no mercado interno» desbloquear instantaneamente a referida linha de crédito se houver «sentido de urgência» e «boa vontade», tal como declarado pelo Presidente do BEI, Werner Hoyer?

3. Quando é que a Comissão prevê que esta situação esteja desbloqueada e Portugal receba a linha de crédito aqui referida?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006944/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(14 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Bloqueio da concessão de créditos do BEI a Portugal — 2

Considerando que:

A concessão de empréstimos do Banco Europeu de Investimentos (BEI) às pequenas e médias empresas (PME) portuguesas está numa situação de impasse devido ao bloqueamento da concessão de linhas de crédito bonificado às empresas europeias;

O Presidente do BEI , Werner Hoyer, responsabilizou no início do mês, a Comissão Europeia por esta situação de impasse, e que estes empréstimos do BEI são essenciais para apoiar o crescimento económico no país;

A Comissão Europeia já avançou algumas alternativas possíveis ao contrato assinado em 2011 de forma a agilizar os empréstimos, mas que, até agora, ainda nada foi decidido e a situação de impasse se prolonga no tempo, agravando assim os seus efeitos negativos e adiando uma retoma do crescimento económico;

1. Quais as alternativas que propôs ao BEI?

2. Qual a alternativa que considera mais adequada, tendo em conta as razões desta situação de impasse e a necessidade de se conformar às regras da União Europeia, nomeadamente da concorrência?

3. É possível, neste caso concreto, encontrar uma alternativa que seja um caso de exceção, de forma que, embora as regras gerais não o permitam, se consiga uma solução de compromisso de caráter especial, tendo em conta as circunstâncias extraordinárias que o país atravessa?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006945/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(14 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Bloqueio da concessão de créditos do BEI a Portugal — 1

Considerando que:

A concessão de empréstimos do Banco Europeu de Investimentos (BEI) às pequenas e médias empresas (PME) portuguesas está numa situação de impasse devido ao bloqueamento da concessão de linhas de crédito bonificado às empresas europeias;

O Presidente do BEI , Werner Hoyer, responsabilizou no início do mês, a Comissão Europeia por esta situação de impasse, apontando nomeadamente a causa à burocracia de Bruxelas que dificulta e atrasa o processo;

Estes empréstimos do BEI são essenciais em Portugal para apoiar o crescimento económico no país uma vez que permitem que as PME nacionais contornem rapidamente as atuais dificuldades de acesso ao crédito provocadas sobretudo pelos altos juros cobrados atualmente pelos bancos comerciais;

1. Como vê estas declarações por parte do BEI?

2. Que diálogos bilaterais tem a Comissão Europeia mantido com o BEI para resolver estasituação?

3. Como simplificar a burocracia no seio da Comissão dada a urgência e a necessidade de tais créditos na atividade das PME e assim contribuir para a retoma económica de Portugal?

Resposta conjunta dada por Joaquín Almunia em nome da Comissão
(15 de julho de 2013)

Em 27 de junho de 2013, foi aprovado um regime de garantia para os empréstimos do BEI a Portugal. O regime estabelece uma série de requisitos para que, nomeadamente, quaisquer vantagens resultantes das garantias oferecidas pelo Estado ao abrigo do regime revertam para o Estado, através de uma remuneração adequada, e para os mutuários finais. Através do regime, estes mutuários poderão manter os seus atuais empréstimos do BEI e ter acesso a um aumento (até 6 mil milhões de euros) de cedência de liquidez definido pelo BEI em Portugal, na sequência da aprovação do regime. Uma vez que o regime garante que os bancos participantes não beneficiem de qualquer vantagem indevida da garantia do Estado, este mecanismo está em conformidade com as regras em matéria de auxílios estatais da UE.

O regime permitirá a continuidade do financiamento concedido pelo BEI à economia real e evitará a rutura do crédito atribuído pelo BEI através de todos os bancos que participam no regime.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006022/13
to the Commission
Edite Estrela (S&D)
(29 May 2013)

Subject: Block on European Investment Bank funding for small and medium-sized enterprises in Portugal

There have been contradictory reports concerning an alleged block on new loans from the European Investment Bank (EIB) to fund small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in Portugal.

The question of who is responsible for this delay has been the subject of an exchange of accusations between the EIB President and representatives of the Commission. Werner Hoyer has stated that the EIB has already signed a contract but that it is being held up in the Commission.

It has been said that more than EUR 1 billion could be paid out from one day to the next if the Commission agreed. This sum could then be used by Portuguese SMEs and would help bring about economic growth and job creation in Portugal at this critical juncture in the country's recovery.

In the light of this serious situation, can the Commission give an urgent and unequivocal explanation of the circumstances and the reasons for this delay? When does it expect that this credit line can be implemented?

Question for written answer P-006029/13
to the Commission
António Fernando Correia de Campos (S&D)
(30 May 2013)

Subject: Block on European Investment Bank funding for small and medium-sized enterprises in Portugal

There have been contradictory reports concerning an alleged block on new loans from the European Investment Bank (EIB) to fund small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in Portugal.

The question of who is responsible for this delay has been the subject of an exchange of accusations between the EIB President and representatives of the Commission. Werner Hoyer has stated that the EIB has already signed a contract but that it is being held up in the Commission.

It has been said that more than EUR 1 billion could be paid out from one day to the next if the Commission agreed. This sum could then be used by Portuguese SMEs and would help bring about economic growth and job creation in Portugal at this critical juncture in the country's recovery.

In the light of this serious situation, can the Commission give an urgent and unequivocal explanation of the circumstances and the reasons for this delay? When does it expect that this credit line can be implemented?

Question for written answer E-006285/13
to the Commission
Carlos Coelho (PPE) and José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)
(3 June 2013)

Subject: Delay in European Investment Bank funding for Portuguese SMEs

At a time when the lack of credit for Portuguese companies is one of the main factors compromising their economic activity and for the rise in unemployment in Portugal, the European Investment Bank (EIB) President, Werner Hoyer, has publicly stated that a EUR 1 billion credit facility agreed with Portugal last year may not be released as Commission approval has still not been forthcoming.

According to the EIB President, providing this credit facility to Portuguese small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) has been delayed due to competition concerns, but he has suggested these obstacles could be overcome in extraordinary circumstances if there is a 'sense of urgency' and 'good will' on the part of the Commission.

Commissioner Almunia, has countered that this credit facility has been delayed as the EIB will not provide new loans until the bank's more demanding requirements are respected for existing credit (the guarantees provided by the Portuguese Government might not be respecting the EU rules relating to state aid).

1. Can the Commission clarify why the credit facility has been blocked?

2. Do the Treaties provide for a rapid response mechanism that would allow this credit facility to be unblocked instantaneously under 'extraordinary circumstances' — even 'with possible distortions to internal market competition' — if there is a 'sense of urgency' and 'good will', as the EIB President, Werner Hover, has stated?

3. When does the Commission expect this situation to be resolved so that Portugal is able to access the aforementioned credit facility?

Question for written answer E-006944/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Block on EIB lending to Portugal — 2

European Investment Bank (EIB) lending to Portuguese small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) is on hold due to the block on preferential credit lines for European companies.

Earlier this month the EIB President, Werner Hoyer, blamed the Commission for the deadlock. These EIB loans are essential to support economic growth in Portugal.

The Commission has already proposed some possible alternatives to the contract concluded in 2011 to speed up the loans; however, nothing has yet been decided and the deadlock continues, thus compounding its negative impact and delaying a return to economic growth.

1. What alternatives has the Commission proposed to the EIB?

2. Which alternative does it believe is the most appropriate, given the reasons for this deadlock and the need to comply with EU regulations, notably competition law?

3. Is it possible to make an exception in this particular case, that is, to find an alternative which contravenes EU rules but provides a one-off compromise solution, given the extraordinary circumstances facing the country?

Question for written answer E-006945/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Block on EIB lending to Portugal — 1

European Investment Bank (EIB) lending to Portuguese small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) is on hold due to the block on preferential credit lines for European companies.

Earlier this month the EIB President, Werner Hoyer, blamed the Commission for the deadlock, specifically pointing the finger at Brussels bureaucracy for hindering and delaying the process.

These EIB loans are essential to support economic growth in Portugal since they enable national SMEs to quickly bypass the current difficulties in accessing credit, caused mainly by the high interest rates being charged by commercial banks.

1. How does the Commission view the EIB's statement?

2. What bilateral talks has it held with the EIB to resolve this situation?

3. How can the Commission's bureaucracy be streamlined, given that SMEs urgently need these loans to operate and thus to contribute to Portugal's economic recovery?

Joint answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission

(15 July 2013)

On 27 June 2013 a Guarantee Scheme for EIB lending in Portugal was approved. The Scheme establishes a number of requirements so that, *inter alia*, any advantages derived from the guarantees offered by the State under the Scheme revert back to the State, through an appropriate remuneration, and to the end borrowers. Through the Scheme, these borrowers will be able to maintain their existing EIB loans and have access to an increased (up to EUR 6 billion) lending facility set out by the EIB in Portugal, following the approval of the Scheme. Since the Scheme ensures that participating banks do not retain any undue advantage from the State guarantee, it is in line with EU State aid rules.

The Scheme will allow the continuation of the funding provided by the EIB to the real economy and prevent the disruption of the credit granted by the EIB through all banks participating in the Scheme.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006320/13
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(4 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Posibles repercusiones para el sector conservero europeo del Acuerdo de Libre Comercio entre la UE y Tailandia

Las negociaciones del Acuerdo de Libre Comercio de la UE con Tailandia, país considerado como el mayor productor y exportador de conservas a nivel mundial, están generando una profunda preocupación en la industria conservera europea.

Según algunas de las principales organizaciones de la UE, este acuerdo puede suponer la pérdida del 67,5 % de la producción europea y del 15 % de la producción global. Debemos considerar las consecuencias que este acuerdo podría tener para las industrias conserveras de España y Portugal que, conjuntamente, generan empleo directo e indirecto para más de 17 000 personas, con una producción total en 2012 de aproximadamente 400 000 toneladas y 1 550 millones de euros.

A la vista de las posibles repercusiones del acuerdo,

¿Ha realizado la Comisión un estudio de impacto sobre el sector conservero de la UE?

¿Considera la Comisión la posibilidad de excluir al sector conservero, total o parcialmente, del ámbito del Acuerdo?

En su caso, ¿con qué mecanismos cuenta la Comisión para garantizar que se produzca una competencia leal y se dé cumplimiento a las normas de la UE a nivel laboral, sanitario, ambiental, etc.?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión
(18 de julio de 2013)

La Comisión es consciente de la situación de la industria conservera de atún en la EU. Es, sin embargo, demasiado pronto para prejuzgar los resultados de las negociaciones para la celebración de un acuerdo de libre comercio con Tailandia. La Comisión aspira a concluir un tratado de libre comercio ambicioso y equilibrado entre la UE y Tailandia que aporte ventajas globales sustanciales a la economía y el empleo de la UE en su conjunto, teniendo en cuenta al mismo tiempo la naturaleza sensible de la industria conservera de pescado y marisco.

La Comisión es plenamente consciente de la sensibilidad de determinados sectores. En esta fase de las negociaciones, es demasiado pronto para considerar la cuestión de un posible mecanismo de compensación. Lo único que puede decirse es que, si fuera necesario, dicho mecanismo debería ajustarse sin duda a las normas de la Organización Mundial del Comercio (OMC).

En 2009, se realizó una Evaluación de Impacto de la Sostenibilidad Comercial entre la UE y los países de la ASEAN, que está disponible en el sitio web de la UE ([1]). En dicha Evaluación se analizaron los posibles efectos que se derivarían del acuerdo comercial y se examinó más especialmente el sector pesquero.

Con respecto a las normas sanitarias, Tailandia tendrá que seguir respetando el alto nivel de rigor de la UE. Además, el acuerdo de libre comercio incorporará disposiciones ambiciosas en materia de comercio y desarrollo sostenible, incluidos compromisos sobre la aplicación eficaz de las normas laborales básicas y los convenios sobre medio ambiente internacionalmente reconocidos, así como un mecanismo de seguimiento.

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2010/april/tradoc_145989.pdf
http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2010/april/tradoc_145990.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006040/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(30 de maio de 2013)

Assunto: Impacto do acordo de comércio livre entre a UE e a Tailândia no setor das conservas de atum

Estão atualmente a decorrer as negociações entre a União Europeia e a Tailândia para um acordo de comércio livre; o acordo será abrangente, incluindo vários setores de comércio, entre os quais os produtos de pescas e de conservas.

Neste momento, as exportações de conservas de atum da Tailândia para a UE pagam uma taxa máxima de direitos, da ordem dos 24 %; todavia, a Tailândia é já o maior exportador para a União Europeia. Assim, se, no âmbito deste acordo, os tailandeses deixarem de pagar direitos ou houver uma forte redução dos mesmos, a UE vai ser invadida e muitas fábricas vão ser afetadas por este facto, em termos de produção e emprego;

Tal situação será extremamente negativa, em termos económicos e de emprego, para a União Europeia, nomeadamente em alguns Estados-Membros, como Portugal e Espanha — mas também França e Itália — sob pena de extinção do tradicional setor ibérico de conservas de atum.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Pretende efetuar alguma avaliação de impacto de um futuro acordo de comércio livre entre a UE e a Tailândia no setor das conservas de atum da UE?

2. Pretende analisar a possibilidade de conceder alguma compensação aos produtores do setor na UE em resultado do impacto negativo de um tal acordo?

3. Tenciona equacionar outras medidas destinadas a compensar ou, pelo menos, minimizar os efeitos eventuais na produção europeia resultantes do referido acordo?

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

A Comissão tem conhecimento da situação na indústria de conservas de atum da UE. É, contudo, muito cedo para presumir dos resultados das negociações para a conclusão de um acordo de comércio livre com a Tailândia. A Comissão pretende chegar a um acordo de comércio livre entre a UE e a Tailândia ambicioso e equilibrado, que irá proporcionar, no seu conjunto, benefícios globais importantes para a economia e o emprego na UE, não deixando de ter em conta a natureza sensível da indústria de conservas de produtos da pesca.

A Comissão está plenamente consciente da sensibilidade de determinados setores. Nesta fase das negociações, é demasiado cedo para considerar a questão de um eventual regime de compensação, exceto para referir que, se acaso fosse necessário, teria de ser criado em conformidade com as normas da Organização Mundial do Comércio (OMC).

Foi realizada em 2009e está disponível no sítio Web da União Europeia ([1]), uma Avaliação de Impacto da Sustentabilidade (AIS) do comércio entre a UE e os países da ASEAN . A AIS analisou os diferentes impactos potenciais decorrentes do acordo comercial e analisou também mais especificamente o setor das pescas.

No que se refere às normas sanitárias, a Tailândia terá de continuar a cumprir as atuais normas rigorosas da UE. Além disso, o ACL irá integrar disposições ambiciosas em matéria de comércio e desenvolvimento sustentável, incluindo compromissos quanto à aplicação efetiva de normas fundamentais do trabalho e convenções ambientais internacionalmente reconhecidas , bem como um mecanismo de acompanhamento.

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2010/april/tradoc_145989.pdf
http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2010/april/tradoc_145990.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006040/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(30 May 2013)

Subject: Impact on the canned tuna sector of the EU-Thailand free trade agreement

Negotiations are currently under way for a comprehensive EU-Thailand free trade agreement that will cover several trade sectors, including fishery products and canned goods.

Although canned tuna exported from Thailand to the EU is currently subject to a maximum duty rate of around 24%, Thailand is still the largest exporter of this product to the EU. Under this agreement, Thailand will pay either no or heavily reduced duty and the EU will be flooded with imported produce, affecting the output and employment levels of many factories.

In economic and employment terms, this situation will have very serious consequences for the EU, particularly for certain Member States such as Portugal, Spain, France and Italy, with the traditional Iberian canned tuna sector at risk of disappearing.

1. Does the Commission intend to carry out an impact assessment on the future EU-Thailand free trade agreement with regard to the EU's canned tuna sector?

2. Would it consider granting compensation to producers in the EU for the negative impact that such an agreement would have?

3. Does it intend to consider other compensatory measures or at least to minimise the possible effects of this agreement on European production?

Question for written answer E-006320/13
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(4 June 2013)

Subject: Possible repercussions for the European canning sector of the Free Trade Agreement between the EU and Thailand

The negotiations on the Free Trade Agreement between the EU and Thailand, a country that is considered to be the world's largest producer and exporter of canned food, are causing great concern among the European canning industry.

According to some of the EU's largest organisations, this agreement could result in the loss of 67.5% of European production and 15% of global production. We have to take into consideration the consequences it could have for the Spanish and Portuguese canning industries, which together generate direct and indirect employment for more than 17 000 people, with a total production in 2012 of approximately 400 000 tonnes, worth a total of EUR 1 550 million.

Given the possible repercussions of the agreement,

Has the Commission carried out an impact study in relation to the EU canning sector?

Is the Commission considering the possibility of excluding the canning sector from the scope of the agreement, either completely or partially?

Where applicable, what mechanisms does the Commission intend to use to guarantee fair competition and compliance with the EU's standards on employment, health, the environment, etc.?

Joint answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission

(18 July 2013)

The Commission is aware of the situation in the EU tuna canning industry. It is, however, too early to prejudge the outcome of the negotiation for the conclusion of a free trade agreement with Thailand. The Commission aims to conclude an ambitious and balanced EU-Thailand free trade agreement which will bring substantial global benefits to the EU economy and employment as a whole, while taking into account the sensitive nature of the seafood canning industry.

The Commission is fully aware of the sensitivities of certain sectors. At this stage of the negotiations, it is too early to consider the question of a possible compensation scheme, except to say that, if ever needed, it would certainly need to be shaped in accordance with World Trade Organisation (WTO) rules.

A Trade and Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA) between the EU and ASEAN countries was conducted in 2009 and is available on the EU's website ([1]). The SIA analysed the different potential impacts deriving from the trade agreement and also looked more specially at the fisheries sector.

As for health standards, Thailand will have to continue to meet the current high EU standards. In addition, the FTA will incorporate ambitious provisions on trade and sustainable development, including commitments on the effective implementation of internationally recognised core labour standards and environment conventions as well as a monitoring mechanism.

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2010/april/tradoc_145989.pdf
http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2010/april/tradoc_145990.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006063/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(30 mai 2013)

Objet: Liste multinationale lors des élections européennes

Le Parlement européen vient de présenter de nouvelles règles quant aux futures élections européennes. Dans cette résolution, qui sera soumise au vote en juillet et qui rencontre déjà un vif succès au sein du Parlement européen, le texte propose que les partis politiques nationaux soient encouragés à faire figurer sur leurs listes de candidats des citoyens européens résidant dans un autre État membre que le leur et enregistrés pour voter dans leur propre pays.

1. Que pense la Commission de cette proposition?

2. Possède-t-elle des statistiques sur le sujet basées sur les élections de 2009?

3. Appuie-t-elle la demande du Parlement?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006064/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(30 mai 2013)

Objet: Mention sur le bulletin de vote européen

Le Parlement européen vient de présenter de nouvelles règles pour les futures élections européennes. Dans la résolution qui sera soumise au vote en juillet et rencontre déjà un vif succès au sein du Parlement, il est proposé que les bulletins de vote mentionnent à quel parti européen appartient le parti national, mais aussi quel est son candidat à la présidence de la Commission européenne. Cela permettra d'assurer plus de transparence.

1. Que pense la Commission de cette proposition?

2. Appuie-t-elle la demande du Parlement?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006065/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(30 mai 2013)

Objet: Élections 2014: élection du Président de la Commission par le citoyen

Le Parlement européen vient de présenter de nouvelles règles quant aux futures élections européennes. Sa résolution, qui sera soumise au vote en juillet et rencontre déjà un vif succès en son sein, préconise l'élection du Président de la Commission européenne par le peuple.

Chaque parti politique européen désignera un chef de file, qui serait ensuite candidat à la présidence de la Commission européenne. En clair, le futur Président de la Commission européenne sera le choix des électeurs européens, contrairement à la situation actuelle. Les candidats seraient donc dorénavant élus de manière transparente et démocratique, en se présentant dans l'ensemble des États membres. Par ailleurs, les partis politiques européens seraient invités à organiser une série de débats publics entre les candidats désignés afin de faire écho aux enjeux européens, trop souvent occultés par des enjeux purement nationaux.

1. Que pense la Commission de cette proposition?

2. Appuie-t-elle la demande du Parlement concernant ce type de désignation pour le poste de Président de la Commission européenne?

Réponse commune donnée par Mme Reding au nom de la Commission

(31 juillet 2013)

La Commission souscrit aux idées avancées par l'Honorable Parlementaire dans sa question. Ces suggestions ont également été formulées dans la proposition de résolution du Parlement européen concernant le «rapport sur l'amélioration de l'organisation des élections au Parlement européen en 2014», soumise au vote du Parlement européen lors de la séance plénière de juillet. Comme mentionné lors des débats en plénière sur le sujet, la Commission se félicite de la convergence entre les idées présentées dans la résolution du Parlement et ses propres recommandations, et de la volonté dont les deux institutions font preuve pour renforcer la légitimité du processus décisionnel de l'Union européenne et pour que celui-ci soit plus proche des citoyens. La Commission souligne en particulier qu'en mars dernier, elle a adopté une recommandation intitulée «Préparer le scrutin européen de 2014: comment renforcer la conduite démocratique et efficace des prochaines élections au Parlement européen» ([1]). Cette recommandation précise notamment que les électeurs devraient être informés des affiliations entre les partis politiques nationaux et les partis politiques européens et que les partis politiques devraient faire savoir publiquement quel candidat à la présidence de la Commission européenne ils soutiennent.

Pour ce qui est de l'idée d'encourager les partis politiques à faire figurer sur leurs listes de candidats des citoyens de l'Union résidant dans un État membre autre que celui dont ils ont la nationalité, la Commission a elle-même contribué à faciliter la participation des citoyens de l'Union aux élections en tant que candidats: la récente directive 2013/1/UE ([2]), adoptée sur proposition de la Commission, facilite le processus consistant à se porter candidat dans l'État membre dans lequel on réside. Lors des élections de 2009, selon les informations dont dispose la Commission, environ 80 citoyens de l'UE se sont porté candidats dans leur État membre de résidence, dont ils n'avaient pas la nationalité.

([1]) COM(2013) 126, adoptée le 12 mars 2013 .

([2]) JO L 26 du 26.1.2013, p. 27.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006063/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(30 May 2013)

Subject: Multinational list for European elections

Parliament has recently drawn up a resolution which proposes new rules for future European elections. The resolution, which will be put to the vote at the July 2013 part-session and which has been widely welcomed within Parliament, urges national political parties to include EU citizens who are registered to vote in their own country, but who live in another Member State, as candidates on their electoral lists.

1. What view does the Commission take of this proposal?

2. Does it have relevant statistics from the 2009 elections?

3. Does it support Parliament's call?

Question for written answer E-006064/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(30 May 2013)

Subject: Information on European ballot papers

Parliament has recently tabled new rules for the forthcoming European elections. The resolution, which will be put to the vote in July and which has already won great support in Parliament, proposes that ballot papers should state which European party national parties belong to, as well as name their candidate for Commission President. This will make the process more transparent.

1. What does the Commission think of this proposal?

2. Does it support Parliament's call?

Question for written answer E-006065/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(30 May 2013)

Subject: 2014 elections: election of the President of the Commission by EU citizens

The European Parliament has just tabled new rules on future European elections. Its resolution, which will be put to the vote in July and is already attracting a great deal of support within the institution, advocates election of the President of the European Commission by the people.

Each European political party will designate a nominee who would then be a candidate for Commission President. In short, unlike today, the future President of the European Commission will be chosen by European voters. Therefore, candidates would henceforth be elected in a transparent, democratic manner, putting themselves forward in all the Member States. Moreover, European political parties would be invited to organise a series of public debates between the nominated candidates in order to raise awareness of European issues, too often overshadowed by purely domestic issues.

1. What does the Commission think of this proposal?

2. Does it support Parliament's request regarding this kind of nomination for the position of President of the European Commission?

Joint answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(31 July 2013)

The Commission supports the ideas raised by the Honourable Member in its question, and also formulated in the Motion for resolution of the European Parliament on the 'Report on improving the organisation of the elections to the European Parliament in 2014' that was voted at the July EP plenary session. As stated during the related plenary debate, the Commission welcomes the convergence between the ideas presented in Parliament's resolution and its own recommendations, as well as the shared will to reinforce the legitimacy of the EU decision-making process and to bring it closer to the citizens. The Commission notes in particular that in March this year it adopted its Recommendation 'Preparing for the 2014 European elections: further enhancing their democratic and efficient conduct' ([1]) which, provides, amongst others, that voters should be informed of the affiliation between national parties and European parties and that political parties should make known the candidate for President of the European Commission they support.

With regard to the idea of encouraging political parties to include on their lists of candidates EU citizens residing in Member States other than their own, the Commission contributed itself to facilitating participation of EU citizens in the elections as candidates: the recent Directive 2013/1/EU ([2]), adopted on a proposal from the Commission, makes it easier for people to stand as candidates in the Member State where they reside. In the 2009 elections, according to the information of the Commission, there were approximately 80 EU citizens who stood as candidate in the Member State where they reside and of which they are not a national.

(1) COM(2013) 126, adopted on 12 March 2013.
(2) OJ L 26, 26.1.2013, p. 27.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор P-006105/13
до Комисията
Ivailo Kalfin (S&D)
(30 май 2013 г.)

Относно: Коментар на комисар Гюнтер Йотингер за България

На 29 май 2013 г. германският вестник „Билд" публикува информация за изказване на комисар Гюнтер Йотингер пред Германо-Белгийско-Люксембургската търговска камара ([1]). В него той прави следната оценка по отношение на България и още няколко държави:

„Тревожат ме страни, които по същество са почти неуправляеми, като България, Румъния, Италия." Освен това в много страни евроскептичните движения се засилват. Във Великобритания управлява министър-председателят Дейвид Камерън с подкрепата на „неописуемия английски вариант на американското обществено-политическо движение *Чаено парти*". Йотингер също изрази загриженост относно икономическото положение на Франция. Страната „няма никаква подготовка за това, което е необходимо да се направи".

Цитираната позиция не беше отречена нито от комисар Йотингер, нито от Европейската комисия. Във връзка с това искам да попитам:

На какво се основава преценката на комисар Йотингер, че България е страна, която е почти неуправляема?

Смята ли Комисията, че е уместно неин официален представител, независимо в какво качество, да прави подобни изказвания по отношение на държави членки?

Съвместен отговор, даден от г-н Шефчович от името на Комисията
(26 юни 2013 г.)

Комисията редовно коментира събития в отделните държави членки. Съществува широк консенсус, че повечето европейски държави, включително тези, посочени във въпросите, са изправени пред важни икономически, социални и политически предизвикателства и трябва да предприемат значителни структурни реформи през идните години.

В рамките на Европейския семестър на 29 май 2013 г. Европейската комисия изготви специфични за всяка държава препоръки за увеличаването на капацитета на държавите членки да се справят по-добре с тези предизвикателства и да предоставят качествени публични услуги на гражданите на устойчива основа.

([1]) http://www.bild.de/politik/inland/guenther-oettinger/eu-kommissar-europa-ist-ein-sanierungsfall-30595650.bild.html

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-006436/13
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(5 ta' Ġunju 2013)

Suġġett: Tħassib dwar il-Bulgarija, l-Italja u r-Rumanija

Fid-29 ta' Mejju 2013, il-Kummissarju għall-Enerġija, Günther Oettinger, esprima t-tħassib tiegħu dwar il-governabilità tal-Bulgarija, l-Italja u r-Rumanija.

Il-Kummissjoni għandha l-ħsieb li tirrakkomanda miżuri bil-għan li titjieb is-sitwazzjoni politika f'dawn il-pajjiżi?

Tweġiba konġunta mogħtija mis-Sur Šefčovič f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(26 ta' Ġunju 2013)

Il-Kummissjoni tikkummenta b'mod regolari dwar l-iżviluppi fl-Istati Membri individwali. Hemm ħafna qbil li bosta pajjiżi Ewropej, inklużi dawk indirizzati fil-mistoqsijiet, jaffaċċaw sfidi ekonomiċi, soċjali u politiċi importanti u jridu jagħmlu riformi strutturali konsidevrevoli matul is-snin li ġejjien.

Taħt is-Semestru Ewropew, il-Kummissjoni, fid-29 ta' Mejju 2013 ħarġet rakkomandazzjonijiet speċifiċi għall-pajjiż biex issaħħaħ l-kapaċità ta' kull Stat Membru biex jaffaċċa aħjar dawn l-isfidi u jagħti servizzi pubbliċi ta' kwalità liċ-ċittadini fuq bażi sostenibbli.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006358/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 iunie 2013)

Subiect: România, țară neguvernabilă

Recent, Comisarul european pentru energie a afirmat într-un discurs, cu ocazia unei întâlniri a Camerei de Comerț Germania — Belgia — Luxemburg, că „România, Bulgaria și Italia sunt pur și simplu aproape neguvernabile".

În contextul în care în acest discurs public au fost menționate trei state membre ale Uniunii Europene, Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă acesta reprezintă un punct de vedere oficial al instituției.

Dacă nu, Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă acest punct de vedere este compatibil cu exercitarea tuturor atribuțiilor specifice funcției de comisar european.

Răspuns comun dat de dl Šefčovič în numele Comisiei
(26 iunie 2013)

Comisia face, în mod regulat, observații cu privire la evoluția situației din fiecare stat membru în parte. Există un larg consens cu privire la faptul că majoritatea țărilor europene, inclusiv cele la care faceți referire, se confruntă cu importante provocări economice, sociale și politice și trebuie să realizeze reforme structurale considerabile în următorii ani.

La 29 mai 2013, Comisia a emis, în cadrul semestrului european, recomandări specifice fiecărei țări, cu scopul de a spori capacitatea fiecărui stat membru de a aborda mai bine aceste provocări și de a furniza, în mod durabil, servicii publice de calitate pentru cetățeni.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006105/13
to the Commission
Ivailo Kalfin (S&D)
(30 May 2013)

Subject: Commissioner Günter Oettinger's comments about Bulgaria

On 29 May 2013 the German daily newspaper *Bild* reported on a speech by Commissioner Günter Oettinger to the German-Belgian-Luxembourg Chamber of Commerce ([1]) expressing views about Bulgaria and a number of other countries.

'I am worried by countries that are essentially ungovernable, namely Bulgaria, Rumania and Italy,' the Commissioner was quoted as saying. He added that eurosceptic movements were on the rise in many EU countries and singled out the UK, where Prime Minister David Cameron enjoyed the support of 'unspeakable backbenchers, his English Tea Party'. The Commissioner also voiced concern about the economic situation in France, saying that the country was 'completely unprepared to do what's necessary to get back on track'.

Given that neither Commissioner Oettinger nor the Commission has denied the reported comments, some questions must be asked.

What are the grounds for the Commissioner's description of Bulgaria as an essentially ungovernable country?

Does the Commission consider it appropriate for its official representative, in whatever capacity he may be speaking, to make statements of this kind about Member States?

Question for written answer E-006358/13
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 June 2013)

Subject: Romania — an ungovernable country

The Commissioner for Energy recently stated in a speech, during a meeting of the German-Belgian-Luxembourg Chamber of Commerce, that 'Romania, Bulgaria and Italy are essentially ungovernable'.

In light of the fact that three Member States were mentioned in this speech made in public, can the Commission specify whether this represents this institution's official point of view?

If not, can the Commission specify whether this point of view is compatible with carrying out all the specific duties of the function of an EU commissioner?

Question for written answer E-006436/13
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(5 June 2013)

Subject: Concern over Bulgaria, Italy and Romania

On 29 May 2013, the Commissioner for Energy, Günther Oettinger, expressed his concern over the governability of Bulgaria, Italy and Romania.

Does the Commission intend to recommend measures aimed at improving the political situation in these countries?

([1]) http://www.bild.de/politik/inland/guenther-oettinger/eu-kommissar-europa-ist-ein-sanierungsfall-30595650.bild.html

Joint answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission

(26 June 2013)

The Commission regularly comments on developments in individual Member States. There is wide consensus that most European countries, including those addressed in the questions, face important economic, social and political challenges and must undertake considerable structural reforms over the coming years.

Under the European Semester, the Commission has on 29 May 2013 issued country specific recommendations to enhance the capacity of each Member State to better tackle these challenges and deliver quality public services to the citizens on a sustainable basis.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006403/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(5 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Η έκρυθμη κατάσταση στην Τουρκία

Η υπερβολική χρήση βίας και ο αλαζονικός τρόπος αντιμετώπισης των λαϊκών μαζών στην Τουρκία από την κυβέρνηση Ερντογάν και την Τουρκική αστυνομία, φαίνεται ότι οδηγούν τη χώρα σε μια πολύ έκρυθμη κατάσταση.

1. Πώς ερμηνεύει η Επιτροπή την έκρηξη αγανάκτησης του λαού (και ιδίως νεαρών μορφωμένων ατόμων) κατά της διαρκούς επιδίωξης του κ. Ερντογάν να επιτύχει στροφή στην ισλαμική ατζέντα, επεμβαίνοντας συστηματικά στην καθημερινότητα των πολιτών και επιβάλλοντας αυθαίρετα και σταδιακά τον ισλαμικό τρόπο ζωής;

2. Με δεδομένη τη διαφορετική προσέγγιση που τηρεί για τις εξελίξεις ο πρόεδρος της Τουρκίας κ. Αμπντουλάχ Γκιούλ, τι προτίθεται να πράξει η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή επιπρόσθετα, ώστε να πειστεί ο Τούρκος πρωθυπουργός ότι με τη βία δεν πετυχαίνει την εκδημοκρατικοποίηση της Τουρκίας, αλλά αντίθετα οδηγεί σε μια «Τουρκική Άνοιξη» με απρόβλεπτες αρνητικές συνέπειες για τη χώρα και τη γύρω περιοχή;

3. Πως συνάδει το γεγονός ότι, ενώ το καθεστώς Ερντογάν χειροκροτούσε και επαινούσε τις λαϊκές κινητοποιήσεις στις χώρες του τόξου της αραβικής άνοιξης, τώρα επιδεικνύει ένα αντιδημοκρατικό πρόσωπο και επιχειρεί να καταπνίξει στο αίμα τα δημοκρατικά αιτήματα των Τούρκων πολιτών;

4. Μήπως τελικά καταρρέει ο μύθος ότι η Τουρκία είναι παράγοντας σταθερότητας στην ευρύτερη περιοχή;

5. Συνάδουν τέτοιες αυθαίρετες και αντιδημοκρατικές συμπεριφορές με μια υποψήφια χώρα για ένταξη στην ΕΕ;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006922/13
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος)
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(14 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Κατάσταση στην Τουρκία

Οι πρόσφατες εξελίξεις στην Τουρκία, μια υποψηφία προς ένταξη στην ΕΕ χώρα, έχει προκαλέσει ιδιαίτερη ανησυχία. Παρατηρούμε με λύπη ότι η Τουρκική κυβέρνηση κινείται προς την κατεύθυνση εδραίωσης μιας Ισλαμικής Δημοκρατίας και απομακρύνεται από τα πρότυπα ενός σύγχρονου κράτους-δικαίου.

Θα ήθελα να σας, ρωτήσω λοιπόν, κυρία Άστον:

Συνάδουν αυτά που βλέπουμε με τα χαρακτηριστικά χώρας υποψήφιας προς ένταξη στην ΕΕ;

Τι μέτρα λαμβάνει η ΕΕ για να ξεκαθαριστεί επιτέλους προς κάθε κατεύθυνση ότι τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και ο σεβασμός τους αποτελούν συνθήκη sine qua non για να μπορεί αυτή η χώρα να ενταχθεί στην ευρωπαϊκή ένωση, σε μια ένωση δημοκρατικών χωρών*;*

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007238/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Kyriacos Triantaphyllides (GUE/NGL)
(19 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Πρόσφατες εξελίξεις στην Τουρκία

Σύμφωνα με πληροφορίες που δημοσιεύτηκαν στην τουρκική εφημερίδα *Hürriyet Daily News* στις 13 Ιουνίου 2013, ο Τούρκος Πρωθυπουργός Ρετζέπ Ταγίπ Ερντογάν, απαντώντας στις συστάσεις που διατύπωσε το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο προς την Τουρκία κατά τη συνεδρίαση της ολομέλειας στις 12 Ιουνίου, δήλωσε ότι δεν αναγνωρίζει αποφάσεις του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και επεσήμανε ότι οι αποφάσεις του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου δεν είναι δεσμευτικές για την Τουρκία, η οποία δεν είναι μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Σύμφωνα με δημοσίευμα της ίδιας εφημερίδας, ο Τούρκος Υπουργός Ευρωπαϊκών Υποθέσεων Εγκεμέν Μπαγίς απείλησε το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο λέγοντας ότι «ορισμένα κοινοβούλια πρέπει να κατανοήσουν ότι υπάρχει τίμημα όταν μιλάνε με τόση άνεση και θράσος για τις εσωτερικές υποθέσεις της Τουρκίας … Η Τουρκία είναι ένα δημοκρατικό, κοσμικό κράτος δικαίου το οποίο γνωρίζει πολύ καλά πώς να κυβερνά μέσα στο πλαίσιο της δικής του δημοκρατικής παράδοσης. Ελπίζω να έχουν υπολογίσει το κόστος που έχουν αυτές οι εν θερμώ αντιδράσεις μέσα στην ένταση των πρόσφατων γεγονότων, αντιδράσεις οι οποίες στοχοποιούν όχι μόνο την κυβέρνησή μας αλλά και την Τουρκική Δημοκρατία».

1. Συμφωνεί η Επιτροπή με τη δήλωση του κ. Ερντογάν σχετικά με το πεδίο εφαρμογής των ψηφισμάτων του Κοινοβουλίου; Εάν όχι, σε ποιες ενέργειες προτίθεται να προβεί η Επιτροπή για να υπενθυμίσει στον Τούρκο Πρωθυπουργό ότι η Τουρκία, ως υποψήφια προς ένταξη χώρα, πρέπει να σέβεται τα θεσμικά όργανα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και να επιδεικνύει έμπρακτα τον σεβασμό της;

2. Θα ανεχθεί η Επιτροπή απειλές που εξαπολύονται δημοσίως κατά θεσμικού οργάνου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, όπως αυτές που εξέφρασε ο κ. Μπαγίς;

3. Σε ποιες συγκεκριμένες ενέργειες προτίθεται να προβεί η Επιτροπή σε σχέση με τις πρόσφατες προκλητικές και προσβλητικές δηλώσεις της Τουρκίας προς την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση; Θα προχωρήσει στο άνοιγμα ενός νέου κεφαλαίου στις διαπραγματεύσεις με την Τουρκία;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής

(5 Αυγούστου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή έχει παρακολουθήσει εκ του σύνεγγυς τα ζητήματα και τα γεγονότα που ανέφεραν τα Αξιότιμα Μέλη.

Η Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος/Αντιπρόεδρος της Επιτροπής και ο επίτροπος που είναι αρμόδιος για τη διεύρυνση και την Ευρωπαϊκή Πολιτική Γειτονίας έχουν επανειλημμένως καταδικάσει, ακόμη και κατά τη συζήτηση στην ολομέλεια του Κοινοβουλίου στις 12 Ιουνίου 2013, την υπερβολική χρήση βίας με σκοπό τη φίμωση των ειρηνικών διαδηλώσεων. Η δημοκρατία προϋποθέτει διάλογο με όλα τα τμήματα της κοινωνίας, περιλαμβανομένων και εκείνων που δεν εκπροσωπούνται από την κοινοβουλευτική πλειοψηφία. Η Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος/Αντιπρόεδρος της Επιτροπής και ο επίτροπος που είναι αρμόδιος για τη διεύρυνση και την ευρωπαϊκή πολιτική γειτονίας τόνισαν προς τις τουρκικές αρχές ότι πρέπει να συνεχιστεί η ταχεία και διαφανής έρευνα σε ό,τι αφορά την αστυνομική βία και πρέπει να λογοδοτήσουν οι υπεύθυνοι.

Κάθε χώρα που διαπραγματεύεται την προσχώρησή της στην ΕΕ, οφείλει να εγγυηθεί τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα, περιλαμβανομένης της ελευθερίας της έκφρασης και της ελευθερίας του συνέρχεσθαι και του συνεταιρίζεσθαι, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 10 και το άρθρο 11 της Ευρωπαϊκής Σύμβασης Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων (ΕΣΑΔ) και τη νομολογία του Ευρωπαϊκού Δικαστηρίου Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων (ΕΔΑΔ).

Τα πρόσφατα γεγονότα υπογραμμίζουν τη σημασία της περαιτέρω δέσμευσης με την Τουρκία στο πλαίσιο της διαδικασίας προσχώρησης στην ΕΕ, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των κεφαλαίων διαπραγμάτευσης με τη μεγαλύτερη σημασία για τις μεταρρυθμιστικές της προσπάθειες. Κεφάλαιο 23 — Δικαιοσύνη και θεμελιώδη δικαιώματα και κεφάλαιο 24 — Δικαιοσύνη, ελευθερία και ασφάλεια.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006721/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(11 juin 2013)

Objet: Turquie. Recours scandaleux à une force excessive par la police à Istanbul

Les autorités turques doivent prendre de toute urgence des mesures pour éviter que de nouvelles personnes ne soient blessées et pour faire respecter les droits fondamentaux des manifestants, ainsi que pour assurer la sécurité de la population dans son ensemble. D'autres organisations de la société civile ont pris des mesures similaires. La répression extrêmement brutale des manifestations totalement pacifiques de la place Taksim est proprement scandaleuse. Elle a largement envenimé la situation dans les rues d'Istanbul, où des dizaines de personnes ont été blessées.

Des observateurs européens ont constaté que les canons à eau avaient été utilisés aussi bien contre des manifestants pacifiques que contre ceux qui jetaient des pierres aux policiers.

L'usage inapproprié des gaz lacrymogènes a eu des effets particulièrement dévastateurs sur la sécurité des manifestants, provoquant d'innombrables blessures; des manifestants ont notamment été grièvement blessés à la tête après avoir reçu des bombes lacrymogènes lancées par la police. Sur les lieux des manifestations, le sol est encore jonché de centaines de bombes lacrymogènes vides.

La Chambre médicale d'Istanbul a tenté d'installer des dispensaires de campagne pour soigner les manifestants blessés dans la rue, mais elle en a été empêchée par l'utilisation constante de gaz lacrymogènes par la police dans les zones où se tenaient les manifestations. Qui plus est, les mesures de sécurité mises en place par la police avaient empêché de nombreux blessés d'accéder aux urgences de l'hôpital Taksim.

1. La Commission compte-t-elle vivement protester?

2. Des rencontres sont-elles prévues à très brève échéance pour des explications sur ces dérapages?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Füle au nom de la Commission
(5 août 2013)

La Commission a suivi de près les questions et les événements évoqués par les Honorables Parlementaires.

La Vice-présisente/Haute Représentante et le commissaire chargé de l'élargissement et de la politique européenne de voisinage ont condamné à plusieurs reprises, et notamment lors de la séance plénière du Parlement du 12 juin 2013, le recours excessif à la force pour réduire au silence les manifestations pacifiques. La démocratie a besoin d'un dialogue avec toutes les composantes de la société, y compris celles qui ne sont pas représentées par la majorité parlementaire. La Vice-présisente/Haute Représentante et le commissaire chargé de l'élargissement et de la politique européenne de voisinage ont insisté auprès des autorités turques pour qu'une enquête transparente soit rapidement menée sur les violences policières et pour que les responsables rendent des comptes.

Tout pays ayant engagé des négociations en vue d'adhérer à l'UE doit garantir les Droits de l'homme, y compris la liberté d'expression et la liberté de réunion et d'association, conformément aux articles 10 et 11 de la Convention européenne des Droits de l'homme et à la jurisprudence de la Cour européenne des Droits de l'homme.

Les événements actuels soulignent l'importance d'un renforcement du dialogue avec la Turquie dans le cadre du processus d'adhésion à l'UE, y compris en ce qui concerne les chapitres de négociation les plus importants pour ses efforts de réforme: les chapitres 23 — Pouvoir judiciaire et droits fondamentaux et 24 — Justice, liberté et sécurité.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-006302/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(3 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Alberi e diritti civili in Turchia

La Turchia si è dimostrata interlocutore serio e credibile dell'Occidente e dell'UE nel bacino del Mediterraneo. Tuttavia i recenti sviluppi delle politiche di Recep Tayyip Erdogan e le proteste che ne sono scaturite devono generare una riflessione sul sostegno allo sviluppo della democrazia e al rispetto dei diritti civili nel paese. La vicenda di Gezi Park ci deve far riflettere sull'importanza dei parchi cittadini e sulla loro salvaguardia, oltre che sull'importanza che questi rivestono nella vita dei cittadini. Cancellare un parco nel centro di una città europea per fare spazio ad un centro commerciale sarebbe imperdonabile. Allo stesso tempo preoccupa la situazione dei diritti civili in Turchia e la difesa della laicità dello Stato, colonna portante del regime democratico e della stabilità politica del paese. Alcune recenti legislazioni, come le misure restrittive sugli alcoolici, fanno pensare che si vada nella direzione contraria ad un'apertura verso i valori di libertà propri del mondo occidentale. Questi fattori, uniti all'interessamento della Turchia all'ingresso nell'UE, dovrebbero portare l'Alto Commissario a svolgere una profonda riflessione sulle manifestazioni contro il Governo Erdogan, facendo quanto in suo potere per difendere i diritti civili e la sicurezza del popolo turco.

1. Non ritiene che l'Alto Rappresentante debba mostrare la preoccupazione dell'UE per le proteste e le violenze in corso a Istanbul e in altre città della Turchia?

2. Non crede sia necessario un richiamo al fine di incoraggiare il Governo Turco a rivedere le proprie posizioni sui diritti civili e sulla laicità dello Stato?

3. Non pensa che sia necessario agire in maniera rapida, onde evitare che la situazione degeneri come avvenuto negli altri paesi del Medio Oriente dopo la Primavera Araba?

4. Non ritiene che le misure restrittive della libertà personale messe in atto dal Governo Erdogan siano un ostacolo insormontabile al proseguimento delle trattative sull'ingresso della Turchia nell'UE?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006891/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Manifestanti turchi arrestati dal governo per l'utilizzo dei social network

La critica del 2 giugno scorso da parte del primo ministro Erdogan contro i social media, considerati una minaccia per la società, ha alimentato le proteste da parte della popolazione che da due settimane chiede le dimissioni del governo. Il 10 giugno ad Adana sono stati arrestati 13 manifestanti con l'accusa di avere incitato ai disordini con dei messaggi diffusi sul social network «Twitter». Altri 34 giovani sono stati arrestati la scorsa settimana a Smirne con la stessa accusa. I manifestanti hanno trovato nei nuovi mezzi di comunicazione il canale per diffondere la protesta all'interno del paese e per denunciare all'opinione pubblica internazionale le violenze subite. Gli utenti locali sono stati in grado di aggirare i divieti, nonostante il governo abbia cercato di bloccare tutti gli accessi alle piattaforme di condivisione social. La stampa, dietro intimidazioni del governo, non fa accenno alle proteste, confermando i dati degli osservatori di «Reporters sans frontières», l'organizzazione non governativa internazionale in difesa della libertà di stampa in tutto il mondo, secondo i quali la Turchia si trova al 154° posto della classifica dei paesi che rispettano la libertà di parola.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere:

— se è a conoscenza dei fatti;

— considerando che la libertà di pacifica riunione e manifestazione deve essere un diritto garantito dalla democrazia, come valuta la posizione del governo in tema di rispetto dei diritti umani in vista di una futura entrata della Turchia nell'Unione come membro a pieno titolo;

— se riterrebbe opportuno richiamare il governo turco al rispetto delle convenzioni internazionali ratificate, in particolare al Patto internazionale sui diritti civili e politici, che protegge la libertà di espressione e di riunione pacifica, ratificato dalla Turchia il 23 dicembre 2003?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007259/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(20 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Violenze della polizia turca contro i giornalisti stranieri

Il 12 giugno due giornalisti canadesi sono stati arrestati dalla polizia turca in piazza Taksim per motivi ancora sconosciuti. Durante gli scontri tra manifestanti e forze dell'ordine dello scorso 16 giugno, il fotografo italiano Daniele Stefanini è stato ferito alla testa dalla polizia turca nel quartiere di Bayrampasha. Dopo essere stato trasportato in ospedale, la polizia ha predisposto lo stato di fermo. Dall'inizio delle proteste diversi giornalisti turchi e stranieri sono stati picchiati e arrestati dalle forze antisommossa per evitare che l'opinione pubblica mondiale venisse a conoscenza dell'attività repressiva della polizia. Secondo quanto riportato da alcuni inviati, i reporter stranieri sarebbero sottoposti a continua sorveglianza da parte della polizia armata a scopo intimidatorio.

La Commissione:

1. non ritiene che le azioni della polizia contro i giornalisti presenti sul luogo per documentare le proteste contrasti con la libertà di informazione, diritto garantito da tutti i governi democratici?

2. considererebbe opportuno un eventuale intervento a sostegno della campagna per la liberazione dei giornalisti in carcere in Turchia per presunti reati di opinione lanciata dal Congresso Mondiale della Federazione Internazionale Giornalisti tenutosi a Dublino dal 4 al 7 giugno scorsi?

3. come valuta il mancato rispetto degli articoli 19 e 20 della Dichiarazione Universale dei Diritti dell'Uomo, che garantiscono la libertà di opinione e di espressione e nello stesso tempo la libertà di associazione e di pacifiche riunioni, e della Convenzione europea per i Diritti dell'Uomo ratificate dalla Turchia, alla luce di una futura partecipazione del paese come Stato membro a tutti gli effetti dell'Unione?

4. come valuta l'affermazione del premier Erdogan riferita dall'agenzia Anadolu di non riconoscere il Parlamento europeo dopo che, giovedì 13 giugno, il Parlamento aveva approvato la risoluzione sulla brutalità della polizia turca e sulla mancata volontà del governo di cercare una soluzione conciliativa con i manifestanti?

Risposta congiunta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(5 agosto 2013)

La Commissione ha seguito con attenzione le questioni e gli avvenimenti menzionati dall'onorevole deputato.

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton e il commissario responsabile dell'allargamento e della politica europea di vicinato hanno ripetutamente condannato, anche durante la seduta plenaria in Parlamento del 12 giugno 2013, l'uso eccessivo della forza per mettere a tacere le proteste pacifiche. La democrazia presuppone un dialogo con tutti i segmenti della società, compresi quelli non rappresentati dalla maggioranza parlamentare. L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton e il commissario responsabile dell'allargamento e della politica europea di vicinato hanno ribadito alle autorità turche la necessità di indagare in modo tempestivo e trasparente sull'uso della violenza da parte delle forze di polizia e di far sì che i responsabili di tali atti siano chiamati a risponderne.

Qualsiasi paese che stia negoziando l'adesione all'UE deve garantire il rispetto dei diritti umani, compresa la libertà di espressione, di riunione e di associazione, conformemente agli articoli 10 e 11 della Convenzione europea dei diritti dell'uomo e alla giurisprudenza della Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo.

Gli avvenimenti attuali sottolineano l'importanza di intensificare il dialogo con la Turchia nel quadro del processo di adesione all'UE, anche per quanto riguarda i capitoli di negoziato più fondamentali per il suo processo di riforma: capitolo 23 — Sistema giudiziario e i diritti fondamentali e capitolo 24 — Giustizia, libertà e sicurezza.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006193/13
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(3 juni 2013)

Betreft: Systematisch gebruik van traangas door Turkse politie

Tijdens protestacties op 31 mei tegen de geplande bouw van een winkelcentrum aan het Taksim Gezi park in Istanbul ging de politie zeer gewelddadig te keer. Er werd traangas gebruikt, verschillende mensen liepen verwondingen aan het hoofd op, een persoon brak zelfs een been.

Amnesty International beschuldigt de politiediensten ervan buitensporig geweld te hebben gebruikt (het protest vond gedurende meerdere dagen plaats).

Steeds meer waarnemers wijzen trouwens op het systematische gebruik van traangas door de politiediensten in Turkije, ook wanneer daar geen reden toe is. Het autoritaire karakter van de AKP-regering wordt steeds duidelijker.

— Is de Commissie bekend met het probleem van het onnodige gebruik van traangas door de Turkse politiediensten, ook bij vreedzame manifestaties?

— Werd hierover al contact opgenomen met de Turkse regering? Zo ja, wat waren de conclusies?

— Is deze systematische aantasting van het recht op vergadering in overeenstemming met de criteria van Kopenhagen? Wat zijn de gevolgen voor het onderhandelingsproces m.b.t. de mogelijke toetreding van Turkije?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007093/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(18 juni 2013)

Betreft: Turkije dreigt leger in te zetten tegen demonstranten

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht waarin de Turkse vicepremier Arinc heeft gedreigd met het inzetten van militairen om de protesten in Turkije uiteen te slaan? ([1])

2. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat het volstrekt misdadig is dat de Turkse regering overweegt het leger tegen de eigen bevolking in te zetten? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat het dreigement om het leger in te zetten de krankzinnigheid van het Turkse AK regime onderstreept? Zo neen, waarom niet?

4. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat de toetredingsonderhandelingen met Turkije moeten worden gestaakt? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007260/13
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(20 juni 2013)

Betreft: Erdogan: gebruik van traangas in acquis communautaire

Hürryet Daily News van 19 juni 2013 ([2]) schrijft o.m. het volgende:

„Regarding the widespread criticism of the police's vast use of tear gas, Erdoğan responded, „It is their most inherent right, they will. You will see that in the EU acquis communautaire. When you do not obey, the police use this authority.""

([1]) http://nos.nl/artikel/519242-turkije-dreigt-met-inzet-leger.html
([2]) http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/using-pepper-spray-a-natural-right-of-police-says-turkish-pm-erdogan.aspx?pageID=238&nID=49006&NewsCatID=338.

Wat is de reactie van de Commissie op deze verklaring? Acht de Commissie het wenselijk en in overeenstemming met de werkelijkheid dat het grootschalig gebruik (te pas en te onpas) van traangas in verband wordt gebracht met het acquis communautaire? Nam de Commissie hierover contact op met de Turkse regering? Zo ja, wat waren de conclusies?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007264/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(20 juni 2013)

Betreft: Boete voor kritische tv-stations Turkije

De Turkse autoriteiten zijn begonnen met het uitdelen van boetes aan tv-stations die kritisch verslag hebben gedaan van het politiegeweld bij de ontruiming van het Taksimplein.

O.a. Halk TV, Ulusal TV en twee andere zenders zouden worden beschuldigd van „het in gevaar brengen van de intellectuele en morele ontwikkeling van jongeren”.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Boete voor kritische tv-stations Turkije” ([3])?

2. Acht de Commissie het beboeten van kritische tv-stations in strijd met de vrijheid van meningsuiting en derhalve ook met de Criteria van Kopenhagen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat onder het autoritaire regime van Erdoğan fundamentele vrijheden, zoals de vrijheid van meningsuiting, in Turkije structureel onder druk zijn komen te staan? Is de Commissie derhalve ertoe bereid de toetredingsonderhandelingen met Turkije te beëindigen? Zo neen, kan de Commissie aangeven hoezeer de situatie in Turkije verder dient te verslechteren voordat de Commissie tot de conclusie komt dat afbreken van de toetredingsonderhandelingen onvermijdelijk is?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007265/13
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(20 juni 2013)

Betreft: Gebruik van chemicaliën in water voor waterkanonnen in Turkije

Volgens verschillende persberichten ([4]) heeft de politie in Istanbul minstens op zaterdag 15 juni als zondag 16 juni chemicaliën toegevoegd aan het water dat gebruikt werd om op demonstranten te spuiten op het Taksimplein en in het Gezipark. De gouverneur heeft dat toegegeven, maar heeft ontkend dat het om een gevaarlijke substantie zou gaan. Toch klaagden betogers achteraf over een brandend gevoel aan de huid, dat ongeveer twee uur duurde.

Is de Commissie bekend met de feiten?

Werd hierover contact opgenomen met de Turkse regering? Wat waren de conclusies?

Overweegt de Commissie een onderzoek te vragen naar de precieze aard van de gebruikte chemicaliën, en naar de reden van hun gebruik?

Hoe verhouden de feiten zich tot de criteria van Kopenhagen?

Welke gevolgen heeft dit voor het verdere verloop van de toetredingsonderhandelingen?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(5 augustus 2013)

De Commissie heeft de door de geachte Parlementsleden aangehaalde kwesties en gebeurtenissen op de voet gevolgd.

([3]) http://www.nu.nl/media/3498591/boete-kritische-tv-stations-turkije.html
([4]) o.m http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2668/Buitenland/article/detail/3459800/2013/06/16/Chemicalien-gebruikt-tegen-betogers-Istanbul.dhtml.

De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter en de commissaris voor Uitbreiding en Europees Nabuurschapsbeleid hebben het buitensporige gebruik van geweld om vreedzame protestacties de kop in te drukken, herhaaldelijk veroordeeld, onder meer tijdens het plenaire debat in het Parlement op 12 juni 2013. Democratie vereist dialoog met alle geledingen van de samenleving, dus ook met die welke niet door de parlementaire meerderheid zijn vertegenwoordigd. De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter en de commissaris voor Uitbreiding en Europees Nabuurschapsbeleid hebben er bij de Turkse instanties op aangedrongen dat er een snel en transparant onderzoek naar het politiegeweld wordt gevoerd en dat degenen die ervoor verantwoordelijk zijn ter verantwoording worden geroepen.

Elk land dat met de EU over toetreding onderhandelt, moet de naleving van de mensenrechten kunnen verzekeren, met inbegrip van de vrije meningsuiting en vrijheid van vergadering en vereniging overeenkomstig de artikelen 10 en 11 van het Europees Verdrag voor de rechten van de mens (EVRM) en de rechtspraak van het Europees Hof voor de rechten van de mens (EHRM).

De huidige gebeurtenissen onderstrepen het belang van nadere betrokkenheid bij Turkije in het kader van het proces van toetreding tot de EU, inclusief met betrekking tot de onderhandelingshoofdstukken die het meest essentieel zijn voor het hervormingsproces: hoofdstuk 23 — Rechterlijke macht en fundamentele rechten en hoofdstuk 24 — Recht, vrijheid en veiligheid.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006871/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(13 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Sytuacja w Turcji

Turcja jest członkiem układu o stowarzyszeniu zawartym z UE, a w przyszłości pragnie zostać pełnoprawnym członkiem UE.

Mając na uwadze te ambicje, jak kraj ten ma zostać częścią Unii Europejskiej, skoro znęca się nad swoimi obywatelami i ogranicza ich wolność? Jak władze Unii Europejskiej zamierzają wpłynąć na sytuację w Turcji i ułatwić jej stabilizację?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007036/13
do Komisji
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(17 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Demonstracje w Turcji

Powtarzające się od 28 maja demonstracje na placu Taksim w Stambule początkowo były tylko protestem tureckiej młodzieży przeciwko rządowym planom zabudowy placu i sąsiedniego parku (ma tam powstać meczet i centrum handlowe). Jednakże, demonstracje przekształciły się w ruch polityczny. Pod wpływem przemocy policyjnej wobec demonstrantów wystąpienia przybrały coraz bardziej antyrządowy charakter. Policja nie wahała się przed używaniem gazu łzawiącego czy armatek wodnych. Pomimo tego ruch protestacyjny rozprzestrzenił się ze Stambułu również na inne miasta Turcji; do podobnych rozruchów doszło w Ankarze, Adanie, Izmirze i Edirne. Wskutek ataków policji na demonstrujących do tej pory pięć osób zginęło, a ok. 7,5 tys. odniosło obrażenia.

Pytania:

1. Czy zdaniem Komisji policja nadużyła siły przeciw uczestnikom antyrządowych demonstracji, które w demokratycznym społeczeństwie są legalnym sposobem wyrażania poglądów?

2. Czy Komisja zamierza podjąć konkretne działania w związku z sytuacją zaistniałą w Turcji?

3. Czy Komisja zamierza interweniować u władz Turcji w sprawie pociągnięcia do odpowiedzialności prawnej osób, które podjęły decyzję o brutalnym ataku policji na demonstrantów?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Štefana Fülego w imieniu Komisji
(5 sierpnia 2013 r.)

Komisja z uwagą śledzi kwestie i wydarzenia, do których nawiązują szanowni Państwo Posłowie.

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca oraz komisarz ds. rozszerzenia i polityki sąsiedztwa wielokrotnie potępili, m.in. podczas debaty na posiedzeniu plenarnym Parlamentu w dniu 12 czerwca 2013 r., przesadne użycie siły w celu stłumienia protestów o charakterze pokojowym. Demokracja wymaga dialogu z wszystkimi grupami społecznymi, również tymi, które nie są reprezentowane przez parlamentarną większość. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca oraz komisarz ds. rozszerzenia i polityki sąsiedztwa podkreślili w rozmowach z władzami Turcji, że konieczne jest sprawne i przejrzyste dochodzenie w sprawie aktów przemocy dokonanych przez policję oraz że osoby za nie odpowiedzialne powinny zostać pociągnięte do odpowiedzialności.

Państwa prowadzące negocjacje w sprawie przystąpienia do UE muszą gwarantować przestrzeganie praw człowieka, w tym wolności słowa oraz wolności zrzeszania się i zgromadzeń, zgodnie z art. 10 i 11 europejskiej konwencji praw człowieka (EKPC) oraz orzecznictwem Europejskiego Trybunału Praw Człowieka.

Aktualne wydarzenia uwypuklają znaczenie dalszej współpracy z Turcją w ramach unijnego procesu akcesyjnego, m.in. w zakresie tych rozdziałów negocjacyjnych, które są najbardziej istotne dla działań na rzecz reform prowadzonych przez Turcję, tj. rozdziału 23 – „Wymiar sprawiedliwości i prawa podstawowe" – oraz rozdziału 24 – „Sprawiedliwość, wolność i bezpieczeństwo".

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007023/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Protestos verificados na Turquia

Considerando que:

— Segundo os critérios de Copenhaga, para aderir à UE, um Estado deve cumprir três critérios: o critério político (existência de instituições estáveis que garantam a democracia; Estado de direito; direitos do Homem; respeito pelas minorias e a sua proteção); o critério económico (existência de uma economia de mercado que funcione efetivamente e capacidade de fazer face às forças de mercado e à concorrência da União); o critério do acervo comunitário (capacidade para assumir as obrigações decorrentes da adesão, incluindo a adesão aos objetivos de união política, económica e monetária);

— Desde o início dos protestos na Turquia, morreram já três pessoas e mais de 5 mil ficaram feridas;

Pergunto à Comissão:

— Tendo em conta os referidos critérios, como encara os recentes acontecimentos verificados na Turquia?

Resposta conjunta dada por Štefan Füle em nome da Comissão
(5 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão tem acompanhado de perto as questões e os acontecimentos referidos pelo Senhor Deputado.

A AR/VP e o comissário responsável pelo Alargamento e pela Política Europeia de Vizinhança têm condenado repetidamente o uso excessivo da força para silenciar protestos pacíficos; fizeram-no, nomeadamente, durante o debate plenário no Parlamento Europeu em 12 de junho de 2013. A democracia requer diálogo com todos os segmentos da sociedade, incluindo os não representados pela maioria parlamentar. A AR/VP e o comissário responsável pelo Alargamento e pela Política Europeia de Vizinhança afirmaram enfaticamente às autoridades turcas a necessidade de a violência policial ser investigada de forma cabal, célere e transparente e de os responsáveis prestarem contas.

Qualquer país que negocie a sua adesão à UE tem de garantir o respeito dos direitos humanos, nomeadamente a liberdade de expressão e a liberdade de reunião e de associação, em conformidade com os artigos 10.° e 11.° da Convenção Europeia dos Direitos do Homem e a jurisprudência do Tribunal Europeu dos Direitos do Homem.

Os eventos recentes salientam a importância de uma maior colaboração com a Turquia no âmbito do processo de adesão à UE, designadamente nos capítulos de negociação que são fundamentais para os esforços de reforma, o capítulo 23 — Sistema Judiciário e Direitos Fundamentais e o capítulo 24 — Justiça, Liberdade e Segurança.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006193/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(3 June 2013)

Subject: Systematic use of tear gas by Turkish police

Police resorted to extreme violence during protests which took place on 31 May against the planned construction of a shopping centre on the Taksim Gezi Park in Istanbul. Tear gas was used, a number of people sustained head injuries, and one person even broke their leg.

Amnesty International has accused the police force of using excessive violence (the protest lasted several days).

In actual fact, there are a growing number of observers mentioning the systematic use of tear gas by the police force in Turkey, even when there is no reason for it. The authoritarian nature of the AKP Government is becoming increasingly evident.

— Is the Commission familiar with the problem involving the needless use of tear gas by the Turkish police force, including during peaceful demonstrations?

— Has the Turkish Government already been contacted about this matter? If so, what were the conclusions?

— Does this systematic violation of the freedom of assembly comply with the Copenhagen criteria? What are the repercussions for the negotiation process on Turkey's possible accession to the EU?

Question for written answer P-006302/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(3 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Trees and civil rights in Turkey

While Turkey has proved itself to be a serious and credible interlocutor for western countries and the EU in the Mediterranean Basin, recent events sparked off by a groundswell of discontent at the policies of Recep Tayyip Erdogan are inevitably raising questions regarding measures taken in support of democracy and human rights in that country. The Gezi Park incident must prompt us to reflect on the importance of urban green areas and the conservation thereof, particularly as regards the everyday lives of local residents. Indeed, the destruction of a park in a European city centre to make way for a shopping mall would be unforgivable. At the same time the wider implications in terms of civil rights and secularism, on which democracy and political stability in Turkey are based, are also giving cause for concern. A number of recent laws such as that restricting alcohol consumption, far from reflecting sympathy with western libertarian values, would appear to be a move in the opposite direction. This, together with Turkish aspirations for EU membership, should prompt the High Representative to consider carefully the significance of the protests against the Erdogan administration and do everything in her power to uphold the civil rights and safety of the Turkish people.

In view of this:

1. Does the High Representative not consider that she should express the concern of the EU at the protests and acts of violence occurring in Istanbul and other Turkish cities?

2. Does she not consider it necessary to call on the Turkish Government to review its own stance on civil rights and state secularism?

3. Does she not consider it necessary to act without delay in order to prevent a deterioration of the situation similar to that which occurred in the countries of the Middle East following the Arab Spring?

4. Does she not consider that the restrictions of personal freedom introduced by the Erdogan Government are an insurmountable obstacle to any further negotiations on Turkish accession to the EU?

Question for written answer E-006403/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(5 June 2013)

Subject: The chaotic situation in Turkey

The excessive use of violence and the brash way of dealing with the mass movements in Turkey by the Erdoğan Government and the Turkish police seem to be leading the country into chaos.

1. What is the Commission's interpretation of the rightful mass uprising (particularly by young, educated people) during Mr Erdoğan's continued pursuit of returning to an Islamic agenda, interfering systematically in the daily lives of citizens and arbitrarily imposing an Islamic lifestyle?

2. Given the different approach to these events by the Turkish President, Mr Abdullah Gul, what does the Commission intend to do to persuade the Turkish Prime Minister that violence will not achieve democratisation in Turkey but will lead to a 'Turkish Spring', with unforeseeable negative consequences for the country and the surrounding area?

3. How can Erdoğan's regime, which applauded and praised the mass movements of the Arab Spring, now be taking an anti-democratic stance by attempting to stifle the democratic aspirations of Turkish citizens?

4. Is the myth that Turkey is a stabilising factor in the wider area perhaps being broken?

5. Is this arbitrary and anti-democratic behaviour consistent with a candidate country for EU accession?

Question for written answer E-006721/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(11 June 2013)

Subject: Turkey — Scandalous use of excessive force by police in Istanbul

The Turkish authorities must take urgent measures to ensure that no more people are injured and to respect the basic rights of the demonstrators, as well as to ensure the safety of the population at large. Other civil society organisations have taken similar measures. The extremely brutal suppression of the completely peaceful demonstrations in Taksim Square is completely scandalous. It has poisoned the atmosphere in the streets of Istanbul, where dozens of people have been wounded.

European observers have noted that water cannons have been used as much against peaceful demonstrators as against those throwing stones at the police.

The inappropriate use of tear gas has had particularly devastating effects on the safety of protesters and has caused countless injuries; some demonstrators have received serious head injuries from tear gas grenades fired by the police. Where demonstrations have taken place, the ground is still strewn with hundreds of empty tear gas canisters.

The Istanbul Medical Chamber has attempted to set up mobile treatment centres to treat demonstrators injured in the street, but it has been hampered by the constant use of tear gas by the police in areas where demonstrations have taken place. Moreover, security measures imposed by the police have prevented many of the wounded from accessing emergency services at Taksim Hospital.

1. Does the Commission intend to protest vigorously?

2. Are urgent meetings planned to seek explanations for these abuses?

Question for written answer E-006871/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Situation in Turkey

Turkey is an associate member of the EU and would like to become a full member in the future.

Notwithstanding this ambition, how can this country become a part of the EU while mistreating its citizens and restricting their freedoms? How do the EU authorities intend to influence the situation in Turkey and facilitate its stabilisation?

Question for written answer E-006891/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Turkish protesters arrested by the Government for using social networks

Prime Minister Erdoğan's criticism on 2 June of social media, calling them a threat to society, has fuelled protests by the population, which has been calling for the resignation of the Government for two weeks. On 10 June, in Adana, 13 protesters were arrested on charges of inciting riots via messages on Twitter. Another 34 young people were arrested last week in Izmir on the same charges. The protesters have found they can use new media as a channel to spread protest within Turkey and to denounce the violence they have suffered to international public opinion. Local users were able to circumvent the prohibitions, even though the Government had tried to block all access to social platforms. Following Government intimidation, the press is making no mention of the protests, thus confirming data from observers working for 'Reporters Without Borders', the international non-governmental organisation that defends freedom of the press around the world, which ranked Turkey 154th in the World Press Freedom Index.

— Is the Commission aware of these facts?

— Considering that the freedom of peaceful assembly and demonstration should be a right guaranteed by democracy, how does it regard the Government's position in terms of respect for human rights with a view to Turkey's future entry into the EU as a full member?

— Would it consider it appropriate to call upon the Turkish Government to comply with the international conventions it has ratified, in particular the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which protects freedom of expression and peaceful assembly, and which was ratified by Turkey on 23 December 2003?

Question for written answer E-006922/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Situation in Turkey

Recent developments in Turkey, a candidate country for accession to the EU, are a particular cause for concern. We note with regret that the Turkish government is moving towards the consolidation of an Islamic Republic and is departing from the standards of a modern State governed by the rule of law.

In view of the above, will the High Representative say:

Is Turkey currently exhibiting the characteristics of a candidate country for accession to the EU?

What measures is the EU taking finally to spell out to all parties concerned that human rights and respect for these rights are indispensable conditions for accession to the European Union, a union of democratic countries?

Question for written answer E-007023/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Protests in Turkey

— According to the Copenhagen criteria, countries wishing to join the EU must fulfil three criteria: the political criterion (stable institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities); the economic criterion (a functioning market economy and the capacity to cope with competition and market forces in the EU); and the *acquis communautaire* criterion (the ability to take on and implement effectively the obligations of membership, including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union).

— Three people have already died and more than 5000 have been injured since the protests began in Turkey.

— In view of these criteria, how does the Commission view the recent events in Turkey?

Question for written answer E-007036/13
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Demonstrations in Turkey

The demonstrations in Taksim Square in Istanbul, which have been ongoing since 28 May 2013, started out as a protest of Turkish youth against government plans to build a mosque and a shopping centre in the square and in an adjacent park. The protests have, however, transformed into a political movement. In the face of the police violence being meted out against protesters, the demonstrations have taken on a more anti-government character. The police have not hesitated to use tear gas or water cannons. In spite of this, the protest movement has spread from Istanbul to other Turkish cities, with similar riots occurring in Ankara, Adana, İzmir and Edirne. So far, five people have died as a result of police attacks on demonstrators, and some 7 500 have suffered injuries.

1. Does the Commission feel that the Turkish police have used excessive force against those taking part in anti-government demonstrations, which — in a democratic society — are a legal way of expressing one's views?

2. Does the Commission intend to take specific measures with regard to the current situation in Turkey?

3. Does the Commission intend to make representations to the Turkish Government with a view to ensuring that those who took the decision to authorise such brutal police actions against protesters are held legally responsible?

Question for written answer E-007093/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Turkey threatens to deploy army against demonstrators

1. Is the Commission aware of the report that Turkish Deputy Prime Minister Arinc has threatened to deploy the military to disperse the protests in Turkey? ([1])

2. Does the Commission agree with the Dutch Party for Freedom that it is quite criminal for the Turkish Government to consider deploying the army against its own people? If not, why not?

3. Does the Commission agree with the Party for Freedom that the threat to deploy the army underlines the insanity of the Turkish AKP Government? If not, why not?

4. Does the Commission agree with the Party for Freedom that the accession negotiations with Turkey should be halted? If not, why not?

Question for written answer E-007238/13
to the Commission
Kyriacos Triantaphyllides (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Recent developments in Turkey

On 13 June 2013, the *Hürriyet Daily News* reported that 'Turkish Prime Minister, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, said he did not recognise decisions made by the European Parliament in response to the Parliament's session on Turkey on June 12. The prime minister said the body's decisions were not binding for Turkey, which is not an EU member'. The Turkish daily also reported that Turkey's European Affairs Minister, Egemen Bagis, threatened the European Parliament, stating that: 'Some Parliaments should understand that there is a price for talking so freely and boldly about Turkey's domestic affairs … Turkey is a democratic, secular state of law that knows fully how to govern within its own democratic tradition. I hope that they have calculated the price of getting excited in the heat of the moment and target not just our government but the Turkish Republic as well'.

([1]) http://nos.nl/artikel/519242-turkije-dreigt-met-inzet-leger.html

1. Does the Commission agree with Mr Erdogan's statement concerning the scope of Parliament resolutions? If not, what will the Commission do to remind Turkey's Prime Minister that as a candidate country it needs to respect and show respect towards the EU institutions?

2. Will the Commission tolerate threats issued publicly against an EU institution, such as those expressed by Mr Bagis?

3. What concrete steps will the Commission take with regard to this latest expression of provocation and insult on the part of Turkey towards the EU? Will it go ahead with opening a new chapter in negotiations with Turkey?

Question for written answer E-007259/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Use of violence by Turkish police towards foreign journalists

On 12 June 2013 two Canadian journalists were arrested by Turkish police in Istanbul's Taksim Square on as yet unknown grounds. Four days later, on 16 June, Italian photographer Daniele Stefanini suffered head injuries at the hands of police during clashes with demonstrators in the Bayrampasha district. Stefanini was taken to hospital and then held there by the police. Right from day one of the protests riot police have been beating up and arresting Turkish and foreign journalists in an attempt to prevent the world from finding out about the repressive tactics employed by the security forces. According to reports by several correspondents, armed police have been seeking to intimidate foreign journalists by placing them under continuous surveillance.

1. Does the Commission not agree that the police's treatment of journalists who are in Turkey to cover the protests flies in the face of freedom of information, a right which is guaranteed by all democratic governments?

2. Does it think that it would be appropriate to support the campaign to free the journalists imprisoned in Turkey for alleged crimes of opinion launched at the World Congress of the International Federation of Journalists held in Dublin from 4 to 7 June 2013?

3. Bearing in mind that Turkey is an EU applicant country, what view does it take of the breach of Articles 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which safeguard freedom of opinion and expression and freedom of peaceful assembly and association, and of the European Convention on Human rights, which Turkey has ratified?

4. What view does it take of Prime Minister Erdogan's statement (reported by the AnadoluAgency) that his government no longer recognised the European Parliament following thelatter's adoption, on 13 June 2013, of a resolution on Turkish police brutality and theTurkish Government's unwillingness to negotiate with demonstrators?

Question for written answer E-007260/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Erdoğan: use of tear gas in *acquis communautaire*

On 19 June 2013, Hürryet Daily News [2] reported, *inter alia*, as follows:

'Regarding the widespread criticism of the police's vast use of tear gas, Erdoğan responded, "It is their most inherent right, they will. You will see that in the EU acquis communautaire. When you do not obey, the police use this authority"'.'

[2] http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/using-pepper-spray-a-natural-right-of-police-says-turkish-pm-erdogan.aspx?pageID=238&nID=49006&NewsCatID=338

What is the Commission's response to this statement? Does the Commission consider it desirable and in accordance with reality that the large-scale use (both justified and unjustified) of teargas should be linked to the *acquis communautaire*? Has the Commission contacted the Turkish Government about this? If so, what were the conclusions?

Question for written answer E-007264/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Fines for critical TV stations in Turkey

The Turkish authorities have begun to fine TV stations which have reported critically on the police violence during the clearing of Taksim Square.

Among others, Halk TV, Ulusal TV and two other broadcasters are apparently being accused of 'jeopardising the intellectual and moral development of young people'.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the report 'Boete voor kritische tv-stations Turkije' [Fines for critical TV stations in Turkey] ([3])?

2. Does the Commission consider that fining critical TV stations breaches the principle of freedom of expression and therefore also the Copenhagen Criteria? If not, why not?

3. Does the Commission agree that under the authoritarian Erdoğan regime fundamental freedoms, such as freedom of expression, are being systematically threatened? Will the Commission therefore end the accession negotiations with Turkey? If not, can the Commission indicate how much further the situation in Turkey needs to deteriorate before the Commission reaches the conclusion that breaking off the accession negotiations is unavoidable?

Question for written answer E-007265/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Use of chemicals in water for water cannon in Turkey

According to various reports in the press ([4]), the police in Istanbul — at least on Saturday, 15 June and Sunday, 16 June — added chemicals to the water used in water cannon against demonstrators on Taksim Square and in Gezi Park. The governor has admitted as much, although denying that the chemical added was a dangerous substance. Nonetheless, demonstrators subsequently complained of a burning sensation in their skin, which persisted for approximately two hours.

Is the Commission aware of the facts?

Has it contacted the Turkish Government about this? What were the conclusions?

Will the Commission request an inquiry into the precise nature of the chemicals used and the reason for their use?

Can the facts be reconciled with the Copenhagen Criteria?

What consequences will this have for the further progress of the accession negotiations?

([3]) http://www.nu.nl/media/3498591/boete-kritische-tv-stations-turkije.html
([4]) Inter alia http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2668/Buitenland/article/detail/3459800/2013/06/16/Chemicalien-gebruikt-tegen-betogers-Istanbul.dhtml

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission

(5 August 2013)

The Commission has followed the issues and events mentioned by the Honourable Members closely.

The HR/VP and Commissioner responsible for Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy have repeatedly condemned, including during the plenary debate in Parliament on 12 June 2013, the excessive use of force to silence peaceful protests. Democracy requires dialogue with all segments of society, including those not represented by the parliamentary majority. The HR/VP and Commissioner responsible for Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy have stressed to the Turkish authorities that a swift and transparent investigation into police violence needs to be followed through and those responsible need to be brought to account.

Any country negotiating its EU accession needs to guarantee human rights, including freedom of expression, and freedom of assembly and association, in line with Article 10 and 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR).

Current events underline the importance of further engagement with Turkey within the framework of the EU accession process, including on those negotiating chapters most fundamental to its reform efforts: Chapter 23 — Judiciary and Fundamental Rights and Chapter 24 — Justice, Freedom and Security.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006218/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(3 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Evasão fiscal na UE

— A evasão fiscal na UE representa anualmente o equivalente ao orçamento comunitário para seis anos, ou seja, cerca de mil milhões de euros por ano, praticamente o dobro do défice anual total de 2012 de todos os Estados-Membros.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Existe ou está previsto algum plano concertado, ao nível da UE, na luta contra a evasão fiscal?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006586/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(7 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: União Europeia perde anualmente um bilião de euros com economia paralela

Considerando que:

— O custo da evasão fiscal representa anualmente perdas de um bilião de euros;

— Este montante é superior às despesas totais dos Estados-Membros com a saúde e quatro vezes superior aos gastos com a educação em toda a União Europeia;

— No total, a economia paralela ou não registada representa cerca de 20 % do PIB da União.

Pergunto à Comissão:

— Considerando que as iniciativas de combate à fraude fiscal devem assumir uma dimensão europeia, permitindo trocas de informações automáticas entre os países-membros, que medidas estão inscritas na agenda da Comissão?

Resposta conjunta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão
(12 de julho de 2013)

A luta contra a fraude e a evasão fiscais é uma das principais prioridades da Comissão. Em 6 de dezembro de 2012, a Comissão adotou um pacote ambicioso, que inclui um plano de ação para reforçar a luta contra a fraude e a evasão fiscais, bem como duas recomendações sobre o planeamento fiscal agressivo e a boa governação fiscal. A Comissão acredita que a combinação destas ações pode proporcionar uma resposta global e eficaz aos vários desafios colocados pela fraude e a evasão fiscais, podendo, por conseguinte, contribuir para aumentar a equidade dos sistemas fiscais dos Estados-Membros, para garantir as receitas fiscais necessárias e, em última análise, para melhorar o funcionamento do mercado interno.

No que se refere às iniciativas propostas no plano de ação, a Comissão considera que a troca automática de informações é um instrumento de grande eficácia para evitar e combater a fraude fiscal: aumenta a transparência e tem um efeito dissuasor sobre os autores das fraudes. Assim, em 12 de junho de 2013, a Comissão apresentou uma proposta [1] com vista a alargar o domínio de aplicação da troca automática de informações no âmbito da Diretiva relativa à cooperação administrativa.

---

[1] Proposta de uma Diretiva do Conselho que altera a Diretiva 2011/16/UE no que respeita à troca automática de informações obrigatória no domínio da fiscalidade, COM(2013) 348 final, de 12.6.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006218/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(3 June 2013)

Subject: Tax evasion in the EU

— The amount of money lost through tax evasion in the EU every year is equivalent to the EU budget for six years, or around EUR 1 billion per year, practically double the combined annual deficit of all of the Member States in 2012.

Can the Commission say whether an EU-level plan to fight tax evasion has been or will be produced?

Question for written answer E-006586/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(7 June 2013)

Subject: EU loses EUR 1 trillion annually to the black economy

— EUR 1 trillion a year is lost to tax evasion.

— This amount is higher than the Member States' total health expenditure and four times higher than spending on education throughout the EU.

— Overall, the black or unrecorded economy represents around 20% of EU GDP.

— What measures is the Commission planning given that initiatives to combat tax fraud should be Europe-wide, thereby enabling the automatic exchange of information between member countries?

Joint answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(12 July 2013)

Combatting tax fraud and tax evasion is one of the key priorities of the Commission. On 6 December 2012 the Commission adopted an ambitious package comprising an Action Plan to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion as well as two recommendations on aggressive tax planning and tax good governance. The Commission believes that the combination of these actions can provide a comprehensive and effective response to the various challenges posed by tax fraud and evasion and can thus contribute to increasing the fairness of Member States' tax systems, to securing much needed tax revenues and ultimately to improving the functioning of the internal market.

With regard to the initiatives proposed in the action plan the Commission believes that automatic exchange of information is a most efficient instrument to prevent and combat tax fraud: it increases transparency and has a deterrent effect on fraudsters. The Commission therefore presented on 12 June 2013 a proposal [1] with a view to expanding the scope of automatic exchange of information under the directive on Administrative Cooperation.

[1] Proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 2011/16/EU as regards mandatory automatic exchange of information in the field of taxation, COM(2013) 348 final of 12.6.2013.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-006402/13
til Kommissionen
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(5. juni 2013)

Om: Spørgsmål til Kommissionen om frisøraftalen

I foråret 2012 nåede arbejdsmarkedets parter frem til en rammeaftale (overenskomst) på frisørområdet. Det er sket i overensstemmelse med traktatens (TEUF) artikel 155. Aftalen vil stille krav om, at produkter ikke må være sundhedsskadelige, ligesom man vil forbedre beskyttelsen af frisører, der er i berøring med produkter fyldt med kemikalier.

Men nu er aftalen i fare, fordi visse medlemsstater blokerer for den. Kommissionen vil tilsyneladende heller ikke bakke op om aftalen, selv om den er indgået på helt legitim vis i overensstemmelse med traktatens bestemmelser.

I lyset af ovenstående — og at Kommissionen for nyligt har fremhævet, at dialogen mellem arbejdsmarkedets parter er under pres i flere medlemsstater (udtalelse af László Andor, den 11. april 2013) — vil Kommissionen redegøre for, hvorfor den ikke vil støtte en aftale indgået af arbejdsmarkedets parter på europæisk niveau?

Hvordan forholder Kommissionen sig til muligheden for, at dette skaber præcedens for fremtidige overenskomster?

Endelig bedes Kommissionen svare på, hvordan den fremadrettet vil sikre sig, at frisøraftalen bliver til virkelighed i overensstemmelse med traktatens bestemmelser?

Samlet svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af László Andor
(18. juli 2013)

Kommissionen har endnu ikke taget nogen beslutning vedrørende anmodningen fra sektorens arbejdsmarkedsparter i Europa om gennemførelse af deres rammeaftale om beskyttelse af arbejdssikkerheden og -sundheden ved rådsafgørelse. Kommissionen vurderer i øjeblikket på linje med standardpraksissen for sådanne anmodninger og i overensstemmelse med dagordenen for smart regulering, hvor passende det vil være med en EU-aktion, herunder en analyse af forventede omkostninger og fordele ved aftalen, hvor repræsentative parterne og deres mandater er samt lovligheden af aftalens bestemmelser i forhold til EU-lovgivning og bestemmelserne om små og mellemstore virksomheder. Resultaterne af vurderingen forventes at være tilgængelige i fjerde kvartal af 2013.

Kommissionen lægger stor vægt på at fremme den sociale dialog. Arbejdsmarkedets parters autonomi og deres ret til at indgå aftaler er anerkendt i traktaten og må derfor respekteres. Kommissionen vurderer altid anmodninger om gennemførelse af aftaler indgået af arbejdsmarkedets parter ved rådsafgørelse fra sag til sag. Instrumenterne i artikel 155 i TEUF vil også fremover fuldt ud være til rådighed for arbejdsmarkedets parter.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006346/13
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(4 juni 2013)

Betreft: Europees kaderakkoord over gezondheid en veiligheid in kapperssector

In april 2012 besloten de Europese sociale partners Coiffure EU en UNI Europa een kaderakkoord over gezondheid en veiligheid in de kapperssector. De Europese sociale partners hebben, conform aan artikel 155 VWEU, de Europese Commissie om een voorstel ter implementatie via besluit van de Raad gevraagd.

In een brief van 25 oktober 2012 hebben negen lidstaten hun reserves tegenover het akkoord van de Europese sociale partners geuit. Tot op heden heeft de Europese Commissie geen gevolg gegeven aan het verzoek van de Europese sociale partners.

— Zal de Commissie een voorstel ter implementatie via besluit van de Raad voorleggen en wanneer is dit te verwachten?

— Hoe wil de Commissie in de toekomst de mogelijkheid voor sociale partners om bindende akkoorden te sluiten, zoals gestipuleerd in artikel 155 VWEU, garanderen?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(18 juli 2013)

De Commissie heeft nog geen besluit genomen over het verzoek van de Europese sectoriële sociale partners om tenuitvoerlegging via besluit van de Raad van de raamovereenkomst over de bescherming van gezondheid en veiligheid op het werk in de kapperssector. In overeenstemming met de gangbare praktijk bij dergelijke verzoeken en met de agenda voor slimme regelgeving beoordeelt de Commissie momenteel of EU-maatregelen wenselijk zijn, met inbegrip van een analyse van de verwachte kosten en baten van de overeenkomst, de representativiteit van de partijen en hun mandaat, de wettigheid van de bepalingen van de overeenkomst met betrekking tot het EU-recht en de bepalingen in verband met kleine en middelgrote ondernemingen. De resultaten van de beoordeling moeten in het vierde kwartaal van 2013 beschikbaar zijn.

De Commissie hecht groot belang aan het bevorderen van de sociale dialoog. De autonomie van de sociale partners en hun recht om overeenkomsten te sluiten worden door het Verdrag erkend en moeten dan ook worden geëerbiedigd. De Commissie beoordeelt de verzoeken om tenuitvoerlegging via besluit van de Raad van overeenkomsten van Europese sociale partners steeds per geval. In de toekomst blijven de sociale partners volledig beschikken over de instrumenten van artikel 155 VWEU.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006346/13
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(4 June 2013)

Subject: European framework agreement on health and safety in hairdressing sector

In April 2012, the European social partners Coiffure EU and UNI Europa concluded a framework agreement on health and safety in the hairdressing sector. In accordance with Article 155 TFEU, the European social partners asked the European Commission to submit a proposal for the implementation of this agreement by a Council decision.

In a letter of 25 October 2012, nine Member States expressed their reservations about the European social partners' agreement. As yet, the European Commission has not followed up the European social partners' request.

— Will the Commission submit a proposal for the implementation of the agreement by a Council decision and when can this be expected?

— How will the Commission guarantee in future that social partners will be able to conclude binding agreements, as stipulated in Article 155 TFEU?

Question for written answer E-006402/13
to the Commission
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(5 June 2013)

Subject: Hairdressing sector agreement

In spring 2012, the social partners concluded a framework agreement on the hairdressing sector. This took place in accordance with Article 155 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). Under the agreement, products used must not be harmful to health; the aim is also to improve protection for hairdressers, who come into contact with chemical products.

The agreement is now at risk, however, as it is being blocked by a number of Member States. The Commission does not seem willing to back the agreement, either, even though it was concluded entirely properly in accordance with the provisions of the TFEU.

In the light of this — and the fact that the Commission recently stressed that dialogue between the social partners is under strain in a number of Member States (statement by László Andor on 11 April 2013) — will the Commission explain why it is unwilling to back an agreement concluded by social partners at European level?

How does the Commission view the possibility that this will establish a precedent for future agreements?

Lastly, will the Commission say how it proposes to ensure, subsequently, that the agreement is implemented in accordance with the provisions of the TFEU?

Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission

(18 July 2013)

The Commission has not yet taken a decision on the European sectoral social partners' request for implementation by Council decision of their Framework Agreement on the protection of occupational health and safety in the hairdressing sector. In line with standard practice for such requests and in accordance with the Smart Regulation Agenda, the Commission is currently assessing the appropriateness of EU action, including an analysis of the expected costs and benefits of the Agreement, the representativeness of the parties and their mandate, the legality of the Agreement's provisions in relation to EC law and the provisions regarding small and medium-sized enterprises. The results of the assessment should be available in the fourth quarter of 2013.

The Commission attaches great importance to the promotion of social dialogue. The social partners' autonomy and their right to conclude agreements are recognised by the Treaty and must therefore be respected. Requests for the implementation by Council decision of European social partner agreements are always assessed by the Commission on a case-by-case basis. The instruments provided by Article 155 TFEU will remain fully available to social partners in the future.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006373/13
a la Comisión
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(4 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Acuerdo de pesca con Mauritania

El 29 de mayo, la Comisión de Pesca del Parlamento Europeo votó con una gran mayoría en contra del protocolo de pesca UE-Mauritania, en línea con la posición expresada en mi informe. Este voto demuestra que las condiciones actuales del protocolo deben ser modificadas para que la industria europea solicite licencias para pescar en el caladero mauritano.

Reconozco la importancia vital de este acuerdo, especialmente porque hay 12 Estados miembros que tienen un interés en estas pesquerías, a las que tiene acceso un centenar de barcos con bandera de la Unión Europea. Las autoridades mauritanas deberían ser debidamente informadas de que si las condiciones técnicas del protocolo no mejoran, el acuerdo podría denunciarse por infrautilización de las oportunidades de pesca.

¿Podría la Comisión explicar cuáles son las acciones que tiene pensado realizar para impulsar una mejora de los aspectos técnicos y económicos del protocolo que hagan de éste una actividad rentable para la flota?

Respuesta conjunta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de julio de 2013)

Tras el voto negativo de la Comisión de Pesca del Parlamento Europeo, la Comisión, consciente de las dificultades por las que atraviesa la flota de la UE, está firmemente decidida a proseguir las discusiones con Mauritania para mejorar la condiciones y el grado de utilización del Protocolo.

La Comisión logró mejoras significativas de las medidas técnicas, especialmente las referidas a los camarones y a las especies pelágicas, en la reunión del Comité conjunto celebrada en París en febrero de 2013 y en una reunión técnica que tuvo lugar en Bruselas en mayo de 2013. Pronto (probablemente en septiembre), se celebrará otra reunión del Comité conjunto para certificar el acuerdo alcanzado en la reunión técnica, especialmente en lo que se refiere a la zona pelágica.

El Protocolo es de interés para una gran parte de la flota, que está pescando con buenos resultados (merluza senegalesa, especies demersales, atún y especies pelágicas). En el caso de las especies pelágicas, ya se ha producido un incremento del número de licencias utilizadas y, en el de los camarones, se han logrado mejoras en los cánones y en los niveles de capturas accesorias.

Si el Parlamento Europeo decide retirar su aprobación del Protocolo, deberán paralizarse inmediatamente las actividades pesqueras. Debido a la cláusula de exclusividad que figura en el Acuerdo, los buques de la Unión Europea no podrán comprar licencias privadas para faenar en la zona económica exclusiva de Mauritania con pabellón de Estados miembros de la UE.

El Protocolo contiene una cláusula de no discriminación por la que se aplican las mismas condiciones técnicas a todas las flotas industriales extranjeras que faenan en el caladero mauritano (artículo 1, apartado 5). Mientras el Protocolo esté en vigor, Mauritania debe aplicar condiciones técnicas idénticas a todas las flotas extranjeras. Si se denunciase el Protocolo, Mauritania dejaría de estar sujeta a esa obligación cuando negociase el acceso de flotas extranjeras a su caladero.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006597/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(7 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Acordo de pescas com Mauritânia rejeitado no PE

Recentemente, a Comissão das Pescas do Parlamento Europeu considerou insatisfatório o acordo proposto, pois, embora as negociações tenham evoluído, a falta de garantias de tratamento não discriminatório e preferencial à frota europeia (face aos excedentes de pesca não utilizados pela Mauritânia), a não inclusão de algumas espécies no novo protocolo, o agravamento generalizado dos custos para os armadores, a obrigação de desembarques nos portos mauritanos ou a obrigação de 60 % de tripulação mauritana na frota europeia inviabilizam as operações de pesca nessas águas.

O destino do «mais caro» acordo de pescas da UE está em suspenso. Anualmente, a Mauritânia beneficia de 110 milhões de euros, dos quais 3 milhões para o apoio à sua política de pescas, 67 milhões pagos pela UE como moeda de troca pelo acesso aos recursos e os restantes 40 milhões a ser pagos pela indústria a título de licenças de pesca.

1. Dada a importância do referido acordo, quer no volume de capturas quer na diversidade das espécies abrangidas, e tendo em conta a sustentabilidade dos recursos e a viabilidade económica e financeira das frotas europeias, pode a Comissão indicar que diligências estão a ser efetuadas para a renegociação do acordo de pescas com a Mauritânia?

2. Considera a Comissão normal que, ao fim de tantos anos de parceria entre a Mauritânia e a UE, a mesma UE não usufrua de um estatuto privilegiado face a frotas que operam de forma privada?

Resposta conjunta dada por Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão
(29 de julho de 2013)

Na sequência do voto negativo na Comissão PECH, e ciente das dificuldades que a frota da UE enfrenta, a Comissão está inteiramente empenhada em prosseguir as discussões com a Mauritânia, a fim de melhorar as condições e a taxa de utilização do Protocolo.

A Comissão conseguiu obter melhoramentos significativos a nível das medidas técnicas, em especial para as categorias de pesca «camarão» e «pelágicos», durante a reunião do Comité Misto realizada em Paris em fevereiro deste ano e uma reunião realizada em Bruxelas em maio. Em breve (provavelmente em setembro), será organizado um comité misto para validar o acordo alcançado durante a reunião técnica, em especial no que respeita à zona pelágica.

Uma grande parte da frota tem interesse no Protocolo e está a pescar com bons resultados (pescada negra, demersais, atum e pelágicos). Em relação aos pelágicos, verificou-se já um aumento da utilização das licenças. Quanto ao camarão, conseguiram-se igualmente melhoramentos, em termos de taxas e de capturas acessórias.

Se o PE recusar o seu consentimento, as atividades de pesca terão de cessar de imediato. Devido à cláusula de exclusividade, os navios da UE não poderão comprar licenças privadas para operar na ZEE da Mauritânia sob pavilhão de Estados-Membros da UE.

O Protocolo inclui uma cláusula de não-discriminação, que garante que todas as frotas de pesca industrial estrangeiras a operar na zona de pesca da Mauritânia cumprem as mesmas condições técnicas (artigo 1.°, n.° 5). Enquanto o Protocolo estiver em vigor, a Mauritânia deve aplicar as mesmas condições técnicas a todas as frotas estrangeiras. Em caso de denúncia do Protocolo, a Mauritânia não estará sujeita a esta obrigação quando negociar condições de acesso com frotas estrangeiras.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006373/13
to the Commission
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(4 June 2013)

Subject: Fisheries agreement with Mauritania

On 29 May 2013 Parliament's Committee on Fisheries voted overwhelmingly against the EU-Mauritania fisheries protocol, in line with the position I took in my report. The result shows that the provisions of the protocol as it currently stands should be amended so that European vessels have to apply for permits to fish in Mauritanian waters.

I recognise the strategic importance of this agreement, in particular given that 12 Member States have an interest in the fishing grounds and that around 100 EU-registered vessels have access to these waters. The Mauritanian authorities should be duly informed that, if the technical provisions of the protocol are not improved, the agreement could be deemed null and void on grounds of underuse of fishing opportunities.

Can the Commission say how it intends to promote improvements to the technical and economic provisions of the protocol in order to make it economically viable for the fleet to fish in Mauritanian waters?

Question for written answer E-006597/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(7 June 2013)

Subject: EU-Mauritania fisheries partnership agreement rejected by Parliament

Although progress had been made in negotiations, Parliament's Committee on Fisheries recently deemed the proposed agreement to be unsatisfactory due to the failure to guarantee non-discriminatory and preferential treatment to the European fleet (concerning surplus fish not used by Mauritania), the non-inclusion of certain species in the new protocol, the general increase in shipowners' costs, the obligation to unload catches in Mauritanian ports and the obligation that 60% of crews should be Mauritanian citizens.

The fate of the 'more expensive' fisheries agreement is yet to be determined. Mauritania receives EUR 110 million every year, of which EUR 3 million is intended to support its fisheries policy, EUR 67 million is paid by the EU in exchange for access to resources, and EUR 40 million is paid by the industry for fishing licences.

1. Given the volume of fish and the diversity of species caught under this agreement, and bearing in mind the sustainability of resources and the economic and financial viability of the European fleets, can the Commission state what steps are being taken to renegotiate the fisheries agreement with Mauritania?

2. Given the long-standing nature of the EU-Mauritania partnership, is it acceptable that the EU is not granted privilege over fleets that operate privately?

Joint answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

Following the negative vote in PECH committee, and aware of the difficulties faced by the EU fleet, the Commission is fully committed to continue discussions with Mauritania, in order to improve the conditions and the utilization rate of the protocol.

The Commission has achieved significant improvements of technical measures in particular for shrimp and pelagic categories during the Joint Committee held in Paris in February 2013, and a technical meeting in Brussels in May 2013. A Joint Committee will be organised soon (probably in September) to validate the agreement reached during the technical meeting, especially regarding the zone for pelagics.

A great part of the fleet has an interest in the protocol and is fishing with good results (black hake, demersals, tuna and pelagics). For pelagics, the uptake of licences has already increased. For shrimps, improvements have also been achieved, in terms of fees and by-catch levels.

If the EP decides to withhold its consent, fishing activities would have to stop immediately. Due to the exclusivity clause, EU vessels would not be able to purchase private licences to operate in Mauritania's EEZ under EU Member States flag.

The protocol contains a non-discrimination clause ensuring that all foreign industrial fleets operating in Mauritanian fishing zone confirm to the same technical conditions (art. 1. 5). As long as the protocol is in force, same technical conditions must be applied by Mauritania to all foreign fleets. In case of termination of the protocol, Mauritania would not be restricted by this obligation when negotiating access with foreign fleets.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006378/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(4 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: VP/HR — Represión en Turquía

En los últimos días hemos visto una ola de manifestaciones en contra de la represión del Gobierno de Recep Tayip Erdogan ante la grave violencia con la que la policía respondió a una acampada pacífica en el parque Gezi, en el barrio europeo de Taskim en Estambul.

Todo comenzó el pasado día 30 cuando la policía empleó una violencia desmesurada para desalojar una acampada pacífica para defender un parque de su derribo y la construcción de un centro comercial. Desde entonces se han producido numerosas manifestaciones de condena de la violencia policial tanto en Estambul como en diferentes ciudades del país. Frente a esto, Erdogan tan solo ha incrementado el número de efectivos policiales, y la violencia en la represión de las protestas supone una respuesta digna de un régimen autoritario.

Turquía, aliado fundamental de la Unión Europea, está aplicando unas políticas neoliberales sin ningún tipo de réplica, prohibiendo cualquier tipo de contestación política y repriméndola de manera violenta como estamos viendo en estos días. Mientras se firman numerosos acuerdos de cooperación condenando los regímenes contra los que surgió la primavera árabe, se siguen manteniendo unas excelentes relaciones comerciales y políticas en clara amistad con el Gobierno de Turquía. Lo que vemos estos días es un régimen que aplica una violencia injustificada para desmantelar una acampada pacífica en contra de la destrucción de un parque, desenmascarando la brutal represión de un régimen.

¿Ha condenado la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante la violenta represión del pueblo turco por parte del Gobierno del Presidente Erdogan?

¿Considera que el apoyo político y las buenas relaciones comerciales con el Gobierno de Turquía pueden representar un apoyo por parte de la UE a un régimen represor, como ocurría con los regímenes de la primavera árabe?

¿Está considerando congelar el acuerdo de asociación con Turquía hasta que existan garantías de que se aseguran las libertades fundamentales del pueblo turco?

Respuesta conjunta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de julio de 2013)

La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta ha seguido de cerca los acontecimientos en Turquía desde sus inicios, ha emitido dos declaraciones al respecto (2 y 9 de junio) y se ha dirigido al Parlamento Europeo reunido en sesión plenaria el pasado 12 de junio. En repetidas ocasiones ha propugnado la vía del diálogo como la mejor forma de resolver las diferencias y ha dejado claro en todo momento que el ejercicio de una violencia policial excesiva contra los manifestantes pacíficos debe ser objeto de una inmediata y detallada investigación tras la que se exijan las responsabilidades oportunas. Además, ha permanecido en constante contacto con el ministro turco de Asuntos Exteriores.

Como país candidato, Turquía debe aspirar a las prácticas y principios democráticos más elevados, como la libertad de expresión, el derecho de reunión, la libertad de prensa y la libertad de ideología, religión o creencias.

Los actuales acontecimientos subrayan la importancia de proseguir los contactos con Turquía en el marco del proceso de adhesión a la UE, incluidos los capítulos de negociación más fundamentales para sus esfuerzos de reforma. Por ese motivo, la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta ha acogido con gran satisfacción la decisión de abrir el Capítulo 22 adoptada por el Consejo de Asuntos Generales de 25 de junio de 2013. La Conferencia Intergubernamental con Turquía se celebrará tras la presentación del informe de situación anual de la Comisión y tras el debate del Consejo de Asuntos Generales en el que se confirmará la posición común del Consejo en favor de la apertura del Capítulo 22 y se determinará la fecha de la conferencia de adhesión.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006507/13
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος)
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(6 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Η βίαιη καταστολή των ειρηνικών διαδηλώσεων στην Τουρκία

Η βίαιη καταστολή των ειρηνικών διαδηλώσεων στην Τουρκία από τις αστυνομικές αρχές αποτελεί σφοδρή καταπάτηση του ανθρώπινου δικαιώματος της ελευθερίας έκφρασης (ποτοαπαγόρευση, παρέμβαση στην ιδιωτική ζωή των ανθρώπων, ανέγερση χιλιάδων τζαμιών). Στις ανησυχίες του τουρκικού λαού για τις πολιτικές φονταμενταλισμού που αναπτύσσονται τον τελευταίο καιρό, η τουρκική αστυνομία απαντά επιτιθέμενη με δακρυγόνα. Μέχρι σήμερα έχουν γίνει εκατοντάδες συλλήψεις, χιλιάδες άνθρωποι τραυματίστηκαν ενώ τουλάχιστον δύο άνθρωποι έχασαν την ζωή τους.

Τα γεγονότα αυτά καθώς και η παραποίηση ή και αποσιώπηση τους από τα τουρκικά μέσα ενημέρωσης αποτελούν δυστυχώς απόδειξη της καταπάτησης των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και της Δημοκρατίας στην Τουρκία.

Ερωτάται η Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος:

— Δεν οφείλει η ΕΕ, πέραν της έκφρασης ανησυχιών και λύπης για την χρήση βίας από μέλη της τουρκικής αστυνομίας (βλ. ανακοίνωση 2 Ιουνίου A295/13), καθώς και της έκκλησης για «αυτοσυγκράτηση από όλες τις πλευρές», να στείλει ξεκάθαρο μήνυμα ενάντια στον αυταρχισμό της τουρκικής κυβέρνησης;

— Η Τουρκία, ως υποψήφια για ένταξη χώρα, οφείλει να προχωρήσει άμεσα σε βαθιές μεταρρυθμίσεις, ώστε να αποκαταστήσει την Δημοκρατία και τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα σύμφωνα με τα διεθνή και ευρωπαϊκά πρότυπα. Σε ποιες ενέργειες έχει προβεί η ΕΕ, μετά τα τελευταία γεγονότα, προκειμένου να υποδείξει στην κυβέρνηση της Τουρκίας τις υποχρεώσεις της;

Κοινή απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου κ. Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Ιουλίου 2013)

Η ΥΕ/ΑΠ έχει παρακολουθήσει εκ του σύνεγγυς τα γεγονότα στην Τουρκία από την αρχή, με την έκδοση δύο δηλώσεων (2 και 9 Ιουνίου) και τη διενέργεια συζήτησης με την ολομέλεια του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου στις 12 Ιουνίου. Επανειλημμένα, έχει ενθαρρύνει τον διάλογο ως τον καλύτερο τρόπο για την επίλυση των διαφορών. Υπογραμμίζει κάθε φορά με σαφήνεια ότι η υπερβολική χρήση βίας από μέλη της αστυνομίας κατά ειρηνικών διαδηλωτών πρέπει να διερευνηθεί αμέσως και σε βάθος, και ότι οι υπεύθυνοι πρέπει τελικά να λογοδοτήσουν. Διατήρησε επίσης στενή επαφή με τον τούρκο Υπουργό Εξωτερικών.

Η Τουρκία, ως υποψήφια χώρα, οφείλει να επιδιώκει την επίτευξη όσο το δυνατόν υψηλότερων δημοκρατικών προτύπων και πρακτικών. Αυτά περιλαμβάνουν την ελευθερία της έκφρασης γνώμης και το δικαίωμα του συνέρχεσθαι ειρηνικώς, την ελευθερία των μέσων ενημέρωσης και την ελευθερία της θρησκείας, της πίστης και της σκέψης.

Τα πρόσφατα γεγονότα υπογραμμίζουν τη σημασία της συνέχισης του διαλόγου με την Τουρκία στο πλαίσιο της διαδικασίας προσχώρησης στην ΕΕ, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των διαπραγματευτικών κεφαλαίων που έχουν τη μεγαλύτερη σημασία για τις μεταρρυθμιστικές της προσπάθειες. Η ΥΕ/ΑΠ, ως εκ τούτου, χαιρετίζει την απόφαση του Συμβουλίου Γενικών Υποθέσεων της 25ης Ιουνίου 2013 σχετικά με το άνοιγμα του κεφαλαίου 22. Η διακυβερνητική Διάσκεψη με την Τουρκία θα λάβει χώρα μετά την παρουσίαση της ετήσιας έκθεσης προόδου της Επιτροπής και ύστερα από συζήτηση με το ΣΓΥ, το οποίο θα επιβεβαιώσει την κοινή θέση του Συμβουλίου σχετικά με το άνοιγμα του κεφαλαίου 22 και θα καθορίσει την ημερομηνία για τη διάσκεψη προσχώρησης.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006390/13
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(4 juni 2013)

Betreft: VP/HR — Protesten Turkije

In Istanbul en andere Turkse steden wordt hevig geprotesteerd tegen het autoritaire regime van zittend premier Erdoğan. De politie probeert de protesten met harde hand de kop in te drukken.

Een woordvoerder van de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger Ashton heeft naar aanleiding van de onrust in Turkije het volgende verklaard:

„The High Representative expresses deep concern at the violence that occurred in Istanbul and some other cities in Turkey, and regrets disproportionate use of force by members of the Turkish police.

She hopes for a speedy recovery of all those injured, and calls for restraint on all sides and an end to the violence. Dialogue should be opened to find a peaceful solution to this issue ([1]).”

1. Deelt de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger de mening dat de protesten in Turkije aantonen dat de weerstand onder de Turkse bevolking tegen het autoritaire regime van Erdoğan — terecht! — almaar groeit? Deelt de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger de mening dat de Turkse bevolking zich — terecht! — steeds meer begint af te zetten tegen Erdoğans islamiseringsagenda en de inperking van fundamentele vrijheden, zoals de vrijheid van meningsuiting, in Turkije?

2. De demonstranten noemen Erdoğan een „dictator”. Is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger het hiermee (on)eens, en waarom?

3. Deelt de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger de mening dat de kloof tussen de Turkse bevolking en het Turkse regime aanleiding is de toetredingsonderhandelingen tussen de EU en dit regime te beëindigen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(25 juli 2013)

De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter heeft de gebeurtenissen in Turkije van begin af aan op de voet gevolgd. Zij heeft twee verklaringen afgelegd (op 2 juni en op 9 juni) en heeft op 12 juni de plenaire vergadering van het Europees Parlement toegesproken. Zij heeft herhaaldelijk de dialoog aangemoedigd als de beste manier om geschillen op te lossen. Ook heeft zij steeds duidelijk gemaakt dat het buitensporige geweld van de politie tegen de vreedzame betogers spoedig en grondig moet worden onderzocht, en dat degenen die zich hieraan schuldig hebben gemaakt, verantwoordelijk moeten worden gesteld. Voorts is zij nauwe contacten blijven onderhouden met de Turkse minister van Buitenlandse Zaken.

Als kandidaat-lidstaat moet Turkije de hoogst mogelijke democratische normen en praktijken nastreven. Deze normen en praktijken omvatten onder meer de vrijheid van meningsuiting, het recht van vreedzame vergadering, mediavrijheid en vrijheid van godsdienst, overtuiging en gedachte.

De huidige gebeurtenissen onderstrepen het belang van nadere betrokkenheid bij Turkije in het kader van het proces van toetreding tot de EU, inclusief met betrekking tot de onderhandelingshoofdstukken die het meest essentieel zijn voor het hervormingsproces. Bijgevolg is de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter ingenomen met het besluit van de Raad Algemene Zaken (RAZ) van 25 juni 2013 om hoofdstuk 22 te openen. De intergouvernementele conferentie met Turkije vindt plaats na de presentatie van het jaarlijkse voortgangsverslag van de Commissie en na een bijeenkomst van de RAZ. Tijdens deze bijeenkomst wordt het gemeenschappelijk standpunt van de RAZ ten gunste van de opening van hoofdstuk 22 bekrachtigd en wordt de datum voor de toetredingsconferentie bepaald.

([1]) http://www.avrupa.info.tr/en/resource/news-archiv/news-single-view/article/statement-by-the-spokesperson-of-high-representative-catherine-ashton-on-riots-in-turkey.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006378/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(4 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Repression in Turkey

In recent days, we have seen a wave of demonstrations against the repression by Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's government, stemming from the serious violence with which the police responded to a peaceful camp set up in Gezi Park, in the Taksim district, on the European side of Istanbul.

This all began on 30 May, when the police used excessive violence to evict demonstrators from a peaceful camp set up to defend a park from demolition and the construction of a shopping centre. Since then, there have been numerous demonstrations, both in Istanbul and in other cities in the country, condemning the police violence. Erdoğan's only reaction has been to increase the number of police, with a degree of violence in the repression of the protests worthy of an authoritarian regime.

Turkey, a key ally of the European Union, is implementing neoliberal policies without any right of appeal, prohibiting and repressing violently any political response, as we are now seeing. While numerous cooperation agreements are being signed to condemn the regimes against which the Arab Spring arose, excellent trade and political relations are maintained with the Government of Turkey in a clear spirit of friendship. What we have seen in recent days is a regime using unjustified violence to dismantle a peaceful camp demonstrating against the destruction of a park, which has revealed its brutal repression.

Has the Vice-President/High Representative condemned the violent repression of the Turkish people by President Erdoğan's government?

Does she believe that the political support and good trade relations with the Government of Turkey might signify EU support for a repressive regime, as occurred with the regimes of the Arab Spring?

Is she considering freezing the association agreement with Turkey until guarantees exist to ensure the Turkish people's fundamental freedoms?

Question for written answer E-006390/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(4 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Protests in Turkey

Istanbul and other cities in Turkey are witnessing huge protests against the authoritarian regime of current Prime Minister Erdoğan. The police are trying to adopt a tough approach in quelling the protests.

A spokesperson for the Vice-President/High Representative, Baroness Ashton, made the following statement in relation to the unrest in Turkey:

'The High Representative expresses deep concern at the violence that occurred in Istanbul and some other cities in Turkey, and regrets disproportionate use of force by members of the Turkish police.

She hopes for a speedy recovery of all those injured, and calls for restraint on all sides and an end to the violence. Dialogue should be opened to find a peaceful solution to this issue' ([1]).

1. Does Baroness Ashton agree that the protests in Turkey highlight that the opposition among the Turkish population to the authoritarian Erdoğan regime — and rightly so — is continuing to grow? Does she concur that the Turkish population — and rightly so — is starting increasingly to react against Erdoğan's Islamisation agenda and the restriction on fundamental freedoms, such as the freedom of expression, in Turkey?

2. The demonstrators are calling Erdoğan a 'dictator'. Does Baroness Ashton agree or disagree with this, and why?

([1]) http://www.avrupa.info.tr/en/resource/news-archiv/news-single-view/article/statement-by-the-spokesperson-of-high-representative-catherine-ashton-on-riots-in-turkey.html

3. Does she concur that the rift between the Turkish population and the Turkish regime provides an opportunity to end the accession negotiations between the EU and this regime? If not, why not?

Question for written answer E-006507/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(6 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Harsh clampdown on peaceful protestors in Turkey

The heavy-handed repression of peaceful protest in Turkey by the forces of law and order is a blatant violation of human rights and freedom of expression (as reflected also in alcohol restrictions, interference in individuals' private lives and the erection of thousands of mosques).

The harsh response by the Turkish police to expressions of public concern at the recent rise in fundamentalism is teargas. To date, this has resulted in hundreds of arrests and thousands of casualties, and claimed at least two lives.

Furthermore, the fact that such incidents are misrepresented or totally disregarded by the Turkish media is a sad reflection on the state of human rights in the Republic of Turkey.

In view of this:

— Does the High Representative not consider that, in addition to expressing concern and regret at acts of violence by the Turkish police (Statement A295/13 of 2 June 2013) and calling for restraint on all sides, the EU should send a clear message that the high-handed methods of the Turkish Government are totally unacceptable?

— Following recent events, what action has been taken by the EU to remind Turkey of its obligations as an applicant for EU accession to introduce in-depth reforms immediately so as to restore democracy and respect for human rights in accordance with international and European standards?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

The HR/VP has followed events in Turkey closely from the start, issuing two statements (2 and 9 June) and addressing the European Parliament plenary debate on 12 June. She has repeatedly encouraged dialogue as the best way to resolve differences. She has been clear throughout that excessive use of force by members of the police against peaceful demonstrators must be swiftly and thoroughly investigated, and eventually the responsible should be held accountable. She has also remained in close touch with the Turkish Foreign Minister.

Turkey, as a candidate country, needs to aspire to the highest possible democratic standards and practices. These include the freedom to express opinion and assemble peacefully, freedom of the media, and freedom of religion, belief and thought.

Current events underline the importance of further engagement with Turkey within the framework of the EU accession process, including on those negotiating chapters most fundamental to its reform efforts. The HR/VP therefore welcomes the decision of the General Affairs Council on 25 June 2013 to open Chapter 22. The Inter-Governmental Conference with Turkey will take place after the presentation of the Commission's annual progress report and following a discussion of the GAC which will confirm the common position of the Council for the opening of Chapter 22 and determine the date for the accession conference.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006616/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(7 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Vacina contra cancro do pulmão

Considerando que:

— De acordo com estimativas da Organização Mundial de Saúde, o cancro do pulmão é considerado um dos mais letais, e mata anualmente, em todo o mundo, 1,4 milhões de pessoas;

— Um grupo de investigadores argentinos e cubanos criou a primeira vacina terapêutica contra o cancro do pulmão, que promove a sua destruição através da ativação do sistema imunitário do próprio organismo;

— Os ensaios clínicos já efetuados com a vacina Racotumomab resultaram na triplicação da percentagem de doentes que continuaram vivos dois anos após a sua toma;

— A vacina está indicada para casos de cancro do pulmão avançados ou com metástases, em doentes que receberam tratamentos de quimioterapia e radioterapia e se encontram estáveis, e é administrada através de injeções intradérmicas produzindo uma potente resposta do sistema imunológico.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento da referida vacina?

Está em condições de confirmar os resultados alcançados?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006651/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(10 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Novo medicamento contra cancro do pulmão

Notícias recentes apontam para que um novo medicamento pode ajudar pacientes com cancro do pulmão em estado avançado a viver mais e a contribuir no tratamento de outros tipos de cancro.

Alegadamente, segundo um estudo desenvolvido por Suresh Ramalingam, professor de oncologia da *Emory University* em Atlanta, nos Estados Unidos da América, os pacientes que receberam o medicamento Ganetespib do laboratório Synta tiveram uma média de sobrevivência superior à registada nos pacientes que passaram pelo tratamento padrão.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Acompanha a prossecução deste estudo?

2. Dispõe de informações quanto à incidência do cancro do pulmão na União Europeia e aos índices de sobrevivência ao mesmo?

Resposta conjunta dada por Máire Geoghegan-Quinn em nome da Comissão
(26 de julho de 2013)

A Comissão está consciente dos progressos do inibidor Ganetespib, também conhecido como STA-9090, desenvolvido pela empresa *Synta Pharmaceuticals* e várias instituições nos Estados Unidos e Europa, conforme referido pelo Senhor Deputado ([1]). Os benefícios clínicos do Ganetespib num ensaio clínico de fase II em doentes com cancro do pulmão avançado foram apresentados em 14 de junho de 2013 ([2]). O Ganetespib está a ser avaliado em doentes com cancro do pulmão avançado em seis ensaios clínicos ([3]).

([1]) Socinski et al. (2013) Clin Cancer Res. 19(11):3068-3077.
([2]) http://chicago2013.asco.org/encouraging-results-galaxy-1-trial-advanced-lung-adenocarcinoma
([3]) http://clinicaltrials.gov/

A Comissão está a apoiar a Rede Europeia de Registos Oncológicos que desenvolveu o Observatório Europeu do Cancro ([4]), em colaboração com o Centro Internacional de Investigação do Cancro (IARC) [(5)]. O Observatório Europeu do Cancro faculta amplas informações sobre esta doença na Europa e permite a comparação da incidência, mortalidade e taxas de prevalência entre países no que diz respeito a patologias cancerígenas específicas (incluindo o cancro do pulmão). O Observatório Europeu do Cancro faculta também taxas de sobrevida relativas a diferentes patologias cancerígenas (incluindo o cancro do pulmão), com base em dados Eurocare ([6]), repartidos por grupo etário e por sexo. Tendo em conta o tempo necessário para a recolha e tratamento dos dados, os números mais atualizados são relativos a 2009. Dados mais recentes (2012) são facultados pelo módulo EUCAN do Observatório Europeu do Cancro que fornece estimativas nacionais sobre a incidência, mortalidade e prevalência de 24 grandes tipos de cancro (incluindo o cancro do pulmão).

Além disso, a Comissão recolhe dados anuais sobre as causas de morte, incluindo por cancro do pulmão, na União Europeia ([7]).

([4]) http://eco.iarc.fr
([5]) http://globocan.iarc.fr/
([6]) http://www.eurocare.it/
([7]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/health/public_health/data_public_health/database

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006616/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(7 June 2013)

Subject: Lung cancer vaccine

— According to estimates from the World Health Organisation, lung cancer is one of the most lethal forms of cancer and kills 1.4 million people annually throughout the world.

— A group of Argentine and Cuban researchers have created the first therapeutic vaccine for treating lung cancer, which promotes its destruction by activating the body's own immune system.

— Clinical trials already conducted with the Racotumomab vaccine tripled the percentage of patients who were still alive two years after its application.

— The vaccine is indicated in cases of advanced lung cancer or lung cancer with metastasis, in patients who have received chemotherapy and radiotherapy and are in a stable condition. It is administered through intradermal injections causing a powerful immune system response.

Is the Commission aware of this vaccine?

Is it able to confirm the results obtained?

Question for written answer E-006651/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(10 June 2013)

Subject: New lung cancer drug

It has recently been reported that a new drug could help patients with late-stage lung cancer to live longer and could contribute to treating other types of cancer.

A study by Suresh Ramalingam, an oncology researcher at Emory University in Atlanta, in the US, claims that patients who received the Synta laboratory's drug *Ganetespib* survived longer, on average, than was recorded for patients who underwent the standard treatment.

1. Is the Commission monitoring the progress of this study?

2. Does it have data about lung cancer levels and survival rates in the EU?

Joint answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2013)

The Commission is aware of progress on Ganetespib, also known as STA-9090, developed by Synta Pharmaceuticals and various institutions across the United States and Europe as mentioned by the Honourable Member. ([1]) A clinical benefit of Ganetespib in a phase II clinical trial in patients with advanced lung cancer was presented on 14 June 2013. ([2]) Ganetespib is being evaluated in patients with advanced lung cancer in six clinical trials. ([3])

([1]) Socinski et al. (2013) Clin Cancer Res. 19(11):3068-3077.
([2]) http://chicago2013.asco.org/encouraging-results-galaxy-1-trial-advanced-lung-adenocarcinoma
([3]) http://clinicaltrials.gov/

The Commission is supporting the European Network of Cancer Registries which developed the European Cancer Observatory (ECO) ([4]) in collaboration with the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) ([5]). ECO provides extensive information on cancer burden in Europe and allows comparison of incidence, mortality, and prevalence rates across countries for specific cancer sites (including lung). ECO also provides survival rates for different cancer sites (including lung), based on EUROCARE figures ([6]), broken down by age-group and sex. Due to the time required for collecting and cleaning the data the most up-to-date figures are for 2009. More recent figures (2012) are provided by ECO's EUCAN module that gives national estimates on incidence, mortality, and prevalence for 24 major cancer types (including lung cancer).

In addition, the Commission collects yearly data on causes of death, including lung cancer, for the European Union ([7]).

([4]) http://eco.iarc.fr
([5]) http://globocan.iarc.fr/
([6]) http://www.eurocare.it/
([7]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/health/public_health/data_public_health/database

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006630/13
a la Comisión
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Åsa Westlund (S&D), Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D), Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI) y Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)
(10 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Control del respeto de los derechos humanos en el Sáhara Occidental por parte de la UE

El 6 de marzo de 2013 se denegó la entrada a Marruecos, en el aeropuerto de Casablanca, a Isabella Lövin, Ivo Vajgl, Willy Meyer y Vicente Garcés Ramón —miembros del Intergrupo para el Sáhara Occidental, que cuenta con el apoyo de más de sesenta diputados al PE— cuando intentaban ir a El Aaiún (Sáhara Occidental) en misión de investigación sobre los derechos humanos.

A la vista de este incidente, y teniendo en cuenta lo siguiente: a) que en 2010 la Comisión de Pesca no obtuvo el permiso de Marruecos para organizar una delegación oficial a dicho país, incluido el Sáhara Occidental; b) que ya se ha denegado anteriormente la entrada a otros diputados al PE y a políticos nacionales; c) que la Comisión está ahora negociando con Marruecos un acuerdo de pesca y un acuerdo de libre comercio; y d) que, según un informe de 2013 del Relator Especial de las Naciones Unidas sobre la Tortura, se ha producido un aumento de la tortura y los malos tratos en los procesos de detención y arresto en Marruecos, algo que ha sido confirmado en un reciente informe de la Fundación Robert F. Kennedy, pedimos a la Comisión que responda a cada una de las siguientes preguntas:

¿Cuántas delegaciones oficiales de la UE han visitado en los últimos años el territorio no autónomo del Sáhara Occidental y cómo han investigado dichas delegaciones la situación de los derechos humanos?

¿Tiene previsto la Comisión efectuar una misión oficial de investigación por cuenta propia en el Sáhara Occidental que prevea el encuentro con todas las partes interesadas? En caso negativo, ¿por qué motivo?

¿Cómo garantiza la UE la correcta aplicación de la protección de los derechos humanos y el respeto del Estado de Derecho, previstos en el Acuerdo de asociación UE-Marruecos?

¿Cuál ha sido la reacción oficial de la Comisión ante la expulsión de Marruecos de cuatro diputados al PE el 6 de marzo de 2013?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006631/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Åsa Westlund (S&D), Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D), Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI) y Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)
(10 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: VP/HR — Control del respeto de los derechos humanos en el Sáhara Occidental por parte de la UE

El 6 de marzo de 2013 se denegó la entrada a Marruecos, en el aeropuerto de Casablanca, a Isabella Lövin, Ivo Vajgl, Willy Meyer y Vicente Garcés Ramón —miembros del Intergrupo para el Sáhara Occidental, que cuenta con el apoyo de más de sesenta diputados al PE— cuando intentaban ir a El Aaiún (Sáhara Occidental) en misión de investigación sobre los derechos humanos.

A la vista de este incidente, y teniendo en cuenta lo siguiente: a) que en 2010 la Comisión de Pesca no obtuvo el permiso de Marruecos para organizar una delegación oficial a dicho país, incluido el Sáhara Occidental; b) que ya se ha denegado anteriormente la entrada a otros diputados al PE y a políticos nacionales; c) que la Comisión está ahora negociando con Marruecos un acuerdo de pesca y un acuerdo de libre comercio; y d) que, según un informe de 2013 del Relator Especial de las Naciones Unidas sobre la Tortura, se ha producido un aumento de la tortura y los malos tratos en los procesos de detención y arresto en Marruecos, algo que ha sido confirmado en un reciente informe de la Fundación Robert F. Kennedy, pedimos a la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante que responda a cada una de las siguientes preguntas:

¿Cuántas delegaciones oficiales de la UE han visitado en los últimos años el territorio no autónomo del Sáhara Occidental y cómo han investigado dichas delegaciones la situación de los derechos humanos?

¿Tiene previsto la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante efectuar una misión oficial de investigación por cuenta propia en el Sáhara Occidental que prevea el encuentro con todas las partes interesadas? En caso negativo, ¿por qué motivo?

¿Cómo garantiza la UE la correcta aplicación de la protección de los derechos humanos y el respeto del Estado de Derecho, previstos en el Acuerdo de asociación UE-Marruecos?

¿Cuál ha sido la reacción oficial de la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante ante la expulsión de Marruecos de cuatro diputados al PE el 6 de marzo de 2013?

Respuesta conjunta de la Alta Representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión

(31 de julio de 2013)

La Alta Representante y vicepresidenta de la Comisión tiene conocimiento de las circunstancias en las que un grupo de miembros del Parlamento Europeo (eurodiputados) fue interceptado por las autoridades marroquíes cuando se dirigía al territorio del Sáhara Occidental. La UE ha abordado la cuestión con las autoridades marroquíes. El tema del Sáhara Occidental suscita a menudo posiciones intransigentes de las partes implicadas. La UE considera que debemos actuar para hacer posible un planteamiento más constructivo que permita el diálogo también en cuestiones sensibles y las visitas de buena voluntad por parte de observadores internacionales al Sáhara Occidental. La reciente misión al Sáhara Occidental de los eurodiputados del grupo socialista muestra que es posible.

En repetidas ocasiones, la UE i) ha expresado su preocupación por la duración del conflicto del Sáhara Occidental y las implicaciones para la seguridad y la cooperación en la región; ii) ha abordado cuestiones críticas en las reuniones de los órganos conjuntos establecidos en virtud del Acuerdo de asociación UE/Marruecos y ha instado a todas las partes a evitar la violencia y a respetar los derechos humanos; iii) ha expresado su apoyo a la ONU y ha manifestado su adhesión a la Resolución 2099 del Consejo de Seguridad (2013) que hace hincapié en la importancia de mejorar la situación de los derechos humanos en el Sáhara Occidental y los campamentos de Tinduf y da la bienvenida al fortalecimiento del Consejo Nacional de Comisiones de Derechos Humanos que operan en Dajla y El Aaiún.

La Unión Europea sigue de cerca las conclusiones de las misiones de los Estados miembros en el Sáhara Occidental y está considerando la posibilidad de contribuir a estas iniciativas de forma coordinada y al nivel adecuado.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006630/13
an die Kommission
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Åsa Westlund (S&D), Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D), Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI) und Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)
(10. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Überwachung der Menschenrechte durch die EU in der Westsahara

Am 6. März 2013 befanden sich Isabella Lövin, Ivo Vajgl, Willy Meyer und Vicente Garcés Ramón, Mitglieder der von über 60 MdEPs unterstützten interfraktionellen Arbeitsgruppe für die Westsahara, im Rahmen einer Erkundungsmission zur Lage der Menschenrechte auf dem Weg nach El Aaiún in der Westsahara, allerdings wurde ihnen am Flughafen Casablanca die Einreise nach Marokko verweigert.

Angesichts dieses Vorfalls sowie der Tatsachen, dass a) die marokkanische Regierung dem PECH-Ausschuss im Jahre 2010 keine Genehmigung für die Entsendung einer offiziellen Delegation nach Marokko, einschließlich der Westsahara, erteilt hat; b) vorher anderen MdEPs und nationalen Politkern bereits die Einreise verweigert worden war; c) die Kommission derzeit sowohl ein Fischerei- als auch ein Freihandelsabkommen mit der marokkanischen Regierung aushandelt; und dass d) in einem 2013 veröffentlichten Bericht des UN-Sonderberichterstatters über Folter eine Zunahme von Folter und Misshandlungen während der Haft und von Festnahmen in Marokko festgestellt worden ist, was in einem kürzlich veröffentlichten Bericht der Robert F. Kennedy Stiftung bestätigt wurde, wird die Kommission um Beantwortung folgender Fragen ersucht:

Wie viele offizielle EU-Delegationen besuchten während der letzten Jahre das Hohheitsgebiet ohne Selbstverwaltung Westsahara, und wie viele von diesen Delegationen untersuchten die Lage der Menschenrechte?

Hat die Kommission vor, selbst eine offizielle Erkundungsmission in die Westsahara zu entsenden, mit dem Ziel, alle einschlägigen Akteure zu treffen; wenn nein, warum nicht?

Wie gewährleistet die EU, dass der Schutz der Menschenrechte und die Achtung der Rechtsstaatlichkeit gemäß den im Assoziationsabkommen EU-Marokko festgelegten Bestimmungen wirksam umgesetzt werden?

Wie hat die Kommission offiziell auf die Ausweisung von vier MdEPs aus Marokko am 6. März 2013 reagiert?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006631/13
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Åsa Westlund (S&D), Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D), Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI) und Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)
(10. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Überwachung der Menschenrechte durch die EU in der Westsahara

Am 6. März 2013 befanden sich Isabella Lövin, Ivo Vajgl, Willy Meyer und Vicente Garcés Ramón, Mitglieder der von über 60 MdEPs unterstützten interfraktionellen Arbeitsgruppe für die Westsahara, im Rahmen einer Erkundungsmission zur Lage der Menschenrechte auf dem Weg nach El Aaiún in der Westsahara, allerdings wurde ihnen am Flughafen Casablanca die Einreise nach Marokko verweigert.

Angesichts dieses Vorfalls sowie der Tatsachen, dass a) die marokkanische Regierung dem PECH-Ausschuss im Jahre 2010 keine Genehmigung für die Entsendung einer offiziellen Delegation nach Marokko, einschließlich der Westsahara, erteilt hat; b) vorher anderen MdEPs und nationalen Politkern bereits die Einreise verweigert worden war; c) die Kommission derzeit sowohl ein Fischerei- als auch ein Freihandelsabkommen mit der marokkanischen Regierung aushandelt; und dass d) in einem 2013 veröffentlichten Bericht des UN-Sonderberichterstatters über Folter eine Zunahme von Folter und Misshandlungen während der Haft und von Festnahmen in Marokko festgestellt worden ist, was in einem kürzlich veröffentlichten Bericht der Robert F. Kennedy Stiftung bestätigt wurde, wird die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin um Beantwortung folgender Fragen ersucht:

Wie viele offizielle EU-Delegationen besuchten während der letzten Jahre das Hohheitsgebiet ohne Selbstverwaltung Westsahara, und wie viele von diesen Delegationen untersuchten die Lage der Menschenrechte?

Hat die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin vor, selbst eine offizielle Erkundungsmission in die Westsahara zu entsenden, mit dem Ziel, alle einschlägigen Akteure zu treffen; wenn nein, warum nicht?

Wie gewährleistet die EU, dass der Schutz der Menschenrechte und die Achtung der Rechtsstaatlichkeit gemäß den im Assoziationsabkommen EU-Marokko festgelegten Bestimmungen wirksam umgesetzt werden?

Wie hat die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin offiziell auf die Ausweisung von vier MdEPs aus Marokko am 6. März 2013 reagiert?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(31. Juli 2013)

Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin sind die Umstände bekannt, unter denen einer Gruppe von Mitgliedern des Europäischen Parlaments (MdEP) auf dem Weg zu dem Gebiet in der Westsahara die Einreise durch die marokkanischen Behörden verweigert wurde. Die EU hat die Problematik bei den marokkanischen Behörden angesprochen. Die Westsahara-Frage löst oft eine unnachgiebige Haltung bei den Beteiligten aus. Nach Auffassung der EU sollten wir handeln, um einen konstruktiveren Ansatz zu ermöglichen, um einen Dialog auch über sensible Themen führen zu können und internationale Beobachter die Westsahara in gutem Glauben besuchen dürfen. Die kürzliche Delegationsreise von Europaabgeordneten der Sozialdemokratischen Fraktion zeigt, dass dies möglich ist.

Die EU hat wiederholt i) ihre Sorge über den langanhaltenden Westsahara-Konflikt und die Folgen für die Sicherheit und Zusammenarbeit in der Region geäußert; ii) in den Sitzungen der im Rahmen des Assoziationsabkommens EU-Marokko eingesetzten gemeinsamen Gremien kritische Fragen angesprochen und alle Parteien zum Gewaltverzicht und zur Achtung der Menschenrechte aufgerufen; iii) den Vereinten Nationen ihre Unterstützung zugesagt. Ferner unterstützt sie die Resolution des UN-Sicherheitsrats 2099 (2013), in der betont wird „wie wichtig es ist, die Menschenrechtssituation in Westsahara und in den Lagern von Tindouf zu verbessern“ und die „Maßnahmen Marokkos zur Stärkung der in Dakhla und Laayoune tätigen Kommissionen des Nationalen Rates für Menschenrechte“ begrüßt werden.

Die EU verfolgt die Ergebnisse der Erkundungsmissionen der Mitgliedstaaten in die Westsahara mit großer Aufmerksamkeit und erwägt, zu solchen Initiativen in koordinierter Weise und auf geeigneter Ebene beizutragen.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006630/13
alla Commissione
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Åsa Westlund (S&D), Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D), Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI) e Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)
(10 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Monitoraggio dei diritti umani da parte dell'Unione europea nel Sahara occidentale

Il 6 marzo 2013, Isabella LÖVIN, Ivo VAJGL, Willy MEYER e Vicente GARCÉS RAMÓN, si trovavano in viaggio alla volta di El Aaiún, nel Sahara occidentale, nell'ambito di una missione d'indagine sui diritti umani, quando fu negato loro l'ingresso in Marocco presso l'aeroporto di Casablanca. I deputati summenzionati sono membri dell'intergruppo per il Sahara occidentale, il quale gode del sostegno di oltre 60 deputati al Parlamento europeo.

Alla luce di tale incidente, nonché del fatto che a) nel 2010 la commissione PECH non ha ottenuto il permesso da parte del Marocco di organizzare una visita di delegazione ufficiale in detto paese, in particolare nel Sahara occidentale; b) l'ingresso nel paese era già stato negato in precedenza ad altri deputati al Parlamento europeo e politici nazionali; c) la Commissione sta attualmente negoziando con il Marocco un accordo nel settore della pesca e un accordo di libero scambio, e d) una relazione del 2013 elaborata dal relatore speciale delle Nazioni Unite sulla tortura ha rilevato in Marocco un aumento dei casi di tortura e di maltrattamento nel corso delle procedure di detenzione e di arresto, il che è stato confermato da una recente relazione a cura della Fondazione Robert F. Kennedy, può la Commissione rispondere a ciascuno dei seguenti quesiti:

Quante delegazioni ufficiali dell'UE si sono recate in visita negli ultimi anni presso il territorio non autonomo del Sahara occidentale e in quale misura dette delegazioni hanno indagato sulla situazione relativa ai diritti umani?

Intende la Commissione effettuare una missione d'inchiesta ufficiale per conto proprio nel Sahara occidentale, che preveda un incontro con tutte le parti interessate? In caso contrario, potrebbe spiegarne le ragioni?

In che modo garantisce l'Unione europea che la tutela dei diritti umani nonché il rispetto dello Stato di diritto, enunciati nell'accordo di associazione tra l'UE e il Marocco, vengano applicati correttamente?

Qual è stata la reazione formale da parte della Commissione rispetto all'espulsione dal Marocco, in data 6 marzo 2013, di quattro deputati al Parlamento europeo?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006631/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Åsa Westlund (S&D), Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D), Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI) e Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)
(10 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Monitoraggio dei diritti umani da parte dell'Unione europea nel Sahara occidentale

Il 6 marzo 2013, Isabella LÖVIN, Ivo VAJGL, Willy MEYER e Vicente GARCÉS RAMÓN, si trovavano in viaggio alla volta di El Aaiún, nel Sahara occidentale, nell'ambito di una missione d'indagine sui diritti umani, quando fu negato loro l'ingresso in Marocco presso l'aeroporto di Casablanca. I deputati summenzionati sono membri dell'intergruppo per il Sahara occidentale, il quale gode del sostegno di oltre 60 deputati al Parlamento europeo.

Alla luce di tale incidente, nonché del fatto che a) nel 2010 la commissione PECH non ha ottenuto il permesso da parte del Marocco di organizzare una visita di delegazione ufficiale in detto paese, in particolare nel Sahara occidentale; b) l'ingresso nel paese era già stato negato in precedenza ad altri deputati al Parlamento europeo e politici nazionali; c) la Commissione sta attualmente negoziando con il Marocco un accordo nel settore della pesca e un accordo di libero scambio, e d) una relazione del 2013 elaborata dal relatore speciale delle Nazioni Unite sulla tortura ha rilevato in Marocco un aumento dei casi di tortura e di maltrattamento nel corso delle procedure di detenzione e di arresto, il che è stato confermato da una recente relazione a cura della Fondazione Robert F. Kennedy, può il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante rispondere a ciascuno dei seguenti quesiti:

Quante delegazioni ufficiali dell'UE si sono recate in visita negli ultimi anni presso il territorio non autonomo del Sahara occidentale e in quale misura dette delegazioni hanno indagato sulla situazione relativa ai diritti umani?

Intende il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante effettuare una missione d'inchiesta ufficiale per conto proprio nel Sahara occidentale, che preveda un incontro con tutte le parti interessate? In caso contrario, potrebbe spiegarne le ragioni?

In che modo garantisce l'Unione europea che la tutela dei diritti umani nonché il rispetto dello Stato di diritto, enunciati nell'accordo di associazione tra l'UE e il Marocco, vengano applicati correttamente?

Qual è stata la reazione formale da parte del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante rispetto all'espulsione dal Marocco, in data 6 marzo 2013, di quattro deputati al Parlamento europeo?

Risposta congiunta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(31 luglio 2013)

L'AR/VP è al corrente delle circostanze in cui un gruppo di membri del Parlamento europeo che si dirigeva verso il territorio del Sahara occidentale è stato bloccato dalle autorità marocchine. L'UE ha sollevato la questione con le autorità marocchine. Le parti interessate adottano spesso posizioni intransigenti sulla questione del Sahara occidentale. L'Unione europea ritiene che ci si debba adoperare per promuovere un approccio più costruttivo che consenta di dialogare anche su questioni sensibili e permetta agli osservatori internazionali di recarsi in buona fede nel Sahara occidentale. La recente missione degli eurodeputati del gruppo socialista nel Sahara occidentale dimostra che questo è possibile.

L'UE (i) ha espresso più volte preoccupazione circa il protrarsi del conflitto nel Sahara occidentale e le relative implicazioni per la sicurezza e la cooperazione nella regione; (ii) ha affrontato questioni critiche durante le riunioni degli organismi misti istituiti nel quadro dell'accordo di associazione UE-Marocco, invitando tutte le parti in causa ad astenersi dalla violenza e a rispettare i diritti umani; (iii) ha espresso sostegno all'ONU e appoggia la risoluzione 2099 (2013) del Consiglio di sicurezza, che sottolinea l'importanza di migliorare la situazione dei diritti umani nel Sahara occidentale e nei campi di Tindouf e accoglie con favore il potenziamento delle commissioni del Consiglio nazionale dei diritti umani che operano a Dakhla e a Laayoune.

L'UE segue con la massima attenzione i risultati delle missioni degli Stati membri nel Sahara occidentale e sta valutando l'opportunità di contribuire a tali iniziative, in modo coordinato e al livello adeguato.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-006630/13
za Komisijo
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Åsa Westlund (S&D), Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D), Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI) in Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)
(10. junij 2013)

Zadeva: Spremljanje stanja človekovih pravic v Zahodni Sahari za EU

Dne 6. marca 2013 so se Isabella LÖVIN, Ivo VAJGL, Willy MEYER in Vicente GARCÉS RAMÓN – člani medskupine za Zahodno Saharo, ki jo podpira več kot 60 poslancev Evropskega parlamenta, odpravili na misijo za ugotavljanje dejstev o človekovih pravicah v El Ajun v Zahodni Sahari, vendar jim na letališču v Casablanci niso dovolili vstopa v Maroko.

Zaradi omenjenega incidenta, pa tudi zaradi tega, ker 1) odbor PECH leta 2010 od te države ni prejel dovoljenja za organizacijo uradne delegacije v Maroku in Južni Sahari; b) pred tem so vstop zavrnili drugim poslancem Evropskega parlamenta, pa tudi nacionalnim politikom; c) Komisija in Maroko se trenutno pogajata o sporazumu na področju ribištva ter o sporazumu o prosti trgovini; in d) posebni poročevalec Združenih narodov za mučenje je v poročilu za leto 2013 ugotovil, da je v Maroku opaziti porast mučenja in slabega ravnanja ob prijetju in v priporu, kar so potrdili tudi pri fundaciji Robert F. Kennedy; Komisija naj odgovori na naslednja vprašanja:

Koliko uradnih delegacij EU je v zadnjih letih obiskalo ozemlje Zahodne Sahare brez lastne uprave in kako so te delegacije preiskovale razmere na področju človekovih pravic?

Ali namerava Komisija v Zahodno Saharo napotiti svojo uradno misijo za ugotavljanje dejstev o človekovih pravicah, ki bo imela v svojem programu srečanje z vsemi pomembnimi zainteresiranimi stranmi? Če ne, zakaj?

Kako skrbi EU za to, da se zaščita človekovih pravic in spoštovanje načel pravne države, ki sta določena v pridružitvenim sporazumom med EU in Marokom, ustrezno izvajata?

Kako se je Komisija uradno odzvala na izgon štirih poslancev Evropskega parlamenta iz Maroka 6. marca 2013?

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-006631/13
za Komisijo (podpredsednica/visoka predstavnica)
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Åsa Westlund (S&D), Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D), Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI) in Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)
(10. junij 2013)

Zadeva: VP/HR – Spremljanje stanja človekovih pravic v Zahodni Sahari za EU

Dne 6. marca 2013 so se Isabella LÖVIN, Ivo VAJGL, Willy MEYER in Vicente GARCÉS RAMÓN – člani medskupine za Zahodno Saharo, ki jo podpira več kot 60 poslancev Evropskega parlamenta, odpravili na misijo za ugotavljanje dejstev o človekovih pravicah v El Ajun v Zahodni Sahari, vendar jim na letališču v Casablanci niso dovolili vstopa v Maroko.

Zaradi omenjenega incidenta, pa tudi zaradi tega, ker 1) odbor PECH leta 2010 od te države ni prejel dovoljenja za organizacijo uradne delegacije v Maroku in Južni Sahari; b) pred tem so vstop zavrnili drugim poslancem Evropskega parlamenta, pa tudi nacionalnim politikom; c) Komisija in Maroko se trenutno pogajata o sporazumu na področju ribištva ter o sporazumu o prosti trgovini; in d) posebni poročevalec Združenih narodov za mučenje je v poročilu za leto 2013 ugotovil, da je v Maroku opaziti porast mučenja in slabega ravnanja ob prijetju in v priporu, kar so potrdili tudi pri fundaciji Robert F. Kennedy; podpredsednica/visoka predstavnica naj odgovori na naslednja vprašanja:

Koliko uradnih delegacij EU je v zadnjih letih obiskalo ozemlje Zahodne Sahare brez lastne uprave in kako so te delegacije preiskovale razmere na področju človekovih pravic?

Ali namerava podpredsednica/visoka predstavnica Komisije v Zahodno Saharo napotiti svojo uradno misijo za ugotavljanje dejstev o človekovih pravicah, ki bo imela v svojem programu srečanje z vsemi pomembnimi zainteresiranimi stranmi? Če ne, zakaj?

Kako skrbi EU za to, da se zaščita človekovih pravic in spoštovanje načel pravne države, ki sta določena v pridružitvenim sporazumom med EU in Marokom, ustrezno izvajata?

Kako se je podpredsednica/visoka predstavnica uradno odzvala na izgon štirih poslancev Evropskega parlamenta iz Maroka 6. marca 2013?

Skupni odgovor visoke predstavnice Unije in podpredsednice Komisije Catherine Ashton v imenu Komisije
(31. julij 2013)

Visoka predstavnica Unije in podpredsednica Komisije je seznanjena z okoliščinami, v katerih so maroški organi skupini poslancev Evropskega parlamenta, ki so potovali na območje Zahodne Sahare, zavrnili vstop v Maroko. EU je na to opozorila maroške organe. Pri vprašanju Zahodne Sahare se stališča vpletenih strani pogosto radikalno razlikujejo. EU meni, da bi si morali prizadevati za konstruktivnejši pristop, v okviru katerega bi bilo mogoče vzpostaviti dialog tudi v zvezi z občutljivimi vprašanji in bi lahko mednarodni opazovalci v dobri veri obiskovali Zahodno Saharo. Nedavna misija socialdemokratskih poslancev Evropskega parlamenta v Zahodni Sahari kaže, da je to mogoče.

EU je že večkrat (i) izrazila zaskrbljenost zaradi dolgotrajnega konflikta v Zahodni Sahari in posledic, ki jih ima za varnost in sodelovanje v regiji; (ii) obravnavala ključna vprašanja na srečanjih skupnih teles, ustanovljenih v okviru pridružitvenega sporazuma med EU in Marokom, ter pozvala vse strani, naj se vzdržijo nasilja in spoštujejo človekove pravice; (iii) izrazila podporo ZN in podprla resolucijo Varnostnega sveta 2099 (2013), ki „poudarja pomen izboljšanja stanja na področju človekovih pravic v Zahodni Sahari in taboriščih v Tindoufu“ ter „pozdravlja krepitev komisij Narodnega sveta za človekove pravice, ki delujejo v Dakhli in Laayouneju“.

EU pozorno spremlja ugotovitve misij držav članic, ki se odpravljajo v Zahodno Saharo, in preučuje možnost, da bi usklajeno in na ustrezni ravni prispevala k takim pobudam.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-006630/13
till kommissionen
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Åsa Westlund (S&D), Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D), Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI) och Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)
(10 juni 2013)

Angående: EU:s övervakning av de mänskliga rättigheterna i Västsahara

Den 6 mars 2013 var Isabella Lövin, Ivo Vajgl, Willy Meyer och Vicente Garcés Ramón – medlemmar av den tvärpolitiska gruppen för Västsahara som har över 60 ledamöters stöd – på väg till El Aaiún i Västsahara på ett undersökningsuppdrag för mänskliga rättigheter, men på flygplatsen i Casablanca nekades de att resa in i Marocko.

a) 2010 nekades PECH-utskottet tillstånd från Marocko för att organisera en officiell delegationsresa till Marocko, inklusive Västsahara; b) tidigare har andra ledamöter av Europaparlamentet liksom nationella politiker nekats inresa; c) kommissionen förhandlar för närvarande om ett fiskeavtal och ett frihandelsavtal med Marocko, och d) av en rapport från 2013 från FN:s särskilde rapportör om tortyr framgår det att användningen av tortyr och misshandel under frihetsberövanden och gripanden har ökat i Marocko, något som bekräftats i en rapport som nyligen offentliggjordes av Robert F. Kennedy-stiftelsen. Skulle kommissionen mot bakgrund av ovanstående kunna besvara följande frågor:

Hur många officiella EU-delegationer har under de senaste åren besökt det icke självstyrande territoriet Västsahara, och på vilket sätt har dessa delegationer utrett människorättssituationen?

Har kommissionen för avsikt att på egen hand genomföra ett officiellt undersökningsuppdrag i Västsahara och att under detta träffa alla relevanta berörda parter? Om inte, varför inte?

Hur går EU tillväga för att säkerställa att de bestämmelser avseende skydd för de mänskliga rättigheterna och respekt för rättsstatsprincipen som fastställs i associeringsavtalet EU-Marocko följs korrekt?

Hur har kommissionens formellt reagerat på utvisningen av de fyra ledamöterna av Europaparlamentet från Marocko den 6 mars 2013?

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-006631/13
till kommissionen (Vice-ordföranden / Höga representanten)
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Åsa Westlund (S&D), Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D), Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI) och Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)
(10 juni 2013)

Angående: VP/HR – EU:s övervakning av de mänskliga rättigheterna i Västsahara

Den 6 mars 2013 var Isabella Lövin, Ivo Vajgl, Willy Meyer och Vicente Garcés Ramón – medlemmar av den tvärpolitiska gruppen för Västsahara som har över 60 ledamöters stöd – på väg till El Aaiún i Västsahara på ett undersökningsuppdrag för mänskliga rättigheter, men på flygplatsen i Casablanca nekades de att resa in i Marocko.

a) 2010 nekades PECH-utskottet tillstånd från Marocko för att organisera en officiell delegationsresa till Marocko, inklusive Västsahara; b) tidigare har andra ledamöter av Europaparlamentet liksom nationella politiker nekats inresa; c) kommissionen förhandlar för närvarande om ett fiskeavtal och ett frihandelsavtal med Marocko, och d) av en rapport från 2013 från FN:s särskilde rapportör om tortyr framgår det att användningen av tortyr och misshandel under frihetsberövanden och gripanden har ökat i Marocko, något som bekräftats i en rapport som nyligen offentliggjordes av Robert F. Kennedy-stiftelsen. Skulle vice ordförande för kommissionen/den höga representanten mot bakgrund av ovanstående kunna besvara följande frågor:

Hur många officiella EU-delegationer har under de senaste åren besökt det icke självstyrande territoriet Västsahara, och på vilket sätt har dessa delegationer utrett människorättssituationen?

Har vice ordföranden för kommissionen/den höga representanten för avsikt att på egen hand genomföra ett officiellt undersökningsuppdrag i Västsahara och att under detta träffa alla relevanta berörda parter? Om inte, varför inte?

Hur går EU tillväga för att säkerställa att de bestämmelser avseende skydd för de mänskliga rättigheterna och respekt för rättsstatsprincipen som fastställs i associeringsavtalet EU-Marocko följs korrekt?

Hur har vice ordföranden för kommissionen/den höga representanten formellt reagerat på utvisningen av de fyra ledamöterna av Europaparlamentet från Marocko den 6 mars 2013?

Samlat svar från den höga representanten/vice ordföranden Catherine Ashton på kommissionens vägnar
(31 juli 2013)

Den höga representanten/vice ordföranden känner till de omständigheter under vilka en grupp av Europaparlamentets ledamöter avvisades av marockanska myndigheter på väg till Västsaharas territorium. EU tagit upp frågan med de marockanska myndigheterna. Västsaharafrågan leder ofta till att berörda parter intar orubbliga positioner. EU anser att vi bör agera för att möjliggöra ett mer konstruktivt tillvägagångssätt som innebär att en dialog är möjlig även i känsliga frågor och att besök i Västsahara som görs i god tro av internationella observatörer tillåts. Det besök som parlamentsledamöter i den socialdemokratiska gruppen nyligen genomförde visar att detta är möjligt.

EU har vid upprepade tillfällen i) uttryckt sin oro över att Västsaharakonflikten har varit så utdragen och över dess följder för säkerheten och samarbetet i regionen, ii) tagit upp viktiga frågor vid möten i de gemensamma organ som inrättats inom ramen för associeringsavtalet mellan EU och Marocko och uppmanat alla parter att avstå från våld och respektera mänskliga rättigheter iii) uttryckt sitt stöd för FN, och stöder FN:s säkerhetsråds resolution 2099 (2013), som understryker vikten av att förbättra människorättssituationen i Västsahara och flyktinglägren i Tindouf och välkomnar förstärkningen av nationella rådets för mänskliga rättigheter kommissioner i Dakhla och Laayoune.

EU följer noga resultaten av medlemsstaternas besök i Västsahara och överväger att bidra till sådana initiativ på ett samordnat sätt och på lämplig nivå.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006630/13
to the Commission
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Åsa Westlund (S&D), Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D), Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI) and Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)
(10 June 2013)

Subject: EU monitoring of human rights in Western Sahara

On 6 March 2013, Isabella LÖVIN, Ivo VAJGL, Willy MEYER and Vicente GARCÉS RAMÓN — members of the Intergroup for Western Sahara, which has the support of more than 60 MEPs — were on their way to El Aaiún in Western Sahara on a human rights fact-finding mission, but were denied entry into Morocco at Casablanca airport.

In view of this incident, as well as the facts that a) in 2010 the PECH Committee did not get permission from Morocco to organise an official delegation to Morocco including Western Sahara; b) other MEPs, as well as national politicians, have previously been refused entry; c) the Commission is now negotiating both a fisheries agreement and a free-trade agreement with Morocco; and d) a 2013 report by the UN Special Rapporteur on torture found an increase in torture and ill-treatment during detention and arrest processes in Morocco, something which was confirmed in a recent report by the Robert F. Kennedy Foundation; we would like the Commission to answer each of the following questions:

How many official EU delegations have in recent years visited the non-self-governing territory of Western Sahara, and how have these delegations investigated the human rights situation?

Does the Commission intend to undertake an official fact-finding mission of its own in Western Sahara, with a programme to meet with all the relevant stakeholders, and if not, why not?

How does the EU ensure that the protection of human rights and compliance with the rule of law laid down in the EU-Morocco Association Agreement are properly enforced?

How has the Commission formally reacted to the expulsion of four MEPs from Morocco on 6 March 2013?

Question for written answer E-006631/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Marco Scurria (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Åsa Westlund (S&D), Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D), Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI) and Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)
(10 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EU monitoring of human rights in Western Sahara

On 6 March 2013, Isabella LÖVIN, Ivo VAJGL, Willy MEYER and Vicente GARCÉS RAMÓN — members of the Intergroup for Western Sahara, which has the support of more than 60 MEPs — were on their way to El Aaiún in Western Sahara on a human rights fact-finding mission, but were denied entry into Morocco at Casablanca airport.

In view of this incident, as well as the facts that a) in 2010 the PECH Committee did not get permission from Morocco to organise an official delegation to Morocco including Western Sahara; b) other MEPs, as well as national politicians, have previously been refused entry; c) the Commission is now negotiating both a fisheries agreement and a free-trade agreement with Morocco; and d) a 2013 report by the UN Special Rapporteur on torture found an increase in torture and ill-treatment during detention and arrest processes in Morocco, something which was confirmed in a recent report by the Robert F. Kennedy Foundation; we would like the Vice-President/High Representative to answer each of the following questions:

How many official EU delegations have in recent years visited the non-self-governing territory of Western Sahara, and how have these delegations investigated the human rights situation?

Does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to undertake an official fact-finding mission of her own in Western Sahara, with a programme to meet with all the relevant stakeholders, and if not, why not?

How does the EU ensure that the protection of human rights and compliance with the rule of law laid down in the EU-Morocco Association Agreement are properly enforced?

How has the Vice-President/High Representative formally reacted to the expulsion of four MEPs from Morocco on 6 March 2013?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(31 July 2013)

The HR/VP is aware of the circumstances under which a group of Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) was turned back by Moroccan authorities en route to the territory of Western Sahara (WS). The EU raised the issue with the Moroccan authorities. The WS issue often causes intransigent positions of the parties involved. The EU believes that we should act to enable a more constructive approach according to which dialogue is possible also on sensitive issues and visits to WS undertaken in good faith by international observers are allowed. The recent mission to WS by MEPs of the socialist group shows that this is possible.

The EU has repeatedly (i) expressed concern about the long duration of the WS conflict and the implications for the security and cooperation in the region; (ii) addressed critical issues in the meetings of the joint bodies established under the EU/Morocco Association Agreement and called on all parties to restrain from violence and to respect human rights; (iii) expressed support to the UN and supports the Security Council Resolution 2099 (2013) which is 'stressing the importance of improving the human rights situation in Western Sahara and the Tindouf camps' and 'welcoming the strengthening of the National Council on Human Rights Commissions operating in Dakhla and Laayoune'.

The EU closely follows the findings of Member States missions to WS and is considering to contribute to such initiatives in a coordinated way and at the appropriate level.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006691/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(10 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Despilfarro de fondos europeos en Extremadura

El pasado 13 de mayo, László Ándor, Comisario de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales, participó en un debate celebrado por la Fundación Fuhem donde afirmó que España ha despilfarrado los fondos europeos de cohesión al haber desarrollado políticas poco inteligentes.

El Comisario ha llegado a sostener que este despilfarro se encuentra en la base de los problemas de competitividad que lleva arrastrando la economía española. Los fondos de cohesión en España se han despilfarrado en la construcción de infraestructuras inútiles o duplicadas que no han mejorado en nada la competitividad. Estas infraestructuras tan solo han beneficiado a las grandes compañías de la construcción que, en últimas instancia, han sido las grandes perceptoras de los fondos europeos.

Durante años estos fondos se han estado empleado para beneficiar a las citadas empresas y en la actualidad ha aparecido información sobre los supuestos pagos que dichas compañías realizaban a la cúpula del partido que gestionaba los proyectos. Esto podría explicar la lógica con la que las autoridades españolas han estado elaborando los proyectos financiados con fondos europeos, es por ello que resulta necesario recavar la mayor información posible sobre la evaluación que la Comisión ha realizado de dichos proyectos.

A la vista de las críticas lanzadas por el Comisario sobre la ejecución de dichos fondos, ¿qué proyectos, a la luz de las evaluaciones que la Comisión ha debido realizar, son considerados como «poco inteligentes» y cuáles son las alternativas que la Comisión entiende que podrían haber sido ejecutadas en su lugar? Extremadura es una de las regiones europeas con mayor desempleo y por eso urge conocer ¿cómo evalúa el Comisario los proyectos realizados en la región?

¿Qué proyectos financiados con los fondos de cohesión suponen para la Comisión proyectos que no han servido para el impulso económico de la Comunidad Autónoma de Extremadura y un despilfarro de los fondos europeos?

¿Qué alternativas considera que habrían podido ser financiadas en Extremadura para generar un incremento de la actividad económica y un descenso del desempleo?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007043/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(17 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Despilfarro de fondos europeos en Andalucía

El pasado 13 de mayo László Ándor, Comisario de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales, participó en un debate celebrado por la Fundación Fuhem, donde ha afirmó que España ha despilfarrado los fondos europeos de cohesión al haber desarrollado políticas poco inteligentes.

El Comisario ha llegado a sostener que este despilfarro se encuentra en la base de los problemas de competitividad que arrastra la economía española. Los fondos de cohesión en España se han despilfarrado en la construcción de infraestructuras inútiles o duplicadas que no han mejorado en nada la competitividad. Estas infraestructuras tan solo han beneficiado a las grandes compañías de la construcción que, en últimas instancia, han sido las grandes perceptoras de los fondos europeos.

Durante años, estos fondos se han estado empleando para beneficiar a las citadas empresas y en la actualidad ha aparecido información sobre los supuestos pagos que dichas compañías realizaban a la cúpula del partido que gestionaba los proyectos. Esto podría explicar la lógica con la que las autoridades españolas han estado elaborando los proyectos financiados con fondos europeos. Es por ello que resulta necesario recabar la mayor información posible sobre la evaluación que la Comisión ha realizado de dichos proyectos.

A la vista de las críticas lanzadas por el Comisario sobre la ejecución de dichos fondos, consideramos necesario conocer qué proyectos, a la luz de las evaluaciones que la Comisión ha debido realizar, son considerados como «poco inteligentes» y cuáles son las alternativas que la Comisión Europea entiende que podrían haber sido ejecutadas en su lugar. Andalucía es una de las regiones europeas con mayor desempleo y por eso urge conocer cómo evalúa el Comisario los proyectos realizados en la región.

1. ¿Qué proyectos financiados con los fondos de cohesión son para la Comisión proyectos que no han servido para el impulso económico de Andalucía y un despilfarro de los fondos europeos?

2. ¿Qué alternativas considera que habrían podido ser financiadas en Andalucía para generar un incremento de la actividad económica y un descenso del desempleo?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007662/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(27 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Despilfarro de fondos europeos en Valencia

El pasado 13 de mayo László Ándor, Comisario de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales, participó en un debate celebrado por la Fundación Fuhem donde afirmó que España ha despilfarrado los fondos europeos de cohesión al haber desarrollado políticas poco inteligentes.

El Comisario ha llegado a sostener que este despilfarro se encuentra en la base de los problemas de competitividad que lleva arrastrando la economía española. Los fondos de cohesión en España se han despilfarrado en la construcción de infraestructuras inútiles o duplicadas que no han mejorado en nada la competitividad. Estas infraestructuras tan solo han beneficiado a las grandes compañías de la construcción que, en últimas instancia, han sido las grandes perceptoras de los fondos europeos.

Durante años estos fondos se han estado empleando para beneficiar a las citadas empresas y, en la actualidad, ha aparecido información sobre los supuestos pagos que dichas compañías realizaban a la cúpula del partido que gestionaba los proyectos. Esto podría explicar la lógica con la que las autoridades españolas han estado elaborando los proyectos financiados con fondos europeos, es por ello que resulta necesario recabar la mayor información posible sobre la evaluación que la Comisión ha realizado de dichos proyectos.

A la vista de las críticas lanzadas por el Comisario sobre la ejecución de dichos fondos, consideramos necesario conocer:

— ¿Qué proyectos, a la luz de las evaluaciones que la Comisión ha debido realizar, son considerados como «poco inteligentes» y cuáles son las alternativas que la Comisión Europea entiende que podrían haber sido ejecutadas en su lugar? Valencia es una de las regiones europeas con mayor desempleo y, por eso, urge conocer cómo evalúa el Comisario los proyectos realizados en la región.

— ¿Qué proyectos financiados con los fondos de cohesión suponen para la Comisión proyectos que no han servido para el impulso económico de Valencia y un despilfarro de los fondos europeos?

— ¿Qué alternativas considera que habrían podido ser financiadas en Valencia para generar un incremento de la actividad económica y un descenso del desempleo?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-008153/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(9 de julio de 2013)

Asunto: Despilfarro fondos europeos en Madrid

El pasado 13 de mayo, László Ándor, Comisario de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales, participó en un debate celebrado por la Fundación Fuhem donde afirmó que España ha despilfarrado los fondos europeos de cohesión al haber desarrollado políticas poco inteligentes.

El Comisario ha llegado a sostener que este despilfarro se encuentra en la base de los problemas de competitividad que lleva arrastrando la economía española. Los fondos de cohesión en España se han despilfarrado en la construcción de infraestructuras inútiles o duplicadas que no han mejorado en nada la competitividad. Estas infraestructuras tan solo han beneficiado a las grandes compañías de la construcción que, en última instancia, han sido las grandes perceptoras de los fondos europeos.

Durante años estos fondos se han estado empleado para beneficiar a las citadas empresas y en la actualidad ha aparecido información sobre los supuestos pagos que dichas compañías realizaban a la cúpula del partido que gestionaba los proyectos. Esto podría explicar la lógica con la que las autoridades españolas han estado elaborando los proyectos financiados con fondos europeos. Por ello resulta necesario recabar la mayor información posible sobre la evaluación que la Comisión ha realizado de dichos proyectos.

A la vista de las críticas lanzadas por el Comisario sobre la ejecución de dichos fondos, ¿qué proyectos, a la luz de las evaluaciones que la Comisión ha debido realizar, son considerados como «poco inteligentes» y cuáles son las alternativas que la Comisión Europea entiende que podrían haber sido ejecutadas en su lugar? Madrid es una de las regiones europeas con mayor desempleo y por eso urge conocer cómo evalúa el Comisario los proyectos realizados en la región.

¿Qué proyectos financiados con los Fondos de Cohesión suponen para la Comisión proyectos que no han servido para el impulso económico de Madrid y un despilfarro de los fondos europeos?

¿Qué alternativas considera que habrían podido ser financiadas en Madrid para generar un incremento de la actividad económica y un descenso del desempleo?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión

(29 de julio de 2013)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a las respuestas dadas a las preguntas escritas E-5454/13, E-5885/13 y E-6360/13 por el Sr. Meyer ([1]).

Por otro lado, la Comisión le invita a consultar el estudio de impacto «Fondos estructurales y convergencia regional» ([2]), elaborado por diferentes universidades españolas y publicado en 2010 en la revista *Papeles de Economía Española*, en el que se pone de manifiesto que en España, en particular en Andalucía y Extremadura, los recursos del Fondo de Cohesión no solo no se han despilfarrado, sino que han contribuido de manera significativa al desarrollo de las economías y, por tanto, han ayudado a recortar las diferencias con otras regiones de la UE.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

([2]) http://www.funcas.es/publicaciones/Sumario.aspx?IdRef=1-01123

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006691/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(10 June 2013)

Subject: Wasting of EU funds in Extremadura

On 13 May 2013, László Andor, Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, took part in a debate held by the FUHEM Foundation in which he stated that Spain had wasted EU cohesion funds by developing policies that were not very smart.

The Commissioner even claimed that such waste was at the root of the competitiveness problems hanging over the Spanish economy. In Spain, cohesion funds have been wasted on building useless or duplicated infrastructure that has not led to any improvement in competitiveness at all. Such infrastructure has only benefited the large construction companies, which ultimately have been the main recipients of EU funds.

These funds have been used to benefit these companies for years, and information has recently come to light on the alleged payments that they have made to the leaders of the party administering the projects. That could account for the thinking behind the way the Spanish authorities have been drafting projects funded with EU money; it is vital therefore, to gather as much information as possible on the Commission's evaluation of those projects.

In light of the Commissioner's scathing remarks about the use of said funds, we believe we should be told which projects are regarded as not very smart, based on the evaluations that the Commission must have carried out, and what alternatives the Commission thinks could have been put into practice instead. Extremadura is among the regions with the highest unemployment in Europe, and we therefore need to know how the Commissioner rates the projects carried out in the region.

Which projects financed from cohesion funds does the Commission believe have not helped to boost the Autonomous Community of Extremadura's economy and have been a waste of EU funds?

What alternatives does it think could have been financed in Extremadura so as to increase economic activity and cut unemployment?

Question for written answer E-007043/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Wasting of European funds in Andalusia

On 13 May 2013, László Andor, Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, took part in a debate held by the FUHEM Foundation in which he stated that Spain had wasted European cohesion funds by developing policies that were not very smart.

The Commissioner even claimed that such waste was at the root of the competitiveness problems hanging over the Spanish economy. In Spain, cohesion funds have been wasted on building useless or duplicated infrastructure that has not led to any improvement in competitiveness at all. Such infrastructure has only benefited the large construction companies, which ultimately have been the main recipients of European funds.

These funds have been used to benefit these companies for years, and information has recently come to light on the alleged payments that they have made to the leaders of the party administering the projects. That could account for the thinking behind the way the Spanish authorities have been drafting projects funded with European money; it is vital, therefore, to gather as much information as possible on the Commission's evaluation of those projects.

In the light of the Commissioner's scathing remarks about the use of said funds, we believe we should be told which projects are regarded as not very smart, based on the evaluations that the Commission must have carried out, and what alternatives the Commission thinks could have been put into practice instead. Andalusia is among the regions with the highest unemployment in Europe, and we therefore need to know how the Commissioner rates the projects carried out in the region.

1. Which projects financed from cohesion funds does the Commission believe have not helped to boost the Andalusian economy and have been a waste of European funds?

2. What alternatives does it think could have been financed in Andalusia so as to increase economic activity and cut unemployment?

Question for written answer E-007662/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(27 June 2013)

Subject: European money wasted in Valencia

On 13 May 2013 the European Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, László Ándor, took part in a debate organised by the Fuhem Foundation during which he said that Spain had wasted European cohesion funding on ill-thought-out policies. Mr Ándor claimed that this was one reason for the competitiveness problems besetting the Spanish economy.

Spain has wasted cohesion funding on useless or redundant infrastructure projects which have done nothing to improve the country's competitiveness. The projects have benefited only major construction companies, which have ultimately been the main recipients of European funding.

For years the companies in question have prospered as a result, and now information has emerged suggesting that they made payments to the leaders of the party which was managing the projects. This could explain the thinking behind the Spanish authorities' choice of projects to be funded with EU money, and it is essential, therefore, to gather as much information as possible about the way in which the Commission evaluated the projects.

— Given the Commissioner's criticism, and in the light of the evaluations it has carried out, what projects does the Commission regard as being 'ill thought-out' and what alternative projects could have been implemented instead? Given that Valencia is one of the regions with the highest rates of unemployment in Europe, it is vital to understand how the Commissioner views the projects implemented there.

— Which projects financed with cohesion fund resources have not helped to boost the Valencian economy and were a waste of European money?

— What alternative projects does the Commission think could have been funded in Valencia in an effort to boost economic activity and bring down unemployment?

Question for written answer E-008153/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(9 July 2013)

Subject: Wasting of European funds in Madrid

On 13 May 2013, László Andor, Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, took part in a debate held by the Fuhem Foundation during which he said that Spain had wasted European cohesion funding on ill-thought-out policies.

The Commissioner even claimed that such waste was at the root of the competitiveness problems hanging over the Spanish economy. In Spain, cohesion funds have been wasted on building useless or duplicated infrastructure that has not led to any improvement in competitiveness at all. Such infrastructure has only benefited the large construction companies, which ultimately have been the main recipients of European funds.

These funds have been used to benefit these companies for years, and information has recently come to light on the alleged payments that they have made to the leaders of the party administering the projects. That could account for the thinking behind the way the Spanish authorities have been drafting projects funded with European money; it is vital, therefore, to gather as much information as possible on the Commission's evaluation of those projects.

In the light of the Commissioner's scathing remarks about the use of said funds, which projects are regarded as ill thought-out, based on the evaluations that the Commission must have carried out, and what alternatives the Commission thinks could have been put into practice instead? Madrid is among the regions with the highest unemployment in Europe, and I therefore ask how the Commissioner rates the projects carried out in the region.

Which projects financed from cohesion funds does the Commission believe have not helped to boost Madrid's economy and have been a waste of European funds?

What alternative projects does it think could have been financed in Madrid so as to increase economic activity and cut unemployment?

Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written questions E-5454/13, E-5885/13 and E-6360/13 by Mr Meyer ([1]).

Moreover, the Commission would like to draw the attention to the impact study conducted by the different Spanish universities and gathered in the Spanish magazine Papeles de Economía Española 'Fondos estructurales y convergencia regional' (2010) ([2]) that show that Cohesion Fund resources have not been wasted in Spain and in particular for Andalucía and Extremadura: on the contrary, they have contributed significantly to the development of the economies and have consequently helped to narrow the gap with other EU regions.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://www.funcas.es/publicaciones/Sumario.aspx?IdRef=1-01123

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006715/13
to the Commission
Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)
(11 June 2013)

Subject: Kurdish political settlement

The President-in-Office of the Council, Lucinda Creighton, spoke in a debate in Parliament on 6 February 2013 of how the 'terrible and brutal killings of three PKK activists in Paris' in January 'serve to underline to all of us the importance of settling the Kurdish issue […] in the interests of all concerned' and how 'a settlement would play a vital role in helping to ensure the security and the stability of the region'.

However, Adem Uzun, a Kurdish politician from the Kurdistan National Congress (KNK) and one of the main Kurdish negotiators in the 'Oslo Process' with high-level Turkish government representatives, working to achieve peace through the resumption of negotiations between Turkey and the Kurds, has been detained without trial in France having been arrested there on 6 October 2012.

Is the taking action to facilitate peace talks between Turkey and Abdullah Öcalan?

Question for written answer E-006716/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)
(11 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Kurdish political settlement

The President-in-Office of the Council, Lucinda Creighton, spoke in a debate in Parliament on 6 February 2013 of how the 'terrible and brutal killings of three PKK activists in Paris' in January 'serve to underline to all of us the importance of settling the Kurdish issue […] in the interests of all concerned' and how 'a settlement would play a vital role in helping to ensure the security and the stability of the region'.

However, Adem Uzun, a Kurdish politician from the Kurdistan National Congress (KNK) and one of the main Kurdish negotiators in the 'Oslo Process' with high-level Turkish government representatives, working to achieve peace through the resumption of negotiations between Turkey and the Kurds, has been detained without trial in France having been arrested there on 6 October 2012.

Is the European External Action Service taking action to facilitate peace talks between Turkey and Abdullah Öcalan?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2013)

The EU swiftly welcomed the call on the PKK to lay down arms and withdraw beyond Turkey's borders this spring, and the positive reactions to that call. These are important steps forward in a process aimed at ending a conflict which has claimed far too many victims.

It is now important that both sides continue to take the process forward. The EU has repeatedly encouraged all parties to work unremittingly to bring peace and prosperity for all citizens of Turkey. It gives its full support to the peace process and has made clear that it stands ready to help, including through the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006841/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(12 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Στόχοι του ελληνικού προγράμματος σταθεροποίησης

Είναι γνωστή η δημόσια αντιπαράθεση μεταξύ ΔΝΤ και Επιτροπής για το ποιος φταίει σχετικά με την αποτυχία που διαπιστώνεται αναφορικά με τους στόχους του ελληνικού προγράμματος σταθεροποίησης που ακολουθείται από το 2010 και έχει προξενήσει ζημιά στην ελληνική οικονομία. Ο πρώην εκπρόσωπος της Ελλάδος στο ΔΝΤ (και πρώην υπουργός του ΠΑΣΟΚ) κ. Ρουμελιώτης δήλωσε σε τηλεοπτική εκπομπή του ελληνικού σταθμού MEGA, στις 9.6.2013, ότι οι Ευρωπαίοι εταίροι της Ελλάδας ήταν εκείνοι που ήταν ιδιαίτερα σκληροί στην εφαρμογή του αποτυχημένου προγράμματος, εκείνοι επέμεναν για τα υψηλά επιτόκια που επεβλήθησαν και δεν έδειξαν αλληλεγγύη και κατανόηση των προβλημάτων της ελληνικής οικονομίας.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς τοποθετείται η Επιτροπή για τα παραπάνω που αποτελούν ευθεία αμφισβήτηση της ικανότητας αλλά και των προθέσεων της ΕΕ να βοηθήσει πραγματικά την Ελλάδα;

2. Ποιες διορθωτικές κινήσεις θα προτείνει άμεσα η Επιτροπή τώρα που κατέστη σαφές και στους πιο δύσπιστους ότι το πρόγραμμα που ακολουθήθηκε ήταν αποτυχημένο;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006929/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(14 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Το ΔΝΤ παραδέχεται ότι υπέπεσε σε σφάλμα όσον αφορά τα μέτρα λιτότητας στην Ελλάδα

Σύμφωνα με άρθρο που δημοσιεύθηκε στην βρετανική εφημερίδα *The Guardian*, το ΔΝΤ παραδέχθηκε πρόσφατα ότι δεν αντιλήφθηκε σωστά την έκταση της ζημίας που θα επέφεραν τα μέτρα λιτότητας στη Ελλάδα και ότι τα μέτρα διάσωσης ήταν ανεπαρκή. Παρά το γεγονός ότι η Ελλάδα παραμένει στη ζώνη του ευρώ, «δεν αποκαταστάθηκε η εμπιστοσύνη των αγορών, το τραπεζικό σύστημα έχασε το 30% των καταθέσεών του και η οικονομία αντιμετώπισε ύφεση, πολύ πιο βαθιά από την αναμενόμενη, με εξαιρετικά υψηλά ποσοστά ανεργίας».

— Δεδομένου ότι το ΔΝΤ έχει παραδεχθεί ότι διέπραξε λάθη στον τρόπο που αντιμετώπισε το θέμα της Ελλάδας, τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει η Επιτροπή προκειμένου να αποκαταστήσει τη ζημία που υπέστη η Ελλάδα εξαιτίας των μέτρων λιτότητας που της επιβλήθηκαν;

— Είναι η Επιτροπή διατεθειμένη να αναλάβει το μερίδιο της ευθύνης που της αναλογεί όσον αφορά την Κύπρο και να επανεξετάσει την πολιτική λιτότητας που έχει επιβληθεί στη χώρα λαμβάνοντας τα κατάλληλα μέτρα;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(21 Αυγούστου 2013)

Τόσο ο πρόεδρος Μπαρόζο όσο και ο αντιπρόεδρος της Επιτροπής και αρμόδιος για τις Οικονομικές και Νομισματικές Υποθέσεις έχουν εκφράσει τη διαφωνία τους με ορισμένα από τα συμπεράσματα της αξιολόγησης του ΔΝΤ.

Όσον αφορά την αναδιάρθρωση του χρέους, η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι η έκθεση δεν λαμβάνει υπόψη τη διασύνδεση των κρατών μελών της Ευρωζώνης. Η αναδιάρθρωση του χρέους του ιδιωτικού τομέα το 2010 θα δημιουργούσε κίνδυνο αλυσιδωτών επιπτώσεων στο σύστημα και θα υπονόμευε σε μεγάλο βαθμό το πρόγραμμα, το οποίο αποσκοπούσε στην παραμονή της Ελλάδας στην Ευρωζώνη και τη διασφάλιση της χρηματοπιστωτικής σταθερότητας.

Η Επιτροπή υποστήριξε σθεναρά τη σημαντική εστίαση του προγράμματος στις διαρθρωτικές μεταρρυθμίσεις με στόχο την αποκατάσταση της βιώσιμης οικονομικής ανάπτυξης. Σήμερα, το πρόγραμμα εξελίσσεται ομαλά και οι ενδείξεις σταθεροποίησης στην Ελλάδα είναι ολοένα περισσότερες.

Η Τρόικα συγκροτήθηκε με πρωτοβουλία των κρατών μελών της Ευρωζώνης, πολλά εκ των οποίων επέμεναν όσον αφορά τη συμμετοχή του ΔΝΤ. Βάσει αυτής της εντολής, η Επιτροπή συνεργάζεται σήμερα με την ΕΚΤ και το ΔΝΤ σε πέντε χώρες. Η συνεργασία των μελών του προσωπικού μας είναι πολύ καλή, συχνά κάτω από πολύ δύσκολες συνθήκες.

Τώρα πρέπει να επικεντρωθούμε στην παροχή βοήθειας προς τις κυβερνήσεις των χωρών αυτών με στόχο τον σχεδιασμό και την εφαρμογή των μεταρρυθμίσεων που είναι αναγκαίες για την τόνωση της ανάπτυξης και της απασχόλησης. Στο πλαίσιο του δημόσιου διαλόγου για το μέλλον της Οικονομικής και Νομισματικής Ένωσης, πρέπει οπωσδήποτε να διερευνήσουμε τρόπους για την καλύτερη δυνατή διακυβέρνηση της Ευρωζώνης, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των μηχανισμών διαχείρισης κρίσεων. Αυτή θα είναι η κατάλληλη στιγμή για να συζητήσουμε κατά πόσο και με ποια μορφή θα διατηρηθεί το μοντέλο της Τρόικας. Στο μεταξύ, επισημαίνουμε ότι η Επιτροπή δημοσιεύει πολύ αναλυτικές τριμηνιαίες εκθέσεις για την εφαρμογή όλων των εν εξελίξει προγραμμάτων οικονομικής προσαρμογής.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006794/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(11 juin 2013)

Objet: Rapport du FMI accablant sur la gestion de la dette grecque par la Commission

Le FMI a publié un rapport qui revient sur les erreurs du premier plan d'aide à la Grèce en 2010. Le Fonds monétaire international estime notamment que la restructuration de la dette grecque, menée au printemps 2012, aurait dû l'être dès 2010.

Dans son rapport, le FMI fait son mea culpa, admettant que le premier plan de sauvetage de la Grèce en 2010 s'est soldé par «des échecs notables», en raison notamment de désaccords avec ses partenaires européens au sein de la troïka. Il regrette l'absence de «division claire du travail» au sein de la troïka et reproche aux Européens d'avoir manqué d'expérience et de «compétences» sur le programme d'aide à la Grèce, lié à de très strictes conditions en matière budgétaire et de réformes structurelles.

1. Comment la Commission réagit-elle à ce rapport?

2. Le FMI s'interroge sur la volonté de la Commission de ne pas avoir opéré une restructuration de la dette, qu'en est-il?

3. Toujours dans le même rapport, il est regretté l'absence de «division claire du travail» au sein de la troïka et reproché aux Européens d'avoir manqué d'expérience et de «compétences» sur le programme d'aide à la Grèce, lié à de très strictes conditions en matière budgétaire et de réformes structurelles. La Commission partage-t-elle cet avis?

4. Globalement, la Commission admet-elle que, la crise grecque constituant une situation difficile et sans précédent, elle n'a pas toujours fait les bons choix?

5. Si de mauvais choix ont été faits, quels sont-ils?

6. Le FMI a fait son mea culpa sur certains points. Qu'en est-il de la Commission?

7. Quand la Commission compte-t-elle publier un rapport sur le travail avec ses partenaires?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Rehn au nom de la Commission
(21 août 2013)

Le président Barroso et le vice-président chargé des affaires économiques et monétaires ont tous deux exprimé leur désaccord avec certaines des conclusions de l'évaluation du FMI.

En ce qui concerne la restructuration de la dette, la Commission estime que le rapport ne tient pas compte de l'interconnexion entre les États membres de la zone euro. Si elle avait été conduite en 2010, la restructuration de la dette du secteur privé aurait pu entraîner une contagion systémique et compromettre gravement le programme, qui avait pour objectif de garantir le maintien de la Grèce dans la zone euro et de protéger la stabilité financière.

La Commission a joué un rôle moteur dans l'élaboration d'un programme fortement axé sur des réformes structurelles visant à rétablir une croissance économique durable. Ce programme est aujourd'hui bien engagé et les signes de stabilisation de la Grèce se multiplient.

La troïka a été instituée à l'initiative des États membres de la zone euro, qui ont été nombreux à réclamer la participation du FMI. Conformément à la mission qui lui a été confiée, la Commission collabore aujourd'hui avec la BCE et le FMI dans cinq pays. Nos équipes travaillent très bien ensemble, souvent dans des conditions extrêmement difficiles.

Le temps est venu de centrer nos efforts sur l'aide à apporter aux autorités de ces pays pour concevoir et mettre en œuvre les réformes nécessaires et faire redémarrer la croissance et l'emploi. Alors que nous poursuivons le débat sur l'avenir de l'Union économique et monétaire, nous devons sans nul doute explorer les moyens d'améliorer la gouvernance de la zone euro, notamment en ce qui concerne ses mécanismes de gestion des crises. Le contexte et le moment seront bien choisis pour examiner s'il convient de conserver le modèle de la troïka, et sous quelle forme. En attendant, il convient de rappeler que la Commission publie des rapports trimestriels très détaillés sur la mise en œuvre de tous les programmes d'ajustement économique en cours.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006981/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: FMI admite erros no impacto das políticas de austeridade III

Considerando o seguinte:

— O economista-chefe do Fundo Monetário Internacional, Olivier Blanchard, reconheceu na semana passada, numa entrevista a uma rádio francesa, que o Fundo Monetário Internacional e os Europeus «perderam tempo» a resgatar a Grécia, considerando que a dívida era mesmo insustentável;

Pergunto à Comissão:

— Sendo a Comissão parceira do FMI na «troika», partilha as declarações do economista-chefe do referido fundo, segundo as quais o caso da Grécia foi uma «perda de tempo»?

— Olivier Blanchard afirma ainda que uma análise feita agora permitiria perceber que a Grécia falharia três dos quatro principais critérios para poder receber assistência económica. A Comissão corrobora a ideia de que a Grécia falhou os quatro principais critérios para poder receber assistência económica?

Resposta conjunta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(21 de agosto de 2013)

Tanto o Presidente Barroso como o Vice-Presidente da Comissão responsável pelos Assuntos Económicos e Monetários já manifestaram o seu desacordo com algumas das conclusões da avaliação do FMI.

No que se refere à reestruturação da dívida, a Comissão considera que o relatório em causa não teve em consideração o grau de interligação dos Estados-Membros da zona euro. A reestruturação da dívida do setor privado em 2010 teria suscitado o risco de um contágio sistémico e comprometido gravemente o programa, que se destinava a garantir a manutenção da Grécia na zona euro e a salvaguardar a estabilidade financeira.

A Comissão tem sido uma força motriz importante para centrar o programa nas reformas estruturais que visam restaurar o crescimento económico sustentável. Atualmente, o programa está no bom caminho e há indícios crescentes de que a situação na Grécia está a estabilizar.

A troica foi criada por iniciativa dos Estados-Membros da zona euro, muitos dos quais insistiram em ter o FMI ao seu lado. Com base nesse mandato, a Comissão trabalha atualmente em conjunto com o BCE e o FMI em cinco países. As nossas equipas de pessoal têm funcionado muito bem em conjunto, muitas vezes em situações extremamente difíceis.

Agora chegou a altura de concentrarmos os esforços para ajudarmos os governos dos países em causa a conceberem e a aplicarem as reformas necessárias para estimular o crescimento e o emprego. À medida que se aprofunda o debate sobre o futuro da União Económica e Monetária, importa explorar formas de otimizar a governação da zona euro, incluindo os mecanismos de gestão de crises. Esse será o momento e o contexto adequados para discutirmos se e de que forma se deve manter o atual modelo da troica. Por último, gostaria de referir que a Comissão publica relatórios trimestrais muito pormenorizados sobre a execução de todos os programas de ajustamento económico em curso.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006794/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(11 June 2013)

Subject: IMF report damning on the Commission's management of Greek debt

The IMF has published a report reviewing the errors in the first aid plan for Greece in 2010. The International Monetary Fund feels in particular that the restructuring of Greek debt, which was conducted in the spring of 2012, should have gone ahead in 2010.

The IMF has held its hands up in its report, admitting that the first bailout of Greece in 2010 resulted in 'notable failures', in particular because of disagreements with its European partners within the Troika. The IMF bemoans the lack of a 'clear division of labour' within the Troika and criticises Europe for its lack of experience and 'expertise' with regard to the Greek bailout, accompanied by very strict budgetary conditions and structural reforms.

1. What is the Commission's reaction to this report?

2. The IMF questions the Commission's reluctance to attempt debt restructuring. What is the Commission's position on that?

3. In the same report, the IMF bemoans the lack of a 'clear division of labour' within the Troika and criticises Europe for its lack of experience and 'expertise' with regard to the Greek bailout, accompanied by very strict budgetary conditions and structural reforms. Does the Commission share this view?

4. All in all, does the Commission concede that it has not always made the right choices when confronted by the complicated, unprecedented situation that is the Greek crisis?

5. If wrong choices have been made, what are they?

6. The IMF has held its hands up on certain issues. What about the Commission?

7. When does the Commission intend to publish a report on the work with its partners?

Question for written answer E-006841/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Objectives of Greek stabilisation programme

The public altercation between the IMF and the Commission as to who is responsible for failure to achieve the targets of the Greek stabilisation programme, which has been applied since 2010 and has damaged the Greek economy, has been widely reported. Mr Roumeliotis, former representative of Greece to the IMF (and former PASOK minister), stated in a programme broadcast by the Greek television station Mega on 9 June 2013 that it was Greece's European partners which had been particularly strict in the application of the failed programme, which had insisted on the high interest rates imposed and which had failed to demonstrate solidarity and understanding of the problems of the Greek economy.

1. What is the Commission's stand on this, which directly calls the EU's ability and intention to really help Greece in question?

2. What corrective action will the Commission propose immediately, now that it is clear to even the most sceptical that the programme applied has been a failure?

Question for written answer E-006929/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: IMF admits mistakes concerning austerity measures in Greece

According to an article published in the UK newspaper *The Guardian*, the IMF recently admitted that it failed to realise the extent of the damage that austerity measures would cause in Greece and that the bailout included notable failures. Despite Greece remaining in the euro area, 'market confidence was not restored, the banking system lost 30% of its deposits and the economy encountered a much deeper than expected recession with exceptionally high unemployment'.

— Given that the IMF has admitted mistakes in the way it has handled Greece, what actions is the Commission prepared to take in order to rectify the damage done to Greece as a result of its austerity measures?

— Is the Commission prepared to take its own share of the responsibility in the case of Cyprus, and to reconsider the austerity policy that has been imposed on the country, by taking appropriate actions?

Question for written answer E-006981/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: The International Monetary Fund (IMF) admits to mistakes in gauging the impact of austerity policies III

In an interview on French radio last week, the chief economist at the International Monetary Fund (IMF), Olivier Blanchard, admitted that the IMF and Europe 'lost time' in bailing out Greece, and even said that the debt was unsustainable.

— As the Commission is one of the IMF's partners in the Troika, does it agree with the statements of the IMF's chief economist, according to which time was lost in bailing out Greece?

— Olivier Blanchard also claimed that an analysis done now would show that Greece did not meet three of the four main eligibility criteria for receiving financial assistance. Can the Commission confirm the notion that Greece did not meet the four main eligibility criteria for receiving financial assistance?

Joint answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2013)

Both President Barroso and the Commission Vice-President responsible for Economic and Monetary affairs have expressed their disagreement with some of the conclusions of the IMF evaluation.

On debt restructuring, the Commission considers that the report ignores the interconnected nature of the euro area Member States. Private sector debt restructuring in 2010 would have risked systemic contagion and severely undermined the programme, which was geared to ensuring that Greece remained in the euro area and to safeguarding financial stability.

The Commission has been a driving force behind the programme's strong focus on structural reforms which aim to restore sustainable economic growth. Today, the programme is on track and there are growing signs of stabilisation in Greece.

The Troika was set up on the initiative of the euro area Member States, many of which insisted on having the IMF on board. On the basis of this mandate, the Commission is now working together with the ECB and IMF in five countries. Our staff teams work very well together, often in the most challenging situations.

Now is the time for us to focus on helping these countries' governments to design and implement the reforms needed to lift growth and employment. As we take forward the debate on the future of our Economic and Monetary Union, we should certainly explore ways to optimise the governance of the euro area, including its crisis management mechanisms. That will be the right time and context to discuss whether and in what form to maintain the Troika model. In the meantime, it should be noted that the Commission publishes very detailed quarterly reports on the implementation of all economic adjustment programmes underway.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006799/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(12 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Fundo de resolução do setor bancário I

Considerando:

As novas regras em fase de decisão relativamente a um futuro fundo de resolução destinado a combater bancos em crise.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Qual o número estimado de contas bancárias de valor superior a 100 mil euros na Zona Euro?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006800/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(12 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Fundo de resolução do setor bancário II

Considerando:

As novas regras em fase de decisão relativamente a um futuro fundo de resolução destinado a combater bancos em crise.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Qual a diferença percentual e em número aproximado entre as contas de pessoas singulares e pessoas coletivas com valor superior a 100 000 euros?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006801/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(12 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Fundo de resolução do setor bancário III

Considerando:

As novas regras em fase de decisão relativamente a um futuro fundo de resolução destinado a combater bancos em crise.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tendo em conta o óbvio impacto para a solvabilidade de pessoas coletivas, resultante da apropriação de depósitos bancários acima de 100 000 euros, que mecanismos tem a Comissão previstos para evitar possíveis situações de insolvência?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006802/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(12 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Fundo de resolução do setor bancário IV

Considerando:

As novas regras em fase de decisão relativamente a um futuro fundo de resolução destinado a combater bancos em crise.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Como pretende prever as dificuldades imensas quando as situações de falência das empresas cujos depósitos acima de 100 000 euros sejam utilizados para capitalização de bancos em dificuldade?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006803/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(12 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Fundo de resolução do setor bancário V

Considerando:

As novas regras em fase de decisão relativamente a um futuro fundo de resolução destinado a combater bancos em crise,

Pergunto à Comissão:

Como pretende prever as consequências na redução das receitas para o Estado resultante do encerramento de empresas cujos depósitos acima de 100 000 euros sejam utilizados para capitalização de bancos em dificuldade?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006804/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(12 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Fundo de resolução do setor bancário VI

Considerando:

As novas regras em fase de decisão relativamente a um futuro fundo de resolução destinado a combater bancos em crise,

Pergunto à Comissão:

Como pretende prever as consequências no aumento do número de desempregados com o encerramento de empresas cujos depósitos acima de 100 000 euros sejam utilizados para capitalização de bancos em dificuldade?

Resposta conjunta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão

(5 de agosto de 2013)

De acordo com os dados de que dispõem os serviços da Comissão, o número previsto de contas bancárias acima do nível coberto pelos sistemas nacionais de garantia de depósitos (atualmente 100 000 EUR) era de cerca de 50,3 milhões na UE no final de 2007. Não dispomos de dados específicos para a área do euro. Os serviços da Comissão não dispõem de dados exatos relativos às contas com mais de 100 000 EUR detidas por pessoas singulares e pessoas coletivas. Segundo os dados publicados pelo BCE, a repartição dos depósitos por tipos de depositantes, em maio de 2013, era a seguinte: famílias 5,4 biliões de EUR, empresas não financeiras, incluindo PME 1,6 biliões de EUR, companhias de seguros e fundos de pensões 218 mil milhões de EUR, outras instituições financeiras 823 mil milhões de EUR, administrações públicas 313 mil milhões de EUR.

Uma vez que entre em vigor a Diretiva Recuperação e Resolução Bancárias, todos os Estados-Membros terão ao seu dispor os instrumentos necessários para intervir numa crise bancária, nomeadamente utilizando o instrumento de resgate interno, de modo a evitar a utilização de fundos públicos para apoiar os bancos em dificuldades. Esse instrumento dará às autoridades de resolução o poder de reduzir o valor contabilístico dos créditos de credores não garantidos de uma instituição em dificuldades e de converter os créditos em capitais próprios. Os depósitos inferiores a 100 000 EUR serão explicitamente excluídos do resgate interno e integralmente protegidos. O tratamento dos depósitos superiores a 100 000 EUR no âmbito do futuro enquadramento de resolução ainda está sujeito a negociações, mas o Parlamento, o Conselho e a Comissão estão de acordo em que pode ser necessário dar um tratamento especial a determinados depositantes, em especial às pessoas singulares e às PME.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006799/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Bank resolution fund I

New rules on a future resolution fund aimed at tackling ailing banks are at the decision-making stage.

What is the estimated number of bank accounts worth more than EUR 100 000 in the euro area?

Question for written answer E-006800/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Bank resolution fund II

New rules on a future resolution fund aimed at tackling ailing banks are at the decision-making stage.

What is the approximate difference in the percentage and number of accounts worth more than EUR 100 000 held by individuals and legal persons?

Question for written answer E-006801/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Bank resolution fund III

New rules on a future resolution fund aimed at tackling ailing banks are at the decision-making stage.

What mechanisms has the Commission put in place to prevent potential cases of insolvency, given the obvious impact of appropriating bank deposits above EUR 100 000 on legal persons' solvency?

Question for written answer E-006802/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Bank resolution fund IV

New rules on a future resolution fund aimed at tackling ailing banks are at the decision-making stage.

How will the Commission deal with the immense difficulties arising from the bankruptcy of companies whose deposits over EUR 100 000 are used to capitalise ailing banks?

Question for written answer E-006803/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Bank resolution fund V

New rules on a future resolution fund aimed at tackling ailing banks are at the decision-making stage.

How will the Commission deal with the effects of a reduction in state revenue due to the closure of companies whose deposits over EUR 100 000 are used to capitalise ailing banks?

Question for written answer E-006804/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Bank resolution fund VI

New rules on a future resolution fund aimed at tackling ailing banks are at the decision-making stage.

How will the Commission deal with the effects of increased unemployment due to the closure of companies whose deposits over EUR 100 000 are used to capitalise ailing banks?

Joint answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

According to data available to the Commission Services, the estimated number of bank accounts above the level covered by the national deposit guarantee schemes (currently EUR 100 000) was about 50.3 million in the EU as of end-2007. We do not have specific data for the euro area. The Commission Services do not have any exact figures as regards accounts with more than EUR 100 000 held by individuals and legal persons. According to data published by the ECB, the breakdown of deposits by classes of depositors as of May 2013 was as follows: households EUR 5.4 trillion, non-financial companies, including SMEs EUR 1.6 trillion, insurance companies and pension funds EUR 218 billion, other financial institutions EUR 823 billion, general government EUR 313 billion.

Once the directive on Bank Recovery and Resolution (BRR) is in place, all Member States will have the necessary tools to intervene in a banking crisis, including using the bail-in tool, in order to prevent the use of public money to support ailing banks. The tool will give resolution authorities the power to write down the claims of unsecured creditors of a failing institution and to convert debt claims to equity. Deposits below EUR 100 000 will be explicitly excluded from bail-in and fully protected. The treatment of deposits above EUR 100 000 within the future resolution framework is still subject to negotiations, but the Parliament, the Council, and the Commission agree that special consideration may need to be given to certain depositors, in particular physical persons and SMEs.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-006920/13
til Kommissionen
Søren Bo Søndergaard (GUE/NGL)
(14. juni 2013)

Om: Lukningen af ERT i Grækenland

Den græske regering har uden varsel lukket den græske public service-kanal, ERT. Dermed har den åbenlyst krænket borgernes grundlæggende rettigheder, herunder både den materielle og reelle ret til informationsfrihed, som public service bidrager til i alle demokratiske lande (jævnfør paragraf 10 om ytrings- og informationsfrihed i Den Europæiske Menneskerettighedskonvention). Hvad har Kommissionen tænkt sig at gøre for at sikre de grundlæggende rettigheder, som er blevet krænket?

Kommissionen bedes fuldstændig afkræfte, at den græske regerings lukning af landets public service kanaler (og fyring af de over 2500 ansatte), har noget som helst at gøre med den seneste aftale mellem Trojkaen og Grækenland, som bl.a. indbefattede et krav til Grækenland om at fyre 15 000 offentligt ansatte? Samtidig bedes Kommissionen bekræfte, at den græske regering taler usandt, når den påstår noget andet.

Samlet svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Olli Rehn
(2. august 2013)

Kommissionen henviser det ærede medlem til sin udtalelse om lukningen af Hellenic Broadcasting Corporation (ERT), som blev offentliggjort den 12. juni 2013 ([1]). De græske myndigheders beslutning om at lukke ERT var en fuldt ud selvstændig beslutning. Kommissionen har ikke tilstræbt lukningen af ERT, men Kommissionen sætter heller ikke spørgsmålstegn ved den græske regerings mandat til at forvalte den offentlige sektor. De græske myndigheders beslutning bør vurderes ud fra konteksten af de omfattende og nødvendige foranstaltninger, som de græske myndigheder træffer med henblik på at modernisere den græske økonomi. Disse foranstaltninger omfatter bl.a. en effektivisering af den offentlige sektor.

Traktaten slår fast, at forvaltningen af public service radio- og tv-virksomhed og de strategiske beslutninger, der træffes i forbindelse hermed, ligger hos medlemsstaterne. Kommissionen kan ikke foreskrive medlemsstaterne, hvordan de skal organisere deres public service radio- og tv-virksomhed, men understreger vigtigheden af et dobbelt system med offentlige og private tjenester med henblik på at fremme europæiske værdier under alle økonomiske forhold. Kommissionen bifalder den græske regerings tilsagn om at skabe en medieaktør, der kan udfylde denne vigtige rolle som offentlig radio- og tv-virksomhed, og som er økonomisk bæredygtig.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-545_da.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006955/13
an die Kommission
Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE)
(14. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Abschaltung des staatlichen Rundfunks in Griechenland

Unlängst wurde in Griechenland ein Gesetz veröffentlicht, mit dem die Vermögenswerte eines öffentlichen Unternehmens an die öffentliche Hand zurückfließen sollten. Im Anschluss an den Ministerialerlass, der gemeinsam unterzeichnet wurde, sollte der Betrieb von vier Fernsehkanälen, sieben nationalen Rundfunksendern, weiteren 19 regionalen Radiosendern und einer staatlich geführten Webseite unterbrochen werden.

Kann die Kommission ihre Absichten in Bezug auf die beiden oben genannten Vorschläge verdeutlichen, besonders folgende Aspekte:

1. Hält die Kommission die Entscheidung, den öffentlichen Rundfunk in Griechenland vollkommen abzustellen, für vereinbar mit dem Grundsatz des öffentlichen Guts und dem Grundsatz pluralistischer und objektiver Medien? Unterstützt die Kommission diese Entscheidung?

2. Stellt diese Entscheidung für die Troika eine Notwendigkeit dar? Gehört diese Entscheidung zu den verbindlichen Maßnahmen, die von Griechenland im Rahmen des Programms zur Haushaltskonsolidierung verlangt werden (auch wenn der staatliche Rundfunk ERT nicht in die Zuständigkeit des Haushalts des griechischen Staates fällt)?

3. Stimmt die Kommission als Mitglied der Troika dieser Entscheidung zu? Falls ja, könnte dies zu einem Präzedenzfall für andere Länder werden, die ebenfalls ein Programm zur Haushaltskonsolidierung absolvieren müssen?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006986/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Sparpolitik Griechenlands

Ohne Vorankündigung oder Vorwarnung hat die griechische Regierung am 11.6.2013 den staatlichen Rundfunk abgestellt. Die Regierung ist zwar zu striktesten Sparmaßnahmen angehalten, es stellt sich jedoch die Frage, ob dies alle Vorgehensweisen rechtfertigt.

1. Wie bewertet die Kommission den Umgang der griechischen Regierung mit den zahlreichen Mitarbeitern, die ohne Vorwarnung „von heute auf morgen“ entlassen wurden?

2. Ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass gerade im Medienbereich, der doch wesentlich zur öffentlichen Information und Meinungsbildung beiträgt, eine vollkommene Aussetzung vertretbar ist?

3. Wie bewertet die Kommission die Befürchtung, dass ein solcher Schritt weitere soziale Unruhen im Land hervorrufen kann — schließlich können die Bürgerinnen und Bürger Griechenlands geneigt sein, der Regierung nun vollkommene Willkür zu unterstellen?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission

(2. August 2013)

Die Kommission verweist die Abgeordneten auf ihre Stellungnahme vom 12. Juni 2013 zur Schließung der staatlichen griechischen Rundfunkanstalt ([1]). Die griechischen Behörden haben die Schließung der staatlichen griechischen Rundfunkanstalt (ERT) vollkommen eigenständig getroffen. Der Kommission war nicht an der Schließung von ERT gelegen, aber ebenso wenig möchte die Kommission die Zuständigkeit der griechischen Regierung für die Verwaltung des öffentlichen Sektors infrage stellen. Die Entscheidung der griechischen Behörden ist vor dem Hintergrund der wichtigen und notwendigen Anstrengungen der Behörden zur Modernisierung der griechischen Wirtschaft zu sehen. Dazu gehört die Verbesserung der Effizienz und Wirksamkeit des öffentlichen Sektors.

Im Vertrag wird klargestellt, dass die Governance und strategischen Entscheidungen über den öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunk in die Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten fallen. Die Kommission kann den Mitgliedstaaten zwar nicht vorschreiben, wie sie ihre jeweiligen öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunkanstalten zu organisieren haben, betont jedoch unabhängig von den wirtschaftlichen Rahmenbedingungen die Rolle des dualen Systems mit öffentlichen und kommerziellen Diensten zur Förderung europäischer Werte. Die Kommission begrüßt die Zusicherung der griechischen Regierung, eine Medienstelle einzurichten, die die wichtige Aufgabe des öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunks wahrnimmt und finanziell tragfähig ist.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-545_de.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006815/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D), Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Spyros Danellis (S&D) και Anni Podimata (S&D)
(12 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Αναστολή λειτουργίας κρατικής ραδιοφωνίας και τηλεόρασης

Δημοσιεύτηκε σήμερα Πράξη Νομοθετικού Περιεχομένου με βάση την οποία τα περιουσιακά στοιχεία μιας δημόσιας επιχείρησης που καταργείται περιέρχονται στο δημόσιο. Παράλληλα υπογράφτηκε Κοινή Υπουργική Απόφαση (ΚΥΑ) με την οποία αναστέλλεται η λειτουργία 4 τηλεοπτικών καναλιών, 7 ραδιοφωνικών σταθμών πανελλαδικής εμβέλειας, 19 περιφερειακών ραδιοφωνικών σταθμών και ενός ιστότοπου της κρατικής ραδιοφωνίας και τηλεόρασης.

Ερωτάται επομένως η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

Θεωρεί συμβατή με την προάσπιση του δημόσιου αγαθού της αντικειμενικής και πλουραλιστικής ενημέρωσης την πλήρη κατάργηση του δημόσιου ραδιοτηλεοπτικού φορέα;

Είναι επιβεβλημένη από την Τρόικα η απόφαση αυτή; Συμπεριλαμβάνεται στις υποχρεώσεις της χώρας στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος δημοσιονομικής εξυγίανσης (αν και είναι γνωστό ότι η ΕΡΤ δεν επιβαρύνει τον κρατικό προϋπολογισμό);

Είναι σύμφωνη η Επιτροπή (ως μέλος της Τρόικα) με την απόφαση αυτή και, αν ναι, μπορεί να αποτελέσει προηγούμενο για άλλα κράτη που βρίσκονται σε πρόγραμμα;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006826/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Sylvana Rapti (S&D), Spyros Danellis (S&D), Dimitrios Droutsas (S&D), Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D), Chrysoula Paliadeli (S&D), Anni Podimata (S&D), Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D) και Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(12 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ανάμειξη της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής στο κλείσιμο του ελληνικού Εθνικού Ιδρύματος Ραδιοτηλεόρασης

Σήμερα το απόγευμα η Ελληνική κυβέρνηση έκλεισε αιφνιδιαστικά το Εθνικό ίδρυμα Ραδιοτηλεόρασης (ΕΡΤ) το οποίο απασχολεί ένα σημαντικό αριθμό εργαζομένων. Οι εργαζόμενοι πληροφορήθηκαν, χωρίς καμία προηγούμενη ενημέρωση ότι θα μείνουν άνεργοι μέσα στις επόμενες ώρες.

Ο κυβερνητικός εκπρόσωπος ισχυρίστηκε ότι η απόφαση αυτή αποτελεί μέρος των υποχρεώσεων της Ελλάδας που απορρέουν από το πρόγραμμα οικονομικής προσαρμογής για τη χώρα και, συγκεκριμένα, ως επιταγή της τρόικας (Διεθνές Νομισματικό Ταμείο, Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα, Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή) για την εξασφάλιση της επόμενης δόσης, στο πλαίσιο της οικονομικής βοήθειας που παρέχεται στη χώρα.

Δεδομένου ότι:

— Η Χάρτα Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της ΕΕ προβλέπει στο άρθρο 11 «το σεβασμό και την πολυφωνία των μέσων μαζικής ενημέρωσης» και, στο άρθρο 27, πως «εξασφαλίζεται στους εργαζομένους ή τους εκπροσώπους τους, στα ενδεδειγμένα επίπεδα, εγκαίρως ενημέρωση και διαβούλευση»

— Η Συνθήκη για τη λειτουργία της ΕΕ προβλέπει στο άρθρο 147 την «επίτευξη υψηλού επιπέδου απασχόλησης η οποία πρέπει να λαμβάνεται υπόψη κατά τη χάραξη και την εφαρμογή των πολιτικών της ΕΕ»

Ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

1. Η παραπάνω απόφαση της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης ήταν σε γνώση της;

2. Πρόκειται πράγματι για απαίτηση της τρόικας στο πλαίσιο του σταθεροποιητικού προγράμματος για την Ελλάδα και προκειμένου να εκταμιευτεί η επόμενη δόση της οικονομικής βοήθειας προς τη χώρα; Και επιβεβαιώνει τη συμφωνία της με αυτήν ως μέλος της τρόικας;

3. με την απόφαση αυτή και τον τρόπο εφαρμογής της γίνονται σεβαστές οι παραπάνω αρχές των Συνθηκών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, θεματοφύλακας των οποίων είναι η ίδια (η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή);

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006924/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(14 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Το κλείσιμο της Δημόσιας Ραδιοτηλεόρασης (ΕΡΤ) στην Ελλάδα

Το ξαφνικό κλείσιμο της Δημόσιας Ραδιοτηλεόρασης (ΕΡΤ) στην Ελλάδα προκαλεί θλίψη και οργή όχι μόνο γιατί αποτελεί πλήγμα στη πολυφωνία μιας δημοκρατίας αλλά κυρίως γιατί επιβλήθηκε με τρόπο βίαιο και άκρατα αντικοινωνικό. Η εξυγίανση του ημιδημόσιου και δημόσιου τομέα πρέπει να επιδιώκεται μέσα από διάλογο, ώστε να διασφαλίζεται η κοινωνική συνοχή και να μην απειλούνται τα δικαιώματα των εργαζομένων.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς γίνεται να δηλώνει ο επίτροπος Οικονομικών και Νομισματικών Θεμάτων, κύριος Όλι Ρεν, ότι η Επιτροπή *δεν ζήτησε το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ στο πλαίσιο των περικοπών*, όταν γνωρίζουμε ότι απολύσεις, περικοπές και η γενικότερη αναδιοργάνωση του κρατικού καναλιού, αποτελούσαν επιταγές των δανειστών βάσει του Μνημονίου;

2. Τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει η Επιτροπή, μέσω της Τρόικας, για το σύνολο των απολυμένων εργαζομένων σε μια χρονική συγκυρία κατά την οποία η ανεργία στην Ελλάδα αγγίζει το 27% και το 12,2% στην Ευρωζώνη; Εκτός από τις επιταγές για απολύσεις και μείωση του ανθρωπίνου δυναμικού, προβλέπονται ουσιαστικά μέτρα προστασίας των δικαιωμάτων των εργαζομένων;

3. Δεν αποτελεί αντίφαση ως προς το περιεχόμενο των θέσεων της ΕΕ, το γεγονός ότι, την ίδια στιγμή που διαμηνύει την έναρξη εντατικών προσπαθειών για την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας στις χώρες που υποφέρουν από την κρίση, προωθεί εκβιαστικές πολιτικές ισοπέδωσης του δικαιώματος προς εργασία;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(2 Αυγούστου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στην δήλωσή της για το κλείσιμο της Ελληνικής Ραδιοφωνίας Τηλεόρασης (ΕΡΤ) που δημοσιεύτηκε στις 12 Ιουνίου 2013 ([1]). Η απόφαση των ελληνικών αρχών να κλείσουν την ΕΡΤ ελήφθη με πλήρη αυτονομία. Η Επιτροπή δεν ζήτησε το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ, αλλά ούτε αμφισβητεί το δικαίωμα της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης να διαχειρίζεται τον δημόσιο τομέα. Η απόφαση των ελληνικών αρχών πρέπει εξεταστεί στο πλαίσιο των μεγάλων και αναγκαίων προσπαθειών που καταβάλλουν για τον εκσυγχρονισμό της ελληνικής οικονομίας. Στις εν λόγω προσπάθειες συγκαταλέγεται η βελτίωση της αποδοτικότητας και της αποτελεσματικότητας του δημόσιου τομέα της.

Η Συνθήκη καθιστά σαφές ότι η διακυβέρνηση και οι στρατηγικές επιλογές για τη δημόσια ραδιοτηλεόραση επαφίενται στα κράτη μέλη. Παρόλο που η Επιτροπή δεν μπορεί να επιβάλει στα κράτη μέλη τον τρόπο με τον οποίο θα οργανώσουν τον δημόσιο ραδιοτηλεοπτικό φορέα τους, υπογραμμίζει τον ρόλο που διαδραματίζει ένα διττό σύστημα δημόσιας και εμπορικής υπηρεσίας στην προαγωγή των ευρωπαϊκών αξιών υπό όλες τις οικονομικές περιστάσεις. Η Επιτροπή χαιρετίζει τη δέσμευση της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης να θέσει σε λειτουργία έναν φορέα ενημέρωσης που να εκπληρώνει τον σημαντικό ρόλο της δημόσιας ραδιοτηλεόρασης και να είναι οικονομικά βιώσιμος.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-545_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007171/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: La Grèce ferme sa télévision publique

La Grèce a annoncé hier l'une des mesures les plus drastiques jusqu'à présent en vue de consolider ses finances publiques en faillite et de respecter les conditions d'un renflouement international.

Les chaînes de télévision de l'ERT ont cessé d'émettre mardi à minuit et environ 2 600 membres du personnel sont au chômage technique avant la relance d'une autre société avec moins d'effectifs. Cette situation a déclenché une tempête de protestations des syndicats et même des partenaires de second rang dans la coalition au pouvoir. Certaines chaînes auraient même fermé avant cette date.

L'existence des médias du service public et leur indépendance vis-à-vis du gouvernement se trouvent au centre des sociétés démocratiques et tout changement profond du système médiatique public ne devrait donc être accepté qu'après un débat démocratique ouvert et complet au parlement, et non grâce à un simple accord entre deux ministres du gouvernement.

Il faut certes reconnaître la nécessité de réaliser des économies budgétaires, les sociétés de radiotélévision sont plus importantes que jamais en période de difficultés nationales. Cela ne signifie pas que l'ERT doit être géré moins efficacement qu'une entreprise privée.

Comment réagit la Commission face à cette fermeture?

Ne s'agit-il pas d'un très mauvais signal pour la population, pour le monde journalistique ainsi que pour la démocratie?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Rehn au nom de la Commission
(2 août 2013)

La Commission renvoie l'Honorable Parlementaire à sa déclaration sur la fermeture de la radio-télévision publique grecque (ERT), publiée le 12 juin 2013 ([1]). Les autorités helléniques ont décidé de manière complètement autonome de fermer l'ERT. La Commission n'a pas demandé la fermeture de l'ERT; cependant, elle ne remet pas en question le pouvoir de gestion dont dispose le gouvernement grec dans le secteur public. Il convient de considérer la décision des autorités grecques au regard des efforts importants et nécessaires que celles-ci consentent pour moderniser l'économie nationale et, notamment, pour rendre le secteur public moins coûteux et plus performant.

Le traité établit clairement que la gestion des services publics de radio— et de télédiffusion et les choix stratégiques qui s'y rapportent relèvent de la compétence des États membres. Par conséquent, bien que la Commission ne puisse dicter aux États membres la manière d'organiser leurs services publics de radio et de télévision, elle aimerait souligner le rôle d'un double système de radiodiffuseurs publics et privés, quelle que soit la situation économique du pays, dans la promotion des valeurs européennes. La Commission se réjouit dès lors que le gouvernement grec veuille mettre en place, dans le secteur des médias, une structure économiquement viable et apte à remplir l'importante mission de service public qui lui incombe.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-545_fr.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007241/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(19 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Chiusura della TV di Stato in Grecia

Il 17 giugno il Consiglio di Stato ha sospeso la chiusura dei 5 canali e 29 radio di ERT (televisione e radio pubblica) e il relativo licenziamento di circa 2800 dipendenti.

Occorre tenere presente che l'Unione europea dovrebbe sostenere il ruolo delle emittenti pubbliche come elemento fondamentale della democrazia europea, soggetti importanti per il pluralismo e la libertà dei media.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. La possibilità della chiusura è stata imposta dalla Troika e, se sì, in base a quali condizioni?

2. Sono state rispettate le disposizioni della direttiva 98/59/CE in materia di licenziamenti collettivi, in particolare l'articolo 2?

3. Sono state rispettate le previsioni della direttiva 94/45/CE, modificata dalla direttiva 2009/38/CE e della direttiva 2002/14/CE relativa alla procedura d'informazione e di consultazione dei lavoratori?

4. Tale decisione non costituisce una violazione della libertà e del diritto di informazione e del rispetto del pluralismo dei media, come sanciti dall'articolo 11 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea?

Risposta congiunta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione
(2 agosto 2013)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla sua dichiarazione sulla chiusura dell'Hellenic Broadcasting Corporation (ERT) pubblicata il 12 giugno 2013 ([1]). La decisione di chiudere la ERT è stata presa dalle autorità greche in piena autonomia. La Commissione, che pure non ha richiesto la chiusura dell'ERT, non mette in discussione il mandato del governo greco di gestire il settore pubblico. La decisione delle autorità greche va inquadrata nel contesto dei grandi e necessari sforzi che stanno compiendo per modernizzare l'economia greca, in particolare per migliorare l'efficienza e l'efficacia del settore pubblico.

Il trattato stabilisce chiaramente che la governance e le scelte strategiche sul servizio pubblico di radiotelevisione sono di competenza degli Stati membri. Sebbene non possa prescrivere agli Stati membri come organizzare la loro emittente pubblica, la Commissione sottolinea il ruolo di un sistema duale di servizio pubblico e commerciale per la promozione dei valori europei in tutte le circostanze economiche. La Commissione accoglie con favore l'impegno del governo greco a lanciare un operatore di media che assolva il ruolo importante del servizio pubblico radiotelevisivo e sia finanziariamente sostenibile.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-545_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007274/13
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Encerramento do canal ERT

Na noite de 11 de junho de 2013, o governo grego adotou um ato legislativo que levou ao encerramento, à meia-noite do mesmo dia, da empresa pública grega de rádio e televisão, a ERT, deixando sem emprego 2 560 trabalhadores. Esta decisão constitui um sério ataque ao direito de informação do povo grego e às suas liberdades, visando claramente entregar a informação, os direitos de emissão e toda a infraestrutura da empresa pública aos grupos económicos.

Numa inadmissível demonstração de força, o governo mobilizou a polícia de intervenção para interromper a emissão da televisão e da rádio que estava a ser mantida pelos trabalhadores, o que constituiu um ato sem precedentes de censura relativamente a uma emissão que procurava informar a população dos desenvolvimentos do processo de encerramento. É iminente o risco de o governo encerrar outras instituições e organizações públicas estratégicas, atirando para o desemprego milhares de trabalhadores num dos países onde o número de desempregados não cessa de aumentar.

A Comissão Europeia e o Conselho não se podem esconder por detrás da troika nesta como noutras decisões que violam os direitos dos trabalhadores e do povo grego. O FMI — do qual todos os países da UE são membros —, a Comissão Europeia e o Banco Central Europeu são a troika.

1. Qual a razão justificativa para não considerar a decisão de encerrar a ERT uma violação dos direitos humanos e dos princípios democráticos? E por que motivo, neste como em outros casos, pretende dar cobertura aos interesses dos grupos económicos que querem abocanhar esta empresa pública, a sua infraestrutura e património histórico?

2. Pretende apoiar ou impor este mesmo tipo de procedimento e de medida noutros países em relação a empresas públicas de rádio e televisão ou em relação a outras empresas públicas? Faz parte de algum «memorando de entendimento» que tenha negociado, no quadro das troikas em que participa, o encerramento de serviços públicos de informação e comunicação?

Resposta conjunta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(2 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a sua declaração sobre o encerramento da radiotelevisão grega (ERT), publicada em 12 de junho de 2013 [1]. A decisão das autoridades gregas de encerrar a ERT foi tomada de modo plenamente autónomo. A Comissão não procurou o encerramento da ERT, mas também não põe em causa o mandato do Governo grego para gerir o setor público. A decisão das autoridades gregas deve ser analisada no contexto dos grandes esforços necessários que estão a envidar para modernizar a economia grega. Essas medidas preconizam o aumento da eficiência e eficácia do seu setor público.

O Tratado torna claro que a governação e as escolhas estratégicas sobre o serviço público de radiodifusão são da competência dos Estados-Membros. Apesar de não lhes poder ditar o modo de organizar o seu serviço público de radiodifusão, a Comissão chama a atenção para o papel que um sistema dual de serviços públicos e comerciais pode ter na promoção dos valores europeus em todas as circunstâncias económicas. A Comissão acolhe com agrado o empenho do Governo grego em lançar um meio de comunicação social que satisfaça o importante papel de serviço público de radiodifusão e seja financeiramente sustentável.

---

(1) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-545_en.htm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006912/13
adresată Comisiei
Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D)
(13 iunie 2013)

Subiect: Rolul televiziunilor și al radiourilor publice în UE

Săptămâna aceasta, guvernul Greciei a anunțat închiderea televiziunilor și a radiourilor publice ca măsură de reducere a cheltuielilor publice, impusă de „troika". Atragem atenția că rolul televiziunilor și al radiourilor publice este extrem de important într-un stat democratic, întrucât aceste instituții sunt obligate să prezinte, în mod obiectiv și echidistant, diversitatea opiniilor existente într-un stat democratic, precum și să asigure o reprezentare echilibrată a tuturor forțelor democratice și a tuturor segmentelor unei societăți democratice.

Având în vedere importanța libertății de exprimare și a mass-mediei, în special a instituțiilor publice din domeniul mass-media, pentru apărarea democrației în orice stat, aș dori să întreb Comisia ce măsuri are în vedere pentru a determina și sprijini Grecia să asigure funcționarea a cel puțin unei televiziuni și a unui radio public?

Răspuns comun dat de dl Rehn în numele Comisiei
(2 august 2013)

Comisia ar dori să aducă în atenția distinsului membru declarația sa privind închiderea societății elene de radiodifuziune (ERT), publicată la 12 iunie 2013 ([1]). Decizia luată de către autoritățile elene de a închide ERT a fost luată în deplină autonomie. Comisia nu a solicitat închiderea ERT, însă nici nu pune sub semnul întrebării competența guvernului elen de a gestiona sectorul public. Decizia autorităților elene ar trebui să fie privită în contextul eforturilor majore și necesare pe care acestea le întreprind pentru a moderniza economia elenă. Printre aceste eforturi se numără îmbunătățirea eficienței și a eficacității sectorului public din Grecia.

Tratatul precizează în mod clar că guvernanța serviciilor publice de radiodifuziune și alegerile strategice în această privință țin de competența statelor membre. Deși Comisia nu poate impune statelor membre modul în care să își organizeze societățile publice de radiodifuziune, ea subliniază rolul pe care îl joacă un sistem dual de servicii publice și comerciale, indiferent de circumstanțele economice, în promovarea valorilor europene. Comisia salută angajamentul guvernului elen de a institui un organism mass-media care să îndeplinească rolul important al radiodifuziunii publice și să fie viabil din punct de vedere financiar.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-545_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006815/13
to the Commission
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D), Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Spyros Danellis (S&D) and Anni Podimata (S&D)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Greek State radio and TV pulled off the air

Under a legislative act published today, the assets of a public company which is wound down are transferred to the State. At the same time, a joint ministerial decision was signed taking off the air four television channels and seven radio stations broadcasting throughout Greece, 19 regional radio stations and a government radio and television broadcasting website.

In view of this:

Does the Commission consider the full closure of a public broadcasting body compatible with the defence of objective and pluralistic public media?

Was this decision imposed by the Troika? Was it included among Greece's obligations under the economic rationalisation programme (despite the fact that the ERT broadcasting company is not a burden on the State budget)?

Does the Commission (as a member of the Troika) endorse this decision and, if so, could this be a precedent for other countries included in the programme?

Question for written answer E-006826/13
to the Commission
Sylvana Rapti (S&D), Spyros Danellis (S&D), Dimitrios Droutsas (S&D), Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D), Chrysoula Paliadeli (S&D), Anni Podimata (S&D), Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D) and Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: European Commission involvement in closure of Greek National Radio and Television Foundation

This afternoon, the Greek Government suddenly closed the National Radio and Television Foundation (ERT), which employs a large number of people. The staff was told, without any prior notice, that they would be unemployed within a few hours.

The government spokesman maintained that this decision formed part of Greece's obligations under the economic adjustment programme for Greece, as a condition imposed by the Troika (International Monetary Fund, European Central Bank and European Commission) for the next tranche of financial support for the country.

In view of the fact that:

— the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union makes provision in Article 11 for 'freedom and pluralism of the media' and states in Article 27 that 'workers or their representatives must, at the appropriate levels, be guaranteed information and consultation in good time' and

— the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union makes provision in Article 147 for 'a high level of employment'.

Will the Commission say:

1. Was it aware of the above decision by the Greek government?

2. Is this really a precondition imposed by the Troika, within the framework of the stabilisation programme for Greece, to disbursement of the next tranche of financial support for Greece? Does it confirm that it is in agreement with this as a member of the Troika?

3. Does this decision and the way in which it is being applied respect the above principles of the EU Treaty, of which the European Commission itself is the guardian?

Question for written answer E-006912/13
to the Commission
Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Role of public television and radio services in the EU

The Greek Government announced this week that it was shutting down public television and radio services as a means of cutting public expenditure, a measure imposed by the 'troika'. We should point out that the role of public television and radio services is of paramount importance in a democratic state as these institutions have a duty to present, in an objective, neutral manner, the diverse opinions there are in a democratic state, as well as to ensure that all democratic forces and every section of a democratic society are fairly represented.

Given the importance of the freedom of expression and of the media, and particularly of the public media institutions in defending democracy in any state, I would like to ask the Commission what measures it envisages taking with the aim of getting and helping Greece to guarantee that it has at least one public television and one public radio service operating.

Question for written answer E-006920/13
to the Commission
Søren Bo Søndergaard (GUE/NGL)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Closure of ERT in Greece

The Greek Government has closed down the Greek public service broadcaster ERT without any warning. In so doing it has openly violated the fundamental rights of citizens, including the material and substantive freedom of speech, to which public service broadcasting contributes in all democratic countries (cf. European Convention on Human Rights, Article 10 on freedom of expression and information). What does the Commission propose to do to secure the fundamental rights that have been violated?

Will the Commission issue a full denial that the Greek Government's closure of the country's public service channels (and dismissal of more than 2 500 employees) has anything at all to do with the recent agreement between the Troika and Greece, which included an obligation for Greece to dismiss 15 000 public employees? Will the Commission also confirm that the Greek government's assertions to the contrary are untrue?

Question for written answer E-006924/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: The closure of ERT, the Greek State broadcaster

The sudden closure of ERT, the Greek State broadcaster, has caused distress and anger not only because it is a blow to pluralism in a democracy but, more importantly, because it was imposed by force in complete defiance of the people's wishes. The consolidation of the semi-public and public sectors should be achieved through dialogue so as to preserve social cohesion and avoid threatening workers' rights.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. How can Olli Rehn, Commissioner for Economic and Monetary Affairs, declare that the Commission *did not seek the closure of ERT as part of the cuts*, when we know that layoffs, cuts and the general reorganisation of the State broadcaster were dictated by the creditors on the basis of the Memorandum?

2. What steps does the Commission intend to take, through the troika, to help all the workers who have been made redundant at a time when unemployment in Greece is running at 27% and 12.2% in the eurozone? Apart from the demands for layoffs and a reduction in the workforce, has any provision been made for substantive measures to protect the rights of workers?

3. Does it not agree that the positions adopted by the EU are contradictory, given that at the same time as it is signalling the beginning of intensive measures to combat unemployment in the countries suffering from the crisis, it is promoting coercive policies to destroy the right to work?

Question for written answer E-006955/13
to the Commission
Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Abolition of public radio and television in Greece

A legislative act was very recently published in Greece which would see the assets of a public company being returned to the public. Following the ministerial decision which was jointly signed (DM), the operations of four television channels would be suspended, as well as seven national radio stations, a further 19 regional radio stations, and a state-run broadcasting website.

Could the Commission clarify its intentions with regard to the two abovementioned proposals, and more specifically, answer the following:

1. Does the Commission deem the decision to completely abolish public service broadcasting in Greece to be in accordance with the principle of public good and the principle of pluralist and objective media? Does the Commission support this decision?

2. Is this decision an imperative for the Troika? Is this decision one of the mandatory measures required of Greece under the programme for budgetary reconsolidation (even though the public service broadcaster (ERT) does not fall within the remit of the budget of the Greek State)?

3. Does the Commission, as a member of the Troika, agree with this decision? If so, could it set a precedent for other countries with are also subject to a programme for budgetary reconsolidation?

Question for written answer E-006986/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Austerity in Greece

On 11 June 2013, the Greek Government shut down the state broadcaster without any prior warning. The government is currently required to implement the strictest of austerity measures, but this act raises the question as to whether the current situation can be used to justify all courses of action.

1. What is the Commission's view of the way in which the Greek Government dismissed a large number of employees overnight and without warning?

2. Does the Commission believe that the total shutdown of such a media outlet is justifiable, particularly given the substantial contribution made by the sector to public information and the shaping of public opinion?

3. What is the Commission's view of the concerns expressed that such action could result in further social unrest, and that the Greek people could be led to believe that their government is now capable of committing all sorts of arbitrary acts?

Question for written answer E-007171/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Greece shuts down its state broadcasting company

Yesterday Greece announced one of the most drastic measures yet in its struggle to shore up its bankrupt state finances and meet the terms of an international bailout.

ERT's channels were taken off the air at midnight on Tuesday and some 2 600 employees were laid off until the company can be relaunched in a slimmed-down form, setting off a firestorm of protests from trade unions and even junior partners in the ruling coalition. Some of the channels appeared to shut down even before the deadline.

The existence of public service media and their independence from government lie at the heart of democratic societies, and therefore any far-reaching changes to the public media system should only be decided after an open and inclusive democratic debate in parliament — and not through a simple agreement between two government ministers.

There is of course no denying the need to make budgetary savings, but national broadcasters are more important than ever at times of national difficulty. This is not to say that ERT need be managed less efficiently than a private company.

What is the Commission's response to this shut-down?

Does it not send out entirely the wrong message to the general public and to journalists, and is it not a very bad sign for democracy?

Question for written answer E-007241/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Closure of Greek state TV

On 17 June 2013 Greece's highest administrative court, the Council of State, stopped the shut-down of the 5 television channels and 29 radio stations operated by ERT (the Greek public service radio and television broadcaster) and the consequent dismissal of roughly 2 800 employees.

The EU is called upon to support the role of public broadcasters as a cornerstone of European democracy and key factors in media pluralism and freedom.

1. Was the closure dictated by the Troika? If so, on what terms?

2. Has Directive 98/59/EC on collective redundancies been complied with, especially where Article 2 is concerned?

3. Have the necessary steps been taken to comply with Directive 94/45/EC, as amended by Directive 2009/38/EC and Directive 2002/14/EC, on the procedure for informing and consulting employees?

4. Does not the decision in question violate the right to freedom of information and respectfor media pluralism, as laid down in Article 11 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights?

Question for written answer E-007274/13
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Closure of the ERT channel

On the evening of 11 June 2013, the Greek Government adopted legislation that, with effect from midnight that same day, closed the Greek public broadcaster ERT, leaving 2 560 employees without jobs. This decision constitutes a serious attack on the Greek people's right to information and on their freedoms. It is clearly intended to hand control of the information, the broadcasting rights and the entire infrastructure of this state-owned company over to big business.

In an unacceptable show of force, the government sent in police to halt the television and radio broadcasts that employees were continuing to make. This constitutes an unprecedented act of censorship of a broadcast that sought to inform the population of developments in the planned closure. There is an imminent risk that the government will shut down other strategic state-owned institutions and organisations, thereby making thousands of employees redundant in a country in which the number of unemployed does not stop rising.

The Commission and the Council cannot hide behind the Troika regarding this decision, as with others that violate the rights of workers and the Greek people. The Troika is made up of the Commission, the IMF — of which all Member States are members — and the European Central Bank.

1. What is the justification for not considering the decision to close ERT as a violation of human rights and democratic principles? Why is the Commission, in this and in other cases, seeking to cover for the interests of big business, which wants to absorb this state-owned company, its infrastructure and historical heritage?

2. Does the Commission intend to support or impose the same type of measures in other countries with regard to state-owned broadcasters or other state-owned companies? Is shutting down state-owned information and communication services an element of some 'memorandum of understanding' that it has negotiated as part of the Troikas in which it participates?

Joint answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(2 August 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its statement on the closure of the Hellenic Broadcasting Corporation (ERT) published on 12 June 2013 ([1]). The decision by the Greek authorities to close down the ERT was taken in full autonomy. The Commission has not sought the closure of ERT, but nor does the Commission question the Greek Government's mandate to manage the public sector. The decision of the Greek authorities should be seen in the context of the major and necessary efforts that the authorities are taking to modernise the Greek economy. Those include improving the efficiency and effectiveness of its public sector.

The Treaty makes it clear that the governance and strategic choices on public service broadcasting lie with Member States. While the Commission cannot prescribe Member States how to organise their public service broadcaster, the Commission highlights the role of a dual system of public and commercial service in promoting European values in all economic circumstances. The Commission welcomes the commitment of the Greek Government to launch a media actor that fulfils the important role of public broadcasting and is financially sustainable.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-545_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006821/13
alla Commissione
Carlo Fidanza (PPE)
(12 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Abolizione del regime dei visti tra UE e Russia

Il XXXI vertice Russia — UE, svoltosi nella città di Ekaterinburg il 3 e il 4 giugno 2013, ha visto una sostanziale convergenza dell'Unione sull'iniziativa USA — Russia «Ginevra II» sulla questione siriana, ma non ha fatto registrare passi in avanti significativi sull'abolizione del regime dei visti.

Considerati:

— le dichiarazioni del Presidente della Commissione Barroso a margine del summit, secondo il quale l'accordo sulla semplificazione del regime dei visti tra Russia e Unione europea potrebbe essere firmato nel prossimo futuro, non prima però di aver risolto i problemi tecnici legati soprattutto al reciproco scambio di informazioni personali sui passeggeri;

— l'importanza dei flussi turistici russi per l'UE, soprattutto in questo momento di grave crisi;

— il paragrafo 13 della relazione d'iniziativa «Europa prima destinazione turistica mondiale» adottata dal Parlamento europeo in seduta plenaria nel settembre 2011 e la comunicazione della Commissione europea dal titolo «Attuazione e sviluppo della politica comune in materia di visti per stimolare la crescita nell'UE»;

— che una prima bozza di proposta fu avanzata da Putin già nel 2002;

— che ancora adesso in Russia le unità consolari dei vari Stati membri adottano criteri discrezionali diversi nel rilasciare visti Schengen per turismo, nonostante sia in vigore la politica comune sui visti prevista dalla convenzione di applicazione dell'accordo di Schengen;

— che a partire da luglio 2013 le autorità consolari italiane in Russia concederanno — nel rispetto delle norme di Schengen — un numero maggiore di visti della durata di oltre un anno;

— la precedente interrogazione scritta E-9640/2010, presentata dallo scrivente in data 23 novembre 2010;

può la Commissione far sapere:

— se è in grado di tracciare una tabella di marcia con termini di scadenza concreti;

— se può indicare quali sono gli ostacoli che rallentano e di fatto bloccano tale processo;

— qual è lo stato della controversia sull'abolizione del visto per i titolari di passaporto di servizio?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(23 luglio 2013)

Per quanto riguarda il dialogo tra l'Unione europea e la Russia sui visti, nel corso del vertice UE-Russia del dicembre 2011 le due parti hanno concordato un elenco di misure comuni volte a stabilire l'esenzione dal visto per i viaggi di breve durata dei cittadini russi e dell'Unione europea ([1]).

Le misure comuni sono in corso di attuazione in un processo che non prevede automatismi, né termini specifici. Il dialogo procede a un ritmo scandito dalle azioni che è necessario intraprendere per dare attuazione a tutte le misure comuni.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/international-affairs/russia/docs/common_steps_towards_visa_free_short_term_travel_en.pdf

Per quanto riguarda l'accordo di semplificazione dei visti, nel marzo di quest'anno gli Stati membri hanno raggiunto un accordo di massima sull'esenzione dal visto per i titolari di passaporti di servizio biometrici russi, ma subordinatamente a due condizioni:

1) l'esenzione dal visto deve essere accompagnata da tutte le salvaguardie necessarie ad eliminare eventuali abusi;
2) la firma di questo accordo deve rientrare in un'intesa equa complessiva nelle relazioni bilaterali UE-Russia.

La seconda condizione dovrà contemplare la questione PNR.

È in questo contesto che la Commissione ha ripreso i negoziati a livello tecnico che attualmente si trovano nella fase finale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006821/13
to the Commission
Carlo Fidanza (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Ending visa requirements between the EU and Russia

At the 31st Russia-EU summit held on 3 and 4 June in the city of Yekaterinburg substantial EU agreement was achieved with regard to the US-Russian 'Geneva II' initiative concerning Syria. However, no significant progress was made towards the removal of visa requirements.

In view of:

— the statements by Commissioner President Barroso on that occasion to the effect that an agreement simplifying these arrangements between Russia and the European Union could be signed in the near future once a number of technical issues, in particular the exchange of passenger information, had been resolved;

— the volume of Russian tourists entering the EU, particularly during the current crisis;

— paragraph 13 of the own-initiative report on 'Europe, the World's Number One Tourist Destination' adopted by the European Parliament at the September 2011 part-session and the Commission communication on 'implementation and development of the common visa policy to spur growth in the EU';

— a preliminary draft proposal tabled by Mr Putin as early as 2002;

— the application by various Member State consulates in Russia of different criteria to the issuing of Schengen tourist visas, despite the fact that the common visa policy provided for under the Convention Implementing the Schengen Agreement now applies;

— the increased number of visas valid for more than one year to be issued from July 2013 under the Schengen rules by the Italian consular authorities in Russia;

— previous Written Question E-9640/2010 of 23 November 2010;

Is the Commission able to draw up a roadmap with specific deadlines?

Can it say what obstacles are slowing down or halting the process?

Can it say what stage has been reached in discussions on the abolition of visa requirements for service passport holders?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2013)

With regard to the EU-Russia Visa Dialogue, during the December 2011 EU-Russia summit the two parties agreed on the list of Common Steps towards visa-free short-term travel of Russian and EU citizens ([1]).

The implementation of the Common Steps is ongoing. There is no automaticity, and no specific deadlines in the process. The pace of the dialogue depends on the speed of actions necessary to be undertaken in order to implement all the Common Steps.

With regard to the Visa Facilitaiton Agreement, in March this year the Member States agreed in principle on a visa waiver for holders of Russian biometric service passports but with two conditions:

(1) this visa waiver must be accompanied by all necessary safeguards to eliminate possible abuses; (2) the signature of this Agreement must be part of an overall fair deal in bilateral EU-Russia relations.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/international-affairs/russia/docs/common_steps_towards_visa_free_short_term_travel_en.pdf

The second condition will include taking into account the PNR issue.

Against this background the Commission has resumed negotiations at technical level, which are now in their final phase.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006822/13
alla Commissione
Carlo Fidanza (PPE)
(12 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Dotare di segnale sonoro i sistemi di ritenuta per bambini sugli autoveicoli

Purtroppo nei giorni scorsi l'Italia è stata scossa dalla tragedia di un bambino morto asfissiato dopo essere stato dimenticato per ore da un genitore nella macchina parcheggiata sotto il sole.

Una fatalità, peraltro non la prima del genere, che ha davvero colpito il paese e ha riaperto il dibattito sulla opportunità di sfruttare la più moderna tecnologia per dotare i sistemi di ritenuta per bambini sugli autoveicoli (i cosiddetti seggiolini) di un segnale sonoro che impedisca il ripetersi di tali disgrazie.

Considerato che:

— tali situazioni provocano purtroppo ogni anno in tutta Europa diverse vittime;

— la direttiva 2003/20/CE individua all'articolo 1, paragrafo 3 cinque gruppi di sistemi di ritenuta per bambini dividendoli al paragrafo 4 in due classi, integrali e non integrali;

— gli Stati membri non possono aggiornare autonomamente la propria legislazione in materia essendo questa normata a livello europeo;

può la Commissione far sapere in che modo intende intervenire e se prevede una proposta legislativa nella direzione auspicata?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(29 luglio 2013)

La direttiva relativa alle cinture di sicurezza e ai sistemi di ritenuta per bambini [1] sancisce nell'UE l'obbligatorietà del seggiolino al fine di proteggere la vita e l'incolumità personale dei bambini in caso di incidenti stradali. Nulla osta a che il seggiolino sia dotato di segnali sonori, a condizione che i parametri di sicurezza siano conformi alle norme di omologazione UE e UNECE in vigore.

---

[1] Direttiva 91/671/CEE (GU L 373 del 31.12.1991), modificata dalla direttiva 2003/20/CE (GU L 115 del 9.5.2003).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006822/13
to the Commission
Carlo Fidanza (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Fitting audible alarms to child restraint systems in motor vehicles

A few days ago, Italy was shocked by the tragedy of a child who died of asphyxiation after a parent left him in a parked car for hours on a hot day.

This was not the first death of this kind, yet it has greatly affected the country, reopening the debate on the desirability of using the latest technology to fit audible alarms to child restraint systems in motor vehicles (known as child safety seats) to prevent more such tragedies.

Similar incidents unfortunately claim victims across Europe every year. Article 1(3) of Directive 2003/20/EC identifies five groups of child restraint systems, and paragraph 4 of the same article divides them into two classes: integral and non-integral. Member States cannot independently update their own laws in this area, as it is regulated at EU level.

What action does the Commission plan to take on this matter and will there be any legislative proposals along these lines?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

The directive on safety belts and child-restraint systems ([1]) renders the use of child seats compulsory in the EU in order to prevent fatalities or serious injuries in case of road traffic accidents. Nothing prevents to also fit these seats with audible alarms as long as the safety parameters comply with EU and UN ECE type approval legislation in force.

([1]) Directive 91/671/EEC (OJ L 373, 31.12.1991), as amended by Directive 2003/20/EC (OJ L 115, 9.5.2003).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006823/13
a la Comisión
Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)
(12 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Protagonismo de la mujer en el sector pesquero

En unas declaraciones recientes, la Directora General de Asuntos Marítimos y Pesca en la EU, Lowri Evans, ha afirmado que la nueva Política Pesquera Común incrementará el protagonismo y las posibilidades de la mujer en el sector pesquero.

Esta diputada ha presentado numerosas enmiendas al texto propuesto por el Consejo sobre equiparación salarial, cobertura social y representación en órganos de decisión, enmiendas que no han sido tenidas en cuenta.

¿Qué medidas se han desarrollado en los últimos cuatro años? ¿Qué medidas va a tomar la Comisión respecto de las declaraciones de la Directora General en el nuevo Reglamento de la Política Pesquera Común?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de julio de 2013)

En el periodo de 2007-2013, el Fondo Europeo de Pesca (FEP) ha financiado diversas actuaciones dirigidas a fomentar la igualdad de oportunidades entre hombres y mujeres en el sector pesquero e iniciativas específicas dirigidas a las mujeres. En concreto, el EFF respalda los siguientes tipos de actuaciones:

— creación de redes, intercambio de experiencia y mejores prácticas y otras actividades colectivas entre organizaciones dedicadas a promover la igualdad de oportunidades entre hombres y mujeres en el sector pesquero;

— diversificación, en la que las mujeres desempeñan un papel fundamental, para que puedan participar en la elaboración de estrategias de desarrollo local;

— mejora de las cualificaciones profesionales, la capacidad de adaptación de los trabajadores y el acceso al empleo, particularmente en lo que se refiere a las mujeres;

— iniciativas dirigidas a las mujeres, como el acceso a formaciones específicas, estudios, creación de redes y sensibilización;

— a través del eje 4 del FEP, se han financiado además actuaciones encaminadas a promover la participación de las mujeres en las iniciativas de desarrollo local de las localidades pesqueras.

En su propuesta de Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de la Pesca (FEMP), la Comisión ha propuesto acrecentar el apoyo a las mujeres del sector pesquero en el periodo 2014-2020:

— aplicando el principio de la integración de la perspectiva de género a lo largo de todo el ciclo de programación del FEMP;

— pidiendo a los Estados miembros que informen adecuadamente de las disposiciones tomadas a favor de la integración de la perspectiva de género;

— reconociendo explícitamente a las esposas y a las parejas de los pescadores autónomos, lo que les permitirá acogerse a medidas de formación o de constitución de redes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006823/13
to the Commission
Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Women's role in the fisheries sector

In a recent statement, the EU Director-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Lowri Evans, stated that the new Common Fisheries Policy will increase the role and opportunities for women in the fisheries sector.

I have tabled numerous amendments to the text proposed by the Council on equal pay, social security cover and representation in decision-making bodies, none of which have been taken into account.

What measures have been developed over the last four years? What action will the Commission take regarding the Director-General's statement on the new Common Fisheries Policy Regulation?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(24 July 2013)

In the 2007-2013 period, the European Fisheries Fund has financed a number of actions designed to promote equal opportunities of women and men in the fisheries sector, as well as specific initiatives targeting women. In particular, the EFF provides support for the following types of actions:

— Networking, exchange of experience and best practices and other collective actions among organisations promoting equal opportunities between women and men in the fisheries sector,

— diversification, where women play a key role, enabling them to get involved in the design of local development strategies;

— the improvement of professional skills, worker adaptability and access to employment, particularly in favour of women;

— initiatives targeting women, such as access to specific training, studies, networking and awareness-raising.

— Through Axis 4 of the EFF, a number of actions have also been financed to promote the participation of women in local development initiatives in fisheries communities.

For the 2014-2020 period, in its proposal for the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF), the Commission has sought to extend support to women in fisheries through:

— Extending the principle of gender mainstreaming throughout the programming cycle of the EMFF;

— Member States requesting to provide appropriate reporting on arrangements ensuring the integration of the gender dimension;

— Explicit recognition of spouses and partners of self-employed fishermen which allows them to benefit from measures such as training or networking.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006824/13
a la Comisión
Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)
(12 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Directiva 2010/41/UE en el sector de la pesca

¿Podría informar la Comisión de cuál es el grado de cumplimiento de la Directiva 2010/41/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo sobre la aplicación del principio de igualdad de trato entre hombres y mujeres que ejercen una actividad autónoma, que se está llevando a cabo por parte de los Estados miembros de la UE, concretamente en el sector de la pesca costera y artesanal, especificando de manera desglosada y nominal cada una de las medidas y resultados concretos?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(31 de julio de 2013)

La Comisión tiene previsto proceder a la evaluación detallada de la transposición de la citada Directiva en los Estados miembros. La comenzará cuando concluya el plazo adicional de transposición. La evaluación de la Comisión no se realizará sector por sector. Sin embargo, si se ponen en conocimiento de la Comisión datos sobre algún aspecto específico, puede decidir abordar la cuestión con las autoridades nacionales.

Los Estados miembros han informado a la Comisión de su transposición de la Directiva 2010/41/UE. Cuatro de ellos (Irlanda, Francia, Eslovenia y Reino Unido) han solicitado el plazo adicional mencionado en el artículo 16, apartado 2, para dar cumplimiento a lo establecido en los artículos 7 y 8. Dicho plazo finalizará el 5 de agosto de 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006824/13
to the Commission
Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2010/41/EU in the fisheries sector

Can the Commission say to what extent the EU Member States are complying with Directive 2010/41/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council on the application of the principle of equal treatment between men and women engaged in an activity in a self-employed capacity, particularly in the small-scale and coastal fishing sector, and provide a breakdown of each of the measures and tangible results?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

The Commission will start its detailed assessment of the transposition of this directive in Member States. This will start when the additional time period for transposition ends. The Commission's assessment will not be done on a sectoral basis. However, if information is brought to the Commission's attention about a specific issue it may decide to pursue that with the national authorities.

Member States have informed the Commission of their transposition of Directive 2010/41/EU. Four Member States (Ireland, France, Slovenia and the United Kingdom) have requested the additional period mentioned in Article 16(2) to comply with Articles 7 and 8. It will expire on 5 August 2014.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006825/13
a la Comisión
Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE) y Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE)
(12 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Aumento umbral de la ayudas de minimis

A principios de este año, la Comisión Europea presentó el primer borrador relativo a la aplicación de los artículos 107 y 108 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la UE a las ayudas *de minimis* que sustituirá al **Reglamento actualmente en vigor (Reglamento (CE) n° 1998/2006 de la Comisión, de 15 de diciembre de 2006 cuya vigencia expira el próximo 31 de diciembre de 2013.**

El texto presentado por la Comisión propone mantener el límite máximo de 200 000 EUR para el importe de la ayuda *de minimis* que una empresa puede recibir de un Estado miembro a lo largo de cualquier período de tres ejercicios fiscales, sin que se considere ayuda de estado (excepto para el sector del transporte por carretera, en el que el limite se fija en 100 000 €).

La norma *de minimis* facilita y agiliza las ayudas a las PYME europeas, que constituyen el 99,8 % del tejido empresarial en la EU.

En el marco actual de crisis económica, muchas de estas pequeñas y medianas empresas están optando por la internacionalización como respuesta a la difícil situación de sus mercados domésticos, lo que implica para ellas la necesidad de sufragar costes adicionales de participación en ferias comerciales y de estudios o de servicios de consultoría necesarios para comercializar productos en nuevos mercados.

En este contexto, ¿no cree la Comisión que sería importante elevar el umbral de 200 000 EUR en las ayudas *de minimis* para las PYME en el nuevo Reglamento que se está preparando y apoyar así a un sector de importancia capital para la economía europea?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(30 de julio de 2013)

La Comisión es consciente de las dificultades financieras que afrontan muchas PYME actualmente, especialmente en determinados Estados miembros. No obstante, un Reglamento *de minimis* únicamente puede cubrir medidas para las que pueda suponerse con seguridad que no tendrán efecto alguno sobre el comercio y la competencia.

A la vista de estos límites legales, el principal instrumento de que dispone la Comisión para identificar medidas bien concebidas y orientadas para contribuir a los objetivos de Europa 2020 y que puedan llevarse a cabo sin necesidad de una evaluación individual de la Comisión es el Reglamento general de exención por categorías, que se está revisando actualmente. La Comisión propone que se amplíe considerablemente su ámbito de aplicación. En lugar de las ayudas *de minimis*, que no están condicionadas y no son específicas, este tipo de ayudas se adecua mejor para promover tanto el crecimiento como la calidad de las finanzas públicas. No obstante, el Reglamento *de minimis* todavía está revisándose y la Comisión continúa analizando, fundamentalmente a través de una evaluación de impacto, cuál sería el nivel adecuado del límite máximo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006825/13
to the Commission
Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE) and Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Raising the *de minimis* aid threshold

Earlier this year, the Commission presented the first draft document on the application of Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union to *de minimis* aid, which will replace the current Regulation (Commission Regulation (EC) No 1998/2006 of 15 December 2006) which expires on 31 December 2013**.**

The text tabled by the Commission proposes to maintain the ceiling of EUR 200 000 for the amount of *de minimis* aid that an undertaking may receive over any period of three tax years from one Member State, without it being considered state aid (except for the road freight transport sector, for which the limit is set at EUR 100 000).

The *de minimis* rule facilitates and streamlines aid to European SMEs, which account for 99.8% of all businesses in the EU.

In the current economic crisis, many of these small and medium-sized enterprises are moving towards internationalisation in response to the difficult situation in their domestic markets. This requires them to cover the additional costs of participating in trade fairs and of the studies or consulting services needed to sell products in new markets.

In this context, does the Commission not think that it is important to raise the EUR 200 000 *de minimis* aid threshold for SMEs in the new Regulation being prepared, thereby supporting a sector which is vitally important for the European economy?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(30 July 2013)

The Commission is aware of the financial difficulties many SMEs face at present, in particular in certain Member States. However, a *de minimis* Regulation can only cover measures for which it can be safely presumed that they do not have any effect on trade and competition.

Given these legal boundaries, the main Commission instrument for identifying well-designed and targeted measures contributing to the Europe 2020 targets that can be implemented without individual Commission assessment is the General Block Exemption Regulation, which is currently being revised. The Commission is proposing to significantly extend its scope. This type of aid, rather than untargeted and unconditional *de minimis* aid, is better suited to promoting growth and quality of public finance. However, the *de minimis* Regulation is still under review and the Commission is still analysing, in particular through an impact assessment, the appropriate level of the ceiling.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006827/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Declarações do Comissário Rehn sobre os projetos da França e da Alemanha para a zona euro

Segundo a edição *online* do *Financial Times*, o senhor Comissário Olli Rehn, no decurso de uma conferência económica em Helsínquia, afirmou estar inquieto com os projetos da França e da Alemanha para alargar o papel dos governos na tomada de decisões na zona euro.

O senhor Comissário terá afirmado: «Estou inquieto com algumas propostas apresentadas em relação à governação económica [da zona euro]. Em numerosos aspetos, a França e a Alemanha parecem propor que o roteiro seja reinventado».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Confirma estas declarações?

— Como avalia as propostas apresentadas pela França e pela Alemanha?

— Pode indicar quais são as medidas de que discorda?

— Considera prejudicial uma «reinvenção» do roteiro alegadamente preconizada por estes países?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(23 de julho de 2013)

O Conselho Europeu de dezembro de 2012 exortou à tomada de iniciativas numa série de domínios, com o objetivo de avançar para uma UEM efetiva e aprofundada. O Presidente do Conselho Europeu, em estreita cooperação com o Presidente da Comissão, iniciou um vasto processo de consultas, no qual todos os Estados-Membros apresentaram os seus pontos de vista. As propostas franco-alemãs em referência devem ser encaradas neste contexto. As conclusões do Conselho Europeu de junho apelam ao prosseguimento dos trabalhos sobre todas as componentes de base de uma UEM reforçada, em estreita concertação com os Estados-Membros. Em outubro de 2013, o Conselho Europeu analisará, em particular, indicadores e domínios de intervenção que devem ser tidos em conta no âmbito de uma coordenação reforçada das políticas económicas e da dimensão social da UEM. O debate prosseguirá em dezembro de 2013, com o objetivo de tomar decisões nesta matéria, nomeadamente sobre os principais aspetos dos acordos contratuais e dos mecanismos de solidariedade correlatos. A Comissão dará o contributo necessário a este processo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006827/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Commissioner Rehn's statement on Franco-German proposals for the euro area

According to the online edition of the *Financial Times*, during an economic conference in Helsinki, Commissioner Rehn expressed concern over Franco-German proposals to expand governments' role in the euro area's decision-making process.

The Commissioner said that he was 'concerned' about some of the proposals tabled on euro area economic governance, adding that 'in many aspects they [France and Germany] seem to suggest the wheel should be reinvented'.

— Can the Commission confirm this statement?

— How does it view the proposals tabled by France and Germany?

— Can it specify which measures it disagrees with?

— Does it believe that 'reinventing' the wheel, as these countries reportedly recommend, would be detrimental?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2013)

The December 2012 European Council asked for work to be taken forward in a number of areas with the aim of moving towards a deep and genuine EMU. The President of the European Council, in close cooperation with the President of the Commission, conducted a wide process of consultation, in which all Member States presented their views. The French-German proposals referred to should be seen in this context. The summarising conclusions of the June European Council call for work to be pursued on all building blocks of a reinforced EMU, again in close consultations with the Member States. In October 2013, the European Council will look in particular at indicators and policy areas to be taken into account in the framework of strengthened economic policy coordination and at the social dimension of EMU. The discussion will be continued in December 2013, with the objective of taking decisions on these issues, in particular on the main features of contractual arrangements and of associated solidarity mechanisms. The Commission will provide the necessary input for this process.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006828/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2011/71/UE — produtos de proteção da madeira com creosote

A Diretiva 2011/71/UE da Comissão, de 26 de julho de 2011, alterou a Diretiva 98/8/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho com o objetivo de incluir a substância ativa creosote no anexo I da mesma.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Está em condições de avaliar o impacto das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2011/71/UE?

— Mantém a convicção de que os produtos de proteção da madeira com creosote satisfazem as condições definidas no artigo 5.° da Diretiva 98/8/CE?

— Face aos dados de que dispõe presentemente, como avalia preliminarmente a inclusão do creosote no anexo I? A avaliação de riscos comparativa a que deveria ser sujeita esta inclusão encontra-se em curso? Tem resultados preliminares que possa apresentar?

— Considera que foram tomadas as medidas necessárias para a redução dos riscos da utilização destes produtos para níveis aceitáveis?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006829/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2011/12/UE — produtos biocidas com fenoxicarbe utilizados na proteção de madeiras

A Diretiva 2011/12/UE da Comissão, de 8 de fevereiro de 2011, alterou a Diretiva 98/8/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho com o objetivo de incluir a substância ativa fenoxicarbe no anexo I da mesma.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Está em condições de avaliar o impacto das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2011/12/UE?

— Mantém a convicção de que os produtos biocidas com fenoxicarbe utilizados na proteção de madeiras satisfazem as condições definidas no artigo 5.° da Diretiva 98/8/CE?

— Foram realizadas avaliações posteriores de potenciais utilizações a nível dos Estados-Membros como preconizado na Diretiva 2011/12/UE, nomeadamente no que se refere aos perfis de utilização e de exposição, bem como aos riscos para os compartimentos ambientais e as populações, que não tenham sido contemplados com suficiente representatividade na avaliação de riscos à escala da União?

— Considera que os Estados-Membros têm assegurado a adoção de medidas adequadas ou o estabelecimento de condições específicas com o objetivo de reduzir os riscos da utilização destes produtos para níveis aceitáveis?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006830/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2011/11/UE — produtos biocidas usados como chamarizes

A Diretiva 2011/11/UE da Comissão, de 8 de fevereiro de 2011, alterou a Diretiva 98/8/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho com o objetivo de incluir a substância ativa acetato de (Z,E)-tetradeca-9,12-dienilo nos anexos I e IA da mesma.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Está em condições de avaliar o impacto das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2011/11/UE?

— Mantém a convicção de que os produtos biocidas com acetato de (Z,E)-tetradeca-9,12-dienilo utilizados como chamarizes satisfazem as condições definidas no artigo 5.° da Diretiva 98/8/CE e de que apresentam baixos riscos para pessoas, animais e ambiente?

— Foram realizadas avaliações posteriores de potenciais utilizações a nível dos Estados-Membros como preconizado na Diretiva 2011/11/EU, nomeadamente no que se refere aos perfis de utilização e de exposição, bem como aos riscos para os compartimentos ambientais e as populações, que não tenham sido contemplados com suficiente representatividade na avaliação de riscos à escala da União?

— Considera que os Estados-Membros têm assegurado a adoção de medidas adequadas ou o estabelecimento de condições específicas com o objetivo de reduzir os riscos da utilização destes produtos para níveis aceitáveis?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006831/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2011/10/UE — produtos biocidas com bifentrina utilizados na proteção de madeiras

A Diretiva 2011/10/UE da Comissão, de 8 de fevereiro de 2011, alterou a Diretiva 98/8/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho com o objetivo de incluir a substância ativa bifentrina no anexo I da mesma.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Está em condições de avaliar o impacto das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2011/10/UE?

— Mantém a convicção de que os produtos biocidas com bifentrina utilizados na proteção de madeiras satisfazem as condições definidas no artigo 5.° da Diretiva 98/8/CE?

— Foram realizadas avaliações posteriores de potenciais utilizações a nível dos Estados-Membros como preconizado na Diretiva 2011/10/UE, nomeadamente no que se refere aos perfis de utilização e de exposição, bem como aos riscos para os compartimentos ambientais e as populações, que não tenham sido contemplados com suficiente representatividade na avaliação de riscos à escala da União?

— Considera que os Estados-Membros têm assegurado a adoção de medidas adequadas ou o estabelecimento de condições específicas com o objetivo de reduzir os riscos da utilização destes produtos para níveis aceitáveis?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006832/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2011/13/UE — produtos biocidas com ácido nonanóico utilizados como repelentes

A Diretiva 2011/13/UE da Comissão, de 8 de fevereiro de 2011, alterou a Diretiva 98/8/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho com o objetivo de incluir a substância ativa ácido nonanóico no anexo I da mesma.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Está em condições de avaliar o impacto das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2011/13/UE?

— Mantém a convicção de que os produtos biocidas com ácido nonanóico utilizados como repelentes satisfazem as condições definidas no artigo 5.° da Diretiva 98/8/CE?

— Foram realizadas avaliações posteriores de potenciais utilizações a nível dos Estados-Membros como preconizado na Diretiva 2011/13/UE, nomeadamente no que se refere aos perfis de utilização e de exposição, bem como aos riscos para os compartimentos ambientais e as populações, que não tenham sido contemplados com suficiente representatividade na avaliação de riscos à escala da União?

— Considera que os Estados-Membros têm assegurado a adoção de medidas adequadas ou o estabelecimento de condições específicas com o objetivo de reduzir os riscos da utilização destes produtos para níveis aceitáveis?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006833/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2011/67/UE — produtos biocidas com abamectina utilizados como inseticidas, acaricidas e produtos destinados a controlar outros artrópodes

A Diretiva 2011/67/UE da Comissão, de 1 de julho de 2011, alterou a Diretiva 98/8/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho com o objetivo de incluir a substância ativa abamectina no anexo I da mesma.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva? Está em condições de avaliar o impacto das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2011/67/UE? Mantém a convicção de que os produtos biocidas com abamectina utilizados como inseticidas, acaricidas e produtos destinados a controlar outros artrópodes satisfazem as condições definidas no artigo 5.° da Diretiva 98/8/CE?

— Foram realizadas avaliações posteriores de potenciais utilizações a nível dos Estados-Membros como preconizado na Diretiva 2011/67/UE, nomeadamente no que se refere aos cenários de utilização e de exposição, bem como aos riscos para as populações humanas e os meios, que não tenham sido contemplados com suficiente representatividade na avaliação de riscos à escala da União?

— Considera que os Estados-Membros têm assegurado a adoção de medidas adequadas ou o estabelecimento de condições específicas com o objetivo de reduzir os riscos da utilização destes produtos para níveis aceitáveis?

— As disposições da diretiva têm sido aplicadas simultaneamente em todos os Estados-Membros?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006834/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2011/66/UE — produtos biocidas com 4,5-dicloro-2-octil-2H-isotiazol-3-ona utilizados na proteção de madeiras

A Diretiva 2011/66/UE da Comissão, de 1 de julho de 2011, alterou a Diretiva 98/8/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho com o objetivo de incluir a substância ativa 4,5-dicloro2-octil2H-isotiazol3-ona no anexo I da mesma.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva? Está em condições de avaliar o impacto das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2011/66/UE? Mantém a convicção de que os produtos biocidas com 4,5-dicloro-2-octil-2H-isotiazol-3-ona utilizados na proteção de madeiras satisfazem as condições definidas no artigo 5.° da Diretiva 98/8/CE?

— Foram realizadas avaliações posteriores de potenciais utilizações a nível dos Estados-Membros como preconizado na Diretiva 2011/66/UE, nomeadamente no que se refere aos cenários de utilização e de exposição, bem como aos riscos para as populações humanas e os meios, que não tenham sido contemplados com suficiente representatividade na avaliação de riscos à escala da União?

— Considera que os Estados-Membros têm assegurado a adoção de medidas adequadas ou o estabelecimento de condições específicas com o objetivo de reduzir os riscos da utilização destes produtos para níveis aceitáveis?

— As disposições da diretiva têm sido aplicadas simultaneamente em todos os Estados-Membros?

Resposta conjunta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão
(9 de agosto de 2013)

A Diretiva 98/8 ([1]) será revogada e substituída, em 1 de setembro de 2013, pelo Regulamento (UE) n.° 528/2012 ([2]). A partir dessa data, o atual anexo I da diretiva será substituído por uma lista diretamente aplicável de substâncias autorizadas. A substância ativa creosote, a que a Diretiva 2011/71/UE ([3]) se refere, será assim considerada autorizada por força do novo regulamento.

No que se refere às perguntas relacionadas com a execução das medidas estabelecidas nestas diretivas, a Comissão não está em posição de responder às questões colocadas. A inclusão do creosote no anexo I só é aplicável a partir de 1 de maio de 2013 e, por conseguinte, os produtos que contêm esta substância ativa ainda estão a ser avaliados nos Estados-Membros. Deste modo, ainda não foram tomadas as decisões relativas à renovação da sua autorização. Este processo estará concluída dentro do prazo especificado na diretiva, isto é, até 30 de abril de 2015.

No caso específico do creosote, devido às preocupações associadas a esta substância, os Estados-Membros em cujo território são autorizados produtos biocidas que contêm esta substância ativa devem apresentar à Comissão, até 31 de julho de 2016, um relatório que justifique a sua conclusão de que não existem alternativas adequadas e indicando de que forma se promove o desenvolvimento de alternativas. A Comissão divulgará estes relatórios ao público. A substância ativa será então submetida a uma avaliação de riscos comparativa, nos termos do artigo 10.°, n.° 5, ponto i), segundo parágrafo, para que a autorização possa ser renovada.

([1]) Relativa à colocação de produtos biocidas no mercado, JO L 150 de 8.6.2002.
([2]) Relativo à disponibilização no mercado e à utilização de produtos biocidas, JO L 167 de 27.6.2012.
([3]) Para incluir o creosote como substância ativa, JO L 195 de 27.7.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006828/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2011/71/EU — wood preservatives containing creosote

Commission Directive 2011/71/EU of 26 July 2011 amended Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council to include creosote as an active substance in Annex I thereto.

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— Is the Commission able to evaluate the impact of the amendments introduced by Directive 2011/71/EU?

— Is it still convinced that wood preservatives containing creosote satisfy the requirements laid down in Article 5 of Directive 98/8/EC?

— Given the data currently available, what is the Commission's preliminary evaluation of creosote's inclusion in Annex I? Is the comparative risk assessment to which this inclusion should be subject underway? Can it present any preliminary results?

— Does the Commission believe that appropriate measures have been taken to reduce the risks of using these products to acceptable levels?

Question for written answer E-006829/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2011/12/EU — biocidal products used as wood preservatives and containing fenoxycarb

Commission Directive 2011/12/EU of 8 February 2011 amended Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council to include fenoxycarb as an active substance in Annex I thereto.

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— Is the Commission able to evaluate the impact of the amendments introduced by Directive 2011/12/EU?

— Is it still convinced that biocidal products used as wood preservatives and containing fenoxycarb satisfy the requirements laid down in Article 5 of Directive 98/8/EC?

— Have subsequent evaluations been made regarding potential uses at Member State level as recommended in Directive 2011/12/EU, particularly with regard to uses and exposure scenarios, as well as to risks to the environmental compartments and populations that have not been representatively addressed in the Union level risk assessment?

— Does the Commission believe that the Member States have ensured that appropriate measures have been taken or specific conditions imposed in order to reduce the risks of using these products to acceptable levels?

Question for written answer E-006830/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2011/11/EU — biocidal products used as attractants

Commission Directive 2011/11/EU of 8 February 2011 amended Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council to include (Z,E)-tetradeca-9,12-dienyl acetate as an active substance in Annexes I and IA thereto.

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— Is the Commission able to evaluate the impact of the amendments introduced by Directive 2011/11/EU?

— Is it still convinced that biocidal products used as attractants and containing (Z,E)-tetradeca-9,12-dienyl acetate satisfy the requirements laid down in Article 5 of Directive 98/8/EC and that they present only low risk to humans, animals and the environment?

— Have subsequent evaluations been made regarding potential uses at Member State level as recommended in Directive 2011/11/EU, particularly with regard to uses and exposure scenarios, as well as to risks to the environmental compartments and populations that have not been representatively addressed in the Union level risk assessment?

— Does the Commission believe that the Member States have ensured that appropriate measures have been taken or specific conditions imposed in order to reduce the risks of using these products to acceptable levels?

Question for written answer E-006831/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2011/10/EU — biocidal products used as wood preservatives and containing bifenthrin

Commission Directive 2011/10/EU of 8 February 2011 amended Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council to include bifenthrin as an active substance in Annex I thereto.

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— Is the Commission able to evaluate the impact of the amendments introduced by Directive 2011/10/EU?

— Is it still convinced that biocidal products used as wood preservatives and containing bifenthrin satisfy the requirements laid down in Article 5 of Directive 98/8/EC?

— Have subsequent evaluations been made regarding potential uses at Member State level as recommended in Directive 2011/10/EU, particularly with regard to uses and exposure scenarios, as well as to risks to the environmental compartments and populations that have not been representatively addressed in the Union level risk assessment?

— Does the Commission believe that the Member States have ensured that appropriate measures have been taken or specific conditions imposed in order to reduce the risks of using these products to acceptable levels?

Question for written answer E-006832/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2011/13/EU — biocidal products used as repellents and containing nonanoic acid

Commission Directive 2011/13/EU of 8 February 2011 amended Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council to include nonanoic acid as an active substance in Annex I thereto.

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— Is the Commission able to evaluate the impact of the amendments introduced by Directive 2011/13/EU?

— Is it still convinced that biocidal products used as repellents and containing nonanoic acid satisfy the requirements laid down in Article 5 of Directive 98/8/EC?

— Have subsequent evaluations been made regarding potential uses at Member State level as recommended in Directive 2011/13/EU, particularly with regard to uses and exposure scenarios, as well as to risks to the environmental compartments and populations that have not been representatively addressed in the Union level risk assessment?

— Does the Commission believe that the Member States have ensured that appropriate measures have been taken or specific conditions imposed in order to reduce the risks of using these products to acceptable levels?

Question for written answer E-006833/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2011/67/EU — biocidal products used as insecticides, acaricides and products to control other arthropods and containing abamectin

Commission Directive 2011/67/EU of 1 July 2011 amended Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council to include abamectin as an active substance in Annex I thereto.

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive? Is the Commission able to evaluate the impact of the amendments introduced by Directive 2011/67/EU? Is it still convinced that biocidal products used as insecticides, acaricides and products to control other arthropods and containing abamectin satisfy the requirements laid down in Article 5 of Directive 98/8/EC?

— Have subsequent evaluations been made regarding potential uses at Member State level as recommended in Directive 2011/67/EU, particularly with regard to uses and exposure scenarios, as well as to risks to the environmental compartments and populations that have not been representatively addressed in the Union level risk assessment?

— Does the Commission believe that the Member States have ensured that appropriate measures have been taken or specific conditions imposed in order to reduce the risks of using these products to acceptable levels?

— Have the provisions of this directive been applied simultaneously in all Member States?

Question for written answer E-006834/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2011/66/EU — biocides containing 4,5-Dichloro-2-octyl-2H-isothiazol-3-one used as wood preservatives

Commission Directive 2011/66/EU of 1 July 2011 amended Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council to include 4,5-Dichloro-2-octyl-2H-isothiazol-3-one as an active substance in Annex I thereto.

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive? Can the Commission assess the impact of the changes made by Directive 2011/66/EU? Does it still believe that biocides containing 4,5-Dichloro-2-octyl-2H-isothiazol-3-one used in wood preservatives satisfy the requirements laid down in Article 5 of Directive 98/8/EC?

— Have the Member States now assessed the potential uses as recommended in Directive 2011/66/EU, with particular regard to those uses or exposure scenarios and those risks to human populations and to environmental compartments that have not been representatively addressed in the Union level risk assessment?

— Does the Commission consider that the Member States have ensured that appropriate measures are being taken or specific conditions imposed in order to reduce the risks associated with use of these products to acceptable levels?

— Have the provisions of the directive been applied simultaneously in all the Member States?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission

(9 August 2013)

Directive 98/8 ([1]) is going to be repealed and replaced on 1 September 2013 by Regulation (EU) No 528/2012 ([2]). From that date, the current Annex I to the directive will be replaced by a directly applicable and enforceable list of approved substances. The active substance creosote concerned by Directive 2011/71/EU ([3]) would therefore be considered as approved by virtue of the new Regulation.

Regarding the questions linked to the implementation of the measures laid down in these Directives, the Commission is not in a position to address the questions raised. The inclusion of creosote in Annex I only applied as of 1 May 2013 and therefore the products containing this active substance are still under evaluation in the Member States. Consequently, decisions regarding their re-authorisation have not yet been taken. This process will be finished by the deadline specified in the Inclusion Directive, i.e. 30 April 2015.

In the particular case of creosote, due to the concerns linked with this substance, those Member States authorising biocidal products containing this active substance in their territory shall no later than 31 July 2016 submit a report to the Commission justifying their conclusion that there are no appropriate alternatives and indicating how the development of alternatives is promoted. The Commission will make these reports publicly available. The active substance will then be subjected to a comparative risk assessment in accordance with the second subparagraph of Article 10(5)(i) before approval can be renewed.

([1]) Concerning the placing of biocidal products on the market, OJ L 150, 8.6.2002.
([2]) Concerning the making available on the market and use of biocidal products , OJ L 167, 27.6.2012.
([3]) To include creosote as an active substance, OJ L 195, 27.7.2011.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-006835/13
a la Comisión
Iratxe García Pérez (S&D)
(12 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Desarrollo por acto delegado del OQT producto «de mi granja»

Los términos del artículo 55 del Reglamento (UE) n° 1151/2012 son muy claros en lo que respecta a la posible inclusión dentro del Reglamento de calidad de un etiquetado para la producción agrícola local y las ventas directas: estamos a la espera de la presentación de un informe de la Comisión al Parlamento Europeo y al Consejo, sobre la conveniencia de adoptar este nuevo sistema de etiquetado. Informe que, «si procede», vendría acompañado de las propuestas legislativas adecuadas cuya tramitación estará sujeta al procedimiento legislativo ordinario.

Sin embargo, la Comisión, haciendo caso omiso del citado artículo, ha presentado a los Estados miembros un acto delegado para desarrollar el término «producto de mi granja» dentro del Reglamento de calidad.

Si el informe preceptivo así lo indicara, este término debería formar parte del acto de base y ser incluido mediante el procedimiento legislativo ordinario.

— ¿Cómo explica la Comisión esta grave irregularidad en el desarrollo de un acto delegado que no está establecido en el acto de base?

— ¿En qué fase se encuentra el informe que, en virtud del artículo 55 del Reglamento (EU) n° 1151/2012, debe ser presentado por parte de la Comisión al Parlamento Europeo y al Consejo?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(3 de julio de 2013)

Los servicios de la Comisión han llevado a cabo consultas y análisis para preparar el informe acerca de la conveniencia de un nuevo régimen de etiquetado de la producción agrícola local y las ventas directas previsto por el artíclo 55 del Reglamento (UE) n° 1151/2012, sobre los regímenes de calidad de los productos agrícolas y alimenticios [1]. El proyecto de informe se encuentra en fase de redacción.

Las consultas y los análisis llevados a cabo en ese contexto han puesto de manifiesto que convendría estudiar un sistema de etiquetado facultativo, a escala de la UE y con pocas exigencias administrativas y de control, que pudiera aportar un valor añadido a los productos de granja y contribuyera a potenciar la comercialización de los productos de granja producidos localmente.

El artículo 30, apartado 1, del Reglamento (UE) n° 1151/2012 faculta a la Comisión para adoptar actos delegados por los que reserve un término de calidad facultativo adicional y se establezcan las condiciones de su utilización con el fin de responder a las expectativas de los consumidores y a la situación del mercado, entre otras cosas. Mediante un término de calidad facultativo se pueden atender las expectativas de los consumidores y la situación del mercado en relación con la producción agrícola local y las ventas directas con una carga administrativa menor que la que requeriría un régimen independiente. Es por ello por lo que los servicios de la Comisión han consultado al grupo de expertos en materia de sostenibilidad y calidad de la agricultura y desarrollo rural sobre la utilidad de un término de calidad facultativo basado en el artículo 30, apartado 1.

---

[1] DO L 343 de 14.12.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006835/13
to the Commission
Iratxe García Pérez (S&D)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Delegated act concerning the optional quality term 'product from my farm'

The provisions of Article 55 of Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012 on quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs are very clear regarding the possible inclusion in the text of a local farming and direct sales labelling scheme. We are currently waiting for the Commission to submit a report to Parliament and the Council on the case for adopting this new system. The report would, 'if necessary', be accompanied by appropriate legislative proposals which should be dealt with under the ordinary legislative procedure.

However, the Commission has ignored Article 55 and has submitted to Member States a delegated act for the purpose of incorporating the term 'product from my farm' into the quality regulation.

If the mandatory report were to propose this, the term would have to be incorporated into the basic act by means of the ordinary legislative procedure.

— Can the Commission explain why a delegated act which is not provided for in the basic act has been drawn up?

— What stage has the Commission reached in the drafting of the report which it is requiredto submit to Parliament and the Council under Article 55?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(3 July 2013)

The Commission services have completed consultations and analyses with regard to preparing the report on the case for a new local farming and direct sales labelling scheme requested by Article 55 of Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012 on the quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs ([1]). The text of the draft Report is currently being drafted.

Consultations and analyses in the process of preparing this report indicate that it is appropriate to explore an optional labelling tool with low administrative and control requirements for establishing whether a new local farming and direct sales labelling scheme at EU level could add value to farmer's produce and assist in marketing farmer's produce locally.

Article 30(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012 empowers the Commission to adopt delegated acts reserving an additional optional quality term and laying down its conditions of use in order to take into account, *inter alia*, expectations of the consumers and the market situation. An optional quality term may address consumer expectations and the market situation with regard to local farming and direct sales with relatively little administrative burden notably as compared to a stand-alone scheme. This is why the Commission services have consulted the Expert group for Sustainability and Quality of Agriculture and Rural Development on the case for an optional quality term based on Article 30(1).

([1]) OJ L 343, 14.12.2012.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-006836/13
an die Kommission
Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE)
(12. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Zweiter Verpflichtungszeitraum des Kyoto-Protokolls

Vom 26. November bis zum 8. Dezember 2012 wurde die Klimakonferenz der Vereinten Nationen in Doha, Qatar, abgehalten. Das Paket der unter dem Titel „Doha Climate Gateway" angenommenen Beschlüsse beinhaltete Änderungen des Kyoto-Protokolls, durch die ein zweiter Verpflichtungszeitraum eingeführt wird.

1. Welches Verfahren wird die Kommission für die Lastenteilung zwischen den EU-Mitgliedstaaten anwenden, bis der zweite Verpflichtungszeitraum des Kyoto-Protokolls ratifiziert wird?

2. Wie sehen der zeitliche Rahmen und der derzeitige Stand der Dinge in Bezug auf diesen Prozess aus?

3. Sieht die Kommission irgendwelche Hindernisse für diejenigen EU-Mitgliedstaaten, die in der Klimapolitik mit gutem Beispiel vorangehen und den zweiten Verpflichtungszeitraum des Kyoto-Protokolls ratifizieren möchten, bevor eine Einigung über die Lastenverteilung auf europäischer Ebene erzielt wird?

4. Inwiefern können die EU-Mitgliedstaaten nach Auffassung der Kommission das Verfahren, den Zeitplan bzw. die politischen Ziele für die Lastenteilungsvereinbarung auf EU-Ebene im Ratifizierungsprozess des zweiten Verpflichtungszeitraums des Kyoto-Protokolls beeinflussen? In welchen Fällen haben Mitgliedstaaten der EU, insbesondere Deutschland, bereits solchen Einfluss ausgeübt?

Antwort von Frau Hedegaard im Namen der Kommission
(9. Juli 2013)

1) Die Europäische Union und ihre Mitgliedstaaten beabsichtigen, die in Doha beschlossene Änderung des Kyoto-Protokolls, mit der ein zweiter Verpflichtungszeitraum eingeführt wurde, zu ratifizieren. Wie bereits in Doha angekündigt, wollen die Union und ihre Mitgliedstaaten zusammen mit Island ihren Verpflichtungen gemäß Artikel 4 des Protokolls gemeinsam nachkommen.

2) Die Europäische Union hat mit dem „Klima- und Energiepaket" von 2009 bereits eine verbindliche Regelung für den zweiten Verpflichtungszeitraum (2013-2020) eingeführt, der zufolge die EU und ihre Mitgliedstaaten ihre Treibhausgasemissionen bis 2020 gemessen an den Werten von 1990 um 20 % reduzieren müssen. Die EU und ihre Mitgliedstaaten haben also de facto bereits am 1. Januar 2013 mit der Umsetzung ihrer Verpflichtungen für den zweiten Verpflichtungszeitraum (die sich auf geltende EU-Vorschriften stützt und mit diesen in Einklang steht) begonnen.

3) Was die EU anbelangt, so wird die Änderung von Doha auf Basis von Artikel 218 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union (AEUV) ratifiziert, und zwar im Wege eines auf einem Vorschlag der Kommission basierenden Ratsbeschlusses, dem das Europäische Parlament zustimmen muss. Wie in Doha angekündigt und wie bei internationalen Übereinkommen dieser Art üblich, werden die EU und ihre Mitgliedstaaten ihre Annahmeurkunden, sobald die jeweiligen Ratifikationsverfahren abgeschlossen sind, gleichzeitig hinterlegen, damit die Doha-Änderung für alle Parteien gleichzeitig in Kraft treten kann.

4) Die Kommission arbeitet bereits an den notwendigen Vorschlägen und wird diese so bald wie möglich zur Annahme vorlegen.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006836/13
to the Commission
Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol

From 26 November to 8 December 2012, the United Nations Climate Change Conference was held in Doha, Qatar. The package of the adopted 'Doha Climate Gateway' decisions included amendments to the Kyoto Protocol with a view to establishing its second commitment period.

1. What procedure does the Commission plan to use to manage burden sharing among EU Member States working towards ratifying the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol?

2. What is the schedule and current state of this process?

3. Does the Commission see any obstacles for EU Member States that wish to lead the way in climate policy and to ratify the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol before agreement on burden sharing is reached at EU level?

4. What possibilities does the Commission see for its Member States to influence the kind of procedure chosen, the schedule and/or the political goals of EU-level agreement on burden sharing in the ratification process of the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol? In what cases have EU Member States, and Germany in particular, exerted such influence already?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 2013)

1. The European Union and its Member States intend to ratify the Doha Amendment, which establishes the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. As signalled in Doha, they intend to fulfil their commitments jointly, together with Iceland, in accordance with Article 4 of the Kyoto Protocol.

2. The European Union has already enacted binding legislation for the period corresponding to the second commitment period (2013-2020) through the 2009 'climate and energy' package whereby the EU and its Member States will reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by 20% by 2020 compared to 1990 levels. As a result, implementation of the EU's and Member States' obligations under the second commitment period has *de facto* started on 1 January 2013. It is based on and consistent with existing EU legislation.

3. In as far as the EU is concerned, the Doha Amendment will be ratified in accordance with Article 218 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), through a Council Decision based on a proposal from the Commission and with the consent of the European Parliament. As signalled in Doha and as is standard procedure for such international agreements, the EU and its Member States will simultaneously deposit their instruments of acceptance, following the completion of their respective ratification procedures, to enable the entry into force of the Doha Amendment for all at the same time.

4. The Commission is currently preparing the necessary proposals, with a view to putting these forward and subsequently have them adopted as soon as possible.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006837/13
a la Comisión
Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D)
(12 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Aplicación retroactiva de las medidas antidumping sobre las importaciones de mandarinas en conserva procedentes de la República Popular China

El 22 de febrero de 2013, a propuesta de la Comisión, el Consejo adoptó un Reglamento de ejecución por el que se restablecía un derecho antidumping definitivo sobre las importaciones de determinados cítricos preparados o conservados, principalmente mandarinas, originarios de la República Popular China (Reglamento de Ejecución (UE) n° 158/2013 del Consejo, de 18 de febrero de 2013).

Mediante este Reglamento se aplican dos sentencias de los Tribunales de Luxemburgo, la primera de 17 de febrero de 2011 en el Asunto T-122/09, en la que el Tribunal General anuló el Reglamento en el que se establecían las medidas originales vigentes en la medida en que afectaban a dos exportadores, y la segunda, de 22 de marzo de 2012, en el Asunto C-339/10, en la que el Tribunal de Justicia Europeo declaró nulo ese mismo Reglamento.

Los productores europeos vienen argumentando que, durante los meses en los que no hubo aranceles, se importó masivamente conservas de mandarina procedentes de China, no por un incremento del consumo, sino con la mera intención de almacenar reservas para los próximos años ante un más que posible restablecimiento de los aranceles, como así se produjo finalmente.

En su considerando 161, el Reglamento establecía la posibilidad de cobrar derechos con carácter retroactivo y que dicha retroactividad se decidiría cuando se dispusiera de los datos estadísticos completos.

¿Conoce ya la Comisión, tras casi cuatro meses desde la adopción del Reglamento, los datos estadísticos que le permitan decidir si se cobrarán de forma retroactiva los derechos de arancel?

Respuesta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión
(15 de julio de 2013)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su respuesta a la pregunta escrita P-4675/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=P-2013-004675&language=ES

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006837/13
to the Commission
Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Retroactive application of anti-dumping measures to imports of preserved mandarin oranges from the People's Republic of China

On 22 February 2013, the Council adopted, on a proposal from the Commission, an implementing regulation reimposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain prepared or preserved citrus fruits (namely mandarins, etc.) originating in the People's Republic of China (Council implementing regulation (EU) No 158/2013 of 18 February 2013)

This regulation implements two judgments of the courts in Luxembourg. The first of these was that of the General Court in Case T-122/09, of 17 February 2011, in which it annulled the regulation establishing the original measures applicable in so far as it concerned two exporters. The second was that of the Court of Justice in Case C-338/10, of 22 March 2012, in which it declared the original Regulation invalid.

European producers have consistently maintained that massive imports of mandarin oranges from China took place during the tariff-free months, and that this was not due to an increase in consumption but simply in order to stockpile goods for coming years in face of the likelihood that tariffs would be reinstated, as was finally the case.

Recital 161 of the regulation established the possibility of collecting retroactive duties, with this to be decided upon at a later stage, once full statistical data became available.

Almost four months after the Resolution was adopted, does the Commission now have the statistical data enabling it to decide whether or not to collect retroactive duties?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(15 July 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written question P-4675/2013 [1].

---

[1] http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-006838/13
til Kommissionen
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(12. juni 2013)

Om: Roamingpriser i Europa

En borger har rettet henvendelse til mig vedrørende roamingpriser i Europa. Borgeren giver udtryk for en undren over, hvorfor teleselskaberne må indgå prisaftaler, da det skævvrider markedet og skaber unaturlig høje roamingpriser. De aftalte priser betyder, at det blive meget dyrere at bruge data i udlandet end i sit hjemland.

Mine spørgsmål er derfor følgende:

— Hvorfor må teleselskaberne aftale roamingpriser?

— Gælder kartellovgivningen ikke for telebranchen?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Neelie Kroes
(23. juli 2013)

Roamingpriser udgør en betydelig hindring for et velfungerende indre marked. Derfor har EU vedtaget tre på hinanden følgende forordninger for at imødegå problemet, og EU har til hensigt at tage fat på det igen i sine kommende forslag for at etablere et egentligt indre marked for telekommunikation.

Det bør understreges, at når forbrugere foretager opkald i udlandet, varetages SMS- og datatjenester af en anden udbyder end den, som forbrugeren er kunde hos. Udbyderen for det besøgte net afkræver kundens hjemmeudbyder for denne tjeneste, og hjemmeudbyderen videresender typisk denne ekstraudgift til kunden. Forbrugerpriserne for dette er betydeligt højere end omkostningerne for udbyderen. EU's forordninger satte ind over for disse problemer med overdrevne priser for opkald samt SMS- og datatjenester. De seneste, reviderede regler, som blev vedtaget i 2012, sænker ikke blot roamingpriserne yderligere, men de indfører også foranstaltninger, der skal øge konkurrencen på roamingmarkedet. Dermed sigter EU mod at skabe forhold, hvor roamingmarkedet i sidste ende kan fungere på samme måde som indenrigsmarkedet for mobilkommunikation.

Udbyderne af roamingtjenester skal ganske rigtigt følge både EU's regler på området for elektronisk kommunikation og konkurrencereglerne.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006838/13
to the Commission
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Roaming charges in Europe

A constituent has contacted me concerning roaming charges in Europe. My constituent wonders why telecommunications companies have to conclude pricing agreements, as this distorts the market and creates unnaturally high roaming charges. The agreed prices make it much more expensive to access data abroad than in one's home country.

My question is therefore:

— Why do telecoms companies have to conclude agreements on roaming charges?

— Does cartel legislation not apply to the telecoms sector?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2013)

Roaming charges are an important bottleneck to the functioning of the single market. For this reason the EU has adopted three successive Regulations to tackle the issue and it intends to address it further as part of its upcoming proposals to establish a true Telecoms Single Market.

It has to be considered that when consumers travel abroad their calls, SMS and data services are dealt with by another operator than that of which the consumer is client. The visited network operator charges the customer's home operator for providing this service which usually passes this additional cost on to the customer. These charges are significantly higher than the underlying costs. The EU Regulations addressed these problems of excessive pricing for voice calls, SMS and data services. The latest revised rules, adopted in 2012, not only further diminish roaming charges but also introduce measures to boost competition in the roaming market. In doing so the EU aims at creating the conditions whereby the roaming market can ultimately function as the domestic mobile communications market.

The provision of roaming services has indeed to comply with both EU rules in the field of electronic communications and with competition rules.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006839/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(12 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Κατάργηση του ΟΚΧΕ και μεταφορά αρμοδιοτήτων του στην Κτηματολόγιο ΑΕ

Στο σχέδιο νόμου «Συμπλήρωση διατάξεων περί εθνικού κτηματολογίου και άλλες ρυθμίσεις» ([1]) που κατέθεσε η κυβέρνηση/ΥΠΕΚΑ, δρομολογείται η κατάργηση του Οργανισμού Κτηματολογίου και Χαρτογραφήσεων Ελλάδος (ΟΚΧΕ) και η μεταφορά των αρμοδιοτήτων του στην Κτηματολόγιο ΑΕ, η οποία μετονομάζεται σε Εθνικό Κτηματολόγιο και Χαρτογράφηση ΑΕ (ΕΚΧΑ ΑΕ). Όπως αναφέρεται στην αιτιολογική έκθεση ([2]), η κατάργησή του ΟΚΧΕ έγινε, μεταξύ άλλων, για εξορθολογισμό των φορέων Δημοσίου και εξοικονόμηση δαπανών από μισθοδοσία και λειτουργικά έξοδα. Όμως, ο ΟΚΧΕ έχει 34 υπαλλήλους εκ των οποίων οι 30 είναι μόνιμοι και οι τέσσερις συμβασιούχοι αορίστου χρόνου, οι οποίοι, σύμφωνα με το νομοσχέδιο, θα ενταχθούν στο δυναμικό του υπουργείου. Επίσης, στην αιτιολογική έκθεση αναφέρεται ότι η ΕΚΧΑ ΑΕ θα παρέχει «*καλύτερη υποστήριξη των εθνικών θεμάτων οριοθετήσεων περιοχών όπου η χώρα ασκεί νόμιμα δικαιώματα*» από τον ΟΚΧΕ. Σε ό,τι αφορά την Κτηματολόγιο ΑΕ σημειώνεται ότι, σύμφωνα με τα όσα έχουν γίνει δημόσια γνωστά μέχρι σήμερα, τα τέσσερα τελευταία χρόνια δεν έχει ολοκληρωθεί κάποιο έστω από τα 23 εκκρεμή προγράμματα κτηματογράφησης, ενώ επί δύο δεκαετίες έχουν δαπανηθεί συνολικά περί τα 1 δισ. ευρώ και έχει υλοποιηθεί το 17,7% του συνολικού έργου κατάρτισης του εθνικού κτηματολογίου ([3]). Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει ενημέρωση από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση για τις αλλαγές, δεδομένου ότι, σύμφωνα με το νόμο 3882/2010 ([4]), με τον οποίο η Ελλάδα εναρμονίζεται με την Οδηγία 2007/2/ΕΚ, ο ΟΚΧΕ είχε πολλαπλούς ρόλους στην εφαρμογή της Οδηγίας και ειδικότερα την ενημέρωση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής; Εκτιμά ότι η εν λόγω κατάργηση ενός δημοσίου φορέα και η μεταφορά αρμοδιοτήτων του σε έναν ιδιωτικό, συνάδει με το πνεύμα της Οδηγίας 2007/2/ΕΚ; Ο νέος φορέας μπορεί να αναλάβει τις υποχρεώσεις που είχε ο ΟΚΧΕ;

2. Ποια είναι η τελευταία ενημέρωση που έχει σε σχέση με την πορεία υλοποίησης του εθνικού κτηματολογίου από την Κτηματολόγιο ΑΕ;

3. Έχει στοιχεία σχετικά με το αν η γεωχωρική πληροφορία διατίθεται δωρεάν και είναι ευθύνη του δημοσίου σε άλλα κράτη μέλη;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(23 Αυγούστου 2013)

1. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή ενημερώθηκε από το εθνικό σημείο επαφής για θέματα της οδηγίας Inspire ([5]) στην Ελλάδα ότι οι αρμοδιότητες όσον αφορά την οδηγία Inspire και την επικοινωνία με την Επιτροπή έχουν ανατεθεί στο υπουργείο Περιβάλλοντος, Ενέργειας και Κλιματικής Αλλαγής, όπως προβλέπει ρητά το άρθρο 1 του νόμου αριθ. 4164 που εκδόθηκε στις 9 Ιουλίου 2013.

Η οδηγία Inspire δεν καθιστά υποχρεωτικό κάποιο συγκεκριμένο νομικό καθεστώς για το εθνικό σημείο επαφής. Τα κράτη μέλη είναι υπεύθυνα να διασφαλίζουν ότι το εθνικό σημείο επαφής μπορεί να αναλάβει τις αρμοδιότητες που απαιτεί η οδηγία.

2. Η οδηγία Inspire δεν απαιτεί την υποβολή εκθέσεων σχετικά με την πρόοδο της υλοποίησης του εθνικού κτηματολογίου. Ωστόσο, μέσω της τεχνικής βοήθειας που παρέχεται στην Κτηματολόγιο ΑΕ υπό τον συντονισμό της Ομάδας Δράσης για την Ελλάδα, η Επιτροπή ενημερώνεται τακτικά για την πρόοδο στην ολοκλήρωση του εθνικού κτηματολογίου. Η τελευταία αποστολή εμπειρογνωμόνων για τα κτηματολόγια των κρατών μελών στην Ελλάδα πραγματοποιήθηκε τον Ιούλιο και η Επιτροπή (Ομάδα Δράσης) έλαβε τη σχετική έκθεση στις 31 Ιουλίου (2013).

3. Η οδηγία Inspire δεν απαιτεί τη δωρεάν παροχή γεωχωρικών πληροφοριών με ευθύνη των δημοσίων αρχών. Ορισμένες χώρες αποφάσισαν να παρέχουν δωρεάν ορισμένες από τις γεωχωρικές τους πληροφορίες. Πληροφορίες σχετικά με τις πολιτικές δεδομένων που εφαρμόζουν τα κράτη μέλη μπορούν να βρεθούν στον ιστότοπο Inspire ([6]).

---

(1) httttp://www.tovima.gr/files/1/2013/06/08/%CE%A3%CF%87%CE%AD%CE%B4%CE%B9%CE%BF%CE%9D%CF%8C%CE%BC%CE%BF%CF%85.pdf
(2) htttp://www.tovima.gr/files/1/2013/06/08/%CE%91%CE%B9%CF%84%CE%B9%CE%BF%CE%BB%CE%BF%CE%B3%CE%B9%CE%BA%CE%AE.pdf
(3) http://www.enet.gr/?i=news.el.article&id=334804
(4) http://www.ypeka.gr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=6UfqY151yMQ%3D&tabid=506
(5) Οδηγία 2007/2/ΕΚ — ΕΕ L 108 της 24.4.2007, σ. 1.
(6) http://inspire.jrc.ec.europa.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006839/13
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Abolition of the Greek Land Registry and Mapping Agency and transfer of responsibilities to Ktimatologio SA

A draft law entitled 'Additional provisions governing the national land registry and other provisions' ([1]) tabled by the government (Ministry of the Environment, Energy and Climate Change) has set in motion the closure of the Greek Land Registry and Mapping Agency (OKCHE) and the transfer of its responsibilities to Ktimatologio SA, which is to be renamed Ethniko Ktimatologio kai Chartografisi SA (EKCHA SA). According to the preamble ([2]), the OKCHE is being closed, *inter alia*, in order to rationalise public sector agencies and save money on wages and operating costs. However, the OKCHE has 34 employees, of whom 30 are permanent and four are under contracts of employment of unlimited term who, according to the bill tabled, will be transferred to the ministry staff. The preamble also states that EKCHA SA will provide 'better support for national mapping issues where the country exercises legal rights' than the OKCHE. As far as Ktimatologio SA is concerned, it should be noted that, according to reports to date, not one of the 23 outstanding land registration programmes has been completed in the last four years, a total of EUR 1 billion has been spent over the last twenty years, and just 17.7% of the total land registry project has been implemented. In view of the above ([3]), will the Commission say:

1. Has it been advised of the changes by the Greek Government, given that, under Law 3882/2010 ([4]) transposing Directive 2007/2/EC, the OKCHE plays several roles in the application of the directive, especially in informing the European Commission? Does it consider that the closure of this public sector agency and the transfer of its responsibilities to the private sector is in keeping with the spirit of Directive 2007/2/EC? Will the new agency be able to assume the responsibilities of the OKCHE?

2. When was it last advised of progress in the implementation of the national land register by Ktimatologio SA?

3. Does it have any information as to whether geospatial information is provided free of charge and is the responsibility of the government in other Member States?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(23 August 2013)

1. The Commission has been informed by the Greek national point of contact for the INSPIRE Directive ([5]) that the responsibilities concerning the INSPIRE Directive, and for contacts with the Commission, are assigned to the Ministry for the Environment, Energy and Climate Change, as explicitly stated in Article1 of law No 4164 issued on 9 July 2013.

The INSPIRE Directive does not oblige any particular legal status for the national point of contact. Member States are responsible for ensuring that the national point of contact is able to assume the responsibilities required by the directive.

2. The INSPIRE Directive does not require reporting on the progress of implementation of the national land register. However, through the technical assistance provided to Ktimatologio SA coordinated by the Commission Task Force for Greece, the Commission is regularly informed about progress in completing implementation of the national land register. The last mission of the Member State cadastre experts to Greece was in July and their report received by the Commission (Task Force) on 31 July (2013).

3. The INSPIRE Directive does not require geospatial information under the responsibility of public authorities to be provided free of charge. Some countries decided to provide some of their geospatial data free of charge. Information on data policies applied in Member States can be found on the INSPIRE website ([6]).

([1]) http://www.tovima.gr/files/1/2013/06/08/%CE%A3%CF%87%CE%AD%CE%B4%CE%B9%CE%BF%CE%9D%CF%8C%CE%BC%CE%BF%CF%85.pdf
([2]) http://www.tovima.gr/files/1/2013/06/08/%CE%91%CE%B9%CF%84%CE%B9%CE%BF%CE%BB%CE%BF%CE%B3%CE%B9%CE%BA%CE%AE.pdf
([3]) http://www.enet.gr/?i=news.el.article&id=334804.
([4]) http://www.ypeka.gr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=6UfqY151yMQ%3D&tabid=506.
([5]) Directive 2007/2/EC — OJ L108/1, 24.4.2007.
([6]) http://inspire.jrc.ec.europa.eu/.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006840/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(12 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Απορρόφηση πόρων του ΕΣΠΑ

Πληροφορίες αναφέρουν ότι είναι αργή η απορρόφηση πόρων στα πλαίσια του ΕΣΠΑ, ενώ ερωτηματικά προκαλεί η είδηση που έφτασε και στην Βουλή των Ελλήνων ότι επιχειρήσεις με τις οποίες συνδέονται βουλευτές και πολιτικοί ζητούν να ενισχυθούν με κοινοτικούς πόρους. Την ίδια ώρα, δεκάδες ελληνικές μικρές και μεσαίες επιχειρήσεις έχουν υποβάλει αίτηση συγχρηματοδότησης επενδυτικών σχεδίων και αποκλείονται από αυτή, ενώ αγωνίζονται να εγγυηθούν θέσεις εργασίας σε μια χώρα που η επίσημη ανεργία έφτασε ήδη το 29%.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή ποιες επιχειρήσεις που συνδέονται με πολιτικούς, βουλευτές κ.λπ. έχουν υποβάλει αίτηση χρηματοδότησης από το ΕΣΠΑ και για ποια ποσά ανά περίπτωση;

2. Πού βρίσκεται το ποσοστό απορρόφησης του ΕΣΠΑ σήμερα και γιατί υπάρχει τέτοια δυσκολία να ενισχυθούν μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις που απασχολούν χιλιάδες Έλληνες εργαζόμενους και καταφέρνουν να μείνουν όρθιες εν μέσω της δεινής κρίσεως που χτύπησε την Ελλάδα;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Ιουλίου 2013)

1. Το ελληνικό εθνικό στρατηγικό πλαίσιο αναφοράς (ΕΣΠΑ) προϋποθέτει τη συμμόρφωση με συστήματα και κανόνες διαχείρισης και ελέγχου, έτσι ώστε να διασφαλίζεται η καλύτερη δυνατή χρήση των χρημάτων των Ευρωπαίων φορολογουμένων προς όφελος των βέλτιστων έργων σε κάθε κράτος μέλος. Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει συγκεκριμένα στοιχεία για εταιρείες που χρηματοδοτούνται από κοινοτικούς πόρους λόγω των διασυνδέσεών τους με βουλευτές και πολιτικούς.

2. Το ποσοστό απορρόφησης του ελληνικού ΕΣΠΑ είναι ικανοποιητικό (57%) και υπερβαίνει τον μέσο όρο της ΕΕ (52%). Η στήριξη των ΜΜΕ και η αντιμετώπιση της έλλειψης ρευστότητας στην Ελλάδα συγκαταλέγονται στις κυριότερες προκλήσεις, και ένα σημαντικό μέρος των πόρων της ΕΕ διατίθεται για την αντιμετώπιση των εν λόγω θεμάτων στο πλαίσιο του τρέχοντος ΕΣΠΑ. Πάνω από 4,5 δισ. ευρώ έχουν διατεθεί ως άμεσες ενισχύσεις σε επιχειρήσεις. 2,5 δισ. ευρώ έχουν δηλωθεί ως ήδη καταβληθέντα στους δικαιούχους. 1,3 δισ. ευρώ έχουν διατεθεί σε μέσα χρηματοοικονομικής τεχνικής με στόχο την παροχή βοήθειας σε ΜΜΕ μέσω δανείων, εγγυήσεων και επιδοτούμενων επιτοκίων. Λόγω της βαθιάς κρίσης, ο κανονισμός ΕΤΠΑ τροποποιήθηκε, έτσι ώστε να είναι δυνατή η συγχρηματοδότηση του κεφαλαίου κίνησης μέσω δανείων.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006840/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Take-up of NSRF resources

There have been reports of the slow take-up of NSRF resources and questions have been raised in the wake of news which also reached the Hellenic Parliament that companies with which MPs and politicians have links are to be funded from Community resources. At the same time, dozens of small and medium-sized Greek enterprises have applied for and been refused co-financing for investment plans, while they are fighting to guarantee jobs in a country in which official unemployment has already reached 29%.

1. Does the Commission know which companies with links to politicians, MPs and so on have applied for co-financing under the NSRF and for how much in each case?

2. What is the current take-up rate of the NSRF and why are there such difficulties in supporting small and medium-sized enterprises, which employ thousands of the Greek workers and are managing to keep their head above water in the midst of the harsh crisis which has hit Greece?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

1. The Greek National Strategic Framework Reference (NSRF) is subject to compliance with management and control systems and rules in order to ensure the best use of the European tax payer monies to the benefit of the best projects in each Member State. The Commission has no specific information on companies funded by Community resources, because of their links with MPs and politicians.

2. The take up rate of the Greek NSRF is satisfactory (57%) and above the EU average (52%). Support to SMEs and tackling the lack of liquidity in Greece has been identified as one of the major challenges and a significant part of EU resources has been allocated to address these issues under the current NSRF. More than EUR 4.5 billion have been allocated as direct aid to entreprises. An amount of EUR 2.5 billion has been reported as already disbursed to the beneficiaries. In addition, an amount of EUR 1.3 billion has been allocated to financial engineering instruments to assist SMEs through loans, guarantees and subsidised interest rates. Because of the severe crisis, the ERDF regulation has been modified to allow co-financing of working capital through loans.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006842/13
to the Commission
Marta Andreasen (ECR)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Financial transaction tax (FTT)

It is reported that the Commission's proposal for an enhanced cooperation version of a financial transaction tax is being re-examined as a viable option and that a much reduced rate of tax is now being considered.

Could the Commission say whether tax rates levied as part of the FTT below 0.1% have been considered for equities and whether rates below 0.01% have been considered for derivatives?

Has the Commission carried out an impact assessment of the effects of these lower rates on the GDP of the EU, along the lines of the earlier impact assessment (SEC(2011)1102, Vol. 1) of 28 September2011? If so, what is the best estimate of this impact assessment?

Has the Commission estimated how much revenue these taxes would raise at these lower rates? If so, could the Commission quantify the best estimate and likely range of this revenue?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2013)

1. The EU Member States are discussing — at a detailed article by article level — the Commission proposal in the Council Working Group. The proposed tax rates are minimum rates: 0.01% for derivatives transactions and 0.1% for other transactions (due from each taxable party involved in the transaction). The Commission is not proposing lower rates.

On 3 July 2013 the EU Parliament adopted a resolution on FTT which suggests the application of lower rates to repurchase/reverse repurchase agreements (minimum rate of 0.01% for financial transactions with a maturity of up to three months) on a permanent basis, and to government debt instruments (minimum rate of 0.05%) and to transactions carried out by pension funds (minimum rates of 0.05% and 0.005% respectively) on a temporary basis (until 1 January 2017). The Commission understands the spirit and the logic of the proposal but considers that the issue should be analysed in more detail.

2. No.

3. No.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006843/13
to the Commission
Marta Andreasen (ECR)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: European Union pension scheme

The European Union pension scheme is, I understand, a defined benefit scheme.

Could the Commission say how many retired EU employees drew pensions under the scheme in the most recent year for which complete figures are available?

What was the total sum paid out by the pension scheme that year?

How many retired EU employees are expected to draw pensions under the scheme in 2021?

How much in total do the Commission's actuaries estimate will be paid by the pension scheme over that year?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2013)

The Honourable Member is invited to consult Section III of the EU budget which contains information on demography and pension expenditure of the EU institutions.

The Commission draws the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that long-term demographic and economic forecast related to the pension scheme are dealt with in the 2010 Eurostat pension study (SEC(2010) 989).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006844/13
alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(12 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Omogeneizzazione delle direttive UE in materia di inserimento di prodotti nelle opere audiovisive

A titolo dell'articolo 1 (1) (m), della direttiva sui servizi di media audiovisivi (Direttiva SMA) (2010/13/UE), «l'inserimento di prodotti è ogni forma di comunicazione commerciale audiovisiva che consiste nell'inserire o nel fare riferimento a un prodotto, a un servizio o a un marchio così che appaia all'interno di un programma dietro pagamento o altro compenso».

L'inserimento di prodotti è in linea di principio vietato, ma è consentito in alcuni casi. L'autorizzazione si applica soltanto alle condizioni stabilite nella direttiva, ma gli Stati membri possono, in alcuni casi derogare a queste condizioni e, in altri casi, imporre norme più stringenti. Sono in gioco la responsabilità e l'indipendenza editoriale del fornitore di servizi di media e la tutela del consumatore, nonché la tutela della cultura dalle influenze del mercantilismo.

L'articolo 11 (2) della Direttiva SMA afferma che «è vietato l'inserimento di prodotti». Il divieto tuttavia, è notevolmente indebolito da una serie di ampie eccezioni. Ad esempio, il comma 3 ammette che «in deroga» l'inserimento di prodotti è ammissibile nei seguenti casi:

— «Nelle opere cinematografiche, in film e serie prodotti per i servizi di media audiovisivi, in programmi sportivi e in programmi di intrattenimento leggero», purché questi non siano programmi per bambini; e

— «Dove non ci sia pagamento, ma soltanto fornitura gratuita di determinati beni o servizi, quali aiuti alla produzione e premi, in vista della loro inclusione all'interno di un programma».

Gli inserimenti di prodotti consentiti, come indicato sopra, devono rispettare almeno quattro condizioni relative all'influenza indebita, indebito effetto promozionale, indebito rilievo e all'obbligo di informare. L'articolo 11 (2) presenta quindi una serie di eccezioni al divieto di inserimento di prodotti. Gli unici divieti a livello paneuropeo sono in relazione a prodotti del tabacco e prodotti farmaceuticosanitarî soggetti a prescrizione medica, e nei programmi per bambini.

La formulazione dell'articolo 11 della Direttiva SMA consente a diversi Stati membri di fissare le proprie regole, creando nella pratica atteggiamenti conflittuali tra gli Stati membri, al cui interno le opere audiovisive (e diversi inserimenti di prodotti) circolano liberamente.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, può la Commissione rispondere a quanto segue:

la Commissione ritiene necessario introdurre una direttiva omogenea più severa, applicabile a tutti gli Stati membri, che disciplini l'inserimento di prodotti nelle opere audiovisive?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(17 luglio 2013)

La direttiva sui servizi di media audiovisivi (direttiva n. 2010/13/EU) detta le norme minime di armonizzazione in materia di comunicazioni commerciali audiovisive.

L'inserimento di prodotti è regolato dall'articolo 11 della direttiva, che definisce le condizioni di ammissibilità e il cui rispetto è obbligatorio in ogni Stato membro. I singoli Stati membri hanno comunque facoltà di applicare norme più restrittive, in applicazione di quanto legiferato a livello europeo, oppure di proibire l'inserimento di prodotti.

In merito all'interpretazione delle 4 condizioni elencate all'articolo 11, paragrafo 3, la Commissione effettuerà una valutazione dell'opportunità di emanare ulteriori orientamenti sulla normativa delle comunicazioni commerciali audiovisive quando potrà avvalersi dei risultati della consultazione pubblica attualmente in corso, relativa al Libro verde «Prepararsi a un mondo audiovisivo della piena convergenza: crescita, creazione e valori».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006844/13
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Homogenising EU directives on product placement in audiovisual works

According to Article 1(1)(m) of the Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMSD) (2010/13/EU), product placement is 'any form of audiovisual commercial communication consisting of the inclusion of or reference to a product, a service or the trade mark thereof so that it is featured within a programme, in return for payment or for similar consideration'.

Product placement is in principle prohibited, but is permitted in certain cases. Permission only applies under the conditions set out in the directive, but Member States can in some cases derogate from these conditions and in other cases impose more stringent rules. At stake are the responsibility and editorial independence of the media service provider and the protection of the consumer, as well as the protection of culture from the influences of commercialism.

Article 11(2) of the AVMSD states that 'product placement shall be prohibited'. However, this prohibition, is significantly weakened by a set of broad exceptions. For example, 'by way of derogation', paragraph 3 concedes, product placement is admissible in the following contexts:

— 'In cinematographic works, films and series made for audiovisual media services, sports programmes and light entertainment programmes', provided these are not children's programmes; and

— 'Where there is no payment, but only the provision of certain goods or services free of charge, such as production props and prizes, with a view to their inclusion in a programme.'

The permitted product placements, as outlined above, must abide by at least four conditions relating to undue influence, undue promotional effect, undue prominence and obligation to inform. Article 11(2) therefore presents a set of exceptions to the prohibition of product placement. The only pan-European level prohibitions are in relation to tobacco products and medical products available under prescription, and in children's programmes.

The wording of Article 11 of the AVMSD allows different Member States to set their own rules, creating conflicting attitudes towards practice among Member States, within which audiovisual works (and different product placements) circulate freely.

In light of the above, could the Commission answer the following:

Does the Commission consider it necessary to introduce a stricter, homogenous directive applicable to all Member States governing product placement in audiovisual works?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(17 July 2013)

The Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMSD Directive 2010/13/EU) sets up minimal harmonisation rules governing audiovisual commercial communications.

Product placement is regulated by Article 11 AVMSD. This article defines conditions for admissible product placement which must be respected in each Member State. However individual Member States may choose to apply stricter rules in conformity with EC law or to forbid product placement.

As to the interpretation of the 4 conditions referred to in Article 11 (3), the Commission will assess the need to provide further guidance on rules on audiovisual commercial communications, depending on the outcome of the ongoing public consultation on the Green Paper 'Preparing for a Fully Converged Audiovisual World: Growth, Creation and Values'.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-006845/13
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(12 ta' Ġunju 2013)

Suġġett: Sajd eċċessiv

B'referenza għall-figuri ta' Mejju 2013 għall-istokkijiet tal-ħut fl-ilmijiet tal-UE, il-Kummissjoni dan l-aħħar ħabbret li l-livelli ta' sajd eċċessiv naqsu.

Taħseb il-Kummissjoni li dan it-tnaqqis fil-livelli ta' sajd eċċessiv huwa fenomenu temporanju jew wieħed permanenti, u għaliex?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sra Damanaki f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(6 ta' Awwissu 2013)

Il-proporzjon tal-istokkijiet mistada mill-UE fil-Grigal tal-Atlantiku, fil-Baħar tat-Tramuntana u fil-Baħar Baltiku, li ġew irrappurtati bħala qbid eċċessiv, naqas minn 94% fl-2005 sa 39% fl-2013 ([1]).

Dan is-suċċess kien possibbli bis-saħħa tal-impenn tal-Kummissjoni, tal-Istati Membri u tal-industrija Ewropej tas-sajd biex adottaw pjanijiet fit-tul, biex aċċettaw tnaqqis fuq terminu qasir fl-opportunitajiet tas-sajd biex jiżguraw kisbiet fuq terminu medju u fit-tul, u biex infurzaw miżuri ta' konżervazzjoni.

Fil-Mediterran u fil-Baħar l-Iswed, il-valutazzjonijiet l-aktar riċenti jindikaw li 88% tal-istokkijiet qegħdin jinstadu b'mod eċċessiv. B'kollaborazzjoni mal-Istati Membri u l-pajjiżi terzi li jistadu f'dawn l-ibħra, il-Kummissjoni qiegħda tfittex li timplimenta miżuri biex dan is-sajd eċċessiv jitneħħa progressivament.

Għall-biċċa l-kbira tal-istokkijiet ta' ħut tal-baħar fond fil-Grigal tal-Atlantiku, m'hemmx biżżejjed dejta disponibbli għal valutazzjoni kwantitattiva, u lanqas għal analiżi tax-xejriet. Ħafna stokkijiet, partikularment tal-kelb il-baħar tal-baħar fond, jitqiesu eżawriti. Stokk wieħed biss tal-baħar fond (Roundnose Grenadier, fiż-Żoni VI, VII, Vb u XIIb) minn dawk li ġew ivvalutati nstab li mhuwiex mistad b'mod eċċessiv.

Ir-Riforma tal-Politika Komuni tas-Sajd naqqxet fil-leġiżlazzjoni tal-UE l-politika li l-Kummissjoni ilha timplimenta dawn l-aħħar snin, speċifikament li ssegwi l-impenji internazzjonali tal-Istati Membri sabiex jinkiseb, bħala oġġettiv formali, ir-rendiment massimu sostenibbli. Barra minn hekk, din ir-Riforma tirrikjedi t-tneħħija progressiva tal-iskartar tal-ħut maqbud, u li jiġi evitat il-qbid mhux mixtieq, fost miżuri oħra. Ir-Riforma se tgħin biex tkompli ttejjeb l-istokkijiet fl-ibħra tal-UE.

([1]) Komunikazzjoni tal-Kummissjoni lill-Kunsill fir-rigward ta' konsultazzjoni dwar l-Opportunitajiet tas-Sajd għall-2014 (COM(2013) 319 finali).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006845/13
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Overfishing

Drawing on the May 2013 figures for fish stocks in EU waters, the Commission recently announced that levels of overfishing have decreased.

Does the Commission feel that this decrease in levels of overfishing is a temporary or permanent phenomenon, and why?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2013)

The proportion of stocks fished by the EU in the Northeast Atlantic, North Sea and Baltic Sea that were reported as overfished fell from 94% in 2005 to 39% in 2013 ([1]).

This success was possible thanks to the commitment of the Commission, the Member States and European fishing industries to adopt long-term plans, to accept short-term reductions in fishing opportunities to secure medium to long-term gains, and enforce conservation measures.

In the Mediterranean and the Black Sea the most recent assessments indicate that 88% of the stocks are overfished. The Commission is seeking, in collaboration with Member States and third countries fishing in these waters, to put in place measures to phase out this overfishing.

For most deep-sea fish stocks in the Northeast Atlantic insufficient data is available for a quantitative assessment to be made or for trends to be assessed. Many stocks, particularly of deep-sea sharks, are also believed to be depleted. Only one deep-sea stock (Roundnose Grenadier in Zones VI, VII, Vb and XIIb) has been assessed as not overfished.

The Reform of the Common Fishing Policy has enshrined in EU legislation the policy which the Commission has been implementing for the last years, namely following international commitments of Member States to achieve Maximum Sustainable Yield as a formal objective. Moreover this Reform requires the progressive elimination of discards and the avoidance of unwanted catches among other measures and it will help to further improve the stocks in EU waters.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the Council concerning a consultation on Fishing Opportunities for 2014" (COM(2013) 319 final).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006846/13
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(12 juin 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Obligation de rendre des comptes des dirigeants kényans

Uhuru Kenyatta, le président kényan, et William Ruto, le vice-président, sont accusés de crimes contre l'humanité présumés qui auraient été commis lors des affrontements déclenchés par les résultats contestés de l'élection de décembre 2007, lesquels ont fait plus de 1 000 morts et conduit au déplacement d'un demi-million de personnes. Les crimes exposés dans la décision de la Chambre préliminaire de la CPI incluent le meurtre, le transfert forcé de population, le viol, la persécution et d'autres actes inhumains.

L'Organisation de l'unité africaine, qui a précédé l'Union africaine, a été fondée afin de mettre un terme aux innombrables violations des droits fondamentaux infligées aux Africains se trouvant sous le joug du colonialisme. Aujourd'hui, l'Union africaine doit rester ferme et soutenir les victimes de violations des droits humains imputées à leurs propres dirigeants.

1. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante compte-t-elle inviter l'Union africaine à s'opposer aux tentatives du Kenya de soustraire ses dirigeants à l'obligation de rendre des comptes pour les violations des droits humains ayant eu lieu dans ce pays en 2007-2008?

2. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante Commission ne devrait-elle pas entreprendre des pourparlers afin que l'Union africaine rejette la résolution présentée par le gouvernement kényan demandant que cette affaire portée devant la Cour pénale internationale soit renvoyée devant la justice kényane?

Réponse donnée par Mme Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(20 août 2013)

L'Union européenne est un fervent partisan de la Cour pénale internationale. L'Afrique a joué un rôle important dans la création de la CPI et l'Union européenne est déterminée à travailler avec les gouvernements africains et les populations dans le but de promouvoir l'État de droit et de faire de la CPI l'institution clé dans la lutte contre l'impunité des crimes les plus graves.

Lors de son sommet de mai, l'Union africaine a adopté une résolution, déposée par l'Ouganda et le Soudan du Sud et soutenue par l'ensemble des pays de l'Afrique orientale ([1]), invitant la CPI à renvoyer les affaires devant le Kenya, compte tenu des réformes constitutionnelles et judiciaires menées dans le pays, et à présenter sa plainte aux Nations unies.

Bien que le Statut de Rome accorde la priorité aux tribunaux nationaux si une justice légitime peut être rendue au niveau local, la décision relative à ce recours susceptible de renvoyer une affaire devant une juridiction nationale incombe à la CPI elle-même.

Pour promouvoir davantage le principe de justice internationale, l'Union européenne continuera d'encourager le dialogue et les contacts entre la CPI et l'Union africaine. Le prochain sommet Afrique-UE de 2014 sera l'occasion d'un échange avec les pays africains sur la CPI.

([1]) Éthiopie, Kenya, Ouganda, Soudan, Soudan du Sud, Tanzanie, Burundi, Rwanda, Somalie et Djibouti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006846/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Kenya's leaders should be held to account

The Kenyan President, Uhuru Kenyatta, and Deputy President, William Ruto, stand accused of crimes against humanity allegedly committed during the clashes which were sparked by the disputed results of the election held in December 2007 and which left more than 1000 dead and forced half a million people to leave their homes. The crimes set out in the decision of the International Criminal Court's Pre-Trial Chamber include murder, forcible transfer of population, rape, persecution and other inhumane acts.

The Organisation of African Unity (now the African Union) was established to put an end to the innumerable violations of Africans' fundamental rights under colonial rule. Today, the African Union must stand firm and support the victims of human rights violations of which their own leaders have been accused.

1. Will the Vice-President/High Representative ask the African Union to oppose Kenya's attempts to prevent its leaders from being held to account for the human rights violations which took place in the country in 2007-2008?

2. Should the Vice-President/High Representative not initiate talks to ensure that the African Union throws out the resolution submitted by the Kenyan Government calling for the case brought before the ICC to be referred for trial in Kenya?

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

The EU is a staunch supporter of the ICC. Africa has been instrumental in the setting up of the ICC and the EU is dedicated to working with African Governments and people to support the rule of law and the ICC as the key institution in the fight against impunity of the most serious crimes.

At its summit in May, the AU adopted a resolution, tabled by Uganda and South Sudan and supported by the whole Eastern bloc ([1]), calling on the ICC to refer the cases back to Kenya, in light of judicial and constitutional reforms within the country, and to put forward its complaint at the UN.

While the Rome Statute provides for domestic courts to take priority, if genuine justice is available locally, the decision on this challenge potentially referring a case back to national mechanism is for the ICC itself to take.

In order to promote further the principle of international justice, the EU will continue to encourage dialogue and contacts between the ICC and the AU. It will seize the opportunity of the AU-EU summit 2014 for an exchange with African countries on the ICC.

([1]) Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Sudan, South Sudan, Tanzania, Burundi, Rwanda, Somalia, Djibouti.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006847/13
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(12 juin 2013)

Objet: OCDE et taux de chômage des jeunes en Europe

Les pays de l'Organisation de coopération et de développement économiques (OCDE) se sont engagés à accélérer les efforts déployés pour s'attaquer au chômage élevé des jeunes et renforcer leurs systèmes éducatifs afin que les jeunes soient mieux préparés au monde du travail et ont proposé un plan d'action pour lutter contre le chômage des jeunes en Europe.

Plus de 22 millions de jeunes sont privés d'emploi, sans formation et hors du système éducatif dans les 34 pays que regroupe l'OCDE. Le taux de chômage des jeunes a atteint 16,5 % et la situation ne fait qu'empirer avec la crise. Elle est particulièrement alarmante dans les pays du Sud de l'Europe avec un chiffre record, de plus de 55 %, en Espagne et en Grèce. En France, il s'élève à 26,5 %.

L'OCDE suggère entre autres que les États prennent des mesures anticrise pour garantir aux jeunes un niveau de revenu suffisant, surtout pour les plus défavorisés qui sont souvent les moins qualifiés.

À plusieurs reprises, le président de la Commission s'est dit inquiet du taux de chômage des jeunes en Europe. Le Conseil, de son côté, a mis en marche la «Garantie Jeunesse», cofinancée par les États membres et dotée de 6 millions d'euros pour les 28 États membres, pour une période de 7 ans, afin de réduire le chômage parmi les jeunes.

1. Quelles mesures la Commission compte-t-elle présenter pour tenir compte du plan d'action proposé par l'OCDE dans la lutte contre le chômage des jeunes en Europe?

2. La Commission peut-elle fournir des informations par État membre sur le taux de chômage des jeunes en Europe? Quelle est la tendance pour les deux années à venir?

3. Comment la Commission peut-elle expliquer la mise en place de mesures d'austérité (réforme du marché du travail, précarité, coupes sombres en matière d'éducation, de formation, d'emploi, d'aides au logement et de santé, entre autres) qui empêchent le développement intellectuel, professionnel et humain des jeunes?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(29 juillet 2013)

1. Le plan d'action de l'OCDE pour les jeunes comporte un grand nombre des éléments que la Commission considère comme essentiels pour l'efficacité d'une garantie pour la jeunesse, tels que l'accent mis sur la transition vers le monde du travail, l'importance de l'orientation professionnelle, l'engagement des partenaires sociaux, le soutien aux jeunes qui ne travaillent pas et ne suivent ni études ni formation, les programmes de la deuxième chance pour les jeunes qui quittent prématurément l'école. Le plan souligne également la nécessité de renforcer le rôle et l'efficacité de l'enseignement et de la formation professionnels, y compris en ce qui concerne la formation par le travail et la qualité des contrats d'apprentissage conformément aux objectifs de l'alliance européenne pour l'apprentissage.

2. Les derniers taux de chômage des jeunes par État membre sont indiqués dans la Revue trimestrielle sur l'emploi et la situation sociale dans l'UE, publiée le 25 juin 2013 ([1]). Les prévisions établies par la Commission européenne portent uniquement sur l'évolution du taux de chômage total et ne concernent pas spécifiquement le chômage des jeunes ([2]). L'Organisation internationale du travail établit certes des prévisions pour le taux de chômage des jeunes, mais il s'agit d'un pronostic global pour les économies développées et l'Union européenne ([3]). D'après son rapport de 2013 ([4]), ce taux global de chômage des jeunes devrait commencer à diminuer en 2015 et descendre à un niveau sensiblement plus bas d'ici à 2018 (il passerait de 17,9 % en 2013 à 17,0 % en 2015 et à 15,9 % en 2018).

([1]) Figure 18, page 19. http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=fr&catId=89&newsId=1923&furtherNews=yes
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/forecasts_en.htm
([3]) Les économies développées comprennent le Canada, les États-Unis, l'Australie, Israël, le Japon, la Nouvelle-Zélande, l'Islande, la Norvège et la Suisse.
([4]) Tendances mondiales de l'emploi des jeunes 2013: Une génération menacée, http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/documents/publication/wcms_212873.pdf

3. Les mesures d'austérité ont été dictées par une évolution préoccupante des finances publiques et le fait qu'un certain nombre de pays ont été frappés par une crise de confiance qui a limité l'accès au financement de la dette. Pour éviter un défaut de paiement pur et simple et restaurer la confiance, une action déterminée était nécessaire non seulement dans le domaine fiscal mais aussi dans celui des réformes structurelles, qui peuvent contribuer à la croissance et à l'ajustement.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006847/13
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and youth unemployment rates in Europe

OECD countries have pledged to accelerate efforts to tackle high youth unemployment and to strengthen their education systems so that young people are better prepared for the world of work; they have also proposed an action plan to combat youth unemployment in Europe.

Over 22 million young people are not in education, employment or training in the 34 OECD countries. Youth unemployment has reached 16.5% and the crisis is only making matters worse. The situation is particularly alarming in southern European countries, with youth unemployment at a record level of over 55% in Spain and Greece. In France, youth unemployment stands at 26.5%.

One of the OECD's suggestions is that countries take anti-crisis measures in order to guarantee young people an adequate income, particularly for the most disadvantaged, who are often the least qualified.

The President of the Commission has said on several occasions that he is concerned about youth unemployment in Europe. The Council has launched the 'Youth Guarantee', co-financed by the Member States and allocated a budget of EUR 6 million for the 28 Member States, over seven years, in order to reduce youth unemployment.

1. What steps does the Commission plan to take to accommodate the action plan proposed by the OECD to combat youth unemployment in Europe?

2. Can the Commission provide information on youth unemployment rates in Europe, per Member State? What is the predicted trend for the next two years?

3. How can the Commission explain the introduction of austerity measures (including labour market reform, lack of job security, swingeing cuts to education, training, jobs, housing benefit and healthcare) which prevent the intellectual, professional and human development of young people?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

1. The OECD Youth Action Plan entails many of the elements that the COM considers crucial to deliver a successful Youth Guarantee, e.g. focus on transition to the world of work, importance of career guidance, involvement of social partners, support to NEETs, second-chance programmes for early school leavers. The Plan also highlights the need to strengthen the role and effectiveness of VET, including work-based learning and quality of apprenticeships — this is in line with the objectives of the European Alliance for Apprenticeships.

2. The most recent youth unemployment rates by Member States are provided in the EU Employment and Social Situation Quarterly Review that was published on 25 June 2013 ([1]). The European Commission does not have its own forecasts for youth unemployment and only forecasts the total unemployment rate developments ([2]). The International Labour Organisation projects future youth unemployment rates, but as a total comprising Developed Economies and European Union ([3]). According to its 2013 report ([4]) this total youth unemployment rate is expected to start to fall in 2015 and be noticeably lower by 2018 (from 17.9% in 2013 to 17.0% in 2015 and to 15.9% in 2018).

3. Austerity measures were dictated by worrying developments in public finances and by the fact that a number of countries were hit by a confidence crisis that limited the access to debt financing. To prevent outright default and restore confidence resolute action was necessary not only on the fiscal front but also on the front of the structural reforms that can contribute to growth and adjustment.

([1]) Chart 18, page 19. http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=89&newsId=1923&furtherNews=yes
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/forecasts_en.htm
([3]) Developed economies include Canada, United States, Australia, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Iceland, Norway and Switzerland.
([4]) Global Employment Trends for Youth 2013: A generation at risk, http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/documents/publication/wcms_212423.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006848/13
alla Commissione
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(12 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Indagini sull'America's Cup e fondi europei

È notizia riportata dai maggiori quotidiani che la Procura di Napoli ha aperto un fascicolo d'inchiesta relativa alla cattiva gestione di fondi pubblici nell'organizzazione e nella gestione dell'evento America's Cup a carico di diversi esponenti vicini all'attuale amministrazione della città di Napoli.

Posto che l'indagine in corso prefigura reati che vanno dalla turbativa d'asta, alla truffa, all'associazione a delinquere finalizzata alla truffa in pubbliche forniture e che, a seguito di tale indagine, sono stati bloccati circa 22 milioni di euro di finanziamenti pubblici, in parte fatti valere dal POR regionale ovvero da programmi operativi europei e considerati i recenti sviluppi e la proficua collaborazione esistente tra l'OLAF e le procure nazionali, nonché gli sviluppi di cooperazione giudiziaria posti in essere, può la Commissione riferire:

1. qual è l'ammontare del finanziamento europeo concesso per la realizzazione dell'evento denominato America's Cup e sottoposto al vaglio della magistratura;

2. quale posizione la Commissione intende adottare qualora vengano appurate responsabilità e condotte illecite e se la ripetizione o la sospensione delle risorse sono ipotesi plausibili;

3. se l'evento sopracitato è, a suo giudizio, consono alle finalità proprie del finanziamento europeo ovvero presenta un alto valore aggiunto o un impatto tale da considerarsi come strutturale per il turismo della zona;

4. quale collaborazione ritiene che si possa istaurare tra gli uffici dell'OLAF e la procura di Napoli per il caso specifico?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(6 agosto 2013)

1. Nel giugno 2013, la Commissione ha chiesto alle autorità italiane di fornire informazioni sui punti sollevati nell'interrogazione. L'onorevole deputato sarà informato dopo che la Commissione avrà avuto la possibilità di esaminare la risposta delle autorità italiane.

2. Sino ad oggi la regione Campania non ha presentato richieste di pagamento relative al cofinanziamento dell'America's Cup. Nel caso in cui, nell'ambito dell'indagine in corso, dovessero risultare prove di irregolarità e/o frodi nell'utilizzazione del finanziamento dell'UE, la Commissione adotterà tutte le misure necessarie a tutelare gli interessi finanziari dell'UE.

3. Il quadro di riferimento strategico nazionale italiano consente il finanziamento, da parte del Fondo europeo per lo sviluppo regionale, di eventi che generano un ampio flusso di visitatori e turisti sulla base di specifici studi ex-ante. Sia le valutazioni ex-ante che quelle ex-post effettuate dalla regione Campania riguardanti l'impatto dell'evento in questione sul turismo nell'area interessata danno risultati positivi.

4. Le autorità italiane non hanno richiesto l'assistenza dell'OLAF nelle indagini. Nel caso in cui lo facessero, l'OLAF fornirebbe l'assistenza richiesta. L'OLAF collabora sempre strettamente con le autorità competenti degli Stati membri nel caso in cui vi siano rischi di una possibile utilizzazione irregolare o fraudolenta dei fondi dell'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006848/13
to the Commission
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Investigations into the America's Cup and EU funding

Major newspapers have reported that the Public Prosecution Office of Naples has opened an investigation into the mismanagement of public funds in the running of the America's Cup event by several figures close to the current administration of the city of Naples.

Given that the ongoing investigation outlines crimes ranging from bid rigging and fraud to criminal association for the purpose of committing fraud in public supply contracts and, as a result of this investigation about EUR 22 million of public funds have been blocked, partly provided by the EU regional operational programmes, and in the light of the recent developments and fruitful cooperation between the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) and the national public prosecutors, as well as developments in terms of judicial cooperation, can the Commission say:

1. how much of the EU funding granted for the America's Cup event is now being scrutinised by the judiciary,

2. what position the Commission intends to take should personal accountability and illegal conduct be found and whether one can reasonably assume that funds will be repaid or frozen,

3. whether the above event is, in its view, consistent with the purposes of EU funding, namely that it has high added value or an impact that can be considered as structural for tourism in the area,

4. what form of cooperation it believes may be established between OLAF and the offices of the Public Prosecutor in Naples regarding this specific case?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2013)

1. In June 2013, the Commission asked the Italian authorities to provide information regarding the points raised in the question. The Honourable Member will be informed after the Commission has been able to examine the reply from the Italian authorities.

2. To date, the Campania region has not submitted any request for payment in relation to the co-financing of the America's Cup. Should any evidence of irregularity and/or fraud in the use of EU funding emerge in the course of the ongoing investigations, the Commission will take all necessary steps to protect the EU's financial interest.

3. The Italian national strategic reference framework allows European Regional Development Fund support for events attracting a large flow of visitors and tourists on the basis of specific *ex-ante* studies. Both the *ex-ante* and *ex-post* evaluations carried out by the Campania region on the impact of the event in question on tourism in the area show positive results.

4. The Italian authorities have not requested OLAF's assistance with the investigation. Should they do so, OLAF would provide assistance. OLAF always cooperates closely with the relevant authorities in the Member States in cases where EU funds are at risk of possible irregularities or fraud.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006849/13
alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(12 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Energie rinnovabili

Le energie rinnovabili sono un'alternativa fondamentale ai combustibili fossili. Il loro impiego permette di ridurre non soltanto le emissioni di gas a effetto serra, ma anche la dipendenza dell'UE delle importazioni di combustibili fossili.

Considerato che:

— La Legge 1° giugno 2002 n. 120 ha ratificato l'esecuzione del Protocollo di Kyoto del 11.12.1997 sulla scorta della Convenzione quadro delle Nazioni Unite sui cambiamenti climatici.

— Il comma 1 dell'art. 12 del Decreto Legislativo n. 387 del 29.12.2003 definisce indifferibili e urgenti gli impianti alimentati da fonti rinnovabili di pubblica utilità.

— Il tempo massimo per il rilascio dell'autorizzazione unica, ai sensi del comma 4 dell'art 12 del Decreto Legislativo 387/2003, deve rispettare i principi di semplificazione e quindi non deve essere superiore a 180 giorni.

— Sussistono i chiarimenti della Corte di giustizia in merito alle direttive 2001/77/CE e 2009/28/CE, sulla promozione dell'uso dell'energia da fonti rinnovabili.

— Esiste nello specifico, il regolamento regionale n. 24/2010 che impone sulla quasi totalità del territorio pugliese il regime vincolistico delle «aree non idonee», ovvero la Regione Puglia prevede, su porzioni significative del territorio regionale, un divieto preventivo, assoluto e non derogabile all'installazione di impianti eolici e fotovoltaici di grossa taglia.

— Vige il principio di proporzionalità enunciato all'art. 13 della direttiva 2009/28 che, come affermato dalla Corte di giustizia, appartiene ai principi generali del diritto dell'Unione;

può la Commissione far sapere:

— per quale ragione ritiene che la disciplina introdotta dalla Regione Puglia si pone in contrasto con i principi espressi dalla Corte di giustizia e dalla Corte Costituzionale, non limitandosi a recepire i preesistenti vincoli ambientali, ma trasformandoli, da meri vincoli relativi, in veri e propri divieti preventivi, assoluti e non derogabili;

— reputa di dover elaborare una nuova proposta di regolamento a tutela delle fonti rinnovabili;

— quali politiche ritiene che debbano essere adottate affinché venga rispettato il tempo massimo per il rilascio dell'autorizzazione unica (visto che, in media, la Regione Puglia impiega tra i 1576 (anno 2013) e i 1611 (anno 2012) giorni non rispettando i principi di semplificazione)?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(7 agosto 2013)

Sulla base delle informazioni disponibili, la Commissione non può concludere che le disposizioni della Regione Puglia siano in contrasto con i principi espressi dalla Corte costituzionale italiana o dalla Corte di giustizia europea.

La Commissione non reputa necessario elaborare un regolamento a tutela delle fonti energetiche rinnovabili. La Commissione attua un monitoraggio costante dell'utilizzo delle energie rinnovabili negli Stati membri al fine di valutare se sia necessario un ulteriore intervento a livello dell'Unione. L'Italia è attualmente sulla buona strada per conseguire l'obiettivo nazionale del 17 % di energie rinnovabili. Nel 2010, l'Italia aveva una quota di energie rinnovabili del 10,4 %, ben al di sopra dell'obiettivo intermedio del 7,6 %.

Il rispetto della normativa italiana in materia di autorizzazioni dovrebbe essere verificato, in prima istanza, dai tribunali amministrativi regionali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006849/13
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Renewable energies

Renewable energies are a vital alternative to fossil fuels. Their use helps to reduce not only emissions of greenhouse gases, but also the EU's dependence on fossil-fuel imports.

Given that:

— Italian Law No 120 dated 1 June 2002 ratified the Kyoto Protocol of 11 December 1997 on the basis of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

— Article 12(1) of Italian Legislative Decree No 387 dated 29 December 2003 defines plants fuelled by renewable sources as urgent and undeferrable public utilities.

— The maximum time allowed for the single authorisation to be issued, pursuant to Article 12(4) of Italian Legislative Decree No 387/2003, must comply with the simplification principles and must not therefore exceed 180 days.

— The Court of Justice has clarified the issued of promoting the use of energy from renewable sources with regard to Directives 2001/77/EC and 2009/28/EC.

— There is a specific Regional Regulation, No 24/2010, which imposes a restriction on almost the whole territory of Apulia, defining it as an 'unsuitable area', in other words the Apulian Regional Administration has imposed a preventive, absolute and unwaivable ban on installing large wind and solar plants in significant portions of the region.

— The principle of proportionality is applicable, as set out in Article 13 of Directive 2009/28 which, as stated by the Court of Justice, belongs to the general principles of EC law,

can the Commission say:

— why it regards the provisions introduced by the Apulia Region to be at odds with the principles expressed by the Court of Justice and the Constitutional Court, not simply transposing the existing environmental constraints, but transforming them from mere relative constraints into preventive, absolute and unwaivable prohibitions,

— whether it feels it needs to draw up a new regulation protecting renewable sources,

— what policies it feels should be adopted to ensure compliance with the maximum time allowed for issuing a single authorisation (given that, on average, the Apulian Regional Administration takes between 1 576 (in 2013) and 1 611 (in 2012) days, which is at odds with the simplification principles)?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2013)

Based on the available information, the Commission cannot conclude that the Apulia Region provisions are inconsistent with the principles expressed by the Italian Constitutional Court or the European Court of Justice.

The Commission does not consider it necessary to draw up a regulation protecting renewable energy sources. The Commission is continuously monitoring the implementation of renewable energy in Member States with a view to considering if any further action at EU level is necessary. Italy is currently on track towards its national 17% renewable energy target. In 2010, Italy had a renewable energy share of 10.4%, well above the interim target of 7.6%.

Compliance with the Italian regulations concerning authorisation should be sought, in the first instance, under national administrative courts.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006850/13
aan de Commissie
Wim van de Camp (PPE)
(12 juni 2013)

Betreft: Schriftelijke vragen omtrent het gebruik van 3D printers

Uit mediaberichten, waaronder een artikel op de site ([1]), blijkt dat de 3D printer het mogelijk maakt dat burgers naast pistolen nu ook kogels eigenhandig kunnen produceren.

1. Heeft de Commissie kennis genomen van berichten dat 3D printers het mogelijk maken dat burgers zelfstandig pistolen en kogels kunnen produceren?

2. Heeft de Commissie een overzicht van het aantal 3D printers dat aanwezig is bij Europese burgers?

3. Kan de Commissie aangeven in hoeverre door 3D printers gemaakte wapens een gevaar vormen voor de veiligheid van Europese burgers?

4. Kan de Commissie aangeven hoe zij gaat voorkomen dat 3D printers worden gebruikt voor terroristische aanslagen?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(25 juli 2013)

De Commissie is bekend met de recente persberichten over het gebruik van 3D-printers voor de productie van wapens. Deze activiteit is reeds door EU-wetgeving verboden.

Met name in Richtlijn 91/477/EEG zoals gewijzigd, zijn verplichtingen vastgesteld voor het vervaardigen of aanschaffen van wapens door particulieren overeenkomstig artikel 5 van het Protocol van de Verenigde Naties tegen de illegale vervaardiging van en handel in vuurwapens. In deze richtlijn wordt onder „illegale vervaardiging" de vervaardiging of assemblage van vuurwapens, delen en onderdelen daarvan die illegaal zijn verhandeld of de assemblage of vervaardiging zonder toestemming of markering verstaan. Een evaluatieverslag over de situatie na de toepassing van de richtlijn is voorzien voor 2015.

Geavanceerde productietechnologieën zoals *additive manufacturing* (met inbegrip van 3D-printen) bieden belangrijke zakelijke kansen. Het mogelijke misbruik van deze technologie in combinatie met de vrij beschikbare software om wapens te produceren, en de risico's voor de veiligheid van de burger, verdienen echter speciale aandacht. De Commissie heeft vergaderingen met deskundigen gepland om te bekijken hoe het mogelijke misbruik van 3D-printers het best kan worden aangepakt.

([1]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2694/Tech-Media/article/detail/3446456/2013/05/24/Eerste-kogel-rolt-uit-de-3D-printer.dhtml.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006850/13
to the Commission
Wim van de Camp (PPE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Use of 3D printers

According to reports in the media, including an article on the website of the Dutch daily *Volkskrant* ([1]), 3D printers make it possible to produce not only pistols but also ammunition.

1. Is the Commission aware of reports that 3D printers make it possible for the general public to produce their own pistols and ammunition?

2. Does the Commission have an overview of the number of 3D printers currently held by European citizens?

3. To what extent do weapons made with 3D printers pose constitute a risk for the security of EU citizens?

4. How does the Commission propose to prevent 3D printers from being used for terrorist attacks?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

The Commission is aware of recent articles in the media on the use of 3D printers to produce weapons. This activity is already banned by EU legislation.

In particular, Directive 91/477/EEC as amended establishes obligations for the manufacture of weapons or acquisition of weapons by private individuals according to Art.5 of the Protocol of the United Nations against the Illicit Manufacturing and Trafficking of firearms. For the purpose of this directive, 'illicit manufacturing' means the manufacturing or assembly of firearms, their parts and components which have been trafficked or assembly and manufacture without authorisation or without marking. A report evaluating the situation resulting from the application of the directive is foreseen for 2015.

Advanced manufacturing technologies such as additive manufacturing (including 3D printing) represent an important business opportunity. However, the potential misuse of this technology in combination with freely available software to manufacture weapons and its risks for the security of citizens merit attention. The Commission is planning meetings with experts to evaluate the best options to properly address the possible misuse of 3D printers.

([1]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2694/Tech-Media/article/detail/3446456/2013/05/24/Eerste-kogel-rolt-uit-de-3D-printer.dhtml.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-006851/13
an die Kommission
Daniel Cohn-Bendit (Verts/ALE)
(12. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Die Rolle der Kommission bei der Schließung der staatlichen griechischen Rundfunkanstalt ERT

Am 11. Juni 2013 hat die griechische Regierung die staatliche Rundfunkanstalt ERT unerwartet geschlossen, was den Verlust von vielen Arbeitsplätzen zur Folge hatte. Die Mitarbeiter wurden ohne vorherige Ankündigung unterrichtet, dass sie innerhalb weniger Stunden ihren Arbeitsplatz verlieren würden.

Nach Aussage eines Regierungssprechers sei diese Entscheidung ein Bestandteil der Verpflichtungen Griechenlands im Rahmen des wirtschaftlichen Anpassungsprogramms des Landes und wurde mit Zustimmung der Troika (IWF, Europäische Zentralbank und Kommission) getroffen, um die Auszahlung der nächsten Tranche der Finanzhilfe für Griechenland zu sichern.

1. Nach Artikel 11 der Charta der Grundrechte der Europäischen Union müssen die „Freiheit der Medien und ihre Pluralität" geachtet werden und nach Artikel 27 gilt: „Für die Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer oder ihre Vertreter muss auf den geeigneten Ebenen eine rechtzeitige Unterrichtung und Anhörung in den Fällen und unter den Voraussetzungen gewährleistet sein, die nach dem Unionsrecht und den einzelstaatlichen Rechtsvorschriften und Gepflogenheiten vorgesehen sind."

2. Nach Artikel 147 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union gilt: „Das Ziel eines hohen Beschäftigungsniveaus wird bei der Festlegung und Durchführung der Unionspolitiken und -maßnahmen berücksichtigt".

Kann die Kommission ihre Absichten im Zusammenhang mit den oben genannten Vorschlägen erläutern und insbesondere folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. War der Kommission die oben genannte Entscheidung der griechischen Regierung bekannt?

2. Geht diese Entscheidung tatsächlich auf eine Forderung der Troika im Rahmen des griechischen Stabilisierungsprogramms zurück und steht sie im Einklang mit der Finanzhilfe für das Land? Bestätigt die Kommission als Mitglied der Troika ihre Zustimmung zu dieser Entscheidung?

3. Sind diese Entscheidung und ihre Durchführung mit den oben genannten Grundsätzen der Verträge der Europäischen Union vereinbar, deren Hüterin die Kommission ist?

Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission
(5. Juli 2013)

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Stellungnahme ([1]) vom 12. Juni 2013 zur Schließung der staatlichen griechischen Rundfunkanstalt. Sie möchte darauf hinweisen, dass die griechischen Behörden die Schließung der staatlichen griechischen Rundfunkanstalt (ERT) vollkommen eigenständig getroffen haben.

Der Kommission war nicht an der Schließung von ERT gelegen, aber ebenso wenig möchte die Kommission die Zuständigkeit der griechischen Regierung für die Verwaltung des öffentlichen Sektors infrage stellen. Die Entscheidung der griechischen Behörden ist vor dem Hintergrund der wichtigen und notwendigen Anstrengungen der Behörden zur Modernisierung der griechischen Wirtschaft zu sehen. Dazu gehört die Verbesserung der Effizienz und Wirksamkeit des öffentlichen Sektors.

Die Kommission unterstützt die Funktion des öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunks als wesentlicher Bestandteil der europäischen Demokratie. Das dem EUV und AEUV beigefügte Protokoll Nr. 29 über den öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunk in den Mitgliedstaaten stellt klar, dass die Governance und strategischen Entscheidungen über den öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunk in die Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten fallen. Während die Kommission den Mitgliedstaaten also nicht vorschreiben kann, wie sie ihren öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunk zu organisieren haben, möchte sie unabhängig von den wirtschaftlichen Rahmenbedingungen die Rolle der öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunkanstalten in Bezug auf die europäischen Werte betonen. Sie stellen Medienvielfalt, Medienfreiheit und Medienqualität sicher und sind Ausdruck der kulturellen Vielfalt.

Die Kommission begrüßt daher die Zusicherung der griechischen Regierung, eine Medienstelle einzurichten, die die wichtige Aufgabe des öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunks wahrnimmt und finanziell tragfähig ist.

([1]) MEMO/13/545: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-545_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006851/13
to the Commission
Daniel Cohn-Bendit (Verts/ALE)
(12 June 2013)

Subject: Commission's involvement in the closing of the Greek national broadcaster ERT

On 11 June 2013, the Greek Government unexpectedly closed the Greek national broadcaster ERT, which resulted in job losses for many workers. Employees were informed, without prior notice, that they would be unemployed within hours.

A government spokesman claimed that the decision is part of Greece's obligations under the country's economic adjustment programme and was taken in agreement with the Troika (the IMF, the European Central Bank and the European Commission) so as to secure the next instalment of financial assistance provided to the country.

Given that:

1. Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union provides for 'respect and pluralism of the media' and that Article 27 of the same Charter states: 'Workers or their representatives must, at the appropriate levels, be guaranteed information and consultation in good time in the cases and under the conditions provided for by Community law and national laws and practices';

2. Article 147 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union states: 'The objective of a high level of employment shall be taken into consideration in the formulation and implementation of Union policies and activities',

can the Commission clarify its intentions as regards the abovementioned proposals, and more specifically reply to the following questions:

1. Was the Commission aware of the above decision by the Greek government?

2. Is this decision indeed a requirement of the Troika under the stabilisation programme for Greece and in agreement with the financial aid given to the country? Does the Commission confirm its agreement with this decision as a member of the Troika?

3. Is this decision and its application in compliance with the above principles of the Treaties of the European Union, of which the Commission is the guardian?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(5 July 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its statement ([1]) on the closure of the Hellenic Broadcasting Corporation published on 12 June 2013. The Commission would like to highlight that the decision by the Greek authorities to close down the Hellenic Broadcasting Corporation (ERT) was taken in full autonomy.

The Commission has not sought the closure of ERT, but nor does the Commission question the Greek Government's mandate to manage the public sector. The decision of the Greek authorities should be seen in the context of the major and necessary efforts that the authorities are taking to modernise the Greek economy. Those include improving the efficiency and effectiveness of its public sector.

The Commission supports the role of public broadcasting as an integral part of European democracy. Protocol No 29 on the system of public broadcasting in the Member States attached to the TEU and TFEU makes it clear that the governance and strategic choices on public service broadcasting lie with Member States. So while the Commission cannot prescribe Member States how to organise their public service broadcaster, we would like to highlight the role of public service broadcasters regarding European values in all economic circumstances, for the sake of media pluralism, media freedom and media quality and for the expression of cultural diversity.

The Commission therefore welcomes the commitment of the Greek Government to launch a media actor that fulfils the important role of public broadcasting and is financially sustainable.

([1]) MEMO/13/545: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-545_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006852/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2009/15/CE — regras comuns para as organizações de vistoria e inspeção de navios

A 23 de abril de 2009, foi adotada a Diretiva 2009/15/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa às regras comuns para as organizações de vistoria e inspeção de navios e para as atividades relevantes das administrações marítimas.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz da sua aplicação?

— Considera que foi cumprido o objetivo de eliminar das águas comunitárias todos os navios que não preencham as normas de segurança e assegurar a segurança marítima e a prevenção da poluição marinha?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(18 de julho de 2013)

Todos os Estados-Membros procederam à transposição da Diretiva 2009/15/CE. As medidas adotadas pela Croácia foram comunicadas e estão atualmente a ser examinadas. A Diretiva 2009/15/CE foi adotada juntamente com o Regulamento (CE) n.° 391/2009 (a seguir designado «o regulamento»), relativo às regras comuns para as organizações de vistoria e inspeção de navios ([1]), que prevê, nomeadamente, critérios mínimos para o reconhecimento destas organizações a nível da UE, ou seja, para as autorizar a proceder à certificação de navios que arvoram bandeira de um país da UE. Como condição para obter o reconhecimento da UE, estas organizações têm de aplicar o mesmo nível de rigor a todos os navios objeto de certificação. Cada organização reconhecida está sujeita a inspeções periódicas (pela Agência Europeia da Segurança Marítima em nome da Comissão) e a avaliações periódicas pela Comissão. Ao longo do tempo, as organizações tomaram voluntariamente medidas para remediar as falhas identificadas neste contexto. Além disso, os artigos 6.° e 7.° do regulamento permitem a aplicação de coimas ou sanções pecuniárias temporárias e, em último caso, a retirada do reconhecimento. A Comissão está atualmente a preparar as regras de execução para este efeito. Em termos globais, a Comissão considera que estes instrumentos já contribuiram efetivamente para retirar das águas da UE navios que não respeitam as normas.

([1]) JO L 131 de 28.5.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006852/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2009/15/EC — common rules and standards for ship inspection and survey organisations

Having regard to Directive 2009/15/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on common rules and standards for ship inspection and survey organisations and for the relevant activities of maritime administrations:

— Can the Commission say which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— What is its assessment regarding the implementation thereof?

— Does it consider that the objective of the directive has been achieved with regard to the removal from Community waters of all substandard vessels for the purposes of safety and pollution prevention at sea?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2013)

All Member States have transposed Directive 2009/15/EC. Measures adopted by Croatia have been communicated and are currently being examined. Directive 2009/15/EC was adopted together with Regulation (EC) 391/2009 ('the regulation') on common rules and standards for ship inspection and survey organisations (OJ L 131, 28.5.2009), which i.a. sets out minimum criteria for these organisations to be recognised at EU level, i.e. licensed to certify ships flying the flag of an EU Member State. As a condition to obtain EU recognition these organisations are required to apply the same rigour to all the ships they certify. Each recognised organisation is subject to regular inspections (carried out by the European Maritime Safety Agency on behalf of the Commission) and periodic assessments by the Commission. Over time, the organisations have established voluntary remedial action over shortcomings that have been identified under this framework. In addition, Articles 6 & 7 of the regulation allow for fines, periodic penalty paiements, and ultimately withdrawal of recognition. Implementing rules for these purposes are currently under preparation by the Commission. Altogether, the Commission considers that these instruments have effectively contributed to remove substandard vessels from Community waters.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006853/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2010/61/UE — transporte terrestre de mercadorias perigosas

A Diretiva 2010/61/UE da Comissão, de 2 de setembro de 2010, adaptou pela primeira vez ao progresso científico e técnico os anexos da Diretiva 2008/68/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa ao transporte terrestre de mercadorias perigosas.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz das adaptações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2010/61/EU?

— Considera que a União Europeia se encontra dotada de um regime jurídico relativo ao transporte terrestre de mercadorias perigosas apto a assegurar devidamente a proteção dos cidadãos e do meio ambiente?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(1 de agosto de 2013)

A Diretiva 2010/61/UE da Comissão foi transposta por todos os Estados-Membros.

As alterações preveem condições seguras para o transporte de novas substâncias e de artigos recentemente desenvolvidos que constituam um risco durante o transporte. Foram também revistas as regras nos casos em que a experiência prática demonstrou que a regulamentação em vigor não logrou um nível de segurança adequado ou então é demasiado prescritiva ou desatualizada.

O quadro jurídico da UE aplicável ao transporte de mercadorias perigosas está estreitamente associado ao trabalho internacional neste domínio, que envolve várias centenas de peritos do setor da regulação e do setor privado. O ciclo coordenado de dois anos para a revisão das regras relativas a todos os modos de transporte garante um desenvolvimento seguro e interoperável das regras.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006853/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2010/61/EU — inland transport of dangerous goods

Commission Directive 2010/61/EU of 2 September 2010 adapted for the first time the annexes to Directive 2008/68/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the inland transport of dangerous goods to scientific and technical progress.

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of the amendments introduced by Directive 2010/61/EU?

— Does it believe that the EU's legal framework on the inland transport of dangerous goods is enough to properly ensure the protection of citizens and the environment?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2013)

Commission Directive 2010/61/EU has been transposed by all Member States.

The amendments provide for safe conditions to carry new substances and newly developed articles that pose a risk during their transport. The rules are also revised where practical experience has shown that current regulations do not achieve an adequate level of safety or alternatively are too prescriptive or outdated.

The EU legal framework on the transport of dangerous goods is closely linked to the international work in this area involving several hundred experts from the regulatory and the private sectors. The two-year coordinated cycle of revision of the rules for all modes of transport ensures a safe and an interoperable development of rules.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006854/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2009/20/CE — seguro dos proprietários de navios em matéria de créditos marítimos

A 23 de abril de 2009, foi adotada a Diretiva 2009/20/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa ao seguro dos proprietários de navios em matéria de créditos marítimos.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz da sua aplicação?

— Considera que a mesma contribuiu para uma maior responsabilização de todos os operadores económicos e uma maior proteção das vítimas? Em que termos?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(18 de julho de 2013)

Todos os Estados-Membros notificaram à Comissão as medidas de transposição da diretiva para o direito nacional.

Atualmente, a Comissão está a examinar a aplicação da diretiva em todos os Estados-Membros. É de notar que não houve até à data qualquer denúncia apresentada à Comissão sobre a execução da diretiva.

A diretiva é um passo importante para retirar das águas da UE os navios que não cumprem as normas. Todos os operadores marítimos com navios que arvoram bandeira de um Estado-Membro ou que pretendem entrar num porto da UE são obrigados a garantir que o navio dispõe de uma cobertura de seguro suficiente, em conformidade com o direito internacional, contra quaisquer danos potenciais que possam surgir em relação à sua operação ou de um acidente que envolva esse navio. Esta medida representa uma importante salvaguarda para os cidadãos da UE e para as zonas costeiras passíveis de sofrer danos decorrentes de atividades de transporte marítimo nas águas da UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006854/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2009/20/EC — insurance of shipowners for maritime claims

Directive 2009/20/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the insurance of shipowners for maritime claims was adopted on 23 April 2009.

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of its application?

— Does it believe that it has helped to make all economic operators act more responsibly and to ensure better protection for victims? In what respect?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2013)

All Member States have notified to the Commission the measures transposing the directive in national law.

At present, the Commission is examining the implementation of the directive in all Member States. It should be noted that there has been no complaint received by the Commission so far on the implementation of the directive.

The directive is an important step towards ensuring that sub-standard shipping is eliminated from European waters. All maritime operators with ships flying the flag of a Member State or wishing to enter an EU port are obliged to make sure that the ship has sufficient insurance cover, in accordance with international law, for any potential damages that may arise in relation to its operation or an accident involving that ship. This is a crucial safeguard for EU citizens and coastal areas that are concerned with the possibility of suffering damages as a result of shipping activities in EU waters.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006855/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2009/71/Euratom — segurança das instalações nucleares

A Diretiva 2009/71/Euratom do Conselho, de 25 de junho de 2009, estabeleceu um quadro comunitário para a segurança nuclear das instalações nucleares.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz da sua aplicação?

— Considera que está assegurada, em toda a União, a proteção adequada aos trabalhadores e à população em geral dos perigos decorrentes das radiações ionizantes produzidas pelas instalações nucleares?

Resposta dada por Günther Oettinger em nome da Comissão
(29 de julho de 2013)

1-2. Todos os Estados-Membros comunicaram à Comissão as medidas nacionais tomadas com vista à transposição da Diretiva 2009/71/Euratom do Conselho ([1]) (Diretiva relativa à Segurança Nuclear).

Em geral, as disposições da Diretiva relativa à Segurança Nuclear foram transpostas por várias medidas nacionais em cada Estado-Membro. Ainda está a decorrer a avaliação preliminar destas medidas por parte da Comissão. A Comissão só chegará a conclusões definitivas uma vez concluída esta avaliação.

3. Sim.

No entanto, a fim de tomar em consideração os ensinamentos retirados de Fukushima e dos testes de resistência subsequentes, a Comissão propôs uma nova Diretiva relativa à Segurança Nuclear ([2]) destinada a continuar a melhorar o nível de segurança nuclear na UE. A proposta de Diretiva visa, nomeadamente, estabelecer objetivos de segurança de alto nível a par da criação de um sistema europeu de avaliação pelos pares que contribuirão para uma melhor identificação e gestão em matéria de segurança nuclear nos Estados-Membros.

A Comissão também adotou uma proposta relativa a uma nova diretiva consolidada relativa às normas de segurança de base, estando prevista a sua adoção pelo Conselho até ao final de 2013, após a receção do parecer do Parlamento Europeu sobre a proposta ([3]). São estes os mais recentes desenvolvimentos numa tentativa de continuar a atualizar a legislação relativa à proteção adequada dos trabalhadores e dos cidadãos contra a exposição a radiações ionizantes.

([1]) Diretiva 2009/71/Euratom do Conselho, de 25 de junho de 2009, que estabelece um quadro comunitário para a segurança nuclear das instalações nucleares; JO L 172.

([2]) Proposta de Diretiva do Conselho que altera a Diretiva 2009/71/Euratom do Conselho, de 25 de junho de 2009, que estabelece um quadro comunitário para a segurança nuclear das instalações nucleares; COM(2013) 343 final.

([3]) Proposta de Diretiva do Conselho que fixa as normas de segurança de base relativas à proteção contra os perigos resultantes da exposição a radiações ionizantes; COM(2012) 242. De momento, as normas de segurança de base relativas à proteção da saúde dos trabalhadores e do público em geral contra os perigos resultantes da radiação ionizante constam da Diretiva 96/29/Euratom do Conselho, de 13 de maio de 1996 («Diretiva relativa às normas de segurança de base», também conhecida como «Diretiva NSB»); JO L 159. A diretiva consolidada integrará quatro novas diretivas relativas a esta matéria.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006855/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2009/71/Euratom — safety of nuclear installations

Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom of 25 June 2009 established a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations.

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of its application?

— Does it believe that adequate protection for workers and the general public against the dangers arising from ionising radiations from nuclear installations is guaranteed throughout the EU?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

1-2. All Member States have communicated to the Commission national measures aimed at transposing Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom ([1]) (Nuclear Safety Directive).

Generally, the provisions of the Nuclear Safety Directive have been transposed by a number of national measures in each Member State. The Commission's preliminary assessment of these measures is still ongoing. The Commission will only reach definite conclusions once this assessment is completed.

3. Yes.

However, in order to take on board the lessons drawn from Fukushima and from the subsequent stress tests, the Commission has proposed a new Nuclear Safety Directive ([2]) with a view to continuously improve the level of nuclear safety in the EU. In particular, the proposed Directive aims to establish high level safety objectives coupled with a European system of peer reviews, which will contribute to a better identification and management of nuclear safety issues across Member States.

The Commission has also adopted a proposal for a new consolidated Basic Safety Standards Directive, which is expected to be adopted by the Council by the end of 2013, once the opinion of the European Parliament on the proposal has been received ([3]). These are the latest developments in an effort to continuously update legislation aimed at the adequate protection of workers and other citizens against exposure to ionising radiation.

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

([2]) Draft proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 2009/71/Euratom establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations; COM(2013) 343 final.

([3]) Proposal for a Council Directive laying down basic safety standards for protection against the dangers arising from exposure to ionizing radiation; COM(2012) 242. Currently, the EU basic safety standards for the protection of the health of workers and the general public against the dangers arising from ionizing radiation are contained in Council Directive 96/29/Euratom of 13 May 1996 (the 'Basic Safety Standards Directive' or otherwise known as the 'BSS Directive'); OJ L 159. The consolidated Directive will incorporate four further Directives in this area.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006856/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2011/98/UE — residência de nacionais de países terceiros na União Europeia

Tendo em conta a Diretiva 2011/98/UE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 13 de dezembro de 2011, relativa a um procedimento de pedido único de concessão de uma autorização única para os nacionais de países terceiros residirem e trabalharem no território de um Estado-Membro e a um conjunto comum de direitos para os trabalhadores de países terceiros que residem legalmente num Estado-Membro, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros não transpuseram ainda esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz da sua aplicação?

— Crê, em particular, que a diretiva contribuiu positivamente para assegurar um tratamento equitativo aos nacionais de países terceiros que residam legalmente no território dos Estados-Membros?

— Considera que, presentemente, no seio da União, existe uma interpretação uniforme acerca de qual seja o conjunto comum de direitos mínimos aplicados aos residentes provenientes de países terceiros, com base na igualdade de tratamento em relação aos nacionais do Estado-Membro de acolhimento, independentemente da finalidade inicial ou do motivo da sua admissão?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão
(23 de julho de 2013)

O prazo para a transposição da Diretiva 2011/98/CE termina em 25 de dezembro de 2013. No final junho de 2013, três Estados-Membros tinham notificado a plena transposição (França, Portugal e Luxemburgo) e 4 Estados-Membros (Áustria, Bélgica, Letónia e Lituânia) tinham notificado a sua transposição parcial.

Uma vez que o prazo para a transposição ainda não terminou, a Comissão ainda não procedeu à análise da aplicação da diretiva. A Comissão tenciona iniciar em breve a sua análise da legislação de transposição da Diretiva nos Estados-Membros. Os Estados-Membros devem apresentar em dezembro de 2014 estatísticas sobre o número de nacionais de países terceiros aos quais foi concedida uma autorização única durante o ano civil anterior. A Comissão publicará um relatório sobre a aplicação da Diretiva até dezembro de 2016.

Tendo em conta este calendário, é demasiado cedo para a Comissão dar uma opinião sobre a eficácia da Diretiva ou sobre a interpretação uniforme das disposições relativas à igualdade de tratamento em toda a UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006856/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2011/98/EU — third-country nationals residing in the EU

In view of Directive 2011/98/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on a single application procedure for a single permit for third-country nationals to reside and work in the territory of a Member State and on a common set of rights for third-country workers legally residing in a Member State;

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of its application?

— In particular, does it believe that the directive has helped to ensure the equal treatment of third-country nationals legally residing in the territory of a Member State?

— Does it believe that the common set of minimum rights for residents from third countries, based on equal treatment with the nationals of their host Member State, irrespective of the initial purpose of or basis for admission, is interpreted uniformly across the EU?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2013)

The deadline for transposition of Directive 2011/98/EU is 25 December 2013. As of end-June 2013, 3 Member States had notified full transposition (France, Portugal, Luxembourg), and 4 Member States (Austria, Belgium, Latvia, Lithuania) had notified partial transposition.

Since the deadline for transposition is not expired yet, the Commission has not yet analysed the directive's implementation. The Commission intends to start analysing the legislation implementing the directive in the Member States shortly. Member States are due to report statistics on the volumes of third-country nationals who have been granted a single-permit during the previous calendar year in December 2014. The Commission will issue a report on the implementation of the directive by December 2016.

In view of this timetable, it is too early for the Commission to express a view of the effectiveness of the directive or on whether the provisions for equal treatment are uniformly interpreted across the EU.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006857/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2008/115/CE — regresso de nacionais de países terceiros em situação irregular

A Diretiva 2008/115/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 16 de dezembro de 2008, relativa a normas e procedimentos comuns nos Estados-Membros para o regresso de nacionais de países terceiros em situação irregular.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz da sua aplicação?

— Crê, nomeadamente, que a diretiva contribuiu positivamente para a cessação das situações irregulares de nacionais de países terceiros através de um procedimento justo e transparente?

— Em que medida se encontram asseguradas a justiça e a transparência referidas e a uniformidade de procedimentos no seio da União?

— Como avalia o grau de cooperação entre as instituições implicadas em todas as etapas do procedimento de regresso e do intercâmbio e a promoção das melhores práticas nesta matéria?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão
(30 de julho de 2013)

Apenas dois Estados vinculados pela Diretiva 2008/115/CE relativa ao regresso, ou seja, a Islândia e a Croácia, não notificaram ainda a transposição completa da Diretiva à Comissão.

A Comissão está atualmente a verificar a correta transposição jurídica das medidas de execução nacionais notificadas no âmbito de um programa de trabalho organizado sobre a transposição da Diretiva relativa ao regresso. Está em curso e será finalizado em setembro de 2013 um estudo sobre a aplicação prática nos Estados-Membros da Diretiva relativa ao regresso.

Na sua próxima Comunicação sobre a política de repatriamento, prevista para dezembro de 2013, a Comissão apresentará um relatório pormenorizado sobre a aplicação da Diretiva e o seu impacto, tendo em conta os resultados dos referidos exercícios e informações adicionais de todos os intervenientes relevantes. Ao apresentar a sua Comunicação ao Parlamento Europeu e ao Conselho, a Comissão irá fornecer respostas completas às questões mais específicas levantadas pelo Senhor Deputado.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006857/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2008/115/EC — returning illegally staying third-country nationals

In view of 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;

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of its application?

— In particular, does it believe that the directive has helped to end the illegal stay of third-country nationals through a fair and transparent procedure?

— To what extent are fair, transparent and uniform procedures within the Union guaranteed?

— How does the Commission view the degree of cooperation between the institutions involved at all levels in the return process and the exchange and promotion of best practices in this area?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(30 July 2013)

Only two States bound by the Return Directive 2008/115/EC, namely Iceland and Croatia, have not yet notified complete transposition of the directive to the Commission.

The Commission is currently in the process of checking the correct legal transposition of the notified national implementing measure as part of an organised programme of work on the transposition of the Return Directive. A study relating to the practical application of the Return Directive in Member States is ongoing and will be finalised in September 2013.

In its upcoming Communication on Return Policy, scheduled for December 2013, the Commission will report in detail on the application of the directive and its impact, taking into account the findings of the abovementioned exercises and further information received from all relevant players. By submitting this communication to the European Parliament and the Council, the Commission will provide complete replies to the more detailed questions raised by the Honourable Member.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006858/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2009/21/CE — transporte marítimo: cumprimento das obrigações do Estado de bandeira

A 23 de abril de 2009, foi adotada a Diretiva 2009/21/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa ao cumprimento das obrigações do Estado de bandeira.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz da sua aplicação?

— Nomeadamente, em que medida esta contribuiu para garantir um cumprimento eficaz e coerente por parte dos Estados-Membros das suas obrigações enquanto Estados de bandeira e para reforçar a segurança e prevenir a poluição causada pelos navios que arvoram a bandeira de um Estado-Membro?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(25 de julho de 2013)

Todos os 28 Estados-Membros declararam ter transposto a diretiva relativa às obrigações do Estado de bandeira. A Comissão está agora a analisar as disposições de direito nacional.

Em conformidade com o artigo 9.° da diretiva, a Comissão apresentará ao Conselho e ao Parlamento Europeu, no decurso do segundo semestre de 2013, um relatório sobre a aplicação da diretiva.

As exigências impostas pela diretiva conduziram a um cumprimento mais eficaz das obrigações que incumbem a cada Estado-Membro na qualidade de Estado de bandeira. Entre essas obrigações incluem-se a verificação da tomada de medidas corretivas a respeito de navios da sua bandeira que tenham sido detidos (art. 5.°), assegurar a transparência das informações relativas aos navios da sua bandeira (art. 6.°), submeter a administração marítima a auditorias IMO (art. 7.°), desenvolver, aplicar e manter um sistema de gestão da qualidade para os aspetos operacionais das atividades exercidas na qualidade de Estado de bandeira (art. 8.°, n.° 1) e, no caso de constar da lista negra ou figurar dois anos consecutivos na lista cinzenta do MOU de Paris (Memorando de Entendimento para a inspeção de navios pelo Estado do porto), apresentar à Comissão um relatório sobre o seu desempenho na qualidade de Estado de bandeira que identifique e analise as causas principais do incumprimento (art. 8.°, n.° 2).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006858/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2009/21/EC — maritime transport: compliance with flag State requirements

Directive 2009/21/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on compliance with flag State requirements was adopted on 23 April 2009.

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of its application?

— In particular, to what extent has it helped to ensure that Member States effectively and consistently discharge their obligations as flag States and to enhance safety and prevent pollution from ships flying the flag of a Member State?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

All 28 Member States have all declared having completed their transposition obligations in relation to the flag State Directive. The Commission is now assessing the respective national legislation.

In accordance with Article 9 of the directive, the Commission will report on the application of this directive to the Council and the European Parliament in the second half of 2013.

The obligations imposed by the directive on Member States have triggered a more effective discharge of Member State's obligations as flag states. The obligations include (Art.5) overseeing corrective action for a detained ship flying its flag; (Art. 6) transparency of information held on ships flying its flag; (Art. 7) undergoing an International Maritime Organisation (IMO) audit of its maritime administration; (Art.8(1)) developing, implementing and maintaining a quality management system for the operational parts of flag State-related activities; and (Art. 8(2)) reporting on their flag State performance to the Commission if they appear on the black list or for two consecutive years on the grey list of the Paris Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control, and in so doing, identifying and analysing the main reasons for lack of compliance.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006859/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2011/88/UE — motores colocados no mercado ao abrigo do regime flexível

A Diretiva 2011/88/UE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 16 de novembro de 2011, alterou a Diretiva 97/68/CE no que diz respeito às disposições aplicáveis aos motores colocados no mercado ao abrigo do regime flexível.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz das adaptações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2011/88/UE?

— Em que medida a qualidade do ar na União Europeia beneficiou com a sua adoção?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(30 de julho de 2013)

Todos os Estados-Membros comunicaram as suas medidas nacionais de transposição da Diretiva 2011/88/UE, com exceção do Reino Unido. No entanto, no decurso de um procedimento por infração, o Reino Unido informou a Comissão que as medidas de transposição serão adotadas até ao fim de julho de 2013.

A principal alteração introduzida pela Diretiva 2011/88/UE está relacionada com uma alteração do regime flexível, permitindo à indústria colocar no mercado, por um período de tempo limitado, uma percentagem mais elevada de motores que cumprem os anteriores valores-limite de emissões. Concebida como uma medida pontual temporária, foi justificada pelas condições de mercado muito difíceis que os fabricantes de máquinas móveis não rodoviárias (NRMM) enfrentaram a partir de 2009 em resultado da crise económica e financeira.

Dado que esta medida deve ser implementada durante o período em que são aplicáveis as normas da fase III-B, e tendo em conta que são essas as normas atualmente em vigor (NB: as normas da fase IV apenas serão aplicáveis a partir de 1 de janeiro e 1 de outubro de 2014, respetivamente, dependendo da categoria de potência do motor), até ao momento, não foram comunicadas à Comissão pelos Estados-Membros estatísticas sobre a utilização efetiva deste instrumento.

Por conseguinte, não é ainda possível uma avaliação conclusiva dos efeitos das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2011/88/UE, incluindo o seu impacto na qualidade do ar na UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006859/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2011/88/EU — engines placed on the market under the flexibility scheme

Directive 2011/88/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 November 2011 amended Directive 97/68/EC as regards the provisions for engines placed on the market under the flexibility scheme.

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of the amendments introduced by Directive 2011/88/EU?

— To what extent has air quality in the EU benefited from its adoption?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(30 July 2013)

All Member States have communicated their national transposition measures for Directive 2011/88/EU, except the United Kingdom. However, in the course of an infringement procedure, the United Kingdom has informed the Commission that the transposition measures will be adopted by the end of July 2013.

The main amendment introduced by Directive 2011/88/EU relates to a modification of the flexibility scheme, allowing industry to place for a limited period of time a higher percentage of engines on the market that comply with the previous emission limit values. Designed as a temporary one-off measure, it was warranted by the very difficult market conditions that manufacturers of non-road mobile machinery (NRMM) were facing from 2009 onwards as a result of the financial and economic crisis.

As this measure is to be implemented during the period where Stage IIIB standards apply, and considering that those are the standards currently in force (NB: Stage IV standards will only apply as of 1 January and 1 October 2014, respectively, depending on the engine power category), statistics on the actual use of this instrument have so far not been reported to the Commission by the Member States.

A conclusive assessment of the effects of the amendments introduced by Directive 2011/88/EU, including their impact on air quality in the EU, is therefore not yet possible.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006860/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2010/45/UE — IVA: regras em matéria de faturação

A Diretiva 2010/45/UE do Conselho, de 13 de julho de 2010, alterou a Diretiva 2006/112/CE relativa ao sistema comum do imposto sobre o valor acrescentado no que respeita às regras em matéria de faturação.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2010/45/UE?

— Considera que os Estados-Membros dispõem atualmente de mais condições para controlar os produtos que circulam temporariamente de um Estado-Membro para outro?

— Existe já um prazo harmonizado para a emissão de faturas no que diz respeito a determinadas entregas ou prestações transfronteiras, tal como previsto pela diretiva?

— Considera que se encontram garantidas a autenticidade da origem, a integridade do conteúdo e a legibilidade das faturas, em suporte papel ou em formato eletrónico, desde o momento da emissão até ao final do período de armazenagem?

Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão
(5 de agosto de 2013)

1. Todos os Estados-Membros transpuseram a Diretiva 2010/45/UE para a legislação nacional, exceto a Alemanha (transposição parcial) e Chipre (que está na fase final do processo legislativo). A Comissão iniciou processos por infração por não transposição contra ambos os países.

2. A Comissão apoia a Diretiva 2010/45/UE, que visa reduzir significativamente os encargos das empresas, nomeadamente no que diz respeito à faturação eletrónica.

3. A Diretiva 2010/45/UE introduziu requisitos claros obrigatórios em matéria de registo das mercadorias expedidas para outros países da UE para efeitos de avaliação, permitindo assim um controlo direto pelos Estados-Membros em causa.

4. A partir de 1 de janeiro de 2013, para entregas intra-UE de bens e para prestações de serviços a um cliente num outro país da UE, deve ser emitida uma fatura, o mais tardar, no décimo quinto dia do mês seguinte àquele em que ocorreu o facto gerador. Trata-se de uma nova regra harmonizada.

5. O artigo 233.°, n.° 1, da Diretiva 2006/112/CE, com a redação que lhe foi dada pela Diretiva 2010/45/UE, exige, de facto, que a autenticidade da origem, a integridade do conteúdo e a legibilidade das faturas sejam asseguradas desde a emissão até ao final do período de armazenagem. A Comissão não tem conhecimento de quaisquer dificuldades específicas a este respeito.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006860/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2010/45/EU — VAT: rules on invoicing

Council Directive 2010/45/EU of 13 July 2010 amended Directive 2006/112/EC on the common system of value added tax as regards the rules on invoicing.

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of the amendments introduced by Directive 2010/45/EU?

— Does it believe that the Member States are now better equipped to control goods moving temporarily from one Member State to another?

— Is there already a harmonised time limit for the issue of an invoice with respect to certain cross-border supplies or services, as laid down in the directive?

— Does it believe that the authenticity of the origin, the integrity of the content and the legibility of an invoice, whether on paper or in electronic form, are ensured from the point in time of issue until the end of the period for storage?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

1. All Member States have transposed Directive 2010/45/EU into national legislation, except for Germany (partial transposition) and Cyprus (which is at the final stages of the legislative procedure). The Commission has initiated infringement procedures for non-transposition to both countries.

2. The Commission is supportive of Directive 2010/45/EU which aims to significantly reduce burdens on business especially as regards e-invoicing.

3. Directive 2010/45/EU introduced clear obligatory record keeping requirements for goods dispatched to other EU countries for valuation purposes thus enabling straightforward control between the Member States concerned.

4. As from 1 January 2013 for intra-EU supplies of goods and for supplies of services to a customer in other EU country, an invoice shall be issued no later than on the fifteenth day of the month following that in which the chargeable event occurs. This is a new harmonised rule.

5. Article 233(1) of Directive 2006/112/CE, as amended by Directive 2010/45/EU, indeed requires that the authenticity of the origin, the integrity of the content and the legibility of invoices are ensured from issue until the end of the storage period. The Commission is not aware of any particular difficulties in this respect.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006861/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Internet: Alegada espionagem norte-americana

Notícias recentes dão conta da divulgação, pelo jornal britânico *The Guardian* e pelo norte-americano *The Washington Post*, de um documento confidencial da Agência de Segurança Nacional norte-americana no qual esta revelava ter acesso a e-mails, fotografias, transferência de arquivos, vídeos e conversas através dos servidores de nove empresas: Microsoft, Yahoo, Google, Facebook, PalTalk, AOL, Skype, YouTube e Apple. Alegadamente, as informações são compiladas com o consentimento das empresas envolvidas.

Assim, pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

— Tem conhecimento destas informações?

— Que credibilidade lhes atribui?

— Contactou as autoridades norte-americanas a este respeito?

— Que respostas obteve?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(5 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão Europeia manifesta a sua preocupação em relação às informações recentes veiculadas pelos meios de comunicação de que as autoridades dos Estados Unidos estão a aceder e a tratar, em grande escala, dados de cidadãos europeus quando estes utilizam prestadores de serviços em linha dos EUA. A Comissão manifestou preocupação e solicitou esclarecimentos aos homólogos dos EUA no que respeita às questões levantadas pelas informações recentes veiculadas pelos meios de comunicação, em especial no que respeita ao impacto sobre os cidadãos europeus. Remetemos igualmente para a recente declaração da Vice-Presidente Viviane Reding durante o debate na sessão plenária de 3 de julho, sobre esta questão.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006861/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Internet: Alleged US espionage

According to recent reports, *The Guardian* (UK) and *The Washington Post* (US) newspapers have published a confidential NSA document which reveals that the US National Security Agency can access e-mails, photographs, file transfers, videos and conversations by tapping into the servers of nine companies: Microsoft, Yahoo, Google, Facebook, Paltalk, AOL, Skype, YouTube and Apple. The information is reportedly compiled with the consent of the companies involved.

— Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this information?

— How credible does she believe it is?

— Has she contacted the US authorities in this regard?

— What responses has she received?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

The European Commission is concerned regarding the recent media reports that United States authorities are accessing and processing, on a large scale, the data of Europeans using major US online service providers. The Commission has expressed concerns and requested clarifications from the US counterparts regarding the issues raised by the reports in the media, in particular regarding the impact on Europeans. We also refer to the recent statement made by VP Reding during the Plenary debate of 3 July on the subject matter.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006862/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2010/47/UE — inspeção técnica de veículos comerciais

A Diretiva 2010/47/UE da Comissão, de 5 de julho de 2010, adaptou ao progresso técnico a Diretiva 2000/30/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa à inspeção técnica na estrada dos veículos comerciais que circulam na Comunidade.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz das adaptações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2010/47/EU?

— Em que medida esta contribuiu efetivamente para assegurar que os veículos comerciais em funcionamento são devidamente objeto de manutenção e inspecionados para que mantenham o seu comportamento seguro no tráfego quando circulam no interior da União Europeia?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(19 de julho de 2013)

1. Nenhum.

2-3. As alterações introduzidas pela referida diretiva preveem uma maior harmonização das inspeções técnicas na estrada no que diz respeito aos sistemas de travagem dos veículos comerciais, bem como à conformidade com aspetos ambientais. Com a inclusão de uma lista de verificação no relatório harmonizado de inspeção na estrada, a manutenção e as inspeções incidirão nas peças e componentes relacionados com a segurança. Tudo isto deverá conduzir a um melhor desempenho em matéria de segurança dos veículos comerciais que circulam na União Europeia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006862/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2010/47/EU — technical inspection of commercial vehicles

Commission Directive 2010/47/EU of 5 July 2010 adapted to technical progress Directive 2000/30/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the technical roadside inspection of the roadworthiness of commercial vehicles circulating in the Community.

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of the amendments introduced by Directive 2010/47/EU?

— To what extent has it effectively helped to ensure that commercial vehicles in operation are properly maintained and inspected, in order to maintain their safe traffic performance when circulating within the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2013)

1. None.

2 and 3. The amendments introduced by this directive provide for a more harmonised approach of technical roadside inspections as regards the braking systems of commercial vehicles as well as the compliance with environmental aspects. With the harmonised roadside inspection report including a checklist, maintenance and inspections will focus on the safety related parts and components. This should lead to better safety performance of commercial vehicles circulating within the Union.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006863/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2009/50/CE — entrada e de residência de nacionais de países terceiros para emprego altamente qualificado

A Diretiva 2009/50/CE do Conselho, de 25 de maio de 2009, relativa às condições de entrada e de residência de nacionais de países terceiros para efeitos de emprego altamente qualificado.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz da sua aplicação?

— Considera que a diretiva potenciou a atratividade da União Europeia junto dos profissionais altamente qualificados? Dispõe de dados a este respeito?

— Em que medida esta diretiva contribuiu para colmatar a escassez de mão de obra?

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

Todos os Estados-Membros transpuseram a diretiva e a legislação nacional entrou em vigor. Está atualmente a decorrer o processo de verificação pela Comissão da correta transposição jurídica das medidas nacionais de execução notificadas.

A Comissão não dispõe ainda de informações precisas e completas sobre o número de emissões do Cartão Azul UE. Foi recordado aos Estados-Membros que tinham de comunicar as suas estatísticas ao Eurostat até 19 de junho de 2013. É, portanto, cedo demais para a Comissão exprimir um parecer sobre a eficácia da diretiva para potenciar a atratividade da UE junto dos trabalhadores altamente qualificados e sobre a forma como foi abordada a questão da escassez de mão-de-obra no mercado laboral da UE.

A Comissão comunicará informações pormenorizadas ao Parlamento Europeu e ao Conselho sobre a aplicação da diretiva e o seu impacto, tendo em conta os resultados dos exercícios de avaliação acima referidos e outras informações recebidas de todas as partes relevantes, o mais tardar em 19 de junho de 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006863/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2009/50/EC — entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly qualified employment

In view of Council Directive 2009/50/EC of 25 May 2009 on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly qualified employment;

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of its application?

— Does it believe that the directive has made the EU more attractive to highly qualified workers? Does it have data in this regard?

— To what extent has this directive helped to address the workforce shortage?

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

All Member States have transposed the directive and the national legislation has entered into force. The Commission is currently in the process of checking the correct legal transposition of the notified national implementing measures.

The Commission does not have accurate and complete information yet on the number of EU Blue Cards issued. Member States have been reminded that they have to submit their statistics to Eurostat before 19 June 2013. Therefore, it is too early for the Commission to express a view on the effectiveness of the directive in making the EU more attractive to highly qualified workers and on to what extent workforce shortages on the EU labour market have been addressed.

The Commission will report in detail to the European Parliament and the Council on the application of the directive and its impact, taking into account the findings of the abovementioned assessment exercises and further info received from all relevant actors, at the latest by 19 June 2014.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006864/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2009/52/CE — sanções e medidas contra os empregadores de nacionais de países terceiros em situação irregular

A Diretiva 2009/52/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 18 de junho de 2009, estabeleceu normas mínimas sobre sanções e medidas contra os empregadores de nacionais de países terceiros em situação irregular.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz da sua aplicação?

— Crê que esta diretiva tem vindo a contribuir adequadamente para reforçar a cooperação entre Estados-Membros na luta contra a imigração clandestina e, em especial, intensificar as medidas contra o emprego ilegal a nível dos Estados-Membros e da EU?

— Dispõe de informações acerca das medidas vigentes nos Estados-Membros que sejam mais severas relativamente aos empregadores?

— Partilha da convicção de que o cumprimento de sanções administrativas pode e deverá ser reforçado através da aplicação de sanções penais?

— Considera que esta diretiva contribuiu para aumentar o fator dissuasor junto dos empregadores? De que dados dispõe para sustentar semelhante convicção?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão
(25 de julho de 2013)

Todos os Estados-Membros notificaram a transposição integral da Diretiva, com exceção da Suécia, onde foi notificada uma transposição parcial, estando prevista para breve a notificação completa.

A Comissão está atualmente a avaliar a aplicação da Diretiva nos Estados-Membros. A avaliação da aplicação proporcionará igualmente informações relativas ao facto de haver Estados-Membros que impõem obrigações mais severas relativamente aos empregadores.

Dado que na maioria dos Estados-Membros a aplicação é relativamente recente, não existe atualmente informações sobre a incidência efetiva das disposições da Diretiva. Em 2014, a Comissão apresentará um relatório sobre a aplicação da Diretiva, incluindo as inspeções realizadas nos Estados-Membros e os seus resultados.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006864/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2009/52/CE — sanctions and measures against employers of illegally-staying third-country nationals

Directive 2009/52/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2009 provides for minimum standards on sanctions and measures against employers of illegally staying third-country nationals.

Can the Commission answer the following:

— Which Member States have still not transposed this directive?

— How does it assess its implementation?

— Does it believe that this directive makes a satisfactory contribution towards strengthening cooperation among Member States in the fight against illegal immigration and, in particular, in intensifying measures against illegal employment at Member State and EU level?

— Does it have any information about existing measures in the Member States which impose stricter obligations on employers?

— Does it agree that compliance with administrative sanctions can and should be increased through the imposition of criminal penalties?

— Does it believe that this directive helps to provide further deterrents to employers? What data does it have to support this belief?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

All Member States have notified full transposition of the directive with the exception of Sweden where partial transposition has been notified, with full notification expected shortly.

The Commission is currently assessing the implementation of the directive in the Member States. The assessment of the implementation will also provide information on whether Member States impose stricter obligations on employers.

Given that implementation in most Member States has taken place relatively recently, there is currently no information about the actual impact of the directive. In 2014, the Commission will report on the implementation of the directive, including on inspections carried out in the Member States and their results.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006865/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2011/51/UE — direitos dos beneficiários de proteção internacional

A Diretiva 2011/51/UE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 11 de maio de 2011, alterou a Diretiva 2003/109/CE do Conselho de modo a alargar o seu âmbito de aplicação aos beneficiários de proteção internacional.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2011/51/UE?

— Dispõe de dados quanto ao número de beneficiários de proteção internacional que obtiveram o estatuto de residente de longa duração no Estado-Membro que lhes concedeu proteção internacional?

— O estatuto de residente de longa duração no Estado-Membro é-lhes concedido nas mesmas condições dos outros nacionais de países terceiros, tal como pretendido?

— Encontra-se garantida a informação aos Estados-Membros diferentes do Estado-Membro que concede a proteção internacional quanto às situações de proteção internacional, a fim de lhes permitir atender às suas obrigações em matéria do respeito do princípio da não repulsão?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão
(4 de setembro de 2013)

Os Estados-Membros deviam transpor a Diretiva 2011/51/UE até 20 de maio de 2013. Até à data, 10 Estados-Membros ainda não comunicaram medidas de transposição [1] e seis comunicaram medidas de transposição parciais [2]. Em conformidade com as competências que lhe são atribuídas pelos Tratados, a Comissão tomou as medidas necessárias para garantir que os Estados-Membros transponham completamente a legislação.

A diretiva não obriga os Estados-Membros a recolherem dados estatísticos sobre o número de beneficiários de proteção internacional que obtiveram o estatuto de residentes de longa duração num Estado-Membro nem sobre as condições ao abrigo das quais esse estatuto foi concedido. Por conseguinte, a Comissão não compila tais informações.

Em conformidade com a diretiva, a autorização de residência de longa duração deve mencionar expressamente o facto de o seu titular ser beneficiário de proteção internacional, se for caso disso, de modo a garantir o respeito do princípio da não repulsão.

---

[1] BE, DE, EL, FR, IT, LV, MT, PL, SI e SE.
[2] EE, ES, AT, RO, FI e LT.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006865/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2011/51/EU — rights of beneficiaries of international protection

Directive 2011/51/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2011 amended Council Directive 2003/109/EC to extend its scope to beneficiaries of international protection.

Can the Commission answer the following:

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive into their national law?

— What is the Commission's assessment of the changes made by Directive 2011/51/EU?

— Does it have any data on the number of beneficiaries of international protection who obtained long-term resident status in the Member State which offered them international protection?

— Were the persons involved granted long-term resident status on the same terms as nationals of other countries, as intended by the directive?

— Has it been ensured that Member States other than the one which granted international protection are informed of the protection background of persons involved, to enable them to attend to their obligations regarding the principle of non-refoulement?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(4 September 2013)

Member States were due to transpose Directive 2011/51 by 20 May 2013. To date, ten Member States have not yet communicated any transposition measures ([1]) and six have communicated partial transposition measures ([2]). In line with its role under the treaties, the Commission has taken the necessary steps to ensure Member States transpose the legislation completely.

The directive does not oblige Member States to collect statistics concerning the number of beneficiaries of international protection who obtained the status of long term residents in a Member State or concerning the conditions under which such status was granted. Therefore the Commission does not compile such information.

According to the directive, the long term residence permit must mention explicitly the fact that its holder is a beneficiary of international protection, where relevant, so as to ensure respect for the principle of non-refoulement.

([1]) BE, DE, EL, FR, IT, LV, MT, PL, SI, SE.
([2]) EE, ES, AT, RO, FI, LT.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006866/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2009/136/CE — redes e serviços de comunicações eletrónicas: serviço universal e direitos dos utilizadores

A Diretiva 2009/136/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 25 de novembro de 2009, alterou a Diretiva 2002/22/CE relativa ao serviço universal e aos direitos dos utilizadores em matéria de redes e serviços de comunicações eletrónicas, a Diretiva 2002/58/CE relativa ao tratamento de dados pessoais e à proteção da privacidade no setor das comunicações eletrónicas e o Regulamento (CE) n.° 2006/2004 relativo à cooperação entre as autoridades nacionais responsáveis pela aplicação da legislação de defesa do consumidor.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2009/136/CE nos diplomas acima identificados?

— Em que medida esta contribuiu efetivamente para a realização do espaço único europeu da informação e de uma sociedade da informação inclusiva?

— Considera que os Estados-Membros aplicam efetivamente medidas que promovem a criação de um mercado de produtos e serviços de grande difusão, que integram funcionalidades para os utilizadores finais com deficiência?

Resposta dada por Neelie Kroes em nome da Comissão
(31 de julho de 2013)

Todos os Estados-Membros notificaram a transposição integral da diretiva relativa aos direitos dos cidadãos. A sua implementação dá um contributo eficaz para a criação de um espaço europeu único da informação e de uma sociedade da informação inclusiva, através do reforço dos direitos dos consumidores e das exigências em matéria de acessibilidade dos utilizadores finais com deficiência aos serviços de comunicações eletrónicas (SCE). A tabela de avaliação da Agenda Digital para a Europa, de 2013 ([1]), recentemente publicada, mostra que a concorrência continua a aumentar nos diversos mercados nacionais e que a redução dos preços das telecomunicações beneficia os consumidores.

Vários Estados-Membros incluíram medidas específicas a favor dos utilizadores deficientes nas suas obrigações de serviço universal (por exemplo, serviços de tradução de voz para texto, ou vice-versa, para os utilizadores). Além disso, os Estados-Membros autorizaram as autoridades nacionais competentes a especificarem requisitos, se necessário, para garantir a equivalência de acesso e de escolha de SCE para os utilizadores finais com deficiência. O ORECE analisou estes requisitos ([2]) e decidiu organizar uma *workshop* em 2013 para discutir estas questões. Será em breve publicado um estudo da Comissão ([3]) que mostra a extensão da e-acessibilidade em toda a UE e os esforços políticos crescentes.

Com base no atual quadro regulamentar, a Comissão adotará, no início de setembro de 2013, propostas de medidas concretas adicionais para criar um mercado único das telecomunicações na UE, tornando mais fácil para os consumidores a compra de serviços em qualquer local na Europa.

([1]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/scoreboard
([2]) Relatório do ORECE «Ensuring equivalence in access and choice for disabled end-users».
([3]) SMART 2011/0070.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006866/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2009/136/EC — electronic communications networks and services: universal service and users' rights

Directive 2009/136/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2009 amended Directive 2002/22/EC on universal service and users' rights relating to electronic communications networks and services, Directive 2002/58/EC concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 on cooperation between national authorities responsible for the enforcement of consumer protection laws.

Can the Commission answer the following:

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive into their national law?

— What is the Commission's assessment of the changes made by Directive 2009/136/EU in the areas listed above?

— How has this made an effective contribution towards creating the single European information space and an inclusive information society?

— Does it feel that the Member States are effectively introducing measures to promote the creation of a market for widely available products and services incorporating facilities for disabled end-users?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

All Member States have notified full transposition of the Citizens' Rights Directive. Its implementation makes an effective contribution creating the Single European Information Space and an inclusive information society by strengthening the consumer rights and reinforcing requirements regarding accessibility of end-users with disabilities to electronic communications services (ECS). The recently published EU Digital Agenda Scoreboard 2013 ([1]) shows that competition continues to increase in the various national markets and consumers benefit from a reduction of telecom prices.

Several Member States have included specific measures for disabled end-users within their universal service obligations (e.g. text relay or text-to-speech service for users). In addition, Member States have enabled the relevant national authorities to specify, where appropriate, requirements to ensure equivalence in access and choice of ECS for disabled end-users. BEREC has analysed these requirements ([2]) and decided to organise a workshop in 2013 to address these issues. A Commission study ([3]) will soon be published showing the extent of e-accessibility across the EU and emerging policy efforts.

Building on the existing regulatory framework, the Commission will adopt in early September 2013 proposals for additional concrete measures to achieve a EU Single Telecoms Market making it easier for consumers to buy services anywhere in Europe.

([1]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/scoreboard.
([2]) BEREC report 'Ensuring equivalence in access and choice for disabled end-users'.
([3]) SMART 2011/0070.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006867/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2010/24/UE — assistência mútua em matéria de cobrança de créditos

Em 16 de março de 2010, foi adotada a Diretiva 2010/24/UE do Conselho relativa à assistência mútua em matéria de cobrança de créditos respeitantes a impostos, direitos e outras medidas.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz da sua aplicação?

— Considera que se encontra assegurada a assistência mútua entre Estados-Membros em matéria de cobrança recíproca dos respetivos créditos e dos da União respeitantes a determinados impostos, tal como pretendido?

— Ainda se encontram em vigor nos Estados-Membros medidas de proteçãodiscriminatórias destinadas a evitar a fraude e as perdas orçamentais?

Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão
(22 de julho de 2013)

A Diretiva 2010/24/UE do Conselho relativa à assistência mútua em matéria de cobrança de créditos respeitantes a impostos, direitos e outras medidas foi adotada em 16 de março de 2010. Os Estados-Membros passaram a ter de aplicar as suas disposições a partir de 1 de janeiro de 2013.

— A Polónia é o último Estado-Membro a adotar disposições nacionais para dar cumprimento a esta diretiva. Todos os outros Estados-Membros já a transpuseram.

— Tendo em conta o facto de que a assistência mútua em matéria de cobrança é um elemento essencial na luta contra a fraude fiscal, a Comissão instaurou processos por infração contra a Polónia pela não transposição da diretiva em causa. As autoridades polacas anunciaram que as disposições nacionais de execução seriam adotadas e publicadas no terceiro trimestre de 2013.

— Dado que a diretiva apenas se aplica a partir de 1 de janeiro de 2013, não é ainda possível tirar conclusões no que respeita à utilização das novas disposições e ao seu efeito sobre a cobrança de créditos fiscais por pagar. A Comissão tenciona avaliar esta situação em 2014.

— A Comissão não tem conhecimento de quaisquer medidas de proteção discriminatórias destinadas a evitar a fraude e as perdas orçamentais nos Estados-Membros.

Decorre de jurisprudência bem estabelecida que a existência de diferentes regimes de cobrança de impostos, refletindo a diferença nas situações em que pessoas ou empresas residentes e não residentes se encontrarem no que diz respeito à cobrança de impostos, não equivale necessariamente a medidas de proteção discriminatórias.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006867/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2010/24/EU — mutual assistance for the recovery of claims

Council Directive 2010/24/EU concerning mutual assistance for the recovery of claims relating to taxes, duties and other measures was adopted on 16 March 2010.

Can the Commission answer the following:

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— How does the Commission view the implementation of this directive?

— Does it feel that the aim of ensuring mutual assistance between Member States for the recovery of each others' claims and those of the Union with respect to certain taxes has been achieved?

— Are discriminatory protective measures designed to prevent fraud and budgetary losses still in force in some Member States?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(22 July 2013)

Council Directive 2010/24/EU concerning mutual assistance for the recovery of claims relating to taxes, duties and other measures was adopted on 16 March 2010. Member States had to apply its provisions from 1 January 2013.

— Poland is the last Member State to adopt national provisions to comply with this directive. All other Member States already transposed it.

— Given the fact that mutual recovery assistance is a corner stone in the fight against tax fraud, the Commission has opened infringement proceedings against Poland for the non-transposition of this directive. The Polish authorities have announced that the national implementing provisions will be adopted and published in the third quarter of 2013.

— As this directive only applies since 1 January 2013, it is not yet possible to draw conclusions with regard to the use of the new provisions and their effect on the recovery of unpaid tax claims. The Commission intends to evaluate this in 2014.

— The Commission is not aware of any discriminatory protective measures designed to prevent fraud and budgetary losses in Member States.

It follows from well-established case law that different tax collection arrangements, reflecting the difference in the situations in which resident and non-resident persons or companies find themselves with regard to recovery of taxes, do not necessarily constitute discriminatory protective measures.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006868/13
a la Comisión
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial (S&D) y María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(13 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Implementación de los Fondos Estructurales y de Cohesión

Según ha informado la Comisión, a 31 de mayo de 2013, los créditos de compromisos previstos en el Marco financiero 2007-2014 han sido comprometidos al 100 % en todos los fondos y en todos los países. Asimismo, la Comisión informaba que, de estos compromisos, han sido pagados algo más del 50 % de los relativos al FEDER y al FSE y poco mas del 40 % de los del Fondo de Cohesión.

¿Cree la Comisión que estos porcentajes de pagos son los programados o que existen diferencias significativas (positivas o negativas) en algunos Fondos y Estados miembros?

Para completar estas informaciones de implementación, ¿puede dar la Comisión los siguientes datos, desglosados por fondos y países, a 31 de mayo:

— cantidades pendientes de liquidación del período 2000-2006,

— anulaciones de compromisos (por aplicación de las reglas N+2, N+3 u otra legislación) hechas desde el 1 de enero de 2007, desglosadas además por período de programación (2000-2006 y 2007-2013),

— solicitud de pagos presentadas por los Estado miembros pendientes de liquidación?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de agosto de 2013)

Todos los créditos de compromiso para 2013 se han comprometido. Dado que se está llevando a cabo cierta reprogramación entre programas y fondos, la tasa de ejecución puede desviarse temporalmente del 100 %. Además, tras la adopción del presupuesto rectificativo 1/2013, se han puesto a disposición de Croacia créditos de compromiso adicionales. A 10 de julio de 2013, los índices de absorción de los Fondos Estructurales eran los siguientes: Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional (FEDER), 55 %; Fondo de Cohesión (FC), 47 %; Fondo Social Europeo (FSE), 58 %.

Aunque las dificultades de tesorería a nivel de la Comisión han impedido procesar parte de las solicitudes pendientes, los índices de ejecución siguen demostrando cifras más altas que el año pasado. Ello se refleja en un rápido aumento de los índices de absorción. La norma de liberación automática se ha concebido con el fin de garantizar una buena gestión financiera y de garantizar que se respetan los perfiles de pago previstos para el período.

Debido a dificultades de tesorería a nivel de la Comisión, se ha retrasado el reembolso de algunas solicitudes. En la actualidad, siguen pendientes de pago unos 5 400 millones EUR debido a la falta de liquidez, y también debido a las interrupciones y suspensiones de las solicitudes de pago. El cuadro 3 del anexo muestra el desglose por países y por fondo. El cuadro 2 recoge las liberaciones n + 2 / n + 3 por año desde 2007, desglosadas por período de programación y por fondo. El cuadro 1 muestra los compromisos pendientes correspondientes al período 2000-2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006868/13
to the Commission
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial (S&D) and María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Implementation of the structural and cohesion funds

As of 31 May 2013, according to the Commission, 100% of the commitment appropriations in the financial framework for 2007-2014 had been allocated in all the funds and all countries. The Commission has also reported that just over 50% of the commitments relating to the ERDF and the ESF had been paid, and a little over 40% of those relating to the Cohesion Fund.

Does the Commission believe that these payment percentages are in line with the programming, or are there significant differences (positive or negative) in some funds and Member States?

Could the Commission also provide the following information regarding implementation, broken down by fund and country, as of 31 May:

— outstanding payment amounts for the period 2000-2006,

— cancellations of commitments (under the N+2 or N+3 rules or other legislation) since 1 January 2007, for each of the programming periods 2000-2006 and 2007-2013,

— outstanding payment requests lodged by the Member States?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(12 August 2013)

All commitment appropriations for 2013 have been committed. As some reprogamming is ongoing between programmes and funds, the execution rate may temporarily deviate from 100%. Moreover, following the adoption of amending budget 1/2013, additional commitment credits have been made available for Croatia. The absorption rates for the Structural Funds are as follows at 10 July 2013: European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) 55%; Cohesion Fund (CF) 47%; European Social Fund (ESF) 58%.

Although cash constraints at the Commission's level prevented the Commission from processing part of the pending claims, execution rates still demonstrate higher figures than last year. This is reflected in the rapidly rising absorption rates. The automatic de-commitment rule has been designed to ensure sound financial management and guarantee that payment profiles foreseen for the period are respected.

Due to cash constraints at the Commission's level, the reimbursement of some claims has been delayed. Currently, some EUR 5.4 billion are still unpaid due to a lack of cash, and also due to interruptions and suspensions of payment claims. Table 3 in the annex shows the breakdown by country and fund. Table 2 shows n+2 / n+3 de-commitments per year since 2007, broken down per programming period and fund. Table 1 shows the outstanding commitments from the 2000-2006 period.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006870/13
an die Kommission
Nessa Childers (S&D), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), Sven Giegold (Verts/ALE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE) und Sylvie Goulard (ALDE)
(13. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: EU-Plattform für verantwortungsvolles Handeln im Steuerwesen

Angesichts der Tatsache, dass der Union durch Steuerhinterziehung und -umgehung jährlich ein Schaden von etwa 1 Billion EUR entsteht, begrüßen wir es, dass EU-Kommissionsmitglied Algirdas Šemeta endlich einen soliden Plan für die Bekämpfung von Steuerflucht vorgelegt hat.

Die neue Plattform für verantwortungsvolles Handeln im Steuerwesen ist für die wirksame Anwendung des Kommissionsplans ganz wesentlich. Es hat jedoch den Anschein, dass im Rahmen dieser Plattform sehr viele der Verbände vertreten sind, deren Mitglieder in Steuerumgehung und in manchen Fällen sogar Steuerhinterziehung verwickelt waren oder entsprechende Beratungsleistungen erbracht haben. Hierin besteht ein klarer Interessenkonflikt.

Die Kommission akzeptierte im September 2012 die vom Haushaltsausschuss des Europäischen Parlaments aufgestellten Bedingungen im Gegenzug für die Aufhebung der Blockade der Mittel für die Expertengruppe.

Hält es die Kommission für hinnehmbar, dass die Zahl der Wirtschaftsvertreter, die der Plattform als Mitglieder angehören, doppelt so hoch ist wie die aller anderen Interessenträger (Gewerkschaften, Steuerexperten aus der Wissenschaft oder in der Entwicklung tätige nichtstaatliche Organisationen)? Hält es die Kommission für hinnehmbar, dass 9 der 15 Mitglieder Wirtschaftsverbänden angehören, die Steuerberater und Buchprüfer vertreten? Welche Maßnahmen wird die Kommission ergreifen, um dieses Ungleichgewicht unter den Mitgliedern der Plattform zu korrigieren, und wie wird sie mit diesem offensichtlichen Interessenkonflikt umgehen?

Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission
(25. Juli 2013)

Bezüglich der Rolle der Plattform sowie der Kriterien für die Mitgliedschaft und das Auswahlverfahren werden die Damen und Herren Abgeordneten auf die Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage P-006690/2013 von Frau Martina Anderson verwiesen. Um die komplexe Diskussion über verantwortungsvolles Handeln im Steuerwesen besser zu strukturieren, müssen Interessenträger — auch diejenigen, deren Verhalten in der öffentliche Debatte infrage gestellt worden ist — die Gelegenheit erhalten, ihre Ansichten zu den debattierten Themen zu äußern. Daher führt die Teilnahme von Wirtschafts- und Steuerberaterverbänden nicht zu einem Interessenkonflikt, sondern ist in Anbetracht des mit der Plattform verfolgten Zwecks sogar von wesentlicher Bedeutung.

Praktikable Antworten auf sachlich und politisch komplexe Fragen zu finden, erfordert entsprechendes Fachwissen. Daher gaben für die Kommission Erfahrung und Sachkunde der von den Organisationen benannten Vertreter und Stellvertreter den Ausschlag. Im Lichte der im Haushaltsausschuss des Europäischen Parlaments im September 2012 zum Ausdruck gebrachten Bedenken wurden jedoch nur fünf von 17 Bewerbungen aus der Wirtschaft und vier von 17 Bewerbungen von Steuerberatern ausgewählt, also im Verhältnis erheblich weniger als die fünf (von zehn) Organisationen aus der Zivilgesellschaft (NRO und Union). Die Kommission erinnert daran, dass die Plattform kein Beschlussfassungsorgan ist, sondern beratend wirkt. Daher ist die Anzahl der vorgetragenen Positionen nicht so wichtig wie die Frage, um wessen Position es sich handelt und wie sie begründet wird. Die Kommission ist davon überzeugt, dass alle derzeitigen Mitglieder der Plattform einen wertvollen Beitrag zur Erörterung der anstehenden Fragen leisten können, und beabsichtigt deshalb nicht, die Zusammensetzung der Plattform zu ändern.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006870/13
à la Commission
Nessa Childers (S&D), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), Sven Giegold (Verts/ALE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE) et Sylvie Goulard (ALDE)
(13 juin 2013)

Objet: Plateforme de l'Union concernant la bonne gouvernance dans le domaine fiscal

Nous nous félicitons que le commissaire Šemeta ait enfin mis au point un plan vigoureux de lutte contre la fraude et l'évasion fiscales, ces activités faisant perdre chaque année à l'Union quelque 1 000 milliards d'EUR.

La nouvelle plateforme concernant la bonne gouvernance dans le domaine fiscal joue un rôle essentiel pour l'efficacité du plan de la Commission. Or, un grand nombre de membres de cette plateforme sont issus d'organisations dont les membres se livrent à des activités d'évasion fiscale ou prodiguent des conseils en la matière, voire, dans certains cas, pratiquent et conseillent la fraude. Il s'agit là d'un conflit d'intérêts manifeste.

La Commission a accepté les conditions fixées par la commission des budgets du Parlement en septembre 2012 en l'échange de la levée de son blocage sur le budget du groupe d'experts.

La Commission juge-t-elle acceptable que le nombre de membres de la plateforme issus des milieux professionnels soit le double de celui des autres acteurs concernés (syndicats, universitaires fiscalistes ou ONG de développement)? Selon la Commission, est-il acceptable que neuf des quinze membres issus des professionnels du secteur représentent des conseillers fiscaux et des comptables? Quelles mesures compte prendre la Commission pour corriger ce déséquilibre dans la composition de la plateforme et comment entend-elle gérer ce conflit d'intérêts manifeste?

Réponse donnée par M. Šemeta au nom de la Commission
(25 juillet 2013)

Concernant le rôle de la plateforme, les critères de participation et le processus de sélection, les Honorables Parlementaires sont invités à consulter la réponse à la question écrite P-006690/2013, posée par Mme Martina Anderson. En vue de mieux structurer le débat complexe sur la bonne gouvernance dans le domaine fiscal, les parties prenantes, y compris celles dont le comportement a été remis en question dans le débat public, doivent être en mesure de donner leur avis sur les enjeux. La nomination d'associations d'entreprises et de conseillers fiscaux en qualité de membres ne crée donc pas de conflit d'intérêts et, compte tenu de la finalité de la plateforme, celle-ci apparaît au contraire essentielle.

L'identification de solutions réalistes à des problèmes techniquement et politiquement complexes requiert des connaissances spécifiques en la matière. L'expérience et les connaissances des représentants et des suppléants désignés par les organisations ont donc constitué les principaux critères d'évaluation de la Commission. Toutefois, compte tenu des sensibilités exprimées par la commission des budgets du Parlement européen en septembre 2012, seuls 5 des 17 dossiers concernant des entreprises et 4 des 17 dossiers de conseillers fiscaux ont été sélectionnés, ce qui, proportionnellement, est nettement inférieur aux 5 dossiers sélectionnés sur les 10 présentés par des organisations de la société civile (ONG et UE). La Commission rappelle que la plateforme ne constitue pas un organe décisionnel mais consultatif. Ce n'est donc pas tant le nombre d'avis en faveur d'une position que le membre qui la présente et sa justification qui importent. La Commission est convaincue que chaque membre actuel de la plateforme peut apporter une contribution précieuse aux discussions concernant les enjeux et, par conséquent, n'a pas l'intention d'en modifier la composition.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006870/13
aan de Commissie
Nessa Childers (S&D), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), Sven Giegold (Verts/ALE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE) en Sylvie Goulard (ALDE)
(13 juni 2013)

Betreft: EU-platform inzake goed fiscaal bestuur

Wij zijn verheugd over het feit dat Commissaris Šemeta eindelijk een gedegen plan heeft om belastingontduiking en -ontwijking aan te pakken, aangezien de Unie vanwege deze activiteiten jaarlijks circa 1 000 miljard euro misloopt.

Het nieuwe platform inzake goed fiscaal bestuur is van essentieel belang voor een doeltreffende tenuitvoerlegging van het plan van de Commissie. Het platform blijkt echter in grote mate te worden vertegenwoordigd door juist die organisaties waarvan de leden te maken hebben gehad met en advies hebben uitgebracht over belastingontwijking en, in een paar gevallen, belastingontduiking. Dit vormt een duidelijk belangenconflict.

In september 2012 heeft de Commissie de door de Begrotingscommissie van het Parlement vastgestelde voorwaarden geaccepteerd in ruil voor het opheffen van de blokkering van de deskundigengroep begroting.

Vindt de Commissie het acceptabel dat er twee keer zoveel brancheorganisaties in het platform zitting hebben dan ongeacht welke andere betrokkene (vakbonden, belastingwetenschappers of ontwikkelingsorganisaties)? Vindt de Commissie het acceptabel dat negen van de vijftien leden afkomstig zijn uit brancheorganisaties die belastingadviseurs en accountants vertegenwoordigen? Welke maatregelen neemt de Commissie om deze onbalans met betrekking tot de lidmaatschappen van het platform recht te trekken en hoe gaat zij om met het duidelijke belangenconflict?

Antwoord van de heer Šemeta namens de Commissie
(25 juli 2013)

Voor informatie over de rol van het platform, de criteria voor lidmaatschap en de selectieprocedure worden de geachte Parlementsleden verwezen naar het antwoord op schriftelijke vraag P-006690/2013 van mevrouw Martina Anderson. Teneinde meer structuur te brengen in de complexe discussie over goed fiscaal bestuur moeten belanghebbenden, met inbegrip van degenen van wie het gedrag reeds in het publieke debat ter discussie is gesteld, de kans krijgen om hun mening te geven over de relevante kwesties. Het lidmaatschap van de organisaties uit het bedrijfsleven en de organisaties voor belastingadviseurs vormt bijgevolg geen belangenconflict. Het is integendeel juist van cruciaal belang gezien het doel van het platform.

Voor het vinden van haalbare beleidsmaatregelen voor complexe kwesties op technisch en politiek vlak is expertise over deze kwesties nodig. De belangrijkste criteria die de Commissie heeft gehanteerd, waren bijgevolg de ervaring en kennis van de vertegenwoordigers en plaatsvervangers die door de organisaties zijn aangewezen. Gezien de gevoeligheden die de begrotingscommissie van het Parlement in september 2012 heeft aangehaald, zijn echter slechts 5 van de 17 sollicitaties van organisaties uit het bedrijfsleven en 4 van de 17 sollicitaties van belastingadviseurs geselecteerd, wat proportioneel aanzienlijk minder is dan de 5 organisaties uit het maatschappelijk middenveld (ngo's en vakbonden) die zijn geselecteerd uit de 10 kandidaat-leden. De Commissie herinnert eraan dat het platform een adviesorgaan is, en dus geen besluitvormingsorgaan. Bijgevolg is niet zozeer het aantal stellingnamen voor of tegen een bepaald punt van belang, maar wel om wiens standpunt het gaat en hoe het wordt onderbouwd. De Commissie is ervan overtuigd dat elk van de huidige leden van het platform een waardevolle bijdrage levert aan de bespreking van de relevante kwesties en is bijgevolg niet voornemens de samenstelling van het platform te wijzigen.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006870/13
adresată Comisiei
Nessa Childers (S&D), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), Sven Giegold (Verts/ALE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE) şi Sylvie Goulard (ALDE)
(13 iunie 2013)

Subiect: Platforma UE pentru buna guvernanță fiscală

Salutăm faptul că comisarul Šemeta are în sfârșit un plan solid pentru combaterea fraudei și evaziunii fiscale, dat fiind faptul că Uniunea pierde aproape 1 trilion EUR în fiecare an din cauza acestor activități.

Noua Platformă pentru buna guvernanță fiscală este esențială pentru aplicarea efectivă a planului Comisiei. Cu toate acestea, Platforma pare să cuprindă în mare măsură aceleași asociații ai căror membri au desfășurat activități în domeniul evaziunii fiscale și, în unele cazuri, în cel al fraudei fiscale sau au oferit consiliere în aceste domenii. Acesta reprezintă un clar conflict de interese.

Comisia a acceptat condițiile stabilite de Comisia pentru bugete a Parlamentului în septembrie 2012 în schimbul ridicării blocajului în ceea ce privește bugetul grupului de experți.

Consideră Comisia că este acceptabil ca Platforma să cuprindă de două ori mai mulți membri ai industriei în raport cu orice alte părți interesate (sindicate, cadre universitare din domeniul fiscal sau ONG-uri din domeniul dezvoltării)? Consideră Comisia că este acceptabil ca nouă din cei cincisprezece membri să provină din grupuri industriale reprezentând consultanți fiscali și fiscaliști? Ce măsuri intenționează să adopte Comisia pentru a rectifica dezechilibrul în ceea ce privește componența Platformei și cum va gestiona Comisia conflictul clar de interese?

Răspuns dat de dl. Šemeta în numele Comisiei
(25 iulie 2013)

În ceea ce privește rolul Platformei, criteriile de acordare a calității de membru și procesul de selecție, distinșii membri ai Parlamentului European sunt rugați să consulte răspunsul dat la întrebarea scrisă P-006690/2013 de d-na Martina Anderson. Discuțiile referitoare la o bună guvernanță fiscală sunt complexe. Pentru a le da substanță, toate punctele de vedere trebuie reprezentate — inclusiv cele ale entităților al căror comportament a fost pus sub semnul întrebării în cadrul unor dezbateri publice. Prin urmare, faptul că anumite asociații de întreprinderi și de consilieri fiscali sunt membre ale Platformei nu reprezintă un conflict de interese. Din contră, acesta este esențial, având în vedere scopul Platformei.

Găsirea de răspunsuri strategice fezabile la probleme tehnice și politice complexe necesită cunoștințe de specialitate în domeniu. Prin urmare, principalele criterii pe care Comisia le-a luat în considerare au fost experiența și cunoștințele reprezentanților și membrilor supleanți desemnați de către organizații. Cu toate acestea, având în vedere aspectele delicate prezentate în septembrie 2012 de către Comisia pentru bugete a Parlamentului, au fost selectate doar 5 din cele 17 asociații de întreprinderi care și-au depus candidatura și 4 din cele 17 asociații de consilieri fiscali. Proporțional, raportul este net în favoarea organizațiilor societății civile (ONG-uri și sindicate), întrucât 5 din 10 astfel de organizații au fost selectate. Comisia reamintește că platforma nu este un organism decizional, ci unul consultativ. De aceea, numărul de opinii care pledează pentru o poziție este mai puțin important decât sectorul a cărui viziune este exprimată și modul în care această viziune este susținută. Comisia este convinsă că toți membrii actuali ai Platformei pot aduce o contribuție valoroasă la analizarea aspectelor în cauză și, prin urmare, nu are nicio intenție de a schimba componența Platformei.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006870/13
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (S&D), Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), Sven Giegold (Verts/ALE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE) and Sylvie Goulard (ALDE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: EU Platform for Tax Good Governance

We welcome that Commissioner Šemeta finally has a robust plan for tackling tax evasion and avoidance, given that the Union loses approximately EUR 1 trillion every year to these activities.

The new Platform for Tax Good Governance is essential for the effective application of the Commission plan. However, the platform appears to be heavily populated by the very same associations whose members have been engaging in and advising on tax avoidance and, in some instances, evasion. This is a clear conflict of interest.

The Commission accepted the conditions laid down by Parliament's Committee on Budgets in September 2012 in exchange for lifting the block on the expert group budget.

Does the Commission believe it is acceptable for the Platform to have twice the number of industry members as any other stakeholder (trade unions, tax academics or development NGOs)? Does the Commission believe it is acceptable for nine of the fifteen members to be drawn from industry groups representing tax advisors and accountants? What measures will the Commission take to rectify this membership imbalance on the Platform and how will it manage the clear conflict of interest?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

As regards the role of the Platform, the criteria for membership and the selection process, the Honourable Members are kindly referred to the answer given to Written Question P-006690/2013 by Ms Martina Anderson. In order to provide more structure in the complex discussion about tax good governance, stakeholders — including those whose behaviour has been questioned in public debate — must be given the opportunity to share their view on the issues at stake. The membership of business associations and tax adviser associations therefore does not create a conflict of interest. On the contrary, it is vital given the purpose of the Platform.

Finding feasible policy responses for technically and politically complex issues requires expert knowledge of these topics. The key criteria the Commission considered were therefore the experience and knowledge of the representatives and alternates nominated by the organisations. However, in the light of the sensitivities expressed by the Parliament's Committee on Budgets in September 2012, only 5 out of 17 business applications and 4 out of 17 tax adviser applications were selected, which proportionately is considerably fewer than the 5 out of 10 civil society organisations selected (NGO and Union). The Commission recalls that the Platform is not a decision making body but an advisory one. The number of views advocating a position is therefore not as important as whose vision it is and how it is substantiated. The Commission is convinced that the current members of the Platform can all make a valuable contribution to the discussion of the issues at stake and therefore has no intention of changing its composition.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006872/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 juin 2013)

Objet: Suivi des droits des passagers aériens

Dans sa réponse à ma question E-004269/2013, la Commission indique que les passagers ont droit à une indemnisation en cas de retard important, au même titre que pour les vols annulés, conformément aux arrêts de la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne. Ceci constitue une avancée très importante en faveur des consommateurs. Encore faut-il que les passagers en soient informés, ce que les compagnies aériennes se gardent de faire.

La même réflexion vaut pour la réponse de la Commission sur les indemnisations dues par les compagnies en cas de circonstances extraordinaires causées par des problèmes techniques, dont la définition a été fortement limitée.

Dans ces conditions, s'agissant d'un règlement directement applicable dans les États membres, la Commission pourrait-elle faire savoir comment elle entendra informer et obliger les compagnies à informer les consommateurs sur ces droits très importants et sur les procédures et moyens simples et rapides de percevoir ces indemnités obligatoires?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(18 juillet 2013)

Conformément à l'article 16, paragraphe 1, du règlement (CE) n° 261/2004 ([1]), chaque État membre doit désigner un organisme national (ONA: organismes nationaux chargés de l'application) chargé de garantir l'application correcte du règlement. Depuis que la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne a confirmé que les passagers dont le vol est retardé ont droit à une indemnisation dans certaines circonstances [affaires *Sturgeon* (C-402/07) et *Nelson* (C-581/10)], les ONA sont chargés de veiller au versement des indemnisations de retard. Ils doivent également s'assurer que les transporteurs aériens s'acquittent de leur obligation d'informer les passagers de leurs droits, en vertu de l'article 14 dudit règlement. La Commission contrôle les travaux des ONA, contacte ces organismes et organise des réunions avec eux de manière régulière, afin de s'assurer que les mesures d'exécution sont mises en œuvre correctement.

Par ailleurs, la Commission a récemment lancé une nouvelle campagne d'information destinée à sensibiliser les citoyens à leurs droits en tant que voyageurs:
(http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/passengers/campaign/campaign2013_en.htm).

Enfin, dans sa proposition de règlement modifiant le règlement (CE) n° 261/2004 ([2]), la Commission a proposé de renforcer tant les mesures d'exécution incombant aux ONA que les procédures de réclamation et de traitement des plaintes qui permettront aux passagers de faire valoir leurs droits plus facilement. En particulier, au moment de la réservation, le transporteur aérien devrait communiquer aux passagers les adresses de contact auxquelles les passagers peuvent envoyer leurs réclamations et plaintes, notamment par des moyens de transmission électroniques.

([1]) Règlement (CE) n° 261/2004 du Parlement et du Conseil du 11 février 2004 établissant des règles communes en matière d'indemnisation et d'assistance des passagers en cas de refus d'embarquement et d'annulation ou de retard important d'un vol, et abrogeant le règlement (CEE) n° 295/91 (JO L 46 du 17.2.2004).

([2]) COM(2013)130 final du 13.3.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006872/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Monitoring of air passengers' rights

In its answer to my Question E-004269/2013, the Commission stated that passengers were entitled to compensation in the event of long delays, in the same way as for cancelled flights, in line with the judgments of the Court of Justice of the European Union. This is a very important step forward for consumers. Passengers have to be informed about it too, which airlines are wary of doing.

The same comment applies to the Commission's answer regarding compensation payable by airlines in extraordinary circumstances caused by technical problems, the definition of which was very narrow.

Under these circumstances, given that this concerns a regulation that is directly applicable in the Member States, could the Commission say how it will inform and force airlines to inform consumers of these very important rights and of the procedures they can follow to obtain this compulsory compensation quickly and easily?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2013)

Pursuant to Article 16(1) of Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 ([1]), each Member State must designate a National Enforcement Body (NEB) responsible for the enforcement of the regulation. Since the EU Court of Justice confirmed in the cases *Sturgeon* (C-402/07) and *Nelson* (C-581/10) that passengers of delayed flights have a right to compensation in certain circumstances, the NEBs are responsible for the enforcement of delay compensation. This also includes the obligation on air carriers to inform passengers on their rights pursuant to Article 14 of the regulation. The Commission monitors the work of the NEBs and meets and contacts them on a regular basis to ensure that this enforcement action is correctly carried out.

Furthermore, the Commission recently launched a new information campaign to make citizens aware of their rights when travelling
(http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/passengers/campaign/campaign2013_en.htm).

Finally, in its proposal for a regulation amending Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 ([2]), the Commission has proposed to enhance both, enforcement action by the NEBs, and claim and complaint handling procedures that will make it easier for passengers to enforce their rights. In particular, at the time of reservation, the air carrier would have to inform the passenger on the contact addresses to which passengers can submit claims and complaints, including via electronic means of transmission.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation of flights, and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 295/91 (OJ L46, 17.2.2004).
([2]) COM(2013) 130 final, 13.3.2013.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006873/13
au Conseil
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 juin 2013)

Objet: Trafic illégal d'espèces sauvages

Le Conseil compte-t-il utiliser ses instruments commerciaux et de développement pour instaurer des programmes spécifiques, dotés de suffisamment de fonds, en vue de renforcer la mise en œuvre de la convention CITES et de fournir des ressources pour renforcer les capacités de lutte contre le braconnage et les trafics illégaux, notamment en soutenant, en consolidant et en élargissant les initiatives répressives, telles qu'ASEAN-WEN et HA-WEN, qui visent à créer des centres régionaux d'expertise et à fournir des modèles de coopération contre la criminalité liée aux espèces sauvages?

Réponse
(16 septembre 2013)

La convention sur le commerce international des espèces de faune et de flore sauvages menacées d'extinction (CITES), à laquelle l'Union n'est pas partie contractante, est néanmoins mise en œuvre dans l'Union en vertu du règlement (CE) nº 338/97 du Conseil du 9 décembre 1996 relatif à la protection des espèces de faune et de flore sauvages par le contrôle de leur commerce ([1]).

Il appartiendrait à la Commission — dans le cadre de son droit d'initiative — de prendre, le cas échéant, les décisions appropriées concernant l'action future à mener face au problème évoqué par l'Honorable Parlementaire. Le Conseil examinerait avec grande attention toute proposition que la Commission pourrait présenter à cet égard.

([1]) JO L 61 du 3.3.1997, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006873/13
to the Council
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Wildlife trafficking

Does the Council plan to leverage its trade and development instruments to establish dedicated programmes, with substantial funding, to strengthen the implementation of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES) and provide resources for capacity-building against poaching and trafficking, in particular by supporting, strengthening and expanding enforcement initiatives such as the Association of South-east Asian Nations Wildlife Enforcement Network (ASEAN-WEN) and the Horn of Africa Wildlife Enforcement Network (HA-WEN), which aim to establish regional centres of expertise and provide models for cooperation against wildlife crime?

Reply
(16 September 2013)

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES), to which the Union is not a contracting party, is nonetheless implemented in the Union by Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97 of 9 December 1996 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein ([1]).

It would be for the Commission — in the context of its right of initiative — to take, if necessary, the appropriate decisions for future action on the issue to which the Honourable Member refers. The Council would examine with great attention any proposals that might be presented by the Commission on this subject.

([1]) OJ L 61, 3.3.1997, p. 1.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006874/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 juin 2013)

Objet: Trafic illégal d'espèces sauvages

La Commission compte-t-elle élaborer, comme le lui demande le Parlement européen, un plan d'action européen contre le trafic illégal d'espèces sauvages, assorti d'objectifs concrets, tant à l'intérieur qu'à l'extérieur de l'Union, afin de réduire le trafic illégal d'espèces sauvages et de parties de corps d'animaux?

La Commission compte-t-elle utiliser ses instruments commerciaux et de développement pour instaurer des programmes spécifiques, dotés de suffisamment de fonds, en vue de renforcer la mise en œuvre de la convention CITES et de fournir des ressources pour renforcer les capacités de lutte contre le braconnage et les trafics illégaux, notamment en soutenant, en consolidant et en élargissant les initiatives répressives, telles qu'ASEAN-WEN et HA-WEN, qui visent à créer des centres régionaux d'expertise et à fournir des modèles de coopération contre la criminalité liée aux espèces sauvages?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(1er août 2013)

La Commission assure le suivi du plan d'action de l'Union visant à lutter contre le commerce illégal d'espèces sauvages ([1]), adopté en 2007. Elle préside également le groupe de l'Union «application de la réglementation concernant le commerce des espèces de faune et de flore sauvages», réunissant des services répressifs et des organismes internationaux, dans le but d'améliorer la coopération dans la lutte contre le trafic des espèces sauvage au sein de l'Union.

L'Union européenne joue également un rôle de premier plan dans la Convention sur le commerce international des espèces de faune et de flore sauvages menacées d'extinction (CITES). Lors de sa dernière réunion en mars 2013, elle a adopté un ensemble de mesures visant à lutter contre le trafic des espèces sauvages, qui se concentrent sur un certain nombre de pays impliqués dans le trafic illégal d'ivoire et de corne de rhinocéros. L'Union européenne est également le principal donateur du «consortium international de lutte contre la criminalité liée aux espèces sauvages», qui regroupe Interpol, l'Office des Nations unies contre la drogue et le crime, l'Organisation mondiale des douanes, la CITES et la Banque mondiale, l'objectif étant de combattre le trafic des espèces sauvages.

([1]) Voir la recommandation de la Commission C(2007)2551 définissant un ensemble de mesures de mise en œuvre du règlement (CE) n° 338/97 du Conseil relatif à la protection des espèces de faune et de flore sauvages par le contrôle de leur commerce.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006874/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Wildlife trafficking

Does the Commission plan to develop a European action plan against wildlife trafficking, highlighting clear deliverables, both internal and external to the EU, in order to reduce the illegal trade in wildlife species and body parts, as called upon to do by Parliament?

Does the Commission plan to leverage its trade and development instruments to establish dedicated programmes, with substantial funding, to strengthen the implementation of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES) and provide resources for capacity-building against poaching and trafficking, in particular by supporting, strengthening and expanding enforcement initiatives such as the Association of South-east Asian Nations Wildlife Enforcement Network (ASEAN-WEN) and the Horn of Africa Wildlife Enforcement Network (HA-WEN), which aim to establish regional centres of expertise and provide models for cooperation against wildlife crime?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2013)

The Commission ensures the follow-up to the EU action plan against illegal wildlife trade ([1]) adopted in 2007. It also chairs the EU wildlife trade enforcement group which brings together law enforcement officers and international agencies with an aim to improve cooperation against wildlife trafficking in the EU.

The EU also plays a leading role in the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES). At its last meeting in March 2013, it adopted comprehensive measures against wildlife trafficking, focusing on a number of countries involved in illegal ivory and rhinoceros horn trafficking. The EU is also the major donor to the 'International Consortium against Wildlife Crime' which brings together Interpol, the UN Office on Drugs and Crime, the World Customs Organisation, CITES and the World Bank with a view to tackling wildlife trafficking.

([1]) Cf. Commission Recommendation C (2007) 2551 identifying a set of actions for the enforcement of Regulation (EC) No 338/97 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006875/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 juin 2013)

Objet: Proposition législative Europol

La Commission compte-t-elle, comme le lui demande le Parlement, présenter une proposition législative sur Europol, comme le prévoit l'article 88, paragraphe 2, du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne, afin d'améliorer l'efficacité opérationnelle d'Europol dans la lutte contre la grande criminalité et la criminalité organisée?

Comment la Commission imagine-t-elle la future réforme de l'agence sans qu'elle ne perturbe le rôle déterminant joué par le CEPOL dans les activités de formation de l'Union dans le domaine répressif?

Réponse donnée par Mme Malmström au nom de la Commission
(9 août 2013)

La Commission a présenté une proposition législative sur Europol le 27 mars 2013 ([1]).

La Commission propose de fusionner le CEPOL avec Europol. Cela renforcerait les liens et les synergies entre la coopération policière opérationnelle et la formation. Une fusion entraînerait également une réduction des coûts qui permettrait, notamment, un redéploiement du personnel en vue de la création du programme de formation des services répressifs ([2]), programme présenté par la Commission parallèlement à la proposition législative. L'approche proposée est conforme à l'approche commune sur les agences adoptée par le Parlement européen, le Conseil et la Commission en 2012.

([1]) COM(2013)173 final.
([2]) COM(2013)172 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006875/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Legislative proposal on Europol

Does the Commission plan to submit a legislative proposal on Europol, as stipulated in Article 88(2) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, with a view to improving Europol's operational efficiency and effectiveness in the field of combating serious and organised crime, as called upon to do by Parliament?

How does the Commission envisage the future reform of the agency without it hampering the decisive role of CEPOL in the EU's training activities and in the field of law enforcement?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

The Commission submitted a legislative proposal on Europol on 27 March 2013 ([1]).

The Commission has proposed to merge CEPOL into Europol. This would strengthen links and synergies between operational police cooperation and training. A merger would also bring costs savings that would notably allow the redeployment of staff posts to develop the Law Enforcement Training Scheme ([2]), which the Commission presented alongside the legislative proposal. The proposed approach is in line with the Common Approach on agencies endorsed by the European Parliament, Council and Commission in 2012.

([1]) COM(2013) 173 final.
([2]) COM(2013) 172 final.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006876/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 juin 2013)

Objet: Programme européen pour la protection des dénonciateurs

Quand la Commission compte t-elle présenter une proposition législative sur un programme européen efficace pour la protection des dénonciateurs pour les cas de corruption transfrontaliers et de corruption affectant les intérêts financiers européens et pour la protection des témoins et des collaborateurs de justice, notamment afin de remédier aux difficultés qu'ils peuvent éprouver dans leurs conditions de vie, entre les risques de représailles, la rupture des liens familiaux, leur déracinement et leur exclusion sociale et professionnelle?

Réponse donnée par Mme Malmström au nom de la Commission
(9 août 2013)

La protection des dénonciateurs revêt en effet une importance capitale dans le cadre d'une politique efficace de lutte contre la corruption. La Commission compte répertorier plus précisément les lacunes existantes, définir les besoins réels et analyser les solutions disponibles avant de déployer des moyens d'action concrets.

La Commission travaille actuellement à l'élaboration du premier rapport de l'Union européenne sur la lutte contre la corruption; celui-ci doit évaluer les efforts consentis en la matière par tous les États membres et examiner, parmi bien d'autres, les aspects relatifs à la protection des dénonciateurs dans l'ensemble de l'Union. Une étude comparative cofinancée par l'Union et portant sur la protection des informateurs (dénonciateurs compris) dans les États membres est actuellement menée par Transparency International; elle devrait être achevée avant la fin de l'année. Une fois que le rapport et l'étude seront prêts, des moyens d'action concrets seront éventuellement déployés.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006876/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: European programme to protect informants

When does the Commission plan to present a legislative proposal for an effective European programme to protect informants in cases of cross-border corruption and corruption affecting Europe's financial interests and to protect cooperative and other witnesses, especially in order to eliminate the difficulties they may experience in their living conditions, including the risk of reprisals, the need to break family ties and uproot and their social and professional exclusion?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

Protection of whistle-blowers is indeed an essential element of an effective anti-corruption policy. The Commission intends to identify in more detail the existing shortcomings, define the actual needs and analyse available possible solutions before considering any policy options.

The Commission is currently working on the first EU Anti-Corruption Report which assesses anti-corruption efforts in all Member States and which also considers, among many others, aspects related to protection of whistleblowers across the board in the EU. A comparative study co-funded by the EU on protection of informants (including whistle-blowers) in the Member States is currently being carried out by Transparency International and due to be completed before the end of this year. Once the EU Anti-Corruption Report and the study are finalised, possible policy options will be considered.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006877/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 juin 2013)

Objet: Responsabilité des personnes morales dans les affaires de criminalité financière

La Commission envisage-t-elle de répondre positivement au Parlement qui voudrait qu'elle présente une proposition législative visant à poser la responsabilité des personnes morales dans les affaires de criminalité financière et, plus particulièrement, la responsabilité des holdings et des sociétés mères à l'égard de leurs filiales?

Dans l'affirmative, la Commission partage-t-elle l'idée que cette proposition devrait préciser la responsabilité des personnes physiques dans les délits commis par une société, ou ses filiales, dont elles peuvent être tenues pour entièrement ou partiellement responsables?

Réponse donnée par Mme Reding au nom de la Commission
(30 juillet 2013)

Afin de mieux protéger les intérêts financiers de l'Union, la Commission a proposé en juillet 2012 l'adoption d'une directive relative à la lutte contre la fraude portant atteinte aux intérêts financiers de l'Union au moyen du droit pénal. Cette proposition comprend une disposition relative à la responsabilité des personnes morales en cas de fraude et d'autres infractions portant atteinte aux intérêts financiers de l'Union. La proposition prévoit également que les personnes morales déclarées responsables seront passibles de sanctions effectives, proportionnées et dissuasives, qui incluront des amendes pénales ou non pénales et éventuellement d'autres sanctions, notamment des mesures d'exclusion du bénéfice d'un avantage ou d'une aide publics. Ces dispositions sont identiques à d'autres dispositions relatives à la responsabilité des personnes morales figurant dans des instruments juridiques récemment adoptés par l'UE dans le domaine du droit pénal.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006877/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Responsibility of legal persons in fraud cases

Does the Commission intend to respond positively to Parliament's request that it should present a legislative proposal on the responsibility of legal persons in fraud cases and, more specifically, the responsibility of holding and parent companies in respect of their subsidiaries?

If so, does the Commission endorse the idea that the proposal should define the responsibility of natural persons for offences committed by a company or its subsidiaries, for which they may be held partially or wholly liable?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(30 July 2013)

In order to better protect the Union's financial interests, the Commission proposed in July 2012 a directive on the fight against fraud to the Union's financial interests by means of criminal law. This proposal includes a provision on the liability of legal persons for fraud and other offences affecting the Union's financial interests. The proposal also stipulates that legal persons that are held liable shall be subject to effective, proportionate and dissuasive sanctions, which shall include criminal or non-criminal fines and may include other sanctions, such as the exclusion from entitlement to public benefits or aid. These provisions are identical to other provisions on the liability of legal persons in recent EU legal instruments on criminal law.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006878/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 juin 2013)

Objet: Feuille de route en faveur d'une coopération judiciaire et policière

La Commission va-t-elle définir une feuille de route en faveur d'une coopération judiciaire et policière renforcée, en créant un organisme d'enquête criminelle et un service de renseignement interne compétents pour enquêter sur les infractions et les délits commis au sein de l'Union?

Réponse donnée par Mme Reding au nom de la Commission
(30 août 2013)

Comme l'avait annoncé le président Barroso dans son discours sur l'état de l'Union prononcé en septembre 2012, la Commission a adopté, le 17 juillet 2013, une proposition relative à la création d'un Parquet européen (EPPO). Conformément à l'article 86, paragraphe 1, du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne, le Parquet européen combattra «les infractions portant atteinte aux intérêts financiers de l'Union». Il sera compétent pour rechercher, poursuivre et renvoyer en jugement les auteurs de telles infractions.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006878/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Roadmap for judicial and police cooperation

Will the Commission set out a roadmap for enhanced judicial and police cooperation, by setting up a competent criminal investigation body and internal information service to investigate offences and crimes committed within the Union?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(30 August 2013)

As announced in President Barroso's State of the Union speech of September 2012, the Commission adopted a proposal on the establishment of a European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO) on 17 July 2013. In accordance with Article 86 (1) TFEU, the EPPO will deal with 'crimes affecting the financial interests of the Union'. The EPPO shall be responsible for investigating, prosecuting and bringing to judgment the perpetrators of these crimes.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006879/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 juin 2013)

Objet: Charte européenne d'aide aux victimes de la traite des êtres humains

La Commission envisage-t-elle l'élaboration d'une charte européenne pour l'aide aux victimes de la traite des êtres humains et leur protection en vue de recueillir des informations sur l'ensemble des indicateurs, mesures, programmes et moyens existants, d'une manière plus cohérente, plus efficace et plus utile pour toutes les parties concernées, afin de renforcer la protection des victimes?

Réponse donnée par Mme Malmström au nom de la Commission
(26 juillet 2013)

La stratégie de l'UE en vue de l'éradication de la traite des êtres humains pour la période 2012-2016 définit plusieurs mesures à mettre au point par la Commission européenne pour mieux identifier, protéger et aider les victimes de ce fléau (priorité A).

Dans le contexte de cette stratégie, la Commission finance un projet visant à élaborer des lignes directrices et à définir des indicateurs permettant de mieux identifier les victimes grâce à une démarche plus harmonisée.

Elle concevra en outre, d'ici à 2015 un modèle européen de mécanisme d'orientation transnational pour mieux identifier, orienter, protéger et aider les victimes.

Consciente du rôle crucial joué par les agents présents sur le terrain dans l'identification rapide des victimes, elle travaille à la rédaction de lignes directrices qui serviront de référence aux services consulaires et aux gardes-frontières en la matière.

Elle a récemment publié un guide sur les droits des victimes dans l'UE ; ce guide concret et complet (mais non contraignant) s'inspire de la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne, de plusieurs directives européennes et décisions-cadres et de la jurisprudence de la Cour européenne des Droits de l'homme. Il a pour but de contribuer à rendre ces droits effectifs en aidant les autorités des États membres à apporter aux victimes l'assistance et la protection dont elles ont besoin et qu'elles méritent.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006879/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: EU charter for victims of human trafficking

Does the Commission plan to draw up an EU charter for victims of human trafficking, with a view to gathering information about all existing indicators, measures, programmes and resources in a more coherent and efficient way which is more helpful to all the parties involved and, in so doing, improving support for and the protection of victims?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2013)

The EU Strategy for the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016 sets out several steps to be developed by the European Commission in order to improve the identification, protection and assistance of victims of trafficking (Priority A).

Within this framework, the Commission is funding a project to develop guidelines and set indicators to better identify victims of trafficking in human beings. These guidelines will facilitate a more harmonised approach and will improve identification of victims of human trafficking.

The European Commission will also develop, by 2015, a model for an EU Transnational Referral Mechanism to better identify, refer, protect and assist victims.

In recognition of the crucial role of first line officers in early identification of victims, the Commission is developing a reference document on guidelines for consular services and border guards on the identification of victims of trafficking in human beings.

The Commission has recently published a Handbook on the EU Rights of Victims, which provides a practical and comprehensive (non-binding) overview of victims' rights based on the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, EU directives, framework decisions and European Court of Human Rights case-law. The overview intends to contribute to making these rights effective, by helping authorities in the Member States to deliver the assistance and protection that victims need and deserve.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006880/13
au Conseil
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 juin 2013)

Objet: Liste européenne des organisations criminelles

Le Conseil envisage-t-il la mise en place d'une liste européenne d'organisations criminelles à l'instar de la liste européenne d'organisations considérées comme terroristes?

Réponse
(16 septembre 2013)

Le Conseil n'a pas examiné cette question.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006880/13
to the Council
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: EU list of criminal organisations

Is the Council considering drawing up an EU list of criminal organisations, along the lines of the EU list of terrorist organisations?

Reply
(16 September 2013)

The Council has not discussed this issue.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006881/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 juin 2013)

Objet: Article18 de la directive sur la traite des êtres humains

La Commission entend-t-elle présenter, comme l'y invite le Parlement européen, une proposition visant à développer l'article 18 de la directive sur la traite des êtres humains afin d'inciter les États membres à criminaliser l'utilisation de services de victimes de toutes les formes d'exploitation liées à la traite des êtres humains, qu'il s'agisse de l'exploitation sexuelle ou de l'exploitation de main-d'œuvre?

Réponse donnée par Mme Malmström au nom de la Commission
(19 juillet 2013)

Dans son entreprise visant à éradiquer ce phénomène, l'Union européenne a placé la prévention au cœur de sa politique de lutte contre la traite des êtres humains.

Conformément à la directive 2011/36/UE concernant la lutte contre la traite des êtres humains, les États membres sont tenus de décourager la demande qui favorise toutes les formes d'exploitation. L'article 18, paragraphe 4, de la directive incite les États membres à envisager d'adopter les mesures nécessaires pour conférer le caractère d'infraction pénale au fait d'utiliser les services d'une personne en sachant qu'elle est victime de la traite des êtres humains.

Afin d'évaluer l'incidence des mesures prises à l'échelon national, la Commission collectera les informations requises auprès des États membres et les analysera. Conformément à l'article 23, paragraphe 2, de la directive, la Commission présentera au Parlement européen et au Conseil, en 2016, un rapport d'évaluation de cette incidence.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006881/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Article 18 of the Trafficking in Human Beings (THB) Directive

Does the Commission intend to submit a proposal, as called for by Parliament, to expand Article 18 of the Trafficking in Human Beings (THB) Directive in an effort to encourage Member States to criminalise the use of services provided by victims of all forms of exploitation linked to human trafficking, including both sexual and labour exploitation?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2013)

In its work towards the eradication of the phenomenon, EU anti-trafficking policy puts a central emphasis on prevention.

The anti-trafficking directive (2011/36/EU) obliges Member States to curb the demand that fosters exploitation of all forms. Article 18(4) of the directive encourages Member States to consider taking measures to establish as a criminal offence the use of services with the knowledge that persons involved are victims of trafficking in human beings.

The Commission will assess the impact of such national laws, collecting all the relevant information from the Member States, before analysing it. In line with Article 23(2) of the directive, this assessment will be submitted in a report to the European Parliament and the Council by 2016.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006882/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 juin 2013)

Objet: Définition de l'autoblanchiment

La Commission compte-t-elle arrêter une définition commune du délit d'autoblanchiment reposant sur les bonnes pratiques des États membres et permettant de considérer comme des infractions principales les délits réputés graves parce qu'ils sont susceptibles de générer un profit pour leurs auteurs?

Va-t-elle dès lors intégrer cette définition dans sa proposition d'harmonisation du droit pénal en matière de blanchiment, qu'elle doit présenter en 2013?

Réponse donnée par Mme Malmström au nom de la Commission
(2 août 2013)

Les menaces associées au blanchiment d'argent évoluent constamment, de sorte qu'il faut actualiser les règles régulièrement. La Commission envisage la possibilité d'adopter une proposition législative modifiant le cadre juridique en vigueur dans ce domaine. Cette proposition définirait des règles minimales pour tous les États membres en ce qui concerne les types de délit et le niveau des sanctions pénales à appliquer pour assurer un effet dissuasif.

Pour l'heure, les législations des États membres diffèrent sensiblement en ce qui concerne la définition du délit de blanchiment d'argent (certains, par exemple, ne pénalisent pas l'autoblanchiment) et le niveau des sanctions pénales.

La proposition abordera la question de l'autoblanchiment.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006882/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Definition of 'self-laundering'

Does the Commission plan to draw up a common definition of the offence of 'self-laundering', drawing on best practices employed in the Member States, so that serious crimes from which the offender gains financially would be considered predicate offences?

Will it make sure to include that definition in its proposals on the harmonisation of criminal law in the area of money laundering, due to be put forward in 2013?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

The threats associated with money laundering are constantly evolving, which require regular updates of the rules. The Commission is considering the possibility of adopting a legislative proposal amending the existing legal framework on Anti-Money laundering. It would lay down minimum rules for all Member States concerning the types of offences on money laundering and the level of criminal penalties to apply to ensure deterrence.

Currently, Member States' legislation differs significantly with regard to the definition of the offence of money laundering (e.g. some Member States do not criminalise self-laundering) and to the level of criminal sanctions.

The proposal will address the issue of self-laundering.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006883/13
au Conseil
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 juin 2013)

Objet: Définition de la criminalité organisée

La Commission compte-t-elle présenter, comme l'y invite le Parlement européen, sur la base d'un rapport d'évaluation relatif à la mise en œuvre de la décision-cadre sur la criminalité organisée et au vu des législations nationales les plus avancées, une proposition législative contenant une définition commune de la criminalité organisée, qui couvrirait, entre autres, le délit d'association de type mafieux, en mettant l'accent sur l'orientation entrepreneuriale des organisations criminelles de ce type et le pouvoir d'intimidation qu'elles exercent, compte tenu de l'article 2, point a), de la convention des Nations unies contre la criminalité transnationale organisée?

La Commission compte-t-elle établir une définition commune de la corruption en vue de l'élaboration d'une politique d'ensemble cohérente de lutte contre la corruption?

Compte-t-elle traiter, dans son rapport sur les mesures contre la corruption adoptées par les États membres, qui doit être publié en 2013, toutes les formes de corruption, tant dans le secteur public que dans le secteur privé, y compris les organismes sans but lucratif, en mettant en relief les expériences nationales les plus efficaces dans la lutte contre ce phénomène, et proposer une méthode permettant de le mesurer avec précision, de manière à livrer un tableau complet des domaines exposés à la corruption dans chaque pays?

Réponse
(16 septembre 2013)

L'Honorable Parlementaire est invité à poser sa question à la Commission, étant donné qu'elle relève de sa compétence.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006883/13
to the Council
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Definition of organised crime

Does the Commission plan to submit, on the basis of an evaluation report on the implementation of the framework Decision on the fight against organised crime and building on Member States' most advanced legislation, a legislative proposal setting out a common definition of organised crime, which should include, *inter alia*, the offence of participation in a mafia-style organisation, emphasising the fact that criminal groups of this kind are business-oriented and wield a power of intimidation and taking into account Article 2(a) of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime, as called upon to do by Parliament?

Does the Commission plan to draw up a common definition of corruption in order to develop a coherent global policy against corruption?

When drawing up its report on action taken by Member States against corruption, due to be published in 2013, does it plan to cover all forms of corruption, in both the public and the private sector, including non-profit organisations, highlighting the best national experiences in combating it, and to provide an accurate way of measuring the phenomenon, to include a comprehensive overview of vulnerable areas of corruption on a country-by-country basis?

Reply
(16 September 2013)

The Honourable Member is invited to put this question to the Commission, as it falls within its sphere of competence.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006884/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 juin 2013)

Objet: Étude comparative de techniques d'enquête spéciales

Pourquoi la Commission européenne ne répond-elle pas à la requête déjà plusieurs fois formulée, entre autres dans la résolution du Parlement du 25 octobre 2011, de réaliser une étude comparative des techniques spéciales d'enquête actuellement utilisées dans les différents États membres qui puisse se traduire par une action au niveau européen visant à fournir aux autorités compétentes les instruments d'investigation nécessaires sur la base des meilleures pratiques en vigueur? Compte-t-elle accéder à notre demande?

Réponse donnée par Mme Malmström au nom de la Commission
(25 juillet 2013)

À la suite d'un appel d'offres lancé par la Commission, un consultant externe réalise actuellement une étude dont l'objectif général est de préparer la voie à de futures initiatives politiques dans le domaine de la lutte contre la criminalité organisée en vérifiant l'efficacité des différentes mesures de droit pénal visant cette criminalité. Une partie importante de cette étude est consacrée à une analyse comparative des instruments d'investigation utilisés aux niveaux national et européen pour lutter contre la criminalité organisée, en mettant l'accent sur les résultats opérationnels. Les conclusions de cette étude devraient être rendues au second semestre 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006884/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Comparative study of special investigative techniques

Why has the Commission not responded to the repeated request, also expressed in Parliament's resolution of 25 October 2011, to develop a comparative study of the special investigative techniques currently used in the different Member States, to provide a basis for action at EU level, with the aim of equipping the authorities responsible with the investigative tools they need, based on existing best practices? Does it intend to comply with our request?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

The Commission has tendered a study which is currently being carried out by an external consultant. The general objective of the study is to pave the way for future policy initiatives in the field of fight against organised crime through checking the effectiveness of specific criminal law measures targeting organised crime. An important part of the study is dedicated to a comparative analysis of investigative tools used at the national and the EU level for the purpose of fighting organised crime and with a focus on operational results. The results of the study are expected in the second half of 2014.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-006885/13
à la Commission
Jacky Hénin (GUE/NGL)
(13 juin 2013)

Objet: Société MyFerryLink

Le 6 juin 2013, la *Competition Commission* britannique a rendu une décision concernant l'acquisition par le groupe Eurotunnel SA de certains actifs de l'ancienne société SeaFrance SA. Au terme de cette décision, les activités de la société MyFerryLink (société créée pour assurer des liaisons maritimes entre la France et la Grande-Bretagne, société associant le groupe Eurotunnel et une société coopérative ouvrière regroupant plus de 500 anciens salariés de SeaFrance) devraient être suspendues passé le délai de six mois. Il est à noter que l'affaire ne reçoit pas le même examen des deux côtés de la Manche. Si les Britanniques entendent interdire toute activité aux navires de l'ancienne compagnie SeaFrance, la France de son côté a estimé que la procédure ne remettait pas en cause le principe de concurrence libre et non faussée. Près de 600 salariés sont sur le point de perdre leur emploi, pour un conflit qui les dépasse d'autant plus qu'aucune solution n'apparaît acceptable à la *Competiton Commission*: ni la mise à disposition des navires, ni l'autonomie de MyFerryLink, ni l'évocation de la constitution d'une société d'économie mixte de droit français…

La Commission peut-elle nous informer de ce qu'elle entend entreprendre: pour que l'emploi soit préservé, pour que la libre circulation des marchandises et des personnes soit respectée sur le territoire européen, pour que la concurrence soit réellement respectée sur le détroit du Pas-de-Calais et qu'elle ne soit pas une fausse concurrence réservée aux compagnies britanniques qui sont déjà aujourd'hui au-delà du seuil de position dominante et pour permettre la continuité d'activité de MyFerryLink?

Réponse donnée par M Almunia au nom de la Commission
(15 juillet 2013)

La Commission est informée du fait que l'autorité de la concurrence française a autorisé sous condition l'activité de MyFerryLink (MFL) [1] tandis que la commission de la concurrence britannique a en substance adopté une décision inverse [2].

Ces autorités ont chacune des cadres d'analyse propres. Si elles sont invitées à coopérer lorsqu'elles examinent une même transaction, cette coopération ne conduit pas nécessairement à ce que des conclusions similaires soient tirées [3]. Ces autorités ont été en relation dans l'examen de ce cas.

La Direction Générale de la Concurrence de la Commission a reçu des représentants d'Eurotunnel et de MFL en avril 2013 après la publication du rapport préliminaire de la commission de la concurrence britannique. Ces derniers ont fait part en substance des mêmes éléments que ceux que l'Honorable Parlementaire souligne.

Le règlement (CE) n° 139/2004 du Conseil [4] ne conférait à la Commission aucune juridiction dans ce dossier car la concentration n'avait pas une dimension européenne.

La Commission déplore les éventuelles répercussions négatives de cet état de fait pour les travailleurs concernés. Elle invite instamment la direction et les représentants des travailleurs à suivre les bonnes pratiques en matière de prévision et de gestion socialement responsable des restructurations. Les travailleurs touchés par des restructurations peuvent être admissibles à bénéficier d'une aide du Fonds social européen et du Fonds européen d'ajustement à la mondialisation.

La Commission ne décèle en l'espèce aucune incidence sur le droit de libre circulation conféré par le droit de l'UE aux citoyens de l'UE.

---

[1] Décision 12-dcc-154 du 7 novembre 2012.
[2] Groupe Eurotunnel S.A. et SeaFrance S.A. enquête sur les concentrations, rapport sur l'acquisition par le Groupe Eurotunnel S.A. de certains actifs de l'ancienne SeaFrance S.A., 6 juin 2013.
[3] Voir «Guide de bonnes pratiques de coopération entre les autorités nationales de concurrence de l'Union Européenne en matière de contrôle des concentrations».
[4] JO L 24 du 29.1.2004, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006885/13
to the Commission
Jacky Hénin (GUE/NGL)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: MyFerryLink

On 6 June 2013, the UK's Competition Commission issued a ruling concerning the acquisition of certain assets of the former ferry company SeaFrance by the Eurotunnel Group. Under the terms of the ruling, MyFerryLink (a company set up by Eurotunnel to provide a cross-Channel ferry service and operated by a cooperative of more than 500 former SeaFrance employees) will have to cease activities in six months' time. This matter is not viewed in the same way on either side of the Channel. Whereas the British intend to ban all activity using the former SeaFrance vessels, France, for its part, believes that the operation did not affect the principle of free and undistorted competition. Nearly 600 employees are on the point of losing their jobs, over a conflict which has nothing to do with them, and it appears that none of the potential solutions — MyFerryLink leasing its vessels or becoming being an independent company, the idea of forming a public-private enterprise under French law — are acceptable to the Competition Commission.

Could the Commission please state what it intends to do to preserve jobs, to ensure that the free movement of goods and persons within the EU is respected and that competition across the Strait of Dover is genuinely respected and is not a false competition reserved for British companies which now hold a dominant position, and to allow MyFerryLink to continue to operate?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(15 July 2013)

The Commission is aware that the French competition authority authorised the activities of MyFerryLink (MFL), subject to conditions ([1]), whereas the UK Competition Commission essentially adopted an opposing decision ([2]).

Each of these authorities has its own analytical framework. If they are invited to cooperate when examining the same transaction, this cooperation does not necessarily lead to similar conclusions being drawn ([3]). The authorities were in contact with one another when examining this case.

The Directorate-General for Competition of the European Commission received representatives from Eurotunnel and MFL in April 2013 after the UK Competition Commission published its preliminary report. They essentially raised the same points as were highlighted by the Honourable Member.

The Commission had no jurisdiction in this case pursuant to Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 ([4]), as the merger did not have a European dimension.

The Commission regrets the possible negative consequences of this situation for the workers involved. It urges the management and workers' representatives to follow good practices as regards anticipation and socially responsible management of restructuring. Workers affected by restructuring may qualify for support from the ESF and from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund.

In the case in point, the Commission has not detected any interference with the right to freedom of movement granted to EU citizens by EC law.

([1]) Decision 12-DCC-154 dated 7 November 2012.
([2]) Groupe EuroTunnel S.A. and SeaFrance S.A. merger inquiry, A report on the completed acquisition by Groupe Eurotunnel S.A. of certain assets of former SeaFrance S.A., 6 June 2013.
([3]) See: 'Guide to Best Practices on Cooperation between EU National Competition Authorities in Merger Review'.
([4]) OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p. 1.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-006886/13
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(13 juni 2013)

Betreft: Gedelegeerde handelingen in het kader van de verordening geharmoniseerde voorwaarden bouwproducten

In Artikel 7 van de Verordening (EU) Nr. 305/2011 tot vaststelling van geharmoniseerde voorwaarden voor het verhandelen van bouwproducten wordt beschreven dat er van elk product dat op de markt wordt aangeboden een prestatieverklaring dient te worden aangeboden, op papier of in elektronische vorm.

Deze prestatieverklaring mag ook op een website ter beschikking worden gesteld onder de voorwaarden die door de Europese Commissie bij gedelegeerde handelingen worden vastgesteld.

Deze verordening zal op 1 juli 2013 in werking treden, maar tot op heden heeft de Commissie nog geen gedelegeerde handelingen met betrekking tot dit element vastgesteld, wat voor grote onduidelijkheid zorgt.

1. Wanneer verwacht de Commissie dat deze gedelegeerde handeling zal worden vastgesteld?

2. Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat — in afwachting van de vaststelling van de gedelegeerde handeling — het volstaat om de prestatieverklaring enkel op een website ter beschikking te stellen?

3. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat zolang de betreffende gedelegeerde handeling niet is vastgelegd en er dus onduidelijkheid bestaat over de precieze modaliteiten van de verstrekking van de prestatieverklaring, er een overgangsperiode moet plaatsvinden waarin niet zal worden gesanctioneerd?

Antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie
(24 juli 2013)

De bouwproductenverordening (305/2011/EU) is op 1 juli 2013 van toepassing geworden. Op 8 juli 2013 heeft een bijeenkomst plaatsgevonden om te peilen naar de standpunten van de belanghebbenden over de opstelling van de gedelegeerde handeling betreffende het gebruik van websites voor prestatieverklaringen. De Commissie is voornemens deze gedelegeerde handeling zo snel mogelijk aan te nemen en uiterlijk in september 2013 aan het Europees Parlement en de Raad ter kennis te geven. De twee medewetgevers zullen dan de mogelijkheid hebben tegen deze handeling bezwaar aan te tekenen. De definitieve datum van inwerkingtreding zal derhalve afhangen van de reactie van de medewetgevers. Vervolgens zullen websites kunnen worden gebruikt om aan de wettelijke verplichtingen van de bouwproductenverordening te voldoen.

Overigens heeft de bouwsector meer dan twee jaar gehad om zich aan de bepalingen van de bouwproductenverordening aan te passen, en moet deze derhalve vanaf 1 juli 2013 in haar geheel worden toegepast. In dit stadium is er geen behoefte aan extra overgangsregelingen. Dat houdt ook in dat het ontbreken van een gedelegeerde handeling (om het systeem van de bouwproductenverordening verder uit te werken) geen rechtvaardiging is om de bouwproductenverordening niet toe te passen.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006886/13
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Delegated acts under the regulation concerning harmonised conditions for the marketing of construction products

Article 7 of Regulation (EU) No 305/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 March 2011 laying down harmonised conditions for the marketing of construction products states that a copy of the declaration of performance of each product which is made available on the market shall be supplied either in paper form or by electronic means.

It may also be made available on a website in accordance with conditions to be established by the Commission by means of delegated acts.

The regulation is due to enter into force on 1 July 2013. However, the Commission has not yet adopted any delegated acts in this area, which is causing considerable confusion.

1. When does the Commission anticipate that the delegated act will be adopted?

2. Can the Commission confirm that, in the meantime, it is sufficient to make the declaration of performance available on a website?

3. Does the Commission agree that, as long as the delegated act has not been adopted and the requirements regarding the declaration of performance are therefore unclear, it is necessary to establish a transitional period during which no penalties are imposed?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(24 July 2013)

The Construction Products Regulation (305/2011/EU; the CPR) entered into full application on 1 July 2013. A meeting was held on 8 July 2013 to gather stakeholders' views towards the preparation of the delegated act on the use of websites for declarations of performance. The Commission intends to proceed with the adoption of this delegated act as quickly as possible, so as to notify it to the European Parliament and the Council at the latest in September 2013. The two co-legislators will then have an opportunity to object to the act. The final date of its entry into force will thus depend on the actions by the two co-legislators. Afterwards, the websites can be used to fulfil the legal obligations set out in the CPR.

On a general note, since the construction sector has had more than two years to adapt to the provisions set out in the CPR, as from 1 July 2013, the CPR needs to be applied as it stands. At this stage, no additional transitional rules are needed. This also means that the lack of a delegated act (to further develop the CPR system) is no justification not to apply the CPR itself.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006887/13
to the Commission
Marian Harkin (ALDE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Medical card entitlements for those aged over 70

I would like to ask the Commission for its legal opinion on the following situation regarding medical card entitlements for those aged over 70.

An Irish citizen living and working in the UK was granted a medical card by the National Health Service (NHS) and benefited from certain health services free of charge.

He returned permanently to Ireland, and applied and qualified for a medical card under the Health Service Executive's (HSE) eligibility requirements. He recently received a letter from the HSE which reviewed his personal circumstances and stated that he was no longer entitled to a medical card on the basis of his gross income.

What are the general guidelines on the transfer of entitlements from the UK for emigrants who return to live in Ireland?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2013)

Entitlement to healthcare in cross border situations such as described by the Honourable Member is governed by the rules on social security coordination contained in Regulation (EC) No 883/2004. Under those rules a person not exercising a professional activity or not in receipt of a pension will be entitled to sickness insurance in the Member State of residence, in accordance with the conditions laid down in the legislation of that State. EC law does not contain any rules on a transfer of entitlement to healthcare from the UK to Ireland.

The Commission has no jurisdiction to deal with the specific question asked by the Honourable Member. The question asked concerns the application of a means test for entitlement to an Irish medical card, which is a matter concerning national conditions for entitlement to sickness insurance cover and therefore solely for the national authority concerned.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006888/13
alla Commissione
Francesco De Angelis (S&D)
(13 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Pericoli delle radiazioni ionizzanti e trasposizione della legislazione UE in Italia

1. Vista la direttiva 90/641/Euratom del Consiglio, del 4 dicembre 1990, concernente la protezione operativa dei lavoratori esterni esposti al rischio di radiazioni ionizzanti nel corso del loro intervento in zona controllata;

2. preso atto della direttiva 96/29/Euratom del Consiglio, del 13 maggio 1996, che stabilisce le norme fondamentali di sicurezza relative alla protezione sanitaria della popolazione e dei lavoratori contro i pericoli derivanti dalle radiazioni ionizzanti;

3. considerata la direttiva 97/43/Euratom del Consiglio, del 30 giugno 1997, riguardante la protezione sanitaria delle persone contro i pericoli delle radiazioni ionizzanti connesse a esposizioni mediche;

4. preso atto della proposta di direttiva del Consiglio che stabilisce norme fondamentali di sicurezza relative alla protezione contro i pericoli derivanti dall'esposizione alle radiazioni ionizzanti, 2011/0254(NLE);

può la Commissione precisare:

— se le disposizioni contenute nell'atto di trasposizione della direttiva 97/43/Euratom, ovvero nel decreto legislativo del 26 maggio 2000 n. 187, non siano in palese contraddizione con i principi della direttiva stessa, con specifico riferimento alla libera facoltà di esercizio professionale sul suolo italiano da parte dei tecnici di radiologia?

— se gli aspetti di «Responsabilità» (art. 5), «Procedure» (art. 6) e «Formazione» (art. 7) della direttiva 97/43/Euratom siano pienamente soddisfatti dai rispettivi articoli 5, 6 e 7 del decreto legislativo n. 187 del 2000, o se invece la trasposizione italiana non abbia introdotto elementi che vanno a detrimento dello status, delle prerogative e della funzione stessa dei tecnici di radiologia così come definiti nei testi legislativi sopracitati?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(6 agosto 2013)

1. Dalla valutazione della Commissione risulta che le disposizioni del decreto legislativo del 26 maggio 2000, n. 187 sono conformi ai principi della direttiva 97/43/Euratom.

2. Per quanto riguarda gli articoli specifici della direttiva 97/43/Euratom cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare — articolo 5 «Responsabilità», articolo 6 «Procedure» e articolo 7 «Formazione» — la Commissione non ha rilevato carenze nel loro recepimento. La direttiva non menziona esplicitamente i tecnici di radiologia, né intende definirne o tutelarne lo status e la funzione. I tecnici di radiologia sono implicitamente raggruppati con altri soggetti che possono svolgere «aspetti pratici» su delega del «titolare» o del «prescrivente» (articolo 5, paragrafo 3). Spetta agli Stati membri decidere le modalità pratiche per tale delega nonché provvedere alla formazione necessaria (articolo 7).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006888/13
to the Commission
Francesco De Angelis (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Dangers of ionising radiation and transposition of EU legislation in Italy

1. Having regard to Council Directive 90/641/Euratom dated 4 December 1990 on the operational protection of outside workers exposed to the risk of ionising radiation during their activities in controlled areas;

2. Taking note of Council Directive 96/29/Euratom dated 13 May 1996 laying down basic safety standards for the protection of the health of workers and the general public against the dangers arising from ionising radiation;

3. Considering Council Directive 97/43/Euratom of 30 June 1997 on health protection of individuals against the dangers of ionising radiation in relation to medical exposure;

4. Taking note of the proposal for a Council Directive laying down basic safety standards for protection against the dangers arising from ionising radiation, 2011/0254(NLE);

can the Commission state:

— whether or not the provisions contained in the act of transposition of Directive 97/43/Euratom, i.e. Italian Legislative Decree No 187 of 26 May 2000, are in conflict with the principles of the directive, with specific reference to the right of radiographers to freely exercise their profession on Italian soil?

— whether the issues of ‘Responsibilities’ (Article 5), ‘Procedures’ (Article 6) and ‘Training’ (Article 7) of Directive 97/43/Euratom are fully satisfied by the respective Articles 5, 6 and 7 of Italian Legislative Decree No 187/2000, or whether the Italian transposition introduces elements that are to the detriment of the status, powers and function of radiographers as defined in the legislation mentioned above?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2013)

1. The Commission’s evaluation shows that the provisions contained in the Italian Legislative Decree No 187 of 26 May 2000 are in conformity with the principles of the Council Directive 97/43/Euratom.

2. As for the specific Articles of Directive 97/43/Euratom referred to by the Honourable Member — i.e. Articles 5 ‘Responsibilities’, 6 ‘Procedures’ and 7 ‘Training’ — the Commission has not found any failure or insufficiency in the transposition of the directive. With regard to radiographers, the directive does not explicitly mention them, nor is it intended to define or protect their status and functions. Radiographers are implicitly grouped together with other individuals who can carry on ‘practical aspects’ by delegation from the ‘holder’ or the ‘prescriber’ (Article 5.3). The practical arrangements for this delegation and the required training (Article 7) are left to the Member State to decide.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006889/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Danni per i cittadini europei derivanti dalla delocalizzazione dei gestori telefonici

Continua ad aumentare il numero dei gestori telefonici europei che delocalizzano i propri servizi di assistenza verso paesi non appartenenti all'Unione Europea, in particolare Albania, Bosnia, Croazia, Moldavia e India dove il costo del lavoro è più basso. La scelta di affidarsi ai call center stranieri non solo pregiudica la qualità del servizio per i consumatori che, in caso di informazione o assistenza, si trovano ad interloquire con consulenti che non conoscono bene la lingua, ma riduce anche i posti di lavoro nazionali, molti dei quali occupati da giovani, in un momento difficile per l'economia e il mercato del lavoro. Inoltre, considerando che l'attività dei call center prevede l'accesso ai dati personali dei clienti, con la delocalizzazione le compagnie telefoniche affidano informazioni sensibili dei propri utenti nazionali a paesi stranieri dove non sono previste garanzie legislative in materia, mettendo così a rischio i dati delle carte di credito, i codici fiscali e i documenti di identificazione dati personali.

— È la Commissione a conoscenza dei fatti?

— Ritiene la Commissione opportuno che vengano inseriti appositi vincoli per il trattamento dei dati sensibili dei cittadini europei all'estero, così da assicurare adeguati livelli di tutela in tema di trattamento dei dati personali da parte dei call center localizzati al di fuori dell'Unione europea ed eventualmente che venga vietato l'utilizzo delle informazioni quando l'ordinamento del paese di destinazione o di transito dei dati non assicuri un livello di tutela adeguato?

— Ritiene la Commissione che l'inserimento di un eventuale apposito vincolo nelle concessioni possa rappresentare uno strumento per tutelare i dati personali e quali altre misure considererebbe adeguate per tutelare la privacy dei cittadini europei e garantire la qualità del servizio per i consumatori?

— Come valuta la Commissione la posizione del governo spagnolo che ha chiesto alle aziende che negli ultimi dieci anni hanno delocalizzato i propri call center di riportare in Spagna il servizio per contribuire alla creazione di nuovi posti di lavoro?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(30 luglio 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza della tendenza dei gestori di servizi di comunicazione elettronica a trasferire le proprie sedi al di fuori dell'UE. È un fenomeno che interessa anche altri settori.

La Commissione ritiene che gli elevati standard di protezione dei dati stabiliti dalla direttiva 95/46/CE non debbano essere pregiudicati in caso di trasferimento di dati personali verso paesi terzi al di fuori dell'UE/del SEE. Ciò è garantito dall'attuale legislazione: l'articolo 25 della direttiva 95/46/CE vieta infatti il trasferimento di dati personali al di fuori dell'UE/del SEE, a meno che il paese terzo in questione garantisca un livello di protezione adeguato. Se il livello di tutela non è specificato, i dati personali non possono essere trasferiti, tranne che nelle circostanze particolari di cui all'articolo 26. Ciò è valido anche quando l'esportatore adotta adeguati meccanismi di salvaguardia, per esempio stipulando un contratto con l'importatore dei dati e fornendo un'adeguata tutela dei dati personali dopo che essi sono stati trasferiti al di fuori dell'UE/del SEE. Tali trasferimenti devono essere autorizzati dalle autorità nazionali di protezione dei dati.

Nel 2012 la Commissione ha proposto una riforma della legislazione sulla protezione dei dati. Le norme proposte conservano in sostanza il sistema attuale.

La Commissione è consapevole del fatto che per raggiungere gli obiettivi dell'agenda digitale, in particolare per generare crescita e posti di lavoro, la Spagna ha adottato varie iniziative, tra cui quella di riportare in patria vari servizi di base, compresi i call center.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006889/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Damage to European citizens arising from the relocation of telephone companies

Increasing numbers of European telephone companies are relocating their services to non-EU countries, in particular Albania, Bosnia, Croatia, Moldova and India, where labour costs are lower. The decision to use foreign call centres not only affects the quality of service to consumers who, when they need information or assistance, find themselves interacting with advisors who are not fluent in the language, but also reduces the number of jobs at home, many of which are occupied by young people, at a difficult time for the economy and for the labour market. In addition, considering that working in a call centre requires access to the personal data of customers, by relocating, the telephone companies are sending sensitive information on its domestic users to foreign countries where there are no legislative guarantees on the subject, thus putting credit card data, social security numbers and personal ID documents at risk.

— Is the Commission aware of these facts?

— Does the Commission consider that special restrictions should be introduced with regard to the handling of sensitive data on European citizens in foreign countries, so as to ensure adequate levels of protection regarding the handling of personal data by call centres located outside the EU and perhaps to prohibit the use of such information when the regulations in the country of destination or transit for the data does not provide an adequate level of protection?

— Does the Commission consider that the inclusion of a special licensing constraint might provide a way to protect personal data, and what other measures would it consider appropriate to protect the privacy of European citizens and guarantee the quality of service for consumers?

— How does the Commission regard the position of the Spanish Government, which has asked companies that have relocated their call centres to third countries in the past decade to bring their services back to Spain to help create new jobs?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(30 July 2013)

The Commission is aware of providers of electronic communications transferring their facilities outside the EU. This is a trend that goes beyond this sector.

The Commission is of the view that the high standards of data protection established by Directive 95/46/EC should not be undermined when personal data is transferred to third countries outside the EU/EEA. This is guaranteed under current legislation. Indeed, Article 25 of Directive 95/46/EC prohibits the transfer of personal data outside the EU/EEA unless the third country in question ensures an adequate level of protection. Where the level of protection has not been determined, personal data may not be transferred, except under special circumstances set forth under Article 26. This includes when the exporter puts in place adequate safeguards, for example, by entering into a contract with the importer of the data, providing adequate protection for personal data after it has been transferred outside the EU/EEA. Such transfers must be authorised by national data protection authorities.

In 2012 the Commission proposed a reform of the data protection legislation. The proposed rules maintain in essence the current system.

The Commission is aware that in order to attain the objectives of the Digital Agenda, in particular to create growth and jobs, Spain has taken several steps , such as advocating the return to Spain of basic services, including call centres, to Spain.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006890/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Gestione dei dati personali dei passeggeri europei sui voli per la Russia

Il prossimo luglio entrerà in vigore il decreto adottato dal governo russo nel settembre 2012 che impone alle compagnie aeree europee di fornire le informazioni personali dei passeggeri a bordo degli aerei in arrivo o che sorvolano il territorio russo. Tale provvedimento si pone in contrasto con il diritto alla privacy nella gestione dei dati personali stabilito dalla comunicazione della Commissione, del 21 settembre 2010, sull'approccio globale al trasferimento dei dati del codice di prenotazione (Passenger Name Record, PNR) verso paesi terzi (COM(2010)492). La normativa dell'Unione in materia limita, infatti, l'uso dei dati personali a circostanze eccezionali, per contrastare il terrorismo e la criminalità organizzata, oppure nell'ambito di indagini o azioni penali. Il nuovo provvedimento, inoltre, costringerà le compagnie aeree a confrontarsi con la legislazione europea sulla tutela dei dati personali da una parte e con le richieste del governo russo dall'altra.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione riferire se:

— è a conoscenza dei fatti;

— può riferire circa la proposta avanzata dal portavoce europeo, Cecilia Malmström, di sospendere l'entrata in vigore del provvedimento e di predisporre un tavolo di confronto con gli Stati membri al fine di valutare le conseguenze di tali misure restrittive;

— come intende tutelare il diritto alla privacy dei cittadini europei che si recano in Russia, alla luce della sempre più diffusa e marcata sensibilità dell'opinione pubblica su questo tema;

— quale posizione intende assumere nei confronti del governo russo, considerando che il 15 marzo scorso l'Unione europea aveva inviato, senza ricevere risposta, una lettera per chiedere spiegazioni in merito al provvedimento?

Risposta congiunta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(9 agosto 2013)

La Commissione è consapevole del decreto russo, che obbliga gli operatori dei trasporti a trasmettere alle autorità russe i dati relativi ai passeggeri. Come concordato in occasione del vertice UE-Russia del 3-4 giugno 2013, i servizi della Commissione hanno incontrato i rappresentanti del ministero dei Trasporti a Mosca il 21 giugno per chiedere chiarimenti sul contenuto e le implicazioni del decreto. Diverse disposizioni del decreto destano preoccupazione, in particolare quelle relative ai voli sul territorio russo e al campo di applicazione dei dati richiesti. Il ministero dei Trasporti russo ha spiegato che il decreto non verrà attuato pienamente prima del 1° dicembre 2013. La Commissione continua tuttavia a insistere che le autorità russe confermino per iscritto che il traffico da e verso l'UE sia esonerato in attesa di una soluzione che salvaguardi i diritti fondamentali dei cittadini dell'UE. La questione potrebbe altrimenti avere ripercussioni sugli altri temi correlati.

Se l'UE non ha firmato un accordo sullo scambio di dati con un paese terzo, le autorità nazionali indipendenti degli Stati membri preposte alla protezione dati possono essere consultate riguardo alla possibilità del trasferimento internazionale di dati.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006890/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Handling personal data of European passengers on flights to Russia

This July, a decree will come into force which was adopted by the Russian Government in September 2012, requiring European airlines to provide the personal details of passengers on board aircraft arriving in or flying over Russian territory. This measure conflicts with the right to privacy in the handling of personal data established by the Commission Communication of 21 September 2010 on the global approach to transfers of Passenger Name Record (PNR) data to third countries (COM(2010) 492). Indeed, EU legislation restricts the use of personal data to exceptional circumstances, such as to combat terrorism and organised crime, or for ongoing investigations or prosecutions. The new measure will also force the airlines to confront European legislation on the protection of personal data on the one hand and the demands of the Russian Government on the other.

— Is the Commission aware of these facts?

— Can it comment on the proposal made by the European spokesperson, Cecilia Malmström, to suspend this measure and hold a discussion with Member States in order to assess the consequences of these restrictive measures?

— How does it intend to protect the right to privacy of EU citizens travelling to Russia, in the light of the increasingly widespread and marked public sensitivity on this issue?

— What position will it take towards the Russian Government, considering that on 15 March the European Union sent a letter, to which it received no reply, asking for explanations on this measure?

Question for written answer E-007649/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(27 June 2013)

Subject: Air passenger data

An ongoing dispute between the EU and the Russian Federation regarding EU air passenger data has raised a number of concerns. If the EU agrees to hand over data to the Russian authorities, it may be in contravention of EU data privacy rules. If the EU refuses to cooperate, it is my understanding that the Russian authorities could ground up to 53 000 European flights.

What does the Commission intend to do to remedy this situation?

Joint answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

The Commission is aware of the Russian Decree obliging transport operators to transfer passenger data to the Russian authorities. As agreed during the EU-Russia summit of 3-4 June 2013, the Commission services met representatives of the Russian ministry of transport in Moscow on 21 June to seek clarifications on the content and implications of the Decree. Several requirements of the Decree cause concern, in particular those on flights over the Russian territory and also on the scope of the required data. The Russian ministry of transport also explained that the Decree will not be fully implemented before 1 December 2013. The Commission nevertheless continues to insist that the Russian authorities confirm in writing that traffic to and from the EU is exempted until a solution has been found that safeguards fundamental rights of EU citizens. This issue could otherwise impact discussions on related topics.

Where the EU has not signed an agreement on exchange of data with a third country, the independent national data protection authorities of the Member States can be consulted regarding the possibility of international data transfers.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006892/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Nuovo attacco al made in Italy: la falsa Sambuca

Dopo lo scandalo dei vini in polvere commercializzati come veri vini italiani, gli imitatori stranieri hanno messo sul mercato una nuova bevanda, colorata e senza anice, spacciandola per Sambuca. Il tipico liquore all'anice di produzione tipicamente italiana presenta caratteristiche qualitative notevolmente diverse dalla bevanda alcolica prodotta e venduta in diversi Stati membri. Nonostante il regolamento (CE) n. 110/2008 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 15 gennaio 2008, consenta l'uso della denominazione Sambuca solo per le bevande alcoliche incolori, con un tenore naturale di anetolo compreso tra 1 e 2 grammi per litro e una gradazione alcolica del 38 %, sono stati messi in commercio prodotti che, pur riportando tale denominazione, non sono conformi a tali requisiti.

Si chiede alla Commissione:

— È a conoscenza dei fatti?

— Quali iniziative intende prendere a livello comunitario per bloccare il commercio illegale di tali prodotti e fare in modo che gli Stati membri adottino provvedimenti sanzionatori in grado di arginare queste pratiche abusive?

— Quali provvedimenti ritiene opportuni per difendere il diritto d'informazione dei consumatori che rischiano di essere ingannati circa la vera natura del prodotto?

— Considerato l'aumento dei casi di imitazione di vini e bevande alcoliche italiane, come intende tutelare le esportazioni del made in Italy per evitare ai produttori italiani il danno non solo economico, ma anche di immagine provocato dai prodotti falsificati?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione
(18 luglio 2013)

La definizione della categoria «sambuca», di cui al punto 38 dell'allegato II del regolamento (CE) n. 110/2008 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativo alla definizione, alla designazione, alla presentazione, all'etichettatura e alla protezione delle indicazioni geografiche delle bevande spiritose ([1]), contiene una disposizione specifica in base alla quale «*La sambuca è il liquore incolore aromatizzato all'anice…*». Di conseguenza, l'assenza di ingredienti coloranti è uno dei requisiti essenziali per la conformità del prodotto alla definizione di «sambuca».

Al fine di evitare pratiche ingannevoli e garantire un elevato livello di protezione dei consumatori, il regolamento sulle bevande spiritose fissa inoltre norme generali sull'uso delle denominazioni delle categorie di bevande spiritose come denominazioni di vendita, come parte di un termine composto o in allusione a categorie di bevande spiritose.

La Commissione è stata informata di un commercio di sambuca che potrebbe essere in violazione della pertinente definizione dell'UE e sta ora esaminando la documentazione disponibile al riguardo. Qualora risulti che il prodotto in questione venga etichettato illegalmente, la Commissione ne informerà gli Stati membri interessati.

Gli Stati membri sono comunque responsabili del controllo delle bevande spiritose e dell'adozione delle misure necessarie a garantire la conformità delle bevande spiritose alle norme dell'UE.

([1]) GU L 39 del 13.2.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006892/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: New attack on Italian products: counterfeit Sambuca

After the scandal of powdered wines marketed as true Italian wines, foreign imitators have launched a new coloured drink, with no aniseed, which is passed off as Sambuca. This aniseed liqueur is a traditional Italian product and its quality differs significantly from the alcoholic beverage produced and sold in several Member States. Although Regulation (EC) No 110/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council, dated 15 January 2008, allows the name Sambuca to be used only for colourless alcoholic beverages, with a natural anethole content of between 1 and 2 grammes per litre and a minimum alcoholic strength of 38%, products have been put on the market which bear the same name but do not comply with these requirements.

— Is the Commission aware of these facts?

— What steps does it intend to take at Community level to stop the illegal trade in such products and to ensure that Member States introduce sanctions to curb these abusive practices?

— What measures does it deems necessary to protect the consumers' right to information given that they are likely to be deceived about the true nature of the product?

— Given the increase in cases of counterfeit Italian wines and spirits, how does it intend to protect Italian exports in order to avoid Italian producers incurring financial losses and having their image harmed by counterfeit products?

Answer given by Mr Cioloș on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2013)

The definition of the category *sambuca*, included in point 38 of Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 110/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the definition, description, presentation, labelling and the protection of geographical indications of spirit drinks ([1]), contains a specific provision according to which '*Sambuca is a colourless aniseed-flavoured liqueur…*'. Consequently, the absence of colouring ingredients is one of the essential conditions for the conformity of the product with the definition of *sambuca*.

The Spirit Drinks Regulation also establishes general rules on the use of the names of categories of spirit drinks as sales denominations, as part of a compound term or as an allusion to spirit drinks categories, in order to prevent deceptive practices and ensure a high level of consumer protection.

The Commission has been alerted on trade of Sambuca which could be in breach of the relevant EU definition and is currently analysing the available documentation. If it appears that the product at issue is illegally labelled, the Commission will inform the concerned Member States.

However, Member States are responsible for the control of spirit drinks and for taking the necessary measures to ensure compliance of spirit drinks with EU rules.

([1]) OJ L 39, 13.2.2008.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006893/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Violazione del diritto alla riservatezza e alla protezione dei dati personali dei cittadini europei

Il 6 giugno scorso la National Security Agency (NSA) americana è stata accusata di aver intercettato telefonate e ricerche su internet di cittadini statunitensi e non solo nell'ambito di un programma di controllo delle comunicazioni chiamato Prism. Attraverso tale programma, la NSA è in grado di intercettare informazioni, i dati e i contenuti delle conversazioni dei clienti di compagnie telefoniche come Verizon, AT&T e Sprint, di aziende che emettono carte di credito e di grandi marchi come Apple, Google, Facebook e Microsoft, Yaho, PalTalk, Aol, Skype e YouTube, in violazione del diritto alla riservatezza e alla protezione dei dati personali dei cittadini. Il governo è in grado, intercettando conversazioni e tabulati telefonici, email, password e carte di credito, di accedere a qualsiasi tipo di informazione riservata dei cittadini. Il governo statunitense precisa che il programma governativo Prism è uno strumento per garantire la sicurezza nazionale e per individuare eventuali minacce terroristiche. Le società, da parte loro, ribadiscono il loro impegno nel garantire la sicurezza delle informazioni. Il pericolo per la privacy riguarda anche i paesi stranieri: in un solo mese Prism ha raccolto 100 miliardi di dati provenienti dai computer di Iran, Pakistan, India, Egitto, Giordania, Cina, Afghanistan, Iraq, Arabia Saudita, Kenya, Germania e Italia.

— È la Commissione a conoscenza dei fatti?

— Non ritiene che questo tipo di sorveglianza senza garanzie per la privacy rappresenti un'intrusione nei diritti civili garantiti da ogni società democratica ai propri cittadini?

— Come valuta la richiesta delle compagnie tecnologiche e finanziarie americane di allentare le restrizioni sulla condivisione dei dati tra Europa e Stati Uniti, anche in vista dell'inizio del negoziato per un accordo commerciale bilaterale Unione europea-Stati Uniti, previsto per il prossimo luglio?

— Con riferimento alla revisione della normativa sulla protezione dei dati, sulla base della proposta non ancora approvata, avanzata il 25 gennaio 2012, che stabilisce l'obbligo per gli operatori non comunitari che agiscono sul mercato europeo di rispettare le regole stabilite dall'Unione, e alla luce delle vicende recentemente accadute, non riterrebbe opportuno richiamare l'attenzione del Parlamento e del Consiglio al fine di trovare al più presto un accordo sulla questione?

— Ritiene che le misure attualmente in vigore sulla protezione dei dati personali garantiscano il diritto alla privacy dei cittadini europei e, in caso contrario, valuterebbe l'adozione di eventuali modifiche per elevare lo standard di protezione dei dati ed evitarne indebite divulgazioni?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(10 settembre 2013)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputata alla risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-007934/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006893/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Violation of European citizens' right to privacy and personal data protection

On 6 June, the National Security Agency (NSA) was accused of intercepting phone calls and Internet searches by American citizens and much more as part of a communications surveillance programme called PRISM. Through this programme, the NSA can intercept information, data and content of conversations by customers of telephone companies such as Verizon, AT&T and Sprint, credit card companies and big brands such as Apple, Google, Facebook and Microsoft, Yahoo!, PalTalk, AOL, Skype and YouTube, in violation of citizens' right to privacy and the protection of personal data. By intercepting conversations and phone records, emails, passwords and credit cards, the Government can access any kind of confidential information of citizens. The US government has stated that the PRISM government programme is a weapon for ensuring national security and thwarting terrorist threats. The companies, for their part, have reiterated their commitment to ensuring the security of information. The threat to privacy also involves third countries: in a single month, PRISM collected 100 billion pieces of data from computers in Iran, Pakistan, India, Egypt, Jordan, China, Afghanistan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Kenya, Germany and Italy.

— Is the Commission aware of the facts?

— Does it not believe that this kind of surveillance, without safeguards for privacy, is an intrusion into the civil rights that any democratic society guarantees to its citizens?

— How does it assess the request by US technology and finance companies to relax restrictions on data sharing between Europe and the United States, in view of the start of negotiations for a bilateral trade agreement between the European Union and the United States, scheduled for next July?

— With reference to reviewing data protection legislation, based on its as-yet-unapproved draft proposals, published on 25 January 2012 requiring non-EU businesses acting in the European market to comply with the rules laid down by the Union, and in light of recent events, would it not consider it appropriate to encourage Parliament and the Council to find an agreement on this issue as soon as possible?

— Does it consider that the measures currently in force on personal data protection guarantee European citizens the right to privacy and, if not, would it consider adopting any amendments in order to raise the standards of data protection and prevent unwarranted leaks?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(10 September 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-007934/13.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006894/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(13 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Arresto della speculazione sui prodotti agricoli

La banca tedesca DZ Bank, quarta per volume d'affari in Germania, ha annunciato che non offrirà più prodotti finanziari legati alla speculazione sulle derrate alimentari. Lars Hille, Presidente dell'Istituto, domanda inoltre che i mercati delle materie prime agricole siano regolamentati in modo più severo. Quanto emerso con chiarezza in un recente rapporto di Oxfam France, ovvero che la finanza basata sui mercati delle commodities agricole specula in realtà sulla fame dei ceti meno abbienti, ha fatto sì che i primi gruppi bancari europei abbiano iniziato a ritirarsi da questo tipo di speculazioni. Alcuni strumenti finanziari in agricoltura avevano, in origine, un significato non meramente speculativo, come i cosiddetti «futures» che potevano di fatto assicurare i diversi operatori (agricoltori da un lato, mangimisti, molini, industrie dall'altro) rispetto ai rischi di sbalzi dei listini al di sopra o al di sotto di determinate soglie. Ma la completa deregolamentazione ha favorito la proliferazione di strumenti complessi, sempre più lontani dal mercato reale e difficili da verificare (quanto a funzionamento e garanzie).

Infatti, negli ultimi dieci anni si è innescato un pericoloso sistema di scommesse sull'andamento dei listini delle derrate agricole di base. Questa crescita esponenziale del mercato finanziario non corrisponde però alla realtà degli scambi, il cui incremento è per lo più lineare essendo collegato all'andamento demografico e dei consumi nei paesi emergenti: su un bushel (unità di misura) di grano gravitano capitali fittizi sino a 80 volte il suo prezzo, e basta una pur modesta diminuzione dei raccolti, a causa di alluvioni o siccità o incendi, per fare volare i prezzi delle materie prime.

— Intende la Commissione proporre la regolamentazione degli strumenti finanziari sulle derrate alimentari?

— Alla luce delle recenti scelte di BNP Paribas, Crédit Agricole, Landesbank Berlin, Landesbank Baden-Württemberg e Commerzbank e Österreichische Volksbanken di abbandonare le speculazioni di fondi d'investimento basati sulle commodities agricole, non intende la Commissione rendere tali fondi illegali nell'Unione europea?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(9 agosto 2013)

Per la Commissione la necessità di affrontare l'eccessiva volatilità dei prezzi sui mercati delle materie prime a livello mondiale è una priorità assoluta. Nella sua comunicazione del 2011 ([1]) la Commissione ha invitato a intraprendere ulteriori azioni per migliorare l'integrità e la trasparenza di questi mercati. In linea con gli impegni assunti nel quadro del G20, la Commissione ha avviato una serie di iniziative normative per aumentare l'integrità e la trasparenza dei mercati dei derivati sulle materie prime, tra cui proposte per chiarire le tipologie di negoziazioni sui mercati delle materie prime che costituiscono abuso di mercato ([2]) e proposte intese a prescrivere che i prodotti derivati sulle materie prime standardizzati siano negoziati esclusivamente nelle sedi di negoziazione organizzate, che tali attività di negoziazione siano trasparenti e che sia attivata un'ampia sorveglianza delle posizioni in derivati sulle materie prime, che consenta anche l'imposizione di limiti di posizione ([3]).

([1]) Affrontare le sfide relative ai mercati dei prodotti di base e alle materie prime, febbraio 2011, COM(2011)25 definitivo.

([2]) Regolamento relativo all'abuso di informazioni privilegiate e alla manipolazione del mercato (abusi di mercato), COM(2011)651 definitivo, e la direttiva relativa alle sanzioni penali in caso di abuso di informazioni privilegiate e di manipolazione del mercato, COM(2011)654 definitivo del 20.10.2011.

([3]) Proposta di direttiva relativa ai mercati degli strumenti finanziari che abroga la direttiva 2004/39/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio (rifusione) COM(2011)656 definitivo, e proposta di regolamento sui mercati degli strumenti finanziari e che modifica il regolamento [EMIR] sugli strumenti derivati OTC, le controparti centrali e i repertori di dati sulle negoziazioni, COM(2011)652 definitivo del 20.10.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006894/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Stopping speculation on agricultural products

DZ Bank, Germany's fourth largest bank by turnover, has announced that it will no longer offer financial products linked to speculation on foodstuffs. The Bank's director, Lars Hille, is also calling for agricultural commodities markets to be regulated more strictly. A recent report by Oxfam France, which clearly showed that agricultural commodities markets actually speculate on the hunger of poorer people, has led to a number of European banking groups beginning to withdraw from this kind of speculation. Some agriculture-based financial instruments originally served a purpose that was not merely speculative. These included 'futures', which could insure the various stakeholders (farmers as well as feed producers, mills, and factories) against the risks of price changes above or below certain thresholds. Total deregulation has however encouraged the proliferation of complex instruments which are increasingly isolated from the real world and difficult to verify (in terms of operation and guarantees).

Indeed, over the past 10 years a dangerous system has developed which involves betting on the trend of basic agricultural commodities prices. This exponential growth of the financial market does not reflect the true nature of trade, which shows a mostly linear increase, being connected with demographic trends and consumption in emerging countries: a bushel of wheat attracts fictitious capital of up to 80 times its price, and all it takes is a modest fall in harvests due to floods, drought or fire, for the prices of raw materials to hit the roof.

— Will the Commission propose regulating financial instruments on foodstuffs?

— In light of recent decisions by BNP Paribas, Crédit Agricole, Landesbank Berlin, Landesbank Baden-Württemberg and by Commerzbank and Österreichische Volksbanken to withdraw from speculation through investment funds based on agricultural commodities, does the Commission intend to make such funds illegal in the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

The Commission considers the need to address excessive price volatility on the world's commodity markets a high priority. In its communication of February 2011 ([1]), the Commission called for further action to improve integrity and transparency on these markets. In line with G20 commitments, the Commission has launched a number of regulatory initiatives to increase the integrity and transparency of commodity derivatives markets. This includes proposals to clarify the types of trading in commodity markets that constitute market abuse ([2]), as well as proposals to require that standardised commodity derivative products are traded exclusively on organised trading venues, that these trading activities are transparent and a comprehensive oversight of commodity derivative positions, including the imposition of position limits ([3]).

([1]) Tackling the challenges in commodity markets and on raw Materials, February 2011, COM(2011) 25 final.

([2]) Regulation on insider dealing and market manipulation (market abuse), COM(2011) 651 final, and Directive on criminal sanctions for insider dealing and market manipulation, COM(2011) 654 final, 20.10.2011.

([3]) Proposal for a directive on markets in financial instruments repealing Directive 2004/39/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (Recast) COM(2011) 656 final, and a regulation on markets in financial instruments and amending Regulation [EMIR] on OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories, COM(2011) 652 final, 20.10.2011.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006895/13
adresată Comisiei
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(13 iunie 2013)

Subiect: Sprijin acordat statelor membre afectate de inundațiile din luna iunie 2013

Inundațiile din ultimele săptămâni au afectat grav multe state europene precum Germania, Austria, Slovacia, Ungaria și România. Pentru perioada următoare sunt prevăzute atât noi cantități importante de precipitații, cât și creșterea debitelor unor ape interne importante precum Elba și Dunărea, precum și ale afluenților acestora. Pagubele înregistrate până în prezent sunt imense și ele se referă atât la locuințe, la infrastructura de transport, cât și la întreprinderi și plantații agricole.

Având în vedere atât restricțiile bugetare existente pentru anul 2013, cât și criza economică cu care se confruntă marea majoritate a statelor membre afectate, aș dori să întreb Comisia care sunt măsurile pe care aceasta intenționează să le adopte pentru a putea sprijini statele membre să reducă impactul acestor inundații și pentru ca sumele pe care statele membre le vor primi din bugetul european să ajungă la destinatari în timp util?

Răspuns dat de dl Hahn în numele Comisiei
(2 august 2013)

Politica de coeziune sprijină statele membre în prevenirea riscurilor naturale. În actuala perioadă de programare 2007-2013, aproximativ 6 miliarde EUR sunt investiți în prevenirea dezastrelor naturale, în cea mai mare parte în prevenirea inundațiilor. În perioada 2014-2020, un obiectiv tematic specific privind „Adaptarea la schimbările climatice și prevenirea și gestionarea riscurilor naturale" va permite investiții suplimentare în proiecte relevante.

La cererea unui stat membru, Fondul de solidaritate al UE poate oferi asistență financiară pentru măsuri de urgență, spre exemplu pentru refacerea infrastructurilor esențiale (cum ar fi baraje, energie, apă, transport, telecomunicații, sănătate și educație), furnizarea de adăposturi temporare, acordarea de asistență populației, protecția patrimoniului cultural și desfășurarea de operațiuni de curățare. Daunele private nu pot fi compensate.

În timpul unei situații de urgență acută, statele membre se pot baza pe sprijinul Centrului Comisiei de răspuns la situații de urgență (CRSU), care monitorizează îndeaproape situațiile de criză din întreaga lume, oferă informații de alertă timpurie și acționează ca un canal de informații. Atunci când amploarea situației de urgență depășește capacitățile naționale de reacție, o țară afectată de dezastru poate beneficia de mijloace și echipe de protecție civilă recurgând la inițierea Mecanismului de protecție civilă prin intermediul CRSU.

În ceea ce privește politica de dezvoltare rurală a UE, ajutorul poate fi plătit în cazul în care programele de dezvoltare rurală ale statelor membre includ măsuri legate de refacerea potențialului agricol/forestier afectat de dezastre naturale. Această chestiune este tratată de statele membre, fără implicarea directă a Comisiei. Politica de dezvoltare rurală de după 2013 va oferi sprijin pentru măsuri de protecție împotriva dezastrelor naturale și de reparare a daunelor rezultate în urma acestora.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006895/13
to the Commission
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Assistance provided to Member States affected by flooding in June 2013

The flooding in recent weeks has seriously affected many Member States such as Germany, Austria, Slovakia, Hungary and Romania. The forecast indicates new significant volumes of rainfall in the coming period, along with an increase in the flow rate of major inland waterways such as the Elbe and Danube, as well as their tributaries. Huge losses have been sustained so far, affecting not only homes and the transport infrastructure, but also businesses and farms.

In view of the current budgetary restrictions imposed for 2013 and the economic recession faced by the large majority of Member States affected, I would like to ask the Commission what measures it intends to take to be able to support Member States in mitigating the impact of this flooding, so that the amounts which Member States are due to receive from the European budget will reach recipients promptly.

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

Cohesion policy supports Member States in the prevention of natural risks. In the current 2007-13 programming period, about EUR 6 billion are invested in the prevention of natural disasters, mostly flood prevention. In the 2014-2020 period, a specific Thematic Objective on 'Adaptation to climate change and prevention and management of natural risks' will allow further investment in relevant projects.

The EU Solidarity Fund — upon application by a Member State — may provide financial assistance for emergency measures such as for the restoration of essential infrastructure (e.g. dams, energy, water, transport, telecoms, health and education), temporary accommodation, assistance to the population, protection of the cultural heritage, and cleaning-up-operations. Private damage may not be compensated.

During an acute emergency, Member States can rely on support by the Commission's Emergency Response Centre (ERC) which closely monitors crises around the world, provides early warning information and acts as an information hub. When the scale of the emergency overwhelms national response capabilities, a disaster-stricken country can benefit from civil protection means or teams by initiating the Civil Protection Mechanism via the ERC.

With regard to the EU's rural development policy, aid may be paid where the Member State's rural development programmes include measures related to the rebuilding of agricultural / forestry potential damaged by natural disasters. This is dealt with by the Member States without direct involvement of the Commission. The post-2013 rural development policy will offer support for measures to protect against and repair damage from natural disasters.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-006896/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(13 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Αναστολή της λειτουργίας της κρατικής ελληνικής τηλεόρασης

Η ελληνική κυβέρνηση αποφάσισε αιφνίδια την προσωρινή παύση των δραστηριοτήτων της δημόσιας τηλεόρασης ΕΡΤ, με αποτέλεσμα, δυστυχώς, 2 700 περίπου εργαζόμενοι σε αυτήν να απολέσουν την εργασία τους, γεγονός θλιβερό υπό τις παρούσες συνθήκες αγοράς εργασίας στην Ελλάδα.

Συνάμα, δημιουργεί προβληματισμό η άποψη ότι η ελληνική κυβέρνηση οδηγήθηκε στην ενέργεια αυτή από την απαίτηση της τρόικας για απολύσεις προσωπικού αμέσως ή εμμέσως εργαζόμενου στον δημόσιο τομέα. Από την άλλη πλευρά, η ελληνική κυβέρνηση, υπαινίσσεται ότι η ΕΡΤ λειτουργούσε με αδιαφάνεια και σπατάλη.

Κατόπιν των ανωτέρω ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Υπάρχει έμμεση ή άμεση επέμβαση της Επιτροπής δια του εκπροσώπου της στην τρόικα, στην απόφαση της ελληνικής κυβερνήσεως να διακόψει την λειτουργία της ΕΡΤ;

2. Υπάρχει υποχρέωση από τους κανόνες της ΕΕ για λειτουργία κρατικού φορέα ενημέρωσης;

3. Έχει στοιχεία η Επιτροπή ή η τρόικα για το κόστος λειτουργίας της ΕΡΤ και αν τούτο κινείται μέσα σε λογικά πλαίσια;

4. Έχει γνώση η Επιτροπή για το ύψος των εισφορών που πληρώνει ο ελληνικός λαός μέσω των λογαριασμών ηλεκτρικού ρεύματος υπέρ της ΕΡΤ;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Ιουλίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε να παραπέμψει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στην δήλωσή της ([1]) για το κλείσιμο της ελληνικής ραδιοφωνίας και τηλεόρασης, που δημοσιεύτηκε στις 12 Ιουνίου 2013. Η Επιτροπή επιθυμεί να τονίσει ότι η απόφαση των ελληνικών αρχών να κλείσουν τον ελληνικό ραδιοτηλεοπτικό οργανισμό (ΕΡΤ) ελήφθη υπό συνθήκες πλήρους αυτονομίας.

Η Επιτροπή δεν είχε ζητήσει το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ και ούτε αμφισβητεί την ανάληψη της διαχείρισης του δημόσιου τομέα από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση. Η απόφαση των ελληνικών αρχών θα πρέπει να τοποθετηθεί στο πλαίσιο των εκτενών και αναγκαίων προσπαθειών των αρχών για τον εκσυγχρονισμό της ελληνικής οικονομίας. Οι προσπάθειες αυτές περιλαμβάνουν τη βελτίωση της αποδοτικότητας και της αποτελεσματικότητας του δημόσιου τομέα.

Το πρωτόκολλο αριθ. 29 σχετικά με το σύστημα της δημόσιας ραδιοτηλεόρασης στα κράτη μέλη (ΚΜ), που προσαρτάται στην ΣΕΕ και στην ΣΛΕΕ, καθιστά σαφές ότι η διακυβέρνηση και οι στρατηγικές επιλογές για τη δημόσια ραδιοτηλεόραση εναπόκεινται στα κράτη μέλη. Συνεπώς, η Επιτροπή δεν μπορεί να υποδείξει στα κράτη μέλη τον τρόπο οργάνωσης της δημόσιας ραδιοτηλεόρασης, όμως δίδουμε ιδιαίτερη σημασία στον ρόλο που έχει το διττό σύστημα δημόσιων και εμπορικών ραδιοτηλεοπτικών φορέων στη διατήρηση πλουραλιστικών μέσων ενημέρωσης και στην προαγωγή των ευρωπαϊκών αξιών, σε όλες τις οικονομικές περιστάσεις. Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει λεπτομερείς και επικαιροποιημένες πληροφορίες σχετικά με το λειτουργικό κόστος της ΕΡΤ.

([1]) MEMO/13/545: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-545_el.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006896/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Suspension of Greek State TV broadcasting

The Greek Government has suddenly decided to suspend services of Greece's State TV channel, ERT, a move which has unfortunately resulted in about 2 700 of its employees losing their jobs. This is a bleak thing to happen given current labour market conditions in Greece.

At the same time, the view that the Greek Government was driven to take this action by the Troika's demand for the layoff of staff directly or indirectly employed in the public sector raises a number of issues. The Greek Government, for its part, has suggested that ERT operated in an opaque and wasteful manner.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Has there been any indirect or direct intervention by the Commission, through its representative in the Troika, in the Greek government's decision to suspend broadcasting by ERT?

2. Is there any requirement under EU rules to operate a State media organisation?

3. Does the Commission or the Troika have any information about ERT's running costs and whether they are reasonable?

4. Is the Commission aware of the amount of contributions paid by the Greek people to ERT through electricity bills?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(4 July 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its Statement ([1]) on the closure of the Hellenic Broadcasting Corporation, published on 12 June 2013. The Commission would like to highlight that the decision by the Greek authorities to close down the Hellenic Broadcasting Corporation (ERT) was taken in full autonomy.

The Commission has not sought the closure of ERT, but nor does the Commission question the Greek Government's mandate to manage the public sector. The decision of the Greek authorities should be seen in the context of the major and necessary efforts that the authorities are taking to modernise the Greek economy. Those include improving the efficiency and effectiveness of its public sector.

The Protocol No 29 on the system of public broadcasting in the Member States (MS) attached to the TEU and TFEU makes it clear that the governance and strategic choices on public service broadcasting lie with MS. So while the Commission cannot prescribe MS how to organise their public service broadcaster, we attach special importance to the role of the dual system of public and commercial service broadcasters in preserving media pluralism and promoting European values in all economic circumstances. The Commission does not possess detailed updated information about ERT's operational costs.

([1]) MEMO/13/545: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-545_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-006897/13
aan de Commissie
Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE)
(13 juni 2013)

Betreft: Liberalisering grensoverschrijdend passagiersvervoer per trein

Het Europees parlement heeft in 2007 de Liberaliseringsrichtlijn (2007/58/EG) vastgesteld om de aanpassing van de spoorwegen in de Gemeenschap aan de eisen van de interne markt te vergemakkelijken. De Nederlandse Staat heeft de Liberaliseringsrichtlijn geïmplementeerd in een Algemene Maatregel van Bestuur (AMvB): het Besluit Liberaliseringsrichtlijn (kenmerk: BWBR0031701). In het Besluit Liberaliseringsrichtlijn heeft de Nederlandse Staat de voorwaarden gesteld om te voorkomen dat een bestaand openbaar dienstcontract (de exploitant hoofdrailnet) in het gedrang komt:

— Een nieuw initiatief voor grensoverschrijdend passagiersvervoer mag niet meer dan 25 % binnenlandse reizigers vervoeren;

— Het aantal reizigers op het hoofdrailnet mag door een nieuwe grensoverschrijdend initiatief niet met meer dan 0,4 % dalen.

Volgens de Liberaliseringsrichtlijn zou de toezichthoudende instantie, i.c. de ACM, moeten vaststellen of het economisch evenwicht in gedrang komt op grond van een objectieve economische analyse. In Nederland heeft de Staat bovenbedoelde criteria echter zélf vastgesteld waarbij de bedoelde economische analyse achterwege is gelaten.

1. Acht de Commissie het juist dat de Nederlandse staat op bovengenoemde wijze invulling heeft gegeven aan het Besluit Liberaliseringsrichtlijn?

2. Acht de Commissie de eisen die de Nederlandse Staat heeft gesteld in strijd met het Unierecht?

Het valt op dat verschillende lidstaten het begrip „aanvrager” (van capaciteit op het spoor) in de zin van artikel 2, lid 3, 2007/58/EG jo artikel 2, sub b), 2001/14/EG op verschillende wijze invullen. Afhankelijk van de eisen die aan een „aanvrager” worden gesteld is het aanvragen van capaciteit moeilijker of makkelijker.

3. Is de Commissie met ons van mening dat deze verschillen leiden tot een onnodige beperking van de mogelijkheid voor ondernemingen om in verschillende lidstaten capaciteit aan te vragen ten behoeve van het verrichten van grensoverschrijdend passagiersvervoer per trein?

De Belgische Staat stelt alleen spoorwegondernemingen (en niet andere zogenaamde „authorised applicants”) in staat om een aanvraag in te dienen voor capaciteit op het Belgische spoor. In artikel 32 van de Belgische wet van 4.12.2006 is daarbij de eis gesteld dat spoorwegondernemingen in het bezit dienen te zijn van een Deel B veiligheidscertificaat voor het Belgische Spoor om als „kandidaat” te kwalificeren en derhalve om capaciteit op het spoor aan te mogen vragen (althans dat dit certificaat moet zijn aangevraagd).

4. Is de Commissie met ons van mening dat deze eis onnodige drempels opwerpt voor ondernemingen om in België spoorcapaciteit aan te vragen?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(10 juli 2013)

1 & 2. Nadat de Commissie de kennisgeving van de Nederlandse maatregel had ontvangen, heeft zij Nederland via de EU-Pilot-databank gemeld dat zij van mening is dat zowel het vooraf bepalen van drempelwaarden met weinig of geen mogelijkheid tot afwijking voor de regelgevende instantie, als de relatief beperkende cijfers die in de Nederlandse maatregel worden opgelegd, in strijd zijn met het recht van de EU. Aangezien de Nederlandse regering duidelijk heeft laten blijken dat zij niet voornemens is de maatregel te wijzigen, hebben de diensten van de Commissie een ontwerpuitvoeringsbesluit opgesteld betreffende de niet-toepassing van de Nederlandse maatregelen overeenkomstig artikel 61 van Richtlijn 2012/34/EU ([1]). Dit ontwerp is op 14 juni 2013 besproken door het Comité voor de Europese Spoorwegruimte in het kader van een raadplegingsprocedure. De Commissie zal het uitvoeringsbesluit naar verwachting binnenkort aannemen.

([1]) Richtlijn 2012/34/EU van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 21 november 2012 tot instelling van één Europese spoorwegruimte, PB L 343 van 14.12.2012.

3 & 4. Bij de herschikking van het eerste spoorwegpakket is in het nieuwe artikel 3, lid 19, van Richtlijn 2012/34/EU de mogelijkheid van een aanvrager om infrastructuurcapaciteit aan te vragen, uitgebreid. Deze uitbreiding geldt niet alleen voor spoorwegondernemingen, maar eveneens voor verladers, overheidsinstanties en andere partijen die infrastructuurcapaciteit willen verwerven. Uit hoofde van de huidige EU-wetgeving wordt het nog steeds aan de lidstaten overgelaten om te beslissen of ze dit al dan niet toestaan. De lidstaten dienen deze richtlijn uiterlijk op 16 juni 2015 om te zetten in nationale wetgeving. Overeenkomstig haar verplichting uit hoofde van de Verdragen zal de Commissie de omzetting en uitvoering van deze richtlijn op de voet volgen.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006897/13
to the Commission
Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Liberalisation of cross-border passenger transport by rail

In 2007, the European Parliament adopted Directive 2007/58/EC seeking to facilitate measures to bring EU railways into line with the needs of the internal market. The Dutch Government has transposed the directive under a general administrative ruling (Implementing Decision BWBR0031701), in which it stipulates a number of conditions to avoid jeopardising an existing public service (main railway network) contract:

— No new cross-border passenger transport service must carry more than 25% of inland travellers;

— The number of travellers on the main railway network must not fall by more than 0.4% as a result of such an initiative.

Under the directive, the regulatory body, in this case the ACM, must, on the basis of an objective economic analysis, establish whether the economic equilibrium is being compromised. The Dutch Government, however, has laid down the above criteria in the absence of any economic analysis.

1. Does the Commission endorse the Dutch Government's interpretation of the rules in the Implementing Decision?

2. Does the Commission consider that these conditions run counter to EC law?

The term 'applicant' (requesting infrastructure capacity) referred to in Article 2(3) of Directive 2007/58/EC and Article 2(b) of Directive 2001/14/EC is also interpreted differently by the various Member States. Depending on the conditions an applicant is required to fulfil, the procedure for requesting rail network capacity is more or less straightforward.

3. Does the Commission agree that these differences are unnecessarily restricting opportunities for undertakings to seek additional capacity in the various Member States for the purpose of providing cross-border passenger rail services?

The Belgian Government authorises only railway undertakings companies (and not other 'authorised applicants') to apply for Belgian rail network capacity. Article 32 of the Belgian law of 4 December 2006 requires such undertakings to hold (or at least have applied for) a Part B safety certificate issued by the Belgian rail authorities before such an application will be considered.

4. Does the Commission agree that this requirement is creating unnecessary obstacles to undertakings applying for railway network capacity in Belgium?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(10 July 2013)

1 and 2. After receiving the notification of the Dutch measure in question, the Commission informed the Netherlands via the EU-Pilot database that, in the opinion of the Commission services, both the setting of any predetermined thresholds with limited or no possibilities for derogation for the regulatory body and the relatively restrictive figures applied for that in the Dutch measure were contrary to EC law. As the Dutch Government made clear that it would not amend the measure, the Commission services prepared a draft Implementing Decision on the non-application of the Dutch measures in accordance with Article 61 of Directive 2012/34/EU ([1]). In the framework of an advisory procedure, this draft was discussed on 14 June 2013 by the Single European Railway Area Committee. The Commission is expected to adopt the Implementing Decision shortly.

([1]) Directive 2012/34/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 November 2012 establishing a single European railway area Text with EEA relevance, OJ L 343, 14.12.2012.

3 and 4. As a result of the Recast of the First Rail Package, the capacity of an 'applicant' entitled to request infrastructure capacity was extended in the new Article 3(19) of Directive 2012/34/EU and does not only relate to railway undertakings, but also shippers, public authorities and other parties interested in procuring infrastructure capacity. The current EU legislation still leaves it to the Member States to decide whether or not they want to allow this possibility. Member States have until 16 June 2015 to transpose the Directive 2012/34/EU into national legislations. The Commission will closely follow, as it is its duty under the Treaties, the transposition and the implementation of this directive.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006898/13
a la Comisión
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(13 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Estadísticas sobre la situación de niñas y mujeres con discapacidad en relación a la violencia

La Agenda para los Objetivos del Milenio destacó la falta de datos concretos sobre las personas con discapacidad, y resaltó el carácter esencial del fomento de las capacidades estadísticas de los países en desarrollo.

Se estima que existen en el mundo alrededor de 1 000 millones de personas con algún tipo de discapacidad, de las cuales hay más mujeres que hombres, y en algunos países de ingresos bajos y medios, aquéllas constituyen hasta las tres cuartas partes del total de personas con discapacidad. Entre un 65 % y un 70 % de estas mujeres viven en zonas rurales.

En el 90 % del mundo en desarrollo, no existen estadísticas desagregadas por sexo y, en muchos casos, la discriminación de género y discapacidad no es identificada ni registrada, o los registros existentes no reflejan la dimensión de los problemas de género en temas como violencia de género, «feminicidio», acoso sexual, feminización de la pobreza, etc.

Considerando la importancia del desarrollo de estudios de información apropiada, respetando los derechos humanos y libertades fundamentales, los principios éticos, las salvaguardias jurídicas, la protección de los datos, la confidencialidad y la privacidad, a fin de permitir a los gobiernos formular y aplicar políticas para cumplir sus obligaciones en relación con los tratados internacionales de derechos humanos;

Considerando que el artículo 31 de la Convención de Naciones Unidas de los derechos de las personas con discapacidad obliga a los Estados a recopilar información adecuada, incluidos datos estadísticos y de investigación, que les permita formular y aplicar políticas, a fin de dar efecto a la Convención;

Considerando que la elaboración de estadísticas y recopilación y seguimiento de datos, forma parte de la puesta en práctica de la Estrategia Europea de Discapacidad;

Considerando que los escasos estudios sobre la materia en personas con discapacidad señalan la salud, la violencia y el abuso, así como los derechos sexuales y reproductivos, entre otras, como áreas que deben ser atendidas por separado desde las necesidades y demandas expresadas por hombres y mujeres respectivamente;

1. ¿Qué medidas estima adoptar la Comisión para asegurar una correcta formación en materia de género de las personas que tengan que asumir estas tareas, las cuales deberán velar por la inclusión de la perspectiva de género en las actuaciones, servicios y apoyos ofrecidos?

2. ¿Cómo quiere la Comisión acabar con la invisibilidad de las niñas y mujeres con discapacidad en las estadísticas, y en concreto poner de manifiesto la violencia de género en el caso de las mujeres con discapacidad?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(31 de julio de 2013)

1. Desde 2007 y al amparo del Programa Progress, la Comisión ha financiado con 3,8 millones de euros un total de 34 proyectos destinados a mejorar la integración de la perspectiva de género en las políticas y programas nacionales, en particular mediante la organización de sesiones de formación al respecto. A estas acciones se suma además la actividad del Instituto Europeo de la Igualdad de Género (EIGE), encargado de promover la integración de esta cuestión a escala nacional y de la UE.

2. La perspectiva de género es una de las variables sociales fundamentales empleadas en todos los datos recopilados por la Comisión, que utilizada en combinación con el módulo mínimo comunitario sobre el estado de salud (MEHM) —incluido en encuestas como la encuesta comunitaria de salud por entrevista (EHIS) o la encuesta comunitaria sobre la renta y las condiciones de vida (SILC)— permite a la Comisión evaluar de manera fiable la situación de las mujeres con discapacidad. El módulo especial *ad hoc* sobre personas con discapacidad de las encuestas de población activa de 2002 y 2011 proporciona estadísticas aún más detalladas.

En 2014, la Agencia de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea (FRA) publicará los resultados de un estudio a escala de la UE sobre la violencia de género contra las mujeres en la que se incluirán datos sobre salud y discapacidad.

El tema de la violencia contra las mujeres con discapacidad ya ha sido tratado a petición de la Comisión en un estudio específico sobre la situación de este colectivo de mujeres ([1]).

([1]) ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=4363&langId=en

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006898/13
to the Commission
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Statistics on the situation of children and women with disabilities in relation to violence

The Agenda for the Millennium Development Goals highlighted the absence of concrete data on people with disabilities and stressed that it was essential to encourage the collection of statistics in developing countries.

It is estimated that around 1 000 million people in the world have some type of disability. More women are affected than men, and in some low and medium-income countries, up to three quarters of all disabled people are women. Between 65% and 70% of these women live in rural areas.

In 90% of the developing world, there are no separate statistics for men and women, and in many cases gender discrimination and disability are neither identified nor recorded, or the records that do exist do not reflect the extent to which gender plays a role in issues such as gender-based violence, 'feminicide', sexual harassment, feminisation of poverty, etc.

Whereas it is crucial to draw up appropriate studies, with respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, ethics, legal safeguards, data protection, confidentiality and privacy, to enable governments to formulate and implement policies to fulfil their obligations under international human rights treaties;

Whereas Article 31 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities requires the states to collect appropriate information, including statistical and research data, to enable them to formulate and implement policies to give effect to the Convention;

Whereas the preparation of statistics and data collection and monitoring are activities that are included in the scope of the European Disability Strategy;

Whereas the few studies on how people with disabilities are affected point to health, violence and abuse, and sexual and reproductive rights, *inter alia*, as areas that must be tackled separately in terms of the needs and demands of men and women;

1. What measures does the Commission intend to adopt to ensure appropriate gender training for those responsible for these tasks, who must ensure that the gender perspective is incorporated in the actions, services and support offered?

2. How does the Commission plan to put an end to the fact that children and women with disabilities are not represented in statistics, and specifically to highlight gender-based violence in the case of women with disabilities?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

1. Since 2007, in the framework of the PROGRESS programme, the Commission has financed 34 projects aiming at improving gender mainstreaming, including by organising gender trainings, in national policies and programmes for a total of 3.8 million euros. Furthermore the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) promotes gender mainstreaming at national and EU levels.

2. Gender is among core social variables included in all data gathered by the Commission. Combined with the Minimum European health module (MEHM) that is included in surveys such as European health interview survey (EHIS) or the Survey of Income and Living Conditions (SILC) this allows the Commission to reliably assess the situation of women with disabilities. The Special ad-hoc module on disability in the Labour Force Surveys (LFS) of 2002 and 2011, provides even more detailed data.

In 2014, the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) will release the results of an EU wide survey on gender-based violence against women. This survey will include data on women's health and disability.

The Commission had included violence against women with disabilities among the subjects covered by a specific study about the situation of women with disabilities ([1]).

([1]) ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=4363&langId=en.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006899/13
a la Comisión
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(13 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Coordinación de las vacaciones en los Estados miembros

En la Comunicación de la Comisión Europea al Parlamento Europeo titulada «Europa, primer destino turístico del mundo: un nuevo marco político para el turismo europeo», en la séptima de las acciones previstas, la Comisión Europea anunció su intención de que se llevara a cabo la elaboración de un mecanismo voluntario de intercambio de información en línea para la mejor coordinación de las vacaciones escolares entre los Estados miembros. Posteriormente, en el informe del Parlamento, se acogió favorablemente esta propuesta en su apartado 1, pidiendo que se llevaran a cabo el establecimiento de los plazos y las estrategias para su consecución.

¿Cuándo tiene previsto la Comisión llevar a cabo la elaboración de este mecanismo?

¿De qué forma tiene pensado la Comisión fomentar este tipo de iniciativas sin perjuicio de las tradiciones culturales de los Estados miembros?

Respuesta del Sr. Tajani en nombre de la Comisión
(16 de agosto de 2013)

La recopilación de los calendarios escolares y académicos y, en consecuencia, las pautas de vacaciones, está en manos de los Estados miembros y la Comisión se propone respetar esta situación. Sin embargo, a través de su red Eurydice, la Comisión ya publica anualmente una visión general estratégica de las distintas situaciones de treinta y seis países europeos:
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/facts_and_figures_en.php#calendars

La red Eurydice actualmente publica información sobre las pautas vacacionales que se refieren al actual año escolar y académico. Dicha información se presenta actualmente junto con una gran cantidad de otros datos relativos a los sistemas y las políticas de educación, de modo podría desarrollarse su utilización y su valor para fines turísticos.

En consonancia con su Comunicación de 2010 sobre el turismo ([1]), la Comisión está intentando aumentar la visibilidad de las pautas de las vacaciones escolares en toda Europa, relacionando la información de la red Eurydice con su iniciativa turística Calypso ([2]), en particular a través de la plataforma e-Calypso basada en la web ([3]). El objetivo principal de la plataforma, que se podrá en marcha oficialmente en otoño de 2013, es promover el turismo social en toda la UE para facilitar la conexión entre la oferta y la demanda turísticas fuera de temporada y para aumentar los flujos turísticos transfronterizos en temporada baja. Se espera que la plataforma web Calypso pueda servir también como herramienta adecuada para planificar el turismo.

([1]) COM(2010) 352 final de 30.6.2010.
([2]) Puede obtenerse más información sobre la iniciativa Calypso en: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/calypso/index_en.htm
([3]) Puede obtenerse más información sobre la plataforma e-Calypso en: http://www.ecalypso.eu/steep/public/index.jsf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006899/13
to the Commission
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Coordinating holidays in the Member States

In the communication from the Commission to the Parliament entitled 'Europe, the world's No 1 tourist destination — a new political framework for tourism in Europe', the Commission announced under the seventh planned action its intention to develop a voluntary online information exchange mechanism to improve the coordination of school holidays in the Member States. Subsequently, in paragraph 1 of its report, the Parliament welcomed this proposal, calling for timetables and strategies to achieve this target.

When does the Commission intend to develop this mechanism?

In what way does the Commission intend to promote these types of initiatives, without prejudice to the cultural traditions of the Member States?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(16 August 2013)

The compilation of school and academic calendars, and subsequently holiday patterns, lies in the hands of Member States and the Commission intends to respect this. Still, through its Eurydice Network, the Commission already publishes annually a strategic overview of the varying situations for 36 European countries:

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/facts_and_figures_en.php#calendars

The Eurydice Network at present publishes information on holiday patterns that relate to the current academic and school years. Such information is currently presented together with a wealth of other data related to education systems and policies, so its use and value for tourism purposes could be developed.

In line with its 2010 Communication on tourism ([1]), the Commission is moreover seeking to increase the visibility of school holiday patterns across Europe, by linking the information from the Eurydice Network to its Calypso tourism initiative ([2]), in particular through the e-Calypso web-based platform ([3]). The primary aim of the platform, which will be officially launched in the autumn of 2013, is to promote social tourism across the EU, to facilitate the connection between the off-season tourism demand and offer and to increase cross boarder tourism flows in the low season. It is hoped that the Calypso web platform could also serve as an adequate tool for tourism planning purposes.

([1]) COM(2010) 352 final of 30.6.2010.
([2]) For more information on the CALYPSO initiative: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/calypso/index_en.htm
([3]) For more information on the e-Calypso platform: http://www.ecalypso.eu/steep/public/index.jsf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006900/13
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(13 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Nuevo plan de reestructuración del Banco CEISS

El Banco CEISS, resultante de la fusión de Caja Duero y Caja España y en proceso de adquisición por Unicaja, ha presentado recientemente un expediente de regulación de empleo (ERE) que supondrá el cierre de todas sus sucursales en Galicia y la pérdida de al menos 130 empleos. Según informaciones de prensa, tanto la entidad como las autoridades regionales han indicado que esta medida ha sido impuesta por la Comisión Europea para dar luz verde al nuevo Plan de Reestructuración aprobado el pasado 14 de mayo.

¿Confirma la Comisión estas informaciones?

¿Podría redimensionarse el Banco CEISS con otras fórmulas que evitaran la desaparición de activos (más de 10 000 depositantes y pensionistas y más de 7 000 PYMES) y del empleo en Galicia?

¿Se le han propuesto a la Comisión otras alternativas menos traumáticas para la reestructuración de la entidad que garanticen su viabilidad a largo plazo?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(19 de julio de 2013)

El objetivo principal de la Comisión, al adoptar su decisión, era garantizar que el Banco CEISS recuperara su viabilidad y, por lo tanto, pudiera empezar de nuevo a conceder préstamos a la economía real. En las conversaciones con las autoridades españolas se consensuó rápidamente que el Banco CEISS debía volver a centrarse en sus regiones centrales, abandonando en consecuencia las que no lo fueran, como Galicia, además de reducir costes. La Comisión no está condiciones de confirmar las cifras de Galicia, ya que España no las notificó desglosadas por regiones. Las cifras acumuladas se consideran secreto comercial en España y tienen, por lo tanto, carácter confidencial.

No hubo ninguna posibilidad realista de remodelar el Banco CEISS a fin de evitar la pérdida de activos y puestos de trabajo. Tampoco se recibieron propuestas creíbles de otras alternativas menos drásticas para la reestructuración de la entidad que garantizaran su viabilidad a largo plazo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006900/13
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: New restructuring plan of Banco CEISS

Banco CEISS, which was formed from the merger of Caja Duero and Caja España and is in the process of being bought over by Unicaja, has recently presented a labour force adjustment plan (LFAP) that will result in the closure of all of its branches in Galicia and the loss of at least 130 jobs. According to press reports, both the bank and the regional authorities have said that this measure has been imposed by the Commission in order to give the green light to the new restructuring plan approved on 14 May.

Can the Commission confirm this information?

Could Banco CEISS be remodelled in a different way that would avoid the loss of assets (more than 10 000 account holders and pensioners and more than 7 000 SMEs) and jobs in Galicia?

Has the Commission received any proposals for other less drastic alternatives for the bank's restructuring that would ensure that it was viable in the long term?

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

The primary aim for the Commission when adopting its decision was to ensure that Banco CEISS returns to viability and thus can start lending to the real economy again. In the discussions with the Spanish authorities a consensus was quickly reached that Banco CEISS needs to refocus on its core regions, thus exiting the non-core regions such as Galicia, and cut costs. The Commission is in no position to confirm the numbers for Galicia as those numbers were not transmitted by Spain on a regional basis. The aggregate figures are considered as business secrets by Spain and are therefore confidential.

No realistic possibility materialised to remodel Banco CEISS in a way so as to avoid the loss of assets and jobs. Also, no credible proposals were received for other less drastic alternatives for the bank's restructuring that would ensure long term viability.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006901/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Spyros Danellis (S&D)
(13 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Υπηρεσίες Γενικού Οικονομικού Συμφέροντος σε νησιωτικές περιοχές

Με βάση την Συνθήκη των Ευρωπαϊκών Κοινοτήτων (άρθρο 14) και την πρόσφατη απόφαση της Επιτροπής (20.12.2011 — E(2011)9380), η Επιτροπή μεριμνά ώστε οι Υπηρεσίες Γενικού Οικονομικού Συμφέροντος (ΥΓΟΣ) να λειτουργούν βάσει αρχών και προϋποθέσεων που τους επιτρέπουν την εκπλήρωση του σκοπού τους. Αυτό ενδεχόμενα θα απαιτεί χορήγηση οικονομικής ενίσχυσης από το κράτος για τη κάλυψη του συνόλου ή μέρους του ειδικού κόστους που απορρέει από τις υποχρεώσεις της δημόσιας υπηρεσίας.

Στον ευρωπαϊκό νησιωτικό χώρο, η αντιμετώπιση της τρίτης αρχής της Στρατηγικής Ευρώπη 2020 για «μεγέθυνση χωρίς αποκλεισμούς» προϋποθέτει την παροχή ΥΓΟΣ αντίστοιχου επιπέδου με εκείνες στην ηπειρωτική Ευρώπη. Η παροχή των ΥΓΟΣ αυτών σε κρίσιμους τομείς όπως η ακτοπλοΐα, η ενέργεια, το νερό, η υγεία, η εκπαίδευση και κατάρτιση σε ποιότητα και ανεκτές τιμές αποτελεί αναγκαία συνθήκη για την ύπαρξη στοιχειώδους ελκυστικότητας των περιοχών αυτών για κατοίκους και επιχειρήσεις και για εξασφάλιση της εδαφικής συνοχής του ευρωπαϊκού χώρου.

Με βάση τη νομοθεσία πρέπει η υποχρέωση να είναι σαφώς καθορισμένη και το αντιστάθμισμα προς τη δικαιούχο επιχείρηση να καθορίζεται με βάση την ανάλυση των δαπανών για μια μέση επιχείρηση με χρηστή διαχείριση, ενώ θα πρέπει να λαμβάνονται υπόψη και θέματα ποιότητας της παρεχόμενης υπηρεσίας, θεσπίζοντας συγκεκριμένα κριτήρια. Η επιχείρηση που ασκεί δραστηριότητες ΥΓΟΣ σε συνδυασμό με άλλες δραστηριότητες οφείλει στη λογιστική της να καταγράφει ξεχωριστά τα σχετικά έσοδα και έξοδα καθώς και τις παραμέτρους κατανομής τους.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Πώς ελέγχει τα κράτη μέλη για την εφαρμογή της σχετικής απόφασης της ώστε να εξασφαλίζονται οι κατάλληλες ΥΓΟΣ στα ευρωπαϊκά νησιά;

— Πώς, με δεδομένο το γεγονός ότι η ανάγκη εξυπηρέτησης των μικρών νησιωτικών πληθυσμών συχνά ανάγει τον εκάστοτε πάροχο σε δεσπόζουσα θέση, ελέγχει η Επιτροπή τα κράτη μέλη σε ό,τι αφορά το ύψος στης αντιστάθμισης, ώστε να μην επιβαρύνεται υπερβολικά το κοινωνικό σύνολο και να παρέχονται ικανοποιητικές υπηρεσίες;

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Αυγούστου 2013)

Τα κράτη μέλη έχουν ευρεία διακριτική ευχέρεια κατά τον προσδιορισμό των υπηρεσιών γενικού οικονομικού συμφέροντος, μεταξύ άλλων όσον αφορά την ποιότητα και όλα τα άλλα χαρακτηριστικά των υπηρεσιών, καθώς και τη χορήγηση οικονομικής αντιστάθμισης για τις εν λόγω υπηρεσίες. Οι κανόνες περί κρατικών ενισχύσεων δεν απαιτούν από το κράτος μέλος να χορηγεί ορισμένο ποσό αντιστάθμισης, ούτε δημιουργούν δικαιώματα για τους φορείς παροχής των εν λόγω υπηρεσιών προκειμένου να λαμβάνουν συγκεκριμένη αντιστάθμιση. Στο κράτος μέλος εναπόκειται να καθορίσει τη διαδικασία επιλογής του φορέα παροχής υπηρεσιών και το κατάλληλο ποσό της αντιστάθμισης εντός του εν λόγω πλαισίου, λαμβάνοντας επίσης υπόψη την επιβάρυνση των εθνικών δημόσιων οικονομικών.

Από την άλλη πλευρά, οι κανόνες περί κρατικών ενισχύσεων και ιδίως η απόφαση [1] για τις υπηρεσίες γενικού οικονομικού συμφέροντος (ΥΓΟΣ) περιλαμβάνουν ορισμένες προϋποθέσεις για τη χρηματοδότηση από τα κράτη μέλη των υπηρεσιών γενικού οικονομικού συμφέροντος, σκοπός των οποίων είναι να διασφαλίζεται ότι ο φορέας παροχής υπηρεσιών μπορεί να λαμβάνει νόμιμα την απαραίτητη αντιστάθμιση, ενώ συγχρόνως περιορίζεται η στρέβλωση του ανταγωνισμού (κατά πρώτο λόγο με αποφυγή της υπεραντιστάθμισης) με αποτέλεσμα να δημιουργούνται ισότιμοι όροι ανταγωνισμού για τους οικονομικούς φορείς. Συνεπώς, δεν εναπόκειται στην Επιτροπή, στο πλαίσιο της εφαρμογής των κανόνων για τις κρατικές ενισχύσεις, να διασφαλίζει ότι οι αντισταθμιστικές ενισχύσεις στα ενδιαφερόμενα κράτη μέλη δεν μετατρέπονται σε υπερβολική επιβάρυνση για την κοινωνία στο σύνολό της.

[1] Απόφαση 2012/21/ΕΕ της Επιτροπής, της 20ής Δεκεμβρίου 2012, ΕΕ L 7 της 11.1.2012, σ. 3.

Η αντιστάθμιση που καλύπτεται από την απόφαση για τις ΥΓΟΣ απαλλάσσεται από την υποχρέωση προηγούμενης κοινοποίησης (άρθρο 108 παράγραφος 3 της ΣΛΕΕ). Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή ελέγχει τη συμμόρφωση με όλους τους όρους σε περίπτωση καταγγελίας και, επίσης, παρακολουθεί τη συμμόρφωση αυτεπαγγέλτως. Αυτό περιλαμβάνει την ανάλυση των τακτικών εκθέσεων που τα κράτη μέλη οφείλουν να υποβάλλουν σχετικά με την εφαρμογή της απόφασης περί υπηρεσιών γενικού οικονομικού συμφέροντος και τον έλεγχο της συμμόρφωσης των καθεστώτων στο πλαίσιο της ετήσιας διαδικασίας παρακολούθησης.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006901/13
to the Commission
Spyros Danellis (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Services of general economic interest in island areas

Pursuant to Article 14 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and the recent Commission decision of 29 December 2011 (C(2011)9380), the Commission is required to take care that such services operate on the basis of principles and conditions which enable them to fulfil their missions. This is likely to require public funding to cover some or all of the costs of providing these services.

In European island areas, implementation of the third principle of the Europe 2020 strategy, that is to say inclusive growth, requires the provision of services of general economic interest to the same degree as continental Europe, ensuring quality and affordability. This is particularly true of such vital areas as coastal shipping, energy, water supply, health and education and training, and is a necessary condition to attract individual residents and businesses, thereby consolidating the geographical cohesion of Europe.

This requirement must be clearly defined by law and compensatory payments to the undertakings concerned established on the basis of a cost analysis in respect of a well-run medium-sized business, taking into account certain specific criteria relating to service quality. Undertakings also engaged in other activities should make separate accounting entries in respect of income, expenditure and fund allocation relating to the provision of services of general economic interest.

In view of this:

— What action is being taken by the Commission to monitor compliance by the Member States with this decision, thereby ensuring the provision of suitable services of general economic interest to island communities in Europe?

— Given that the dependence small island communities on these services frequently places the supplier in a dominant position, how does the Commission ensure that compensatory payments in the Member States concerned do not become an excessive burden on society as a whole, while ensuring the quality of the services provided?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2013)

Member States enjoy a wide margin of discretion for defining services of general economic interest, including as regards the quality and all other characteristics of the service, and for providing financial compensation for those services. State aid rules do not require the Member State to grant a certain amount of compensation nor do they create rights for providers of such services to receive a given compensation. It is up to the Member State to define the selection process of the service provider and the appropriate amount of compensation within this framework, also taking into account the burden for the national public finances.

On the other hand state aid rules, and the SGEI Decision [1] in particular, contain certain conditions for Member States' financing of services of general economic interest aimed at ensuring that the service provider can lawfully receive the necessary compensation while limiting distortion of competition (in the first place by avoiding overcompensation), and thereby create a level playing field for economic operators. Thus, it is not for the Commission in the context of the application of state aid rules to ensure that compensatory payments in the Member States concerned do not become an excessive burden on society as a whole.

Compensation covered by the SGEI Decision is exempted from the obligation of prior notification (Article 108(3) TFEU). However, the Commission checks compliance with all conditions in the event of a complaint and also monitors compliance *ex officio*. This includes the analysis of regular reports that Member States have to provide on the application of the SGEI Decision and the check for compliance of schemes in the annual monitoring exercise.

---

[1] Commission Decision 2012/21/EU of 20 December 2011, OJ L 7, 11.1.2012, p. 3.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006902/13
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(13 juni 2013)

Betreft: De richtlijn herstel en afwikkeling: hoe een golf faillissementen kan worden veroorzaakt

Op grond van het voorstel betreffende het herstel en de afwikkeling van kredietinstellingen en beleggingsondernemingen krijgen afwikkelingsautoriteiten de bevoegdheid om vier afwikkelingsinstrumenten toe te passen, inclusief de inbreng van de particuliere sector („bail-in"). De Commissie stelt dat dit instrument afwikkelingsautoriteiten de bevoegdheid verleent om de vorderingen van de concurrente crediteuren van een faillerende instelling af te schrijven ([1]).

Aangezien de meeste ondernemingen deposito's hebben van meer dan 100 000 euro ten gevolge van bedrijfskapitaal, zou een eventuele bail-in leiden tot enorme verliezen voor hen, in het bijzonder voor kleine en middelgrote ondernemingen. Waarschijnlijk leiden deze verliezen ertoe dat die ondernemingen van de markt worden gedrukt, dat de economie schade wordt toegebracht, dat opbrengsten sterk afnemen en dat de werkloosheid verder toeneemt.

De Commissie verklaart echter ook dat de liquidatie van een bank ernstiger gevolgen kan hebben dan het verdwijnen van andere ondernemingen van de markt ([2]).

Tegen deze achtergrond wordt de Commissie verzocht de volgende vragen te beantwoorden:

1. Is de Commissie van mening dat het verdwijnen van niet-financiële ondernemingen van de markt minder ernstig is dan het verdwijnen van financiële ondernemingen?

2. Is de Commissie van mening dat financiële instellingen een grotere bijdrage leveren aan de (echte) economie dan niet-financiële ondernemingen? Zo niet, waarom is het dan nuttiger om kredietinstellingen en beleggingsondernemingen te behoeden voor een wanbetaling dan andere ondernemingen?

3. Kan de Commissie aangeven welke gevolgen een eventuele bail-in zou hebben voor ondernemingen met onverzekerde deposito's?

4. Is de Commissie van mening dat de voorgestelde bail-in-regeling verenigbaar is met het beleid en de maatregelen inzake ondernemingen van de Unie?

5. Bestaat er een studie waaruit blijkt dat het redden van banken de moeite waard is wanneerdit andere faillissementen tot gevolg heeft?

Antwoord van de heer Barnier namens de Commissie
(9 augustus 2013)

In juni 2012 heeft de Commissie een richtlijnvoorstel ([3]) ingediend dat het mogelijk moet maken op een ordelijke manier met potentiële bankfaillissementen om te gaan. Aan het voorstel lag de redenering ten grondslag dat de normale insolventieregels die in de lidstaten gelden, weliswaar geschikt zijn voor de afhandeling van het faillissement van gewone ondernemingen, maar niet op het bankwezen zijn toegesneden.

Als een noodlijdende bank niet op passende wijze wordt aangepakt, dan kan dit schokgolven in de gehele economie van een lidstaat en van de Unie teweegbrengen, omdat banken dagelijks diensten aan burgers en aan andere ondernemingen verlenen (inontvangstneming van deposito's, kredietverlening of exploitatie van betalingssystemen). Bovendien is er als gevolg van de verwevenheid tussen banken sprake van een systeemrisico, waardoor problemen bij een bepaalde bank naar het gehele systeem kunnen overslaan. De Commissie is evenwel van mening dat het beroep op belastinggeld in deze context tot een minimum moet worden beperkt, een uitzonderlijk karakter moet hebben en slechts in laatste instantie mag plaatsvinden, namelijk nadat aandeelhouders en crediteuren al verliezen hebben opgevangen.

([1]) http://www.ipex.eu/IPEXL-WEB/dossier/document/COM20120280.do.
([2]) http://www.ipex.eu/IPEXL-WEB/dossier/document/COM20120280.do.
([3]) Voorstel voor een RICHTLIJN VAN HET EUROPEES PARLEMENT EN DE RAAD betreffende de totstandbrenging van een kader voor het herstel en de afwikkeling van kredietinstellingen en beleggingsondernemingen, COM(2012) 280 final.

De Commissie geeft er zich rekenschap van dat een mogelijke inbreng van de particuliere sector („bail-in”) negatieve gevolgen kan hebben voor bedrijven met onverzekerde deposito’s. Tegen die achtergrond heeft de Raad op 27 juni 2013 in het kader van de onderhandelingen over het wetgevingsvoorstel overeenstemming bereikt over de algemene oriëntatie om een voorkeursbehandeling te geven aan alle deposito’s die door een natuurlijke persoon of een kleine of middelgrote onderneming worden aangehouden. De Commissie stond achter deze voorkeursbehandeling, die inhoudt dat deposito’s van natuurlijke personen of kleine en middelgrote ondernemingen pas kunnen worden aangesproken nadat aandeelhouders en crediteuren verliezen hebben opgevangen. Deposito’s tot een bedrag van EUR 100 000 zouden hoe dan ook steeds door het depositogarantiestelsel worden vervangen en zouden bijgevolg niet aan verliezen zijn blootgesteld.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006902/13
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: The recovery and resolution directive: how to cause a flood of bankruptcies

According to the proposal on the recovery and resolution of credit institutions and investment firms, resolution authorities will have the power to apply four resolution tools, including the bail-in. The Commission states that this tool will give resolution authorities the power to write down the claims of the unsecured creditors of a failing institution ([1]).

Since most businesses will have deposits of above EUR 100 000 as a result of working capital, a possible bail-in would result in huge losses for them, particularly for small and medium-sized enterprises. These losses would most likely push those enterprises out of business, damage the economy, cause a sharp decrease in output and further increase unemployment.

However, the Commission also states that the liquidation of a bank can have more serious consequences than the exit of other businesses from the market ([2]).

In the light of this, could the Commission answer the following:

1. Does the Commission think that the exit of non-financial businesses from the market is less serious than the exit of financial ones?

2. Does the Commission think that financial institutions contribute to the (real) economy more than non-financial businesses? If not, why should it be more worthwhile to protect credit institutions and investment firms from a default rather than other businesses?

3. Could the Commission point out how a possible bail-in would impact businesses which have uninsured deposits?

4. Does the Commission think that the proposed regime of bail-ins is compatible with EU enterprise policies and actions?

5. Is there any research showing that saving banks is worthwhile if it leads to other bankruptcies?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

In June 2012, the Commission opposed a directive ([3]) which should deal with potential bank's failures in an orderly manner on the grounds that normal insolvency rules existing in Member States, and which are appropriate to deal with the failure of an ordinary business, do not fit the banking business.

An ailing bank, if not dealt with properly, can cause disturbance to the entire economy of a Member State and of the Union, since banks provide daily services to citizens and to other businesses (deposit-taking, lending, or operation of payment systems). Moreover, the interdependency between banks creates a systemic risk so that problems in a bank can cascade across the whole system. However, the Commission believes that the use of taxpayers' money in this context should be minimised, be exceptional and operate in a residual manner, namely after shareholders and creditors have absorbed losses.

([1]) http://www.ipex.eu/IPEXL-WEB/dossier/document/COM 20120280.do.
([2]) http://www.ipex.eu/IPEXL-WEB/dossier/document/COM 20120280.do.
([3]) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for the recovery and resolution of credit institutions and investment firms, COM(2012) 0280 final.

The Commission is aware of how a possible bail-in would impact businesses which have uninsured deposits. Against this background, and within the context of the negotiations on the legislative proposal, the Council agreed on a general approach on 27 June 2013 to give preferential treatment to any deposit which is held by an individual or an SME. The Commission was favourable to this preferential treatment, so that deposits held by individuals or SMEs could only be bailed-in after shareholders and creditors have absorbed losses. In any event, deposits up to EUR 100 000 would always be replaced by the deposit guarantee scheme and would, therefore, not suffer any losses.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006903/13
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(13 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Tattiche innecessariamente violente impiegate dal governo turco in risposta alle proteste

Più di una settimana fa, sono cominciate in Turchia delle manifestazioni pacifiche contro il piano del governo di trasformare un parco di Istanbul in un nuovo complesso edilizio. Piazza Taksim è stata il centro delle manifestazioni antigovernative nelle ultime due settimane.

Le manifestazioni sono iniziate il 28 maggio 2013, quando circa 100 attivisti hanno iniziato un sit-in di protesta. Due giorni dopo, il 30 maggio 2013, la polizia ha fatto irruzione nel parco e ha sparato con gli idranti e con gas lacrimogeni contro gli attivisti pacifici per farli sgomberare. La polizia ha poi bruciato le loro tende ed effetti personali. L'1 giugno 2013 le manifestazioni hanno iniziato a diffondersi in altre città. L'11 giugno la polizia antisommossa è entrata in Piazza Taksim. Le manifestazioni si sono evolute in protesta contro le reazioni del governo che violano i diritti fondamentali dei cittadini.

La risposta del governo è stata l'uso di tattiche innecessariamente aggressive nel tentativo di sciogliere i raduni. Quasi ogni notte, la polizia ha usato idranti, spray al pepe e gas lacrimogeni per disperdere le manifestazioni. Tre persone sono già morte, e più di 5 000 sono state curate per lesioni o per gli effetti dell'esposizione a gas durante le proteste. Inoltre, numerose persone sono state arrestate o sono detenute per aver incoraggiato la ribellione sui social network e i media o per aver tweettato «informazioni fuorvianti e diffamatorie».

Dal 2007, l'Unione europea ha erogato sovvenzioni annuali alla Turchia per finanziare azioni di riforma delle istituzioni e la cooperazione transfrontaliera, lo sviluppo regionale e delle risorse rurali e umane, in modo che la Turchia possa soddisfare ai criteri di adesione. Detti contributi sono ammontati a 497,2 milioni di euro nel 2007, aumentando ogni anno per un totale di 653 milioni di euro nel 2010, 860 milioni di euro nel 2012 e un totale previsto di oltre 935 milioni di euro nel 2013.

Chiediamo pertanto alla Commissione se intende continuare con i finanziamenti dell'UE alla Turchia, alla luce delle azioni dell'attuale governo in Turchia, in particolare delle violazioni dei diritti umani fondamentali.

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(7 agosto 2013)

La Commissione ha seguito con attenzione le questioni e gli avvenimenti menzionati dall'onorevole deputato.

Erogare finanziamenti attraverso lo strumento di assistenza preadesione (IPA) è nell'interesse sia dell'UE che della Turchia. L'obiettivo dei progetti finanziati attraverso l'IPA è aiutare la Turchia ad allinearsi con le norme dell'UE, ad esempio contribuendo a rafforzare le istituzioni democratiche, migliorando il rispetto dei diritti umani e lottando in modo più efficace contro la criminalità. Questi miglioramenti hanno ripercussioni positive sulla stabilità e sulla sicurezza dell'Unione europea.

Come il Consiglio d'Europa, le amministrazioni degli Stati membri sono strettamente associate all'erogazione di assistenza tecnica tramite le attività di sviluppo istituzionale e gemellaggio dello strumento di assistenza tecnica e scambio di informazioni (TAIEX).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006903/13
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Unnecessarily violent tactics being employed by the Turkish Government in response to protests

More than a week ago peaceful demonstrations began in Turkey over government plans to replace an Istanbul park with a new development. Taksim Square has been at the heart of anti-government demonstrations for the past two weeks.

The demonstrations began on 28 May 2013, when about 100 activists started a sit-in. Two days later, on 30 May 2013, the police raided the park and fired tear gas and water cannons at peaceful activists to force them out. The police then burned activists' tents and belongings. On 1 June 2013 demonstrations began to spread to other cities. On 11 June the riot police moved into Taksim Square. Demonstrations have evolved into protests against government actions that infringe the fundamental rights of citizens.

The government response has been the use of unnecessarily harsh tactics in an effort to break up the rallies. Almost every night, the police have used water cannons, pepper spray and tear gas to break up demonstrations. Three people have already died, and more than 5 000 people have been treated for injuries or for the effects of exposure to gas during the protests. In addition, numerous people have been arrested or detained for encouraging rebellion on social media or tweeting 'misleading and libellous information'.

Since 2007, the European Union has given Turkey annual grants to fund operations to reform institutions and fund cross-border cooperation, regional development and rural and human resources, so that Turkey can fulfil the criteria for membership. These contributions amounted to EUR 497.2 million in 2007, increasing each year and reaching a total of EUR 653 million in 2010, EUR 860 million in 2012 and a projected total of more than EUR 935 million in 2013.

We therefore ask the Commission if it intends to continue with EU funding to Turkey, in the light of current government actions in Turkey, and in particular violations of fundamental human rights.

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2013)

The Commission has followed the issues and events mentioned by the Honourable Member closely.

Funding through the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) is in the EU's interest, as well as Turkey's. Projects funded through IPA are designed to support Turkey's efforts of alignment with EU standards. For example help strengthening democratic institutions, improve compliance with Human Rights and fight crime more effectively. These improvements are beneficial for the EU's own stability and security.

Member States' administrations are closely involved through the Technical Assistance and Information Exchange (TAIEX) institution building and twinning instrument in providing Technical Assistance as is also the Council of Europe.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006905/13
alla Commissione
Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)
(13 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Evitare la destabilizzazione della democrazia libica

Il presidente del Parlamento libico Mohammed Megharief ha annunciato che si dimetterà dal suo incarico. Colui che attualmente, e in via temporanea, ricopre la più alta carica del Paese, in attesa che si completi definitivamente la transizione della Libia verso una democrazia rappresentativa e funzionale, è stato quasi costretto a questa decisione in seguito all'approvazione da parte del Parlamento stesso di una legge che vieta ad ex esponenti del regime di Gheddafi di ricoprire incarichi pubblici. Megharief, infatti, fu ambasciatore in India, salvo poi schierarsi contro il colonnello e contribuire a fondare il Fronte Nazionale di Salvezza per la Libia.

Questo avvenimento potrebbe essere indicativo di come in Libia siano ancora in atto tentativi di ritorsione nei confronti di chiunque possa aver avuto un ruolo, ancorché marginale, durante il periodo della dittatura del colonnello Gheddafi. Se da un lato è giusto che si preservi la fragile integrità della democrazia libica da possibili tentativi di infiltrazione da parte di soggetti non idonei a rappresentare la popolazione, vanno anche tutelati e garantiti i diritti fondamentali di ogni cittadino: in quest'ottica sarebbe opportuno che non venisse adottata una procedura così restrittiva come invece la legge approvata dal Parlamento libico prevede e che venisse effettuata un'adeguata valutazione soggettiva da un organo istituito ad hoc quantomeno per gli incarichi di maggiore rilevanza come è, infatti, la presidenza del Parlamento.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

— È a conoscenza di ritorsioni indiscriminate e ingiustificate perpetrate dalle milizie rivoluzionarie?

— Quali provvedimenti ha adottato o intende adottare per favorire la fase di transizione che sta vivendo la Libia, evitando che la pur giustificabile epurazione di elementi eccessivamente compromessi con il passato regime non divenga indiscriminata?

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

L'adozione della legge sull'interdizione dai pubblici uffici è una questione di politica interna libica. Tuttavia, va segnalato che i fatti che hanno preceduto l'adozione di tale legge non facilitano la creazione di solide basi per una democrazia moderna e ben funzionante, che molti cittadini libici vorrebbero veder prendere forma gradualmente nel paese.

Ciò è legato ovviamente alla questione della giustizia transitoria e agli sforzi a favore della riconciliazione nazionale.

L'UE ritiene che questi settori siano cruciali e sta pertanto attuando diversi progetti volti ad attenuare il rischio di futuri conflitti, sostenendo un processo di dialogo inclusivo tra i portatori d'interesse in Libia, sviluppando la capacità della società civile e di altri soggetti interessati di esprimere i propri pareri in modo costruttivo e sistematico e promuovendo la partecipazione locale al processo di transizione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006905/13
to the Commission
Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Preventing the destabilisation of Libyan democracy

Mohammed Magariaf, president of the Libyan Parliament, has announced that he is to resign his post. He currently, and temporarily, holds the highest post in the country, pending Libya's full transition to a representative and operational democracy. He has been more or less forced into this decision following the Libyan Parliament's approval of a law banning former officials in the Gaddafi regime from holding public office. Mr Magariaf was ambassador to India, but then sided against the colonel and helped found the National Front for the Salvation of Libya.

This event might be an indication of attempts still taking place in Libya to retaliate against anyone who might have played a role, however marginal, during the dictatorship of Colonel Gaddafi. While, on the one hand, it is right to preserve the fragile integrity of Libyan democracy from possible infiltration attempts by individuals who are not suitable representatives of the people, universal fundamental rights should also be safeguarded and guaranteed. It would therefore be preferable not to adopt a procedure as restrictive as the law approved by the Libyan Parliament, but instead for an appropriate individual assessment to be carried out by a body set up for that purpose, at least for the most senior posts, such as president of parliament.

In view of the above, can the Commission reply to the following questions:

— Is it aware of indiscriminate and unjustified retaliation by revolutionary militias?

— What steps has it taken or does it intend to take to promote the transition phase currently underway in Libya, to ensure that the justifiable removal of elements excessively compromised by links to the previous regime does not become indiscriminate?

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

The adoption of the Political Isolation Law is a matter of internal Libyan politics. However, one should mention that the incidents which preceded the adoption of the law are counterproductive to lay the basis of the well-functioning and modern democracy which many Libyans would like to see gradually taking shape in their country.

This is of course related to the issue of transitional justice and efforts towards national reconciliation.

The EU perceives these areas as crucial and is therefore implementing several projects aiming at mitigating the chances of future conflicts by supporting an inclusive dialogue process among relevant stakeholders in Libya, by developing the capacity of civil society and other stakeholders to voice their opinions in a constructive and systematic manner and by promoting local ownership of the transition process.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006906/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Discarica Co.Ve.Ri di Casale sul Sile in provincia di Treviso

Nonostante il parere contrario dell'amministrazione comunale e la ferma opposizione dei cittadini, procede l'iter per la costruzione della discarica di Lughignano, Treviso, a poche centinaia di metri dal perimetro del Parco naturale regionale del fiume Sile. La nuova discarica raccoglierà nei prossimi cinque anni 315.000 tonnellate di materiali, ricevendo in media quindici camion di rifiuti al giorno.

Nonostante il parere negativo sul progetto del Consiglio provinciale di Treviso che, con la delibera del 30 luglio 2012, ha definito la nuova discarica non necessaria, sebbene l'Ente Parco naturale regionale del fiume Sile, con una nota del 19 febbraio 2013, abbia fatto sapere che il progetto della discarica non ha mai tenuto in considerazione le ripercussioni ambientali dell'opera, il 24 aprile 2013 la Commissione regionale di valutazione di impatto ambientale ha concesso alla ditta Co.Ve.Ri il via libera a procedere.

L'Ente Parco naturale regionale del fiume Sile non solo non è stato interpellato sulla questione dalle direzioni regionali preposte, ma non ha mai nemmeno ricevuto risposta in merito alle osservazioni avanzate sul progetto. La realizzazione della nuova discarica con il passaggio di autocarri carichi di rifiuti all'interno dell'area protetta comporterà la deturpazione del territorio e un peggioramento della qualità della vita per i cittadini, dato che le acque del Sile per uso idropotabile saranno prelevate a Quarto d'Altino, Venezia, a poca distanza dal punto previsto per l'immissione delle acque della rete idrologica della discarica. Senza contare l'impatto ambientale della nuova discarica sulla Greenway, la rete ciclo-pedonale finanziata dall'Unione europea, che attraversa le province di Treviso, Padova e Venezia e rappresenta oggi una attrattiva turistica fonte di ricchezza per l'economia della zona.

La Commissione:

— è informata dei fatti;

— può riferire se è stata correttamente esperita la procedura di valutazione d'impatto ambientale preventiva (VIA) prevista dalla direttiva 2011/92/UE del 13 dicembre 2011;

— con riferimento alla direttiva 1999/31/CE del Consiglio, non ritiene che la realizzazione della discarica possa interferire con gli obiettivi ambientali e idrogeologici stabiliti a livello comunitario;

— cosa intende fare per assicurare agli abitanti dei territori interessati dal progetto che il patrimonio culturale, il patrimonio naturalistico e quello economico non saranno intaccati da questo intervento?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(8 agosto 2013)

Spetta alle autorità competenti degli Stati membri decidere in merito all'ubicazione delle discariche, assicurando il rispetto delle pertinenti disposizioni della legislazione dell'EU, in particolare la direttiva 2008/98/CE relativa ai rifiuti [1] (la direttiva quadro sui rifiuti), la direttiva 1999/31/CE relativa alle discariche di rifiuti [2] (la «direttiva Discariche») e la direttiva 2011/92/UE concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale di determinati progetti pubblici e privati [3] (la «direttiva VIA»).

Nel caso in oggetto è stata condotta la procedura prevista dalla direttiva VIA, il che fa presumere che le autorità competenti abbiano individuato e valutato i rischi. La Commissione ha chiesto ragguagli alla Regione Veneto circa le modalità di consultazione adottate per questo particolare progetto.

Al momento la Commissione non dispone di alcuna informazione specifica da cui risulti che le autorità italiane competenti abbiano rilasciato un'autorizzazione non conforme alla pertinente legislazione dell'Unione europea.

---

(1) GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.
(2) GU L 182 del 16.7.1999.
(3) GU L 26 del 28.1.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006906/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Co.Ve.Ri landfill in Casale sul Sile, Treviso

Despite the contrary opinion of the municipal administration and the firm opposition of the people, construction continues of the landfill in Lughignano, Treviso, just a few hundred metres from the edge of the River Sile Regional Nature Park. Over the next five years, the new landfill will receive 315 000 tonnes of material: an average of 15 lorries of waste per day.

Despite the opposition to the project expressed by the Treviso provincial council which, in its decision of 30 July 2012, stated that the new landfill was not necessary, and in spite of the fact that the River Sile Regional Nature Park authority, in a letter dated 19 February 2013, announced that the landfill project had never taken the environmental effects into consideration, on 24 April 2013 the regional environmental impact assessment committee gave the company Co.Ve.Ri a green light to proceed.

Not only was the River Sile Regional Nature Park authority not consulted on this issue by the regional directorates with responsibility for this area, but it never even received a reply to the comments it made on the project. The construction of the new landfill, with the trucks loaded with waste transiting within the protected area, will disfigure the area and worsen the quality of life of its residents, given that drinking water from the River Sile will be taken from Quarto d'Altino, in the province of Venice, not far from the location earmarked for the water from the landfill's water system to be discharged. In addition to this, the new landfill will have an environmental impact on the Greenway, the pedestrian/cycle network funded by the European Union, which crosses the provinces of Treviso, Padua and Venice and is now a tourist attraction providing wealth for the area's economy.

— Is the Commission aware of the facts?

— Can it state whether the prior environmental impact assessment (EIA) as laid down in Directive 2011/92/EU of 13 December 2011 has been correctly carried out?

— With reference to Council Directive 1999/31/EC, does the Commission not consider that the construction of the landfill might interfere with the environmental and hydro-geological targets established at EU level?

— What does it intend to do to guarantee to residents that the project will not harm the natural and cultural heritage and economic potential of the area?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2013)

Decisions about the location of landfills are taken by the competent authorities in Member States. They must comply with relevant requirements in EC law, particularly the directive 2008/98/EC on waste ([1]) (the 'Waste Framework Directive'), Directive 1999/31/EC on the landfill of waste ([2]) (the 'Landfill Directive') and Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment ([3]) (the 'EIA Directive').

In this case, a procedure as foreseen in the EIA Directive has been carried out which suggests that competent authorities conducted risk identification and assessment. The Commission has contacted the Veneto Region to obtain information with regard to consultation arrangements for this particular project.

At this stage, the Commission does not have any specific information indicating that the competent Italian authorities issued a permit that is non-compliant with the relevant EU legislation.

([1]) OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([2]) OJ L 182, 16.7.1999.
([3]) OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-006907/13
Komisijai
Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)
(2013 m. birželio 13 d.)

Tema: Atstovavimas valstybėms narėms Jungtiniame G20 finansų ir darbo ministrų susitikime

2013 m. liepos 18 d. Maskvoje vyks Jungtinis G20 finansų ir darbo ministrų susitikimas, kuriame dalyvaus ir ES delegacija.

Užimtumo ir darbo politika Europos Sąjungoje iš esmės priklauso valstybių narių kompetencijai. Kaip Europos Komisija rengiasi užtikrinti, kad šio svarbaus susitikimo metu būtų tinkamai atstovaujama valstybėms narėms ir Europos Sąjungos Tarybai pirmininkaujančiai valstybei narei?

L. Andoro atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2013 m. liepos 25 d.)

Europos Sąjunga yra visateisė G 20 narė, aukščiausio lygio susitikimuose atstovaujama Europos Tarybos Pirmininko Van Rompuy ir Europos Komisijos Pirmininko Barroso. Europos Komisija atstovauja ES G 20 ministrų susitikimuose.

Dėl ankstesnių G 20 užimtumo ministrų susitikimų: Taryba sutarė dėl ES gairių, kuriomis Komisija galėtų vadovautis šių metų liepos mėn. G 20 užimtumo ir darbo ministrų susitikime. Gaires Taryba patvirtino 2013 m. gegužės 29-30 d. (http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/intm/137340.pdf).

Tarybai pirmininkaujanti Airija kreipėsi į G 20 pirmininkaujančią Rusiją dėl galimo Tarybai pirmininkaujančios valstybės dalyvavimo Jungtiniame finansų ir darbo ministrų susitikime; šį klausimą kėlė ir Europos Komisija, siekdama užtikrinti, kad ES būtų deramai atstovaujama šiame svarbiame susitikime.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006907/13
to the Commission
Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Representation of the EU Member States at the Joint G20 Finance and Labour Ministers Meeting

The G20 Finance and Labour Ministers Meeting, which will be attended by a delegation from the EU, will take place in Moscow on 18 July 2013.

Employment and labour policies in the European Union basically fall within the competence of the Member States. How does the European Commission plan to ensure that the Member States and the Member State holding the Presidency of the European Council will be properly represented at this important meeting?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

The European Union is a full member of the G20 and is represented by European Council Presidency Van Rompuy and the European Commission President Barroso at summit level. The European Commission represents the EU at G20 ministerial meetings.

As for previous G20 Employment Ministerials, EU guidelines were agreed by the Council to provide guidance for the Commission's line at this year's G20 Employment and Labour Ministers' meeting in July. These guidelines have been adopted by the Council on 29/30 May 2013
(http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/intm/137340.pdf).

The Russian G-20 Presidency has been contacted by the Irish Council Presidency concerning a possible participation of the Council Presidency at the Joint Finance and Labour Ministers' meeting and the European Commission has also raised the issue so as to ensure that the EU is properly represented at this important meeting.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006908/13
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(13 juni 2013)

Betreft: Mogelijke strijdigheid richtlijn hernieuwbare energie met principe van vrij verkeer van goederen

In een zaak rond de Vlaamse groenestroomcertificaten, geïnitieerd door een geschil tussen energieleveranciers Essent en de Vlaams energieregulator VREG, luidt het advies van de advocaat-generaal van het Europees Hof van Justitie dat het Vlaamse groenestroomcertificatensysteem, hoewel volgens de advocaat-generaal volledig in lijn met de richtlijn hernieuwbare energie van 2001 (2001/77/EG), toch strijdig is met het vrij verkeer van goederen. Als het Hof die redenering volgt, staan alle steunregelingen voor groene stroom in de Europese Unie op de helling. Immers, de Vlaamse weigering om garanties van oorsprong te aanvaarden, als strijdig te zien met het vrij verkeer van goederen, impliceert dat de richtlijn zelf strijdig zou zijn met het vrij verkeer van goederen.

De redenering van de advocaat-generaal lijkt het gevolg van verwarring over het onderscheid tussen groenestroomcertificaten enerzijds en garanties van oorsprong anderzijds. Garanties van oorsprong maken het leveranciers mogelijk om te bewijzen dat de stroom die ze leveren ergens in Europa op een hernieuwbare manier is opgewekt. Groenestroomcertificaten zijn bedoeld als subsidiemechanisme om de binnenlandse productie van groene stroom in Vlaanderen te stimuleren.

Intussen is er weliswaar een nieuwe richtlijn (2009/28/EG), die het onderscheid tussen groenestroomcertificaten en garanties van oorsprong explicieter maakt, maar ook over die nieuwe richtlijn loopt een zaak bij het Europees Hof — niet over het Vlaamse steunmechanisme, maar over het Zweedse. Als de redenering van de advocaat-generaal ook in die zaak wordt doorgetrokken, dreigen alle Europese steunmechanismen onbruikbaar te worden want dan kunnen garanties van oorsprong uit om het even welke lidstaat elders in Europa gebruikt worden om groenestroomsubsidies op te strijken.

1. Is de Commissie zelf ook van oordeel dat er een conflict is tussen de richtlijn hernieuwbare energie en het principe van vrij verkeer van goederen?

2. Welk antwoord werkt de Commissie uit om ervoor te zorgen dat de lidstaten de productie van groene stroom kunnen blijven ondersteunen voor het geval het Hof vaststelt dat er sprake is van strijdigheid met het principe van vrij verkeer van goederen?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(29 juli 2013)

De Commissie wenst te benadrukken dat de conclusie van de advocaat-generaal niet hoeft te worden gevolgd door het Hof van Justitie, en dat de Commissie geen commentaar geeft op lopende zaken bij het Hof voordat uitspraak is gedaan.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006908/13
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Possible conflict between the Renewable Energy Directive and the principle of free movement of goods

In a case concerning Flemish green electricity certificates, arising from a dispute between energy suppliers Essent and the Flemish energy regulator VREG, the opinion of the Advocate-General of the European Court of Justice is that the Flemish green electricity certificate system, while fully in line with the 2001 Renewable Energy Directive (2001/77/EC), conflicts with the freedom of movement of goods. If the Court follows this reasoning, all support measures for green electricity in the European Union are at risk. Regarding the Flanders authorities' refusal to accept guarantees of origin as in conflict with the free movement of goods implies that the directive itself is incompatible with the free movement of goods.

The Advocate-General's reasoning seems to result from a confusion over the difference between green electricity certificates on the one hand and guarantees of origin on the other. Guarantees of origin enable suppliers to prove that the electricity they are supplying was produced from a renewable source somewhere in Europe. Green electricity certificates are intended as a subsidy mechanism to promote domestic production of green electricity in Flanders.

There is now a new directive (2009/28/EC) which draws the distinction between green electricity certificates and guarantees of origin more clearly, but this new directive too is the subject of a case before the European Court of Justice, concerning not the Flemish but the Swedish support mechanism. If the Advocate-General's reasoning is followed in that case too, all European support mechanisms risk becoming unworkable, because that would enable guarantees of origin from any Member State to be used elsewhere in Europe to pocket green electricity subsidies.

1. Does the Commission itself consider that there is a conflict between the Renewable Energy Directive and the principle of the free movement of goods?

2. What response is the Commission preparing so as to ensure that the Member States can continue to support the production of green electricity should the Court of Justice find that there is a conflict with the free movement of goods?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

The Commission wishes to underline that the Advocate-General's Opinion is not binding on the Court of Justice and that the Commission refrains from commenting on pending Court cases prior to the delivery of the judgment.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006909/13
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(13 juni 2013)

Betreft: Bescherming van de Bruinvis

Op 30.5.2012 stelde ik een vraag in verband met de bescherming van de bruinvis door de Belgische overheid (E-005463/2012) en de mate waarin beschermingsmaatregelen, genomen op regionaal Vlaams niveau, volstaan om negatieve gevolgen van visserij op de Bruinvis aan te pakken.

In uw antwoord stelde de Commissie ondermeer het volgende:

„De Commissie heeft geen nadere instructies gegeven wat betreft de termijn waarbinnen dergelijke maatregelen moesten worden genomen, noch wat betreft de minimale inhoud van de uit te werken plannen of maatregelen. Wel is duidelijk dat indien de mortaliteit van bruinvissen ten gevolge van accidentele vangst niet-verwaarloosbaar blijft, zo snel mogelijk alle vereiste maatregelen moeten worden getroffen om verdere accidentele sterfte te vermijden. De Commissie zal de Belgische instanties vragen de situatie toe te lichten”

Een jaar later, verschijnen er berichten in de Vlaamse pers waarin wetenschappers melden dat er in de maanden april en mei een opvallende hoeveelheid dode dieren aanspoelden aan de Belgische kust (bijna dagelijks). Geciteerde mariene biologen leggen daarbij een verband met de impact van visserij door het gebruik van warrelnetten.

1. Wat was het resultaat van de vorig jaar aangekondigde bevraging van de Belgische instanties?

2. Is de Commissie van oordeel dat het hier niet meer gaat om verwaarloosbare mortaliteit van bruinvissen en zo ja, worden er dan stappen overwogen om een betere bescherming af te dwingen?

Antwoord van de heer Potočnik namens de Commissie
(2 augustus 2013)

In 2012 heeft de Commissie na de vraag van het geachte Parlementslid en een klacht met hetzelfde onderwerp de Vlaamse overheid via EU Pilot in juli en november 2012 om verduidelijking gevraagd. Op grond van de in maart 2013 verstrekte informatie heeft de Commissie de klager haar antwoord toegezonden. Het dossier is nog niet gesloten.

Uit de verduidelijkingen van de Vlaamse overheid blijkt dat ondanks haar niet aflatende inspanningen om de doodsoorzaak van de aan de kust aangetroffen dode bruinvissen vast te stellen, bijzonder moeilijk kan worden nagegaan of het aanspoelen van de dode bruinvissen is veroorzaakt door het gebruik van warrelnetten door recreatievissers. Deze netten worden niet vanop schepen op zee maar aan de kust gebruikt en onder bepaalde omstandigheden staan de lokale Vlaamse overheden het gebruik van deze netten nog steeds toe.

Momenteel beschikt de Commissie niet over voldoende bewijsmateriaal voor een duidelijk verband tussen het gebruik van deze warrelnetten door recreatievissers aan de kust en de doodsoorzaak van de aangespoelde bruinvissen die aan de kust worden aangetroffen. De diensten van de Commissie zijn op dit ogenblik recente informatie van de klager aan het onderzoeken. Naar aanleiding van dat onderzoek zal de Commissie een besluit nemen over de passende follow-up voor dit dossier.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006909/13
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Protection of the harbour porpoise

On 30 May 2012 I asked a question on the protection of the harbour porpoise by the Belgian authorities (E-005463/2012) and the extent to which protection measures taken at regional (Flanders) level are adequate to tackle the adverse effects of fishing on the harbour porpoise.

It its answer, the Commission stated:

'The Commission has not issued instructions with regard to the deadline by which such measures should be taken or with regard to the minimum content of the plans or measures to be taken, but it is clear that if accidental killing of harbour porpoises still occurs on a non-negligible scale, all measures required to avoid further accidental killing must be taken as soon as possible. The Commission will ask the Belgian authorities to explain the situation.'

A year later, articles are appearing in the Flemish press in which scientists report that, in April and May 2013, large numbers of dead animals were washed up on the Belgian coast, at a rate of nearly one per day. The marine biologists who are quoted link this to the impact of fishing with gillnets.

1. What was the outcome of the Commission's questioning of the Belgian authorities, which it said last year that it would carry out?

2. Does the Commission believe that the scale of porpoise mortality is no longer negligible, and if so, is it considering measures to enforce better protection?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

In 2012 following the Honourable Member's question and a complaint on the same issue, the Commission asked via the EU Pilot mechanism in July and November 2012 the Flemish Authorities for clarification. On the basis of the information provided in March 2013, the Commission sent a reply to the complainant. The file is still open.

The clarifications given by the Flemish authorities indicate that, although they continue efforts to identify the death cause of porpoises found dead on the beach, it is very difficult to ascertain whether strandings of dead porpoises are as a result of being caught in gill nets used by recreational fishermen. These nets are not deployed from vessels at sea but on beaches and under certain circumstances are still allowed by the local Flemish authorities.

At present the Commission does not dispose of sufficient evidence of a clear link between the use of these gill nets by the recreational fishermen operating from beaches and the cause of death of porpoises found washed up on beaches. However, the services are currently assessing recent information provided by the complainant. Following that assessment the Commission will decide the appropriate follow up to the file.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006911/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(13 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Ameaça da China à exportação do vinho português

Considerando que:

A China reagiu recentemente às novas taxas europeias contra as suas exportações de painéis solares com o anúncio de uma investigação que poderá levar ao agravamento dos direitos de entrada dos vinhos europeus no seu território;

A reação chinesa, através da sua possível retaliação comercial, poderá afetar a exportação dos vinhos europeus, e nomeadamente dos vinhos portugueses, num momento em que a faturação das exportações para a China duplicou em apenas dois anos e em que a China representa cerca de 11 milhões de euros por ano;

O mercado chinês é um mercado cheio de potencial e tem sido uma grande aposta, nos últimos anos, da exportação portuguesa, sendo já um mercado prioritário, mas que se vê ameaçado, face à intenção demonstrada de uma retaliação e do anúncio de uma investigação por práticas comerciais desleais do lado da UE, como dumping e subsídios;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais os desenvolvimentos futuros que antevê quanto a esta situação no que respeita ao impacto nas produções e no emprego ao nível nacional?

2. Qual a estratégia da Comissão quanto à salvaguarda dos interesses dos produtores de vinho nos Estados-Membros e do seu respetivo regime, ao abrigo das normas agrícolas europeias, caso a relação comercial se complique?

3. Como pretende a Comissão evitar que aqueles saiam penalizados de toda esta situação para a qual não contribuíram?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(7 de agosto de 2013)

A China deu início efetivamente, em 1 de julho de 2013, a um inquérito *anti-dumping* e antissubvenções contra as importações de vinhos provenientes da União Europeia na sequência de uma denúncia apresentada pela indústria vinícola chinesa, alegando que o setor sofre de importações efetuadas em condições desleais.

A Comissão está ciente da importância desta questão para a indústria vinícola europeia. Contudo, é impossível, nesta fase, avaliar o impacto na produção e no emprego da UE, uma vez que tal dependerá do resultado do inquérito.

A China, como qualquer outro membro da Organização Mundial do Comércio (OMC), tem o direito de lançar um inquérito em matéria de defesa comercial ao abrigo das regras da OMC, caso tenha recebido uma denúncia devidamente justificada da sua indústria. A China é, no entanto, obrigada a seguir escrupulosamente as regras da OMC pertinentes. A Comissão acompanhará de perto o inquérito e intervirá adequadamente, sempre que necessário, a fim de assegurar que essas regras são respeitadas. Caso viesse a concluir que a China não tinha cumprido escrupulosamente as regras aplicáveis, a Comissão não hesitaria em defender os interesses da União Europeia.

Entretanto, a Comissão presta assistência e aconselhamento à indústria vinícola da UE no que respeita à defesa dos seus interesses objeto de inquérito.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006911/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: The Chinese threat to Portuguese wine exports

Recently China reacted to new EU taxes applied to its solar panel exports by announcing an investigation that could lead to barriers to EU wines entering its territory.

The possible trade retaliation by China could affect the export of EU wines, and particularly Portuguese wines, just as income from exports to China has doubled in only two years to about EUR 11 million per year.

The Chinese market is full of potential. In recent years, Portuguese exporters have invested significantly in it as a priority market, but this is threatened by the clear intention to retaliate and the announcement of an investigation of unfair trade practices, such as dumping and subsidies, on the part of the EU.

1. What impact does the Commission foresee this situation having on national production and employment?

2. How will the Commission safeguard the interests of wine producers in Member States and the associated regime, under EU farming standards, if the trade relationship becomes difficult?

3. How does the Commission intend to prevent producers from being penalised in this situation, which is not of their making?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2013)

China has indeed initiated on 1st July 2013 a joint anti-dumping and anti-subsidy investigation against imports of wine from the European Union as a result of a complaint lodged by the Chinese wine industry alleging that the sector suffers from unfairly traded imports.

The Commission is aware of the importance of this issue for the European wine industry. It is however impossible at this stage to assess the impact on EU production and employment because that will depend on the outcome of the investigation.

China, as any other Member of the World Trade Organisation (WTO), has the right to launch a trade defence investigation under WTO rules if it has received a duly justified complaint from its industry. China is however obliged to strictly follow the relevant WTO rules. The Commission will closely monitor the investigation and duly intervene where necessary in order to ensure that these rules are respected. If the Commission reached a conclusion that China did not strictly comply with the applicable rules, it would not hesitate to take action to defend the interests of the European Union.

In the meantime, the Commission assists and advises the EU wine industry in the defence of its interests subject to the investigation.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006913/13
to the Commission
Gerard Batten (EFD)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Right to legal aid for migrant workers under Council Directive 2003/8/EC

In the event that a person domiciled or habitually resident in a Member State who seeks to exercise his or her right to free movement under the Treaties by moving to another Member State is (1) refused benefits equal to those received by residents in that Member State and (2) is then refused legal aid to pursue legal action to secure those benefits, does the Commission consider that this person has a right to legal aid under Article 3(1) of Council Directive 2003/8/EC of 27 January 2003?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(30 July 2013)

The question whether this person would have a right to legal aid under Article 3(1) of Council Directive 2003/8/EC of 27 January 2003 would be dependent on the one hand on whether this person is domiciled or habitually resident and on the other hand on the court of which Member State the claim is filed.

The Honourable Member might be aware that Directive 2003/8/EC of 27 January 2003 gives the right to legal aid in cross-border cases. According to Article 2 of the directive a cross-border dispute is one where the party applying for legal aid is domiciled or habitually resident in a Member State other than the Member State where the court is sitting or where the decision is to be enforced.

Therefore, if the migrant worker has his domicile and his habitual residence in the Member State he or she moved to and filed the claim in a court of this Member State, he/she would not be entitled to legal aid under Directive 2003/8/EC of 27 January 2003 as the case would not be considered as a cross-border case in the sense of Article 2 of the directive. However, this does not prevent the person from applying for legal aid according to the national law of the Member State concerned, in the same way as nationals of that Member State could do. In granting legal aid on the basis of national law Member States should not discriminate on the ground of nationality.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-006914/13
Komisijai
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(2013 m. birželio 13 d.)

Tema: Galimybės finansuoti Laisvės aikštės Vilniuje rekonstrukciją ES lėšomis

Laisvės aikštė (taip pat vadinama Lukiškių aikšte) yra viena didžiausių viešųjų erdvių Vilniaus miesto centre. Šimtmečiais aikštė buvo viena iš svarbiausių viešųjų susibūrimo vietų, joje vykdavo demonstracijos ir tradiciniai renginiai, pavyzdžiui, Kaziuko mugė. Aikštė labai vertinga istoriškai, kadangi joje 19-ojo amžiaus pabaigoje įvykdyta mirties bausmė Lietuvos ir Lenkijos sukilimo vadovams. 20-ajame amžiuje čia pat, NKVD ir KGB kalėjime, nukankinta ir nužudyta daug politinių kalinių.

Tačiau nugriovus Lenino paminklą per pastaruosius du dešimtmečius ši svarbi viešoji erdvė neteko visuomeninės reikšmės. Aikštės pertvarkymo darbai ir šios erdvės rekonstrukcija siekiant ją pritaikyti visuomenės reikmėms nevykdomi dėl biudžeto apribojimų ir viešojo finansavimo trūkumo.

Ar Komisija, atsižvelgdama į minėtus faktus, galėtų konkrečiai nurodyti, ar yra galimybių ES lėšomis tiesiogiai ar netiesiogiai finansuoti šios viešosios erdvės rekonstrukciją?

J. Hahno atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2013 m. rugpjūčio 5 d.)

Šiuo metu galiojančioje reglamentavimo sistemoje numatytos galimybės teikti Europos regioninės plėtros fondo (ERDF) paramą nurodyto pobūdžio veiklai. Tačiau verta atkreipti dėmesį į tai, kad pagal pasidalijamojo valdymo principą, taikomą administruojant sanglaudos politiką, konkrečios ERDF tinkamumo kriterijų taisyklės ir sprendimai dėl atrankos kriterijų bei finansuojamų projektų priklauso Lietuvos valdžios institucijų kompetencijai. Todėl Lietuva turi spręsti, kokios būtent investicijos geriausiai atitinka šalies vystymosi strategiją, nustatytus prioritetus ir konkrečius ERDF paramos Lietuvai programose apibrėžtus tikslus.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006914/13
to the Commission
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Possible EU funding for the rehabilitation of Freedom Square in Vilnius

Freedom Square (also called Lukiškių) is one of the biggest public spaces in Vilnius city centre. For centuries, the square was one of the main public gathering spaces for demonstrations and traditional events, such as the Kaziukas fair. The square is of highly significant historical value, as it was here, at the end of 19th century, that leaders of the Lithuanian-Polish uprising were executed, and it was here, in the 20th century, that many political prisoners were tortured and killed at an NKVD-KGB detention facility.

However, following the demolition of the Lenin monument, this central public space has dropped out of the social landscape in the past two decades. Reconstruction work on the square and rehabilitation of this space for public use are not moving forward due to budgetary constraints and lack of public funding.

In view of the above, could the Commission specify whether there is any direct or indirect EU funding available for the rehabilitation of this public space?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

The current regulatory framework does not exclude support from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) for the type of activities described. It should nevertheless be noted that, in line with the shared management principle used for the administration of cohesion policy, the specific rules on the eligibility of ERDF expenditure, as well as the decisions on selection criteria and projects to be financed, fall within the competence of the Lithuanian authorities. It is therefore for Lithuania to decide which particular investments best serve the country's development strategy, the set of priorities and their specific targets as defined in the programmes for ERDF support in Lithuania.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006915/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: EU investigation into alleged manipulation of oil prices

On 14 May 2013, the Commission carried out on-the-spot inspections at the premises of three major EU oil producers and one Price Reporting Agency (PRA) to investigate allegations that they intentionally distorted the reporting of oil trading prices, thus manipulating the published prices. If the allegations are proven to be true, it is possible that this activity could have negatively impacted the price paid for fuel at the pump by EU consumers for a considerable period of time.

Can the Commission please provide an update as to the status, scope and potential impact of the ongoing investigation into alleged oil price manipulation?

What steps are being taken at EU level to tackle the causes of high prices for fuel, including petrol and diesel, across Member States, especially in light of the constraints already placed on citizens by the economic downturn?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2013)

The Commission's investigation in the crude oil, refined oil products and biofuels sectors is at an early stage. The Commission is currently analysing the information gathered from the undertakings concerned, which includes the companies that were subject to the Commission's unannounced inspections ([1]) and numerous companies that were addressees of requests for information. It is therefore too early to draw conclusions about the findings of the investigation.

With regard to scope and potential impact of the investigation, the Commission has concerns that the companies may have colluded in reporting distorted prices to a Price Reporting Agency to manipulate the published prices for a number of oil and biofuel products, and that the companies may have prevented others from participating in the price assessment process, with a view to distorting published prices. Even small distortions of assessed prices may have a significant impact on the prices of crude oil, refined oil products and biofuels purchases and sales, potentially harming final consumers.

The Commission will seek to finalise the investigation as quickly as possible. The duration of the proceedings depends on a number of factors, including the complexity of the case, the extent to which the undertakings concerned cooperate with the Commission and the exercise of the rights of defence.

The present investigation is a concrete step taken at EU level which could contribute to tackling the causes of high fuel prices in the EU.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-435_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006916/13
à la Commission
Louis Michel (ALDE) et Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 juin 2013)

Objet: Financement de la Stratégie européenne pour un Internet mieux adapté aux enfants au sein du programme «Connecting Europe Facility 2014-2020»

Au cours de ces dernières années, la Commission a soutenu, via le Safer Internet Programme, la protection des enfants en ligne au sein des États membres. Elle les a encouragés à adopter un usage sûr et responsable des technologies de l'information et de la communication, par le biais d'activités de prévention et de sensibilisation des citoyens, ainsi qu'en luttant contre les images d'abus sexuels et d'exploitation sexuelle en ligne. La continuité de ce programme devrait être assurée au sein du «Connecting Europe Facility» par le biais de la Stratégie européenne pour un Internet mieux adapté aux enfants (COM(2012)196 final).

Or, la nouvelle proposition de la Commission relative aux lignes de conduite concernant le «Connecting Europe Facility» ne se réfère que très discrètement à cette stratégie européenne et ce tant au niveau de ses activités en lien avec la sécurité en ligne qu'en ce qui concerne le budget qui serait alloué à ces activités.

Bien que ces nouvelles lignes directrices mentionnent une plateforme européenne d'outils de prévention, aucune mention n'est faite des centres nationaux pour la sécurité en ligne qui assurent la distribution de ces outils. De plus, le budget total dédié pour les «hauts débits et services numériques» a été revu à la baisse par le Conseil de 9,2 milliards à 1 milliard, soit une réduction de 92 %. Aucun fonds ne serait donc alloué aux services génériques, parmi lesquels se retrouveraient les centres nationaux pour la sécurité en ligne, ce qui mettrait en péril leurs activités de prévention et de protection des enfants.

Au vu de ces informations, comment la Commission peut-elle assurer la mise en œuvre de la Stratégie européenne pour un Internet mieux adapté aux enfants sans allouer de manière officielle un budget à la mise en œuvre de ces objectifs?

Serait-il possible d'allouer également un budget à tous les centres nationaux pour la sécurité en ligne (disposant d'un *awareness centre*, d'une *helpline* et d'une *hotline*) en plus des plateformes européennes INSAFE/INHOPE qui assurent la mise en œuvre des objectifs, la prévention et la protection de nos enfants?

Réponse donnée par Mme Kroes au nom de la Commission
(31 juillet 2013)

La communication de la Commission relative à une stratégie européenne pour un Internet mieux adapté aux enfants s'appuie, pour atteindre ses objectifs, sur une combinaison de méthodes et d'instruments, dont certaines mesures prises par les États membres, ou encore, des partenariats avec l'industrie. La Commission collabore d'ailleurs étroitement avec cette dernière grâce au travail de la coalition des PDG d'entreprises de premier plan vouées aux médias et aux technologies : il s'agit de constituer une vaste plate-forme des parties prenantes qui œuvrerait à la sécurité des enfants sur l'Internet. La stratégie européenne invite aussi les États membres à intensifier les actions qu'ils mènent à leur propre niveau, y compris sur le triple plan de la sensibilisation, des lignes d'assistance et du signalement de contenus illicites.

Dans le contexte de l'accord politique sur le cadre financier pluriannuel (CFP) et, singulièrement, du Mécanisme pour l'interconnexion en Europe, la version révisée de la proposition de règlement au sujet des orientations pour les réseaux transeuropéens de télécommunications définit les critères à respecter en matière d'établissement de priorités et d'admissibilité pour les services numériques. Comme le soulignent les auteurs de la question, une distinction est faite entre les plates-formes de base, qui sont prioritaires, et les services génériques. Cela n'exclut pas *de facto* la possibilité d'allouer des fonds aux services génériques, expression qui désigne, dans la proposition d'infrastructures plus sûres pour les services numériques sur l'Internet, les services fournis par les centres nationaux pour un Internet plus sûr.

Il est notoire que ces centres, dont le financement est assuré jusqu'à la mi-2014 au moins, apportent une contribution importante — à l'échelon national, certes, mais aussi à celui de l'Union européenne — aux activités de réseau en cours dans le domaine de la sensibilisation, des lignes d'assistance et des lignes directes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006916/13
to the Commission
Louis Michel (ALDE) and Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 June 2013)

Subject: Funding for the European strategy for a Better Internet for Children under the 'Connecting Europe Facility 2014-2020' programme

The Commission has supported online child protection in the Member States via the Safer Internet Programme over recent years. It has encouraged them to make safe and responsible use of information and communication technologies, through preventive and public awareness-raising activities and by combating images of sexual abuse and sexual exploitation online. Continuity of this programme should be safeguarded under the 'Connecting Europe Facility', through the European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children (COM(2012) 196 final).

The new Commission proposal on courses of action for the 'Connecting Europe Facility' only refers very discreetly to this European strategy, both at the level of its activities in connection with online security and concerning the budget that would be allocated to such activities.

Although these new guidelines refer to a European platform of preventive tools, no mention is made of the national centres for online security responsible for distributing such tools. Moreover, the total budget earmarked for 'broadband and digital services' has been revised downwards by the Council by 92%, from EUR 9.2 billion to 1 billion. No funds would therefore be allocated to generic services, which would include national centres for online security, thereby putting their preventive and child protection activities at risk.

In light of this information, how can the Commission guarantee the implementation of the European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children, without officially allocating a budget for the implementation of those objectives?

Would it be possible to also allocate a budget to all the national centres for online security (which have an awareness centre, a helpline and a hotline) in addition to the European INSAFE/INHOPE platforms that safeguard the implementation of the objectives of prevention and protection of our children?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

The communication of the Commission on a European Strategy for a better Internet for children relies on a mix of approaches and instruments to reach its objectives, including actions by the Member States and partnerships with industry. In that respect, the Commission has been working closely with industry through the work of the CEO Coalition of top technology and media companies in order to make a broad stakeholder platform for child online safety. In the strategy Member States are also asked to step up their support at national level — including for awareness raising, helplines and reporting illegal content.

In the context of the political agreement on Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF), particularly with respect to the Connecting Europe Facility, the Commission's revised proposal for a regulation on guidelines for trans-European telecommunications networks sets out the necessary criteria for prioritisation and eligibility of the digital services. As pointed out, there is a distinction made between core platforms and generic services with priority to the core platforms. This does not de facto exclude the possibility of funding generic services which, in the context of the proposed Safer Internet digital service infrastructure, refer to the services carried out currently by the national Safer Internet Centres.

The national Safer Internet Centres, which are currently funded until at least mid 2014, are recognised as making an important contribution not only at national level but at EU level to the network activities currently carried out, regarding awareness raising, helplines and hotlines.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-006917/13
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(14 juin 2013)

Objet: Fermeture de la télévision publique grecque

La fermeture de la seule station de radiotélévision publique, Ellinikí Radiofonía Tileórasi (ERT), le 11 juin dernier, a provoqué une profonde réaction d'indignation face à la décision du gouvernement grec, sur recommandation de la troïka, à laquelle participe la Commission européenne, imposant des coupes dans les organismes publics en application des politiques d'austérité.

Les télévisions publiques constituent un atout essentiel pour la diffusion de la culture, le pluralisme des médias et la démocratie.

Cette décision prise par le gouvernement grec a finalement été publiée au Journal officiel sans consultation des organisations syndicales, ni du parlement J'ai noté que la Commission a répondu qu'elle «prenait acte» de ladite décision. Ceci sous-entend donc qu'elle approuve.

Par ailleurs, l'Union européenne de radiotélévision (UER), institution établie à Genève qui regroupe les chaînes publiques de 56 pays européens et méditerranéens, a appelé à l'annulation immédiate de cette décision de fermer toutes les chaînes publiques du pays.

1. Quel a été le rôle de la Commission, en tant que membre de la troïka, dans cette décision qui ne semble pas conforme à l'article 11 sur la liberté d'expression et d'information de la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne?

2. Au nom des valeurs portées par la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne, qui garantit le pluralisme des idées et des médias, la Commission compte-t-elle demander au gouvernement de la Grèce d'annuler cette décision?

Réponse donnée par M. Rehn au nom de la Commission
(2 juillet 2013)

La Commission renvoie l'auteur de la question à sa déclaration sur la fermeture de la radio-télévision publique grecque (ERT), publiée le 12 juin (MEMO/13/545). Elle souhaiterait souligner que les autorités helléniques ont décidé de manière complètement autonome de fermer l'ERT.

La Commission n'a pas demandé la fermeture de l'ERT; cependant, elle ne remet pas en question le pouvoir de gestion dont dispose le gouvernement grec dans le secteur public. Il convient de considérer la décision des autorités grecques au regard des efforts importants et nécessaires que celles-ci consentent pour moderniser l'économie nationale et, notamment, pour rendre le secteur public moins coûteux et plus performant.

La Commission considère que les services publics de radio et de télédiffusion font partie intégrante de la démocratie européenne. Le traité établit clairement que la gestion de ces services et les choix stratégiques qui s'y rapportent relèvent de la compétence des États membres. Par conséquent, bien que la Commission ne puisse dicter aux États membres la manière d'organiser leurs services publics de radio et de télévision, elle aimerait rappeler le rôle que jouent ces services, quelle que soit la situation économique du pays, pour les valeurs européennes et, partant, pour le respect du pluralisme, de la liberté et de la qualité des médias, ainsi que pour l'expression de la diversité culturelle. La Commission se réjouit dès lors que le gouvernement grec veuille mettre en place, dans le secteur des médias, une structure économiquement viable et apte à remplir l'importante mission de service public qui lui incombe.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006917/13
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Closure of Greek State TV station

The closure of Greece's only public broadcasting station, *Ellinikí Radiofonía Tileórasi* (ERT), on 11 June has triggered a storm of outrage at the decision taken by the Greek Government on the recommendation of the troika, which includes the Commission, as part of cuts in the funding of public bodies under the austerity policies.

Public television is a key asset for the dissemination of culture, media pluralism and democracy.

This decision by the Greek Government was finally published in the official government journal without consultation with the unions or with Parliament. I have noted that the Commission responded, stating that it had 'taken note' of the decision. This implies that it approved the decision.

Moreover, the European Broadcasting Union (EBU), an institution based in Geneva which brings together the public stations of 56 European and Mediterranean countries, has called for the immediate revocation of this decision to close the only public broadcaster in the country.

1. What has been the role of the Commission, as a member of the troika, in this decision which appears to be incompatible with Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the Union European on freedom of expression and information?

2. In the name of the values embodied in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, which guarantees the pluralism of ideas and the media, does the Commission intend to ask the Greek Government to revoke this decision?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its statement on the closure of the Hellenic Broadcasting Corporation published on 12 June (MEMO/13/545). The Commission would like to highlight that the decision by the Greek authorities to close down the Hellenic Broadcasting Corporation (ERT) was taken in full autonomy.

The Commission has not sought the closure of ERT, but nor does the Commission question the Greek Government's mandate to manage the public sector. The decision of the Greek authorities should be seen in the context of the major and necessary efforts that the authorities are taking to modernise the Greek economy. Those include improving the efficiency and effectiveness of its public sector.

The Commission supports the role of public broadcasting as an integral part of European democracy. The Treaty makes it clear that the governance and strategic choices on public service broadcasting lie with Member States. So while the Commission cannot prescribe Member States how to organise their public service broadcaster, we would like to highlight the role of public service broadcasters regarding European values in all economic circumstances, for the sake of media pluralism, media freedom and media quality and for the expression of cultural diversity. The Commission therefore welcomes the commitment of the Greek Government to launch a media actor that fulfils the important role of public broadcasting and is financially sustainable.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande P-006918/13
till kommissionen
Åsa Westlund (S&D)
(14 juni 2013)

Angående: Förbud mot bisfenol A i kontakt med livsmedel

Den hormonstörande kemikalien bisfenol A är ett av de mest undersökta hormonstörande ämnena. I studie efter studie påvisas dess negativa egenskaper för människors hälsa. Den 12 juni 2013 presenterade ett kinesiskt forskarteam undersökningen *Urine Bisphenol-A Level in Relation to Obesity and Overweight in School-Age Children*, som visar på ett samband mellan bisfenol A och fetma och övervikt hos flickor ([1]).

Bisfenol A är vanligt förekommande i plast, matförpackningar och i olika typer av produkter som kommer i kontakt med livsmedel. Mat är den viktigaste exponeringskällan för bisfenol A. Det finns tillräckligt många skäl till oro, och det är dags att agera efter försiktighetsprincipen när det gäller bisfenol A.

Ämnar kommissionen lägga fram ett snabbt förslag som förbjuder bisfenol A i produkter som kommer i kontakt med livsmedel?

Svar från Tonio Borg på kommissionens vägnar
(2 juli 2013)

Europeiska myndigheten för livsmedelssäkerhet (Efsa) förväntas anta ett yttrande under andra kvartalet 2014. Efter det kommer kommissionen att fatta beslut om nationella åtgärder och eventuellt se över användningen av bisfenol A i material som kommer i kontakt med livsmedel.

([1]) http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371 %2Fjournal.pone.0065399

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006918/13
to the Commission
Åsa Westlund (S&D)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Ban on bisphenol A in contact with food

The hormone-disrupting chemical bisphenol A is one of the most studied endocrine disrupters. Its negative properties for human health have been demonstrated in study after study. On 12 June 2013, a Chinese research team presented a survey entitled '*Urine Bisphenol-A Level in Relation to Obesity and Overweight in School-Age Children*', which found an association between bisphenol A and obesity and overweight in girls ([1]).

Bisphenol A is commonly found in plastics, in food packaging and in different types of products that come into contact with food. Food is the main source of exposure to bisphenol A. There are more than enough reasons for concern, and it is now time to act in accordance with the precautionary principle with respect to bisphenol A.

Does the Commission intend to come up soon with a proposal to ban bisphenol A in products that come into contact with food?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 2013)

The Commission awaits the EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) opinion expected to be published in the second quarter of 2014 before taking a decision on the national measures and a possible revision of the status of Bisphenol A as food contact material.

([1]) http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0065399.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-006919/13
til Kommissionen
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(14. juni 2013)

Om: EU's patentdomstol

Som bekendt er der en vis debat i Danmark om dansk deltagelse i den kommende fælles EU Patentdomstol. Et af de emner der bliver diskuteret, er spørgsmålet om »forum-shopping«.

Kan Kommissionen bekræfte, at det med dansk deltagelse i Patentdomstolen vil være muligt for danske virksomheder, som mener, at deres patent bliver krænket, at føre denne håndhævelsessag ved en dansk domstol?

Kan Kommissionen desuden redegøre for, under hvilke forudsætninger retssagen vil skulle køres på lokalsproget og under hvilke forudsætninger den vil skulle køres på ét af de 3 hovedsprog (engelsk, tysk fransk)?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Michel Barnier
(7. august 2013)

Kommissionen ønsker at præcisere, at aftalen om en fælles patentdomstol er en mellemstatslig aftale mellem medlemsstaterne.

Hvis Danmark ratificerer aftalen, skal de danske myndigheder afgøre, om man vil oprette en lokal afdeling i Danmark, deltage i en regional afdeling med andre medlemsstater eller undlade at oprette en afdeling.

På grundlag af aftalen kan sager om krænkelse af europæiske patenter eller enhedspatenter generelt anlægges ved den lokale (eller regionale) afdeling i den kontraherende medlemsstat, hvor krænkelsen har fundet sted, eller hvor sagsøgte har hjemsted. Hvis de danske myndigheder således beslutter at oprette en lokal afdeling, kan virksomheder anlægge sag om krænkelse ved den danske afdeling, forudsat at krænkelsen har fundet sted i Danmark eller at sagsøgte har hjemsted i Danmark. Sager om krænkelse af nationale patenter vil stadig høre under de nationale domstoles kompetenceområde.

Proceduresproget ved en dansk lokal afdeling vil i princippet være dansk. Proceduresproget vil dog være det sprog, som patentet er udstedt på, hvis parterne enes herom, eller hvis retspræsidenten for Retten i Første Instans i særlige tilfælde efter anmodning fra en af parterne og efter høring af de øvrige parter og det kompetente panel træffer afgørelse herom ud fra rimelighedshensyn og i betragtning af alle relevante omstændigheder. I dette særlige tilfælde kan det være nødvendigt at sørge for oversættelse og tolkning.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006919/13
to the Commission
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: EU Patent Court

There is some debate in Denmark regarding Denmark's participation in the future Unified EU Patent Court. One of the topics discussed is the issue of 'forum shopping'.

Can the Commission confirm that if Denmark participates in the Patent Court, it will be possible for Danish companies which believe their patent to have been infringed to bring this enforcement case before a Danish court?

Can the Commission also explain under which conditions the case would be conducted in the local language and under which conditions it would be conducted in one of the 3 main languages (English, German, French)?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2013)

The Commission would like to clarify first that the Agreement on the Unified Patent Court is an intergovernmental agreement between Member States.

If Denmark ratifies the Agreement, Denmark will have to decide whether to set up a local division in Denmark, participate in a regional division with other Member States or not to set up any division.

On the basis of the Agreement, actions on infringement of European patents and European patents with unitary effect generally have to be brought either before the local (or regional) division of the Contracting Member State where the infringement occurs or in the local division where the defendant has its residence or place of business. Thus, if Denmark decides to set up a local division Danish companies may bring infringement actions before the Danish division provided that either the infringement has occurred in Denmark or the defendant is resident/has his place of business in Denmark. In any case, the actions on infringement of national patents will stay in the competence of national courts.

The language of proceedings at a Danish local division will in principle be Danish. Yet, the language of proceedings will be the one in which the patent is granted if either the parties agree to that or if in exceptional cases, at the request of one of the parties and after having heard the other parties and the competent panel, the President of the Court of First Instance, on grounds of fairness and taking into account all relevant circumstances, takes a decision. In this case specific translation and interpretation arrangements may need to be provided.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006925/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(14 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Εταιρική κοινωνική ευθύνη στην ΕΕ και στον κόσμο

Σύμφωνα με τα ευρήματα της έρευνας του Ευρωβαρόμετρου υπό τον τίτλο «Πως οι επιχειρήσεις επηρεάζουν την κοινωνία μας» ([1]), αποδεικνύεται ότι μόλις 52% πιστεύουν πως ο αντίκτυπος των επιχειρήσεων στην κοινωνία είναι θετικός όταν το 41% τον θεωρεί αρνητικό. Την ίδια στιγμή, το ποσοστό ερωτηθέντων που διατηρεί θετική άποψη στο σχετικό ερώτημα είναι σημαντικά υψηλότερο στις αναπτυσσόμενες οικονομίες. Παράλληλα, οι ευρωπαίοι ερωτηθέντες θεωρούν κατά 71% πως οι μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις επιδεικνύουν κοινωνικά υπεύθυνη συμπεριφορά όταν το ανάλογο ποσοστό για τις μεγάλες επιχειρήσεις βρίσκεται στο 48%. Τέλος, οι ευρωπαίοι αν και κατά 79% ενδιαφέρονται για τον κοινωνικό αντίκτυπο της δράσης των εταιρειών μόλις το 36% νιώθουν πληροφορημένοι σε αντίθεση με τους ερωτηθέντες σε χώρες εκτός ΕΕ που διαθέτουν σημαντικά μεγαλύτερη πληροφόρηση. Δεδομένης της σημασίας της εταιρικής κοινωνικής ευθύνης (ΕΚΕ) για τη στρατηγική Ευρώπη 2020 και τη βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη ([2]) αλλά και δεδομένων των παραπάνω στοιχείων ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

α) Πώς αξιολογεί τα στοιχεία αυτά και πως αντιμετωπίζει τις σημαντικές αποκλίσεις μεταξύ ΕΕ και υπολοίπων χωρών (Βραζιλία 74%, Κίνα 65%, Ινδία 62%) σχετικά με την κοινωνική αντίληψη των εταιρικών δράσεων; Ποιος ο αντίκτυπος της απόκλισης στην επιχειρηματική δραστηριότητα σε παγκόσμιο επίπεδο;

β) Πώς αντιμετωπίζει και τη σημαντική διάσταση της κοινωνικής αντίληψης στο εσωτερικό της ΕΕ, καθώς τα ποσοστά θετικής αντίληψης για τις εταιρικές δραστηριότητες κυμαίνονται από 36% στην Ιταλία έως 85% στη Δανία; Πως επηρεάζει η απόκλιση αυτή τη λειτουργία της ενιαίας αγοράς;

γ) Πώς κρίνει την πρόοδο στους 8 άξονες πολιτικών ([3]) για την ΕΚΕ για την περίοδο 2011-2014 και πότε θα παρουσιάσει την αναμενόμενη έκθεση αξιολόγησης τους;

Απάντηση του κ. Tajani εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Ιουλίου 2013)

Η στρατηγική της ΕΕ για την εταιρική κοινωνική ευθύνη (ΕΚΕ) — θεματολόγιο δράσης για την περίοδο 2011-2014 — εναρμονίζεται με τις κατευθυντήριες γραμμές και αρχές που έχουν συμφωνηθεί σε παγκόσμιο επίπεδο, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των κατευθυντήριων αρχών των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για τις επιχειρήσεις και τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και τις κατευθυντήριες γραμμές του ΟΟΣΑ για τις πολυεθνικές επιχειρήσεις. Αυτό θα βοηθήσει να εξασφαλιστεί ότι οι εταιρείες θα έχουν παρόμοιες προσδοκίες είτε λειτουργούν στην ΕΕ είτε αλλού.

Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι η εφαρμογή των πολιτικών ΕΚΕ στις βασικές επιχειρηματικές στρατηγικές των εταιρειών θα συμβάλλει στην αύξηση της εμπιστοσύνης στον επιχειρηματικό κλάδο. Ως εκ τούτου, τα πορίσματα της έρευνας του Ευρωβαρομέτρου μπορούν να δώσουν κίνητρα στις εταιρείες να εφαρμόσουν στρατηγικές εταιρικής κοινωνικής ευθύνης (ΕΚΕ). Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει πληροφορίες σχετικά με τυχόν περαιτέρω επιπτώσεις των αποκλίσεων στις αντιλήψεις γύρω από την επιρροή των επιχειρήσεων, είτε εντός Ευρώπης και της ενιαίας ευρωπαϊκής αγοράς, είτε εκτός Ευρώπης στις επιχειρηματικές δραστηριότητες των ευρωπαϊκών εταιρειών.

Για την καλύτερη προβολή της ΕΚΕ και την προώθηση και διάδοση των ορθών πρακτικών της, δημιουργήθηκε ένα ευρωπαϊκό βραβείο για τις συμπράξεις επιχειρήσεων και των ενδιαφερόμενων μερών. Η λογική πίσω από το βραβείο αυτό βασίζεται σε παρόμοια προγράμματα απονομής βραβείων στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ. Η πρώτη τελετή απονομής ευρωπαϊκών βραβείων ΕΚΕ πραγματοποιήθηκε στις Βρυξέλλες στις 25 Ιουνίου 2013 στην οποία βραβεύτηκαν 60 ευρωπαϊκές επιχειρήσεις για την αριστεία τους στον τομέα της ΕΚΕ.

Επιπλέον, στο σχέδιο δράσης για την επιχειρηματικότητα το 2020 που εγκρίθηκε πρόσφατα, η Επιτροπή αναγνώρισε τη σημασία της ενημέρωσης και της αναγνώρισης των επιχειρηματιών για τη δημιουργία θετικών επιχειρηματικών προτύπων, ιδίως για τους νέους.

---

(1) http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_363_en.pdf
(2) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0681:FIN:EN:PDF
(3) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-11-730_en.htm?locale=en

Όπως αναφέρεται στην ανακοίνωση της ΕΚΕ, η Επιτροπή σχεδιάζει συνεδρίαση απολογισμού κατά το 2ο εξάμηνο του 2014 με συμμετέχοντες το πολυμερές ευρωπαϊκό φόρουμ για την εταιρική κοινωνική ευθύνη και τα κράτη μέλη, όπου θα συζητηθεί η πρόοδος που έχει σημειωθεί και θα εξετασθεί το ενδεχόμενο επακόλουθων πρωτοβουλιών.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006925/13
to the Commission
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Corporate Social Responsibility in the EU and the world

According to the findings of a Eurobarometer survey entitled 'How Companies Influence Our Society' ([1]), just 52% of respondents believe that the impact of companies on society is positive, compared to 41% who see it as negative. At the same time, the percentage of respondents who reply in the affirmative to the question is significantly higher in emerging economies. At the same time, 71% of European respondents believe that SMEs exhibit socially responsible behaviour, compared to a figure of 48% for large companies. Finally, while 79% of Europeans are interested in the social impact of the action of companies, just 36% feel well-informed; this contrasts with respondents in countries outside the EU where citizens are significantly better informed. Given the importance of corporate social responsibility (CSR) for the Europe 2020 strategy and sustainable development ([2]) but given also the above information, will the Commission say:

a) How does it view this information and how will it address the significant differences between the EU and other countries (Brazil 74%, China 65%, India 62%) on the social perception of corporate actions? What is the impact of this divergence on business activity globally?

b) How does it view the important dimension of social perception within the EU, given that rates of positive perception of corporate activities range from 36% in Italy to 85% in Denmark? How does this divergence affect the operation of the single market?

c) How does it judge progress in the eight policy areas ([3]) on CSR for 2011-2014 and when will it present its evaluation report?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(22 July 2013)

The EU strategy on Corporate social responsibility (CSR) — Agenda for Action 2011-2014 — is consistent with guidelines and principles agreed at global level, including the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. This should help to ensure that companies face similar expectations whether they operate in the EU or elsewhere.

The Commision believes that the implementation of CSR policies in companies's core business strategies will contribute to raise trust in business.Therefore the findings of the Eurobarometer survey may motivate companies to implement CSR strategies. The Commission has no information about any further impacts of the divergence of perceptions of business influence within Europe and the European Single Market or outside Europe on the business activities of European companies.

To enhance the visibility of CSR as well as to showcase and disseminate good practices, a European CSR Award for partnerships between enterprises and their stakeholders was created. This Award is based on similar award schemes in the EU Member States. The first European CSR Award ceremony took place in Brussels on 25 June 2013 and highlighted the excellence of 60 European enterprises in the field of CSR.

Furthermore, in the recently adopted Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan, the Commission recognised the importance of outreach and recognition of entrepreneurs' to create positive entrepreneurial role models, particularly for young people.

As foreseen in the CSR Communication, the Commission plans a review meeting of the Multistakeholder Forum and Member States in the 2nd half of 2014 to discuss achievements and reflect on possible follow-up initiatives.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_363_en.pdf
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0681:FIN:EN:PDF.
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-11-730_en.htm?locale=en.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006926/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(14 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ένταξη της Τουρκίας: έναρξη διαπραγματεύσεων για τα κεφάλαια 23 και 24

Παρά την υπέρμετρη βία με την οποία η τουρκική κυβέρνηση καταστέλλει τις ευρύτατες κινητοποιήσεις που λαμβάνουν χώρα στην Τουρκία, ορισμένοι πολιτικοί κύκλοι στην Ευρώπη θεωρούν ότι η Τουρκία δικαιούται να ξεκινήσει διαπραγματεύσεις για τα κεφάλαια 23 και 24, με το επιχείρημα ότι η χώρα αυτή χρειάζεται την συνδρομή της ΕΕ σε ζητήματα όπως η δικαιοσύνη, οι εσωτερικές υποθέσεις και η μεταρρύθμιση της δικαιοσύνης.

Πέραν του ότι θα αποτελούσε ουσιαστικά επιβράβευση της τουρκικής κυβέρνησης και θα αποκαρδίωνε τους διαμαρτυρόμενους, κάτι τέτοιο θα συνιστούσε ένδειξη μάλλον αφέλειας εκ μέρους της Επιτροπής αν όντως πιστεύει ότι η Τουρκία έχει ανάγκη την βοήθειά μας για να αντιληφθεί το περιεχόμενο της ελευθερίας της έκφρασης.

Δεδομένου ότι οι διαπραγματεύσεις σε αυτά τα κεφάλαια έχουν παγώσει λόγω της άρνησης της Τουρκίας να εκπληρώσει τις υποχρεώσεις της που απορρέουν από το Πρωτόκολλο της Άγκυρας:

1. Προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να προχωρήσει στο άνοιγμα των κεφαλαίων 23 και 24;

2. Αντιμετωπίζει η Επιτροπή το ενδεχόμενο να ζητήσει από την τουρκική πλευρά να επιστρέψει την Αμμόχωστο στην Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία σε αντάλλαγμα για το άνοιγμα των κεφαλαίων 23 και 24;

3. Πως σκοπεύει η Επιτροπή να αντιμετωπίσει την έντονη αντίθεση που εκφράζεται εντός του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου όσον αφορά το άνοιγμα των κεφαλαίων 23 και 24;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Δεν έχουν ακόμη κοινοποιηθεί στην Τουρκία τα κριτήρια αξιολόγησης για το άνοιγμα του κεφαλαίου 23 (Δικαιοσύνη και Θεμελιώδη Δικαιώματα) και του κεφαλαίου 24 (Δικαιοσύνη, Ελευθερία και Ασφάλεια), δεδομένου ότι δεν έχει καταστεί δυνατή η επίτευξη συναίνεσης μεταξύ των κρατών μελών.

Η πρόταση της Επιτροπής σχετικά με τα κριτήρια αξιολόγησης έχει υποβληθεί στα κράτη μέλη, μαζί με την αναλυτική έκθεση κάθε κεφαλαίου. Όσον αφορά ειδικότερα τα κεφάλαια 23 και 24 για την Τουρκία, το 2007 η Επιτροπή υπέβαλε στα κράτη μέλη τις αναλυτικές εκθέσεις, μαζί με τα προτεινόμενα κριτήρια αξιολόγησης.

Ως εκ τούτου, η Τουρκία δεν έχει ενημερωθεί για τους όρους που οφείλει να εκπληρώσει για να ανοίξουν τα σχετικά κεφάλαια. Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι αυτό δεν συμβάλλει στις δημοκρατικές μεταρρυθμίσεις. Στο ίδιο πνεύμα, το Συμβούλιο της ΕΕ, στις 11 Δεκεμβρίου 2012, κατέληξε στο συμπέρασμα ότι «είναι προς το συμφέρον αμφότερων των μερών να αναθερμανθούν σύντομα οι διαπραγματεύσεις προσχώρησης, διασφαλίζοντας ότι η ΕΕ παραμένει βασικό σημείο αναφοράς για τις μεταρρυθμίσεις στην Τουρκία».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006926/13
to the Commission
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Accession of Turkey: opening of negotiations on Chapters 23 and 24

Despite the Turkish Government's exaggerated crackdown on the widespread protests taking place in Turkey, some European policymakers feel that Turkey merits the opening of negotiations on Chapters 23 and 24, stating that it needs the EU's help on issues such as justice and home affairs and the reform of the judicial system.

Apart from the fact that this would actually be a reward for the Turkish Government and a discouragement for the protesters, it is rather naive for the Commission to believe that Turkey needs our help in understanding the meaning of freedom of expression.

Given that negotiations on these chapters have been frozen because of Turkey's refusal to honour its obligations under the Ankara Protocol:

1. does the Commission intend to proceed with the opening of Chapters 23 and 24?

2. is the Commission considering asking the Turkish side to give Famagusta back to the Republic of Cyprus in return for the opening of Chapters 23 and 24?

3. how does the Commission intend to address the strong opposition expressed in the European Parliament to the opening of Chapters 23 and 24?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2013)

Turkey has not yet been notified of opening benchmarks for Chapter 23 — Judiciary and fundamental rights, and Chapter 24 — Justice, freedom and security due to lack of consensus among the Member States.

The proposal of the Commission for opening benchmarks is submitted to Member States together with the screening report of each chapter. As regards in particular chapters 23 and 24 for Turkey, the Commission submitted to Member States the screening reports, together with proposed opening benchmarks, in 2007.

Turkey has, thus, not been informed of the conditions it needs to meet in order for the chapters to be opened. The Commission takes the view that this is not conducive to democratic reforms. In the same vein, the Council of the EU concluded on 11 December 2012 that 'It is in the interest of both parties that accession negotiations regain momentum soon, ensuring that the EU remains the benchmark for reforms in Turkey'.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006927/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(14 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Επιπτώσεις στην Τουρκία από την σύρραξη στη Συρία

Η εμπλοκή της Τουρκίας στον πόλεμο στη Συρία έχει οδηγήσει σε αναπόφευκτες δευτερογενείς επιπτώσεις της σύρραξης που διαδραματίζεται στα σύνορά της. Μία από τις συνέπειες είναι η αισθητή αύξηση των διακρίσεων σε βάρος των κοινοτήτων Αλεβιτών στην Τουρκία από σουνίτες εξτρεμιστές που διέρχονται ανεξέλεγκτα τα συρο-τουρκικά σύνορα.

Ο Πρωθυπουργός Ερντογάν εγκαινίασε πρόσφατα μια νέα γέφυρα πάνω από τον Βόσπορο, που έχει πάρει το όνομά του Yavuz Sultan Selim, διαβόητου για τη σφαγή των Αλεβιτών.

Δεδομένου ότι η σύρραξη στη Συρία συνεχίζεται, ποια μέτρα λαμβάνουν η Επιτροπή και η Τουρκία για να εξασφαλίσουν ότι η σύγκρουση Σουνιτών-Σιιτών δεν επιδεινώνεται στο εσωτερικό της Τουρκίας; Πόσο ανησυχεί η Επιτροπή για τις κινήσεις του πρωθυπουργού Ερντογάν προς το πολιτικό Ισλάμ και μακριά από την κοσμική δημοκρατία που οραματίστηκε ο ιδρυτής της Τουρκίας, Κεμάλ Ατατούρκ;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Αυγούστου 2013)

Το άνοιγμα στους Αλεβίτες το 2009, το οποίο υποστηρίχθηκε από τις τουρκικές αρχές, απέβλεπε στην επίτευξη προόδου όσον αφορά την επίλυση των κυριότερων προβλημάτων που αντιμετωπίζει η κοινότητα των Αλεβιτών στη χώρα. Πραγματοποιήθηκαν επτά συναντήσεις εργασίας με διαφορετικές κοινωνικές και επαγγελματικές ομάδες, καθώς και με εκπροσώπους των Αλεβιτών. Μετά το πέρας των συναντήσεων, δημοσιεύθηκε τελική έκθεση τον Μάρτιο του 2011. Η Επιτροπή ακολούθησε εκ του σύνεγγυς τη διαδικασία και προέβη σε σχετική αναφορά μεταξύ άλλων και στις ετήσιες εκθέσεις προόδου.

Ωστόσο, όπως αναφέρθηκε και στην έκθεση προόδου για την Τουρκία για το 2012 ([1]), δεν υπήρξαν συγκεκριμένες ενέργειες που να δίνουν συνέχεια στο άνοιγμα αυτό. Οι ευκτήριοι οίκοι Τζεμεβί, παρά τις αποφάσεις ορισμένων πρωτοβάθμιων δικαστηρίων, δεν έχουν ακόμη αναγνωριστεί επίσημα ως χώροι λατρείας. Οι Αλεβίτες εξακολουθούν να αντιμετωπίζουν δυσχέρειες κατά την ίδρυση νέων χώρων λατρείας. Η απόφαση του Ευρωπαϊκού Δικαστηρίου Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων (ΕΔΑΔ) στην υπόθεση Zengin κατά Τουρκίας σχετικά με τα μαθήματα θρησκευτικών και ηθικής δεν έχει ακόμη υλοποιηθεί.

Η Τουρκία, ως χώρα που διαπραγματεύεται την προσχώρησή της στην ΕΕ, οφείλει να δημιουργήσει ένα περιβάλλον σύμφωνα με την Ευρωπαϊκή Σύμβαση Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων (ΕΣΑΔ), παρέχοντας δυνατότητες στους Τούρκους πολίτες από όλα τα κοινωνικά στρώματα και επιτρέποντας σε όλες τις μη μουσουλμανικές κοινότητες, καθώς και στην κοινότητα των Αλεβιτών, να λειτουργούν χωρίς αδικαιολόγητους περιορισμούς. Η Επιτροπή θα συνεχίσει να παρακολουθεί εκ του σύνεγγυς όλα τα σχετικά ζητήματα, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των δικαιωμάτων των μειονοτήτων, όπως οι Αλεβίτες.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2012/package/tr_rapport_2012_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006927/13
to the Commission
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Spillover in Turkey from Syrian conflict

Turkey's involvement in the war in Syria has led to inevitable fallout and spillover from the conflict taking place on its borders. One of the spillover effects has been the noticeable rise in discrimination against the Alawite communities in Turkey by Sunni extremists who pass back and forth across the Syrian-Turkish border unchecked.

Prime Minister Erdoğan recently inaugurated a new bridge over the Bosphorus, which has been named after Yavuz Sultan Selim, who was notorious for the massacre of Alawites.

As the conflict in Syria evolves, what steps are the Commission and Turkey taking to ensure that the Sunni-Shi'ite conflict is not exacerbated internally in Turkey? How concerned is the Commission about Prime Minister Erdoğan's movement towards political Islam and away from the secular democracy envisaged by Turkey's founder, Kemal Atatürk?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2013)

The 2009 Alevi opening, sponsored by the Turkish authorities, aimed at making headway on the main issues the Alevi Community faces in the country. Seven workshops were held with different social and professional groups and with Alevi representatives. Following these workshops, a final report was issued in March 2011. The Commission followed this process closely and reported on it including in its yearly Progress Reports.

However, and as was reported in the 2012 Turkey Progress Report ([1]), concrete follow-up of the opening is lacking. Cem houses, despite decisions of some first-instance courts, have not yet been officially recognised as places of worship. Alevis continue to experience difficulties in establishing new places of worship. The Zengin v. Turkey European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) judgment on religious culture and ethics classes has yet to be implemented.

Turkey, as a country negotiating its accession to the EU, needs to establish an environment in line with the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), providing space for Turkish citizens of all walks of life and allowing all non-Muslim communities and the Alevi community to function without undue constraints. The Commission will continue to monitor closely all related issues, including the rights of minorities such as the Alevis.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2012/package/tr_rapport_2012_en.pdf

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006928/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Paweł Robert Kowal (ECR)
(14 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Sytuacja w Syrii

Wojna domowa w Syrii trwa od trzech lat, a sytuacja ludności syryjskiej jest nadal bardzo trudna. Rzekomo stosowana jest broń chemiczna, nielegalne egzekucje, a do walk wykorzystywane są dzieci-żołnierze. W maju Narody Zjednoczone oszacowały, że 80 000 osób straciło życie w konflikcie, natomiast niektóre organizacje, takie jak Syryjskie Obserwatorium Praw Człowieka, twierdzą, że zginęło 120 000 osób. W marcu 2013 r. UNHCR zrejestrowało 1 204 707 uchodźców, a kolejnych 2,5 mln Syryjczyków, jak się szacuje, zostało przesiedlonych wewnętrznie. Wobec rosnącego sektarianizmu i braku możliwości przewidzenia zakończenia konfliktu w najbliższej przyszłości UE ma obowiązek działać jako mediator i rozjemca.

1. Jakie działania podjęła UE, aby złagodzić cierpienie uchodźców?

2. Jaka jest zdolność UE do przyjęcia uchodźców syryjskich?

3. Jakie środki podejmuje UE wraz ze zniesieniem embarga na dostawę broni do Syrii, aby położyć kres przemocy?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji
(3 września 2013 r.)

Od początku kryzysu 53 % z wynoszącej 515 mln EUR pomocy humanitarnej dla Syrii finansowanej przez UE i zarządzanej przez Komisję zostało wykorzystane na zaspokojenie najważniejszych potrzeb występujących w państwach sąsiadujących, które przyjmują syryjskich uchodźców ([1]). Środki na pomoc humanitarną przeznaczane są w Syrii na doraźną pomoc medyczną, podstawowe leki, produkty żywnościowe i żywność bogatą w składniki odżywcze, dostęp do wody pitnej, artykuły sanitarne i higieniczne, schronienie, podstawowe produkty nieżywnościowe i ochronę w celu niesienia pomocy najbardziej zagrożonym grupom społecznym. Głównym celem pomocy humanitarnej jest zapewnianie wsparcia obywatelom Syrii znajdującym się w szczególnie trudnej sytuacji, w większości kobietom, dzieciom i starszym uchodźcom przebywającym w obozach i w społecznościach przyjmujących uchodźców.

Przyjmowanie Syryjczyków z zagranicy leży w gestii państw członkowskich. Kilka państw członkowskich zobowiązało się do tymczasowego przyjęcia lub przesiedlenia pewnej liczby uchodźców z Syrii. Komisja apelowała do państw członkowskich, wydając także w tej sprawie ostatni wspólny komunikat ([2]), by postępowały wielkodusznie przy przyjmowaniu Syryjczyków na terytorium UE. UE wspiera takie działania finansowo w ramach dostępnych instrumentów. Jeżeli państwo członkowskie znajdzie się pod szczególną presją, Komisja we współpracy z Europejskim Urzędem Wsparcia w dziedzinie Azylu jest gotowa uzupełnić krajowe plany interwencyjne, zapewniając pomoc lub koordynację działań solidarnościowych, w tym w szczególności pomoc finansową oraz fachowe wsparcie.

UE podkreśla pilną potrzebę znalezienia politycznego rozwiązania konfliktu i z zadowoleniem przyjęła wspólny amerykańsko-rosyjski apel o zwołanie konferencji pokojowej w sprawie Syrii w celu propagowania procesu politycznego w oparciu o zasady zawarte w komunikacie z Genewy z dnia 30 czerwca 2012 r. UE nie będzie szczędzić wysiłków, by pomóc w tworzeniu warunków odpowiednich do pomyślnego zwołania tej konferencji.

([1]) 64,5 mln EUR przyznano Libanowi, 61,5 mln EUR Jordanii, 6 mln EUR Turcji oraz 9 mln EUR Irakowi.
([2]) „W kierunku kompleksowej strategii wobec kryzysu w Syrii"; http: //europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-596_pl.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006928/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Paweł Robert Kowal (ECR)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Situation in Syria

As the Syrian Civil War continues in its third year of conflict, the plight of the Syrian people continues. Chemical weapons, illegal executions, and child soldiers have all allegedly been used. While the United Nations estimated in May that 80 000 people have died in the conflict, some groups, such as the Syrian Observatory for Human Rights, estimate that as many as 120 000 have perished. The UNHCR has registered 1 204 707 refugees as of March 2013, and another 2.5 million Syrians are estimated to be internally displaced. With rising sectarianism and no foreseeable end to the conflict in the near future, the EU has a responsibility to act as a mediator and peacemaker.

1. What actions has the EU taken to alleviate the suffering of refugees?

2. What capacity does the EU possess for admitting Syrian refugees?

3. With the lifting of the arms embargo on Syria, what measures is the EU taking to bring an end to the violence?

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

Since the beginning of the crisis, 53% of EUR 515 million EU funded humanitarian assistance managed by the Commission for Syria has been directed to needs in the neighbouring countries where refugees are hosted ([1]) This humanitarian assistance primarily supports life-saving medical emergency responses, the provision of essential drugs, food and nutritional items, safe water, sanitation and hygiene, shelter, distribution of basic non-food items and protection to help the most vulnerable. It aims at supporting the most vulnerable people being, in majority, women, children and elder people refugees in the camps and also in the host communities.

The admission of Syrians from abroad falls within Member States' responsibility. Several Member States have offered to temporarily admit or to resettle a certain number of Syrian refugees. The Commission has called on Member States, including in the recent Joint Communication ([2]) to adopt a generous attitude towards admitting Syrians on EU territory. The EU supports such activities financially within the framework of available instruments. Should a Member State come under particular pressure, the Commission, together with the European Asylum Support Office, is ready to complement national contingency arrangements through the provision or coordination of assistance, including in particular financial assistance and expert support.

The EU reiterates the urgent need for a political solution of the conflict and welcomed the joint US-Russian call for a peace conference on Syria to promote a political process based on the principles included in the Geneva communiqué of 30 June 2012. The EU will spare no effort in helping to create the appropriate conditions for a successful convening of this conference.

([1]) EUR 64.5 million to Lebanon, EUR 61.5 million to Jordan, EUR 6 million to Turkey and EUR 9 million to Iraq.
([2]) 'Towards a Comprehensive EU Approach to the Syrian Crisis'; http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-596_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006930/13
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Arctic Council permanent observer status

Can the Commission explain why Canada, a country with which we are in the final stages of negotiating a Free Trade Agreement, has chosen to block the EU from having permanent observer status at the Arctic Council, while approving similar status for China, India, Italy, Japan, the Republic of Korea and Singapore?

Does the Commission believe that, as has been reported in the media, this is in retaliation for the EU's stance on the banning of the sale of seal products within the Union?

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

The Arctic Council in its Declaration of 15 May states: 'The Arctic Council receives the application of the EU for observer status affirmatively, but defers a final decision on implementation until the Council Ministers are agreed by consensus that the concerns of Council members, addressed by the President of the EU Commission in his letter of 8 May are resolved, with the understanding that the EU may observe Council proceedings until such time as the Council acts on the letter's proposal.'

The EU welcomes the 15 May Arctic Council member's consensus decision on its observer status and looks forward to continuing to contribute to the work of the Arctic Council.

The concern referred to in the 15 May Arctic Declaration relates to the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1007/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 on the placing on the market of seal products, which shall be allowed only where the seal products result from hunts traditionally conducted by Inuit and other indigenous communities and contribute to their subsistence. Seal products complying with these requirements can be introduced in the EU market if accompanied by an attesting document issued by a recognised body which meets the requirements specified in the Commission Regulation (EU) No 737/2010 of 10 August 2010 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1007/2009.

Further to previous exchanges with the Canadian authorities, the Commission will continue to work expeditiously with them towards the establishment of administrative arrangements that will enable Canadian Inuit and other indigenous communities to take advantage of the exemption provided for in the regulation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006931/13
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Implications of Swiss trade agreements with third countries

In view of the recent visit by Chinese Premier Li to Switzerland to broker a deal in the ongoing negotiations for a China-Switzerland Free Trade Agreement (FTA), could the Commission comment on the implications for the EU of such an agreement coming into force, in light of the open-borders arrangement with Switzerland? Has the Commission expressed a view to the Swiss Government as to the steps it might need to take and, if not, when does it plan to do so?

In light of the fact that Japan preceded its request for an EU-Japan FTA with the negotiation of a Japan-Switzerland FTA, does the Commission believe that the same strategy is being followed here? How would the Commission respond to a renewal of the offer made at the last EU-China summit in 2012 for an EU-China Comprehensive Partnership Agreement?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2013)

Switzerland is a sovereign country that independently choses partners to sign trading deals with. Swiss Free Trade Agreements (FTA) are not incompatible with the EU's own bilateral trade deals, and the China-Switzerland Free Trade Agreement is not in any way incompatible with the 1972 Agreement between the EU and Switzerland. Consequently, the Commission does not intend to express a view on this issue to the Swiss Government.

With regard to China's proposal to consider launching a feasibility study on an EU-China FTA, the current focus is to make progress towards a bilateral investment agreement. These negotiations are the Commission's first priority, where progress should be achieved first. Only with positive and concrete developments on an investment deal, would the Commission be in a position to examine broader trade ambitions.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006932/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(14 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Pressioni USA sulla Commissione per il controllo dei dati personali

Emerge da un'inchiesta su un noto giornale economico che l'Amministrazione Obama avrebbe fatto pressioni con successo sulla Commissione per modificare l'articolo 42 della normativa sulla privacy, che non avrebbe consentito il controllo dei dati personali dei cittadini dell'UE, come invece sta emergendo dai recenti scandali oltreoceano. La misura in questione avrebbe vietato agli USA di richiedere i dati personali dei cittadini alle compagnie di comunicazione europee che li detengono e, a quanto riporta lo stesso giornale, alcuni funzionari della Commissione confessano che la richiesta è stata accettata per non compromettere gli accordi commerciali USA-UE.

Di conseguenza, gli Stati Uniti possono ora accedere liberamente ai dati dei cittadini europei, di cui erano in molti casi già in possesso, dal momento che la maggior parte delle grandi compagnie tecnologiche ha sede proprio negli USA. Il mantenimento dell'articolo 42 non lo avrebbe invece consentito, e avrebbe contribuito ad una maggiore protezione dei dati dei cittadini europei.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione confermare la veridicità della notizia e rilasciare un commento sul caso?

Può la Commissione assicurare che i dati personali dei cittadini europei sono protetti in virtù della legislazione dell'UE e che nessuna agenzia di sicurezza straniera vi può accedere senza il consenso dei cittadini?

Non ritiene di dover ripensare a ulteriori misure a protezione della privacy dei cittadini UE, a fronte dell'evolversi delle nuove tecnologie?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(11 settembre 2013)

La Commissione è preoccupata dalle recenti notizie riportate sui media secondo le quali le autorità degli Stati Uniti hanno accesso e hanno trattato su ampia scala i dati di cittadini europei che utilizzano i principali provider di servizi online statunitensi. La Commissione ha chiesto chiarimenti alle autorità statunitensi in merito a tali notizie, soprattutto per quanto riguarda l'impatto sui diritti fondamentali dei cittadini europei. A tal proposito, la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-007934/2013.

Per proteggere efficacemente i dati personali, nel gennaio 2012 la Commissione ha proposto una riforma delle regole dell'UE sulla protezione dei dati. La Commissione ha elaborato la proposta secondo le normali procedure, che comprendono l'organizzazione di diverse consultazioni pubbliche, alle quali ha partecipato una molteplicità di soggetti privati e pubblici sia all'interno che all'esterno dell'UE. Il pacchetto di riforma proposto che è stato adottato dalla Commissione rafforzerà i diritti delle persone fisiche e preciserà ulteriormente gli obblighi dei responsabili e degli incaricati del trattamento dei dati, anche quando i dati dei cittadini europei sono trasferiti al di fuori dell'UE. Il pacchetto contiene una serie di elementi che rispondono alla situazione descritta dall'onorevole parlamentare. Le misure garantiranno che le imprese extra-europee, quando offrono beni e servizi ai consumatori europei, debbano applicare appieno la legislazione UE in materia di protezione dei dati, e assicureranno il rispetto delle norme UE attraverso appropriate sanzioni. Inoltre, i trasferimenti potranno essere consentiti solo se rispettano le condizioni previste nella proposta di regolamento sui trasferimenti a paesi terzi, ad esempio, se sussistono motivi di rilevante interesse pubblico previsti dalla legislazione di uno Stato membro o dell'Unione. Il pacchetto stabilisce, inoltre, regole chiare e complete per il trattamento dei dati personali per fini di applicazione della legge.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006932/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: US lobbying the Commission to inspect personal data

According to a report in a well-known economic newspaper, the Obama administration successfully lobbied the Commission to amend Article 42 of the Data Protection Regulation, which would have prevented EU citizens' personal data from being inspected, as has happened in recent scandals in the United States. The measure in question would have prohibited the US from requesting citizens' personal data from European communications companies holding the data and, according to the same newspaper, Commission officials admit that the request was granted so as not to jeopardise US-EU trade agreements.

As a result, the United States now has free access to European citizens' data, which it was already in possession of in many cases, since most of the major technology companies are based in the US. Had Article 42 been retained, this would not have been allowed and it would have helped ensure greater protection of European citizens' data.

Can the Commission confirm whether the news is true and comment on the case?

Can the Commission guarantee that European citizens' personal data are protected under EU legislation and that no foreign security agency can access them without citizens' consent?

Does it not think it should consider further measures to protect EU citizens' privacy, in view of the advances in new technologies?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(11 September 2013)

The European Commission is concerned regarding recent media reports that US authorities are accessing and processing, on a large scale, the data of Europeans using major US online service providers. The Commission has requested clarifications from the US regarding these reports, in particular on the impact on Europeans' fundamental rights. On these aspects, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-007934/2013.

To effectively protect personal data, the Commission proposed in January 2012 a reform of the EU data protection rules. In the preparation of this proposal, the Commission followed the usual procedures, including by launching several public consultations to which a multiplicity of EU and non-EU public and privaty actors reacted. The proposed reform package that was adopted by the Commission will strengthen the rights of individuals and further clarify the obligations of data controllers and processors, including when data of Europeans is transferred outside the EU. It contains a number of elements that are relevant to the situation mentionned by the Honourable Member. It will ensure the application of EU data protection law in full by non-European companies, when offering goods and services to EU consumers, as well as guarantee the respect of EU rules through appropriate sanctions. It also makes clear that transfers should only be allowed where the conditions of the proposed Regulation for a tranfer to third countries are met, such as, *inter alia*, where the disclosure is necessary for an important ground of public interest recognised in Union or Member State law. Moreover, it will establish clear and comprehensive rules for the processing of personal data for the purposes of law enforcement.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006933/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(14 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Integrazione valutativa dei disabili

In Italia, come probabilmente in molti altri paesi europei, esiste un organismo per la valutazione del sistema dell'istruzione. Le procedure sono informatizzate e le prove, che hanno luogo nelle scuole, vengono inserite alla loro conclusione nel computer centrale di valutazione, in base a certe procedure. Una di queste consiste nella segnalazione del codice di disabilità, secondo il quale la prova dello studente disabile non viene valutata insieme a quella dei suoi compagni. Se si valuta che in Italia gli allievi disabili che frequentano le scuole sono 200 000, ci si chiede quale sia l'esattezza della valutazione di un sistema che esclude 200 000 test dal monitoraggio.

Può la Commissione riferire:

1. se una valutazione del sistema dell'istruzione esiste anche in altri paesi (in quali, eventualmente);

2. in caso affermativo, se anche in quelle valutazioni sono esclusi automaticamente i disabili;

3. se ritiene corretto un criterio di valutazione nazionale che non includa anche i bambini con «bisogni educativi speciali», come vengono pudicamente chiamati i disabili;

4. se un sistema nazionale d'istruzione può permettersi una non integrazione di questo genere?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(1º agosto 2013)

Le informazioni su quali paesi sottopongano a valutazione i rispettivi sistemi d'istruzione possono essere reperite nello studio dell'OCSE del 2013 intitolato «Sinergie per migliorare l'apprendimento: una prospettiva internazionale sulle tecniche di analisi e valutazione», capitolo 8.

Le prassi relative alla partecipazione di alunni con bisogni educativi speciali alle valutazioni variano da uno Stato membro all'altro. A tal proposito si veda il rapporto della rete Eurydice del 2009, intitolato «Prove nazionali di valutazione degli alunni in Europa: obiettivi, organizzazione e uso dei risultati», pagg. 38-41,

(http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/109IT.pdf).

Il rapporto individua tre modelli nel quadro dell'istruzione dell'obbligo nelle classi ordinarie, a seconda del fatto che la partecipazione di alunni con bisogni educativi speciali sia «prevista», «obbligatoria o facoltativa».

Informazioni in merito possono altresì essere reperite nello strumento online della Commissione relativo alla disabilità (DOTCOM) ([1]) sviluppato dall'*Academic Network of European Disability Experts* (ANED — Rete accademica degli esperti europei sulla disabilità) e nel rapporto «*Inclusive education for young disabled people in Europe: trends, issues and challenges*» (Integrazione nel campo dell'istruzione per i giovani disabili in Europa: tendenze, problematiche e sfide).

A norma dell'articolo 165 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea i governi nazionali restano pienamente responsabili dei contenuti e dell'organizzazione dei propri sistemi d'istruzione. La Commissione sostiene tuttavia l'integrazione nel campo dell'istruzione attraverso la strategia europea sulla disabilità 2010-2020 ([2]), in conformità dell'articolo 24 della Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sui diritti delle persone con disabilità.

([1]) http://www.disability-europe.net/dotcom
([2]) «Un rinnovato impegno per un'Europa senza barriere», COM(2010)0636 definitivo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006933/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Including disabled students in evaluation of the education system

Italy has a national body to evaluate the education system, as many other European countries probably do. The evaluation procedures are computerised and examination papers, which are sat in schools, are added to the central evaluation database on completion, according to specific procedures. One such procedure involves flagging up the disability code, whereby a disabled student's examination paper is not assessed together with those of his peers. There are an estimated 200 000 disabled students in Italian schools, which raises questions as to how accurate is the evaluation of a system that excludes 200 000 examination papers from scrutiny.

1. Do any other countries evaluate their education systems? Which ones?

2. If so, are disabled students automatically excluded from those evaluations?

3. Does the Commission think it is right that one of the principles of the national evaluation system is to exclude children with 'special educational needs', as disabled students are modestly referred to?

4. Can a national education system allow this kind of exclusion?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2013)

Information on which countries evaluate their education systems can be found in the 2013 OECD study 'Synergies for Better Learning — an international perspective on evaluation and assessment', Chapter 8.

Practices vary across Member States as to the participation of pupils with special educational needs (SEN) in evaluations. Please see the 2009 Eurydice report 'National Testing of Pupils in Europe: Objectives, Organisation and Use of Results', pp. 38-41,

(http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/109EN.pdf).

The report identifies three models within the context of compulsory education in mainstream classrooms: depending on whether participation of SEN students 'occurs', is 'compulsory' or 'optional'.

Information can also be found in the disability online tool of the Commission (DOTCOM) ([1]) created by the Academic Network of European Disability Experts (ANED) and in the report 'Inclusive education for young disabled people in Europe: trends, issues and challenges'.

According to Art. 165 of the Treaty on the functioning of the European Union, national governments remain fully responsible for the content and organisation of their education systems. However, the Commission supports inclusive education through the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([2]) in line with Art. 24 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

([1]) http://www.disability-europe.net/dotcom
([2]) 'A renewed commitment to a barrier-free Europe', COM(2010) 0636 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006934/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Patrizia Toia (S&D) e Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(14 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Ricatto dell'anti-dumping cinese

Dopo l'anti-dumping messo in essere dalla Cina contro il vino europeo, giungono notizie secondo le quali sarebbero imposti nuovi dazi sulle automobili europee con una cilindrata superiore ai 2000 cm^3, esportate in Cina. Questi dazi colpiscono importanti paesi dell'Unione come la Germania, il Regno Unito, la Francia e l'Italia. È pertanto evidente l'intenzione della Cina di minacciare e ricattare l'Unione europea facendo pressione sui governi di singoli Stati membri in risposta alla decisione della Commissione che ha aperto una procedura anti-dumping per i pannelli solari cinesi.

— Può la Commissione confermare la veridicità della notizia?

— Nell'affermativa, quali misure intende adottare per impedire che s'instauri un sistema ricattatorio all'interno dei paesi membri dell'OMC?

— Intende la Commissione confrontarsi su questo tema anche con l'OMC per valutare e studiare nuove norme che impediscano la concorrenza scorretta e la distorsione del mercato?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(25 luglio 2013)

La Commissione è al corrente delle voci secondo le quali la Cina potrebbe decidere di aprire un'inchiesta antidumping relativa alle importazioni di automobili provenienti dall'UE.

Secondo le pertinenti disposizioni dell'OMC, qualora uno Stato membro riceva dall'industria la richiesta di avviare un'inchiesta di questo tipo, tale Stato è tenuto a informare il governo del paese esportatore prima di procedere all'avvio di detta inchiesta.

Al momento la Commissione non è stata informata né ha ricevuto alcuna indicazione relativa al fatto che la Cina intenda effettivamente aprire un'inchiesta antidumping relativa alle importazioni di automobili.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006934/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Patrizia Toia (S&D) and Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Anti-dumping blackmail by China

Following on from the anti-dumping measures imposed by China on European wine, reports have emerged that new duties are to be imposed on European cars with an engine capacity greater than two litres exported to China. These duties affect major EU countries such as Germany, the United Kingdom, France and Italy. China therefore clearly intends to threaten and blackmail the EU by putting pressure on the governments of individual Member States in response to the Commission's decision to open anti-dumping proceedings against Chinese solar panels.

— Can the Commission confirm whether this news is true?

— If so, what steps will it take to prevent World Trade Organisation (WTO) member countries being blackmailed?

— Does the Commission plan to discuss this issue with the WTO in order to weigh up and consider new rules to prevent unfair competition and distortion of the market?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

The Commisison is aware of rumours that China may decide to initiate an anti-dumping investigations into imports of cars from the EU.

According to the relevant WTO rules, when a Member country receives an application by its industry to commence such an investigation, it has to notify the government of the exporting country before proceeding to initiate an investigation.

At this stage the Commission has neither been notifed nor has it received any indication that China indeed intends to initiate an anti-dumping investigation against imports of cars.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006935/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(14 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Nuove banconote da 5 euro non accettate dai distributori automatici

Alcune settimane fa la Banca centrale europea ha emesso una nuova versione di banconota da 5 euro, che rende la vita più difficile ai falsari. Peccato che, oltre ai falsari, abbia complicato anche la vita dei cittadini italiani, dal momento che la maggior parte dei distributori automatici in tutta Italia non accettano la nuova banconota, che viene persino rigettata dai macchinari anti-falsificazione usati dai commercianti. Poiché è assurdo pensare che tutti gli esercenti debbano spendere denaro per apportare modifiche o addirittura cambiare i loro distributori, peraltro per un unico taglio, viene da domandarsi perché la BCE non abbia pensato subito a questo problema, che mette in difficoltà i consumatori e rischia di portare un grave danno all'economia e all'erogazione dei servizi in Italia.

— È la Commissione a conoscenza di altri paesi in cui si è verificato lo stesso problema?

— Intende farsi carico di misure che siano in grado di risolverlo senza fare gravare le spese direttamente sugli esercenti e sulla loro clientela?

— È in grado di accertare chi siano i responsabili di tale errore e di valutare un'eventuale sanzione?

Risposta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione
(25 luglio 2013)

In largo anticipo rispetto all'emissione della nuova banconota da 5 euro, la BCE e le banche centrali nazionali dell'area dell'euro (BCN) hanno offerto il loro contributo ai produttori di apparecchiature per banconote affinché potessero apportare modifiche ai dispositivi in tempo per la data di emissione. A tal fine, a partire dal maggio 2011 sono state attuate quattro fasi:

i) maggio 2011: informazioni tecniche sulla nuova banconota da 5 euro;

ii) quarto trimestre 2011: prima serie di test per i produttori di apparecchiature per banconote presso le BCN con prototipi di banconote;

iii) quarto trimestre 2012: secondo ciclo di test presso le BCN per i produttori di apparecchiature per banconote con banconote da 5 euro definitive; e

iv) a partire da metà gennaio 2013: disponibilità delle nuove banconote da 5 euro per test interni presso gli stabilimenti dei produttori o di terzi.

Mentre molti dispositivi hanno riconosciuto la nuova banconota da 5 euro dal giorno stesso della sua emissione o subito dopo, alcuni non sono ancora abilitati, a causa delle difficoltà logistiche incontrate dagli operatori e fornitori di questi dispositivi nel modificare il grande numero di apparecchi in tutta l'area dell'euro in un breve lasso di tempo. Gli utenti e proprietari di dispositivi per l'accettazione e l'autenticazione delle banconote non ancora compatibili con la nuova banconota da 5 euro devono contattare il fornitore o produttore e farli adattare il prima possibile ([1]).

([1]) Sul sito Internet della BCE è disponibile un elenco dei dispositivi per l'autenticazione delle banconote testati dalle banche centrali dell'Eurosistema che indica se la nuova banconota da 5 euro è accettata o meno da ciascuno di essi: http://www.ecb.europa.eu/euro/cashhand/devices/results/html/Devices-print.it.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006935/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: New EUR 5 banknotes not accepted by vending machines

Several weeks ago, the European Central Bank (ECB) issued a new version of the EUR 5 banknote, which makes life more difficult for counterfeiters. Unfortunately, as well as for counterfeiters, it has also made life difficult for the Italian public, since most vending machines across Italy do not accept the new note, which is even rejected by the counterfeit detection equipment used by shopkeepers. Since it is preposterous to think that all shopkeepers should spend money to modify their vending machines or even get new ones — for a single denomination — it raises the question of why the ECB did not consider this problem, which puts consumers in a difficult position and is liable to cause great harm to the economy and the provision of services in Italy, at the outset.

— Is the Commission aware of any other countries having the same problem?

— Will it undertake to introduce measures to resolve the issue without incurring direct costs for shopkeepers and their customers?

— Can it establish who is responsible for this error and consider imposing a sanction as appropriate?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

Long in advance to the issuance of the new EUR 5 banknote, support has been offered by the ECB and the national central banks of the euro area (NCBs) to banknote equipment manufacturers in order to have the devices adapted in time for the issuance date. To this purpose, four phases were implemented starting in May 2011:

(i) May 2011: The provision of technical information on the new EUR 5 banknote;

(ii) Q4/2011: A first round of testing activities for banknote equipment manufacturers at NCBs premises with pilot production banknotes;

(iii) Q4/2012: A second round of testing at NCBs premises for banknote equipment manufacturers with final EUR 5 banknotes; and

(iv) From mid-January 2013: Availability of the new EUR 5 banknote for in-house testing at manufacturers and other third parties' premises.

While many devices have indeed been able to recognise the new EUR 5 banknote on the day of its issuance or shortly after, some are as yet not enabled, owing to the logistical difficulties encountered by operators and suppliers of these devices in adjusting the large number of devices across the euro area in a short time period. If not yet enabled, the users/owners of banknote handling and authentication devices should liaise with the supplier or manufacturer in order to have them adapted to the new EUR 5 banknote as soon as possible. ([1])

([1]) A list available on the ECB website provides the banknote authentication devices tested by the Eurosystem central banks and indicates whether the new EUR 5 banknote is accepted or not by each of them: http://www.ecb.europa.eu/euro/cashhand/devices/results/html/Devices-print.en.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006936/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(14 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Equitalia e società di riscossione dei crediti: famiglie e cittadini italiani sul lastrico

Le famiglie, i cittadini e le imprese italiane in crisi per la mancanza di lavoro e liquidità sono sempre più numerose. Secondo i dati raccolti dalla Banca d'Italia nel Rapporto sulla stabilità finanziaria pubblicato lo scorso aprile, il 3,1 % dei nuclei familiari italiani spende più del 30 % delle sue entrate per ripagare i debiti, il 6,2 % associa allo stato di povertà quello d'indebitamento, mentre il 29,8 % dichiara di incontrare «difficoltà» o «grande difficoltà» ad arrivare alla fine del mese.

Alle difficoltà create dalla crisi economica, dall'aumento dei prezzi e della pressione fiscale, lo scorso 4 marzo si è aggiunto l'aumento del 15 % degli interessi di mora da parte di Equitalia, società incaricata della riscossione dei debiti verso lo Stato dall'Agenzia delle Entrate. Dal primo maggio 2013, infatti, il tasso è passato dal 4,55 % al 5,22 % rendendo per i cittadini ancora più difficile sanare la loro posizione debitoria. Inoltre è sempre più frequente il ricorso, da parte delle Agenzie di recupero credito e di Equitalia, a soluzioni drastiche quali il pignoramento della casa o il sequestro dell'auto.

In un momento in cui molti cittadini italiani si trovano sopraffatti dai debiti, Equitalia e le altre Agenzie di recupero credito ricorrono sempre più spesso a sistemi che annullano le garanzie offerte a tutela del soggetto più debole, ovvero dell'esecutato, inibendo al debitore ogni possibilità di contestare e di verificare la pretesa del creditore.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

— è a conoscenza di questa situazione che colpisce i cittadini italiani?

— Tenuto conto del parere del Comitato economico e sociale europeo (2002/C149/01) in materia di sovraindebitamento delle famiglie, non ritiene che il provvedimento adottato da Equitalia contribuisca ad aggravare il peso dei debiti sulle famiglie italiane?

— Con riferimento ai punti 3.1 e 3.2 c) del suddetto parere, come valuta il processo di armonizzazione delle diverse legislazioni degli Stati membri in materia?

— Ha valutato la possibilità di sostenere la creazione di una rete europea di servizi di mediazione (pubblici o privati), incaricati di informare le persone sovraindebitate dei loro diritti e obblighi e di aiutarle a proporre ai loro creditori dei piani di rimborso o altre legittime strategie?

— Intende istituire un Fondo per l'assistenza alle persone e alle famiglie sovraindebitate?

Risposta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione
(20 agosto 2013)

L'esame approfondito per l'Italia nell'ambito della procedura per gli squilibri macroeconomici ha analizzato l'indebitamento del settore pubblico e privato ([1]). La posizione finanziaria netta delle famiglie italiane continua a essere relativamente forte. La ricchezza finanziaria netta rimane superiore al livello stimato per la media della zona euro. L'indebitamento delle famiglie italiane continua a essere tra i più bassi della zona euro, e la loro vulnerabilità finanziaria, misurata come l'incidenza della rata sul reddito, rimane bassa. L'elevato debito pubblico costituisce un grave onere per l'economia italiana e deve pertanto essere ridotto.

Allo stesso tempo l'evasione fiscale, che rimane un fenomeno molto diffuso in Italia, genera una ingiusta distribuzione della pressione fiscale tra la popolazione. La lotta contro l'evasione fiscale figura nelle raccomandazioni specifiche per paese (RSC) all'Italia che sono state adottate dal Consiglio il 9 luglio 2013 su raccomandazione della Commissione. Quanto alle penalità di mora, applicate dalle amministrazioni fiscali nazionali, esse sono di competenza dei governi nazionali.

([1]) SWD(2013)118 def. del 10.4.2013.

Per quanto riguarda l'Unione europea, attualmente i servizi della Commissione attualmente lavorano ad uno studio riguardante il sovraindebitamento delle famiglie, compreso un accumulo dei ritardi di pagamento, che esamina le misure in vigore in tutta l'UE per affrontare la situazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006936/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Equitalia and debt collection companies: Italian households and individuals reduced to poverty

Increasing numbers of Italian households, individuals and businesses are facing difficulties caused by the lack of employment and money. According to data collected by the Bank of Italy in its report on financial stability published in April 2013, 3.1% of Italian households are spending over 30% of their income on repaying their debts, 6.2% are both in debt and in poverty, and 29.8% say they are experiencing 'difficulties' or 'great difficulties' at the end of the month.

In addition to the difficulties created by the economic crisis, price increases and fiscal pressure, a 15% increase in late payment interest was imposed on 4 March 2013 by Equitalia, a company employed by the tax authorities to collect debts owed to the State. As of 1 May 2013, the rate has risen from 4.55% to 5.22%, making it even more difficult for individuals to get out of debt. In addition, debt recovery agencies and Equitalia are increasingly taking drastic measures, including evictions and the seizure of vehicles.

At a time when many Italian citizens find themselves overcome by debt, Equitalia and the other debt collection agencies are increasingly using systems that override the protection available to the most vulnerable individuals, or parties against which enforcement is sought, removing any opportunity for the debtor to challenge or check the creditor's claims.

In view of the above, can the Commission specify:

— Is it aware of this situation affecting Italian citizens?

— Considering the opinion of the Economic and Social Committee (2002/C149/01) on 'Household over-indebtedness', does it not consider that the measure adopted by Equitalia will contribute to worsening the burden of debt on Italian households?

— With reference to points 3.1 and 3.2(c) of the abovementioned opinion, how does it view the process of harmonising the various Member State laws on this subject?

— Has it considered the possibility of supporting the creation of a European network of mediation services (public or private), responsible for providing information to over-indebted people on their rights and obligations and helping them to put forward repayment plans or other legitimate strategies to their creditors?

— Does it intend to set up a fund to assist over-indebted households and individuals?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2013)

The in-depth review for Italy under the macroeconomic imbalances procedure analysed private and public sector indebtedness. ([1]) The net financial position of Italian households continues to be relatively strong. Their net financial wealth is above the average level estimated for the euro areas. The indebtedness of Italian households continues to be among the lowest in the euro area and their financial vulnerability — measured as the ratio of debt service to income — remains low. The high government debt represents a major burden for the Italian economy and needs to be reduced.

At the same time, tax evasion remains a widespread phenomenon in Italy, which generates an unfair distribution of the tax burden across the population. The fight against tax evasion features in the Country Specific Recommendations (CSRs) to Italy that were adopted by the Council on 9 July 2013 upon recommendation by the Commission. As to the penalty fees on overdue taxes charged by the national tax administrations, they are of the responsibility of the national governments.

For the European Union, Commission services are currently working on a study on household over-indebtedness, including the accumulation of payment arrears, which looks at the measures in place across the EU to address such situation.

([1]) SWD(2013)118 final, 10..4.2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006937/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(14 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Decreto sblocca-debiti favorevole alle amministrazioni locali dell'Italia meridionale

Il 6 aprile scorso il Consiglio dei Ministri ha adottato il decreto legge 8.4.2013 n. 35 per il pagamento dei debiti della pubblica amministrazione agli enti locali. I dati raccolti sulla base delle decisioni assunte dal governo dimostrano che l'86,4 % degli anticipi di liquidità messi a disposizione dalla Cassa depositi agli enti locali sono stati destinati alle regioni del Meridione: la Campania ha ottenuto da sola un terzo del totale dei fondi disponibili, seguita da Lazio e Calabria, mentre la Lombardia ha ricevuto solo il 7,7 %, il Piemonte l'11,1 % e il Veneto l'8,15 %.

Tra le amministrazioni comunali privilegiate dal decreto figurano il comune di Napoli e quello di Reggio Calabria che, nonostante rientrino nel fondo di rotazione varato dallo Stato per le amministrazioni in default, beneficeranno dei fondi del decreto più di altri comuni virtuosi nella gestione dei conti. Il comune di Napoli ha ottenuto l'anticipo di 949 milioni di euro come richiesto, circa la metà dei 2 miliardi messi a disposizione per i comuni italiani, mentre quello di Reggio Calabria ha ricevuto invece 187,5 milioni. Il risultato è che le amministrazioni meno virtuose possono soddisfare le richieste delle imprese in maniera più rapida rispetto agli enti locali che hanno invece fatto più attenzione ai conti. Gli enti locali del Nord, nel rapporto con le imprese fornitrici, devono gestire vincoli più stringenti del Patto di stabilità: il solo Veneto nel 2013 è la regione più penalizzata d'Italia per quanto riguarda il tetto di spesa pro capite previsto dal Patto (328 euro a fronte dei 942 della Basilicata).

È la Commissione al corrente della situazione?

Considerata la risposta alla mia interrogazione E-004235/2013 riguardante l'attuazione del fiscal compact e le conseguenze per le imprese italiane di un eventuale blocco dei pagamenti pregressi da parte della pubblica amministrazione, nella quale, in riferimento al DL 8.4.2013 n. 35 la Commissione dichiarava che «seguirà con attenzione il processo di approvazione nel Parlamento nazionale e la sua attuazione», può la Commissione riferire nel rispetto dell'articolo 6 TFUE:

— se ritiene che il DL oggetto dell'interrogazione penalizzi ulteriormente le amministrazioni virtuose, già svaforite da un tasso di spesa pro capite tra i più bassi, in cui si concentra però la forza industriale del paese, anche in funzione dell'obiettivo di ripresa economica auspicata nella raccomandazione del Consiglio sul programma nazionale di riforma 2013 dell'Italia 2012-2017 (COM(2013)0362 finale del 29 maggio 2013);

— come valuta tale disparità tra gli Stati membri stante che in Italia il tempo medio per il saldo dei debiti da parte della pubblica amministrazione nel 2013 è di 170 giorni contro i 24 della Finlandia;

— se ritiene che la direttiva 2011/7/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 16 febbraio 2011 sia stata correttamente recepita e si sia rivelata efficace contro il problema dell'insolvenza della pubblica amministrazione italiana e quali altri strumenti ritiene opportuno che il governo adotti per raggiungere gli standard europei?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(28 ottobre 2013)

Alla fine del 2012 il settore pubblico italiano aveva accumulato un enorme debito inevaso nei confronti dei suoi fornitori, ma alcune amministrazioni avevano contribuito in modo superiore alla media a far lievitare il monte delle fatture non pagate; pertanto, qualsiasi piano volto ad accelerare il pagamento del debito arretrato avrebbe avuto un impatto diversificato sulle finanze pubbliche locali. Nella consapevolezza di ciò, la Commissione ha sollecitato, nel marzo 2013 ([1]), l'inclusione nel piano di liquidazione del debito di «adeguate misure contro il rischio di comportamenti opportunistici (azzardo morale) da parte delle pubbliche amministrazioni titolari del debito pregresso». Il DL 35 del 8 aprile 2013, che stabilisce il piano per regolare nel periodo 2013-2014 il debito commerciale pregresso ammontante a 40 miliardi di euro, contiene alcune di queste misure.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-231_it.htm

Per tener conto delle disparità relative ai periodi di pagamento delle transazioni commerciali tra gli Stati membri, il legislatore europeo ha adottato la direttiva 2011/7/UE sui ritardi di pagamento. La Commissione ritiene della massima importanza che essa sia attuata in modo tempestivo ed efficace e segue attualmente da vicino la sua corretta trasposizione e attuazione. Nel caso dell'Italia la Commissione, per il momento, ha espresso preoccupazioni quanto al recepimento della direttiva nella normativa italiana. Nel merito essa intrattiene attualmente contatti con le autorità italiane.

Se la valutazione giuridica delle misure che recepiscono la direttiva nel diritto nazionale mettesse in luce una mancata conformità al disposto della direttiva, la Commissione potrà adottare le azioni necessarie, tra cui, se del caso, procedure di infrazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006937/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Debt unblocking decree favours local administrations in southern Italy

On 6 April 2013, the Italian cabinet adopted Decree-Law No 35 of 8 April 2013, published in the Italian Official Journal of 8 April 2013, for the settlement of the public administration's debts to local authorities. Data collected on the basis of the decisions taken by the government show that 86.4% of the advances made available by the Cassa Depositi e Prestiti to local authorities has been paid to regions in the south of the country: Campania alone has received a third of the total funds available, followed by Lazio and Calabria, while Lombardy has received only 7.7%, Piedmont 11.1% and Veneto 8.15%.

Among the municipal administrations given priority by the decree are the municipalities of Naples and Reggio Calabria which, although they fall within the revolving fund established by the State for administrations in default, will benefit from funds under the decree to a greater extent than other municipalities that have managed their accounts well. The municipality of Naples has achieved an advance payment of EUR 949 million as requested, about half of the EUR 2 billion made available for Italian municipalities, while the municipality of Reggio Calabria has received EUR 187.5 million. The outcome is that the less competent administrations can meet claims by businesses more quickly than local authorities which paid more attention to their accounts. In their relations with the businesses that supply them, local authorities in the north of the country have to comply with more stringent obligations than those of the Stability Pact: in 2013, Veneto has been the most penalised region of Italy in terms of the per capita spending ceiling laid down by the Pact, which is EUR 328 as compared with EUR 942 for the Basilicata region.

Is the Commission aware of this situation?

In its reply to my Written Question E-004235/2013 'Implementation of the Fiscal Compact and consequences for Italian enterprises of a possible block on old payments by the public administration', the Commission, referring to Decree-Law No 35 of 8 April 2013, stated that it would 'carefully monitor its approval process through the national Parliament and its implementation'.

Can the Commission, under Article 6 TFEU, therefore answer the following questions:

— Does it not agree that the decree-law in question further penalises the authorities that have managed their accounts properly, which are already at a disadvantage due to per capita expenditure that is among the lowest, in areas in which the industrial strength of the country is concentrated, also in view of the goal of economic recovery called for in the Council Recommendation on Italy's 2013 national reform programme for 2012-2017 (COM(2013) 362 of 29 May 2013)?

— What is its view of this disparity between Member States, given that in Italy the average time frame for the payment of debts by government authorities in 2013 is 170 days, against 24 days in Finland?

— Does it believe that directive 2011/7/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 has been correctly implemented and has proven effective against the problem of insolvency of the Italian Government authorities, and what other instruments does it think the government should adopt in order to attain European standards?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(28 October 2013)

At end-2012, the Italian public sector owed a huge stock of trade debt arrears to its suppliers, but some administrations contributed more than proportionally to cumulate the stock; therefore, any plan to accelerate the settlement of such arrears would have a differentiated impact on local public finances. Aware of this, the Commission called in March 2013 ([1]) for the inclusion in the settlement plan of 'adequate safeguards against moral hazard by the administrations responsible for the debt overhang'. Decree-law 35 of 8 April 2013, which lays out the plan to settle EUR 40 bn of trade debt arrears over 2013-2014, does contain some such safeguards.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-231_en.htm

To address the disparities in payment periods of commercial transactions between Member States, the European legislator adopted Directive 2011/7/EU on Late Payments. The Commission considers of outmost importance that it is timely and effectively implemented and is currently strictly monitoring the correct transposition and implementation. In the case of Italy, the Commission at this stage has expressed concerns about the transposition of the directive in Italian law. It is currently in contact with the Italian authorities on this issue.

Should the legal assessment of the measures transposing the directive into national law reveal non-compliance with the requirements of the directive, the Commission may take necessary action including, where appropriate, infringement procedures.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006938/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(14 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Ketamina, farmaco-droga: quale futuro della ricerca per trovare nuove cure a patologie gravi

Dal risultato di due recenti studi sulla depressione maggiore e sul disturbo ossessivo-compulsivo (DOC) è emerso che la ketamina potrebbe essere un valido farmaco nel trattamento di alcuni disturbi psichiatrici. La ketamina ha capacità di antagonizzare i recettori NMDA del glutammato, uno dei più diffusi neurotrasmettitori alla base di numerose funzioni cognitive. In un primo studio, su un campione di 72 pazienti affetti da depressione maggiore che non avevano risposto alle terapie standard, ad un primo follow up nelle 24 ore successive alla somministrazione del farmaco per via endovenosa, i punteggi medi ad un test psicologico che misura la depressione sono risultati dimezzati; nella seconda ricerca condotta su 15 pazienti affetti da DOC, non sottoposti ad alcun trattamento farmacologico o psicoterapeutico, dopo sette giorni dall'infusione del farmaco il 50 % dei pazienti ha mostrato una riduzione dei sintomi ossessivi superiore al 35 %. I ricercatori sono concordi nel sostenere che la ketamina ha la capacità di agire più in fretta e di durare più a lungo rispetto a molti trattamenti «standard»;

Patologie come depressione maggiore e DOC attualmente sono trattate attraverso cure integrate tra psicofarmaci e psicoterapia, in particolare con la pratica psicoanalitica e la ketamina, proprio per i suoi effetti immediati e prolungati nel tempo, viene utilizzata e spacciata come droga e pertanto non è contemplata quale farmaco antidepressivo. La sostanza ha inoltre la capacità di antagonizzare i recettori NMDA del glutammato e nelle 24 ore successive all`infusione endovenosa ha fornito buoni risultati nel trattamento dei sintomi presentati da pazienti e i suoi effetti si protraggono per un tempo maggiore rispetto ai trattamenti con placebo.

Considerato quanto precede, può la Commissione precisare:

— Quale posizione intende assumere, alla luce di tali ricerche, sull`utilizzo di un farmaco-droga, quale la ketamina, per la cura di malattie per le quali cure specifiche e rapide per attenuare i sintomi sono carenti?

— Intende incentivare nei paesi europei metodi di cura integrati che impieghino farmaci e pratiche psicoterapeutiche per il trattamento di patologia gravi, come quelle citate?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(26 luglio 2013)

I medicinali contenenti ketamina vengono impiegati nella medicina umana e veterinaria, primariamente per l'induzione e il mantenimento dell'anestesia generale; tra gli altri impieghi rientrano il trattamento sedativo nel caso di cure intensive, analgesia e terapia del broncospasmo.

Un medicinale può essere immesso nel mercato dell'Unione europea solo in seguito al ritiro dell'autorizzazione all'immissione in commercio conformemente alla legislazione in campo farmaceutico ([1]) da parte dell'autorità competente di uno Stato membro per il suo territorio o della Commissione europea mediante una procedura centralizzata per l'intera UE. Gli Stati membri hanno autorizzato medicinali contenenti ketamina. Finora non è stata presentata nessuna domanda di autorizzazione all'immissione in commercio nell'ambito della procedura centralizzata dell'UE.

Se del caso, il foglio illustrativo del medicinale autorizzato contiene l'indicazione che il trattamento farmacologico dovrebbe essere parte integrante di un più ampio programma terapeutico, con interventi d'ordine psicosociale ed educativo. Esistono esempi di medicinali con tale indicazione, autorizzati a livello centrale ([2]) o nazionale ([3]), ([4]). Non compete tuttavia alla Commissione promuovere alcun medicinale specifico.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 726/2004 che istituisce procedure comunitarie per l'autorizzazione e la sorveglianza dei medicinali per uso umano e veterinario, e che istituisce l'agenzia europea per i medicinali (GU L 136 del 30.4.2004 e successive modifiche) nonché direttiva 2001/83/CE recante un codice comunitario relativo ai medicinali per uso umano (GU L 311 del 28.11.2001 e successive modifiche).

([2]) Selincro, http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/2013/20130225125325/anx_125325_it.pdf

([3]) Medicinali contenenti metilfenidato, http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/2009/2009052755708/anx_55708_it.pdf

([4]) Medicinali contenenti metilfenidato, http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/2009/20090109533111/anx_55708_it.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006938/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Ketamine, a narcotic medication: future prospects of research to find new treatments for serious illnesses?

The results of two recent studies on serious depression and obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD) show that ketamine could be a suitable drug for treating some psychiatric disorders. Ketamine can relax the NMDA glutamate receptors, one of the most widespread neurotransmitters, which is a basis for many cognitive functions. In the first study, on a sample of 72 patients suffering from serious depression who had not responded to standard treatments, at the first follow-up in the 24 hours following intravenous administration of the drug, the average scores on a psychological test measuring depression had halved; in the second study, conducted on 15 patients suffering from OCD, not receiving any pharmacological or psychotherapeutic treatment, after seven days of infusions of the drug 50% of patients had experienced a reduction of over 35% in obsessive symptoms. Researchers agree that ketamine has the capacity to act more quickly and to last longer compared to many 'standard' treatments.

Illnesses such as serious depression and OCD are currently treated by integrated treatment involving drugs for mental illnesses and psychotherapy, in particular psychoanalysis. Because of its immediate and long-lasting effects, ketamine is used and sold as a narcotic and is not therefore viewed as an antidepressant. The substance also has the capacity to relax the NMDA glutamate receptors and in the 24 hours following the intravenous infusion produced good results in the treatment of symptoms presented by patients and its effects last for a longer period than treatments with a placebo.

In view of the above, could the Commission answer the following questions:

— What position does it intend to adopt, in the light of this research, on the use of a narcotic medication such as ketamine in the treatment of illnesses for which there are currently no specific, rapid treatments to mitigate symptoms?

— Does it intend to promote in European countries integrated treatment methods that use drugs and psychotherapy for the treatment of serious illnesses, such as those mentioned above?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2013)

Ketamine-containing medicinal products are used in human and veterinary medicine, primarily for the induction and maintenance of general anaesthesia, other uses include sedation in intensive care, analgesia and treatment of bronchospasm.

A medicinal product can be placed on the European Union market only after a marketing authorisation has been granted in accordance with the pharmaceutical legislation ([1]) either by the competent authority of a Member State for its own territory or by the European Commission via a centralised procedure for the entire EU. Ketamine-containing medicinal products have been authorised by the Member States. So far no marketing authorisation application has been submitted under the EU centralised procedure.

Where appropriate, the approved medicinal product's information includes a statement that pharmacological treatment should be an integral part of a more comprehensive treatment programme, including psychosocial and educational intervention. There are examples of products with such statement, authorised either centrally ([2]) or nationally ([3]) ([4]). However, it is not the role of the Commission to promote any specific medicinal product.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 laying down Community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency, OJ L 136, 30.4.2004, as amended, Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, as amended.
([2]) Selincro, http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/2013/20130225125325/anx_125325_en.pdf
([3]) Methylphenidate- containing medicinal products, http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/2009/2009052755708/anx_55708_en.pdf
([4]) Methylphenidate- containing medicinal products, http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/2009/2009010953111/anx_53111_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006939/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(14 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Misure per favorire il riutilizzo degli olii esausti

La tutela dell'ambiente, la ricerca di nuove tipologie di combustibili e il risparmio da questi derivante sono obiettivi sempre più spesso collegati tra loro nei progetti di ricerca di sviluppo riguardanti la fornitura di elettricità e di biocarburanti. In questo contesto, l'Unione europea è da diversi anni alla guida del processo di incentivazione di nuove tecnologie che consentano di limitare l'impatto sull'ambiente delle attività dell'uomo, sia dal punto di vista istituzionale, grazie ai vari strumenti normativi posti in essere, che dell'imprenditorialità, con le sperimentazioni di nuove tecniche di produzione. A tal proposito, un modello che si sta sempre più diffondendo è quello che vede l'utilizzo degli olii esausti che, tramite un adeguato processo di raffinazione, sarebbero in grado di fungere da combustibile da utilizzare per i trasporti o per generare elettricità. A seconda dei casi, infatti, l'olio da cucina acquisito presso esercenti e privati, tramite una adeguata raccolta differenziata, è sottoposto a transesterificazione, cioè all'induzione di una reazione chimica per mezzo dell'aggiunta di un alcol, o a filtraggio e conseguente deumidificazione: ad ogni modo il risultato è un diesel in grado di alimentare motori per generare, alternativamente, forza motrice o elettricità. Due esempi di questo tipo possono essere attualmente citati. Il primo riguarda una cooperativa di armatori di un grande porto italiano il cui obiettivo è produrre combustibile per i propri pescherecci: secondo alcune stime, infatti, il gasolio, ai prezzi odierni, può arrivare a incidere anche per il 50 % del totale delle spese e, utilizzando il diesel ottenuto dagli olii da cucina, si potrebbe ottenere un risparmio all'incirca di 300 000 euro per l'itera flotta e di 20 000 euro per imbarcazione. Il secondo caso riguarda un'azienda idrica britannica, la quale si prefigge di alimentare una centrale elettrica di 130 GW di potenza con l'olio esausto raccolto da numerose attività di ristorazione, soprattutto situate a Londra. Il progetto potrebbe entrare in funzione dal 2015 e fornire, di conseguenza, energia a quasi 40 000 abitazioni.

Inoltre, gli olii esausti hanno un notevole impatto ambientale e il loro riutilizzo potrebbe portare beneficio nella lotta all'inquinamento.

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

— se la normativa ha già previsto dei programmi specifici volti a incentivare il riciclo degli olii vegetali e, parallelamente, progetti che ne favoriscano il riutilizzo;

— in caso negativo, se intende prendere delle misure particolari in merito?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(31 luglio 2013)

La legislazione dell'UE non comprende strumenti specifici per il sostegno diretto all'uso di olii vegetali esausti. Tuttavia, il loro utilizzo è promosso da diverse politiche europee. Per esempio, la direttiva 2009/28/CE sulla promozione dell'uso dell'energia da fonti rinnovabili ha fissato obiettivi vincolanti per il consumo di energia rinnovabile. L'uso di olii vegetali esausti può contribuire a raggiungere questi obiettivi perché l'energia ricavata da questi prodotti è considerata una fonte rinnovabile. I biocarburanti realizzati dai rifiuti contano il doppio per il raggiungimento degli obiettivi di energia rinnovabile utilizzata nel settore dei trasporti. Questo costituisce un incentivo per gli Stati membri ad attuare misure a sostegno dell'uso di olii vegetali esausti. Inoltre, la direttiva 2009/30/CE relativa alla qualità dei carburanti impone agli Stati membri di ridurre l'intensità di carbonio nel trasporto stradale. L'utilizzo di biocarburanti prodotti da olii esausti è un modo per conseguire questo obiettivo in quanto generalmente i biocarburanti prodotti in questo modo favoriscono una forte riduzione delle emissioni rispetto ai combustibili fossili.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006939/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Measures to encourage the reuse of waste oil

Environmental protection and the search for new types of fuels and the resulting savings are aims that are increasingly linked together in research and development projects on the supply of electricity and bio-fuels. In this context, the European Union has for some years been at the forefront of incentivising new technologies that will allow the environmental impact of human activity to be reduced, both at institutional level, thanks to the various legislative instruments introduced, and in business, with trials of new production techniques. In this respect, a model which is becoming increasingly widespread is the use of waste oil which, through an appropriate refining process, can fuel vehicles or generate electricity. Depending on the circumstances, cooking oil acquired from businesses and private individuals, through appropriate separate waste collection, undergoes a transesterification process: inducing a chemical reaction by adding an alcohol, or is filtered and dehumidified. In any event, the result is a diesel fuel that can be used in engines to generate either motive power or electricity. There are currently two examples of this kind. The first is a cooperative of vessel owners in a large Italian port, whose aim is to produce fuel for their fishing boats: according to some estimates, at today's prices, diesel can amount to as much as 50% of their total costs and, by using diesel obtained from cooking oil, a saving of approximately EUR 300 000 could be achieved for the fleet as a whole, amounting to EUR 20 000 per vessel. The second example is a British water company which plans to fuel a 130 GW capacity power plant using waste oil collected from various catering businesses, mainly located in London. The project could become operational in 2015 and supply energy to nearly 40 000 homes.

Waste oil has a significant environmental impact and reusing it could bring benefits in terms of combating pollution.

In light of the above:

— Can the Commission say whether legislation has already laid down specific programmes to incentivise the recycling of vegetable oil and projects to promote its reuse?

— If not, does it intend to take specific measures in this respect?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

EU legislation does not include instruments specifically supporting the use of waste vegetable oil directly. Still, the use of waste vegetable oils is promoted by several EU policies. The Renewable Energy Directive (2009/28/EC) for instance has established binding targets for the consumption of renewable energy. The use of waste vegetable oil can contribute towards meeting these targets because energy from waste vegetable oil is considered as a source of renewable energy. Biofuels made from waste count double towards the target for renewable energy used in the transport sector. This provides an incentive for Member States to implement measures supporting the use of waste vegetable oils. Further, the Fuel Quality Directive (2009/30/EC) requires Member States to reduce the carbon intensity in road transport. The use of biofuels produced from waste oils represents one way to achieve this objective as biofuels made form waste oil typically lead to significant emission savings compared to the use of fossil fuels.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006941/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(14 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Resistenza ad alcuni antimicrobici nella Salmonella e nel Campylobacter in Europa

Gli antimicrobici sono sostanze usate per il trattamento di un ampio ventaglio di malattie negli esseri umani e animali. Negli Stati membri una persistente resistenza a queste sostanze è stata riscontrata nella salmonella e nel campylobacter, i principali batteri responsabili d'infezioni alimentari. La resistenza e la coresistenza agli antimicrobici devono essere monitorate attentamente in quanto possono rappresentare una seria minaccia alla salute pubblica, comportando conseguenze che si riflettono nell'aumento delle spese sanitarie, il prolungamento della degenza ospedaliera o l'insuccesso dei trattamenti e avendo, talvolta, esiti letali.

La resistenza agli antimicrobici nei batteri zoonotici che interessano esseri umani, animali e generi alimentari, deve essere attentamente monitorata al fine di fornire informazioni preventive qualora dovesse verificarsi un'eventuale diffusione nell'uomo. Vista l'efficacia che i trattamenti con gli antimicrobici hanno dimostrato nell'arrestare ed inibire la crescita di microrganismi, come i batteri responsabili delle infezioni, è necessario uno sforzo congiunto di tutti gli Stati membri, degli operatori sanitari, dell'industria, degli allevatori e di molti altri soggetti per migliorare ed incrementare la ricerca e lo studio della resistenza ad alcuni di questi.

Considerato che la resistenza e la coresistenza agli antimicrobici rappresentano una minaccia per la salute pubblica, poiché essere resistenti a queste sostanze può rendere inefficace il trattamento in caso di malattia; attualmente il trattamento con antimicrobici risulta molto efficace contro le infezioni batteriche dell'uomo e contro la lotta ai crescenti rischi di resistenza agli antimicrobici sono state individuate aree prioritarie di intervento, tra cui un miglioramento del monitoraggio della resistenza a queste sostanze, può la Commissione far sapere:

— come intende intervenire a garanzia dell'utilizzo di antimicrobici che oggi rappresentano un trattamento efficace delle infezioni batteriche nell'uomo;

— come intende sostenere ed incentivare la ricerca in tale campo al fine di prevenire una possibile minaccia per la salute pubblica;

— se intende fornire maggiori informazioni per nuove campagne comunitarie sull'uso prudente degli antimicrobici?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(26 luglio 2013)

Il 15 novembre 2011 la Commissione ha elaborato un piano d'azione di lotta ai crescenti rischi di resistenza antimicrobica ([1]). Tale piano prevede 12 azioni volte, tra l'altro, a rafforzare la promozione dell'utilizzazione adeguata degli antimicrobici in tutti gli Stati membri, a incentivare la prevenzione e il controllo delle infezioni presso le strutture medico-sanitarie, a mettere a punto nuovi antimicrobici efficaci o trovare altre soluzioni di trattamento, nonché a sostenere ulteriori lavori di ricerca e di innovazione. Le iniziative concrete e gli obiettivi operativi di tali azioni sono illustrati nel relativo documento pubblicato dalla Commissione ([2]).

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0748:FIN:IT:PDF.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/antimicrobial_resistance/policy/index_it.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006941/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Resistance to some antimicrobials in Salmonella and Campylobacter in Europe

Antimicrobials are substances used to treat a wide range of illnesses in humans and animals. In the Member States, persistent resistance to these substances has been found in salmonella and campylobacter, the main bacteria responsible for food-borne infections. Resistance and combined resistance to antimicrobials must be carefully monitored since they may pose a serious threat to public health, involving increasing health costs, prolonged hospital stays, treatment failures and, sometimes, death.

Antimicrobial resistance in zoonotic bacteria affecting humans, animals and foods must be closely monitored with a view to providing preventive information should they spread to humans. Given the success of antimicrobial treatment in killing and inhibiting the growth of microorganisms such as bacteria that cause infections, a joint effort by all Member States, healthcare professionals, industry, farmers and many others is needed to improve and increase research and studies of resistance to some antimicrobials.

Resistance and combined resistance to antimicrobials pose a threat to public health, as resistance to these substances may render treatment ineffective in cases of illness; antimicrobial treatment is currently very effective against bacterial infections in humans. In combating the growing risks of antimicrobial resistance key priority areas have been identified, including improving monitoring of antimicrobial resistance. In view of this, can the Commission state:

— what action it intends to take to ensure that antimicrobials, which are currently an effective treatment for bacterial infections in humans, can continue to be used;

— how it intends to support and encourage research in this field with a view to preventing a possible threat to human health;

— whether it intends to provide more information for new EU campaigns on the prudent use of antimicrobials.

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2013)

The Commission issued an action plan against the rising threats from antimicrobial resistance ([1]) on 15 November 2011. This action plan contains 12 measures including strengthening the promotion of appropriate use of antimicrobials in all Member States, strengthening infection prevention and control in healthcare settings, development of new effective antimicrobials or alternatives for treatment and additional research and innovation. An overview of the concrete activities and the operational objectives of these measures are described in the AMR road map published by the Commission ([2]).

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0748:FIN:EN:PDF.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/antimicrobial_resistance/policy/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006942/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(14 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Situazione dei diritti degli animali in Serbia

La Serbia è dal 1 marzo 2012 ufficialmente un Paese candidato ad entrare nell'Unione europea. Nonostante l'importante concessione fatta dal Consiglio europeo, ad oggi è opportuno rimarcare la situazione della tutela dei diritti degli animali in territorio serbo.

Alcune associazioni di volontariato locali hanno, infatti, denunciato le condizioni nelle quali versa il sistema di cattura e detenzione degli animali randagi: nello specifico vengono segnalate le circostanze inerenti i rifugi di due città serbe, Temerin e Subotica. Nel primo caso gli attivisti contestano un'evidente e grave inosservanza delle leggi vigenti in Serbia in tema di tutela degli animali. Secondo i fatti riportati, nel rifugio di Temerin vengono accuditi i randagi catturati nelle zone limitrofe soltanto per pochissimi giorni, precisamente dai 3 ai 7 giorni, prima che questi siano soppressi in osservanza del vecchio regolamento n. 29 del 1994, che, fanno notare i volontari, è da qualche anno stato soppiantato dalla legge veterinaria del 2005. Più precisamente, l'articolo 168 della legge in questione vieta l'abbattimento di animali, esclusi i casi in cui questi siano stati catturati in aree ove vi è un epidemia di rabbia. Per questi motivi si ritiene che il rifugio di Temerin non solo non sia conforme alla normativa, ma sia anche identificabile come un luogo ove gli animali abbandonati sono tenuti per qualche giorno prima di andare incontro alla soppressione. Per quanto concerne il canile di Subotica, che ospita più di 1000 cani e da 2 anni è gestito da volontari del posto, le autorità locali ne hanno recentemente intimato la chiusura per la non conformità con le norme che ne regolano il funzionamento: in questo caso i volontari denunciano che, seppur le contestazioni mosse dalle autorità siano corrette, non vi sono altri luoghi in Serbia dove le condizioni siano migliori e che la chiusura porterà solo al ripristino della pratica, molto diffusa, della soppressione dei cani randagi della zona.

Sulla base di quanto sopra esposto, può la Commissione far sapere:

— se è a conoscenza delle condizioni di trattamento degli animali in Serbia;

— se intende richiamare le autorità serbe ad una maggiore tutela dei diritti degli animali;

— se terrà conto di tale situazione in sede di negoziati sugli acquis comunitari e se ciò possa costituire un vincolo all'ingresso della Serbia nell'Unione europea?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(3 settembre 2013)

In linea con l'articolo 13 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea, la Commissione europea attribuisce grande importanza al benessere degli animali. L'Unione ha già adottato un gran numero di atti legislativi a tutela del benessere degli animali, tuttavia nessuno riguarda la protezione degli animali randagi. L'UE ha il potere di legiferare unicamente in settori specifici delle politiche, quali l'agricoltura, il mercato interno, la salute e la tutela dei consumatori.

Per quanto riguarda la Serbia, la gestione della popolazione di animali randagi e delle strutture per la loro accoglienza da parte delle autorità nazionali responsabili resta di competenza del governo serbo e la questione non rientra pertanto nel processo di adesione.

Il governo serbo ha tuttavia informato la Commissione del fatto che, a seguito di denunce sulla situazione dei canili a Temerin e Subotica, l'Ispettorato veterinario serbo ha effettuato diversi accertamenti nelle due strutture e sta preparando una relazione sui risultati raccolti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006942/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Situation of animal rights in Serbia

Since 1 March 2012, Serbia has officially been a candidate for accession to the European Union. Despite the significance of the European Council's approval, it is right to comment on the situation to date regarding the protection of animal rights in Serbia.

A number of local voluntary associations have denounced the current state of the system of catching and holding stray animals: specifically, they describe the circumstances in shelters in two Serbian towns, Temerin and Subotica. In the first of these, activists maintain that there is a clear and serious failure to comply with the laws in force in Serbia regarding the protection of animals. According to the reports, in the Temerin shelter, strays caught in the neighbouring areas are looked after for just three to seven days before being put down in accordance with former regulation No 29 of 1994 although, as the volunteers point out, this was replaced by the 2005 veterinary law a few years ago. More specifically, Article 168 of the law in question prohibits the slaughter of animals, unless they have been caught in areas where there is a rabies epidemic. For these reasons, I believe that the Temerin shelter not only fails to comply with the law, but can also be identified as a place where abandoned animals are kept for a few days before being slaughtered. As regards the Subotica kennels, which house over 1 000 dogs and has for two years been managed by local volunteers, the local authorities have recently stated that it will be closing due to a failure to comply with the rules governing its operation. According to the volunteers, although the complaints made by the authorities may be correct, there are no other places in Serbia where conditions are better, and closure will only lead to the resumption of the very widespread practice of slaughtering stray dogs in the area.

In view of the above:

— Can the Commission state whether it is aware of the conditions in which animals in Serbia are kept?

— Does it intend to draw the attention of the Serbian authorities to the need for better protection of animal rights?

— Will it take this situation into account when negotiating on the EU acquis, and might this constitute a condition for Serbia's accession to the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(3 September 2013)

In line with Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the European Commission attaches great importance to animal welfare. A considerable body of Union legislation has already been adopted for the protection of animal welfare, which however does not concern the protection of stray animals. The EU's ability to legislate only relates to specific policy areas such as agriculture, internal market, health and consumer protection.

In relation to Serbia, the management of animal shelters and populations of stray animals by the national competent authorities remains under the remit of the Serbian government and is as such not covered by the accession process.

Nevertheless, the Serbian government has informed the Commission that, following complaints regarding the situation in dog shelters in Temerin and Subotica, the Serbian Veterinary Inspectorate has carried out several inspections in the two shelters and is preparing a report on the results of those inspections.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006946/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(14 iunie 2013)

Subiect: Incetinirea ritmului de creștere a producției agricole

Organizația Națiunilor Unite pentru Alimentație și Agricultură (FAO) și Organizația pentru Cooperare și Dezvoltare Economică (OECD) afirmă într-un raport că ritmul de creștere a producției agricole mondiale va încetini în următorii zece ani, aceasta urmând să înregistreze o creștere medie anuală de 1,5% până în 2022 (față de 2,1% în perioada 2003-2012). Încetinirea ritmului de creștere a producției ar putea conduce la creșterea prețurilor globale la alimente.

Comisia este rugată să prezinte un punct de vedere cu privire la acest raport, luând în calcul 1) contribuția UE la creșterea producției agricole mondiale și 2) impactul încetinirii creșterii asupra industriei europene și asupra consumatorilor europeni.

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloş în numele Comisiei
(18 iulie 2013)

Comisia și statele membre au participat la elaborarea raportului FAO-OCDE privind perspectivele din agricultură pentru perioada 2013-2022. Din informațiile furnizate în raport, rezultă că rata de creștere a producției agricole mondiale ar urma într-adevăr să scadă în următorii 10 ani; cu toate acestea, se preconizează o creștere a producției în UE cu până la 0,8 % pe an, după ce în ultimii 10 ani aceasta a fost nulă. În general, potrivit estimărilor, contribuția UE la producția mondială, exprimată ca pondere a UE-27 în producția la nivel mondial, ar urma să scadă, de la 13,2 % în 2012 la 12,0 % în 2022.

Se estimează că rata de creștere a consumului în UE-27 va fi de 0,7 % pe an (în perioada 2012-2020), față de 0,5% cât s-a înregistrat în perioada anterioară (2002-2012). Aceasta înseamnă că este posibil ca exporturile nete ale UE să rămână aproximativ constante.

Ținând cont de cererea tot mai mare la nivel mondial, Comisia consideră că creșterea producției agricole mondiale trebuie realizată în mod sustenabil și eficient din punct de vedere al utilizării resurselor. În acest sens, țările dezvoltate și cele în curs de dezvoltare trebuie să coopereze în chestiuni de securitate alimentară, în cadrul diverselor foruri la nivel mondial. După cum se arată în raport, țările în curs de dezvoltare au capacitatea de a-și îmbunătăți productivitatea prin reducerea decalajului dintre nivelul producției actuale și al celei potențiale.

În ceea ce privește impactul în UE, acordul politic privind PAC din 26 iunie permite crearea unui nou cadru pentru a răspunde provocărilor legate de securitatea alimentară, creșterea economică și crearea de locuri de muncă în zonele rurale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006946/13
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Slowdown in agricultural production growth rate

The UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) confirm in a report that the growth rate of global agricultural production will slow down in the next 10 years, being expected to achieve an average annual growth rate of 1.5% until 2022 (compared with 2.1% for the 2003-2012 period). The slowdown in the production growth rate could push up global food prices.

Can the Commission give its view on this report, taking into account 1) the EU's contribution to the growth in global agricultural production and 2) the impact of the slowdown in growth on European industry and consumers?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2013)

The Commission and Member States participated in the elaboration of the FAO-OECD Agricultural Outlook report 2013-2022. From the information provided in the report, the growth rate of global agricultural production is indeed projected to slow down in the next 10 years; however production growth in the EU is expected to rise to 0.8% per year, after it has been zero in the last 10 years. Overall, the EU's contribution to global production, as the share of EU-27 in world production, is estimated to decrease from 13.2% in 2012 to 12.0% in 2022.

The growth in consumption in the EU-27 is expected to be 0.7% per year (2012 to 2020) versus 0.5% recorded in the prior period (2002 to 2012). This means that the EU net-exports are likely to remain roughly constant.

Given the growing global demand, the Commission trusts that increased global agricultural production must be reached in a sustainable and resource-efficient manner. To do so, developed and developing countries need to cooperate on global food security issues in the various fora. As shown in the report, developing countries have the capacity to improve productivity by narrowing the yield gap between current and potential production.

As regards the impact in the EU, the political agreement on the CAP of 26 June allows for a new framework to respond to the challenges of food security, growth and jobs in rural areas.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006947/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(14 iunie 2013)

Subiect: Efectele inundațiilor din Europa Centrală asupra agriculturii

Inundațiile care au avut loc recent în Austria, Cehia, Germania, Ungaria și Slovacia au compromis suprafețe semnificative de culturi, pentru întregul sezonul agricol. În multe regiuni, aceste inundații au afectat cele mai fertile terenuri agricole și viticole din țările respective. Au avut de suferit suprafețe agricole însămânțate cu grâu, orz, ovăz, porumb și floarea-soarelui. Organizațiile agricultorilor afirmă că este prea târziu ca terenurile inundate din Europa Centrala sa fie semănate din nou după retragerea apelor.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă are în vedere măsuri pentru sprijinirea fermierilor afectați de inundații şi dacă a estimat impactul potențial al efectelor acestor inundații asupra recoltei în UE și asupra prețurilor la alimente.

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(2 august 2013)

Comisia acționează prin diferite metode pentru a sprijini fermierii în caz de calamități și dezastre naturale, cum ar fi inundațiile.

La solicitarea statelor membre, începând cu data de 16.10.2013, Comisia poate autoriza plăți în avans pentru schemele de sprijin direct.

Prin intermediul măsurilor de dezvoltare rurală, Comisia poate oferi un sprijin important pentru refacerea potențialului de producție agricolă și forestieră, compromis de inundații, în special prin intermediul măsurilor 125 și 226 din regulamentul 1698/2005 ([1]).

Comisia a aprobat, de asemenea, în conformitate cu orientările comunitare privind ajutoarele de stat în sectorul agricol și forestier ([2]) o serie de măsuri de ajutor de stat notificate de statele membre în conformitate cu articolul 108 alineatul (3) din TFUE, care vizează repararea daunelor provocate de dezastre naturale de natură excepțională. Sprijinul de stat acordat în temeiul acestor măsuri poate acoperi până la 100 % din valoarea daunelor cauzate în mod direct de aceste dezastre naturale.

În ceea ce privește impactul asupra piețelor, Comisia urmărește îndeaproape evoluția prețurilor și a tendințelor. Perioada umedă excepțională care a cauzat saturarea solului și inundații privește bazinele hidrografice aflate în apropierea râurilor. Impactul la nivel local este devastator pentru agricultorii individuali, însă, la nivel de țară, impactul este redus, întrucât terenul arabil inundat reprezintă o suprafață mică în raport cu suprafața totală de teren arabil. Cu unele excepții având un pronunțat caracter local, nu s-au observat efecte deosebite ale recentelor inundații asupra prețurilor.

De exemplu, tendința generală a prețurilor la cereale este de scădere, odată cu intrarea în noul an de comercializare; de pildă, la Budapesta, prețul porumbului a scăzut cu aproximativ 10 EUR/t de la începutul lunii mai până la sfârșitul lunii iunie, ca urmare a recoltei bogate preconizate pentru 2013-2014.

([1]) JO L 277, 21.10.2005.
([2]) JO C 319, 27.12.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006947/13
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Impact of the flooding in Central Europe on agriculture

The recent flooding which has occurred in Austria, the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary and Slovakia has compromised significant areas of crops for the entire crop season. In many regions, these floods have affected the most fertile farming land and vineyards in the relevant countries. Agricultural area sown to wheat, barley, oats, maize and sunflower has sustained damage. Farmers' organisations confirm that it is too late for the flooded lands in Central Europe to be resown after the waters subside.

Can the Commission specify whether it envisages measures for supporting the farmers affected by flooding and whether it has assessed the potential impact of this flooding on the harvest in the EU and on food prices?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

The Commission acts through different channels to support farmers in cases of calamities and natural disasters such as flooding.

Upon requests of Member States, the Commission can allow advance payments for direct support schemes as from 16/10/2013.

Through Rural Development measures the Commission can bring an important support to re-build the agriculture and forestry production potential compromised by flooding, in particular through measures 125 and 226 of Regulation 1698/2005 ([1]).

The Commission has also approved under the Community guidelines for state aid in the agriculture and forestry sector ([2]) a number of state aid measures notified by the Member States according to Article 108(3) TFEU that aim to make good damages caused by exceptional natural disasters. State support granted under these measures can cover up to 100% of the damages directly caused by these natural disasters.

As for the impact on markets the Commission follows closely the evolution of prices and trends. The exceptional wet period which caused soil saturation and flooding concerns catchment areas close to rivers. The local impact is devastating for single farmers, but at the country level the impact is mitigated as the flooded arable land represents a small area compared to the total area of arable land. With very local exceptions no particular effects of the recent floods on prices could have been observed.

For instance the general price trend for cereals is decreasing while moving into the new marketing year, and the maize price for Budapest has for example decreased by around EUR 10/t from early May to late June in view of the expected large crop in 2013/14.

([1]) OJ L 277, 21.10.2005.
([2]) OJ C 319, 27.12.2006.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006948/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(14 iunie 2013)

Subiect: Reglementarea utilizării produsului rotenone în agricultură

Comisia este rugată să răspundă la următoarele întrebări:

1. Care este statutul legal al produsului „rotenone” utilizat în agricultură, respectiv dacă utilizarea acestuia este permisă în toate statele membre ale UE?

2. Dacă are în vedere propuneri noi cu privire la reglementarea utilizării acestui produs, considerat toxic?

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(18 iulie 2013)

Rotenone nu este aprobat ca substanță activă pentru a fi utilizată în UE în produse fitosanitare.

Cu toate acestea, Rotenone este supus evaluării, în temeiul Directivei 98/8/CE, în vederea utilizării sale ca produs cu efect piscicid. Până la finalizarea acestei evaluări, Rotenone poate fi introdus pe piață pentru a fi utilizat ca produs cu efect piscicid, în conformitate cu normele naționale ale statelor membre.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006948/13
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Regulating the use of the product Rotenone in agriculture

Can the Commission answer the following questions?

1. What is the legal status of the product Rotenone used in agriculture, and is its use permitted in all Member States?

2. Does the Commission envisage new proposals on regulating the use of this product regarded as being toxic?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2013)

Rotenone is not approved as an active substance to be used in plant protection products in the EU.

Rotenone is, however, under assessment under Directive 98/8/EC for its use as a piscicide. Pending the completion of this assessment, Rotenone can be placed on the market for use as a piscicide in accordance with Member States national rules.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006949/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(14 iunie 2013)

Subiect: Reglementarea utilizării produselor pe bază de cupru în agricultură

Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă are în vedere propuneri noi cu privire la reglementarea utilizării produselor pe bază de cupru în agricultură, în cursul acestui mandat.

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(29 iulie 2013)

De mai multe decenii, o serie de compuși ai cuprului au fost autorizați ca aditivi pentru hrana animalelor în cadrul grupării funcționale „oligoelemente”. Pentru a asigura sănătatea animală și publică, au fost stabilite niveluri maxime stricte ale conținutului permis în furajele destinate speciilor vizate. În contextul reevaluării prevăzute la articolul 10 din Regulamentul nr. 1831/2009 ([1]), compușii cuprului existenți au fost evaluați de Autoritatea Europeană pentru Siguranța Alimentară (EFSA).

În plus, compușii cuprului au un efect fungicid și bactericid și sunt utilizați la scară largă în agricultură, ca pesticide. Ei au făcut parte din programul de reevaluare a substanțelor active, în conformitate cu Directiva 91/414/CEE privind introducerea pe piață a produselor de uz fitosanitar, care a fost abrogată și înlocuită cu Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1107/2009 ([2]). Compușii de cupru au fost autorizați prin Directiva 2009/37/CE a Comisiei ([3]), cu dispoziția specială potrivit căreia notificatorii trebuie să prezinte informații suplimentare (date de confirmare) asupra anumitor aspecte legate de evaluarea riscurilor. Astfel, notificatorii au trebuit să efectueze investigații suplimentare cu privire la riscurile pentru organismele nevizate și mediu.

Recent, Comisia a primit din partea EFSA concluziile privind evaluarea *inter pares* a datelor de confirmare pentru compușii de cupru ([4]). În prezent, le examinează pentru a stabili dacă este necesară vreo modificare a condițiilor de autorizare.

([1]) JO L 268, 18.10.2003.
([2]) JO L 309, 24.11.2009.
([3]) JO L 104, 24.4.2009.
([4]) EFSA, 2013 — Concluziile examinării *inter pares* a evaluării riscurilor utilizării ca pesticide pe baza datelor de confirmare prezentate pentru substanțele active conținând cupru (I), cupru (II) și anume hidroxid de cupru, oxiclorură de cupru, sulfat de cupru tribazic, oxid de cupru (I), amestec de Bordeaux. Jurnalul EFSA 2013; 11 (6): 3235, 40 pp. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2013.3235, document disponibil on-line: www.efsa.europa.eu/efsajournal

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006949/13
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Regulating the use of copper-based products in agriculture

Can the Commission specify whether it envisages new proposals on regulating the use of copper-based products in agriculture during this term?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

Since decades, several compounds of copper have been authorised as feed additives under the functional group 'Trace elements'. Strict maximum contents in the feed for the different target species have been fixed in order to ensure animal and public health. In the context of the re-evaluation foreseen in Article 10 of Regulation 1831/2009 ([1]) the existing copper compounds were assessed by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA).

In addition, copper compounds have a fungicide and bactericide effect and are widely used in agriculture as pesticides. They were part of the review programme of active substances under the directive 91/414/EEC concerning the placing on the market of plant protection products, which has been repealed and replaced by Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 ([2]). They have been approved by Commission Directive 2009/37/EC ([3]) with the specific provision for the notifiers to submit further information (confirmatory data) on certain aspects of the risk assessment. This required further investigation by the notifier with respect to the risks for non-target organisms and the environment.

The Commission has recently received from EFSA the conclusions on the peer review of the confirmatory data for copper compounds ([4]) and is currently examining them to identify if any amendment to the conditions of approval is needed.

([1]) OJ L 268, 18.10.2003.
([2]) OJ L 309, 24.11.2009.
([3]) OJ L 104,24.4.2009.
([4]) EFSA 2013. Conclusion on the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of confirmatory data submitted for the active substance Copper (I), copper (II) variants namely copper hydroxide, copper oxychloride, tribasic copper sulphate, copper (I) oxide, Bordeaux mixture. EFSA Journal 2013; 11(6):3235, 40 pp. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2013.3235 available online: www.efsa.europa.eu/efsajournal

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006950/13
adresată Comisiei (Vicepreședintelui/Înaltului Reprezentant)
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(14 iunie 2013)

Subiect: VP/HR — Revenire la întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004398/2013

Am adresat Comisiei (Vicepreședintelui Comisiei/Înaltului Reprezentant al Uniunii pentru afaceri externe și politica de securitate) întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004398/2013, având ca subiect echilibrul geografic în selecția și numirea personalului SEAE. Prin această întrebare, am cerut ca Serviciul European de Acțiune Externă să răspundă la următoarele întrebări:

Care este numărul de angajați ai Serviciului European de Acțiune Externă? Care este originea angajaților SEAE, în funcție de statul membru? Care este originea angajaților SEAE cu funcții de conducere, în funcție de statul membru? Ce măsuri va lua conducerea SEAE pentru realizarea unui echilibru geografic mai pronunțat în selecția și numirea personalului.

Răspunsul primit a făcut referire numai la numărul total de persoane angajate la SEAE, atât la sediul central, cât și în delegații, pe categorii, la data de 25 aprilie 2013. Consider că acest răspuns este nesatisfăcător și adresez din nou aceleași întrebări.

Răspuns dat de dna Ashton, Înalt Reprezentant/Vicepreședinte în numele Comisiei
(26 iulie 2013)

ÎR/VP regretă faptul că, din cauza unei erori tehnice, distinsul deputat a primit un răspuns incomplet la întrebarea E-004398/2013.

În tabelul 1 (din anexă) este prezentată defalcarea pe categorii a întregului personal al SEAE aflat în activitate la 25 aprilie 2013 atât la sediu, cât și în cadrul delegațiilor.

În tabelul 2 (din anexă) este prezentată defalcarea pe state membre a categoriilor „Administratori", „Asistenți" și „Agenți contractuali". Categoria „Administratori" este împărțită în „Funcționari" și „Agenți temporari" (AT: corespund diplomaților din statele membre).

În tabelul 3 (din anexă) este indicat numărul funcțiilor de conducere de la sediu și din delegații, împreună cu totalul. În ultima coloană este indicat procentajul personalului din fiecare stat membru în raport cu totalul.

ÎR/VP se angajează să asigure un echilibru geografic corespunzător și echilibrul de gen al personalului SEAE, precum și o prezență semnificativă a cetățenilor din toate statele membre.

Echilibrul geografic actual reflectă parțial componența personalului transferat la SEAE la 1 ianuarie 2011 de la Comisie și de la Secretariatul General al Consiliului. De la transferul inițial, situația a evoluat într-o anumită măsură, după cum era de așteptat.

SEAE a realizat progrese în ceea ce privește asigurarea unei prezențe semnificative a cetățenilor din toate statele membre, de exemplu în rândul șefilor de delegație. În prezent există șefi de delegație din 25 dintre cele 27 de state membre (numai Cipru și Slovacia nu sunt reprezentate la acest nivel).

ÎR/VP profită de orice ocazie pentru a încuraja candidații calificați de orice naționalitate care poate este în prezent subreprezentată să candideze la posturile pentru care sunt eligibili.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006950/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Returning to the question for a written answer E-004398/2013

I submitted to the Commission (Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy) the question for a written answer E-004398/2013 on the subject of geographical balance in the selection and appointment of staff in the European External Action Service (EEAS). I used this question to ask the EEAS to answer the following questions.

How many people are employed by the EEAS? What is the breakdown by Member State in terms of where EEAS employees come from? What is the breakdown by Member State in terms of where EEAS employees in management positions come from? What measures is the EEAS leadership going to take to achieve a more apparent geographical balance in the selection and appointment of staff?

The reply given referred only to the total number of employees in the EEAS by category, both at headquarters and in delegations, as of 25 April 2013. I feel that this is an unsatisfactory reply and I am therefore asking the same questions again.

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

The HR/VP regrets the incomplete answer given to the Honourable Member's question No E-004398/2013, which was due to a technical error.

The breakdown by categories of all staff in activity in the EEAS, together in Headquarters and in Delegations, on the 25 April 2013 is shown in the Table 1 (in annex).

Table 2 (in annex) shows the breakdown by Member State of the categories of Administrators, Assistants and Contractual Agents. The Administrators category is divided between 'Officials' and 'Temporary Agents' (TA: which correspond to the diplomats from Member States).

Table 3 (in annex) shows the number of management positions either in Headquarters and Delegations, and the total. The last column shows the amount of staff from each Member State as a percentage of the total.

The HR/VP is committed to achieving an adequate geographical balance, as well as gender balance, in the staff of the EEAS, and a meaningful presence of nationals from all Member States.

The current geographical balance, in part, reflects the make up of the staff transferred to the EEAS on 1 January 2011 from the Commission and the General Secretariat of the Council. Since the original transfer, the situation has evolved somewhat as would be expected.

The EEAS has made good progress in achieving a meaningful presence of all Member State nationals, for example, among Heads of Delegation. There are now Heads of Delegation from 25 of 27 Member States (only Cyprus and Slovakia are not represented at that level).

The HR/VP takes every opportunity to encourage good candidates from any nationality which may currently be under-represented to put themselves forward for posts for which they are eligible.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006952/13
a la Comisión
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(14 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Turismo respetuoso con el medio ambiente

En el informe sobre Europa primer destino turístico del mundo: un nuevo marco político para el turismo europeo, en su apartado 50 se hace referencia a la promoción de una iniciativa comunitaria transversal en el ámbito del impacto ambiental del turismo, prestando especial atención a la biodiversidad europea, el ciclo de los residuos, el ahorro hídrico y energético, la dieta saludable y el uso de la tierra y los recursos naturales, con el fin de difundir información y materiales útiles, sensibilizar a la opinión pública y reducir el impacto del turismo en el medio ambiente.

— ¿Cuándo tiene previsto la Comisión llevar a cabo tal iniciativa?

— ¿Se tiene previsto fomentar el turismo ecológico, así como el uso de energías limpias y renovables, y el reciclado de desechos en las instalaciones del sector turístico por medio de sanciones o incentivos?

Respuesta del Sr. Tajani en nombre de la Comisión
(31 de julio de 2013)

La Comisión reconoce que el turismo debe gestionarse de forma responsable y sostenible tanto en la Unión Europea como a escala mundial, con el fin de evitar efectos perjudiciales para el medio ambiente.

La Comisión ya ha propuesto varias iniciativas a escala de la UE para promover una gestión del turismo sostenible y respetuosa con el medio ambiente. Se trata, entre otras medidas, del desarrollo de un sistema europeo de indicadores para la gestión sostenible de destinos turísticos (ETIS) ([1]), que se puso en marcha para el uso de los diversos destinos en febrero de 2013 e incluye indicadores pertinentes, entre otras cosas, en materia de protección de la biodiversidad, reciclado de residuos y ahorro de energía y de agua.

La Comisión también ha cofinanciado varios proyectos transnacionales relacionados con el cicloturismo o el senderismo ([2]), fomentando así la reducción de las emisiones de CO_2 procedentes de la industria del turismo.

Además, la Comisión ofrece varios instrumentos voluntarios para facilitar una correcta gestión ambiental para las empresas, también en el sector del turismo, como la etiqueta ecológica de la UE ([3]) o el sistema de gestión y auditoría medioambientales de la UE (EMAS) ([4]).

Mediante sus iniciativas, la Comisión fomenta prácticas destinadas a reducir al mínimo las repercusiones negativas de las actividades turísticas en el medio ambiente. Sin embargo, la aplicación de sanciones a instalaciones turísticas no entra en el ámbito de competencias de la Comisión en el ámbito del turismo.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/sustainable-tourism/indicators/index_en.htm

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/cycling-tourism/index_en.htm

([3]) En relación con el sistema de etiqueta ecológica de la UE, ya están disponibles los criterios ecológicos de concesión de la etiqueta a los alojamientos turísticos y a los servicios de campings (Decisiones 2009/578/CE y 2009/564/CE, respectivamente), que son válidos hasta el 30 de noviembre de 2015. Los dos conjuntos de criterios de la etiqueta ecológica de la UE tienen por objeto limitar las repercusiones ambientales más importantes de las tres fases del ciclo de vida de los servicios (compra, prestación del servicio y residuos). Para más información: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ecolabel/

([4]) Parte de las actividades EMAS de la Comisión Europea es la publicación de un informe científico y político sobre las mejores prácticas de gestión medioambiental en el sector turístico, que puede consultarse en el siguiente sitio web:
http://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/activities/emas/file_exchange/Tourism_JRC_Report_final.pdf
Este documento indica las prácticas más avanzadas en materia de resultados medioambientales, en todos los ámbitos pertinentes, y permite que otros aprendan de los pioneros. Además de ello, el sitio web de EMAS proporciona una lista de todos los hoteles y campings registrados en EMAS para ayudar al público a identificar aquellas organizaciones que mejoran voluntariamente su comportamiento medioambiental:
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/emas/pdf/EMAS%20Registered%20Hotels%20List%20by%20Country.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006952/13
to the Commission
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Environmentally friendly tourism

Paragraph 50 of the report on Europe, the world's No 1 tourist destination — a new political framework for tourism in Europe refers to the need to promote a cross-cutting Community initiative on the environmental impact of tourism, with particular reference to European biodiversity, the waste cycle, energy and water saving, a healthy diet and the use of land and natural resources, in order to distribute information and useful materials, raise public awareness and reduce the impact of tourism on the environment.

— When will the Commission undertake this initiative?

— Will the Commission use sanctions or incentives to promote eco-tourism, the use of clean and renewable energies and recycling of waste in tourist facilities?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

The Commission acknowledges that tourism, both at European Union level and globally, needs to be managed in a responsible and sustainable manner to avoid negative impacts on the environment.

The Commission has already proposed several EU level initiatives to encourage sustainable, including environmentally friendly, tourism management. These include, amongst others, the development of a European system of indicators for the sustainable management of tourist destinations (ETIS) ([1]). The European Tourism Indicator System was launched for destinations' use in February 2013 and it includes relevant indicators, amongst others, related to biodiversity protection, waste recycling, energy and water saving.

The Commission has also co-financed several transnational projects related to cycle or hiking tourism ([2]), encouraging the reduction of CO_2 emissions in the tourism industry.

Moreover, the Commission offers several voluntary tools to facilitate sound environmental management for businesses, including in the tourism sector, such as the EU Ecolabel ([3]) or the Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS) ([4]).

By its initiatives the Commission encourages practices aiming at minimising the negative impact of tourism activities on the environment. However, the use of sanctions on tourist facilities does not fall under the Commission competence in the field of tourism.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/sustainable-tourism/indicators/index_en.htm

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/cycling-tourism/index_en.htm

([3]) Regarding the EU Ecolabel scheme, ecological criteria to award this label to tourist accommodations and campsites services are available (Decisions 2009/578/EC and 2009/564/EC, respectively) and valid until 30 November 2015. The referred two set of EU Ecolabel criteria aim to set limits on the main environmental impacts from the three phases of these services' life cycle (purchasing, provision of the service and waste). For more information: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ecolabel/

([4]) Part of the EMAS activities of the European Commission is the publication of a Scientific and Policy Report on Best Environmental Management Practice in the Tourism Sector, which can be viewed on the following website:
http://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/activities/emas/file_exchange/Tourism_JRC_Report_final.pdf
This document identifies the most advanced practices, in terms of environmental performance, in all relevant areas, and enables others to learn from front runners. Further to this, the EMAS website provides a list of all EMAS registered hotels and campsites to help the general public identify those organisations that voluntarily improve their environmental performance: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/emas/pdf/EMAS%20Registered%20Hotels%20List%20by%20Country.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006953/13
a la Comisión
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(14 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Página web informativa dirigida a las personas con discapacidad, donde se exploren sus derechos

Los proveedores de información y servicios, tales como los organismos del sector público, confían cada vez más en Internet para producir, recoger y proporcionar una amplia gama de información y servicios en línea, que son esenciales para el público.

El acceso a las ITC, donde destaca la accesibilidad a páginas web, es actualmente un derecho fundamental del que todo el mundo debe beneficiarse. Asimismo, incrementa el nivel de autonomía e independencia y representa una oportunidad para integrarse en la sociedad en igualdad de condiciones.

En la sociedad actual, un elevado porcentaje de personas con discapacidad desconoce los derechos y garantías de que disponen a nivel europeo, e incluso nacional.

Considerando que actualmente Internet es el mayor y más rápido medio de difusión;

Considerando que el artículo 9 de la Convención de las Naciones Unidas sobre los derechos de las personas con discapacidad obliga a los Estados miembros y a la UE a tomar las medidas adecuadas para asegurar el acceso de las personas con discapacidad, en igualdad de condiciones con las demás, a servicios como las tecnologías de la información y las comunicaciones, incluida Internet;

Considerando que en la Comunicación «Una Agenda Digital para Europa» la Comisión anunciaba que los sitios web del sector público deberían ser plenamente accesibles para 2015;

Considerando que la Estrategia Europea sobre Discapacidad 2010-2020 incluye medidas en varios ámbitos prioritarios, incluida la accesibilidad de los sitios web, con el objetivo de «garantizar la accesibilidad a los bienes y servicios, en especial los servicios públicos y los dispositivos de apoyo para las personas con discapacidad»;

1. ¿Qué medidas estima necesarias la Comisión para lograr la plena accesibilidad a las páginas web de entidades públicas?

2. ¿Considera oportuno la Comisión crear una página web específica para acercar Europa y los derechos que desde Bruselas se defienden a las personas con discapacidad?

Respuesta de la Sra. Kroes en nombre de la Comisión
(31 de julio de 2013)

Para que los sitios web del sector público sean plenamente accesibles, sería necesaria una norma europea armonizada para la accesibilidad de los sitios web, más la obligación de aplicar esta norma a un conjunto limitado de sitios web de organismos del sector público. Esto ayudaría a las administraciones nacionales a hacer sus sitios accesibles a todos y a cumplir asimismo con las obligaciones y compromisos que han asumido en cuanto a la accesibilidad de sus sitios web. En diciembre de 2012, la Comisión adoptó una propuesta de Directiva sobre la accesibilidad de los sitios web de los organismos del sector público ([1]), que actualmente está en proceso de codecisión. La Comisión también dio un mandato (M/376) a los organismos europeos de normalización para que elaborasen una norma en la que se especifiquen los requisitos de accesibilidad funcional para los productos y servicios de TIC, incluidos los contenidos web. El proyecto de norma definitiva está a disposición del público para que formulen sus comentarios y está previsto que la norma propuesta se acepte en la primera mitad de 2014. Sobre esta base, puede establecerse una norma europea armonizada.

Además, la Comisión está estudiando actualmente la posibilidad de presentar un instrumento jurídico sobre la aproximación de las disposiciones legales, reglamentarias y administrativas de los Estados miembros por lo que se refiere a los requisitos de accesibilidad de bienes y servicios.

([1]) COM(2012) 721 final.

En su documento sobre la Estrategia Europea sobre Discapacidad 2010-2020 ([2]), la Comisión se comprometió a trabajar para garantizar que las personas con discapacidad sean conscientes de sus derechos, prestando especial atención a la accesibilidad de los materiales y de los canales de información. La UE apoya y completa las campañas nacionales de sensibilización y proporciona financiación a la red de ONG activas en temas de discapacidad a escala de la UE que trabajan en la promoción de la Convención de las Naciones Unidas sobre los Derechos de las Personas con Discapacidad (UNCRPD) tanto a nivel de la UE como a nivel nacional.

([2]) Estrategia Europea sobre Discapacidad 2010-2020:un compromiso renovado para una Europa sin barreras (COM(2010) 0636 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT). La sensibilización es uno de los instrumentos definidos en la Estrategia Europea sobre Discapacidad para respaldar su aplicación. Véase la lista de acciones para el período 2010-2015, SEC (2010) 1324 final en: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/lexuriserv/lexuriserv.do?uri=celex:52010sc1324:en:not [sólo existe en inglés].

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006953/13
to the Commission
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Website to help disabled persons understand their rights

Organisations such as public sector bodies are increasingly coming to rely on the Internet in order to collect and disseminate information and to provide a wide range of basic public services online.

Access to ICTs (Information and Communications Technologies), including website accessibility, is now a fundamental right which should be enjoyed by all. It gives disabled persons more independence and an opportunity to integrate into society in the same way as everyone else.

Many disabled people are currently unaware of the rights and guarantees they have at European, or even national, level.

The Internet is currently the largest and fastest communications tool.

Article 9 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) requires Member States and the EU to take appropriate measures to ensure that persons with disabilities have access, on an equal basis with others, to services such as information and communications technologies, including the Internet.

In its communication 'A Digital Agenda for Europe' the Commission announced that public sector websites should be fully accessible by 2015.

The European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 includes measures in several priority areas, including website accessibility, with the objective of ensuring 'accessibility to goods and services, including public services and assistive devices for people with disabilities.'

1. In the light of the above, what measures does the Commission think are needed in order to ensure that public sector websites are fully accessible?

2. Does it think that it would be a good idea to launch a specific website to help disabledpersons understand their rights under EC law?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

To make public sector websites fully accessible, a harmonised European standard for Web-accessibility would be needed, plus the obligation to apply this standard to a limited set of public sector bodies' websites. This would help national administrations to make their websites accessible to all and to fulfil the obligations and commitments they have made regarding the accessibility of their websites. In December 2012, the Commission has adopted a proposal for a directive on the accessibility of public sector bodies' websites ([1]), which currently is in co-decision process. The Commission has also issued a mandate (M/376) to the European Standards Organisations to develop a standard specifying the functional accessibility requirements for ICT products and services, including web content. The final standard draft is available for public comments and the proposed standard is set to be accepted in the first half of 2014. Based on this, a harmonised European standard can be established.

In addition, the Commission is currently examining the possibility to present a legal instrument on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States as regards the accessibility requirements of goods and services.

([1]) COM(2012) 721 final.

In the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([2]) the Commission committed to work to ensure that people with disabilities are aware of their rights, paying special attention to accessibility of materials and information channels. The EU supports and supplements national public awareness campaigns and provides funding for EU-level disability network NGOs active in the promotion of the UNCRPD at EU as well national level.

([2]) 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. Awareness-raising is one of the instruments identified in the European Disability Strategy to underpin its implementation. See the list of actions for 2010-2015, SEC(2010)1324 final at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/ LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006954/13
a la Comisión
Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D)
(14 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Compatibilidad de la Ley española de Protección y uso del litoral y de modificación de la Ley de Costas con la legislación de la UE

El pasado 31 de mayo entró en vigor en España la Ley de protección y uso sostenible del litoral y la modificación de la Ley de costas (publicada en el B.O.E. de 30 de mayo). En su respuesta E-001300/2013, la Comisión se comprometía a evaluar dicha legislación desde su entrada en vigor y a valorar la necesidad de adoptar medidas particulares si se detectaban inadecuaciones de la ley a la normativa de la UE.

En concreto, la nueva legislación española podría presentar problemas de incompatibilidad con las siguientes directivas:

— Directiva 2000/60/CE por la que se establece un marco comunitario de actuación en el ámbito de la política de aguas, en especial por lo que respecta a medidas insuficientes para garantizar la protección de las aguas costeras y aguas de transición;

— Directiva 2007/60/CE relativa a la evaluación y gestión de los riesgos de inundación, especialmente en la delimitación de las zonas con probabilidad de inundación que podrían quedar con un inadecuado grado de protección;

— Directiva 2008/56/CE por la que se establece un marco de acción comunitaria para la política del medio marino, especialmente sobre el impacto de las medidas para garantizar un estado ecológico satisfactorio de las aguas afectadas por el uso que permite la ley;

— Directiva 2009/147/CE relativa a la conservación de las aves silvestres, especialmente por lo que respecta a las necesidades de protección de las especies dentro de la zona geográfica marina y terrestre de aplicación de esta Directiva;

— Directiva 92/43/CEE relativa a la conservación de los hábitats naturales y de la fauna y flora silvestres, especialmente en lo que se refiere a la variación de las medidas de conservación de lugares de importancia comunitaria;

— Directiva 2006/123/CE relativa a los servicios en el mercado interior, especialmente por lo que respecta al procedimiento de renovación de las concesiones administrativas y a la duración de dichas concesiones.

¿Puede garantizar la Comisión que la nueva ley española cumple los preceptos de las Directivas mencionadas?

¿Qué medidas piensa emprender la Comisión en el caso de detectar errores graves de inadecuación a la normativa comunitaria?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(9 de agosto de 2013)

La Comisión ha recibido quejas sobre la posible incompatibilidad entre esta nueva Ley española y la legislación medioambiental de la UE. La Comisión está estudiando en la actualidad las alegaciones que le han presentado los denunciantes. A la vista de las conclusiones de esta evaluación, la Comisión podría decidir abrir una investigación oficial y solicitar mayor información de las autoridades españolas. En cualquier caso, la Comisión no dudará en tomar las medidas necesarias para garantizar el correcto cumplimiento de la normativa de la UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006954/13
to the Commission
Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Spanish law on protection and use of the shoreline and amending the Coasts Act: compatibility with EU legislation

The Spanish law on protection and use of the shoreline and amending the Coasts Act (published in the Spanish Official Gazette on 30 May 2013) entered into force in Spain on 31 May 2013. In its answer to Question E-001300/2013, the Commission promised to assess this law once it had entered into force, specifically with a view to determining whether particular action would be needed to remove inconsistencies with EU legislation.

The new Spanish law might pose problems on account of its incompatibility with the following directives:

— Directive 2000/60/EC establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy, especially as regards measures insufficient to protect coastal and transitional waters;

— Directive 2007/60/EC on the assessment and management of flood risks, especially as regards the delimitation of areas where flooding is likely to occur and the risk that they might not be properly protected;

— Directive 2008/56/EC establishing a framework for Community action in the field of marine environmental policy, especially as regards the impact of measures to maintain good environmental status in the waters used for the purposes allowed by the law;

— Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds, especially as regards the protection needs of species within the marine and terrestrial geographical area covered by the directive;

— Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, especially as regards departures from conservation measures for sites of Community importance;

— Directive 2006/123/EC on services in the internal market, especially as regards the procedure for renewing administrative concessions and the duration of such concessions.

Can the Commission guarantee that the new Spanish law will fulfil the requirements of the abovementioned directives?

What steps will it take if the new law is found to be seriously flawed in terms of its compatibility with EU legislation?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

The Commission has received complaints on the possible incompatibility between this new Spanish law and EU environmental legislation. The Commission are currently assessing the allegations brought to its attention by the complainants. In view of the conclusions of this assessment, the Commission may decide to launch a formal investigation and request further information from the Spanish authorities. In any event, the Commission will not hesitate to take the necessary measures to ensure that EU legislation is correctly applied.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006956/13
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: EU-Malaysia trade

Although Malaysia is currently negotiating a free-trade agreement with the European Union, the country still enjoys trade preferences under the EU's Generalised Scheme of Preferences (GSP). However, this arrangement is due to lapse at the end of this year with the introduction of the EU's new GSP system, which excludes upper-middle economies such as Malaysia. Given that the EU-Malaysia Free Trade Agreement is unlikely to be concluded by then, this clearly creates a certain degree of legal uncertainty for both the Government of Malaysia and European and Malaysian businesses.

Can the Commission therefore state what measures it has already taken or plans to take in the near future in order to remedy this situation?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2013)

The EU and Malaysia have been in negotiations on a Free Trade Agreement (FTA) since December 2010 with the objective of concluding an ambitious agreement liberalising substantially all trade in goods between the parties as well as services and other areas such as procurement. The Agreement will provide a predictable and long-term access to the EU market.

The EU adopted the reformed GSP Regulation in October 2012 ([1]). The publication of the new Regulation was accompanied by a comprehensive information package explaining the changes and implications to all affected beneficiaries.

In addition, the EU has during the decision-making process on the GSP reform clearly communicated the objectives behind the reform (with its focus on countries most in need) and the possible impact on concerned GSP beneficiaries, such as upper middle income countries like Malaysia, in the absence of a concluded FTA.

Thus, the Government of Malaysia and business both in the EU and Malaysia have been given the necessary time and legal certainty to adapt to the new applicable regime as of 1 January 2014.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 978/2012 of Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 applying a scheme of generalised tariff preferences and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 732/2008, OJ L 303, 31.10.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006957/13
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Civil society monitoring committees under the Association Agreement with Central America

As the Commission has acknowledged many times (E-006385/2012), civil society is expected to play a significant role in implementing the trade and sustainable development provisions in Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) through joint civil society platforms and Domestic Advisory Groups (DAGs) such as the DAG already established under the EU-Korea FTA.

Can the Commission state whether any Central American countries have proposed removing or weakening civil society committees under the Association Agreement between the EU and Central America? If so, can the Commission indicate which countries have taken such approaches?

Can the Commission also confirm that it will robustly defend the inclusion in FTAs of civil society monitoring committees, including DAGs as established in the EU-Korea FTA?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

The countries of Central America and the Commission are actively working on the provisional application of the trade chapter of the EU-Central America Association Agreement. This includes the setting up of the necessary bodies of the Agreement amongst which are the Board on Trade and Sustainable Development and the civil society Advisory Groups. In this context, no Central America State has expressed to the Commission any intention of altering or weakening the provisions concerning civil society involvement included in this Agreement.

The Commission considers the involvement of civil society in the implementation of the provisions on trade and sustainable development included in EU Free Trade Agreements as a key element, and will continue to pursue in ongoing negotiations the inclusion of appropriate mechanisms to this effects.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006958/13
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership issues

1. As the EU prepares to launch negotiations on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) with the USA, what assurances can the Commission give that employment and social rights, including freedom of association and collective bargaining, will be protected, both in the negotiating partner countries involved and in any third countries affected by the agreement?

2. What action will the Commission be taking to remedy the US's failure to implement fundamental ILO Conventions, which could compromise the ability to establish effective fundamental human rights and labour standards clauses within the trade agreement?

3. What action will the Commission take to ensure the quality of, and access to, public services and utilities, and the right of the US and of EU Member States to retain the freedom to decide how these services are delivered, which includes the legitimate choice to keep them publicly run?

4. In addition, what provisions will be put in place to ensure that trade unions are able to participate fully in the negotiation process, as well as in any subsequent implementation monitoring and enforcement?

5. The Commission will be aware that the TTIP with the US is raising the same concerns over investor-state issues that have dogged the EU-Canada negotiations. What assurances can the Commission give that private companies will not be given an unacceptable level of power, enabling them to sue the European Union, Member States or public authorities at any level in those states?

6. Can the Commission provide details of its position regarding the US's sanctions against EU companies that trade with Cuba, and whether the EU will oppose finalising the agreement until the US's illegal blockade on Cuba is lifted?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(30 July 2013)

The TTIP negotiations provide a good basis to achieve ambitious provisions on labour rights. The Commission aims to build on the key elements of the EU trade and sustainable development chapters concluded so far, including the respect and implementation of core labour standards and the set-up of mechanisms for involving civil society and workers' organisations in the monitoring of provisions.

For public services, the Commission will be guided by the negotiating directives, which refer to relevant EU Treaty provisions and protocols. Investor-to-state dispute settlement (ISDS) is not a mechanism limiting the EU/ or the Member States' right to regulate. The EU is working to ensure that the relevant rules enable regulatory measures to be consistent with investment protection provisions. If a claim brought by a foreign investor is legally justified, the Respondent will be able to choose between various options: modify the measure at stake, or provide compensation or restitution of the property unduly taken. The Commission also aims to prevent the abuse of the ISDS mechanism, whether by US or EU investors. It will include language barring frivolous claims and a number of safeguards which will make investors think twice before raising an ISDS claim.

The EU has enacted Regulation 2271/96 to protect the economic interests of EU companies and citizens from the extra-territorial effects of US sanctions. According to the regulation, such effects violate international law and impede the objective of progressive abolition of restrictions on international trade.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006959/13
alla Commissione
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(14 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Sigarette elettroniche: trovati metalli pesanti in liquidi

La procura di Torino ha aperto un nuovo fascicolo d'indagine nell'ambito dell'inchiesta sulle sigarette elettroniche. Un'analisi del prodotto effettuata dal dipartimento di Farmacia dell'*Università Federico II* di Napoli e sollecitata dal settimanale *il Salvagente*, ha portato alla luce la presenza di alcuni metalli pesanti tossici per l'uomo: piombo, cadmio, cromo e arsenico. Sembrerebbe, sostiene il procuratore Guariniello, che i valori di tali sostanze siano molto elevati, con una concentrazione di arsenico maggiore, in alcuni dei campioni analizzati, di quella ammessa per l'acqua potabile. In mancanza di una normativa di riferimento che stabilisca le sostanze ammesse nel prodotto e che preveda una valutazione del rischio per la salute di chi utilizza le sigarette, il pericolo di avere dei prodotti sul mercato molto dannosi per la salute umana è concreto.

— È la Commissione a conoscenza dei fatti sopra esposti?

— Prevede di avviare, in tempi brevi, uno studio approfondito che accerti l'eventuale presenza di sostanze nocive per la salute umana?

— È intenzionata a operare una valutazione del rischio sui prodotti diffusi in commercio?

— Intende proporre una normativa organica in materia che garantisca la salute dei consumatori in tutto il territorio dell'UE?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(16 luglio 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza delle discussioni in merito ai rischi sanitari connessi alle sigarette elettroniche e degli studi finora realizzati in tale ambito. Sono state pubblicate anche talune notifiche sulla piattaforma di allarme rapido RAPEX.

Conformemente alla proposta della Commissione riguardante la revisione della direttiva sui prodotti del tabacco ([1]), le sigarette elettroniche contenenti livelli di nicotina superiori a determinate soglie rientrerebbero nel quadro legislativo dei prodotti medicinali. Di conseguenza, prima dell'immissione sul mercato, richiederebbero un'autorizzazione a norma della legislazione farmaceutica. La soglia di nicotina è stata identificata basandosi sul tenore di nicotina delle terapie sostitutive di tale sostanza che sono già state autorizzate all'immissione sul mercato dagli Stati membri.

Per quanto riguarda le sigarette elettroniche il cui contenuto di nicotina non superi le suddette soglie, la proposta della Commissione prevede che debbano recare avvertenze sanitarie. Esse devono inoltre continuare a rispettare le disposizioni della direttiva sulla sicurezza generale dei prodotti.

La Commissione ritiene che la maggior parte delle sigarette elettroniche attualmente sul mercato dovrebbe disporre di un'autorizzazione all'immissione in commercio come prodotto farmaceutico. La loro commercializzazione dovrebbe quindi rispettare le norme applicabili ai prodotti medicinali, compresa un'analisi rischio/beneficio prima dell'immissione sul mercato, l'obbligo di rispettare standard qualitativi noti come «buone prassi di fabbricazione» e l'obbligo di rispettare il sistema di farmacovigilanza dell'UE.

([1]) COM(2012)788 def.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006959/13
to the Commission
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Electronic cigarettes: heavy metals found in e-liquids

The Turin public prosecutor's office has opened a new file in the investigation into electronic cigarettes. An analysis of the e-liquids used in electronic cigarettes carried out by the Department of Pharmacy at the *Università Federico II* in Naples, the results of which were published in *il Salvagente* magazine, revealed the presence of some toxic heavy metals: lead, cadmium, chrome and arsenic. Prosecutor Guariniello has stated that high levels of these substances appear to be present in some of the samples analysed and that the concentrations of arsenic found in e-liquids were higher than those authorised for drinking water. In the absence of any standards specifying which substances are permitted in e-liquids and stipulating that the health risks to users must be assessed, there is a real danger of having products very harmful to public health available on the market.

— Is the Commission aware of this issue?

— Does it intend to initiate an in-depth study in the near future to verify whether e-liquids contain substances that are harmful to health?

— Does it intend to carry out a risk assessment of the e-liquids which are already on the market?

— Does it intend to propose new standards on electronic cigarettes to protect the health of consumers throughout the EU?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(16 July 2013)

The Commission is aware of the discussions about adverse health risks associated with electronic cigarettes and the studies carried out thus far. There were also a number of alerts in the rapid alert plaform RAPEX.

According to the Commission proposal for a revised Tobacco Product Directive, ([1]) electronic cigarettes would fall under the legal framework for medicinal products if they contain levels of nicotine above certain thresholds. Thus, their market launch would require prior marketing authorisation under pharmaceutical legislation. The nicotine threshold has been identified by considering the nicotine content of nicotine replacement therapies that have already received a marketing authorisation by Member States.

For electronic cigarettes below the thresholds, the Commission proposal foresees that they carry health warnings. They would also have to comply with the General Product Safety Directive as it is the case at the moment.

The Commission estimates that the majority of electronic cigarettes currently on the market would require marketing authorisation as a pharmaceutical product. Their placing on the market would thus have to comply with the rules applying to medicinal products, including a prior risk/benefit analysis before market launch, an obligation to comply with quality standards known as 'good manufacturing practice' and an obligation to comply with an EU wide system of pharmacovigilance.

([1]) COM(2012) 788 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006960/13
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE)
(14 juni 2013)

Betreft: VP/HR — Bestorming gemeentehuis Skopje-centrum (Macedonië)

Op vrijdag 7 juni 2013 bestormde een menigte in Skopje (Macedonië) het gemeentehuis in Skopje-Centrum, waar de gemeenteraad in zitting bijeen was. De menigte scandeerde racistische, xenofobische en grievende leuzen, waarna de ingang van het gemeentehuis werd gebarricadeerd. Ondanks de aanwezigheid van de politie, werd er niet ingegrepen. Burgemeester Andrej Zernovski (leider van de Liberal democratic Party en aanwezig bij de vergadering) heeft de autoriteiten direct gevraagd om op te treden tegen de menigte, maar dit is niet gebeurd.

1. Heeft de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger kennis genomen van de recente gewelddadigheden in Skopje?

2. Vindt de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger ook dat de Macedonische autoriteiten alles moeten doen om de vrijheid van (politieke) vergadering en de vrijheid van meningsuiting te beschermen en dat het niet ingrijpen van de politie ter plaatse onaanvaardbaar is? Gaat zij de Macedonische autoriteiten hierop aanspreken?

3. Welke acties gaat de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger ondernemen richting om te voorkomen dat dergelijke gewelddadigheden zich wederom voordoen?

4. Volgens getuigen zijn de gewelddadigheden door de autoriteiten georkestreerd. Heeft de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger hier aanwijzingen voor? Welke consequenties verbindt de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger hieraan?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(3 september 2013)

De Commissie is op de hoogte van de incidenten die op 7 juni plaatsvonden bij het gemeentehuis van Skopje-Centrum.

Het hoofd van de EU-delegatie en andere internationale vertegenwoordigers in Skopje hebben tegenover de minister van Binnenlandse Zaken hun bezorgdheid uitgesproken over het gewelddadige karakter van het protest, waarbij de bescherming van het gemeentehuis niet volledig was gewaarborgd. De Commissie hecht bijzonder belang aan de bescherming van de grondrechten als de vrijheid van vergadering en de vrijheid van meningsuiting. Dergelijke rechten mogen evenwel niet worden misbruikt voor gewelddadige doeleinden.

De Commissie zal in haar jaarlijkse voortgangsverslag verslag blijven uitbrengen over de eerbiediging van de grondrechten door de voormalige Joegoslavische republiek Macedonië. Het volgende voortgangsverslag zal op 16 oktober 2013 verschijnen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006960/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Storming of city hall in Skopje-Centre (FYROM)

On Friday 7 June 2013 a crowd in Skopje (former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) stormed the Skopje-Centre city hall, where the city council was meeting. The crowd chanted racist, xenophobic and hurtful slogans, whereupon the entrance to the town hall was barricaded. Although the police were present, they did not intervene. The Mayor, Andrej Zernovski (leader of the Liberal Democratic Party), who was present at the meeting, asked the authorities directly to move against the crowd, but this did not happen.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the recent violence in Skopje?

2. Does the Vice-President/High Representative agree that the Macedonian authorities should do all in their power to protect the freedom of (political) assembly and the freedom of expression, and that the non-intervention by the police on site is unacceptable? Will she speak to the Macedonian authorities about this?

3. What measures will the Vice-President/High Representative take to prevent the recurrence of such violence?

4. According to witnesses, the violence was orchestrated by the authorities. Does the Vice-President/High Representative have any evidence for this? If so, what action will the Vice-President/High Representative take in consequence?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(3 September 2013)

The Commission is aware of the incidents that occurred on 7 June at the Municipal Council of Skopje-Centar.

The Head of the EU Delegation, and other international representatives in Skopje, have expressed concerns to the Minister of Interior about the violent nature of part of the protest, during which the protection of the premises of Centar municipality was not fully ensured. The Commission attaches particular importance to the protection of the fundamental rights of the freedom of assembly and expression. Such rights should not, however, be misused for violent purposes.

The Commission will continue to report on the respect of fundamental rights in the country in its annual progress reports, as next foreseen for 16 October 2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006961/13
an die Kommission
Karin Kadenbach (S&D) und Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(14. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: EU-weites Verbot genetisch veränderter Tiere

1. Beabsichtigt die Kommission, einen Vorschlag zu unterbreiten, der darauf ausgerichtet ist, die folgenden EU-weiten Verbote einzuführen:

— Verbot genetisch veränderter Tiere für die Lebensmittelversorgung und Verbot des Verkaufs von Fleisch und Milch von genetisch veränderten Tieren und deren Nachzucht,

— Verbot der Verwendung von genetisch veränderten Nutztieren und deren Nachzucht in der EU, um der Einfuhr von Samen und Embryonen genetisch veränderter Tiere die Grundlage zu entziehen?

2. Sollte die Kommission nicht beabsichtigen, entsprechende Verbote einzuführen, wie gedenkt sie dann, den Problemen zu begegnen, die in Zukunft entstehen könnten, weil es die Verbote nicht gibt?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(22. Juli 2013)

1. Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete auf ihre Antwort auf die parlamentarische Anfrage E-005290/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006961/13
to the Commission
Karin Kadenbach (S&D) and Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: EU-wide ban on genetically modified animals

There are currently no genetically modified (GM) animals being used on EU farms, and neither are any food products derived from GM animals available on the EU market. However, an increasing number of GM animals are being developed in the EU and elsewhere, and the EU will shortly have to formulate a policy in this area.

1. Is the Commission planning a proposal regarding an EU-wide ban on:

— genetically modifying animals for food and on the sale of meat and milk from GM animals and their offspring?

— the use of GM farm animals and their offspring in the EU, making the import of semen and embryos from GM animals futile?

2. If the Commission is not planning such bans, how will it deal with the future problems which could arise in the absence of a ban?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(22 July 2013)

1. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Parliamentary Question E-005290/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006962/13
adresată Comisiei
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(14 iunie 2013)

Subiect: Mierea din supermarketuri

Având în vedere că în general conținutul de miere pură al unui borcan care se comercializează în supermarketuri sub această denumire este de aproximativ 25% și că restul conține aditivi și sirop de porumb și că denumirea generică „miere" nu ar trebui să inducă consumatorii în eroare,

1. Ce măsuri prevede Comisia pentru a asigura o informare mai clară a consumatorilor referitor la produsele apicole?

2. Consideră Comisia oportună interzicerea comercializării produselor care au un conținut de miere mult prea scăzut și sunt vândute sub termenul generic de „miere de albine"?

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(31 iulie 2013)

Conform definiției din alineatul (1) din anexa I la Directiva 2001/110/CE ([1]), mierea este „substanța naturală dulce produsă de albinele *Apis mellifera* din nectarul plantelor sau din secrețiile secțiunilor vii ale plantelor sau din excrețiile, pe secțiunile vii ale plantelor, ale insectelor care se hrănesc prin sucțiune din plante, și pe care albinele le colectează, le transformă, combinându-le cu substanțe proprii specifice, le depozitează, le deshidratează, le adună și le lasă în faguri pentru a se macera și a se maturiza".

Alineatul (1) din articolul 2 din Directiva 2001/110/CE prevede că termenul „miere" se aplică doar produselor definite mai sus și este utilizat, în mod exclusiv în cazul comercializării, pentru a desemna produsele respective. Prin urmare, introducerea pe piața UE a produselor desemnate ca „miere", dar care nu îndeplinesc cerințele Directivei 2001/110/CE nu este permisă în temeiul legislației Uniunii. Punerea în aplicare a cerințelor legislației Uniunii vizând operatorii privați este încredințată autorităților naționale competente.

([1]) JO L 10, 12.01.2002.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006962/13
to the Commission
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(14 June 2013)

Subject: Honey in supermarkets

Given that, in general, the content of pure honey in a jar which is put on sale in supermarkets under this description is roughly 25%, that the remainder contains additives and maize syrup and that the generic description of 'honey' should not mislead consumers,

1. What measures does the Commission envisage to ensure that consumers are provided with clearer information about apiculture products?

2. Does the Commission consider it appropriate to ban the marketing of products whose honey content is far too low and which are sold under the generic description of 'honey'?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

Honey is defined in paragraph 1 of Annex I to Directive 2001/110/EC ([1]) as 'the natural sweet substance produced by *Apis mellifera* bees from the nectar of plants or from secretions of living parts of plants or excretions of plant-sucking insects on the living parts of plants, which the bees collect, transform by combining with specific substances of their own, deposit, dehydrate, store and leave in honeycombs to ripen and mature'.

Paragraph 1 of Article 2 of Directive 2001/110/EC states that the term 'honey' is applied only to the products as defined above and that this term is used exclusively in trade to designate these specific products. Therefore , the placing on the EU market of products designated as 'honey' but which do not fulfil the requirements of Directive 2001/110/EC is not allowed under Union law. The enforcement of the Union law requirements on private operators is entrusted to the national competent authorities.

([1]) OJ L 10, 12.01.2002.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006963/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(17 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Σφαγή ζώων στην Κύπρο κάτω από παράνομες συνθήκες

Πρόσφατη έρευνα σε σφαγείο στην Κύπρο κατέγραψε σοβαρές παραβάσεις του Κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1099/2009 για την προστασία των ζώων κατά τη θανάτωσή τους. Κατσίκες και πρόβατα σφάχθηκαν κάτω από πολύ σκληρές και παράνομες συνθήκες, αγνοώντας σε μεγάλο βαθμό τους νέους κανόνες της ΕΕ για τη σφαγή των ζώων που τέθηκαν σε εφαρμογή το τρέχον έτος [1]. Οι παραβάσεις αφορούν: σφαγή των ζώων χωρίς αναισθητοποίηση, χρονοβόρες καθυστερήσεις μεταξύ αναισθητοποίησης και σφαγής, και ανύψωση των ζώων πριν από την αναισθητοποίηση.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Προτίθεται να ζητήσει ενημέρωση από την Κυπριακή κυβέρνηση για τις ως τώρα ενέργειές της γύρω από το ζήτημα;

2. Προτίθεται να ζητήσει από την Κύπρο την άμεση λήψη μέτρων για να ενταθούν οι έλεγχοι που διενεργούνται στα σφαγεία, να επιλυθούν τα υπάρχοντα προβλήματα και να αποφευχθεί η επανάληψή τους στο μέλλον; Ποια θα είναι αυτά τα μέτρα;

3. Τα σφαγεία στην Κύπρο έχουν καταρτίσει διαδικασίες λειτουργίας (Standard Operating Procedures), όπως απαιτείται από το άρθρο 6 του Κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1099/2009 και ποιες είναι αυτές οι διαδικασίες;

4. Τα σφαγεία στην Κύπρο έχουν ορίσει υπαλλήλους για την καλή μεταχείριση των ζώων (Animal Welfare Officers), όπως απαιτείται από το άρθρο 17 του Κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1099/2009;

Απάντηση του κ. Borg εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(2 Αυγούστου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει για τις ενδεχόμενες παραβάσεις της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ σε σφαγείο της Κύπρου. Σύμφωνα με τις πληροφορίες που δημοσιεύτηκαν [2] έως το τέλος του Μαΐου του 2013, και τις οποίες έλαβε μια οργάνωση προστασίας και καλής μεταχείρισης των ζώων τον Ιούλιο του 2013, έχουν κοινοποιηθεί στις κυπριακές αρχές οι ελλείψεις που παρατηρήθηκαν από την οργάνωση στο συγκεκριμένο σφαγείο.

Σύμφωνα με την αρχή της επικουρικότητας που κατοχυρώνεται στις συνθήκες της ΕΕ, τα κράτη μέλη είναι κυρίως υπεύθυνα για την εφαρμογή, τον έλεγχο και την επιβολή της νομοθεσίας της Ένωσης στο έδαφός τους. Η Επιτροπή, γενικά, δεν παρεμβαίνει σε μεμονωμένες περιπτώσεις, αλλά ξεκινά έρευνα για ενδεχόμενη παράβαση μόνο αν υπάρχουν ενδείξεις ότι, σε κάποιο κράτος μέλος, η νομοθεσία της Ένωσης δεν εφαρμόζεται συστηματικά και συνεχόμενα.

Στη συγκεκριμένη περίπτωση, εναπόκειται στις κυπριακές αρχές να προβούν στις αναγκαίες ενέργειες.

---

(1) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xQFEHQeBdTI&feature=youtu.be
(2) http://www.ciwf.org.uk/news/factory_farming/illegal_slaughter_of_animals_in_cyprus.aspx

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006963/13
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Slaughter of animals in Cyprus under illegal conditions

A recent investigation at a slaughterhouse in Cyprus has found serious breaches of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing. Goats and sheep have been slaughtered under very harsh and illegal conditions, largely in defiance of the new EU rules on animal slaughter that took effect this year ([1]). The infringements concern: the slaughtering of animals without stunning, lengthy delays between stunning and slaughter and the hoisting of animals before stunning.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it intend to request information from the government of Cyprus on the measures it has taken so far relating to this issue?

2. Does it intend to request Cyprus to take immediate measures to intensify checks carried out at slaughterhouses, to solve existing problems and prevent their recurrence in the future? What will these measures be?

3. Have slaughterhouses in Cyprus drawn up Standard Operating Procedures, as required by Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009, and what are these procedures?

4. Have slaughterhouses in Cyprus appointed Animal Welfare Officers, as required by Article 17 of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

The Commission is aware of possible breaches of the EU legislation in one Cypriot slaughterhouse. According to the information published ([2]) by the end of May 2013 and received from an animal welfare organisation in July 2013, the Cypriot Authorities have been notified of the shortcomings observed by the animal welfare organisation in that particular slaughterhouse.

In line with the principle of subsidiarity enshrined in the EU Treaties, Member States are primarily responsible for the implementation, control and enforcement of Union law on their territory. The Commission generally does not intervene in individual cases but only starts an investigation into possible infringements if there are indications that in a Member State, Union law is not applied in a systematic and continuous manner.

It is thus primarily for the Cypriot Authorities to take necessary action in this case.

([1]) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xQFEHQeBdTI&feature=youtu.be.
([2]) http://www.ciwf.org.uk/news/factory_farming/illegal_slaughter_of_animals_in_cyprus.aspx.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006964/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: EU support for first-time home-buyers

From research compiled by the Council of Mortgage Lenders in the United Kingdom, it has emerged that approximately two thirds of first-time home-buyers in 2012 relied on support from their parents.

With this in mind, can the Commission please respond to the following queries:

1. What steps are being taken at EU level to support first-time home-buyers, including young adults, who are attempting to enter the housing market at this time of global economic uncertainty?

2. What provision exists at EU level to ensure that potential first-time home-buyers enter into mortgage agreements on the basis of clear information and with sufficient knowledge of their rights?

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

1. Possible public support schemes for first-time home buyers are regulated at national or regional/local level. The Social Investment Package ([1]) has explored good practices on how Member States could improve access to affordable housing, emphasising that balanced housing market developments should consist of a balanced mixture of ownership, rental and social housing schemes and that a careful planning is needed in order to avoid speculative real estate bubbles.

2. In March 2011 the Commission proposed a directive on mortgage credits ([2]) (MCD), which introduces for the first time EU-wide creditworthiness assessment rules. Creditors will also have to provide consumers, including first-time buyers, with a European Standardised Information Sheet (ESIS). The ESIS will clearly outline the costs of the credit and will include, where appropriate, relevant risk scenarios and warnings. The ESIS will thus allow consumers to 'shop around' for the best offer according to their needs.

In addition, the text provisionally agreed by the co-legislators acknowledges the particular situation of first-time buyers, inviting Member States to promote measures that support the education of consumers in relation to responsible borrowing and debt management.

The MCD should be formally adopted in autumn.

([1]) See notably the Commission Staff Working Document SWD(2013) 42 final on Confronting Homelessness in the European Union, as part of the Social Investment Package.
([2]) COM(2011)142.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006965/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Payday lenders

Recent statistics published by the Belfast Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) in my constituency of Northern Ireland have shown that the number of individuals seeking help with problems caused by a payday loan in the city has risen from 60 cases in 2011 to 470 in 2012.

In this context, could the Commission please respond to the following queries:

1. What steps have been — and are being — taken at EU level to raise awareness among potential borrowers of the possible consequences of taking out short-term/payday loans?

2. What provisions are currently in place across the EU to promote responsible lending, including through better informing EU consumers of their rights and by ensuring that loan companies are not misleading in their advertising?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

The Commission is currently undertaking a number of initiatives in the area of financial education to raise awareness among potential borrowers and to complement the activities of Member States in this area.

The Commission is running, since 2011, a project on the 'training of non-profit organisations that provide financial advice to consumers' ([1]). The aim is to build the capacity of these entities by further developing their knowledge of financial services and their ability to provide effective general financial advice to consumers. So far, courses have taken place in 23 Member States in their official languages.

Furthermore, the Commission launched in May 2013 an information campaign on consumer credit ([2]). The aim is to inform consumers that are between 18 and 35 years old about the rights that they have when they take out credit, as granted to them by the Consumer Credit Directive. The campaign runs as a pilot in three Member States (Ireland, Malta and Spain) and, following an evaluation of its impact, it might be extended to more Member States.

As to ensuring that loan companies are not misleading in their advertising, the Commission is now assessing the functioning of the consumer credit market. The report of the Commission on the implementation of the Consumer Credit Directive will be published in autumn 2013. The Commission is also organising meetings with national enforcement authorities to ensure correct implementation of the directive.

Lastly, the report on the application of the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive adopted on 14 March 2013 ([3]) includes the results of a study carried out in the area of financial services ([4]). The report identifies precisely this area as one of the key priorities for a stepped up enforcement of the directive.

([1]) Commission Decision 2010/462/ EU 'concerning the adoption of a financing decision on a pilot project to promote consumer empowerment, efficiency and stability of European financial markets through training of consumer associations and similar organisations' See also http://www.confinad.eu/.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/citizen/my_rights/consumer-credit/index_en.htm
([3]) COM(2013) 139.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/consumer-marketing/files/ucpd_final_report_part_1_synthesis.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006966/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Use of waste packaging for heating in schools

In recent months, Dungannon Integrated College, a school in my constituency, Northern Ireland, became the first in the United Kingdom to use waste packaging for the purposes of producing free heating. Northern Ireland's Department of Education contributed financially to the scheme, which will save the school approximately GBP 40 000 and several hundred tonnes of carbon emissions every year.

In this context, could the Commission please respond to the following queries:

1. What, if any, provision exists at EU level to promote projects that aim to recycle waste, including packaging, for the purposes of energy efficiency?

2. Does the Commission have any plans to make funding available within the new programming period, 2014-2020, for private-public projects and initiatives in Member States that seek to improve energy efficiency by using waste to generate heating?

3. Is the Commission aware of any other cases where waste packaging has been — or is being — used to produce heating for public buildings in Member States?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2013)

1. According to the information available to the Commission, the Dungannon Integrated College in Northern Ireland is supplied with waste heat from a neighbouring industrial installation. Many provisions exist in EC law that directly or indirectly promote waste heat recovery. The Commission would point in particular to the Energy Efficiency Directive ([1]), the Renewable Energy Directive ([2]) (in as far as the waste is of biological origin) and the Packaging Waste Directive ([3]) which sets targets for recycling and recovery of packaging waste, including incineration..

2. Yes, the Structural Funds prioritise energy efficiency measures and the use of renewable energy (applicable in as far as the waste is of biological origin), within the scope of national strategies to be agreed with the Commission. Moreover, the Horizon 2020 research and development programme will support technology development and it is anticipated that some areas of research would support the improvement of energy conversion efficiency by exploiting new biomass supply chains and e.g. advanced waste feedstock biomass based materials.

3. The Commission is not aware of cases where packaging waste in particular is used to produce heating for public buildings.

([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 L 315, 14.11.2012.

([2]) 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 L 140, 5.6.2009.

([3]) European Parliament and Council Directive 94/62/EC of 20 December 1994 on packaging and packaging waste, OJ L 365, 31.12.1994.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006967/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Cervical cancer rates

According to recent figures released by Cancer Research UK, the incidence rate of cervical cancer in my constituency, Northern Ireland, is currently higher than in any other region of the United Kingdom. This situation continues to be exacerbated by the fact that approximately one third of women aged between 50 and 70 are estimated to regard screening tests as unnecessary.

In this context, can the Commission please respond to the following queries:

1. What steps are being taken at EU level to raise awareness, especially among young and middle-aged women, of the importance of screening as a means of facilitating the prevention and early diagnosis of cervical cancer across the EU?

2. Can the Commission please detail any relevant information it has compiled regarding incidence rates and the number of deaths attributed to cervical cancer across each Member State in the past five years?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2013)

The Council Recommendation of 2 December 2003 ([1]) on cancer screening sets out the principles of best practice in early detection of cancer. The EU has promoted via the European Partnership Action Against Cancer Joint Action ([2]) initiatives on population-based screening programmes, including cervical cancer. These screening initiatives are conceived as part of the National Cancer Plans.

The ongoing revision of the European Code Against Cancer ([3]), which will be completed in 2014, is also expected to strenghthen collective efforts of the Commission, Member States and relevant stakeholders to promote screening for certain target groups, such as young and middle-aged women.

Data on incidence and prevalence of cancer are compiled by the International Agency for Research on Cancer and at EU level by their project European Cancer Observatory ([4]), included in the EU Cancer Information System ([5]). In 2012, the observatory estimated that there were over 33 300 cases of cervical cancer which represents an Age Standardised Rate of 11.3 per 100 000 of population.

Eurostat collects data on causes of death ([6]) for many cancers at EU and regional level. In 2010, over 10 900 deaths were due to cervical cancer in the EU. For the period 2008-2010, the Standardised Death Rate for cervical cancer was 3.3 per 100 000 inhabitants at EU-27 level, 2.3 for the United Kingdom and 2.1 for Northern Ireland.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2003:327:0034:0038:EN:PDF.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_information/dissemination/diseases/docs/com_2009_291_en.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/major_chronic_diseases/diseases/cancer/index_en.htm#fragment2.
([4]) http://eco.iarc.fr/EUCAN/Country.aspx?ISOCountryCd=930.
([5]) http://ihcp.jrc.ec.europa.eu/our_activities/public-health/cancer_policy_support/priority_activities/EU_cancer_information.
([6]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/health/public_health/data_public_health/database.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006969/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Eliminating leprosy in India

In 2005, the authorities in India announced that leprosy had been eradicated. However, it is estimated that approximately 130 000 new cases of the disease are identified every year, as the government continues to cut back on investment aimed at tackling the situation.

In this context, can the Commission please respond to the following queries:

1. What action is being, or has been, taken by the EU to raise awareness of the prevalence of leprosy in India and to debunk the social stigma currently observed throughout the country in relation to the disease?

2. What steps are being taken at EU level to encourage the Indian authorities to renew their focus on tackling leprosy through effective investment in medical treatment and research?

3. What resources, if any, has the Commission provided to authorities in India with a view to eradicating leprosy among its rising population?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

1. On the basis of the World Health Organisation (WHO) calculation methods, leprosy was believed to be eliminated in India. It was therefore not a priority health issue and very few cases of discrimination were reported compared to other communicable diseases such as HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis, which the EU fights in India through the Global Fund, and no specific awareness raising activity has been taken to date to debunk the social stigma relating to leprosy.

2-3. The EU continues to provide support indirectly to Indian authorities and to private, civil society or faith-based organisations, through the Global Fund. The EU Delegation in India has advised competent Civil Society Organisations (CSO) which have a very good partnership record with the Ministry of Health, to work collectively towards a 'tuberculosis and leprosy' proposal to the Global Fund. The interest of combining tuberculosis with leprosy is to increase chances of being funded by the Global Fund compared to a standalone 'leprosy' intervention. Also, almost all CSO working on leprosy work also on tuberculosis, and in both cases, they work very closely with government health services.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006970/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Meningitis B vaccine

In recent days, a campaign has been launched in my constituency of Northern Ireland seeking to make the meningitis B (4cMenB) vaccine available for children, especially those under the age of five. Health professionals are of the view that the new vaccine can protect children against one of the most deadly strains of meningitis. It was licensed for use in the EU earlier this year.

With this in mind, can the Commission please respond to the following queries:

1. What steps are being taken at EU level to promote uptake of the meningitis B vaccine among the healthcare systems of the Member States?

2. Could the Commission please indicate which Member States currently administer the meningitis B vaccine or envisage uptake in the future?

3. What other provisions, if any, exist at EU level to raise awareness and tackle incidence rates of meningitis among children across the EU?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2013)

1. The decision to introduce a new vaccine into the national vaccination schedule, including all the formal steps to be followed, is the exclusive competence of each Member State's health authority, as is the prevention and treatment of childhood invasive meningococcal disease.

2. As the vaccine against Neisseria meningitides type B only recently became available on the EU market, a survey by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) has been planned for 2014 to produce guidance to support the decision-making process in the Member States.

3. Meningitis is on the list of communicable diseases to be notified under EU legislation and the rapid EU alert system for communicable disease has been very useful in giving early warning to Member States in case of cross-border outbreaks due to invasive meningococcal disease. The ECDC has also established a network of laboratories which will be instrumental in monitoring the trends of invasive meningococcal disease as well as the efficacy of the new vaccine.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006971/13
à la Commission
Agnès Le Brun (PPE)
(17 juin 2013)

Objet: Cellules photovoltaïques chinoises

Depuis de nombreuses années, l'Union européenne considère l'énergie verte comme un facteur de croissance présent et futur, mais aussi comme une source d'emploi pérenne. Il est donc nécessaire de protéger les industriels européens en les aidant à se prémunir du dumping excessif exercé par certains pays dans ce domaine.

Or, la Chine profite de nombreux avantages concurrentiels pour produire et vendre des panneaux photovoltaïques à bas coût sur le marché de l'Union européenne, ce qui lui permet de détenir un quasi-monopole avec 84 % des parts du marché européen dans ce secteur.

La récente préconisation de la Commission européenne de mettre en place des droits de douane à hauteur de 47 %, acceptée par les États membres et effective le 6 juin 2013, permettra donc de participer au rééquilibrage du rapport de force commercial du marché photovoltaïque.

Je m'interroge toutefois sur les pressions que la Chine pourrait exercer sur nos États membres à travers les mesures de rétorsion qu'elle menace de prendre, et notamment un éventuel arrêt des importations de produits européens.

1. La Commission prend-elle au sérieux les menaces de représailles de la Chine? Si oui, a-t-elle des données chiffrées permettant d'évaluer l'impact d'éventuelles mesures de rétorsion chinoises?

2. Plus généralement, la Commission a-t-elle estimé les bénéfices espérés par la mise en place de droits de douane dans la défense des industries européennes du secteur?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(5 août 2013)

Conformément aux exigences de l'article 5 du règlement antidumping de base ([1]) de l'Union européenne, la Commission est légalement tenue d'ouvrir une enquête visant à déterminer l'existence, le degré et l'effet de tout dumping allégué. La plupart des membres de l'OMC ([2]) mènent de telles enquêtes, y compris la Chine, en suivant les règles précisées dans l'accord de cette même organisation internationale. Si la Chine considère l'action de l'UE injustifiée, elle est libre de contester les mesures antidumping dans le respect des procédures de règlement des différends de l'OMC. Si la Chine décidait de prendre des mesures de rétorsion unilatérales que l'UE estime contraires aux règles de l'OMC, l'Union n'hésiterait pas à défendre avec vigueur ses propres intérêts, y compris en introduisant, si nécessaire, un recours auprès de l'OMC contre de telles mesures.

Le but des mesures antidumping est de protéger l'industrie européenne contre les pratiques commerciales déloyales et de rétablir des conditions de concurrence équitables dans l'UE. Concernant la présente enquête, la Commission a provisoirement conclu que l'institution de mesures antidumping permettrait à l'industrie des panneaux solaires de l'Union de modifier ses prix pour qu'ils reflètent les coûts de production et d'améliorer ainsi sa rentabilité. Cette industrie devrait récupérer au moins une partie des parts de marché perdues au cours des dernières années, ce qui aurait des conséquences positives pour sa situation financière globale et lui permettrait d'investir dans la recherche, le développement et l'innovation, ainsi que de sauvegarder les 25 000 emplois existant à ce moment-là.

L'analyse des intérêts des acteurs de l'UE (producteurs, importateurs, producteurs de matières premières, fabricants de machines, promoteurs de projets, installateurs et consommateurs ou utilisateurs finaux) a montré qu'il n'y avait aucune raison impérieuse de ne pas instituer de mesures provisoires, étant donné que les répercussions négatives éventuelles sur l'industrie, en aval et en amont, seraient limitées.

([1]) Règlement (CE) n° 1225/2009 du Conseil du 30 novembre 2009 relatif à la défense contre les importations qui font l'objet d'un dumping de la part de pays non membres de la Communauté européenne, JO L 343 du 22.12.2009.

([2]) Organisation mondiale du commerce.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006971/13
to the Commission
Agnès Le Brun (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Chinese solar panels

For many years now, the European Union has regarded green energy not only as a current and future driver of growth but also as a source of sustainable employment. European manufacturers must therefore be helped to defend themselves against the flagrant dumping practised by certain countries in the green energy sector.

China enjoys numerous competitive advantages that enable it to produce solar panels and sell them cheaply on the EU market, where and it has thus acquired a virtual monopoly — an 84% market share in this sector.

The Commission's recent initiative, accepted by the Member States and effective as of 6 June 2013, of imposing import duty at rates rising to 47%, will thus help to strike a fairer balance in the solar panel market.

I am concerned, however, about ways in which China could pressurise our Member States through the retaliatory measures it is threatening to take, particularly if it goes so far as to stop importing European products.

1. Does the Commission take China's threats of retaliation seriously? If so, can it quantify the likely impact of any Chinese retaliatory measures?

2. More generally, has the Commission estimated the expected benefits of the imposition of import duty to protect this sector of EU industry?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

The Commission is legally obliged to initiate an investigation to determine the existence, degree and effect of any alleged dumping, according to the requirements set out in Article 5 of the EU Basic Antidumping Regulation ([1]). Most WTO ([2]) members carry out such investigations, including China, following the rules in the WTO Agreement. If China considers the EU's action unwarranted, it is free to challenge antidumping measures according to the procedures of WTO dispute settlement. If China were to take unilateral countermeasures that the EU believes are illegal under WTO rules, the EU would not hesitate to vigorously defend the Union interests, including by challenging such WTO illegal measures at the WTO if appropriate

The aim of anti-dumping measures is to protect the EU industry from unfair trading practices and to restore the level playing field in the EU. In the present investigation, the Commission provisionally concluded that anti-dumping measures would allow the Union solar panels industry to align its prices to reflect production costs and thus improve profitability. It can be expected that the Union solar panels industry will regain at least part of the market share lost in recent years with a positive impact on the overall financial situation which would allow the industry to invest in Research and Development and innovation and to secure the 25 000 jobs existing during this period.

Analysis of the interests of Union operators (producers, importers, raw material and machinery producers, project developers, installers and consumers/end-users) showed that there were no compelling reasons against the imposition of provisional measures as the potential negative effect on the downstream and upstream industry would be limited.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009 of 30 November 2009 on protection against dumped imports from countries not members of the European Community, OJ L 343, 22.12.2009.

([2]) World Trade Organisation.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006972/13
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(17 iunie 2013)

Subiect: Combaterea șomajului în rândul tinerilor

Șomajul în rândul tinerilor continuă să fie una dintre principalele probleme cu care se confruntă statele membre în prezent.

Adoptarea Pachetului de măsuri privind încadrarea în muncă a tinerilor, care conține și o Recomandare privind instituirea unei „Garanții pentru tineret”, a fost un important pas în abordarea problemei. Recomandarea Comisiei a fost ca schemele de „garanții pentru tineri” să fie aplicate, de preferință, începând cu anul 2014.

Însă în continuare, la nivel de implementare a măsurilor privind combaterea șomajului în rândul tinerilor există disparități între statele membre.

În cazul României, spre exemplu, există o singură schemă pilot de tip „garanții pentru tineri” care însă este destinată unui număr de 5 000 de tineri, care nu au fost declarați admiși la examenul de Bacalaureat.

În alte state membre, precum Suedia sau Finlanda, programele de tipul „garanției pentru tineri” funcționează deja de mai mulți ani.

În cadrul Consiliului European din luna februarie 2013, s-a agreat un buget de 6 miliarde de euro destinat măsurilor de combatere a șomajului în rândul tinerilor — Inițiativa privind Ocuparea Forței de Muncă în rândul Tinerilor. Conform Concluziilor Consiliului European, „aceasta va susține măsurile prevăzute în cadrul pachetului privind ocuparea forței de muncă în rândul tinerilor propus de Comisie în decembrie 2012 și va sprijini în special garanția pentru tineret”.

Poate să condiționeze Comisia acordarea fondurilor din cadrul „Inițiativei privind Ocuparea Forței de Muncă în rândul Tinerilor” de adoptarea unor scheme de tipul „garanții pentru tineri” la nivelul fiecărui stat membru (dat fiind că instrumentul juridic folosit pentru instituirea „garanției pentru tineret” este o recomandare) sau a unor planuri naționale pentru ocupare?

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei
(31 iulie 2013)

Comisia consideră că este esențial ca orice investiție în cadrul „Inițiativei privind ocuparea forței de muncă în rândul tinerilor” să fie susținută de un cadru politic coerent privind ocuparea forței de muncă în rândul tinerilor, iar recomandarea Consiliului privind crearea unei garanții pentru tineret oferă o bază solidă în acest sens.

Modificările aduse propunerilor pentru Regulamentul privind dispozițiile comune (RDC) și Regulamentul privind Fondul social european 2014-2020 prezentate de Comisie în luna martie prevăd că Inițiativa privind ocuparea forței de muncă în rândul tinerilor va sprijini în mod direct punerea în aplicare a garanției pentru tineret ([1]).

Acest lucru se reflectă și în textul condiționalității *ex-ante* privind Inițiativa privind ocuparea forței de muncă în rândul tinerilor propus de Comisie în anexa V la Regulamentul privind dispozițiile comune. Comisia a propus, ca și condiție-cadru generală prealabilă în vederea obținerii de către statele membre a finanțărilor acordate în cadrul politicii de coeziune, existența unui cadru strategic cuprinzător pentru realizarea obiectivelor pachetului de măsuri privind încadrarea în muncă a tinerilor și în special pentru adoptarea unei scheme de tipul garanției pentru tineret în conformitate cu recomandarea Consiliului. Comisia indică, de asemenea, ce elemente ar trebui să conțină acest cadru. Această condiționalitate *ex-ante* ar fi aplicabilă respectivei priorități de investiții privind integrarea pe piața muncii a tinerilor șomeri sau a celor aflați în procesul de educație sau formare (articolul 3 alineatul (1) litera (a) punctul (ii) din proiectul de regulament privind FSE).

Comisia continuă să mențină o poziție fermă în acest sens în cadrul discuțiilor trilaterale aflate în curs de desfășurare despre Inițiativa privind ocuparea forței de muncă în rândul tinerilor și condiționalității *ex-ante*. Sprijinul Parlamentului European pentru aceste propuneri va fi esențial.

([1]) COM(2013)145 final și COM(2013)146 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006972/13
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Combating youth unemployment

Youth unemployment remains one of the main problems facing the Member States.

The adoption of the youth employment package, which also includes a recommendation for a 'Youth Guarantee', was an important step in tackling the problem. The Commission recommended that youth guarantee schemes should preferably be implemented from the start of 2014.

Nevertheless, there are still disparities among the Member States in relation to implementing measures to combat youth unemployment.

In Romania, for example, there is only one youth guarantee pilot scheme targeted at 5 000 young people who left secondary school without taking the Baccalaureate exam.

In other Member States such as Sweden and Finland, youth guarantee schemes have already been operating for some years.

The European Council of February 2013 allocated a budget of EUR 6 billion for measures to combat youth unemployment: the Youth Employment Initiative. According to the European Council conclusions, 'it will act in support of measures set out in the youth employment package proposed by the Commission in December 2012 and in particular to support the Youth Guarantee'.

Could the Commission make the allocation of funding under the Youth Employment Initiative conditional on the adoption of youth guarantee schemes at national level (given that the legal instrument used to establish the youth guarantee was a recommendation), or on the adoption of national employment plans?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

The Commission finds it essential that any investments under the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) are underpinned by a coherent youth employment policy framework and the Council Recommendation on Establishing a Youth Guarantee provides a strong basis for this.

The amendments to the proposals for a Common Provisions Regulation (CPR) and the ESF Regulation 2014-2020 put forward by the Commission in March envisage that the YEI will directly support the implementation of the Youth Guarantee ([1]).

This is also reflected in the text of the *ex-ante* conditionality on the YEI proposed by the Commission in Annex V of the CPR. The Commission proposed as an overall framework condition which is a prerequisite for Member States to receive cohesion policy funding, that a comprehensive strategic policy framework is in place for achieving the objectives of the Youth Employment Package and in particular for establishing a Youth Guarantee scheme in accordance with the Council Recommendation. The Commission also indicates what elements in particular this framework should contain. This *ex-ante* conditionality would be applicable to the respective investment priority on labour market integration of young persons not in employment, education or training (Art. 3(1)(a)(ii) of the draft ESF Regulation).

The Commission continues to hold a strong position on this matter in the ongoing trilogue discussions on the YEI and *ex-ante* conditionalities. European Parliament support for these proposals will be critical.

([1]) COM(2013)145 final and COM(2013)146 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006973/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Criminalidade organizada em Marselha

Considerando que:

— Marselha contabiliza todos os meses os mortos e os feridos, os tiroteios e os assassínios premeditados;

— As autoridades estimam que sejam milhares as armas de guerra em circulação;

— As *cités* (bairros de lata onde campeiam o crime e a violência), onde não há recolha de lixo nem assistência médica de urgência aos doentes, estão entregues aos traficantes e aos criminosos;

— O uso de armas de guerra se banalizou e que, tratando-se de uma cidade portuária, o crime se internacionalizou, com a presença de tráfico de droga, armas e seres humanos;

Pergunto à Comissão:

— Tem conhecimento da realidade descrita?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão
(30 de julho de 2013)

A Comissão tem conhecimento da realidade descrita e está a tomar medidas destinadas a combater o tráfico de armas de fogo numa perspetiva estratégica, operacional e jurídica.

A Diretiva 91/477/CEE, alterada em 2008, define já um conjunto de obrigações mínimas em matéria de fabrico de armas de fogo para uso civil, bem como quanto à sua aquisição e detenção por parte de particulares na UE. Está previsto para 2015 um relatório de avaliação da situação decorrente da aplicação da diretiva.

A fim de minimizar os riscos para os cidadãos e impedir a circulação de armas de fogo ilegais, a Comissão está a preparar uma comunicação, a publicar no outono de 2013, com propostas de novas iniciativas a desenvolver a nível da UE nos próximos anos, incluindo eventuais propostas legislativas.

Ao mesmo tempo, o Conselho Justiça e Assuntos Internos adotou recentemente nove prioridades no domínio da cooperação policial transfronteiriça contra a criminalidade grave e organizada no quadro do ciclo político da UE para o período de 2014 a 2017. Por iniciativa da Comissão, o tráfico de armas de fogo ilegais figura entre estas prioridades.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006973/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Organised crime in Marseilles

Every month, Marseilles is left counting the cost of people killed and injured, shootings and premeditated murders.

The authorities estimate that there are thousands of firearms in circulation.

The *cités* (shanty towns where crime and violence are entrenched), where the rubbish is not collected and emergency medical services will not attend to the sick, are ruled by traffickers and criminals.

The use of firearms has become commonplace and, as Marseilles is a port city, crime has taken on an international aspect, with drugs, arms and human beings all being trafficked.

— Is the Commission aware of this situation?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(30 July 2013)

The Commission is aware of the issue described and is developing actions to tackle the illicit trafficking of firearms from a strategic, operational and legal angle.

Already today, Directive 91/477/EEC as amended in 2008 lays down a set of minimum obligations for the manufacture of civilian firearms as well as their acquisition and possession by private individuals within the EU. A report evaluating the situation resulting from the application of the directive is foreseen for 2015.

To further minimise harm to the citizen and disrupt criminal circulation firearms, the Commission is preparing a communication, for publication in the Autumn of 2013, outlining further actions to be undertaken at EU level in the coming years, including possible legislative proposals.

In parallel, the Justice and Home Affairs Council recently agreed on nine priorities for EU cross-border law enforcement cooperation within the EU policy cycle 2014-2017 against serious and organised crime. Illicit firearm trafficking was, at the Commission's initiative, included as one of these priorities.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006974/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Comissão financia projetos em Moçambique

A Comissão anunciou recentemente o financiamento de projetos em Moçambique num montante total de 93 milhões de euros, destinados à construção de infraestruturas que ajudem o desenvolvimento do país.

Considerando que estes programas são uma prova do empenho da UE em apoiar Moçambique na construção das infraestruturas sociais e económicas necessárias para combater a pobreza no país, em que consistem exatamente os projetos referidos?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão
(7 de agosto de 2013)

O programa de ação anual de 2013 para Moçambique (93 milhões de EUR) é composto pelas três ações seguintes:

(i) «Desenvolvimento Integrado do corredor Milange-Mocuba» (fase II — 81 milhões de EUR). A construção do primeiro troço desta estrada está em execução e o projeto proposto concluirá a estrada revestindo de betume, segundo as normas internaiconais, 111 quilómetros do eixo N11. A estrada principal e as respetivas estradas rurais permitirão abrir aos mercados zonas de produção agrícola significativas; cerca de 110 km de estradas rurais serão requalificados de modo a satisfazerem as normas de resistência a todas as condições meteorológicas.

(ii) «Extensão dos serviços de água e saneamento em pequenas localidades da Província de Inhambane» (9 milhões de EUR). Prevê-se que este projeto permita o acesso à água e ao saneamento básico a cerca de 50 000 novos utilizadores nas localidades de Homoíne, Morrumbene e Jangamo através da extensão das redes atuais. As obras são acompanhadas de um programa de apoio que ajudará as autoridades locais e o setor privado a gerirem de forma sustentável o sistema.

(iii) «Modernização dos hospitais distritais de Manhiça e Gilé» (fase II — 3 milhões de EUR). O projeto concluirá as obras nos dois hospitais distritais do Gilé — único estabelecimento de referência numa zona remota da província da Zambézia) — e da Manhiça (complementar do prestigiado centro internacional de investigação da malária de Manhiça, financiado por múltiplos doadores). Espera-se que contribua igualmente para aumentar e melhorar a estabilização dos técnicos de saúde qualificados colocados nos dois distritos e reforce a capacidade de planeamento e gestão do setor a nível das infraestruturas.

Para informações mais pormenorizadas, consultar: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/ap/aap/2013_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006974/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Commission funding of projects in Mozambique

The Commission recently announced that it was to provide a total of EUR 93 million in funding for infrastructure construction projects in Mozambique to help the country's development.

Given that these programmes are proof of the EU's commitment to supporting Mozambique in constructing the social and economic infrastructure it needs to combat poverty in the country, what exactly do these projects involve?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2013)

The 2013 Annual Action Programme for Mozambique (EUR 93 million) is composed of the following three actions:

(i) the 'Integrated Development of Milange — Mocuba Corridor' (phase II — EUR 81 million). The construction of the first section of this road is under implementation and the proposed project will complete the road by upgrading to bitumen standards 111 km of the N11 axis. It is opening up areas of significant agricultural production to markets through the trunk road and associated rural roads; approximately 110 km of rural road will be upgraded to all weather standards.

(ii) 'Expanding water and sanitation services in small towns of Inhambane province' (EUR 9 million) expects to increase access to water and basic sanitation of approximately 50 000 new users in the towns of Homoine, Morrumbene & Jangamo by expanding the current systems. The works activity is accompanied by a support programme that will help decentralized authorities and private sector to achieve sustainable management of the system.

(iii) 'Upgrade of Manhiça and Gilé District Hospitals' (phase II — EUR 3 million, the project will complete the two district hospitals in Gilé — only referral facility in a very remote area of Zambézia) and Manhiça (complementary to the internationally prestigious multi-donor Manhiça malaria research centre). It is expected that it will also help to increase and improve the stabilisation of qualified health staff deployed in the two districts and will strengthen sector planning and management capacity at infrastructure level.

Details are available under: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/ap/aap/2013_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006975/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Créditos do BEI a Portugal

Considerando o seguinte:

O impasse que rodeia a concessão de empréstimos do Banco Europeu de Investimentos (BEI) às pequenas e médias empresas (PME) em Portugal tem sido causado pela Comissão;

Werner Hoyer, Presidente do BEI — a instituição financeira da União Europeia (UE) — responsabilizou no início do mês a Comissão pelo impasse, acusando-a de estar a bloquear a concessão linhas de crédito bonificado às PME portuguesas. Estes empréstimos são cruciais em Lisboa e no resto da Europa para apoiar o crescimento económico em Portugal, pelo facto de permitirem que as PME nacionais contornem rapidamente as atuais dificuldades de acesso ao crédito provocadas nomeadamente pelos elevados juros cobrados pelos bancos comerciais;

Pergunta-se:

Como avalia esta situação?

O que é necessário fazer para que a Comissão ultrapasse os problemas que têm originado o impasse acima referido?

Resposta dada por Joaquín Almunia em nome da Comissão
(5 de agosto de 2013)

O impasse em causa foi resolvido ao se alcançar um acordo no sentido de alinhar as normas da UE relativas aos auxílios estatais com as políticas de risco do BEI.

Após longas negociações entre as autoridades portuguesas, o BEI e a Comissão, obteve-se um acordo final e, em 27 de junho de 2013, foi aprovado um regime de garantia para os empréstimos do BEI concedidos a Portugal. O regime estabelece uma série de requisitos para que, nomeadamente, quaisquer vantagens resultantes das garantias oferecidas pelo Estado ao abrigo desse regime revertam para o Estado, através de uma remuneração adequada, e para os mutuários finais. Por meio do regime, estes mutuários poderão manter os seus atuais empréstimos do BEI e ter acesso a uma linha de crédito do BEI que pode ir até 6 mil milhões de euros, estabelecida para Portugal na sequência da aprovação do regime. Uma vez que o regime garante que os bancos participantes não beneficiem de qualquer vantagem indevida da garantia do Estado, está em conformidade com as regras da UE em matéria de auxílios estatais.

O regime permitirá ainda ao BEI prosseguir o financiamento da economia real e evitará a rutura do crédito atribuído pelo BEI através de todos os bancos que participam no regime.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006975/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: European Investment Bank (EIB) loans to Portugal

The deadlock in the granting of loans by the EIB to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in Portugal is the Commission's fault.

Early this month, Werner Hoyer, President of the EIB — the EU's financial institution — blamed the Commission for the deadlock, accusing it of blocking the granting of low-interest credit to Portuguese SMEs. Such loans are vital in Lisbon, as they are in the rest of Europe, to support economic growth in Portugal, because they enable Portuguese SMEs rapidly to get round the difficulties they currently face in accessing credit, primarily as a result of the high interest rates charged by commercial banks.

What is the Commission's assessment of this situation?

What needs to be done for the Commission to overcome the problems that have led to the abovementioned deadlock?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

The deadlock was resolved when an agreement was reached to align EU State aid rules and the EIB risk policies.

After lengthy negotiations among the Portuguese authorities, the EIB and the Commission, a final agreement was reached and on 27 June 2013 a Guarantee Scheme for EIB lending in Portugal was approved. The Scheme establishes a number of requirements so that, *inter alia*, any advantages derived from the guarantees offered by the State under the Scheme revert back to the State, through an appropriate remuneration, and to the end borrowers. Through the Scheme, these borrowers can maintain their existing EIB loans and have access to an increased (up to EUR 6 billion) lending facility set out by the EIB in Portugal. Since the Scheme ensures that participating banks do not retain any undue advantage from the State guarantee, it is in line with EU State aid rules.

The Scheme allows EIB funding to the real economy to continue, and prevents disruption of the credit granted by the EIB for all banks participating in the Scheme.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006976/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: EUA com acesso direto a informação de utilizadores do Google, do Facebook e da Apple

Considerando que:

— a Agência de Segurança Nacional (NSA) e o FBI têm tido acesso direto aos servidores de nove gigantes tecnológicos, como a Microsoft, o Google, a Apple, o YouTube ou o Facebook e que, por essa via, acederam a informação e contactos dos utilizadores, segundo um documento secreto a que os jornais *The Washington Post* e *The Guardian* tiveram acesso;

— «Os membros do Congresso que conheciam o programa estavam obrigados por juramento a não revelar a sua existência», segundo o Washington Post, que o PRISM (o nome de código do programa de recolha de dados) «permite à NSA copiar o conteúdo das mensagens de correio eletrónico, dos arquivos enviados e das conversas nos chats», segundo o Guardian, e que o *Post* afirma igualmente que os ficheiros áudio e vídeo, bem como as fotografias, são elementos suscetíveis de serem investigados;

Pergunto à Comissão:

— Tem conhecimento da situação descrita?

— Que posição assume a União Europeia face às tentativas de estabelecimento de acordos com os EUA em matéria de proteção de dados pessoais?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(5 de setembro de 2013)

A Comissão Europeia manifesta a sua preocupação em relação às informações recentemente veiculadas pelos meios de comunicação, segundo as quais as autoridades dos Estados Unidos estão a aceder e a tratar, em grande escala, dados de cidadãos europeus quando estes utilizam grandes prestadores de serviços em linha dos EUA. A Comissão solicitou esclarecimentos ao homólogos dos EUA sobre as questões levantadas pelas informações publicadas nos meios de comunicação social. Foi criado um grupo de peritos entre a UE-EUA em matéria de proteção de dados.

A Comissão considera que o acordo UE-EUA sobre a protecção de dados pessoais para fins de aplicação da lei, cujas negociações tiveram início em 2011, deverá garantir um nível elevado de proteção para os cidadãos de ambos os lados do Atlântico. Na reunião ministerial «Justiça e Assuntos Internos» UE-EUA, a Comissão sublinhou que o acordo deve, em especial, estabelecer direitos suscetíveis de proteção judicial a favor das pessoas cujos dados foram transferidos para além do Atlântico para fins de aplicação da lei e conceder um tratamento idêntico para os cidadãos da UE e dos EUA, nomeadamente o acesso aos tribunais no caso de tais direitos terem sido violados.

O respeito dos direitos fundamentais e do Estado de direito constituem o fundamento das relações UE-EUA. Este entendimento comum tem sido e deve continuar a ser a base da cooperação na área da justiça. A confiança de que o Estado de direito será respeitado é igualmente essencial para a estabilidade e o crescimento da economia digital, designadamente das atividades transatlânticas. Este aspeto é de importância primordial para as pessoas singulares e para as empresas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006976/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: United States' direct access to Google, Facebook and Apple users' data

According to a secret document seen by *The Washington Post* and *The Guardian* newspapers, the National Security Agency (NSA) and the FBI have obtained direct access to the servers of nine technology giants, such as Microsoft, Google, Apple, YouTube and Facebook, and have used it to access users' data and contacts.

According to *The Washington Post*, congressmen who knew about the programme were sworn to secrecy about its existence, and according to *The Guardian*, PRISM (the data collection programme's code name) allows the NSA to collect the content of email messages, file transfers and live chats. *The Washington Post* also confirmed that audio and video files, as well as photographs, were likely to be investigated.

— Is the Commission aware of this situation?

— What is the EU's position on attempts to conclude agreements with the United States on personal data protection?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2013)

The Commission is concerned regarding the recent media reports that United States authorities are accessing and processing, on a large scale, the data of Europeans using major US online service providers. The Commission has requested clarifications from the US counterparts regarding the issues raised by the reports in the media. An EU-US expert group on data protection has been established.

The Commission considers that the EU-US data protection agreement in the area of law enforcement, on which negotiations began in 2011, should guarantee a high level of protection for citizens on both sides of the Atlantic. At the June EU-US Justice and Home Affairs ministerial meeting, the Commission reiterated that the agreement should, in particular, establish enforceable rights for individuals whose data are being exchanged across the Atlantic for law enforcement purposes and provide for equal treatment between EU and US persons, including access to judicial redress in case these rights are violated.

The respect for fundamental rights and the rule of law are the foundations of the EU-US relationship. This common understanding has been, and must remain, the basis of cooperation in the area of Justice. Trust that the rule of law will be respected is also essential to the stability and growth of the digital economy, including transatlantic business. This is of paramount importance for individuals and companies alike.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006977/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: David Cameron exige que o Google retire a pornografia infantil da Internet

Considerando que:

— O Reino Unido foi recentemente abalado por dois crimes de natureza sexual que envolveram crianças (April Jones, de 5 anos, e Tias Sharp, de 12, foram mortas por dois homens diferentes, que, em comum, tinham o facto de verem na Internet pornografia infantil e imagens de crianças a serem abusadas sexualmente);

— David Cameron, primeiro-ministro britânico, condena os motores de busca, nomeadamente o Google, por disponibilizarem imagens de pornografia com menores, razão por que exige que essas imagens sejam retiradas;

Pergunto à Comissão:

— Que ações têm sido desenvolvidas de forma a reunir os representantes das maiores empresas, como o Google e o Facebook, e exigir que sejam tomadas medidas para regular os seus conteúdos?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão
(9 de agosto de 2013)

Em conformidade com o direito da UE, os prestadores de serviços da sociedade de informação não podem ser sujeitos a uma obrigação geral de controlar as informações que transmitem ou armazenam, nem de procurar ativamente factos ou circunstâncias que indiciem atividades ilícitas. No entanto, podem ser responsabilizados se, a partir do momento em que tiverem conhecimento da ilicitude da atividade ou das informações, não agirem com diligência para retirar ou impossibilitar o acesso às informações ([1]). Os Estados-Membros devem também garantir a supressão imediata das páginas eletrónicas que contenham ou difundam pornografia infantil sediadas no seu território e procurar obter a supressão das mesmas páginas sediadas fora do seu território ([2]), o que envolve necessariamente medidas de alguns elementos da indústria da Internet.

A Comissão está ciente de que alguns agentes do setor, incluindo o Google, estão dispostos a ir além das suas obrigações jurídicas e procuram voluntariamente evitar a utilização dos seus serviços para distribuição de material pedopornográfico.

O Google é um dos signatários da «coligação de diretores de empresas para fazer da Internet um lugar melhor para as crianças» ([3]), uma iniciativa voluntária da indústria em resposta a um convite da Comissão e por esta apoiada. Como tal, o Google comprometeu-se a fazer tudo o que estiver ao seu alcance, incluindo medidas proativas, para retirar da Internet o material pedopornográfico, para além das medidas previstas da diretiva do abuso sexual de crianças.

O Google é também membro da coligação financeira europeia contra a exploração sexual comercial das crianças em linha ([4]), uma iniciativa apoiada com financiamento da Comissão Europeia, que reúne os principais elementos das autoridades policiais, do setor privado e da sociedade civil da Europa, para tomar medidas relativas aos sistemas de pagamento e de TIC utilizados para difundir pornografia infantil.

([1]) Diretiva 2000/31/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 8 de junho de 2000, relativa a certos aspetos legais dos serviços da sociedade de informação, em especial do comércio eletrónico, no mercado interno («diretiva do comércio eletrónico»).

([2]) Diretiva 2011/93/UE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 13 de dezembro de 2011, relativa à luta contra o abuso sexual e a exploração sexual de crianças e a pornografia infantil, e que substitui a Decisão-Quadro 2004/68/JAI do Conselho («diretiva do abuso sexual de crianças»).

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/self-regulation-better-internet-kids

([4]) http://www.europeanfinancialcoalition.eu

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006977/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: David Cameron demands that Google remove child pornography from the Internet

The United Kingdom was recently shaken by two sexual crimes involving children (five-year-old April Jones and Tia Sharp, who was 12, were killed by two different men who had both viewed child pornography and images of children being sexually abused on the Internet).

The British Prime Minister, David Cameron, has criticised search engines, and Google in particular, for making child pornography images available, and has thus called for such images to be taken offline.

— What action has the Commission taken to meet representatives of leading companies, such as Google and Facebook, and demand that they take action to regulate their content?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

Under EC law, providers of information society services cannot be subject to a general obligation to monitor the information they transmit or store or to actively seek facts or circumstances indicating illegal activity. However, they may be liable if, upon obtaining knowledge or awareness on the illegal activity or the information, they do not act expeditiously to remove or disable access to the information ([1]). Member States must also ensure the prompt removal of web pages containing or disseminating child pornography hosted in their territory and endeavour to obtain the removal of such pages hosted outside of their territory ([2]), and this necessarily involves action by some of the Internet industry.

The Commission is aware that some industry actors, including Google, are willing to go beyond their legal obligations and voluntarily seek to avoid the use of their services for distributing child sexual abuse material.

Google is a signatory of the 'CEO coalition to make the Internet a better place for kids' ([3]), a voluntary initiative by industry in response to an invitation from and supported by the Commission. As such, Google has committed to doing all within its power, including by proactive steps, to remove from the Internet child sex abuse material, in addition to necessary measures in the child sexual abuse Directive.

Google is also a member of the European Financial Coalition against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children Online ([4]), an initiative supported with funding by the European Commission, bringing together key actors from law enforcement, the private sector and civil society in Europe to take action on the payment and ICT systems that are used to disseminate child pornography.

([1]) Directive 2000/31/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2000 on certain legal aspects of information society services, in particular electronic commerce, in the internal market ('e-commerce Directive').

([2]) Directive 2011/93/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13December 2011 on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA ('child sexual abuse Directive').

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/self-regulation-better-Internet-kids.

([4]) http://www.europeanfinancialcoalition.eu.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006978/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Previsões da «troika» no início do programa português versus realidade em 2013

Considerando que:

— No memorando original, estava previsto um crescimento de 1,2 % para 2013, sendo -2,3 % a atual previsão de crescimento do PIB para o ano em curso;

— No memorando original, estava previsto um crescimento do investimento de 2,6 % em 2013, prevendo-se atualmente um decréscimo de 7,6 %, depois de ter caído 14,5 % em 2012;

— A previsão do desemprego para este ano é de 18,2 % e de 18,5 % para 2014, quando no memorando original o previsto era 12,6 %;

Pergunta-se:

— Face a resultados tão díspares entre o memorando original e a realidade em 2013, como explica a Comissão estas diferenças?

— Poderão estas diferenças ter origem nos erros que o FMI diz terem existido no desenho dos programas de resgate, nomeadamente na Grécia, mas que podem ter sido replicados em Portugal?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(6 de agosto de 2013)

As diferenças entre as previsões iniciais do programa e os resultados até à data devem-se a vários fatores. Um fator importante é o meio externo muito menos favorável com uma procura externa que se situa vários pontos percentuais aquém dos pressupostos subjacentes às previsões do programa. Outro fator importante é a persistência da fragmentação financeira na área do euro, o que provoca uma perturbação dos mecanismos de transmissão monetária nos Estados-Membros vulneráveis, de modo que os operadores nesses Estados-Membros têm de pagar taxas de juro muito mais altas do que o que seria requerido pelas taxas da política monetária. Além disso, a necessidade de reduzir simultaneamente o nível de endividamento do setor público e do setor privado combinada com uma rigidez nominal e real significativa aumentaram o impacto negativo da consolidação orçamental na produção e no emprego em Portugal.

No que diz respeito à execução do programa, embora, em geral, o desempenho do Governo tenha sido muito bom, as decisões do Tribunal Constitucional forçaram-no a introduzir novas medidas numa fase muito tardia a fim de assegurar a realização dos objetivos orçamentais. Estas medidas eram com frequência de natureza *ad hoc* e tinham por base aumentos de impostos, o que, dado o ambiente de recessão, não conduziu aos rendimentos esperados, levando ao desencadeamento de novas séries de medidas.

Por último, a situação em Portugal não é comparável à da Grécia, e os fatores subjacentes à discrepância entre as previsões e os resultados diferem substancialmente.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006978/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: The Troika's forecasts at the start of the Portuguese programme compared with the reality in 2013

In the original Memorandum of Understanding, growth of 1.2% was predicted for 2013, whereas GDP is currently predicted to shrink by 2.3% this year.

The original Memorandum predicted that investment would grow by 2.6% in 2013 but it is currently predicted to fall by 7.6% after having fallen by 14.5% in 2012.

Unemployment is predicted to reach 18.2% this year and 18.5% in 2014, whereas the original Memorandum predicted it would be 12.6%.

— In view of such a discrepancy between the figures in the original Memorandum and the actual figures for 2013, how can the Commission explain these differences?

— Could these differences be a result of the errors that the International Monetary Fund says were made in the way the rescue programmes were drawn up, specifically in the case of Greece, but which may have been repeated in Portugal's case?

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

The differences between the initial programme projections and outcomes so far have been due to several factors. One major factor is a much less benign external environment with external demand several percentage points below the assumptions underlying the programme projections. Another important factor is the continued financial fragmentation in the euro area which results in a disruption of the monetary transmission mechanisms in vulnerable Member States so that operators in these Member States have to pay much higher interest rates than would be warranted by policy rates. Furthermore, the need for simultaneous deleveraging of the public and the private sector combined with significant nominal and real rigidities have increased the adverse impact of fiscal consolidation on output and employment in Portugal.

Concerning issues related to programme implementation, while the government's performance in implementing the programme was generally very good, rulings by the Constitutional Court forced the government to introduce new measures at a very late stage to ensure the achievement of the budgetary targets. These measures were often of an ad-hoc nature and based on tax increases which due to the recessionary environment did not deliver the expected yields, triggering new rounds of measures.

Finally, the situation in Portugal is not comparable with the one in Greece, and the factors behind the discrepancy between projections and outcome differ substantially.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006979/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: FMI admite erros no impacto das políticas de austeridade I

Considerando o seguinte:

— Pela segunda vez, em menos de um ano, os técnicos do FMI reconhecem que subestimaram o impacto das políticas de austeridade nas economias dos países sob ajuda externa;

— Esta nova admissão foi feita especificamente para o caso da Grécia, no quadro de uma avaliação sobre o seu programa de ajustamento;

— Apesar do esforço significativo que foi exigido aos gregos em termos de consolidação orçamental, o programa não permitiu alcançar muitos dos seus objetivos, como a recuperação da confiança dos investidores e o regresso ao crescimento económico;

— Sobre a Comissão, o FMI diz que esta «tem tido um sucesso limitado na implementação [das condições associadas aos empréstimos] e não tem experiência na gestão de crises», para além de considerar que a CE está mais preocupada com o «cumprimento das regras da União Europeia do que com o impacto no crescimento económico» e que «não foi capaz de contribuir muito para identificar reformas estruturais potenciadoras de crescimento»;

Pergunto à Comissão:

— Confirma e corrobora as declarações do FMI?

— Como analisa as implicações de um novo modelo de credores que não integre o Fundo Monetário Internacional (FMI)?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(2 de agosto de 2013)

Tanto o Presidente da Comissão como o Vice-Presidente da Comissão responsável pelos assuntos económicos e monetários reagiram à avaliação do FMI e expressaram o seu desacordo com algumas das suas conclusões.

A Grécia revelou ao longo da última década um grande desfasamento de competitividade face aos outros Estados-Membros da área do euro e acumulou uma elevada dívida. O programa grego pretendia, desde o início, desenvolver uma base mais sólida para o crescimento e a criação de emprego, com a sustentabilidade das finanças públicas, a estabilidade do sistema financeiro e maior concorrência e dinamismo. Todas as medidas incluídas no programa se destinam a garantir que a Grécia permaneça na zona euro e a salvaguardar a estabilidade financeira da União Monetária.

A Comissão tem sido um importante motor para centrar o programa nas reformas estruturais que visam restaurar um crescimento económico sustentável. Atualmente, o programa de reforma está a ser cumprido e há indícios crescentes de estabilização e de crescente confiança na Grécia: em maio, os indicadores das expectativas económicas atingiram o seu nível mais elevado em cinco anos e, em geral, mantiveram este nível em junho.

A troica foi criada por iniciativa dos Estados-Membros da área do euro, muitos dos quais insistiram para contar com o FMI a seu lado. Com base nesse mandato, a Comissão está agora a trabalhar em conjunto com o BCE e o FMI em cinco países. As nossas equipas de pessoal funcionam muito bem em conjunto, muitas vezes em situações difíceis.

Agora é altura de concentrar esforços para ajudar os governos desses países a conceber e a aplicar as reformas necessárias para estimular o crescimento e o emprego. Estando a Comissão a avançar com o debate sobre o futuro da União Económica e Monetária, é necessário explorar formas de otimizar a governação da zona euro, incluindo os seus mecanismos de gestão de crise. Esse será o momento certo e o contexto para discutir se e de que forma manter o modelo da troica.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006979/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: The International Monetary Fund (IMF) admits to mistakes in gauging the impact of austerity policies I

For the second time in less than a year, IMF officials have acknowledged that they underestimated the impact austerity policies would have on the economies of countries receiving external assistance.

This latest admission was made specifically in relation to Greece, during an assessment of its adjustment programme.

Despite the considerable effort that Greece has been required to make in terms of budgetary consolidation, the programme has not enabled it to achieve many of its objectives, such as winning back investor confidence and restoring economic growth.

According to the IMF, the Commission 'had enjoyed limited success with implementing [conditions attached to the loans] and had no experience with crisis management'. The IMF also felt that the Commission was focused more on compliance with EU rules than on the impact of economic growth and that it was unable 'to contribute much to identifying growth-enhancing structural reforms.'

— Can the Commission confirm and corroborate the IMF's statements?

— What implications does it think a new creditor model that does not include the International Monetary Fund would have?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

Both the Commission President and the Commission Vice-President responsible for Economic and Monetary affairs reacted to the IMF evaluation and expressed their disagreement with some of its conclusions.

Greece developed over the last decade a large competitiveness gap vis-à-vis the other euro-area Member States and accumulated a large debt stock. The Greek programme aimed, from the start, to build a more solid basis for growth and job creation, with sustainable public finances, a stable financial system, and more competition and dynamism. All the measures included in the programme are geared to ensure that Greece remains in the euro area and to safeguard financial stability in the currency union.

The Commission has been a major driving force behind the programme's strong focus on structural reforms which aim to restore sustainable economic growth. Today, the reform programme is on track and there are growing signs of stabilisation and rising confidence in Greece: in May the Economic Sentiment Indicator reached its highest level in five years, and broadly maintained this level in June.

The Troika was set up on the initiative of the euro area Member States, many of which insisted on having the IMF on board. On the basis of this mandate, the Commission is now working together with the ECB and IMF in five countries. Our staff teams work very well together, often in the most challenging of situations.

Now is the time to focus on helping these countries' governments to design and implement the reforms needed to lift growth and employment. As the Commission takes forward the debate on the future of the Economic and Monetary Union, it is necessary to explore ways to optimise the governance of the euro area, including its crisis management mechanisms. That will be the right time and context to discuss whether and in what form to maintain the Troika model.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006980/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: FMI admite erros no impacto das políticas de austeridade II

— Pela segunda vez, em menos de um ano, os técnicos do FMI reconhecem que subestimaram o impacto das políticas de austeridade nas economias dos países sob ajuda externa;

— Esta nova admissão foi feita especificamente para o caso da Grécia, no quadro de uma avaliação sobre o seu programa de ajustamento;

— Apesar do esforço significativo que foi exigido aos gregos em termos de consolidação orçamental, o programa não permitiu alcançar muitos dos seus objetivos, como a recuperação da confiança dos investidores e o regresso ao crescimento económico;

Pergunto à Comissão:

— O reconhecimento feito pelo FMI, parceiro da Comissão na troika, poderá levar à suavização da austeridade nas políticas aplicadas às economias dos países sob ajuda externa?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(21 de agosto de 2013)

Remetemos o Senhor Deputado do Parlamento Europeu para as respostas às questões E-004947/2013 e E-006979/2013 colocadas por Vossa Excelência ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/pt/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006980/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: The International Monetary Fund (IMF) admits to mistakes in gauging the impact of austerity policies II

For the second time in less than a year, IMF officials have acknowledged that they underestimated the impact austerity policies would have on the economies of countries receiving external assistance.

This latest admission was made specifically in relation to Greece, during an assessment of its adjustment programme.

Despite the considerable effort that Greece has been required to make in terms of budgetary consolidation, the programme has not enabled it to achieve many of its objectives, such as winning back investor confidence and restoring economic growth.

— Could the admission by the IMF, one of the Commission's Troika partners, lead to the relaxation of austerity measures in the policies applied to the economies of countries receiving external assistance?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2013)

We refer the Honourable Member of the European Parliament to the replies given to the Honourable Member to questions E-004947/2013 and E-006979/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006982/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Mancha flutuante de lixo localizada no Pacífico ocidental

Considerando o seguinte:

— Uma expedição com a designação «7.° continente» partiu, no fim do mês passado, de San Diego, na Califórnia, para estudar em pormenor, durante um mês, uma mancha flutuante de lixo com três vezes a dimensão da Península Ibérica, localizada no Pacífico ocidental e que se forma devido às correntes oceânicas. Situada entre a Califórnia e o Havai, a ilha só foi descoberta em 1997. No entanto, existem outras: uma mais pequena no Pacifico norte, ente o Havai e o Japão, outra no Mar dos Sargaços, no Atlântico norte;

— O lixo lançado ao mar põe em perigo a fauna marinha;

— Dos 100 milhões de toneladas de plástico produzidos por ano 10 % acabam no mar, sendo que 20 % são produzidas nas plataformas e barcos e 80 % provêm das zonas costeiras;

Pergunto à Comissão:

— Tem conhecimento da situação descrita?

— Que medidas propõe a Comissão para inverter a tendência de poluição dos mares?

Resposta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão
(13 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão está consciente da situação no Pacífico Ocidental e do perigo que os resíduos depositados no mar constituem para a vida marinha. O 7.° Programa de Ação em matéria do ambiente, recentemente acordado, preconiza a fixação de um objetivo de redução global quantitativo do lixo marinho à escala da UE. Os trabalhos neste domínio já estão em curso e apoiam-se numa série de ações. Por exemplo, em abril de 2013, a Comissão organizou, juntamente com as autoridades alemãs, uma conferência internacional sobre a prevenção e a gestão dos resíduos marinhos nos mares europeus, como contribuição para a resolução deste problema mundial; este evento resultou, nomeadamente, na criação de uma caixa de ferramentas para eventuais medidas e no esboço de planos de ação regionais de luta contra o lixo marinho para cada uma das quatro convenções sobre os mares regionais. Os projetos de investigação da UE no âmbito do 7.° Programa-Quadro de investigação e os estudos no domínio da política marítima integrada, assim como a Diretiva-Quadro «Estratégia Marinha» (DQEM), têm por objetivo compreender a dimensão do problema e avaliar as potenciais medidas corretivas. O documento de trabalho dos serviços da Comissão sobre o lixo marinho ([1]) proporciona uma visão geral das políticas e iniciativas relacionadas com o lixo marinho. A Comissão remete ainda o Senhor Deputado para as suas respostas às perguntas parlamentares ([2]) E-007183/2012, E-007175/2012 e E-001354/2012.

([1]) Documento de trabalho dos serviços da Comissão, SWD(2012) 365.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006982/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Floating rubbish patch in the western Pacific

Late last month, an expedition called '7th continent' set off from San Diego in California to study in detail, for one month, a floating patch of rubbish three times the size of the Iberian Peninsula, which is located in the western Pacific and has been formed by ocean currents. The island of rubbish, located between California and Hawaii, was discovered in 1997. However, there are others: a smaller patch in the northern Pacific, between Hawaii and Japan, and another in the Sargasso Sea, in the northern Atlantic.

Waste disposed of in the sea endangers marine wildlife.

Of the 100 million tonnes of plastic produced each year, 10% ends up in the sea, with 20% of that coming from rigs and boats and 80% from coastal regions.

— Is the Commission aware of this situation?

— What steps will the Commission take to reverse the trend of sea pollution?

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

The Commission is aware of the situation in the western Pacific and the danger waste disposed of in the sea causes for marine life. The recently agreed 7th Environment Action Programme calls for the establishment of an EU wide quantitative headline reduction target for marine litter. Work in this domain has already started and is underpinned by a variety of actions. For example, in April 2013 the Commission organised, together with German authorities, an International Conference on Prevention and Management of Marine litter in European Seas, as a contribution to addressing this global problem which resulted, amongst others, in a toolbox with possible measures and an outline of regional action plans on marine litter for each of the four Regional Seas Conventions. Research projects under the EU's Seventh Framework Programme for Research and studies under the integrated maritime policy and the MSFD are aimed to understand the scale of the problem and assess potential remedial actions. An overview of policies and initiatives related to marine litter is provided in the Commission Staff Working Document on marine litter [1]. The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its answers to the Parliamentary questions [2] E-007183/2012, E-007175/2012 and E-001354/2012.

---

[1] SWD (2012) 365.
[2] http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006983/13
a la Comisión
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(17 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Número de personas con discapacidad que trabajan en las instituciones europeas

El empleo es un elemento esencial para conseguir la inserción en la sociedad de las personas con discapacidad, y una de las formas más importantes de promover su independencia y dignidad. La integración laboral de las personas con discapacidad es absolutamente necesaria para lograr una verdadera integración social.

El acceso al mercado laboral de las personas con discapacidad es uno de los objetivos prioritarios de las políticas de empleo. La UE recomienda a los Estados miembros incrementar la ocupación de estas personas, aumentar sus oportunidades de trabajo e impedir cualquier tipo de discriminación.

Considerando que la actual situación de crisis económica tiene, entre sus nefastas consecuencias, la eliminación de puestos de trabajo,

Considerando que la UE debe ser ejemplar en el ejercicio y la protección de los derechos fundamentales en Europa, entre los que destaca el derecho de las personas con discapacidad a trabajar en igualdad de condiciones,

Considerando el artículo 15 de la Carta Europea de los Derechos Fundamentales,

Considerando el artículo 27 de la Convención de las Naciones Unidas sobre los derechos de las Personas con Discapacidad,

Cabe formular las siguientes preguntas:

1. ¿Qué políticas rigen la contratación de personas con discapacidad en el interior de las instituciones europeas?

2. ¿De qué programas disponen las instituciones europeas para ofertar trabajo a las personas con discapacidad?

Respuesta del Sr. Šefčovič en nombre de la Comisión
(21 de agosto de 2013)

El Estatuto de los funcionarios y el código de buenas prácticas adjunto ([1]), del año 2003, prohíben toda discriminación de las personas con discapacidad y exigen que se atiendan las necesidades del personal o los aspirantes, salvo cuando ello suponga una carga desproporcionada. Esa norma implica que el personal en nuestra plantilla pueda acogerse a un horario más flexible y que se le facilite la tecnología apropiada u otros equipos de trabajo adaptados, o que se realicen alteraciones en las construcciones para asegurar el acceso a nuestros edificios y permitirles desempeñar debidamente sus funciones.

La Comisión recibe con sumo agrado las candidaturas de aspirantes con discapacidad y las atiende en función de las necesidades.

Por lo que respecta a las demás instituciones de la UE, toda consulta debe efectuarse a los servicios competentes respectivos.

([1]) C(2003)4362/1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006983/13
to the Commission
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Number of people with disabilities working at the European institutions

Work plays a key role in helping people with disabilities integrate into society, and one of the best ways of ensuring that they can lead their lives with dignity and independence. If we wish to see genuine social inclusion, it is of essential importance that people with disabilities are able to join the workforce.

Ensuring that people with disabilities may enter the labour market is one of the most important objectives of employment policy. The EU recommends that Member States help people with disabilities to become more economically active, improve their job opportunities and prevent all forms of discrimination.

Given the fact that one effect of the current economic crisis has been widespread redundancies,

Given the fact that the EU should be exemplary in ensuring the exercise and protection of fundamental rights in Europe, which include the right of people with disabilities to work on an equal basis with others,

Given Article 15 of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights,

Given Article 27 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities,

1. What policies govern the recruitment of people with disabilities to work at the European institutions?

2. What programmes are there to encourage people with disabilities to work at the European institutions?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2013)

The Staff Regulations and its related 2003 Code of good practice ([1]) prohibit discrimination against people with disabilities and require that the needs of disabled staff or applicants be accommodated unless this would cause a disproportionate burden. This includes among others for our colleagues with disabilities the possibility to work under more flexible working hours; the provision of appropriate technology or other workplace adapted equipment or alterations to the built environment to ensure access to our buildings or that they can duly perform their duties.

The Commission welcomes applications from candidates with disabilities and accommodates their applications when needs arise.

As regards the other EU institutions, requests for information should be addressed to their respective competent services.

([1]) C(2003)4362/1.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006984/13
a la Comisión
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(17 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Turismo del patrimonio industrial

En el apartado 44 del informe del Parlamento Europeo titulado «Europa, primer destino turístico del mundo: un nuevo marco político para el turismo europeo», se hace referencia al impulso del patrimonio industrial de Europa y a la promoción de los destinos secundarios y la contribución a la consolidación de un sector turístico europeo más sostenible, diversificado y distribuido de forma más armónica, mediante la conservación, transformación y rehabilitación de los emplazamientos industriales.

¿Qué estrategias tiene pensado utilizar la Comisión para hacer el patrimonio industrial y los destinos secundarios más atractivos para los usuarios del sector?

Respuesta del Sr.Tajani en nombre de la Comisión
(14 de agosto de 2013)

Con el fin de aumentar el atractivo del patrimonio industrial europeo, la Comisión publicó la convocatoria de propuestas «Cooperation projects to support transnational tourism based on European cultural and industrial heritage» (Proyectos de cooperación para apoyar el turismo transnacional basado en el patrimonio cultural e industrial europeo). La convocatoria apoyará las actividades de cooperación transnacional con el objetivo de crear productos turísticos transnacionales innovadores basados en un patrimonio cultural o industrial común. Entre los objetivos específicos de la convocatoria figura la promoción de actividades turísticas en regiones en declive a fin de impulsar el empleo y el crecimiento.

La convocatoria asignará un presupuesto total de 1 millón de euros. Al menos cinco proyectos recibirán un máximo de 200 000 euros de financiación de la UE, la cual financia un 75 % de los costes subvencionables. El plazo de presentación finaliza el 31 de julio de 2013 y el procedimiento de evaluación tendrá lugar posteriormente, con el objetivo de firmar el acuerdo de subvención antes de que finalice el año.

La Comisión también lleva a cabo el Sello de Patrimonio Europeo, nueva medida de la UE destinada a destacar los lugares declarados patrimonio que simbolizan la integración, los ideales y la historia de Europa. Los lugares que reciben el Sello pueden ser de cualquier tipo, incluido el patrimonio industrial. El Sello de Patrimonio Europeo contribuirá a aumentar el turismo cultural debido a la visibilidad y al atractivo de las actividades llevadas a cabo en los lugares que lo hayan recibido. La primera selección de lugares tiene lugar en 2013.

Por otra parte, la Comisión está apoyando el desarrollo del Programa de itinerarios culturales del Consejo de Europa. Este apoyo ha tomado la forma de programas de gestión conjunta, suscritos por la Comisión y el Consejo de Europa. Las dos instituciones acuerdan un plan de acción, que es ejecutado por el European Institute of Cultural Routes, agencia del Consejo de Europa. La ayuda financiera asciende a 500 000 euros para 2013-2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006984/13
to the Commission
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Industrial heritage tourism

In paragraph 44 of the European Parliament report entitled 'Europe, the world's No 1 tourist destination — a new political framework for tourism in Europe', reference is made to the promotion of Europe's industrial heritage and secondary destinations and the way in which the preservation, transformation and rehabilitation of industrial sites can contribute to achieving a more sustainable, diversified and evenly spread tourism sector in Europe.

What action does the Commission intend to take in order to increase the appeal to tourists of industrial heritage and secondary destinations?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2013)

In order to increase the appeal of the European industrial heritage, the Commission launched a Call for proposals 'Cooperation projects to support transnational tourism based on European cultural and industrial heritage'. The call will support transnational cooperation activities with the aim of creating innovative transnational tourism products based on a shared cultural or industrial heritage. Among the Call's specific objectives, there is the promotion of tourism activities in declining regions in order to boost employment and growth.

The Call will allocate a total budget of 1M EUR . At least five projects will be awarded with a maximum EU financing of EUR 200.000. The EU financing rate of eligible costs is 75%. The deadline for submission is 31 July 2013 and the evaluation procedure will take place thereafter with the aim of signing the grant agreement by the end of the year.

The Commission also implements the European Heritage Label, a newly-established EU action aiming at highlighting heritage sites that symbolise European integration, ideals and history. The labelled sites may be of any kind, industrial heritage included. By its visibility and the attractiveness of the activities implemented in the labelled sites, the European Heritage Label will help to increase cultural tourism. The first selection of sites takes place in 2013.

Furthermore the Commission is supporting the development of the Cultural Routes Program of the Council of Europe (CoE). This support has taken the form of 'Joint Management Programmes' signed by the Commission and the CoE. The two Institutions agree on an Action Plan that is implemented by the CoE's agency, the 'European Institute of Cultural Routes'. The financial support amounts to EUR 500.000 for 2013-2014.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006985/13
a la Comisión
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(17 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Turismo en bicicleta

En el apartado 42 del informe del Parlamento Europeo titulado «Europa, primer destino turístico del mundo: un nuevo marco político para el turismo europeo», se hace referencia a la interconexión en red y la cooperación entre las regiones de la UE, con el fin de enlazar los actuales circuitos ciclistas regionales, nacionales y europeos y potenciar a nivel de la Unión un turismo de la bicicleta sostenible, eficiente en el plano energético y respetuoso con el medio ambiente;

1. ¿De qué forma llevará la Comisión a cabo la creación de esta red que interconectará los circuitos ciclistas?

2. ¿Qué medidas se tomarán para promover el turismo en bicicleta en aquellos lugares en que este entre en discordancia con elementos característicos del entorno tales como tráfico excesivo, vías de dimensiones reducidas en el casco histórico o relieve muy irregular?

3. ¿Se incluirá algún tipo de vehículos adaptados a personas con discapacidad, tales como tándems o bicicletas con tres ruedas, en esta iniciativa?

Respuesta del Sr. Tajani en nombre de la Comisión
(21 de agosto de 2013)

La Comisión reconoce el papel del ciclismo y de las rutas para bicicletas a la hora de fomentar el turismo sostenible y promocionar destinos europeos menos conocidos, así como su contribución al desarrollo regional.

1. Desde el punto de vista del turismo, durante el período 2009-2012, la Comisión organizó varias licitaciones específicas y cofinanció proyectos relacionados con el desarrollo y el fomento de determinadas rutas transnacionales para bicicletas [por ejemplo, la Ruta del Telón de Acero (EuroVelo 13) o el Camino de Santiago (EuroVelo 3)] ([1]). Las inversiones en infraestructuras para bicicletas se pueden financiar con cargo a la política de cohesión de la UE y, en concreto, al Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional (FEDER) ([2]).

2. La Comisión ha cofinanciado proyectos relacionados con la red EuroVelo ([3]) con el fin de reforzar su coordinación central y de aumentar su potencial y visibilidad turísticos. La Federación Europea de Ciclistas, que gestiona la red EuroVelo, ha desarrollado para las rutas que poseen la certificación EuroVelo una serie de directrices y normas relacionadas con el exceso de tráfico, los desniveles del terreno, etc.

Además, el programa STEER (el pilar relacionado con los transportes del programa Energía Inteligente — Europa) ha contribuido con 14 millones de euros a doce proyectos piloto europeos relacionados con el ciclismo. La iniciativa Civitas ([4]) fomenta el desarrollo y la evaluación de nuevos enfoques para mejorar la seguridad del ciclismo urbano. Asimismo, la Comisión fomenta la multimodalidad (en la que se incluye el ciclismo) en las áreas urbanas a través de la Semana Europea de la Movilidad y la campaña «Do the Right Mix» ([5]).

3. La Comisión también ha cofinanciado varios proyectos relacionados con el fomento de las Vías Verdes ([6]), cuyo objetivo es satisfacer las necesidades de distintos usuarios de transporte no motorizado con una amplia gama de discapacidades.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/cycling-tourism/index_es.htm
([2]) Durante el período 2000-2006, aproximadamente 74,4 millones de euros se destinaron a carriles para bicicletas, mientras que la contribución del FEDER para el período 2007-2013 se elevará a 646 millones de euros. La financiación de las infraestructuras para bicicletas depende da las prioridades nacionales o regionales.
([3]) www.eurovelo.org and www.eurovelo.com
([4]) El presupuesto, que se eleva a 200 millones de euros, ha servido para realizar desde 2002 más de ciento veinte medidas relacionadas con el ciclismo en las cincuenta y nueve ciudades Civitas.
([5]) www.dotherightmix.eu
([6]) http://www.aevv-egwa.org/site/hp_es.asp

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006985/13
to the Commission
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Bicycle tourism

Paragraph 42 of Parliament's report entitled 'Europe, the world's No 1 tourist destination — a new political framework for tourism in Europe' calls for networking and cooperation between EU regions in order to link up existing regional, national and European cycle routes and increase sustainable, energy-efficient and environmentally friendly cycling tourism.

1. How does the Commission intend to connect these cycle routes to form a complete network?

2. What measures will be taken to promote bicycle tourism in places not conducive to it for reasons specific to the locality, such as excessive traffic, narrow roads in historical towns or very uneven terrain?

3. Will this initiative make provision for any vehicles suitable for people with disabilities such as tandems or tricycles?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2013)

The Commission recognises the role of cycling and cycle routes in promoting sustainable tourism and lesser-known destinations in Europe as well as their contribution to regional development.

1. From a tourism perspective, over the period 2009-2012, the Commission had several dedicated calls for proposals and co-financed projects related to the development and promotion of some transnational cycle routes (e.g. the Iron Curtain Trail (EuroVelo 13), Saint James Way (EuroVelo 3)) ([1]). Cycling infrastructure investments can be financed under the EU cohesion policy, in particular the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) ([2]).

2. The Commission co-financed projects related to the EuroVelo network ([3]) aimed at strengthening its central coordination and increasing its tourism potential and visibility. The European Cyclists' Federation, which manages the EuroVelo Network, has developed some guidance and standards concerning the certified EuroVelo routes in relation to excessive traffic, uneven terrain etc.

Moreover, the STEER Programme (transport pillar of the Intelligent Energy-Europe programme) has provided EUR 14 million to 12 European pilot projects related to cycling. The CIVITAS Initiative ([4]) promotes the development and evaluation of new approaches to safe cycling in cities. Furthermore, the Commission promotes multimodality (including cycling) in urban areas through European Mobility Week and the campaign 'Do the Right Mix' ([5]).

3. The Commission has also co-financed several projects related to promotion of accessible Greenways ([6]) which aim at accommodating the needs of various users of non-motorized transport with a wide range of disabilities.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/cycling-tourism/index_en.htm
([2]) For the period 2000-2006, about 74.4 million EUR were allocated to cycle paths and, for the 2007-2013 period, the support from the ERDF will amount to 646 million EUR. Funding of cycling infrastructure depends on regional/national priorities.
([3]) www.eurovelo.org and www.eurovelo.com
([4]) With a budget of EUR 200 million, since 2002, over 120 cycling-related measures have been implemented in the 59 CIVITAS cities.
([5]) www.dotherightmix.eu
([6]) http://www.aevv-egwa.org/site/hp_en.asp

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006987/13
an die Kommission
Michael Gahler (PPE)
(17. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Eröffnung des Notfallabwehrzentrums (Emergency Response Centre, ERC) der Europäischen Kommission

Am 15. Mai 2013 wurde das Notfallabwehrzentrum (Emergency Response Centre, ERC) der Europäischen Kommission eröffnet. Laut eigenen Ausführungen verfolgt die Kommission mit dem Notfallabwehrzentrum das Ziel, „für eine besser koordinierte, schnellere und effizientere Katastrophenabwehr in Europa und weltweit" einzustehen.

— Inwieweit ist eine gemeinsame Nutzung des Notfallabwehrzentrums durch Zivilschutzorganisationen und Akteure der humanitären Hilfe vorgesehen?

— Welche bisherigen Dienststellen der Kommission wurden im Notfallabwehrzentrum zusammengeführt?

— Ist geplant, sämtliche vergleichbaren Einrichtungen bei der Kommission und dem Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienst in das Notfallabwehrzentrum zu integrieren?

Antwort von Frau Georgieva im Namen der Kommission
(21. August 2013)

Das Europäische Notfallabwehrzentrum (Emergency Response Centre — ERC) dient als Koordinierungsschnittstelle der Kommission, um eine rasche, kohärente und effiziente Reaktion der EU auf Krisen und Notsituationen weltweit zu ermöglichen. Das ERC ist außerdem ein Symbol für die noch engere Zusammenarbeit und Koordinierung zwischen den Instrumenten und Strategien für die humanitäre Hilfe einerseits und den Katastrophenschutz andererseits, die seit 2010 in einem Dienst der Kommission (Generaldirektion ECHO) vereint sind.

Seit der Einweihung des ERC im Mai 2013 wurde es von zahlreichen externen Partnern besucht, um zu erfahren, wie das Zentrum funktioniert und welchen Mehrwert es zu ihren eigenen Maßnahmen erbringen kann. Wie jüngste Beispiele gezeigt haben, erleichtert dieser transparente und offene Ansatz die Kommunikation und den Informationsaustausch im Fall von Krisen.

Das ERC wendet diesen uneingeschränkt transparenten und offenen Ansatz auch gegenüber anderen Kommissionsdienststellen und den übrigen EU-Organen und -Einrichtungen an. Es bietet einen spezifischen Ad-hoc-Arbeitsraum für Kollegen aus den Delegationen und Außenstellen, für Verbindungsbeamte der Mitgliedstaaten sowie Kollegen aus anderen EU-Organen und -Einrichtungen. Dies ermöglicht eine enge Koordinierung zwischen allen am Krisenmanagement und an humanitären Einsätzen Beteiligten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006987/13
to the Commission
Michael Gahler (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Opening of the European Commission's Emergency Response Centre (ERC)

The European Commission's Emergency Response Centre (ERC) was opened on 15 May 2013. The Commission's stated aim for the ERC is to guarantee 'a better coordinated, faster and more efficient European response to disasters in Europe and the world'.

— To what extent have arrangements been made to provide civil protection organisations and humanitarian aid agencies with access to ERC facilities?

— Which former Commission departments have been brought together in the ERC?

— Are there any plans to integrate all similar facilities at the Commission and the European External Action Service into the ERC?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2013)

The Emergency Response Centre (ERC) serves as the Commission's coordination hub to facilitate a rapid, coherent and efficient response of the Union to crises and emergencies worldwide. The ERC stands also as a symbol for an even closer cooperation and coordination between humanitarian aid and civil protection policies and instruments which, in 2010, were brought together in one Commission department (DG ECHO).

Since its inauguration in May 2013, many external partners have come to visit and learn about the ERC and to understand the added value it can provide also to their activities. As recent examples have already shown, this transparent and open approach facilitates communication and information sharing in times of crises.

The ERC also employs a fully transparent and open approach vis-à-vis other Commission services and other EU institutions and bodies. It provides dedicated ad hoc workspace for colleagues from Delegations and field offices, for liaison officers from Member States or colleagues from other EU institutions and bodies. This allows for close coordination between all stakeholders involved in crisis management and relief operations.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006988/13
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Cross-border healthcare

The freedom to receive health services throughout the European Union is confirmed by Directive 2011/24/EU. This piece of legislation sets out the conditions under which EU citizens can receive healthcare in other Member States and the conditions under which they will be reimbursed for costs once they return home.

The directive allows Member States to have in place a system of prior authorisation for the reimbursement of costs where necessary and proportionate. Member States can therefore refuse to grant prior authorisation elsewhere when the healthcare can be provided on its own territory within a time limit which is medically justifiable taking the patient's health and illness into account.

In the UK, those wishing to seek healthcare in another Member State under both the directive route, and under Article 56 of TFEU (the 'S2 route'), will be granted treatment in another Member State if they cannot receive the same treatment from the state National Health Service (NHS) within a medically acceptable period. This waiting time is based on patient medical needs and evidence of the condition (including central NHS guidance). The NHS suggests that decisions on the basis of undue delay must be based on a medical assessment.

However, patients can be placed in a difficult situation, in that after their own local doctor (general practitioner, GP) has referred them on to a hospital or specialist for treatment, there may be a delay (of, say, 18 weeks) in seeing that specialist. The NHS authorisation body does not, in many cases, allow GPs to advise them as the competent authority and they instead await comments from specialist doctors within hospitals. Yet there may be an undue delay in getting this hospital appointment.

In light of this, does the Commission believe this mechanism hampers citizens' rights under the directive to access healthcare in other Member States?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2013)

Directive 2011/24/EU ([1]) on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare, which is due to be transposed by 25 October 2013, allows Member States to have in place a system of prior authorisation for the reimbursement of costs for a limited range of healthcare only. Prior authorisation may not be refused where the healthcare to which the patient is entitled cannot be provided on his/her territory within a time limit which is medically justifiable given the individual circumstances of that patient. In addition, all procedures relating to cross-border healthcare must be easily accessible and capable of dealing with requests or applications within a timely manner.

In the example given by the Honourable Member, it is not entirely clear whether the potential delay cited (18 weeks) is a delay in getting treatment, or a delay in getting a decision about the grant of prior authorisation once such authorisation has been applied for, or a delay in finding out what treatments a patient is entitled to. If it is the first, the decision about whether or not 18 weeks represents a medically justifiable time limit would depend on the individual circumstances of the patient in question. If it is either the second or third case, subject to an analysis of the provisions in question, such delay could be viewed as being likely to be in conflict with the requirements of the directive that administrative procedures must be easily accessible and capable of responding in a timely manner.

([1]) OJ L 88, 04.04.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006989/13
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: European Patent Organisation and the Biotechnology Directive

Directive 98/44/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 July 1998 (the Biotechnology Directive) harmonises the national laws of the Member States in the area, notably, of patenting biotechnological inventions. The directive clearly provides that plant and animal varieties and essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals (i.e. conventional breeding methods based on crossing and selection) are not patentable.

The European Patent Organisation (EPO) remains an independent intergovernmental institution, separate from the EU, established by the Contracting States to the European Patent Convention. The Biotechnology Directive has been fully integrated into the legal framework of the EPO, meaning that it should grant European patents in line with this directive.

In its resolution of 10 May 2012 on the patenting of essential biological processes ([1]), Parliament called 'on the EPO also to exclude from patenting products derived from conventional breeding and all conventional breeding methods, including SMART breeding (precision breeding) and breeding material used for conventional breeding'. However, the EPO has continued to grant patents on plants, seeds and fruits.

1. Is the Commission satisfied that the spirit of the Biotechnology Directive is being applied by the EPO?

2. Does the Commission believe that further legislation may be required to close gaps in the existing legislation?

3. Does the Commission believe that further measures are required to ensure that the EPO observes its obligations under both its own Convention and EC law?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(10 September 2013)

1. All essential provisions of the Biotechnology Directive ([2]) have been copied into the Implementing Regulations ('IR') of the European Patent Convention ('EPC'). At the EPO patent applications are granted or rejected after careful and rigorous examination: only 45% of all patent applications are actually granted. In the field of biotechnology, this figure is even lower, with only 28% of the patent applications being granted.

2. The Commission does not consider gaps to be present in the existing legislation. The Biotechnology Directive and the equivalent provisions of the EPC provide that there is a common standard for the patenting of biotechnological inventions regardless of whether an applicant seeks protection under the EPC or the national patent law of a Member State. Under both the Biotechnology Directive and the EPC conventional breeding methods are excluded from patentability. The decisional practice of the European Patent Office, as illustrated in the so-called 'Broccoli' and 'Tomato' cases, shows that it rigorously applies this rule, and that conventional breeding methods are not eligible for patent protection even if they contain a technical step ([3]).

3. Both the Biotechnology Directive and the EPC provide that plant related inventions are eligible for patent protection if the technical feasibility of the invention is not confined to a particular plant variety; the latter are excluded from patent protection. This implies that a patent may only be granted if the invention can be carried out in a number of plants.

([1]) Texts adopted, P7_TA(2012)0202.
([2]) OJ L 213, 30.7.1998, p. 13-21Directive 98/44/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 July 1998 on the legal protection of biotechnological inventions.
([3]) See in particular decisions G 2/07 and G1/08 of the Enlarged Board of Appeal of the EPO: http://www.epo.org/law-practice/case-law-appeals/eba/number.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006990/13
to the Commission
Emma McClarkin (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Rural broadband

An area in my East Midlands region has been excluded from the 'white area' designated for superfast broadband installation. This has severe implications for the area and its local businesses. According to the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) delivery team, the only alternative way of gaining funding support is through individual applications for state aid, which, aside from entailing a tedious procedure, is not very promising it has been indicated that, because the applicants concerned are within a 'grey area', any European funding would be limited.

Can the Commission please clarify how I might advise my constituents on how they may escape this circle and receive the funding, and the broadband speeds, that they and their local economy need in order to flourish?

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

The Honourable Member refers to the possibility of using European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) support for superfast (Next Generation Access or NGA) broadband investment in an area which is outside those defined as white NGA areas ([1]) by the UK Government in their request for state aid clearance for '*National Broadband scheme for the UK — Broadband Delivery UK*'.

The State Aid Broadband Guidelines ([2]) stipulate that public sector intervention in broadband deployment can only be justified in situations where the private sector will not deliver within the next three years. The underlying goal is to ensure that public funding does not distort competition by crowding out private investment.

For the Broadband Delivery UK programme, the UK Government conducted a mapping exercise to identify white NGA areas for the purpose of their state aid notification. Areas outside this coverage, such as grey NGA areas, would still be required to comply with state aid rules in the event that they were to apply for public funding, including ERDF or rural development funding. This would require a notification of the individual aid measure to the Commission. As regards aid for the deployment of an NGA network in a grey NGA area, the Commission would need to carry out a more detailed analysis of its impact on competition in the provision of broadband services on the basis of the compatibility conditions established in the aforementioned Guidelines ([3]).

([1]) Areas where (1) NGA broadband services at an access (download) speed of more than 30 Mbps are not available at affordable prices and (2) there are no private sector plans to deliver such services in the next three years.

([2]) Available on the Commission's webpage here: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/legislation/specific_rules.html#broadband

([3]) Point 76 of the state aid Broadband Guidelines.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006991/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Industrial farming and conservation

I have been contacted by a constituent who informs me that Monsanto, an American agricultural company, is making efforts to increase its patent rights on seeds that are used in our food supply.

My constituent is concerned that if this practice is allowed to continue then our food supply will gradually become vulnerable to the control of corporate strategists and disconnected from the nutritional demands of the population.

My constituent would like to see the inclusion of a clause in patent agreements ensuring that companies pay royalties. He believes that these payments should go towards rehabilitating and conserving the terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems that have been severely damaged by industrial farming and the pesticides and fertilisers that it uses.

Could the Commission indicate if it has any plans to encourage farming companies to pay towards the conservation of nature?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2013)

Patents are granted for technical solutions to specific technical problems. In the plant field, such solutions typically concern characteristics such as improvements in yield, higher nutritional value or resistance to drought and pests. Not every granted patent for a plant related invention will end up in an agricultural application. Moreover plant varieties are excluded from patent protection.

A patent right is a legal right conferred on an inventor in respect of a specific invention essentially entitling him to prevent others from making, using or selling the invention. The protection is granted for a limited period, generally 20 years. If one wishes to use the patented invention he/she must request authorisation from the patent holder and may have to pay a licence fee.

Directive 98/44/EC ([1]) provides for specific derogations for farmers the so-called farmers' privilege. This privilege allows farmers, when there has been a sale or any other commercialisation of a plant-propagating material to a farmer, to save and reuse the patent protected seeds for their own use. Farmers are not permitted, however, to re-sell the patented seed ([2]). An equivalent provision is provided for animal breeding; allowing farmers to freely use the protected animal and its reproductive material if, he does not sell them afterwards ([3]).

Furthermore, the European Union is member of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. The Treaty helps maximise the use and breeding of all crops and promotes development and maintenance of diverse farming systems. Indeed, the Treaty creates a Multilateral System of access and benefit-sharing that provides a global pool of genetic resources which have been considered the most important to food security.

([1]) OJ L 213, 30.7.1998, pp. 13-21. Directive 98/44/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 July 1998 on the legal protection of biotechnological inventions.
([2]) Article 11, paragraph (1) of Directive 98/44/EC.
([3]) Article 11, paragraph 2 of Directive 98/44/EC.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006993/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Ana Gomes (S&D)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Direitos Humanos no Barém

Em 7 de janeiro de 2013, o Supremo Tribunal do Barém confirmou as condenações de 13 pessoas, incluindo a aplicação de penas de prisão perpétua, pelo seu envolvimento em protestos contra o governo daquele país em 2011. Três dos condenados — incluindo Abdulhadi Al-Khawaja — são cidadãos da União Europeia. A repressão prosseguiu ao longo do último ano, com a detenção de proeminentes ativistas e defensores dos Direitos Humanos, como Nabeel Rajab, Zainab Al-Khawaja e Naji Fateel. Em janeiro, o Parlamento Europeu solicitou à VP/HR que cooperasse com os Estados-Membros da UE no sentido de se trabalhar ativamente em prol da libertação dos ativistas presos, antes da reunião ministerial União Europeia-Conselho de Cooperação do Golfo (UE-CCG). Desde a aprovação da referida resolução, não é claro o facto de alguma coisa ter sido feita pela UE para garantir a libertação dos detidos. Permito-me sublinhar o facto de a Alta Representante não ter explicitamente reclamado a libertação das pessoas presas injustamente.

Na perspetiva da sua próxima viagem ao Barém por ocasião da reunião ministerial UE-CCG, a realizar em 30 de junho próximo, solicita-se à Vice-Presidente da Comissão e Alta Representante da União Europeia para os Negócios Estrangeiros e a Política de Segurança que responda às seguintes questões:

— Que esforços concretos desenvolveu ao longo dos últimos seis meses para dar corpo ao apelo lançado pelo Parlamento Europeu no sentido de se trabalhar em prol da libertação de quem foi preso apenas por exercer o seu direito à liberdade de expressão e de reunião no Barém?

— E hoje, compromete-se a fazer tudo o que estiver ao seu alcance, em cooperação com os 27 Estados-Membros da UE, para garantir a libertação das pessoas injustamente presas no Barém, lançando inclusivamente um apelo público em prol da libertação imediata e incondicional de todos os ativistas e defensores dos Direitos Humanos no Barém antes da reunião UE-CCG?

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

A Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente segue atentamente a situação no Barém e continuará a fazê-lo no futuro.

A AR/VP aproveitou a sua visita ao Barém por ocasião da reunião ministerial UE-CCG de 30 de junho para defender, uma vez mais, uma combinação de moderação e de medidas concretas de reforço da confiança, necessária para diminuir a distância que separa as comunidades, provocada pela polarização do clima político, pela falta de confiança e pela violência.

Após a conclusão da sua visita a Manama, a Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente reiterou explicitamente na sua declaração de 1 de julho ([1]) que estas medidas deveriam incluir medidas conducentes à libertação das pessoas detidas no contexto de atividades políticas pacíficas.

A Senhora Deputada poderá consultar a resposta à pergunta escrita anterior E-006473/2013 ([2]) para mais informações.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/137678.pdf
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006993/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Ana Gomes (S&D)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Human rights in Bahrain

On 7 January 2013, Bahrain's Court of Cassation upheld convictions against 13 individuals, some of whom were given life sentences, for their involvement in anti-government protests in 2011. Three of those convicted, including Abdulhadi al-Khawaja, are EU citizens. The repression has continued into 2013 with the imprisonment of prominent activists and human rights defenders such as Nabeel Rajab, Zainab al-Khawaja and Naji Fateel. In January 2013, Parliament called on you to work together with Member States to actively push for the release of the imprisoned activists prior to the EU-GCC ministerial meeting. Since this resolution was adopted it is unclear what, if anything, the EU has done to secure the release of those detailed. I note the fact that the High Representative has not explicitly called for the release of those wrongfully imprisoned.

In view of your forthcoming trip to Bahrain for the EU-GCC ministerial meeting taking place on 30 June 2013, can the Vice-President/High Representative answer the following:

— What efforts have you made precisely over the past six months to implement Parliament's call for you to push for the release of those who have been imprisoned solely for exercising their rights to freedom of expression and assembly in Bahrain?

— Will you commit today to do everything in your power, in coordination with the 27 Member States, to secure the release of those wrongfully imprisoned in Bahrain, including by publicly calling, prior to the EU-GCC meeting, for the immediate and unconditional release of all activists and human rights defenders detained in Bahrain?

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

The HR/VP follows the situation in Bahrain very closely and will continue to do so.

The HR/VP used her visit to Bahrain on 30 June for the EU-GCC Ministerial meeting to advocate once more for a combination of moderation and concrete confidence building steps needed to bridge the gulf between communities created by the polarisation of the political climate, lack of trust and violence. Upon completion of her visit to Manama, she explicitely reiterated in her statement of 1 July ([1]) that these steps had to include measures leading to the release of those arrested in the context of peaceful political activities.

The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the reply to previous Written Question E-006473/2013 ([2]) for more details.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/137678.pdf
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006994/13
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: 10th European Development Fund — UK contribution

Regarding the European Development Fund (EDF):

Of the 10th EDF budget of EUR 22.682 billion, could the Commission please advise me as to how much of the sum was provided by the United Kingdom?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

The 10th EDF contributions per Member State are laid down in Article 1.2 of the 10th EDF Internal agreement. The total for the 10th EDF fund is EUR 22 682 000 000, of which the UK contribution is 14.82% of the total fund or EUR 3 361 472 400.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006995/13
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: 11th European Development Fund — UK contribution

Regarding the European Development Fund (EDF):

Of the 11th EDF budget of EUR 31.589 billion, could the Commission please advise me as to how much of this sum is to be provided by the United Kingdom?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2013)

Under the Internal Agreement between the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States of the European Union, meeting within the Council, on the financing of European Union aid under the multiannual financial framework for the period 2014-2020, in accordance with the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement, and on the allocation of financial assistance for the Overseas Countries and Territories to which Part Four of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU applies, signed on 24 and 26 June 2013 by the 27 Member States of the European Union, the total amount of the 11th European Development Fund (EDF) is EUR 30 506 million (current prices) for the period 2014-2020.

The agreement provides for a contribution by the United Kingdom of EUR 4 477 859 817.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006997/13
à la Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 juin 2013)

Objet: Forfait de droit d'auteur

Les tarifs concernant les droits d'auteur pour les manifestations de type bals, soirées dansantes, sont calculés dans plusieurs pays européens en fonction du prix d'entrée et de la surface de la salle.

Existe-t-il une harmonisation des critères au niveau européen?

Est-ce que le nombre de personnes présentes et la liste des musiques diffusées ne seraient pas des critères plus équitables pour le paiement des droits d'auteurs?

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(28 août 2013)

Les droits d'auteur dans les œuvres musicales constituent des droits exclusifs. L'article 3, paragraphe 1, de la directive 2001/29/CE dispose que les États membres prévoient pour les auteurs le droit exclusif d'autoriser ou d'interdire toute communication au public de leurs œuvres. L'exploitation de ces droits dans le cadre de l'utilisation d'œuvres musicales lors de bals et de soirées dansantes est généralement administrée par une société de gestion collective.

Les critères de tarification ne sont pas harmonisés au niveau de l'UE.

Le 11 juillet 2012, la Commission a adopté une proposition de directive sur la gestion collective des droits d'auteur et la concession de licences multiterritoriales de droits portant sur des œuvres musicales en vue de leur utilisation en ligne ([1]). L'un des objectifs de la proposition de la Commission est d'améliorer les normes de transparence et de gouvernance des sociétés de gestion collective en renforçant les obligations d'information et le contrôle de leurs activités par les titulaires de droits afin d'encourager le recours à des services plus innovants et de meilleure qualité. L'article 15 de la proposition porte sur les relations entre les sociétés de gestion collective et les utilisateurs. Selon cette disposition, les conditions de concession de licences reposent sur des critères objectifs et non discriminatoires, notamment en matière de tarifs.

([1]) COM(2012)372 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006997/13
to the Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Fixed rate for royalties

In several EU countries, the calculation of royalties for events such as balls or dances is based on the ticket price and the size of the room used.

Are these criteria harmonised in any way at EU level?

Would it not be fairer to base royalty payments on the number of people present and the playlist for the music?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(28 August 2013)

The rights of authors in musical works are exclusive rights. Article 3(1) of Directive 2001/29/EC provides that Member States shall provide authors with the exclusive right to authorise or prohibit any communication to the public of their works. The exploitation of these rights as regards the use of music at balls and dances are typically administered by a collecting society.

The criteria for tariff-setting are not harmonised at EU level.

On 11 July 2012, the Commission adopted a proposal for a directive on collective rights management and multi-territorial licensing of rights in musical works for online uses ([1]). One of the objectives of the Commission's proposal is to promote greater transparency and improved governance of collecting societies through strengthened reporting obligations and right holders' control over their activities, so as to create incentives for more innovative and better quality services. Article 15 of this proposal concerns the relation between collecting societies and users. According to this provision, licensing terms shall be based on objective and non-discriminatory criteria, in particular in relation to tariffs.

([1]) COM(2012) 372 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006998/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(17 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Informazioni sul dispiegamento della gendarmeria europea denominata Eurogendfor

Nel 2007 il Trattato di Velsen ha istituito una forza di gendarmeria europea denominata Eurogendfor (EGF), con compiti di intervento in operazioni di gestione delle crisi e operazioni umanitarie.

Nello specifico, in base agli articoli del trattato, la EGF svolge compiti militari di supporto alle fasi iniziali di un conflitto e di transizione, da sola o insieme a forze che eseguono esclusivamente obiettivi militari. La EGF svolge anche funzioni di polizia e addestramento di un esercito e polizia locali nella fase di ritiro della componente militare.

Il coordinamento politico-militare della EGF sarebbe affidato al Comitato interministeriale di alto livello (CIMIN), composto dai ministri degli esteri e della difesa degli Stati membri che aderiscono all'EGF, fornendo uomini e mezzi. Il suo quartier generale è a Vicenza (Italia).

Vista l'importanza che l'Unione europea ripone nello sviluppo e nel rafforzamento di una politica estera e di difesa comune, può la Commissione:

fornire un quadro della partecipazione finanziaria dell'Unione all'interno dell'EGF?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(13 novembre 2013)

La Commissione rimanda l'onorevole deputato alla risposta fornita alle interrogazioni scritte E-003470/2012, E-003548/2012, E-3551/2012 e E-003552/2012.

Eurogendfor non risponde del proprio operato dinanzi alla Commissione o qualsiasi altra istituzione dell'UE, e di conseguenza la Commissione non svolge alcun ruolo né ha alcuna competenza relativamente all'organizzazione, al funzionamento, alla formazione o agli strumenti di Eurogendfor. Pertanto la Commissione non può fornire informazioni dettagliate sul bilancio di Eurogendfor o sui suoi meccanismi di finanziamento.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006998/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Information on the deployment of the European Gendarmerie Force, Eurogendfor

In 2007, the Treaty of Velsen established a European gendarmerie force known as Eurogendfor (EDF), tasked with carrying out crisis management and humanitarian operations.

In particular, under the Treaty, the EGF performs military tasks to provide support in the early stages of a conflict and during the transition phase, alone or in collaboration with forces carrying out exclusively military operations. The EGF also performs policing duties and trains armies and local police forces during military disengagement.

The EGF's military policy is coordinated by the high-level interdepartmental committee (CIMIN), which is made up of the foreign and defence ministers of the Member States that participate in the EGF, providing manpower and equipment. The EGF's permanent headquarters are in Vicenza, Italy.

In view of the importance the European Union attaches to the development and strengthening of a common foreign and defence policy:

Can it provide an overview of the EU's financial contribution to the EGF?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(13 November 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its reply to questions E-003470/2012, E-003548/2012, E-3551/2012 and E-003552/2012.

Since Eurogendfor is not accountable to the Commission or to any other EU institution, the Commission is not involved in and has no competence over the organisation, operation, training or equipment of Eurogendfor. Therefore, the Commission cannot provide details either on the budget of Eurogendfor or its financing arrangements

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006999/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(17 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Presunte violazioni nella gara di assegnazione dei fondi Tempus IV (EACEA/35/2012)

Nell'ambito dell'aggiudicazione del bando di gara Tempus IV (EACEA/35/2012), indetto dall'Agenzia EACEA per sostenere diversi progetti in ambito lifelong learning, la Link University di Roma ha lamentato alcune presunte irregolarità. Anzitutto, essa sottolinea la mancata presa d'atto del suo riconoscimento legale e contesta l'osservazione per la quale parte del progetto presentato dal consorzio cui partecipa sarebbe stato copiato da quello presentato, un anno prima, dall'Università cattolica di Sint-Lieven (Belgio). Quest'ultimo progetto non era mai stato pubblicato in internet e i partecipanti al consorzio universitario escluso affermano di non aver mai avuto contatti con l'ente belga.

Considerando che il rigetto della domanda di partecipazione al programma è giunto quando il procedimento di notifica dei risultati della selezione si era ormai chiuso con esito positivo per il consorzio universitario italiano e che l'eventualità di una non corretta esplicazione del bando di gara comporterebbe grave pregiudizio agli obiettivi prefissati ai sensi dell'articolo 179, paragrafo 2 del TFUE, ed in particolare alla gestione degli appalti pubblici nazionali citati in questa stessa norma, può dire la Commissione se sia a conoscenza della situazione? Può dire, altresì, se intenda procedere ad attuare ulteriori indagini per verificare la correttezza della gara indetta con bando EACEA/35/2012?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(2 agosto 2013)

L'interrogazione sembra collegata a due diverse proposte presentate nell'ambito di due diversi inviti a presentare proposte Tempus (nel 2010 e 2012).

In primo luogo, i candidati devono rispettare i criteri pubblicati nell'invito a presentare proposte. La guida alla presentazione delle candidature per l'invito a presentare proposte EACEA/35/2012 Tempus IV, sezione 5.3.1, punto (1) stabilisce chiaramente che tutte le persone giuridiche che si candidano devono essere legalmente costituite da più di 5 anni al momento della scadenza del termine per la presentazione delle candidature. Secondo le informazioni ufficiali pubblicate dal Ministero italiano dell'Istruzione, dell'università e della ricerca (Gazzetta ufficiale, serie generale n. 268 del 17 novembre 2011) la Link Campus University di Roma non sembrava inizialmente conformarsi a questo criterio. Tuttavia, considerando le informazioni aggiuntive fornite successivamente dal candidato, l'Agenzia esecutiva per l'Istruzione, gli audiovisivi e la cultura ha accettato la candidatura e l'ha considerata ammissibile, informandone immediatamente il candidato. Il procedimento di selezione nell'ambito dell'invito a presentare proposte EACEA/35/2012 è attualmente in corso e si concluderà nell'ottobre 2013.

In secondo luogo, nell'ambito dell'invito a presentare proposte EACEA/35/2012 Tempus IV, è stata presentata nel 2011 dall'Università di Genova una diversa proposta di progetto contenente parti identiche a una candidatura presentata in precedenza da un'università belga. Il caso si è chiuso con la piena accettazione da parte del candidato della decisione finale dell'Agenzia, adottata dopo un'approfondita indagine. Questo caso non è collegato all'attuale invito a presentare proposte.

La Commissione è coinvolta in ciascuna fase della procedura di selezione. Un comitato di valutazione, comprendente rappresentanti della Commissione e dell'Agenzia, procede alla supervisione dei giudizi, al fine di garantire la parità di trattamento di tutte le candidature mediante un'equa e trasparente applicazione delle procedure.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006999/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Alleged infringements in the call for proposals for the award of Tempus IV funds (EACEA/35/2012)

As regards the call for proposals for the award of Tempus IV (EACEA/35/2012) funding, organised by the EACEA agency to support various projects in the field of lifelong learning, Link University of Rome has complained about certain alleged irregularities. Firstly, it points out that its legally recognised status has not been acknowledged and secondly, it disputes the comment that part of the project submitted by the consortium of which it is a member had been copied from a project submitted the previous year by the Sint-Lieven Catholic University (Belgium). The latter project had never been published on the Internet and the members of the university consortium deny having had any contact with the Belgian university.

The rejection of the application to take part in the programme was received only after the Italian university consortium had been informed that it had been successful in the selection procedure. Any incorrect execution of the call for proposals would be of grave detriment to the objectives set out under Article 179(2) TFEU and, in particular, to the management of national public contracts mentioned in that article.

Can the Commission therefore say whether it is aware of the situation? Can it also say whether it will carry out any further investigations to check whether the call for proposals EACEA/35/2012 was properly conducted?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

The question seems to be related to two different proposals submitted under two different Tempus Calls (in 2010 and 2012).

Firstly, applicants must comply with the criteria published in the call for proposals. The application guidelines of the Tempus IV EACEA/35/2012 call Section 5.3.1 (1) clearly stipulate that all legal entities acting as applicants 'must have been legally established for more than 5 years by the deadline for submission of applications'. According to the official information published by the Italian Ministry for Higher Education and Research (Gazzetta Ufficiale, Serie Generale N.268 / 17.11.2011) the Link University of Rome did initially not seem to comply with this criterion. However, considering the additional information provided subsequently by the applicant, the Executive Agency for Education, Audiovisual and Culture accepted the application as eligible and informed immediately the applicant. The selection process under the call EACEA/35/2012 is still ongoing and will be finalised in October 2013.

Secondly, under the Tempus IV EACEA/32/2010 call a different project proposal was submitted in 2011 by the University of Genoa, and contained duplicate parts from an application submitted previously by a Belgian university. The case was closed with the applicant's full acceptance of the Agency's final decision, taken after a thorough investigation. It is not related to the current call for proposals.

The Commission is involved in each step of the selection process. An evaluation committee, including representatives from the Commission and the Agency, supervises the assessment to guarantee the equal treatment of all applications, through a fair and transparent application of the procedures.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007000/13
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(17 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Problematiche nei rapporti commerciali UE-Cina

Nelle scorse settimane sembra essere iniziata una vera e propria guerra commerciale tra l'Unione europea e la Cina: a seguito infatti della decisione di Bruxelles di imporre dazi ai pannelli fotovoltaici cinesi, Pechino ha risposto con un'indagine in merito all'esportazione di vini europei in Cina ed il prossimo terreno di scontro sembra essere rappresentato dai tubi di acciaio inossidabile, con i dazi cinesi giudicati irregolari dall'UE.

A mio avviso sarebbero molteplici i settori nei quali l'Europa dovrebbe intervenire per bloccare l'invasione di produzione cinese, che ha come conseguenza la chiusura di aziende e la crisi di interi settori produttivi dell'Unione, con gravissime ripercussioni sull'occupazione.

Le misure cinesi sul vino andrebbero a danneggiare in particolare alcuni Paesi esportatori, come Italia, Francia e Spagna, che verrebbero fortemente penalizzati.

La Commissione si è sempre mostrata contraria all'introduzione di restrizioni al commercio internazionale ma, alla luce anche dei recenti sviluppi e delle reazioni smisurate della controparte, non ritiene doveroso rivedere il suo intero approccio ed applicare con più decisione, anche da parte nostra, misure protezionistiche a difesa dell'industria e della produzione europea, con particolare attenzione soprattutto ad alcuni settori e ad alcuni Paesi, come ad esempio il tessile?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(7 agosto 2013)

L'obiettivo primario della Commissione è difendere gli interessi dell'UE. L'impegno dell'UE a favore dell'apertura dei mercati è confermato dalla sua capacità di agire contro le pratiche commerciali anticoncorrenziali, utilizzando a tal fine le procedure antidumping e antisovvenzioni. L'UE non si propone di ridurre i vantaggi comparativi dei suoi partner, ma non esita ad adottare le necessarie azioni quando questi vantaggi derivano da pratiche sleali come la fissazione di prezzi su base anticoncorrenziale o la concessione di sussidi o altre distorsioni generate da interventi statali. L'inchiesta in corso riguardante i pannelli solari cinesi costituisce una chiara dimostrazione della determinazione dell'UE di intraprendere questo tipo di azioni quando sussistono le condizioni giuridiche. L'UE non esita neppure a deferire i vari paesi all'organismo di risoluzione delle controversie dell'Organizzazione mondiale del commercio (OMC) quando ciò è nell'interesse dell'Unione ed è utile alla difesa dei suoi diritti. L'UE è stata uno degli utilizzatori più attivi ed efficaci di questa procedura, insieme agli Stati Uniti.

La Commissione analizza attentamente le misure commerciali di difesa adottate da paesi terzi contro le esportazioni dell'UE, al fine di garantire la loro conformità alle pertinenti disposizioni giuridiche e di fare in modo che i diritti dei produttori dell'UE siano pienamente rispettati. In questo contesto, inoltre, la Commissione non esiterà ad opporsi ad eventuali misure illegali nell'ottica dell'OMC nell'ambito della stessa Organizzazione mondiale del commercio, se ciò risulterà necessario.

L'UE non accetterà misure adottate a mero di ritorsione. Ma l'UE non chiuderà i suoi mercati e non danneggerà la sua economia solo perché altri lo fanno. L'UE è in prima linea nella lotta contro il protezionismo e, per essere credibile ed efficace nella sua azione, deve respingere tutte le misure a carattere protezionistico, non solo all'esterno, ma anche all'interno delle proprie frontiere.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007000/13
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Difficulties in EU-China trade relations

In recent weeks, a real trade war between the EU and China appears to have broken out. Further to a decision by Brussels to impose duties on Chinese solar panels, Beijing has responded by carrying out an investigation into European wine exports to China and the next battleground appears to be over stainless steel pipes, with Chinese duties being deemed unlawful by the EU.

In my view, there are many areas in which the EU should take action to put a halt to the invasion of Chinese products, which has resulted in business closures and crisis in entire manufacturing sectors in the Union, having serious repercussions on employment.

The Chinese measures concerning wine would harm some exporting countries in particular, such as Italy, France and Spain, which would be heavily penalised.

The Commission has always expressed its opposition to the introduction of restrictions on international trade. However, in the light also of recent developments, and of the disproportionate reactions of our counterpart, does it not think it should review its entire approach and apply more vigorously, even on the EU side, protectionist measures to defend European industry and manufacturing, with a special focus on certain sectors and certain countries, such as the textile industry?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2013)

The primary objective of the Commission is to defend the EU's interests. The EU's commitment to open markets is upheld by its capacity to act against anti-competitive trade practices, using both anti-dumping and anti-subsidy to do so. The EU does not seek to roll back the comparative advantages of its partners. However, the EU does not hesitate to take action where those advantages are backed up by unfair practices such as anti-competitive pricing behaviours or subsidies or other state induced distortions. The ongoing investigation against Chinese solar panels is a clear demonstration of the EU's determination to address such measures, when the legal conditions for action are met. Neither does the EU hesitate to take countries to World Trade Organisation (WTO) dispute settlement when this is in the Union interest in order to preserve its rights. The EU has been an active and most effective user of it, on a par with the United States.

The Commission is following closely trade defence measures initiated by third countries against EU exports in order to ensure that these are carried out in accordance with relevant legal provisions and that the rights of EU producers are fullly respected. In this context as well, the Commission will not hesitate to challenge WTO illegal measures at the WTO if appropriate.

The EU will not accept measures taken for retaliatory purposes. But the EU will not close its market and hamper its economy simply because others do. The EU is at the forefront of the fight against protectionism, and to be credible and effective in doing so, all protectionist measures must be firmly rejected, not only abroad but also at home.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007003/13
do Komisji
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Siedem tysięcy nauczycieli w Polsce straci pracę

Z oceny Ministerstwa Edukacji Narodowej wynika, że w tym roku w Polsce ok. 7 000 nauczycieli straci pracę. We wschodniej Polsce urzędy pracy realizują programy współfinansowane przez UE w celu udzielenia pomocy bezrobotnym. Programy te są skierowane głównie do osób nisko wykwalifikowanych, które poszukują pracy, i należących do innych defaworyzowanych grup, natomiast nie są dostępne dla bezrobotnych nauczycieli.

W jaki sposób Komisja mogłaby pomóc bezrobotnym nauczycielom w UE, zwłaszcza w krajach takich jak Polska?

Czy Komisja mogłaby przedstawić statystyki dotyczące bezrobocia w sektorze oświaty w UE?

Jakie kroki Komisja mogłaby podjąć w celu obniżenia bezrobocia wśród nauczycieli w UE?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(2 sierpnia 2013 r.)

Polska jest jednym z głównych beneficjentów wsparcia finansowego z Europejskiego Funduszu Społecznego (EFS), którego celem jest zwiększenie zatrudnienia poprzez inwestycje w umiejętności i poprawę perspektyw zatrudnienia. Program Operacyjny Kapitał Ludzki na lata 2007-2013 udziela wsparcia osobom w szczególnie trudnej sytuacji na rynku pracy.

Problemy wynikające ze zmian demograficznych, w tym nadwyżka liczby nauczycieli, powinny być należycie uwzględnione w ramach odpowiednich strategii. EFS będzie nadal udzielać wsparcia w zakresie reorientacji zawodowej, z którego mogą korzystać nauczyciele zagrożeni zwolnieniem i które będzie umożliwiać łatwiejsze przejście do innych zawodów wymagających podobnych umiejętności i kompetencji. Istnieją różne możliwości korzystania ze wsparcia EFS. Polscy nauczyciele, jak również inni bezrobotni, mogą uczestniczyć w szkoleniach proponowanych przez Urzędy Pracy, mogą otrzymywać wsparcie przy zakładaniu własnych firm szkoleniowych lub na przykład dotację na założenie przedszkola.

Odnośnie do kwestii statystyk, nauczyciele należą do grupy zawodowej specjalistów ([1]). Około 70 tysięcy specjalistów było bezrobotnych w Polsce w 2012 r. ([2])

Negocjacje na temat kolejnych programów współfinansowanych przez EFS w Polsce aktualnie nadal trwają. W oczekiwaniu na przyjęcie rozporządzeń oraz wieloletnich ram finansowych, jak i przedstawienie przez Polskę stanowiska w sprawie przyszłego wykorzystania funduszy, Komisja będzie kontynuować nieformalne rozmowy z polskimi władzami. Problemy poruszone przez Szanownego Pana Posła są należycie uwzględnione.

([1]) Zgodnie z Międzynarodowym Standardem Klasyfikacji Zawodów (ISCO2008).

([2]) Eurostat, Internetowy kod danych: lfsa_ugpis (badanie sondażowe dotyczące siły roboczej w UE). Ograniczenia próby w tych badaniach nie pozwalają na zebranie wiarygodnych danych na temat bardziej sprecyzowanych grup zawodowych.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007003/13
to the Commission
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: 7 000 teachers will lose their job in Poland

According to the Polish Ministry of Education, about 7 000 teachers will lose their jobs this year in Poland. In Eastern Poland, employment agencies are implementing programmes co-financed by the EU to help the unemployed. These programmes are mainly targeted to assist low-skilled job seekers and other disadvantaged groups, and are not available to unemployed teachers.

In what ways could the Commission help unemployed teachers within the EU, in particular in countries such as Poland?

Could the Commission provide statistics on unemployment in the EU education sector?

What steps could the Commission take to reduce unemployment among teachers in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

Poland is one of the major beneficiaries of the European Social Fund (ESF), which provides funding to increase employment through investment in skills and improved job prospects. The Human Capital Operational Programme, covering the period 2007-2013, provides assistance for individuals in a particularly difficult situation on the labour market.

Challenges related to demographic change, one of them being an excess of teachers, will have to be taken duly into account through relevant policies. ESF will continue to provide assistance to professional reorientation, from which teachers at risk of redundancies can benefit and which would support a smoother transition to other occupations with similar skills and competences requirements. There are different possibilities to benefit from ESF support. Teachers in Poland, as other unemployed, can participate in the trainings offered by the Labour Offices, they can get support to start their own training companies or, for example, receive a subsidy to create kindergartens.

As to the question on statistics, teachers belong to the group of occupations of professionals ([1]). About 70 thousand professionals were unemployed in Poland in 2012 ([2]).

Negotiations of the next programmes co-funded by the ESF in Poland are ongoing. Pending adoption of regulations and Multi-Annual Financial Framework, and presentation of the Polish position on the future use of funds, the Commission is continuing informal discussions with Poland. Challenges mentioned by the honourable Member are duly taken into account.

([1]) According to the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO 2008).

([2]) Eurostat online data code: lfsa_ugpis (EU Labour Force Survey). LFS sample restrictions do not allow providing reliable data for more detailed occupational groups.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007004/13
do Komisji
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Największe od dziesięciu lat powodzie w Europie Środkowej

Powodzie, jakie rozpoczęły się w ubiegłym tygodniu w Europie Środkowej, są największymi powodziami od dziesięciu lat. Według doniesień co najmniej 15 osób straciło życie w tych powodziach. Oprócz tego 23 000 osób musiało opuścić swoje domy. Setki tysięcy żołnierzy, strażaków i ochotników usiłuje walczyć z powodziami i nieść pomoc potrzebującym.

Jak Komisja zadba o to, aby państwa członkowskie w przyszłości były lepiej przygotowane do radzenia sobie z niszczycielskimi powodziami?

Jakie kroki poczyniła Komisja, aby pomóc osobom dotkniętym powodziami?

Jaki jest plan działania Komisji po ustąpieniu powodzi?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Kristalinę Georgijewą w imieniu Komisji
(25 lipca 2013 r.)

Dnia 20 grudnia 2011 r. Komisja przedstawiła wniosek dotyczący decyzji Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie unijnego mechanizmu ochrony ludności (COM(2011)934 final). Komisja proponuje w tym wniosku wzmocnienie współpracy UE w zakresie zapobiegania klęskom żywiołowym, w tym powodziom, zapewniania gotowości do tych zjawisk i reagowania na nie. We wniosku tym – między innymi – położono większy nacisk na ocenę ryzyka i planowanie. W oparciu o doświadczenia z poprzednich powodzi Centrum Reagowania Kryzysowego Komisji Europejskiej jest w trakcie opracowywania scenariuszy i planów reagowania w przypadku powodzi.

W trakcie sytuacji kryzysowej Centrum Reagowania Kryzysowego Komisji Europejskiej ściśle monitorowało sytuację, przekazywało informacje wczesnego ostrzegania oraz pełniło rolę węzła informacyjnego. Centrum Reagowania Kryzysowego dostarczało także specjalne wsparcie na wniosek stron, na przykład zdjęcia satelitarne o wysokiej rozdzielczości z zalanych obszarów.

Fundusz Solidarności UE może być jednym z dostępnych instrumentów udzielania pomocy państwom członkowskim w pokryciu kosztów środków nadzwyczajnych, takich jak odbudowa infrastruktury publicznej, ochrona dziedzictwa kulturowego oraz zapewnianie tymczasowego zakwaterowania. Ponadto polityka spójności zapewnia wsparcie państwom członkowskim w zakresie inwestycji w zarządzanie ryzykiem, w tym zapobieganie zagrożeniom oraz zwiększenie gotowości. Doświadczenie z poprzednich powodzi umożliwi dalszą analizę potencjalnych ulepszeń w zakresie zapewniania gotowości i działań zapobiegawczych.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007004/13
to the Commission
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Central Europe's worst flooding in over a decade

The flooding that began a week ago in central Europe is the worst in over a decade. It has been reported that at least 15 people have died in the floods. In addition, 23 000 residents were forced to flee their homes. There are hundreds of thousands of soldiers, fire-fighters, and volunteers trying to battle the floods and help those in need.

How will the Commission ensure that Member States are better prepared in the future to deal with devastating floods?

What steps has the Commission taken to aid those that were affected by the floods?

What is the Commission's plan of action once the floodwaters have abated?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

On 20 December 2011, the Commission presented a proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on a Union Civil Protection Mechanism (COM(2011)934 final). In this proposal, the Commission proposes to strengthen EU cooperation on the prevention of, preparedness for and response to disasters, including floods. The proposal, *inter alia*, places more emphasis on risk assessment and planning. Based on lessons learnt from previous floods, the European Commission's Emergency Response Centre is in the process of developing scenarios and response plans for floods.

Throughout the crisis the European Commission's Emergency Response Centre (ERC) closely monitored the situation, provided early warning information and acted as an information hub. The ERC also provided specific support on demand such as high resolution satellite images of the flooded areas.

The EU's Solidarity Fund could be one available instrument to provide assistance to our Member States in dealing with the costs of the emergency measures like restoring public infrastructure, preservation of cultural heritage or temporary accommodation. Further to that, cohesion policy is supporting Member States to invest in risk management, including prevention of risks and enhanced preparedness. Lessons learnt from the floods will eventually also allow for further exploration of potential improvements of preparedness and prevention activities.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007005/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Dyskryminacja kobiet z grupy dalitów i przemoc wobec nich

Według organizacji Human Rights Watch miliony kobiet z grupy dalitów są szczególnie narażone na dyskryminację oraz przemoc, w tym gwałty, przymusową prostytucję oraz współczesne formy niewolnictwa. Specjalna sprawozdawczyni ONZ ds. przemocy wobec kobiet Rashida Manjoo stwierdziła, że rzeczywistość kobiet oraz dziewcząt z grupy dalitów to wykluczenie i marginalizacja, które podtrzymują podporządkowaną pozycję kobiet w społeczeństwie oraz z pokolenia na pokolenie zwiększają stopień ich narażenia.

Jakich informacji może udzielić ESDZ na temat dyskryminacji kobiet z grupy dalitów oraz przemocy wobec nich w Azji Południowej?

W Indiach mieszka blisko 100 mln kobiet z grupy dalitów i obowiązują tam chroniące je przepisy. Jak ESDZ ocenia skuteczność tych przepisów?

Jakie działania ESDZ może podjąć w celu udzielenia wsparcia kobietom z grupy dalitów?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(20 sierpnia 2013 r.)

Problem dyskryminacji na tle przynależności kastowej jest złożony i trudny, a jeszcze trudniejsza jest sytuacja kobiet z kasty dalitów, ale wydaje się, że większość rządów w regionie poczyniła znaczne postępy w walce z nim.

W celu zapewnienia reprezentacji politycznej tych kast, rząd Indii ustanowił przeznaczony dla nich system przewidujący kwoty w ramach akcji afirmatywnej (84 miejsc w Parlamencie, Lok Sabha) oraz kwoty 15% w zakresie dostępu do szkolnictwa wyższego i zatrudnienia w służbie publicznej. W Nepalu w 2011 r. uchwalono nową ustawę o przeciwdziałaniu dyskryminacji i jest ona obecnie wprowadzana w życie, przy wsparciu projektów finansowanych ze środków UE.

Kwestie te są poruszane w rozmowach w ramach dwustronnego dialogu UE z krajami tego regionu. W przypadku Indii są one również podejmowane w ramach regularnego dialogu na temat praw człowieka.

W Indiach i Nepalu środkami wsparcia finansowego ze strony UE objęto również problem dyskryminacji kastowej i jego skutki, zarówno za pomocą instrumentów geograficznych (strategii dla kraju lub regionu), jak i tematycznych (w szczególności za pomocą Europejskiego Instrumentu na rzecz Wspierania Demokracji i Praw człowieka). Dokumenty strategiczne Europejskiego Instrumentu na rzecz Wspierania Demokracji i Praw Człowieka na lata 2011-2013 zawierają wyraźne odniesienie do dyskryminacji na tle przynależności kastowej.

W ciągu ostatnich 14 lat UE przeznaczyła ponad 450 mln EUR na wsparcie rządu Indii w dziedzinie zdrowia i edukacji; sektor edukacji otrzymywać będzie wsparcie do 2017 r. (80 mln EUR). Wszystkie finansowane przez UE projekty społeczeństwa obywatelskiego skierowane są do najuboższych, a co za tym idzie – najniższych kast dalitów i kobiet z kasty dalitów. Najnowsze zaproszenie do składania wniosków Europejskiego Instrumentu na rzecz Wspierania Demokracji i Praw Człowieka, ogłoszone w Indiach na początku lipca 2013 r., faktycznie koncentruje się na walce z przemocą wobec kobiet w ramach strategii ograniczania ubóstwa, ze zwróceniem szczególnej uwagi na kobiety z kasty dalitów i z innych niższych kast.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007005/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Discrimination and violence against Dalit women

According to Human Rights Watch, millions of Dalit women are extremely vulnerable to discrimination and violence, including rape, forced prostitution, and modern forms of slavery. The UN Special Rapporteur on violence against women, Rashida Manjoo, has stated, 'The reality of Dalit women and girls is one of exclusion and marginalization, which perpetuates their subordinate position in society and increases their vulnerability, throughout generations'.

What information can the EEAS provide on discrimination and violence against Dalit women in South Asia?

India is home to almost 100 million Dalit women and there are laws in place to protect them. How effective does the EEAS consider these laws?

What steps can the EEAS take to aid Dalit women?

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

The issue of caste discrimination is complex and challenging, and even more so the condition of Dalit women, but most governments in the region have made considerable progress in terms of advancement of this issue.

In India the government has established a regime providing for affirmative action quotas for these castes to ensure their political representation (84 seats in the lower house of Parliament, the Lok Sabha) and quotas up 15% for access to higher education and employment in the public service. In Nepal, a new law on Anti-discrimination was enacted in 2011 and is now under implementation, supported by EU-funded projects.

These issues are raised in the bilateral dialogue the EU has with the countries of the region. In the case of India, they are also discussed in the context of the regular Human Rights Dialogue.

In India and Nepal, caste discrimination and its effects have also been targeted by EU financial support, both through geographic instruments (Country or Regional Strategies) and thematic instruments (in particular the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rigths). The EIDHR strategy documents for 2011-2013 contain an explicit reference to caste discrimination.

Over the last 14 years the EU has invested over 450 million euros in support to the government of India's health and education sector, and support to education will continue up to 2017 (80 million euros). All EU-funded civil society projects target the poorest, hence scheduled castes, Dalit and Dalit women. The latest EIDHR Call for proposals launched in India in early July 2013 actually focuses on violence against women, within a poverty reduction framework, paying special attention to Dalit and other lower caste women.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007006/13
do Komisji
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Niemieckie systemy szkolenia zawodowego oraz edukacji w innych państwach członkowskich

Dwa europejskie państwa z najniższą stopą bezrobocia to Austria oraz Niemcy. Mają one tradycję łączenia praktyk zawodowych z formalną edukacją młodych uczniów, co zapewnia wielu uczniom pracę po ukończeniu edukacji. Około dwóch na trzech niemieckich uczniów przechodzi przez ten system i może wybrać ścieżkę kariery spośród 350 zawodów. Niemiecka minister pracy Ursula Von Der Leyen podpisała ostatnio protokoły ustaleń z Grecją, Hiszpanią, Łotwą, Portugalią, Słowacją oraz Włochami w celu wdrożenia systemów szkolenia zawodowego oraz edukacji w tych państwach. Celem przyświecającym temu przedsięwzięciu jest zmniejszenie wysokiej stopy bezrobocia w państwach takich jak Hiszpania, w której wskaźnik bezrobocia wynosi 56 %, oraz we Włoszech, w których wskaźnik ten sięga 38 %.

Jaka jest opinia Komisji w sprawie podpisanych protokołów ustaleń?

Czy Komisja uważa, że jest to najlepsze rozwiązanie pozwalające zwalczyć wysoką stopę bezrobocia?

Jakie inne czynniki gospodarcze państwa te powinny rozważyć?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(6 sierpnia 2013 r.)

Ze względu na bezprecedensowy kryzys zatrudnienia młodzieży oraz z uwagi na fakt, że polityka kształcenia i szkolenia leży przede wszystkim w gestii państw członkowskich, Komisja Europejska popiera dwustronne i wielostronne inicjatywy państw członkowskich mające na celu zwiększenie wskaźnika zatrudnienia młodzieży. Inicjatywy te stanowią wsparcie dla europejskiego sojuszu na rzecz przygotowania zawodowego, zainaugurowanego przez Komisję w dniu 2 lipca 2013 r., którego celem jest skupienie różnych prowadzonych obecnie działań dwustronnych z myślą o tworzeniu synergii oraz ich wykorzystaniu na szczeblu europejskim.

Nie ma jednego idealnego sposobu na walkę z bezrobociem, gdyż wybór tego sposobu zależy od specyficznych okoliczności, które znacznie się różnią w poszczególnych państwach członkowskich. W niedawno przyjętych przez Radę zaleceniach dla poszczególnych krajów wskazano na obszary, w których państwa członkowskie powinny podjąć działania w celu poprawy warunków na rynku pracy i sytuacji społecznej. Państwa te powinny zatem przedsięwziąć właściwe im środki polityczne, które razem mogą przyczynić się do zmniejszenia stopy bezrobocia. Takim środkiem może być ustanowienie wysokiej jakości systemów przygotowania zawodowego, jednak powinno ono być rozpatrywane wraz z wdrożeniem gwarancji dla młodzieży, która stanowi główne działanie o charakterze reformy strukturalnej na rzecz walki z bezrobociem. Gwarancja dla młodzieży opiera się na pięciu głównych osiach – przede wszystkim na wczesnej interwencji i aktywacji – oraz na wielu środkach wspierających integrację z rynkiem pracy. Wdrażanie gwarancji dla młodzieży może być wspieranie w ramach Inicjatywy na rzecz zatrudnienia ludzi młodych oraz ze środków Europejskiego Funduszu Społecznego.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007006/13
to the Commission
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Germany's vocational-education systems in other Member States

The two European countries with the lowest level of unemployment are Austria and Germany. They have a tradition of combining apprenticeships with formal schooling for their young students, which gives many of the students a job after graduation. About two in three German students go through this system and into about 350 careers. Germany's Labour Minister, Ursula Von Der Leyen, recently signed memoranda with Greece, Italy, Latvia, Portugal, Slovakia, and Spain to implement vocational-education systems in those countries. The aim of this is to reduce high unemployment in countries such as Spain, which has 56% unemployment, and Italy which as 38% unemployment.

What is the Commission's opinion of the signed memoranda?

Does the Commission think that this is the best solution to combat high unemployment?

What other economic factors should these countries consider?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2013)

Given the unprecedented scale of the youth employment crisis, and given that employment, education and training policies fall first and foremost under Member State responsibility, the European Commission welcomes bi- and multilateral initiatives by Member States to enhance the support to youth employment. Those initiatives support the European Alliance for Apprenticeships, launched by the Commission, on 2 July 2013, to pool the various streams of existing bilateral actions under a common umbrella, with a view to create synergies and scale up action at European level.

There is no one single best solution to combat unemployment since what is best depends on the specific circumstances, which differ considerably across Member States. The 2013 country-specific recommendations, which have recently been adopted by the Council, identify the areas in which the individual Member States should take action to improve their labour market and social outcomes. Countries should thus pursue a set of different policies that can all contribute to lowering unemployment. Setting up high quality apprenticeship systems can be one of those policies, but should not be seen in isolation from the implementation of the Youth Guarantee which is a key structural reform to combat youth unemployment. The Youth Guarantee is based on five main axes, notably early intervention and activation, and a lot of measures that are supportive for labour market integration. The implementation of the Youth Guarantee could be supported by the Youth Employment initiative and the European Social Fund.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007007/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – zcentralizowany program monitoringu, realizowany przez rząd Indii

Z informacji Human Rights Watch wynika, że rząd Indii rozpoczął wdrażanie zcentralizowanego systemu monitoringu, dzięki któremu będzie w stanie w całości monitorować komunikację telefoniczną i internetową w kraju. System ten umożliwi rządowi dostęp do krajowej sieci telekomunikacyjnej oraz monitorowanie rozmów telefonicznych, wiadomości tekstowych i wykorzystania Internetu.

Jakie informacje Europejska Służba Działań Zewnętrznych posiada na temat owego zcentralizowanego systemu monitoringu w Indiach?

Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel zwróciła się do rządu Indii z zapytaniem, czy system ten nie podważa prawa do prywatności oraz wolności wypowiedzi?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(20 sierpnia 2013 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca zapoznała się z doniesieniami prasowymi o rzekomym wdrożeniu centralnego systemu monitoringu w Indiach, jednak obecnie nie posiada dalszych informacji w tej sprawie.

UE przykłada dużą wagę do ochrony praw człowieka i podstawowych wolności w relacjach z państwami trzecimi na całym świecie. Tematy te są stałym przedmiotem dyskusji z partnerami UE, w tym również z Indiami, szczególnie w ramach dialogu UE-Indie na temat praw człowieka.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007007/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Centralised monitoring by the Indian government

According to Human Rights Watch, the Indian government has begun to roll out a central monitoring system(CMS) which will allow the government to monitor all telephone and Internet communication in the country. The CMS will give the government access to the country's telecommunications network which will monitor phone calls, text messages, and Internet use.

What information can the European External Action Service (EEAS) provide about the CMS in India?

Has the Vice-President/High Representative addressed the Indian government to ensure that this system does not undermine rights to privacy and free expression?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the press reports on the alleged rolling out of a Central Monitoring System in India but, for the time being, has no further information on this.

The EU places great emphasis on the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms in its relations with third countries all over the world. These topics are discussed on a regular basis with the EU's partners and India is no exception to this rule, particularly in the context of the local EU-India Human Rights Dialogue.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007008/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Prześladowania aktywistów przez malezyjskie władze

Od niedawnych wyborów powszechnych w Malezji w miejscach publicznych zbierają się demonstranci w proteście przeciw wynikom wyborów. Doprowadziło to do prześladowania przez malezyjskie władze co najmniej sześciu organizatorów tzw. demonstracji „Blackout 505". Osobom tym zarzuca się niepoinformowanie policji z dziesięciodniowym wyprzedzeniem o planowanych imprezach, przez co naruszyły postanowienia malezyjskiej ustawy z 2012 r. o pokojowych zgromadzeniach. Policja aresztowała też 18 demonstrantów, którzy pokojowo protestowali podczas nocnego czuwania przed komisariatem policji. Te działania władz Malezji naruszają prawa obywateli tego kraju.

Jakich informacji może udzielić ESDZ na temat wyników niedawnych wyborów w Malezji?

Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji/Wysoka Przedstawiciel poruszyła tę kwestię w rozmowie z premierem Najibem Razakiem?

Czy ESDZ zauważyła, że powyższe działania stanowią naruszenie standardów praw człowieka?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(20 sierpnia 2013 r.)

W 13. wyborach powszechnych, które odbyły się dnia 5 maja, rządząca koalicja Barisan Nasional (BN) zdobyła 133 z 222 miejsc w parlamencie, podczas gdy koalicja opozycyjna Pakatan Rakyat (PR) zdobyła 89 miejsc. Premier Najib utworzył swój drugi rząd dnia 15 maja, a parlament został zaprzysiężony dnia 24 czerwca. W zaprzysiężeniu wzięli udział parlamentarzyści opozycyjni mimo wcześniej rozważanego bojkotu.

W szczególności lider opozycji Anwar Ibrahim początkowo nie chciał zaakceptować wyników wyborów, określając system wyborczy jako bezprawny. W całym kraju zorganizowano serię demonstracji „Black 505", które przyciągnęły członków wszystkich grup etnicznych. Ostatni wiec „Black 505" odbył się dnia 22 czerwca, podczas którego Anwar Ibrahim ogłosił, że opozycja zakończy protesty, ale będzie domagała się reformy wyborczej w parlamencie. Wszystkie protesty przebiegły pokojowo, bez interwencji policji.

Zgodnie z oświadczeniem Wysokiej Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącej na temat wyborów w Malezji, UE oczekuje na wyniki prac komisji wyborczej i innych organów, które badają i w razie potrzeby reagują na skargi.

ESDZ odnotowała aresztowania oraz stawianie zarzutów i nadal monitoruje sytuację.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007008/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Activists prosecuted by Malaysian authorities

Following the recent general election in Malaysia, demonstrators have been gathering in public to protest against the election results. This has led the Malaysian authorities to seek the prosecution of at least six organisers of the so-called 'Blackout 505' rallies. The six individuals have been charged with failing to provide the police with ten days prior notice of the planned events, thereby violating Malaysia's Peaceful Assembly Act of 2012. The police have also arrested 18 peaceful protesters participating in a candlelight vigil outside the police station. These actions by the Malaysian government undermine the rights of the Malaysian people.

What information can the EEAS provide about the recent election results in Malaysia?

Has the Vice-President/High Representative raised this issue with Malaysian Prime Minister Najib Razak?

Has the EEAS taken note of the fact that these actions fail to meet international human rights standards?

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

Following the 13th General Election held on 5th May, the governing Barisan Nasional (BN) coalition won 133 out of 222 Parliamentary seats, while Opposition Pakatan Rakyat (PR) seized 89 seatsi. Prime Minister Najib formed his second Government on 15 May and Parliament was sworn in on 24 June. All Opposition Members of Parliament took their oath despite earlier considerations of a boycott.

In particular, Opposition leader Anwar Ibrahim was initially reluctant to accept the results accusing the electoral system for being fraudulent. A series of 'Black 505' protests were organised countrywide attracting people from all ethnic groups. The last 'Black505' rallies took place on 22 June, where Anwar Ibrahim announced that the Opposition would cease the rallies but would continue to push for electoral reform within the parliamentary framework. All the protests were held peacefully with no intervention by the Police.

As expressed by the HR/VP in her statement on the elections in Malaysia, the EU is looking forward to the findings of the Election Commission and the other competent authorities, who will investigate and address the complaints as appropriate.

The EEAS has taken note of the arrests and charges and keeps monitoring the situation.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007009/13
do Komisji
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Najniższa stopa wzrostu w Polsce od 2001 r. w pierwszym kwartale 2013 r.

Według raportu gospodarczego Bellwether w pierwszym kwartale 2013 r. odnotowano w Polsce najniższą stopę wzrostu od 2011 r. W pierwszym kwartale produkt krajowy brutto w Polsce wzrósł jedynie o 0,4 %. Według prognozy Międzynarodowego Funduszu Walutowego polska gospodarka ma wzrosnąć o 1,3 % w 2013 r. Wskazuje to na wyraźny spadek stopy wzrostu z 4,4 % w 2011 r. i 3,3 % w 2012 r. Ponadto Komisja dała Polsce dwa lata na zmniejszenie stosunku deficytu budżetowego do PKB z 3,9 % do mniej niż 3 %.

Jakie są zalecenia Komisji w sprawie najlepszych działań, które mogą zostać podjęte w celu zwiększenia stopy wzrostu gospodarczego w przyszłości oraz osiągnięcia celu wyznaczonego przez Komisję?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Olliego Rehna w imieniu Komisji
(2 sierpnia 2013 r.)

W ramach europejskiego semestru Komisja podjęła się szczegółowej oceny wyzwań gospodarczych stojących przed Polską. W oparciu o zalecenie Komisji Rada w dniu 9 lipca 2013 r. przyjęła tzw. „zalecenia dla poszczególnych krajów" dotyczące Polski. Polsce zaleca się w szczególności poprawę stabilności finansów publicznych, ram budżetowych, zatrudnienia młodzieży, kobiet i osób starszych, innowacyjności gospodarki, jak również infrastruktury i otoczenia biznesowego. Ponadto, w uznaniu starań Polski na rzecz konsolidacji budżetowej oraz uwzględniając niekorzystną sytuację gospodarczą, w dniu 21 czerwca 2013 r. Rada, zgodnie z zaleceniem Komisji, przedłużyła do 2014 r. termin, w którym Polska ma zlikwidować nadmierny deficyt.

Więcej informacji na temat zaleceń dla poszczególnych krajów oraz analiz stanowiących ich podstawę można znaleźć na następującej stronie internetowej:
http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/europe-2020-in-your-country/polska/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007009/13
to the Commission
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Slowest growth rate in Poland since 2001 in the first quarter of 2013

According to a Bellwether economic report, Poland had its slowest growth rate since 2001 in the first quarter of 2013. Its gross domestic product grew by only 0.4% in the first quarter. The International Monetary Fund forecasted that the Polish economy would grow by 1.3% in 2013. This represents a clear decrease in growth from 4.4% in 2011 and 3.3% in 2012. In addition, the Commission gave Poland two years to reduce its budget deficit to GDP ratio from 3.9% to less than 3%.

What are the Commission's recommendations with regard to the best actions to be taken in order to increase the rate of economic growth in the future and to achieve the Commission's goal?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

Within the European semester, the Commission undertook a detailed assessment of the economic challenges Poland is facing. On the basis of a recommendation of the Commission, the Council adopted Country Specific Recommendations (CSRs) concerning Poland on 9 July 2013. In particular, Poland is recommended to improve the sustainability of public finances, its fiscal framework, the employment of youth, women and elderly, the innovativeness of the economy, as well as infrastructure and business environment. In addition, in recognition of Poland's fiscal consolidation efforts and the adverse economic situation, on 21 June 2013 the Council following a recommendation by the Commission has extended the deadline to 2014 for Poland to bring the excessive deficit situation to an end.

More details on the CSRs and the underlying analysis can be found at:
http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/europe-2020-in-your-country/polska/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007010/13
do Komisji
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)
(17 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Kwalifikowalność VATu do wkładu funduszy unijnych w nowym budżecie UE

W związku z brakiem jednoznacznej informacji na temat tego, czy VAT będzie kosztem kwalifikowanym do wkładu funduszy unijnych na terenie Polski, zwracam się z prośbą o odpowiedź na następujące pytanie:

Czy VAT będzie kosztem kwalifikowanym do wkładu funduszy unijnych na terenie Polski w budżecie Unii Europejskiej na lata 2014-2020?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(8 sierpnia 2013 r.)

Przepisy uzgodnione przez współprawodawców w odniesieniu do europejskich funduszy strukturalnych i inwestycyjnych w latach 2014-2020 stanowią, że podatek VAT nie jest kosztem kwalifikowalnym, chyba że jest to podatek niepodlegający zwrotowi zgodnie z krajowym ustawodawstwem VAT.

Podobne przepisy będą obowiązywać wobec dotacji UE przyznanych w ramach zarządzania bezpośredniego, z wyjątkiem działań, w które zaangażowani są beneficjenci publiczni, np. organy publiczne. Podatek VAT zapłacony w związku z takimi działaniami nie będzie kwalifikował się do finansowania UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007010/13
to the Commission
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Eligibility of VAT in connection with EU funding under the new EU budget

Given the lack of clear information on whether VAT will be an eligible cost in connection with EU funding in Poland, I am seeking an answer to the following question:

Will VAT be an eligible cost in connection with EU funding in Poland under the EU budget for the period 2014-2020?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2013)

The rules agreed by the co-legislators for the European Structural and Investment Funds for the 2014-2020 period set out that VAT is an ineligible cost except where it is non-recoverable under national VAT legislation.

A similar rule will apply to EU grants awarded under direct management, with the exception of activities engaged in by public beneficiaries as public authorities. VAT paid in relation to those activities will be ineligible for EU funding.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007011/13
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(17 juin 2013)

Objet: Moratoire de deux ans relatif à trois pesticides néonicotinoïdes

Des citoyens et des associations de protection de l'environnement et de la biodiversité s'interrogent quant à l'imposition pour deux ans d'un moratoire sur trois pesticides néonicotinoïdes — la clothianidine, le thiamétoxame et l'imidaclopride.

En effet, ces associations soulignent le caractère problématique de cette interdiction en raison de sa nature partielle (ces produits étant autorisés certains mois de l'année sur différentes cultures) et de sa limitation à deux ans, ce qui ne permet pas de tirer de conclusions objectives sur les liens entre ces molécules et la santé des abeilles.

Selon ces associations, ces molécules pourraient donc continuer de contaminer les abeilles une partie de l'année. De plus, quand bien même cette interdiction s'étendrait à toute l'année, ces molécules seraient susceptibles de rester présentes dans le sol (et donc sur les cultures dont le pollen est en contact avec les abeilles), jusqu'à 3 ans après le traitement originel.

Ainsi, il ne serait pas possible de constater la nocivité ou l'absence de nocivité de ces molécules sur les abeilles puisque ces éléments pourraient biaiser les résultats.

Quel avis porte la Commission sur la prise de position de ces associations?

La Commission pourrait-elle, avec l'appui de l'EFSA, nous éclairer sur les possibilités de déterminer ou non l'impact de ces molécules sur les abeilles avec un moratoire de ce type d'une durée de deux ans?

Comment la Commission compte-t-elle décider de la prolongation ou non de ce moratoire?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(23 juillet 2013)

1. La Commission a considéré qu'une interdiction totale n'était pas justifiée à ce stade, car l'EFSA a recensé des utilisations sûres.

2. Le règlement d'exécution (UE) nº 485/2013 ([1]) modifiant le règlement d'exécution (UE) nº 540/2011 en ce qui concerne les conditions d'approbation des substances actives clothianidine, thiaméthoxame et imidaclopride et interdisant l'utilisation et la vente de semences traitées avec des produits phytopharmaceutiques contenant ces substances actives est applicable à compter du 1er décembre 2013. L'application du règlement n'est pas limitée dans le temps, mais celui-ci indique que la Commission entamera, dans un délai de deux ans, un examen des nouvelles informations scientifiques qu'elle aura reçues. À l'issue de cet examen, la Commission pourra modifier les restrictions actuelles, les maintenir ou décider d'une interdiction. Il n'est pas possible d'anticiper, à ce stade, les résultats de l'examen.

([1]) JO L 139 du 25.5.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007011/13
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Two-year ban on three neonicotinoid-based pesticides

Ordinary people, as well as organisations for the defence of the environment and biodiversity, are asking questions about the two-year moratorium that has been imposed on three neonicotinoid-based pesticides — clothianidin, thiamethoxam and imidacloprid.

Environmental organisations point out that the ban is problematic because it is only partial (use of the products in question on various crops will be authorised during certain months of the year) and it is limited to two years, which will not be long enough for objective conclusions to be reached on the link between the banned compounds and bee health.

They explain that the chemical compounds could continue to contaminate bees for part of the year — and, even if the ban were to be extended to apply all year round, the molecules are likely to persist in the soil (and thus in crops the pollen from which comes into contact with bees) for up to three years after application of the pesticide.

Because these factors could distort research findings, it would thus be impossible to determine to what extent the compounds in question are, or are not, harmful to bees.

What is the Commission's view of the stance taken by these environmental organisations?

Could the Commission, in consultation with the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), supply further information about whether the impact of these chemical compounds on bees can, or can not, be determined on the basis of this type of two-year ban?

How does the Commission intend to decide whether or not to extend the ban?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2013)

1. The Commission considered that a total ban was not justified at this stage, as safe uses were identified by EFSA.

2, 3. Regulation (EU) No 485/2013 [1] amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No 540/2011, as regards the conditions of approval of the active substances clothianidin, thiamethoxam and imidacloprid, and prohibiting the use and sale of seeds treated with plant protection products containing those active substances, is applicable as of 1 December 2013. This regulation is not limited in time, but announces that the Commission will initiate a review within two years based on the new scientific information which it has received. As a result of this review the Commission might amend the current restrictions, keep them in place, or proceed with a ban. At this stage it is not possible to pre-empt the results of the review.

(1) OJ L 139, 25.5.2013.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007012/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Bombas nucleares em território da UE

Considerando que:

— Numa entrevista recente, Ruud Lubbers, antigo primeiro-ministro dos Países Baixos, denunciou a existência de 22 armas nucleares norte-americanas em território neerlandês;

— De acordo com o jornal «De Telegraaf», as bombas existentes na base neerlandesa de Volkel são do tipo B-61, e são quatro vezes mais potentes do que as utilizadas em Hiroshima e Nagasaki, na II Guerra Mundial;

— Estima-se que haja cerca de 240 bombas nucleares escondidas em bases localizadas em território europeu.

Pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

Tem conhecimento desta situação?

Tendo em conta o fim da guerra fria, e a ausência de uma ameaça externa referenciada aos Estados-Membros da UE, de que forma interpreta a presença deste tipo de arsenal nuclear em países da UE?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007021/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Bombas nucleares em território da UE

— Numa entrevista recente, Ruud Lubbers, antigo primeiro-ministro dos Países Baixos, denunciou a existência de 22 armas nucleares norte-americanas em território neerlandês;

— De acordo com o jornal «De Telegraaf», as bombas existentes na base neerlandesa de Volkel são do tipo B-61, e são quatro vezes mais potentes do que as utilizadas em Hiroshima e Nagasaki, na II Guerra Mundial;

— Estima-se que haja cerca de 240 bombas nucleares escondidas em bases localizadas em território europeu;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento desta situação?

Confirma a existência deste arsenal nuclear em território da UE?

Resposta conjunta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(3 de setembro de 2013)

A UE aproveita todas as oportunidades para reiterar o seu empenhamento na busca de um mundo mais seguro para todos e na criação das condições para um mundo sem armas nucleares, em conformidade com os objetivos do Tratado de Não Proliferação de Armas Nucleares (TNP).

A UE sublinha, de forma sistemática, a necessidade de continuar a redução global dos arsenais nucleares, tendo em conta os princípios de transparência, verificabilidade e irreversibilidade que devem guiar todas as iniciativas no domínio do desarmamento nuclear e do controlo do armamento, como contributo para o estabelecimento e manutenção da paz internacional, da segurança e da estabilidade. Por conseguinte, congratulo-me com a maior transparência por parte de alguns dos Estados que possuem armas nucleares, em particular os Estados-Membros da UE (França e Reino Unido), relativamente às armas nucleares que possuem. Convido outros Estados a fazerem o mesmo. Se estes esforços forem vigorosamente seguidos por todos os Estados que possuem armas nucleares, o nosso mundo tornar-se-á mais seguro.

A UE congratulou-se com os esforços envidados pelos P5 no sentido de reconfirmar o princípio da irreversibilidade no domínio do desarmamento nuclear e do controlo do armamento. Com base na Decisão 2010/212/PESC do Conselho, a UE continuará a defender uma maior transparência relativamente ao processo de desarmamento nuclear. A UE acolheu com agrado o novo acordo START, tendo incentivado sistematicamente a realização de novas reduções.

No âmbito da NATO são debatidas questões de segurança nacional e, em particular, a questão da dissuasão nuclear. Pelo seu lado, a UE tem estado ativa em fóruns internacionais relevantes no quadro da sua estratégia relativa às armas de destruição maciça (ADM) adotada pelo Conselho em 2003.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007012/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Nuclear bombs in EU territory

— In a recent interview, former Dutch Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers revealed that 22 US nuclear weapons are stored on Dutch soil.

— According to the *De Telegraaf* newspaper, the bombs being held at Volkel Air Base in the Netherlands are B61 nuclear weapons, which are four times more powerful than those used on Hiroshima and Nagasaki during World War II.

— An estimated 240 nuclear bombs are hidden at bases throughout the EU.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this situation?

Given that the Cold War has ended and that there is no known external threat to the EU Member States, how does she interpret the presence of this kind of nuclear arsenal in EU countries?

Question for written answer E-007021/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Nuclear bombs in EU territory

In a recent interview, former Dutch Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers revealed that 22 US nuclear weapons are stored on Dutch soil.

According to the *De Telegraaf* newspaper, the bombs being held at Volkel Air Base in the Netherlands are B61 nuclear weapons, which are four times more powerful than those used on Hiroshima and Nagasaki during World War II.

An estimated 240 nuclear bombs are hidden at bases throughout the EU.

Is the Commission aware of this situation?

Can it confirm that this nuclear arsenal is being stored in the EU?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(3 September 2013)

The EU uses all relevant opportunities to reaffirm its commitment to seeking a safer world for all and to creating the conditions for a world without nuclear weapons, in accordance with the goals of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

We consistently underline the need to continue the overall reduction of global stockpiles of nuclear weapons, taking into account the principles of irreversibility, verifiability and transparency to guide all measures in the field of nuclear disarmament and arms control as a contribution to establishing and upholding international peace, security and stability. I therefore welcome the increased transparency shown by some nuclear weapon States, in particular the EU Member States France and the UK, on the nuclear weapons they possess and I call on others to do likewise. If these efforts are pursued vigorously by all Nuclear Weapon States, our world will become safer.

The EU has welcomed P5 efforts to reconfirm the principle of irreversibility with regard to nuclear disarmament and arms control, and — based on Council Decision 2010/212/CFSP — will continue to advocate for further progress in the nuclear disarmament process. The EU has welcomed the new START Agreement, and has consistently encouraged further reductions.

Questions of national security and in particular the question of nuclear deterrence are discussed in the NATO context. For its part, the EU has been active in the relevant international fora in the framework of its WMD Strategy adopted by the Council in 2003.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007013/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Utilização de gás sarin na Síria

Considerando que:

— A comissão independente, patrocinada pela ONU para investigar o conflito na Síria, confirmou o uso de armas químicas no conflito, e de acordo com o relatório apresentado, apesar «das acusações» do uso de armas químicas pelas duas partes em conflito, «a maioria» aponta como autor as forças governamentais e «não há provas» de que os grupos rebeldes tenham e usem armas químicas;

— O porta-voz do governo britânico afirmou que a Grã-Bretanha tem provas «fisiológicas» de que foi usado gás sarin na Síria, «muito provavelmente» pelas forças governamentais do presidente Bashar al-Assad, e que os britânicos não detêm provas de utilização de armas químicas «por parte da oposição» síria;

— A França também confirmou a presença de gás sarin em amostras trazidas da Síria, sem contudo apontar culpados;

— O governo do presidente Bashar al-Assad afirma-se inocente e remete a acusação para as forças rebeldes, que negam igualmente a autoria dos ataques com armas químicas.

Pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

Que dados possui relativamente a esta matéria?

Confirma a utilização de gás sarin pelas forças governamentais do presidente Bashar al-Assad?

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

A AR/VP tem conhecimento de relatórios de alguns Estados-Membros da UE e dos EUA sobre a utilização de agentes químicos contra civis na Síria. A AR/VP emitiu uma declaração sobre esta questão a 14 de junho de 2013, segundo a qual «esta avaliação, combinada com outras que foram divulgadas, torna ainda mais urgentes os nossos repetidos apelos para que se chegue a acordo quanto ao envio imediato de uma missão de verificação das Nações Unidas para investigar estas alegações no terreno» ([1]).

Neste momento, sem o envio de uma missão desse tipo, é difícil confirmar a utilização de armas químicas. A UE continuará a instar a Síria a aderir à Convenção sobre Armas Químicas e ratificar a Convenção sobre Armas Biológicas com urgência. A UE recorda que o uso de armas químicas, por qualquer pessoa e em quaisquer circunstâncias, é um ato condenável e que viola gravemente as normas da comunidade internacional. As autoridades sírias são especialmente responsáveis por assegurar que as suas armas químicas são armazenadas em segurança, enquanto não são destruídas e sujeitas a um controlo independente, e que não caem nas mãos de qualquer outro interveniente no conflito, estatal ou não.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/137474.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007013/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Use of sarin gas in Syria

— The UN Independent Commission of Inquiry on Syria has confirmed the use of chemical weapons in the country's conflict. Its latest report says that despite 'allegations' concerning the use of chemical weapons by both parties, the 'majority' concern their use by government forces and there is 'no compelling evidence' that rebel groups possess and use chemical weapons.

— A UK Government spokesperson has said that the United Kingdom has 'physiological' evidence of the use of sarin gas in Syria, which is 'highly likely' the responsibility of President Bashar al-Assad's government forces. He added that the UK has no evidence of chemical weapons use by the Syrian opposition.

— France has also confirmed the presence of sarin gas in samples brought back from Syria, but has not said who is to blame.

— President Bashar al-Assad's government says it is innocent and points the finger at rebel forces, who also deny responsibility for the chemical weapons attacks.

What information does the Vice-President/High Representative have on this matter?

Can she confirm the use of sarin gas by President Bashar al-Assad's government forces?

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

The HR/VP is aware of reports from some EU Member States and the US on the use of chemical agents against civilians in Syria. The HR/VP released a statement on that matter on 14 June 2013, which stated that 'this assessment, combined with others that have been circulated, makes even more urgent our repeated calls for an agreement to immediately deploy a UN verification mission to investigate these allegations on the ground.' ([1])

At this time, without a successful deployment of a UN investigation mission, it is difficult to confirm the use of chemical weapons. The EU will continue to urge Syria to accede to the Chemical Weapons Convention and to ratify the Biological Weapons Convention as a matter of urgency. The EU recalls that any use of chemical weapons by anyone under any circumstances would be reprehensible and completely contrary to the legal norms and standards of the international community. The Syrian authorities bear a particular responsibility to ensure that their chemical weapons are stored securely pending independently verified destruction and are not permitted to fall into the hands of any other State or non-state actor.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/137474.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007014/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Norte-coreanos expulsos do Laos

Considerando que:

— Desde o fim da Guerra das Coreias, em 1953, cerca de 25 000 norte-coreanos fugiram do seu país e estabeleceram-se na vizinha Coreia do Sul;

— O Laos confirmou recentemente que deportou nove requerentes de asilo norte-coreanos com idades entre os 14 e os 18 anos que tinham sido detidos a 10 de maio por entrada ilegal no país;

— Os nove norte-coreanos foram capturados pelas autoridades do Laos, alegadamente por atravessarem ilegalmente a fronteira com a China, e, apesar de a embaixada sul-coreana ter pedido a custódia dos jovens, estes foram entregues à Coreia do Norte no dia 28 de maio;

— De acordo com as últimas declarações do regime de Pyongyang, a Coreia do Norte acusou o Governo sul-coreano de querer sequestrar um grupo de nove desertores norte-coreanos recentemente repatriado para o país comunista a partir do Laos, descartando assim a possibilidade de um repatriamento forçado.

Pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

Que diligência tomou ou prevê tomar relativamente a esta matéria?

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

Ao tomar conhecimento do incidente, a AR/VP emitiu imediatamente uma declaração, através do seu porta-voz, a 5 de junho, manifestando preocupação acerca dos nove refugiados e apelando a que fossem tratados de forma segura. A UE procedeu a uma diligência diplomática oficial junto do Laos relativamente às responsabilidades deste país pelos refugiados nos termos do direito internacional. O assunto foi igualmente abordado com o Governo chinês, nomeadamente durante a última ronda do diálogo anual UE-China sobre os direitos humanos, a 25 de junho.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007014/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — North Koreans deported from Laos

— Since the end of the Korean War in 1953, around 25 000 North Koreans have fled their country and settled in neighbouring South Korea.

— Laos recently confirmed that it deported nine North Korean asylum-seekers, aged between 14 and 18, who had been arrested on 10 May for illegally entering the country.

— The nine North Koreans were captured by Laotian authorities, for allegedly illegally crossing the border with China. Although the South Korean embassy requested custody of the youngsters, they were handed over to North Korea on 28 May.

— In its latest statement, the North Korean regime accused the South Korean Government of wanting to kidnap a group of nine North Korean defectors who were recently repatriated to the communist country from Laos, and thereby ruled out the possibility of a forced repatriation.

What action has the Vice-President/High Representative taken or does she intend to take on this matter?

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

On learning of the incident, the HR/VP immediately issued a statement through her spokesperson on 5th of June expressing concern about the nine refugees and calling for their safe treatment. An official EU demarche took place with Laos over its responsibilities for refugees under international law. The matter has also been taken up with Chinese Government, including during the last round of the annual EU-China human rights dialogue on 25 June.