IV

(Informacje)

INFORMACJE INSTYTUCJI, ORGANÓW I JEDNOSTEK ORGANIZACYJNYCH UNII EUROPEJSKIEJ

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

PYTANIA PISEMNE Z ODPOWIEDZIĄ

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

(2014/C 221/01)

Treść Strona

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor P-010755/13
upućeno Komisiji
Tonino Picula (S&D)
(20. rujna 2013.)

Predmet: Potpora regionalnim zračnim lukama

U srpnju ove godine Europska komisija objavila je nacrt Smjernica za državne potpore zračnim lukama i avioprijevoznicima koje bi, nakon što se okončaju konzultacije sa zemljama članicama Europske unije 2. listopada 2013., trebale stupiti na snagu početkom sljedeće godine.

Predložene smjernice znatno izmjenjuju dosadašnju dinamiku ulaganja u avioinfrastrukturu i smjernice usvojene 2005. godine. Pritom se šalju signali da investicije u zračnu infrastrukturu u ovom trenutku nisu najpoželjnije (takva se interpretacija primjerice može čuti od Glavne uprave za regionalni i urbani razvoj Europske komisije). To nikako ne doprinosi ujedinjenosti Europe u različitosti (United in diversity), kako to često i Komisija naglašava, a za koju je upravo kvalitetna prometna povezanost jedan od osnovnih preduvjeta.

Među mnoštvom izmjena predloženim u području zračnog prometa nekolicina je od iznimne važnosti za Republiku Hrvatsku. Prije svega, kategorizacija zračnih luka isključivo prema broju putnika koji njima prolaze. Takva klasifikacija zanemaruje specifičnosti, kako hrvatskih tako i ostalih europskih regija, vezano uz npr. njihove postojeće intermodalne prometne veze ili zemljopisnu izoliranost. U hrvatskom slučaju to se primarno odnosi na zračne luke na otocima ili na zračnu luku Dubrovnik koja povezuje jedini ekstrateritorijalni kopneni dio cijele Europske unije, gdje su okolnosti bitno drugačije od onih u središnjem dijelu kontinenta. Pored toga, nužno je uzimati u obzir ukupnu razvojnu i socijalnu korist koju zračne luke donose cijeloj regiji.

Također, važno je naglasiti da Republika Hrvatska kao najnovija članica Europske unije, za razliku od ostalih zemalja članica, nije imala mogućnost korištenja europskih fondova u svrhu ulaganja u avioinfrastrukturu. Budući da se na sve zemlje članice EU-a primjenjuje načelo tzv. *equal treatmenta*, odnosno jednakog tretmana, predviđa li Europska komisija za Hrvatsku mjere kojima bi se olakšala takva ulaganja, s obzirom na to da Hrvatska u ovom trenutku priprema operativne programe i jedan dio budućih investicija planira u ovom sektoru?

Odgovor g. Almunije u ime Komisije
(15. listopada 2013.)

Komisija je u potpunosti svjesna važnosti regionalnih zračnih luka u omogućivanju dostupnosti regija i regionalnog razvoja.

Potrebno je, međutim, uzeti u obzir moguće narušavanje tržišnog natjecanja zbog državnih potpora te nužnost sprečavanja rasipanja javnih sredstava.

U tom je kontekstu nacrtom novog okvira državnih potpora za zračne luke i zračne prijevoznike predviđeno da se potpore za ulaganje u zračne luke s obzirom na njihov promet proglase sukladnima uz određene uvjete. Određene operativne potpore za regionalne zračne luke moći će se dodjeljivati tijekom prijelaznog razdoblja od 10 godina.

Države članice zadržavaju i mogućnost nametanja obveza pružanja javne usluge određenim zračnim lukama posebno u izoliranim regijama te dodjeljivanja naknade za pružanje javne usluge, u skladu s odredbama o sukladnosti potpora za javne usluge.

Države članice moći će, dakle, osigurati financiranje određenih ulaganja u zračne luke kao odgovor na stvarne potrebe građana.

Komisija još nije konačno utvrdila svoje stajalište i pomno će proučiti primjedbe koje bude zaprimila tijekom javnog savjetovanja.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-010755/13
to the Commission
Tonino Picula (S&D)
(20 September 2013)

Subject: Support for regional airports

In July 2013, the Commission published proposals for directives on state support for airports and airlines. Following the conclusion of consultations with Member States on 2 October 2013, those directives should enter into force in 2014.

The proposed directives significantly alter the traditional dynamic for investment in air infrastructure and modify the directive adopted in 2005. They also send out signals that investments in air infrastructure are not currently viewed as desirable (such attitudes may be encountered in the Commission's Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy). This in no way serves the objective of European unity in diversity, as the Commission often claims. High-quality transport links are one of the key preconditions for such unity to exist.

Among the numerous changes proposed in the area of air transport, several will have a particular impact on Croatia. Above all, there is the classification of airports solely on the basis of how many passengers pass through them. Such a classification system ignores the specificities of regions both in Croatia and elsewhere in Europe (for example, their existing intermodal traffic links or geographic isolation). In the case of Croatia, the issue mainly concerns airports on islands or the airport serving Dubrovnik, which provides a transport link for the only exclave in the EU, where conditions differ greatly from those in the central part of the continent. Additionally, it is vital to take into consideration all of the developmental and social benefits that airports bring to the entire region.

Furthermore, it is important to stress that Croatia — as the newest EU Member State — has not been able to benefit from EU funds for air infrastructure investment, unlike the other Member States. Given that the principle of equal treatment is supposed to be applied with regard to all Member States, does the Commission foresee any measures to facilitate such investment for Croatia, given that Croatia is currently preparing operational programmes and that a portion of future investments are planned in this sector?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M Almunia au nom de la Commission
(15 octobre 2013)

La Commission est pleinement consciente de l'importance des aéroports régionaux pour assurer l'accessibilité et le développement régional.

Il convient toutefois de prendre également en considération les distorsions de la concurrence qui peuvent résulter des aides d'État et la nécessité d'éviter un gaspillage des ressources publiques.

Dans ce contexte, le projet de nouvel encadrement des aides d'État en faveur des aéroports et des compagnies aériennes prévoit notamment de déclarer compatibles sous certaines conditions, les aides à l'investissement en faveur des aéroports en fonction de leur trafic. Certaines aides au fonctionnement en faveur des aéroports régionaux pourront être octroyées pendant une période transitoire de 10 années.

Les États membres conservent aussi la possibilité d'imposer des obligations de service public à certains aéroports notamment dans les régions isolées et d'octroyer des compensations de service public, conformément aux dispositions régissant la compatibilité des aides pour les services publics.

Les États membres auront donc la possibilité d'assurer le financement de certains investissements dans les aéroports qui répondent à un besoin réel des citoyens.

La Commission n'a pas encore finalisée sa position et analysera avec attention les commentaires fournis lors de la consultation publique.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011726/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: Projet Aprosys

Le projet Aprosys a reçu 18 millions d'euros de l'UE, ce qui en fait une initiative européenne phare dans le domaine de la recherche sur la sécurité routière. L'équipe a rassemblé la recherche et l'expertise scientifique et technologique de toute l'Europe et a englobé un large éventail de questions liées à la sûreté, dont la biomécanique humaine, la résistance des véhicules et des infrastructures aux collisions, la détection et le contrôle ainsi que les systèmes de protection des usagers de la route et des passagers.

1. Quelles sont les avancées du projet?

2. Quels sont les objectifs déjà réalisés?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Geoghegan-Quinn au nom de la Commission
(3 décembre 2013)

1. Aprosys était un projet intégré ([1]) (2004-2009) du 6^e^ PC ([2]). Il a bénéficié d'un financement de 18 millions d'euros de l'Union européenne, sur un budget total de 30 millions d'euros. Les 48 partenaires du projet étaient des constructeurs automobiles, des fournisseurs, des centres de recherche et des universités.

2. Il a obtenu des résultats significatifs: nouveaux modèles informatiques permettant de simuler le comportement des victimes d'accidents de la route, harmonisation des mannequins d'essais de collision *(crash-test)* au niveau mondial, méthode d'évaluation des systèmes de sécurité avancés, méthodes d'essai et nouveaux systèmes de protection des usagers de la route vulnérables, nouvel essai de collision frontale et essais d'impact latéral avancés. Certains produits sont aujourd'hui disponibles sur le marché, tels qu'un casque amélioré et un dispositif de protection de la partie supérieure du corps destinés aux motocyclistes.

Les connaissances acquises dans les essais d'impact latéral ont alimenté de nouvelles initiatives en matière de sécurité des conducteurs et des passagers prises par Euro NCAP ([3]) (organisme européen chargé des essais de collision), des groupes de travail du Comité européen pour l'amélioration de la sécurité des véhicules et d'autres organismes internationaux.

Les travaux se poursuivent après la fin du projet en ce qui concerne la méthode d'évaluation, les essais d'impacts frontal et latéral, les essais spécifiques pour les piétons, les cyclistes et les motocyclistes et l'intégration d'essais virtuels dans la réglementation.

Plusieurs projets du 7^e^ PC ([4]) se fondent également sur les résultats d'Aprosys, comme Imviter ([5]), EuroFOT ([6]), Assess ([7]) et Saferider ([8]).

Aprosys a apporté une contribution considérable à la sécurité routière et à l'objectif d'une sécurité totale sur les routes pour 2050, fixé dans le livre blanc sur les transports, en faisant progresser la sécurité des citoyens européens de manière significative.

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp6/instr_ip.htm
([2]) Sixième programme-cadre pour des activités de recherche, de développement technologique et de démonstration (6^e^ PC, 2002-2006).
([3]) http://www.euroncap.com/home.aspx
([4]) Septième programme-cadre pour des activités de recherche, de développement technologique et de démonstration (7^e^ PC, 2007-2013).
([5]) http://www.imviter.com
([6]) http://www.eurofot-ip.eu
([7]) http://www.assess-project.eu
([8]) http://www.saferider-eu.org

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011726/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: APROSYS Project

The APROSYS (Advanced Protection Systems) project has received EUR 18 million from the EU, which is making it a flagship European initiative in the field of road safety research. The team has brought together research and scientific and technological expertise from across Europe and covered a wide range of issues linked to safety, including human biomechanics, the resistance of vehicles and infrastructures to collisions, detection and control, as well as protection systems for road users and passengers.

1. What progress has the project made?

2. What objectives have already been achieved?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2013)

1. APROSYS was an FP6 ([1]) Integrated Project (2004-2009) ([2]). The EU funding amounted to EUR 18 million, out of a total budgeted cost of EUR 30 million. The 48 partners included car manufacturers, suppliers, research centres and universities.

2. Significant results were new computer models simulating people's behaviour in crashes, a worldwide harmonised crash test dummy, an assessment method for advanced safety, testing methods and new protection systems for Vulnerable Road Users (VRUs), a new front crash test and advanced side impact tests. Some products are now available on the market e.g. an improved helmet and upper body protector for motorcyclists.

Knowledge gained in the side impact tests is being included in new, driver/passenger safety initiatives by Euro NCAP ([3]), (the European crash test authority), EEVC (European Enhanced Vehicle Safety Committee) working groups and other international bodies.

Further work continues after the project on the assessment method, front and side impact tests, specific tests for pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists and implementing virtual testing in regulations.

Several FP7 ([4]) projects are also building on results, such as IMVITER ([5]), EuroFOT ([6]), ASSESS ([7]) and SAFERIDER ([8]).

APROSYS has made a major contribution to road safety and to the 'zero-vision' 2050 objective on the Transport White Paper, delivering a significant step forward for the safety of the European citizen.

([1]) Sixth Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP6, 2002-2006).
([2]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp6/instr_ip.htm
([3]) http://www.euroncap.com/home.aspx
([4]) Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013).
([5]) http://www.imviter.com
([6]) http://www.eurofot-ip.eu
([7]) http://www.assess-project.eu
([8]) http://www.saferider-eu.org

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011727/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: Gaz de schiste

Le Parlement européen a proposé mercredi que les activités d'exploration et d'extraction d'hydrocarbures non-conventionnels par fracturation hydraulique fassent obligatoirement l'objet d'une étude d'impact environnemental, en amendant une législation existante.

1. La Commission nous rejoint-elle sur cette proposition?

2. La Commission partage-t-elle notre point de vue sur la proposition d'empêcher les conflits d'intérêt, d'informer le public et de le consulter sur le déroulement des projets?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(10 décembre 2013)

La Commission examine actuellement les propositions votées par le Parlement afin d'étudier cette question avec les colégislateurs dans le cadre du processus législatif en cours. Au stade actuel, la Commission reste neutre sur cette question et se veut à l'écoute. Étant donné que la question porte sur l'application d'un acte législatif existant (Annexe I de la directive EIE) aux projets relatifs au gaz de schiste (qui relèvent actuellement soit de l'annexe I soit de l'annexe II de la directive EIE), la position adoptée par la Commission dans ce contexte est sans préjudice de toute décision ultérieure de la Commission relative à l'initiative visant à instaurer un nouveau cadre spécialement conçu pour une extraction sûre et sécurisée des hydrocarbures, qui figure dans le programme de travail 2014 de la Commission.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011727/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Shale gas

On Wednesday, Parliament proposed that activities involving the exploration and extraction of non-conventional hydrocarbons by hydraulic fracturing should be subject to an environmental impact assessment, amending existing legislation.

1. Does the Commission support us on this proposal?

2. Does the Commission share our point of view on the proposal to prevent conflicts of interest, to inform the public and to consult with them on the development of projects?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2013)

The Commission is currently examining the proposals voted by Parliament in order to discuss this matter with the co-legislators in the framework of the ongoing legislative process. At this moment, the Commission remains neutral on this issue and in listening mode. Since the issue is the scope of application of an existing piece of legislation (Annex I of the EIA Directive) to shale gas projects (which are currently covered by either Annex I or Annex II of the EIA Directive), the Commission's position in this context is without prejudice to any future Commission decision on the initiative aimed at establishing a new framework specifically designed for the safe and secure hydrocarbon extraction, which is included in the Commission Work Programme of 2014.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012000/13
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(21 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Prezentarea de către Comisia Europeană a unei liste de 250 de proiecte de infrastructuri eligibile pentru o finanțare în valoare de 5,85 miliarde EUR

Comisia Europeană a prezentat în 14 octombrie o listă de 250 de proiecte de infrastructuri eligibile pentru o finanțare în valoare de 5,85 miliarde Euro. Aceste proiecte de interes comun pot beneficia de sprijin financiar prin intermediul Mecanismului Conectarea Europei. Însă suma totală alocată (5,85 miliarde Euro) nu poate acoperi nevoile de finanțare a tuturor proiectelor incluse pe lista publicată de către Comisie.

În acest context, poate oferi Comisia informații cu privire la criteriile în baza cărora vor fi selectate proiectele ce vor fi efectiv finanțate din această sumă? Cum intenționează Comisia să soluționeze situația ipotetică în care valoarea proiectelor depuse în vederea finanțării depășește anvelopa financiară de 5,85 miliarde Euro?

Răspuns dat de dl Oettinger în numele Comisiei
(6 ianuarie 2014)

Regulamentul privind liniile directoare pentru infrastructurile energetice transeuropene ([1]) stabilește o procedură de identificare, o dată la doi ani, a proiectelor de infrastructură energetică cu valoare adăugată ridicată la nivel european. O primă listă de 248 de proiecte de interes comun a fost publicată în octombrie 2013. Cu toate acestea, doar o mică parte dintre aceste proiecte (în special cele care se confruntă cu dificultăți în ceea ce privește viabilitatea lor comercială) vor fi eligibile pentru sprijin financiar sub formă de granturi pentru lucrări în cadrul mecanismului „Conectarea Europei" (MCE). Cele mai multe dintre acestea vor fi eligibile pentru sprijin financiar sub formă de granturi destinate exclusiv studiilor. Rata de cofinanțare pentru granturi este limitată la maximum 50 % din suma eligibilă. Anumite proiecte vor fi eligibile, de asemenea, pentru finanțare sub formă de instrumente financiare, suma maximă care urmează să fie utilizată pentru instrumentele financiare fiind limitată la 10 % din bugetul MCE. Anumite proiecte nu sunt eligibile pentru niciun ajutor financiar.

Liniile directoare stabilesc, de asemenea, măsuri nefinanciare pentru facilitarea investițiilor. Proiectele de interes comun beneficiază de facilități în ceea ce privește acordarea autorizațiilor și de un proces de reglementare ajustat în funcție de riscuri. Studiul de impact ([2]) realizat înainte de redactarea liniilor directoare a identificat aceste aspecte ca fiind cele mai serioase obstacole în calea investițiilor.

În mai 2014 va fi lansată prima cerere de propuneri în cadrul MCE — Energie. Criteriile de selecție și de atribuire pe care trebuie să le îndeplinească proiectele de interes comun eligibile pentru a primi finanțare vor fi identificate în programul de lucru care urmează să fie adoptat la începutul lunii aprilie 2014. Acestea vor lua în considerare, printre altele, analiza cost-beneficiu a proiectului, rezultatul deciziei de alocare transfrontalieră a costurilor și planul de afaceri.

([1]) Regulamentul (UE) nr. 347/2013 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 17 aprilie 2013 privind liniile directoare pentru infrastructurile energetice transeuropene, de abrogare a Deciziei nr. 1364/2006/CE și de modificare a Regulamentelor (CE) nr. 713/2009, (CE) nr. 714/2009 și (CE) nr. 715/2009 (JO L 115/39, 25.4.2013).

([2]) Documentul de lucru al serviciilor Comisiei COM(2011) 658.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012000/13
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: The Commission submits a list of 250 infrastructure projects eligible for funding to the value of EUR 5.85 billion

On 14 October, the Commission submitted a list of 250 infrastructure projects which were eligible for funding to the value of EUR 5.85 billion. The projects of common interest are eligible for financial support through the Connecting Europe Facility. However, the total amount allocated (EUR 5.85 billion) cannot cover the funding needs of all the projects included on the list published by the Commission.

In light of this, can the Commission provide information regarding the criteria on which the projects that will actually be funded from this amount will be selected? How does the Commission intend to address the hypothetical situation in which the value of projects submitted for funding exceeds the EUR 5.85 billion available?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(6 January 2014)

The regulation on Guidelines for trans-European energy infrastructure ([1]) establishes a bi-annual procedure to identify energy infrastructure projects of high European added value. A first list of 248 Projects of Common Interest was published in October 2013. However only a minority of these projects (especially the ones facing difficulties in their commercial viability) will be eligible for financial support in the form of grants for works under the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF). Most of them will be eligible for financial support in the form of grants for studies only. The co-financing rate for grants is limited to a maximum of 50% of the eligible amount. Some projects will also be eligible for access to financial instruments, the maximum amount to be used for financial instruments being limited to 10% of the CEF budget. Some projects are not eligible for any financial support at all.

The Guidelines also establish non-financial measures to facilitate investments. PCIs benefit from improved permit granting and risk-adjusted regulatory treatment. The impact assessment ([2]) conducted prior to the Guidelines identifies these obstacles as the most important ones to investments.

In May 2014, the first call for proposals under CEF energy will be launched. The selection and award criteria that eligible PCIs will have to meet in order to receive funding will be identified in the Work Programme to be adopted in early April 2014. They will take into account, among others, the project specific cost-benefit analysis, the outcome of the cross-border cost allocation decision and the business plan.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 347/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2013 on guidelines for trans-European energy infrastructure and repealing Decision No 1364/2006/EC and amending Regulations (EC) No 713/2009, (EC) No 714/2009 and (EC) No 715/2009 (OJ L 115/39, 25.4.2013).

([2]) Commission staff working paper COM(2011) 658.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-012002/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Orientaciones RTE-T, análisis coste-beneficios, volumen de pasajeros y sostenibilidad económica de algunos trayectos del AVE

Uno de cada cuatro trayectos del AVE solo tiene un pasajero al día. En 2012 se contabilizaron 10 rutas entre las 22 estaciones de la red con menos de 10 pasajeros en los doce meses y otras 88 con menos de cinco viajeros diarios. Únicamente 16 relaciones superaron los 100 000 pasajeros en el año, y tan solo dos rebasaron el millón ([1]). Entre Puente Genil y Córdoba viajaron en todo el año 295 personas; entre Guadalajara y Calatayud, 127; entre Antequera y Puertollano, 108.

Entre las estaciones en las que existieron relaciones con menos de diez pasajeros al día está la de Tardienta, en Huesca; de los diez trayectos de ida o vuelta con parada en este apeadero, solo dos logran un pasajero por día. De los ocho restantes, dos suman poco más de 30 pasajeros a lo largo del año y seis no llegan ni siquiera a diez viajeros en los 12 meses. Pero este pequeño pueblo aragonés no es un caso único. Poblaciones con mucho más empaque, como Guadalajara (2 trayectos), Huesca (1), Calatayud (2), Antequera (2), Puertollano (2), Cuenca (1), Utiel-Requena (2) o Puente Genil (2), explotan alguna relación con menos de 10 pasajeros al año. Si a estas estaciones les sumamos las de ciudades como Ciudad Real o Lleida, habremos identificado las poblaciones desde las que se explota la práctica totalidad de los 48 trayectos del AVE a los que calificamos de «unipersonales», porque tuvieron uno o menos de un pasajero por día. Por ejemplo, entre Puente Genil y Córdoba viajaron en todo el año 295 personas; entre Guadalajara y Calatayud, 127; entre Antequera y Puertollano, 108.

El parque de RENFE, en el que se han invertido 5 000 millones de euros, cuenta con 195 trenes de alta velocidad. Solo 86 han sido diseñados para los trayectos directos o semidirectos entre grandes capitales del país. Las restantes 109 unidades fueron adquiridas para los servicios Alvia y Avant.

¿Tiene la Comisión conocimiento de estos datos sobre el volumen de pasajeros y el tráfico del AVE? ¿Nos puede facilitar la Comisión los datos que tiene?

¿Considera la Comisión que el dispendio dedicado a la alta velocidad en España respeta las nuevas normas RTE-T y el principio de coste-beneficio?

¿Ha recibido la Comisión un estudio sobre los retornos económicos de esta infraestructura y, en particular, se han implicado fondos de financiación europeos?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(9 de diciembre de 2013)

1. La Comisión no tiene ningún dato específico. Las autoridades españolas no están obligadas a enviar esa información a la Comisión.

2. Por lo que se refiere a las inversiones en la infraestructura de transportes española, incluida, pero no exclusivamente, la red de alta velocidad, la Comisión, en el marco del semestre europeo de 2013, insistió en lo siguiente: «La infraestructura de transporte es abundante, pero hay margen para que la selección de las inversiones sea más estricta y se dé prioridad al mantenimiento eficiente de las redes existentes. La creación de un observatorio independiente, tal como está previsto, sería de utilidad a este respecto» ([2]). Al evaluar la red española de alta velocidad, sin embargo, debe considerarse el valor añadido europeo resultante de la integración de la Península Ibérica en la red RTE-T a través de líneas interoperables aptas para el tráfico mixto.

En el análisis costes-beneficios del tren de alta velocidad en España se tienen en cuenta al menos entre veinte y veinticinco años de actividad. Los datos sobre tráfico del año citado son realmente insatisfactorios; no obstante, debe realizarse un análisis a largo plazo. Además, en el análisis costes-beneficios debe considerarse no solo la rentabilidad financiera, sino también la rentabilidad económica para todo el país y para la UE.

([1]) http://www.eldiario.es/economia/Renfe-AVE-Tardienta-Puente_Genil_0_121438139.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/csr2013_spain_es.pdf

3. No. La Comisión solo encarga la realización de estudios de evaluación *ex post* de la rentabilidad económica y financiera cuando los proyectos están finalizados. Entre el final de las obras y la evaluación *ex post* pueden llegar a transcurrir diez años para poder analizar esa rentabilidad a largo plazo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012002/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: TEN-T guidelines, cost-benefit analysis, passenger volumes and economic sustainability of Spanish high-speed rail (AVE) routes

One in every four AVE routes has only one passenger a day. In 2012, 10 routes between the network's 22 stations were recorded as having fewer than 10 passengers over the year and another 88 routes had fewer than five passengers a day. Only 16 routes had more than 100 000 passengers in the year, and only two had more than a million ([1]). Two hundred and ninety-five people travelled between Puente Genil and Córdoba in the whole year, 127 between Guadalajara and Calatayud and 108 between Antequera and Puertollano.

Stations with connections carrying fewer than 10 passengers a day included Tardienta, in Huesca; of the 10 return trips stopping at this passenger stop, only two managed one passenger a day. Of the other eight, two accounted for a little over 30 passengers over the year combined and six did not even manage 10 passengers in the 12 months. However, this little town in Aragon is not a unique case. Much bigger towns, like Guadalajara (2 routes), Huesca (1), Calatayud (2), Antequera (2), Puertollano (2), Cuenca (1), Utiel-Requena (2) and Puente Genil (2), operate connections with fewer than 10 passengers a year. If we add to these the stations in towns like Ciudad Real and Lleida, we will have identified the towns and cities from which practically all of the 48 AVE routes that we term 'one-person' routes — because they had one, or less than one, passenger a day — are operated. For example, in the whole year, 295 people travelled between Puente Genil and Córdoba, 127 between Guadalajara and Calatayud and 108 between Antequera and Puertollano.

Spain's national rail company, RENFE, has invested EUR 5 billion in its fleet, which includes 195 high-speed trains. Only 86 of these are designed for direct or semi-direct routes between the country's major cities. The other 109 units were acquired for the Alvia and Avant services.

Is the Commission aware of this AVE passenger volume and traffic data? Can the Commission provide us with the data it has?

Does the Commission believe that the excessive sums spent on high-speed rail in Spain adhere to the new TEN-T guidelines and the cost-benefit principle?

Has the Commission received a study on the economic returns of this infrastructure and, in particular, have European funds been involved?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 2013)

1. The Commission has no specific data. The Spanish authorities are not obliged to send this information to the Commission.

2. With regards to the investments in transport infrastructure in Spain, including — but not exclusively — the high-speed network, the Commission stressed, in the framework of 2013 EU Semester that 'The transport infrastructure is abundant but there is scope to make the selection of investment more stringent and prioritise efficient maintenance of existing networks. Setting up an independent observatory, as planned, would help in this respect.' ([2]) When assessing the Spanish high-speed network, however, the European added value arising from integration of the Iberian Peninsula in the TEN-T network through interoperable lines suitable for mix traffic, ought to be considered.

The cost benefit analysis of the high speed train in Spain takes into consideration at least 20-25 years of activity. The traffic data of the year mentioned are indeed unsatisfactory; however the analysis has to be made on a long term basis. Furthermore, the cost benefit analysis has to consider not also the financial returns but also the economic returns to the whole country and the EU.

([1]) http://www.eldiario.es/economia/Renfe-AVE-Tardienta-Puente_Genil_0_121438139.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/csr2013_spain_en.pdf

3. No. 'Ex post' evaluation studies of the economic and financial returns are commissioned by the Commission once the projects are finished. The lag between the end of the works and the 'ex post' evaluation can take 10 years, in order to analyse the long term financial and economic benefits.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012003/13
to the Commission
Glenis Willmott (S&D)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Fructose

Earlier this year, the health claim 'consumption of foods containing fructose leads to a lower blood glucose rise compared to foods containing sucrose or glucose' was authorised. As a diet with high levels of fructose has been linked to obesity, and fructose is metabolised in a way that can cause health problems in the long term, it is important that this health claim does not encourage people to consume unhealthy amounts of fructose.

Will the Commission be monitoring the consumption of fructose across Europe and how this is affected by the newly authorised health claim? Will it consider revoking the authorisation of the health claim if there is evidence that it is leading to unhealthy levels of consumption of fructose? When authorising health claims in the future, will the Commission take into account the long-term health effects of increased consumption of a certain nutrient?

Question for written answer E-012473/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(5 November 2013)

Subject: Acceptance of fructose

The European Food Safety Authority recently decided to allow a health claim for fructose, on the grounds that it has a lower glycaemic index than sucrose or glucose. On the basis of this advice, the EU has ruled that food and drink manufacturers may claim that their sweetened products are healthier if they replace more than 30% of the glucose and sucrose in the product with fructose.

Nevertheless, health experts have warned that this could potentially increase obesity levels across the EU. Is the Commission aware of the objections raised by the health sector? If so, what plans does it have to ensure that people are adequately warned of the dangers of excessive consumption of products containing fructose?

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 2013)

The authorised claim on fructose may only be made on foods where glucose and /or sucrose have been replaced by fructose in sugar-sweetened foods or drinks; it targets people who are already consumers of sugar sweetened foods or drinks and are concerned about their blood glucose levels.

The claim was authorised on the basis of a favourable assessment carried out by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). During the meeting of the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health that gave a favourable opinion to the Commission's draft Regulation authorising the aforementioned claim, on the request of some Member States it was agreed that particular attention will be paid by the Commission to the evolution of fructose intakes following the authorisation of the claim in the report on the application of Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 ([1]). The Commission may consider whether EFSA should be requested to provide further scientific advice in relation to the use of the claim, taking into account the evolution of scientific knowledge on fructose and the evolution of its consumption in the EU.

([1]) OJ L 404, 30.12.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012004/13
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: United Kingdom's implementation of the Birds Directive

Is the Commission satisfied that the UK is meeting the requirements of the Birds Directive with regard to the designation of Special Protection Areas intended to conserve the marine habitats of seabirds, and with regard to the acquisition of data for seabirds at sea as required by Article 10?

The Birds Directive is one of the oldest EU measures intended to protect habitats and the biodiversity of species. If the Commission is not wholly satisfied that the UK is in compliance more than 30 years after the date set, what steps is it taking to ensure that respect is paid to the provisions of the directive?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

The Commission is in contact with the UK authorities on the question of the insufficient designation of marine Special Protection Areas (SPAs) under the Birds Directive ([1]) and the underlying question of data-needs. The issue has been discussed a number of times with the UK authorities. The Commission has raised concerns that the data collection efforts and designation process need to be speeded up and is considering what further steps to take.

([1]) Council Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the conservation of wild birds, codifying Directive 79/409/EEC; OJ L 020, 26.1.2010.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-012005/13
do Komisji
Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)
(21 października 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Dostępność niebezpiecznych substancji odchudzających na rynku Unii Europejskiej

W ostatnim czasie w mediach pojawiły się niepokojące doniesienia na temat osób, które poniosły śmierć ze względu na spożycie substancji odchudzających. Większość tych substancji jest nielegalna i pochodzi z nieznanych źródeł. Zdając sobie sprawę z faktu, iż wśród młodych osób modne stało się zrzucanie wagi za wszelką cenę, chciałbym zwrócić uwagę na leki i substancje, które mimo całej gamy skutków ubocznych jednak trafiają do konsumentów. Zaliczamy do nich między innymi:

— kapsułki z larwami tasiemca;

— dinitrophenol;

— sibutramina;

— rimonabant.

Nie są to zapewne wszystkie tego typu substancje, jednak to te są najczęściej wymieniane w kontekście niebezpieczeństwa dla człowieka. Odnalezienie ofert leków, które w swym składzie zawierają wymienione elementy, nie przysparza większych trudności. Zdając sobie sprawę, że działania służb odpowiedzialnych za ochronę zdrowia i bezpieczeństwo obywateli są niewystarczające, chciałbym zadać Komisji następujące pytania:

1. Czy w obecnej chwili istnieje jednolity wykaz substancji odchudzających, szkodliwych dla ludzi obejmujący całą Unię Europejską?

2. W jaki sposób Komisja chciałaby rozwiązać problem dostępności szkodliwych środków?

3. Czy Komisja posiada dane na temat wielkości szarej strefy, która trudni się produkcją i sprzedażą substancji odchudzających?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(20 grudnia 2013 r.)

Produkty lecznicze mogą być wprowadzane do obrotu w UE wyłącznie po uzyskaniu pozwolenia na dopuszczenie do obrotu wydanego zgodnie z prawodawstwem farmaceutycznym ([1]) przez właściwy organ państwa członkowskiego w odniesieniu do jego terytorium lub przez Komisję w odniesieniu do całej UE. W obu tych przypadkach pozwolenie na dopuszczenie do obrotu produktu leczniczego udzielane jest wyłącznie po uprzedniej ocenie jakości, bezpieczeństwa stosowania i skuteczności tego produktu oraz po stwierdzeniu pozytywnego stosunku korzyści do ryzyka związanego z jego stosowaniem.

Wspólnotowy rejestr produktów leczniczych dopuszczonych przez Komisję jest dostępny na stronie internetowej Dyrekcji Generalnej ds. Zdrowia i Konsumentów (DG SANCO) ([2]). Rejestr ten zawiera aktualne pozwolenia na dopuszczenie do obrotu, w tym pozwolenia wydane dla produktów stosowanych w leczeniu otyłości (substancja czynna: orlistat), wycofane pozwolenia (rimonabant, 2009 r.) oraz decyzje wydane w ramach ogólnounijnych procedur wyjaśniających (zawieszenie pozwolenia dla sybutraminy, 2010 r.). Przegląd produktów leczniczych dopuszczonych przez państwa członkowskie jest dostępny na stronie internetowej szefów agencji ds. leków (UE) ([3]). Dodatkowych informacji o produktach dopuszczonych do obrotu w drodze procedury krajowej udzielają właściwe organy państw członkowskich.

([1]) Rozporządzenie (WE) nr 726/2004 ustanawiające wspólnotowe procedury wydawania pozwoleń dla produktów leczniczych stosowanych u ludzi i do celów weterynaryjnych i nadzoru nad nimi oraz ustanawiające Europejską Agencję Leków, Dz.U. L 136 z 30.4.2004 z późn. zm. oraz dyrektywa 2001/83/WE w sprawie wspólnotowego kodeksu odnoszącego się do produktów leczniczych stosowanych u ludzi, Dz.U. L 311 z 28.11.2001 z późn. zm.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/alfregister.htm

([3]) http://mri.medagencies.org/Human/

Komisja nie posiada szczegółowych informacji na temat skali nielegalnej produkcji i sprzedaży substancji odchudzających. W kwietniu i czerwcu tego roku służby celne Zjednoczonego Królestwa przechwyciły nielegalne leki odchudzające. W czerwcowej akcji przechwycono ponad 3,7 mln dawek niedozwolonych leków, w tym leków odchudzających, o wartości około 14,5 mln EUR.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012005/13
to the Commission
Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Access to hazardous weight-loss substances on the EU market

There have recently been disturbing media reports about people dying after taking weight-loss products. Most such substances are illegal and originate from unknown sources. Given that it has become fashionable among young people to lose weight whatever the cost, I would like to draw attention to medicinal products and substances which, in spite of their many side effects, are nevertheless available to consumers. They include the following:

— capsules made from tapeworm larvae;

— dinitrophenol;

— sibutramine;

— rimonabant.

This is not a comprehensive list of all such substances, but these are the most frequently mentioned in terms of their danger to human health. It is not difficult to obtain medicinal products which contain the abovementioned substances. Given that not enough action is taken by the agencies responsible for protecting people's health and safety, I would like to ask the Commission the following:

1. Is there currently an EU-wide register of harmful weight-loss substances?

2. How does the Commission intend to tackle the problem of the availability of harmful substances?

3. Does the Commission have any information on the extent of the illegal production and sale of weight-loss substances?

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

A medicinal product can be placed on the EU 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 Commission for the entire EU. In both cases a marketing authorisation is granted to a medicinal product only after its quality, safety and efficacy have been evaluated and a positive benefit-risk balance related to its use has been concluded.

The Community register of medicinal products authorised by the Commission is available on the website of the Health and Consumers Directorate General (DG SANCO) ([2]) and contains valid marketing authorisations, including those for treatment of obesity (the active substance orlistat), withdrawn authorisations (rimonabant, 2009) as well as decisions in EU-wide referral procedures (suspension of authorisation of sibutramine, 2010). An overview of medicinal products authorised by the Member States is available on the website of the Heads of Medicines Agencies (EU) ([3]). Additional information about nationally authorised products is provided by the competent authorities of the Member States.

The Commission does not have detailed information on the extent of the illegal production and sale of weight-loss substances. This year illegal weight-loss medicines were seized by UK borders controls in April and June. The June crackdown resulted in the seizure of over 3.7 million doses of unlicensed medicines, including for slimming, worth approximately EUR 14.5 million.

([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]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/alfregister.htm
([3]) http://mri.medagencies.org/Human/

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-012006/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Eleni Theocharous (PPE)
(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Εκδρομή μαθητών στην κατεχόμενη Κύπρο

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Σχολείο στις Βρυξέλλες, το οποίο χρηματοδοτείται για τη λειτουργία του και από την ΕΕ, δηλαδή και από την Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία που είναι κράτος μέλος της, διοργανώνει εκδρομές για τους μαθητές του στην κατεχόμενη Κύπρο, η οποία συνιστά κατεχόμενο ευρωπαϊκό έδαφος (διαθέτουμε όλα τα έγγραφα). Οι εκδρομές διοργανώνονται μέσω Τουρκίας και του παράνομου αεροδρομίου της Τύμπου και οι μαθητές καλούνται να μην μεταβαίνουν από την «τουρκική Κύπρο» — όπως η οδηγία του σχολείου αποκαλεί τα κατεχόμενα — στις ελεύθερες περιοχές της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας.

Θα επέμβει η Επιτροπή για να αποτραπεί η διοργάνωση εκδρομών από ένα εκπαιδευτικό ίδρυμα που λειτουργεί και με δικούς της πόρους και το οποίο, αντί να προάγει τη νομιμότητα και το σεβασμό στην ευρωπαϊκή και διεθνή έννομη τάξη, γίνεται συνεργό στην παρανομία και στην προσβολή της εδαφικής ακεραιότητας της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας και των πολιτών της και, ειδικότερα, των προσφύγων;

Αυτά μαθαίνουν στο Ευρωπαϊκό Σχολείο στους νέους μας;

Τους μαθαίνουν να συνδράμουν την παρανομία και να επικροτούν την κατοχή ή ακόμη και να διαμένουν, καθόλου παράξενο, σε κλεμμένες περιουσίες Ελληνοκυπρίων προσφύγων;

Απάντηση του κ. Šefčovič εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Έχει ήδη ληφθεί υπόψη από την Επιτροπή το θέμα που έθεσε η κυρία βουλευτής. Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει πολύ καλά τον ευαίσθητο χαρακτήρα του θέματος. Με βάση τις πληροφορίες που έλαβε, η σχολική εκδρομή έχει έκτοτε καταργηθεί.

Τα ευρωπαϊκά σχολεία είναι επίσημα εκπαιδευτικά ιδρύματα που ελέγχονται από κοινού από τις κυβερνήσεις των κρατών μελών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012006/13
to the Commission
Eleni Theocharous (PPE)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: School trips to occupied Cyprus

Despite the fact that the Republic of Cyprus, a Member State, contributes to its EU funding, the European School in Brussels, in cooperation with the Turkish authorities, is organising school trips to what is fully documented as occupied European territory in Cyprus, using the illegal airport of Tymbou. Pupils are also being instructed not to cross from what the school authorities refer to as 'Turkish Cyprus' into the free territory of the Republic of Cyprus.

Will the Commission take action to prevent the organisation of such excursions by an EU-funded educational institution which, instead of encouraging compliance with European and international law, is becoming an accessory after the fact to infringements of the territorial sovereignty of the Republic of Cyprus and its people, in particular those forced to flee from the occupied territory?

Is this what the European School is teaching our young people today?

Is it teaching them to aid and abet illegal activity, condone acts of occupation and unquestioningly accept accommodation in properties stolen from Greek Cypriot refugees?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(25 November 2013)

The Commission's attention has already been brought to the issue raised by the Honourable Member. The Commission is well aware of the sensitive nature of this issue. Based on the information received, the school trip has since been cancelled.

The European Schools are official educational establishments controlled jointly by the governments of the Member States of the European Union.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-012010/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(21 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Elecciones al Consejo Agrario en España

El Ministro de Agricultura del Gobierno de España, Miguel Ángel Arias Cañete, ha anunciado su intención de celebrar unas nuevas elecciones al Consejo Agrario durante el primer semestre de 2014. Estas elecciones se producen a 35 años de las últimas elecciones celebradas entre los representantes del sector. El reglamento propuesto favorece la participación de los grandes agricultores dejando a las organizaciones de pequeños agricultores en clara desventaja.

Según han denunciado COAG, UPA y Unión de Uniones, tres de las principales organizaciones agrarias del país, dicha reglamentación de las elecciones favorece a ASAJA, organización de agricultores afín a los principios del partido en el Gobierno. La propuesta de reglamento para las elecciones supone un censo electoral cuya elaboración podría beneficiar la participación de grandes agricultores; dicho censo, además de incluir a las 265 000 personas afiliadas a la seguridad social como agricultores, incluiría a aquellos perceptores de ayudas agrarias por un valor superior a los 3 000 euros anuales, unos 397 000 agricultores, dejando a otros 590 000 fuera del proceso electoral que perciben cantidades menores. Muchos de estos son pequeños agricultores que no llegan a percibir grandes cuantías en ayudas y por tanto quedan fuera del proceso, además abre la puerta a que puedan votar personas cuyas rentas agrarias supongan al menos el 25 % de sus rentas totales. Además de toda la problemática relacionada con la elaboración del censo electoral, varias asociaciones agrarias han denunciado el problema y el sesgo que puede imprimir a dicho proceso electoral el hecho de que solo se pueda votar en las capitales de provincia y en un periodo máximo de 15 días. La distribución de los agricultores a lo largo de la geografía del país supone importantes dificultades, además de unos costes en los que los agricultores deben incurrir, suponiendo otra barrera de entrada para la participación de los pequeños agricultores y aquellos que habitan en sus fincas. Existiendo una estructura nacional de oficinas agrarias que podría permitir el voto en muchas localidades sin un excesivo coste, esta condición supone otra piedra puesta en el camino para que participen cierto tipo de agricultores.

¿Conoce la Comisión el reglamento para las elecciones presentado por el Gobierno de España? ¿Considera que el censo planteado y el reglamento facilitan la participación de todos los agricultores por igual sin imprimir un sesgo hacia cierto tipo? Comparando con otras elecciones agrarias en otros Estados miembros, ¿considera el censo y el reglamento planteado la mejor opción? ¿Podría citar ejemplos de buenas prácticas en las elecciones agrarias en los otros Estados miembros?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

La Comisión no es competente en materia de elecciones al Consejo Agrario en España o en cualquier otro Estado miembro. Es ese un asunto de índole puramente nacional.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012010/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Elections to the Agriculture Council in Spain

The Spanish Minister for Agriculture, Miguel Ángel Arias Cañete, has announced his intention to hold new elections to the Agriculture Council in the first half of 2014. These elections come 35 years after the last elections held among representatives in the sector. The proposed rules favour the participation of large-scale farmers, putting small-scale farming organisations at a clear disadvantage.

According to the Coordinating Committee of Farmer and Livestock Breeder Organisations (COAG), the Small-Scale Farmers' Union (UPA) and the Union of Unions, three of the main agricultural organisations in Spain, these election rules favour the Young Farmers' Agricultural Association (ASAJA), the farmers' organisation aligned with the ruling party. The proposed election rules involve an electoral census, which could, in practice, favour participation by large-scale farmers. The census, as well as including 265 000 people registered with the social security scheme as farmers, will include those who receive more than EUR 3 000 in agricultural aid annually, some 397 000 farmers, excluding from the electoral process another 590 000 who receive less. Many of those are small-scale farmers who do not receive large amounts of aid and are therefore left out of the process, and it paves the way for people whose agricultural income accounts for at least 25% of their total income to vote. On top of the problem concerning the electoral census, several agricultural associations have raised the fact that voting can only take place in provincial capitals, and for a maximum of 15 days, as a problem that might skew this electoral process. The fact that farmers are spread right across Spain creates major difficulties, as well as the costs that farmers have to incur, creating another barrier to participation by small-scale farmers and those who live on their farms. As there is a national network of agricultural offices that could make it possible to vote in many places inexpensively, this condition creates another obstacle to participation by certain farmers.

Is the Commission aware of the rules for the elections proposed by the Spanish Government? Does it think that the planned census and the rules facilitate participation by all farmers equally, without creating a bias towards a particular category of farmers? Compared with other agricultural elections in other Member States, does the Commission think the census and the planned rules are the best option? Could it give examples of good practices in agricultural elections in other Member States?

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

The Commission has no competence as regards the elections to the Agriculture Council in Spain or in any other Member State. This is purely a national matter.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012013/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Διαφορές στις τιμές υγρών καυσίμων μεταξύ των κρατών μελών της ΕΕ

Σύμφωνα με τα επίσημα στατιστικά στοιχεία που δημοσιεύονται στον δικτυακό τόπο της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής για την ενέργεια ([1]), οι τιμές των υγρών καυσίμων διαφέρουν σε πολύ μεγάλο βαθμό μεταξύ των κρατών μελών της Ένωσης. Οι διαφορές αυτές οφείλονται εν μέρει στις διαφορές στο επίπεδο φορολογίας μεταξύ των κρατών μελών. Παρατηρούνται όμως και τεράστιες διαφοροποιήσεις στο ποσοστό κέρδους (margin) που καρπούνται οι διάφορες επιχειρήσεις που εμπλέκονται στα ενδιάμεσα στάδια της διαδικασίας, από την αγορά της πρώτης ύλης (crude oil) μέχρι τη διάθεση του τελικού προϊόντος στην αγορά. Συγκεκριμένα, το ποσοστό κέρδους (margin), για την αμόλυβδη βενζίνη 95 οκτανίων, ποικίλει από 0,107 ευρώ το λίτρο στην Κροατία και 0,137 ευρώ το λίτρο στο Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο μέχρι 0,285 ευρώ το λίτρο στην Κύπρο και 0,286 ευρώ το λίτρο στην Πορτογαλία. Παρόμοιες διαφορές παρατηρούνται και σε διάφορα άλλα είδη υγρών καυσίμων. Εκ πρώτης όψεως τέτοιου μεγέθους διαφορές δεν δικαιολογούνται σε μια υποτιθέμενη ενιαία αγορά και μάλιστα για ομοιογενή προϊόντα όπως είναι τα καύσιμα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι σε γνώση της οι ανωτέρω διαφορές και παρακολουθεί στενά την εξέλιξη των τιμών των καυσίμων στα κράτη μέλη;

2. Πού κατά την άποψη της οφείλονται οι μεγάλες αυτές διαφορές και δικαιολογούνται με βάση πραγματικά στοιχεία κόστους;

3. Διαπιστώνει η Επιτροπή αισχροκέρδεια, ανεπαρκή λειτουργία της αγοράς ή εκμετάλλευση δεσπόζουσας θέσης σε χώρες όπως η Κύπρος και η Πορτογαλία, όπου το περιθώριο κέρδους (margin) στη διαδικασία διάθεσης των καυσίμων εμφανίζεται εξαιρετικά υψηλό;

4. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει ώστε να υπάρξει σύγκλιση τιμών μεταξύ των κρατών μελών σε μια κατηγορία βασικών για τους πολίτες προϊόντων όπως είναι τα καύσιμα;

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(11 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή έχει επίγνωση των διαφορών που υφίστανται μεταξύ των κρατών μελών όσον αφορά τα ακαθάριστα περιθώρια λιανικής πώλησης των διάφορων καυσίμων. Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί τακτικά τις εξελίξεις των τιμών καυσίμων, κυρίως μέσω του Παρατηρητηρίου Ενεργειακών Αγορών το οποίο παρουσιάζει σε εβδομαδιαία βάση τις τιμές καταναλωτή και τις καθαρές τιμές (άνευ τελών και φόρων) των προϊόντων πετρελαίου στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ ([2]).

Όπως τονίζεται στη μελέτη που διεξήγαγε η εταιρεία Pöyry το 2009 ([3]), οι διαφορές που υφίστανται μεταξύ των κρατών μελών όσον αφορά τα ακαθάριστα περιθώρια λιανικής πώλησης είναι αποτέλεσμα διάφορων παραγόντων όπως οι δομές των αγορών διύλισης και λιανικής πώλησης και οι πρακτικές εμπορίας. Βέβαια, η διαχρονική εξέλιξη των παραγόντων αυτών είναι δυνατόν να διαφέρει από το ένα κράτος μέλος στο άλλο, γεγονός το οποίο ενδέχεται να οξύνει τις διαφορές.

Η Επιτροπή δεν παύει να επαγρυπνεί όσον αφορά τυχόν αντιανταγωνιστική συμπεριφορά στην ΕΕ. Εφόσον απαιτείται, η Επιτροπή δεν θα διστάσει να λάβει μέτρα είτε η ίδια είτε σε συνεργασία με τις εθνικές αρχές ανταγωνισμού, εάν λάβει επαρκείς πληροφορίες που δείχνουν την ύπαρξη σύμπραξης μεταξύ επιχειρήσεων ή καταχρηστικής συμπεριφοράς από μέρους μεμονωμένων εταιρειών.

Επιπλέον, η Επιτροπή έχει προτείνει αναθεώρηση της «οδηγίας για τη φορολόγηση της ενέργειας» ([4]) η οποία προσανατολίζεται προς πιο ομοιογενείς συντελεστές ΦΠΑ και έμμεσων φόρων, ιδίως των ειδικών φόρων κατανάλωσης, και η οποία θα μπορούσε να οδηγήσει σε μεγαλύτερη σύγκλιση στις τιμές καυσίμων εντός της ΕΕ.

([1]) http://www.energy.eu/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/observatory/oil/bulletin_en.htm
([3]) Διατίθεται στον δικτυακό τόπο: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/oil/studies/doc/2009_oil_market_survey.pdf
([4]) Πρόταση οδηγίας του Συμβουλίου για την τροποποίηση της οδηγίας 2003/96/ΕΚ σχετικά με την αναδιάρθρωση του κοινοτικού πλαισίου φορολογίας των ενεργειακών προϊόντων και της ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012013/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Differences in fuel prices between EU Member States

According to official statistical data on energy published on the Commission website ([1]), fuel prices differ to a considerable degree between Member States of the Union. These differences are due in part to the different taxation levels in Member States. However, huge differences have also been noted in the profits (margin) reaped by the various firms involved in the intermediate stages of the procedure, from the purchase of the raw material (crude oil) up to the placing of the final product on the market. Specifically, the profits (margin) for 95 octane unleaded petrol varies from EUR 0.107 per litre in Croatia and EUR 0.137 per litre in the UK, up to EUR 0.285 per litre in Cyprus and EUR 0.286 per litre in Portugal. Similar differences are also seen for other types of fuel. At first sight, such large differences cannot be justified in a supposedly single market, particularly for homogenous products such as fuels.

1. Is the Commission aware of the above differences, and does it monitor fuel price developments in Member States closely?

2. What is the reason, in its view, for these large differences, and can they be justified on the basis of real cost data?

3. Does the Commission see profiteering, inadequate functioning of the market or abuse of a dominant position in countries such as Cyprus and Portugal, where the profits (margin) in the process of bringing fuels to the market appear to be extremely high?

4. What does it intend to do to ensure convergence of prices between Member States in the category of products that are fundamental to citizens, such as fuels?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

The Commission is aware of the differences between Member States in the gross retail margins (GRM) of different fuels. It regularly monitors fuel price developments notably via the Market Observatory for Energy Oil, which presents consumer prices and net prices (excluding duties and taxes) of petroleum products in the EU Member States each week ([2]).

As highlighted in the 2009 Pöyry study ([3]), differences between Member States in the GRM can be the result of various factors such as the refining and retail market structures and the marketing practices. The evolution in time of these factors can of course be different from one Member State to another, which can possibly amplify the differences.

The Commission remains vigilant in relation to possible anti-competitive behaviour in the EU. If required, it will not hesitate to act, either itself or in coordination with national competition authorities, if it receives sufficient information pointing to collusive behaviour of undertakings or abusive behaviour of individual companies.

Additionally, the Commission has proposed a revised 'Energy Taxation Directive' ([4]) which goes in the direction of more homogeneous VAT and indirect tax rates, in particular excise duties, and which could result in a better convergence of fuel prices in the EU.

([1]) http://www.energy.eu/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/observatory/oil/bulletin_en.htm
([3]) Available at : http://ec.europa.eu/energy/oil/studies/doc/2009_oil_market_survey.pdf
([4]) Proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 2003/96/EC restructuring the Community framework for the taxation of energy products and electricity.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-012016/13
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(22 octobre 2013)

Objet: Programme Galileo

La presse française vient de se faire l'écho d'un nouveau retard dans l'avancée du programme européen de radionavigation par satellites, Galileo. Elle fait ainsi état de difficultés touchant à la fabrication des satellites de la constellation par l'entreprise OHB choisie en 2011 par la Commission européenne.

La Commission confirme-t-elle l'existence de telles difficultés? Peut-elle préciser, de manière claire et transparente, de quelle nature sont les problèmes rencontrés? Un audit a-t-il été effectué sur cette situation, audit qui mentionnerait de nombreuses erreurs en termes de choix de technologies?

La Commission peut-elle en outre confirmer qu'il a été fait appel aux sociétés Thales Alenia Space et EADS Astrium pour venir en aide au fabricant désigné?

Quel impact auront ces dysfonctionnements sur les délais de livraison de l'ensemble des satellites de la constellation et sur la mise en service de Galileo? Y aura-t-il en outre des conséquences financières?

Enfin, la Commission estime-t-elle sa responsabilité engagée, vu que lorsqu'elle a choisi en 2011 la société OHB, des voix se sont fait entendre? Compte tenu de la technicité du projet, pourquoi se passe-t-on du savoir-faire des champions européens de l'industrie spatiale que sont EADS Astrium et Thales Alenia Space?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(4 décembre 2013)

Un certain nombre de défauts de conformité aux spécifications, relevés durant la phase d'essais, retardent la livraison des satellites Galileo par la société OHB. Cela n'est pas inhabituel dans l'industrie spatiale. La durée des essais a été étendue afin de résoudre les problèmes constatés.

L'Agence spatiale européenne (ASE) est en train de mener un audit visant à déterminer pourquoi les retards imputables à OHB n'ont pas été anticipés et détectés à temps par l'équipe de gestion du projet de l'ASE.

Les choix technologiques et de conception de Galileo sont robustes et adéquats. Les essais effectués sur les quatre satellites déjà déployés ont permis de faire la démonstration de l'excellente précision de positionnement.

La Commission n'a pas fait appel à Thales Alenia Space et à EADS Astrium pour que ces sociétés viennent en aide à OHB. En revanche, elle a exhorté l'ASE et OHB à prendre les mesures d'atténuation qui s'imposent et à assumer leurs responsabilités respectives.

La prolongation de la période d'essais remet en cause le calendrier de livraison des satelllites de l'OHB. L'ASE soumettra à la Commission un calendrier de lancement révisé dès que le test clé qu'est l'essai thermique sous vide sera achevé. Aucun lancement de satellites Galileo n'aura lieu en 2013. La Commission a invité l'ASE à prendre toutes les mesures appropriées pour garantir la fourniture des services initiaux d'ici à la fin de l'année 2014 ou au début de l'année 2015.

La Commission ne demandera pas de budget supplémentaire. Le contrat forfaitaire conclu avec la société OHB prévoit en effet que le risque de performance est supporté par le contractant. OHB assumera donc les conséquences du retard. Des pénalités pour retard de livraison seront imposées par la Commission conformément aux dispositions contractuelles.

La Commission a attribué le marché à OHB à l'issue d'une mise en concurrence parfaitement conforme aux règles en vigueur dans l'UE. La décision d'attribution était fondée sur les recommandations de l'ASE, selon lesquelles l'offre d'OHB était économiquement la plus avantageuse.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012016/13
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Galileo programme

The French press has reported recently a further delay in progress on the European satellite navigation programme Galileo. The report spoke of problems the firm OHB is having with the manufacture of the constellation satellites. OHB was awarded the contract by the Commission in 2011.

Can the Commission confirm that problems have been encountered? Can it state clearly and openly, what these problems are? Has the situation been audited and will the audit mention the numerous mistakes made in terms of the technology chosen?

Can the Commission confirm too that it has asked Thales Alenia Space and EADS Astrium to come to the aid of the appointed manufacturer?

What impact will these problems have on the delivery schedule for all the satellites in the constellation and on Galileo becoming operational? Will this have financial repercussions as well?

Finally, does the Commission consider itself responsible in any way, in view of the objections raised when it awarded the contract to OHB in 2011? Considering the technical nature of this project, why are we not drawing on the know-how of EADS Astrium and Thales Alenia Space, the European leaders in the space industry?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(4 December 2013)

A number of non-compliances with the specifications identified during testing are delaying the delivery of Galileo satellites by the firm OHB. This is not unusual for space industrial activities. The test duration has been extended to resolve the problems.

The European Space Agency (ESA) is conducting an audit to assess why OHB delays were not anticipated and detected in time by ESA project management.

The Galileo design and technological choices are robust and adequate. Tests carried out on the four satellites already deployed have demonstrated an excellent positioning precision.

The Commission has not requested Thales Alenia Space or EADS Astrium to aid OHB. Instead, the Commission has urged ESA and OHB to take the mitigation measures and assume their respective responsibilities.

The prolongation of tests impacts the delivery schedule for the OHB satellites. ESA will submit to the Commission a revised launch schedule on completion of the key thermal vacuum test. No launch of Galileo satellites will take place in 2013. The Commission has requested ESA to take all appropriate measures to guarantee the provision of early services by the end of 2014, beginning of 2015.

The Commission will not require supplementary budget. Under the firm and fixed price contract concluded with OHB the risk of performance is borne by the contractor. OHB will assume the consequences of the delay. Penalties for the late delivery will be claimed by the Commission in accordance with contractual provisions.

The Commission awarded the contract to OHB as result of a competitive procurement carried out in full compliance with the EU rules. The award decision was based on the ESA recommendations that the OHB tender represented best value for money.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012018/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(22. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Der große Energiebericht

Die Medien berichten, dass der große Energiebericht der Europäischen Kommission Gefahr läuft, „beschönigt" zu werden. Zwei Entwürfe, ein vorläufiger sowie der endgültige Entwurf, wurden dankenswerterweise gleich zur Verfügung gestellt.

Das zuständige Kommissionsmitglied Oettinger wird um eine umfassende Stellungnahme zu den folgenden Punkten gebeten:

1. Inwiefern liegen die Mediendarstellungen richtig, wenn dort geschrieben wird, dass die vorliegenden Zahlen eindeutig darauf hinweisen, dass Kohle-, Gas- und Atomkraftwerke tatsächlich mehr Geld erhalten als Träger erneuerbarer Energien?

2. Warum wurden entsprechende Zahlen aus dem endgültigen Entwurf gestrichen?

3. Inwiefern ist der Vorwurf zutreffend, dass die Beamten von Kommissionsmitglied Oettinger „einige Zahlen streichen müssen", weil sein „Argument für eine Änderung der Vergabepraxis in sich zusammenfallen" würde?

4. Wie bewertet die Kommission insgesamt die sogenannte „Beschönigung" dieses Berichts?

5. Warum wurden diese Zahlen im Nachhinein als „nicht gesichert" bezeichnet? Welche Argumente stützen diese Behauptung der Sprecherin von Kommissionsmitglied Oettinger gegenüber den Medien?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(11. Dezember 2013)

Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage P-011809/2013 von Herrn Leinen, in der auch in vollem Umfang auf die Frage eingegangen wird, die von den Abgeordneten in den oben genannten Anfragen angesprochen wurde.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-013072/13
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(18 november 2013)

Betreft: Hoeveelheid energiesubsidies per energiebron

Op 5 november 2013 presenteerde de Commissie de communicatie „Delivering the internal electricity market and making the most of public intervention". De juiste toepassing van ondersteuningsmechanismen is inderdaad cruciaal voor de verdere ontwikkeling van ons energielandschap en het halen van onze energie- en klimaatsdoelstellingen. Dit onderwerp verdient dan ook een uitgebreid debat in al de Europese instellingen. Om dit debat grondig te kunnen voeren moet men echter beschikken over correct, gedetailleerd en recent cijfermateriaal.

Het werkdocument betreffende bovengenoemde communicatie lekte al uit in oktober in de Duitse pers. Dit document bevatte ook passages waarin cijfermateriaal zat opgenomen over de hoeveelheid steun die de verschillende energiebronnen (hernieuwbare, fossiele en nucleaire energie) konden ontvangen in 2011. Deze passages, die te vinden waren op pagina 2 van het werkdocument, werden echter geschrapt en zijn ook niet opgenomen in de definitieve versie van de communicatie.

Kan de Commissie:

1. aangeven waarom deze cijfers geschrapt werden en niet werden opgenomen in de definitieve versie van de communicatie?

2. gedetailleerde cijfers verstrekken over welke soort en welke hoeveelheid steun elke energiecategorie ontvangen heeft, inclusief indirecte ondersteuning en steun inzake onderzoek en ontwikkeling?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(11 december 2013)

De Commissie wil het geachte Parlementslid verwijzen naar haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag P-011809/2013 van de heer Jo Leinen, waarin bovenstaande vragen van de geachte Parlementsleden ook volledig worden beantwoord.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012018/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: The big energy report

The media are reporting that there is a risk of the Commission's big energy report being 'glossed over'. Thankfully, two drafts, a preliminary one and the final draft, were both made available.

I would ask the competent Commissioner, Mr Oettinger, to provide a detailed statement on the following points:

1. To what extent are the media reports correct in stating that the available figures clearly indicate that coal-fired, gas and nuclear power plants actually receive more money than renewable energy sources?

2. Why were the corresponding figures deleted from the final draft?

3. To what extent is the accusation that Commissioner Oettinger's officials had to 'delete a few figures' because his 'argument for changing the way subsidies are granted would collapse' correct?

4. What is the Commission's overall view of the so-called 'glossing over' of this report?

5. Why were these figures subsequently described as 'unreliable'? What are the arguments to support this claim made to the media by the spokeswoman for Commissioner Oettinger?

Question for written answer P-013072/13
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(18 November 2013)

Subject: Amount of energy subsidies per energy source

On 5 November 2013, the Commission presented the communication 'Delivering the internal electricity market and making the most of public intervention'. The correct use of support instruments is indeed crucial for the further development of our energy landscape and the attainment of our energy and climate targets. This subject therefore ought to be debated in detail within all the European institutions. To enable this debate to be conducted thoroughly, however, correct, detailed and recent statistics are needed.

The working document concerning the above communication was already leaked to the German press in October. This document also contained passages which included statistics on the amount of support given to the various energy sources (renewables, fossil fuels and nuclear power) in 2011. However, these passages, which appeared on page 2 of the working document, were deleted and do not appear in the final version of the communication either.

1. Can the Commission indicate why these figures were deleted and were not included in the final version of the communication?

2. Can the Commission provide detailed figures showing what type of support, and how much, was received by each category of energy, including indirect support and support for research and development?

Joint answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written question P-011809/2013 by Mr Jo Leinen, which also fully addresses the question raised by the Honourable Members in the questions above.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012019/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(22. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Die angeblich „nicht gesicherten" Zahlen des Energieberichts

Die — aus bisher nicht nachvollziehbaren Gründen — gestrichenen Zahlen im vorläufigen Entwurf der Europäischen Kommission zeichnen ein fragwürdiges Bild über die Förderung von Energieformen im Jahre 2011. 26 Mrd. EUR wurden für fossile Kraftwerke, 35 Milliarden (laut Medienbericht) EUR für nukleare Anlagen und für indirekte Förderungen von Energie aus Kohle und Gas rund 40 Mrd. EUR von den Mitgliedsländern ausgegeben. „Lediglich" 30 Mrd. EUR an Fördergeldern gehen an erneuerbare Energieträger (renewable energy ressources).

1. Warum erhalten die erneuerbaren Energieträger im Vergleich zum herkömmlichen Energiesektor verhältnismäßig wenig Förderungen — gerade angesichts der notwendigen Energiewende?

2. Wie lässt sich angesichts dieser Zahlen die in Medienartikeln zitierte Aussage von Kommissionsmitglied Oettinger untermauern, erneuerbare Energien würden zu hoch gefördert?

3. Wie gedenkt die Kommission, in Zukunft die Vergabe von Fördergeldern zu regeln?

4. Sollte sich die Vergabe der Fördergelder weiter schwerpunktmäßig auf herkömmliche Energieträger konzentrieren, wie rechtfertigt die Kommission dies?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(29. November 2013)

Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage P-11809/2013 ([1]).

Die Kommission hat ihre Vorstellungen zu staatlichen Interventionen im Elektrizitätssektor in ihrer Mitteilung vom 5. November 2013 ([2]) dargelegt. Öffentliche Interventionen müssen gut konzipiert und verhältnismäßig sein, damit sie optimal genutzt werden können, die Energiepreise erschwinglich bleiben und das Funktionieren des Binnenmarktes nicht beeinträchtigt wird. Diese Grundsätze gelten für alle Technologien.

In einigen Mitgliedstaaten, z. B. Deutschland, gibt es Anhaltspunkte dafür, dass erneuerbare Energien in einer Höhe gefördert wurden, die die Erzeugungskosten überstieg. Die Kommission rät zwar von rückwirkenden Kürzungen ab, dennoch vertritt sie die Auffassung, dass die kostenorientierte Förderung erneuerbarer Energien für langfristige stabile Investitionsbedingungen im Hinblick auf erneuerbare Energien wichtig ist.

Wenn die Gewährung von Subventionen staatliche Beihilfen involviert, gelten hierfür die Regelungen des Vertrags und die einschlägige Rechtsprechung. Liegt keine staatliche Beihilfe vor, können Subventionen dennoch unter die für gemeinwirtschaftliche Verpflichtungen geltenden Regelungen der Elektrizitätsrichtlinie ([3]) fallen. In der oben genannten Mitteilung beschreibt die Kommission, welche Grundsätze und Kriterien sie bei der Überprüfung der diesbezüglichen staatlichen Interventionen zugrunde zu legen beabsichtigt.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Mitteilung der Kommission „Vollendung des Elektrizitätsbinnenmarktes und optimale Nutzung staatlicher Interventionen", C(2013)7243 endg.
([3]) Richtlinie 2009/72/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 13. Juli 2009 über gemeinsame Vorschriften für den Elektrizitätsbinnenmarkt und zur Aufhebung der Richtlinie 2003/54/EG, ABl. L 211 vom 14.8.2009, S. 55-93.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012019/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: The allegedly 'unreliable' figures in the energy report

The — for reasons which are currently unclear — deleted figures in the Commission's preliminary draft paint a dubious picture of the subsidising of energy sources in 2011. The Member States paid out EUR 26 billion for fossil fuel power stations, EUR 35 billion (according to media reports) for nuclear plants and around EUR 40 billion in indirect subsidies for energy from coal and gas. 'Only' EUR 30 billion in subsidies goes to renewable energy resources.

1. Why do renewable energy resources receive relatively little in the way of subsidies compared with the conventional energy sector — particularly in view of the necessary energy turnaround?

2. In light of these figures, what support is there for the statement by Commissioner Oettinger quoted in the media that renewable energies receive too much in the way of subsidies?

3. How does the Commission intend to regulate the granting of subsidies in the future?

4. If the granting of subsidies is to continue to focus on conventional energy sources, how does the Commission justify this?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(29 November 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written question P-11809/2013 ([1]).

The Commission has set out its vision on public interventions in the electricity sector in its communication of 5th November 2013 ([2]). Public intervention must be proportionate and well designed in order to make most of it, to keep energy bills affordable and not to distort the functioning of the internal market. Such principles apply to all technologies.

For some Member States, for example Germany, evidence exists that for some time renewables received support above the costs of production. Whilst advising against retroactive cuts, the Commission considers that cost-reflective support for renewables is important to underpin long-term stable investment conditions for renewables.

If granting of subsidies involves state aid, it is regulated by the Treaty and the relevant state aid jurisprudence. If no state aid is involved, subsidies may still fall under the rules on Public Service Obligations of the Electricty Directive ([3]). In the abovementioned Communication, the Commission sets out which principles and criteria it intends to rely on when reviewing public interventions in this context.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Communication from the Commission 'Delivering the internal electricity market and making the most of public intervention', C(2013) 7243 final.
([3]) Directive 2009/72/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 July 2009 concerning common rules for the internal market in electricity and repealing Directive 2003/54/EC, OJ L 211, 14.8.2009, p. 55-93.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012020/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(22. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Liste von Kommissionsmitglied Oettinger

Infrastruktur im Sinn des Allgemeinwohls ist eine Sache. Die andere ist es, wenn Bürgerinnen und Bürger der Europäischen Union unter Großprojekten leiden. Es ist eine Grundsatzfrage, ob ab einem gewissen Ausmaß noch von „Allgemeinwohl" die Rede sein kann, wenn ganze Landstriche massive Eingriffe in das Landschaftsbild und EinwohnerInnen Auswirkungen von Leitungen fürchten müssen.

1. Viele Bürgerinnen und Bürger sind um ihre Sicherheit und ihre Lebensqualität sehr besorgt, wenn die Europäische Union Energie-Großprojekte im Schnellverfahren umsetzt und die UVP-Richtlinien quasi „umgeworfen" werden. Kann die Kommission ausführlich dazu Stellung nehmen, wie sie den betreffenden Bürgerinnen und Bürgern, von deren Steuergeldern auch die Subventionen für dieselben Projekte bezahlt werden, erklären möchte, warum Großleitungen und Großprojekte mit eingeschränktem UVP-Verfahren durchgesetzt werden sollen?

2. Wie rechtfertigt die Kommission im Einzelfall, dass nicht umweltschonendere und langfristig gesehen weniger invasive Leitungsformen genutzt werden, weil sie teurer sind?

3. Welche Energie-Infrastrukturprojekte in Österreich wurden in diese Liste aufgenommen? Wie gewährleistet die Kommission den Schutz der Bürgerinnen und Bürger bzw. den Erhalt der Lebensqualität in den betroffenen Gebieten?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(4. Dezember 2013)

1. Vorhaben von gemeinsamem Interesse sind Gegenstand einer Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung. Sie durchlaufen jedoch effizientere Genehmigungsverfahren, wobei der hohe Standard der Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung und das hohe Umweltschutzniveau beibehalten werden. Zu diesem Zweck werden mit der Infrastruktur-Verordnung ([1]) eine Reihe von Maßnahmen eingeführt, wie eine verbindliche Gesamthöchstdauer für Genehmigungsverfahren (diese beträgt in der Regel 3,5 Jahre), die Benennung einer zuständigen nationale Behörde für die Koordinierung der Genehmigungsverfahren, ein transparenter und offener Ansatz für die Anhörung der Öffentlichkeit und der betroffenen Kreise sowie die Verpflichtung der Mitgliedstaaten, die Notwendigkeit einer Straffung der Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfungen zu bewerten und die von ihnen für die Straffung als zweckmäßig erachteten relevanten Maßnahmen zu ergreifen. Ein Leitfaden hierzu wurde auf der Website der GD Energie veröffentlicht ([2]).

2. In der Liste der Vorhaben von gemeinsamem Interesse sind die Projekte aufgeführt, die unter energiepolitischen Gesichtspunkten erforderlich sind. Die Vereinbarkeit des jeweiligen Vorhabens mit dem Umweltrecht wird von den nationalen Behörden geprüft, was die öffentliche Beteiligung der betroffenen Akteure voraussetzt.

3. Informationen über die nach Mitgliedstaaten aufgeführten Vorhaben von gemeinsamem Interesse finden Sie auf der Website der GD Energie:
http://ec.europa.eu/energy/infrastructure/pci/doc/2013_pci_projects_country.pdf

Um die Bürgerbeteiligung in einer sehr frühen Phase der Projektplanung sicherzustellen, ist in der Infrastruktur-Verordnung geregelt, dass die Öffentlichkeit frühzeitig vor der Einreichung der vollständigen Unterlagen bei der Genehmigungsbehörde durch den Projektträger angehört werden muss. Stellt sich heraus, dass ein Projekt, das auf der Unionsliste der Vorhaben von gemeinsamem Interesse steht, mit dem EU-Recht nicht in Einklang steht, sollte es von dieser Liste gestrichen werden.

([1]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 347/2013 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 17. April 2013 zu Leitlinien für die transeuropäische Energieinfrastruktur und zur Aufhebung der Entscheidung Nr. 1364/2006/EG und zur Änderung der Verordnungen (EG) Nr. 713/2009, (EG) Nr. 714/2009 und (EG) Nr. 715/2009 (ABl. L 115 vom 25.4.2013, S. 39).

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/infrastructure/doc/assessment/20130919_pci-en-guidance.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012020/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Commissioner Oettinger's list

Infrastructure of common interest is one thing. It is quite another when citizens of the European Union suffer as a result of large-scale projects. It is a fundamental question whether, as projects reach a certain scale, it is still possible to regard them as 'of common interest' if whole regions have to fear major disruption to the landscape and the residents the effects of pipelines.

1. Many citizens are very concerned for their safety and quality of life if the European Union implements large-scale energy projects using an accelerated procedure and the EIA directives are virtually 'overturned'. Can the Commission provide a detailed statement on how it might explain to the citizens concerned, from whose money as taxpayers the subsidies for these projects are actually paid, why large pipelines are to be installed and large-scale projects implemented with a limited EIA procedure?

2. In relation to specific cases, how does the Commission justify the fact that pipelines that are more environmentally friendly and less invasive in the long term are not being used because they are more expensive?

3. Which energy infrastructure projects in Austria have been included on this list? How will the Commission ensure that citizens are protected and quality of life is maintained in the areas concerned?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(4 December 2013)

1. The Projects of Common Interest are subject to an environmental impact assessment. The Projects of Common Interest shall, however, benefit from more efficient permitting procedures, whilst the high standard of environmental assessment and protection is maintained. To this end, the Infrastructure Regulation ([1]) introduces a number of measures such as: the introduction of a binding overall time limit for permit procedures of normally 3,5 years, a national competent authority for the coordination of permit procedures, a transparent and open approach to consultation of the public and stakeholders, and the obligation on Member States to assess the need for streamlining environmental assessment procedures, and to take relevant streamlining measures they have identified as appropriate. A guidance document is published on DG Energy's website ([2]).

2. The PCI list identifies the projects which are needed from the energy policy perspective. The compatibility of the project with environmental law is assessed by the national authorities, which require public participation of the involved stakeholders.

3. The information on Projects of Common interest listed by Member State can be found on DG ENER website: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/infrastructure/pci/doc/2013_pci_projects_country.pdf

To ensure that citizens are involved in the very early phase of the project planning process, the Infrastructure Regulation introduced a mandatory early public consultation before the project promoter submits the complete file to the permit granting authority. If a project included in the PCI list turns out not to be in compliance with the EU acquis, it should be removed from the Union list of PCIs.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 347/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2013 on guidelines for trans-European energy infrastructure and repealing Decision No 1364/2006/EC and amending Regulations (EC) No 713/2009, (EC) No 714/2009 and (EC) No 715/2009 (OJ L 115/39, 25.4.2013).

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/infrastructure/doc/assessment/20130919_pci-en-guidance.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012021/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(22. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Die neue Wirtschaftspolitik Frankreichs

Die französische Nationalversammlung hat vor kurzem ein Gesetz verabschiedet, das die Schließung von Privatfirmen mit mehr als 1 000 Mitarbeitern unter Strafe stellen soll, falls die Firma an sich noch wirtschaftlich ist.

1. Wie bewertet die Kommission derart protektionistische Eingriffe in die Privatwirtschaft?

2. Werden sich nach diesem offensichtlich progressiven Schritt nach Ansicht der Kommission solche Vorgehensweisen in der EU möglicherweise mehren?

2.1. Wenn ja, welche Konsequenzen muss die Europäische Union in Betracht ziehen, was mögliche Schäden durch Firmenabwanderungen aufgrund auferlegter Entscheidungszwänge anbetrifft?

2.2. Wird sich dies nach Ansicht der Kommission auf das außereuropäische Investitionsvolumen auswirken? Wenn ja, in welcher Höhe können sich mögliche Verluste bei der Investitionstätigkeit bewegen?

Antwort von László Andor im Namen der Kommission
(17. Dezember 2013)

Die französische Nationalversammlung hat am 1. Oktober 2013 einen Gesetzesentwurf verabschiedet, der derzeit im Senat erörtert wird und Unternehmen mit mehr als 1 000 Mitarbeitern, die einen Standort schließen, verpflichtet, nach einem möglichen Käufer zu suchen. Im Gesetzesentwurf ist tatsächlich die Möglichkeit vorgesehen, Sanktionen zu verhängen, wenn i) das Unternehmen nicht nach einem Käufer für diesen Standort sucht oder ii) das Unternehmen nicht ausreichend begründet, weshalb es ein gültiges Angebot ablehnt.

Ebensowenig wie die Kommission Unternehmensentscheidungen, z. B. zur Umstrukturierung, beeinflusst, mischt sie sich in nationale Gesetzgebungsakte hinsichtlich der Konsequenzen solcher Entscheidungen ein bzw. kommentiert diese, es sei denn, sie verstoßen gegen EU-Recht. Abgesehen von den Vorschriften für die Arbeitnehmerbeteiligung, die in mehreren EU-Richtlinien geregelt wird, unterliegen Unternehmensumstrukturierungen und insbesondere Unternehmensschließungen als solche nicht den EU-Rechtsvorschriften.

Die Kommission ist nicht in der Lage, die Konsequenzen eines Gesetzes, das später verabschiedet wird, für ausländische Investitionen oder seinen Einfluss auf andere Länder nicht antizipieren. Die Kommission merkt jedoch an, dass die geplanten neuen Anforderungen Unternehmensschließungen zwar erschweren, den Umfang der Auflagen für Unternehmensschließungen allerdings nicht grundlegend ändern würden, da in Frankreich infolge der Annahme des Gesetzes zur Beschäftigungssicherung vom Juni 2013 und in vielen anderen Mitgliedstaaten bereits vergleichbare Verpflichtungen existieren.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012021/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: France's new economic policy

The French National Assembly has recently passed a law that provides for the imposition of a fine in the event of the closure of a private company with more than 1 000 employees if the company is still viable.

1. What is the Commission's view of this kind of protectionist intervention in the private sector?

2. In its view, will such practices potentially increase in the EU following this obviously progressive step?

2.1. If so, what consequences does the European Union need to take into consideration as regards possible damage caused by businesses relocating on account of the constraints imposed on their decisions?

2.2. In the Commission's opinion, will this affect the volume of investments from outside Europe? If so, how large might potential losses in investments be?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

The French National Assembly adopted on 1 October 2013 a draft law, currently in discussion in the Senate, which requires companies with more than 1 000 employees closing a site to look for a potential buyer. The draft law indeed introduces the possibility to impose sanctions if (i) the company fails to look for a buyer for this site or (ii) if it does not sufficiently justify the reasons for refusing a valid offer.

In the same way as it does not interfere in companies' business decisions, including when they lead to restructuring, the Commission does not intrude, nor comment, on national legislative acts governing the consequences of such decisions insofar as they do not collide with EC law. In that respect, apart from rules on employee involvement, governed by several EU Directives, corporate restructuring, and in particular, the closure of undertakings is not in itself subject to any EU legal provision.

The Commission is not in a situation to anticipate the consequences of the law which will eventually be passed on inward investment or its influence in other countries. It notes however that the foreseen new requirements, while making the process for site closure more complex, would not fundamentally change the level of constraint imposed on closing companies, as similar obligations already exist in France, following the adoption of the law on securing employment in June 2013, and in many other Member States.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012022/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(22. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Finanzierung von Tierschutz in Rumänien

Das Problem begleitet Europa schon seit Jahren: Offenbar kommen in Rumänien immer wieder Tiere, vor allem Straßenhunde in großer Zahl zu Tode. Solche Maßnahmen seien notwendig, weil eine Gefahr für die Bevölkerung bestehe, heißt es mitunter.

1. Wieviel Geld hat Rumänien in den letzten fünf Jahren von der Europäischen Union (in Form von Fondsauszahlungen, entsprechenden Förderprogrammen etc.) erhalten, um die Situation der streunenden Tiere auf humane Weise zu einer guten Lösung zu bringen?

2. Wie hat die Kommission die korrekte Verwendung der Gelder überprüft, bzw. waren sie überhaupt ganz konkret für diesen bestimmten Zweck gebunden?

3. Wie erklärt die Kommission, dass sich der Zustand in diesem Jahr offenbar eklatant verschlechtert hat, so dass europäische Bürgerinnen und Bürger aller Länder die Notwendigkeit sehen, gegen die Vorgehensweisen in Rumänien zu protestieren?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(10. Dezember 2013)

Die Kommission möchte die Frau Abgeordnete auf die Antworten zu den schriftlichen Anfragen E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011, E-002062/2012 und E-005276/2013 ([1]) verweisen, die sich mit der Problematik streunender Hunde und der Kontrolle des Hundebestands beschäftigen.

Die Zuständigkeiten der EU ermöglichen der Kommission nicht, Programme zur Bekämpfung streunender Hunde zu finanzieren.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012022/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Funding of animal welfare in Romania

For many years, Europe has been dealing with the problem of animals in Romania, stray dogs in particular, apparently being killed in large numbers on a regular basis. Such measures are sometimes said to be necessary because there is a danger to the people.

1. How much money has Romania received from the European Union in the last five years (in the form of Fund payments, corresponding support programmes, etc.) in order to find a good and humane solution to the problem of the stray animals?

2. How has the Commission verified the proper use of these funds, or were they ever actually tied very specifically to this purpose?

3. How does it explain the fact that the situation has clearly deteriorated so dramatically this year that European citizens in all countries feel the need to protest against the practices in Romania?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2013)

The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the answers to written questions E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011, E-002062/2012 and E-005276/2013 ([1]) which address the issues of stray dogs and of dog population management.

EU competences do not allow the Commission to fund stray dogs control programs.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012024/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(22. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Regierungskrise in Italien — Vertrauensverlust

In den vergangenen Tagen wurden zahlreiche Medienberichte laut, die die — nun bereits wiederholt stattfindende — Regierungskrise in Italien zum Thema hatten.

1. Wie schätzt die Kommission die Stabilität der italienischen Regierung ein?

2. Wie schätzt die Kommission die negativen Auswirkungen der Regierungskrise in Italien ein, insbesondere das Ausmaß des Vertrauensverlustes im Hinblick auf die italienischen Bürgerinnen und Bürger und den Weltmarkt?

3. Wie sehr dürfte die Regierungskrise in Italien das Rating des Landes beeinflussen, und wie schwerwiegend sind wiederum die Folgen für den Euroraum?

Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission
(3. Dezember 2013)

1) Die Kommission äußert sich nicht zu innenpolitischen Fragen. Sie hat zur Kenntnis genommen, dass beide Kammern des Parlaments der Regierung am 2. Oktober 2013 ihr Vertrauen ausgesprochen haben und die Regierungskrise, die Ende September begonnen hatte, damit beendet worden ist. Die Kommission vertraut darauf, dass das Land seinen Verpflichtungen auf europäischer Ebene weiterhin nachkommt.

2) Die Reaktion der Märkte auf die politischen Spannungen fiel verhalten aus: Die Spreads zehnjähriger Staatsanleihen erhöhten sich nur geringfügig und gaben anschließend wieder nach. Allgemein betrachtet sind stabile politische Verhältnisse wichtig für eine weitere Stärkung des Vertrauens von Investoren und Verbrauchern und zur Steigerung der Binnennachfrage.

3) Es ist nicht Aufgabe der Kommission, sich zu Spekulationen über die Stabilität oder künftige Entwicklung des Länderratings zu äußern.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012024/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Governmental crisis in Italy — loss of confidence

In recent days, there have been numerous media reports on the subject of the — now recurring — governmental crisis in Italy.

1. What is the Commission's assessment of the stability of the Italian Government?

2. What is its assessment of the negative effects of the governmental crisis in Italy, in particular the scale of the loss of confidence on the part of Italian citizens and the world market?

3. To what extent is the governmental crisis in Italy likely to affect the country's rating, and, in turn, how serious will the consequences be for the euro area?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2013)

1. The Commission does not comment on domestic political matters. It took note that the governmental crisis which had arisen at the end of September ended with the Government winning a confidence vote in both houses of parliament on 2 October 2013. The Commission trusts that the country will maintain its European commitments.

2. Market reactions to tensions in the political sphere were mild, with spreads on 10-year government bond yields increasing only marginally and falling back afterwards. In a broader perspective, for investor and consumer confidence to grow further and to lift domestic demand, political stability is important.

3. It is not the role of the Commission to comment on speculations of the stability or future changes in the market rating.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012025/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(22. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Qualitätsunterschiede bei Gerichtsgutachten

Die Bestellung von Gutachtern in Sorgerechtsfällen funktioniert europaweit nach unterschiedlichen Regelungen, die — insbesondere was die fachlichen Qualifikationen angeht — zunehmend häufiger zu unbilligen Ergebnissen führen. In einem derart sensiblen und auswirkungsstarken Bereich sind unwissenschaftliche und schlicht falsche Gutachten in großem Ausmaß kritisch zu sehen.

1. Ist der Kommission die oben genannte Problematik bekannt?

2. Gibt es bereits EU-weite Empfehlungen zur Qualitätssicherung bei Gutachten (auch im Hinblick auf wissenschaftliche Standards und Testverfahren)? Wenn nicht, sind dann in naher Zukunft derartige Empfehlungen geplant?

3. Wie bewertet die Kommission die unterschiedlichen Standards bei Gutachten und deren Auswirkungen im Lichte der gegenseitigen justiziellen Anerkennung?

4. Sieht die Kommission insbesondere bei grenzüberschreitenden Sorgerechtsstreitigkeiten Probleme in Bezug auf Gutachten von unterschiedlichem qualitativem Niveau?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(8. Januar 2014)

Der Kommission liegen bislang keine Informationen über Probleme aufgrund unterschiedlicher Rechtsvorschriften der Mitgliedstaaten über die Bestellung von Gutachtern in Sorgerechtsfällen vor. Die Kommission prüft diese Frage derzeit jedoch im Zusammenhang mit der Überarbeitung der Anwendung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1206/2001 des Rates über die Zusammenarbeit zwischen den Gerichten der Mitgliedstaaten auf dem Gebiet der Beweisaufnahme in Zivil- oder Handelssachen.

Im Zuge dieser Überarbeitung hat die Kommission den Mitgliedstaaten einen Fragebogen zugesandt, um Informationen über die praktische Anwendung der Verordnung zu sammeln. Die darin enthaltene Frage Nr. 40 bezieht sich auf die Folgen der Anwendung unterschiedlicher Qualitätsstandards auf Gutachten infolge voneinander abweichender nationaler Rechtsvorschriften.

Die Qualitätsstandards für Gutachten und ihre Auswirkungen in zivilrechtlichen Verfahren unterliegen nicht den EU-Rechtsvorschriften. Die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1206/2001 betrifft insbesondere die Mechanismen der Zusammenarbeit zwischen den Gerichten der Mitgliedstaaten zum Zweck der grenzübergreifenden Beweisaufnahme. Andere Themen wie der Beweismittelbegriff, die Beweislast, die Beweiswürdigung und das Beweismaß unterliegen dem jeweiligen nationalen Recht. Gemäß der Verordnung soll das ersuchte Gericht das Gesuch zwar nach Maßgabe des Rechts seines Mitgliedstaats erledigen, doch wird die Wirkung solcher Beweise im ersuchenden Mitgliedstaat nicht durch das EU-Recht geregelt. Die Gerichte des ersuchenden Mitgliedstaats müssen daher bei der Würdigung der von dem ausländischen Gericht übermittelten Beweise (einschließlich der Qualität von Gutachten) und bei der Ermittlung ihrer Beweiskraft ihr nationales Recht anwenden.

Die Kommission sammelt nun Informationen über die Auswirkungen dieser uneinheitlichen Rechtslage auf die grenzübergreifende Beweisaufnahme. Diese Informationen werden in den Bewertungsbericht einfließen, der 2014 angenommen werden soll. Anschließend wird die Kommission prüfen, welche Folgemaßnahmen möglicherweise erforderlich sind.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012025/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Quality differences in expert opinions in court

The appointment of experts in custody cases operates according to different rules throughout Europe. These different rules — in particular where professional qualifications are concerned — are increasingly resulting in unsatisfactory outcomes. In a sensitive area such as this, where the consequences can be serious, unscientific and quite simply erroneous expert opinions on a large scale are to be viewed with criticism.

1. Is the Commission aware of this problem?

2. Do EU-wide recommendations on quality assurance in relation to expert opinions already exist (including in relation to scientific standards and testing procedures)? If not, are there any plans for such recommendations in the near future?

3. What is the Commission's view of the differing standards for expert opinions and their effects in light of the mutual recognition of judicial decisions?

4. In particular, does it see problems in connection with cross-border custody disputes in respect of expert opinions of differing quality?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(8 January 2014)

To date the Commission has not received information on problems derived from diverging Member State laws on the appointment of experts in custody cases. The Commission is, however, currently examining this issue in the context of the review of the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 1206/2001 on cooperation between the courts of the Member States in the taking of evidence in civil or commercial matters.

As part of this review exercise, the Commission sent a questionnaire to Member States to gather information on the practical operation of the regulation. Question No 40 addresses the consequences of applying different quality standards to expert opinions as a result of diverging national laws.

EU legislation does not govern quality standards of expert opinions or their effects in civil litigation. Regulation 1206/2001 covers in particular the cooperation mechanisms between Member State courts for the purposes of the cross-border taking of evidence. Other issues such as means of evidence, burden of proof, assessment of evidence and standard of evidence are left to national law. Although the regulation provides that the requested court shall execute the request in accordance with its own law, the effect of such evidence in the requesting Member State is not governed by EC law. The courts of the requesting Member State must thus apply national law to assess the evidence delivered by the foreign court, including the quality of expert opinions, and to establish its evidentiary value.

The Commission is now collecting input on the impact of this legal diversity on the cross-border taking of evidence, which will be reflected in the evaluation report to be adopted in 2014. The Commission will thereafter consider the follow-up action that may be required.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012026/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(22 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Restricțiile comerciale aplicate de Rusia statelor membre ale UE și țărilor din Parteneriatul estic

În cadrul observațiilor sale referitoare la restricțiile vamale aplicate de Federația Rusă începând cu 12 septembrie 2013 produselor lactate din Lituania, comisarul pentru comerț, Karel de Gucht, a declarat la 8 octombrie 2013 că va introduce acest subiect pe ordinea de zi a Consiliului pentru comerțul cu mărfuri din cadrul Organizației Mondiale a Comerțului (OMC), care urma să aibă loc la 18 octombrie 2013.

În plus, la 10 octombrie 2013, în urma unui dezacord cu guvernul neerlandez, Federația Rusă a amenințat că va impune restricții asupra importurilor de lalele și de brânză cu pastă tare din Țările de Jos.

Aceste restricții urmează unor măsuri vamale similare aplicate de Federația Rusă Ucrainei și Republicii Moldova. Aceste sancțiuni au fost condamnate atât de Parlament, în cuprinsul rezoluției sale referitoare la presiunea exercitată de Rusia asupra țărilor din cadrul Parteneriatului estic (în contextul apropiatului summit al Parteneriatului estic ce va avea loc la Vilnius), cât și de Comisie, ca fiind o formă inacceptabilă de presiune. La 11 septembrie 2013, comisarul pentru extindere și politica de vecinătate, Štefan Füle, a criticat obstacolele artificiale din calea comerțului, cum ar fi interdicțiile aplicate importurilor, care nu par să fie compatibile cu normele OMC, precum și practicile vamale greoaie.

În prezent, Federația Rusă menține în continuare numai interdicția aplicată importurilor de vinuri din Republica Moldova. Serviciile sanitare din ambele țări desfășoară în prezent negocieri, însă amânarea eliminării restricțiilor cauzează pierderi semnificative producătorilor și exportatorilor din Republica Moldova.

1. A ridicat comisarul de Gucht problema presiunilor exercitate de Federația Rusă asupra țărilor din cadrul Parteneriatului estic la Consiliul pentru comerțul cu mărfuri al OMC, care a avut loc la 18 octombrie 2013?

2. Ce măsuri întreprinde Comisia pentru a împiedica Federația Rusă să recurgă la interdicții comerciale cu scopul de a exercita presiuni politice asupra statelor membre și a țărilor partenere?

Răspuns dat de dl De Gucht în numele Comisiei
(13 decembrie 2013)

1. Comisia a ridicat problema restricțiilor impuse transportatorilor lituanieni, salutând încheierea acestora la data de 10 octombrie 2013, precum și problema interdicției aplicate produselor lituaniene, în vigoare începând cu data de 7 octombrie 2013, în cadrul reuniunii Consiliului pentru comerțul cu mărfuri al Organizației Mondiale a Comerțului din data de 18 octombrie 2013. Comisia a profitat de această ocazie pentru a-și exprima preocupările cu privire la măsurile motivate politic adoptate de Rusia.

2. UE a precizat clar faptul că presiunea exercitată asupra țărilor din cadrul Parteneriatului estic, legată de posibila semnare a acordurilor de asociere (AA), inclusiv de stabilirea de zone de liber schimb complex și cuprinzător (ZLSCC) este inacceptabilă și că UE își va sprijini partenerii și va fi alături de aceștia.

Comisia este de părere că cel mai bun răspuns în fața presiunii externe este semnarea și punerea rapidă în aplicare, cu titlu provizoriu, a AA/ZLSCC cu partenerii din est care optează pentru acest lucru. În plus, UE analizează în prezent toate posibilitățile de sprijin, inclusiv măsurile comerciale. Un exemplu de măsură comercială de sprijin care ar putea fi adoptată de UE ar fi liberalizarea importurilor de vin din Moldova. Acest lucru ar putea fi realizat prin intermediul unei modificări a actualului Regulament (CE) nr. 55/2008 al Consiliului ([1]) privind preferințele comerciale autonome ale UE (Regulamentul PCA) pentru Moldova. La 25 septembrie 2013, Comisia a prezentat o propunere legislativă în acest sens, care este analizată în prezent în cadrul Parlamentului și al Consiliului.

În plus, Comisia va continua să colaboreze îndeaproape cu statele membre pentru a aborda obstacolele încă existente care afectează exporturile UE către Rusia.

([1]) Regulamentul (CE) nr. 55/2008 al Consiliului din 21 ianuarie 2008 de introducere a unor preferințe comerciale autonome pentru Republica Moldova și de modificare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 980/2005 și a Deciziei 2005/924/CE a Comisiei, JO L 20, 24.1.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012026/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Russia's trade restrictions on EU Member States and on Eastern Partnership countries

Commenting on the Russian Federation's customs restrictions on Lithuanian dairy products, in force since 12 September 2013, Commissioner for Trade Karel de Gucht declared on 8 October 2013 that he would place this subject on the agenda of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) Council for Trade in Goods which was due to take place on 18 October 2013.

Furthermore, on 10 October 2013, the Russian Federation also threatened restrictions on imports of tulips and hard cheese from the Netherlands, as a result of a disagreement with the Dutch Government.

These restrictions come after similar customs restrictions were imposed by the Russian Federation on Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova. These sanctions were condemned as unacceptable pressure by both Parliament, through its resolution on pressure exerted by Russia on Eastern Partnership countries (in the context of the upcoming Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius), and the Commission. On 11 September 2013, Commissioner for Enlargement and Neighbourhood Policy Štefan Füle criticised 'the artificial trade obstacles, such as import bans of dubious WTO compatibility, and cumbersome customs procedures'.

At present, the Russian Federation only upholds the ban on wines from the Republic of Moldova. Talks are taking place between the health services of both countries, but the delays in lifting the restrictions are causing significant losses to producers and exporters from the Republic of Moldova.

1. Did Commissioner de Gucht raise the issue of the pressures exerted by the Russian Federation on the Eastern Partnership countries at the WTO Council for Trade in Goods of 18 October 2013?

2. What measures is the Commission taking to prevent the Russian Federation from using trade bans to put political pressure on Member States and partner countries?

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

1. The Commission did raise the customs restrictions for Lithuanian carriers, welcoming their termination on 10 October 2013, and the ban on Lithuanian products in place since 7 October 2013 during the meeting of the World Trade Organisation Council for Trade in Goods of 18 October 2013. The Commission used this opportunity to express its concerns with regard to politically motivated measures by Russia.

2. The EU has made clear that pressure on Eastern Partnership countries linked to the possible signing of the Association Agreements (AA), including the establishment of Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas (DCFTA) is unacceptable, and that the EU will support and stand by its partners.

The Commission believes that the best response in the face of external pressure is the signature and swift provisional application of the AA/ DCFTAs with the Eastern Partners who choose to do so. Furthermore, the EU is examining all support possibilities, including trade measures. One example of support trade measures that could be undertaken by the EU would be the liberalisation of wine imports from Moldova. This could be achieved through a modification of the existing Council Regulation (EC) No 55/2008 ([1]) on EU autonomous trade preferences (ATP Regulation) for Moldova. On 25 September 2013 the Commission made a legislative proposal in this regard which is being considered by Parliament and the Council.

In addition, the Commission will continue to work closely with the Member States to address the remaining barriers which affect EU exports to Russia.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 55/2008 of 21 January 2008 introducing autonomous trade preferences for the Republic of Moldova and amending Regulation (EC) No 980/2005 and Commission Decision 2005/924/EC, OJ L 20, 24.1.2008.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-012028/13
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(22 ta' Ottubru 2013)

Suġġett: Tluq bikri mill-iskola

Skont ir-rapport ippublikat wara l-konferenza dwar "It-tnaqqis tat-Tluq Bikri mill-Iskola: Politiki effiċjenti u effettivi fl-Ewropa" li saret fi Brussell fl-1 u t-2 ta' Marzu 2012, it-tluq bikri mill-iskola (ESL) jaffettwa żagħżugħ minn kull seba' u hu wieħed mill-isfidi edukattivi ewlenin fl-Ewropa: it-tnaqqis tar-rati tal-ESL hu objettiv kondiviż tal-Istati Membri.

Iktar minn 14 % taż-żgħażagħ kollha fl-UE li għandhom bejn it-18 u l-24 sena jispiċċaw l-edukazzjoni u t-taħriġ tagħhom biss b'livell baxx ta' edukazzjoni sekondarja jew inqas; it-tnaqqis tar-rati tal-ESL hu għalhekk wieħed mill-miri ewlenin tal-istrateġija Ewropa 2020. Jekk din il-mira tintlaħaq, ir-rata medja tal-ESL fl-UE tkun tniżżlet taħt l-10 % sal-2020.

Ir-Rakkomandazzjoni tal-Kunsill tat-28 ta' Ġunju 2011 dwar linji politiċi sabiex jitnaqqas it-tluq bikri mill-iskejjel ([1]) tiddefinixxi linja ta' referenza komuni għall-iżvilupp tal-politika. F'din ir-rakkomandazzjoni l-Istati Membri qablu li sal-2012 għandhom jimplimentaw strateġiji komprensivi biex jikkumbattu l-ESL.

1. Tista' l-Kummissjoni tipprovdi l-konklużjonijiet tagħha mill-monitoraġġ ta' din il-kwistjoni, kif ukoll tiddeskrivi fid-dettall dawn l-istrateġiji komprensivi?

2. Il-Kummissjoni taħseb li din il-mira ser tintlaħaq u li għalhekk il-medja tar-rati tal-ESL fl-UE ser tinżel taħt l-10 % sal-2020?

3. Il-Kummissjoni x'inizjattivi qed tippjana għas-snin li ġejjin sabiex tilħaq din il-mira?

4. Il-Kummissjoni taqbel li, minkejja l-miżuri li diġa' ttieħdu mill-Istati Membri, il-progress fit-tnaqqis tar-rati tal-ESL għadu miexi bil-mod wisq?

5. Il-Kummissjoni tista' telenka l-Istati Membri li għadhom lura?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Vassiliou f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(12 ta' Diċembru 2013)

1. Il-Kummissjoni tissorvelja u tirrapporta dwar l-iżviluppi fit-tluq bikri mill-iskola (ESL) fl-UE, inkluż permezz tal-Istħarriġ Annwali dwar it-Tkabbir u fl-istrateġija għall-Edukazzjoni u t-Taħriġ tal-2020. Mill-ewwel semestru Ewropew, rakkomandazzjonijiet speċifiċi għall-pajjiżi (CSRs) marbuta ma' mira ewlenija tat-tluq bikri mill-iskola ġew ippreżentati lil: erba' Stati Membri fl-2011 (AT, DK, ES u MT), sitta fl-2012 (DK, ES, HU, IT, LV u MT) u sitta fl-2013 (DK, ES, HU, IT, MT u RO). Ir-rakkomandazzjonijiet qed ikollhom impatt: l-Istati Membri riċevituri kollha tal-2011 u l-2012 tejbu r-rati tagħhom (b'mod partikolari ES, li tjiebet b'3.5 % mill-2010).

Minkejja li l-biċċa l-kbira tal-Istati Membri ħadu miżuri biex jikkumbattu l-ESL, ftit huma dawk li implimentaw strateġiji komprensivi. NL u IE ilhom is-snin li implimentawhom; AT għamlet dan milux, filwaqt li BG u MT se jimplimentawhom issa.

2. Skont l-"Education and Training Monitor 2013" ir-rata medja tal-ESL fl-UE kienet 12.7 % fl-2012. Dan ifisser li niżlet b'0.7 % mill-2011. Dan it-titjib primarjament jirrifletti progress f'xi pajjiżi akbar, iżda jaħbi x-xejriet negattivi f'oħrajn.

3. Il-Kummissjoni mexxiet diskussjonijiet dwar l-ESL permezz tal-metodu miftuħ ta' koordinazzjoni (OMC). Grupp ta' Ħidma Tematiku, li jirrappreżenta kważi l-Istati Membri kollha mwaqqaf f'Diċembru 2011, organizza taħriġ u evalwazzjonijiet bejn il-pari dwar il-politiki u daqt se jippreżenta rakkomandazzjonijiet. Huwa ppjanat li ħidma bħal din tkompli.

4. Il-biċċa l-kbira tal-Istati Membri għamlu progress. Madanakollu għad fadal lakuni kbar. L-Istati Membri jeħtieġ li jsostnu l-isforzi tagħhom biex tintlaħaq il-mira.

([1]) ĠU C 191, 1.7.2011, p.1.

5. ES, MT u PT għandhom l-oġħla rati ta' ESL, iżda għamlu progress mill-2011. Fost il-pajjiżi b'rati 'il fuq mill-10 % IT, DE, FR u CY għamlu ftit tal-progress jew xejn, filwaqt li r-rati ta' BE, BG u RO qegħdin jiżdiedu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012028/13
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Early school leaving

According to the report published following the conference on 'Reducing Early School Leaving: Efficient and effective policies in Europe' held in Brussels on 1 and 2 March 2012, early school leaving (ESL) affects one in seven young people and is one of the main educational challenges in Europe: reducing ESL rates is a shared objective of the Member States.

More than 14% of all 18-to-24-year-olds in the EU finish their education and training with only lower secondary education or less; to reduce ESL rates is therefore one of the headline targets in the Europe 2020 strategy. If the target is met, the average ESL rate in the EU will have been cut to under 10% by 2020.

The Council recommendation of 28 June 2011 on policies to reduce early school leaving ([1]) defines a common baseline for policy development. The Member States agreed in this recommendation to put in place comprehensive strategies to combat ESL by the end of 2012.

1. Can the Commission provide the conclusions from its monitoring of the matter, as well as details of these comprehensive strategies?

2. Does the Commission think that the target will be met and that the average ESL rate in the EU will therefore have fallen below 10% by 2020?

3. What initiatives does the Commission plan for the coming years in order to achieve this target?

4. Does the Commission agree that, despite the numerous measures already taken by Member States, progress in reducing ESL rates remains too slow?

5. Can the Commission list the Member States which are lagging behind?

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

1. The Commission monitors and reports on developments in early school leaving (ESL) including through the Annual Growth Survey and within the Education and Training 2020 strategy. Since the first European Semester, Country Specific Recommendations (CSRs) linked to the ESL headline target have been delivered to: 4 Member States (MS) in 2011 (AT, DK, ES and MT), 6 in 2012 (DK, ES, HU, IT, LV and MT) and 6 in 2013 (DK, ES, HU, IT, MT and RO). The recommendations are having an impact: all 2011 and 2012 recipient MS have improved their rates (notably ES, which improved by 3.5% from 2010).

Despite most MS having taken measures to tackle ESL, few have implemented comprehensive strategies. The NL and IE have had them for some years; AT recently, while BG and MT are about to do so.

2. According to the 'Education and Training Monitor 2013', the EU average ESL rate was 12.7% in 2012; down 0.7% from 2011. This improvement mainly reflects progress in some larger countries, but hides negative trends in others.

3. The Commission has led reflections on ESL within the open method of coordination (OMC). A Thematic Working Group, representing nearly all MS set up in December 2011, has organised peer learning and peer reviews on policies and will soon deliver recommendations. Such work is set to continue.

4. A majority of MS have made progress, but there are still wide disparities. MS will need to sustain their efforts if the target is to be reached.

5. ES, MT, and PT have the highest rates of ESL, but have made progress since 2011. Among countries with rates above 10%, IT, DE, FR and CY show little or no progress, while in BE, BG and RO rates have been increasing.

([1]) OJ C 191, 1.7.2011, p. 1.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-012029/13
upućeno Komisiji
Sandra Petrović Jakovina (S&D)
(22. listopada 2013.)

Predmet: Problemi sigurnosti u pružanju usluga na području zračne plovidbe

Zakonodavstvo o jedinstvenom europskom nebu regulira zajedničke zahtjeve za pružanje usluga na području zračne plovidbe, kao i certificiranje i određivanje pružatelja usluga u zračnoj plovidbi. Certifikatima se utvrđuju prava i obveze pružatelja usluga u zračnoj plovidbi s posebnim naglaskom na sigurnost. Od nacionalnih nadzornih tijela očekuje se da nadziru sukladnost sa zajedničkim zahtjevima i uvjetima vezanima uz certifikate.

Otkrije li nacionalno nadzorno tijelo da nositelj certifikata više ne zadovoljava zahtjeve i uvjete, mora poduzeti primjerene mjere istovremeno osiguravajući neprekinuto pružanje usluge. Kako bi se osiguralo ispravno funkcioniranje sustava certificiranja, države članice u okviru svojih godišnjih izvješća Komisiji trebale bi pružiti sve relevantne informacije o odstupanjima koje je odobrilo njihovo nacionalno nadzorno tijelo. Pružatelj usluga u zračnoj plovidbi dužan je dokazati usklađenost za razdoblje valjanosti certifikata i za sve pružene usluge. Prije izdavanja certifikata, nacionalno nadzorno tijelo trebalo bi ispitati primjerenost pružatelja usluga te svake godine ocijeniti trajnu sukladnost pružatelja usluga u zračnoj plovidbi.

Budući da pružatelj usluga u zračnoj plovidbi mora dokazati sukladnost, tj. pokazati usklađenost i trajnu usklađenost, opravdano je ukazati da u većoj ili manjoj mjeri postoji mogućnost nedostataka, a time se mogu dovesti u pitanje aspekti sigurnosti putnika u pružanju usluga u zračnoj plovidbi. Godišnja izvješća Eurocontrola o provedbi zakonodavstva o jedinstvenom europskom nebu jasno pokazuju da neke države članice u pitanjima koje regulira zakonodavstvo EU-a nisu potpuno usklađene.

Na primjer, što se tiče trajne usklađenosti, neka nacionalna nadzorna tijela nisu provjerila sve svoje certificirane pružatelje usluga u zračnoj plovidbi kao što je određeno zajedničkim zahtjevima. Preporuka je bila da bi se, s obzirom na broj zahtjeva te na veliki broj pružatelja usluga koje je potrebno nadgledati, trebalo promicati uporabu savjetodavnog materijala i dobre prakse kako bi se osigurala kako bi se osigurala primjerena provjera i potvrda sukladnosti istovremeno posvećujući pozornost ograničenim sredstvima nacionalnih nadzornih tijela. Nadalje, što se tiče određivanja, dvije države članice odredile su pružatelje usluga u zračnoj plovidbi za koje se čini da nemaju certifikat. Na području ocjenjivanja uspješnosti zaključeno je da kapacitet i učinkovitost zračnog prostora sveukupno dostavljenih podataka upućuju na prilično nisku razinu provedbe. Što se tiče nadzora usklađenosti, ukupni prijavljeni broj provedenih inspekcija, istraživanja i sigurnosnih revizija u svrhu takvog nadzora bio je vrlo nizak.

S obzirom na to da smo nedavno bili suočeni s ozbiljnim sigurnosnim pitanjima u vezi s pružanjem usluga u zračnom prometu, što je u konačnici ugrozilo ljudske živote, može li Komisija izjaviti koje mjere namjerava poduzeti u cilju konačnog ukidanja takvih štetnih praksi država članica i/ili pružatelja usluga u zračnoj plovidbi, imajući na umu da uvođenje sankcija državama članicama zbog neprovedbe ili nepravilne provedbe zakonodavstva nije konačno rješenje tog problema?

Odgovor g. Kallasa u ime Komisije
(10. prosinca 2013.)

Uredbe o Jedinstvenom europskom nebu (SES) razlikuju dva odvojena subjekta: Pružatelje usluga zračne plovidbe koji pružaju kontrolu nad zračnim prijevozom i ostale usluge te Nacionalna nadzorna tijela koja nadgledaju pružatelje usluga. Kako je navedeno u pitanju, nedavne revizije ukazale su na nedostatke u načinu na koji tijela vlasti ovjeravaju i nadgledaju pružatelje usluga te kako osiguravaju provedbu propisa koji se odnose na Jedinstveno europsko nebo (SES). Nadalje provedba zadanih ciljeva i dalje je nezadovoljavajuća u smislu ambicija i korektivnih mjera. To se događa naime zbog nedostatka neovisnosti i sredstava ili stručnosti u tijelima vlasti.

Prijedlog za SES2+ zahtijevao bi organizacijsku podjelu između dvaju subjekata kako bi se omogućila istinska neovisnost. Neovisnost će biti potrebna i u pitanjima povezanim s proračunom te prilikom imenovanja osoblja. U konačnici, prijedlog bi utvrdio, na razini EU-a, mrežu nacionalnih tijela pod pokroviteljstvom Europske agencije za sigurnost zračnog prometa kako bi se omogućila razmjena najbolje prakse, osposobljavanje i udruživanje stručnjaka.

Pomoću tih mjera Komisija očekuje da će tijela vlasti dobiti motivaciju i potrebna sredstva te ujedno izbjeći trenutačne sukobe interesa u radu. Velika razlika u radu stoga će se smanjiti jer će se pružatelje usluga zračne plovidbe nadgledati i nadzirati prema istim standardima kao što se već radi sa zračnim prijevoznicima.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012029/13
to the Commission
Sandra Petrović Jakovina (S&D)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Safety- related issues in air navigation service provision

The SES (Single European Sky) legislation regulates common requirements for the provision of air navigation services, as well as the certification and designation of air navigation service providers (ANSPs). Certificates set out the rights and obligations of ANSPs with particular regard to safety. National supervisory authorities (NSAs) are expected to monitor compliance with the common requirements and with the conditions attached to the certificates.

If an NSA finds that the holder of a certificate no longer satisfies the requirements and conditions, it must take appropriate measures while ensuring continuity of service. In order to ensure the proper functioning of the certification scheme, Member States should provide the Commission with all relevant information on the derogations granted by their NSA in the context of their annual reports. The onus of proving compliance should lie with the ANSPs, for the period of validity of the certificate and for all the services covered. The NSA should examine the suitability of a provider prior to issuing a certificate and should assess the ongoing compliance of the ANSPs it has certified on a yearly basis.

As the onus of proving compliance, i.e. the demonstration of compliance and the ongoing compliance, is on the ANSPs, there are reasonable grounds to assert the possibility of gaps, to a lesser or greater extent, and this may lead to the questioning of the passenger safety-related aspects of air navigation service provision. Eurocontrol's annual reports on the implementation of SES legislation clearly indicate that there has not been full compliance by some Member States on matters regulated by the EU legislation.

For instance, as to ongoing compliance, some NSAs have not checked all their certified ANSPs as set forth in the common requirements. The recommendation was that, considering the number of requirements and the large numbers of providers to be overseen, advisory material and good practices should be promoted in order to ensure that compliance is adequately verified/confirmed while giving due consideration to the limited resources of the NSAs. Secondly, as to the designation, two Member States have designated air traffic services providers (ATSPs) which appear not to have been certified. As to performance assessment, it was concluded that regarding airspace capacity and efficiency, the overall reported information indicates a rather low level of implementation. Regarding compliance monitoring, the overall reported level of implementation of inspections, surveys and safety audits for the purpose of such monitoring was very low.

Considering that we have recently been faced with serious safety issues relative to air traffic provision, ultimately jeopardising people's lives, can the Commission state what measures it envisages with a view to ultimately putting an end to such adverse practices by Member States and/or ATSPs, while bearing in mind that the imposition of sanctions on Member States for non-implementation or improper implementation does not ultimately resolve this issue?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2013)

The Single European Sky (SES) regulations distinguish between two separate entities; the Air Navigation Service Providers providing air traffic control and other services and the National Supervisory Authorities overseeing the service providers. As the question notes, recent audits have revealed shortcomings in the way the authorities certify and oversee the service providers and how they ensure the implementation of the SES rules. Furthermore the implementation of performance targets is still suboptimal in terms of ambition and corrective measures. This is namely due to lack of independence and resources or expertise in the authorities.

The proposal for SES2+ would require an organisational separation between the two, to ensure true independence. Independence will also be required in budgetary matters and staff nominations. Finally the proposal would establish an EU-level network of national authorities under the auspices of the European Aviation Safety Agency to ensure exchanges of best practises, training and pooling of experts.

With these measures Commission expects that the authorities will gain the motivation and resources needed and also avoid the current conflicts of interest in their work. Thus a major performance gap will be closed as the air navigation service providers would be overseen and monitored to the same standards as the airlines already are.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012030/13
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(22 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Terra dei fuochi, emergenza sversamenti

Tra Napoli e Caserta, nella cosiddetta «Terra dei fuochi», il fenomeno degli sversamenti illegali dura da più di 30 anni. Il litorale domitio, l'agro aversano-atellano, l'agro acerrano-nolano e vesuviano e la città di Napoli costituiscono un vasto territorio colpito dal fenomeno dei roghi e dall'abbandono incontrollato di rifiuti solidi urbani, di rifiuti speciali, pericolosi e non, con conseguenze gravi per la salute, per l'ambiente e per la sicurezza. Questo disastro ambientale si inserisce nel più ampio quadro delineato dal primo studio dell'Istituto superiore di sanità, per il quale tutta l'area che va da Giugliano a Villaricca, fino al litorale domitio, è inquinata da discariche abusive, dall'interramento di rifiuti illegali, successivamente incendiati, in gran parte provenienti dalle imprese del Nord, con la complicità della camorra, che hanno contaminato la falda acquifera e 2.000 ettari di terreni agricoli circostanti, inquinati da fanghi tossici, metalli pesanti e sostanze chimiche. Secondo l'Istituto superiore di sanità, in Campania, nell'area ex Resit di Giugliano, l'inquinamento è senza rimedio: 20 chilometri quadrati «morti», 220 ettari di veleni senza possibilità di bonifica. Nella stessa area sono triplicate le malattie in meno di venti anni con una forte incidenza di tumori, malformazioni feto-neonatali ed epigenetica. Il ministero dell'ambiente italiano per risolvere il problema e per evitare sversamenti futuri di materiali tossici sta per istituire una task-force investigativa e giudiziaria contro le infiltrazioni nelle operazioni.

Alla luce di ciò, può la Commissione chiarire quanto segue:

1. è informata sulla perenne emergenza che riguarda la «Terra dei fuochi» in Campania?

2. Ci sono specifici programmi dell'Unione europea che finanziano la bonifica di terreni che hanno subito inquinamenti prolungati nel corso di decenni e, eventualmente, intende utilizzarli?

3. Intende fare parte della task-force del ministero dell'ambiente italiano che punta a individuare adeguati e tempestivi interventi per far fronte al disastro ambientale in Campania?

4. Alla base del lavoro che sarà svolto dalla task-force intende prevedere specifici programmi per finanziare azioni di bonifica per i territori ad alto tasso di inquinamento?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012131/13
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE) e Salvatore Tatarella (PPE)
(23 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Terra dei fuochi, emergenza sversamenti

Tra Napoli e Caserta, nella cosiddetta «Terra dei fuochi», il fenomeno degli sversamenti illegali dura da più di 30 anni. Dal litorale domitio, all'agro aversano-atellano, all'agro acerrano-nolano e vesuviano e la città di Napoli, un intero territorio colpito dal fenomeno dei roghi e dall'abbandono incontrollato di rifiuti solidi urbani, di rifiuti speciali, pericolosi e non, con conseguenze gravi per la salute, per l'ambiente e per la sicurezza. Questo disastro ambientale si inserisce nel più ampio quadro delineato dal primo studio dell'Istituto superiore di sanità, per il quale tutta l'area che va da Giugliano a Villaricca, fino al litorale domitio, è inquinata da discariche abusive, dall'interramento di rifiuti illegali, successivamente incendiati, in gran parte provenienti dalle imprese del Nord, con la complicità della camorra, che hanno contaminato la falda acquifera e 2 000 ettari di terreni agricoli circostanti, inquinati da fanghi tossici, metalli pesanti e sostanze chimiche. Secondo l'Istituto superiore di sanità, in Campania, nell'area ex Resit di Giugliano, l'inquinamento è senza rimedio: 20 chilometri quadrati «morti», 220 ettari di veleni senza possibilità di bonifica. Nella stessa area sono triplicate le malattie in meno di venti anni con una forte incidenza di tumori, malformazioni feto-neonatali e modificazioni epigenetiche. Il ministero dell'ambiente italiano, per risolvere il problema e per evitare sversamenti futuri di materiali tossici, sta per istituire una task-force investigativa e giudiziaria contro le infiltrazioni nelle operazioni.

Alla luce di ciò, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. se è informata sulla perenne emergenza che riguarda la «Terra dei fuochi» in Campania;

2. se ci sono specifici programmi dell'Unione europea che finanziano la bonifica di terreni che hanno subito inquinamenti prolungati nel corso di decenni e se intende utilizzarli;

3. se intende fare parte della task-force del ministero dell'ambiente italiano che punta a individuare adeguati e tempestivi interventi per far fronte al disastro ambientale in Campania;

4. se alla base del lavoro che sarà svolto dalla task-force intenda prevedere specifici programmi per finanziare azioni di bonifica per i territori ad alto tasso di inquinamento?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012244/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(28 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Terra dei fuochi: roghi e discariche illegali

La «Terra dei fuochi» è un'area tra le province di Napoli e Caserta così denominata in quanto sconvolta da numerosi roghi di rifiuti, dove si segnala l'esistenza di molteplici discariche illegali che vengono sistematicamente incendiate. Occorre notare che esiste un vero e proprio business dei rifiuti in mano ad alcune famiglie mafiose, per cui si può parlare di «ecomafia». I numeri sono molto elevati: negli ultimi 5 anni in quest'area sono stati registrati 205 arresti per traffici e smaltimenti illegali di rifiuti, pari a circa un terzo del totale su base nazionale. Dal primo gennaio 2012 al 31 agosto 2013 i roghi di rifiuti, materiali plastici, scarti di lavorazione del pellame e stracci sono stati 6.034 di cui 3.049 in provincia di Napoli e 2.085 in quella di Caserta.

Stante che tale situazione provoca notevoli danni ambientali e paesaggistici (dispersione di sostanze inquinanti nel suolo, nell'aria e nelle falde idriche) con evidenti conseguenze anche per la salute umana, in quanto si registra un incremento di tumori proprio in quei comuni che presentano il maggior numero di rifiuti (Acerra, Aversa, Bacoli, Caivano, Castelvolturno, Giugliano in Campania, Marcianise e Villaricca) e si sta discutendo sulla necessità di istituire il reato di «ecocidio», che configuri la distruzione ambientale come un vero e proprio crimine;

può la Commissione far sapere:

— se è a conoscenza di questo problema che grava sulla Terra dei fuochi;

— con quali mezzi intende aumentare la lotta al traffico illecito dei rifiuti;

— se è a conoscenza dell'iniziativa dei cittadini europei volta a richiedere l'istituzione del reato di «ecocidio» e intende supportarla da un punto di vista legislativo?

Risposta congiunta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(18 dicembre 2013)

Nell'ambito della procedura di infrazione 2007/2195 ([1]) la Commissione ha sollevato la questione dello smaltimento illegale di rifiuti pericolosi, in particolare per quanto riguarda l'incenerimento selvaggio dei rifiuti nella cosiddetta «terra dei fuochi» nelle province di Napoli e Caserta. Nella procedura di infrazione esorta le autorità italiane a prendere le misure necessarie. Secondo le informazioni fornite alla Commissione, nel novembre 2012, il governo italiano ha nominato un commissario straordinario incaricato di risolvere la questione al fine di prevenire e contrastare lo smaltimento illegale di rifiuti.

Inoltre, nel quadro della procedura di infrazione 2003/2077 relativa alle discariche illegali in tutta Italia, nell'aprile 2013 la Commissione ha adito la Corte dell'Unione Europea per la seconda volta, visto che l'Italia non ha ancora bonificato le discariche interessate, tra cui molte in Campania. La causa è ancora pendente dinanzi alla Corte.

Il programma 2007-2013 per la Regione Campania, cofinanziato dal Fondo per lo sviluppo rurale, prevede anche misure volte alla bonifica di siti contaminati secondo il principio del «chi inquina paga», a condizione che i progetti siano coperti dal piano bonifiche approvato dalla regione.

Per quanto riguarda la questione più ampia del traffico illegale di rifiuti in Europa, nel luglio 2013 la Commissione ha adottato una proposta per rafforzare i controlli sulle spedizioni di rifiuti, attraverso una modifica del regolamento (CE) n. 1013/2006 ([2]). La Commissione controlla l'attuazione di detto regolamento e ogni tre anni pubblica una relazione.

([1]) Relativa alla gestione dei rifiuti nella Regione Campania.
([2]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1013/2006 relativo alle spedizioni di rifiuti (GU L 190 del 12.7.2006).

La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'iniziativa dei cittadini «Fermiamo l'ecocidio in Europa: un'iniziativa dei cittadini per dare diritti alla terra». Il termine per la raccolta delle necessarie dichiarazioni di sostegno di 1 milione di euro è il 21.1.2014. In seguito la Commissione deciderà l'intervento appropriato.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012030/13
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Dumping emergency in the 'land of fires'

Illegal dumping has been going on for over 30 years in the 'land of fires', between Naples and Caserta. The Domitian coast, the countryside around Aversa and Orta di Atella, the countryside around Acerra and Nola, the area around Mount Vesuvius and the city of Naples form a vast area that is blighted by bonfires and the uncontrolled dumping of solid urban waste and hazardous and non-hazardous special waste, with serious consequences for health, the environment and safety. This environmental disaster fits into the wider framework of the first study by the Italian National Institute of Health, according to which the entire area that stretches from Giugliano to Villaricca, up to the Domitian coast, is polluted by illegal landfills and the burying of illegal waste, which is then burned. The waste mainly comes from businesses in northern Italy, in collusion with the Camorra, and has contaminated the aquifer and 2 000 hectares of surrounding farmland, polluted by toxic sludge, heavy metals and chemicals. According to the Italian National Institute of Health, the pollution in the area of the former Resit di Giugliano landfill in Campania, is irreparable: 20 square kilometres are 'dead' and 220 hectares are poisoned beyond decontamination. In the same area, the incidence of disease has tripled in under 20 years, with high rates of cancer, congenital deformities and genetic mutations. In order to resolve the problem and prevent toxic waste being dumped in the future, the Italian Ministry of the Environment is about to set up a task force to investigate and prosecute infiltration of waste disposal operations.

1. Is the Commission aware of the continuing disaster involving the 'land of fires' in Campania?

2. Are there any specific EU programmes to finance the decontamination of land that has been polluted over decades and, if so, will the Commission use them?

3. Will the Commission participate in the Italian Ministry of the Environment's task force, which aims to identify suitable and timely actions to tackle the environmental disaster in Campania?

4. Based on the work that the task force will carry out, will the Commission establish specific programmes to finance actions to clean up heavily polluted land?

Question for written answer E-012131/13
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE) and Salvatore Tatarella (PPE)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: 'Terra dei fuochi' dumping emergency

Between Naples and Caserta, in the so-called 'Terra dei fuochi' ('land of fire'), illegal dumping has been taking place for over 30 years. An entire area, including the Domitian coast, the Aversano-Atellano countryside, the Acerrano-Nolano and Mount Vesuvius area and the city of Naples, has been affected by the uncontrolled disposal of solid urban waste and special waste, which is often hazardous, with serious consequences for the health of local people, the environment and safety. This environmental disaster is part of a broader scenario that was first outlined in a study by the Italian Institute of Health, which found that the entire area from Giugliano to Villaricca, right up to the Domitian coast, is polluted as a result of the fly tipping and landfill of illegal waste that is subsequently burnt. The majority of this waste arrives from businesses in the North of Italy with the help of the Camorra and has led to the contamination of the groundwater and 2 000 hectares of surrounding agricultural land with toxic sludge, heavy metals and chemicals. According to the Institute of Health, in Campania, at the ex-Resit di Giugliano site, the pollution is irreversible — there are 20 km2 of 'dead' land and 220 hectares of polluted land that can never be restored. In this area, the incidence of illness has tripled in less than 20 years, with a high rate of tumours, birth defects and epigenetic changes. The Italian Ministry for the Environment is about to set up an investigative judicial task force to combat these illegal operations with a view to solving the problem and preventing future toxic waste dumping.

1. In the light of the above, can the Commission say whether it is aware of the ongoing emergency in the 'Terra dei fuochi' area of the Campania Region?

2. Can it say whether there is any EU funding available to clean up the land that has been subject to prolonged pollution for decades?

3. Does the Commission intend to participate in the Italian Ministry for the Environment's task force, which aims to identify suitable and timely steps to be taken to combat the environmental disaster in Campania?

4. On the basis of the task force's findings, does it intend to provide specific funding to clean up the areas with high rates of pollution?

Question for written answer E-012244/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Land of fires: illegal bonfires and landfills

The 'land of fires' is an area between the provinces of Naples and Caserta, so named because of the many rubbish bonfires that blight the landscape, where there are reported to be many illegal landfills, which are systematically burned. A genuine waste business does exist, but it is controlled by a number of Mafia families, an 'ecomafia'. The figures involved are staggering: in the last five years in this area, 205 arrests have been made for illegal trafficking and disposal of waste, accounting for around a third of the national total. From 1 January 2012 to 31 August 2013, there were 6 034 bonfires burning waste, plastics, leather and textile processing waste, of which 3 049 were in the province in Naples and 2 085 in Caserta.

This phenomenon is seriously damaging the environment and the landscape (pollutants leaking into the ground, air and aquifers) with obvious consequences also for human health, as there has been an increase in the incidence of cancer in those municipalities with the most waste (Acerra, Aversa, Bacoli, Caivano, Castel Volturno, Giugliano in Campania, Marcianise and Villaricca). Discussions are also under way as to whether the offence of 'ecocide' needs to be introduced, making environmental destruction a real criminal offence.

— Is the Commission aware of this problem affecting the land of fires?

— How does it plan to step up the fight against illegal trafficking of waste?

— Is the Commission aware of the European citizens' initiative calling for 'ecocide' to be made an offence, and will it give it legislative support?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(18 December 2013)

Within infringement procedure 2007/2195 ([1]), the Commission has raised the issue of illegal disposal of hazardous waste, in particular as regards the uncontrolled burning of waste in the so-called 'Land of Fires' in the Naples and Caserta provinces, urging Italian authorities to take the necessary measures. According to the information provided to the Commission, in November 2012 the Italian Government appointed a special commissioner to deal with the issue, in order to prevent and remedy the illegal disposal of waste.

Furthermore, within infringement procedure 2003/2077 concerning illegal landfills in the whole of Italy, in April 2013 the Commission applied to the EU Court for the second time, because Italy has not yet cleaned up all the landfills covered by the case, including many sites in Campania. The case is still pending before the Court.

The 2007-2013 programme for Campania, co-funded by the European Regional Development Fund, includes measures aimed at cleaning up contaminated sites according to the 'polluter payer' principle, provided that the projects are covered by the 'Piano bonifiche' approved by the region.

As for the more general issue of illegal traffic of waste, in July 2013 the Commission adopted a proposal to strengthen inspections on waste shipments through an amendment to Regulation 1013/2006 ([2]). The Commission monitors the implementation of this regulation and publishes a report every three years.

The Commission is aware of the citizen's initiative 'End Ecocide in Europe: A Citizens' Initiative to give the Earth Rights'. The deadline to collect the requisite 1 million statements of support is 21.1.2014, following which the Commission will decide what action is appropriate.

([1]) Concerning waste management in Campania.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 on shipments of waste (OJ L 190, 12.7.2006).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012031/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(22 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Füle: „vaart" achter toetredingsonderhandelingen

Momenteel zijn er vijf kandidaat-lidstaten (Turkije, voormalige Joegoslavische Republiek Macedonië, Montenegro, Servië en Albanië) en twee potentiële kandidaat-lidstaten (Kosovo en Bosnië en Herzegovina). De heer Füle, eurocommissaris voor Uitbreiding, heeft gezegd „vaart" achter de toetredingsonderhandelingen te willen zetten ([1]). Met Turkije wil hij de besprekingen „intensiveren". IJsland heeft onlangs zijn kandidatuur voor de EU ingetrokken.

1. Realiseert de Commissie zich dat landen als Roemenië en Bulgarije tot de EU zijn toegetreden hoewel zij destijds volstrekt niet aan de daarvoor geldende criteria voldeden en daaraan vandaag de dag nog altijd niet voldoen, zoals blijkt uit de onvolmaaktheid van de rechtsstaat, de democratie en de economie én de welig tierende corruptie? Wat heeft de Commissie van de premature toetreding van deze landen geleerd, en hoe uit zich dat?

2. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie het dat IJsland zijn kandidatuur voor de EU onlangs heeft ingetrokken? Deelt de Commissie de mening dat het buitengewoon verstandig is van de welvarende IJslanders om de EU de rug toe te keren en zich niet, na toetreding, als melkkoe voor de armere Europese landen te laten misbruiken? Zo neen, hoe interpreteert de Commissie de intrekking van de IJslandse EU-kandidatuur dan wel?

3. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat de toetredingsonderhandelingen met Turkije allesbehalve „geïntensiveerd" moeten worden — enerzijds vanwege de gebreken inzake rechtsstaat en democratie, anderzijds vanwege de ernstige inperking van de vrijheid van meningsuiting, de stelselmatige onderdrukking van minderheden en de massale gevangenneming van critici? Vanwaar komt de naïviteit van de Commissie om deze gebreken voor lief te nemen, en vanwaar komt de arrogantie van de Commissie om uitspraken van de Turkse premier Erdoğan „dat het land helemaal niet tot de EU wíl toetreden" ([2]) in de wind te slaan, om vervolgens — alsof er niets aan de hand is — de toetredingsonderhandelingen doodleuk te „intensiveren"? Deelt de Commissie de mening dat het voor de EU, maar ook voor Turkije, verstandiger is om de onderhandelingen definitief te beëindigen?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(19 december 2013)

De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid naar haar verslag over de uitbreidingsstrategie van de EU voor 2013-2014. Hierin wordt melding gemaakt van een belangrijke les uit vorige uitbreidingen, namelijk het belang om de fundamentele kwesties het eerst aan te pakken: de rechtsstaat, de versterking van het economisch bestuur, de versterking van de democratische instellingen, de grondrechten en goede nabuurschapsbetrekkingen ([3]).

IJsland is nog steeds een kandidaat-lidstaat. De nieuwe regering van IJsland heeft besloten de toetredingsonderhandelingen met de EU op te schorten. IJsland blijft een belangrijke partner van de EU in de Europese Economische Ruimte en in het Schengengebied.

De Commissie blijft Turkije en zijn burgers ondersteunen in hun legitieme verwachtingen ten aanzien van verdere hervormingen om de vrijheid van meningsuiting, de persvrijheid, de vrijheid van vergadering en de bescherming van minderheden te versterken.

De Commissie verwijst naar haar uitbreidingspakket van 2013 waarin zij beklemtoont dat de aanhoudende tekortkomingen wijzen op het belang voor de EU om het overleg met Turkije op het gebied van de grondrechten te intensiveren. Vooruitgang in de toetredingsonderhandelingen en vorderingen met de politieke hervormingen in Turkije gaan hand in hand.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/fule/headlines/news/2013/10/20131016_2_en.htm
([2]) http://diepresse.com/home/politik/eu/1339046/Tuerkei_Dann-sagen-wir-der-EU-auf-Wiedersehen?from=home.meinung.gastkommentar.sc.p1.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/strategy_paper_2013_nl.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012031/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Commissioner Füle: 'momentum' behind accession negotiations

There are currently five candidate countries for EU membership (Turkey, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Albania) and two potential candidate states (Kosovo and Bosnia and Herzegovina). Mr Füle, European Commissioner for Expansion, has said that he wants to put some momentum behind the accession negotiations ([1]). He also wants to 'intensify' discussions with Turkey. Iceland, meanwhile, recently withdrew its candidacy for EU membership.

1. Does the Commission realise that countries such as Romania and Bulgaria acceded to the EU despite the fact that they did not fully comply with the applicable criteria for doing so at the time, and indeed still do not do so, as is evident from the imperfections in the rule of law, democracy and the economy in these countries, as well as the rampant corruption? What has the Commission learnt from the premature accession of these countries, and how does this manifest itself?

2. What is the Commission's assessment of the fact that Iceland recently withdrew its candidacy for EU membership? Does the Commission share the view that it is extremely sagacious of the prosperous Icelanders to turn their backs on the EU and not allow themselves to be abused as milch cows for poorer European nations after accession? If not, how does the Commission interpret Iceland's withdrawal of its candidature?

3. Does the Commission share the view that, in view of the shortcomings in Turkey in relation to the rule of law and democracy and given the serious curtailment of the freedom of expression, the systematic oppression of minorities and the mass imprisonment of Government critics, the accession negotiations with Turkey need to be anything but 'intensified'? Why is the Commission so naïve as to tolerate these shortcomings, and what is the reason for its arrogance in turning a blind eye to the statements by the Turkish prime minister, Mr Erdoğan, that his country 'absolutely does not want to join the EU' ([2]), in order to then calmly 'intensify' the accession negotiations as if nothing had happened? Does the Commission share the view that it would make more sense for the EU, as well as for Turkey, for a line to be drawn under the negotiations once and for all?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its EU Enlargement Strategy paper for 2013-2014, which mentions that a key lesson learned from previous enlargements is the importance of addressing the fundamentals first: rule of law, economic governance, strengthening democratic institutions, fundamental rights and good neighbourly relations ([3]).

Iceland is still a candidate country. The new Government of Iceland decided to put EU accession negotiations on hold. Iceland remains an important partner for the EU, in the European Economic Area and in the Schengen Area.

The Commission continues to support Turkey and its citizens in fulfilling their legitimate expectations of further reform to strengthen freedom of expression, freedom of the media, freedom of assembly and protection of minorities.

The Commission refers to its 2013 Enlargement package, in which it underlines that persisting shortcomings underline the importance for the EU to enhance its engagement with Turkey on fundamental rights. Progress in the accession negotiations and progress in the political reforms in Turkey are two sides of the same coin.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/fule/headlines/news/2013/10/20131016_2_en.htm
([2]) http://diepresse.com/home/politik/eu/1339046/Tuerkei_Dann-sagen-wir-der-EU-auf-Wiedersehen?from=home.meinung.gastkommentar.sc.p1
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/strategy_paper_2013_en.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-012032/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(22 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Υποεκπροσώπηση των γυναικών στον τομέα της επιστήμης

Ακόμα και σήμερα, οι γυναίκες υποεκπροσωπούνται σε πολλούς τομείς, όπως στους τομείς της επιστήμης και της τεχνολογίας στην Ευρώπη. Η έκθεση «Mutationnelles 2013», που δημοσιεύθηκε από την Global Contact εξ ονόματος της Orange, τον Σεπτέμβριο του 2013 για να συμπέσει με το φεστιβάλ Επιστημών της Γαλλίας, εξετάζει το ρόλο των γυναικών στην επιστήμη και την τεχνολογία στη Γαλλία, τονίζοντας το γεγονός ότι οι γυναίκες εξακολουθούν να αποτελούν μειονότητα στον επιστημονικό τομέα ([1]). Στην ΕΕ οι γυναίκες αποτελούν μόνο το 33% των φοιτητών που εγγράφονται σε σχολές θετικών επιστημών και μόνο το 27% των εγγεγραμμένων σε πολυτεχνικές σχολές, σύμφωνα με την «Έρευνα για τα φύλα και την καινοτομία», μια μελέτη που δημοσιεύθηκε από την Επιτροπή το 2012 ([2]).

Η ΕΕ έχει αναλάβει πολλές πρωτοβουλίες και έχει δρομολογήσει πολλά προγράμματα με στόχο την αύξηση της συμμετοχής των γυναικών στην καινοτομία και την επιστήμη. Ωστόσο, οι πρωτοβουλίες αυτές δεν έχουν αποφέρει τα αναμενόμενα αποτελέσματα.

Ως εκ τούτου, κρίνεται σκόπιμο να ερωτηθεί η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποιοι πιστεύει ότι είναι οι λόγοι που το πρόβλημα αυτό δεν έχει αντιμετωπιστεί αποτελεσματικά; Έχουν ανατεθεί συγκεκριμένες μελέτες σχετικά με το θέμα;

2. Πώς σχεδιάζει να αντιμετωπίσει τα στερεότυπα των φύλων στην επιστήμη και να ενθαρρύνει τα κορίτσια να εξετάσουν το ενδεχόμενο μιας σταδιοδρομίας σε τομείς όπως η επιστήμη, η τεχνολογία και η μηχανική;

3. Υπάρχει τρόπος αξιολόγησης των αρνητικών επιπτώσεων της υποεκπροσώπησης των γυναικών στην οικονομία της ΕΕ;

4. Ποιες είναι οι επιδόσεις των διαφόρων κρατών μελών στον τομέα αυτό, και ποια συμπεράσματα μπορούν να εξαχθούν;

Απάντηση της κ. Geoghegan-Quinn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(13 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

1. Για περισσότερο από δέκα χρόνια, η Επιτροπή αναλαμβάνει δραστηριότητες οι οποίες έχουν συμβάλει στην ενίσχυση του ρόλου και του αριθμού των γυναικών στις επιστήμες, καθώς και στην προώθηση της ισότητας των φύλων στην έρευνα και την καινοτομία (στατιστικές και δείκτες από το «She figures» («Στοιχεία για τις γυναίκες»), δραστηριότητες καθοδήγησης/δικτύωσης στο πλαίσιο του 5ου ΠΠ ([3]) και του 6ου ΠΠ ([4]), «θεσμικές αλλαγές» στο πλαίσιο του 7ου ΠΠ ([5])). Ωστόσο, δεδομένου ότι το πρόβλημα είναι διαρθρωτικό, πρέπει να αναληφθούν πρωτοβουλίες που θα απευθύνονται σε μια κρίσιμη μάζα πανεπιστημίων και ερευνητικών ιδρυμάτων και θα αποσκοπούν στην άρση των φραγμών που εμποδίζουν τη συμμετοχή και την πρόοδο των γυναικών σε επιστημονικές σταδιοδρομίες. Επιπλέον, υπάρχει ανάγκη για μια πιο συνεκτική προσέγγιση όσον αφορά τις θεσμικές αλλαγές σε ολόκληρη την ΕΕ και για συγκεκριμένες πολιτικές σε επίπεδο κρατών μελών της ΕΕ.

2. Η επικοινωνιακή εκστρατεία «Η επιστήμη είναι γένους θηλυκού!» ξεκίνησε το 2012. Απευθύνεται σε κορίτσια ηλικίας 13-18 ετών με σκοπό να τα ενθαρρύνει να ακολουθήσουν επιστημονικούς κλάδους. Έχει αναπτυχθεί μια επικαιροποιημένη στρατηγική, η οποία προβλέπει διαδικτυακές δραστηριότητες και διαρθρωμένη συνεργασία με τα χρηματοδοτούμενα έργα του σχεδίου δράσης «Επιστήμη και κοινωνία», καθώς και πιο έντονη αλληλεπίδραση με άλλες πρωτοβουλίες της ΕΕ.

3. Ναι, μέσω οικονομετρικής ανάλυσης των εκπαιδευτικών δαπανών έως την τριτοβάθμια εκπαίδευση. Επίσης, θα μπορούσε να χρησιμοποιηθεί ένα μοντέλο μερικής ισορροπίας ώστε να εκτιμηθούν τα αποτελέσματα που προκύπτουν από τη μη βέλτιστη χρήση του ανθρώπινου ερευνητικού κεφαλαίου.

([1]) http://www.global-contact.net/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Mutationnelles-20131.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document_library/pdf_06/she-figures-2012_en.pdf
([3]) 5ο ΠΠ: Πέμπτο πρόγραμμα πλαίσιο δραστηριοτήτων έρευνας, τεχνολογικής ανάπτυξης και επίδειξης (1998-2002).
([4]) 6ο ΠΠ: Έκτο πρόγραμμα πλαίσιο δραστηριοτήτων έρευνας, τεχνολογικής ανάπτυξης και επίδειξης (2002-2006).
([5]) 7ο ΠΠ: Έβδομο πρόγραμμα πλαίσιο δραστηριοτήτων έρευνας, τεχνολογικής ανάπτυξης και επίδειξης (2007-2013).

4. Σύμφωνα με την πρώτη έκθεση προόδου της Επιτροπής για τον ΕΧΕ ([6]), ελάχιστα κράτη μέλη φαίνεται να διαθέτουν στο νομικό τους πλαίσιο για την έρευνα διατάξεις σχετικά με την ισότητα των φύλων, ενώ δεν δίνεται ιδιαίτερη προσοχή στην ενσωμάτωση της διάστασης του φύλου σε εθνικά ερευνητικά προγράμματα. Η έκθεση συνιστά στα κράτη μέλη να εφαρμόσουν ολοκληρωμένες στρατηγικές διαρθρωτικών αλλαγών για την εξάλειψη των διαφορών μεταξύ των φύλων στο πλαίσιο των ερευνητικών ιδρυμάτων και προγραμμάτων.

([6]) COM(2013)637 της 20.9.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012032/13
to the Commission
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Women's underrepresentation in science

Even today, women are underrepresented in many fields, as can be observed in the fields of science and technology in Europe. The 'Mutationnelles 2013' report, published by Global Contact on behalf of Orange in September 2013 to coincide with France's Festival of Science, looks at the role of women in science and technology in France, highlighting the fact that women continue to be a minority in the scientific sector ([1]). In the EU women account for only 33% of students enrolled in science faculties and only 27% of those enrolled in engineering schools, according to the 'Gender Research and Innovation' study published by the Commission in 2012 ([2]).

The EU has taken multiple initiatives and launched many projects with a view to increasing women's participation in innovation and science. However, these initiatives have not yielded the expected results.

Accordingly, it seems appropriate to ask the Commission:

1. What does it believe to be the reasons that this problem has not been addressed effectively? Have any specific studies been commissioned on the topic?

2. How does it plan to tackle gender stereotypes in science and encourage girls to consider careers in sectors such as science, technology and engineering?

3. Is there a way to assess the negative impact of women's underrepresentation on the EU economy?

4. How well are the different Member States performing in this area, and what conclusions can be drawn?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(13 November 2013)

1. For over 10 years, the Commission has engaged in activities that have helped to increase the role and number of women in science and to promote gender in research and innovation ('She Figures' statistics and indicators; mentoring/networking activities in FP5 ([3]) and FP6 ([4]); 'institutional changes' in FP7 ([5])). However, as the problem is structural, a critical mass of universities and research institutions needs to be targeted with initiatives aimed at removing barriers that prevent female participation and progression in scientific careers. Moreover, there is a need for a more consistent approach with respect to institutional changes across the EU and for specific policies at EU Member State level.

2. The 'Science it's a girl thing!' communication campaign was launched in 2012. It targets girls aged 13-18 and encourages them to study science. An updated strategy has been developed, which foresees online activities and a structured collaboration with 'Science in Society' funded projects as well as a stronger interaction with other EU initiatives.

3. Yes, through econometric analysis of education costs up to tertiary level. Also, a partial equilibrium model could be used to estimate the effects of sub-optimal use of human research capital.

4. According to the first ERA progress report of the Commission ([6]) , few Member States appear to have provisions on gender equality in their research legal framework and little attention is paid to integrating the gender dimension into national research programmes. The report recommends that Member States implement comprehensive strategies of structural change to overcome gaps in research institutions and programmes.

([1]) http://www.global-contact.net/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Mutationnelles-20131.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document_library/pdf_06/she-figures-2012_en.pdf
([3]) FP5 : Fifth Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (1998-2002).
([4]) FP6 : Sixth Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (2002-2006).
([5]) FP7 : Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (2007-2013).
([6]) COM(2013) 637, 20.9.2013.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés P-012033/13
a Bizottság számára
Bánki Erik (PPE)
(2013. október 22.)

Tárgy: A krumovgradi alternatív bányászati projekt

Napjainkban számos aranybányászati projekt vár engedélyeztetésre, többek között Romániában, Szlovákiában és Bulgáriában. Aggodalomra ad okot, hogy a beruházók a gazdasági szempontból legkedvezőbb, cianidos lúgozás technológiát alkalmaznák az esetleges környezetbarátabb megoldások helyett, noha célszerű lenne alternatív megoldásokat választani. Erre nagyon jó példa, hogy a bulgáriai Krumovgrad melletti bányaberuházásban olyan vezető technológiák kerülnek majd alkalmazásra, mint például az integrált bányahulladék-rendszer.

1. Az imént leírtakkal kapcsolatban kérdezem a Bizottságot, hogy tudomással van-e arról, hogy a Krumovgrad melletti aranybányában pontosan milyen technológia kerül alkalmazásra?

2. Kérem a Bizottságot, hogy listázza a lehetséges alternatívákat és járjon utána a legújabb kutatási eredményeknek e téren.

3. Ezek fényében gondolja-e a Bizottság, hogy kezdeményezi végre a cianidos bányászat uniós betiltását?

Janez Potočnik válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. november 20.)

Ami a Kumovgrad melletti aranybányát illeti, a bányatársaság az arany kivonására hagyományos megbontási, aprítási és flotációs eljárást szándékozik alkalmazni.

Az olyan alternatív technológiákat illetően, mint például más lúgzószerek vagy egyéb (fizikai) módszerek alkalmazása az aranynak az érctől való leválasztására megjegyzendő, hogy az alternatívák mindegyikének vannak olyan sajátos aspektusai és jellegzetességei, amelyek alapján jelenleg nem tekinthetők megfelelő alternatíváknak a cianid valamennyi bányászati műveletben való, ipari méretű használatának kiváltására.

A cianidos bányászati technológiák EU-ban történő betiltásának esetleges bevezetésével kapcsolatban a Bizottság a tisztelt képviselők figyelmébe ajánlja a Tabajdi Csaba képviselő úr által beterjesztett E-3589/2010. számú írásbeli kérdésre adott válaszát.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012033/13
to the Commission
Erik Bánki (PPE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Alternative mining project at Krumovgrad

At present, many goldmining projects are awaiting authorisation, *inter alia* in Romania, Slovakia and Bulgaria. There is cause for concern in the fact that the investors use the financially cheapest technology — cyanide leaching — rather than any environmentally more benign methods, although it would be advisable to opt for alternative solutions. A very good example is the mining project near Krumovgrad in Bulgaria, in which such cutting-edge technologies are to be used as the integrated mining-waste system.

1. In view of the above, does the Commission know exactly what technology is to be used in the goldmine near Krumovgrad?

2. Can the Commission list the possible alternatives and ascertain the latest research results in this field?

3. In this light, will the Commission finally propose that mining with cyanide be banned by the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(20 November 2013)

As regards the technique to be applied in the Kumovgrad gold mine the mining company intends to employ conventional crushing, grinding and flotation processing for gold extraction.

As regards alternative techniques such as the use of other lixiviants and other (physical) methods to separate gold from the ore, each of the alternatives has a number of intrinsic aspects and characteristics which mean that they are currently not considered suitable alternatives for cyanide use in all gold mining operations on an industrial scale.

As regards the potential introduction of a ban of the use of cyanide mining technologies in the EU the Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answer to Written Question P-3589/2010 from Mr Tabajdi.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012034/13
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(22 octobre 2013)

Objet: Consommation d'énergie des smartphones

Dans son rapport intitulé «Internet commence avec le charbon» publié en août 2013, Mark Mills, physicien et PDG de Digital Power Group, affirme que le smartphone, utilisé au maximum de ses capacités, consommerait plus d'électricité qu'un réfrigérateur, soit 361 kWh, contre 322 kWh, du fait de l'utilisation accrue du wifi, de la 3G, du téléchargement et du partage des données.

Alors que l'objectif de l'efficacité énergétique à l'horizon 2020 est de 20 %, selon la directive en date du 14 novembre 2012 sur l'efficacité énergétique, la consommation électrique des smartphones constitue un véritable enjeu économique et environnemental pour l'Union européenne.

1. De quelle manière la Commission peut-t-elle aider l'Union à atteindre son objectif de 20 % d'efficacité énergétique à l'horizon 2020 face à la multiplication des nouveaux usages spécifiques de l'électricité symbolisée par l'utilisation des smartphones, sachant que les seuls progrès réalisés à ce jour concernent la baisse de consommation recherchée par les constructeurs pour augmenter l'autonomie des appareils?

2. Plus précisément, la Commission envisage-t-elle d'instaurer, au niveau européen, un label d'efficacité énergétique pour faire face au caractère énergivore des technologies de l'information et de la communication (TIC), tout en préservant la compétitivité des opérateurs et du pouvoir d'achat des ménages?

3. Comment la Commission souhaite-t-elle sensibiliser les citoyens européens aux économies d'énergie liées à l'utilisation de leur smartphone?

Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission
(11 décembre 2013)

Afin de dresser la liste des produits qui devraient faire l'objet d'une évaluation au titre du cadre en matière d'écoconception et d'étiquetage énergétique, la Commission européenne a élaboré des plans de travail fondés sur des études scientifiques. Lors de la préparation des plans de travail pour 2009-2011 et 2012-2014, les téléphones portables se sont révélés être un groupe de produits présentant un potentiel d'économies d'énergie relativement faible ([1]). En conséquence, la Commission ne prévoit pas, à ce stade, d'instaurer un étiquetage énergétique pour les téléphones portables. Dans le même temps, d'autres produits du secteur des TIC font l'objet de mesures; on peut citer à titre d'exemples les règlements en matière d'écoconception relatifs aux ordinateurs/serveurs et à la «veille en réseau», ainsi que les accords volontaires sur les décodeurs numériques complexes et le matériel de traitement d'image. Le programme d'efficacité énergétique «EnergyStar» pour le matériel de bureau et «l'écolabel» (qui comportent, par exemple, des critères applicables aux ordinateurs portables) qui ont une incidence importante dans le cadre des marchés publics viennent compléter la législation de l'Union relative aux produits ([2]).

([1]) http://www.ecodesign-wp2.eu/documents.htm
([2]) http://www.eu-energystar.org/en/index.html; http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ecolabel/eu-ecolabel-for-consumers.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012034/13
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Energy consumption of smartphones

In his report entitled 'The Cloud Begins with Coal', published in August 2013, Mark Mills, physicist and CEO of Digital Power Group, states that the smartphone, used to its maximum capacity, would consume more electricity than a refrigerator, in other words 361 kWh as opposed to 322 kWh, due to the increased use of Wi-Fi, 3G, downloads and data sharing.

Whilst the energy efficiency target for 2020 is 20%, according to the directive on energy efficiency of 14 November 2012, the electric energy consumption of smartphones poses a real economic and environmental challenge for the European Union.

1. How can the Commission help the EU achieve its 20% energy efficiency target by 2020 when faced with the increase in specific new uses for electricity symbolised by the use of smartphones, given that the only progress made to date relates to the reduced consumption sought by manufacturers in order to increase the autonomy of the devices?

2. More specifically, does the Commission plan to establish an energy efficiency label at EU level to tackle the energy-intensive nature of information and communication technology (ICT), whilst preserving the competitiveness of operators and the purchasing power of households?

3. How does the Commission intend to raise European public awareness regarding energy saving associated with the use of their smartphone?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

To identify products that should be assessed under the Ecodesign and the Energy Labelling Framework, the European Commission established Working plans based on scientific studies. In the preparation for the 2009-2011 and 2012-2014 Working plans, mobile phones were found to be a product group with relatively low energy saving potential ([1]). Therefore, the Commission does not plan to establish an energy label for mobile phones at this stage. At the same time other products of the ICT-sector are being addressed (examples are the Ecodesign regulations on computers/computer servers and on 'networked standby', the voluntary agreements on complex set top boxes and imaging equipment). The energy efficiency programme 'EnergyStar' for office equipment and the 'Ecolabel' (e.g. with criteria for portable computers) which have an important impact through public procurement complement EU product legislation ([2]).

([1]) http://www.ecodesign-wp2.eu/documents.htm
([2]) http://www.eu-energystar.org/en/index.html; http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ecolabel/eu-ecolabel-for-consumers.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012035/13
à la Commission
Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL)
(22 octobre 2013)

Objet: Le Conseil est-il aux ordres de Mme Merkel?

Le lundi 14 octobre, le Conseil des ministres de l'environnement a reporté l'obligation de réduction des émissions de CO_2 des voitures. L'accord conclu avec le Parlement européen, en juin dernier, fixait un objectif de réduction à 95 g de CO_2/km d'ici à 2020. L'entrée en vigueur du plafond de 95 g/km pourrait être repoussée à 2024, voire carrément remise en cause.

Comment la Commission compte-elle remplir les objectifs de réduction des émissions de CO_2 de 40 % en 2030 si cette mesure est repoussée éternellement?

Ce report a été obtenu après l'insistance de M[me] Merkel auprès du Conseil arguant que «certains de nos constructeurs, qui produisent majoritairement des grosses voitures, même s'il s'agit des plus efficaces et des plus innovantes dans leur segment, seraient très pénalisés par le projet européen actuel» et que «des emplois en Allemagne seraient menacés». On apprend, dans le même temps, que la CDU, formation de Mme Merkel, a reçu 690 000 euros de dons, une semaine avant la réunion du Conseil, de la part de BMW, constructeur visé par la réduction des émissions de CO_2.

Pourquoi la voix de M[me] Merkel a-t-elle été prépondérante au sein du Conseil, au détriment de l'intérêt général humain des Européens?

Ce report a été acquis grâce au revirement de dernière minute de trois grands pays qui soutenaient la limitation des émissions de CO_2, à savoir la France, le Royaume-Uni et la Pologne.

Peut-on connaître les raisons de ce revirement?

Réponse donnée par M[me] Hedegaard au nom de la Commission
(3 décembre 2013)

Lors de la réunion du Conseil (environnement) d'octobre, la Commission a constaté avec inquiétude que le Conseil avait décidé de ne pas approuver le résultat du trilogue de juin 2013, qui constituait un compromis équilibré. À la suite de cette réunion, la Commission facilite à présent les discussions entre les colégislateurs afin de trouver dans les meilleurs délais une solution qui permettrait de parvenir à un accord en première lecture.

La Commission n'a pas à se prononcer sur la manière dont chaque État membre, qui prend ses décisions en toute souveraineté, est parvenu à sa position concernant la législation proposée.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012035/13
to the Commission
Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Is the Council taking orders from Mrs Merkel?

On Monday 14 October 2013, the Council of Environment Ministers postponed the requirement for CO_2 emissions from cars to be reduced. The agreement concluded with Parliament, in June of this year, set a target of reducing CO_2/km to 95 g by 2020. The entry into force of the 95 g/km threshold could be pushed back to 2024, evidently calling it into question.

How does the Commission intend to reach the target of reducing CO_2 emissions by 40% by 2030 if this measure is continually postponed?

The postponement was obtained following Mrs Merkel's insistence to the Council, arguing that some German manufacturers, which predominantly produced large cars, even if they were the most efficient and innovative of their kind, would be heavily penalised by the current European plan and that jobs in Germany would be threatened. At the same time, we have also learnt that, one week prior to the meeting, the CDU, Mrs Merkel's party, received EUR 690 000 in donations from BMW, a manufacturer that is targeted by the reduction in CO_2 emissions.

Why has Mrs Merkel's voice dominated within the Council, to the detriment of the general interest of the European people?

This postponement was obtained thanks to the last-minute change of heart of three major countries that were in support of limiting CO_2 emissions, namely France, the United Kingdom and Poland.

May we know the reasons for this change of heart?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2013)

At the meeting of the Council (Environment) in October, the Commission noted with concern the Council's decision not to endorse the trilogue outcome of June 2013, which represented a balanced compromise. Further to that meeting, the Commission is now facilitating discussions between the co-legislators in order to find a solution as soon as possible, which would allow an agreement in first reading.

The Commission does not have a view on how individual Member States, which are responsible for their sovereign decisions, arrived at their position on the proposed legislation.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-012036/13
a Bizottság számára
Bánki Erik (PPE)
(2013. október 22.)

Tárgy: Fiatalok elhelyezkedése az idegenforgalmi ágazatban

A fiatalok munkanélkülisége az Európai Unió egyik legégetőbb problémájává vált. Az unió országaiban jelenleg öt és félmillió 25 év alatti fiatal nem tud elhelyezkedni, tehát a probléma a korosztálynak csaknem negyedét érinti.

Európa egyik közös és fontos célja, hogy továbbra is a világ leglátogatottabb úti célja maradjon. Az Európai Unióban a munkahelyek 12%-a származik közvetetten a turizmusból. Nem szabad figyelmen kívül hagyni, hogy a fiatalok foglalkoztatása ebben az ágazatban a legmagasabb. A turizmus területén igen sokféle munkalehetőség létezik, ezért mind az alacsonyabb, mind a magasabb végzettséggel rendelkezők alkalmazhatók.

A fent említettek alapján kérdezem a Bizottságot, hogy eddig milyen eszközöket alkalmazott annak érdekében, hogy megkönnyítse a fiatalok elhelyezkedését az idegenforgalmi ágazatban? Illetve milyen intézkedéseket kíván tenni a közeljövőben e téren?

Andor László válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. december 10.)

Az ifjúsági garancia létrehozásáról szóló tanácsi ajánlás célja annak biztosítása, hogy a tagállamok 25 éves korig minden fiatal számára színvonalas munkahelyet kínáljanak, vagy pedig lehetővé tegyék számukra, hogy további oktatásban, tanulószerződéses gyakorlati képzésben vagy gyakornoki képzésben vegyenek részt. Az ilyen típusú kezdeményezések finanszírozását a fiatalok munkanélküliségével leginkább sújtott régiókban a 2014-től 2020-ig tartó időszakra szóló ifjúsági foglalkoztatási kezdeményezés segíti, támogatva ezáltal az ifjúsági garancia valósággá válását. Az ajánlás nem emel ki egyetlen ágazatot sem a többi közül; ha a tagállamok egy-egy ágazatnak külön figyelmet kívánnak szentelni, azt maguknak kell elhatározniuk.

Az Európai Foglalkoztatási Mobilitás Portálja ([1]) (EURES) segít összehozni a munkaerő-piaci kínálatot és keresletet. Az idegenforgalommal kapcsolatban az EURES nemsokára új funkcióval bővül: lehetőség lesz ágazatilag meghatározott készségek alapján is keresni az adatbázisban. Ez az újdonság először a vendéglátóipar területén lesz elérhető, majd később a kulturális ágazatban, a kalandturizmus területén, valamint a tengerhajózásban és a tengerrel összefüggő más területeken, illetőleg a különleges szükségletekkel rendelkező turisták kiszolgálásával kapcsolatos készségek esetében.

Tekintettel arra, hogy a nyelvi készségek központi szerepet játszanak az idegenforgalomban, az Erasmus+ elnevezésű új finanszírozási program 2014-től kiemelten foglalkozik majd a fiatalok tanulási, képzési és önkéntes munkavállalási célú mobilitásának támogatásával. Az Eurasmus+ ([2]) emellett – az idegenforgalomban és más területeken – lehetőséget ad az ágazatilag megalapozott projektek finanszírozására is.

Az úgynevezett ágazati szakképzettség-fejlesztési szövetségek támogatni fogják a szakképző intézmények és az ugyanazon szakmában ([3]) működő szervezetek közötti együttműködéseket olyan közös szakképzési programok és módszerek kidolgozása érdekében, amelyek a munkaerőpiacon könnyen hasznosítható készségekkel ruházzák fel a képzés résztvevőit. A Leonardo da Vinci program máris mintegy 600 projektet finanszírozott az idegenforgalomban ([4]).

([1]) https://ec.europa.eu/eures/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus-plus/index_en.htm
([3]) A NACE-kódok szerint.
([4]) http://www.adam-europe.eu/adam/project/extendedsearch.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012036/13
to the Commission
Erik Bánki (PPE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Jobs for young people in tourism

Youth unemployment has become one of the EU's most pressing problems. 5.5 million people under the age of 25 in the EU are currently unable to find work — almost a quarter of all people in that age group.

One of Europe's principle common aims is to remain the world's most-visited tourist destination. 12% of jobs in the EU result indirectly from tourism. We should not forget that youth employment is highest in this sector. There are so many employment opportunities in the field of tourism that there is a place for everyone, regardless of their level of qualifications.

What action has the Commission taken so far to facilitate young people finding work in tourism? What does it intend to do in the near future in this area?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2013)

The Council Recommendation on establishing a Youth Guarantee seeks to ensure that Member States offer all young people up to the age of 25 years old a quality job, continued education, an apprenticeship or a traineeship within four months of leaving formal education or becoming unemployed. The Youth Employment Initiative 2014-2020, will help finance the provision of this initiatives in the region's worst affected by youth unemployment, thus supporting the implementation of the Youth guarantee. However the recommendation does not target any sector as such. It is up to the Member State to target any specific sector if they want to.

Furthermore, the European Job Mobility Portal ([1]) (EURES) is helping match the supply of jobs with the demand. Regarding the tourim sector, EURES will be refined to allow for searches to be based on skills as defined by industry. This innovative approach will concern first jobs in the hospitality sector and subsequently in the cultural, adventure, marine and maritime sectors, as well as skills to meet the needs of tourists with special needs

As language skills are crucial for employment in the tourism sector, the new funding programme Erasmus+, effective from 2014, will prominently support mobility of young people for learning, training or volunteering purposes. Erasmus+ ([2]) will also provide opportunities to fund sector-based projects (including tourism).

The Sector Skills Alliances will support partnerships between vocational institutions and organisations from the same trade ([3]), to design and deliver joint vocational training programmes and methods which provide vocational learners with labour-market relevant skills. Already Leonardo da Vinci has supported about 600 projects in the tourism sector ([4]).

([1]) https://ec.europa.eu/eures/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus-plus/index_en.htm
([3]) According to NACE codes.
([4]) http://www.adam-europe.eu/adam/project/extendedsearch.htm

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-012037/13
do Komisji
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(22 października 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Opłaty za reklamację pobierane przez przewoźników lotniczych

Większość firm lotniczych oferuje bezpłatne składanie reklamacji za pomocą formularzy online. Jednak nie wszyscy obywatele Unii korzystają lub mają dostęp do internetu. Osoby chcące skorzystać ze złożenia reklamacji telefonicznie są zmuszone do uiszczenia dodatkowych opłat telefonicznych, droższych niż u standardowych operatorów telekomunikacyjnych. Często opłata taka przekracza 1 euro za minutę połączenia.

Czy Komisja zamierza podjąć jakieś działania, aby linie lotnicze nie obciążały pasażerów postępowaniem reklamacyjnym, szczególnie w sytuacji, gdy to po stronie przewoźnika jest wina co do niedotrzymania warunków umowy?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Viviane Reding w imieniu Komisji
(8 stycznia 2014 r.)

Artykuł 21 dyrektywy 2011/83/UE w sprawie praw konsumentów ([1]) stanowi, że nie można pobierać od konsumentów wyższej opłaty niż opłata podstawowa, w przypadku gdy sprzedawca usług używa linii telefonicznej w celu kontaktu z nim w sprawie zawartej umowy. Przepis ten nie ma jednak zastosowania do usług transportu pasażerskiego.

Niemniej jednak w konkretnych przypadkach danej sprawy niedostarczenie konsumentom odpowiedniej (tj. kompletnej i prawdziwej) informacji dotyczącej kosztów i warunków obsługi klienta może stanowić nieuczciwą praktykę w rozumieniu dyrektywy 2005/29/WE ([2]) w sprawie nieuczciwych praktyk handlowych. Dyrektywa obejmuje działania wprowadzające w błąd i zaniechania. Na mocy tej dyrektywy, informacje, które są potrzebne konsumentowi w celu dokonania świadomego wyboru, w tym ustalenia dotyczące rozpatrywania reklamacji, muszą być wyraźnie przedstawione.

Państwa członkowskie są odpowiedzialne za ustanowienie odpowiednich i skutecznych środków zwalczania nieuczciwych praktyk handlowych. Jednakże doświadczenie wskazało potrzebę poprawy koordynacji działań w zakresie egzekwowania prawa, w szczególności w przypadku, gdy ten sam problem pojawia się w różnych państwach członkowskich. Zgodnie z komisyjnym Europejskim programem na rzecz konsumentów ([3]), sprawozdanie w sprawie stosowania dyrektywy 2005/29/WE ([4]) przyjęte w dniu 14 marca 2013 r. określa główne obszary działań, w tym sektor podróży i transportu, w których egzekwowanie prawa powinno być bardziej rygorystyczne. W przypadku naruszenia o charakterze transgranicznym tych przepisów organy egzekwowania prawa mogą współpracować w ramach sieci współpracy w zakresie ochrony konsumenta utworzonej w 2006 r. ([5]). Konsumenci, z drugiej strony, mogą wnioskować o pomoc do Sieci Europejskich Centrów Konsumenckich (ECC-Net), współfinansowanej przez Komisję, w przypadku skarg dotyczących podmiotu mającego siedzibę w innym państwie członkowskim.

([1]) Dz.U. L 304 z 22.11.2011, s. 64.
([2]) Dz.U. L 149 z 11.6.2005.
([3]) COM(2012) 225.
([4]) COM(2013) 139.
([5]) Rozporządzenie (WE) nr 2006/2004 z dnia 27 października 2004 r., Dz.U. L 364 z 9.12.2004, s. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012037/13
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Complaint fees charged by air carriers

Most airlines have a free-of-charge online complaints procedure which involves filling in a form. However, not everyone in the EU uses or has access to the Internet. Anyone wanting to lodge a complaint by telephone must pay an additional phone charge which is higher than that levied by normal telecoms operators and is often in excess of EUR 1 per minute.

Does the Commission intend to take any action to ensure that airlines do not charge passengers making complaints, particularly where the carrier has failed to comply with contractual terms?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(8 January 2014)

Article 21 of Directive 2011/83/EU on Consumer Rights ([1]) provides that consumers cannot be charged more than the basic rate, where the trader operates a telephone line for the purpose of contacting him in relation to the contract concluded. This provision, however, does not apply to passenger transport services.

Nevertheless, based on the circumstances of the individual case, failure to provide the consumer with appropriate (i.e. complete and truthful) information relating to the costs and modalities of customer assistance may constitute an unfair practice under the directive 2005/29/EC ([2]) on Unfair Commercial Practices. The directive covers misleading actions and omissions. Under the directive, information, which the consumer needs in order to make an informed choice, including the arrangements for complaints handling policy, must be displayed clearly.

Member States are responsible for setting up adequate and effective means to combat unfair commercial practices. However experience has shown a need for improving coordinated enforcement, in particular where the same problem arises in different Member States. In line with the Commission's Consumer Agenda ([3]), the report on the application of Directive 2005/29/EC ([4]) adopted on 14 March 2013 identifies key areas for actions, including the travel and transport sectors, where enforcement should be stepped up. For cross-border infringements of this legislation enforcement authorities may cooperate within the Consumer Protection Cooperation Network established in 2006 ([5]). Consumers, on the other hand, may seek assistance from the European Consumer Centre Network (ECC-net), co-funded by the Commission, for their complaints with a business operator established in another Member State.

([1]) OJ L 304/64, 22.11.2011.
([2]) OJ L 149, 11.6.2005.
([3]) COM(2012) 225.
([4]) COM(2013) 139.
([5]) Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 of 27 October 2004, OJ L364, 9.12.2004, p.1.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012038/13
to the Commission
Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Israeli Government on Horizon 2020

The Commission is currently negotiating a memorandum of understanding (MoU) with the Israeli Government specifying the conditions under which Israeli entities may participate in and receive financial assistance under the Horizon 2020 programme, which is due to start as of 1 January 2014.

The Commission's authority to enter into such an MoU is based on Article 5 of the EU-Israel Protocol of 15 April 2008 on the general principles governing Israel's participation in EU programmes, which is provisionally applicable in accordance with Article 10(2) thereof.

1. This Protocol has not been approved by Parliament. In view of the present sensitivity of participation in EU programmes by Israeli entities, in particular those established or active in Israeli settlements in Palestine, does the Commission consider itself entitled to conclude a MoU with Israel in spite of the fact that it is not known whether Parliament will give its assent to the Protocol when the question is finally submitted to it?

2. On 19 July 2013 the Commission issued guidelines to ensure that EU grants, loans and prizes do not benefit Israeli settlements in the West Bank, which are considered by the EU as 'illegal and an obstacle to peace'. This is an important step to ensure that the EU does not support the Israeli settlement enterprise. It is reported that Israel opposes a distinction being made between beneficiaries in its recognised territory and those in illegal settlements, and is therefore exercising major pressure for a flexible interpretation of the EU guidelines in the ongoing negotiations on Israel's participation in the Horizon 2020 research funding programme. How are EU negotiators ensuring that the content of the EU guidelines is not compromised in this process?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(22 November 2013)

1. The Protocol to the Euro-Mediterranean Agreement on the general principles governing the State of Israel's participation in Community programmes is provisionally applied and hence, allows the Commission to negotiate an agreement with Israel under the Protocol. The Commission has, on 1 August 2013, notified the Parliament of the opening of such negotiations.

2. The application of the Guidelines will be translated into all agreements on Israel's participation in EU programmes to be put in place as from 2014. A high level of media attention reflects the fact that association of Israel to Horizon 2020 is both a high-profile agreement and also the first such agreement to be negotiated for the 2014-20 financial framework. The Guidelines are not subject to re-negotiation. As negotiations are ongoing, the Commission is not able to comment on specific details.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-012039/13
aan de Commissie
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(22 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Levering van traangas aan de regering van Bahrein

Sinds 2011 vinden er in Bahrein regelmatig confrontaties plaats tussen demonstranten en veiligheidstroepen. De veiligheidstroepen zetten daarbij vaak lukraak traangas in, hetgeen de dood van ongeveer 39 mensen tot gevolg heeft gehad, ofwel door verstikking, ofwel doordat ze door een traangasgranaat op hun hoofd werden geraakt. Volgens een gelekt document van Bahrain Watch wil de regering van Bahrein haar voorraden traangas en andere uitrusting voor het in bedwang houden van menigten, aanvullen ([1]). Ze is momenteel op zoek naar bedrijven die een offerte kunnen doen voor de benodigde hoeveelheden. Het Zuid-Koreaanse DaeKwang Chemicals, dat tussen 2011 en 2012 reeds een miljoen traangasgranaten aan Bahrein heeft geleverd ([2]), zou nu opnieuw een van de aangezochte bedrijven zijn.

1. Is de Commissie het met mij eens dat de levering van traangas aan Bahrein moet worden gestopt en zo niet, waarom niet?

2. Is de Commissie het met mij eens dat er een EU-verbod op de levering van uitrusting voor het in bedwang houden van menigten, waaronder traangas, aan Bahrein moet komen, zoals gevraagd in de resolutie van het Europees Parlement van 17 januari 2013 over de mensenrechtensituatie in Bahrein ([3]) en zo niet, waarom niet?

3. Is de Commissie het met mij eens dat de belofte van een aantal lidstaten om de afgifte van vergunningen voor de export van militaire uitrusting naar Bahrein streng in de gaten te houden, niet ver genoeg gaat en zo niet, waarom niet?

4. Is de Commissie bereid een voorstel te doen voor beperkende maatregelen, en dat soort maatregelen ook daadwerkelijk te nemen, tegen de personen die in Bahrein verantwoordelijk zijn voor de (aanhoudende) schendingen van de mensenrechten, in overeenstemming met de hierboven aangehaalde resolutie van het Europees Parlement en zo niet, waarom niet?

5. Is de Commissie het met mij eens dat Zuid-Korea gedwongen moet worden zich te houden aan de vigerende vrijhandelsovereenkomst tussen de EU en Zuid-Korea, in het bijzonder wat de bekrachtiging door Zuid-Korea van de Universele Verklaring van de rechten van de mens betreft en zo niet, waarom niet?

6. Is de Commissie bereid dit onderwerp op het hoogste politieke niveau met Zuid-Korea te bespreken, teneinde de mogelijke export van traangas van Zuid-Korea naar Bahrein te voorkomen en zo niet, waarom niet?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(21 november 2013)

De HV/VV volgt de situatie in Bahrein van zeer nabij en zal dit blijven doen.

De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter heeft steeds benadrukt dat alleen waardevolle en concrete vertrouwenwekkende maatregelen, waaronder de vrijlating van personen die zijn aangehouden in het kader van vreedzame politieke activiteiten, eerbiediging van de vrijheid van vergadering en meningsuiting en inzet voor de politieke hervormingen en de nationale dialoog bij alle partijen, het vertrouwen kunnen herstellen in de aanloop naar werkelijke nationale verzoening, vrede en stabiliteit in het land.

De beslissing om wapenuitvoer toe te staan of te weigeren, wordt aan de lidstaten overgelaten en op EU-niveau gecoördineerd bij Gemeenschappelijk Standpunt 2008/944/CFSP ([4]) (dat in 2008 de eerste gedragscode betreffende wapenuitvoer verving die sinds 1998 in voege was) en door de Groep van de Raad voor de export van conventionele wapens (COARM).

Naar aanleiding van de volksopstanden in het Midden-Oosten en Noord-Afrika en de Golfregio volgt COARM nauwlettend de ontwikkelingen in deze gebieden, om nationale vergunningverlenende instanties van de meest nuttige informatie over gevoelige exportbestemmingen, zoals Bahrein, te voorzien.

([1]) http://stoptheshipment.org/.
([2]) http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/67a619e2-397d-11e3-a3a4-00144feab7de.html#axzz2iKt2pG80.
([3]) Aangenomen teksten, P7_TA(2013)0032.
([4]) Gemeenschappelijk Standpunt 2008/944/GBVB van de Raad van 8 december 2008 tot vaststelling van gemeenschappelijke voorschriften voor de controle op de uitvoer van militaire goederen en technologie, PB L 335, 13.12.2008.

Het opleggen van beperkende maatregelen tegen individuele Bahreini wordt in de huidige politieke omstandigheden niet als gepast beschouwd.

De HV/VV wenst niet te speculeren over mogelijke afzonderlijke besluiten van Zuid-Koreaanse of andere ondernemingen van buiten de EU die willen deelnemen aan aanbestedingsprocedures in Bahrein.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012039/13
to the Commission
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Supply of tear gas to the Bahraini Government

Since 2011, protestors and security forces have clashed regularly in Bahrain. Security forces often use teargas indiscriminately, which has resulted in the deaths of some 39 people by suffocation or being hit on the head by tear gas canisters. According to a leaked document released by advocacy group Bahrain Watch, the Bahraini Government plans to replenish its depleted supplies of tear gas and other crowd control equipment ([1]). It is looking for companies to submit bids to supply the required quantities. DaeKwang Chemical of South Korea, which provided 1 million teargas canisters to Bahrain between 2011 and 2012 ([2]), may be eligible.

1. Does the Commission agree that shipments of tear gas to Bahrain should be stopped? If not, why not?

2. Does the Commission agree that an EU ban on the export of crowd control equipment, including tear gas, to Bahrain is necessary, in line with the European Parliament resolution of 17 January 2013 on the human rights situation in Bahrain? ([3]) If not, why not?

3. Does the Commission agree that the promise made by some Member States to closely monitor the granting of licences to export military equipment to Bahrain does not go far enough? If not, why not?

4. Is the Commission willing to propose and introduce restrictive measures against those individuals in Bahrain who are responsible for (ongoing) human rights violations in the country, in line with the abovementioned European Parliament resolution? If not, why not?

5. Does the Commission agree that South Korea should be held to the terms of the EU-South Korea Free Trade Agreement in force, especially as regards its reaffirmation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the agreement? If not, why not?

6. Is the Commission willing to address this issue with South Korea at the highest political level in order to prevent the potential export of tear gas from South Korea to Bahrain? If not, why not?

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

The HR/VP follows the situation in Bahrain very closely and will continue to do so.

The HR/VP has steadily stressed that only significant and concrete confidence building steps, including the release of those arrested in the context of peaceful political activities, the respect for freedom of assembly and expression, and commitment to political reform and National Dialogue on all sides, have the potential to restore confidence leading up to genuine national reconciliation, peace and stability in the country.

The decision to authorise or deny arms exports remains at the discretion of Member States, coordinated at EU level by Common Position 2008/944/CFSP ([4]) (that replaced in 2008 the initial Code of conduct on arms export in place since 1998) and the Council working party on conventional arms exports (COARM).

Following popular uprisings in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) and Gulf regions, COARM closely follows developments in those regions, with a view to providing national licensing authorities with the most relevant information regarding sensitive export destinations, including Bahrain.

Imposing restrictive measures against Bahraini individuals is not considered appropriate at the current political juncture.

The HR/VP does not wish to speculate on potential individual decisions by South Korean or other non-EU companies to take part in tendering processes in Bahrain.

([1]) http://stoptheshipment.org/
([2]) http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/67a619e2-397d-11e3-a3a4-00144feab7de.html#axzz2iKt2pG80
([3]) Texts adopted, P7_TA(2013) 0032.
([4]) Council Common Position 2008/944/CFSP of 8 December 2008 defining common rules governing control of exports of military technology and equipment, OJ L 335, 13.12.2008.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012042/13
an die Kommission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(22. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: OLAF-Ermittlungen: Griechisches Institut für Berufliche Bildung (OEEK) — OF/2011/0704

Presseberichten zufolge wurde im Juli 2010 das OLAF auf Fälle von Missbrauch und Betrug im Griechischen Institut für Berufliche Bildung (OEEK) aufmerksam gemacht. Nachdem das Amt nicht reagierte, wurde der Kabinettschef des zuständigen Kommissars eingeschaltet. Auch daraufhin reagierte das Amt nur schwerfällig. Bis heute seien nur 516 000 EUR, damit ein Zwölftel des geschätzten Schadens für den EU-Haushalt von 4,5 Millionen EUR, zurückgefordert worden. Strafrechtlich seien die Verschwendungsfälle bereits verjährt.

1. Wann wurde der Vorgang in das Fallmanagementsystem des OLAF eingepflegt?

2. Wann wurde der Fall vom OLAF geschlossen?

3. Wurde die Kommission als Quelle der Information in den Fallakten vermerkt oder der Informant?

4. Welche Ermittlungsmethoden hat das OLAF nach Anzeige des Falls unternommen, um die Vorwürfe zu klären?

5. Zu welchem Ergebnis kam das OLAF?

6. Welche Empfehlungen gab das OLAF ab?

7. Wie wurde der Fall nach Abschluss der OLAF-Ermittlung weiterverfolgt?

8. Wie wurden die Informationen, die der Rechnungsprüfer des OEEK dem OLAF zur Verfügung stellte, bewertet?

9. Warum hat OLAF nach der ersten Anzeige im Jahr 2010 nicht reagiert?

10. Wie wird die Kommission mit dem restlichen, noch nicht wiedereingezogenen Schaden von geschätzten 4 Millionen EUR umgehen?

11. Was sind die nächsten Schritte der Kommission?

12. Wird die Kommission den Abschlussbericht und die Wiedereinziehungsentscheidungen im Fall OF/2011/0704 ungeschwärzt und vollständig veröffentlichen oder dem Parlament, insbesondere den Mitgliedern des Haushaltskontrollausschusses des Europäischen Parlaments, gegebenenfalls auch vertraulich zur Einsicht zur Verfügung stellen?

13. Wann?

Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission
(20. Dezember 2013)

Das OLAF hat der Kommission mitgeteilt, dass die von der Frau Abgeordneten angesprochenen Angelegenheiten Gegenstand eines schwebenden Verfahrens sind ([1]). Dieser Fall wird vom OLAF in enger Zusammenarbeit mit den zuständigen griechischen Behörden, und zwar dem Strafgericht erster Instanz von Athen, dem Richterrat des Appellationshofs von Athen und dem griechischen Rechnungshof, untersucht.

Der justizielle Teil dieses Falls ist Gegenstand eines laufenden Strafprozesses vor den genannten nationalen Gerichten, sein finanzieller Teil wird (auf Ersuchen der betreffenden Gerichte) vom griechischen Rechnungshof detailliert geprüft.

([1]) Aktenzeichen OF/2011/0704.

Seit Aufnahme dieses Falls in das Fallmanagementsystem im Jahre 2011 hat das OLAF demjenigen, der es über diese Angelegenheit unterrichtet hat, mehrfach mitgeteilt, dass erst dann eine mögliche strafrechtliche Haftung und eine damit einhergehende mögliche finanzielle Haftung (im Hinblick auf griechische oder auf EU-Haushaltsmittel) festgestellt werden kann, wenn das Ergebnis der beiden laufenden Verfahren vorliegt. Die Frau Abgeordnete hat sicherlich dafür Verständnis, dass ein ordnungsgemäßes Verfahren respektiert werden muss und das OLAF angesichts laufender Gerichtsverfahren die Pflicht hat, von weiteren Stellungnahmen abzusehen.

Erst wenn die Verfahren abgeschlossen sind, kann das OLAF Schlüsse aus diesem Fall ziehen und Empfehlungen abgeben bzw. weitere Maßnahmen ergreifen, falls dies für angemessen gehalten wird.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012042/13
to the Commission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: OLAF investigations: Greek Office for Vocational Education and Training (OEEK) — OF/2011/0704

According to press reports, in July 2010 OLAF's attention was drawn to cases of misuse of funds and fraud in the Greek Office for Vocational Education and Training (OEEK). When this brought no response from OLAF, the head of cabinet of the Commissioner responsible became involved, but even then OLAF continued to drag its feet. To date only EUR 516 000, i.e. roughly one-eighth of the estimated loss to the EU budget of EUR 4.5 million, has been recovered. These cases involving the waste of public money can no longer give rise to prosecutions.

1. When were details of the case first entered in OLAF's case management system?

2. When did OLAF close the case?

3. Was it the Commission or the whistle-blower who was recorded as the information source in the case files?

4. After being notified of the case, what investigative measures did OLAF take in order to shed light on the allegations?

5. What conclusions did OLAF reach?

6. What recommendations did OLAF make?

7. How was the case followed up after the OLAF investigation closed?

8. How was the information made available to OLAF by OEEK's auditors assessed?

9. Why did OLAF fail to take action when it was first informed about the case in 2010?

10. What is the Commission going to do about the money that has not yet been recovered, estimated to be EUR 4 million?

11. What does the Commission plan to do next?

12. Will the Commission publish or make available to Parliament, in particular the members of Parliament's Committee on Budgetary Control, a full, unredacted version of the final report and the recovery decisions concerning case OF/2011/0704, confidentially if necessary?

13. When?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(20 December 2013)

The Commission has been informed by OLAF that the matters mentioned in the Honourable Member's question are the subject of an ongoing case ([1]). This case is being conducted by OLAF in close cooperation with the relevant Greek authorities, namely the Criminal Court of First Instance of Athens, the Council of Magistrates of the Court of Appeal of Athens and the Court of Auditors of Greece.

The case in question has both a judicial part, which is the subject of ongoing criminal proceedings in the named courts at national level; and a financial part, which is the subject of an ongoing detailed examination by the Court of Auditors of Greece (having been required to do so by the courts in question).

([1]) Reference of the case: OF/2011/0704.

Since the recording of the case in its case management system in 2011, OLAF has regularly explained to the person who brought the matters to its attention that the determination on possible penal responsibility and the related question of possible financial liabilities (whether in respect of Greek or EU funds) must await the outcome of these two ongoing processes. The Honourable Member will understand that due process has to be respected and that in the light of ongoing judicial proceedings OLAF is under a duty to refrain from commenting further.

Once these processes are completed, OLAF will be in a position to conclude its case and make recommendations or take additional action if deemed appropriate.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012043/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Charalampos Angourakis (GUE/NGL)
(22 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ένταση του δόγματος «Νόμος και τάξη» εις βάρος του εργατικού λαϊκού κινήματος

Στην Ελλάδα η ανεργία αγγίζει το 28%, ενώ οι 87 στους 100 ανέργους δεν παίρνουν καν επίδομα ανεργίας, το οποίο φτάνει μόλις στα 361 ευρώ. Πολλές χιλιάδες εργαζόμενοι παραμένουν απλήρωτοι για μήνες. Οι φόροι και τα χαράτσια αυξάνονται, γίνονται κατασχέσεις σπιτιών για μικρές οφειλές στην εφορία, κόβεται το ρεύμα σε ανθρώπους που αντικειμενικά δεν έχουν να πληρώσουν. Δεκάδες χιλιάδες οικογένειες θα μείνουν χωρίς θέρμανση.

Ταυτόχρονα πληθαίνουν οι αγώνες του ΠΑΜΕ, των Λαϊκών Επιτροπών, των εκπαιδευτικών και των μαθητών. Εφαρμόζοντας το αυταρχικό δόγμα «Νόμος και Τάξη», όπως επιτάσσουν οι εργοδότες και η άρχουσα τάξη, η συγκυβέρνηση ΝΔ-ΠΑΣΟΚ προσπαθεί να επιβάλει «σιγή νεκροταφείου».

Ιδιαίτερη αγανάκτηση και ένα ευρύ κίνημα αλληλεγγύης προκάλεσαν και τα ακόλουθα κρούσματα:

— Η σύλληψη 20 μαθητών του 1ου ΕΠΑΛ Λαμίας με πρόσχημα τη διατάραξη της κοινής ησυχίας και η αυτόφωρη διαδικασία για 8 από αυτούς διότι κάνανε κατάληψη για να μην κλείσει το σχολείο τους μετά τις διαθεσιμότητες των εκπαιδευτικών και την κατάργηση των ειδικοτήτων τους. Τα παιδιά δηλαδή δικάζονται γιατί παλεύουν για το αυτονόητο δικαίωμά τους στη μόρφωση και στη ζωή.

— Η επέμβαση των ΜΑΤ στο κτίριο της Περιφερειακής Ενότητας Εύβοιας, πριν μερικές μέρες, που τελούσε υπό κατάληψη από τους εργαζομένους απλήρωτους και απολυμένους υπαλλήλους πολλών εργοστασίων της περιοχής που το τελευταίο διάστημα κλείσανε, ενώ, υπό νέα διεύθυνση, πουλάνε το στοκ τους κρατώντας έτσι τους εργαζόμενους όμηρους σε μια κατάσταση όπου δεν είναι ούτε εργαζόμενοι, ούτε άνεργοι και δεν έχουν ούτε κάρτα ανεργίας, ούτε ασφάλιση, ούτε και μισθό.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή: πώς τοποθετείται απέναντι στις πρωτοφανείς ενέργειες αυταρχισμού της ελληνικής συγκυβέρνησης ΝΔ-ΠΑΣΟΚ;

Απάντηση της κ. Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(9 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

Με βάση τις Συνθήκες στις οποίες είναι θεμελιωμένη η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει γενικές εξουσίες παρέμβασης. Νομιμοποιείται να το πράττει μόνον εάν τίθεται ζήτημα δικαίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 51 παράγραφος 1, τα δικαιώματα και οι ελευθερίες που κατοχυρώνονται από τον Χάρτη Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων πρέπει να τηρούνται από τα κράτη μέλη μόνο όταν εφαρμόζουν ενωσιακή νομοθεσία.

Από τις πληροφορίες που υπέβαλε το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου, το ζήτημα στο οποίο αναφέρεται δεν δείχνει να σχετίζεται με την εφαρμογή του δικαίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Ειδικότερα, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 72 της Συνθήκης για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, εναπόκειται στα κράτη μέλη να διατηρούν τον νόμο και την τάξη και να διαφυλάσσουν την εσωτερική ασφάλεια στη χώρα τους, σύμφωνα με την ισχύουσα νομοθεσία.

Στις περιπτώσεις αυτές, εναπόκειται στα κράτη μέλη, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των δικαστικών αρχών, να εξασφαλίσουν ότι τα θεμελιώδη δικαιώματα τηρούνται αποτελεσματικά και προστατεύονται σύμφωνα με την εθνική τους νομοθεσία και τις διεθνείς τους υποχρεώσεις για τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα, όπως προκύπτουν ιδίως από την Ευρωπαϊκή Σύμβαση Δικαιωμάτων του Ανθρώπου και από τη Σύμβαση των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για τα δικαιώματα του παιδιού.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012043/13
to the Commission
Charalampos Angourakis (GUE/NGL)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Intensified use of the 'Law and Order' doctrine against the working people's movement

In Greece, unemployment is nearing 28%, and 87 out of 100 unemployed people do not even receive unemployment benefit, which amounts to just EUR 361. Several thousand people who are in work have not been paid for months. Taxes and tax hikes are on the increase, houses are being confiscated because of small debts to the tax authority, and power is being cut off for people who have no money to pay. Tens of thousands of families will be without heating.

At the same time, the All-workers' Militant Front, the People's Committees, and teachers and pupils are increasing their struggle. By implementing the authoritarian doctrine of 'Law and Order' required by employers and the ruling class, the coalition Government of New Democracy and PASOK is attempting to impose the 'silence of the tomb'.

The following incidents have caused particular resentment and a very broad solidarity movement:

— The arrest of 20 pupils from the 1st High School of Lamia on the pretext of a breach of the peace, and the accelerated court procedure for eight of them on the ground that they had occupied the school to prevent it from being closed down after the teachers were placed on standby and their specialisations discontinued. In other words, children are being tried because they are fighting for the self-evident right to education and life.

— The intervention a few days ago of riot police at the building of the Evia Regional Authority, which was occupied by unpaid employees and former employees of many factories in the region that have recently closed down, the new managers of which are selling their stock, and in this way keeping the employees as hostages in a situation where they are neither employed nor unemployed, and they have no unemployment card, insurance or salary.

What is the Commission's position regarding the unprecedented authoritarian actions of the Greek coalition Government of New Democracy and PASOK?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 2013)

Under the Treaties on which the European Union is based, the European Commission has no general powers to intervene. It can do so only if an issue of European Union law is involved. According to its Article 51(1), the rights and freedoms enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights must be respected by Member States only when they are implementing Union law.

From the information provided by the Honourable Member, the matter referred to does not appear to be related to the implementation of European Union law. In particular, according to Article 72 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, it is the responsibility of Member States to maintain law and order and safeguard the internal security in their country in line with applicable legislation.

In such situations, it is for Member States, including their judicial authorities, to ensure that fundamental rights are effectively respected and protected in accordance with their national legislation and international human rights obligations, in particular as resulting from the European Convention on Human Rights and from the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012045/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(22 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Κλείσιμο αμυντικών βιομηχανιών στην Ελλάδα

Μεγάλη έκταση πήρε στον ελληνικό Τύπο το διαβόητο «ηλεκτρονικό μήνυμα» σύμφωνα με το οποίο στέλεχος της Επιτροπής ζητούσε δραστικά μέτρα και συρρίκνωση της ελληνικής αμυντικής βιομηχανίας, κάτι που ασφαλώς δεν μπορεί να γίνει δοθέντος του περίγυρου της Ελλάδας και των συνεχών απειλών που αντιμετωπίζουν Ελλάδα και Κύπρος εκ μέρους της Τουρκίας.

1. Είναι άποψη της Επιτροπής ότι θα πρέπει να κλείσουν εργοστάσια που σχετίζονται με την παραγωγή πολεμικού υλικού στην Ελλάδα;

2. Εστάλη τέτοιο ηλεκτρονικό μήνυμα στην ελληνική κυβέρνηση: Αν ναι, με πρωτοβουλία ποίου;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(16 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

1. Η Επιτροπή έχει επίγνωση των προκλήσεων που η ευρωπαϊκή αμυντική βιομηχανία αντιμετωπίζει και ενέκρινε στις 24 Ιουλίου τρέχοντος έτους ανακοίνωση στην οποία εκθέτει μια σειρά προτάσεων για να ενισχύσει την εσωτερική αγορά και την ανταγωνιστικότητα της αμυντικής βιομηχανίας ανά την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή δεν έχει την πρόθεση να επηρεάσει την πολιτική άμυνας της Ελλάδας, υπό την προϋπόθεση ότι ευθυγραμμίζεται με τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ. Η Επιτροπή πιστεύει ότι οι ελληνικές κρατικές επιχειρήσεις πρέπει να είναι αποδοτικές και οικονομικά βιώσιμες.

2. Η Επιτροπή διατήρησε πράγματι αλληλογραφία με τις ελληνικές αρχές προκειμένου να παρακολουθεί τη συμμόρφωση με ένα από τα ορόσημα στον τομέα των ιδιωτικοποιήσεων που συνδέονται με το δεύτερο τμήμα της δόσης του EFSF που αντιστοιχεί στην 3η ανασκόπηση. Εν προκειμένω απαιτείται από τις αρχές να «υιοθετήσει αμετάκλητες αποφάσεις μέχρι τον Αύγουστο του 2013 για την αναδιάρθρωση — η οποία συνεπάγεται ουσιαστική συρρίκνωση — εν όψει της ιδιωτικοποίησης, ή για την εξυγίανση των ΕΛΒΟ, HDS, και ΛΑΡΚΟ, σύμφωνα με τους κανόνες περί κρατικών ενισχύσεων, με στόχο την υλοποίηση των αποφάσεων αυτών έως τον Δεκέμβριο του 2013». Η Επιτροπή, ωστόσο, δεν μπορεί να σχολιάσει δημοσιεύματα του Τύπου σχετικά με το θέμα αυτό. Η Επιτροπή θα δημοσιεύσει τις απόψεις της σχετικά με τα ορόσημα που συνδέονται με την προηγούμενη ανασκόπηση και άλλα θέματα που έχουν σχέση με την τρέχουσα ανασκόπηση του προγράμματος προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα, μετά την ολοκλήρωσή της.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012045/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Defence industry closures in Greece

Wide coverage has been given in the Greek press to an infamous 'email', according to which a Commission official was asking for drastic measures and the shrinking of the Greek defence industry, something which surely cannot be done given Greece's surrounding environment and the constant threats which Greece and Cyprus face from Turkey.

1. Is it the Commission's view that defence-related factories in Greece will have to close down?

2. Has such an email been sent to the Greek Government? If so, on whose initiative?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

1. The Commission is aware of the challenges the european defence industry is facing and adopted on 24th July this year a communication which sets out a number of proposals to strenghten the internal market and the competitiveness of defence industry across the EU. Nevertheless, the Commission has no intention to influence the defence policies of Greece, provided that they are in line with EC law. The Commission believes that Greece's state-owned enterprises should be efficient and financially viable.

2. The Commission has indeed maintained correspondance with the Greek authorities in order to monitor compliance with one of the milestones in the field of privatisations linked to the second sub-tranche of the EFSF instalment corresponding to the 3rd review. The milestone requires the authorities to 'adopt irreversible decisions by August 2013 on the restructuring, involving substantial downsizing, ahead of privatisation or on the resolution of ELVO, HDS, and LARCO, both in compliance with state aid rules, with a view to implementing these decisions by December-2013'. The Commission will, however, not comment on press reports on this issue. The Commission will publish its views on the milestones linked to the previous review and other issues related to the ongoing review of the adjustment programme for Greece after its completion.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012046/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(22 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Υπερβολική επιβάρυνση ΙΧ αυτοκινήτων στην Ελλάδα

Είναι γνωστό ότι τα ΙΧ είναι πανάκριβα στην Ελλάδα, και ως προς την αγορά τους, και ως προς την κίνησή τους (λόγω του εξαιρετικά ακριβού καυσίμου) και ως προς την πληρωμή τελών κυκλοφορίας, συνεχών εισφορών, έκτακτων επιβαρύνσεων κ.ο.κ.

Εσχάτως ανακοινώθηκε στην Ελλάδα και νέος φόρος πολυτελείας για τα αυτοκίνητα με κυβισμό πάνω από 1 929 κ. εκ. Ένα αυτοκίνητο, δηλαδή, που αγοράστηκε π.χ. 40 000 ευρώ το 2009 είχε με τιμή αγοράς 15%-20% μεγαλύτερη π.χ. από το Βέλγιο και επιβαρύνεται συνεχώς με έκτακτες εισφορές, έχει αξία σήμερα κάτω από 13 000 ευρώ (και λόγω της καχεξίας ουδείς το αγοράζει) και — παρόλα αυτά — εξακολουθεί να θεωρείται από τις ελληνικές αρχές ως «αντικείμενο πολυτελείας»(!)

Είναι ανεκτό από την Επιτροπή να υπάρχει αυτή η προκλητική και άδικη επιβάρυνση ενός μεταφορικού μέσου σε μια χώρα μέλος της ΕΕ;

Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(29 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Η φορολογία οχημάτων προς το παρόν δεν είναι εναρμονισμένη σε επίπεδο ΕΕ. Κατά συνέπεια, τα κράτη μέλη έχουν δικαίωμα να αποφασίζουν και να εφαρμόζουν το επίπεδο φορολογίας που θεωρούν ότι είναι κατάλληλο. Σήμερα, το επίπεδο φορολογίας των κρατών μελών διαφέρει αρκετά· ορισμένα κράτη μέλη επιβάλλουν πολύ υψηλούς φόρους στα αυτοκίνητα, ενώ άλλα χαμηλότερους ή και κανένα. Τα κράτη μέλη έχουν το δικαίωμα να ενεργούν κατ' αυτόν τον τρόπο, υπό τον όρο ότι τηρείται η αρχή της αποφυγής των διακρίσεων, που περιέχεται στο άρθρο 110 της συνθήκης για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Ο φόρος επί οχήματος που αφορά τα αλλοδαπά και τα εγχώρια οχήματα δεν παραβιάζει την εν λόγω αρχή.

Η Επιτροπή επεδίωξε τη διόρθωση της υφιστάμενης έλλειψης εναρμόνισης σε πολλά επίπεδα, τελευταία δε με την υποβολή πρότασης οδηγίας το 2005 (COM(2005)261) τελικό της 5ης Ιουλίου 2005. Ωστόσο, η παρούσα πρόταση δεν έτυχε αρκετής στήριξης από κράτη μέλη.

Παρά την ελευθερία άσκησης πολιτικής που έχουν τα κράτη μέλη στον τομέα αυτό, η Επιτροπή επαγρυπνεί στο πλαίσιο του ρόλου της ως «θεματοφύλακα των Συνθηκών», προκειμένου να εξασφαλιστεί η τήρηση, από τα κράτη μέλη, της αρχής της μη διάκρισης και το κεκτημένο της ΕΕ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012046/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Excessive charges for private cars in Greece

It is known that private cars are very expensive in Greece, both to buy and to use (due to the high cost of fuel), and also due to road taxes, continuous contributions, extraordinary charges etc.

A new luxury tax has recently been announced in Greece for cars with engines larger than 1929 cc. This means that a car purchased, for example, for EUR 40 000 in 2009 with a market price 15-20% higher than in Belgium, for example, and constantly burdened with extraordinary contributions, today has a value of less than EUR 13 000 (and due to the bad situation nobody will buy it), and — in spite of all that — the Greek authorities still consider it to be a 'luxury item'!

Does the Commission accept such a provocative and unfair surcharge on a means of transport in an EU Member State?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(29 November 2013)

Vehicle taxation is currently not harmonised at EU level. As a consequence, Member States are entitled to decide upon and implement the level of taxation that they see fit. Currently the level of taxation among Member States is quite different; some Member States levy very high taxes on vehicles while others levy lower ones or even none. Member States are entitled to do so provided that the principle of non-discrimination enshrined in Article 110 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union is respected. A tax on a vehicle that treats foreign vehicles and domestic ones alike does not infringe that principle.

The Commission has sought to remedy the current lack of harmonisation on several instances, the last being the submission of a proposal for a directive in 2005 (COM(2005) 261 final of 5 July 2005. However, this proposal did not receive enough support from Member States.

Notwithstanding the policy freedom enjoyed by Member States in this field, the Commission remains vigilant in its role as 'Guardian of the Treaties' to ensure the respect by Member States of the principle of non-discrimination and the EU acquis.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012047/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(22 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Προκήρυξη της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής και χρήση του όρου «Μακεδονία» για τα Σκόπια

Η Επιτροπή («Directorate-General for Translation, Directorate R — Resources, Unit R.4») ανακοίνωσε την Προκήρυξη «EMT Network — 2013/2014 selection round) στην οποία αναφέρεται ότι ανάμεσα στις επιλέξιμες χώρες είναι και η … Μακεδονία»! Επειδή — ως γνωστόν, τέτοια χώρα δεν υπάρχει (Μακεδονία είναι το βόρειο τμήμα της Ελλάδας) και επειδή η ΕΕ έχει αναγνωρίσει τα Σκόπια ως FYROM, προκαλεί εντύπωση η διατύπωση της παραπάνω προκήρυξης, η οποία προέρχεται και από μια Γενική Διεύθυνση που — υποτίθεται ότι — είναι ευαίσθητη για τους όρους, τα ονόματα και την απόδοσή τους.

Ποιος είναι ο λόγος του λάθους αυτού και γιατί η Επιτροπή επιτρέπει να γίνονται τέτοια χονδροειδή και προκλητικά λάθη; Τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει για την άμεση διόρθωση του λάθους αυτού;

Απάντηση της κ. Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Ο κύριος βουλευτής επισημαίνει ένα ατυχές συντακτικό λάθος, που εν τω μεταξύ διορθώθηκε ώστε να χρησιμοποιηθεί η προσωρινή αναφορά με την οποία η χώρα έγινε δεκτή στα Ηνωμένα Έθνη. Η Επιτροπή λυπάται για αυτήν την παραδρομή και ζητά συγνώμη από εκείνους τους οποίους ενδεχομένως έθιξε.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012047/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: European Commission Notice using the term 'Macedonia' for 'Skopje'

The Commission (Directorate-General for Translation, Directorate R — Resources, Unit R.4) has issued a Notice ('EMT Network — 2013/2014 selection round') in which it mentions that the eligible countries include 'Macedonia'! Since — as is known — no such country exists (Macedonia is the northern part of Greece), and as the EU has recognised Skopje as FYROM, the formulation of the above notice is striking, especially as it comes from a Directorate-General which is supposed to be sensitive to terms, names and the rendering thereof.

What is the reason for this mistake, and why did the Commission allow such gross and provocative errors to occur? What measures does it intend to take for the immediate correction of this error?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(28 November 2013)

The Honourable Member points to an unfortunate drafting mistake that has been corrected in the meantime to use the provisional reference under which the country was admitted to the United Nations. The Commission regrets this inadvertent error and presents its apologies to those whom it might have offended.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012048/13
à la Commission
Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE)
(22 octobre 2013)

Objet: Évaluation sanitaire du MON810: invalidation d'un résultat de Monsanto par un expert de l'AESA

Une étude sur l'évaluation des OGM dans l'Union européenne a été réalisée par l'association française Inf'OGM ([1]), en se fondant notamment sur le dossier de demande de renouvellement d'autorisation du maïs GM MON810 de la société Monsanto. Ces travaux mettent en cause la fiabilité de certaines présentations de résultats par cet industriel, ainsi que de certaines des méthodes utilisées pour l'évaluation sanitaire du MON810 et des autres PGM.

L'association évoque le cas du test de résistance à la pepsine (ou de digestibilité in vitro) et indique qu'un expert du panel OGM de l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (AESA), Jean-Michel Wal, spécialiste de ces questions, a révélé qu'en conditions proches de celles rencontrées en physiologie de la digestion, la protéine Cry1Ab (protéine d'intérêt du MON810) n'est pas détruite en liquide gastrique simulé. Ce résultat est strictement en contradiction avec celui présenté par Monsanto dans son dossier, résultat pourtant validé par l'AESA comme faisant partie du faisceau d'arguments en faveur de l'innocuité du MON810.

1. Comment la Commission européenne peut-elle expliquer la validation par l'AESA d'un résultat infirmé par l'un de ses experts?

2. La Commission estime-t-elle qu'un test fait dans des conditions non physiologiques et dénoncé comme tel par au moins un des experts de l'AESA peut être pris en compte dans l'évaluation sanitaire des OGM?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012049/13
à la Commission
Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE)
(22 octobre 2013)

Objet: Évaluation sanitaire du MON810

Une étude sur l'évaluation des OGM dans l'Union européenne a été réalisée par l'association française Inf'OGM ([2]), en se fondant notamment sur le dossier de demande de renouvellement d'autorisation du maïs GM MON810 de la société Monsanto. Ces travaux mettent sérieusement en cause la fiabilité de certaines présentations de résultats par cet industriel, ainsi que de certaines des méthodes utilisées pour l'évaluation sanitaire du MON810 et des autres PGM.

Inf'OGM affirme que dans le dossier du MON810, lors de l'analyse en composition, les comparaisons des moyennes obtenues pour le MON810 avec les intervalles publiés («literature range») et les intervalles historiques («reported range») ne sont citées que pour les cas où les résultats sont en faveur de la conclusion voulue par Monsanto et sont passées sous silence lorsque ces moyennes se situent hors des intervalles publiés et/ou historiques.

1. La Commission peut-elle confirmer qu'il en est bien ainsi?

2. Si oui, la Commission peut-elle confirmer ou infirmer que de telles pratiques de tri des données sont scientifiquement recevables?

L'association critique la validité de ces références publiées et historiques provenant de cultures faites dans des conditions très différentes de celles de l'expérience de comparaison.

3. La Commission peut-elle affirmer la pertinence de ces comparateurs (publiés et historiques)?

Toujours à propos de ces comparateurs, Inf'OGM cite le cas troublant de la moyenne du taux d'histidine, supérieure à l'intervalle publié et inférieure à l'intervalle historique, tous deux servant de référence de valeurs normales. L'histidine se trouverait donc, selon les comparateurs utilisés par Monsanto, à la fois supérieure et inférieure à la normale.

4. La Commission peut-elle expliquer le sens biologique d'un tel résultat?

([1]) «Expertise des OGM: l'évaluation tourne le dos à la science», http://infogm.org.
([2]) «Expertise des OGM: l'évaluation tourne le dos à la science», http://infogm.org.

Réponse commune donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(12 décembre 2013)

Les questions de l'Honorable Parlementaire portent sur des détails de l'évaluation des risques effectuée par l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA); celle-ci a été invitée à fournir des éléments permettant à la Commission de répondre à ces questions. Les informations seront disponibles sous peu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012048/13
to the Commission
Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Safety assessment of MON810: invalidation of a Monsanto result by a European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) expert

A study on the assessment of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) in the European Union has been conducted by the French association Inf'OGM ([1]), with a particular focus on the application for renewal of the authorisation of Monsanto's MON810 genetically modified maize. The study casts doubt on the reliability of some of the results published by Monsanto and of some of the methods used to assess the safety of MON810 and other genetically modified plants.

Inf'OGM refers to the pepsin-resistance (or *in vitro* digestion) test and reports that Jean-Michel Wal, an expert on EFSA's GMO panel and a specialist in these matters, indicated that in conditions close to those of the physiology of digestion, the Cry1Ab protein (MON810 protein of interest) is not destroyed in simulated gastric fluid. This result totally contradicts the result presented by Monsanto in its case, yet it was validated by EFSA as part of the body of evidence for the safety of MON810.

1. Can the Commission explain why EFSA validated a result which was invalidated by one of its own experts?

2. Does the Commission consider that a test carried out in non-physiological conditions and exposed as such by at least one EFSA expert can be taken into account when assessing the safety of GMOs?

Question for written answer E-012049/13
to the Commission
Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Safety assessment of MON810

A study on the assessment of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) in the European Union has been conducted by the French association Inf'OGM ([2]), with a particular focus on the application for renewal of the authorisation of Monsanto's MON810 genetically modified maize. The study casts serious doubt on the reliability of some of the results published by Monsanto and of some of the methods used to assess the safety of MON810 and other genetically modified plants.

In the case of MON810 Inf'OGM asserts that during the composition analysis, comparisons of the averages obtained for MON810 with the literature range and the reported range are only cited for cases where the results support Monsanto's desired conclusion and are ignored when those averages fall outside the literature range and/or reported range.

1. Can the Commission confirm that this is indeed the case?

2. If yes, can the Commission confirm or refute that using selected data in this way is scientifically valid?

Inf'OGM questions the validity of these reported and literature references, which were derived from crops produced in conditions very different from those of the comparison experiment.

3. Can the Commission confirm that these comparators (literature and reported) are relevant?

On this same issue of comparators, Inf'OGM cites the disturbing case of the average histidine rate, which was above the literature range and below the reported range; both of these are used as references for normal values. According to the comparators used by Monsanto, the histidine rate would therefore be both above and below normal.

4. Can the Commission give a biological explanation of this result?

([1]) 'GMO expertise: assessment turns its back on science', http://infogm.org
([2]) 'GMO expertise: assessment turns its back on science', http://infogm.org.

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2013)

The questions of the Honourable Member concern details of the risk assessment carried out by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), which has been requested to provide elements allowing the Commission to answer to the questions. The information will be available shortly.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-012050/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(22 października 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – W związku prośbą polskiego MSZ dotyczącą kwestii zwrotu przez Rosję wraku TU-154

W grudniu ubiegłego roku polski minister spraw zagranicznych zwrócił się do Pani Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel z prośbą, aby w oficjalnych rozmowach z Rosją poruszyła kwestię wraku prezydenckiego samolotu, który rozbił się pod Smoleńskiem w dniu 10 kwietnia 2010 r. Strona rosyjska dotychczas nie podjęła decyzji odnośnie zwrotu ww. wraku, o co wielokrotnie zabiegały polskie władze. Sprawa wraku pozostaje niezwykle ważna dla prowadzonego w Polsce śledztwa związanego z katastrofą smoleńską.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się z prośbą o informacje, czy i jakie działania na szczeblu relacji Unia Europejska–Rosja zostały zainicjowane w przedmiotowej sprawie oraz jakie są ich rezultaty w chwili obecnej? Jaka jest – w opinii Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel – perspektywa pomyślnego zakończenia tej sprawy?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji
(3 grudnia 2013 r.)

Katastrofa smoleńska, która miała miejsce 10 kwietnia 2010 r., kiedy to rozbił się samolot polskich Sił Powietrznych, Tupolew TU-154M, i wskutek której zginął Prezydent Polski oraz 95 innych osób, była tragedią nie tylko dla tych, którzy stracili swoich bliskich, ale także dla całego polskiego narodu oraz ogółu społeczeństwa europejskiego. Wiele krajów i organizacji międzynarodowych wyraziło żal i złożyło Polakom kondolencje z powodu wypadku.

Zdając sobie w pełni sprawę ze znaczenia tej kwestii dla stosunków polsko-rosyjskich, Wysoka Przedstawiciel / Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji wyraziła życzenie, aby trwające rosyjskie dochodzenie zostało wkrótce ukończone, a wrak samolotu przekazany Polsce.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012050/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — request by the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs for Russia to return the crashed TU-154

In December last year, the Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs asked the Vice-President/High Representative to raise the issue of the presidential plane crash which occurred close to Smolensk on 10 April 2010 in official talks with Russia. The Russian side has so far failed to reach any decision on the question of returning the plane wreck, even though the Polish authorities have requested this on many occasions. The remains of the crashed plane are of vital importance for the investigation into the Smolensk tragedy which is currently underway in Poland.

I would therefore like to ask whether any action has been taken on this matter in the context of relations between the European Union and Russia, and if so what the nature of the action was and what its outcome has been. In the opinion of the Vice-President/High Representative, what is the likelihood of a favourable outcome?

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

The Smolensk accident on 10 April 2010 when a Tupolev TU-154M aircraft of the Polish Air Force crashed and the Polish President and 95 other people lost their lives was a tragedy, not only for those who lost their loved ones but for the whole Polish nation as well as for the European public at large. Many countries and international organisations expressed sorrow and condolences to the people of Poland over the crash.

Being fully aware of the importance of the issue for the Polish-Russian relations, the HR/VP has expressed the wish that the ongoing Russian investigation will soon be concluded and the wreckage of the airplane handed over to Poland.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-012051/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(22 października 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – W związku z wypowiedzią przedstawiciela Rosji przy UE na temat Polski

W rozmowie z rosyjską agencją ITAR-TASS, przedstawiciel Rosji przy Unii Europejskiej Władimir Cziżow miał – według doniesień medialnych – stwierdzić, że wprowadzone przez Moskwę w 2005 r. embargo na polskie mięso doprowadziło do zmiany polskiego rządu. W odniesieniu do obecnej „wojny mlecznej" z Litwą dyplomata miał natomiast otwarcie przyznawać, że Rosjanie w walce politycznej chętnie sięgają po broń, jaką stanowi zakaz importu produktów żywnościowych.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się z prośbą o odpowiedź:

1. Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel zna przytoczoną wypowiedź pana Cziżowa na temat Polski i potwierdza, że miała ona miejsce?

2. Czy w opinii Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel nie należałoby za pośrednictwem europejskiej dyplomacji wyrazić publicznego stanowiska w tej kwestii, aby podobne wypowiedzi nie zdarzały się przyszłości?

3. Czy i jak wypowiedzi pana Cziżowa mogą – w opinii Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel – odzwierciedlać obecne, agresywne poczynania kremlowskich władz wobec krajów Partnerstwa Wschodniego oraz krajów Wspólnoty sąsiadujących z Rosją?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji
(11 grudnia 2013 r.)

Rosja jest dla UE bardzo ważnym partnerem strategicznym, czego dowodem są głębokie dwustronne stosunki w zakresie handlu i inwestycji. Tym bardziej niepokojące są dla UE liczne nierozwiązane problemy handlowe i celne, obok których w kontekście Partnerstwa Wschodniego pojawiły się ostatnio nowe, w tym obecny rosyjski zakaz przywozu produktów mlecznych z Litwy, która sprawuje obecnie rotacyjną prezydencję w Radzie Unii Europejskiej.

Kwestie te były podnoszone wielokrotnie w rozmowach z rosyjskimi partnerami na różnych szczeblach, w tym z ambasadorem Cziżowem. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji poruszyła te kwestie podczas spotkania z rosyjskim ministrem spraw zagranicznych Siergiejem Ławrowem we wrześniu 2013 r. Podczas debat w Parlamencie w dniach 11 września i 8 października 2013 r. Komisja jasno stwierdziła, że wykorzystywanie środków ekonomicznych do wywierania politycznej presji jest niedopuszczalne. Szanowny Pan Poseł jest również proszony o zapoznanie się ze wspólnym oświadczeniem przewodniczących Komisji i przewodniczącego Rady Europejskiej z dnia 25 listopada 2013 r.

Komisja bardzo aktywne poszukuje sposobów na zniesienie tych różnych barier handlowych przez częste konsultacje ze stroną rosyjską. Jeśli to okaże się nieskuteczne, Komisja gotowa jest wykorzystać dostępne mechanizmy wielostronne. UE złożyła na przykład niedawno wniosek o stworzenie panelu orzekającego Światowej Organizacji Handlu (WTO) do zbadania sprawy rosyjskich dyskryminujących opłat za recykling pojazdów.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012051/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — comments by the Russian ambassador to the EU on Poland

According to media reports, Vladimir Chizhov, the Russian ambassador to the European Union, apparently told the Russian news agency ITAR-TASS that the embargo on Polish meat imposed by Moscow in 2005 brought about the fall of the Polish Government. While discussing the current 'milk war' with Lithuania, the diplomat is furthermore said to have openly admitted that Russia is happy to use food import bans as a weapon in political struggles.

I should therefore like to ask the following questions:

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative familiar with these alleged comments by Mr Chizhov about Poland, and can she confirm that this is in fact what he said?

2. Would the Vice-President/High Representative not agree that European diplomats should issue a public statement on this issue in order to avoid similar comments in the future?

3. In the opinion of the Vice-President/High Representative, is it true that Mr Chizhov's comments may be a reflection of the Kremlin's current aggressive stance towards the countries of the Eastern Partnership and the EU Member States neighbouring Russia, and if so how?

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

While Russia is a very important strategic partner for the EU, as evidenced by the deep bilateral trade and investment relationship, the EU is very concerned about the significant number of unresolved trade and customs problems, to which new ones have been added recently in the context of the Eastern Partnership, including the current Russian ban on dairy products from Lithuania, which currently holds the rotating Presidency of the Council of the European Union.

These concerns have been raised with Russian counterparts repeatedly and at various levels, including with Ambassador Chizhov. The HR/VP raised these concerns during her meeting with Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov in September 2013. The Commission has stated clearly in Parliament during debates on 11 September 2013 and 8 October 2013 that the use of economic means to exercise political pressure is unacceptable. The Honourable Member is also referred to the joint statement by the Presidents of the Commission and the President of the European Council of 25 November 2013.

The Commission is very actively seeking solutions to these various trade irritants in frequent consultations with Russian counterparts. Where these prove ineffective, the Commission is ready to use available multilateral mechanisms. The EU has, for instance, recently requested the establishment of a World Trade Organisation (WTO) panel to examine the case of discriminatory Russian vehicle recycling fees.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-012053/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(22 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Gasto adicional en el submarino S-80

El Ministerio de Industria aportará el año próximo 208,7 millones de euros para corregir el sobrepeso del submarino S-80.

Lo habitual es que este ministerio prefinancie hasta el 60 % de los nuevos programas de armamento, con el argumento de que se trata de subvencionar desarrollos tecnológicos. Sin embargo, dicho departamento ya había desembolsado más de 1 300 millones para el submarino S-80, por lo que estaría agotada casi toda la prefinanciación prevista, lo que ha obligado al Gobierno a aumentarla en más de 800 millones, hasta completar los 2 135 del presupuesto total del programa. Los primeros 208,7 millones se desembolsarán en 2014.

Aún no se sabe cuánto costará subsanar el problema de diseño del S-80. Sí se sabe que la desviación en el peso es de aproximadamente el 7 % del desplazamiento en rosca (sin combustible ni pertrechos), que estaba previsto en 1 700 toneladas ([1]).

El Reglamento (UE) n° 473/2013 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 21 de mayo de 2013, sobre disposiciones comunes para el seguimiento y la evaluación de los proyectos de planes presupuestarios y para la corrección del déficit excesivo de los Estados miembros de la zona del euro, obliga a la Comisión a emitir una recomendación sobre el presupuesto de los Estados miembros de la zona euro antes del fin del mes de noviembre.

¿Cree la Comisión que este gasto de 208,7 millones es coherente con los objetivos del Pacto de Estabilidad y Crecimiento en un momento en el que el Estado español está bajo el protocolo de déficit excesivo?

¿Ha recibido la Comisión cálculos del impacto fiscal de este gasto según se requiere en el artículo 6 del citado Reglamento?

¿Piensa la Comisión pronunciarse sobre esta partida en su opinión prevista para finales de noviembre?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de noviembre de 2013)

La Comisión presentó su evaluación sobre el proyecto de plan presupuestario de España el 15 de noviembre de 2013.

Dicho proyecto ([2]) no contiene información sobre el exceso de peso del submarino S-80. A este respecto, conviene observar que el artículo 6 del Reglamento (UE) n° 473/2013 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 21 de mayo de 2013, sobre disposiciones comunes para el seguimiento y la evaluación de los proyectos de planes presupuestarios y para la corrección del déficit excesivo de los Estados miembros de la zona del euro, establece que: «La descripción a que se hace referencia en la letra e) del párrafo primero podrá ser menos detallada para medidas con un impacto presupuestario estimado inferior al 0,1 % del PIB. Se prestará especial atención, de forma explícita, a los planes de reforma sustancial de la política fiscal que puedan tener efectos desbordamiento en otros Estados miembros de la zona del euro».

En las recomendaciones específicas por país dirigidas a España en 2013 se insta a realizar una revisión sistemática de las principales partidas de gasto antes de marzo de 2014.

([1]) http://politica.elpais.com/politica/2013/10/13/actualidad/1381689359_105016.html
([2]) Disponible en: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/economic_governance/sgp/pdf/dbp/es_2013-10-15_dbp_es.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012053/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Additional cost of S-80 submarine

The Spanish Ministry of Industry will have to spend EUR 208.7 million next year in order to resolve the issue of the S-80 submarine's excess weight.

Under normal circumstances, the ministry provides up to 60% pre-financing for new weapons programmes, on the basis that it is subsidising technological developments. However, it has already spent more than EUR 1.3 billion on the S-80 submarine, almost the full pre-financing budget. The Government must therefore increase this sum by more than EUR 800 million in order to complete the total EUR 2.135 billion budget of the programme. The first 208.7 million will be paid in 2014.

The cost of fixing the S-80 design problem is as yet unknown. We do know that the excess weight is approximately 7% of its lightweight displacement tonnage (without fuel or cargo), which was estimated at 1 700 tonnes ([1]).

Regulation (EU) No 473/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2013 on common provisions for monitoring and assessing draft budgetary plans and ensuring the correction of excessive deficit of the Member States in the euro area obliges the Commission to issue a recommendation on the budget of Eurozone Member States before the end of November.

Does the Commission believe that this EUR 208.7 million expenditure is in line with the Stability and Growth Pact at a time when Spain is under the excessive deficit procedure protocol?

Has the Commission received an estimate of the fiscal impact of this spending as required by Article 6 of above Regulation?

Does the Commission intend to address this matter in the opinion due to be issued at the end of November 2013?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(27 November 2013)

The Commission has issued its assessments of the Draft Budgetary Plan of Spain on 15 November 2013.

The Draft Budgetary Plan ([2]) does not contain information on S-80 submarine's excess weight. It should be noted in this respect that Article 6 of Regulation (EU) No 473/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2013 on common provisions for monitoring and assessing draft budgetary plans and ensuring the correction of excessive deficit of the Member States in the euro area foresees that 'The description referred to in point (e) of the first subparagraph may be less detailed for measures with a budgetary impact estimated to be lower than 0,1% of GDP. Particular and explicit attention shall be paid to major fiscal policy reform plans with potential spill-over effects for other Member States whose currency is the euro.'

The 2013 country-specific recommendations addressed to Spain contain a recommendation to conduct a systematic review of major spending items by March 2014.

([1]) http://politica.elpais.com/politica/2013/10/13/actualidad/1381689359_105016.html
([2]) Available at : http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/economic_governance/sgp/pdf/dbp/es_2013-10-15_dbp_es.pdf

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012055/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(22 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Furnizorii de internet belgieni impun condiții de domiciliu noilor clienți

Mi s-a adus la cunoștință că Scarlet, un furnizor de internet belgian, refuză să ofere contracte noi clienților potențiali care domiciliază în Belgia de mai puțin de trei luni. Telenet, un alt furnizor belgian, nu oferă contracte persoanelor care au domiciliat în Belgia mai puțin de șase luni.

Această măsură discriminează persoanele care au sosit recent în Belgia sau care au intenția de a locui în această țară.

1. Are Comisia cunoștință de restricțiile impuse de acești doi furnizori de internet?

2. Care sunt măsurile pe care Comisia le va lua pentru introducerea unor reguli care să asigure servicii de internet persoanelor care tocmai au sosit în Belgia?

Răspuns dat de dl Barnier în numele Comisiei
(17 decembrie 2013)

1. Comisia are cunoștință de astfel de restricții impuse de furnizorii de internet. Cu toate acestea, în conformitate cu legislația UE existentă în sectorul serviciilor, Comisia nu poate lua nicio măsură în sprijinul utilizatorilor de servicii internet afectați de aceste practici întrucât articolul 20 alineatul (2) din Directiva 2006/123/CE privind serviciile în cadrul pieței interne ([1]), care se referă la nediscriminarea beneficiarilor de servicii pe baza naționalității sau a locului lor de reședință, nu se aplică serviciilor de comunicații electronice [articolul 2 alineatul (2) litera (c)].

2. Obiectivul propunerii recente a Comisiei din 11 septembrie 2013 de Regulament de stabilire a unor măsuri privind piața unică europeană a comunicațiilor electronice și de realizare a unui continent conectat ([2]) este de a asigura, printre altele, dreptul utilizatorilor finali și al întreprinderilor „de a accesa servicii de comunicații electronice competitive, sigure și fiabile, indiferent de locul din Uniune din care sunt furnizate, fără să fie împiedicați de restricții transfrontaliere sau de costuri suplimentare nejustificate”. Propunerea conține o serie de măsuri și de dispoziții specifice pentru a atinge aceste obiective și, în special, o interdicție pentru furnizorii de servicii de comunicații electronice pentru public de a aplica „cerințe sau condiții de acces sau de utilizare discriminatorii, pe baza naționalității sau a locului de reședință al utilizatorului final”, cu excepția cazului în care astfel de diferențe sunt justificate în mod obiectiv de diferențe în ceea ce privește costurile, riscurile și condițiile de piață.

([1]) Directiva 2006/123/CE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 12 decembrie 2006 privind serviciile în cadrul pieței interne (JO L 376, 27.12.2006, p. 36).
([2]) COM(2013)627.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012055/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Belgian Internet providers imposing residence conditions on new clients

It has been brought to my attention that Scarlet, a Belgian Internet provider, refuses to open new contracts for prospective customers who have been resident in Belgium for less than three months. Telenet, another Belgian provider, does not open contracts for persons who have been resident in Belgium for less than six months.

This is a measure which discriminates against people who have recently arrived in Belgium or who plan to live in Belgium.

1. Is the Commission aware of the restrictions imposed by these two Internet providers?

2. What action will the Commission take to introduce rules ensuring access to Internet services for persons who have just arrived in Belgium?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

1. The Commission is aware of such restrictions imposed by Internet providers. However, in accordance with the existing EU legislation in the services sector, there is no possibility for the Commission to take action in favour of the Internet users affected by these practices, as Article 20(2) of Directive 2006/123/EC on services in the internal market ([1]), referring to the non-discrimination of service recipients on the basis of their nationality or residence, is not applicable to electronic communication services (Article 2(2)(c)).

2. The recent Commission proposal of 11 September 2013 for a regulation laying down measures concerning the European single market for electronic communications and to achieve a Connected Continent ([2]) aims at ensuring, *inter alia*, the right of end-users and businesses 'to access competitive, secure and reliable electronic communications services, irrespective of where they are provided from in the Union, without being hampered by cross-border restrictions or unjustified additional costs'. The proposal contains a number of measures and specific provisions to achieve these objectives and, in particular, a prohibition on providers of electronic communications to the public to apply 'any discriminatory requirements or conditions of access or use to end-users based on the end-user's nationality or place of residence' unless such differences are objectively justified by differences in costs, risks and market conditions.

([1]) Directive 2006/123/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 on Services in the internal market, OJ L376 of 27.12.2006, p. 36.
([2]) COM(2013) 627.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012056/13
alla Commissione
Salvatore Tatarella (PPE)
(22 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Gestione del fondo salva Stati

Secondo alcune fonti di stampa, «per come è stata strutturata la risposta all'eurocrisi, i contribuenti tedeschi stanno ricevendo un sussidio silenzioso da parte di quelli italiani». Il meccanismo europeo di stabilità (MES) ha una forza di fuoco di 700 miliardi di euro, raccolti in gran parte emettendo bond sui mercati. La sua base però è il capitale versato direttamente dai governi dell'area euro. La settimana scorsa hanno tutti trasferito la quarta tranche, per un totale di 64 miliardi di euro, ed entro la prima metà del 2014 si arriverà a ottanta. La Germania, che con una quota del 27,14 % è il primo azionista, ha già pagato al fondo europeo 17,3 miliardi e alla fine dovrà versarne 21,7. L'Italia, che è il terzo azionista con il 17,91 %, ha versato 11,4 miliardi e nel 2014 saranno 14,3. Tali risorse versate dal governo italiano, se fossero rimaste in Italia, probabilmente sarebbero state sufficienti a gestire i problemi delle banche nazionali. Per ora, però, delle risorse del MES si fa un uso diverso: vengono investite prevalentemente in titoli di Stato tedeschi. Ciò contribuisce, con i soldi dei contribuenti italiani, a ridurre i tassi sui Bund e su tutto il sistema finanziario in Germania, quindi ad allargare lo spread e lo svantaggio competitivo delle imprese italiane. Il MES non comunica in dettaglio come gestisce il capitale affidatogli, ma i criteri sono chiari: non può comprare titoli con rating sotto «la doppia A» (dunque Italia e Spagna fuori) e compra «attività liquide di alta qualità», dunque certamente Bund tedeschi.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione riferire:

1. se conferma che le nazioni del sud Europa stanno aiutando la Germania, senza poter utilizzare le risorse del MES per sostenere le proprie banche;

2. se non ritiene necessario un correttivo che impedisca questa paradossale situazione;

3. se non reputa necessario che la gestione del MES debba essere più trasparente?

Risposta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione
(3 dicembre 2013)

Il meccanismo europeo di stabilità (MES) disporrà di un capitale versato di 80 miliardi di EUR e di un capitale richiamabile di 620 miliardi di EUR, e avrà pertanto una capacità di prestito di 500 miliardi di EUR.

Il MES costituisce una protezione importante contro la crisi: il sostegno finanziario del MES può essere chiesto da tutti i suoi membri. La Spagna e Cipro hanno già beneficiato dell'assistenza finanziaria del MES.

L'articolo 22 del trattato MES stabilisce che «Il direttore generale attua una politica di investimento del MES improntata al principio di prudenza atta a garantire la sua massima affidabilità creditizia, conformemente alle direttive adottate dal consiglio di amministrazione e da questo periodicamente riesaminate.» La Commissione non dispone di informazioni circa gli investimenti attuali del MES.

I rendimenti dei titoli di Stato tedeschi sono in effetti molto bassi rispetto a quelli di altri Stati membri dell'UE. Uno dei motivi risiede nel fatto che, al pari di altri Stati membri dell'UE, la Germania beneficia del suo status di luogo sicuro per gli investimenti.

Il MES è un'istituzione internazionale responsabile nei confronti dei suoi membri. Esso è gestito da un consiglio dei governatori e da un consiglio di amministrazione. Ogni membro del MES nomina un governatore e un governatore supplente. Ogni governatore nomina un amministratore e un amministratore supplente. Le competenze di questi organi e le norme sulla procedura decisionale sono specificate nel trattato MES.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012056/13
to the Commission
Salvatore Tatarella (PPE)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Management of the ESM bailout fund

According to press reports, because of the way that the response to the eurozone crisis has been structured, Italian taxpayers are effectively subsidising their German counterparts. The European Stability Mechanism (ESM) has a lending capacity of EUR 700 billion, which it funds primarily by issuing bonds. Its paid-in capital, however, is made up of the contributions it receives directly from eurozone governments. The latter recently transferred the fourth tranche of funding for the ESM, bringing the total to EUR 64 billion, a figure which will have climbed to EUR 80 billion by the first half of 2014. Germany is the main contributor (providing 27.14% of its capital) and has already transferred EUR 17.3 billion of the EUR 21.7 billion it has pledged. Italy, the third largest contributor (17.91%), has transferred EUR 11.4 billion of what will ultimately be a total of EUR 14.3 billion in 2014. If these monies had remained in Italy, they would probably have been sufficient to tackle the problems facing the Italian banks. For the time being, however, ESM funds are being invested primarily in German Government bonds. This means that Italian taxpayers' money is helping to push down the interest rates on German Government bonds and in the German financial system as a whole. In turn, this is widening the spread between interest rates and making Italian businesses less and less competitive. The ESM does not release details of the way it manages the capital it raises, but the criteria are clear: it cannot purchase bonds with a rating lower than AA (which rules out Italy and Spain) and must invest in only 'high-quality liquid assets' (i.e. German bonds).

1. Can the Commission say whether money from southern European countries is being used to help Germany, with the result that these countries are unable to use ESM funds to prop up their own banks?

2. Does it not think that new arrangements are needed to rule out paradoxical situations of this kind?

3. Does it agree that the management of the ESM should be more transparent?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2013)

The European Stability Mechanism (ESM) will have a paid-in capital of EUR 80 billion and a callable capital of EUR 620 billion, resulting in a lending capacity of EUR 500 billion.

The ESM is an important firewall against the crisis; financial support from the ESM can be requested by all its members. Spain and Cyprus already benefitted from ESM financial assistance.

Article 22 of the ESM Treaty stipulates that 'the Managing Director shall implement a prudent investment policy for the ESM, so as to ensure its highest creditworthiness, in accordance with guidelines to be adopted and reviewed regularly by the Board of Directors. …'. The Commission does not have information about the current investment holdings of the ESM.

The yields for German bonds are indeed very low compared to other EU Member States. Among other reasons, some EU Member States, and in particular Germany, benefitted from their status as safe haven investment location.

The ESM is an international institution accountable to its members. The ESM is run by a Board of Governors and a Board of Directors. Each ESM member shall appoint a Governor and an alternate Governor. Each Governor shall appoint one Director and one alternate Director. The competences of these bodies and the decision making rules are specified by the ESM Treaty.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012058/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(22 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Kit per la fabbricazione di falsi formaggi italiani in vendita on-line

Sulle maggiori piattaforme di compravendita on-line, tra le quali Amazon e Ebay, sono in vendita kit per la produzione «fai da te» di alcuni fra i più famosi formaggi italiani: Mozzarella, Ricotta, Parmigiano Reggiano e Pecorino romano.

Nei kit, commercializzati anche da un'azienda inglese, si trovano i recipienti e le polveri che, combinate con il latte, permetterebbero di ottenere, in soli 30 minuti, mozzarella o, aspettando 2 mesi per la stagionatura, altri formaggi italiani.

Preso atto che si tratta chiaramente di una pratica di contraffazione che, sfruttando il fenomeno dell'*Italian Sounding*, permette di realizzare dei surrogati che imitano prodotti tutelati da denominazioni DOP e IGP, creando un gravissimo danno economico e di immagine a un settore già fortemente colpito dalla contraffazione nonché tutelato dalla normativa europea quale il regolamento (CEE) n. 2081/92 del Consiglio del 14 luglio 1992, e considerato che questo fenomeno colpisce i consumatori che vengono tratti in inganno e indotti all'acquisto esponendosi a potenziali rischi per la salute;

può la Commissione riferire:

1. se è al corrente dei fatti sopra descritti;

2. come intende agire per tutelare i caseifici, i consorzi e tutti i produttori italiani dalla concorrenza sleale e dai danni arrecati dalla vendita di tali kit;

3. come intende tutelare i consumatori europei da un'offerta ingannevole; se ritiene che vi sia un potenziale rischio per la salute dei cittadini che usano questi prodotti e, in caso affermativo, come interverrà;

4. se intende vietare definitivamente la commercializzazione di kit che, attraverso la sintesi di polveri chimiche, potenzialmente dannose per la salute, permettono di riprodurre prodotti alimentari tradizionalmente ottenuti dalla lavorazione di materie prime fresche e di qualità?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(9 dicembre 2013)

La Commissione è al corrente dell'esistenza di kit per la fabbricazione di determinati formaggi.

La normativa UE prevede che, quando la denominazione di un formaggio è registrata come denominazione di origine protetta (DOP) (come nel caso del Parmigiano Reggiano e del Pecorino Romano) o come indicazione geografica protetta (IGP) a norma del regolamento (UE) n. 1151/2012 ([1]), tale denominazione è protetta da qualsiasi impiego commerciale diretto o indiretto dei prodotti che non sono oggetto di registrazione, qualora questi ultimi siano comparabili ai prodotti registrati con tale nome o l'uso di tale nome consenta di sfruttare la notorietà della denominazione protetta. Una DOP o IGP registrata è protetta anche da qualsiasi usurpazione, imitazione o evocazione; da qualsiasi altra indicazione falsa o ingannevole relativa alla provenienza, all'origine, alla natura o alle qualità essenziali del prodotto usata sulla confezione o sull'imballaggio, nel materiale pubblicitario o sui documenti relativi al prodotto considerato; e da qualsiasi altra pratica che possa indurre in errore il consumatore sulla vera origine del prodotto.

Inoltre, l'articolo 114 e all'allegato XII del regolamento (CE) n. 1234/2007 ([2]) stabiliscono che i prodotti destinati all'alimentazione umana possono essere commercializzati come latte e prodotti lattiero-caseari solo se ottenuti esclusivamente da latte. Possono essere aggiunte sostanze necessarie per la loro fabbricazione, ma solo a patto che non siano utilizzate per sostituire totalmente o parzialmente uno qualsiasi dei componenti del latte.

([1]) GU L 343 del 14.12.2012, pag. 1.
([2]) GU L 299 del 16.11.2007, pag. 1.

Va rilevato che la responsabilità di far rispettare la suddetta normativa UE relativa alla catena alimentare spetta agli Stati membri, i quali sono tenuti a verificare la conformità da parte degli operatori ai requisiti da essa derivanti. Gli Stati membri devono inoltre prendere le dovute misure per eliminare i rischi e sanzionare le inosservanze. La Commissione verificherà certamente che gli Stati membri facciano effettivamente applicare la normativa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012058/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(22 October 2013)

Subject: Online sale of kits for producing fake Italian cheeses

Large online retailers, such as Amazon and Ebay, are selling kits for the home production of some of the best-known Italian cheeses, including Mozzarella, Ricotta, Parmigiano Reggiano and Pecorino romano.

The kits, which are sold by an English company, include containers and powder, which, when mixed with milk, produces mozzarella in just 30 minutes, or other kinds of Italian cheese if left to mature for two months.

This is clearly a counterfeit practice, which takes advantage of Italian names to copy Italian products that are protected by PDO and PGI denominations and is seriously damaging both to the Italian economy and to the image of a sector which has already been hit hard by counterfeiting despite the fact that it is protected by EC law under Council Regulation (ECC) No 2081/92 of 14 July 1992. This problem affects consumers who are being misled and induced to purchase products that could be potentially harmful to their health.

1. Can the Commission say if it is aware of the abovementioned issue?

2. What steps does it intend to take to protect dairies, farmers and all Italian cheese producers from unfair competition and the damage caused by the sale of these kits?

3. How does it intend to protect EU consumers against misleading offers? Does the Commission consider there to be a potential risk to the health of consumers buying these products and if so, what action will it take?

4. Does it intends to definitively ban the sale of these kits which, through the mixing of chemical powders that are potentially harmful to health, produce food stuffs that are usually made using fresh, high-quality raw materials?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 2013)

The Commission is aware of the existence of kits for the production of certain cheeses.

EU legislation provides that where a cheese name is registered as a protected designation of origin (PDO) (as is the case for Parmigiano Reggiano and Pecorino Romano) or as a protected geographical indication (PGI) under Regulation (EU) Nr. 1151/2012 ([1]), it is protected against any direct or indirect commercial use in respect of products not covered by the registration where those products are comparable to the products registered under that name or where using the name exploits the reputation of the protected name. A registered PDO or PGI is also protected against any misuse, imitation or evocation; any other false or misleading indication as to the provenance, origin, nature or essential qualities of the product that is used on the inner or outer packaging, advertising material or documents relating to the product concerned; and any other practice liable to mislead the consumer as to the true origin of the product.

Moreover, Article 114 and Annex XII of Regulation (EC) 1234/2007 ([2]) provide that foodstuffs intended for human consumption may be marketed as milk products only if they are derived exclusively from milk. Substances necessary for their manufacture may be added but they cannot be used for the purpose of replacing any milk constituent.

It should be recalled that the responsibility for enforcing the abovementioned EU food chain legislation lies with Member States which are required to verify that requirements deriving therefrom are fulfilled by operators. Member States must also take measures necessary to eliminate risks and sanction non-compliances. The Commission will of course monitor the delivery by the Member States of their enforcement duties.

([1]) OJ L 343, 14.12.2012, p. 1.
([2]) OJ L 299, 16.11.2007, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012059/13
to the Commission
Struan Stevenson (ECR)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: European mountain quality label

The Commission is about to approve delegated legislation confirming the designation of a European mountain quality label.

The delegated act provides for a change to the rule established in the basic regulation which would authorise, by default, the denomination as mountain products of processed dairy products (milk and cheese) made within 30 km of mountain areas, without the need for any justifying criteria. Many Member States, industry and the advisory group on quality believed that no derogation should be granted by default and that, instead, national authorities should have the right to grant derogations in duly justified cases.

Can the Commission therefore explain why it should press ahead with this damaging act despite such broad opposition?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(13 November 2013)

In duly justified cases and in order to take into account natural constraints affecting agricultural production in mountain areas, Article 31 (3) of the regulation (EU) No 1151/2012 on quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs ([1]) empowers the Commission to lay down derogations from the condition that processing of 'mountain products' must take place in mountain areas. The same Article also empowers the Commission to define the geographical area in which the processing of products is permitted outside of the mountain areas. The regulation does not provide for a right of national authorities to grant the derogations.

The Commission services are currently considering a Commission Delegated Regulation with derogations regarding the conditions of use of the optional quality term 'mountain product'. For that purpose extensive consultation has been carried out including consultation of Member States' experts as well as stakeholders in accordance with the Commission's commitments ([2]) and long-standing practice.

The Commission is now reflecting on the outcome of these consultations to finalise a possible delegated act on mountain farming.

([1]) OJ L 343, 14.12.2012, p. 1.
([2]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council, COM(2009) 673 final, Implementation of Article 290 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Brussels, 9.12.2009.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-012061/13
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(23 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: La realidad del desempleo juvenil en Europa

La crisis económica en Europa está castigando a muchos sectores de la sociedad y en muchos Estados miembros el denominador común es el desempleo entre jóvenes, que afecta al 23 % en toda Europa. La falta de oportunidades en los países más castigados por la crisis, como es el caso de España, y sobre todo en algunas regiones como Cataluña, ha obligado a muchos jóvenes altamente cualificados a una movilidad laboral forzada (incluso fuera de Europa) en busca de mejores oportunidades laborales. El pasado mes de septiembre en Estrasburgo, se volvió a insistir en la importancia de cómo combatir el desempleo juvenil.

Teniendo en cuenta que el presupuesto asignado (6 000 millones de euros dentro de la Estrategia de la UE para la Juventud para el periodo 2010-2018) es insuficiente y que de cara a las elecciones de 2014 los jóvenes tendrán un importante papel,

1. ¿Cómo pretende la Comisión motivar a los jóvenes desempleados cualificados?

2. ¿Qué medidas inmediatas considera la Comisión que deben llevarse a cabo para que los jóvenes participen en las próximas elecciones de 2014, teniendo en cuenta el alto grado de desmotivación y frustración?

3. ¿Cómo se comprometerá la Comisión a erradicar el empleo juvenil precario y a fomentar la contratación, sobre todo en las regiones en que no existe tanta oferta laboral?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de diciembre de 2013)

La aplicación de la Garantía Juvenil ([1]) constituye una de las máximas prioridades de la Comisión. Los Estados miembros con regiones en las que la tasa de desempleo juvenil supera el 25 % deben presentar un Plan de Aplicación de la Garantía Juvenil a más tardar en diciembre de 2013; el resto de los Estados miembros debe hacerlo en 2014. La Comisión presta apoyo técnico al respecto. Por lo que respecta a la financiación, los presupuestos nacionales deberían dar prioridad a las cuestiones que afectan a los jóvenes a fin de evitar costes mayores en el futuro. También es posible obtener apoyo de los Fondos Estructurales de la UE y, en particular, del Fondo Social Europeo y de la Iniciativa sobre Empleo Juvenil, que cuenta con un presupuesto de 6 000 millones de euros.

La participación de los jóvenes en el proceso democrático constituye una prioridad fundamental de la estrategia de la UE para la juventud y fue el tema principal de la Semana Europea de la Juventud 2013. Con motivo de dicho evento se publicó un estudio que ponía de relieve que los jóvenes se interesan por las cuestiones políticas que les afectan y están dispuestos a participar en ellas. Sin embargo, existe un claro y creciente descontento respecto a la forma de hacer política, y los jóvenes consideran que no están suficientemente representados. Uno de los objetivos anuales fundamentales del programa «La juventud en acción» en 2013 han sido los proyectos encaminados a fomentar la participación en las elecciones europeas de 2014 ([2]).

Una de las medidas adoptadas por la Comisión para luchar contra el desempleo consiste en estimular la demanda laboral ([3]), tal como se describe en particular en el paquete sobre empleo de abril de 2012 ([4]). Esta medida también forma parte de la Recomendación del Consejo sobre el establecimiento de la Garantía Juvenil.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2013:120:0001:0006:ES:PDF
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/evidence-based_en.htm
([3]) Por ejemplo, subvencionando la contratación específica, reduciendo la fiscalidad del trabajo, estimulando el emprendimiento y el empleo por cuenta propia, convirtiendo el trabajo informal o no declarado en trabajo regular y mejorando el salario neto.
([4]) COM(2012) 173 final de 18.4.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012061/13
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: The reality of youth unemployment in Europe

The economic crisis in Europe is punishing many sectors of society and in many Member States the common denominator is youth unemployment, which affects 23% throughout Europe. The lack of opportunities in the countries hardest hit by the crisis, like Spain, and particularly in certain regions, such as Catalonia, has meant that many well qualified young people have had to resort to forced labour mobility (even outside of Europe) in search of better employment opportunities. In September 2013, the importance of how to combat youth unemployment was highlighted once again in Strasbourg.

Given that the allocated budget (EUR 6 billion under the EU Youth Strategy 2010-2018) is not enough and that young people will have an important role to play in the 2014 elections,

1. How does the Commission plan to motivate qualified young people who are unemployed?

2. What immediate measures does the Commission think should be taken so that young people participate in the forthcoming elections in 2014, bearing in mind that they are highly demotivated and frustrated?

3. How will the Commission undertake to eradicate unstable youth employment and encourage recruitment, particularly in regions where there is a lower supply of labour?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2013)

The implementation of the Youth Guarantee ([1]) is a top priority for the Commission. Member States with regions experiencing youth unemployment rates above 25% should submit a Youth Guarantee Implementation Plan by December 2013 and in 2014 for the other Member States. The Commission is providing technical support in this regard. As regards funding, national budgets should prioritise youth to avoid higher costs in the future. In addition, the EU Structural Funds and in particular the European Social Fund and the dedicated EUR 6 billion Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) can provide support.

Participation of young people in democratic life is a key priority of the EU Youth Strategy, it was the main theme of the 2013 European Youth Week. On this occasion, a study was released, highlighting that young people are interested in political issues that concern them and willing to contribute. However, there is a clear and growing dissatisfaction with the way politics is conducted and young people feel insufficiently represented. The Youth in Action programme in 2013 has put as one of its annual priorities projects aimed at encouraging participation in the 2014 European elections. ([2])

Encouraging labour demand ([3]) is part of the Commission's efforts to combat unemployment, as described in particular in the Employment Package of April 2012 ([4]). It is also part of the Council Recommendation on Establishing a Youth Guarantee.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2013:120:0001:0006:EN:PDF
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/evidence-based_en.htm
([3]) e.g. through targeted hiring subsidies, reducing labour taxation, promoting entrepreneurship and self-employment, conversion of informal or undeclared work into regular employment, boosting take home pay.
([4]) COM(2012) 173 final of 18 April 2012.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012063/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Fehlende Filter in Flaggenfabrik

In Österreich gibt es eine Fabrik, die unter anderem Flaggen erzeugt und die dabei ohne Filter arbeiten soll. Umliegende Bewohner und Bewohnerinnen erfahren so einen relevant verringerten Lebenswert auf ihren Liegenschaften, in einigen Fällen eine Minderung des Wertes der Grundstücke und eine direkte Bedrohung ihrer Umwelt. Sie haben zudem mit gesundheitlichen Beeinträchtigungen zu rechnen, nachdem es für Schadstoffe erst angeblich keine geltenden Grenzwerte geben soll und später widersprüchliche Aussagen diesbezüglich gemacht wurden.

Ist dieser Umstand der Kommission bekannt? Wenn ja: Welche Schritte und Maßnahmen gedenkt sie einzuleiten, um die Bewohner und Bewohnerinnen wie auch die Umwelt angemessen zu schützen?

Zudem soll der direkt anliegende Betriebskindergarten besagten Unternehmens mit EU-Mitteln gefördert worden sein.

Wie erklärt die Kommission, dass für eine Kindergarteneinrichtung, in welcher aufgrund der eingangs beschriebenen Umstände ernst zu nehmende gesundheitliche Probleme zu erwarten sind, in der Tat europäische Fördermittel vergeben werden?

Antwort von Johannes Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(6. Januar 2014)

Der Kommission war dieser Sachverhalt vor dem Erhalt der schriftlichen Anfrage nicht bewusst. Bei Tätigkeiten, die nicht unter die einschlägigen EU-Richtlinien ([1]) fallen, müssen die zuständigen nationalen Behörden sicherstellen, dass die geltenden nationalen Rechtsvorschriften eingehalten werden.

Die nationalen Behörden bestätigten, dass der neben der Fabrik liegende Betriebskindergarten im Zeitraum 2000-2006 aus dem Europäischen Fonds für regionale Entwicklung (EFRE) gefördert wurde. Mit dem Betriebskindergarten sollen den im Unternehmen angestellten Frauen Betreuungsmöglichkeiten zur Verfügung gestellt werden, insbesondere für Kinder, die keinen Zugang zu öffentlichen — in dem betroffenen ländlichen Gebiet stark nachgefragten — Betreuungseinrichtungen haben.

Gemäß dem Grundsatz der geteilten Mittelverwaltung in der Kohäsionspolitik und den in den Programmunterlagen festgelegten Auswahlkriterien entscheiden allein die Mitgliedstaaten darüber, welche Projekte aus dem EFRE unterstützt werden. Die ausführlichen Projektunterlagen, die die nationalen Behörden der Kommission inzwischen vorgelegt haben, enthalten keinen Hinweis auf ein mögliches Risiko. Die Kommission kann daher nicht beurteilen, ob den Behörden zum Zeitpunkt der Entscheidung über die Finanzierung des Projekts die potenziellen gesundheitlichen Risiken bereits bekannt waren.

([1]) Die Richtlinie 2008/1/EG über die integrierte Vermeidung und Verminderung der Umweltverschmutzung (IVU-Richtlinie) deckt die in Anhang I aufgelisteten industriellen Tätigkeiten (gegebenenfalls oberhalb der Kapazitätsschwellenwerte) ab. Laut dieser Richtlinie ist der Betrieb einer Anlage an die Erteilung einer Genehmigung gebunden, in der BVT-basierte Emissionsgrenzwerte vorgegeben sind, um Emissionen in und Auswirkungen auf die gesamte Umwelt allgemein zu vermeiden oder, wenn dies nicht möglich ist, zu vermindern. Diese Richtlinie wird am 7. Januar 2014 durch die Richtlinie 2010/75/EU über Industrieemissionen ersetzt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012063/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Lack of filters in flag factory

There is a factory in Austria that produces flags, among other things, and in doing so is said to operate without filters. Residents in the surrounding area thus experience an associated reduction in quality of life on their properties and, in some cases, a reduction in the value of their land and a direct threat to their environment. They can also expect health problems, since it was initially claimed that there were, allegedly, no limit values for the pollutants, and then later contradictory statements were made in this regard.

Is the Commission aware of this situation? If so, what steps and measures does it intend to take to provide adequate protection for the residents and the environment?

In addition, the company kindergarten immediately adjacent to this factory is said to be supported by EU funds.

How does the Commission explain the fact that a kindergarten establishment in which significant health problems are to be expected on account of the circumstances described above, is in fact receiving European funding?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(6 January 2014)

The Commission was not aware of the situation prior to receiving the question. For activities not falling under the relevant EU directive(s) ([1]), it is up to the competent national authorities to ensure that the applicable national legislation is complied with.

The national authorities confirmed that the company kindergarten adjacent to the factory received support from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) in the 2000-2006 period. Its purpose was to offer a childcare service to women employed in the company, and in particular to those children not covered by public childcare services, for which there was strong demand in the rural area concerned.

In accordance with the principle of shared programme management of cohesion policy and the selection criteria laid down in programme documents, decisions on funding individual projects by the ERDF are solely taken by national authorities,. The extensive project documentation which the national authorities have now made available to the Commission does not contain any reference to any potential risk. Therefore, the Commission is unable to assess whether potential health problems were known to the authorities when the decision on the funding of the project was taken.

([1]) Directive 2008/1/EC concerning integrated pollution prevention and control (IPPC) covers industrial activities listed in its Annex I, operating above the capacity threshold, where applicable. It requires installations to operate in accordance with permits including emission limit values based on the best available techniques, designed to prevent and, where that is not practicable, generally to reduce emissions and the impact on the environment as a whole. The IPPC Directive will be replaced and repealed from 7 January 2014 by Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012064/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Frauen und Altersarmut

Medienberichten zufolge sind in Deutschland immer mehr Menschen auch im Alter auf eine Mindestsicherung angewiesen. Diese Meldungen stehen im Gegensatz zu Tendenzen, die die Kommission in ihrer Antwort auf die Anfrage E-002240/2013 hinsichtlich einer sinkenden Armutsgefährdungsquote erwähnt hat.

1. Davon ausgehend, dass die Tendenzen wahrscheinlich nicht nur für Deutschland gelten: Welche konkreten Ansätze hat die Europäische Innovationspartnerschaft „Aktivität und Gesundheit im Alter", um diesem offensichtlich erneuten Anstieg der Altersarmut entgegenzuwirken?

2. Welche Strategien hat die Kommission entwickelt, um besonders die Situation von Frauen, die im Durchschnitt im Alter noch mehr von Armut betroffen sind, zu verbessern?

Antwort von László Andor im Namen der Kommission
(16. Dezember 2013)

1. Da die Europäische Innovationspartnerschaft „Aktivität und Gesundheit im Alter" ([1]) sich nicht mit dem Problem der Altersarmut befasst, sind keine speziellen Initiativen geplant oder vorgesehen.

2. Ziel der Strategie für die Gleichstellung von Frauen und Männern 2010-2015 ist eine weiter gehende Gleichstellung von Frauen und Männern auf den Arbeitsmärkten. Ganz oben auf der Prioritätenliste stehen die gleiche wirtschaftliche Unabhängigkeit und gleiches Entgelt für gleiche und gleichwertige Arbeit.

Mehr Gleichheit bei den Renten- und Pensionsbezügen wird auch im Weißbuch zu Pensionen und Renten ([2]) und im Jahreswachstumsbericht (2014) ([3]) als Ziel genannt.

In einer neueren Studie über das geschlechterspezifische Gefälle bei den Altersbezügen ([4]) wurden die wichtigsten Ursachen untersucht und Möglichkeiten dargelegt, wie geschlechterspezifische Unterschiede bei den Renten- und Pensionsansprüchen gemessen und verglichen werden können. Im Bericht zur Angemessenheit der Renten- und Pensionshöhe ([5]) wird unterstrichen, wie Garantie- und Mindestrenten sowie Gutschriften zur Kompensation von Erwerbsunterbrechungen wegen Mutterschaft und Kinderbetreuung in Verbindung mit abgeleiteten Renten-/Pensionsansprüchen und Witwenrenten derzeit einen Teil der gegenwärtig niedrigeren Renten- und Pensionsbezüge von Frauen auffangen. Darin wird jedoch auch betont, dass eine weiter gehende Gleichstellung von Frauen und Männern auf den Arbeitsmärkten und bei der privaten Rentenversicherung weiterhin den wichtigsten Faktor zur Verringerung des geschlechterspezifischen Renten- und Pensionsgefälles darstellt.

Da ein niedrigeres Renteneintrittsalter zu einem höheren Risiko der Altersarmut bei Frauen führen kann, hat die Kommission im Europäischen Semester ([6]) empfohlen, das Renteneintrittsalter von Frauen und Männern anzugleichen. Geringere Rentenansprüche infolge von niedrigerem Arbeitsentgelt, weniger Arbeitsstunden und kürzeren Lebensarbeitszeiten waren auch Thema in den länderspezifischen Empfehlungen ([7]), die sich schwerpunktmäßig auf die Beseitigung von Beschäftigungshindernissen für Frauen durch Zugang zu erschwinglichen Kinderbetreuungseinrichtungen und die Bekämpfung der geschlechterspezifischen Unterschiede bei Arbeitsentgelt, Renten und Pensionen konzentrierten.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=active-healthy-ageing
([2]) Weißbuch: Eine Agenda für angemessene, sichere und nachhaltige Pensionen und Renten, KOM(2012)55: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7341&langId=de
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/annual-growth-surveys/index_en.htm
([4]) Europäisches Netz von Experten für die Gleichstellung von Männern und Frauen: „The Gender Gap in Pensions in the EU", GD JUST 2013: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/documents/130530_pensions_en.pdf
([5]) Pension Adequacy in the European Union 2010-2050: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7805&langId=en
([6]) Europäisches Semester: Länderspezifische Empfehlungen: Europa aus der Krise führen, KOM(2013)350 endg.: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_de.htm
([7]) Siehe Fußnote 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012064/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Women and poverty in old age

According to media reports, more and more people in Germany have to survive on a minimum income even in their old age. These reports contradict the trends that the Commission referred to in its answer to Question E-002240/2013 in respect of a decreasing proportion of people at risk of poverty.

1. Assuming that these trends probably do not just apply to Germany, what specific initiatives does the European Innovation Partnership on Healthy and Active Ageing have planned to counteract this apparent renewed increase in poverty in old age?

2. What strategies has the Commission developed in order to improve the situation of women in particular, who are, on average, affected to a greater extent by poverty in old age?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

1. As the European Innovation Partnership on Healthy and Active Ageing ([1]) does not address poverty problems in old age no specific initiatives are planned or foreseen.

2. Greater gender equality in labour markets is a key aim of the strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015 . Its two first priorities are equal economic independence and equal pay for equal work and work of equal value.

The White Paper on Pensions ([2]) and the Annual Growth Survey (2014) ([3]) emphasise the objective of greater equality in pension outcomes.

A recent study of the Gender Pension Gap ([4]) has examined its key drivers and set out how gender differences in pension entitlements can be measured and compared. The Pension Adequacy Report ([5]) highlights how guarantee and minimum pensions and credits for labour market absence due to maternity and childcare along with derived pension rights and survivors' pensions currently mitigate the effect of women earning lower pension entitlements. But it also emphasises that greater gender equality in labour markets and in private pension coverage remains the main route to reductions in the gender pension gap.

As lower pensionable ages may cause higher old age poverty risk for women the Commission in the European Semester ([6]) has recommended to equalise the pension age for women with that of men. Lower pension entitlements resulting from the lower pay, fewer working hours and shorter careers of women have also been addressed through Country Specific Recommendations ([7]) focused on removing barriers to female employment through access to affordable care and on tackling the gender pay and pension gap.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=active-healthy-ageing
([2]) White Paper: An Agenda for Adequate, Safe and Sustainable Pensions, COM(2012) 55 final: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7341&langId=en
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/annual-growth-surveys/index_en.htm
([4]) European Network of Experts on Gender Equality: 'The Gender Gap in Pensions in the EU', DG JUST 2013. http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/documents/130530_pensions_en.pdf
([5]) Pension Adequacy in the European Union 2010-2050: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7805&langId=en
([6]) 2013 European Semester: Country Specific Recommendations: Moving Europe Beyond the Crisis, COM(2013) 350 final: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/
([7]) Ibid.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012066/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Wiederaufnahme der Verhandlungen mit der Türkei

Angesichts der in dieser Plenarwoche angekündigten möglichen Zahlungsunfähigkeit der Europäischen Union sowie angesichts der Tatsache, dass viele unserer eigenen Mitgliedsländer von einem „ausgeglichenen Budget" weit entfernt sind:

1. Wie wird die Weiterführung von Beitrittsverhandlungen mit der Türkei, welche möglicherweise kurz- bis mittelfristig, aber auch langfristig Zahlungen für weitere Heranführungshilfen mit sich bringen werden, gerechtfertigt?

2. Welche Entwicklungen haben sich im Rahmen des Europäischen Nachbarschafts- und Partnerschaftsinstruments bzw. in den regionalen grenzüberschreitenden Partnerschaften in den vergangenen Monaten ergeben?

3. Wie gedenkt die Kommission vor diesem Hintergrund künftig mit dem Konflikt zwischen Zypern und der Türkei umzugehen?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(11. Dezember 2013)

Die Aufnahme von Beitrittsverhandlungen mit der Türkei im Oktober 2005 erfolgte auf einstimmigen Beschluss der EU-Mitgliedstaaten. Im Dezember 2012 bekräftigten die Mitgliedstaaten, dass die Beitrittsverhandlungen sowohl im Interesse der Türkei als auch der Europäischen Union rasch wieder an Dynamik gewinnen sollten, und die Kommission betonte in ihrem Erweiterungspaket 2013, dass ein verstärktes Engagement in den Beziehungen zur Türkei erforderlich sei.

Die Informationen über die Unterstützung der Erweiterungsländer sind im Jahresbericht 2012 über die finanzielle Unterstützung des Erweiterungsprozesses und in der dazugehörigen Arbeitsunterlage ([1]) zusammengefasst. Beide Dokumente wurden dem Rat und dem Europäischen Parlament vorgelegt.

Von 2007 bis 2013 hat die Türkei an zwei Programmen für die grenzübergreifende Zusammenarbeit teilgenommen: am Programm zur grenzübergreifenden Zusammenarbeit zwischen Bulgarien und der Türkei und am Gemeinsamen Operativen Programm für die grenzübergreifende Zusammenarbeit im Schwarzmeerraum

Im Finanzierungszeitraum 2014-2020 verfolgt die Heranführungshilfe der EU folgende Ziele: Förderung der territorialen Zusammenarbeit, Stärkung der grenzenübergreifenden, transnationalen Zusammenarbeit, Förderung der sozioökonomischen Entwicklung der Grenzregionen und Entwicklung angemessener Verwaltungskapazitäten auf lokaler und regionaler Ebene durch die Beteiligung der Türkei an grenzübergreifenden Aktivitäten.

Was den Konflikt mit Zypern anbetrifft, so verweist die Kommission die Frau Abgeordnete auf ihre Antwort auf die Frage E-011122/13 ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/2012_ipa_annual_report_with_annex_new_en.pdf
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012066/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Resumption of the negotiations with Turkey

In view of the potential insolvency of the European Union that was announced during this plenary part-session, as well as the fact that many of our own Member States are a long way from having a 'balanced budget':

1. What is the justification for continuing the accession negotiations with Turkey, which will involve further pre-accession aid payments in the long term, but potentially also in the short to medium term?

2. What developments have there been within the framework of the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument and in the regional cross-border partnerships in recent months?

3. Against this background, how does the Commission intend to deal with the conflict between Cyprus and Turkey in future?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

Opening accession negotiations with Turkey in October 2005 was a unanimous decision by the EU Member States. In December 2012, the Member States reconfirmed that it is in the interest of both Turkey and the European Union that accession negotiations regain momentum soon, and the Commission emphasised in its October 2013 Enlargement package the need for enhanced engagement with Turkey.

Information on assistance to Enlargement countries is presented in the Annual Report on Financial Assistance for Enlargement 2012 and its accompanying Staff Working Document ([1]). Both have been transmitted to Council and Parliament.

In the period 2007-2013, Turkey has been participating in two Cross-Border Cooperation programmes: the Bulgaria-Turkey and the Black Sea Basin Joint Operational Programme.

For the financial period 2014-2020, the objective of EU pre-accession assistance is to promote territorial cooperation; strengthen cross-border, transnational cooperation, foster the socioeconomic development of the border regions and develop appropriate administrative capacities at local and regional levels through participation of Turkey in cross-border activities.

As regards Cyprus, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to the reply it gave in its answer to Question E-011122/13 ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/2012_ipa_annual_report_with_annex_new_en.pdf
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012067/13
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(23 octobre 2013)

Objet: Adhésion de la Turquie

Le 22 octobre 2013, les ministres chargés des affaires européennes ont donné leur accord pour l'ouverture à partir du 5 novembre prochain d'un nouveau chapitre de négociation pour l'adhésion de la Turquie à l'Union européenne suivant les recommandations de la Commission.

Cette décision intervient au moment où les Européens se méfient de plus en plus de l'Europe et la perspective d'un élargissement supplémentaire ne les rassure pas, notamment en termes de gouvernance.

D'un point de vue institutionnel, cette ouverture est d'autant plus incompréhensible que la Turquie a gelé les relations avec l'Union européenne lors de la présidence chypriote de l'Union européenne.

D'un point de vue humaniste, elle ne se justifie pas davantage après les sanglantes répressions qu'a connu le pays cet hiver pendant les manifestions civiles de la place Taksim.

Le chapitre qui va être ouvert concerne, pour le moment, uniquement la politique régionale. Bien que l'UE n'ait pas les moyens financiers pour intégrer un pays qui sera probablement bénéficiaire net de cette politique communautaire, un problème opérationnel se pose d'ores et déjà concernant le volet de la coopération transfrontalière et particulièrement avec Chypre.

La Commission prend-elle réellement en compte la situation de Chypre dans ses propositions?

La Commission a-t-elle analysé l'impact financier de cette décision (tant sur le coût administratif des négociations, qui ont débuté en 1987, que sur le budget de l'Union)?

A-t-elle analysé son impact géopolitique (sur les nouvelles frontières de l'UE et sur la politique d'immigration)?

Réponse donnée par M. Füle au nom de la Commission
(10 décembre 2013)

La Turquie est à la fois un pays candidat, un partenaire stratégique de l'Union européenne, un partenaire commercial majeur, un élément précieux de la compétitivité de l'UE grâce à l'union douanière et un acteur régional de premier plan. L'UE reste un point d'ancrage important pour les réformes économiques et politiques en Turquie. Les événements survenus à propos du parc Gezi ont mis en évidence l'importance de promouvoir le dialogue au sens large.

Le potentiel de la relation UE-Turquie est pleinement exploité dans le cadre d'un processus d'adhésion actif et crédible. Ce dernier reste la structure la plus adéquate pour promouvoir les réformes liées à l'UE et renforcer la coopération, y compris en matière de politique d'immigration. Les négociations d'adhésion ont besoin d'une nouvelle impulsion, dans le respect des engagements de l'UE et des conditions fixées. L'ouverture du chapitre 22 consacré à la politique régionale, début novembre 2013, constitue à cet égard une étape importante. L'un des critères à respecter pour clôturer ce chapitre, ainsi que tous les chapitres de négociation, est que la Turquie remplisse son obligation de mise en œuvre intégrale et non discriminatoire du protocole additionnel à l'accord d'association vis-à-vis de l'ensemble des États membres, y compris la République de Chypre.

Un an avant le début des négociations d'adhésion en 2005, la Commission avait publié une communication au Conseil et au Parlement concernant les progrès réalisés par la Turquie sur la voie de l'adhésion ([1]). Une évaluation plus détaillée des implications budgétaires de l'adhésion d'un pays à l'UE est réalisée lorsque les négociations touchent à leur fin.

([1]) COM(2004) 656 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012067/13
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Accession of Turkey

On 22 October 2013, the European affairs ministers approved the opening of a new chapter of negotiations on Turkish accession on 5 November, in keeping with the Commission's recommendation.

This decision comes at a time when Europeans are growing increasingly distrustful of the Union, and the prospect of further enlargement, particularly its implications for governance, will do nothing to reassure them.

From an institutional perspective, the decision to open new negotiations is all the more bewildering considering that Turkey froze relations with the European Union during the Cyprus Presidency in 2012.

From a humanitarian perspective, following last winter's bloody crackdowns against demonstrations in Taksim Square it makes just as little sense.

For the time being, the chapter to be opened will deal exclusively with regional policy. Quite apart from the fact that the EU cannot afford to incorporate a country which will probably be a net beneficiary of this Community policy, there is already a practical problem regarding cross-border cooperation, particularly with Cyprus.

Do the Commission's proposals really take the situation of Cyprus into account?

Has the Commission considered the financial implications of its decision, i.e. the administrative cost of the negotiations, which began in 1987, and the impact on the EU budget?

Has the Commission considered the geopolitical implications of its decision, i.e. the new borders the EU will acquire and the repercussions for immigration policy?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2013)

Turkey is a candidate country and a strategic partner for the European Union, an important trading partner, a valuable component of EU competitiveness through the Customs Union and plays an important regional role. The EU remains an important anchor for Turkey's economic and political reforms. The events surrounding Gezi Park have highlighted the importance of promoting dialogue broadly.

The full potential of the EU-Turkey relationship is best fulfilled within the framework of an active and credible accession process. This process remains the most suitable framework for promoting EU-related reforms and increasing cooperation, including on immigration policy. Accession negotiations need to regain momentum, respecting the EU's commitments and the established conditionality. The opening of Chapter 22-Regional policy in early November 2013 represents an important step. One of the closing benchmarks for this, but also for all negotiating chapters, is that Turkey has fulfilled its obligation of the full non-discriminatory implementation of the Additional protocol to the Association Agreement towards all Member States, including the Republic of Cyprus.

The Commission had issued a communication to the Council and Parliament on Turkey's progress towards accession ([1]), a year before the start of the accession negotiations in 2005. A more detailed assessment of budgetary implications of a country's accession to the EU is conducted close to the completion of negotiations.

([1]) COM(2004) 656 final.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012068/13
an die Kommission
Rainer Wieland (PPE)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Elektronisches Anmelde- und Ausfuhrverfahren/Mehrwertsteuerrückerstattung

Jeder, der seinen Wohnsitz außerhalb der Europäischen Union hat und in der EU erworbene Waren ausführen will, kann sich die Mehrwertsteuer bei der Ausreise zurückerstatten lassen. Bei der Ausreise erfolgt die Erstattung nicht durch den Zoll, sondern direkt durch den Händler. Dafür müssen Kunden die beim Zoll erhaltene Ausfuhrbescheinigung an diesen zurücksenden.

Um die erforderliche Ausfuhrbescheinigung zu erhalten, ist EU-weit die Teilnahme am elektronischen Anmelde- und Ausfuhrverfahren verpflichtend. Die Ausfuhrzollstelle (AfZSt) überführt die elektronisch angemeldeten Waren in das Ausfuhrverfahren. Die Ausgangszollstelle (AgZSt) überwacht den körperlichen Ausgang der Waren aus dem Zollgebiet der Union und informiert durch einen Ausgangsvermerk die AfZSt. Der Ausgangsvermerk gilt in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland als Beleg und ist als Nachweis für Umsatzsteuerzwecke anerkannt. Die Mehrwertsteuer kann dann zurückerstattet werden.

Geht diese Ausgangsbestätigung bei der AfZSt nicht ein, kann das Ausfuhrverfahren nicht automatisiert beendet werden. In diesem Fall sieht das Unionsrecht eine Überprüfung des Ausfuhrvorgangs vor. Gegebenenfalls wird ein Nachforschungsersuchen durch die Ausfuhrzollstelle eingeleitet und der Teilnehmer aufgefordert, einen Alternativnachweis vorzulegen. Für die AfZSt entsteht also zusätzlicher Aufwand, unter anderem dadurch, dass die AgZSt das Verfahren nicht ordnungsgemäß schließt.

Ohne die Ausfuhrbescheinigung kann die Mehrwertsteuer nicht erstattet werden und entweder der Händler oder der Kunde verliert die Möglichkeit der Rückforderung. Für den Händler besteht die Gefahr, diese Kunden zu verlieren oder die Kosten selbst tragen zu müssen. Der Käufer steht regelmäßig vor dem Problem, dass er bei der Ausreise unter Zeitdruck steht und bei fehlerhafter Ausfuhrbescheinigung kaum Abhilfe schaffen kann.

1. Liegen der Kommission Erkenntnisse über die Umsetzung des elektronischen Ausfuhrverfahrens in den einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten vor?

2. Ist der Kommission bekannt, ob es an Zollstellen innerhalb der Europäischen Union zu Problemen mit der Erstellung des Ausgangsvermerks kommt, beispielsweise dadurch, dass Zollbeamte das Ausfuhrverfahren nicht ordnungsgemäß schließen?

3. Welche Möglichkeiten bieten sich nach Ansicht der Kommission Betroffenen, bei fehlerhafter Verfahrensbearbeitung durch die Ausgangszollstelle schnelle Hilfe zu erhalten?

Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission
(29. November 2013)

1. Die Kommission bestätigt, dass ihr Informationen über das elektronische Ausfuhrkontrollsystem vorliegen, die die Betriebskontinuität auf Ebene der einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten betreffen. Sofern bei ihr aber keine konkrete Beschwerde eingeht, ist ihr der Inhalt der ausgetauschten Meldungen nicht bekannt, da dieser in den ausschließlichen operativen Zuständigkeitsbereich der Mitgliedstaaten fällt.

2. Der Kommission sind einige Fälle bekannt, in denen der Ausfuhrzollstelle kein Ausgangsvermerk übermittelt wurde. Diese Probleme sind in erster Linie darauf zurückzuführen, dass die Ausführer/Anmelder den Zoll nicht ordnungsgemäß unterrichtet haben, wogegen die Zollbeamten die einschlägigen Verfahren in den meisten Fällen richtig anwenden. Dessen ungeachtet ist es in der Vergangenheit in einigen Zollstellen zu Verzögerungen gekommen.

3. Es ist äußerst wichtig, dass der Wirtschaftsbeteiligte, der für die Waren an der Ausgangszollstelle verantwortlich ist, den Zoll gemäß den Ausfuhrverfahren unterrichtet ([1]). Die Kommission wird die Situation weiterhin überwachen, damit Verzögerungen auf ein Mindestmaß reduziert werden können. In der Regel kann der Ausführer/Anmelder die Ausfuhrzollstelle darüber unterrichten, dass die Waren das Zollgebiet der EU verlassen haben (mit Angabe des Ausgangsdatums und der Ausgangszollstelle) und die Ausgangszollstelle um eine Bestätigung des Warenausgangs ersuchen. In diesem Fall fordert die Ausfuhrzollstelle bei der Ausgangszollstelle den Ausgangsvermerk an, der ersterer innerhalb von zehn Tagen zu übermitteln ist. Auf Ersuchen des Ausführers oder Anmelders, dass der Warenausgang anhand eines Alternativnachweises bescheinigt wird, kann frühestens 15 Tage, nachdem die Waren zur Ausfuhr überlassen wurden, ein Suchverfahren eingeleitet werden, das zur Ausstellung einer Bescheinigung führt.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/ecip/documents/procedures/export_exit_guidelines_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012068/13
to the Commission
Rainer Wieland (PPE)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Electronic declaration and export procedure/VAT refund

Anyone who resides outside the European Union and wishes to export goods purchased in the EU can have the VAT refunded when the goods exit the Union. On exiting the Union, the refund is given directly by the trader, not by customs. To this end, the customer must send the export certificate obtained at customs to the trader.

In order to obtain the necessary export certificate, it is mandatory EU-wide to participate in the electronic declaration and export procedure. The customs office of export transfers the electronically declared goods to the export procedure. The customs office of exit supervises the physical exit of the goods from the customs territory of the Union and informs the customs office of export by means of an exit results message. In the Federal Republic of Germany, the exit results message is classed as documentary evidence and is recognised as proof for VAT purposes. The VAT can then be refunded.

If this export confirmation is not received by the customs office of export, the export procedure cannot be concluded in the automated procedure. In this case, Union law provides for an investigation into the export movement. Where necessary, an enquiry procedure is initiated by the customs office of export and the participant is invited to produce alternative evidence. Thus, extra work is created for the customs office of export as a result, among other things, of the fact that the customs office of exit does not complete the procedure properly.

Without the export certificate, the VAT cannot be refunded, and either the trader or the customer loses the opportunity for recovery. For traders, there is a danger of losing these customers, or they must bear the costs themselves. Buyers regularly face the problem of being under time pressure when exiting and have very little chance of rectifying the situation in the event of a defective export certificate.

1. Does the Commission have information concerning the implementation of the electronic export procedure in the individual Member States?

2. Does it know whether there have been problems at customs offices within the European Union with the issuing of the export results message, for example as a result of customs officials not concluding the export procedure properly?

3. In its opinion, what means are available to those affected to obtain assistance quickly in the event of the defective conclusion of the procedure by the customs office of exit?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(29 November 2013)

1. Yes, the Commission has information on the IT Export Control System as regards continuity of operations at the level of an entire Member State. However, unless a specific complaint is addressed to the Commission, it is not aware on the content of messages that are exchanged because this is the exclusive operational competence of Member States.

2. The Commission is aware of a number of cases where the 'exit results' message was not sent to the office of export. These problems are mainly occurring due to the fact that exporters/declarants have not informed customs properly, whereas customs officials are applying the relevant procedures correctly in most cases. Nevertheless, certain delays have been experienced in the past in some customs offices.

3. It is of outmost importance that the economic operator responsible for the goods at the point of exit informs customs according to the export procedures ([1]). The Commission will continue to monitor the situation to minimise delays in the future. In general, the exporter/declarant may inform the customs office of export that the goods have left the customs territory of the EU (indicating the date of exit and the customs office of exit), and request from the customs office of export that the exit be certified. In this case, the customs office of export will request the 'exit results' message from the customs office of exit, which shall respond within 10 days. On request from the exporter or declarant to certify exit based on alternative evidence, an enquiry procedure leading to certification can be started, but not earlier than 15 days after the goods have been released for export.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/ecip/documents/procedures/export_exit_guidelines_en.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-012069/13
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(23 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Y vasca y financiación europea

Según informaciones periodísticas, la Unión Europea financiará la construcción de la red de alta velocidad de la Comunidad Autónoma del País Vasco llamada Y vasca. Se menciona la cantidad de 5,9 millones de euros para el tramo que discurre por la provincia de Gipuzkoa.

Por otra parte, tal como la Comisión conoce, una comisión de la Asamblea Nacional Francesa ha elaborado este año un informe (Informe Duron) sobre la red de alta velocidad en Francia. Dicho informe recomienda retrasar la construcción de nuevas líneas de alta velocidad hasta «más allá de 2030». Entre ellas se encuentra la conexión entre Burdeos y el ramal gipuzkoano de la Y vasca.

Además, la conexión de la Y vasca con la red peninsular también atraviesa dificultades. Por problemas presupuestarios la construcción de las obras del tramo Valladolid-Venta de Baños ha estado prácticamente paralizada los dos últimos años. El tramo Estepar-Burgos sufre también problemas presupuestarios. Finalmente, el tramo Burgos-Vitoria de 91 km está todavía en fase de redacción del proyecto. Se ha comentado que este tramo puede ser sustituido por la adición de un tercer carril a la red convencional. Ninguno de los tramos construidos tiene instaladas ni vías, ni señales ni otros elemento de circulación.

La conexión de la Y vasca con el corredor mediterráneo a través de Navarra, también está en una situación todavía más precaria y alejada de su construcción.

En definitiva, la conexión de la Y vasca con la red peninsular de alta velocidad se está retrasando y hay peligro de que no se termine de construir. La Y vasca puede quedar convertida en una muy cara infraestructura para unir solo ciudades que distan entre sí 100 km.

¿Es consciente la Comisión de la realidad de la Y vasca y su conexión con las redes peninsulares y francesas?

¿Considera la Comisión que, en este periodo de crisis económica, reducción de presupuestos públicos y recortes sociales, es conveniente invertir el dinero de los contribuyentes en infraestructuras cuya viabilidad es incierta?

¿No considera la Comisión que sería más interesante invertir esos fondos en la mejora de la red convencional y de cercanías, que dicho sea de paso, necesitan un gran modernización y renovación y son utilizadas por miles de ciudadanos todos los días?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de diciembre de 2013)

La Comisión está siguiendo muy de cerca la situación de la Y vasca, inclusive mediante la realización de visitas *ad hoc*. En la actualidad, la inmensa mayoría de los tramos se encuentran en una fase avanzada de ejecución y se espera que estén terminados para el año 2017. La Y vasca contribuirá también de manera directa a la mejora de la red de transportes locales y regionales, permitiendo la movilidad de más de 70 000 vehículos cada día entre las tres capitales vascas.

La Comisión considera que merece la pena avanzar en la implantación de este corredor transeuropeo, que puede contribuir de manera significativa a la integración europea y a la cohesión territorial, mejorando a su vez la integración del comercio mundial en el espacio único europeo de transporte.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012069/13
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Y Vasca and European funding

According to media sources, the European Union will finance the construction of the Autonomous Community of the Basque Country's high-speed rail network, Y Vasca. The amount quoted for the section which runs through the province of Gipuzkoa is EUR 5.9 million.

However, as the Commission is aware, a committee from the French National Assembly has drawn up a report this year (Duron Report) on the high-speed network in France. This report recommends postponing the construction of new high-speed lines until 'after 2030', including the connection between Burdeos and the Gipuzkoan section of Y Vasca.

Furthermore, the Y Vasca connection with the peninsular network has also run into difficulties. Due to budgetary problems, the construction of the Valladolid-Venta de Baños section has practically been at a standstill for the last two years. The Estepar-Burgos section is also suffering as a result of budgetary problems. Finally, the 91 km Burgos-Vitoria section is still in the drafting stage of the project. There has been talk that this section could be replaced by adding a third railway line to the conventional network. None of the sections built has been installed, and neither have the tracks, signals or other circulation components.

The Y Vasca connection with the Mediterranean corridor through Navarra is also still in a very precarious situation and is far from being built.

Ultimately, the Y Vasca connection with the high-speed peninsular network is being delayed and there is a danger that construction will not be finished. Y Vasca could become a very expensive infrastructure connecting cities that are only 100 km apart.

Is the Commission aware of the Y Vasca situation and its connection to the peninsular network and the French network?

Does the Commission think that, in this time of economic crisis, reduced public budgets and social cuts, it is appropriate to invest taxpayers' money in infrastructures which may not be viable?

Does the Commission not believe that it would be more worthwhile to invest these funds in improving the conventional network and the commuter network, which, incidentally, are in need of major modernisation and renovation and which are used by thousands of citizens every day?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2013)

The Commission is closely monitoring the situation of the Y-Basque, including through *ad hoc* site-visits. Currently, the vast majority of the lots are in an advanced stage of implementation and expected to be finalised by 2017. The Y-Basque will directly contribute also to improving the local and regional transport with more than 70,000 vehicles moving daily between the three Basque capitals.

The Commission believes that it is worth progressing towards the deployment of this Trans-European Corridor that can significantly contribute to the European integration and its territorial cohesion, while better integrating the global trade into the Single European Transport Area.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012071/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(23 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ωραιοποίηση της εικόνας

Φαίνεται πως η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή επιχειρεί να δημιουργήσει θετικές εντυπώσεις για την Τουρκία, αφού στο προσχέδιο της έκθεσης προόδου της Τουρκίας, γίνεται προσπάθεια αποενοχοποίησης της Άγκυρας στο Κυπριακό.

Και ερωτώ την Επιτροπή:

1. Με τη συμπερίληψη της φράσης ότι «η Τουρκία συνέχισε να εκφράζει δημόσια στήριξη για τις διαπραγματεύσεις μεταξύ των ηγετών των δύο κοινοτήτων στην Κύπρο, υπό την αιγίδα του Γενικού Γραμματέα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για μια δίκαιη, συνολική και βιώσιμη λύση» δεν κατανοεί ότι ουσιαστικά αποενοχοποιεί την κατοχική Τουρκία και την εμφανίζει μάλιστα ως ένα επιτήδειο τρίτο που όχι μόνο ενθαρρύνει για την επανέναρξη των συνομιλιών, αλλά επιζητεί και διακαώς μια δίκαιη λύση του Κυπριακού;

2. Μήπως η προδήλως εξωπραγματική αυτή εικόνα αποσκοπεί να στρωθεί το χαλί στην Άγκυρα ώστε να ανοίξουν νέα ενταξιακά κεφάλαια, στο πλαίσιο των ευρωτουρκικών διαπραγματεύσεων και να διευκολυνθεί η Τουρκία, την ώρα μάλιστα που δεν έχει κάνει κανένα ουσιαστικό βήμα στο Κυπριακό, πέραν από τις ρητορικές της φανφάρες;

3. Γιατί η Επιτροπή κλείνει τα μάτια στη συνεχιζόμενη κατοχή;

4. Γιατί δεν βλέπει πως η εκκρεμότητα του Κυπριακού οφείλεται στις μαξιμαλιστικές διεκδικήσεις της Άγκυρας;

5. Γιατί, χωρίς να έχει αρμοδιότητα, επιχειρεί να ερμηνεύσει τη θέση του ΕΔΑΔ επί της «επιτροπής αποζημιώσεων» στην υπόθεση Μελεάγρου, θεωρώντας ότι το Δικαστήριο υπονόησε χρήση όλων των ένδικων μέσων για εξασφάλιση οικονομικής ανακούφισης, «ακόμη και εάν αυτό οδηγεί σε απώλεια της αξίωσης επί του τίτλου ιδιοκτησίας»; Προς τι αυτή η ερμηνεία; Είναι θέμα της έκθεσης το ζήτημα τούτο;

6. Γιατί δημιουργείται η εντύπωση ότι η ευθύνη δεν βρίσκεται στους ώμους της Άγκυρας; Είναι ικανοποιημένη η Επιτροπή από τη διαχρονική τουρκική αδιαλλαξία έναντι της Κύπρου;

7. Γιατί αποφεύγεται επιμελώς οποιαδήποτε αναφορά στο θέμα της Αμμοχώστου;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Τα ζητήματα που θίγει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος είναι μέρος της διαδικασίας για την επίτευξη συνολικής διευθέτησης του κυπριακού μεταξύ των ηγετών της ελληνοκυπριακής και της τουρκοκυπριακής κοινότητας υπό την αιγίδα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών.

Όπως τονίζεται στο πλαίσιο διαπραγμάτευσης και τις δηλώσεις του Συμβουλίου, προσδοκάται από την Τουρκία να υποστηρίξει ενεργά τις διαπραγματεύσεις με σκοπό τη δίκαιη, συνολική και βιώσιμη επίλυση του κυπριακού προβλήματος στο πλαίσιο του ΟΗΕ, σύμφωνα με τα σχετικά ψηφίσματα του Συμβουλίου Ασφαλείας των Ηνωμένων Εθνών και με τις αρχές στις οποίες θεμελιώνεται η ΕΕ. Η συγκεκριμένη δέσμευση που ανέλαβε η Τουρκία για συνολική επίλυση είναι κρίσιμης σημασίας.

Επιπλέον, η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το αξιότιμο μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στην έκθεση προόδου του 2013 για την Τουρκία ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012071/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Gilding the pill

It would appear that the European Commission is trying to paint Turkey in a positive light, given that the draft progress report on Turkey endeavours to absolve Ankara of all responsibility in Cyprus.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it not understand that, by including the phrase 'Turkey continued to express public support for the negotiations between the leaders of the two communities under the Good Offices of the UN Secretary-General aimed at a fair, comprehensive and viable solution', it is basically absolving occupying Turkey of all responsibility and presenting it as an astute third party which is both encouraging the resumption of talks and rightly seeking a fair solution to the Cyprus question?

2. Is the aim of this manifestly unrealistic picture to smooth things over with Ankara, so that new accession chapters can be opened within the framework of Euro-Turkish negotiations, and to make things easier for Turkey, at the very time when it is not taking any serious action on the Cyprus question over and above its rhetorical bombast.

3. Why it is turning a blind eye to the continuing occupation?

4. Why does it refuse to acknowledge that the fact that the Cyprus question has still not been resolved due to Ankara's maximalist ambitions?

5. Why, given that it has no jurisdiction, it is trying to construe the position of the European Court of Human Rights on the 'Immovable Property Commission' in the Meleagrou case as meaning that the Court implied that all legal means should be used to secure financial relief, even if that results in a loss of claim to the property right? What is the point of that interpretation? Is that issue the subject matter of the report?

6. Why it is creating the impression that responsibility does not lie with Ankara? Is it satisfied with Turkey's persistent intransigence towards Cyprus?

7. Why it has carefully avoided all reference to the question of Famagusta?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(7 January 2014)

The issues raised by the Honourable Member are part of the process aiming at a comprehensive settlement in Cyprus between the leaders of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities under the auspices of the United Nations.

As emphasised in the negotiating framework and Council declarations, Turkey is expected to actively support the negotiations aimed at a fair, comprehensive and viable settlement of the Cyprus issue within the UN framework, in accordance with the relevant UN Security Council resolutions and in line with the principles on which the EU is founded. Turkey's commitment in concrete terms to such a comprehensive settlement is crucial.

The Commission further refers the Honourable Member to its 2013 Progress Report on Turkey ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012072/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(23 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Δήμευση της περιουσίας 17 ιστορικών μονών στην Τουρκία

Επιθυμώ να επιστήσω την προσοχή σας στη δήμευση της περιουσίας 17 ιστορικών μονών στην Τουρκία, τις οποίες το τουρκικό κράτος χαρακτήρισε ως «εγκαταλελειμμένες», θέτοντάς τις υπό την άμεση εποπτεία του, παρά το γεγονός ότι έχει επιτραπεί στην ελληνορθόδοξη κοινότητα να τις χρησιμοποιεί.

Σε ποιες ενέργειες θα προβεί η Επιτροπή και τι είδους πίεση θα ασκήσει για την επίλυση του χρονίζοντος αυτού προβλήματος στο πλαίσιο των ενταξιακών διαπραγματεύσεων Τουρκίας/ΕΕ;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012074/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(23 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Παράνομη κατοχή τριών ελληνορθόδοξων εκκλησιών και της περιουσίας τους στο Karaköy/Γαλατά (Κωνσταντινούπολη)

Επιθυμώ να επιστήσω την προσοχή σας στη συνεχιζόμενη παράνομη κατοχή τριών ελληνορθόδοξων εκκλησιών και της περιουσίας τους στην περιοχή Karaköy/Γαλατά της Κωνσταντινούπολης, από τη λεγόμενη (και αυτοανακηρυχθείσα το 1924) τουρκική ορθόδοξη εκκλησία, κατοχή που ανάγεται στην περίοδο 1923-1965 και η οποία διεπράχθη με την υποστήριξη της τότε τουρκικής κυβέρνησης. Η πράξη αυτή είναι αντίθετη σε όλους τους κανόνες της χριστιανικής πίστης. Οι εκκλησίες και η περιουσία τους πρέπει να επιστραφούν στους νόμιμους ιδιοκτήτες τους, δηλαδή στο Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο και στην ελληνορθόδοξη κοινότητα της Κωνσταντινούπολης.

Επιθυμώ να γνωρίζω ποια είναι η στάση της Επιτροπής στο θέμα της αποκατάστασης του νόμιμου ιδιοκτησιακού καθεστώτος των εκκλησιών και της προστασίας των δικαιωμάτων της ελληνορθόδοξης εκκλησίας στην Τουρκία.

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(19 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει τα προβλήματα που οι μη μουσουλμανικές κοινότητες εξακολουθούν να αντιμετωπίζουν, για λόγους όπως η αδυναμία τους να αποκτήσουν νομική υπόσταση. Αυτό έχει δυσμενή αποτελέσματα, μεταξύ άλλων, όσον αφορά τα δικαιώματα κυριότητας. Οι σχετικές με το θέμα συστάσεις της Επιτροπής της Βενετίας του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης δεν έχουν ακόμη εφαρμοσθεί. Τα ζητήματα αυτά θίγονται με τις τουρκικές αρχές σε όλες τις κατάλληλες περιστάσεις και επαναλαμβάνονται στην έκθεση προόδου του 2013 για την Τουρκία ([1]).

Αναφορικά με τα δικαιώματα ιδιοκτησίας, οι τουρκικές αρχές έχουν καταβάλει σημαντικές προσπάθειες για την εφαρμογή της νομοθεσίας του 2011 για την αναθεώρηση του νόμου περί ιδρυμάτων του 2008. Σύμφωνα με την αναθεωρημένη νομοθεσία, 116 ιδρύματα της μειονοτικής κοινότητας υπέβαλαν αίτηση για την αποκατάσταση συνολικά 1 560 ιδιοκτησιών. Έως τον Αύγουστο του 2013, το Συμβούλιο των ιδρυμάτων ενέκρινε την επιστροφή 253 ιδιοκτησιών και την καταβολή αποζημίωσης για 18 ιδιοκτησίες, ενώ αποφάσισε ότι 878 αιτήσεις δεν ήταν επιλέξιμες. Ωστόσο, η ισχύουσα νομοθεσία δεν καλύπτει περιπτώσεις ιδρυμάτων των οποίων τη διαχείριση έχει αναλάβει η Γενική Διεύθυνση Ιδρυμάτων και περιπτώσεις ιδιοκτησιών ιδρυμάτων που έχουν μεταβιβασθεί σε τρίτα πρόσωπα.

Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί το θέμα εκ του σύνεγγυς και βρίσκεται σε τακτική επαφή με τα εμπλεκόμενα ιδρύματα. Η Επιτροπή, ωστόσο, δεν έχει υπόψη της τις «17 ιστορικές μονές στην Τουρκία» των οποίων η ιδιοκτησία έχει δημευθεί, όπως αναφέρει η κ. βουλευτής, και θα επιθυμούσε να λάβει συμπληρωματικές πληροφορίες επί του θέματος.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/tr_rapport_2013.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012072/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Confiscation of the property of 17 historical monasteries in Turkey

I bring to your attention the confiscation of the property of 17 historical monasteries in Turkey which have been declared 'abandoned' by the Turkish state and placed under its direct supervision, despite the fact that their use by the Greek Orthodox community has been authorised.

What actions will the Commission take, and what pressure will it exert, in order to resolve this persistent problem within the framework of the Turkey/EU accession negotiations?

Question for written answer E-012074/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Illegal occupation of three Greek Orthodox churches and their property in Karaköy/Galata (Istanbul)

I bring to your attention the continuing illegal occupation of three Greek Orthodox churches and their property in the Karaköy/Galata district of Istanbul by the so-called (self-declared as such in 1924) Turkish Orthodox Church, dating from the period 1923-1965 and perpetrated with the support of the Turkish governments of the time. This act is against all the rules of the Christian religion. These churches and their property should be returned to their legal owners, namely the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul.

I would like to know the Commission's attitude to the restoration of legal ownership and the protection of the rights of the Greek Orthodox church in Turkey.

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

The Commission is aware of problems non-Muslim communities continue to face, including as a result of being unable to acquire legal personality. This has adverse effects *inter alia* on property rights. The relevant 2010 Council of Europe Venice Commission recommendations have yet to be implemented. These issues are raised with the Turkish authorities on all appropriate occasions and reiterated in the Turkey 2013 Progress Report ([1]).

On property rights, the Turkish authorities have made significant efforts to implement the 2011 legislation revising the 2008 Law on Foundations. Under the revised legislation, 116 minority community foundations applied for the restitution of a total of 1 560 properties. By August 2013, the Foundations Council had approved the return of 253 properties and the payment of compensation for 18 properties, and decided that 878 applications were not eligible. Current legislation does not, however, cover foundations which have had their management taken over by the Directorate-General for Foundations, nor properties of foundations which have been transferred to third persons.

The Commission follows the issue closely and is in regular contact with institutions concerned. The Commission is, however, not aware of the '17 historical monasteries in Turkey' whose property has been confiscated, as mentioned by the Honourable Member and would appreciate additional information on these.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/tr_rapport_2013.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012073/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(23 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Απάλειψη ανυπόστατων αρνητικών ισχυρισμών σε σχολικά βιβλία ιστορίας στην Τουρκία

Σχολικά βιβλία ιστορίας που χρησιμοποιούνται στην Τουρκία περιέχουν ψευδείς ισχυρισμούς εις βάρος των μειονοτικών σχολείων και ανυπόστατους αρνητικούς ισχυρισμούς κατά των μειονοτήτων. Για παράδειγμα, το σχολικό βιβλίο ιστορίας που χρησιμοποιείται στην ενδέκατη τάξη αναφέρει ότι, κατά την τελευταία περίοδο της Οθωμανικής Αυτοκρατορίας, τα σχολεία για μειονότητες και αλλοδαπούς ήταν ένα και το αυτό και προωθούσαν εθνικιστικές πολιτικές (σ. 204-205). Ο ισχυρισμός αυτός δεν ανταποκρίνεται στην αλήθεια, δεδομένου ότι τα μειονοτικά σχολεία είχαν δημιουργηθεί από πολίτες της Οθωμανικής Αυτοκρατορίας και είχαν μεγάλη συμβολή στην κοινωνική και οικονομική ανάπτυξη της χώρας. Επιπλέον, το βιβλίο ιστορίας της δωδέκατης τάξης περιέχει έναν ψευδέστατο ισχυρισμό για το Πατριαρχείο, σε σχέση με το κυπριακό ζήτημα (σ. 161). Είναι σημαντικό οι επαναλαμβανόμενοι και ψευδείς αυτοί ισχυρισμοί να απαλειφθούν.

Πώς μπορεί η Επιτροπή να συμβάλει στο θέμα αυτό, λαμβανομένου υπόψη ότι η Τουρκία επιθυμεί να γίνει μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή ευχαριστεί το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου για το ότι επέστησε την προσοχή της στα θέματα αυτά και σκοπεύει να τα θίξει στις τουρκικές αρχές με την επόμενη κατάλληλη ευκαιρία.

Η Επιτροπή έχει εγείρει παρεμφερή ζητήματα με τις τουρκικές αρχές στο παρελθόν, με πνεύμα που ευνοεί την επίλυσή τους.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012073/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Elimination of unfounded negative claims in history textbooks in Turkey

History textbooks used in Turkey still contain false statements hostile to minority schools and unfounded negative claims against minorities. As an example, the history textbook used in the eleventh year of school states that during the last period of the Ottoman Empire minority and foreign schools were one and the same thing and promoted nationalist policies (p. 204-205). This is not true, since the minority schools were established by citizens of the Ottoman Empire and contributed greatly to the social and economic development of the country. Additionally, the history textbook for the twelfth year includes a totally false statement about the Patriarchate, related to the Cyprus issue (p. 161). It is important that such persisting false statements are eliminated.

How can the Commission help in this direction, since Turkey wishes to join the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2013)

The Commission thanks the Honourable Member for bringing the issues to its attention and intends to raise them with the Turkish authorities on the next appropriate occasion.

The Commission has raised similar issues with the Turkish authorities in the past in a spirit conducive to their resolution.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012075/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 octobre 2013)

Objet: Droits sexuels absents des programmes de santé de l'Union européenne

Nous déplorons vivement que la proposition de programme «La santé en faveur de la croissance» pour la période 2014-2020 ne fasse aucune mention des SDSG (santé et droits sexuels et génésiques).

1. Pourquoi n'est-ce pas le cas?

2. La Commission va-t-elle suivre la recommandation du Parlement et inclure les SDSG dans sa prochaine stratégie européenne en matière de santé publique?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(3 décembre 2013)

Les programmes de santé, précédents et actuel, ont effectivement servi à financer des projets visant à améliorer l'information sur la santé sexuelle et génésique.

L'objectif général du nouveau programme de santé pour la période 2014-2020 qui, à la suite de l'accord récemment conclu en trilogue, devrait être officiellement adopté par le Parlement et le Conseil au début de l'année 2014, est d'œuvrer avec les États membres à l'amélioration tant des systèmes de soins que de la santé de la population de l'UE.

Ce nouveau programme est de nature essentiellement horizontale. Il vise par exemple à contribuer à la prévention des maladies chroniques en général et à l'échange de bonnes pratiques. En tant que tel, le programme n'est pas organisé en fonction de thèmes spécifiques. Des mesures concrètes seront décidées chaque année, sur la base d'un programme de travail annuel. Les propositions qui présentent la plus forte valeur ajoutée, ont des répercussions importantes et génèrent des retours sur investissement élevés bénéficieront d'un soutien.

Toute action menée à l'échelle de l'UE dans le domaine de la santé doit respecter les limites fixées par l'article 168 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne, selon lequel «celle-ci respecte les responsabilités des États membres en ce qui concerne la définition de leur politique de santé, ainsi que l'organisation et la fourniture de services de santé et de soins médicaux».

En ce qui concerne le rapport du Parlement sur les droits en matière de santé sexuelle et génésique, la Commission attend les résultats du vote en plénière.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012075/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Lack of any reference to sexual rights in the European Union's health programmes

We greatly regret the fact that the proposed Health for Growth Programme (2014-2020) makes no reference to SRHR (sexual and reproductive health and rights).

1. Why is this the case?

2. Will the Commission follow Parliament's suggestion and include SRHR in its next European public health strategy?

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

The current and previous Health Programmes have indeed financed projects to improve information on reproductive and sexual health.

The overall objective of the new Health Programme 2014-2020 — to be formally adopted by the Parliament and Council in early 2014 following agreement recently reached in trilogue — is to work with Member States both to improve health systems and the health of the EU population.

The new programme is mostly horizontal in nature. For example it seeks to help prevent chronic diseases in general and exchange of best practice. As such, the programme is not organised according to specific themes. Concrete actions will be decided every year on the basis of an annual work programme. Proposals with the most added-value and with high impact and high returns will be supported.

Any EU level action in the health area must recognise the limits set by Art.168 of the Treaty on the functioning of the EU according to which 'the Union shall respect the responsibilities of the Member States for the definition of their health policy and for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care.'

Regarding the Parliament's Report on Sexual and Reproductive Health Rights, the Commission is awaiting the result of the vote in the Plenary.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012076/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 octobre 2013)

Objet: Accès à l'information pour les grossesses VIH

Comment la Commission pourrait-elle simplifier l'accès aux informations, aux vaccins et aux soins conçus pour empêcher que les fœtus ne contractent le VIH pendant la grossesse et pour le traiter à temps après la naissance?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(3 décembre 2013)

La prévention et le traitement du VIH/SIDA relèvent en premier lieu de la responsabilité des autorités nationales des États membres. Soucieuse de soutenir et de compléter les politiques nationales, la Commission a mis en place, autour de la question du VIH/SIDA, un cadre politique qu'elle présente dans la communication intitulée «La lutte contre le VIH/SIDA dans l'Union européenne et les pays voisins, 2009-2013» Au moyen de ce cadre, la Commission soutient les actions qui contribuent à la prévention et au traitement du VIH/SIDA.

Le Centre européen de prévention et de contrôle des maladies a, en outre, élaboré des lignes de conduite sur la prévention du VIH et sur le traitement de la maladie, qui s'étend à la prévention de la transmission mère-enfant. Le document est à la disposition du public à l'adresse suivante:

http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/publications/hiv-treatment-as-prevention.pdf

En outre, la Commission soutient l'échange de meilleures pratiques en matière de prévention, de détection et de traitement du VIH/SIDA dans le cadre du programme de santé de l'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012076/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Access to information about HIV pregnancies

How could the Commission ensure easier access to information, vaccines and care packages aimed at preventing HIV transmission during pregnancy and treating it during the postnatal period?

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

Prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS is primarily a responsibility of the national authorities in the Member States. To support and complement such national policies, the Commission established a policy framework on HIV/AIDS presented in the communication 'Combating HIV/AIDS in the European Union and neighbouring countries, 2009-2013'. Through this framework the Commission supports action to help prevent and treat HIV/AIDS.

The European Centre for Disease Preventions and Control has further developed guidance on HIV prevention and on treatment, which includes the prevention of mother-to-child transmission. The relevant document is publicly available at:

http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/publications/hiv-treatment-as-prevention.pdf

In addition, the Commission supports exchange of best practice on prevention, detection and treatment of HIV/AIDS under the EU Health Programme.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012078/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 octobre 2013)

Objet: Droits sexuels et coopération

Pourquoi la Commission n'a-t-elle pas prévu une ligne spéciale sur la santé sexuelle et reproductive et les droits sexuels et reproductifs dans le cadre des lignes thématiques de l'instrument de coopération au développement, ainsi que des crédits suffisants pour l'ensemble du programme en la matière dans tous les instruments concernés?

Compte-t-elle le faire?

Réponse donnée par M. Piebalgs au nom de la Commission
(18 décembre 2013)

La Commission élabore actuellement de nouveaux programmes thématiques au titre du CPF, portant sur les «aides aux acteurs non étatiques» et les «biens publics mondiaux et défis qui les accompagnent». Ces programmes viendront compléter les programmes bilatéraux et ne feront pas double emploi avec les actions qui peuvent être couvertes dans le cadre de la coopération géographique. Ils seront donc par nature ciblés et stratégiques. Le programme concernant les biens publics mondiaux et les défis qui les accompagnent, par exemple, apportera son soutien aux secteurs sociaux, notamment à la santé dans les domaines où une approche mondiale apporte une valeur ajoutée ([1]). Quant au programme en faveur des acteurs non étatiques, il contribuera à favoriser les initiatives de développement des ONG dans différents secteurs au niveau national. S'il y a lieu, le Parlement européen sera consulté sur ces programmes.

Réduire les inégalités, promouvoir une approche en faveur des pauvres, favoriser l'accès à des services de santé essentiels de qualité et améliorer les systèmes de santé sont des éléments importants de la nouvelle politique de développement de l'UE, définie dans le programme pour le changement ([2]), ainsi que dans les conclusions du Conseil sur le programme post-OMD ([3]) et sur le rôle de l'UE en matière de santé dans le monde ([4]). Les femmes, les enfants et les jeunes devraient être les principaux bénéficiaires de cette approche, car ils sont particulièrement vulnérables et souffrent souvent d'un manque d'accès aux services de santé, y compris aux services de santé sexuelle et génésique.

Améliorer la santé et les droits en matière sexuelle et génésique exige également des actions dans des domaines du développement autres que le secteur traditionnel de la santé: Droits de l'homme, égalité des sexes, enseignement, emploi, protection sociale et renforcement des capacités des jeunes. La Commission estime que la conjugaison des nouveaux programmes thématiques en projet et de la coopération bilatérale et géographique au niveau national constituera une bonne combinaison d'instruments à même de promouvoir les droits sexuels et génésiques dans nos pays partenaires.

([1]) C'est notamment le cas pour ce qui est de l'accès aux médicaments et du soutien aux initiatives mondiales en matière de santé, comme le Fonds mondial de lutte contre le sida, la tuberculose et le paludisme.
([2]) COM(2011) 637 final.
([3]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/137606.pdf (en anglais seulement).
([4]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/FR/foraff/114352.pdf (en anglais seulement).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012078/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Sexual rights and cooperation

Why has the Commission not allowed for a specific line on sexual and reproductive health and rights under the thematic lines of the Development Cooperation Instrument, or sufficient funding for the broad SRHR agenda in all appropriate instruments?

Does it intend to do so?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(18 December 2013)

The Commission is preparing new thematic programmes under the MFF, grouped under 'aid to Non-State Actors' (NSA) and 'Global Public Goods and Challenges' (GPGC). They are complementary to bilateral programmes and will not duplicate actions that can be covered in geographical cooperation. The new programmes will therefore be focused and strategic by nature. The GPGC programme, for instance, will provide support to social sectors including health in the areas where a global approach adds value ([1]), and the NSA programme will provide support to NGO's development initiatives in many different sectors at country level. The European Parliament will be consulted on these programmes, as appropriate.

Reducing inequality, a pro-poor approach, increasing access to good quality essential health services and improving health systems are important parts of the new EU development policy as defined in the Agenda for Change ([2]), the Council conclusions on the post MDG agenda ([3]), and the EU Role on Global Health ([4]). It is expected that women, children and youth will be the main beneficiaries of this approach as they are particularly vulnerable and often lacking access to health services, including to sexual and reproductive health services.

Better sexual and reproductive health and rights also require action in other development fields outside the traditional health sector: improving human rights and gender equality, providing education, job creation, social protection and empowering of young people. The Commission considers that the draft new thematic programmes and geographical and bilateral cooperation at country level will provide a good mix of instruments to pursue SRHR in our partner countries.

([1]) Access to medicines, support to global health initiatives such as the Global Fund to Fight AIDS Tuberculosis and Malaria.
([2]) COM(2011) 637 final.
([3]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/137606.pdf
([4]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/114352.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012079/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 octobre 2013)

Objet: Plan d'orientation

Le Parlement européen, durant sa session plénière, à travers le rapport Crețu, a demandé à la Commission d'élaborer des plans d'orientation et d'application en faveur d'une approche de la coopération au développement de l'Union fondée sur les Droits de l'homme, en concertation avec les organisations de la société civile, et à poursuivre la mise en œuvre des orientations de l'Union concernant les défenseurs des Droits de l'homme.

Que compte proposer la Commission à cet effet?

Réponse donnée par M. Piebalgs au nom de la Commission
(2 décembre 2013)

Les questions de l'Honorable Parlementaire sont identiques aux demandes formulées par le Parlement dans sa résolution «Autorités locales et société civile: engagement de l'Europe en faveur du développement durable», publiée le 22 octobre 2013. La Commission communiquera sa réponse au Parlement conformément aux règles applicables en matière de suites données par la Commission aux résolutions non législatives adoptées par le Parlement.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012079/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Guidance plan

The Crețu report adopted during Parliament's last part-session calls on the Commission to develop guidance and implementation plans for a human-rights based approach to EU development cooperation in dialogue with civil society organisations and to further the implementation of the European Union Guidelines on Human Rights Defenders.

What measures will the Commission propose in response?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(2 December 2013)

The Honourable Member's enquiries are identical to the requests formulated by Parliament in its Resolution on local authorities and civil society: Europe's engagement in support of sustainable development adopted on 22 October 2013. The Commission will inform Parliament of its reply in accordance with the rules in force concerning the follow-up by the Commission regarding non-legislative resolutions adopted by Parliament.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012080/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 octobre 2013)

Objet: Approche globale des SDSG et du VIH

La Commission compte-t-elle aborder la question spécifique des SDSG et des besoins des femmes vivant avec le VIH dans le cadre d'une approche globale visant à limiter cette épidémie?

En effet, cet objectif pourrait être atteint en généralisant l'accès aux programmes de soins de santé sexuelle et génésique, en intégrant l'accès au dépistage et au traitement du VIH/sida, en offrant des services de soutien, de conseil et de prévention, et en remédiant aux facteurs socio-économiques contribuant au risque pour les femmes de contracter le VIH/sida, comme les inégalités entre hommes et femmes, la discrimination, et l'absence de mécanismes de protection des droits fondamentaux.

Quel est l'avis de la Commission sur le sujet?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(11 décembre 2013)

Les traités ont accordé des compétences limitées à l'Union européenne en matière de santé et de soins de santé. L'organisation et la fourniture de services de santé et de soins médicaux et la gestion et l'allocation des ressources relèvent de la compétence des États membres.

Soucieuse de compléter et de soutenir les politiques nationales, la Commission a mis en place un cadre politique sur le VIH/SIDA au moyen de la communication intitulée «La lutte contre le VIH/SIDA dans l'Union européenne et les pays voisins».

Toute forme de discrimination ou de stigmatisation liée au VIH/SIDA est inacceptable. La Commission européenne s'est engagée à s'occuper de la prévention et du traitement du VIH/SIDA et des discriminations dans le secteur de la santé, en coopérant avec les États membres dans la lutte contre les inégalités.

Le programme d'action de l'UE en matière de santé soutient un ensemble d'initiatives visant à éliminer les inégalités associées au VIH/SIDA. Celles-ci incluent: le soutien à un réseau européen en faveur de l'inclusion sociale et de la santé; la coopération avec l'Organisation mondiale de la santé sur des stratégies de réduction des risques; et l'amélioration de l'accès aux tests VIH pour les groupes marginaux. La Commission poursuivra sa surveillance des maladies sexuellement transmissibles et du VIH, qui est indispensable à la prévention et au traitement.

La Commission a organisé en octobre 2013 un atelier sur les discriminations dans l'accès aux soins de santé, — y compris les discriminations en raison de l'orientation sexuelle et du type de maladie, par exemple le SIDA, — et prépare une conférence sur la lutte contre les discriminations en matière de santé qui aura lieu au printemps de 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012080/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: A holistic approach to sexual and reproductive health and rights and HIV

Will the Commission address the specific sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) and needs of women living with HIV, as part of a holistic approach to curbing the epidemic?

This could be achieved by expanding access to sexual and reproductive healthcare programmes, integrating access to HIV/AIDS testing and treatment, providing peer-support, counselling and prevention services, and reversing the underlying socioeconomic factors contributing to women's HIV/AIDS risk, such as gender inequality, discrimination and lack of human rights protection.

What is the Commission's opinion on this matter?

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

In relation to health and healthcare, the Treaties have granted limited competence to the European Union. The organisation and delivery of health services and medical care, and the management and allocation of resources are the competence of the individual Member States.

To complement and support national policies, in 2009 the Commission established a policy framework on HIV/AIDS through the communication 'Combating HIV/AIDS in the European Union and neighbouring countries'.

Any form of HIV/AIDS related discrimination and stigmatisation is unacceptable. The European Commission is committed to working on prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS, and to addressing discrimination in health, working together with Member States to fight inequalities.

The EU Health Programme has supported a range of initiatives to address inequalities linked to HIV/AIDS. These include: support for a European Network on Social Inclusion and Health; work with the World Health Organisation on strategies on harm reduction; and improving access to HIV testing for marginal groups. The Commission will continue surveillance of sexually transmitted infections and HIV, which is indispensable for prevention and treatment.

The Commission organised in October 2013 a workshop on discrimination in access to healthcare — including discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation and type of condition e.g. AIDS — and is convening conference on fighting discrimination in health in spring 2014.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012081/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 octobre 2013)

Objet: Taux d'exécution automatique pour les projets de préadhésion à l'Union

Nous regrettons que la Commission ne dispose pas d'un instrument qui lui permette de fournir un taux d'exécution de manière automatique pour les projets de préadhésion à l'Union. Soulignons que les connaissances relatives au taux d'exécution sont essentielles pour assurer le suivi de l'efficacité de la mise en œuvre des projets et, par conséquent, pour détecter assez vite d'éventuels goulets d'étranglement.

Dès lors, la Commission pourrait-elle rassembler semestriellement les données relatives au taux d'exécution des projets pour lesquels une aide de préadhésion est octroyée par l'Union?

Réponse donnée par M. Füle au nom de la Commission
(10 décembre 2013)

La Commission encode systématiquement les informations sur les engagements, les contrats et les paiements relatifs à la mise en œuvre de l'aide de préadhésion. Ces informations fournissent des détails en termes de taux d'exécution pour l'ensemble d'un programme, ainsi que par contrat spécifique, permettant d'assurer une gestion efficace de l'aide et d'adopter en temps utile les mesures correctives nécessaires.

Des mises à jour mensuelles sur les engagements et les décaissements liés à l'aide de préadhésion sont publiées sur le site internet du registre de l'initiative internationale pour la transparence de l'aide (IATI), pour chaque pays bénéficiaire. Ces données couvrent l'ensemble des engagements par projet, ainsi que les dépenses effectuées; elles sont fournies au format XML, permettant ainsi l'extraction de données sur le taux d'exécution par projet.

Un rapport semestriel, généralisé, sur les taux d'exécution ne permettrait pas de tirer des conclusions valables, puisqu'il combinerait des projets assortis de délais d'exécution différents, et ne tiendrait pas compte de la nature différente et des spécificités de chaque projet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012081/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Automated execution rate for European Union pre-accession projects

We regret that the Commission does not have a tool to provide an automated execution rate for the EU pre-accession projects and emphasise that knowledge on execution rate is crucial in order to monitor the efficient implementation of projects and, therefore, in order to point out potential bottlenecks at an early stage.

Could the Commission therefore centralise data on a six-monthly basis on the execution rate of the projects for which EU pre-accession assistance is allocated?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2013)

The Commission systematically encodes information on commitments, contracts and payments relating to the implementation of pre-accession assistance. This information provides the status in terms of execution rate for an overall programme, as well as for a specific contract, with the aim of efficiently managing the assistance and adopting the necessary corrective measures in a timely manner.

Monthly updates on commitments and disbursements relating to pre-accession assistance are published on the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) registry website, for each beneficiary country. This includes total commitments per project as well as the disbursements made. The data is provided in XML format, thus allowing the extraction of data on the execution rate per project.

A half-yearly, generalised execution rate would not allow for any meaningful conclusions, since it would combine projects with different execution periods, and without taking into account the differing nature and specificities of the individual projects.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012082/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 octobre 2013)

Objet: Rapport d'étape sur la stratégie Europe 2020

Il faut saluer la publication par certains États membres de rapports d'étape sur la stratégie Europe 2020, qui exposent dans certains cas les grandes lignes des projets visant à réaliser les objectifs fixés.

Mais pourquoi la Commission n'a-t-elle pas présenté de rapport d'étape sur la stratégie Europe 2020?

Pourrait-elle, comme le lui demande le Parlement, présenter chaque année un tel rapport?

Réponse donnée par M. Barroso au nom de la Commission
(12 décembre 2013)

La Commission souhaite informer l'Honorable Parlementaire que les progrès concernant la stratégie Europe 2020 et ses grands objectifs font l'objet d'un suivi régulier dans le cadre du semestre européen et, tout particulièrement, lors de la présentation par la Commission des recommandations par pays. Cet exercice fait partie intégrante de la coordination des politiques économiques au niveau de l'UE et tient pleinement compte des programmes nationaux de réforme des États membres.

La dernière évaluation a eu lieu en mai 2013. Le chapitre 4 du document de travail des services de la Commission pour chaque État membre, qui accompagne les recommandations par pays pour 2013, contient des informations sur les progrès accomplis dans la réalisation des objectifs de la stratégie Europe 2020 ([1]).

Cette année, la Commission a également présenté un document de travail sur l'état d'avancement de la mise en œuvre des recommandations par pays, accompagnant l'examen annuel de la croissance 2014 ([2]).

En vue du Conseil européen de mars 2014, la Commission adoptera une communication visant à permettre au Conseil européen de faire le point sur les progrès réalisés concernant la stratégie Europe 2020 et ses grand objectifs.

([1]) Une vue d'ensemble de tous les documents de travail des services de la Commission ainsi que des programmes nationaux de réforme est disponible sur le site web de la Commission consacré à la stratégie Europe 2020: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_fr.htm

([2]) SWD(2013) 800 final du 13 novembre 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012082/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Europe 2020 progress report

We should welcome the fact that some Member States have submitted Europe 2020 progress reports, in some cases outlining specific projects for achieving the targets.

Why, then, has the Commission not presented a Europe 2020 progress report?

Could the Commission comply with Parliament's request by presenting such a report annually?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2013)

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that progress on the Europe 2020 strategy and its headline targets is regularly monitored in the context of the European semester and in particular at the moment when the Commission presents the country specific recommendations. This exercise forms an integral part of economic policy coordination at the EU level and fully reflects Member States' National Reform Programmes.

The latest assessment took place in May 2013. Information on progress towards targets of the Europe 2020 strategy is contained in Chapter 4 of the Commission staff working document for each Member States accompanying the 2013 country specific recommendations ([1]).

This year, together with the 2014 Annual Growth Survey, the Commission also presented a staff working document assessing progress on the overall implementation of the country-specific recommendations by each Member State ([2]).

In view of the March 2014 European Council, the Commission will adopt a communication to allow the European Council to take stock of progress on the Europe 2020 strategy and its headline targets.

([1]) A full overview of all the Commission staff working documents as well as the National Reform Programmes is contained on the Commission's Europe 2020 website: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm

([2]) SWD(2013) 800 final of 13 November 2013.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012083/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 octobre 2013)

Objet: Processus de convergence au sein du semestre européen

La Commission pourrait-elle présenter d'urgence des propositions législatives en vue d'instaurer un véritable processus de convergence au sein du semestre européen, sur la base des objectifs Europe 2020, en incluant des incitations destinées à soutenir les États membres dans la mise en œuvre de réformes structurelles, par exemple un instrument de convergence et de compétitivité et des dispositions relatives à une coordination en amont des politiques économiques, fondées sur la méthode communautaire, en tant que première étape de la mise en place d'une capacité budgétaire européenne?

Réponse donnée par M. Rehn au nom de la Commission
(9 décembre 2013)

Le 20 mars 2013, la Commission a présenté deux communications consultatives, sur la création d'un «instrument de convergence et de compétitivité» et sur la coordination préalable des projets de grandes réformes des politiques économiques. Sur la base des informations obtenues en retour sur les options qu'elle présente dans ces deux communications, la Commission décidera de la voie à suivre au cours des prochains mois.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012083/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Convergence process within the European Semester

Could the Commission submit as a matter of urgency legislative proposals with the aim of creating a genuine convergence process within the European Semester, based on Europe 2020 objectives and including incentives to support Member States in the implementation of structural reforms, such as a competitiveness and convergence instrument, as well as provisions on *ex-ante* economic policy coordination based on the Community method as a first step towards a European fiscal capacity?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 2013)

On 20 March 2013 the Commission presented two consultative Communications: on the creation of a 'Convergence and Competitiveness Instrument' and on the ex ante coordination of plans for major economic reforms. On the basis of feedback on the options presented in the two Communications, the Commission will decide how to move forward in the course of the coming months.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012084/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(23 octobre 2013)

Objet: Répercussions sociales des réformes

Nous saluons la déclaration de la Commission selon laquelle les mesures de soutien financier adoptées par les États membres et l'Union devraient davantage tenir compte des effets redistributifs des réformes.

Dès lors, la Commission pourrait-elle procéder à une évaluation ex-ante approfondie des répercussions sociales à court terme comme à long terme de toutes les nouvelles réformes recommandées, ainsi que tirer toutes les conclusions nécessaires des précédentes recommandations, y compris celles adressées aux États membres bénéficiant de programmes d'assistance financière?

Réponse donnée par M. Rehn au nom de la Commission
(23 décembre 2013)

L'évaluation ex ante des effets redistributifs des réformes requiert des outils analytiques complexes. L'un de ces outils est Euromod, un modèle harmonisé de microsimulation des effets des politiques fiscales, qui couvre l'ensemble de l'UE et dont le développement et la maintenance bénéficient du soutien du Fonds social européen (FSE).

La Commission accorde une grande attention à l'évolution de la situation sociale et à l'impact social des mesures décidées dans les États membres, y compris ceux qui sont concernés par des programmes. En témoigne l'examen annuel de la croissance pour 2013 et 2014, dans le cadre duquel la Commission a recommandé aux États membres de concevoir l'assainissement budgétaire de manière à en réduire le plus possible les effets négatifs sur les groupes à faible revenu, notamment en accordant une plus grande attention à l'incidence de la politique budgétaire sur l'équité sociale, et à préserver le potentiel de croissance future, notamment en protégeant les investissements dans l'éducation et en modernisant les systèmes de protection sociale.

En témoigne également la communication de la Commission intitulée «Renforcer la dimension sociale de l'Union économique et monétaire» ([1]), qui propose de renforcer les instruments et les mécanismes de politique sociale et de l'emploi, au moyen notamment d'indicateurs clés en matière sociale et d'emploi dans le contexte du semestre européen pour la coordination des politiques économiques. Plus récemment, le projet de rapport conjoint sur l'emploi accompagnant l'examen annuel de la croissance 2014 a présenté une première application de ce principe, sur la base du «tableau de bord social» ([2]).

([1]) COM(2013) 690 final du 2 octobre 2013.
([2]) COM(2013)801 final du 13 novembre 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012084/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Social impact of reforms

We commend the Commission's statement that financial support measures taken by Member States and the EU should devote greater attention to the distributional impact of reforms.

Could the Commission therefore carry out a thorough *ex-ante* assessment of both the short- and long-term social impact of all the new recommended reforms and derive all the necessary conclusions from previous recommendations, including those made to Member States under financial assistance programmes?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(23 December 2013)

Assessing *ex-ante* the distributional impact of reforms requires complex analytical tools. One of such tools is EUROMOD, a harmonised tax-benefit micro-simulation model covering the whole EU whose development and maintenance is supported through the European Social Fund (ESF) .

The Commission is paying great attention to social developments and to the social impact of measures decided in MS, including in programme countries. This is reflected in the AGS for 2013 and 2014, where the Commission recommends MS to devise fiscal consolidation in such a way to minimise adverse effects on low-income groups, notably by paying increased attention to the influence of fiscal policy on social equity, and to preserve future growth potential, including by protecting investment in education and by modernising social protection systems.

This is also reflected in the Commission Communication on strengthening the Social Dimension of the EMU ([1]), which proposes to reinforce the monitoring tools in the employment and social field, notably by using key employment and social indicators within the European Semester. More recently, in the Draft Joint Employment Report accompanying the AGS2014 a first application of this monitoring has been conducted via the so-called social scoreboard. ([2])

([1]) COM(2013) 690 final of 2 October 2013.
([2]) COM(2013) 801 final of 13 November 2013.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012085/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(23 octobre 2013)

Objet: Union économique et monétaire plus sociale

La Commission pourrait-elle présenter des propositions législatives visant à compléter l'UEM, qui devrait comporter un volet social et instaurer un pacte social pour l'Europe, comme l'a recommandé le Parlement dans sa résolution du 20 novembre 2012 intitulée «Vers une véritable Union économique et monétaire» (P7_TA(2012)0430), étant donné que les stabilisateurs automatiques nationaux sont bloqués dans les États membres où ils sont les plus nécessaires?

La Commission pourrait-elle mettre en place, à cet effet, un tableau de bord autonome lié à la dimension sociale de l'UEM?

Partage-t-elle l'avis selon lequel les examens approfondis prévus dans la procédure de déséquilibre macroéconomique pourraient permettre d'évaluer régulièrement les politiques sociales et d'emploi en vue de recenser celles qui atténuent les problèmes sociaux et favorisent l'emploi?

Selon la Commission, ce système de contrôle renforcé contribuerait-il bien, comme nous le pensons, à une coordination plus efficace des politiques en vue de recenser et de relever les principaux défis en temps utile et de mieux intégrer au paysage politique global les enjeux dans le domaine social et de l'emploi?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(17 décembre 2013)

La Commission reconnaît l'importance d'un suivi accru de la situation des États membres en matière d'emploi et de conditions sociales, en vue de parvenir à une conception et à une coordination plus éclairées des politiques de l'Union. Faisant suite à la proposition formulée dans sa communication intitulée «Renforcer la dimension sociale de l'Union économique et monétaire» ([1]), la Commission a intégré dans son projet de rapport conjoint sur l'emploi ([2]) un tableau de bord d'indicateurs clés en matière sociale et d'emploi. Il vise à recenser et à mettre en évidence les grands problèmes qui, dans ces deux domaines, sont déterminants pour le bon fonctionnement de l'UEM. Ces indicateurs permettront de cerner les phénomènes essentiels pour chaque État membre et de mieux comprendre la dynamique des écarts socio-économiques, et contribueront à leur apporter une réponse politique efficace en temps utile. Le tableau de bord orientera la fixation de priorités stratégiques dès le semestre européen 2014 et viendra alimenter la surveillance multilatérale des États membres.

La Commission a également intégré, en nombre limité, des indicateurs auxiliaires sur les questions sociales et l'emploi dans son rapport sur le mécanisme d'alerte établi conformément à la procédure concernant les déséquilibres macroéconomiques ([3]). L'objectif est de mieux comprendre l'évolution de la situation sociale dans les pays qui souffrent de déséquilibres macroéconomiques et lors des processus d'ajustement macroéconomique.

([1]) COM(2013) 690 du 2.10.2013.
([2]) COM(2013) 801 du 13.11.2013.
([3]) COM(2013) 790 du 13.11.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012085/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: A more social Economic and Monetary Union

Would it be possible for the Commission to submit legislative proposals to complete the EMU through a social pillar and a social pact for Europe, as recommended by Parliament in its resolution of 20 November 2012 entitled 'Towards a genuine Economic and Monetary Union' (P7_TA(2012)0430), given that the national automatic stabilisers are blocked in the Member States where they are most needed?

To this end, would it be possible for the Commission to establish a standalone scoreboard related to the EMU social dimension?

Does it agree that the in-depth reviews provided for in the Macroeconomic Imbalances Procedure could regularly review employment and social policies with a view to identifying those policies that mitigate social problems and improve employment?

Does the Commission agree that this enhanced monitoring system would help to coordinate policies more effectively with a view to identifying and tackling major challenges in a timely fashion and integrating employment and social concerns more effectively in the overall policy landscape?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

The Commission agrees that enhanced monitoring of the employment and social situations in the Member States is important for better-informed EU policy formulation and coordination. Following its proposal in the communication on strengthening the social dimension of the Economic and Monetary Union ([1]) the Commission incorporated in the draft Joint Employment Report ([2]) a scoreboard of key employment and social indicators aiming to identify and highlight main employment and social problems relevant for the good functioning of the EMU. These indicators will permit to capture key phenomena for each Member State, better understand the dynamics of socioeconomic divergence and help ensure timely and effective policy response. The scoreboard will inform the setting of policy priorities already in the context of the 2014 European Semester and feed into Member States' multilateral surveillance.

The Commission also incorporated a limited number of auxiliary employment and social indicators in the Alert Mechanism Report under the Macroeconomic Imbalances Procedure ([3]) so as to better understand social developments in countries suffering from macroeconomic imbalances and during macroeconomic adjustment processes.

([1]) COM(2013) 690 of 02.10.2013.
([2]) COM(2013) 801 of 13.11.2013.
([3]) COM(2013) 790 of 13.11.2013.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012086/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(23 octobre 2013)

Objet: Parlement et semestre européen

Le semestre européen ne doit en aucune façon porter atteinte aux prérogatives du Parlement européen ou à celles des parlements nationaux.

La Commission peut-elle nous garantir la participation formelle et adéquate du Parlement européen à toutes les étapes du processus du semestre européen afin de renforcer la légitimité des décisions qui concernent tous les citoyens?

Quels sont les moyens que la Commission pourrait utiliser afin de renforcer la visibilité dudit processus?

Réponse donnée par M. Barroso au nom de la Commission
(12 décembre 2013)

La Commission tient à rassurer l'Honorable Parlementaire et à lui garantir qu'elle soutient le rôle actif joué par le Parlement européen dans le nouveau dialogue économique, tout en l'encourageant à le poursuivre. Le dialogue économique instauré par le train de mesures sur la gouvernance économique («six-pack») prévoit une procédure transparente en matière de contrôle démocratique dans le domaine de la politique économique. La Commission accueille aussi favorablement la contribution du Parlement au semestre européen par ses résolutions, régulières et présentées en temps voulu, relatives au semestre européen pour la coordination des politiques économiques ainsi qu'à l'examen annuel de la croissance. La Commission soutient pleinement la Semaine parlementaire sur le semestre européen, qui a été organisée pour la première fois en janvier 2013 et permet d'accroître la visibilité du semestre européen au niveau national et de mieux le faire connaître.

En ce qui concerne la participation des parlements nationaux au semestre européen, la Commission encourage les États membres, dans ses lettres d'orientation régulières concernant l'élaboration des programmes nationaux de réforme, à associer les parties concernées à l'élaboration et à la mise en œuvre de ces programmes. Elle a également invité les États membres, dans son dernier examen annuel de la croissance ([1]), à renforcer l'appropriation au niveau national et la participation des parlements nationaux. Les procédures nationales ne relèvent toutefois pas des compétences de la Commission. La Commission est, néanmoins, prête à répondre aux invitations des parlements nationaux pour débattre du semestre européen. Enfin, en vertu du nouveau règlement (UE) n° 473/2013, la Commission envoie désormais une copie de son avis concernant les projets de plans budgétaires des États membres de la zone euro directement aux parlements nationaux des États membres concernés. Cette nouvelle procédure facilite également les travaux des parlements nationaux relatifs au semestre européen.

([1]) COM(2013) 800 du 13.11.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012086/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Parliament and the European Semester

The European Semester must in no way jeopardise the prerogatives of the European Parliament or the national parliaments.

Can the Commission ensure the proper formal involvement of Parliament in all the steps of the European Semester process in order to increase the legitimacy of decisions which affect all citizens?

How could the Commission make this process more visible?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2013)

The Commission would like to reassure the Honourable Member that it supports the active role of the European Parliament in the new Economic Dialogue, and encourages the Parliament to continue taking it forward. The Economic Dialogue introduced by the Six-Pack provides for a transparent process of democratic accountability in the area of economic policy. The Commission also welcomes the contribution the Parliament is making to the European Semester by way of its regular and timely resolutions on the European Semester for economic policy coordination and on the Annual Growth Survey. The Commission fully supports the Parliamentary week on the European Semester, organised for the first time in January 2013, as a good way to increase awareness and visibility of the European Semester at national level.

Regarding involvement of the national parliaments in the European Semester the Commission encourages Member States, in its regular guidance letters regarding the preparation of the National Reform Programmes, to involve stakeholders in their preparation and implementation. The Commission also called on the Member States to increase national ownership and involvement of national parliaments in its latest Annual Growth Survey ([1]). The national procedures are, however, not within the Commission's remit. The Commission, nevertheless, also stands ready to respond to invitations of national parliaments to discuss the European Semester. Finally, under the new Regulation (EU) No 473/2013 the Commission now addresses a copy of its opinion on the draft budgetary plans of the euro area Member States directly to the national parliaments of the concerned Member States. This new procedure also facilitates National Parliament's work in relation to the European Semester.

([1]) COM(2013) 800 of 13 November 2013.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012087/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(23 octobre 2013)

Objet: Cadre qualitatif relatif aux stages

La Commission pourrait-elle nous proposer un cadre qualitatif relatif aux stages, qui couvre notamment les critères de rémunération équitable, les objectifs pédagogiques, les conditions de travail et les normes de santé et de sécurité?

La Commission compte-t-elle mettre en œuvre l'alliance européenne pour l'apprentissage de manière plus ambitieuse?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(10 décembre 2013)

La Commission fera une proposition de recommandation du Conseil sur un cadre de qualité pour les apprentis à la fin de 2013. Cette proposition présentera l'avis de la Commission sur la manière de traiter les problèmes évoqués par l'Honorable parlementaire.

Depuis le lancement de l'Alliance le 2 juillet 2013, la Commission s'est assuré l'engagement d'importantes parties intéressées, notamment par une déclaration commune des partenaires sociaux européens, de la Commission européenne et de la présidence lituanienne du Conseil de l'UE; par la déclaration du Conseil adoptée par les États membres de l'UE le 15 octobre; par une trentaine d'engagements de prestataires d'enseignement et de formation professionnels (EFP), d'entreprises, de chambres de commerce, de l'industrie et de l'artisanat, de partenaires sociaux, d'organisations de jeunesse et autres; et par un groupe « d'ambassadeurs» de 13 entreprises souhaitant partager leurs connaissances et leur expérience avec des PME pour soutenir l'instauration d'un apprentissage de qualité dans toute l'Europe.

Étant donné que la réforme des systèmes d'enseignement et de formation professionnels relève avant tout de la compétence des États membres, la Commission a invité les États membres à prendre des engagements concrets conformément à la déclaration du Conseil. La Commission attend que les États membres incluent la réforme de l'apprentissage dans leurs plans de mise en œuvre de la garantie pour la jeunesse et utilisent le financement de l'UE et l'expertise technique disponible pour améliorer leurs systèmes, le cas échéant.

La page web de l'Alliance ([1]), créée par la Commission, fournit un aperçu des divers éléments de l'initiative et des engagements pris jusqu'à présent. Elle sera actualisée avec les informations sur les réformes en cours ou prévues au niveau national.

([1]) ec.europa.eu/apprenticeships-alliance

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012087/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Quality framework for traineeships

Would it be possible for the Commission to propose a quality framework for traineeships comprising, *inter alia*, criteria for proper remuneration, learning outcomes, working conditions and health and safety standards?

Does the Commission intend to implement the European Alliance for Apprenticeships in a more ambitious manner?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2013)

The Commission will make a proposal for Council Recommendation on a Quality Framework for Traineeships at the end of 2013. This proposal will set out Commission's views on how to address the elements pointed out by the Honourable Member.

Since launch of the Alliance on 2 July 2013, the Commission has secured the commitment of important stakeholders, notably by a Joint declaration by the European Social Partners, the European Commission and the Lithuanian Presidency of the European Union; the Council Declaration by the EU Member States adopted 15 October; some 30 pledges from vocational education and training (VET) providers, businesses, chambers of commerce, industry and crafts, social partners, youth organisations and others; a pool of 'ambassadors' of 13 companies willing to share their knowledge and experience with SMEs to support the establishment of quality apprenticeships all across Europe.

Given that the reform of VET and apprenticeship systems is first and foremost MS competence, the Commission has called on MS to make concrete commitments in line with the Council Declaration. The Commission expects that MS will include apprenticeship reform within their Youth Guarantee Implementation Plans, and use EU funding and available technical expertise to improve their systems where need be.

The Alliance webpage ([1]), set up by the Commission, provides an overview of the different elements of the initiative and the pledges made so far. It will be updated with information on ongoing or planned reforms at national level.

([1]) ec.europa.eu/apprenticeships-alliance

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012089/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 octobre 2013)

Objet: Conflit Sahel

Étant donné que la résolution politique du conflit au Sahara occidental, la réconciliation et la situation des Droits de l'homme sont intrinsèquement liés, la Commission pourrait-elle prendre une part plus active dans la résolution du conflit au Sahara occidental, non seulement en soutenant les négociations des Nations unies, mais aussi en se servant de ses différents instruments de politique extérieure (par exemple, le renforcement de la surveillance et de la sensibilisation des forces policières et de sécurité aux Droits de l'homme, le soutien aux réformes démocratiques, notamment à la décentralisation et à la lutte contre la discrimination dans la région) pour favoriser une consolidation hautement nécessaire de la confiance entre les parties au conflit?

Réponse donnée par M[me] Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(6 décembre 2013)

En ce qui concerne la situation au Sahara occidental, l'UE ne cesse i) de faire part de sa préoccupation au sujet de ce conflit de longue durée et de ses conséquences sur la sécurité, le respect des Droits de l'homme et la coopération dans la région; ii) d'aborder des questions essentielles dans le cadre des réunions des organes mixtes institués par l'accord d'association UE-Maroc et d'inviter toutes les parties à s'abstenir de recourir à la violence et à respecter les Droits de l'homme. Ainsi, le 16 janvier 2013, à Rabat, la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante s'est déclarée préoccupée par la situation des 24 militants sahraouis incarcérés à Salé à la suite des événements survenus à Laayoune les 8 et 9 novembre 2010, où 11 policiers marocains et deux civils sahraouis avaient trouvé la mort. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a suivi attentivement avec les États membres le déroulement du procès au terme duquel les accusés ont été condamnés à de lourdes peines en janvier 2013; iii) d'exprimer son soutien aux Nations unies et de se prononcer en faveur de la résolution 2099 (2013) du Conseil de sécurité qui souligne «qu'il importe d'améliorer la situation des Droits de l'homme au Sahara occidental et dans les camps de Tindouf» et se félicite des mesures prises pour «renforcer les commissions du Conseil national des Droits de l'homme à Dakhla et Laayoune». Par ailleurs, l'UE soutient actuellement le Conseil national des Droits de l'homme (dont le mandat a été renforcé et officialisé par la réforme constitutionnelle de 2011) afin de consolider les capacités opérationnelles nécessaires pour enquêter sur des violations des Droits de l'homme et y remédier.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012089/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Conflict in the Sahel

Considering that the political resolution to the Western Sahara conflict, reconciliation and the human rights situation are closely linked, could the Commission be more active in the resolution of the Western Sahara conflict, not only by supporting the UN negotiations but also by using its various external policy instruments (for example strengthening human rights monitoring and awareness among police and security forces, and supporting democratic reforms, including decentralisation and the fight against discrimination in the region) to promote much-needed confidence building between the conflict parties?

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

In relation with the Western Sahara conflict, the EU is repeatedly and constantly (i) expressing concern about the long duration of the Western Sahara conflict and the implications for the security, respect of human rights and cooperation in the region; (ii) addressing critical issues in the meetings of the joint bodies established under the EU/Morocco Association Agreement and calling on all parties to restrain from violence and to respect human rights; for example, on 16 January 2013, the HR/VP expressed concern in Rabat about the situation of the 24 Saharawi activists in prison in Salé, accused in relation to events occurred around Laayoune on 8-9 November 2010 when 11 Moroccan policemen and two Saharawi civilians were killed. The HR/VP followed closely with the Member States the trial that was concluded on February 2013 with heavy sentences; (iii) expressing support to the UN and supports the Security Council Resolution 2099 (2013) which is 'stressing the importance of improving 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'. Moreover, the EU is currently supporting the National Council on Human Rights (whose mandate has been reinforced and officialised by the 2011 Constitutional reform) with a view to strengthening its operational capacity in relation to investigating and remedying human rights abuses.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012090/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(23 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Bağış: „Voortgangsverslag Turkije niet op „Religious Holiday" publiceren"

De Europese Commissie heeft haar „Turkey 2013 Progress Report" en „Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2013-2014" gepubliceerd. Dat gebeurde op 16 oktober 2013, en dat is — zo klaagt Egemen Bağış, de Turkse minister van Europese Zaken — de tweede dag van de Turkse „Religious Holiday". Hij stelt dat de Turkse „Religious Holiday" een inspiratie is voor „liefde, vrede, vriendschap, broederschap, eenheid en solidariteit". Daarom verzoekt hij de Commissie haar rapporten in het vervolg op een andere dag te publiceren — aangezien de EU een „unie van waarden" is.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het „Statement by Egemen Bağış, Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator, on Turkey 2013 Progress Report of the European Commission" ([1])?

2. Hoe ervaart de Commissie het dat de heer Bağış het „ongepast" vindt dat zij haar rapporten op de tweede dag van de Turkse „Religious Holiday" heeft gepresenteerd?

3. Hoe reageert de Commissie op het verzoek van de heer Bağış om haar rapporten in het vervolg op een andere dag te publiceren? Is de Commissie voornemens hierop in te gaan? Waarom wel/niet?

4. Impliceert de heer Bağış, naar het oordeel van de Commissie, dat de door haar gekozen dag voor publicatie van haar rapporten de waarden „liefde, vrede, vriendschap, broederschap, eenheid en solidariteit" ondermijnt? Zo neen, hoe interpreteert de Commissie de door de heer Bağış genoemde waarden en het daaraan gekoppelde verzoek om haar rapporten in het vervolg op een andere dag te publiceren dan wel?

5. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat dit een zoveelste voorbeeld van de stuitende Turkse arrogantie is? Zo neen, hoe ziet de Commissie deze kwestie dan wel?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(19 december 2013)

De Commissie is zich ervan bewust dat de Turkse autoriteiten liever gezien hadden dat het voortgangsverslag over Turkije van 2013 ([2]) op een andere dag was gepubliceerd. Helaas was dit niet haalbaar, omdat de goedkeuring van het gehele uitbreidingspakket daardoor zou zijn uitgesteld. Dit werd in detail besproken met onze Turkse collega's die deze beperkingen begrepen en dit blijkt geheel uit de verklaring van minister Bağış, waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst ([3]). Er zij op gewezen dat het voortgangsverslag van 2013 in Turkije en bij minister Bağış over het algemeen als eerlijk en evenwichtig werd aangemerkt.

Bovendien is het tijdstip van goedkeuring van het uitbreidingspakket nauw verbonden met de agenda van andere EU-instellingen, met name het Europees Parlement en de Raad. Deze agenda's zijn ruim van tevoren vastgesteld. De Commissie wijst er in dit verband op dat op 22 november een Raad Algemene Zaken plaatsvond, waarop het voortgangsverslag over Turkije van 2013 moest worden besproken.

([1]) http://egemenbagis.com/en/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2012/package/strategy_paper_2012_nl.pdf
([3]) http://egemenbagis.com/en/8231

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012090/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Egemen Bağış: 'Do not publish the Turkey progress report on a religious holiday'

The European Commission has published its 'Turkey 2013 progress report' and its 'Enlargement strategy and main challenges 2013-2014'. It did so on 16 October 2013, which, Egemen Bağış, the Turkish Minister for EU Affairs, has complained, is the second day of Turkey's 'religious holiday'. He argues that the Turkish religious holiday is a source of inspiration for 'love, peace, friendship, brotherhood, unity and solidarity'. He is therefore asking the Commission to publish its reports on a different date in future, given that the EU is a 'union of values'.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the 'Statement by Egemen Bağış, Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator, on the Turkey 2013 Progress Report of the European Commission'? ([1])

2. How does the Commission feel about the fact that Mr Bağış finds it inappropriate that it should have published its reports on the second day of the Turkish religious holiday?

3. What is the Commission's reaction to Mr Bağış's request for it to publish reports on a different date in future? Does the Commission intend to agree to this? Why so/why not?

4. In the Commission's view, is Mr Bağış implying that the date chosen by it for publication of its reports undermines the values of 'love, peace, friendship, brotherhood, unity and solidarity'? If not, how does the Commission interpret the values listed by Mr Bağış and the associated request for the Commission to publish its reports on a different date in future?

5. Does the Commission share the view that this is yet another example of Turkey's shocking arrogance? If not, what is the Commission's interpretation of this matter?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

The Commission is aware that the Turkish authorities would have preferred for the 2013 Progress Report on Turkey ([2]) to have been published on a different day. Unfortunately, this was not feasible as it would have meant postponing the adoption of the entire enlargement package. This was discussed in detail with our Turkish counterparts, who showed understanding for these constraints, as is fully reflected in the statement by Minister Bağış mentioned by the Honourable Member. ([3]) It is to be noted that the 2013 Progress Report was broadly welcomed in Turkey as fair and balanced, including by Minister Bağış.

Moreover, the timing of the adoption of the enlargement package is closely related to the calendar of other EU institutions, namely the European Parliament and the Council. These calendars are set well in advance. The Commission would like to recall in this respect that a General Affairs Council took place on 22 November for which the 2013 Progress Report on Turkey was needed for discussion.

([1]) http://egemenbagis.com/en/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm
([3]) http://egemenbagis.com/en/8231

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012092/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Papiermenge im Übersetzungsdienst der Kommission

Die Kommission unterhält einen eigenen Übersetzungsdienst.

1. Wie hoch war die Menge an Papier für übersetzte Unterlagen in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013?

2. Wie viel Papier wurde entsorgt?

3. Wie viel Papier wurde dem Recycling zugeführt?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(20. Dezember 2013)

Die Europäische Kommission überwacht und berichtet über die Umweltauswirkungen ihrer Tätigkeit im Rahmen des Gemeinschaftssystems für das Umweltmanagement und die Umweltbetriebsprüfung (EMAS), das sich auf immer mehr Gebäude in Brüssel, Luxemburg und darüber hinaus erstreckt. Über die Ressourcenverwendung an den Standorten der Kommission in Brüssel und Luxemburg, einschließlich Papierverbrauch (zur allgemeinen Verwendung und zu Druckzwecken), wird jährlich berichtet. Der Papierverbrauch im Übersetzungsdienst belief sich 2011 auf 51 Tonnen, 2012 auf 46 Tonnen und dürfte sich 2013 auf 41 Tonnen belaufen.

Das Gesamtaufkommen an Altpapier ([1]), das im Übersetzungsdienst in Brüssel gesammelt wurde, belief sich 2011 auf 140 Tonnen, 2012 auf 133 Tonnen und bis Juni 2013 auf 64 Tonnen (und dürfte sich somit für das gesamt Jahr auf 128 Tonnen belaufen). Laut Bericht der technischen Dienste wird Altpapier in Brüssel durchschnittlich zu 95 % recycelt. Auf den Übersetzungsdienst entfallen dementsprechend für 2011, 2012 und 2013 (Trend) 133 Tonnen, 126 Tonnen bzw. 122 Tonnen. In Luxemburg wird das Altpapier vollständig recycelt.

([1]) Einschließlich (jedoch nicht ausschließlich) Papier, Verpackungsmaterial, Zeitschriften und Rundschreiben aus internen und externen Quellen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012092/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Amount of paper used by the Commission's translation service

The Commission maintains its own translation service.

1. How much paper was used for translated documents in 2011, 2012 and 2013?

2. How much paper was disposed of?

3. How much paper was sent for recycling?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(20 December 2013)

The European Commission monitors and reports on the environmental impact of its activities through its accredited impact Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS), which is expanding to cover more of its buildings in Brussels, Luxembourg and beyond. Resource use, including paper consumption (for general use and mostly for printing) is reported annually for the Commission sites in Brussels and Luxembourg. Paper consumption in DGT was 51 tonnes in 2011, 46 tonnes in 2012, and trending towards 41 tonnes in 2013.

The total of all waste paper products ([1]) collected from DGT in Brussels was 140 tonnes in 2011, 133 tonnes in 2012 and 64 tonnes up to June 2013 (therefore trending towards 128 tonnes for the year.) Technical services report that recycling of waste paper products in Brussels averages 95%, which for DGT is equivalent to 133 tonnes, 126 tonnes and 122 tonnes for 2011, 2012 and 2013 (trend) respectively. In Luxembourg all waste paper products are recycled.

([1]) Includes (but not exclusively) paper, packaging, journals/circulars from internal and external sources.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012093/13
an den Rat
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Übersetzergehälter beim Rat

Der Rat unterhält einen eigenen Übersetzungsdienst.

1. Wie hoch war im Jahr 2012 das niedrigste Gehalt für Übersetzer?

2. Wie hoch war im Jahr 2012 das höchste Gehalt für Übersetzer?

3. Wie gliederten sich die Übersetzer im Jahr 2012 auf der Gehaltsstufenskala des Rates?

Antwort
(23. Dezember 2013)

Im Jahr 2012 waren ungefähr 630 Übersetzer beim Rat beschäftigt: 590 Beamte und 40 Vertragsbedienstete.

Die Übersetzergehälter richten sich nach den Gehaltstabellen des Statuts der Beamten und der Beschäftigungsbedingungen für die sonstigen Bediensteten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012093/13
to the Council
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Translator salaries in the Council

The Council maintains its own translation service.

1. What was the lowest salary for translators in 2012?

2. What was the highest salary for translators in 2012?

3. What was the breakdown of translators in 2012 in terms of the Council's salary scale?

Reply
(23 December 2013)

In 2012 the Council employed approximately 630 translators: 590 were statutory officials and 40 were contract agents.

Translators are paid in accordance with the salary scales of the Staff Regulations and of the Conditions of employment of other servants.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012094/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Übersetzergehälter in der Kommission

Die Kommission beschäftigte im Jahr 2012 1 474 Übersetzer.

1. Wie hoch war im Jahr 2012 das niedrigste Gehalt für Übersetzer?

2. Wie hoch war im Jahr 2012 das höchste Gehalt für Übersetzer?

3. Wie gliederten sich die Übersetzer im Jahr 2012 auf der Gehaltsstufenskala der Kommission?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(6. Januar 2014)

Am 1. Januar 2013 arbeiteten 1 474 Übersetzer in der Generaldirektion Übersetzung der Europäischen Kommission.

Die niedrigste Besoldungsgruppe war AD 5, die höchste AD 14.

Eine Aufschlüsselung der 1 474 Übersetzer nach Besoldungsgruppen findet sich in der Tabelle in Anhang 1.

Die Gehaltstabellen mit den monatlichen Grundgehältern der einzelnen Besoldungsgruppen können dem Statut der Beamten Titel V Kapitel 1 (Bezüge und Kostenerstattung) ([1]) entnommen werden.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Result.do?T1=V1&T2=1962&T3=31&RechType=RECH_consolidated&Submit=Search

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012094/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Translators' salaries in the Commission

The Commission employed 1474 translators in 2012.

1. What was the lowest salary for translators in 2012?

2. What was the highest salary for translators in 2012?

3. What was the breakdown of translators in 2012 in terms of the Commission's salary scale?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(6 January 2014)

On 1 January 2013, 1474 translators were working in DG Translation of the European Commission.

The lowest grade was AD 5, the highest grade AD 14.

The breakdown of all 1474 translators over the different grades is provided in the table in Annex 1.

The basic monthly salaries corresponding to the different grades are set out in Title V, Chapter 1 of the Staff Regulations (Remuneration and expenses) ([1])

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Result.do?T1=V1&T2=1962&T3=31&RechType=RECH_consolidated&Submit=Search

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012095/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Kosten der Europäischen Beobachtungsstelle für Drogen und Drogensucht (EMCDDA) für das Informationsnetzwerk „Reitox"

Die Europäische Beobachtungsstelle für Drogen und Drogensucht (EMCDDA) plante für die Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 Kosten für das Informationsnetzwerk „Reitox" von 2 606 569, 2 646 388 und 2 646 388 EUR ein.

Wie genau gliedern sich diese Kosten auf?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012106/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Personal der Europäischen Beobachtungsstelle für Drogen und Drogensucht (EMCDDA)

Dem Haushaltsplan der Europäischen Beobachtungsstelle für Drogen und Drogensucht (EMCDDA) für das Jahr 2013 zufolge stiegen allein die Gehaltskosten der Agentur von 2011 bis 2013 um über eine Million Euro — von 5 853 220 EUR auf 6 952 278,76 EUR. Die Personalkosten insgesamt stiegen von 7 780 100 EUR im Jahr 2011 auf 9 280 878,76 EUR im Jahr 2013. Im selben Zeitraum stieg die Anzahl der Planstellen von 77 auf 84 und die Anzahl der Zeitbediensteten von 26 auf 28.

1. Wie genau erklärt EMCDDA diese Kostensteigerung?

2. Wofür wurde das zusätzliche Personal benötigt? Welche konkreten Aufgaben sind mit den neu geschaffenen Positionen verbunden?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012108/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Restaurantkosten der Europäischen Beobachtungsstelle für Drogen und Drogensucht (EMCDDA)

Die Europäische Beobachtungsstelle für Drogen und Drogensucht (EMCDDA) plante für die Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 Kosten für „Restaurants und Kantinen" von 20 000, 17 100 und 12 000 EUR ein.

1. Verfügt die EMCDDA über eine eigene Kantine?

2. Wie genau verteilten sich die Kosten in den genannten Jahren auf die Unterpunkte „Restaurants" und „Kantinen"?

3. Wie viele Mahlzeiten finanzierte die EMCDDA für ihre Mitarbeiter außer Haus?

4. Warum finanzierte die EMCDDA Mahlzeiten für ihre Mitarbeiter?

5. Kamen alle oder nur bestimmte Mitarbeiter in den Genuss von finanzierten Mahlzeiten?

6. Wurden bei den Mahlzeiten auch alkoholische Getränke eingenommen?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012111/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Trainingskosten der Europäischen Beobachtungsstelle für Drogen und Drogensucht (EMCDDA)

Die Europäische Beobachtungsstelle für Drogen und Drogensucht (EMCDDA) plante für die Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 Schulungskosten von respektive 95 000, 79 500 und 50 000 EUR ein.

1. Welche Schulungen organisierte oder finanzierte die EMCDDA in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils bzw. plant sie zu organisieren?

2. Wie hoch waren die Kosten für jede dieser Schulungen?

3. Wie viele Mitarbeiter kamen in den Genuss einer Schulung? Wie viele erhielten jeweils zwei, drei oder mehr Schulungen?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(11. Dezember 2013)

Die Kommission hat die Europäische Beobachtungsstelle für Drogen und Drogensucht (EMCDDA) um die Beantwortung der Frage des Herrn Abgeordneten gebeten. Die Antwort der Agentur wird dem Herrn Abgeordneten so bald wie möglich von der Kommission zugesandt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012095/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Costs of the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) for the Reitox information network

The planned costs of the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) for the Reitox information network for 2011, 2012 and 2013 were EUR 2 606 569, EUR 2 646 388 and EUR 2 646 388, respectively.

What is the exact break down of these costs?

Question for written answer E-012106/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Staff at the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction

According to the 2013 budget for the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA), salary costs alone rose by a million euros between 2011 and 2013 from EUR 5 853 220 to EUR 6 952 278.76. Total staffing costs rose from EUR 7 780 100 in 2011 to EUR 9 280 878.76 in 2013. In the same period, the number of permanent posts rose from 77 to 84 and the number of temporary agents rose from 26 to 28.

1. How exactly does the EMCDDA explain this increase in costs?

2. For what purposes were the additional staff members required? What specific tasks are associated with the newly created posts?

Question for written answer E-012108/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Restaurant costs of the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA)

The planned costs of the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) for 'restaurants and canteens' for 2011, 2012 and 2013 were EUR 20 000, EUR 17 100 and EUR 12 000, respectively.

1. Does the EMCDDA have its own canteen?

2. How exactly were the costs in the years specified distributed between the sub-items 'restaurants' and 'canteens'?

3. How many meals does the EMCDDA subsidise for its staff away from home?

4. Why does the EMCDDA subsidise meals for its staff?

5. Did all members of staff enjoy subsidised meals, or only certain of them?

6. Were alcoholic beverages also consumed during these meals?

Question for written answer E-012111/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Training costs of the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA)

The European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) provided for training costs for 2011, 2012 and 2013 of EUR 95 000, EUR 79 500 and EUR 50 000, respectively.

1. What training did the EMCDDA organise or fund in 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively, or is it planning to organise?

2. How much did each of these training courses cost?

3. How many members of staff benefited from a training course? How many of them attended two, three or more training courses, respectively?

Joint answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

The Commission has asked the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) to provide a response to the questions raised by the Honourable Member. The Agency's reply will be sent by the Commission to the Honourable Member as soon as possible.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012096/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Personalkosten der Europäischen Agentur für Netz- und Informationssicherheit (ENISA)

Das Jahresbudget der Europäischen Agentur für Netz- und Informationssicherheit (ENISA) für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 ([1]) sieht für 2013 Gehaltskosten von 3 065 000 EUR vor. Im Jahr 2012 waren es noch 2 798 112,39 EUR. Ebenfalls stiegen die Kosten für Familienzulagen, Auslandszulagen und nationale Experten, so dass die ENISA insgesamt für 2013 Personalausgaben von 5 453 541,70 EUR einplante. Die Kosten für 2013 lagen damit mehr als 200 000 EUR über dem Vorjahresbetrag, während die Mitarbeiterzahl konstant bei 47 Planstellen verblieb.

1. Wie erklärt die Agentur diese Steigerung?

2. Welche Maßnahmen unternimmt die Agentur, um zukünftige Steigerungen zu vermeiden?

Antwort von Frau Kroes im Namen der Kommission
(10. Dezember 2013)

Die Kommission hat die Europäische Agentur für Netz- und Informationssicherheit (ENISA) gebeten, die Fragen des Herrn Abgeordneten zu beantworten. Die Kommission wird die Antwort der Agentur so schnell wie möglich an den Herrn Abgeordneten weiterleiten.

([1]) http://www.enisa.europa.eu/about-enisa/accounting-finance/files/enisa-2013-annual-budget

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012096/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Staff costs of the European Network and Information Security Agency (ENISA)

The annual budget of the European Network and Information Security Agency (ENISA) for the financial year 2013 ([1]) provides for salary costs for 2013 of EUR 3 065 000. In 2012, the amount was just EUR 2 798 112.39. The costs also increased for family allowances, expatriation and foreign-residence allowances, and national experts, with the result that ENISA allowed for total staff costs of EUR 5 453 541.70 for 2013. The costs for 2013 were therefore more than EUR 200 000 higher than the amount for the previous year, whereas the staff headcount remained the same at 47.

1. How does the Agency explain this increase?

2. What steps is the Agency taking to avoid future increases?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2013)

The Commission has asked the European Network and Information Security Agency (ENISA) to provide a response to the question raised by the Honourable Member. The Agency's reply will be sent by the Commission to the Honourable Member as soon as possible.

([1]) http://www.enisa.europa.eu/about-enisa/accounting-finance/files/enisa-2013-annual-budget

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012105/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Operative Ausgaben der Europäischen Eisenbahnagentur (ERA)

Dem Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan der Europäischen Eisenbahnagentur (ERA) für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 zufolge plante die Agentur für das Jahr 2013 Mittel von 3 713 799 EUR für „Operative Ausgaben" ein. Im Vorjahr waren noch 2 900 000 EUR vorgesehen, im Jahr 2011 wurden tatsächlich 1 757 581 EUR ausgegeben.

1. Welche konkreten Aktivitäten, Tätigkeiten und Funktionen umfasst die Agentur unter dem Begriff „Operative Ausgaben"?

2. Warum haben sich die „Operativen Ausgaben" nach Einschätzung der Agentur von 2011 bis 2013 mehr als verdoppelt?

3. Welche Maßnahmen hat die Agentur unternommen, um diesen Kostensteigerungen entgegenzuwirken?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012110/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Sitzungen und Nebenkosten der Europäischen Eisenbahnagentur (ERA)

Dem Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan der Europäischen Eisenbahnagentur (ERA) für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 zufolge plante die Agentur für das Jahr 2013 Mittel von 235 000 EUR für „Sitzungen und Nebenkosten" ein. Im Vorjahr waren noch 85 000 EUR vorgesehen, im Jahr 2011 wurden tatsächlich 66 978 EUR ausgegeben.

1. Warum erwartete die Agentur für 2013 eine Vervierfachung der noch 2011 für diesen Posten genutzten Mittel?

2. Wie viele Sitzungen organisierte die Agentur in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 beziehungsweise wie viele wird sie organisieren?

3. Wie hoch waren a) die Teilnehmerzahl und b) die Kosten für jede dieser Sitzungen?

4. Was umfasst die Agentur unter dem Begriff „Nebenkosten" für Sitzungen?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012116/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Bewegliche Sachen und Nebenkosten der Europäischen Eisenbahnagentur (ERA)

Dem Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan der Europäischen Eisenbahnagentur (ERA) für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 zufolge plante die Agentur für das Jahr 2013 Mittel von 170 000 EUR für „Bewegliche Sachen und Nebenkosten" ein. Im Vorjahr waren ebenfalls 170 000 EUR vorgesehen, im Jahr 2011 wurden tatsächlich 78 225 EUR ausgegeben.

1. Wie genau gliederten sich die geschätzten bzw. tatsächlichen Kosten der Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils?

2. Warum erwartet die Agentur für die Jahre 2012 und 2013 mehr als doppelt so hohe Kosten wie im Jahr 2011?

3. Über welche beweglichen Sachen verfügt die Agentur? Welcher Anteil davon ist geleast, und welcher befindet sich im Eigentum der Agentur?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(2. Dezember 2013)

Die Kommission hat die Europäische Eisenbahnagentur (ERA) gebeten, die Antworten auf die Fragen des Herrn Abgeordneten zu liefern.

Diese Antworten wird die Kommission dem Herrn Abgeordneten weiterleiten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012105/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Operational expenditures of the European Railway Agency (ERA)

In the statement of revenue and expenditure of the European Railway Agency (ERA) for the financial year 2013, the Agency provides for an appropriation for 2013 of EUR 3 713 799 for 'operational expenditures'. Last year there was an appropriation of EUR 2 900 000, and in 2011 the outturn was EUR 1 757 581.

1. What specific activities, tasks and functions does the Agency include under the term 'operational expenditures'?

2. Why have the 'operational expenditures' more than doubled from 2011 to 2013, according to the Agency's estimates?

3. What steps has the Agency taken to counter these cost increases?

Question for written answer E-012110/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Meetings and associated costs of the European Railway Agency (ERA)

In the statement of revenue and expenditure of the European Railway Agency (ERA) for the financial year 2013, the Agency provided for an appropriation for 2013 of EUR 235 000 for 'meetings and associated costs'. The appropriation for last year was just EUR 85 000, and in 2011 the outturn was EUR 66 978.

1. Why does the Agency expect a fourfold increase in 2013 compared to the amount spent on this item in 2011?

2. How many meetings did the Agency organise in 2011, 2012 and 2013, or will it organise?

3. What were (a) the participant numbers and (b) the costs for each of these meetings?

4. What does the Agency include under the term 'associated costs' for meetings?

Question for written answer E-012116/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Movable property and associated costs of the European Railway Agency (ERA)

In the statement of revenue and expenditure of the European Railway Agency (ERA) for the financial year 2013, the Agency provided for an appropriation for 2013 of EUR 170 000 for 'movable property and associated costs'. The appropriation for last year was also EUR 170 000, and in 2011 the outturn was EUR 78 225.

1. What is the exact breakdown of the estimated or actual costs for 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively?

2. Why does the Agency expect the costs for 2012 and 2013 to be more than twice those for 2011?

3. What movable property does the Agency have at its disposal? What proportion of this is leased and what proportion is owned by the Agency?

(Version française)

Réponse commune donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(2 décembre 2013)

La Commission a demandé à l'Agence Ferroviaire Européenne (AFE) de fournir les éléments de réponse aux questions posées par l'Honorable Parlementaire.

Ces éléments seront transmis par la Commission à l'Honorable Parlementaire.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012107/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Personalzusammensetzung des Übersetzungszentrums für die Einrichtungen der Europäischen Union (CdT)

Den statistischen Informationen zum Personal des Übersetzungszentrums für die Einrichtungen der Europäischen Union (CdT) für das Jahr 2010 ([1]) zufolge stammten von 215 Mitarbeitern des Zentrums 48 aus Frankreich und 30 aus Belgien, dabei stammten von 86 Assistenten 70 entweder aus Frankreich oder aus Belgien.

1. Wie erklärt das Zentrum die ungewöhnlich hohe Anzahl von belgischen und französischen Staatsbürgern in ihrem Personal und insbesondere unter den Assistenten?

2. Wie setzt sich das Personal derzeit zusammen?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012109/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Sicherheits- und Überwachungskosten des Übersetzungszentrums für die Einrichtungen der Europäischen Union (CdT)

Dem Vorentwurf des Haushaltsplans 2014 des Übersetzungszentrums für die Einrichtungen der Europäischen Union (CdT) für das Jahr 2010 ([2]) zufolge plant das Zentrum für 2014 Kosten für „Sicherheit und Überwachung der Dienstgebäude" von 194 700 EUR ein. Im Jahr 2013 waren 382 400 EUR eingeplant, im Jahr 2012 wurden 91 836 EUR ausgegeben.

1. Wie genau gliederten sich die Kosten in den Jahren 2011 und 2012 auf? Wie schätzt das Zentrum die Kostengliederung für die Jahre 2013 und 2014?

2. Wie erklärt das Zentrum die hohe Fluktuation der Kostenhöhe in den letzten Jahren?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012119/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Dienstreisen des Übersetzungszentrums für die Einrichtungen der Europäischen Union (CdT)

Dem geänderten Arbeitsprogramm des Übersetzungszentrums für die Einrichtungen der Europäischen Union (CdT) für das Jahr 2013 ([3]) zufolge führte das Zentrum ein Ausschreibungsverfahren für eine Reiseagentur im Schätzwert von 260 000 EUR durch.

1. Wie viele Dienstreisen finanzierte das CDT für a) die eigenen Mitarbeiter und b) fremdes Personal, Bewerber und Experten in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013?

2. Was waren die Zwecke dieser Dienstreisen?

3. Gibt es bereits ein Ergebnis des Auswahlverfahrens? Welches Unternehmen gewann mit welchem Preis?

([1]) http://cdt.europa.eu/CDT%20Documents/Statistical%20information%20on%20staff%202010/Stat%20personnel%202010%20EN.pdf
([2]) http://cdt.europa.eu/CDT%20Documents/Preliminary%20draft%20Budget%202014/APB%202014%20adopt%C3%A9%20DE.pdf
([3]) http://cdt.europa.eu/CDT%20Documents/AMENDED%20WORK%20PROGRAMME%202013/039%202013%2003_CT-CA_2013_AWP_DE.pdf

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012146/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Immobilien des Übersetzungszentrums für die Einrichtungen der Europäischen Union (CDT)

Dem Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan des Übersetzungszentrums für die Einrichtungen der Europäischen Union für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 zufolge plante das Zentrum für das Jahr 2013 Kosten für „Grundstücksinvestitionen, Miete von Gebäuden und Nebenkosten" in Höhe von 1 764 200 EUR ein. Im Vorjahr waren 2 049 300 EUR eingeplant, im Jahr 2011 wurden 1 519 786 EUR tatsächlich genutzt. Für das Jahr 2014 rechnet das Zentrum mit Kosten von 1 482 829 EUR für „Gebäude, Material und verschiedene Sachausgaben."

1. Wie erklärt das Zentrum die starken Schwankungen bei den Kosten für Gebäude?

2. Welche Gebäude befinden sich im Besitz des Zentrums? Wie groß ist die nutzbare Quadratmeterfläche und wie hoch waren die Anschaffungskosten?

3. Welche Gebäude mietet das Zentrum? Wie groß ist die nutzbare Quadratmeterfläche, wie hoch sind die Mietkosten und wie hoch ist der Mietpreis pro Quadratmeter?

4. Wie hoch sind die Nebenkosten für jedes dieser Gebäude?

5. Welche Grundstücksinvestitionen tätigte das Zentrum in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 beziehungsweise wird das Zentrum in den Jahren 2013 und 2014 noch tätigen?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(26. November 2013)

Die Kommission hat das Übersetzungszentrum für die Einrichtungen der Europäischen Union gebeten, die Fragen des Herrn Abgeordneten zu beantworten. Die Kommission wird dem Herrn Abgeordneten die Antwort der Agentur so bald wie möglich übermitteln.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012107/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Composition of the staff of the Translation Centre for the Bodies of the European Union (CdT)

According to the statistical information on the staff of the Translation Centre for the Bodies of the European Union (CdT) for 2010 ([1]), out of 215 Centre staff, 48 were from France and 30 from Belgium, with 70 out of 86 assistants coming from either France or Belgium.

1. How does the Centre explain the unusually high number of Belgian and French citizens among its staff, and in particular among the assistants?

2. What is the current composition of its staff?

Question for written answer E-012109/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Security and surveillance costs of the Translation Centre for the Bodies of the European Union (CdT)

According to the Preliminary Draft Budget 2014 of the Translation Centre for the Bodies of the European Union (CdT) for 2010 [*sic*] ([2]), the Centre provided for costs of EUR 194 700 for 'security and surveillance of buildings' for 2014. The appropriation for 2013 was EUR 382 400, and in 2012 the outturn was EUR 91 836.

1. What is the exact breakdown of the costs for 2011 and 2012? What is the Centre's estimate of the breakdown of costs for 2013 and 2014?

2. How does the Centre explain the large fluctuation in costs over the last few years?

Question for written answer E-012119/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Missions of the Translation Centre for the Bodies of the European Union (CdT)

According to the Amended Work Programme 2013 of the Translation Centre for the Bodies of the European Union (CdT) ([3]), the Centre carried out a tender procedure for a travel agency with an estimated value of EUR 260 000.

1. How many missions did the CdT fund for a) its own staff, and b) external staff, applicants and experts in 2011, 2012 and 2013?

2. What were the purposes of these missions?

3. Has this competition already produced a result? Which company won, and with what price?

([1]) http://cdt.europa.eu/CDT%20Documents/Statistical%20information%20on%20staff%202010/Stat%20personnel%202010%20EN.pdf
([2]) http://cdt.europa.eu/CDT%20Documents/Preliminary%20draft%20Budget%202014/APB%202014%20adopt%C3%A9%20EN.pdf
([3]) http://cdt.europa.eu/CDT%20Documents/AMENDED%20WORK%20PROGRAMME%202013/039%202013%2003_CT-CA_2013_AWP_DE.pdf

Question for written answer E-012146/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Properties of the Translation Centre for the Bodies of the European Union (CdT)

According to the statement of revenue and expenditure of the Translation Centre for the Bodies of the European Union for the financial year 2013, the Centre has provided for costs of EUR 1 764 200 for 'investment in immovable property, rental of buildings and associated costs' for 2013. Last year, an appropriation of EUR 2 049 300 was provided for, and in 2011 the outturn was EUR 1 519 786. For 2014, the Centre expects costs of EUR 1 482 829 for 'buildings, equipment and miscellaneous operating expenditure'.

1. How does the Centre explain the considerable fluctuations in the costs for buildings?

2. What buildings does the Centre own? What is the useful area in square metres, and how much did the buildings cost to purchase?

3. What buildings does the Centre rent? What is the useful area in square metres, what are the rental costs, and how much is the rent per square metre?

4. How high are the associated costs for each of these buildings?

5. What investments in immovable property did the Centre make in 2011, 2012 and 2013 or will the Centre make in 2013 and 2014?

Joint answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2013)

The Commission has asked the Translation Center for the Bodies of the European Union (TC) to provide a response to the questions raised by the Honourable Member. The Agency's reply will be sent by the Commission to the Honourable Member as soon as possible.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012112/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Veröffentlichungskosten der Europäischen Stiftung zur Verbesserung der Lebens- und Arbeitsbedingungen (Eurofound)

Dem Arbeitsprogramm ([1]) der Europäischen Stiftung zur Verbesserung der Lebens- und Arbeitsbedingungen (Eurofound) zufolge sah die Stiftung für das Jahr 2013 Veröffentlichungskosten von 968 000 EUR vor. Diese Kosten unterteilen sich laut dem Arbeitsprogramm in die Unterpunkte „editing", „typesetting & printing", „design" und „translation".

1. Wie genau gliederten sich die Kosten in den Jahren 2011 und 2012 jeweils auf diese Unterpunkte auf?

2. Wie schätzt die Stiftung die Aufgliederung der Kosten für das Jahr 2013?

3. Welche Veröffentlichungen produzierte die Stiftung in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils? Wie hoch war die gedruckte Auflage jeder dieser Veröffentlichungen?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012113/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Webveröffentlichungskosten der Europäischen Stiftung zur Verbesserung der Lebens- und Arbeitsbedingungen (Eurofound)

Dem Arbeitsprogramm ([1]) der Europäischen Stiftung zur Verbesserung der Lebens- und Arbeitsbedingungen (Eurofound) zufolge sah die Stiftung für das Jahr 2013 Kosten von 968 000 EUR für „Web-based publishing and distribution, including web development" vor. Diese Kosten unterteilen sich laut dem Arbeitsprogramm in die Unterpunkte „web content development", „web hosting", „web application development (incl. project 38)" und „web publishing".

1. Wie gliederten sich die Kosten in den Jahren 2011 und 2012 im Einzelnen jeweils auf diese Unterpunkte auf?

2. Wie schätzt die Stiftung die Aufgliederung der Kosten für das Jahr 2013?

3. Welche Websites betreibt die Stiftung, und wie hoch waren die Kosten pro Website in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 beziehungsweise wie hoch werden sie sein?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012115/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Ausstellungs- und Eventkosten der Europäischen Stiftung zur Verbesserung der Lebens- und Arbeitsbedingungen (Eurofound)

Dem Arbeitsprogramm ([1]) der Europäischen Stiftung zur Verbesserung der Lebens- und Arbeitsbedingungen (Eurofound) zufolge sah die Stiftung für das Jahr 2013 Kosten von 968 000 EUR für Events und Ausstellungen vor. Diese Kosten unterteilen sich laut dem Arbeitsprogramm in die Unterpunkte „Ausstellungen" und „Events", wobei 200 000 EUR auf den Event-Unterpunkt „Foundation Forum 2013" entfielen.

1. Wie genau gliederten sich die Kosten in den Jahren 2011 und 2012 jeweils auf diese Unterpunkte auf?

2. Wie schätzt die Stiftung die Aufgliederung der Kosten für das Jahr 2013?

([1]) http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2012/79/en/2/EF1279EN.pdf

3. Wie viele Ausstellungen und Events organisierte die Stiftung in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013, und wie hoch waren jeweils die Kosten?

4. Wie viele Teilnehmer nahmen an den einzelnen Events teil bzw. besuchten die einzelnen Ausstellungen?

5. Wie genau gliedern sich die Kosten für das „Foundation Forum 2013“ auf?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012149/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Kosten für Gebäude der Europäischen Stiftung zur Verbesserung der Lebens- und Arbeitsbedingungen (Eurofound)

Der Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan für die Europäische Stiftung zur Verbesserung der Lebens- und Arbeitsbedingungen (Eurofound) für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 enthält Kosten von 708 000 EUR für „Instandhaltung der Gebäude und zugehörige Kosten“. Für das Jahr 2012 waren 923 583 EUR vorgesehen, im Jahr 2011 wurden 585 731 EUR ausgegeben.

1. Über wie viele Gebäude mit welcher nutzbaren Quadratmeterfläche verfügt die Stiftung?

2. Welche dieser Gebäude sind gemietet, und wie hoch sind die monatlichen Mietkosten sowie der Mietpreis pro Quadratmeter?

3. Welche dieser Gebäude befinden sich ganz oder teilweise im Eigentum der Stiftung? Wie groß ist die nutzbare Quadratmeterfläche jeder dieser Immobilien, und wann wurden die Gebäude zu welchem Preis erworben?

4. Wie viele Mitarbeiter sind den einzelnen Gebäuden jeweils zugeordnet?

5. Welche Instandhaltungskosten traten für jedes dieser Gebäude in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 auf?

6. Welche „zugehörigen Kosten“ gibt es, und wie hoch waren diese in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013?

7. Wie erklärt die Stiftung die hohe Fluktuation der Kosten — nahezu eine Verdoppelung der Kosten von 2011 auf 2012 und eine Reduktion um 200 000 EUR von 2012 auf 2013?

8. Welche Kosten erwartet die Stiftung für die Jahre 2014 und 2015?

9. Welche Maßnahmen unternimmt die Stiftung, um Kosten für ihre Immobilien gering zu halten bzw. zu reduzieren?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission
(9. Dezember 2013)

„Die Kommission hat die Europäische Stiftung zur Verbesserung der Lebens- und Arbeitsbedingungen (Eurofound) gebeten, auf die von dem Herrn Abgeordneten gestellten Fragen (12112, 12113, 12115, 12149) zu antworten. Die Kommission wird dem Herrn Abgeordneten die Antwort der Stiftung so rasch wie möglich zukommen lassen“.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012112/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Publishing costs of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound)

According to the Annual Work Programme ([1]) of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound), the Foundation provided for publishing costs of EUR 968 000 for 2013. According to the Annual Work Programme, these costs are subdivided into 'editing', 'typesetting & printing', 'design' and 'translation'.

1. How exactly are the costs for 2011 and 2012, respectively, split between these sub-items?

2. How does the Foundation expect the costs for 2013 to be split between these sub-items?

3. What publications did the Foundation produce in 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively? How many copies of each of these publications were printed?

Question for written answer E-012113/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Web publishing costs of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound)

According to the Annual Work Programme ([2]) of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound), the Foundation provided for costs for 2013 of EUR 968 000 [*sic*] for 'web-based publishing and distribution, including web development'. According to the Annual Work Programme, these costs are subdivided into 'web content development', 'web hosting', 'web application development (incl. project 38)' and 'web publishing'.

1. How exactly are the costs for 2011 and 2012 split between each of these sub-items?

2. How does the Foundation expect the costs for 2013 to be split between these sub-items?

3. What websites does the Foundation run and how much did, or will, each website cost in 2011, 2012 and 2013?

Question for written answer E-012115/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Costs of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound) for events and exhibitions

According to the Annual Work Programme ([3]) of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound), the Foundation provided for costs for 2013 of EUR 968 000 for events and exhibitions. These costs are subdivided, according to the Annual Work Programme, into the sub-items 'exhibitions' and 'events', with the event sub-item 'Foundation Forum 2013' accounting for EUR 200 000.

1. How exactly are the costs for 2011 and 2012, respectively, split between these sub-items?

2. How does the Foundation expect the costs for 2013 to be split between these sub-items?

([1]) http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2012/79/en/2/EF1279EN.pdf
([2]) http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2012/79/en/2/EF1279EN.pdf
([3]) http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2012/79/en/2/EF1279EN.pdf

3. How many exhibitions and events did the Foundation organise in 2011, 2012 and 2013, and how much did each of them cost?

4. How many people took part in each of the events or visited each of the exhibitions?

5. What is the exact breakdown of the costs for the Foundation Forum 2013?

Question for written answer E-012149/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Buildings costs of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound)

The statement of revenue and expenditure of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound) for the financial year 2013 contains costs of EUR 708 000 for 'maintenance of buildings and associated costs'. For 2012, an appropriation of EUR 923 583 was provided for, and in 2011, the outturn was EUR 585 731.

1. How many buildings does the Foundation have at its disposal and what is the useful area of each in square metres?

2. Which of these buildings are rented, and what are the monthly rental costs and the rent per square metre?

3. Which of these buildings does the Foundation fully or partly own? What is the useful area of each of these properties in square metres, and when and for what price were the buildings purchased?

4. How many members of staff are assigned to each of these buildings?

5. What maintenance costs were incurred for each of these buildings in 2011, 2012 and 2013?

6. What 'associated costs' are there, and how much were they in 2011, 2012 and 2013?

7. How does the Foundation explain the considerable fluctuation in the costs, with them almost doubling from 2011 to 2012 and decreasing by EUR 200 000 between 2012 and 2013?

8. What costs does the Foundation expect for 2014 and 2015?

9. What steps does the Foundation take to keep the costs for its properties low or to reduce them?

Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 2013)

'The Commission has asked the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound) to provide a response to the questions raised by the Honourable Member (12112, 12113, 12115, 12149). The Agency's reply will be sent by the Commission to the Honourable Member as soon as possible.'

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012114/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Horizontale Tätigkeiten der Europäischen Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit (EFSA)

Die Zahlungen der Europäischen Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit (EFSA) für „Horizontale Tätigkeiten" in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 betrugen 2 659 653,15 (2011), 9 130 989 (2012) und 8 808 000 EUR (2013) bzw. werden circa dieses Niveau erreichen.

1. Welche konkreten Aufgaben und Funktionen der Behörde werden in dem Budgetposten „Horizontale Tätigkeiten" erfasst?

2. Wie erklärt die Behörde die Verdreifachung der Zahlungen von 2011 bis 2013?

3. Warum waren die Zahlungen im Jahr 2012 besonders hoch?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(9. Dezember 2013)

Die Kommission hat die Europäische Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit (EFSA) gebeten, die Frage des Herrn Abgeordneten zu beantworten. Die Antwort der Behörde ist als Anhang beigefügt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012114/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Horizontal operations of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)

The payments of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) for 'horizontal operations' for 2011, 2012 and 2013 were EUR 2 659 653.15, (2011), EUR 9 130 989 (2012) and EUR 8 808 000 (2013), or will reach approximately this level.

1. What specific tasks and functions of the Authority are included in the budget item 'horizontal operations'?

2. How does the Authority explain the threefold increase in the payments from 2011 to 2013?

3. Why were the payments particularly high in 2012?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 2013)

The Commission asked the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) to provide a response to the question raised by the Honourable Member. The Agency's reply is attached in annex.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012123/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(23. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Finanzielle und politische Aspekte der Wiederaufnahme der Verhandlungen mit der Türkei

Die Verhandlungen mit der Türkei laufen nun bereits seit mehr als einem Jahrzehnt. Zwischenzeitlich hat es Umfragen sowohl in der Türkei als auch in der EU gegeben, die darauf hindeuten, dass die Bevölkerung in beiden Gebieten einen Betritt nicht unbedingt befürwortet.

Angesichts der enormen Kosten, die sowohl ein Beitrittsverfahren (inklusive weiterer Heranführungshilfen) als auch der endgültige Beitritt für die Europäische Union mit sich bringen würden, ebenso wie angesichts der Tatsache einer möglichen Zahlungsunfähigkeit der EU:

1. Aus welchen Gründen hält die Europäische Union gerade in der gegenwärtigen finanziellen Situation derart vehement an den Beitrittsverhandlungen fest?

2. Europa sieht sich derzeit bei verschiedenen Wahlen mit vermehrten Tendenzen hin zum rechten Flügel konfrontiert. Ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass weitere nicht absehbare finanzielle Verpflichtungen und die Weiterführung umstrittener Beitrittsverhandlungen der richtige Weg sind, um derartigen Tendenzen zu begegnen?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(13. Dezember 2013)

Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete auf die Antwort der Kommission auf die vorherige Anfrage P-010893/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012123/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Financial and political aspects of the resumption of negotiations with Turkey

The negotiations with Turkey have been continuing now for more than a decade. In the meantime, surveys have been carried out in both Turkey and the EU which indicate that the people in both regions are not necessarily in favour of accession.

In view of the enormous costs that both the accession procedure (including further pre-accession aid) and the final accession would involve for the European Union, and also the EU's potential inability to pay these costs:

1. Why is the European Union sticking so vehemently to the accession negotiations, particularly given the current financial situation?

2. Europe is increasingly finding itself faced with right-wing tendencies in various elections. Does the Commission believe that further immeasurable financial obligations and the continuation of controversial accession negotiations are the right way to deal with such tendencies?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to previous Question P-010893/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-012124/13
do Komisji
Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)
(23 października 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Status skarg CHAP(2013)02744 i 2013/090949

We wrześniu 2013 r. firmy zaangażowane w budowę farm wiatrowych w gminie Darłowo (województwo pomorskie, Polska) wniosły skargi CHAP(2013)02744 i 2013/090949 odpowiednio do Dyrekcji Generalnej ds. Polityki Regionalnej i Miejskiej oraz do Dyrekcji Generalnej ds. Konkurencji przeciwko decyzji polskich władz, które odmówiły finansowania ich wspólnego projektu. W uzasadnieniu odmowy stwierdzono, że wspomniany projekt narusza przepisy UE dotyczące pomocy państwa. Składający skargę twierdzą jednakże, że na mocy prawodawstwa UE polskie władze nie miały prawa całkowicie odmówić finansowania i że sprawa powinna była zostać przekazana do Komisji, która ma uprawnienia do orzekania w sprawie intensywności pomocy dla wspólnie realizowanych projektów. Z powodu wydanej z dużym opóźnieniem decyzji administracyjnej projekt został zrealizowany bez pomocy UE i w związku z tym okazał się nieopłacalny pod względem ekonomicznym.

Jaki jest status wspomnianych skarg i jakie jest stanowisko Komisji w tej sprawie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(3 grudnia 2013 r.)

W dniu 13 września 2013 r. Komisja otrzymała dwie skargi na brak zabezpieczenia finansowania przez UE projektów rozwoju farm wiatrowych, o których mowa w pytaniu.

Skarga skierowana do Dyrekcji Generalnej ds. Polityki Regionalnej i Miejskiej została zarejestrowana pod numerem CHAP(2013)02744, a potwierdzenie otrzymania zostało wysłane do wnoszącego skargę dnia 19 września 2013 r. Ta sama skarga została także skierowana do Dyrekcji Generalnej ds. Konkurencji (pod numerem 2013/090949 i zarejestrowana pod numerem sprawy SA. 37704). Biorąc pod uwagę, że kwestie oceny pomocy państwa poruszone przez wnoszących skargę są nadal w toku, nie zajęto na tym etapie oficjalnego stanowiska w tej sprawie.

Projekty współfinansowane w ramach polityki spójności muszą być zgodne z obowiązującymi przepisami unijnymi i krajowymi. Zasada ta obejmuje przepisy dotyczące polityki spójności, przepisy dotyczące pomocy państwa, a także ochrony środowiska. Pomoc z funduszy jest również zgodna z działaniami, politykami i priorytetami UE. W gestii organów krajowych w pierwszej kolejności leży ocena, czy projekty są zgodne z tymi zasadami. W szczególności w gestii instytucji zarządzającej leży zapewnienie, że wybrane projekty są zgodne z obowiązującymi przepisami unijnymi i krajowymi przez cały okres ich realizacji.

Zarzuty nieprawidłowego stosowania lub interpretacji prawodawstwa UE są obecnie badane przez Komisję. Komisja zastosuje odpowiednią procedurę do rozpatrzenia skargi zgodnie z komunikatem do Rady i Parlamentu Europejskiego „Aktualizacja zasad postępowania w stosunkach ze skarżącymi w przedmiocie stosowania prawa unijnego” ([1]), natychmiast po zakończeniu badania.

([1]) COM(2012) 0154 wersja ostateczna.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012124/13
to the Commission
Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Status of complaints CHAP(2013) 02744 and 2013/090949

In September 2013, companies engaged in the construction of electricity-generating wind farms in the municipality of Darłowo (Pomorskie voivodeship, Poland) filed complaints CHAP(2013) 02744 and 2013/090949 with the Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy and the Directorate-General for Competition, respectively, against the decision by Polish authorities to refuse financing for their joint wind farm project. The justification given for the refusal was that the project in question was in breach of EU regulations on state aid. The claimants, however, argue that under EU legislation the Polish authorities had no right to refuse funding entirely and that the case should have been referred to the Commission, which has the power to rule on the intensity of aid in jointly developed projects. As a result of the much-delayed administrative decision, the project in question was developed without EU aid and therefore turned out to be economically unviable.

What is the status of the two complaints and what is the Commission's position on the matter?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2013)

On 13 September 2013, the Commission received two complaints about the failure to secure EU funding for the wind farm development projects mentioned in the question.

The complaint addressed to the Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy was registered under reference CHAP(2013)02744 and an acknowledgement of receipt was sent to the complainant on 19 September 2013. The same complaint was also addressed to the Directorate-General for Competition (under reference 2013/090949 and registered under case SA.37704). Given that the assessment of the state aid issues raised by the complainants is still ongoing, no official position can be communicated at this stage.

Projects co-financed under cohesion policy must respect applicable EU and national rules. This includes the rules on cohesion policy, on state aid, as well as on environment. Assistance from the Funds shall also be consistent with EU activities, policies and priorities. It is for the national authorities in the first instance to assess whether projects are compliant with these rules. In particular, it is for the managing authority to ensure that selected projects comply with applicable EU and national rules for the whole of their implementation period.

The allegations of incorrect application or interpretation of EU legislation are currently under examination by the Commission. The Commission will give the appropriate follow up to the complaint in accordance with its communication to the Council and the European Parliament 'Updating the handling of relations with the complainant in respect of the application of Union law' ([1]), once this examination is finalised.

([1]) COM(2012) 154 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012125/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(23 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Uccisione di un dipendente dell'ambasciata tedesca

Il 6 ottobre 2013 vari siti web di informazione hanno riportato la notizia dell'uccisione di una guardia del corpo dell'ambasciata tedesca a seguito di uno scontro a fuoco a Sanaa, la capitale dello Yemen. L'uomo è stato ucciso mentre usciva da un supermercato nel quartiere di Hadda. I servizi di sicurezza indicano che l'attacco sarebbe riconducibile ai militanti di al-Qaeda nella penisola araba (AQAP). Stando ad alcune notizie, l'intenzione degli assalitori era di rapire la nuova ambasciatrice tedesca, sebbene questa tesi non sia stata comunque confermata.

Lo stesso giorno un operatore dell'UNICEF è stato rapito mentre si recava in autobus dalla capitale yemenita al villaggio di Hudaidah sul Mar Rosso. Nel novembre 2012 erano rimasti uccisi un diplomatico saudita e la sua guardia del corpo yemenita, mentre il mese precedente aveva perso la vita anche un funzionario della sicurezza dell'ambasciata statunitense. Il governo yemenita dipende in larga misura dal sostegno degli USA per reprimere le varie rivolte che scoppiano nel paese; dal canto suo, l'AQAP manifesta l'intenzione di continuare a combattere una «guerra santa» nello Yemen.

1. Quali misure precauzionali sono state adottate nello Yemen per garantire la protezione dei funzionari e del personale dell'UE?

2. Qual è il ruolo svolto dall'Unione nel mettere a punto strategie assieme agli Stati Uniti e/o agli altri paesi nella regione al fine di gestire la minaccia rappresentata dall'AQAP?

3. Fino ad ora, quale assistenza specifica ha fornito l'UE alle autorità yemenite per gestire le questioni legate alla sicurezza?

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

Dopo gli avvenimenti del 6 ottobre, l'AR/VP ha esaminato attentamente la situazione in loco e ha rafforzato le misure di sicurezza per la delegazione dell'UE e il suo personale.

L'UE sta valutando la possibilità di riprendere il dialogo con lo Yemen sulle politiche volte a rafforzare la sicurezza e a combattere il terrorismo, che era stato sospeso in seguito alle rivolte del 2011. L'UE fornisce inoltre un sostegno incentrato sulla cooperazione con le organizzazioni della società civile per contrastare l'estremismo violento. L'approccio seguito dall'UE in questo ambito si basa sui principi dello Stato di diritto e della giustizia penale. L'UE sta infine lavorando su un piano d'azione antiterrorismo per il Corno d'Africa e lo Yemen nell'intento di attuare una strategia di lotta al terrorismo in stretta collaborazione con i partner della regione.

Per quanto riguarda l'assistenza fornita alle autorità in materia di sicurezza, l'UE è attualmente in contatto con l'amministrazione yemenita per avviare un programma di riforma del settore presso il ministero dell'Interno.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012125/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Murder of German Embassy employee

On 6 October 2013, it was reported by various news websites that gunmen had killed a security guard from the German Embassy in the Yemeni capital, Sanaa. He was shot whilst leaving a supermarket in the district of Hadda. Security officials say that the attack bears the hallmark of al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP). Some reports suggest that the gunmen were attempting to kidnap the new German Ambassador, but this has not been confirmed.

On the same day, a Unicef employee was kidnapped when travelling by bus from the capital to the Red Sea coastal town of Hudaidah. In November 2012, a Saudi diplomat and his Yemeni bodyguard were shot, and a month before that a security officer at the US mission was also shot dead. The Yemeni Government depends heavily on US support to combat the various insurgencies in the country; meanwhile AQAP says it wants to continue fighting a 'holy war' in Yemen.

1. What precautions are being taken in Yemen to secure the protection of EU officials and staff?

2. What role is the EU taking to develop strategies with the US and /or other countries in the region to deal with the threat of AQAP?

3. Up to now, what assistance has the EU offered the Yemeni authorities specifically to deal with security-related issues?

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

Following the event of 6 October, the HR/VP has carefully reviewed the situation on the ground and has subsequently increased security measures for the EU Delegation and its staff.

In order to enhance security and combat terrorism, the EU was engaged with Yemen in a counter terrorism and policy dialogue which was suspended following the 2011 uprisings and is now looking into reviving it. In addition to that, the EU provides support focused on cooperation with civil society organisations with the aim of countering violent extremism. In this endeavour, the EU approach is underpinned by the principles of rule of law and criminal justice. Finally, the EU is working on a Counterterrorism Action Plan for the Horn of Africa and Yemen to implement a counter terrorism strategy in close cooperation with its partners in the region.

Regarding assistance provided to the authorities in the area of security, the EU is currently in talks with the Yemeni administration in order to launch a Security Sector Reform programme aimed at reforming the Ministry of Interior.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012126/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(23 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Esecuzioni nella Repubblica islamica dell'Iran

L'11 ottobre 2013 il quotidiano britannico *The Times* ha riferito che dal giorno dell'elezione del nuovo Presidente Hassan Rouhani, avvenuta nell'agosto di quest'anno, in Iran erano state giustiziate almeno 150 persone. Tale cifra segna un aumento del numero di esecuzioni dall'entrata in carica di Rouhani, malgrado l'impegno dichiarato dell'Iran ad operare per porre fine alla repressione nel paese e la promessa di Rouhani di adoperarsi per una società più moderata e più giusta.

L'organizzazione Iran Human Rights (IHR), con sede in Norvegia, ha registrato 560 esecuzioni in tutto il paese quest'anno, più di quante ve ne siano state nel corrispondente periodo del 2012. Un attivista dell'organizzazione ha dichiarato: «Non vi sono state reazioni internazionali a questa notizia. È preoccupante il fatto che, essendo cambiata la retorica usata dalle autorità iraniane al di fuori del paese, il mondo trascuri ciò che accade al suo interno». L'Iran ha rilasciato un certo numero di noti prigionieri politici, come Nasrin Sotoudeh, ma molti critici del regime avvertono che si tratta solo di un gesto politico e non di un segnale di autentiche riforme interne.

1. Qual è la posizione della Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante in merito alle notizie provenienti da attivisti iraniani dei diritti umani secondo le quali, malgrado la retorica positiva del Presidente iraniano, il numero di esecuzioni continua ad aumentare?

2. Intende la VP/AR chiedere al governo degli Stati Uniti e ad altri governi di attribuire un'alta priorità, ai fini dell'alleggerimento delle sanzioni, alle riforme nel campo dei diritti umani?

3. Quali iniziative sta assumendo attualmente l'UE per fare pressione su Teheran affinché rilasci tutti i prigionieri politici? Se ne può conoscere qualche esempio?

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

Si rassicura l'onorevole parlamentare che l'Unione europea continua a seguire la situazione dei diritti umani in Iran con il massimo interesse e ad esprimere le proprie preoccupazioni alle autorità iraniane ad ogni livello.

Come egli sottolinea, il numero di esecuzioni in Iran resta estremamente elevato, un fatto documentato di recente dal relatore speciale delle Nazioni Unite sui diritti umani in Iran. Per questa ragione, l'UE ha ribadito in diverse occasioni la propria preoccupazione per questo grave problema e ha invitato il governo iraniano a interrompere tutte le esecuzioni e ad introdurre una moratoria sulla pena di morte. Questa posizione dell'UE viene confermata ed è destinata altresì al nuovo governo iraniano e al presidente Hasan Rouhani.

Il rilascio di prigionieri in Iran nel settembre 2013 è stato accolto con soddisfazione dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente, che ha auspicato si tratti del primo passo verso il miglioramento della situazione dei diritti umani nel paese, come promesso all'inizio dell'anno dal nuovo presidente iraniano nel corso della campagna elettorale. L'UE continuerà a seguire attentamente il rispetto concreto di tali impegni politici in Iran.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012126/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Executions in the Islamic Republic of Iran

On 11 October 2013, the UK newspaper *The Times* reported that at least 150 people had been executed in Iran since President Hassan Rouhani's election in August of this year. This figure represents an increase in the number of executions since Rouhani took office, despite Iran's pledge to work towards ending repression in the country and Rouhani's pledge to work for a more moderate and just society.

The Norwegian-based organisation Iran Human Rights (IHR) has recorded 560 executions across the country this year, more than in the same period in 2012. An activist from the organisation has stated: 'There has been no international reaction to this. It is worrying that, with the change in rhetoric from the Iranian authorities outside Iran, the world is overlooking what is happening inside the country'. Iran has released a number of high-profile political prisoners, such as Nasrin Sotoudeh, but many critics warn that this is just a political gesture rather than a sign of genuine internal reform.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding reports from Iranian human rights activists that allege that, despite the positive rhetoric from Iran's President, the number of executions is continuing to rise?

2. Will the VP/HR ask the US and other governments to make human rights reform a high priority when it comes to the subject of sanctions relief?

3. What steps is the EU taking at present to put pressure on Tehran to release all political prisoners, and can some examples of this be given?

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

The Honourable Parliamentarian can rest assured that the EU continues to follow the human rights situation in Iran with the utmost interest and continues to address its concerns to the Iranian authorities at all levels.

As mentioned by the Honourable Parliamentarian, the number of executions in Iran remains very high. This has most recently been documented by the UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights in Iran. This is why the EU, on several occasions, has expressed its concern over this serious matter and has called on the Iranian Government to halt all executions and install a moratorium on the death penalty. This position by the EU remains valid and is also adressed to the new Iranian Government and President Hasan Rouhani.

The release of prisoners in September 2013 in Iran was welcomed by the HR/VP, who expressed the hope that this would be the first step towards a better human rights situation in the country, as promised by the new Iranian President in his election campaign earlier this year. The EU will continue to follow closely the concrete implementation in Iran of these political commitments.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012129/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(23 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Problema della schiavitù in Mauritania

Il 17 ottobre 2013 alcune riviste hanno pubblicato i dati di uno studio condotto dalla Walk Free Foundation, associazione che si occupa di valutare il problema della schiavitù nel mondo. Si tratta di un fenomeno che ha la prevalenza più alta in Mauritania, dove si ritiene che circa il 4 % della popolazione (pari a 140 000-160 000 individui) viva in condizioni di servitù forzata. La fondazione definisce la schiavitù come asservimento per debiti economici, matrimonio forzato, vendita e sfruttamento di bambini, tratta di esseri umani e lavoro forzato. In aggiunta, descrive la Mauritania come la nazione in cui è presente una schiavitù ereditaria profondamente radicata.

Nel paese africano essa si manifesta sotto forma di schiavismo: gli adulti e i bambini sono completamente di proprietà dei loro padroni, i quali esercitano il controllo totale su di loro e sui loro discendenti. In altre parole, la schiavitù si tramanda di generazione in generazione. Agli schiavi non è consentito possedere alcun bene ed è negato il diritto all'eredità e alla proprietà della terra. Il governo mauro ha ratificato vari trattati contro la schiavitù e la pratica è ufficialmente illegale dal 1961. Ciononostante, si osserva una mancanza di consapevolezza e di azione per la sua eliminazione.

1. Alla luce del diffuso problema della schiavitù in Mauritania e in altri paesi del Sahel, in che modo intende l'UE sostenere le iniziative volte a eliminare il problema?

2. Può il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante indicare quali sono le misure adottate percontribuire a sensibilizzare sui problemi legati alla schiavitù in Africa e in Asia?

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

Il governo della Mauritania ha preso atto dell'annoso problema della schiavitù nella società del paese e ha adottato misure per contrastarlo, anche mediante l'adozione nel novembre 2012 di una legge per rendere la schiavitù reato penale e l'instaurazione di un piano nazionale per eliminarla. Tuttavia, resta ancora molto da fare per attuare tali misure.

In Mauritania la lotta contro i residui di schiavitù e le sue conseguenze è una delle massime priorità tematiche nell'ambito della strategia nazionale dell'UE in materia di diritti umani. La questione viene affrontata formalmente dall'UE nel quadro del dialogo politico regolare con il governo della Mauritania. Inoltre, l'UE finanzia numerosi progetti in materia di diritti umani, immigrazione, tratta di esseri umani, gestione delle frontiere e riforma della giustizia.

L'UE sostiene le raccomandazioni del relatore speciale delle Nazioni Unite sulle forme attuali di schiavitù e ha intrapreso di recente un'iniziativa diplomatica per incitare il governo della Mauritania ad adottare una tabella di marcia per la loro attuazione. Per quanto riguarda la dimensione socioeconomica, l'UE sta lavorando direttamente con le popolazioni interessate e con i difensori dei diritti umani, attraverso progetti specifici.

L'UE è profondamente impegnata a combattere tutte le forme di schiavitù nel mondo. L'impegno generale dell'UE per la lotta contro la schiavitù figura all'articolo 5 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali. L'UE sostiene inoltre gli sforzi internazionali in questo campo, promuovendo in vari consessi delle Nazioni Unite la prevenzione, l'assistenza alle vittime, la creazione di un quadro legislativo, l'elaborazione delle politiche e l'azione di contrasto, nonché una migliore cooperazione internazionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012129/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Problem of slavery in Mauritania

On 17 October 2013, a number of periodicals reported the findings of the Walk Free Foundation, which works to assess the problem of slavery across the globe. The problem is most prevalent in Mauritania, where approximately 4% of the population is deemed to be held in slavery — this figure represents between 140 000 and 160 000 people. The foundation defines slavery as debt bondage, forced marriage, sale and exploitation of children, human trafficking and forced labour. Mauritania is described by the organisation as a nation in which 'deeply entrenched hereditary slavery' exists.

Slavery in Mauritania takes the form of chattel slavery, which means that adults and children are the full property of their masters who exercise total control over them and their descendants. In other words, slavery is handed down through the generations. Slaves are not allowed to have their own possessions and they are denied inheritance rights and ownership of land. The Mauritanian government has ratified a number of treaties against slavery and officially the practice has been outlawed since 1961. Nevertheless, there is a lack of awareness and action to eradicate the practice.

1. In light of the widespread problem of slavery in Mauritania and other Sahel countries, what steps is the EU taking to support initiatives which aim to eradicate the problem?

2. Can the Vice President/High Representative point to measures that are being adopted to help to raise awareness of the problems of slavery in Africa and Asia?

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

The long-standing problem of slavery in Mauritanian society has been acknowledged by the Mauritanian Government which has taken steps to combat it, including through the adoption in November 2012 of a law to criminalise it and the establishment of a national plan to eradicate it. Yet, much remains to be done to implement such measures.

In Mauritania, the struggle against remnants of slavery and its consequences is a top thematic priority under the EU country Strategy for Human Rights. The issue is formally addressed by the EU in the framework of the regular Political Dialogue with the Mauritanian Government. Moreover, the EU funds several projects on Human Rights, migration, trafficking in human beings, border management and justice reform.

The EU supports the recommendations of the UN Rapporteur on Contemporary Forms of Slavery and made recently a demarche to press for adoption by the Mauritanian Government of a road map for their implementation. On the socioeconomic dimension, the EU is also working directly with the affected population and human rights defenders through specific projects.

The EU is deeply committed to fighting all forms of slavery worldwide. The EU's overall commitment to combating slavery is reflected in Article 5 of the Charter on Fundamental Rights. The EU also supports international efforts in this field, advocating in various UN fora for prevention, assistance to victims, the establishment of a comprehensive legislative framework, policy development and law enforcement as well as improved international cooperation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012130/13
alla Commissione
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(23 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Crisi idrica in Cina

A metà ottobre 2013 l'Economist ha pubblicato un articolo sul peggioramento della crisi idrica in Cina. Il paese utilizza circa 600 miliardi di metri cubi d'acqua all'anno, sebbene una gran parte delle risorse esistenti sia colpita dall'inquinamento. La carenza d'acqua, inoltre, è particolarmente grave nelle regioni settentrionali, dove vive la metà della popolazione e si concentrano i due terzi delle terre coltivabili del paese. Al momento, la Cina utilizza le risorse idriche a un tasso non sostenibile: i fiumi stanno scomparendo a causa dello sfruttamento eccessivo; un terzo delle acque del Fiume Giallo non è adatto per essere utilizzato per scopi agricoli, mentre solo la metà dell'acqua proveniente da fonti urbane è potabile.

Nel 2009 la Banca mondiale aveva calcolato che il costo complessivo della crisi idrica in Cina ammontava al 2,3 % del PIL nazionale, il che riflette soprattutto l'impatto negativo sulla salute della popolazione. La Cina trascura le proprie infrastrutture idriche urbane, come le reti fognarie, le tubazioni e gli impianti di depurazione, con il conseguente aumento dei rifiuti. Secondo Thomson Reuters, all'origine della diminuzione dell'approvvigionamento idrico vi sono la sovrappopolazione, l'industrializzazione aggressiva e il ricorso a progetti ingegneristici sofisticati per l'irrigazione dei campi e il controllo a monte delle risorse. Negli ultimi decenni il paese è riuscito a deviare il corso dei fiumi attraverso dighe gigantesche e canali di deviazione. Al momento è in fase di realizzazione un progetto inteso a collegare il Fiume Azzurro con il Fiume Giallo, che molti temono avrà un impatto ambientale grave.

1. È la Commissione intervenuta per fornire consigli alle autorità cinesi su come preservare e/o depurare le risorse idriche esistenti?

2. Alla luce dell'impatto sulla produzione agricola, quali misure intende intraprendere per monitorare le esportazioni alimentari provenienti dalle regioni cinesi colpite dalla diminuzione dell'approvvigionamento idrico, con particolare riguardo alla contaminazione?

3. Qual è la sua posizione in merito al progetto del governo cinese di mettere in collegamento il Fiume Azzurro con il Fiume Giallo?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(17 dicembre 2013)

1. Per la gestione sostenibile delle risorse idriche in Cina la Commissione svolge un'intensa attività di sostegno e consulenza. Il programma di gestione dei bacini fluviali UE-Cina (2006-2012) ha permesso di diffondere pratiche di gestione integrata dei principali bacini idrografici del paese. A marzo 2012 è stata inoltre lanciata una piattaforma sino europea per le risorse idriche destinata a intensificare le iniziative di ricerca, cooperazione e dialogo sulla gestione idrica in Cina.

Il vertice UE-Cina del 21 novembre è stato incentrato in buona parte su come potenziare il partenariato strategico tra l'Unione e la Cina onde garantire lo sviluppo e la crescita sostenibili. La crescita verde, i cambiamenti climatici e la tutela ambientale sono temi centrali e questo garantisce che la cooperazione in materia di acque (gestione compresa) sia una parte importante di questo programma di lavoro. In occasione del vertice la Commissione ha firmato inoltre una lettera di intenti con l'Accademia cinese delle scienze agricole per favorire la cooperazione mirata alla ricerca e all'innovazione in campo alimentare, agricolo e delle biotecnologie, che permetterà di lanciare attività di cooperazione comuni per la ricerca e l'innovazione anche in materia di agricoltura sostenibile e gestione delle risorse idriche.

2. Non esistono specifiche misure di controllo delle esportazioni alimentari da regioni con problemi di approvvigionamento idrico.

3. La Commissione non ha una posizione su piani della Cina per collegare lo Yangtse e il fiume giallo: trattandosi di una questione interna, la Commissione non ha alcuna competenza.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012130/13
to the Commission
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: China's water crisis

In mid-October 2013, *The Economist* reported on the worsening water crisis in China. The country uses approximately 600 billion cubic metres of water per year but much of the existing supply is affected by pollution. Furthermore, the northern part of the country, which is home to half of the population and which contains two thirds of China's arable land, is where the shortages are most severe. China is currently using water at an unsustainable rate. Due to overuse, rivers are disappearing, with one third of the water in the Yellow River being unfit for agricultural use and only half the of the water sources in cities producing water which is safe to drink.

In 2009 the World Bank noted that the overall cost of China's water crisis amounted to 2.3% of the country's GDP, which mostly reflects the negative affect it is having on the population's health. China is neglecting its urban water infrastructure, such as sewerage systems, pipes and water treatment plants, and this is leading to waste. According to Thomson-Reuters, the dwindling water supply is a result of overpopulation, aggressive industrialisation and a reliance on elaborate engineering schemes to irrigate crops and harness at-source supplies. In recent decades the country has been able to divert water sources through giant dams and diversion channels. At present, a project is underway to connect the Yangtze with the Yellow River, which many fear will have serious environmental consequences.

1. Is the Commission playing a role in helping to advise the Chinese authorities on methods aimed at conserving and/or treating the country's existing water supplies?

2. In light of the effect on agricultural production, what steps is the Commission taking to monitor food exports from regions in China affected by dwindling water supplies, particularly with regard to contamination?

3. What is the Commission's position regarding the Chinese Government's plan to connect the Yangtze and the Yellow River?

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

1. The Commission has provided significant support and advice to China in the sustainable management of water resources. The EU-China River Basin Management Programme (2006-2012) established integrated river basin management practices in some of China's key river basins, and in March 2012, the China Europe Water Platform (CEWP) was launched and will provide an important platform for further research, cooperation and dialogue in managing water resources in China.

The EU-China summit of 21 November has put significant focus on how to strengthen the EU-China Strategic Partnership in order to assure sustainable development and growth. The priority being given to green growth, climate change and the protection of environment ensures that EU-China cooperation on water issues, including water management, form an important part of that agenda. On that occasion, the Commission also signed a Letter of Intent on Research and Innovation Cooperation in Food, Agriculture and Biotechnology with the Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences, which will involve joint research and innovation cooperation activities *inter alia* on sustainable agriculture, including water management.

2. There are no specific measures in place to monitor food exports from regions affected by water supply issues.

3. The Commission does not have a position on China's plans to connect the Yangtze and Yellow rivers. This is an internal Chinese matter for which the Commission does not have competence.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012132/13
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(23 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: La Francia blocca i lavori della Tav

Mentre in Italia procedono i lavori per la costruzione della Tav, l'alta velocità ferroviaria che collegherà Torino a Lione, dall'altra parte del confine la Francia ne blocca i lavori almeno fino al 2030.

È quanto dichiarato durante una trasmissione televisiva da Ivez Crozet, professore di economia all'Università di Lione e membro del Laboratorio di economia dei trasporti, uno dei dieci membri della commissione Mobilité 21. Nell'ottobre 2012 il ministro dei trasporti francesi ha formato una commissione di dieci persone, sei deputati e senatori e quattro esperti tra cui Crozet, per studiare l'insieme delle infrastrutture dei trasporti in Francia. Questa commissione è stata chiamata Mobilité 21 perché è incentrata sul XXI secolo e i servizi di trasporti.

Il Primo Ministro francese ha recentemente fatto una comunicazione sugli investimenti futuri e ha confermato che avrebbero seguito le conclusioni del rapporto Mobilité 21. Cioè, che avrebbe dato la priorità agli investimenti su due stazioni parigine e che il solo progetto futuro entro il 2030 sarebbe stato la linea Bordeaux-Tolosa. Esclusa quindi la Torino-Lione, cofinanziata al 40 % dall'Unione europea e che fa parte del progetto prioritario 6 (Lione-Trieste-Budapest-confine ucraino) della rete ferroviaria trans-europea, parte a sua volta delle reti di trasporto trans-europee TEN-T.

Alla luce di ciò, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. se è a conoscenza del rapporto della commissione Mobilité 21;

2. qual è a oggi nel versante francese lo stato di avanzamento dei lavori dell'alta velocità Torino-Lione?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(26 novembre 2013)

Dato che il tratto transfrontaliero Lione-Torino è disciplinato da un trattato bilaterale, la Francia lo ha escluso dal campo di applicazione del rapporto «Mobilité 21». La Commissione non ha motivo di dubitare della determinazione sia della Francia che dell'Italia di proseguire nella realizzazione del nuovo collegamento ferroviario Lione-Torino.

Per quanto riguarda l'attuale stato di avanzamento dei lavori sul versante francese dell'opera, sono già state costruite tre gallerie di accesso. Per informazioni più dettagliate riguardanti il progetto si rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alla relazione annuale del coordinatore europeo ([1]), la cui ultima edizione sarà presentata alla commissione TRAN del Parlamento europeo il 26 novembre.

([1]) Le relazioni annuali dei coordinatori europei sono disponibili sulla seguente pagina web: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/infrastructure/ten-t-implementation/priority-projects/annual-reports_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012132/13
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: France halts high-speed rail works

While the construction of a high-speed rail link between Turin and Lyon is going ahead in Italy, France has halted all works on this project until at least 2030.

This was confirmed in a recent television interview with Yves Crozet, economics lecturer at the University of Lyon II, member of the Transport Economics Laboratory and one of the ten Mobilité 21 commission members. In October 2012, the French Minister for Transport formed this commission, which consists of six members of the Chamber of Representatives and the Senate and four experts, including Yves Crozet, with the aim of studying the French transport network and was It was named 'Mobilité 21' on account of its focus on transport services in the 21st century.

The French Prime Minister recently confirmed that future investments would depend on the findings of the 'Mobilité 21' report. He said that investment priority would be given to two Parisian train stations and that the only future investment project before 2030 would be the Bordeaux-Toulouse rail link. The Turin-Lyon link was therefore excluded, despite the fact that it is 40% co-financed by the EU and forms part of the Priority Project 6 (Lyon-Trieste-Budapest-Ukranian border) railway, which is, in turn, part of the Trans European Transport (TEN-T) network.

1. In the light of the above, is the Commission aware of the findings of the Mobilité 21 report?

2. What stage has now been reached by works on the French section of the rail link?

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

Given that the Lyon-Turin cross-border section is governed by a bilateral treaty, France has excluded it from the scope of the 'Mobility 21' report. The Commission has no reason to doubt the determination of both France and Italy to go ahead with building the new railway link Lyon-Turin.

As regards the current status on the French part of the railway link, three access tunnels have already been constructed. For more detailed information on the project the Honourable member is referred to the Annual Report of the European Coordinator ([1]), the latest issue of which will be presented to the TRAN committee of the European Parliament on 26 November.

([1]) The Annual Reports of the European Coordinators are available on this web page: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/infrastructure/ten-t-implementation/priority-projects/annual-reports_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012133/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(23 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Indagine Europol sulla tratta di organi di minori

Dopo il caso della bimba bionda con gli occhi azzurri strappata dalla polizia greca ai suoi sfruttatori nomadi, che ha commosso l'opinione pubblica internazionale, anche a Dublino emerge un caso quasi identico

Può la Commissione indicare quali iniziative intende intraprendere, attraverso Europol, al fine di realizzare una più stretta ed efficace collaborazione fra le polizie degli Stati membri per verificare, con un'indagine a tappeto in tutti i campi nomadi esistenti in Europa, con particolare riguardo a quelli abusivi, se e in quale misura gli stessi siano utilizzati come «santuari» da parte di chi gestisce la tratta internazionale di organi di minori?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(23 dicembre 2013)

Europol e gli Stati membri dell'UE collaborano nella lotta contro tutte le forme di tratta di esseri umani, in particolare contrastando le organizzazioni della criminalità organizzata. Con particolare riferimento al traffico di organi, Europol è partner di uno specifico progetto le cui attività sono coordinate dagli Stati membri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012133/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Europol investigation into the trafficking of children for their organs

People across the world were shocked by the case of a blonde girl with blue eyes who was taken by the Greek police from the Roma who were exploiting her. Recent reports have now emerged of another almost identical case in Dublin.

Can the Commission say what steps it intends to take through Europol to encourage closer and more efficient collaboration between the police forces of the Member States in investigating all travellers' camps in the EU, targeting illegal camps in particular — in order to establish whether and to what extent they are being used as 'sanctuaries' by those who engage in the international trafficking of children for their organs?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(23 December 2013)

Europol and EU Member States work jointly to combat all forms of trafficking in human beings, notably by targeting organised crime groups. Specifically on organs trafficking, Europol is a partner to a dedicated project in which Member States coordinate activities.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012134/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(23 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Bağış: „Turkije dicht bij EU-standaards"

De Europese Commissie heeft haar „Turkey 2013 Progress Report" en „Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2013-2014" gepubliceerd. Naar aanleiding daarvan stelt Egemen Bağış, de Turkse minister van Europese Zaken, dat Turkije wat betreft „democratisering, mensenrechten en economische ontwikkeling" nog nooit zo dicht bij de EU-standaards zou zijn als nu. Volgens hem zou Turkije „veranderen, ontwikkelen en hervormen" door inzet van de regering.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het „Statement by Egemen Bağış, Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator, on Turkey 2013 Progress Report of the European Commission"([1])?

2. Hoe reageert de Commissie op de stelling van de heer Bağış dat Turkije wat betreft „democratisering, mensenrechten en economische ontwikkeling" nog nooit zo dicht bij de EU-standaards zou zijn als nu? Deelt de Commissie zijn mening? Waarom wel/niet?

3. Welke zichtbaar positieve resultaten heeft, naar inzicht van de Commissie, de door de heer Bağış aangehaalde inzet van de regering, die Turkije zou „veranderen, ontwikkelen en hervormen"?

4. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat Turkije de mensenrechten, waaronder de vrijheid van meningsuiting, in feite met voeten treedt — vooral blijkens het door de regering toegepaste buitensporige politiegeweld, waarmee vanaf mei 2013 overal in het land doorgaans vreedzame demonstraties hardhandig worden terneergeslagen? Zo neen, interpreteert de Commissie het exorbitante geweld van de Turkse politie resp. het repressieve karakter van de Turkse regering dan wel?

5. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat de heer Bağış de huidige situatie in Turkije veel rooskleuriger voorspiegelt dan zij in werkelijkheid is, en dat dat kwalijk is ten opzichte van zowel de EU-burgers als de Turkse burgers? Zo neen, hoe staaft de Commissie dan de stelling van de heer Bağış dat Turkije wat betreft „democratisering, mensenrechten en economische ontwikkeling" nog nooit zo dicht bij de EU-standaards zou zijn als nu? Zo ja, welke gevolgen heeft de dus leugenachtige houding van de heer Bağış voor de toetredingsonderhandelingen?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012137/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(23 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Bağış: „Veel EU-lidstaten doen het slechter dan Turkije"

De Europese Commissie heeft haar „Turkey 2013 Progress Report" en „Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2013-2014" gepubliceerd. Naar aanleiding daarvan stelt Egemen Bağış, de Turkse minister van Europese Zaken, dat wanneer vandaag de dag dergelijke rapporten over de huidige EU-lidstaten zouden worden opgesteld, zij „verdere stappen zouden moeten ondernemen en verder zouden moeten hervormen". Daarmee bedoelt hij dat vele huidige EU-lidstaten „achter zouden liggen ten opzichte van Turkije" wat betreft „tempo en vastberadenheid van hervormingen".

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het „Statement by Egemen Bağış, Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator, on Turkey 2013 Progress Report of the European Commission"([2])?

2. Hoe interpreteert de Commissie de stelling van de heer Bağış dat huidige EU-lidstaten „verdere stappen zouden moeten ondernemen en verder zouden moeten hervormen", en dat vele huidige EU-lidstaten „achter zouden liggen ten opzichte van Turkije" wat betreft „tempo en vastberadenheid van hervormingen"? Op welke lidstaten en welke concrete hervormingen zou, naar inschatting van de Commissie, de heer Bağış hier doelen?

([1]) http://egemenbagis.com/en/
([2]) http://egemenbagis.com/en/

3. Deelt de Commissie de stelling van de heer Bağış? Zo ja, impliceert dat dat de door hem genoemde „vele EU-lidstaten" daadwerkelijk prematuur tot de EU zouden zijn toegetreden? Zo neen, deelt de Commissie dientengevolge de mening dat de aldus leugenachtig arrogante houding van de heer Bağış er louter toe dient om de affreuze situatie in zijn eigen land te verbloemen? Welke gevolgen heeft zijn ongepaste attitude voor de toetredingsonderhandelingen?

4. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat de kloof tussen de EU en Turkije in feite almaar groter wordt, en dat Turkije nooit — maar dan ook nóóit! — tot de EU dient toe te treden?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012138/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(23 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Bağış: „Voortgangsverslag Turkije is geen scorebord"

De Europese Commissie heeft haar „Turkey 2013 Progress Report" en „Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2013-2014" gepubliceerd. Naar aanleiding daarvan stelt Egemen Bağış, de Turkse minister van Europese Zaken, dat het voortgangsverslag „geen scorebord" voor Turkije zou zijn. Hij zegt dat het alleen aan de Turkse bevolking zou zijn om de Turkse regering „een scorebord voor te houden".

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het „Statement by Egemen Bağış, Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator, on Turkey 2013 Progress Report of the European Commission"([3])?

2. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie de stelling van de heer Bağış dat haar voortgangsverslag „geen scorebord" voor Turkije zou zijn? Deelt zij de mening dat daaruit blijkt dat de heer Bağış haar verslag in de kern helemaal niet serieus neemt? Zo neen, hoe ziet de Commissie het dan wel?

3. Indien het alleen aan de Turkse bevolking zou zijn om de Turkse regering „een scorebord voor te houden", welke „score" denkt de Commissie dat het merendeel van de Turken momenteel aan de regering zou geven — in de context van de vele anti-regeringsdemonstraties die vanaf mei 2013 overal in het land plaatsvinden? Deelt de Commissie de mening dat de Turkse regering feitelijk helemaal niet luistert naar de Turkse bevolking — blijkens het hardhandige terneerslaan van de demonstraties resp. de roep om aftreden van het huidige autoritaire regime? Zo neen, wat vindt de Commissie dan wel?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(17 december 2013)

De Europese Commissie is op de hoogte van de verklaring van de Turkse minister van EU-zaken waarnaar de geachte Parlementsleden verwijzen.

De Europese Commissie is verheugd over de positieve sfeer waarin het voortgangsverslag van 2013 over Turkije werd ontvangen. Naar aanleiding van de recente opening van hoofdstuk 22 „regionaal beleid en coördinatie van structuurinstrumenten" drukte minister Bağış als volgt zijn mening uit over het voortgangsverslag: „Het is het meest objectieve en motiverende van het recente decennium".

Met betrekking tot de vorderingen van Turkije op het gebied van democratisering, mensenrechten en economische ontwikkeling kan onze beoordeling worden gevonden in het laatste beschikbare voortgangsverslag:
http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/brochures/turkey_2013.pdf

([3]) http://egemenbagis.com/en/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012134/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Egemen Bağış: 'Turkey close to EU standards'

The European Commission has published its 'Turkey 2013 progress report' and its 'Enlargement strategy and main challenges 2013-2014'. In response, Egemen Bağış, the Turkish Minister for EU Affairs, has stated that, when it comes to 'democratisation, human rights and economic development', Turkey has never been as close to EU standards as it is now. Mr Bağış believes that Turkey is 'changing, developing and transforming' through Government efforts.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the 'Statement by Egemen Bağış, Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator, on the Turkey 2013 Progress Report of the European Commission'? ([1])

2. What is the Commission's response to Mr Bağış's claim that, when it comes to 'democratisation, human rights and economic development', Turkey has never been as close to EU standards as it is now? Does Commission share the Minister's view? Why/why not?

3. What are the tangible positive results, as far as the Commission can see, of the efforts of the Turkish Government cited by Mr Bağış, which he claims are 'changing, developing and transforming' the country?

4. Does the Commission share the view that Turkey in fact flouts human rights, including the freedom of expression — in particular as demonstrated by the excessive police violence with which the by and large peaceful demonstrations that have been taking place throughout Turkey since May of this year have been harshly cracked down upon? If not, does the Commission at least recognise the inordinate violence of the Turkish police and the repressive character of the Turkish Government?

5. Does the Commission share the view that Mr Bağış paints a much more rose-tinted picture of the current situation in Turkey than the reality, and that this is a bad thing, both for EU citizens and those of Turkey? If not, how does the Commission corroborate Mr Bağış's claim that, when it comes to 'democratisation, human rights and economic development', Turkey has never been as close to EU standards as it is now? If it does share the view, what consequences will Mr Bağış's therefore disingenuous position have for the accession negotiations?

Question for written answer E-012137/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Egemen Bağış: 'Many EU Member States are performing less well than Turkey'

The European Commission has published its 'Turkey 2013 progress report' and its 'Enlargement strategy and main challenges 2013-2014'. In response, Egemen Bağış, the Turkish Minister for EU Affairs, has stated that, if reports of this type were to be drawn up at the moment in respect of the current Member States of the Union, they would 'identify many steps to be taken and areas of further reform'. He also believes that many current EU Member States 'would be lagging behind Turkey in terms of pace and determination with regard to reforms'.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the 'Statement by Egemen Bağış, Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator, on the Turkey 2013 Progress Report of the European Commission'? ([2])

2. What is the Commission's interpretation of Mr Bağış's claims that there would be 'many steps to be taken and areas of further reform' for current EU Member States and that many current Member States 'would be lagging behind Turkey in terms of pace and determination with regard to reforms'? In the Commission's estimation, to which Member States and what specific reforms must Mr Bağış be referring in these comments?

3. Does the Commission share Mr Bağış's view? If so, does that imply that the 'many EU Member States' to which he referred actually joined the Union prematurely? If not, does the Commission consequently share the view that the therefore disingenuous and arrogant position taken by Mr Bağış is purely intended to mask the appalling situation in his own country? What are the consequences of his inappropriate attitude for the accession negotiations?

([1]) http://egemenbagis.com/en/
([2]) http://egemenbagis.com/en/

4. Does the Commission share the view that the gulf between the EU and Turkey is actually getting ever larger and that Turkey should never — never ever — accede to the European Union?

Question for written answer E-012138/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Egemen Bağış: 'The Turkey progress report is not a scorecard'

The European Commission has published its 'Turkey 2013 progress report' and its 'Enlargement strategy and main challenges 2013-2014'. In response, Egemen Bağış, the Turkish Minister for EU Affairs, has stated that the progress report 'is not a scorecard' for Turkey. He declared that the Turkish people are the 'the only competent authority to grade our Government'.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the 'Statement by Egemen Bağış, Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator, on the Turkey 2013 Progress Report of the European Commission'? ([3])

2. How does the Commission assess Mr Bağış's position that its progress report 'is not a scorecard' for Turkey? Does the Commission share the view that this shows that, when it comes down to it, Mr Bağış really does not take its report seriously? If not, what is the Commission's interpretation?

3. If the Turkish people are the 'only competent authority to grade [the Turkish] Government', what 'grade' does the Commission think the majority of Turks would currently give the Government there, given the context of the innumerable anti-government demonstrations that have been taking place throughout the country since May of this year? Does the Commission share the view that the Turkish Government actually completely fails to listen to the Turkish population — as demonstrated by the violent cracking down on the demonstrations and by the calls for the current authoritarian regime to stand down? If not, what is the Commission's view in this regard?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

The European Commission is aware of the declaration the Turkish Minister for EU Affairs to which the Honourable Member refers.

The European Commission welcomes the overall positive atmosphere in which the 2013 Progress Report on Turkey was received. Furthermore, commenting on the recent opening of Chapter 22 'Regional policy and coordination of structural instruments' Minister Bağış referred to the progress report saying that 'it has been the most objective and the most motivating of the recent decade'.

With regard to Turkey's progress on democratisation, human rights and economic development, our assessment can be found in the latest Progress Report available:
http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/brochures/turkey_2013.pdf

([3]) http://egemenbagis.com/en/

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012135/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(23 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Bağış: „Geweld is geen middel om rechten te claimen"

De Europese Commissie heeft haar „Turkey 2013 Progress Report" en „Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2013-2014" gepubliceerd. Naar aanleiding daarvan stelt Egemen Bağış, de Turkse minister van Europese Zaken, dat door middel van „geweld", „acties die de vrede verstoren" en „illegale middelen" nooit rechten geclaimd kunnen worden.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het „Statement by Egemen Bağış, Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator, on Turkey 2013 Progress Report of the European Commission" ([1])?

2. Hoe interpreteert de Commissie de stelling van de heer Bağış — in de context van de doorgaans vreedzame demonstraties die vanaf mei 2013 overal in het land plaatsvinden, maar die door de regering toegepast buitensporig politiegeweld hardhandig worden terneergeslagen?

3. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie het dat de heer Bağış enerzijds geweld klaarblijkelijk afkeurt, maar dat zijn regering anderzijds exorbitant politiegeweld jegens haar eigen bevolking toepast? Deelt de Commissie de mening dat de heer Bağış hypocriet is?

4. Indien de heer Bağış stelt dat door middel van „illegale middelen" nooit rechten geclaimd kunnen worden, bedoelt hij, naar inschatting van de Commissie, daar dan mee dat demonstraties — die door de Turkse politie immers stelselmatig hardhandig worden terneergeslagen! — „illegaal" zouden zijn en dat dergelijke demonstraties aldus nooit tot het gewenste doel zouden kunnen leiden? Zo neen, hoe ziet de Commissie dit dan wel?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(17 december 2013)

De Commissie gaat volledig akkoord met de beginselen die ten grondslag liggen van de heer Bağış betreffende het gebruik van geweld als een middel om rechten te doen gelden. Wat betreft de beoordeling door de Commissie van de protestacties van mei-juni 2013 en de reactie van de politiediensten bevat het voortgangsverslag van 2013 over Turkije ([2]) gedetailleerde en relevante informatie en de beoordeling van de Commissie, met name ten aanzien van het buitensporig gebruik van geweld en de noodzaak om alle schuldigen ter verantwoording te roepen.

([1]) http://egemenbagis.com/en/.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/tr_rapport_2013.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012135/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Egemen Bağış: 'Violence is not a means to claim one's rights'

The European Commission has published its 'Turkey 2013 progress report' and its 'Enlargement strategy and main challenges 2013-2014'. In response, Egemen Bağış, the Turkish Minister for EU Affairs, has stated that rights can never be claimed through 'recourse to violence', 'actions disrupting the peace' and 'illegal methods'.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the 'Statement by Egemen Bağış, Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator, on the Turkey 2013 Progress Report of the European Commission'? ([1])

2. How does the Commission interpret Mr Bağış's position in the context of the by and large peaceful demonstrations that have been taking place throughout Turkey since May of this year, but that have been harshly cracked down upon by the Government, with excessive police violence?

3. How does the Commission view the fact that, while Mr Bağış clearly rejects violence, his Government at the same time employs inordinate police violence against its own population? Does the Commission share the view that Mr Bağış is a hypocrite?

4. When Mr Bağış states that rights can never be claimed through 'illegal methods', does he, in the Commission's estimation, mean by this that demonstrations — which, after all, are being systematically and harshly cracked down upon by the Turkish police — are 'illegal' and that such demonstrations would therefore never be able to lead to their intended goal? If not, what is the Commission's interpretation?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

The Commission fully agrees with the principles underpinning the statements by Mr Bağış on the use of violence as a means to claim one's rights. As regards the Commission's assessment of the protests of May-June 2013 and the response by police forces, the 2013 Progress Report on Turkey ([2]) contains detailed, relevant information and the Commission's assessment, notably as regards the excessive use of force and the need to bring all those responsible to account.

([1]) http://egemenbagis.com/en/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/tr_rapport_2013.pdf

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012136/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(23 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Egemen Bağış: „EU-lidmaatschap concreet doel van Turkije"

De Europese Commissie heeft haar „Turkey 2013 Progress Report" en „Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2013-2014" gepubliceerd. Naar aanleiding daarvan stelt Egemen Bağış, de Turkse minister van Europese Zaken: „The AK Party period has long deserved acknowledgement for turning the EU accession process into real gains for our people and EU membership into a concrete and achievable objective".

Recep Erdoğan, de premier van Turkije, heeft echter gezegd de Shanghai-samenwerkingsorganisatie boven de EU te verkiezen: „Dann sagen wir der EU auf Wiedersehen. Wir brauchen euch [die Europäer] nicht". De heer Erdoğan acht de Shanghai-samenwerkingsorganisatie „veel beter en machtiger" dan de EU.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het „Statement by Egemen Bağış, Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator, on Turkey 2013 Progress Report of the European Commission" ([1]) en het bericht Türkei: „Dann sagen wir der EU auf Wiedersehen" ([2])?

2. Hoe rijmt de Commissie de stelling van de heer Bağış, „dat EU-lidmaatschap een concreet doel van Turkije is", met de stelling van de heer Erdoğan, „dat Turkije de Shanghai-samenwerkingsorganisatie boven de EU verkiest"? Deelt de Commissie de mening dat dit volstrekt tegenstrijdig is? Zo ja, wie van beiden gelooft de Commissie, en waarop baseert zij zich daarbij? Zo neen, hoe legt de Commissie beide stellingen dan niet-conflicterend uit?

3. Hoe verklaart de Commissie dat zij — blijkens de stelling van de heer Erdoğan — blijft trekken aan een dood paard?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(17 december 2013)

De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid naar haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-10832/2013 ([3]).

([1]) http://egemenbagis.com/en/.
([2]) http://diepresse.com/home/politik/eu/1339046/Tuerkei_Dann-sagen-wir-der-EU-auf-Wiedersehen?from=home.meinung.gastkommentar.sc.p1.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/nl/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012136/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Egemen Bağış: 'EU membership a concrete objective for Turkey'

The European Commission has published its 'Turkey 2013 progress report' and its 'Enlargement strategy and main challenges 2013-2014'. In response, Egemen Bağış, the Turkish Minister for EU Affairs, has stated that, 'The AK Party period has long deserved acknowledgement for turning the EU accession process into real gains for our people and EU membership into a concrete and achievable objective.'

However, Recep Erdoğan, the Turkish Prime Minister, has stated that he would choose the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) over the EU. 'Then we would say goodbye to the EU — we would not need you [Europeans],' he said. Mr Erdoğan apparently views the SCO as 'much better and more powerful' than the EU.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the 'Statement by Egemen Bağış, Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator, on the Turkey 2013 Progress Report of the European Commission' ([1]) and the report 'Türkei: "Dann sagen wir der EU auf Wiedersehen"' ['Turkey: "We'll tell the EU goodbye, then"'] ([2])?

2. How does the Commission reconcile Mr Bağış's position that EU membership is a 'concrete objective' for Turkey with Mr Erdoğan's, that Turkey would choose the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) over the EU? Does the Commission share the view that these are totally contradictory positions? If so, which of the two ministers does the Commission believe, and on what does it base that view? If not, how does the Commission explain the two statements in a non-conflicting way?

3. How does the Commission explain the fact that — as appears from Mr Erdoğan's stated views — it continues to flog a dead horse?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-10832/2013 ([3]).

([1]) http://egemenbagis.com/en/
([2]) http://diepresse.com/home/politik/eu/1339046/Tuerkei_Dann-sagen-wir-der-EU-auf-Wiedersehen?from=home.meinung.gastkommentar.sc.p1.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012139/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(23 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Egemen Bağış: „Vrijheid van meningsuiting is in orde"

De Europese Commissie heeft haar „Turkey 2013 Progress Report" en „Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2013-2014" gepubliceerd. Naar aanleiding daarvan stelt Egemen Bağış, de Turkse minister van Europese Zaken: „Today we enjoy the most transparent and liberal atmosphere ever in the area of freedom of expression and freedom of the media; our Government will continue to take the necessary steps to further enhance these freedoms".

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het „Statement by Egemen Bağış, Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator, on Turkey 2013 Progress Report of the European Commission" ([1])?

2. Hoe reageert de Commissie op de stelling van de heer Bağış dat „de vrijheid van meningsuiting en de vrijheid van pers in Turkije in orde zouden zijn" — in de context van het door de regering toegepaste buitensporige politiegeweld, waarmee vanaf mei 2013 overal in het land doorgaans vreedzame demonstraties hardhandig worden terneergeslagen, en de vele arrestaties van demonstranten en (kritische) journalisten? Deelt de Commissie de mening dat Turkije, vooral wat betreft de vrijheid van meningsuiting, juist almaar verder afglijdt? Hoe beoordeelt zij de negatieve ontwikkelingen in Turkije dan wel?

3. Welke verwachtingen heeft de Commissie van de toezegging van de heer Bağış „dat zijn regering verdere stappen ter bevordering van de vrijheid van meningsuiting zal ondernemen"? Deelt de Commissie de mening dat deze toezegging — blijkens de realiteit — een wassen neus is? Accepteert de Commissie het dat zij zich door de heer Bağış aldus bij de neus laat nemen?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(12 december 2013)

De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid naar haar voortgangsverslag van 2013 ([2]) over Turkije waarin zij de situatie van de vrijheid van meningsuiting en van de media uitgebreid beoordeelt.

De Commissie verwacht dat het Turkse rechtssysteem verder verandert, in het bijzonder om de vrijheid van meningsuiting en van de media, en de vrijheid van vergadering en vereniging te versterken; de rechtspraktijk moet systematisch de Europese normen weerspiegelen. Het vierde pakket justitiële hervormingen pakt een aantal struikelstenen aan en moet volledig worden uitgevoerd.

Vooruitgang in de toetredingsonderhandelingen en vooruitgang in de politieke hervormingen in Turkije gaan hand in hand. Het is in het belang van zowel Turkije als de EU dat overeenstemming wordt bereikt over de criteria voor het openen van hoofdstuk 23 (rechterlijke macht en grondrechten) en hoofdstuk 24 (justitie, vrijheid en veiligheid) en dat Turkije zo snel mogelijk in kennis wordt gesteld van deze criteria om de onderhandelingen in het kader van beide hoofdstukken in te leiden. Op die manier kan de dialoog van de EU met Turkije over cruciale aangelegenheden van wederzijds belang worden geïntensiveerd en kunnen de lopende hervormingsinspanningen worden ondersteund.

([1]) http://egemenbagis.com/en/.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012139/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Egemen Bağış: 'Freedom of expression situation is fine'

The European Commission has published its 'Turkey 2013 progress report' and its 'Enlargement strategy and main challenges 2013-2014'. In response, Egemen Bağış, the Turkish Minister for EU Affairs, has stated that, 'Today we enjoy the most transparent and liberal atmosphere ever in the area of freedom of expression and freedom of the media; our Government will continue to take the necessary steps to further enhance these freedoms.'

1. Is the Commission familiar with the 'Statement by Egemen Bağış, Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator, on the Turkey 2013 Progress Report of the European Commission'? ([1])

2. How does the Commission respond to Mr Bağış's claim that the freedoms of expression and of the press are in a healthy state in Turkey, given the context of the excessive police violence with which the by and large peaceful demonstrations that have been taking place throughout Turkey since May of this year have been harshly cracked down upon and the many arrests of demonstrators and (critical) journalists? Does the Commission share the view that, especially when it comes to freedom of expression, Turkey is actually sliding further and further backwards? How does it evaluate the negative developments in Turkey?

3. What expectations does the Commission have in respect of Mr Bağış's pledge that his Government 'will continue to take the necessary steps to further enhance [the] freedom [of expression]'? Does the Commission share the view that this pledge — as the reality demonstrates — is just for show? Does the Commission accept that Mr Bağış is thus taking it for a ride?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its 2013 Progress Report ([2]) on Turkey, in which it draws a comprehensive assessment of the situation vis-à-vis freedom of expression and freedom of the media.

The Commission expects further changes in the Turkish legal system, especially to strengthen freedom of expression and of the media, and freedom of assembly and of association; judicial practice should systematically reflect European standards. The fourth judicial reform package addresses a number of stumbling blocks and should be implemented in full.

Progress in the accession negotiations and progress in the political reforms in Turkey are two sides of the same coin. It is in the interest of both Turkey and the EU that the opening benchmarks for Chapter 23: Judiciary and Fundamental rights and 24: Justice, Freedom and Security are agreed upon and communicated to Turkey as soon as possible with a view to enabling the opening of negotiations under these two chapters so as to enhance the EU's dialogue with Turkey in areas of vital mutual interest and to support ongoing reform efforts.

([1]) http://egemenbagis.com/en/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse P-012140/13
til Kommissionen
Emilie Turunen (S&D)
(23. oktober 2013)

Om: Anonyme betalingskort

Der har i den senere tid været øget fokus i internationale medier på bekæmpelsen af skattely, skattesvig og skattebedrageri. Brugen af såkaldte anonyme betalingskort (prepaid cards) — hvor kortholderens navn ikke står på kortet, og som kan bruges til anonymt at hæve penge i en pengeautomat — kan ifølge dansk politi og skattemyndigheder bruges til at gemme penge for myndighederne, så kortholder slipper for at betale skat. Af en artikel i Dagbladet Politiken den 21.10.2013 fremgår det, at der er anbragt mindst 1 200 mia. DKK på denne type kort, og i en artikel i samme avis den 23.10.2013 udtaler Per Fiig, vicestatsadvokat hos det danske bagmandspoliti, at der »er ingen tvivl om, at det med disse kort er blevet lettere at anvende skjulte penge og sværere for os at finde dem«. Det amerikanske skatteministerium er tilsvarende bekymret for de navnløse betalingskort, som de betragter som en trussel mod bekæmpelsen af hvidvaskning af penge.

Af samme artikel i Politiken fremgår det, at en analyse foretaget af Boston Consulting Group for MasterCard forudser, at brugen af hævekortene på verdensplan vil være firedoblet i 2017, hvor 4 500 mia. DKK forventes at flyde ind og ud af de ofte navnløse betalingskort, og i 2017 ventes 800 mia. DKK at runde hævekort i Europa, hvilket vil være en femdobling.

I lyset af den stigende brug af anonyme betalingskort og dermed den øgede risiko for skatteunddragelse, skattesnyd og hvidvaskning af penge vil jeg gerne bede Kommissionen om svar på følgende:

1. Er Kommissionen bekendt med omfanget af brugen af anonyme betalingskort og kortenes formodede sammenhæng med skattely/skatteunddragelse og hvidvaskning? Har Kommissionen lavet opgørelser eller lignende over antallet og brugen af denne type kort, og har man overblik over, hvor mange penge der menes at stå på denne type kort?

2. Hvilke initiativer vil Kommissionen tage for dels at overvåge udviklingen, dels at forhindre, at kortene systematisk anvendes til skatteunddragelse og hvidvask? Har man fra Kommissionen overvejet muligheden af helt at forbyde denne type kort, og vil det i givet fald være muligt at indføre et sådan forbud i EU?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Michel Barnier
(28. november 2013)

Kommissionen har ikke nogen tal for brugen af forudbetalte kort.

Kommissionen har været dybt involveret i internationalt arbejde ([1]) om potentielle risici ved forudbetalte kort. Det erkendes i denne sammenhæng, at der er forskel på forskellige typer af forudbetalte kort, hvis funktionalitet går fra lavrisikogavekort til højrisikobetalingskort, der kan påføres penge igen, hvilket i nogle tilfælde kan tillade brugerne at overføre midler fra en person til en anden. Der er særlige risici forbundet med, at den person, der overfører og modtager midlerne, er anonym.

Kommissionen har på baggrund af disse forskelle mellem forudbetalte kort ikke foreslået et totalt forbud af sådanne produkter i sit forslag til det fjerde direktiv til bekæmpelse af hvidvaskning af penge. Forstærkningen af den risikobaserede fremgangsmåde, som foreslås i dette direktiv, vil dog forudsætte, at de pågældende enheder og tilsynsmyndigheder under hensyntagen til forskellige risikofaktorer tager passende tiltag for at identificere og vurdere risikoen for hvidvaskning af penge og finansiering af terrorisme. Dokumentation for højrisikofaktorer omfatter produkter eller transaktioner, der kan tilskynde til anonymitet, eller nye produkter og brugen af nye teknologier eller teknologier under udvikling. Udbydere af nye betalingstjenester vil skulle tage foranstaltninger til at identificere og kontrollere identiteten af deres kunder og overvåge forretningsforholdet på en fortløbende basis — dette skal stå i forhold til den risiko, der er ved produktet.

([1]) Guidance for a risk-based approach prepaid cards, mobile payments and internet-based payment services, Den Finansielle Aktionsgruppe (FATF), juni 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012140/13
to the Commission
Emilie Turunen (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Prepaid cards

There has recently been increased focus in international media on combating tax havens, tax evasion and tax fraud. Prepaid cards — on which there is no cardholder name — can be used anonymously to withdraw money from a cash machine and, according to the Danish police and tax authorities, to conceal money from the authorities, with the user avoiding paying tax. According to an article in the Danish newspaper '*Politiken*' on 21 October 2013, at least DKK 1 200 billion is stored on such cards; and, in an article in the same newspaper on 23 October 2013, Deputy Public Prosecutor Per Fiig, at the Serious Fraud Office, stated that there is no doubt that such cards have made it easier to hide money and more difficult for the authorities to find it. The US Department of the Treasury is similarly troubled by anonymous prepaid cards, which it regards as a threat to anti-money-laundering efforts.

According to the same *Politiken* article, an analysis by the Boston Consulting Group for MasterCard projects a fourfold increase in worldwide cash card use by 2017, with DKK 4 500 billion likely to flow into and out of what are in many instances anonymous payment cards and, by 2017, DKK 800 billion expected to be stored on prepaid cards in Europe, which would be a fivefold increase.

In the light of increasing use of anonymous prepaid cards and hence the increased risk of tax avoidance, tax evasion and money laundering:

1. Is the Commission aware of the extent to which anonymous payment cards are used and the likely link between them and tax havens/evasion and money laundering? Has the Commission made assessments as to how many such cards there are, and the uses to which they are put, and does it have an idea of how much money is thought to be stored on such cards?

2. What action will the Commission take both to monitor developments and to prevent cards from being systematically used for tax evasion and money laundering purposes? Has the Commission considered the possibility of a blanket ban on such cards and, if so, would it be possible to introduce such a ban in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(28 November 2013)

The Commission does not have figures on the use of prepaid cards.

The Commission has been closely associated to international work ([1]) on potential risks related to prepaid cards. In this context, it is recognised that there are differences between types of prepaid cards, the functionality of which ranges from low-risk gift cards to higher-risk reloadable payment cards that may in some cases allow person-to-person funds transfers between users. Particular risks are posed by the anonymity of the person transfering and receiving the funds.

Given these differences between prepaid cards, the Commission has not proposed a blanket ban on such products in its proposal for a fourth anti-money laundering Directive. However, the reinforcement of the risk-based approach, proposed in this directive, will require the entities concerned and supervisory authorities to take appropriate steps to identify and assess money laundering and terrorist financing risks, taking into account various risk factors. Evidence of higher risk factors includes products or transactions that might favour anonymity, and new products and the use of new or developing technologies. Providers of new payment services will need to take measures to identify and verify their customer's identity, and monitor the business relationship on an ongoing basis — this will need to be in proportion to the level of risk posed by the product.

([1]) Guidance for a risk-based approach prepaid cards, mobile payments and Internet-based payment services, FATF, June 2013.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-012141/13
à la Commission
Karima Delli (Verts/ALE)
(23 octobre 2013)

Objet: Quelle réponse européenne face au risque sanitaire posé par le mercure dentaire?

La Convention de Minamata sur le mercure, adoptée en octobre 2013, sera bientôt ratifiée par l'Union européenne. Cette convention oblige les signataires à faire diminuer l'utilisation des amalgames dentaires, qui sont composés de mercure à hauteur de 50 %. Cependant, les mesures en ce sens ne suffiront pas à protéger, pour longtemps, les dentistes et les assistants dentaires exposés à des vapeurs de mercure dans leurs cabinets.

En effet, une publication de l'INRS de 2003 indique que les praticiens dentaires sont exposés à d'importantes quantités de vapeurs de mercure, notamment lorsqu'ils travaillent sur l'amalgame d'un patient et quand ils sont à proximité des séparateurs d'amalgames, dont l'étanchéité est insuffisante. De nombreux articles scientifiques ont établi que les vapeurs de mercure induisent chez les dentistes divers troubles, notamment neurocognitifs, et qu'elles affectent en particulier la fertilité des dentistes femmes et des assistantes dentaires. Aussi, dans l'intérêt de ces travailleurs européens:

1. Quelle est la position de la Commission vis-à-vis de ce risque sanitaire? Quelles mesures envisage-t-elle de prendre pour y faire face? La Commission envisage-t-elle d'interdire le mercure dentaire et sinon, pourquoi?

2. Comment la Commission évalue-t-elle la possibilité de contraindre les professions dentaires à adopter des pratiques qui les protègent quand ils travailleront sur les vieux amalgames? Prévoit-elle de prendre des mesures pour exercer cette contrainte, et sinon, quelles mesures alternatives envisage-t-elle d'adopter?

3. Afin notamment de prendre la mesure des risques chimiques sur la santé au travail, la Commission envisage-t-elle de renouveler la stratégie européenne en faveur de la santé et de la sécurité au travail pour la période 2014-2020?

Réponse donnée par M. Mimica au nom de la Commission
(25 novembre 2013)

Dans le cadre de l'application de la stratégie communautaire sur le mercure adoptée en 2005, les services de la Commission ont consulté le comité scientifique des risques sanitaires émergents et nouveaux (CSRSEN) sur la sécurité des amalgames dentaires pour les patients et les utilisateurs.

En ce qui concerne le personnel dentaire, l'avis du CSRSEN de mai 2008 ([1]) a conclu que l'incidence des effets indésirables est très faible et a diminué considérablement, en raison, notamment, des améliorations de la composition des amalgames dentaires.

Sur la base de cet avis, la Commission n'a pas proposé de mesures restreignant davantage l'utilisation du mercure dans les amalgames dentaires. La Commission a demandé au CSRSEN d'actualiser son avis ([2]) et réexaminera sa position si de nouvelles données sont portées à sa connaissance.

En ce qui concerne la protection des travailleurs, le comité scientifique en matière de limites d'exposition professionnelle à des agents chimiques (SCOEL) a adopté en 2007 une recommandation pour le mercure élémentaire et les composés inorganiques bivalents du mercure *(Elemental mercury and inorganic divalent mercury compounds* — SCOEL/SUM/84 final) ([3]). Sur cette base, la Commission a adopté la directive 2009/161/UE ([4]) établissant une valeur limite indicative d'exposition professionnelle pour cette substance.

([1]) Disponible (en anglais) à l'adresse suivante: http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_risk/committees/04_scenihr/docs/scenihr_o_016.pdf
([2]) Disponible (en anglais) à l'adresse suivante: http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/emerging/docs/scenihr_q_034.pdf
([3]) Disponible (en anglais) à l'adresse suivante: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=3852&langId=en
([4]) Disponible à l'adresse suivante: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:338:0087:0089:FR:PDF

Cette directive fait partie du cadre législatif en matière de santé et de sécurité au travail dans l'UE. Un autre élément de ce cadre, la directive 98/24/CE ([5]), oblige l'employeur à prendre des mesures pour protéger la santé et la sécurité des travailleurs exposés à des produits chimiques dangereux.

La Commission a finalisé l'évaluation de la stratégie en matière de santé et de sécurité au travail pour 2007-2012 ([6]) et a lancé une consultation publique sur le nouveau cadre politique de l'UE. Lorsqu'elle aura achevé l'analyse des réponses, la Commission déterminera la suite à donner à ce dossier.

([5]) Disponible à l'adresse suivante: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1998:131:0011:0023:FR:PDF

([6]) SWD(2013)202 du 31.5.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012141/13
to the Commission
Karima Delli (Verts/ALE)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: EU response to health risks posed by mercury in dental amalgrams

The Minamata Convention on Mercury was adopted in October 2013 and is due to be ratified shortly by the European Union. Under the Convention signatories are required to phase down the use of dental amalgams, which consist of 50% mercury. However more is needed to provide long-term protection for dentists and dental assistants exposed to mercury vapours in their surgeries.

A publication in 2003 by the INRS, the French Occupational Safety Research Institute, stated that dental practitioners have a high level of exposure to mercury vapours, particularly when working on patients' fillings and when standing or sitting next to amalgam separators that are inadequately sealed. Many scientific articles have proven that mercury vapours are at the root of a variety of disorders, notably neurocognitive ones, in dentists and that they affect the fertility of women dentists and women dental assistants in particular. Therefore, for the good of these EU workers, can the Commission answer the following:

1. What is the Commission's position regarding this health risk? What measures is it considering to tackle them? Is the Commission considering banning mercury in dental amalgams? If not, why not?

2. Does the Commission believe the dental professions can be made to adopt practices that will protect them when working on old fillings? Is it planning to take measures to make them comply with these practices? If not, what alternative measures is it considering adopting?

3. Will the Commission launch the EU Strategy on Health and Safety at Work again for the period 2014-2020 in order, in particular, to take stock of chemical health hazards at work?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(25 November 2013)

As part of the implementation of the Community Strategy Concerning Mercury adopted in 2005, the Commission services consulted the Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks — SCENIHR on the safety of dental amalgam for patients and users.

As far as dental personnel are concerned, the SCENIHR opinion of May 2008 ([1]) concluded that the incidence of reported adverse effects is very low and decreased substantially, especially in connection with improvements to dental amalgam delivery.

On the basis of this opinion, the Commission has not proposed measures further restricting the use of mercury in dental amalgam. The Commission requested an update of the SCENIHR opinion ([2]) and will re-examine its position in case further evidence becomes available.

Regarding the protection of workers, the Scientific Committee for Occupational Exposure Limit Values adopted a recommendation on *Elemental mercury and inorganic divalent mercury compounds (SCOEL/SUM/84)* ([3]) in 2007. On this basis, the Commission adopted Directive 2009/161/EU ([4]) establishing an Indicative Occupational Exposure Limit Value for this substance.

The directive is part of the legislative framework on Occupational Health and Safety in the EU. As part of this framework, Directive 98/24/EC ([5]) obliges the employer to take the measures to protect the health and safety of workers exposed to hazardous chemicals.

The Commission finalised the evaluation of the Occupational Health and Safety strategy for 2007-2012 ([6]) and launched a public consultation on a new policy EU framework. Once the analysis of the replies will be completed, the Commission will decide on further steps.

([1]) Available on webpage: http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_risk/committees/04_scenihr/docs/scenihr_o_016.pdf
([2]) Available on webpage: http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/emerging/docs/scenihr_q_034.pdf
([3]) Available on webpage: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=3852&langId=en
([4]) Available on webpage: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:338:0087:0089:EN:PDF
([5]) Available on webpage: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1998:131:0011:0023:EN:PDF
([6]) SWD(2013)202 of 31.5.2013.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-012144/13
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(23 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Obligaciones para la financiación de proyectos destinadas al proyecto Castor

El pasado mes de julio el almacén de gas Castor situado en Vinaròs (Castellón) fue seleccionado por el Banco Europeo de Inversiones (BEI) ([1]) y la Comisión Europea para recibir ayuda dentro del marco de la Iniciativa de Obligaciones para la Financiación de Proyectos. En total se emitirán obligaciones por un valor de 1 400 millones de euros a 21,5 años, de los cuales el BEI ya ha comprometido 500 millones de euros. La financiación del proyecto Castor por parte de la Comisión Europea y del BEI los hace responsables directos de cualquier consecuencia o impacto derivados del mismo.

Si bien el objetivo de las obligaciones para la financiación de proyectos es la implementación de la Estrategia Europa 2020, la cual cuenta con criterios de sostenibilidad, el proyecto Castor parece ir en la dirección contraria ya que ha generado movimientos sísmicos de hasta 4,1 grados en la zona de Vinaròs.

Asimismo, en la concesión administrativa a la empresa gestora, Escal UGS, existe una cláusula que asegura que el almacenamiento subterráneo Castor tiene garantizada por parte del Estado la «recuperación de la inversión» en caso de «caducidad o extinción», y una compensación en caso de cese por «dolo o negligencia de la empresa» y que, si se paraliza la actividad del almacén de gas, el Estado español debería pagar una indemnización a dicho proyecto. Dado que este proyecto se ha materializado gracias a la inversión del Banco Europeo de Inversiones, con el visto bueno de la Comisión Europea, y con parte del presupuesto de la Unión Europea, creemos indispensable contar con una opinión oficial y pública de la Comisión.

1. ¿Tenía constancia la Comisión de la cláusula abusiva citada anteriormente entre la empresa y el Estado español en caso de «caducidad o extinción» (incluso por dolo o negligencia de la empresa)?

2. ¿Cuál es el monto total que estima la Comisión que deberá ser asumido por el Estado español como consecuencia de esa cláusula en caso de cierre del proyecto Castor?

3. ¿En cuánto estima la Comisión que aumentará la deuda pública española por esta cláusula abusiva? ¿Existe alguna cláusula de características similares entre el Banco Europeo de Inversiones o la Comisión y la empresa responsable del proyecto Castor?

4. Considerando los sismos producidos recientemente como consecuencia del proyecto Castor y los impactos derivados, ¿apoya la Comisión la clausura del proyecto, independientemente de los costes que esto suponga?

5. ¿Considera la Comisión necesario, al menos, paralizar temporalmente la emisión de obligaciones para la financiación del proyecto Castor hasta que el Gobierno decida si reanuda o no la actividad del proyecto?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de diciembre de 2013)

1., 2. y 3. El papel de la Comisión en este proyecto se limitó a comprobar el cumplimiento político sectorial de las Orientaciones para la RTE-E. Las disposiciones contractuales entre el Estado español y el promotor del proyecto Castor no han sido en modo alguno aprobadas por la Comisión ni revisadas de otro modo, ni tampoco ha participado la Comisión en los acuerdos contractuales entre el BEI y el patrocinador del proyecto.

4. Actualmente hay en marcha un estudio independiente cuya finalidad es determinar el origen de la actividad sísmica y, a partir de él, se espera que el Gobierno español tome una decisión sobre el futuro del proyecto.

5. El proyecto se ha financiado mediante una emisión de bonos con cotización pública que tuvo lugar en julio de 2013.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_BEI-13-117_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012144/13
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Project bonds for the Castor project

In July 2013, the Castor gas storage facility in Vinaròs (Castellón) was chosen by the European Investment Bank (EIB) ([1]) and the Commission to receive aid under the Project Bonds Initiative. In total, EUR 1.4 billion of 21.5-year bonds will be issued, of which the EIB has already committed to EUR 500 million. By funding the Castor project, the Commission and the EIB are directly responsible for any consequences or fallout from the project.

While the aim of project bonds is to implement the Europe 2020 strategy, which has sustainability criteria, the Castor project appears to be at odds with them, since it has caused earthquakes in Vinaròs measuring up to 4.1 on the Richter scale.

Moreover, the administrative concession granted to the company in charge, Escal UGS, contains a clause whereby the State guarantees to return the investment in the Castor underground storage facility should the concession expire or be terminated, and to pay compensation in the event of suspension due to deception or negligence on the part of the company. Furthermore, if gas storage comes to a halt, the Spanish State will have to pay compensation to the project. Given that this project came about as a result of investment by the European Investment Bank, with the Commission's approval, and using a portion of the EU budget, obtaining the Commission's official public opinion is vital.

1. Is the Commission aware of the unfair clause referred to above between the company and the Spanish State in the event of 'expiry or termination' (including due to deception or negligence by the company)?

2. How much in total does the Commission estimate the Spanish State would have to pay out as a result of this clause, were the Castor project to shut down?

3. How much does the Commission think the Spanish public debt will increase by because of this unfair clause? Is there any similar clause between the European Investment Bank or the Commission and the company in charge of the Castor project?

4. In view of the earthquakes that have recently occurred as a result of the Castor project and the associated effects, does the Commission support shutting down the project, irrespective of the costs involved?

5. Does the Commission think it should, at least, temporarily freeze the issuing of bonds to fund the Castor project until the Spanish Government decides whether or not work should resume on the project?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2013)

1, 2 and 3. The role of the Commission on this project was limited to check policy compliance with the TEN-E guidelines. The contractual arrangements between the Spanish State and the Castor project promoter are in no way approved or otherwise reviewed by the Commission nor is the Commission involved in the contractual arrangements between EIB and the project sponsor.

4. An independent study aiming to identify the origin of the seismic activity is ongoing and based on this a decision is expected to be taken by the Spanish Government on the future of the project.

5. The project has been financed by a publicly traded bond issue, which took place in July 2013.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_BEI-13-117_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-012145/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(23 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Energías renovables en el Estado español: objetivo 2020

La propuesta de decreto que el Ministerio de Industria español aprobó en julio de 2013 para regular la producción eléctrica para el autoconsumo ([1]) contempla una multa máxima de treinta millones de euros para aquellos que, entre otras cosas, no registren sus instalaciones o no paguen el nuevo «peaje de respaldo», contemplado en la normativa y que grava la producción casera de electricidad. La cifra —treinta millones de euros— coincide con la sanción máxima contemplada para una fuga radioactiva muy grave en una central nuclear española ([2]) . El Gobierno espera que la normativa para el autoconsumo eléctrico entre en vigor el 1 enero de 2014.

Según *The Wall Street Journal*, este cambio de normativa por parte del Gobierno español podría tener el objetivo de «exprimir» a aquellos ciudadanos que un día decidieron tener un consumo energético lo más autosuficiente posible ([3]).

¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre este tema?

¿Cree la Comisión que esta nueva normativa favorecerá que el Estado español cumpla con los objetivos 2020 en energías renovables?

El Comisario Oettinger admitió que los Estados español y francés no van a alcanzar el objetivo 2020 de lograr que cada uno de los Estados de la UE pueda importar de sus vecinos un 10 % de la energía que consume. ¿Cree la Comisión que el Estado español va a cumplir con los objetivos 2020 en materia de energías renovables?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(28 de noviembre de 2013)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a la respuesta conjunta que dio a las preguntas escritas E-009036/2013, E-009037/2013, E-009040/2013, E-009042/2013 y E-009044/2013, así como a la respuesta dada a las preguntas escritas E-009038/2013 y E-011159/2013 ([4]).

En lo que respecta a la consecución por parte de España de su objetivo nacional en materia de energía renovable del 20 % de aquí a 2020, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría a la respuesta que dio a la pregunta escrita E-001624/2013 ([5]).

([1]) http://porlaboca.es/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/borrador_RD_Autoconsumo.pdf
([2]) http://porlaboca.es/?p=6563
([3]) http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702304626104579121823944695940
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/es/parliamentary-questions.html
([5]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/es/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012145/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Renewable energy in Spain: 2020 target

The draft decree adopted by the Spanish Ministry of Industry in July 2013 to regulate the generation of electricity for self-supply ([1]) lays down a maximum fine of EUR 30 million for anyone who, *inter alia*, fails to register their installations or to pay the new 'endorsement toll', which is laid down in the legislation and applies to domestic electricity generation. The figure of EUR 30 million is on a par with the maximum penalty laid down for a very serious radioactive leak at a Spanish nuclear power plant ([2]). The Spanish Government expects the legislation on self-supply of electricity to enter into force on 1 January 2014.

According to *The Wall Street Journal*, this change in legislation by the Spanish Government could have the aim of 'squeezing' people who one day decided to make their energy consumption as self-sufficient as possible ([3]).

What view does the Commission take on this matter?

Does the Commission think that this new legislation will help Spain meet the 2020 targets for renewable energy?

Commissioner Oettinger has admitted that Spain and France are not going to achieve the target set for 2020 whereby each EU Member State should be able to import 10% of the energy it consumes from its neighbours. Does the Commission think that Spain will achieve the 2020 targets for renewable energy?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(28 November 2013)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its joint reply to Written Questions E-009036/2013, E-009037/2013, E-009040/2013, E-009042/2013 and E-009044/2013, and to its replies to Written Questions E-009038/2013 and E-011159/2013 ([4]).

Concerning the achievement by Spain of its national national renewable energy target of 20% by 2020, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-001624/2013 ([5]).

([1]) http://porlaboca.es/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/borrador_RD_Autoconsumo.pdf
([2]) http://porlaboca.es/?p=6563
([3]) http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702304626104579121823944695940
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([5]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012147/13
aan de Commissie
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(23 oktober 2013)

Betreft: ACTA-bepalingen in de handelsovereenkomst tussen de EU en Singapore

Karel De Gucht, de commissaris belast met handel, had de leden van het EP beloofd dat sommige omstreden bepalingen van de handelsovereenkomst ter bestrijding van namaak ACTA), die door het Parlement is afgewezen, niet in toekomstige vrijhandelsovereenkomsten van de EU zouden worden opgenomen. Gezien de grote interesse van de VS voor de ACTA-overeenkomst is bij de start van de onderhandelingen tussen de EU en de VS over een trans-Atlantische handels- en investeringsovereenkomst (TTIP) de vraag aan de orde gekomen of daarin ACTA-achtige bepalingen zouden worden opgenomen. Ondanks de toezegging van de commissaris dat in de TTIP geen bepalingen van de ACTA-overeenkomst zouden worden overgenomen, bevat de definitieve tekst van de handelsovereenkomst tussen de EU en Singapore bepalingen die identiek zijn aan bepalingen in de ACTA-overeenkomst.

In artikel 11.44, lid 2, staat: „Bij de vaststelling van de hoogte van de schadevergoeding wegens inbreuk op een intellectuele-eigendomsrecht hebben de rechterlijke autoriteiten van een partij de bevoegdheid om onder andere door de houder aangevoerde legitieme waardebepalingen, met inbegrip van gederfde winst, de marktwaarde van de goederen of diensten ten aanzien waarvan inbreuk is gemaakt of de voorgestelde detailhandelsprijs, in aanmerking te nemen."

Deze tekst is identiek aan de tekst van artikel 9, lid 1, van de ACTA-overeenkomst. Een aantal andere leden zijn ook exacte kopieën.

1. Is de Commissie het met mij eens dat het onwenselijk is in de handelsovereenkomst tussen de EU en Singapore tekstdelen op te nemen die identiek zijn aan tekstdelen van de ACTA-overeenkomst?

2. Waarom neemt de Commissie in nieuwe internationale overeenkomsten bepalingen op die reeds door het Parlement zijn afgewezen, waarbij er in het bijzonder aan dient te worden herinnerd dat dit de (verplichte) instemming van het Parlement met dat soort overeenkomsten in gevaar kan brengen?

3. Kan de Commissie het volgende bevestigen (of ontkennen, en dan uitleggen waarom niet):

(a) dat er in de vrijhandelsovereenkomst tussen de EU en Singapore geen strafrechtelijke sancties zijn of zullen worden opgenomen voor inbreuken op intellectuele-eigendomsrechten met betrekking tot hetzij goederen, hetzij diensten;

(b) dat zij nog altijd niet streeft naar private handhaving van intellectuele-eigendomsrechten buiten het rechtskader om;

(c) dat zij nog altijd niet streeft naar de opname van de verplichting voor internetintermediairs om persoonsgebonden informatie van vermeende plegers van inbreuken op intellectuele-eigendomsrechten bekend te maken aan de houders van die rechten;

(d) dat zij terdege rekening zal houden met de bezorgdheid van de burgers en het Parlement met betrekking tot de bescherming van de digitale vrijheden in door de EU gesloten internationale overeenkomsten (waaronder vrijhandelsovereenkomsten)?

Antwoord van de heer De Gucht namens de Commissie
(4 december 2013)

De Commissie verzekert het geachte Parlementslid dat het hoofdstuk betreffende intellectuele-eigendomsrechten in de vrijhandelsovereenkomst tussen de EU en Singapore alleen bepalingen bevat die volledig in lijn zijn met het huidige EU-wetgevingskader en in het bijzonder met de handhaving van de Richtlijn inzake intellectuele-eigendomsrechten ([1]) en de Richtlijn inzake elektronische handel ([2]).

([1]) Richtlijn 2004/48/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 29 april 2004 betreffende de handhaving van intellectuele-eigendomsrechten, PB L 157 van 30.4.2004.

([2]) Richtlijn 2000/31/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 8 juni 2000 betreffende bepaalde juridische aspecten van de diensten van de informatiemaatschappij, met name de elektronische handel, in de interne markt (Richtlijn inzake elektronische handel), PB L 178 van 17.7.2000.

Het hoofdstuk betreffende intellectuele-eigendomsrechten in de vrijhandelsovereenkomst EU-Singapore verschilt aanzienlijk van de handelsovereenkomst ter bestrijding van namaak (ACTA). De vrijhandelsovereenkomst EU-Singapore bevat bijvoorbeeld geen strafrechtelijke bepalingen met betrekking tot inbreuken op intellectuele-eigendomsrechten. Daarnaast verschillen de bepalingen met betrekking tot het internet in de vrijhandelsovereenkomst sterk van die in ACTA. In het bijzonder ontbreken de meest controversiele bepalingen op dat vlak (artikelen 27.3 en 27.4 van ACTA) in de vrijhandelsovereenkomst. De tekst is namelijk grotendeels gebaseerd op de Richtlijn inzake elektronische handel, met inbegrip van alle beschermingsmaatregelen.

Wat betreft de bepaling met betrekking tot schadevergoeding geeft artikel 11.44, lid 2, van de vrijhandelsovereenkomst EU-Singapore slechts een overzicht van de vele verschillende optionele methoden waarmee een rechter de hoogte van een schadevergoeding kan berekenen. Dit lid moet echter samen met het eerste lid worden gelezen, waarin het verplichte beginsel wordt vastgesteld dat een dergelijke schadevergoeding voldoende moet zijn om te compenseren voor de geleden schade. Dit garandeert dat er, overeenkomstig het EU-wetgevingskader, binnen de EU geen schadevergoedingen met een punitief karakter zullen worden opgelegd.

Ten slotte bevestigt de Commissie dat zij de beslissing van het Parlement aangaande ACTA volledig erkent en respecteert.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012147/13
to the Commission
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: ACTA provisions in the EU-Singapore trade agreement text

MEPs were assured by the Commissioner for trade, Karel De Gucht, that future EU free trade agreements would not include certain controversial provisions from the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA), which was rejected by Parliament. Given the strong support shown by the US for ACTA, questions were raised at the start of the negotiations between the US and EU on a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) as to whether ACTA-like provisions would be included. Despite the Commissioner's assurances that the TTIP would not see a repetition of ACTA, there are provisions in the final text of the EU-Singapore trade agreement that are identical to provisions in the ACTA.

Article 11.44 (2) states: 'In determining the amount of damages for infringement of intellectual property rights, a Party's judicial authorities shall have the authority to consider, inter alia, any legitimate measure of value the right holder submits, which may include lost profits, the value of the infringed goods or services measured by the market price, or the suggested retail price'.

This passage is identical to Article 9 (1) of the ACTA. Several other paragraphs are also copies.

1. Does the Commission agree that it is undesirable to include text that is identical to parts of the ACTA in the EU-Singapore trade agreement?

2. Why is the Commission including, in new international agreements, provisions that have already been rejected by Parliament, recalling in particular that this could jeopardise Parliament's (mandatory) consent on such an agreement?

3. Can the Commission confirm the following (or if not, explain why not):

(a) that there are and will be no criminal penalties for IPR infringements, either in goods or services, included in the EU-Singapore FTA;

(b) that it still does not seek private enforcement of IPR rights outside the rule of law;

(c) that it still does not seek to include requirements for Internet intermediaries to disclose the personal information of alleged infringers of these rights to right holders;

(d) that it will duly consider the concerns raised by the people and Parliament when it comes to respecting the protection of digital freedoms in international (free trade) agreements concluded by the EU?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(4 December 2013)

The Commission reassures the Honourable Member that the intellectual property rights chapter of the EU-Singapore Free Trade Agreement (FTA) only includes provisions fully aligned with the current EU legal framework and in particular with the enforcement of the intellectual property rights Directive ([1]) and the e-commerce Directive ([2]).

The chapter on intellectual property in the EU-Singapore FTA differs substantially from ACTA. For instance, the EU-Singapore FTA does not contain criminal provisions for Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) infringements. Also, the provisions relating to the Internet are very different. In particular, the most controversial provisions in that respect (ACTA Articles 27.3 and 27.4) are not present in the FTA. In fact, the text is largely inspired by the e-commerce Directive including all its safeguards.

([1]) Directive 2004/48/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the enforcement of intellectual property rights, OJ L 157, 30.4.2004.
([2]) Directive 2000/31/EC of 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 ('Directive on electronic commerce'), OJ L 178, 17.7.2000.

With regard to the provision on damages, paragraph 2 of Article 11.44 of the EU-Singapore FTA only illustrates a wide range of optional methods for a judge to calculate an indemnity. This paragraph however has to be read with the first paragraph, which establishes the mandatory principle that such indemnity must be adequate to compensate the injury suffered. This ensures that in line with the EU legal framework, there will be no punitive damages in the EU.

Finally, the Commission confirms that it fully recognises and respects Parliament's vote regarding ACTA.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012148/13
to the Commission
Brian Simpson (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Hen harrier decline in North West England

According to Annex I of Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds, the hen harrier (circus cyaneus) is subject to the special habitat conservation measures defined under Article 4 of the directive.

Given that the hen harrier is a species native to the United Kingdom, the UK Government is obliged to implement the clear objectives contained within the Conservation of Wild Birds Directive, to ensure the protection of the species.

In 2006, in its reply to Written Question E-4512/2006, the Commission confirmed that it 'does not have grounds to conclude that the United Kingdom is failing to meet its requirements to protect Hen Harriers under Council Directive 79/409/EEC.'

Unfortunately, a recent investigation by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) indicates that hen harriers are 'on the brink of extinction' in England.

Indeed, the situation has become so severe that the UK Government's Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) is working on an emergency recovery plan for the hen harrier in England.

This would suggest that, since the Commission's assessment in 2006, hen harrier conservation efforts in England have been inadequate.

Can the Commission confirm what steps it has taken to monitor the UK's efforts to conserve the hen harrier since 2006?

Given that the conservation policies of the UK Government appear to be ineffective, can the Commission outline what action it will take to ensure the UK's compliance with EU conservation legislation, thereby preventing the extinction of the hen harrier in England and ensuring the recovery of hen harrier numbers?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2013)

The Commission is aware of the unfavourable status of the Hen Harrier *(Circus cyaneus)* in the United Kingdom where, despite suitable habitat, there is evidence that illegal persecution, both during and following the breeding season, continues to limit recovery of the species.

The Commission is aware that the Hen Harrier is one of the UK priorities in terms of combating wildlife crime for the period 2011-2013. The Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC), the UK government's statutory conservation advisors are currently updating 'A Conservation Framework for Hen Harriers in the United Kingdom'. Conservation agencies and stakeholders are also collaborating on a major project in southern Scotland to work with hunting estates to demonstrate co-existence of birds of prey and game shooting interests.

On the basis of available information, the Commission does not have grounds to conclude that the United Kingdom is failing to meet its requirements to protect Hen Harriers under Directive 2009/147/EC ([1]).

Despite the legal protection afforded by EU and national laws, illegal killing of birds, including by poisoning, is still a problem across the EU. The Commission has produced a Roadmap ([2]) aimed at combating illegal killing of birds in the EU with the collaboration of stakeholders, Member States and the Bern Convention.

([1]) Council Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the conservation of wild birds, codifying Directive 79/409/EEC; OJ L 020, 26.1.2010.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/illegal_killing.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012151/13
à la Commission
Robert Goebbels (S&D)
(23 octobre 2013)

Objet: Taxation des carburants

Dans sa réponse à ma question E-006381/2013, la Commission a, comme à son habitude, évité de répondre précisément aux questions posées.

S'il est vrai que le Grand-Duché de Luxembourg pratique une taxation des carburants «moins élevée que dans les pays voisins», et que l'important trafic de transit qui traverse le Luxembourg profite de l'aubaine pour se ravitailler à moindre coût en essence ou en gazole, on ne comprend pas comment le relèvement des prix des carburants au seul Grand-Duché pourrait influer sur les émissions globales de CO2 de l'Union européenne. Si les prix luxembourgeois étaient par exemple supérieurs à ceux pratiqués en Belgique, le «tourisme à la pompe» se déplacerait vers la région frontalière belge. Une grande partie des automobilistes luxembourgeois iraient probablement s'approvisionner en Belgique.

1. La Commission n'a-t-elle pas une vue trop théorique du comportement des automobilistes?

2. Comment une augmentation des taxes sur le carburant préconisée par la Commission pourrait-elle augmenter les «incitations à l'utilisation des transports publics», notamment pour les millions de touristes qui traversent chaque année le Luxembourg pour se rendre dans le Sud de l'Europe? Quid des camionneurs? Comment les inciter à transporter leurs marchandises via les transports publics, alors que les lignes de chemin de fer traversant le Luxembourg ne permettent de desservir que certaines zones bien ciblées du Sud de l'Europe?

Réponse donnée par M. Šemeta au nom de la Commission
(13 décembre 2013)

1. Non. La Commission a été informée des pratiques des transporteurs routiers consistant à faire des détours, par exemple en se rendant du Royaume-Uni en Allemagne afin de bénéficier des prix du gazole moins élevés au Luxembourg.

Le taux d'imposition national actuel pour les carburants au Luxembourg est proche du niveau minimum de taxation de l'UE, ce qui conduit à de tels détours et instaure ainsi une course au carburant le moins cher. Le tourisme à la pompe entraîne des pertes de ressources budgétaires pour les États membres appliquant un droit d'accise relativement élevé sur les carburants. L'incidence sur l'environnement en cas de détours constitue une autre conséquence négative du tourisme à la pompe. En opérateurs rationnels, les conducteurs font jouer le plus possible la différence des prix du gazole et font le plein dans l'État membre où le carburant est le moins cher, tout en tenant compte des coûts supplémentaires associés (les redevances routières, le carburant utilisé et le temps passé, les risques rencontrés sur la route tels que les embouteillages et les accidents, etc.). Lorsque les camionneurs font délibérément des détours sur leur itinéraire pour profiter des différences entre les droits d'accises nationaux, il en découle des effets négatifs nets sur l'environnement en raison de la distance accrue qui est parcourue. La Commission renvoie également à sa réponse à la question écrite E-006381/2013.

2. La Commission réaffirme son avis selon lequel le niveau relativement modéré des taxes sur les carburants réduit l'efficacité des incitations à utiliser les transports publics. Les transports publics ne peuvent pas remplacer entièrement tous les autres moyens de transport. Toutefois, dans de nombreux cas, les transports publics constituent une alternative au transport privé.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012151/13
to the Commission
Robert Goebbels (S&D)
(23 October 2013)

Subject: Tax on fuel

In its answer to my Question E-006381/2013, the Commission avoided directly addressing the questions I asked, as it usually does.

While it is true that the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg taxes fuel 'below the level in neighbouring countries', and that the many drivers who pass through Luxembourg in transit take full advantage of the situation to fill up with petrol or diesel more cheaply, it is not clear how increasing fuel prices in the Luxembourg alone could affect the EU's overall CO2 emissions. Were prices in Luxembourg higher than those in Belgium, for example, 'tank tourists' would move on to the Belgian border region. Many drivers in Luxembourg would probably fill up in Belgium.

1. Is the Commission not taking an overly hypothetical view of how drivers tend to behave?

2. How could increasing fuel taxes, as recommended by the Commission, increase 'incentives to use public transport', particularly for the millions of tourists who pass through Luxembourg each year on their way to southern Europe? What about hauliers? How can hauliers be encouraged to transport freight via public transport, when rail lines crossing Luxembourg only serve certain specific parts of southern Europe?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2013)

1. No. The Commission has been informed of hauliers' practices to make detours on trips e.g. from the UK to Germany in order to benefit from the lower price of gas oil in Luxembourg.

The current national tax rates for motor fuels in Luxembourg are close to the EU minimum tax level, which leads to such detours and thus creates 'tank tourism'. Fuel tourism leads to losses in budgetary resources for those Member States applying a relatively high excise duty on motor fuels. The other negative consequences of fuel tourism are the impact on the environment in the case of detours. As rational operators, drivers will make use of the fuel price difference as much as they can and tank in the Member State where it is the cheapest. In so doing they would also take into account the additional costs involved (road charges, fuel and time spent, risks encountered on the road such as congestion and accidents). When drivers make deliberate detours from their routes to take advantage of the differences in national excise duties, this has a net negative effects on the environment because of the longer distance driven. The Commission also refers you to its reply on your Question E-006381/2013.

2. The Commission confirms its view that relatively low fuel taxes weaken incentives to use public transport. Public transport cannot replace fully all other means of transport. However in many cases public transport is an alternative to private transport.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012153/13
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: EU investigation into Gibraltar tax system

Is it the view of the Commission that Commissioner Almunia can be objective on the subject of Gibraltar?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(29 November 2013)

The Commission recalls that Article 17 (1) and (3) of the Treaty on the European Union provides that the Commission shall promote the general interest of the Union and shall be completely independent; the members of the Commission shall neither seek nor take instructions from any government or other institution, body or entity.

The Commission is of the view that all its Members fully respect these provisions and act in the general interest of the Union.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-012154/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Compraventa de órganos en la EU

En la web de intercambios Milanuncios.com aparecieron recientemente varios anuncios de venta de órganos por dinero ([1]). La Organización Nacional de Trasplantes (ONT) recordó que la compraventa de órganos es un delito tipificado en el Código Penal con penas de hasta 12 años de cárcel y advirtió de que estos anuncios pueden estar relacionados con mafias o ser ganchos para la realización de estafas.

Fuentes de la web defendieron que cada día se suben a ella cerca de 100 000 anuncios gratuitos y que esta cuenta con un total de cuatro millones, lo que dificulta la detección de los que no son adecuados; afirmaron también que colaborarán con la ONT, incluso enviándoles los datos de los anunciantes para que sean investigados.

La denuncia del Ministerio de Sanidad ante la brigada de delitos telemáticos de la Guardia Civil llevó esta semana a la desaparición en minutos de estos anuncios.

¿Está al corriente la Comisión de estos hechos?

¿Qué medidas se deberían tomar (o se están tomando) para evitar que estos anuncios se extiendan al resto de países de la UE?

¿Qué medidas se deberían tomar (o se están tomando) para evitar la compraventa de órganos en la EU?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de diciembre de 2013)

La Comisión comparte la preocupación de Su Señoría acerca de la publicidad relacionada con la supuesta compra y venta de órganos.

La Directiva 2010/53/UE ([2]) establece el marco de normas de calidad y seguridad para los órganos humanos destinados al trasplante. El artículo 13 obliga a los Estados miembros a velar por que las donaciones de órganos sean voluntarias y no retribuidas y a prohibir que se anuncie la necesidad o la disponibilidad de órganos, si con tal publicidad se pretende ofrecer o tratar de obtener un beneficio económico o una ventaja comparable. Por otra parte, la Directiva 2011/36/UE ([3]) hace punible la trata de seres humanos, incluyendo la que tiene como objeto la extracción de órganos.

Además, el Plan de Acción sobre Órganos ([4]) insta a los Estados miembros a celebrar acuerdos a escala de la UE para supervisar la envergadura del tráfico de órganos. Uno de los principales objetivos del Plan es apoyar los esfuerzos para aumentar la disponibilidad de órganos, que se considera comúnmente como la manera más eficaz de luchar contra el comercio ilegal de órganos. Un proyecto en curso financiado por la UE ([5]) pretende apoyar estos objetivos ampliando la información sobre el tráfico de órganos y desarrollando de una serie de indicadores para identificar y evaluar tales actividades.

La Comisión está comprobando actualmente el grado de transposición de las Directivas anteriormente mencionadas y está previsto un informe al Parlamento sobre la aplicación de la Directiva 2010/53/UE durante el año 2014. Asimismo, la Comisión está preparando una revisión intermedia del Plan de Acción cuya publicación está prevista para principios de 2014. Estas iniciativas proporcionarán una imagen más completa del progreso actual y también de lo que queda aún por hacer para combatir el tráfico de órganos.

([1]) http://www.elperiodico.com/es/noticias/sociedad/sanidad-hace-retirar-una-web-anuncios-venta-organos-2762911
([2]) Directiva 2010/53/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 7 de julio de 2010, sobre normas de calidad y seguridad de los órganos humanos destinados al trasplante (DO L 207 de 6.8.2010, p. 14-29).
([3]) Directiva 2011/36/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 5 abril de 2011, relativa a la prevención y lucha contra la trata de seres humanos y a la protección de las víctimas y por la que se sustituye la Decisión marco 2002/629/JAI del Consejo (DO L 101 de 15.4.2011, p. 1-11).
([4]) Plan de acción sobre donación y trasplante de órganos (2009-15): cooperación reforzada entre los Estados miembros (COM(2008) 819 final).
([5]) Acción contra el tráfico de órganos humanos para trasplantes (proyecto HOTT).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012154/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Buying and selling of organs in the EU

Recently, numerous advertisements selling organs for money appeared on the trading website Milanuncios.com ([1]). The National Transplant Organisation (NTO) pointed out that the buying and selling of organs was a criminal offence under the Criminal Code punishable by up to 12 years in prison and warned that these advertisements could be linked to mafia organisations or could be bait for scams.

Sources from the site rose to the defence, saying that every day close to 100 000 free advertisements are submitted to it and that the site has 4 million advertisements in total, which makes it difficult to detect those which are inappropriate. They also stated that they would work together with the NTO and would even send it advertisers' data so that they could be investigated.

This week, these advertisements disappeared within minutes of the Ministry of Health reporting the matter to the Guardia Civil's cybercrime team.

Is the Commission aware of these facts?

What measures should be taken (or are being taken) to stop these advertisements from reaching the rest of the EU countries?

What measures should be taken (or are being taken) to prevent the buying and selling of organs in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2013)

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's concern regarding advertisements linked to the purported buying and selling of organs.

Directive 2010/53/EU ([2]) lays down the quality and safety framework for human organs intended for transplantation. Article 13 obliges Member States to ensure that donations of organs are voluntary and unpaid and to prohibit advertising the need for, or availability of, organs, where such advertising is with a view to offering or seeking financial gain or comparable advantage. In addition, Directive 2011/36/EU ([3]) criminalises the act of trafficking in human beings including for the purposes of organ removal.

Furthermore, the Organs Action Plan ([4]) calls on Member States to establish EU-wide agreements on monitoring the extent of organ trafficking. One of the main objectives of the Plan is to support efforts to increase organ availability — commonly held as the most effective way of combating the illegal trade in organs. An ongoing EU-funded project ([5]) aims to support these aims by increasing knowledge of organ trafficking and by developing a set of indicators to identify and measure such activities.

The Commission is currently verifying the degree of transposition of the abovementioned Directives and a report to Parliament on the implementation of Directive 2010/53/EU is foreseen during the course of 2014. Moreover, the Commission is preparing a mid-term review of the action plan due for publication in early 2014. These initiatives will provide a fuller picture of current progress and also what still needs to be done in order to combat organ trafficking.

([1]) http://www.elperiodico.com/es/noticias/sociedad/sanidad-hace-retirar-una-web-anuncios-venta-organos-2762911
([2]) Directive 2010/53/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 July 2010 on standards of quality and safety of human organs intended for transplantation, OJ L 207, 6.8.2010, p. 14-29.
([3]) Directive 2011/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA, OJ L 101, 15.4.2011, p. 1-11.
([4]) Action Plan on Organ donation and Transplantation 2009-15: Strengthened cooperation between Member States, COM(2008) 819/3.
([5]) Action against Human Organ Trafficking for Transplantation (HOTT Project).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-012155/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Objetivos en materia de energía para el año 2020

Uno de los objetivos que se pretender lograr en 2020 es que cada uno de los Estados de la UE pueda importar de sus vecinos un 10 % de la energía que consume. El mapa europeo con las megainfraestructuras energéticas, repleto de rayas en países nórdicos y centroeuropeos, aparecía casi intacto en la Península Ibérica. Estamos en el año 2013 y el comisario Oettinger ha admitido que solo dos miembros de la UE saben ya que no van a alcanzar el objetivo con el que se trata de impulsar un mercado paneuropeo: España y Francia ([1]).

«El limitado número de líneas internacionales españolas que hay en el listado de la Comisión Europea refleja la escasez de proyectos presentados por las autoridades nacionales», sintetiza Georg Zachmann, experto en energía del think-tank Bruegel.

Si se toma como referencia la potencia instalada —unos 100 000 megavatios—, está a una distancia sideral; pero si la referencia es algo más modesta —la demanda en punta, en torno a 45 000 megavatios—, la capacidad se quedará cerca del 5 %. Es decir, se quedaría justo a medio camino de la meta que Europa fija para el resto de los países. Además de dar un empujón a la integración de los mercados energéticos europeos, se persigue diversificar sus fuentes, contribuir a poner fin al aislamiento energético de algunos Estados y permitir a la red absorber mayores cantidades de energías renovables, reduciendo así las emisiones de CO_2.

Europa será competitiva cuando todos los Estados miembros cumplan la normativa y los objetivos de la UE para 2020. Si algunos Estados miembros no cumplen, el conjunto de la UE se resiente.

¿Qué medidas piensa tomar la Comisión para que España y Francia cumplan los objetivos energéticos para 2020?

¿Les impondrá alguna sanción?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisióne
(27 de noviembre de 2013)

En la primavera de 2014, la Comisión lanzará la plataforma en línea, de conformidad con lo dispuesto en el artículo 25 de la Directiva de Eficiencia Energética. La plataforma en línea permitirá efectuar intercambios interactivos de experiencias y buenas prácticas entre Estados miembros; estará concebida de tal forma que en ella tenga cabida la aplicación a nivel local y regional, además de a nivel nacional.

Su promoción se efectuará de distintas maneras, entre ellas a través del Comité de la Directiva de Eficiencia Energética y de la Acción Concertada ([2]), que reúne a los representantes de los Estados miembros para debatir la aplicación práctica de la Directiva de Eficiencia Energética.

([1]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2013/10/18/actualidad/1382120141_519914.html
([2]) http://www.esd-ca.eu

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012155/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Energy objectives for 2020

One of the objectives to be achieved by 2020 is that each EU Member State should be able to import 10% of the energy it consumes from its neighbours. The map of Europe showing energy mega-infrastructures, which is full of stripes in Nordic and central European countries, used to appear almost empty in the Iberian Peninsula. It is now 2013 and Commissioner Oettinger has admitted that only two EU Member States now know that they will not reach the objective aimed at driving a pan-European market: Spain and France ([1]).

The limited number of Spanish international infrastructures in the Commission's list reflects the lack of projects presented by the national authorities, according to Georg Zachmann, an energy expert from the think tank Bruegel.

If we use the installed capacity — 100 000 megawatts — as a reference, it is a long way off; but if the reference is more modest — peak demand, around 45 000 megawatts — capacity will remain at around 5%. In other words, it would remain just halfway towards the target set by Europe for the rest of the countries. Apart from boosting the integration of European energy markets, the idea is to diversify their sources, help put an end to the energy isolation of certain States and enable the network to absorb higher amounts of renewable energy, thereby reducing CO_2 emissions.

Europe will be competitive when all Member States comply with the legislation and the EU 2020 objectives. If some Member States do not comply, the whole of the EU suffers.

What measures does the Commission intend to take to ensure that Spain and France meet the 2020 energy objectives?

Will they face any sanctions?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(27 November 2013)

The Commission will launch the online platform pursuant to Article 25 of the Energy Efficiency Directive in spring 2014. The online platform will allow for interactive exchanges of best practices and experiences amongst Member States and it will be constructed in such a way as to include implementation at local and regional level as well as national.

It will be promoted in various ways, including via the Energy Efficiency Directive Committee and the Concerted Action ([2]) that brings together representatives of the Member States to discuss practical implementation of the Energy Efficiency Directive.

([1]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2013/10/18/actualidad/1382120141_519914.html
([2]) http://www.esd-ca.eu

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012156/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(24 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Acțiuni ca urmare a Deceniului incluziunii romilor

Minoritatea romă este una dintre cele mai dezavantajate minorități din Europa. Agenția UE pentru Drepturile Fundamentale afirmă că unul din trei romi sunt șomeri iar 90% dintre aceștia trăiesc sub pragul sărăciei. Conform recensământului din 2011, în România trăiesc 621 573 de romi, ceea ce reprezintă 3,3% din totalul populației. În întreaga Europă, numărul total de romi este estimat între 10 și 12 milioane. Romii trebuie să înfrunte un grad foarte înalt de discriminare și segregare.

În 2005 a fost lansat Deceniul incluziunii romilor, având drept scop îmbunătățirea vieții romilor prin îmbunătățirea statutului lor socioeconomic și prin asigurarea incluziunii lor sociale în întreaga regiune. Inițiativa reprezintă rezultatul eforturilor combinate ale 12 țări europene și se va desfășura până în 2015.

În contextul în care această inițiativă se apropie de sfârșit:

1. Ce acțiuni sunt adoptate în acest domeniu de către statele membre care nu participă la Deceniul incluziunii romilor?

2. Ce inițiative în materie de politici propune Comisia pentru capacitarea minorității rome după încheierea Deceniului incluziunii romilor?

Răspuns dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei
(11 decembrie 2013)

Deceniul incluziunii romilor 2005-2015 este o inițiativă internațională care are drept obiectiv incluziunea romilor, desfășurându-se conform propriilor săi termeni de referință. Această inițiativă nu este finanțată sau gestionată de către Comisie.

Uniunea Europeană are propria sa politică privind incluziunea romilor, care este prevăzută în cadrul UE pentru strategiile naționale de integrare a romilor până în 2020, propus de Comisie în aprilie 2011 ([1]) și aprobat de Consiliul European în iunie 2011 ([2]). Fondurile structurale europene, și mai ales Fondul social european, sprijină în mod concret aceste strategii.

Cu toate acestea, conform celor subliniate de către Comisie în diverse ocazii, complementaritatea dintre cadrul UE pentru strategiile naționale de integrare a romilor, strategia de extindere a UE și Deceniul incluziunii romilor este indispensabilă.

În acest scop, Comisia și Secretariatul Deceniului colaborează îndeaproape și au o cooperare fructuoasă la nivel general. Comisia a participat la procesul de consultare cu privire la viitorul acestei inițiative, întrucât mandatul Deceniului se va încheia în luna iunie 2015. Comisia va respecta decizia statelor membre ale Deceniului cu privire la oportunitatea continuării acestei inițiative și cu privire la eventuala sa formă.

([1]) COM(2011) 173 final.
([2]) EUCO 23/11.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012156/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Follow-up to the Decade of Roma Inclusion

Roma are one of the most disadvantaged minorities in Europe. The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights states that one in three Roma are unemployed and 90% live below the poverty line. According to the 2011 census, there are 621 573 Roma in Romania, making up 3.3% of the total population. In total throughout Europe their numbers are estimated at between 10 and 12 million. Roma have to face high levels of perceived discrimination and segregation.

2005 saw the launch of the Decade of Roma Inclusion, with the goal of enhancing the lives of Roma by improving their socioeconomic status and ensuring the social inclusion of this minority across the region. The initiative is the result of the combined efforts of 12 European countries and will run until 2015.

As the Decade of Roma Inclusion draws to a close:

1. What action is being taken on the issue by those Member States which are not participating in the Decade of Roma Inclusion?

2. What policy initiatives has the Commission proposed to empower the Roma minority after the Decade of Roma Inclusion ends?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

The Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 is an international initiative focusing on Roma inclusion which operates according to the Decade's Terms of Reference. It is not founded or managed by the Commission.

The European Union does have its own policy regarding Roma inclusion, embodied by the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020, proposed by the Commission in April 2011 ([1]) and endorsed by the European Council in June 2011 ([2]). The European Structural Funds, and mainly the European Social Fund, concretely support these Strategies.

However, as emphasised on various occasions by the Commission, complementarity between the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies, the EU enlargement strategy and the Decade of Roma Inclusion, is indispensable.

To this effect, the Commission and the Decade Secretariat work closely together and have a generally fruitful cooperation. The Commission has participated in the consultation process on the future of the Decade beyond its mandate ending in June 2015. The Commission will respect the decision of the Decade Member States whether and under which format the Decade for Roma inclusion should continue.

([1]) COM(2011) 173 final.
([2]) EUCO 23/11.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012157/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Attacks on protestors in Egypt

I have been contacted by a constituent, who tells me that the Egyptian army recently attacked unarmed civilians at the two protest camps in Cairo. He tells me that, according to the latest report, 94 bodies have been counted and that more are being discovered.

My constituent believes that the protestors are largely peaceful in their support for democracy and that the ambivalence shown by the Egyptian Government towards the situation is unsatisfactory. He is concerned that the Egyptian army holds more influence than the government.

Given that my constituent is concerned about the safety of protestors in Egypt and the actions of the Egyptian army, will the Commission answer the following:

1. Is it aware of the attacks on the camps by the Egyptian army?

2. If so, is it currently in dialogue with the Egyptian authorities, and have any results been achieved with a view to protecting the welfare of protestors?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2013)

The European Union is well aware of the situation in Egypt, including the protest camps in Cairo. The EU remains concerned about the continued political polarization and violence in Egypt. The HR/VP issued several statements following the dispersal of the protest camps deploring the loss of lives and injuries and asking all sides to exercise utmost restraint. In its conclusions of 21 August 2013, the Foreign Affairs Council condemned 'in the clearest possible terms all acts of violence' and asked 'to launch an independent investigation into all the killings'. The EU Delegation in Cairo is following the developments closely on the ground.

The EU continues to call for an inclusive process not excluding any political group respecting democratic principles and renouncing the use of violence in order to lead to deep and sustainable democracy as the only solution to the current situation. The HR/VP has been several times travelling to Egypt talking to all sides and the EU also continues to offer its good offices and is ready to talk to all sides if invited to do so without taking a mediation role.

The EU is following the developments closely, including new legislation regarding the right to assembly and demonstration.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012158/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Rights of the LGBT community in Lithuania and Latvia

I have been contacted by a number of constituents who are concerned about the rights of LGBT people living in Lithuania.

My constituents are concerned that Lithuania is pressing forward with anti-homosexuality laws despite the European Union resolution condemning such laws. They are also concerned that similar laws are being drafted in Latvia and Ukraine.

Given that Lithuania and Latvia are EU Member States, and that ties are being strengthened with Moldova and Ukraine, could the Commission confirm:

1. whether it has raised the issue of anti-homosexuality laws with the Latvian and Lithuanian Governments and whether it is putting any pressure on them to reverse their current policy?

2. whether it is taking these discriminatory laws into account when planning closer ties with the Ukraine?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(20 December 2013)

It is for Member States, including their judicial authorities, to ensure that fundamental rights are effectively respected and protected in accordance with their international human rights obligations, including the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). The Commission competence is limited to cases when the implementation of European Union law is at stake.

The Commission is nevertheless following very closely all developments that are relevant to LGBT people in all Member States of the European Union and will raise the concerns of the Honourable Member at a political level in bilateral dialogues with the Member States in question.

In Ukraine, the Commission will follow closely any further developments on the two pending draft laws, submitted by MPs, taking into account the concerns raised by the Venice Commission in its opinion 707/2012 issued on 18 June 2013. In addition, under the Visa Liberalisation Action Plan, Ukraine is expected to adopt comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation, as recommended by UN and Council of Europe monitoring bodies, to ensure effective protection against discrimination.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012160/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Protection of ortolans in France

I have been contacted by a constituent who is concerned about the slaughter of songbirds in the EU, in particular of ortolans in France.

He tells me that these birds are being trapped and killed on a regular basis, even though they are an endangered species.

1. Is the Commission aware of the slaughter of ortolans in France?

2. If so, has it raised this issue with the French authorities?

3. Has the French Government agreed to take action to protect the birds and does it intend to monitor this action?

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

The Commission is aware of the illegal trapping of Ortolan Bunting (*Emberiza Hortulana*) in South western France. Further to exchanges with the French authorities the Commission launched an infringement procedure against France by issuing, on 24 January 2013, a letter of formal notice under Article 258 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union for failing to protect the Ortolan Bunting, as requested by Article 5 of the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC ([1])). The Commission asked the French authorities for detailed information on police controls carried out in autumn 2013. It will assess the issue based on the latest available information and decide on further steps.

([1]) OJ L 020, 26.1.2010.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012164/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 octobre 2013)

Objet: Pollution de l'air classée cancérigène

Quelque 223 000 personnes sont mortes en 2010 dans le monde d'un cancer du poumon provoqué par l'inhalation de substances toxiques contenues dans l'air ambiant. Le Centre international de recherche sur le cancer (CIRC) dit disposer d'éléments démontrant de manière convaincante que la pollution atmosphérique accroît le risque de cancer de la vessie, de maladies respiratoires et de troubles cardiaques.

Les recherches montrent que l'exposition des populations à cette pollution s'est accrue de manière significative dans les pays fortement peuplés et connaissant une croissance industrielle rapide, comme la Chine. Nous savons aujourd'hui que la pollution de l'air extérieur ne constitue pas seulement un risque majeur pour la santé en général mais qu'elle est aussi une cause environnementale prépondérante des décès liés au cancer. L'air que nous respirons est pollué par un mélange de substances responsables du cancer, ajoute le CIRC. Dans son communiqué publié jeudi, il préconise que la pollution atmosphérique et les particules solides ou liquides en suspension dans l'air soient classées dans le groupe 1 des substances cancérigènes pour l'homme. Ce groupe 1 regroupe une centaine de substances connues pour leurs effets cancérigènes comme l'amiante, le plutonium, la poussière de silice, les radiations d'ultraviolet et la fumée de cigarette.

Dès lors, la pollution de l'air ne devrait-elle pas être classée comme cancérigène?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(29 novembre 2013)

Le Centre international de recherche sur le cancer (CIRC) a classé la pollution de l'air extérieur et les particules comme cancérigènes pour l'homme. L'OMS a en outre récemment présenté à la Commission des informations actualisées concernant les avis relatifs aux aspects sanitaires de la pollution atmosphérique, ainsi que les facteurs de risque pris en considération dans les évaluations des effets sur la santé qui sont utilisées pour l'élaboration des politiques européennes ([1]). Les facteurs de risques actualisés, qui s'appuient essentiellement sur le même matériel scientifique que celui utilisé par le CIEC, comprennent également les facteurs de risque liés au cancer. Ces avis sont utilisés dans le cadre de l'actuel réexamen de la politique de l'UE en matière de qualité de l'air, au sujet de laquelle la Commission présentera prochainement des propositions.

([1]) OMS http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/environment-and-health/air-quality/publications/2013/review-of-evidence-on-health-aspects-of-air-pollution-revihaap-project-final-technical-report

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012164/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Air pollution classified as carcinogenic

Worldwide about 223 000 people died in 2010 of lung cancer caused by breathing in toxic substances in the air. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) says that it has convincing proof that atmospheric pollution increases the risk of bladder cancer, respiratory disease and heart disorders.

Research shows that people's exposure to this pollution has increased significantly in densely populated countries undergoing rapid industrial growth, like China. Today we know that pollution in the outside air is not just a major risk for health in general, but is also an overwhelming environmental cause of cancer deaths. IARC adds that the air we breathe is polluted by a mixture of substances which cause cancer. In a statement issued on Thursday, it recommends that atmospheric pollution and suspensions of solid or liquid particles in the air be classified in group 1 of substances causing cancer in humans. Group 1 contains around a hundred substances known to be carcinogenic, such as asbestos, plutonium, silica dust, ultra-violet radiation and cigarette smoke.

Should air pollution not consequently be classified as a carcinogen?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(29 November 2013)

The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) has classified outdoor air pollution and particulate matter as carcinogenic to humans. The WHO has in addition recently provided updated advice to the Commission on air pollution health aspects, and updated risk factors for the health impact assessments used in EU policy development ([1]). Those updated risk factors also include the cancer risk factors, largely based on the same scientific material used by IARC. Thise advice is being used in the context of the current review of EU air quality policy, on which the Commission will be presenting proposals shortly.

([1]) WHO http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/environment-and-health/air-quality/publications/2013/review-of-evidence-on-health-aspects-of-air-pollution-revihaap-project-final-technical-report

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012165/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 octobre 2013)

Objet: STOP aux bonus

Rabobank supprime le système de rémunération variable pour les membres du conseil d'administration. Cette décision a été motivée par la position des clients sur le sujet et par le point de vue de la société à l'égard des bonus bancaires. Pour les années 2012 et 2013, Rabobank avait déjà décidé de ne pas octroyer de bonus. Les salaires fixes sont, eux, gelés jusqu'en 2015.

1. La Commission pourrait-elle dresser une liste des banques qui font de même et de celles qui ne le font pas?

2. Concernant les banques qui continuent de distribuer des bonus plantureux alors que les épargnants ont des taux ridiculement bas — pour autant que les citoyens aient encore de quoi épargner… —, que compte faire la Commission pour mettre fin à ce système anachronique et éloigné de la situation financière des citoyens européens?

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(13 décembre 2013)

La Commission n'envisage pas pour l'instant de dresser une liste des banques qui mettent en place de telles mesures, mais elle va suivre la situation de près, en collaboration avec les autorités nationales compétentes.

La nouvelle directive sur les exigences de fonds propres («CRD IV» ([1])) contient des règles spécifiques ([2]) sur la politique de rémunération des banques, qui définissent notamment des ratios appropriés entre composantes fixe et variable de la rémunération totale pour toutes les catégories de personnel, incluant la direction générale, les preneurs de risques et les personnes exerçant une fonction de contrôle, ainsi que tout salarié qui, au vu de ses revenus globaux, se trouve dans la même tranche de rémunération que la direction générale et les preneurs de risques, dont les activités professionnelles ont une incidence significative sur le profil de risque de leur établissement.

Conformément à la CRD IV, les États membres doivent exiger des établissements qu'ils appliquent les principes mentionnés ci-dessus aux rémunérations accordées pour les services fournis ou pour les performances de travail à compter de 2014, qu'elles soient dues sur la base de contrats existants ou nouveaux.

Le règlement ([3]) adopté avec la CRD IV contient également des règles ([4]) régissant la communication par les banques d'informations relatives à leurs politiques de rémunération, y compris les ratios entre les rémunérations fixe et variable définis conformément à la CRD IV.

La Commission contrôlera la mise en œuvre de la CRD IV par les États membres ainsi que l'application concrète des mesures nationales par les autorités compétentes.

([1]) Directive 2013/36/UE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 26 juin 2013 concernant l'accès à l'activité des établissements de crédit et la surveillance prudentielle des établissements de crédit et des entreprises d'investissement, modifiant la directive 2002/87/CE et abrogeant les directives 2006/48/CE et 2006/49/CE (JO L 176 du 27.6.2013, p. 338).

([2]) Articles 92 et 94 de la directive 2013/36/UE.

([3]) Règlement (UE) n° 575/2013 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 26 juin 2013 concernant les exigences prudentielles applicables aux établissements de crédit et aux entreprises d'investissement et modifiant le règlement (UE) n° 648/2012 (JO L 176 du 27.6.2013, p. 1).

([4]) Article 450 du règlement n° 575/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012165/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: STOP the bonuses

Rabobank is scrapping the system of variable pay for members of its Board of Directors. This decision was prompted by its customers' opinions on the matter and by the company's perspective on bank bonuses. Rabobank had already decided against granting bonuses for 2012 and 2013. Fixed salaries are themselves frozen until 2015.

1. Could the Commission draw up a list of banks that are doing the same and those that are not?

2. With regard to banks continuing to distribute massive bonuses while savers enjoy ridiculously low rates (provided that citizens still have money to save …), what does the Commission intend to do to put a stop to this anachronistic system, far removed from the financial position faced by citizens of Europe?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2013)

At the moment, the Commission does not envisage to draw up a list of banks that are putting in place such measures but will monitor the situation closely together with the national competent authorities.

The new Capital Requirements Directive ('CRD IV' ([1])) contains specific rules ([2]) on remuneration in banks providing, *inter alia*, for appropriate limits to the ratio between the fixed and the variable components of the total remuneration for all categories of staff including senior management, risk takers, staff engaged in control functions and any employee receiving total remuneration that takes them into the same remuneration bracket as senior management and risk takers, whose professional activities have a material impact on their institution's risk profile.

CRD IV provides that Member States must require institutions to apply the provisions referred to above to remuneration awarded for services provided or performance from the year 2014 onwards, whether due on the basis of existing or new contracts.

The regulation ([3]) adopted together with CRD IV also contains rules ([4]) governing the disclosure by banks of information relating to their remuneration policies, including the ratios between fixed and variable remuneration set pursuant to CRD IV.

The Commission will monitor the implementation of CRD IV by the Member States and the concrete application of the national measures by the competent authorities.

([1]) Directive 2013/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on the access to the activity of credit institutions and the prudential supervision of credit institutions and investment firms, amending Directive 2002/87/EC and repealing Directives 2006/48/EC and 2006/49/EC, OJ L 176, 27.6.2013, p. 338.

([2]) Articles 92 and 94 of Directive 2013/36/EU.

([3]) Regulation (EU) No 575/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on prudential requirements for credit institutions and investment firms and amending Regulation (EU) No 648/2012, OJ L 176, 27.6.2013, p. 1.

([4]) Article 450 of Regulation 575/2013.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012166/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 octobre 2013)

Objet: Électronique verte

En 2010, la Commission a identifié une liste de quatorze matières premières importantes du point de vue économique qui sont sujettes à un plus grand risque d'interruption de leur approvisionnement.

Comment les leaders de l'industrie vont-ils pouvoir faire face à cette menace?

Ces matières premières sont-elles encore primordiales?

Cette liste est-elle la même trois ans plus tard?

Concrètement, quelles sont les actions entreprises depuis la création de la liste en 2010?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(11 décembre 2013)

L'initiative «matières premières» a été lancée pour apporter des réponses aux problèmes relatifs aux matières premières au niveau de l'UE, y compris l'identification des matières premières essentielles. La première analyse des matières premières essentielles pour l'UE a été publiée en 2010. La Commission a formellement adopté une liste de quatorze matières premières essentielles et a proposé qu'elle soit régulièrement mise à jour au moins tous les trois ans.

Toutes les matières premières qui étaient considérées comme vitales dans l'étude de 2010 sont en cours de réévaluation en 2013. La Commission doit publier un résumé de l'étude en janvier 2014. La liste des matières premières essentielles doit être officiellement adoptée par la Commission dans le courant de 2014. Par rapport à l'étude de 2010, dans laquelle 41 matières premières ont été analysées, l'étude de 2014 porte sur 54 matières premières non énergétiques, non alimentaires et abiotiques et, pour la première fois, biotiques.

La liste des matières premières essentielles s'est révélée utile en tant qu'instrument pour attirer l'attention des responsables politiques, promouvoir la coordination des politiques nationales relatives à l'approvisionnement en ressources minérales et aux matières premières essentielles, s'opposer aux mesures susceptibles d'aboutir à une distorsion du commerce, analyser le fonctionnement des marchés et promouvoir la recherche. Elle a aussi servi de point de référence lorsque le Conseil économique transatlantique (CET) a arrêté un programme de travail sur les matières premières en novembre 2011.

La liste de l'UE constitue également un outil à la disposition de l'industrie pour obtenir des informations sur les matières premières considérées comme essentielles pour l'économie européenne. Les entreprises sont les mieux placées pour définir quelles matières premières sont essentielles à chacune et prendre les mesures nécessaires afin de garantir la sécurité de leurs approvisionnements.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012166/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Green electronics

In 2010 the Commission identified a list of 14 raw materials of strategic economic importance whose supply was at an increased risk of interruption.

How are industry leaders facing up to this threat?

Are these raw materials still of prime importance?

Is the list still the same three years later?

What concrete action has been taken since the list was created in 2010?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

The Raw Materials Initiative was instigated to manage responses to raw materials issues at an EU level including defining critical raw materials. The first analysis of EU critical raw materials was published in 2010. The Commission formally adopted a list of 14 critical raw materials and proposed that it will regularly update it at least every 3 years.

All the raw materials that were deemed critical in the 2010 study are being assessed again in 2013. A summary of the study is to be published by the Commission in January 2014. The list of critical raw materials is to be officially adopted by the Commission later in 2014. Compared with the 2010 study, in which 41 materials were analysed, the scope of materials considered in this study includes 54 non-energy, non-food abiotic and, for the first time, biotic materials.

The critical raw materials list has proven successful in serving as a tool to raise attention of policy-makers, promote coordination of national policies regarding mineral supply and critical materials, challenge trade distortive measures regarding critical raw materials, analyse the functioning of the markets and promote research. The list has also served as a reference point when the Transatlantic Economic Council (TEC) agreed to a Raw Materials Work Plan in November 2011.

The EU list also constitutes a tool at industry's disposal for information on which raw materials are deemed critical for the European economy. Companies are best placed to identify the raw materials that are important to each of them and to take the necessary steps to secure their supply.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012169/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 octobre 2013)

Objet: Concession Samsung

Cinq ans de répit. ZDnet.com rapporte que, concernant certains brevets, Samsung n'attaquera plus ses petits camarades en justice pendant une demi-décennie.

1. Cela met-il donc fin à la procédure de la Commission?

En échange, toute entreprise qui voudra utiliser les technologies protégées par les brevets de Samsung devra s'acquitter de droits de licence à des conditions raisonnables, équitables et non discriminatoires. En cas de désaccord sur ces droits pendant plus d'un an, un tribunal pourra être saisi pour arbitrage.

Cette information fait partie des dernières concessions de Samsung à la Commission européenne.

2. Samsung va-t-il éviter l'amende? Certes il y a concession, mais ces concessions ont pour origine une fraude. Comment la Commission se positionne-t-elle?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(17 décembre 2013)

Le 27 septembre 2013, Samsung a proposé des engagements, en application de l'article 9 du règlement (CE) nº 1/2003, de nature à répondre aux préoccupations en matière de concurrence exprimées par la Commission dans sa communication des griefs adoptée le 21 décembre 2012.

Ces engagements ont fait l'objet d'une consultation auprès des acteurs du marché ([1]). Le délai pour les observations à présenter par les tiers intéressés avait été fixé au 18 novembre 2013. La Commission examine actuellement ces observations. Si, à la lumière de ces dernières, la Commission estime que les engagements proposés par Samsung répondent de manière appropriée à ses préoccupations en matière de concurrence, elle peut adopter une décision en application de l'article 9 du règlement nº 1/2003, laquelle rendrait juridiquement contraignants les engagements de Samsung. Ceci mettrait alors fin à la procédure de la Commission.

Toutefois, si elle estime que les engagements proposés par Samsung ne répondent pas de manière appropriée aux problèmes de concurrence identifiés, la Commission peut revenir à la procédure prévue à l'article 7 du règlement nº 1/2003.

([1]) Communication de la Commission publiée conformément à l'article 27, paragraphe 4, du règlement (CE) n° 1/2003 du Conseil dans l'affaire AT.39939 — Samsung — Respect des brevets essentiels pour la norme UMTS, JO C 302 du 18.10.2013, p. 14.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012169/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Samsung concessions

According to an article on ZDnet.com, Samsung is to give its fellow market players five years breathing space by no longer bringing certain patent infringement cases against them during that period.

1. Does this therefore put an end to the Commission's procedure?

In exchange, companies wishing to use the technologies protected by Samsung's patents must take out licences on fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory (FRAND) terms. If no licensing agreement is reached after12 months, the courts may be involved to arbitrate the dispute.

This information covers some of Samsung's recent concessions to the Commission.

2. Is Samsung going to avoid a fine? Whilst concessions have been made, they have been made due to an act of fraud. What is the Commission's position?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

On 27 September 2013, Samsung offered commitments pursuant to Article 9 of Regulation 1/2003 to meet the competition concerns expressed by the Commission in its Statement of Objections adopted on 21 December 2012.

The commitments have been market-tested ([1]). The deadline for observations by interested third parties was 18 November 2013. The Commission is currently evaluating those observations. If, in light of those observations, the Commission considers that the commitments proposed by Samsung adequately address its competition concerns, it may adopt a decision pursuant to Article 9 of Regulation 1/2003 making them legally binding on Samsung. This would then put an end to the Commission's procedure.

If, however, the Commission considers that the commitments proposed by Samsung do not adequately address its competition concerns, the Commission may revert to proceedings pursuant to Article 7 of Regulation 1/2003.

([1]) Communication from the Commission published pursuant to Article 27(4) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2003 in Case AT.39939 — Samsung — Enforcement of UMTS standard essential patents, OJ C 302, 18.10.2013, p. 14-15.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012170/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 octobre 2013)

Objet: Financement participatif

La Commission européenne a lancé une consultation invitant les parties prenantes à partager leurs points de vue au sujet du financement participatif: ses avantages, ses risques éventuels et la conception d'un cadre politique optimal pour dégager le potentiel de cette nouvelle forme de financement pour les acteurs culturels et créatifs.

La consultation couvre toutes les formes de financement participatif, des dons aux placements financiers. Tout le monde est invité à partager son opinion en répondant au questionnaire en ligne, y compris les citoyens qui pourraient contribuer à ces campagnes de financement et les entrepreneurs qui pourraient les lancer. Les autorités nationales et les plateformes de financement participatif sont particulièrement encouragées à répondre.

1. Quel est l'objectif de la consultation pour la Commission?

2. Comment compte-t-elle encourager la croissance de cette nouvelle industrie?

3. Quel est l'agenda de la Commission à ce sujet?

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(6 janvier 2014)

Le 3 octobre 2013, la Commission a lancé une consultation publique sur le financement participatif, qui se clôturera le 31 décembre 2013.

L'objectif de cette consultation est d'évaluer la valeur ajoutée potentielle de l'action de l'UE. Bien que le financement participatif dispose d'un potentiel prometteur en vue de financer la croissance et de promouvoir l'innovation sociale, culturelle et technique à travers l'Europe, il pourrait également présenter certains risques. L'essor du financement participatif passe impérativement par une protection efficace des donateurs et par l'instauration d'un environnement juridique clair pour ces pratiques en mutation. Conscients de cet état de fait, certains États membres ont déjà commencé à réglementer le financement participatif au niveau national. En outre, l'Autorité européenne des marchés financiers (AEMF) et l'Organisation internationale des commissions de valeurs mobilières (OICV) ont également entrepris de récolter des informations sur les cadres juridiques applicables.

La consultation lancée par la Commission vérifie des options non législatives, telles que la sensibilisation et le partage de bonnes pratiques, ainsi que l'autorégulation. Les parties prenantes sont appelées à donner leur avis sur des options législatives telles que la corégulation, le financement jumelé, les modifications législatives apportées à la législation en vigueur ou l'instauration d'un régime européen spécialement adapté au financement participatif. La Commission se prononcera sur les éventuelles démarches à adopter ultérieurement à la lumière des résultats de la consultation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012170/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Crowdfunding

The Commission has launched a consultation inviting stakeholders to share their views on crowdfunding: its benefits, potential risks and the design of an optimal policy framework to untap the potential of this new form of financing for the arts and creative industries.

The consultation covers all forms of crowdfunding, from donations to financial investment. Everyone is invited to share their opinion by replying to an online questionnaire, including citizens who might contribute to crowdfunding campaigns and entrepreneurs who might launch them. National authorities and crowdfunding platforms are particularly encouraged to reply.

1. What is the Commission's objective in holding this consultation?

2. How does it intend to encourage the growth of this new industry?

3. What is the Commission's agenda on this matter?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(6 January 2014)

The Commission launched a public consultation on crowdfunding on 3 October 2013 that will close on 31 December 2013.

The aim of this consultation is to assess the potential added value of EU action. Crowdfunding has promising potential to finance growth and promote social, cultural and technical innovation across Europe. However, crowdfunding might raise certain risks too. Ensuring effective protection of contributors and a clear legal environment for these evolving practices are key to the growth of crowdfunding. Realising this, some Member States already started regulating crowdfunding at national level. In addition, the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) and the International Organisation of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) have also started gathering information about the applicable legal frameworks.

The consultation launched by the Commission is testing non-legislative options, such as awareness-raising or sharing of best practices, as well as self-regulation. Co-regulation, matched financing, legal amendments to existing legislation, or a tailored European regime for crowdfunding are among the legislative options that stakeholders are asked to give their views on. The Commission will take a view on possible next steps in the light of the results of the consultation.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012171/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 octobre 2013)

Objet: Powerdriver

Le projet Powerdriver, financé par l'Union européenne, est l'un des projets visant à récupérer la chaleur perdue à grande échelle en Europe. Le projet concerne spécifiquement le secteur des transports, soit un quart des gaz à effet de serre en Europe. Le projet souhaite transformer la chaleur perdue issue des gaz d'échappement des moteurs à combustion en électricité à l'aide de la technologie de thermogénérateur.

1. Quels sont les objectifs précis et chiffrés de la Commission?

2. Quel est l'agenda?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Geoghegan-Quinn au nom de la Commission
(3 décembre 2013)

1. Powerdriver est un projet de recherche financé au titre du programme «Recherche au profit des PME» du 7^e^ PC ([1]). Il vise à élaborer, pour le secteur de l'automobile et des applications marines, un nouveau système de production thermoélectrique respectueux de l'environnement basé sur la récupération de l'énergie thermique issue des gaz d'échappement, en vue d'améliorer le rendement des carburants, de réduire les émissions et de baisser les coûts d'exploitation.

Le projet Powerdriver vise à générer de l'électricité à partir de la chaleur résiduelle des moteurs à combustion interne. Ce faisant, le système d'échappement créé offrira des performances environnementales considérablement accrues grâce à l'amélioration du rendement des carburants et à la réduction des émissions (CO_2, oxyde d'azote, d'hydrocarbures, monoxyde de carbone et particules), le tout pour un coût abordable pour l'utilisateur final. Selon les prévisions, même en tenant compte du supplément de poids qu'elle implique, cette technologie augmenterait le rendement des carburants d'au moins 5 %, toute en réduisant de 5 % les émissions.

Jusqu'à présent, l'Union européenne s'est fixé pour objectif de réduire ses émissions de CO_2 de 20 % d'ici 2020 par rapport aux niveaux de 1990.

2. Le projet a démarré le 1^er^ février 2012 et se terminera le 31 janvier 2014. Ses résultats finaux seront ensuite évalués.

([1]) Septième programme-cadre pour des activités de recherche, de développement technologique et de démonstration (7^e^ PC, 2007-2013).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012171/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: POWERDRIVER

The European Union funded POWERDRIVER project is a project which aims to recover heat which is wasted on a large scale in Europe. The project relates specifically to the transport sector as this represents a quarter of greenhouse gas emissions in Europe. The project seeks to convert exhaust waste heat from combustion engines into electricity using thermoelectric generation technology.

1. What are the Commission's specific quantified targets?

2. What is the timetable?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2013)

1. POWERDRIVER is a research project funded in the FP7 ([1]) 'Research for the benefit of SMEs' programme. It aims to develop an innovative environmentally friendly thermo-electric power generation system for automotive and marine applications that is powered by exhaust waste thermal energy thereby achieving better fuel efficiency, lower emissions and lower operating costs.

The POWERDRIVER project aims to generate power from the Internal Combustion Engine (ICE) waste heat. By doing this, the exhaust system created will offer greatly improved environmental performance due to improved fuel efficiency and reduced emissions (CO_2, nitrogen oxides, hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide and particulates) at a cost that is affordable to the end-user. It is predicted that (even if the additional weight of the unit is considered) fuel efficiency will increase by at least 5%, leading to a corresponding 5% reduction in emissions.

The EU is so far aiming to cut CO_2 emissions by 20% by 2020 compared with 1990 levels.

2. The project started on 1 February 2012 and will end 31 January 2014, after which the final results will be evaluated.

([1]) Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012173/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 octobre 2013)

Objet: Alerte lingettes bébé

La très grande majorité des lingettes et laits de toilette pour bébés (94 %) sont potentiellement nocifs. Ce n'est pas la première fois que les lingettes pour bébés font l'objet d'une alerte. En novembre 2012, l'Agence nationale de sécurité du médicament et des produits de santé (ANSM) avait déjà recommandé de ne pas utiliser les produits contenant du phénoxyéthanol. En effet, les tests réalisés en laboratoire ont révélé que 26 lingettes et 6 laits de toilette grand public sur 34 produits testés seraient saturés de molécules allergisantes, d'antibactériens ou d'antioxydants «toxiques, voire perturbateurs endocriniens». Pas moins de 94 % des produits testés seraient ainsi «potentiellement nocifs». Les lingettes utilisées pour nettoyer les bébés cumulent les facteurs de risque. Elles sont appliquées plusieurs fois par jour sur une peau de bébé souvent irritée et particulièrement fragile. Pire, l'absence de rinçage après application a pour effet de prolonger le temps de pénétration. De plus, certaines substances soupçonnées d'être des perturbateurs endocriniens sont dissimulées sous un étiquetage trompeur.

Le phénoxyéthanol, un conservateur aux effets toxiques pour le foie, suspecté de nuire au système reproducteur et au développement, est présent dans de nombreuses lingettes. Les substances toxiques contenues dans ces lingettes pourraient être particulièrement délétères puisqu'elles agissent aux stades précoces du développement de l'enfant.

1. Face à ces résultats, la Commission compte-t-elle recommander aux parents d'être très vigilants, de se méfier de ces «facilités cosmétiques» et de recourir plutôt aux traditionnels savons beaucoup moins nocifs?

2. Compte-t-elle mener sa propre étude?

3. Pourrait-elle, à titre préventif, envoyer une alerte européenne sur ces produits?

4. La Commission ne devrait-elle pas renforcer la règlementation sur ce type de produits? En effet, cette concentration de toxiques tels que le phénoxyéthanol est rendue possible par le laxisme de la réglementation européenne.

5. Quelles mesures la Commission compte-t-elle prendre pour que les fabricants mettent un terme à leur pratique irresponsable en retirant les nombreuses substances dangereuses trouvées dans leurs produits?

Réponse donnée par M. Mimica au nom de la Commission
(19 décembre 2013)

Le règlement (CE) nº 1223/2009 ([1]) relatif aux produits cosmétiques autorise l'utilisation du phénoxyéthanol en tant qu'agent conservateur dans les produits cosmétiques à condition que sa concentration ne dépasse pas 1 %. Conformément à ce règlement, tous les produits cosmétiques mis sur le marché de l'UE doivent être sans danger pour la santé humaine.

La recherche scientifique existante sur le phénoxyéthanol n'est pas cohérente parce que ses données s'appliquent soit à l'exposition au phénoxyéthanol dans l'isolement soit à des produits ayant une forte concentration de cette substance en tant qu'ingrédient.

La Commission a reçu des autorités françaises des études d'évaluation ([2]) suscitant certaines préoccupations quant à l'utilisation du phénoxyéthanol en tant qu'agent conservateur dans les produits cosmétiques. Sur la base de ces études, les autorités françaises ont publié de nouvelles recommandations sur la concentration du phénoxyéthanol dans les produits destinés aux enfants de moins de trois ans. Elles comportent une interdiction totale du phénoxyéthanol pour les produits «destinés au siège» et une nouvelle restriction de la teneur maximale de cette substance à 0,4 % pour tous les autres produits cosmétiques destinés aux enfants de moins de trois ans.

([1]) Règlement (CE) nº 1223/2009 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 30 novembre 2009 relatif aux produits cosmétiques, JO L 342 du 22.12.2009, p. 59.
([2]) L'Agence nationale de sécurité du médicament et des produits de santé (ANSM).

En réponse, la Commission a publié en octobre 2013 un appel de données ([3]) sur la sécurité du phénoxyéthanol en vue d'une nouvelle évaluation de cet agent conservateur par le comité scientifique européen pour la sécurité des consommateurs de l'UE. En fonction des résultats de cet appel et des conclusions de l'avis scientifique qui s'en suivra, la Commission proposera toutes les mesures appropriées pour garantir la pleine protection des consommateurs.

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/sectors/cosmetics/files/pdf/cfd_phenoxy_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012173/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Baby wipes warning

The vast majority of baby wipes and cleansing lotions (94%) are potentially harmful. This is not the first time that baby wipes have been the subject of a warning. In November 2012, the National Agency for the Safety of Medicines and Health Products (Agence nationale de sécurité du médicament et des produits de santé /ANSM) recommended that products containing phenoxyethanol should not be used. In fact laboratory tests have shown that 26 wipes and 6 lotions out of 34 widely available products tested were full of allergenic, antibacterial or antioxidant molecules which were 'toxic or even endocrine disruptors'. So no less than 94% of products tested were 'potentially harmful'. Wipes used to cleanse babies compound the risk factors. They are applied several times a day to a baby's skin which is often irritated and particularly fragile. Worse, the fact that they are not rinsed off after application has the effect of lengthening the penetration time. Also some substances suspected of being endocrine disruptors are masked behind misleading labelling.

Phenoxyethanol is a preservative with toxic effects on the liver; it is suspected of reproductive and developmental toxicity and is contained in many wipes. The toxic substances in these wipes could be particularly harmful acting as they do in the earliest stages of the child's development.

1. Faced with these results, does the Commission intend to recommend that parents should be very vigilant, should beware of these 'cosmetic convenience products' and should use traditional soaps instead as they are much less harmful?

2. Does it intend to carry out its own study?

3. As a precautionary measure could it issue a Europe-wide warning about these products?

4. Should the Commission not strengthen the regulation of these types of products? In fact the concentration of toxic agents such as phenoxyethanol is made possible by the laxity of European regulation.

5. What measures does the Commission intend to take so that manufacturers put a stop to their irresponsible practices and withdraw the many dangerous substances in their products?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

The EU Cosmetics Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 ([1]) authorises the use of Phenoxyethanol as preservative in cosmetic products for up to 1%. According to that regulation all cosmetic products placed on the EU market must be safe for human health.

Existing scientific research on Phenoxyethanol is inconsistent because research data either apply to exposure to Phenoxyethanol in isolation or to products containing high levels of this substance as ingredient.

The Commission has received assessment studies by the French authorities ([2]) which raised concern about the use of Phenoxyethanol as preservative in cosmetic products. Based on these studies, the French authorities have recently issued new recommendations for concentration of Phenoxyethanol in products destined for children under the age of three years. They contain a full ban of the Phenoxyethanol for products used in the 'diaper area' and a new 0.4% restriction for all other cosmetic products destined for children of the same age.

In response, the Commission published in October 2013 a call ([3]) for data on the safety of Phenoxyethanol in view of assessing this preservative by the EU Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety. Following the outcome of the call and depending on the conclusions of the subsequent scientific opinion, the Commission will propose all appropriate measures to ensure full protection of consumers.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on cosmetic products, OJ L 342, 22.12.2009, p. 59.
([2]) L'Agence nationale de sécurité du médicament et des produits de santé (ANSM).
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/sectors/cosmetics/files/pdf/cfd_phenoxy_en.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012174/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 octobre 2013)

Objet: Cimetière de bateaux

Pour éviter la répétition du scénario du porte-avions Clémenceau, nous venons de donner notre feu vert à une nouvelle réglementation qui a pour objectif d'assurer le démantèlement des vieux navires dans des conditions ne mettant, ni la santé des travailleurs, ni l'environnement, en péril. Dans ses motivations, la nouvelle législation européenne cible d'ailleurs clairement la pratique de «l'échouage» qui consiste à abandonner ces carcasses sur les plages des pays d'Asie du sud (en majorité) où celles-ci seront découpées sans autre forme de procès, à l'aide de simples chalumeaux, par des hommes vivant dans des conditions misérables. Considérées comme des déchets dangereux en raison des substances nuisibles présentes à bord (par exemple, plomb, dioxines, amiante), ces épaves ne devraient normalement pas pouvoir être exportées vers des pays non membres de l'OCDE. Mais en pratique, cette règle n'est pas respectée par leurs propriétaires qui se tournent vers les entreprises de démantèlement prêtes à leur offrir le meilleur prix. Et, sans surprise, les acheteurs les plus à même d'offrir un tarif de rachat attrayant sont ceux qui réalisent des économies sur le dos de leurs ouvriers et de l'environnement.

Le nouveau cadre européen entend en quelque sorte anticiper les dispositions de la convention de Hong Kong. Adopté en 2009, cet accord international vise à assurer «un recyclage sûr et économiquement rationnel des navires», mais il n'entrera pas en vigueur avant plusieurs années, les pays ne se précipitant pas vraiment pour le signer et le ratifier. En outre, cette convention n'exclut pas formellement la pratique de l'échouage.

Alors que l'on s'attend à une augmentation du nombre de bateaux mis au rebut dans les années à venir, les règles européennes prévoient notamment que ce démantèlement soit pratiqué sur des sites de recyclage agréés et régulièrement contrôlés par les autorités nationales, si ces installations se trouvent en Europe, ou par des contrôleurs indépendants, s'il s'agit de pays tiers. Ces infrastructures devront démontrer leur capacité à gérer les matières dangereuses et les déchets produits tout au long du processus de démontage, en empêchant entre autres les infiltrations dans les sols.

Un bémol, mais il est de taille: ces dispositions ne concernent que les navires battant pavillon européen. Ceux-ci devront néanmoins faire l'objet d'inspections quinquennales après leur mise en service. À l'inverse, tous les bateaux, quelle que soit leur provenance, devront dresser et tenir à jour un listing des matériaux dangereux présents à bord et présenter celui-ci lorsqu'ils accèdent aux ports européens. Les sanctions en cas d'infraction seront du ressort des États membres.

Que pense la Commission d'un fonds alimenté par une taxe prélevée lors de chaque escale dans un port de l'Union européenne afin de financer des infrastructures de recyclage sûres? Quelles sont les autres propositions imaginées ou examinées par la Commission?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(16 décembre 2013)

Dans l'analyse d'impact qui accompagne sa proposition concernant le nouveau règlement relatif au recyclage des navires ([1]) à, la Commission a examiné la possibilité de création d'un fonds pour le démantèlement des navires (voir pp. 107 et 108) ([2]) à et s'est référée à une étude antérieure sur le sujet. Toutefois, cette option n'a pas été retenue dans la proposition.

L'article 29 du nouveau règlement relatif au recyclage des navires, tel qu'il a été adopté par les colégislateurs (mais non encore publié au Journal officiel), invite la Commission à élaborer, au plus tard trois ans après l'entrée en vigueur du règlement, un rapport sur la faisabilité d'un instrument financier qui faciliterait le recyclage sûr et écologiquement rationnel des navires, accompagné, le cas échéant, d'une proposition législative.

Afin de préparer ledit rapport, la Commission a l'intention de lancer une étude de faisabilité. Celle-ci doit permettre à la Commission de définir les options envisageables et de formuler son avis sur la question.

([1]) SWD(2012) 47 final du 23.3.2012.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/ships/pdf/Impact%20Assessment.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012174/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Ships' graveyard

To avoid any repetition of the Clémenceau aircraft-carrier scenario, we have approved a new regulation aimed at ensuring that dismantling of old ships is carried out in conditions which do not endanger workers' health or the environment. The motivations of the new European legislation are clearly to target the practice of 'beaching' which consists of abandoning these hulks on South Asian beaches for them to be cut up without further ado by men living in wretched conditions, using simple blowtorches. Theses wrecks should not normally be exported to non-OECD countries as they are considered as hazardous waste because of the harmful substances on board (e.g. lead, dioxins, asbestos). In practice however this rule is not observed by the ship owners who resort to dismantlers prepared to quote them the best price. There is no surprise that the buyers best able to quote an attractive repurchase rate are those who make cost savings at the expense of their workers and the environment.

To some extent the new European framework is intended to bring into force an early implementation of the requirements of the Hong Kong Convention. This international agreement, adopted in 2009, aims to ensure 'the safe and environmentally sound recycling of ships', but it will not take effect for several years as countries are really in no hurry to sign and ratify it. Also, the Convention does not explicitly forbid the practice of beaching.

While an increase in the number of ships scrapped is expected in coming years, the European rules provide in particular for dismantling to be carried out at recycling sites certified and regularly inspected by national agencies if these facilities are in Europe, or by independent inspectors in third countries. These infrastructures need to demonstrate that they can manage hazardous materials and the waste produced throughout the disassembly process and prevent infiltrations into the soil amongst other things.

One substantial disadvantage: these provisions only apply to ships flying EU flags. These will need to be inspected every five years after entering service. On the other hand all ships, no matter where they come from, must maintain an updated inventory of hazardous materials on board, which they must present when calling at European ports. Penalties for non-compliance are to be set by Member States.

What does the Commission think of having a fund raised through a tax levied on each stay in a European Union port to finance safe recycling infrastructure? What other proposals has the Commission thought of or looked into?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

The impact assessment accompanying the proposal of the Commission for the new Regulation on Ship Recycling ([1]) addressed the feasibility of establishing a 'ship dismantling fund' (see pp. 107-108) ([2]) and referred to a previous study on this. However this option was not included in the proposal.

Article 29 of the new Regulation on ship recycling as adopted by the colegislators (but not yet published in the Official Journal) invites the Commission to produce — at the latest three years after entry into force of the regulation — a report on the feasibility of a financial instrument that would facilitate safe and sound ship recycling. The Commission shall, if appropriate, accompany the report by a legislative proposal.

In order to prepare the said report, the Commission intends to launch a feasibility study. The study should allow the Commission to identify the options available and to form its opinion on this issue.

([1]) SWD(2012) 47 final of 23.3.2012.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/ships/pdf/Impact%20Assessment.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012175/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 octobre 2013)

Objet: Accords UE-Canada

Le président de la Commission a déclaré, sur son compte Twitter, «espérer conclure rapidement» les négociations. Car elles furent longues, ces négociations, entamées en mai 2009. Européens et Canadiens auront surtout buté sur des contentieux agricoles, comme la question des produits laitiers et l'ouverture du marché européen au bœuf canadien. Le plafond proposé par l'Union européenne pour la viande a ainsi longtemps été jugé insuffisant du côté canadien. Un sujet très sensible pour les éleveurs européens déjà sous pression.

Qu'en est-il?

Le Canada va-t-il éliminer les barrières tarifaires sur 98 % de ses importations en provenance de l'Union européenne comme convenu plus tôt?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(16 décembre 2013)

Le premier ministre canadien, M. Harper, et le président de la Commission, M. Barroso, sont parvenus à un accord politique sur les éléments essentiels de l'accord économique et commercial global entre le Canada et l'UE, le 18 octobre 2013, à Bruxelles.

En ce qui concerne l'accès au marché dans le domaine de l'agriculture, et plus particulièrement pour les produits jugés sensibles, tels que les produits laitiers pour le Canada et la viande bovine et porcine pour l'Union européenne, il a été convenu que tout nouvel accès au marché serait accordé sous la forme de contingents tarifaires. L'accord sur les produits laitiers porte sur 18 500 tonnes de fromage — dont 1 700 tonnes de fromage industriel — et constitue une concession sans précédent du Canada à l'égard d'un partenaire commercial.

En ce qui concerne la libéralisation tarifaire, la Commission est en mesure de confirmer que le Canada va éliminer les barrières tarifaires sur presque 99 % de ses lignes tarifaires vis-à-vis de l'Union européenne.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012175/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: EU-Canada agreements

On his Twitter feed, the Commission President said that he 'hope[s] to conclude soon' the lengthy negotiations which began in May 2009. The Europeans and Canadians have struggled above all with contentious agricultural issues, such as that of dairy products and the opening up of the European market to Canadian beef. The European Union's proposed ceiling for meat has long been considered inadequate by the Canadians. This is a very sensitive matter for European livestock farmers, who are already under pressure.

What is the current situation with regard to this point?

Will Canada remove the tariff barriers on 98% of its imports from the European Union as agreed earlier?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

Canadian Prime Minister Harper and Commission President Barroso reached a political agreement on the key elements for a Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) between Canada and the EU on 18 October 2013 in Brussels.

As regards market access on agriculture, and more particularly products considered sensitive, such as dairy for Canada and beef and pork for the EU, it has been agreed that new market access will be granted in the form of tariff rate quotas. The agreement on dairy amounts to 18.500 t of cheese — of which 1.700 t of industrial cheese — and constitutes an unprecedented concession from Canada to any trade partner.

As regards tariff liberalisation by Canada, the Commission can confirm that Canada will remove tariffs on almost 99% of tariff lines vis-à-vis the EU.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-012176/13
do Komisji
Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D)
(24 października 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Działanie i możliwość egzekwowania europejskiego nakazu aresztowania

15 Lipca 2013 r. obywatel Grecji (ojciec, pozbawiony przez polski sąd prawomocnym wyrokiem praw rodzicielskich) uprowadził z Polski znajdującego się pod pełną władzą rodzicielską matki (obywatelki Polski) ich 7-letniego syna.

Polski sąd wydał europejski nakaz aresztowania ojca dziecka . Porywacz po ok. 3 miesiącach od zdarzenia został niedawno zatrzymany w Grecji przez tamtejsza policję, a następnie wypuszczony za kaucją, mimo iż odmówił wskazania miejsca, gdzie przebywa dziecko.

Policja grecka nie poinformowała odpowiednich polskich władz o zatrzymaniu, mimo iż była do tego zobligowana na mocy europejskiego nakazu aresztowania. Ponadto pomimo posiadania informacji o miejscu pobytu porywacza, nie chce ich udzielić ani matce, która jest jedynym prawnym opiekunem chłopca, ani polskim organom ścigania. Greckie władze nie podejmują działań koordynujących pracę z polską policją. Matka chłopca, po wizycie w greckiej prowadzącej sprawę prokuraturze, otrzymała informację, iż nikt nie poszukuje jej dziecka.

Chciałabym zapytać Komisję, jakie są zobowiązania stron w przypadku wydania europejskiego nakazu aresztowania oraz jakie są konsekwencje ich zaniedbania? Jakie Komisja przewiduje sankcje dla państw członkowskich nieprzestrzegających zobowiązań wynikających z europejskiego nakazu aresztowania?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Viviane Reding w imieniu Komisji
(20 grudnia 2013 r.)

Celem europejskiego nakazu aresztowania (ENA) jest ułatwienie wydania wskazanej osoby, tak aby mogła zostać osądzona za domniemane przestępstwo w państwie składającym wniosek. Kwestia zatrzymania po aresztowaniu na mocy ENA należy całkowicie do kompetencji organu sądowego państwa wykonującego ENA zgodnie z jego prawem krajowym. Decyzja ramowa w sprawie ENA ([1]) nie reguluje spraw takich jak kwestia miejsca pobytu rzekomo uprowadzonego dziecka, która została podniesiona w tym przypadku.

W odniesieniu do kwestii miejsca pobytu rzekomo uprowadzonego dziecka rozporządzenie Rady (WE) 2201/2003 dotyczące jurysdykcji oraz uznawania i wykonywania orzeczeń w sprawach małżeńskich oraz w sprawach dotyczących odpowiedzialności rodzicielskiej ustanawia między innymi wspólne zasady dotyczące uprowadzenia dziecka przez jednego z rodziców na terytorium UE („rozporządzenie Bruksela II bis"). Organy centralne wyznaczone na mocy wspomnianego rozporządzenia (art. 53-55) mogą gromadzić i wymieniać informacje na temat sytuacji uprowadzonego dziecka.

W omawianym przypadku małżonek, który posiada pełne prawa do opieki nad dzieckiem, powinien zwrócić się do właściwych organów państwa członkowskiego, które było miejscem zwykłego pobytu dziecka bezpośrednio przed bezprawnym zabraniem lub przetrzymywaniem – w tym przypadku do odpowiedniego polskiego sądu, w celu uzyskania orzeczenia na podstawie art. 11 rozporządzenia Bruksela II bis i odzyskania dziecka.

([1]) Dz.U. L 190 z 18.7.2002, s. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012176/13
to the Commission
Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Functioning of the European Arrest Warrant and opportunities for its enforcement

On 15 July 2013, a Greek citizen took his son out of Poland despite having had his parental rights lawfully terminated by a Polish court and even though the child's mother, a Polish citizen, has full parental custody.

The Polish court subsequently issued a European Arrest Warrant for the father. The kidnapper was recently detained in Greece by the local police, around three months after the abduction, but was released on bail even though he refused to provide any information on the child's whereabouts.

The Greek police failed to inform the relevant Polish authorities about the arrest, in contravention of their obligations under the European Arrest Warrant. What is more, they have refused to inform either the mother, as the boy's sole legal guardian, or the Polish law-enforcement agencies of the kidnapper's place of residence. Greek authorities are not taking any steps to coordinate activities with the Polish police. When the boy's mother visited the Greek public prosecutor's office in charge of the case, she was told that no one was looking for her child.

Can the Commission state the obligations incumbent upon the various parties following the issuing of a European Arrest Warrant, and the consequences of failing to discharge these obligations? What sanctions does the Commission plan to impose on Member States which fail to discharge their obligations under the European Arrest Warrant?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(20 December 2013)

The purpose of the European arrest warrant (EAW) is to facilitate the surrender of a requested person in order that they can be tried for the alleged criminal offence in the requesting state. The issue of detention subsequent to arrest pursuant to an EAW arrest is entirely within the competence of the judicial authority in the executing state according to their domestic law. The framework Decision on the EAW ([1]) does not govern the issues such as the location of an allegedly abducted child, as has arisen in this case.

Concerning the issue of locating an allegedly abducted child, Council Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 concerning jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in matrimonial matters and the matters of parental responsibility, establishes *inter alia* common rules on parental child abduction within the EU ('the Brussels IIa regulation'). The Central Authorities designated under the regulation (Articles 53-55) may collect and exchange information on the situation of the abducted child.

In the case at stake, the spouse, who has full custody rights, is advised to apply to the competent authorities in the Member State where the child was habitually resident immediately before the wrongful removal or retention, in casu the competent Polish Court, to obtain a judgment on the basis of Article 11 of the Brussels IIa regulation in order to obtain the return of the child.

([1]) OJ L190/1 18.7.2002.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012177/13
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(24 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Sectorul vitivinicol

În viitoarea reformă din sectorul vitivinicol, nu există o strategie concretă pentru a îmbunătăți protejarea indicațiilor geografice europene la scară internațională, iar uzurpările în detrimentul vinurilor europene DOP și IGP continuă.

În ceea ce privește acordurile bilaterale de liber schimb, trebuie recunoscute și protejate toate indicațiile geografice europene, nu doar cele mai importante.

Politica privind calitatea nu trebuie să se limiteze la produsele DOP și IGP, ci trebuie să includă, de asemenea, vinurile de marcă și cele cu denumire de soi, „întrucât consumatorii le recunosc ca fiind produse de calitate".

În contextul deschiderii piețelor, aceste specificități sunt puncte forte pe care sectorul vitivinicol european trebuie să se poată baza pentru a-și spori competitivitatea pe plan internațional, permițându-le agricultorilor și cooperativelor acestora să obțină de pe piață compensații pe măsura eforturilor depuse.

Ținând cont de faptul că politica privind calitatea vinurilor trebuie concepută ca un instrument în serviciul agricultorilor și al cooperativelor agricole din Europa, are în vedere Comisia măsuri concrete care să îi protejeze pe viticultori și care să le permită să informeze consumatorii cu privire la caracteristicile specifice ale produselor pe care le comercializează, în speță cele referitoare la originea geografică?

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(3 decembrie 2013)

Reforma PAC care urmează să fie adoptată respectă orientarea stabilită în cadrul reformei sectorului vitivinicol din 2008, care a instituit în Uniunea Europeană cele mai înalte standarde în materie de protecție a denumirilor de origine protejată (DOP) și a indicațiilor geografice protejate (IGP).

În ceea ce privește țările terțe, strategia Comisiei este de a obține protecție internațională pentru toate DOP/IGP, după cum reiese din numeroase acorduri bilaterale recente, de exemplu cu Georgia, Moldova și alte țări terțe, în curs de adoptare. Cu toate acestea, în ceea ce privește multe țări terțe reticente, Comisia a trebuit să adopte o abordare pragmatică, acordând prioritate protecției celor mai amenințate DOP/IGP. Această strategie are ca obiectiv sporirea protecției denumirilor și indicațiilor care sunt cel mai des contrafăcute în țările terțe. Chiar și în cazul în care numai DOP/IGP incluse pe liste restrânse sunt inițial protejate, acordurile prevăd un mecanism pentru a adăuga noi denumiri pe liste. În plus, aceste liste restrânse sunt realizate de comun acord cu statele membre în cauză.

Deși reforma actuală a PAC va permite o mai bună organizare a coexistenței dintre DOP/IGP și mărcile comerciale, protecția mărcilor comerciale nu intră în domeniul său de aplicare.

Reforma PAC care urmează să fie adoptată menține posibilitatea de a finanța acțiuni de promovare în țări terțe a vinurilor cu DOP/IGP sau a vinurilor cu denumiri de soiuri, cu posibilitatea de a promova mărci. Aceste măsuri concrete au ca scop consolidarea vandabilității și a competitivității produselor vitivinicole din UE și informarea consumatorilor cu privire la caracteristicile specifice ale produselor care beneficiază de o DOP/IGP. De asemenea, reforma extinde măsurile de promovare a vinurilor la piața internă a Uniunii Europene, pentru a informa consumatorii cu privire la sistemele Uniunii referitoare la DOP/IGP și nu numai.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012177/13
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: The wine sector

In the future reform of the wine sector, there is no concrete strategy to improve the protection of European geographical indications internationally, while usurpations continue to the detriment of protected designation of origin (PDO) and protected geographical indication (PGI) European wines.

As for bilateral free trade agreements, all European geographical indications must be recognised and protected, not only the most important.

Policy concerning quality should not be limited to PDO and PGI products, but should also include wine brands and the variety denomination, 'since consumers recognise them as being quality products'.

In the context of opening up the markets, these specificities are strengths that the European wine sector must be able to rely on to enhance international competition, enabling farmers and their cooperatives to obtain compensation from the market according to the effort put in.

Given that policy concerning the quality of wine should be designed as an instrument to aid farmers and agricultural cooperatives in Europe, what concrete measures is the Commission intending to take to protect wine growers and enable them to inform consumers about the specific characteristics of the products they are marketing, namely those relating to geographical origin?

Answer given by Mr Cioloș on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2013)

The CAP reform to be adopted respects the orientation taken in the 2008 wine reform, which established the highest standards in terms of protection of designations of origin (PDO) and geographical indications (PGI) in the European Union.

Concerning third countries, the strategy of the Commission is to obtain international protection for all PDO/PGI as evidenced by several of our recent bilateral agreements, e.g. with Georgia, Moldova and various other third countries in the process of being adopted. However, as regards many reluctant third countries, the Commission had to adopt a pragmatic approach by giving the priority to the protection of the most threatened PDO/PGI. This strategy aims at fostering the protection of those names which are the most infringed in third countries. Even in cases where only shortlists of PDO/PGI are initially protected, the agreements foresee a mechanism to add further names to the list. Moreover, these shortlists are done in agreement with the concerned Member States.

Even though the current CAP reform will better organise the coexistence between PDO/PGI and trademarks, the protection of trademarks is not within its scope.

The CAP reform to be adopted keeps the possibility to finance promotion measures concerning wines with PDO/PGI or varietal wines in third countries, with the possibility to promote brand names. These concrete measures aim at increasing the marketability and competitiveness of Union grapevine products and informing consumers about the specific characteristics of the products bearing a PDO/PGI. The reform also extends promotion measures concerning wines to the internal market of the European Union with a view to informing consumers about, among others, the Union systems covering PDO/PGI.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-012178/13
do Komisji
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)
(24 października 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: W sprawie promocji ideologii gender

Rządy państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej w tym rząd RP opracowują nowe Programy Operacyjne, które mają określić sposób wdrożenia środków europejskich w ramach budżetu unijnego na lata 2014-2020.

Jednocześnie Instytucje Europejskie, w tym Parlament Europejski oraz Komisja Europejska, wzmogły działania propagujące podejście dla wielu spraw z perspektywy genderowej.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się z pytaniem, czy prawdą jest, że w nowym okresie programowania beneficjent w realizowanych przez siebie projektach o charakterze społecznym, będzie musiał wykazać konkretne działania, które mają za cel realizację polityki równościowej opartej o definicję płci kulturowo-społecznej, tj. zgodnej z koncepcją gender?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(21 listopada 2013 r.)

Komisja zapewnia podejście dwukierunkowe: integrację horyzontalną równouprawnienia płci wymaganą Traktatem należy uzupełnić o specjalne środki. Ramy prawne europejskich funduszy strukturalnych i inwestycyjnych (ESIF) na lata 2014-2020 koncentrują się na równouprawnieniu płci oraz strategii uwzględniania aspektu płci bardziej niż w poprzednich okresach finansowania. W szczególności ramy te obejmują przepisy zobowiązujące państwa członkowskie do zagwarantowania, że równość kobiet i mężczyzn oraz perspektywa płci będą brane pod uwagę i akcentowane w trakcie przygotowania, realizacji, monitorowania i oceny programów. Państwa członkowskie podejmują również odpowiednie kroki w celu zapobiegania wszelkiej dyskryminacji ze względu na płeć i zapewnienia potencjału administracyjnego w celu wdrożenia i stosowania prawa i polityki UE na rzecz równości płci w zakresie ESIF. Ponadto każdy program operacyjny zawiera opis konkretnych działań w celu promowania równych szans i zapobiegania wszelkiej dyskryminacji ze względu na płeć.

Rozporządzenie w sprawie EFS zawiera obszerne wymogi co do połączenia zdecydowanego podejścia i ukierunkowanych działań szczegółowych na rzecz równości płci. EFS wspiera ukierunkowane działania szczegółowe w ramach każdego z priorytetów inwestycyjnych w celu zwiększenia trwałego udziału kobiet w zatrudnieniu i rozwoju ich kariery, takie jak zwalczanie feminizacji ubóstwa, ograniczenie segregacji ze względu na płeć, promowanie godzenia pracy i życia prywatnego dla wszystkich.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012178/13
to the Commission
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Promoting gender ideology

The governments of the Member States, including the Polish Government, are currently drawing up new operational programmes to implement the European funding available in the period 2014-2020.

At the same time, the European institutions, including Parliament and the Commission, have stepped up measures promoting gender mainstreaming.

Is it true that in the new programming period, beneficiaries implementing projects of a social character will have to demonstrate that they are taking specific action aimed at implementing equality policies based on the socio-cultural definition of gender that underpins the gender mainstreaming approach?

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

The Commission pursues to ensure a dual approach: horizontal integration of gender equality required by the Treaty needs to be complemented by specific measures. The legislative framework for the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) 2014-2020 focuses on gender equality and the gender mainstreaming strategy more than in previous funding periods. In particular, the framework includes provisions requiring Member States to ensure that equality between men and women, and the integration of a gender perspective are taken into account and promoted throughout the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes. Member States shall also take appropriate steps to prevent any discrimination based on sex and ensure the existence of administrative capacity for the implementation and application of EU gender equality law and policy in the field of ESIF. Moreover, each operational programme shall include a description of specific actions with the aim of promoting equal opportunities and preventing any discrimination based on sex.

The ESF Regulation includes a comprehensive requirement for a combination of a robust mainstreaming approach and targeted specific actions for gender equality, The ESF shall support specific targeted actions within any of the investment priorities with the aim of increasing the sustainable participation and progress of women in employment, such as combating the feminisation of poverty, reducing gender-based segregation, promoting reconciliation of work and personal life for all.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012180/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Charles Tannock (ECR) e Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(24 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Estensione dell'applicazione della sharia nel Sultanato del Brunei

Il 22 ottobre 2013 è stato annunciato che, a partire dal mese di aprile 2014, il Sultanato del Brunei estenderà l'applicazione della legge islamica al suo interno. Nel Brunei la sharia regola attualmente questioni inerenti alla famiglia, come il matrimonio e la successione, ma a seguito del recente annuncio coprirà anche la materia penale. È stato tuttavia precisato che il nuovo codice si applicherà solo ai cittadini musulmani.

I 400 000 abitanti del Brunei, due terzi dei quali sono musulmani, vivono già in uno degli ordinamenti giuridici più severi della regione, un sistema che proibisce la vendita e il consumo di alcol. Se i cambiamenti annunciati saranno effettivamente introdotti, i cittadini saranno lapidati per adulterio, subiranno amputazioni degli arti per il reato di furto e la fustigazione per reati come l'aborto.

Il sultano del Brunei, Hassanal Bolkiah, ha dichiarato pubblicamente che «è per il nostro bisogno che Allah l'Onnipotente, in tutta la sua generosità, ha creato leggi per noi, in modo che possiamo utilizzarle per ottenere giustizia». Mentre funzionari del Brunei da sempre dichiarano che i giudici godono di un certo potere discrezionale per quanto riguarda le sentenze, un portavoce di «Human Rights Watch» ha affermato che il recente annuncio dimostra che nel Brunei il rispetto dei diritti civili e politici fondamentali è pressoché pari a zero.

1. Intende il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante rilasciare una dichiarazione pubblica sul cambiamento del codice penale nel Brunei?

2. Intende il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante affrontare la questione con le autorità del Brunei, tenuto conto del fatto che il Paese è firmatario dell'Accordo UE-ASEAN del 1980?

3. Intende il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante ricordare alle autorità del Brunei gli obblighi che incombono loro in virtù della Carta ASEAN del 2008 per quanto attiene alla difesa del rispetto dei diritti umani?

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

L'UE è al corrente del fatto che il 22 ottobre scorso il Sultanato del Brunei ha introdotto un nuovo codice penale basato sulla Sharia la cui entrata in vigore è prevista dopo sei mesi e che sarà applicato progressivamente in tre fasi, l'ultima delle quali inizierà dopo 24 mesi dalla pubblicazione del codice come atto legislativo. L'AR/VP sta raccogliendo ulteriori informazioni sulle modalità di applicazione del nuovo codice visto che, a quanto risulta, i relativi orientamenti di applicazione sarebbero ancora in fase di elaborazione.

L'UE rifletterà sull'opportunità di rilasciare una dichiarazione pubblica una volta chiarite le condizioni di applicazione del codice penale basato sulla Sharia.

L'UE è al corrente del fatto che la Carta dell'Associazione delle nazioni del sud-est asiatico (ASEAN) del 2008 contiene un riferimento al rispetto e alla tutela dei diritti umani e delle libertà fondamentali. L'UE coglierà tutte le occasioni per ricordare al Brunei i suoi obblighi in conformità della Dichiarazione universale dei diritti dell'uomo, della Carta dell'ASEAN e della Dichiarazione sui diritti umani dell'ASEAN, il cui articolo 14 vieta il ricorso alla tortura e ad altre pene o trattamenti crudeli, inumani o degradanti. La Commissione ritiene che spetti anche agli Stati membri dell'ASEAN rammentare al Brunei i suoi obblighi in quanto firmatario della Carta.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012180/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Charles Tannock (ECR) and Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Sultanate of Brunei to extend use of Sharia law

On 22 October 2013 it was widely reported that the Sultanate of Brunei is to extend the use of Sharia law within the country as of April 2014. Sharia law is currently exercised in Brunei for family matters such as marriage and inheritance, but this latest proclamation will see its mandate extended to cover criminal matters. It has been stressed, however, that the new code will only apply to the country's Muslim citizens.

Brunei's 400 000-strong population, of whom around two thirds are Muslim, already live under one of the region's strictest Islamic legal systems — a system which sees the sale and consumption of alcohol banned. If the proposed changes go ahead, citizens could be stoned for adultery, have limbs amputated for theft, and face flogging for offences such as abortion.

In a public statement, the Sultan of Brunei, Hassanal Bolkiah, said that 'it is because of our need that Allah the Almighty, in all his generosity, has created laws for us, so that we can utilise them to obtain justice'. Whilst Brunei officials have historically stated that judges enjoy the right of discretion on the issue of sentencing, a spokesman for Human Rights Watch has said that this latest announcement illustrates that 'respect for basic civil and political rights is near zero in Brunei'.

1. Will the Vice-President/High Representative make a public statement on this change to Brunei's penal code?

2. Does the VP/HR plan to raise this matter with the Brunei authorities, bearing in mind the country's status as a signatory to the EU-ASEAN Agreement of 1980?

3. Will the VP/HR remind the Brunei authorities of their obligations, under the 2008 ASEAN Charter, to uphold respect for human rights?

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

The EU is aware that the Sultanate of Brunei announced a new Sharia Penal Code on 22 October which, it was indicated, would come into force after six months and will be applied progressively in three phases, with the final phase entering into force 24 months after the Code was gazetted. The HR/VP is currently in the process of gathering further information on how the new code would be applied, as we understand that implementing guidelines are still under preparation.

The EU will consider the need for issuing a public statement once the conditions for applying the Sharia Penal Code have become clear.

The EU is aware that the 2008 Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Charter contains a reference to respect for and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The EU will use available opportunities to remind Brunei of its obligations under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the ASEAN Charter and the ASEAN Human Rights Declaration, which under Article 14 states that 'no person shall be subject to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.' The Commission is of the opinion that it would also be up to ASEAN Member States themselves to remind Brunei of its obligations under the Charter.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012181/13
an die Kommission
Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE)
(24. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Vorschlag für eine Verordnung über die Erzeugung von Pflanzenvermehrungsmaterial und dessen Bereitstellung auf dem Markt (Saatgutverordnung)

1. In der Sitzung des Ausschusses für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung des Parlaments vom 30. September 2013 berichtete Eric Poudelet (Kommission, GD SANCO), dass 70 % der Saatguterzeuger in der EU kleine oder mittlere landwirtschaftliche Betriebe sind. Kann die Kommission nähere Angaben zu der Datenbank machen, aus der diese Information stammt?

2. Viele Bürger wollen sich aktiv am Schutz und an der Verbreitung althergebrachter Sorten sowie an der Erhaltung der biologischen Vielfalt beteiligen. Oft haben die Bürger keine andere Wahl als Samen und Pflanzen beispielsweise auf lokalen Märkten zu kaufen und zu verkaufen. Ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass dies gemäß der von ihr vorgeschlagenen neuen Verordnung auch in Zukunft noch legal ist?

3. Heutzutage tragen Landwirte durch den Austausch von Samen und Pflanzen erheblich zum Schutz und zur Verbreitung althergebrachter Sorten sowie zur Erhaltung der biologischen Vielfalt bei. Dieser Austausch ist nur möglich, wenn die Landwirte die Erstattung ihrer Ausgaben beantragen können. Ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass dies gemäß der von ihr vorgeschlagenen neuen Verordnung auch in Zukunft noch legal ist?

4. Wie wird die Kommission die Rechte der Landwirte bezüglich der erneuten Aussaat von Samen auf ihren landwirtschaftlichen Betrieben schützen?

5. Für den ökologischen Landbau ist es von entscheidender Bedeutung, die angewandten Zuchtmethoden und -techniken zu kennen. Wie wird die Kommission angesichts von Artikel 75 zur Vertraulichkeit sicherstellen, dass Biolandwirte Zugang zu den notwendigen Informationen erhalten?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(17. Dezember 2013)

1. Der Kommission sind keine Studien mit fundierten Daten zum Anteil der KMU am EU-Markt für Pflanzenvermehrungsmaterial bekannt. Einer jüngsten Studie des Europäischen Parlaments ([1]) zufolge haben die KMU jedoch nach wie vor einen großen Anteil am EU-Saatgutsektor (beispielsweise stellen sie bei den italienischen Saatgutunternehmen die überwältigende Mehrheit dar), auch wenn es — je nach Größe des Unternehmens (Umsatz, Beschäftigtenzahl), Pflanzenportfolio, erfasstem geografischen Gebiet und durchgeführten Tätigkeiten — sehr große Unterschiede gibt. Im Bereich Pflanzkartoffeln und Zuckerrüben sind keine multinationalen Unternehmen tätig, ein einziges Unternehmen kann aber Eigentümer einer großen Zahl von Marken sein. Auch bei Getreide ist der Anteil der multinationalen Unternehmen gering. Im Gegenzug dazu handelt es sich bei den wichtigsten in den Bereichen Strohgetreide, Mais, Sonnenblumen und Rapssamen tätigen Unternehmen überwiegend um multinationale Unternehmen ([2]).

2. In Artikel 36 des Vorschlagsentwurfs sind Abweichungen von den Registrierungsanforderungen im Fall von für Nischenmärkte bestimmtem Pflanzenvermehrungsmaterial festgelegt. Personen, die keine Unternehmer sind, sowie bestimmte Unternehmer dürfen solches Material auf dem Markt bereitstellen, wenn die Bedingungen des genannten Artikels erfüllt sind.

3. Gemäß Artikel 2 Buchstabe d des Vorschlagsentwurfs ist der Austausch von Pflanzenvermehrungsmaterial durch andere Personen als Unternehmer vom Anwendungsbereich der Verordnung ausgeschlossen.

4. Mit der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 2100/94 des Rates über den gemeinschaftlichen Sortenschutz wurde eine Ausnahmeregelung geschaffen, nach der Landwirte unter bestimmten Bedingungen in ihrem eigenen Betrieb selbstgezogenes Saatgut geschützter Sorten verwenden dürfen. Die Kommission schlägt nicht vor, diese Regelung abzuschaffen. Was den Ertrag nicht geschützter Sorten anbelangt, so wird die vorgeschlagene Verordnung über Pflanzenvermehrungsmaterial nicht die Möglichkeit berühren, dass Landwirte diesen zur Wiederbepflanzung in ihrem eigenen Betrieb nutzen.

5. Der Vorschlagsentwurf enthält keine Bestimmungen über Zuchtverfahren oder -techniken.

([1]) Europäisches Parlament, Study on The EU Seed and Plant Reproductive Material (PRM) Market in Perspective — A focus on companies and market shares (Brüssel, 21. November 2013).
([2]) Europäisches Parlament, 21. November 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012181/13
to the Commission
Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Proposal for a regulation on the production and making available on the market of plant reproductive material (plant reproductive material law)

1. At the meeting of Parliament's Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development held on 30 September 2013, it was reported by Eric Poudelet, of the Commission's DG Sanco, that 70% of breeders in the EU are small or medium-sized farmers. Can the Commission provide details of the database from which this information was taken?

2. Many citizens want to be active in saving and disseminating old varieties and preserving biodiversity. Often citizens have no other choice than to sell and buy seeds and plants, for example at local markets. Does the Commission think that under the new legislation it is proposing, such actions will still be considered legal in the future?

3. Today farmers make an important contribution in terms of saving and disseminating old varieties and preserving biodiversity by exchanging their seeds and plants. Such exchange is only practicable if farmers are allowed to ask for a refund of their expenses. Does the Commission think that under the new legislation it is proposing, these actions also will still be considered legal in the future?

4. How does the Commission intend to safeguard farmers' rights as regards replanting seeds on their farms?

5. For the organic farming sector it is fundamental to be aware of the breeding methods and techniques in use. How does the Commission intend to ensure that organic farmers have access to the necessary information in view of Article 75 on confidentiality?

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

1. There are no studies known to the Commission providing solid data on the share of SMEs in the EU market for plant reproductive material, but according to a recent study of the EP ([1]), SMEs still represent a high share of the EU seed sector (for example, they represent the overwhelming majority of Italy's seed companies), although the situation is highly diversified, according to their size (turnover, number of employees), crops portfolio, geographical area covered and activities carried out. In seed potatoes and sugar beet no multinational companies are active, although a single company may own a large number of brands. Also in cereals, the share of multinationals is small. On straw cereals, maize, sunflower and rapeseed on the contrary the main seed companies are mainly multinationals ([2]).

2. Article 36 of the draft proposal establishes a derogation from registration requirements for niche-market material. Any person other than professional operators and some professional operators can make such material available on the market if the conditions of that article are fulfilled.

3. Article 2(d) of the draft proposal excludes the exchange in kind of plant reproductive material between persons other than professional operators from the scope of the regulation.

4. Council Regulation (EC) No2100/94 on Community Plant Variety Rights establishes a derogation for farmers to use, on their own holding, farm saved seed of protected varieties under certain conditions. The Commission is not proposing to abolish this principle. Concerning the harvest of seed of non-protected varieties, the proposed Regulation on plant reproductive material will not affect the possibility for farmers to replant them on their own farm.

5. The draft proposal does not include any provisions concerning breeding methods or techniques.

([1]) European Parliament, Study on The EU Seed and Plant Reproductive Material (PRM) Market in Perspective — A focus on companies and market shares (Brussels, 21 November 2013).

([2]) European Parliament, 21 November 2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012184/13
alla Commissione
Paolo De Castro (S&D)
(24 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Armonizzazione delle autorizzazioni per i prodotti fitosanitari

L'articolo 53 del regolamento (CE) n. 1107/2009 prevede, in situazioni di emergenza fitosanitaria, la possibilità per gli Stati membri di autorizzare l'immissione sul mercato di prodotti fitosanitari per un uso limitato e controllato.

La disposizione normativa sopra citata prevede un'eccessiva discrezionalità nell'utilizzo delle autorizzazioni ed una scarsa armonizzazione delle stesse su scala europea. Ciò rischia concretamente di creare vantaggi competitivi per alcuni paesi dell'UE e una conseguente distorsione sul mercato europeo dei prodotti ortofrutticoli. In base alle autorizzazioni dell'articolo 53, si verifica infatti che alcuni principi attivi/agrofarmaci possono essere utilizzati su determinate colture in alcuni paesi dell'Unione mentre in altri restano vietati.

L'Italia, a differenza di paesi concorrenti sul mercato ortofrutticolo quali la Francia, non ha l'autorizzazione per l'utilizzo del geodisinfestante 1,3 dicloropropene per difendere le produzioni di carote dai nematodi. Sempre in Italia, gli antiossidanti storicamente utilizzati su pomacee (Etossichina e Difenilammina) non sono più autorizzati dalla normativa vigente, mentre in Spagna e Portogallo è stata concessa l'autorizzazione all'uso straordinario sulle pere della molecola Etossichina anche per l'annata 2013/2014 (articolo 53 del regolamento (CE) n. 1107/2009). La gestione differente di tali autorizzazioni da parte dei vari paesi europei sta dunque creando distorsioni di concorrenza a livello europeo.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

È a conoscenza del fenomeno descritto e ha valutato l'eventualità di rivedere il funzionamento del processo di rilascio delle autorizzazioni (di cui all'articolo 53 del regolamento (CE) n. 1107/2009), al fine di prevedere una gestione più armonizzata a livello europeo del sistema delle autorizzazioni e di evitare i sempre più diffusi fenomeni di distorsione di concorrenza sopra descritti?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(20 dicembre 2013)

L'articolo 53 del regolamento (CE) n. 1107/2009 ([1]) concede agli Stati membri un alto grado di flessibilità per quanto riguarda le cosiddette «autorizzazioni di emergenza» e la sua applicazione presenta notevoli differenze tra i diversi paesi dell'UE.

In forza di tale articolo in casi eccezionali gli Stati membri possono autorizzare per non oltre centoventi giorni prodotti fitosanitari non conformi al regolamento n. 1107/2009, ove tale provvedimento appaia necessario a causa di un pericolo che non può essere contenuto in alcun altro modo ragionevole. Allo scopo di fornire una guida per l'applicazione di tali norme la Commissione ha presentato al comitato permanente per la catena alimentare e la salute degli animali un progetto di documento di orientamento riguardante l'articolo 53. Tale documento era finalizzato ad armonizzare l'attuazione dell'articolo 53 e a migliorare il sistema di notifica, in quanto esso imponeva agli Stati membri di notificare alla Commissione le motivazioni particolareggiate dell'autorizzazione e le misure attenuative applicate. Tali informazioni sarebbero state essenziali per l'esame delle autorizzazioni rilasciate dagli Stati membri ed eventualmente per l'adozione delle azioni previste dall'articolo 53, paragrafo 3, ivi compresa la richiesta di revocare o modificare il provvedimento.

Nel febbraio del 2013 la Commissione ha sottoposto il progetto di documento orientativo all'approvazione del comitato permanente. Il testo non è stato però approvato all'unanimità da tutti gli Stati membri, per cui la sua valenza attuale è quella di un documento di lavoro ([2]). Di conseguenza sono rari, tra gli Stati membri, quelli che attualmente applicano il sistema di notifica.

La Commissione continuerà a studiare le azioni più appropriate per garantire l'applicazione armonizzata dell'articolo 53, con l'obiettivo ultimo di evitare situazioni quali quelle descritte dall'Onorevole parlamentare.

([1]) GU L 309 del 24.11.2009, pag. 1.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/pesticides/approval_active_substances/docs/working_document_emergency_authorisations_article53_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012184/13
to the Commission
Paolo De Castro (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Uniform application of authorisations for plant protection products

Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 allows Member States to authorise plant protection products to be placed on the market in emergency plant protection situations, subject to limited, controlled use.

The abovementioned legislative provision allows too much leeway in the use of these authorisations and does not provide for adequate standardisation of the authorisations at EU level. In practice, this is threatening to create a competitive advantage for some EU countries, leading to a distortion of the European fruit and vegetable market. In some countries, certain ingredients or agrochemicals are permitted on specific crops on the basis of the authorisations provided for under the abovementioned Article 53, while in others the same substances are banned.

In Italy, the use of the soil fumigant 1,3-dichloropropene to protect carrot crops against nematodes is not authorised, whereas it is in other countries competing in the fruit and vegetable market, such as France. Again in Italy, the antioxidants traditionally used on apples and pears (ethoxyquin and diphenylamine) are no longer authorised under the current regulations, while in Spain and Portugal authorisation for the exceptional use of ethoxyquin on pears was again granted for the 2013-14 season under Article 53. Variations in the way different Member States apply these authorisations is therefore creating a distortion of competition at EU level.

Is the Commission aware of the problem described above and has it assessed the possibility of reviewing the authorisation issuing procedure under Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, with a view to creating uniform application of the authorisation system across Europe and preventing the growing problem of distortion of competition described above?

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

Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 ([1]) provides for a high degree of flexibility to Member States as regards the so-called 'emergency authorisations' and that its application is much diversified across the EU.

According to this article, in exceptional cases Member States can authorise for maximum 120 days plant protection products not complying with Regulation (EC) No 1107/2007, when it is necessary to do so because of a danger that cannot be contained by any other reasonable means. In order to provide guidance in applying these rules, a draft guidance document on Article 53 has been submitted by the Commission to the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health. The draft guidance aimed at harmonising the implementation of Article 53 and at improving the notification system, by requiring the Member States to submit information to the Commission on the detailed reasons for granting the authorisation and the mitigation measures applied. Such type of information would be essential in reviewing the authorisations issued by Member States and, if necessary, taking any actions as provided for in Article 53(3), including a request to withdraw or amend the authorisation.

In February 2013, the Commission submitted the draft guidance for endorsement to the Standing Committee. The text was however not unanimously endorsed by all Member States, and as a result its status remains that of a working document ([2]). As a consequence, very few Member States are currently making use of the improved notification system.

The Commission will now further reflect on the most appropriate actions to ensure a harmonised application of Article 53, with the ultimate objective to avoid situations as those described by the Honourable Member.

([1]) OJ L 309, 24.11.2009, p. 1.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/pesticides/approval_active_substances/docs/working_document_emergency_authorisations_article53_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012185/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Funding for environmental projects in 2014

Will the Commission make funding available to Member States in 2014 to enable them to fund nationally implemented environmental projects, such as Ireland's Rural Environmental Protection Scheme (REPS), ahead of the implementation of the new Common Agricultural Policy? In order to make the scheme as effective as possible, we must ensure continuity, as a year-long gap could result in considerable deterioration of land quality and jeopardise the progress made by the REPS programme so far.

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2013)

If Member States want to ensure continuity from the current rural development programming period to the next as concerns their agri-environment measures (such as REPS in Ireland), they can make use of the following transitional rules:

If the aim is to extend already existing agri-environment contracts, Article 27(12) of Regulation 1974/2006 ([1]), as amended by Regulation 335/2013 ([2]), allows the extension of agri-environment commitments until the end of the period to which the 2014 payment claim refers. This would normally be financed out of a Member State's 2007-2013 rural development financial envelope. Alternatively, Commission proposal COM(2013) 226 final ([3]) for a regulation laying down transitional provisions proposes in its Article 3 to allow payments for such an extension to be made out of a Member State's 2014-2020 financial envelope.

If the aim is to enter into new agri-environment contracts with beneficiaries, Member States have two possibilities. If there are resources left in their 2007-2013 financial envelope, these can be used for financing these new contracts. Alternatively, Commission proposal COM(2013)226 final foresees in its Article 1 to allow Member States to continue undertaking new legal commitments in 2014 pursuant to current rural development programmes even after the financial resources of the 2007-2013 programming period have been used up. Payments for such new contracts would again be possible from the 2014-2020 rural development financial envelope in accordance with Article 3 of the proposal.

([1]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 1974/2006 of 15 December 2006 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) (OJ L 368, 23.12. 2006, p.15).

([2]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 335/2013 of 12 April 2013 amending Regulation (EC) No 1974/2006 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) (OJ L 105, 13.4.2013, p.1).

([3]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down certain transitional provisions on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and amending Regulation (EU) No [RD] as regards resources and their distribution in respect of the year 2014 and amending Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 and Regulations (EU) No [DP], (EU) No [HZ] and (EU) No [sCMO] as regards their application in the year 2014.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-012187/13
alla Commissione
Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE)
(24 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Malattia vegetale degli ulivi in Puglia

Presentatasi in forma sporadica e inavvertibile, si è diffusa, negli ultimi mesi, in maniera gravissima ed estesa, una letale malattia vegetale degli ulivi, che si è localizzata in Puglia e in particolare nella provincia di Lecce.

L'epidemia riscontrata, che provoca l'essiccamento delle piante, si è estesa in un'area di circa 8 mila ettari colpendo decine e decine di migliaia di alberi di ulivo. A seguito degli accertamenti e delle analisi effettuate da tutti gli uffici e istituti preposti, è emerso in maniera incontrovertibile che l'infezione è originata da un batterio denominato «Xylella fastidiosa», agente particolarmente pericoloso mai individuato in Europa che ha provocato invece, in America e in Asia, malattie su varie specie di piante, tra cui vite e agrumi, causando notevolissime perdite al mondo agricolo ed economico.

La vastità dell'area e del numero delle piante colpite, nonché la rapidissima diffusione del batterio, provocano fortissima preoccupazione non solo per i danni già prodotti, ma per quelli che potrebbero derivare da un ulteriore contagio che potrebbe colpire il resto delle colture olivicole se non anche di altro tipo, in Puglia, in Italia e in Europa.

Alla luce della pericolosissima epidemia, scientificamente accertata, e degli unici rimedi indicati, consistenti nello sradicamento degli alberi colpiti e nella loro distruzione, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. quali provvedimenti intenda adottare con urgenza al fine di provvedere all'accertamento e alla verifica dell'epidemia riscontrata e, conseguentemente, quali aiuti scientifici e tecnici possano essere disposti per essere di supporto alle istituzioni locali;

2. quali misure di natura finanziaria possano essere mobilitate per tamponare con un cordone sanitario l'area colpita e provvedere allo sradicamento degli alberi infetti onde impedire la propagazione del batterio;

3. quale aiuto economico possa essere indirizzato verso i produttori colpiti da questa gravissima infezione che sta provocando ingentissimi danni economici?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-012314/13
alla Commissione
Paolo De Castro (S&D)
(29 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Interventi per contrastare il batterio degli ulivi

Il batterio Xylella fastidiosa ha contaminato circa ottomila ettari di uliveti nella zona del Salento (Puglia) mettendo a rischio di sradicamento 500-600 mila alberi d'ulivo, tra cui moltissimi secolari.

Tale batterio causa il disseccamento della chioma e l'imbrunimento del legno fino alla morte definitiva della pianta.

Fino ad ora, esso non si è diffuso né in Europa né tantomeno sulle piante di ulivo, ma la sua diffusione, che si pensa veicolata da insetti cicadellidi, è molto repentina e mette a rischio l'economia e il paesaggio di un'intera Regione la cui agricoltura si basa sulla coltivazione dell'ulivo e il cui ambiente è legato alla presenza di ulivi secolari di inestimabile valore paesaggistico-naturale.

Può la Commissione far sapere se è a conoscenza del fenomeno e cosa intende fare anche in termini di risorse finanziarie per contrastare la propagazione repentina della malattia (che potrebbe estendersi ad altre parti del territorio europeo) e per aiutare lo Stato membro interessato e gli agricoltori colpiti a fronteggiare questa crisi?

Risposta congiunta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(5 dicembre 2013)

Alla fine di ottobre, la Commissione è stata informata dalle autorità italiane dell'esistenza di un focolaio del batterio *Xyllela fastidiosa* in Puglia. Una discussione sulla necessità di misure dell'Unione europea è programmata per il 27 novembre 2013 nell'ambito del Comitato fitosanitario permanente, sulla base anche di un primo parere scientifico dell'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare.

A norma della direttiva sul regime fitosanitario UE ([1]), a determinate condizioni e per talune misure, l'Italia potrebbe ricevere un cofinanziamento dell'Unione per le spese direttamente connesse alle misure necessarie per contrastare il batterio.

Attualmente, il FEASR prevede un sostegno al ripristino del potenziale produttivo agricolo danneggiato da calamità naturali. Per beneficiare di questo sostegno, il provvedimento deve essere coperto dal PSR regionale ([2]). Se così non fosse la Regione può presentare alla Commissione una domanda di modifica del PSR che introduca il provvedimento, utilizzando i fondi disponibili o nuovi fondi a decorrere dal 2014.

L'Italia può concedere aiuti nazionali fino al 100 % per compensare le perdite causate da organismi nocivi, conformemente agli Orientamenti comunitari per gli aiuti di Stato nel settore agricolo e forestale 2007-2013 ([3]) o al regolamento 1857/2006 ([4]). L'Italia può anche accordare aiuti *de minimis* a norma del regolamento 1535/2007 ([5]).

La creazione di una banca dati europea sugli organismi patogeni delle colture per la quarantena dei vegetali è attualmente in discussione presso l'Organizzazione europea e mediterranea per la protezione delle piante; il sostegno finanziario dell'UE sarà considerato quando vi sarà una base di finanziamento *ad hoc* in linea con la proposta della Commissione di un regolamento per la gestione della spesa nel settore della catena alimentare ([6]).

([1]) Stabilito dalla direttiva 2000/29/CE del Consiglio, dell'8 maggio 2000, concernente le misure di protezione contro l'introduzione nella Comunità di organismi nocivi ai vegetali o ai prodotti vegetali e contro la loro diffusione nella Comunità (GU L 169 del 10.7.2000).
([2]) Programma di sviluppo rurale.
([3]) Orientamenti comunitari per gli aiuti di Stato nel settore agricolo e forestale 2007-2013.
([4]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1857/2006 della Commissione.
([5]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1535/2007 della Commissione.
([6]) 2013/0169 (COD).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012187/13
to the Commission
Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Olive tree disease in Puglia

Initially only sporadic and imperceptible, in recent months a very serious, extensive and deadly plant disease has been spreading among olive trees in Puglia and in particular in the province of Lecce.

The epidemic, which causes the trees to dry out, has spread across an area of around 8000 hectares, affecting tens of thousands of olive trees. Following investigations and tests carried out by all the offices and institutions responsible, incontrovertible evidence has emerged that the infection comes from a bacterium called '*Xylella fastidiosa*', a particularly dangerous agent that has never been identified in Europe but which, in America and Asia, has caused disease in various species of plants, including vines and citrus trees, resulting in substantial losses to the agricultural sector and the economy.

The vastness of the area and the number of affected trees, not to mention the extremely rapid spread of the bacterium, is causing grave concern not only for the damage already done, but for that which might be caused by further contagion, which could affect the rest of the olive, and other, crops in Puglia, Italy and Europe.

In the light of this dangerous, scientifically proven epidemic and of the only course of action recommended, namely the uprooting and destruction of the diseased trees, can the Commission say:

1. what measures it intends to take, as a matter of urgency, to ascertain and conduct checks on the epidemic in question and, consequently, what scientific and technical aid can be provided to support local institutions;

2. what financial measures can be taken with a view to setting up a sanitary cordon around the affected area and uprooting the infected trees, in order to prevent the spread of the bacterium;

3. what financial assistance can be given to producers affected by this extremely seriousinfection that is causing such great economic damage?

Question for written answer P-012314/13
to the Commission
Paolo De Castro (S&D)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: Measures to contain bacterium infecting olive trees

Around 8000 hectares of olive groves in the Salento area of Puglia have been infected by the Xylella fastidiosa bacterium, possibly necessitating the uprooting of between 500 000 and 600 000 olive trees, many of them centuries old.

The bacterium causes foliage to dry out and wood to darken, eventually killing the infected plant.

The disease, which is believed to be carried by the leafhopper (Cicadellidae), has not yet been propagated further afield and still less affected olive trees in the rest of Europe. However, it is spreading very rapidly, posing an economic and environmental threat to an entire region where olive production is the staple agricultural activity and centuries-old olive trees form an inestimably valuable part of the landscape and natural heritage.

Is the Commission aware of the problem? What financial and other measures is it envisaging contain the rapid propagation of the disease (which could spread further afield in Europe) and help the Member State and olive growers concerned confront this crisis?

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2013)

End October, the Commission was informed by Italy of the *Xyllela fastidiosa* bacterium outbreak in Puglia. A discussion on the need for EU measures is scheduled in the Standing Committee on Plant Health on 27 November 2013, using also a first scientific statement of the European Food Safety Authority.

Under the EU plant-health regime Directive ([1]), on certain conditions and for certain measures, Italy might receive, a co-financing from the Union for expenditure relating directly to necessary measures against the bacterium.

Currently, the EAFRD provides for support to restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters. To benefit from this support the measure has to be covered by the regional RDP ([2]). If it is not the case the region can submit a request to the Commission for an amendment to the RDP introducing the measure, using available funds or making use of new funds as of 2014.

Italy may grant national aid up to 100% to compensate for losses caused by harmful organisms in line with the Community guidelines for state aid in the agriculture and forestry sector 2007 to 2013 ([3]) or of Regulation 1857/2006 ([4]). Italy may also grant *de minimis* aid in accordance with Regulation 1535/2007 ([5]).

The creation of a European crop pathogen database for plant quarantine organisms is currently discussed at the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organisation, EU financial support will be considered once *ad hoc* financing basis will exist in line with Commission proposal for a regulation for the management of the expenditure in the food chain area ([6]).

([1]) Established by Council Directive 2000/29/EC of 8 May 2000 on protective measures against the introduction into the Community of organisms harmful to plants or plant products and against their spread within the Community (OJ L 169, 10.7.2000).
([2]) Rural Development Programme.
([3]) The Community guidelines for state aid in the agriculture and forestry sector 2007 to 2013.
([4]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006.
([5]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 1535/2007.
([6]) 2013/0169 (COD).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012188/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(24 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Scandalo alimentare nell'UE: intestini di maiale venduti al posto dei calamari

In numerosi supermercati europei sono in vendita calamari che in realtà sarebbero intestini di suino la cui consistenza gelatinosa ricorderebbe i molluschi.

Considerati i recenti scandali alimentari dei preparati a base di carne di manzo sofisticati, già sollevati nelle interrogazioni E-001557/2013 «Hamburger di manzo sofisticati con altre carni: necessità di una normativa sulla tracciabilità della filiera dei preparati alimentari trasparente per i consumatori» e E-001559/2013 «Lasagne surgelate contenenti carne di cavallo: normativa sull'etichettatura, tutela dei consumatori e lotta all'Italian sounding», e tenuto conto che il livello di guardia sulla sicurezza alimentare dovrebbe essere aumentato;

Può la Commissione indicare:

— Se è a conoscenza dei fatti sopra esposti e se ha aperto un'indagine in merito?

— Quanto è estesa la situazione e quali catene della grande distribuzione sono coinvolte e in quali Stati membri?

— Se ritiene che vi sia un rischio per la salute dei cittadini e, se sì, come intende intervenire per tutelare i consumatori europei?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(4 dicembre 2013)

La Commissione presta attenzione a tutte le informazioni concernenti potenziali frodi nella catena agroalimentare e si impegna a migliorare la capacità degli Stati membri di opporsi a casi di tale natura.

La Commissione non dispone di informazioni da cui risulti che le pratiche cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato e che sono state riferite da alcuni articoli di stampa, si stiano effettivamente verificando. Secondo altre fonti giornalistiche, le notizie secondo cui intestini di suino sarebbero stati venduti come calamari sarebbero in realtà una pura invenzione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012188/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Food scandal in the EU: pigs' intestines sold as calamari

Pigs' intestines, the gelatinous consistency of which is reminiscent of squid, has apparently been sold as calamari in a number of European supermarkets.

There have been other recent food scandals involving adulterated beef-based products, as raised in Questions E-001557/2013 'Beefburgers adulterated with other kinds of meat: need for a transparent set of rules on traceability in the food preparations sector for consumers' and E-001559/2013 'Frozen lasagne containing horsemeat: labelling legislation, consumer protection and combating the "Italian sounding" phenomenon', and safeguards need to be stepped up in terms of food safety.

Is the Commission aware of the above facts and has it opened an investigation into the issue?

How widespread is the phenomenon, which large retail chains are involved and in which Member States?

Does the Commission think that there is a risk to public health and, if so, what will it do to protect European consumers?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(4 December 2013)

The Commission is attentive to all information regarding potential frauds along the agri-food chain and is actively seeking to improve the Member States' capability to counter any such case.

The Commission has no information indicating that the practices to which the Honourable Member refers, and reported by some press articles, are actually taking place. Indeed, further press articles point to the possibility that the claim according to which pigs' intestines would be sold as calamari, is a hoax.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012189/13
al Consiglio
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(24 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Costruzione del nuovo edificio del Consiglio europeo

Nel 2002 il governo belga propone la ristrutturazione di una parte del Residence Palace, da destinare alle attività del Consiglio europeo.

Il Consiglio europeo dispone già di diversi spazi e in particolare il Justus Lipsius, all'angolo del Rond-Point Schuman, e il LEX, sulla rue de la Loi.

Il nuovo edificio, la cui costruzione è iniziata nel 2008, comprende tre sale conferenze con cabine d'interpretazione, altre cinque sale riunioni, luoghi di lavoro per il presidente del Consiglio europeo, per le presidenze del Consiglio, per le delegazioni degli Stati membri dell'Unione europea e per la stampa.

Si sostiene che il costo di tale progetto, secondo quanto approvato nel 2004, rimarrà al di sotto del limite massimo concordato di 240 milioni di euro.

Pertanto chiedo al Consiglio se ci possa essere fornito un dettaglio del piano finanziario legato all'opera, con evidenza delle fonti di finanziamento della stessa.

Risposta
(16 dicembre 2013)

Il Consiglio non ha nulla da aggiungere alla sua risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-002198/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012189/13
to the Council
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Construction of the new Council building

In 2002, the Belgian Government proposed to refurbish part of the Residence Palace to house some of the Council's activities.

The Council already has various premises, including the Justus Lipsius building on the corner of Schuman Square, and the Lex building on rue de la Loi.

The new building, begun in 2008, will house three conference halls with interpreters' booths, five meeting rooms, work space for the President of the European Council and the rotating presidencies, Member State delegations and the press.

It is claimed that the cost of the project will remain under the threshold budget of EUR 240 million approved in 2004.

Is the Council able to provide details of the project's budget, highlighting the sources of funding?

Reply
(16 December 2013)

The Council has nothing to add to its reply to Written Question E-002198/13.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012190/13
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(24 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Evaluatieprocedure bouw kerncentrale Hinkley Point C

In het zuidwesten van Engeland „Hinkley Point" zal men van start gaan met het bouwen van een nieuwe kerncentrale.

In een eerdere vraag (E-008523/2011), peilde ik naar de houding en inmenging van de Commissie in dit gigantische investeringsproject, gebaseerd op de bepalingen vervat in art 43 van het Euratom verdrag. Meer bepaald vroeg ik of de Commissie voor haar advies, volgend uit een evaluatieprocedure, rekening ging houden met de gebeurtenissen in Fukushima.

In het antwoord stond het volgende te lezen: „tijdens deze besprekingen zal de Commissie de investeerder vragen de lessen van het incident in Fukushima in acht te nemen. In het bijzonder zal de Commissie deze projecten bestuderen en daarbij de criteria en de resultaten van de diepgaande veiligheids- en risicoanalyses („stresstests") in acht nemen".

Kan de Commissie aangeven:

— op welke wijze de investeerder deze lessen in acht heeft genomen?

— hoe de Commissie zelf de criteria en resultaten van de stresstests in acht heeft genomen?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(29 november 2013)

1. De lessen die werden getrokken uit het incident in Fukushima en de stresstests werden tijdens de artikel-43-procedure met de investeerder besproken. Aangezien er op dat moment in Europa twee Europese drukwaterreactoren in aanbouw waren, waarvan één (Flamanville, in Frankrijk) diende als referentieontwerp voor Hinkley Point, werd het relevant bevonden rekening te houden met de conclusies van het Franse stresstestverslag. Volgens dit verslag werd voor de Europese drukwaterreactoren vanaf de ontwerpfase rekening gehouden met scenario's van ernstige ongevallen en overwoog de licentienemer ([1]) verscheidene aanvullende maatregelen die de veiligheid van de reactor in Flamanville moeten verbeteren. Uit de discussies bleek ook duidelijk dat de investeerder ([2]) van Hinkley Point rekening zou houden met de resultaten van de stresstests in het Verenigd Koninkrijk ([3]).

2. Op basis van de resultaten van de stresstests en van het overleg met de nationale toezichthouders en belanghebbenden heeft de Commissie een voorstel goedgekeurd voor een gewijzigde richtlijn inzake nucleaire veiligheid ([4]). Het voorstel bevat nieuwe bepalingen die de rol en de onafhankelijkheid van de nationale toezichthouders moeten versterken, de transparantie op het gebied van nucleaire veiligheid moeten vergroten en nieuwe veiligheidsdoelstellingen en -eisen moeten invoeren voor alle fasen van de levenscyclus van kerninstallaties (het ontwerp, de keuze van de vestigingsplaats, de bouw, het bedrijfsklaar maken, de exploitatie en de ontmanteling). Een Europees systeem van „peer-reviews" van de veiligheid van kerninstallaties wordt overwogen, net als een mechanisme voor de ontwikkeling van in heel de EU geharmoniseerde richtsnoeren inzake nucleaire veiligheid. Het voorstel wordt momenteel in de Raad besproken.

([1]) EDF — Enérgie de France. EDF is tevens de meerderheidsaandeelhouder van de investeerder van Hinkley Point.
([2]) NNB Generation Company Ltd., een deel van EDF Group.
([3]) De uitvoering van deze verbintenissen, die onder de verantwoordelijkheid van de investeerder valt, vindt plaats onder toezicht van de Britse toezichthouder.
([4]) Voorstel voor een richtlijn van de Raad houdende wijziging van Richtlijn 2009/71/Euratom tot vaststelling van een communautair kader voor de nucleaire veiligheid van kerninstallaties (COM(2013)0715).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012190/13
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Evaluation procedure for the construction of the Hinkley Point C nuclear power station

A new nuclear power station is to be built at Hinkley Point in the South-West of England.

In a previous question (E-008523/2011), I sought to find out the attitude and involvement of the Commission in this enormous investment project, based on the provisions of Article 43 of the Euratom Treaty. More specifically, I asked whether, for its opinion, following an evaluation process, the Commission took into consideration the events at Fukushima.

The answer included the following: 'In the discussion the Commission will ask the investor to consider the lessons learnt from the Fukushima event. In particular, the Commission will examine these projects taking into account the criteria and the outcome of the comprehensive risk and safety assessments ("stress tests").'

Can the Commission tell me:

— how the investor has taken account of these lessons; and

— how the Commission itself has taken account of the results of the stress tests?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(29 November 2013)

1. The lessons learned from the Fukushima accident and the stress tests were discussed with the investor during the article 43 procedure. Since at the time there were two European pressurised reactors (EPR) under construction in Europe, one of which (Flamanville, in France) served as reference design for Hinkley Point, it was deemed relevant to consider the conclusions of the French stress test report. According to this report, in the case of the EPR, severe accident scenarios were integrated from the design stage and several complementary safety improvement measures for the EPR in Flamanville were envisaged by the licensee ([1]). From the discussions it also became clear that the Hinkley Point investor ([2]) would take into account the results of the stress tests in the UK ([3]).

2. On the basis of the results of the stress tests, as well as consultations with national regulators and stakeholders, the Commission adopted a legislative proposal for an amended Nuclear Safety Directive ([4]). The proposal includes new provisions aiming at strengthening the role and independence of national regulators, enhancing transparency on nuclear safety matters and introducing new safety objectives and requirements for the different stages of the lifecycle of nuclear installations (design, siting, construction, commissioning, operation and decommissioning). A European system of peer reviews of the safety of nuclear installations is envisaged, as well as a mechanism for the development of EU-wide harmonised nuclear safety guidelines. The proposal is currently being discussed in the Council.

([1]) EDF — Enérgie de France. EDF is also the majority shareholder of the Hinkley Point investor.
([2]) NNB Generation Company Ltd., part of the EDF Group.
([3]) The implementation of these commitments, which is the responsibility of the investor, takes place under the supervision of the UK regulator.
([4]) Proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 2009/71/Euratom establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations (COM(2013) 715).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012191/13
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(24 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Kostenraming en timing bouw kerncentrale Verenigd Koninkrijk

In het zuidwesten van Engeland „Hinkley Point" zal men van start gaan met het bouwen van een nieuwe kerncentrale. Het betreft de constructie van twee EPR-reactoren. Een type dat nog niet operatief is in Europa.

In Finland bouwt men sinds 2005 in de Olkiluoto kerncentrale eveneens aan een EPR-reactor. Het bouwproces verloopt uiterst moeizaam. De huidige kosten worden momenteel geraamd op 8,5 miljard euro, bijna 3 maal de prijs van de eerst voorgestelde 3,2 miljard euro. De datum voor de start van de productie werd ook al meermaals jaren uitgesteld. Ondertussen wordt verwacht dat de reactor niet voor 2016 „on line" zal gaan.

De investering voor Hinkley Point in het Verenigd Koninkrijk wordt geraamd op 19 miljard euro. De geplande productiedatum 2023.

Areva, het Franse nucleaire bedrijf dat het EPR ontwerp voor Hinkley Point C verzorgt, is ook betrokken bij het project in Finland.

— Werd er in de evaluatieprocedure van de Commissie voor de centrale in het Verenigd Koninkrijk rekening gehouden met de vertragingen en extra kosten die de constructie in Finland ondervindt?

— Zo ja, hoe?

— Zijn er reeds vermoedens dat de timing en kostenraming ook in het Verenigd Koninkrijk onderschat worden?

— Werden er „veiligheidsmarges" ingebouwd in de vooropgestelde timing en kostenraming?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(3 december 2013)

1. en 2. De Europese drukwaterreactoren (EPR-reactoren) in de kerncentrales van Olkiluoto en Hinkley Point zijn volgens de regels aangemeld bij de Commissie, die haar standpunt bij artikel 43 van het Euratom-verdrag heeft gepubliceerd ([1]).

In het kader van deze procedure bespreekt de Commissie met de investeerders alle aspecten van het project die in verband staan met de doelstellingen van het Euratom-Verdrag. De financiering en het tijdschema van een project komen tijdens deze besprekingen weliswaar ter sprake, maar worden enkel behandeld wanneer het gaat over de haalbaarheid van het gehele project en de positieve bijdrage ervan tot het verzekeren van de continuïteit van de energievoorziening.

De procedure van beide EPR-projecten, met name het project van de Olkiluoto-reactor, vond plaats in omstandigheden die aanzienlijk verschilden van die van vandaag. De evaluatie van de Commissie bij die gelegenheid vond plaats vóór de ramp in Fukushima en de beslissing van de Duitse regering om met kernenergie te stoppen. Beide gebeurtenissen hebben het financieringslandschap voor kerncentrales aanzienlijk veranderd. Het consortium voor Hinkley Point bijvoorbeeld bestond destijds uit Duitse nutsbedrijven die zich nadien hebben teruggetrokken. De kostenramingen en tijdschema's waarover de Commissie op het ogenblik van de evaluatie beschikte, vermeldden geen overschrijdingen of vertragingen.

3. en 4. De vertragingen en kostenoverschrijdingen zijn in de eerste plaats een handelszaak, waarvan de risico's worden gedragen door de betrokken investeerder(s).

In verband met de door de Commissie uitgevoerde evaluatie van de veiligheid van de Europese drukwaterreactoren, in het bijzonder na de ramp in Fukushima, wordt het geachte Parlementslid verwezen naar het antwoord van de Commissie op schriftelijke vraag E-012190/2013 ([2]).

([1]) http://hinkleypoint.edfenergyconsultation.info/newsroom-faqs/press-releases/974
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/nl/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012191/13
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Cost estimate and timescales for the construction of a nuclear power station in the UK

A new nuclear power station is to be built at Hinkley Point in the South-West of England. This will mean the construction of two European pressurised reactors (EPR). This is a type of reactor not yet operational in Europe.

In Finland, too, an EPR has been under construction at the Olkiluoto nuclear power station since 2005. The construction process is making extremely laborious progress. The current costs are presently estimated at EUR 8.5 billion, nearly three times the price of EUR 3.2 billion originally proposed. The date for the commencement of power generation has also been put back by years on multiple occasions. Meanwhile, the reactor is not expected to go online before 2016.

The investment for Hinkley Point in the United Kingdom is estimated at EUR 19 billion. Power generation is expected to start in 2023.

Areva, the French nuclear firm providing the EPR design for Hinkley Point C, is also involved in the project in Finland.

— In the Commission's evaluation process for the nuclear power station in the UK, is account being taken of the delays and extra costs experienced during construction in Finland?

— If so, how?

— Are there already suspicions that the timescales and cost estimates for the UK may also be underestimated?

— Have safety margins been built into the proposed timescales and cost estimates?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2013)

1-2. The European Pressurised Reactors (EPR) at the Olkiluoto and Hinkley Point nuclear power plants (NPPs) were duly notified to the Commission, which issued its point of view under Article 43 Euratom ([1]).

As part of this procedure, the Commission discusses with the investors all aspects of the project which relate to the objectives of the Euratom Treaty. The financing and the timeframe of a project, though touched upon during these discussions, are treated only as far as the feasibility of the entire project and its positive contribution to ensuring supply security in Europe are concerned.

The procedure in relation to both EPR projects, particularly the Olkiluoto reactor, took place under circumstances which were considerably different from those prevailing today. The Commission's evaluation on that occasion predated both the Fukushima accident as well as the German government's decision to phase out nuclear energy. Both events changed considerably the financing landscape for NPP. For example, the consortium for Hinkley Point at the time included German utilities, which have since backed out. The cost estimates and timeframes at the Commission's disposal at the time of its evaluation did not indicate overruns or delays.

3-4. Delays and cost overruns are primarily a commercial matter, the risks of which are borne by the investor(s) concerned.

In terms of the Commission's evaluation of the safety of EPR, particularly following the Fukushima accident, the Honourable Member is referred to the Commission's reply to Written Question E-012190/2013 ([2]).

([1]) The notification documents and the Commission's point of view in relation to the Hinkley Point C EPR reactors are in the public domain and can be accessed at the following url: http://hinkleypoint.edfenergyconsultation.info/newsroom-faqs/press-releases/974

([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012192/13
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(24 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Bouw van EPR reactor in Hinkley Point C

In het Verenigd Koninkrijk plant men de nieuwe kerncentrale „Hinkley Point C" waarvoor twee EPR-reactoren gebouwd zullen worden in Sumerset in het zuidwesten van Engeland.

Een EPR is een nieuw type reactor, behorend tot de „derde generatie" met een erg groot vermogen. Er is momenteel nog geen enkele EPR reactor operatief in de EU.

Er is er één in aanbouw in Finland (Olkiluoto). De Franse firma AREVA heeft hierover de leiding. Het bouwproces loopt reeds jaren vertraging op. Er werd vooropgesteld dat de reactor online zou gaan in 2009 maar deze datum werd al uitgesteld tot minstens 2016. Een andere EPR reactor wordt gebouwd in Frankrijk (Flamanville), onder leiding van het, eveneens Franse, EDF. Ook hier zijn vertragingen opgelopen. Bij beide reactoren zijn die onder andere te wijten aan kwaliteitsproblemen.

Volgens de bepalingen van art 43 van het Euratom verdrag moet de Commissie een evaluatieprocedure uitvoeren voor de bouwplannen in Hinkley Point C. Bij dit gigantische investeringsproject zijn ook EDF en AREVA als eigenaars, uitbaters en bouwers verantwoordelijk.

— Zag de Commissie het feit dat er nog geen werkende reactoren zijn van dit type in Europa als een bijkomende moeilijkheid in haar evaluatieprocedure?

— Op welke manier werd dit gegeven meegenomen in de evaluatieprocedure?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(28 november 2013)

Bij de evaluatie van een investeringsproject overeenkomstig artikel 43 van het Euratom-Verdrag bespreekt de Commissie met de investeerders alle aspecten van het project die in verband staan met de doelstellingen van het Verdrag, met inbegrip van de veiligheid. Volgens de Euratom-wetgeving en in het bijzonder volgens de richtlijn inzake nucleaire veiligheid ([1]) is de veiligheid van de kerncentrales echter de verantwoordelijkheid van de uitbater die onder supervisie van een onafhankelijke nationale toezichthouder staat; bovendien moeten de lidstaten volgens deze richtlijn een wettelijk kader ontwerpen dat ook zorgt voor de goedkeuring van de nationale voorschriften inzake nucleaire veiligheid. In haar standpunt aangaande Hinkley Point behandelde de Commissie wel het feit dat er nog steeds geen functionerende EPR in Europa was, maar moest zij een beroep doen op de beoordeling van de nationale toezichthouder op basis van de relevante nationale regels.

Met name in de loop van de besprekingen met de investeerders bleek dat Flamanville 3 diende als referentieontwerp van Hinkley Point C, met enkele kleine verschillen vanwege de bijzondere eisen van de Britse toezichthouder. Aan het einde van 2009, in het kader van een gedetailleerde studie van het EPR-ontwerp heeft de Britse toezichthouder verklaard dat hij niet adviseerde om de EPR te bouwen wegens de veiligheidsproblemen in het ontwerp die eerst moesten worden aangepakt. In november 2010 stelde de toezichthouder echter het EOF en Areva officieel op de hoogte dat deze punten van zorg op bevredigende wijze waren afgehandeld en dat daardoor de kwestie was afgesloten.

Voor nadere informatie wordt het geachte Parlementslid verwezen naar de kennisgevingsdocumenten en het standpunt van de Commissie die zijn gepubliceerd ([2]).

([1]) Richtlijn 2009/71/Euratom van de Raad van 25 juni 2009 tot vaststelling van een communautair kader voor de nucleaire veiligheid van kerninstallaties (PB L 172 van 2.7.2009, blz. 18).
([2]) http://hinkleypoint.edfenergyconsultation.info/newsroom-faqs/press-releases/974.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012192/13
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Construction of a European pressurised reactor (EPR) at Hinkley Point C

The new Hinkley Point C nuclear power station is being planned in the United Kingdom, for which two EPRs are to be built in Somerset, in the South-West of England.

An EPR is a new type of reactor, a third-generation reactor, with a very large capacity. At present there is not a single operational EPR in the EU.

One such reactor is under construction in Finland (Olkiluoto). This project is headed by the French firm Areva. The building process is already subject to years of delay. The reactor was originally scheduled to go live in 2009, but that date has already been put back until at least 2016. Another EPR is being built in France (Flamanville), under the leadership of another French firm in EDF. Here, too, there have been delays. In both reactors, these delays have been attributable, amongst other things, to quality issues.

Article 43 of the Euratom Treaty requires the Commission to carry out an evaluation process in respect of the construction plans at Hinkley Point C. EDF and Areva are also in charge of this enormous investment project, as owners, operators and constructors.

— In its evaluation process, did the Commission consider the fact that there are still no working reactors of this type in Europe as an additional difficulty?

— How is this fact incorporated into the evaluation process?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(28 November 2013)

During the evaluation of an investment project under Article 43 of the Euratom Treaty, the Commission discusses with the investors all aspects of the project which relate to the objectives of the Treaty, including safety considerations. However, under Euratom law and in particular according to the Nuclear Safety Directive ([1]), the safety of nuclear power plants is the responsibility of the operator, under the supervision of an independent national regulator; in addition, according to this directive, Member States have to establish a legislative framework, which shall also provide for the adoption of national nuclear safety requirements. In its point of view in relation to Hinkley Point, the Commission did address the fact that there is still no operating European pressurised reactor (EPR) in Europe, but had to rely on the national regulator's assessment of this matter on the basis of the relevant national rules.

In particular, throughout the course of discussions with the investors, it emerged that Flamanville 3 served as reference design for Hinkley Point C, with some slight differences owing to specific requirements laid down by the UK regulator. At the end of 2009, in the context of a detailed study of the EPR design, the UK regulator had stated that it could not recommend new builds based on the EPR due to issues with the safety features of the design that would first have to be addressed. In November 2010, however, the regulator officially informed EDF and AREVA that they had addressed these concerns in a satisfactory manner, and that it had therefore closed the corresponding regulatory issue.

For more information, the Honourable Member is referred to the notification documents and the Commission's point of view, which are in the public domain ([2]).

([1]) Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom of 25 June 2009 establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations, Official Journal L 172, 2/07/2009, p. 18.
([2]) http://hinkleypoint.edfenergyconsultation.info/newsroom-faqs/press-releases/974

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012193/13
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(24 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Chinese participatie in het Hinkley Point C project

Het nieuwe reactorpark „Hinkley Point C" dat gepland is in Somerset (UK) zal gebouwd, uitgebaat en in eigendom zijn van het Franse bedrijf EDF. In het consortium zit echter ook de Chinese partner, China General Nuclear Power Group, dat voor 100% in Chinese staatshanden is. Het Chinese aandeel in het consortium bedraagt 40%. Het bedrijf gaf zelf eerder al aan in de internationale pers dat het hoopt dat het project in het VK hen de nodige geloofwaardigheid zal opleveren om ook op andere plaatsen in Europa nieuwe reactors te bouwen.

China is echter op gebied van nucleaire thema's niet onbesproken.

Bij de constructie van de eerste nucleaire centrale in China, ook in samenwerking met EDF, werden slechts 50 % van de vereiste verstevigingsstaven gebruikt in de betonnen constructie onder de reactor.

— China wordt beschuldigd van betrokkenheid in cyberspionage. Ziet de Commissie risico's in het verstrekken van toegang aan een Chinees overheidsbedrijf tot gevoelige informatie over de Europese energie-infrastructuur?

China is tevens een kernwapenstaat. Men vermoedt dat het land beschikt over 240 kernkoppen. Gezien de beperkte hoeveelheid beschikbare informatie hierover variëren de schattingen van 100 tot 400.

— Vindt de Commissie deze feiten aangaande veiligheidsaspecten, politieke regimes en proliferatie risico's zorgwekkend?

— Op welke manier heeft zij hiermee rekening gehouden bij de evaluatieprocedure van het Hinkley point C project?

— Is verder het feit dat 40 % van een nieuw energieproject in de EU in handen is van de Chinese overheid in lijn met de doelstellingen die de EU voorop stelt inzake energie-onafhankelijkheid van derde landen?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(23 december 2013)

1. In de nasleep van het ongeluk in Fukushima werden stresstests uitgevoerd op het vlak van zowel veiligheid als beveiliging. De beveiligingsaspecten werden besproken door een ad-hocgroep nucleaire beveiliging ([1]) die belast is met het opstellen van aanbevelingen voor de lidstaten om de beveiliging van kerncentrales te verbeteren ([2]). In het bijzonder op het gebied van cyberbeveiliging werd in het eindverslag van de ad-hocgroep herhaald dat dit eigenlijk een verantwoordelijkheid van de nationale autoriteiten was, maar toch werd een aantal algemene aanbevelingen gedaan om de beveiliging van kerncentrales te verbeteren.

2.-3. Op het tijdstip van de evaluatie door de Commissie krachtens artikel 43 van het Euratom-Verdrag was er nog geen Chinese betrokkenheid bij het project ([3]). In het kader van deze procedure werden alle aspecten in verband met de doelstellingen van het Euratom-Verdrag, waaronder nucleaire veiligheidscontrole besproken. Mogelijke militaire gevolgen vallen echter buiten de werkingssfeer van het Euratom-Verdrag en maken dan ook geen deel uit van de besprekingen. Ongeacht de samenstelling van het consortium zullen de exploitanten van de Hinkley-Point-kerncentrales echter de veiligheidscontroles volgens het Euratom-Verdrag moeten toepassen zodra de installatie operationeel is; zij moeten eveneens de internationale instrumenten in acht nemen op het gebied van nucleaire veiligheid waaraan het Verenigd Koninkrijk, de EU en het Euratom deelnemen, net zoals het Verdrag inzake de fysieke bescherming van nucleair materiaal ([4]).

4. De deelname van een buitenlandse investeerder brengt de elektriciteitsvoorziening in Europa niet in gevaar. De energiemarkt in de EU staat open voor investeringen uit derde landen. Buitenlandse investeerders die deelnemen aan de interne energiemarkt moeten net zoals investeerders uit de EU voldoen aan de toepasselijke voorschriften.

([1]) De ad-hocgroep werd voorgezeten door het voorzitterschap van de Raad.
([2]) Het verslag is beschikbaar op: http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st10/st10616.en12.pdf
([3]) De evaluatie van de Commissie werd voltooid toen de Commissie op 12 juli 2012 haar standpunt publiceerde.
([4]) De veiligheidscontrole en de beveiligingsgerelateerde regels moeten derhalve worden toegepast, ongeacht de Chinese betrokkenheid bij het betrokken consortium.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012193/13
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Chinese participation in the Hinkley Point C project

The new Hinkley Point C reactor park planned for the English county of Somerset is to be built, operated and owned by the French company EDF. However, the consortium also includes a Chinese partner, China General Nuclear Power Group, which is 100% owned by the Chinese State. The Chinese stake in the consortium is 40%. The company itself has previously stated in the international press that it hopes that the project in the UK will give it the necessary credibility to also build new reactors elsewhere in Europe.

However, China is not beyond reproach when it comes to nuclear issues.

When the first nuclear power station was built in China, even in collaboration with EDF, only 50% of the required reinforcing bars were used in the concrete structure beneath the reactor.

— China is accused of involvement in cyber-espionage. Does the Commission see risks in granting access to a Chinese State firm to sensitive information about Europe's energy infrastructure?

China is also a nuclear weapons State. It is believed to possess over 240 nuclear warheads. In light of the limited information available in this regard, the estimates range between 100 and 400.

— Does the Commission find these facts concerning aspects of security, political regimes and proliferation risks disturbing?

— How did it take this into consideration in the evaluation procedure for the Hinkley Point C project?

— Furthermore, is the fact that 40% of a new energy project in the EU is in the hands of the Chinese Government in line with the EU's proposed objectives in relation to energy independence from third countries?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(23 December 2013)

1. The stress tests conducted in the aftermath of the Fukushima accident were performed on the basis of a two-track process, dealing with safety and security. The security aspects were discussed by an Ad Hoc Group on Nuclear Security (AHGNS) ([1]), tasked with producing recommendations for the Member States on how to improve the security of nuclear power plants (NPPs) ([2]). Specifically on the subject of cyber-security, the final report of AHGNS reiterated that this was primarily a responsibility of national authorities, but offered a set of general recommendations to improve the security of NPPs.

2-3. At the time of the Commission's evaluation under Article 43 Euratom, there was as yet no Chinese involvement in the project ([3]). Discussions under this procedure include all aspects which relate to the objectives of the Euratom Treaty, including nuclear safeguards. Possible military implications are however outside the scope of the Euratom Treaty and are therefore not part of the discussions. Regardless of the composition of the consortium however, the operators of the Hinkley Point NPP will have to apply safeguards according to the Euratom Treaty once the plant is operational, as well as abide by international instruments in the field of nuclear security to which the United Kingdom, the EU and Euratom are parties, such as the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material ([4]).

4. The participation of a foreign investor does not constitute as such a risk to secure electricity supply in Europe. The EU energy market is open to investment from third countries. Foreign investors who participate in the internal energy market must comply with the applicable rules just as EU investors.

([1]) AHGNS was chaired by the Council Presidency.
([2]) Report available at the following URL: http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st10/st10616.en12.pdf
([3]) The Commission's evaluation was completed when the Commission issued its point of view on 12 July 2012.
([4]) Thus, safeguards and security related regulations will have to be applied, irrespective of the Chinese involvement in the consortium in question.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012196/13
to the Commission
Andrew Henry William Brons (NI)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Treaty of 8 April 1965

Under Article 28 of the Merger Treaty of 8 April 1965 and Article 9 of the Protocol thereto, Members of the European Parliament may not be subject to any form of inquiry, detention or legal proceedings in respect of the opinions expressed or votes cast by them when carrying out their duties.

This treaty was declared invalid on 1 May 1999 on the grounds that its provisions had been included in later treaties adopted by the Member States.

In which treaty do these provisions now appear, and what, exactly, is the current wording?

If the current wording differs in any way from the original, can the Commission explain the reasons for any such changes?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(20 November 2013)

The Treaty of 8 April 1965 establishing a Single Council and a Single Commission of the European Communities (the 'Merger treaty') was not declared invalid, but repealed by Article 9(1) of the treaty of Amsterdam. By virtue of the treaty of Amsterdam, the adapted text of Article 28 of the Merger treaty was inserted into the EC treaty (Article 291 EC), the ECSC treaty (Art. 76 ECSC) and the Euratom treaty (Art. 191 EAEC). By virtue of the treaty of Lisbon, Article 291 EC treaty has become Article 343 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

The Protocol of 8 April 1965 on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Communities, originally annexed to the Merger treaty, was not repealed by the treaty of Amsterdam. By virtue of the treaty of Lisbon, it has been annexed, as Protocol No 7 on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Union, to the Treaty on European Union, the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and the Euratom treaty.

The text of Article 9 of the Protocol of 8 April 1965 has remained unchanged save for the replacement of the expression 'Members of the Assembly' by 'Members of the European Parliament'. Article 9 of Protocol No 7 on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Union reads : 'Members of the European Parliament shall not be subject to any form of inquiry, detention or legal proceedings in respect of opinions expressed or votes cast by them in the performance of their duties'.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012197/13
to the Commission
Glenis Willmott (S&D), Catherine Stihler (S&D) and Brian Simpson (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Method of slaughter labelling and Sikhism

The most humane way to slaughter an animal is to stun it first. Some religious communities are exempted from using pre-stunning in line with their dietary laws. However, for various reasons, a significant amount of meat from animals that are slaughtered without being pre-stunned ends up on the market for general consumption. This is a matter of great concern to consumers who care about animal welfare and want to make sure that the meat they buy is killed in the most humane way possible.

Furthermore, people following the Sikh religion should not eat ritually slaughtered meat. However, without mandatory labelling of the method of slaughter, there is often no way for practising Sikhs to know whether they are following this rule correctly or not.

When slaughter method labelling was discussed during negotiations on the Food Information Regulation, the Commission promised to come forward with separate proposals under the animal welfare strategy. This was foreseen for late 2013, but Parliament has yet to receive anything.

When can we expect to receive this report?

Will the Commission take into account the concerns of EU citizens who care about animal welfare, as well as the issues surrounding religious freedom of practicing Sikhs?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2013)

Recital (50) of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers ([1]) states that: '(50) Union consumers show an increasing interest in the implementation of the Union animal welfare rules at the time of slaughter, including whether the animal was stunned before slaughter. In this respect, a study on the opportunity to provide consumers with the relevant information on the stunning of animals should be considered in the context of a future Union strategy for the protection and welfare of animals.'

When the Commission adopted the EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 ([2]), it included in its annex the delivery of this study.

The study is presently ongoing and results are expected by April 2014. In the light of them, the Commission will consider if further action is necessary, with due regard to the different socioeconomic aspects.

([1]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18-63.
([2]) COM(2012) 6 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012198/13
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Follow-up on vehicle defects and accidents

In his answer to Written Question E-009633/2013, Commissioner Kallas cites two sources of statistics on motorcycle accidents due to technical defects: 'Statistics relating to motorcycle accidents is taken from MAIDS' study (http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/pdf/projects/maids.pdf) as well as DEKRA's motorcycle report: (http://www.dekra.com/en/home).'

However, the two studies give quite contradictory statistics, with the DEKRA study citing 8% and the MAIDS study citing less than 1%. The Commissioner has publicly cited 8% in a press release on vehicle roadworthiness issued on2 July 2013 (MEMO/13/637).

Can the Commission explain why the statistics in the independent DEKRA study were favoured over the Commission's own MAIDS survey?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2013)

The Commission draws the attention of the Honourable member that the MAIDS study is not a Commission study but an independent study carried out by the motorcycle industry with the partial financial support of the European Union.

As regards the findings of the MAIDS study, it is correct that less than 1% of accidents involving motorcycles have as the only single cause an identified technical defect, but it concludes that up to 6% ([1]) of motorcycle accidents could be linked to technical defects. This value is indeed consistent with the findings of the most recent DEKRA road safety report . The Commission based its conclusions on the most recent data when elaborating its proposal for a revision of the roadworthiness legislation.

([1]) MAIDS study report p40: 5,1% with identified technical defects plus 0,9% where the investigators were unable to determine if a vehicle technical failure had occurred.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012200/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 octobre 2013)

Objet: Danger des «chasseurs de brevets»

Les «chasseurs de brevets» vont-ils bientôt débarquer en masse en Europe? Ces sociétés, très actives aux États-Unis, vivent de l'acquisition de brevets dans le seul but d'attaquer en justice quiconque les violeraient. Les «chasseurs de brevets» n'utilisent donc pas commercialement les brevets acquis mais s'en servent uniquement comme moyen de pression afin de soutirer de l'argent à d'autres sociétés.

Actuellement, le phénomène des «chasseurs de brevets» est essentiellement américain. Mais la nouvelle législation européenne sur les brevets pourrait changer la donne.

1. Comment la Commission se prépare-t-elle à cela?

2. Ne craint-elle pas des abus?

Un litige en matière de propriété intellectuelle peut être traité par deux tribunaux. L'un se penche sur la validité du brevet et l'autre détermine s'il y a eu violation ou non de ce brevet. Les deux procédures étant indépendantes l'une de l'autre, la commercialisation d'un produit peut être suspendue préventivement avant que la question de la validité du brevet ne soit tranchée. Et cela dans treize États membres au minimum, une fois que le brevet unique sera d'actualité.

3. Étant donné l'impact majeur d'une telle interdiction, les plaignants ne parviendraient-ils pas soutirer des sommes considérables sur la base de brevets de faible qualité ou même invalides?

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(8 janvier 2014)

La Commission ne voit pas pourquoi la récente législation de l'Union sur les brevets, à savoir les règlements (UE) nº 1257/2012 et 1260/2012, conduirait à une augmentation de l'activité des «chasseurs de brevets» en Europe. Dans la mesure où la question de l'Honorable Parlementaire concerne la juridiction unifiée du brevet (JUB), il convient de rappeler que l'accord relatif à cette juridiction («accord JUB») est un instrument de droit international et ne fait pas partie du droit de l'Union. Ce domaine ne relève donc pas des compétences de la Commission. Celle-ci peut néanmoins fournir les informations factuelles ci-dessous.

La JUB, en tant que juridiction commune spécialisée dans les brevets, renforcera la sécurité juridique, et l'existence d'une procédure centralisée de révocation des brevets rendra l'activité des «chasseurs de brevets» plus difficile que dans la situation de fragmentation actuelle.

L'accord JUB prévoit des mesures de sauvegarde contre les «chasseurs de brevets». Aucune injonction ne sera prononcée automatiquement: la JUB dispose d'un pouvoir d'appréciation pour mettre en balance les intérêts des parties et tenir compte des effets préjudiciables éventuels résultant de sa décision de prononcer ou non l'injonction en question. Le règlement de procédure de cette juridiction (projet du 25 juin 2013) prévoit la possibilité d'exiger des preuves raisonnables de la validité du brevet et de sa violation ainsi que d'imposer la constitution d'une garantie suffisante pour réparer tout préjudice susceptible d'être causé au contrevenant présumé si l'injonction est levée ultérieurement.

La JUB est une juridiction unique compétente à la fois pour les actions en contrefaçon et pour les actions en nullité en matière de brevets. Une division locale ou régionale a simplement la faculté, après avoir entendu les parties, de renvoyer une demande reconventionnelle devant la division centrale. Le règlement de procédure prévoit qu'en cas de probabilité élevée que le brevet soit déclaré non valide dans le cadre de l'action en nullité, le tribunal doit suspendre l'action en contrefaçon, de sorte qu'une décision soit prise quant à la validité du brevet avant que l'action en contrefaçon ne puisse se poursuivre.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012200/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Danger posed by 'patent trolls'

Are 'patent trolls' soon to arrive in Europe en masse? These companies, which are very active in the United States, make money by buying up patents with the sole aim of taking anyone who infringes them to court. 'Patent trolls' thus make no commercial use of the patents they own; rather, they use them purely as a way of pressuring other companies into giving them money.

For now, 'patent trolls' are largely an American problem. However, the new EU legislation on patents could change that.

1. How is the Commission preparing for this legislation?

2. Does it have concerns that the law will be abused?

Intellectual property cases may be dealt with by two courts: one focuses on the validity of the patent, while the other establishes whether the patent has been infringed or not. As both courts work independently of each other, a product may be preventively taken off the market before the issue of the patent's validity has been resolved. What is more, this could happen in at least 13 Member States, once the single patent becomes a reality.

3. In view of the major impact such a ban would have, would this not enable plaintiffs to extract considerable sums of money on the basis of poor-quality or even invalid patents?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(8 January 2014)

The Commission fails to see how the recent Union legislation on patents, namely Regulations 1257/2012 and 1260/2012, could increase the activity of so called 'patent trolls' in Europe. To the extent that the Honourable Member's question pertains to the Unified Patent Court (UPC), it should be noted that the UPC agreement is an instrument under international law and is not part of Union law. The matter is thus outside the Commission's remit. The Commission will, however, provide the following factual information.

The UPC as a common specialized patent court will increase legal certainty, and a centralized patent revocation procedure will leave less room for 'patent trolls' to exploit current fragmentation.

The UPC Agreement provides for safeguards against 'patent trolls'. No automatic injunctions shall be granted: the UPC has the discretion to weigh the parties' interests and to take into account the potential harm from the grant/refusal of the injunction. The Rules of Procedure (draft of 25 June 2013) foresee a possibility to require reasonable evidence that the patent is valid and being infringed and to order an adequate security for any injury likely to be caused to the alleged infringer if the injunction is later revoked.

The UPC is a single court competent for both patent infringement and revocation actions. A local/regional division has only a possibility, after having heard the parties, to refer a counterclaim for revocation to the central division. The Rules of Procedure provide that in case of a high probability that the patent will be held invalid in the revocation procedure the court must stay the infringement proceedings. The objective is to ensure that the patent validity is dealt with before the infringement action can proceed.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012206/13
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 octobre 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Blogueur emprisonné

Les autorités algériennes ont arrêté un blogueur sur la base d'accusations de terrorisme et de diffamation après avoir partagé des photos et des caricatures du président et du premier ministre sur son compte Facebook.

1. Quelle est la réaction officielle des autorités européennes?

2. Ne s'agit-il pas là d'un cas flagrant d'une restriction de la liberté d'expression?

3. Des contacts vont-ils être pris avec les autorités nationales sur ce dossier?

Réponse donnée par M. Füle au nom de la Commission
(5 décembre 2013)

Les autorités européennes suivent de près le dossier auquel fait référence l'Honorable Parlementaire. Il s'agit du deuxième cas de ce genre; un autre blogueur avait été arrêté sur la base d'accusations similaires, c'est-à-dire pour avoir fait l'apologie du terrorisme, et libéré après neuf mois de détention en avril 2013.

La question de la liberté d'expression est régulièrement soulevée lors de réunions avec les autorités algériennes, comme dans le cadre du sous-comité sur le dialogue politique, la sécurité et les Droits de l'homme. Cette problématique a également été abordée par des membres de la délégation du PE qui s'est rendue récemment (du 28 au 31 octobre 2013) en Algérie.

Les questions liées aux Droits de l'homme, à l'État de droit et à la démocratie font partie intégrante des négociations en cours relatives au plan d'action avec l'Algérie dans le cadre de la politique européenne de voisinage. L'UE insiste sur le plein respect des libertés fondamentales conformément aux normes internationales auxquelles l'Algérie a souscrit pour la plupart.

L'UE entretient aussi un dialogue avec les représentants de la société civile tant en Algérie qu'à Bruxelles; bon nombre d'entre eux suivent la situation dans le pays de près et font part de leur préoccupation concernant les cas avérés de non-respect des libertés fondamentales.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012206/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Imprisoned blogger

The Algerian authorities have arrested a blogger on terrorism and defamation charges after he shared photos and caricatures of the President and the Prime Minister on his Facebook account.

1. What is the official reaction of the European authorities?

2. Is this not a blatant restriction of the freedom of expression?

3. Will any contact be made with the national authorities over this case?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2013)

The European authorities are following closely the issue the Honourable MEP is referring to. This is the second case after another blogger had been arrested with similar charges of praising terrorism and released after nine months of detention in April 2013.

The issue of freedom of expression is regularly raised in meetings with the Algerian authorities such as in the Sub-Committee on political dialogue, human rights and security. During the recent visit of the EP Delegation to Algeria (28-31 October 2013) the issue was equally raised by individual members of the EP Delegation.

In the ongoing negotiations for the action plan with Algeria within the framework of the European Neighbourhood Policy, human rights, the rule of law and democracy constitute an integral part of the discussions. The EU insists on full respect of fundamental freedoms in accordance with international standards to many of which Algeria has subscribed.

The EU also entertains a dialogue with civil society representatives both in the country and in Brussels; many of them are active in monitoring the actual situation in the country and raise concerns where there is evidence of non-compliance.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012207/13
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 octobre 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — La Russie et ses migrants

1. L'arrestation et le placement en détention arbitraires de plus de 1 200 migrants lors d'une rafle effectuée le 14 octobre sur un marché de Moscou, en réaction au meurtre d'un Russe, ne peut-il pas être assimilé à des pratiques discriminatoires et excessives dans le domaine du maintien de l'ordre?

Un Azerbaïdjanais, dont l'interpellation n'a pas eu lieu dans le cadre de la récente vague d'arrestations, a été désigné aujourd'hui 15 octobre comme suspect de cet assassinat, qui a déclenché au cours du week-end d'importantes émeutes prenant les migrants pour cible.

2. Quelle est la réaction officielle des autorités européennes?

3. Des contacts vont-ils pris avec les autorités nationales sur ce dossier?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante, au nom de la Commission
(11 décembre 2013)

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a suivi avec attention les manifestations qui ont eu lieu à Moscou les 12 et 13 octobre 2013, ainsi que d'autres événements, comme l'arrestation et la détention de plusieurs centaines de migrants et les informations faisant état de crimes de haine à leur encontre. L'Union européenne est en effet préoccupée par la rhétorique constatée, xénophobe et hostile aux migrants.

L'UE profitera de l'occasion offerte par les consultations à venir sur les Droits de l'homme avec la Fédération de Russie, prévues le 28 novembre 2013 à Bruxelles, pour faire part aux autorités russes de ses préoccupations. Le racisme, la xénophobie et la discrimination seront des éléments essentiels de l'ordre du jour de ces consultations.

Ces consultations devraient ainsi permettre à l'UE d'obtenir des informations plus précises au sujet des événements mentionnés et des suites que les autorités comptent y donner.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012207/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Russia and its migrants

1. Over 1 200 migrants were arbitrarily arrested and detained during a raid on a market in Moscow on 14 October in response to the murder of an ethnic Russian. Was this not a discriminatory and excessive use of police powers?

On 15 October an Azerbaijani citizen interrogated independently of the recent wave of arrests was named as a suspect in the murder, which triggered serious anti-migrant disturbances over the previous weekend.

2. What is the official reaction of the European authorities?

3. Will any contact be made with the national authorities over this matter?

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

The HR/VP has carefully followed demonstrations which took place in Moscow on 12-13 October 2013 as well as other developments including the arrest and detention of several hundred migrants and the reports about hate crimes affecting them. The EU is indeed concerned with the xenophobic and anti-migrant rhetoric which has been witnessed.

The EU will take the opportunity of the forthcoming human rights consultations with the Russian Federation, planned on 28 November 2013 in Brussels, to raise its concerns with the Russian authorities. The issues of racism, xenophobia and discrimination will feature as a key element on the agenda of these consultations.

These consultations should thereby allow the EU to seek clarification about these events and about the follow-up that the authorities intend to give.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012208/13
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 octobre 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Syriens en Égypte

L'Égypte maintient illégalement en détention des centaines de réfugiés syriens et palestiniens.

Des enfants, dont certains n'ont pas plus d'un an, sont incarcérés depuis des semaines.

Des centaines de personnes ont été expulsées de force vers des pays de la région, notamment la Syrie.

Des familles sont séparées par les expulsions forcées.

Les autorités égyptiennes doivent renoncer à leur politique affligeante consistant à placer illégalement en détention et à expulser de force des centaines de réfugiés ayant fui le conflit armé en Syrie, a déclaré Amnesty International.

1. Quelle est la réaction officielle des autorités européennes?

2. Des contacts sont-ils pris avec les autorités nationales sur ce dossier?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(6 janvier 2014)

L'Union européenne est totalement au fait de la situation des réfugiés syriens et palestiniens, dont des enfants, qui sont incarcérés et expulsés d'Égypte.

La détention de réfugiés, en particulier de mineurs, sans motifs juridiques suffisants, ne respecte pas les normes internationales en matière de Droits de l'homme.

L'Union européenne a soulevé cette question lors de ses contacts avec ses interlocuteurs égyptiens, en leur demandant de clarifier le processus juridique et d'instaurer un régime temporaire pour les visas. La délégation de l'UE suit cette question de près sur le terrain, en y associant les États membres et le coordinateur régional du Haut-Commissariat des Nations unies pour les réfugiés.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012208/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Syrians in Egypt

Egypt is illegally detaining hundreds of Syrian and Palestinian refugees.

Children, including some who are only a year old, have been detained for several weeks.

Hundreds of people have been forcibly expelled to other countries in the region, in particular to Syria.

Family members have been separated by these forced expulsions.

The Egyptian authorities must end their appalling policy of unlawfully detaining and forcibly returning hundreds of refugees who have fled the armed conflict in Syria, said Amnesty International.

1. What is the official reaction of the European authorities?

2. Has any contact been made with the national authorities over this matter?

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

The European Union is fully aware of the situation of Syrian and Palestinian refugees, including children, being detained in and being expelled from Egypt.

The detention of refugees, in particular minors, without sufficient legal grounds, does not comply with international human rights standards.

The European Union has raised this issue in its contacts with relevant Egyptian interlocutors asking to clarify the legal process and introduce a temporary visa scheme. The EU Delegation is following this matter closely on the ground, involving Member States and the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR) Regional Coordinator.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012210/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(24. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: EU-Erweiterung am Balkan/Türkei

EU-Kommissionspräsident Barroso gab unlängst bekannt, dass es Ziel sei, alle Länder des Balkanraums in die EU aufzunehmen, um eine dauerhafte Befriedung dieses Raums zu erzielen. Dazu ergeben sich eine Reihe von Fragen:

1. Macht die Kommission dieses Ziel nun unmissverständlich zur Maxime ihres Expansionsgedankens, ungeachtet anderer Bedenken? Wo hat diese Logik dann ein zumindest geografisches Ende — im Donez-Becken, am Kaukasus, im Nahen Osten?

2. Wie soll dieses Ziel angesichts der relativ strengen Aufnahmekriterien realistischerweise durchgesetzt werden? Sollen die Kriterien zur Aufnahme gelockert werden? Wenn ja: inwiefern?

3. Da die EU bereits jetzt im Hinblick auf die Wirtschafts- und Geldpolitik sowie andere Konfliktherde auf eine Zerreißprobe zusteuert, kann die Aufnahme zerstrittener Regionen nicht auch zum Bumerang für die EU werden und ihren Niedergang herbeiführen?

4. Wie ist eine EU-Balkanerweiterung als Taktik in Hinblick auf einen Türkei-Beitritt zu sehen, nachdem Barroso angedeutet hat, dass diese Entwicklungen in mittelbarer Verbindung miteinander stehen? Welche genaue Logik verfolgt die Kommission hier zwischen Balkanerweiterung und Türkei-Beitritt?

5. Ist die Kommission angesichts der Signale aus Ankara (BRICS-Annäherung, keine Fortschrittsbemühungen bei den Beitrittskapiteln) nach wie vor noch überzeugt, dass die Türkei der EU überhaupt beitreten möchte?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(19. Dezember 2013)

Die Kommission weist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf Artikel 49 ([1]) des Vertrags über die Europäische Union hin. Die derzeitige Erweiterungsagenda der EU bezieht sich auf die westlichen Balkanländer, die Türkei und Island.

Der EU-Erweiterungsprozess ist mit strikten, aber fairen Auflagen verknüpft, wobei die Fortschritte auf dem Weg zur Mitgliedschaft von den Maßnahmen abhängen, die jedes Land ergreift, um die geltenden Kriterien zu erfüllen, insbesondere die Kriterien von Kopenhagen, die der Europäische Rat im Jahr 1993 festgelegt hat. Für die Fortschritte jedes Landes sind seine eigenen Leistungen maßgeblich.

Die Erweiterungspolitik der EU trägt nach wie vor zu Frieden, Sicherheit und Wohlstand auf unserem Kontinent bei. Die früheren Erweiterungen haben wirtschaftliche Vorteile sowohl für die beitretenden Länder als auch für die EU insgesamt mit sich gebracht. Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die parlamentarische Anfrage E-009970/2012 ([2]).

Was die strategische Verpflichtung der Türkei zum EU-Beitritt betrifft, so verweist die Kommission den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die parlamentarische Anfrage E-010763/2013 ([3]). Die EU und die Türkei haben am 5. November die Beitrittsverhandlungen über Kapitel 22 — Regionalpolitik und Koordinierung der strukturpolitischen Instrumente aufgenommen.

([1]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/doc/srv?l=DE&t=PDF&gc=true&sc=false&f=ST%206655%202008%20REV%207&r=http%3A%2F%2Fregister.consilium.europa.eu%2Fpd%2Fen%2F08%2Fst06%2Fst06655-re07.de08.pdf
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2012-009970&language=EN
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-010763&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012210/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: EU enlargement in the Balkans/Turkey

Commission President Barroso announced recently that the goal is for all the Balkan countries to join the EU in order to achieve lasting peace in this region. This gives rise to a number of questions:

1. Is the Commission now making this goal an unequivocal maxim in its thoughts on enlargement, irrespective of other considerations? Where does this logic end, at least from a geographical point of view — in the Donets basin, the Caucasus, the Middle East?

2. In view of the relatively stringent accession criteria, how, realistically, is this goal to be achieved? Are the criteria for accession to be relaxed? If so, to what extent?

3. Since the EU is already about to face an ordeal in relation to its economic and monetary policy and other sources of conflict, could the accession of fractious regions not have a boomerang effect on the EU and bring about its downfall?

4. How should the EU-Balkans enlargement as a tactical approach be viewed in relation to the accession of Turkey, since Mr Barroso has indicated that these developments are indirectly connected? What exactly is the logical connection that the Commission is making here between enlargement in the Balkans and the accession of Turkey?

5. In view of the signals coming from Ankara (BRICS convergence, lack of effort in making progress on the accession chapters), is the Commission still convinced that Turkey actually wants to join the EU?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to Article 49 ([1]) of the Treaty on European Union. The current EU enlargement agenda covers Western Balkans, Turkey and Iceland.

The EU enlargement process is built on strict but fair conditionality, with progress towards membership dependent on the steps taken by each country to meet the established criteria, in particular the Copenhagen criteria decided by European Council in 1993. The progress of each country is based on its own merits.

The EU's enlargement policy continues to contribute to peace, security and prosperity on our continent. Previous enlargements of the EU have brought economic benefits to both the acceding countries and the EU as a whole. The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its previous answer to parliamentary Question E-009970/2012 ([2]).

As regards the Turkish Authorities' strategic commitment to EU accession, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to previous answer to parliamentary Question E-010763/2013 ([3]). On 5 November EU and Turkey started accession negotiations for Chapter 22 — Regional policy & coordination of structural instruments.

([1]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/08/st06/st06655-re07.en08.pdf
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2012-009970&language=EN
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-010763&language=EN

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-012211/13
do Komisji
Tadeusz Cymański (EFD), Jacek Włosowicz (EFD), Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD) oraz Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(24 października 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Ekologiczne problemy w Bułgarii

Zwracam uwagę, na sposób przyznawania koncesji w Bułgarii. Preferowane są tam dwie grupy – firmy bułgarskie powiązane ze strukturami oligarchicznymi lub rządowymi, a jeżeli koncesję otrzymuje inna firma, to są to przedsiębiorstwa spoza UE, jak na przykład z Australii czy Kanady. Takie postępowanie pozostaje w głębokiej sprzeczności z interesami UE, a mianowicie wolnego rynku wewnętrznego, zwłaszcza podczas kryzysu gospodarczego.

Bułgaria posiada bogactwa naturalne, których wydobycie jest koncesjonowane, aby wszystko odbywało się zgodnie z prawem. Takie koncesje na wydobycie metali szlachetnych zostały przyznane trzem firmom: kanadyjskiej firmie Dundee Precious Metals, firmie Ełacjte-Med oraz firmie Asarel Medet.

Dowiedziałem się, że działalność tych dwóch firm stoi w pełnej sprzeczności z ustawodawstwem Unii Europejskiej, jak również powodują one ogromne szkody dla środowiska naturalnego w okolicy – ponad 800 hektarów lasu zostało zniszczone, życie wielu dzikich zwierzętom, jak i ludzi, jest poważne zagrożone. W związku z tym chciałbym zapytać Komisję:

1. Czy Komisja zamierza zbadać obydwa przypadki?

2. Jakie działania podejmie Komisja w przypadku wykrycia nieprawidłowości?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Janeza Potočnika w imieniu Komisji
(17 grudnia 2013 r.)

Komisja otrzymała skargi dotyczące działań i projektów przedsiębiorstw wymienionych przez Szanownych Panów Posłów i dokonała wymiany informacji z władzami bułgarskimi. Opierając się na dostępnych informacjach, Komisja nie zidentyfikowała do tej pory żadnego naruszenia odpowiednich przepisów prawa UE.

Sprawy, które są regulowane jedynie przez prawo bułgarskie (np. decyzje dotyczące udzielania koncesji na wydobycie metali szlachetnych) leżą w wyłącznej kompetencji władz bułgarskich.

Komisja będzie nadal ściśle monitorować realizację działań i projektów w zakresie wydobycia metali szlachetnych w Bułgarii w świetle prawodawstwa Unii, a w razie konieczności podejmuje odpowiednie działania.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012211/13
to the Commission
Tadeusz Cymański (EFD), Jacek Włosowicz (EFD), Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD) and Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Environmental problems in Bulgaria

Concessions in Bulgaria are granted preferentially to one of two types of company: either Bulgarian companies with links to oligarchic or governmental structures, or companies from countries outside the EU such as Australia or Canada. This is at complete odds with the EU's goal of a free internal market, in particular at a time of economic crisis.

Bulgaria grants concessions for extraction of its natural resources in order to ensure that the law is followed. Concessions of this kind have been awarded to three companies for the extraction of precious metals: the Canadian company Dundee Precious Metals, Ellatzite-Med and Asarel Medet.

It has come to my attention that the activities of these three companies run completely counter to EU legislation and are causing great harm to the surrounding environment. Over 800 hectares of forest have been destroyed and the lives of many wild animals, and indeed human beings, are at great risk. I should therefore like to ask the following questions:

1. Does the Commission intend to examine these three cases?

2. What action will it take if it finds evidence of irregularities?

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

The Commission has received complaints concerning the activities and projects of the companies mentioned by the Honourable Members and has exchanged information with the Bulgarian authorities. Based on the information at its disposal, the Commission has not identified any breaches of the respective EU legislation so far.

Matters which are regulated exclusively by Bulgarian law (e.g. decisions concerning granting concessions for extractions of precious metals) are in the sole competence of the Bulgarian authorities.

The Commission will continue to follow closely the implementation of the activities and projects for extraction of precious metals in Bulgaria in the light of the Union's legislation, and will if necessary take appropriate action.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012212/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(24. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Auftragsvergabe in Bulgarien — Bau der Sporthalle „Arena Armeec"

Im Juli 2011 wurde in Sofia die Sporthalle „Arena Armeec" erbaut. Hierbei handelt es sich um ein durch die EU gefördertes Projekt. Bürgerberichten zufolge nahmen an der Ausschreibung für dieses Projekt die österreichische STRABAG und das bulgarische Unternehmen Glavbolgarstroi (GBS) teil.

Laut den mir vorliegenden Berichten war das Angebot der STRABAG um 3,8 Mio. EUR niedriger als das Angebot der GBS. Auch bei den Parkplätzen lag die STRABAG AG offenbar eindeutig vorne: Gesetzlich waren 1 153 Parkplätze vorgeschrieben, das Angebot der STRABAG AG belief sich auf 1 206 Parkplätze, das der GBS auf nur 1 006.

Bei der Auswertung erzielte die STRABAG daher zunächst deutlich mehr Punkte. Schlussendlich erhielt jedoch die bulgarische GBS den Zuschlag, weil sie im Nachhinein ihr Preisanbot gesenkt hatte.

Laut der Vergaberichtlinie müssten nach einer Änderung einer Ausschreibung alle Unternehmen erneut aufgefordert werden, Angebote zu unterbereiten. Dies ist nach meiner Kenntnis in diesem Fall nicht erfolgt.

1. Ist der Kommission der oben dargestellte Sachverhalt bekannt?

2. Wenn nein: Wird die Kommission die Causa untersuchen?

3. Wenn ja: Wurde gegen EU-Vergaberecht verstoßen?

4. Wie wird die Kommission weiter vorgehen, falls sie zu dem Schluss gelangt, dass das gegenständliche Vergabeverfahren in Bulgarien EU-rechtswidrig war,

5. Gibt es weitere Beispiele für ein ähnliches Vorgehen der bulgarischen Behörden in anderen Vergaberechtsfällen, in denen Unternehmen aus anderen Mitgliedstaaten ungerechtfertigterweise schlechter gestellt wurden als bulgarische Unternehmen?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(7. Januar 2014)

Der vom Herrn Abgeordneten vorgetragene Sachverhalt wurde der Kommission bisher nicht zur Kenntnis gebracht. Daher sieht sie sich nicht in der Lage, eine förmliche rechtliche Analyse des in Rede stehenden öffentlichen Vergabeverfahrens vorzunehmen.

Generell ist der Kommission nicht bekannt, das bulgarische Bieter systematisch zum Nachteil von Bietern aus anderen EU-Mitgliedstaaten bevorzugt werden.

Die Kommission hat keine Kenntnis von einer etwaigen finanziellen Beteiligung der EU am Bau der Sporthalle „Arena Armeec".

Die Kommission wird in dieser Sache weitere Informationen einholen und erforderlichenfalls geeignete Maßnahmen treffen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012212/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Awarding of contracts in Bulgaria — construction of the 'Arena Armeec' sports hall

In July 2011, the sports hall 'Arena Armeec' was built in Sofia. This was a project that was supported by the EU. According to reports from citizens, the Austrian company STRABAG and the Bulgarian company Glavbolgarstroi (GBS) participated in the call for tenders for this project.

The reports I have received indicate that the tender submitted by STRABAG was EUR 3.8 million lower than the tender submitted by GBS. As regards the parking spaces, too, STRABAG AG was apparently clearly ahead: 1 153 parking spaces were laid down by law; the bid from STRABAG AG provided for 1 206 parking spaces and the one from GBS only 1 006.

In the evaluation, STRABAG therefore obtained significantly more points to start with. In the end, however, the Bulgarian GBS was awarded the contract, because it subsequently reduced the price it was offering.

According to the Procurement Directive, following an amendment to a call for tender, all companies should be invited to submit a new tender. To my knowledge, this did not happen in this case.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the facts described above?

2. If not, will it investigate the matter?

3. If so, was there a violation of EU procurement law?

4. How will the Commission proceed if it should conclude that this tendering procedure in Bulgaria was contrary to EC law?

5. Are there other examples of similar behaviour by the Bulgarian authorities in other procurement cases in which companies from other Member States were unjustifiably placed in a less favourable position than Bulgarian companies?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(7 January 2014)

The situation referred to by the Honourable Member has not been brought to the attention of the Commission. The Commission is therefore not in a position to provide a formal legal analysis concerning the corresponding public procurement procedure.

In a general manner, the Commission is not aware of any systematic practice concerning a potential favorable treatment reserved to the Bulgarian bidders to the detriment of bidders from other EU Member States.

The Commission is not aware of any involvement of EU co-financing in the construction of the 'Arena Armeec' sports hall.

The Commission intends to collect further information on this case and, if necessary, take appropriate further actions.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012213/13
à la Commission
Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE) et Michel Dantin (PPE)
(24 octobre 2013)

Objet: Projet d'accord de libre-échange entre l'Union européenne et le Canada

La conclusion du projet d'accord bilatéral envisagé entre l'Union européenne et le Canada est suspendue à un accord politique entre les deux parties qui nécessite désormais un vote du Parlement européen.

L'ouverture d'un contingent à droit nul qui y est envisagée pour les exportations bovines canadiennes — que ce soit du côté de la Commission, dont la ligne rouge supposée est de 40 000 tonnes, ou du côté canadien, qui demande a minima 58 000 tonnes — sera, si elle est effective, complètement déstructurante pour la filière européenne.

Outre le fait que les normes de production de part et d'autre de l'Atlantique (réglementations en ce qui concerne le bien-être, en matière sanitaire ou environnementale, etc.) constituent une distorsion de concurrence inacceptable pour la filière bovine européenne, l'ouverture d'un tel contingent à des produits qui ne respectent pas les normes communautaires constitue une grave entorse au principe d'une concurrence loyale et équitable.

Comment la Commission entend-elle gérer ces distorsions de commerce inacceptables?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(16 décembre 2013)

L'accord politique auquel sont parvenus, le 18 octobre 2013, le premier ministre canadien, M. Harper, et le président de la Commission, M. Barroso, envisage l'ouverture, à la date d'entrée en vigueur de l'accord économique et commercial global entre le Canada et l'UE, d'un contingent tarifaire de l'UE en faveur du Canada concernant 45 838 tonnes de viande bovine, exprimées en équivalent poids carcasse, dont 30 838 tonnes de viande bovine fraîche.

La viande bovine est sans aucun doute un produit agricole sensible pour l'UE, et la Commission est consciente que la capacité d'ouvrir le marché de l'UE est limitée. Pour cette raison, dans les négociations commerciales internationales, la Commission réserve un traitement particulier à la viande bovine, et notamment aux morceaux de grande valeur frais et réfrigérés, et chacune des concessions est soigneusement évaluée, comme ce fut le cas pour l'accord économique et commercial global.

En ce qui concerne les normes de production au Canada, en l'absence de normes internationales reconnues dans des domaines tels que le bien-être des animaux, l'UE ne peut pas imposer de restrictions aux importations en provenance de pays tiers en raison de différences de normes. Toutefois, cela n'a pas empêché la Commission de poursuivre un programme audacieux dans ce domaine dans le cadre des négociations bilatérales, par exemple par la promotion de la coopération renforcée entre les parties.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012213/13
to the Commission
Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE) and Michel Dantin (PPE)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Draft free trade agreement between the European Union and Canada

The conclusion of the draft bilateral agreement between the European Union and Canada depends on a political agreement between the two parties, which now needs to be voted on in Parliament.

Opening a duty-free quota, as planned for Canadian beef exports — supposedly the Commission's limit is 40 000 tonnes, while the Canadians are demanding a minimum of 58 000 tonnes — will, if it comes into force, be completely devastating for the European beef sector.

Beyond the fact that production standards on both sides of the Atlantic (regulations on welfare, health or the environment, etc.) represent an unacceptable distortion of competition for the European beef sector, opening such a quota for products that do not meet EU standards is a serious infringement of the principle of fair competition.

How does the Commission plan to deal with these unacceptable distortions of trade?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

The political agreement of 18 October 2013 between Canadian Prime Minister Mr Harper and Commission President Mr Barroso envisages the opening, at the date of entry into force of the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) between Canada and the EU, of an EU tariff rate quota in favour of Canada of 45.838 tonnes of beef, expressed in carcass weight equivalent, of which 30.838 tonnes are fresh beef.

Beef is certainly a sensitive agricultural product for the EU and the Commission is conscious that the capacity to open the EU market is limited. For that reason, in international trade negotiations, the Commission reserves a special treatment to bovine meat, and notably to the high value chilled and fresh cuts, and any concession is carefully evaluated, as has been the case for CETA.

As regards production standards in Canada, in the absence of internationally recognised standards in areas such as animal welfare, the EU cannot impose restrictions to imports from third countries on the grounds of different standards. However, this has not prevented the Commission from pursuing an offensive agenda in this field in the framework of bilateral negotiations, for instance by promoting enhanced cooperation between the parties.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012214/13
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(24 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Programul de lucru al Comisiei Europene pentru anul 2014

În data de 22 octombrie a fost aprobat Programul de lucru al Comisiei Europene pentru anul 2014. Printre altele, Comisia intenționează să propună, conform anexei documentului, o Comunicare privind statul de drept în Uniunea Europeană. Această comunicare va reprezenta un cadru de reflecție care să asigure în viitor un răspuns la eventuale provocări cu care statul de drept s-ar putea confrunta în Uniunea Europeană.

Intenționează Comisia să adopte această comunicare în actualul mandat? Poate oferi Comisia detalii cu privire la principiile care vor sta la baza comunicării? Se are în vedere ca acest document să conțină și o serie de indicatori care să permită o eventuală evaluare a cazurilor în care statul de drept este pus în pericol în Uniunea Europeană?

Răspuns dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei
(8 ianuarie 2014)

Comisia îl invită pe distinsul membru să consulte răspunsul oferit de Comisie la întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-009924/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012214/13
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Commission Work Programme for 2014

The Commission Work Programme for 2014 was approved on 22 October. As part of this, the Commission intends to present, according to the document's annex, a communication on the rule of law in the European Union. This communication will provide a framework for reflection for ensuring in future a response to any challenges which the rule of law might encounter in the European Union.

Does the Commission intend to adopt this communication during the present mandate? Can the Commission provide details of the principles which the communication will be based on? Does this document also intend to include a series of indicators allowing a possible assessment of the instances where the rule of law is at risk in the European Union?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(8 January 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-009924/2013.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-012215/13
a la Comisión
Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D) y María Muñiz De Urquiza (S&D)
(24 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Aplicación de la Directiva sobre cogeneración

La Directiva 2004/8/CE sobre cogeneración es un importante instrumento para que Europa logre responder a los desafíos energéticos. A medida que avanza en su control de la incorporación de la Directiva a las respectivas legislaciones nacionales, la Comisión ha ido tomando conciencia de los obstáculos administrativos y de otro tipo que entorpecen la expansión de la cogeneración en los Estados miembros.

En el caso español, uno de los principales aspectos por los que la cogeneración no ha tenido un progreso significativo en los últimos años es la transitoriedad de los regímenes económicos y legales. Es indudable la necesidad de un marco legal estable que garantice una rentabilidad razonable a largo plazo para los promotores de plantas de cogeneración. ¿Puede la Comisión informar de las medidas que el Estado español ha adoptado en este sentido?

Otro punto importante para la viabilidad de cualquier proyecto consiste en disponer de conexión a la red. El hecho de que las compañías eléctricas que gestionan la red sean en ocasiones las mismas que compiten como suministradores de energía eléctrica con proyectos de cogeneración ha llevado a situaciones de falta de competencia. A este respecto, ¿puede informar la Comisión de si el Estado español ha llevado a cabo la necesaria articulación de mecanismos administrativos de control para el cumplimiento del derecho de acceso a la red?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de diciembre de 2013)

Según la evaluación de la Comisión, España ha cumplido sus obligaciones jurídicas en virtud de la Directiva 2004/8/CE ([1]), sobre cogeneración. La Directiva 2012/27/UE ([2]), sobre la eficiencia energética, que ha derogado la Directiva sobre cogeneración, establece normas más concretas para fomentar la cogeneración. Estas normas incluyen la exigencia de tomar las medidas adecuadas para desarrollar el potencial de rentabilidad de la cogeneración de alta eficiencia (artículo 14), así como la de asegurar un acceso prioritario o garantizado a la red de la electricidad producida mediante cogeneración de alta eficiencia (artículo 15, apartado 5). La Comisión evaluará la conformidad de las medidas de aplicación adoptadas por España tras la finalización del plazo para la transposición general el 5 de junio de 2014.

([1]) Directiva 2004/8/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 11 de febrero de 2004, relativa al fomento de la cogeneración sobre la base de la demanda de calor útil en el mercado interior de la energía y por la que se modifica la Directiva 92/42/CEE, DO L 52 de 21.2.2004.

([2]) Directiva 2012/27/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 25 de octubre de 2012, relativa a la eficiencia energética, por la que se modifican las Directivas 2009/125/CE y 2010/30/UE, y por la que se derogan las Directivas 2004/8/CE y 2006/32/CE, DO L 315 de 14.11.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012215/13
to the Commission
Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D) and María Muñiz De Urquiza (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: The application of the directive on cogeneration

Directive 2004/8/EC on cogeneration is an important tool intended to enable Europe to meet its energy challenges. As it monitors the implementation of the directive into national law across the EU, the Commission has become aware of administrative and other obstacles that hinder the expansion of cogeneration in the Member States.

In the case of Spain, one of the main obstacles hindering the progress of cogeneration in recent years has been the transitory nature of economic and legal systems. There is a clear need for a stable legal framework that guarantees reasonable long-term profitability for the promoters of cogeneration plants. Can the Commission state what steps Spain has taken in this regard?

The availability of a connection to the grid is another factor that affects the viability of any project. In certain cases, the fact that the electricity companies that manage the grid are sometimes competing as electricity suppliers with cogeneration projects has led to a lack of competition. In view of the above, can the Commission state whether Spain has implemented the administrative mechanisms required to monitor compliance with the right to access the grid?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2013)

According to the Commission's assessment, Spain has complied with its legal obligations under Directive 2004/8/EC ([1]) on cogeneration. Directive 2012/27/EU ([2]) on energy efficiency, which has repealed the Cogeneration Directive sets more detailed rules to promote cogeneration. These rules include a requirement that adequate measures are taken to develop the cost-effective potential for high-efficiency cogeneration (Art. 14) and a requirement to ensure priority or guaranteed access to the grid of electricity from high-efficiency cogeneration (Art. 15.5). The Commission will assess the conformity of Spain's implementation measures after the general transposition deadline of 5 June 2014.

([1]) Directive 2004/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2004 on the promotion of cogeneration based on a useful heat demand in the internal energy market and amending Directive 92/42/EEC, OJ L 52, 21.2.2004.

([2]) 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 Text with EEA relevance, OJ L 315, 14.11.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012216/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Funding for environmental projects

Will the Commission make funding available to Member States to enable them to fund nationally implemented environmental projects such as the National Parks and Wildlife Scheme (NPWS)?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2013)

Although EU regulations for the next multi-annual financial framework have still to be finalised, the Commission's proposals include funding opportunities for environment projects in the key EU funds. As the competent authority in Ireland for EU nature legislation the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) will have a particular interest in EU funds that support nature and biodiversity projects, especially for the management and restoration of sites in the Natura 2000 network of protected areas. Ireland has already developed a prioritised action framework for Natura 2000, indicating its priorities for action and potential use of EU funding. It will be for the Irish authorities to avail themselves of the EU funding opportunities, having regard to the rules governing the use of the funds. For example, this may be through the EU rural development programme for Ireland or making applications for projects under the future LIFE programme.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012217/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(24 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Reducerea investițiilor efectuate de către autoritățile locale

În Uniunea Europeană autoritățile locale și regionale sunt responsabile pentru 65% din investițiile publice. Conform unui studiu publicat în 2013 de către Banca Europeană de Investiții și de Comitetul Regiunilor, criza economică a afectat capacitățile de investiții ale municipalităților și ale regiunilor. Doar câteva state membre susțin în continuare investițiile la nivel local, în timp ce alte state membre au decis să înghețe sau să suspende sprijinul acordat investițiilor efectuate de către autoritățile locale.

Aceste reduceri afectează investițiile în dezvoltare regională, comerț și piața muncii, agricultură, transport și cercetare. Măsurile prelungite de austeritate și reducerea bugetelor publice înseamnă că autoritățile locale nu sunt în măsură să întreprindă acțiunile necesare realizării obiectivelor Europa 2020.

Ce măsuri întreprinde Comisia pentru a îmbunătăți dispozițiile în vigoare astfel încât autoritățile locale din regiunile cele mai afectate de criză să-și poată îmbunătăți capacitatea de absorbție fondurilor structurale și de coeziune, pentru a putea fi în măsură să sprijine în continuare investițiile la nivel local?

Răspuns dat de dl Hahn în numele Comisiei
(16 decembrie 2013)

Începând cu anul 2008, Comisia a introdus o serie de măsuri pentru a îmbunătăți capacitatea autorităților locale de a absorbi fondurile acordate în cadrul politicii de coeziune. În acest sens, o măsură esențială este creșterea ratelor de cofinanțare cu 10 puncte procentuale în cazul țărilor care beneficiază de asistență financiară, reducând astfel contribuția națională într-o perioadă caracterizată de constrângeri bugetare severe. Un alt exemplu este reprogramarea (deplasarea fondurilor între diferite priorități din cadrul programelor) care a avut loc în numeroase țări, facilitând astfel investițiile UE, sporind gradul de absorbție a fondurilor și furnizând rezultate mai bine orientate. Un ultim exemplu al măsurilor pe care Comisia le-a luat în considerare în cazul țărilor celor mai afectate de criza economică este cel al eliberării mai rapide a fondurilor UE și al plăților în avans suplimentare.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012217/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Reduction in investment by local authorities

In the European Union, local and regional authorities are responsible for 65% of public investment. According to a study published in 2013 by the European Investment Bank and the Committee of the Regions, the economic crisis has affected the investment capacities of cities and regions. Only a few Member States continue to support local investment, while others have decided to freeze or stop financial support for investments led by local authorities.

These cuts affect investment in regional development, commercial and labour affairs, agriculture, transport and research. The prolonged austerity measures and cuts in public budgets mean that local authorities are not able to take the action needed to achieve the Europe 2020 targets.

What is the Commission doing to improve the existing provisions so that local authorities from the regions most affected by the crisis can improve their capacity to absorb structural and cohesion funds, so as to be able to continue to invest at local level?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

Since 2008, the Commission has introduced several measures to improve the capacity of local authorities to absorb cohesion policy funding. Most notable is the increase of co-financing rates of 10 percentage points for countries under financial assistance, which reduces the national contribution at a time of severe budget constraints. Another example is reprogramming (the moving of funds between different priorities within programmes) which has taken place in many countries, thus facilitating EU investments and increasing the absorption of funds and providing more targeted results. A final example of the measures the Commission has taken in consideration of the countries most affected by the economic crisis, was the quicker release of EU funding and additional advance payments.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012218/13
adresată Comisiei (Vicepreședintelui/Înaltului Reprezentant)
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(24 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: VP/HR — Restricții financiare impuse unor înalți oficiali sudanezi responsabili de încălcări grave ale drepturilor omului

În septembrie 2013, forțele de securitate sudaneze au reprimat un val de proteste îndreptate împotriva regimului autoritar al lui Omar al-Bashir. Peste 800 de activiști au fost arestați și până la 100 de persoane au fost ucise, inclusiv tineri și copii. Aceste noi încălcări ale drepturilor omului confirmă faptul că regimul sudanez va continua să ignore standardele internaționale și voința sudanezilor, așa cum a făcut-o și în trecut.

Decizia 2011/423/PESC a Consiliului privind măsuri restrictive împotriva Sudanului și a Sudanului de Sud a reintrodus sancțiuni financiare și limitarea dreptului de călătorie „împotriva persoanelor care împiedică procesul de pace, constituie o amenințare la adresa stabilității în Darfur și în regiune, încalcă dreptul internațional umanitar sau dreptul internațional al drepturilor omului sau comit alte atrocități, încalcă embargoul asupra armelor și/sau se fac responsabile de survolări militare cu caracter ofensiv în regiunea Darfur și deasupra acesteia". Cu toate acestea, doar patru persoane se află pe această listă, care nu a fost actualizată din 2005.

Date fiind gravele încălcări ale drepturilor omului de care se face responsabil regimul sudanez, intenționează Comisia să actualizeze lista cu persoanele care sunt supuse restricțiilor, astfel încât să includă și alți înalți oficiali ce se fac vinovați de încălcări ale dreptului internațional al drepturilor omului sau de comiterea altor atrocități?

Răspuns dat de dna Ashton Înaltul Reprezentant/Vicepreședintele Comisiei, în numele Comisiei
(18 decembrie 2013)

Într-o declarație din data de 30 septembrie, Înaltul Reprezentant/Vicepreședintele Comisiei și-a exprimat profunda îngrijorare cu privire la rapoartele privind violențele și pierderea semnificativă de vieți omenești în cadrul protestelor desfășurate în orașe din Sudan în septembrie, condamnând violența și îndemnând toate părțile implicate să dea dovadă de reținere maximă. Înaltul Reprezentant/Vicepreședintele Comisiei a solicitat, în special, guvernului Sudanului să se abțină de la utilizarea excesivă a forței și să respecte libertatea de exprimare, accesul la mass-media și dreptul la întrunire pașnică. Persoanelor reținute ar trebui să li se ofere posibilitatea de a beneficia de un proces echitabil, mass-media ar trebui să fie autorizată să își desfășoare liber activitatea și ar trebui efectuată o investigare credibilă a incidentelor care au dus la pierderea de vieți omenești, vătămări grave sau daune materiale.

Aspectele menționate în această declarație sunt monitorizate de către Delegația UE din Sudan, iar drepturile omului sunt promovate în cadrul contactelor dintre reprezentanții UE și cei ai guvernului Republicii Sudan.

Decizia 2011/423/PESC a Consiliului pune în aplicare Rezoluția 1591 (2005) a Consiliului de Securitate al ONU (CSONU) și deciziile adoptate de Comitetul de sancțiuni instituit în temeiul acestora. CSONU analizează în mod constant situația din Sudan, inclusiv prin discutarea rapoartelor periodice elaborate de Comitetul de sancțiuni. UE și-a exprimat recent, prin intermediul statelor sale membre în cadrul CSONU, dorința ca Comitetul de sancțiuni să prezinte recomandări privind o mai mare eficace a regimului de sancțiuni. În eventualitatea în care vor fi făcute și puse în aplicare astfel de recomandări, Decizia 2011/423/PESC a Consiliului va fi adaptată în consecință.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012218/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Financial restrictions on senior Sudanese officials responsible for serious human rights breaches

In September 2013 the Sudanese security forces repressed a wave of protests against the authoritarian regime of Omar al-Bashir. More than 800 activists were arrested and up to 100 people were killed, including young people and children. These new human rights violations confirm that the Sudanese regime will continue to ignore international standards and the will of its people, as it has done in the past.

Council Decision 2011/423/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Sudan and South Sudan reinstated financial sanctions and travel limitations for 'individuals who impede the peace process, constitute a threat to stability in Darfur and the region, commit violations of international humanitarian or human rights law or other atrocities, violate the arms embargo and/or are responsible for offensive military overflights in and over the Darfur region'. However, only four individuals are on this list, which has not been updated since 2005.

Given the serious human rights violations for which the Sudanese regime is responsible, does the Commission intend to update the list of individuals who are subject to restrictions, so as to include other senior officials responsible for committing violations of international human rights law or other atrocities?

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

In a Statement issued on 30 September the HR/VP expressed her deep concern over reports of violence and significant loss of life during protests in cities across Sudan in September, condemning violence and urging all parties to exercise maximum restraint. The HR/VP called in particular on the Government of Sudan to refrain from excessive use of force and to respect the freedom of expression, media access and the right of peaceful assembly. Those detained should be given the opportunity for a fair trial, the media should be allowed to operate freely and a credible investigation should be conducted into incidents that have led to loss of life, injury and material damage.

The HR/VP follows up on this Statement through the EU Delegation in Sudan and by promoting human rights in EU contacts with representatives of the Government of Sudan.

Council Decision 2011/423/CFSP implements UN Security Council (UNSC) Resolution 1591 (2005) and the decisions of the Sanctions Committee established thereunder. The UNSC keeps the situation in Sudan under constant consideration, including by discussing regular reports of the Sanctions Committee. The EU through its Member States at the UNSC has recently expressed its wish that the Sanctions Committee makes recommendations on how to make the sanctions regime more effective. Should those recommendations be made and put into practice, Council Decision 2011/423/CFSP would be adapted accordingly.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-012220/13
a la Comisión
Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D)
(24 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Situación actualizada del complejo Ciudad de la Luz en Alicante

La Decisión de la Comisión de 8 de mayo de 2012 fijó los resultados de la investigación sobre la financiación del complejo Ciudad de la Luz por parte de la Generalitat Valenciana. Se concluyó que 265 millones de euros concedidos por la Generalitat Valenciana a los estudios cinematográficos Ciudad de la Luz no se facilitaron en condiciones de mercado y el beneficiario tiene que devolverlos. En la Comunicación de la Comisión sobre la política de recuperación (DO C 272 de 15.11.2007, p. 4.) se expone la manera en que se deben ejecutar las decisiones de la Comisión por las que se ordena a los Estados miembros que recuperen las ayudas estatales ilegales e incompatibles. Sin embargo, la Comisión comunicó a este Parlamento que, habida cuenta de la difícil situación financiera del complejo Ciudad de la Luz, puesta de manifiesto por sus cuentas publicadas y señalada durante años por la Sindicatura de Cuentas de Valencia, el mencionado complejo no podrá reembolsar todo el importe de la ayuda, y la recuperación deberá realizarse a través de su liquidación y la venta de sus activos. Parece ser que Ciudad de la Luz cesó su actividad comercial en febrero de 2013 y está a la venta desde entonces. Se están negociando las condiciones en las que esa venta se hará efectiva de un modo acorde a la legislación europea para impedir, por ejemplo, que haya una transferencia de las ayudas al comprador.

— En la negociación bilateral entre la Comisión Europea y el Reino de España para solventar la cuestión, ¿qué papel juega la Generalitat Valenciana como responsable de las ayudas de estado ilegales?

— ¿Qué soluciones válidas ha propuesto la Generalitat o/y el Reino de España para solventar el problema?

— ¿Qué propuestas del Reino de España o de la Generalitat, en su caso, fueron rechazadas por la Comisión por encontrar que no eran acordes a la legislación europea sobre competencia?

Dado que el cese de la actividad como estudios cinematográficos implica el cese de la distorsión en el mercado pero no exime de la devolución de las ayudas de estado recibidas ilegalmente,

— ¿ha impuesto la Comisión al Reino de España el cese de la actividad como estudios cinematográficos o ha sido una decisión del Reino de España?

— ¿establecerá la Comisión sanciones y, en su caso, cuáles, si finalmente Ciudad de la Luz no puede devolver el dinero público dada su situación financiera?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de diciembre de 2013)

La Comisión quiere destacar que la normativa de la UE no señala qué órgano del Estado miembro afectado debe encargarse de la ejecución práctica de las decisiones de recuperación. A este respecto, la Comisión señala a Su Señoría la respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-011152/2013 ([1]), en la que se describe el proceso de negociación con las autoridades españolas sobre los aspectos técnicos del proceso de licitación para la venta del complejo Ciudad de la Luz.

La Comisión desea recordar también que el objetivo de la recuperación se alcanza cuando se ha reembolsado la ayuda ilegal e incompatible y se ha restablecido la situación existente antes de la concesión de la ayuda. En el caso de las empresas insolventes, cuando no se puede recuperar la ayuda en su totalidad, el TJE ha declarado que la liquidación del beneficiario puede considerarse una alternativa aceptable a la plena recuperación. La Comunicación de la Comisión relativa a la recuperación establece que la recuperación puede considerarse debidamente ejecutada cuando se ha liquidado la empresa y sus activos se venden en condiciones de mercado. Ello implica, además, el cese definitivo de las actividades de la empresa que había recibido la ayuda estatal ilegal e incompatible ([2]). Por lo que respecta a la posibilidad de imponer sanciones, el TJE tiene derecho a hacerlo si el Tribunal considera que el Estado miembro en cuestión no ha cumplido sus obligaciones incluso después de una primera sentencia.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/es/parliamentary-questions.html
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/es/parliamentary-questions.html

([2]) Asunto C-610/10, Comisión/España, apartado 104.
Asunto C-610/10, Comisión/España, apartado 104.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012220/13
to the Commission
Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: The current situation of the Ciudad de la Luz complex in Alicante

The Commission decision of 8 May 2012 set forth the results of the investigation into the funding of the Ciudad de la Luz complex by the Valencian Regional Government. It was concluded that the EUR 265 million given by the Valencian Regional Government to the Ciudad de la Luz film studios was not granted under market conditions and that the beneficiary must return the sum in question. The Commission's communication on recovery policy (OJ C 272/4 of 15 November 2007, p. 4) sets down the way in which Commission decisions ordering Member States to recover unlawful and incompatible state aid must be enforced. Bearing in mind the financial difficulties faced by the Ciudad de la Luz complex, which are reflected in its published accounts and have been highlighted for years by the Valencian Court of Auditors, the Commission has informed this Parliament that the complex will be unable to return all of the aid, which must be recovered by winding up the complex and selling its assets. Ciudad de la Luz seems to have ceased commercial activity in February 2013 and has been up for sale ever since. The conditions under which this sale will take place are being negotiated in accordance with European legislation to prevent aid from being transferred to the purchaser.

— In the bilateral negotiations held between the Commission and the Spanish Government to settle this matter, what role is being played by the Valencian Regional Government as the provider of the unlawful state aid?

— What valid solutions has the Valencian Regional Government and/or the Spanish Government proposed to resolve the problem?

— What proposals made by Spain or by the Valencian Regional Government have been rejected by the Commission because they contravened European competition law?

Although the complex is no longer distorting the market since it has ceased to operate as a film studio, it is still obliged to return the unlawfully obtained state aid.

— In view of the above, was the decision to force the complex to cease operating as a film studio taken by the Commission or by the Spanish Government?

— If the Ciudad de la Luz complex ultimately proves to be unable to return the public funds due to its financial situation, will the Commission impose penalties? If so, which?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

The Commission would like to emphasise that EC law does not prescribe which organ of the Member State concerned should be in charge of the practical implementation of a recovery decision. In this respect, the Commission draws the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply to Written Question E-011152/2013 ([1]), describing the process of negotiation with the Spanish authorities on the technicalities of the tender process for the sale of the Ciudad de la Luz complex.

The Commission wishes to recall also that the purpose of recovery is accomplished once the unlawful and incompatible aid is repaid and the situation as it existed prior to the granting of the aid is restored. In the case of insolvent companies, where it is not possible fully to recover the aid, the ECJ has stated that the liquidation of the beneficiary can be regarded as an acceptable alternative to full recovery. The Commission's Recovery Notice stipulates that recovery can be considered properly executed when the company is liquidated and its assets are sold under market conditions ([2]). Furthermore, it implies the definitive cessation of the activities of the undertaking, which has received the illegal and incompatible state aid ([3]). As for the possibility to impose penalties, the ECJ has the right to do so if the Court finds that the Member State in question has failed to fulfil its obligations even after a first judgment.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) §61-63 of the Recovery Notice 2007/C0272/05.
([3]) Case 610/10, Commission v Spain, para 104.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012221/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(24 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Vervolgvragen (4) subsidieverlening aan Egypte

Op 24 oktober 2013 heeft de heer Füle namens de Commissie antwoord gegeven op schriftelijke vraag E-009928/2013. Daarin schrijft hij onder andere: „In het verslag [van de Rekenkamer] is er sprake van „tekortkomingen", die volgens de Commissie en de hoge vertegenwoordiger het gevolg waren van externe factoren waarop zij geen invloed hadden. De Rekenkamer erkende in haar verslag dat de EU-steun onder moeilijke omstandigheden is verleend, maar gaf geen concrete aanwijzingen dat efficiëntere alternatieven beschikbaar of mogelijk waren."

1. Welke „tekortkomingen" betreft het hier, en van welke „externe factoren" waren deze het gevolg? Waarom hadden de Commissie en de hoge vertegenwoordiger hier geen invloed op?

2. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat het feit dat zowel zijzelf als de hoge vertegenwoordiger geen invloed hadden op de „externe factoren", die leidden tot „tekortkomingen", bevestigt dat de subsidieverlening aan Egypte een foutieve beslissing is geweest? Deelt de Commissie de mening dat de combinatie van „onder moeilijke omstandigheden" en het gebrek aan „efficiëntere alternatieven" eveneens bevestigt dat de subsidieverlening „duister" en foutief is geweest? Zo ja, is de Commissie er derhalve toe bereid dit direct terug te draaien?

Voorts schrijft de heer Füle: „[Dankzij] de aanhoudende druk van de Commissie en de hoge vertegenwoordiger werd bijvoorbeeld een subcomité mensenrechten opgericht en werd 10 % van de bilaterale begroting gereserveerd voor de ondersteuning van mensenrechten, goed bestuur en democratie, met inbegrip van steun voor kinder- en vrouwenrechten. Dit heeft concrete positieve en meetbare gevolgen gehad."

3. Hoe specificeert de Commissie de hier genoemde „concrete positieve en meetbare gevolgen"? Waarin uiten de door de Commissie geïmpliceerde positieve ontwikkelingen zich wat betreft „mensenrechten, goed bestuur en democratie, met inbegrip van steun voor kinder- en vrouwenrechten"?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(18 december 2013)

1. Het verslag van de Rekenkamer vermeldt tekortkomingen met betrekking tot het beheer van de overheidsfinanciën, waarbij wordt erkend dat langzaam vooruitgang wordt gemaakt met name in het informatiesysteem voor financieel beheer door de overheid of het uitgavenkader op middellange termijn. De Commissie en de hoge vertegenwoordiger hebben ook gewezen op de nodige geleidelijke verwezenlijking van zulke doelstellingen voor de middellange termijn en de institutionele en op de politieke instabiliteit die sinds 2011 heerst.

2. De Commissie en de hoge vertegenwoordiger zijn niet van mening dat het verlenen van subsidies aan Egypte een verkeerde beslissing is geweest. Zij hebben veeleer de steun aangepast aan de veranderende situatie. Sinds augustus 2011 werden nog geen nieuwe begrotingssteunmaatregelen vastgesteld. Overigens zijn de interne regels van het verlenen van begrotingssteun in januari 2013 verscherpt. De Commissie en de hoge vertegenwoordiger hebben dan ook de derde uitbetaling van 41 miljoen EUR van het programma voor sectorale steun voor het onderwijs opgeschort. Zoals de Raad Buitenlandse Zaken het benadrukte, waren de meeste aanbevelingen van de Rekenkamer sinds de verslagperiode al opgevolgd.

3. De EU heeft de meest tastbare resultaten bereikt in het kader van het programma voor de bevordering en de bescherming van de rechten van de mens, waarin met name de volgende problemen voor het eerst op grote schaal zijn aangepakt: genitale verminking van vrouwen (belangrijke rechtszaken werden met succes ondersteund, een gemeenschappelijke verklaring op het gebied van gezinsempowerment werd uitgebracht, verschillende mediacampagnes werden gevoerd om acties van conservatieve fundamentalistische groeperingen te neutraliseren, in 10 gouvernementen werd een dialoog op gang gebracht via 20 niet-gouvernementele organisaties (ngo's)) en waarborging van de rechten en verbetering van de bestaansmiddelen van vrouwen (een nationaal statistisch overzicht werd ontwikkeld, met de regering werd overeengekomen om de afgifte van 67 000 identiteitskaarten te versoepelen en een sociale mediacampagne werd opgezet en is nog steeds aan de gang).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012221/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(24 October 2013)

Subject: Follow-up questions (4) concerning subsidies granted to Egypt

On 24 October 2013, Mr Füle replied on behalf of the Commission to Written Question E-009928/2013. In the answer, he stated, amongst other things, that 'The [Court of Auditors' (CoA) report] mentions "shortcomings", which in the view of the Commission and the High Representative (HR) resulted from external factors outside their control. The CoA recognised in its report that EU support has been provided under difficult conditions, and did not provide concrete evidence that more effective alternatives were available or possible.'

1. What were the 'shortcomings' in question, and from what 'external factors' did they result? Why did the Commission and the High Representative not have any influence on this?

2. Does the Commission share the view that the fact that both it and the High Representative had no influence on the 'external factors' that gave rise to 'shortcomings' confirms that granting subsidies to Egypt was the wrong decision? Does the Commission share the view that the combination of 'difficult conditions' and the lack of 'more effective alternatives' similarly confirms that the granting of subsidies was 'dubious' and mistaken? If so, is the Commission therefore prepared to revoke the granting of such subsidies immediately?

Mr Füle went on to say that, 'The continuous pressure of the Commission and the HR has led e.g. to the establishment of a subcommittee on human rights, the earmarking of 10% of the bilateral budget to support human rights, good governance and democracy, including support for children's and women's rights, with concrete positive and measureable impact.'

3. Can the Commission specify the 'concrete positive and measureable impact' to which it refers? How do the positive developments implied by the Commission in relation to 'human rights, good governance and democracy, including support for children's and women's rights' manifest themselves?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(18 December 2013)

1. The Court's report mentions shortcomings with regard to Public Finance Management, while acknowledging 'slow' progress for example in the Government Financial Management Information System or Medium Term Expenditure Framework. The Commission/HR also underlined the gradual process required to achieve such medium-term objectives as well as the institutional and political instability prevailing since 2011.

2. The Commission/HR do not share the view that granting subsidies to Egypt was the wrong decision. Rather, it adapted its assistance as the situation evolved. No new Budget Support (BS) operations have been decided since August 2011. Besides, given the strengthening of its internal rules for granting BS, effective since January 2013, it suspended the 3rd disbursement worth EUR 41 million of the Education Sector Support Programme. As underlined by the Foreign Affairs Council, a majority of the Court's recommendations had already been acted upon since the reporting period.

3. The EU has achieved the most tangible results under the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights programme, in which the following issues have been tackled for the first time on a large scale, namely Female Genital Mutilation practices (important law cases successfully supported, unified Family Empowerment Declaration developed, several media campaigns conducted to counteract all actions by conservative fundamentalist groups, dialogue activated in 10 governorates through 20 non-governmental organisations (NGOs)) and Securing Rights and Improving Livelihoods of Women (nationwide Statistical Mapping developed, agreement with the Government to facilitate the issuance of 67 000 ID Cards, a Social Media Campaign has been launched and is ongoing).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-012222/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Deuda privada insostenible

Según el director de Asuntos Monetarios del FMI, José Viñals, «un 41 % de la deuda empresarial en España tiene unos intereses que superan los beneficios brutos anuales antes de interés de la empresa. Esto es un problema para el dinamismo de la actividad empresarial, ya que esta deuda es impagable a menos que se acuda a refinanciaciones» ([1]).

Si esta afirmación es cierta, significaría que las entidades bancarias están retrasando la reestructuración de estas deudas mediante refinanciaciones para mejorar su balance. Reconocer estas pérdidas subyacentes podría acarrear nuevas recapitalizaciones bancarias en el Estado español.

A la luz de lo anterior,

¿Conoce la Comisión los datos de los que habla este alto ejecutivo del FMI?

¿Cree la Comisión que la deuda privada en el Estado español es sostenible?

Teniendo en cuenta los citados datos, ¿cree la Comisión que será necesaria una quita de deuda privada para hacer sostenible su pago?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de diciembre de 2013)

1. Sí.

2. La Comisión presentó un análisis detallado de la deuda privada en España en el Examen exhaustivo que se puede hallar en la siguiente dirección en Internet:
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SWD:2013:0116:FIN:ES:PDF

Los informes de examen al amparo del programa de ayuda financiera proporcionan un análisis adicional útil (véase: http://wcmcom-ec-europa-eu-wip.wcm3vue.cec.eu.int:8080/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2013/op163_en.htm).

3. La deuda de las empresas está descendiendo como resultado del incremento de sus ahorros netos y del saneamiento de los bancos.

([1]) http://vozpopuli.com/blogs/3524-juan-laborda-montoro-en-su-realidad-paralela

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012222/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 October 2013)

Subject: Unsustainable private debt

According to José Viñals, the director of the IMF's Monetary and Capital Markets Department, '41% of corporate debt in Spain incurs interest in excess of the company's gross annual income before interest. This has an adverse effect on the dynamism of business activity, since this debt is unpayable without refinancing' ([1]).

If this statement is correct, it would mean that banks are delaying the use of refinancing to restructure these debts in order to improve their balances. The identification of these underlying losses could lead to new rounds of bank recapitalisation in Spain.

Is the Commission aware of the information cited by José Viñals?

Does the Commission believe that private debt in Spain is sustainable?

In view of the facts cited above, does the Commission believe that private debt should be relieved to make the payment of it sustainable?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2013)

1. Yes.

2. The Commission presented a detailed analysis of private debt in Spain in the 2013 In-depth review that can be found at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SWD:2013:0116:FIN:EN:PDF

The review reports under the financial assistance programme provide additional useful analysis (see http://wcmcom-ec-europa-eu-wip.wcm3vue.cec.eu.int:8080/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2013/op163_en.htm).

3. Companies' debt is falling as a result of their increased net savings and banks' write-offs.

([1]) http://vozpopuli.com/blogs/3524-juan-laborda-montoro-en-su-realidad-paralela

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012223/13
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(25 octobre 2013)

Objet: Pertinence du programme REFIT pour rendre cohérente la politique énergétique

J'ai interpellé récemment la Commission européenne sur l'incohérence des objectifs en matière d'environnement, d'énergie et de climat. Ces objectifs, pris de manière isolés, sont louables. Mais conjugués, ils participent à affaiblir notre compétitivité industrielle.

Cette incohérence se manifeste en particulier avec les énergies renouvelables. Les subventions dont elles bénéficient, faussent le marché et obligent à un recours prioritaire à ces sources d'énergie, qui sont par nature intermittentes. Le résultat aujourd'hui est qu'elles affaiblissent notre sécurité énergétique.

C'est d'ailleurs l'un des messages forts que dix de nos fleurons énergétiques ont envoyés, il y a deux semaines, aux dirigeants européens. J'ai soutenu cet appel pour une politique énergétique européenne forte, qui est avant tout dans l'intérêt des citoyens que je représente.

Si j'interpelle une nouvelle fois la Commission aujourd'hui, c'est parce que le programme REFIT lancé au début du mois, visant à simplifier et alléger le droit européen, me semble être une excellente occasion pour s'attaquer à ces incohérences d'objectifs. L'idée de conserver un seul objectif, celui de la réduction des émissions de gaz à effet de serre, donnerait en particulier une plus grande souplesse au marché au profit d'une meilleure efficacité.

Je déplore toutefois que dans le programme de travail de la Commission pour 2014, publié il y a deux jours, il n'y ait aucune trace d'une volonté d'avancer dans ce sens. Pire, la Commission fait de la détermination de nouveaux objectifs pour 2030 une priorité, ajoutant de la contradiction à la contradiction.

La Commission peut-elle par conséquent justifier ses choix et nous dire comment elle simplifiera et rendra plus cohérents à brève échéance ces objectifs énergétiques, environnementaux et climatiques?

Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission
(9 décembre 2013)

Comme cela avait déjà été prévu lors de l'élaboration et de l'adoption du train de mesures pour l'horizon 2020, il existe effectivement une interaction entre les grands objectifs. Les mesures visant à promouvoir l'efficacité énergétique et les énergies renouvelables contribuent généralement, par exemple, à la réduction des émissions de GES (gaz à effet de serre) tandis que les mesures visant à réduire les émissions de GES encouragent quant à elles habituellement à la fois le développement des énergies renouvelables et les économies d'énergie. La Commission est d'avis qu'il n'existe pas de contradiction intrinsèque entre ces objectifs et qu'ils contribuent tous à la compétitivité, à la décarbonisation et à l'utilisation efficace des ressources.

Pour ce qui est des sources d'énergie renouvelables (SER), la directive sur les énergies renouvelables ([1]) a permis la réalisation de progrès importants concernant la pénétration des SER dans le mix énergétique de l'Union, ce qui a créé croissance et emplois dans ce secteur, a permis une réduction des émissions de CO_2 et enfin, et surtout, s'est traduit par une diminution de la dépendance vis-à-vis des importations. De ce point de vue, les SER contribuent à accroître la sécurité de l'approvisionnement en Europe. Les efforts déployés pour promouvoir les SER ont également permis de réduire considérablement les coûts des technologies y afférentes.

Toutefois, il est nécessaire de revoir les régimes d'aide en faveur des SER et d'assurer leur coordination dans l'ensemble de l'Union afin d'en améliorer la rentabilité. C'est précisément l'objectif de la communication adoptée le 5 novembre ([2]). De plus, la communication REFIT d'octobre 2013 ([3]) annonce la réalisation d'une évaluation de la directive sur les énergies renouvelables au titre de REFIT.

([1]) Directive 2009/28/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 23 avril 2009 relative à la promotion de l'utilisation de l'énergie produite à partir de sources renouvelables et modifiant puis abrogeant les directives 2001/77/CE et 2003/30/CE (JO L 140 du 5.6.2009).

([2]) Communication intitulée «Réaliser le marché intérieur de l'électricité et tirer le meilleur parti de l'intervention publique» et accompagnée entre autres par les lignes directrices de la Commission européenne concernant la conception des régimes d'aides en faveur des énergies renouvelables: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/gas_electricity/internal_market_fr.htm

([3]) Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions — Programme pour une réglementation affûtée et performante (REFIT): Résultats et prochaines étapes, COM(2013) 685 du 2.10.2013.

En ce qui concerne la période postérieure à 2020, il convient d'offrir aux opérateurs économiques et aux parties prenantes une certaine sécurité à propos du futur cadre réglementaire en matière d'énergie et de climat. La Commission met la dernière main à une proposition de cadre pour les politiques en matière de climat et d'énergie à l'horizon 2030. La fixation d'objectifs cohérents figure parmi les principales questions traitées.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012223/13
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(25 October 2013)

Subject: Relevance of the REFIT programme for harmonising energy policy

I recently asked the Commission a question about the discrepancies between environmental, energy and climate targets. These targets, individually, are commendable. However, together they combine to weaken our industrial competitiveness.

This inconsistency is particularly obvious when it comes to renewable energy. Subsidies for renewable energy distort the market and force people to prioritise using energy sources that are naturally intermittent. The result is that they are currently weakening our energy security.

That is also one of the main messages sent out to EU leaders by 10 of our flagship energy companies two weeks ago. I supported that call for a robust European energy policy, which is, above all, in the interest of the citizens I represent.

I am questioning the Commission once again today, but it is because I think that the REFIT programme, launched in early October 2013 with the aim of simplifying and easing European legislation, provides an excellent opportunity to tackle these inconsistent targets. The idea of keeping a single target, that of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, would, in particular, give the market greater flexibility, promoting greater efficiency.

However, I regret that the Commission's working programme for 2014, published two days ago, does not hint at any desire to go down this route. Worse still, the Commission's priority is to establish new targets for 2030, piling contradiction upon contradiction.

Can the Commission therefore justify its choices and say how it will simplify these energy targets and make them more consistent in the near future?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 2013)

As foreseen already when the 2020 package was prepared and adopted, there is indeed an interaction between the headline targets. Measures to promote energy efficiency and renewable energy generally contribute e.g. to reductions in GHG (Greenhouse Gas) emissions and on the other hand measures to reduce GHG emissions generally also incentivise both renewables development and energy savings. In the Commission's opinion, there is no intrinsic contradiction between these targets and they all contribute to competitiveness, decarbonisation and resource efficiency.

As far as Renewable energy (RES) is concerned, the Renewable Energy Directive ([1]) has contributed to good progress in penetration of RES in the EU energy mix, bringing about growth and jobs in this sector, reduction of CO_2 emissions and last but not least reduction of our import dependency. In this sense, RES are helping increase our security of supply in Europe. The efforts to promote RES have also significantly reduced the costs of these technologies.

However RES support schemes need to be revised and coordinated across the EU, in order to make them more cost-efficient. This is exactly the purpose of the communication adopted on 5 November ([2]). Furthermore, the REFIT Communication of October 2013 ([3]) announces a REFIT evaluation of the Renewable Energy Directive.

As for the period post-2020 economic operators and stakeholders need to have certainty about the future energy and climate regulatory framework. The Commission is finalising a proposal for a climate and energy policy framework for 2030. Consistent target setting is one of the key issues addressed.

([1]) Directive 2009/28/EC of the European parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources and amending and subsequently repealing Directives 2001/77/EC and 2003/30/EC, OJ L 140, 5.6.2009.

([2]) Communication 'Delivering the Internal market and making the most of public intervention' notably accompanied by European Commission Guidance for the design of renewable support schemes http://ec.europa.eu/energy/gas_electricity/internal_market_en.htm

([3]) Communication from the Commission to the European parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions Regulatory Fitness and Performance (REFIT): Results and Next Steps, COM(2013) 685 final, 2.10.2013.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-012225/13
do Komisji
Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE)
(25 października 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Spadająca populacja pszczół w Europie

Komisja Europejska w ciągu ostatnich kilkunastu miesięcy podjęła szereg działań mających na celu zahamowanie spadku populacji pszczół w Europie. Służyć temu miały głównie ograniczenia w stosowaniu trzech substancji czynnych z grupy neonikotynoidów, które w ocenie Europejskiej Agencji ds. Bezpieczeństwa Żywności (EFSA) w szczególności zagrażają populacji pszczół w Europie.

Według szacunków, z powodu zbyt długiej zimy, w przeciągu ostatniego roku populacja pszczół w Polsce zmalała o przeszło 20 %. To o ok. 5-10 % więcej niż w latach ubiegłych. Spadająca populacja pszczół przyczynia się nie tylko do zmniejszenia produkcji miodu, lecz także ma niebagatelne znaczenie dla rolnictwa, gdyż pszczoły zapylając rośliny podnoszą plony m.in.: rzepaku (30 %) i słonecznika (45 %). W województwie lubelskim, które jest regionem rolniczym, sprawa ta jest bardzo ważna i wywołuje duże zainteresowanie zarówno wśród pszczelarzy, jak i producentów produktów rolnych.

Chciałabym zapytać Komisję, jakie inne dalsze kroki ma zamiar podjąć Komisja, aby zahamować proces spadającej populacji pszczół w państwach Unii Europejskiej?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(5 grudnia 2013 r.)

Informacje o różnych działaniach podejmowanych dla dobra populacji pszczół znajdują się w odpowiedziach Komisji na pytania wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-02739/2012, E-10355/2012, E-11092/2012, E-3944/2013, E-8017/2013, E-8771/2013, E-9457/2013, E-6069/2013 oraz E-6194/2013 ([1]). Ponadto niedawno zostało przyjęte rozporządzenie wykonawcze (UE) nr 781/2013 ([2]) w sprawie fipronilu.

Komisja jest świadoma usługi ekosystemowej, którą wykonują owady zapylające. Zachowanie i odbudowa usług ekosystemowych jest jednym z głównych celów strategii UE w dziedzinie różnorodności biologicznej. Cel 3 tej strategii wspiera przejście do zrównoważonego rolnictwa.

Nowa wspólna polityka rolna ([3]) stanowi, co następuje: W nowym rozporządzeniu dotyczącym jednolitej wspólnej organizacji rynku utrzymano możliwość przedkładania krajowych programów dotyczących pszczelarstwa. Wykaz środków współfinansowanych przez te programy został uaktualniony. Na mocy nowego rozporządzenia w sprawie programu rozwoju obszarów wiejskich państwa członkowskie mogą zastosować szereg środków w celu dalszego wspierania sektora pszczelarskiego. Ponadto wiele środków w ramach zreformowanej wspólnej polityki rolnej pośrednio przyniesie korzyści pszczelarstwu. Obowiązkowe środki na rzecz ekologizacji nowego rozporządzenia w sprawie płatności bezpośrednich wspierają utrzymywanie stałych pastwisk, dywersyfikację upraw i utrzymywanie obszarów proekologicznych, umożliwiając lepszą dostępność pożytków dla pszczół.

W kwietniu 2014 r. Komisja zorganizuje też konferencję poświęconą pszczołom i innym owadom zapylającym, która ma wspomóc przekształcanie postępu naukowego w lepsze programy i praktyki.

W siódmym programie ramowym jeden z tematów zaproszenia do składania wniosków na 2013 r. był poświęcony badaniom nad zrównoważonym pszczelarstwem i ochroną genetycznej różnorodności pszczoły miodnej.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Rozporządzenie wykonawcze Komisji (UE) nr 781/2013 z dnia 14 sierpnia 2013 r. zmieniające rozporządzenie wykonawcze (UE) nr 540/2011 w odniesieniu do warunków zatwierdzenia substancji czynnej fipronil oraz zabraniające stosowania i sprzedaży nasion zaprawionych środkami ochrony roślin zawierającymi tę substancję czynną. Dz.U. L 219 z 15.8.2013, s. 22-25.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012225/13
to the Commission
Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE)
(25 October 2013)

Subject: Declining bee population in Europe

In recent months the Commission has taken a series of measures aimed at halting the decline in Europe's bee population. These have focused on restricting the use of three active substances in the neonicotinoid group of pesticides which, according to the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), pose a particular threat to the bee population in Europe.

Estimates suggest that last year's long winter caused a decline in Poland's bee population of over 20%, a figure some 5-10% higher than in previous years. The fall in bee numbers not only means that less honey is produced, it also has a significant effect on farming, since plant pollination by bees increases yields of crops such as rape (by 30%) and sunflowers (by 45%). This is a key issue in the agricultural province of Lublin and is causing a great deal of concern among beekeepers and agricultural producers alike.

What further steps does the Commission intend to take in order to halt the decline in the bee population in the Member States?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2013)

Information on various actions in favour of honey bees has been provided in Commission replies to written questions E-02739/2012, E-10355/2012, E-11092/2012, E-3944/2013, E-8017/2013, E-8771/2013, E-9457/2013, E-6069/2013 and E-6194/2013 ([1]). In addition, Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 781/2013 ([2]) has been adopted recently on fipronil.

The Commission is aware of the ecosystem service delivered by pollinators. Maintenance and restoration of ecosystem services is a key objective of the EU Biodiversity Strategy. Target 4 of this strategy supports a transition towards a sustainable agriculture.

The new Common Agricultural Policy ([3]) provides for the following: The new single Common Market Organisation Regulation continues with the possibility to submit national apiculture programmes. The list of measures co-financed through these programmes has been updated. With the new Rural Development Programme Regulation, Member States can use a series of measures to further support the apiculture sector. Finally, several measures in the reformed CAP will be indirectly in favour of beekeeping. The compulsory greening measures of the new Direct Payment Regulation support the maintenance of permanent grasslands, crop diversification and ecological focus areas, allowing a better availability of feed for bees.

In April 2014 the Commission will also organise a conference on bees and other pollinators aimed at helping to translate scientific progress into better policies and practices.

In the Seventh Framework Programme, a topic in the 2013 call for proposals was dedicated to research on sustainable apiculture and conservation of honey bee genetic diversity.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 781/2013 of 14 August 2013 amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No 540/2011, as regards the conditions of approval of the active substance fipronil, and prohibiting the use and sale of seeds treated with plant protection products containing this active substance, OJ L 219, 15.8.2013, p. 22-25.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/index_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-012226/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Medicación en pacientes crónicos

Según han asegurado diversos expertos, reunidos en el 58° Congreso de la Sociedad Española de Farmacia Hospitalaria (SEFH), cinco de cada diez pacientes crónicos no cumplen el tratamiento prescrito. Las causas son diversas, debido a la edad, la duración de la terapia, los efectos adversos de los fármacos o el hecho de que la enfermedad no se llegue a curar ([1]). El reto no es otro que contribuir a mejorar su calidad de vida, evitando muchos de los problemas causados por un uso inadecuado de los medicamentos. Normalmente, el paciente crónico suele convivir con diversas enfermedades y los expertos han alertado de que a los riesgos de la polimedicación hay que unir las comorbilidades propias que presentan estos pacientes, su valoración funcional y situación social. «La cronicidad debe abordarse centrándose en el paciente y no en la enfermedad. Hay que tener en cuenta que el estado de salud del paciente crónico es dinámico», ha explicado la coordinadora del Grupo Cronos de la SEFH, María García-Mina.

¿Tiene conocimiento la Comisión sobre este tema?

¿Conoce la Comisión algún «proyecto de buenas prácticas» en algún Estado miembro para minimizar este problema en el Estado español?

¿Puede proponer la Comisión algunas recomendaciones para solucionar este problema?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(3 de diciembre de 2013)

La Comisión es consciente de que las recetas inadecuadas y la falta de rigor en el seguimiento de los tratamientos farmacológicos y no farmacológicos constituyen un problema de salud pública.

En junio de 2012, la Comisión organizó una conferencia internacional sobre esta cuestión que ayudó a concienciar a este respecto. También está facilitando la labor sobre recetas y cumplimiento terapéutico en el marco de la Cooperación de Innovación Europea sobre el Envejecimiento Activo y Saludable, en la que partes interesadas de diez Estados miembros están trabajando para detectar intervenciones e iniciativas eficaces en relación con el cumplimiento terapéutico, la medicación excesiva y la información y capacitación del usuario, así como la investigación y la metodología.

Este grupo de partes interesadas ha acordado un plan de acción sobre la manera de mejorar las recetas y el cumplimiento terapéutico y recientemente concluyó un ejercicio de detección en el que identificaron sesenta y una prácticas en curso destinadas a abordar algunas de las barreras que conducen a unas recetas y un cumplimiento terapéutico inadecuados. Algunas de esas prácticas provienen de España.

La Comisión y las partes interesadas presentaron este trabajo en la segunda conferencia de socios de la Cooperación de Innovación Europea sobre el Envejecimiento Activo y Saludable, celebrada el 25 de noviembre de 2013.

([1]) http://www.europapress.es/salud/noticia-cinco-cada-diez-pacientes-cronicos-no-cumplen-tratamiento-prescrito-20131023185919.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012226/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 October 2013)

Subject: Medication for chronically ill patients

According to various experts at the 58th Congress of the Spanish Society of Hospital Pharmacies (SEFH), five out of every ten chronically ill patients do not comply with their prescribed treatment. The reasons for this include age, the duration of the therapy, the adverse effects of medication and the fact that the illness is not cured ([1]). The challenge in question involves helping to improve the quality of patients' lives, avoiding many of the problems caused by improper use of medication. Chronically ill patients normally suffer from several illnesses and experts have warned that the risks of polypharmacy must be considered alongside the comorbidity experienced by these patients as well as functional evaluations of their condition and their social situations. 'Chronicity must be tackled by focusing on the patient and not on the illness. It must be borne in mind that the state of chronically ill patients' health is dynamic,' explained María García-Mina, the coordinator of the SEFH's Cronos Group.

Is the Commission aware of this problem?

Does the Commission know of any 'good-practice plans' in any Member State that might minimise this problem in Spain?

Could the Commission make any recommendations that would resolve this problem?

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

The Commission is aware that inappropriate prescription and poor adherence to pharmacological and non-pharmacological medical plans is an issue of public health concern.

In June of 2012, the Commission organised an international Conference on this issue that helped raise awareness. The Commission is also facilitating work on 'Prescription and Adherence to medical plans', under the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing, where stakeholders from 10 EU Member States are working on the identification of successful interventions and initiatives in the area of adherence, polypharmacy, user information and empowerment, and research and methodology.

This group of stakeholders has agreed on an action plan on 'how to improve prescription and adherence to medical plans' and recently completed a mapping exercise which resulted in the identification of 61 ongoing practices aiming to address some of the existing barriers to inappropriate prescription and adherence. Some of these practices are from Spain.

The Commission and stakeholders have presented this work at the second Conference of Partners of the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing on 25 November 2013.

([1]) http://www.europapress.es/salud/noticia-cinco-cada-diez-pacientes-cronicos-no-cumplen-tratamiento-prescrito-20131023185919.html

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012228/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(25. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Überarbeitung Verordnung Fluggastrechte

Kritischen Medienberichten zufolge würden die geplanten Neuerungen im Bereich Fluggastrechte das bestehende Schutzniveau für Passagiere deutlich mindern. Laut Kommissionsvorschlag hätte der Gast erst bei längeren Verspätungen als bisher das Recht, Entschädigungszahlungen geltend zu machen. Das würde bedeuten, ein Passagier müsste fünf Stunden warten, bevor er überhaupt einen Anspruch auf jegliche Entschädigung hätte. Des Weiteren sind andere Ansprüche, wie zum Beispiel die Ausgleichszahlungen bei Überbuchungen oder Annullierungen eines Fluges, die nach der geltenden Verordnung 2004 geregelt sind, nicht mehr in der Novelle vorgesehen.

1. Wie steht die Kommission zu diesen Kritikpunkten?

2. Verspätungen sollten in die Risikosphäre der Fluglinie fallen, nicht in die des Passagiers, denn dem Fluggast ist es sicher am wenigsten zumutbar, allfällige Probleme (Technik, Witterungsbedingungen, Streiks usw.), die die Flugzeit beeinflussen könnten, zu antizipieren. Wie rechtfertigt es die Kommission, dass nun der Passagier Verspätungen von bis zu fünf Stunden ohne entsprechende Entschädigung in Kauf nehmen muss?

3. Auch Annullierungen und überbuchte Flüge liegen in der Risikosphäre des Flugunternehmens. Wie kommt der Fluggast dazu, diese Ausfälle einfach ohne entsprechende Ausgleichszahlung hinzunehmen?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(9. Dezember 2013)

Zu Frage 1 und 2: Der Vorschlag zur Überarbeitung der Verordnung über Fluggastrechte ([1]) zielt vor allem darauf ab, die Anwendung und Durchsetzung dieser Rechte zu verbessern. So sollen die nationalen Durchsetzungsstellen beispielsweise ihre Arbeit besser koordinieren und proaktivere Überwachungs- und Sanktionierungsmaßnahmen treffen. Die Fluggäste erhalten wirksamere Möglichkeiten, ihre individuellen Rechte durchzusetzen, da die Luftfahrtunternehmen unter anderem zur Anwendung klarer, strenger Verfahren zum Umgang mit Beschwerden verpflichtet werden.

Zudem werden in dem Vorschlag eine Reihe neuer Fluggastrechte eingeführt und mehrere vorhandene rechtliche Bestimmungen zugunsten der Passagiere geklärt. Insbesondere ist vorgesehen, die Definition des Begriffs „außergewöhnliche Umstände" eng zu fassen, um die Zahl der Fälle, in denen die Fluggesellschaften Ausgleichszahlungen vermeiden können, zu verringern. Da die meisten technischen Probleme nicht als außergewöhnliche Umstände zu betrachten sind, wird vorgeschlagen, den Zeitraum, nach dem ein Ausgleichsanspruch besteht, zu verlängern, um den Luftfahrtunternehmen ausreichend Zeit zur Behebung dieser Fehler zu geben und zu verhindern, dass Änderungen an den Vorschriften zu Annullierungen und höheren Ticket-Preisen führen. Diese Fragen wurden in der Folgenabschätzung ([2]) zu dem Vorschlag sorgfältig analysiert.

3. Im Vorschlag der Kommission werden die derzeitigen Rechte auf Betreuungs-, Unterstützungs- und Ausgleichsleistungen bei Nichtbeförderung oder Annullierung beibehalten. Ferner wird vorgeschlagen, auch für Fluggäste, deren Flug verschoben wurde, Maßnahmen vorzusehen, um deren Schutz ebenfalls sicherzustellen.

([1]) Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Änderung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 261/2004 über eine gemeinsame Regelung für Ausgleichs- und Unterstützungsleistungen für Fluggäste im Fall der Nichtbeförderung und bei Annullierung oder großer Verspätung von Flügen und der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 2027/97 über die Haftung von Luftfahrtunternehmen bei der Beförderung von Fluggästen und deren Gepäck im Luftverkehr (KOM(2013)0130 endg.).

([2]) SWD(2013)062 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012228/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(25 October 2013)

Subject: Revision of the Air Passenger Rights Regulation

According to critical media reports, the planned amendments in the area of air passenger rights significantly reduce the current level of protection for passengers. According to the Commission's proposal, passengers would have the right to apply for compensation only in the event of a longer delay than is currently the case. This would mean that a passenger would have to wait five hours before he or she was even entitled to any compensation. Moreover, other entitlements, such as compensation payments in the event of overbooking or cancellation of a flight, which are regulated in the current Regulation from 2004, are no longer provided for in the revised version.

1. What is the Commission's position with regard to these criticisms?

2. Delays ought to fall within the airlines' sphere of risk, not in that of the passengers, as it is surely least reasonable to expect passengers to anticipate any potential problems (technology, weather conditions, strikes, etc.) that could affect the flight time. How does the Commission justify the fact that passengers will now have to put up with delays of up to five hours without suitable compensation?

3. Cancellations and overbooked flights also fall within the sphere of risk of the airlines. How can passengers simply accept these losses without appropriate compensation?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 2013)

1-2. The proposal to revise air passenger rights ([1]) mainly aims at improving the application and the enforcement of air passengers' rights. For example, the work of the national enforcement bodies will be better coordinated and their monitoring and sanctioning policies will become more pro-active. Passengers will be given more effective means to enforce their individual rights, such as the imposition of clear and stringent complaint-handling procedures on the airlines.

The proposal also introduces a series of new passenger rights and clarifies a number of existing legal provisions in favour of passengers. It is notably proposed to introduce a strict defnition of extraordinary circumstances which reduces the number of cases where airlines can avoid paying compensation. As most technical failures will not be considered as extraordinary, it is proposed to increase the time threshold which gives a right to compensation in order to give the air carrier a reasonable amount of time to cope with such failures and avoid that changes to the rules would lead to cancellations and higher ticket prices. These issues were carefully analysed in the impact assessment ([2]) accompanying the proposal.

3. The Commission maintained in its proposal the current rights to assistance, care and compensation which apply to cases of denied boarding and cancellation. It further proposed to include measures for passengers whose flight is rescheduled, to ensure that they are equally protected.

([1]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights and Regulation (EC) No 2027/97 on air carrier liability in respect of the carriage of passengers and their baggage by air COM/2013/0130 final — 2013/0072 (COD).

([2]) SWD(2013) 062 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012229/13
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE), Alojz Peterle (PPE) en Glenis Willmott (S&D)
(25 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Behandelingen met ATMP's (geneesmiddelen voor geavanceerde therapie)

De laatste tijd zijn in de hele wereld met succes geavanceerde-therapiebehandelingen met gekweekt weefsel, gemanipuleerde cellen en/of genproducten (ATMP's) uitgevoerd en dit is voor patiënten een hoopgevende ontwikkeling. Biotechnologiebedrijven werken aan de productie van ATMP's middels het gebruik van allogene menselijke cellen of weefsel, of fungeren als productieorganisaties op contractbasis, waarbij ze patiëntspecifiek materiaal gebruiken. Onder de bestaande regelgeving, die al vele jaren van kracht is, zijn slechts vier ATMP's goedgekeurd om op de markt te worden gebracht, wat erop duidt dat het bijzonder moeilijk is om aan de eisen van de regelgeving te voldoen.

De productie van nieuwe ATMP's in universiteitsziekenhuizen is een andere waardevolle wijze van het ontwikkelen van geavanceerde-therapiebehandelingen, en heeft als bijkomend voordeel dat de kennis die met fundamenteel wetenschappelijk onderzoek wordt opgedaan ingang vindt in de klinische praktijk in de desbetreffende ziekenhuizen. ATMP's in universiteitsziekenhuizen worden in de meeste gevallen per patiënt vervaardigd, met andere woorden op zeer kleine schaal. Daarnaast zijn er niche-indicaties voor geavanceerde-therapiebehandelingen met ATMP's die voor biotechnologiebedrijven nooit interessant zullen zijn. De productie van ATMP's in universiteitsziekenhuizen concurreert niet met, maar vormt een aanvulling op de activiteiten van biotechnologiebedrijven.

De bestaande ATMP-regelgeving maakt geen onderscheid tussen de kleinschalige, sterk gepersonaliseerde productie van ATMP's in universiteitsziekenhuizen en de grootschalige, industriële ontwikkeling daarvan. ATMP's kunnen ook onder de zogenaamde „ziekenhuisuitzondering" worden geproduceerd, maar in dat geval kunnen de gegevens niet voor wetenschappelijk onderzoek worden gebruikt, kunnen geen klinische proeven worden gehouden en is de productie beperkt tot „niet-routineuze" productie.

Dit alles betekent dat de wetenschappelijke ontwikkeling van geavanceerde-therapiebehandelingen, waarbij ATMP's in een ziekenhuis worden ontwikkeld, en de validering van hun doeltreffendheid in klinische proeven voor weesziekten waarbij geavanceerde-therapiebehandelingen onderdeel uitmaken van multimodale, vaak ingewikkelde behandelingsprotocollen (met inbegrip van therapieoptimaliseringsstudies) op grond van de bestaande regelgeving voor ATMP's bijna helemaal onmogelijk is. Hierdoor staat Europa zwak ten opzichte van andere delen van de wereld.

Toch ligt de toekomst in gepersonaliseerde behandelingen voor patiënten, en de productie van ATMP's voor patiënten met speciale nichebehoeften in universiteitsziekenhuizen is de sleutel tot het waarborgen van universele volksgezondheid. De kloof in de regelgeving die verhindert dat wetenschappelijke ontwikkelingen in universiteitsziekenhuizen hun weg naar de patiënt vinden, moet zo snel mogelijk worden gedicht.

Hoe denkt de Commissie de productie van patiëntspecifieke ATMP's in ziekenhuizen te bevorderen en het mogelijk te maken dat passende klinische proeven in universiteitsziekenhuizen kunnen worden gehouden zodat daar nieuwe, innovatieve behandelingen tot wasdom kunnen komen en in een vervolgstadium aan alle Europese burgers kunnen worden aangeboden, waarmee Europa op het gebied van innovatieve geavanceerde therapiebehandelingen ook weer concurrerend wordt?

Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(16 december 2013)

De handel in geneesmiddelen voor geavanceerde therapie in de EU is geregeld in Verordening (EG) nr. 1394/2007 ([1]), die sinds 30 december 2008 van toepassing is.

De omzetting van onderzoeksactiviteiten in geneesmiddelen die voor patiënten beschikbaar zijn, vormt voor alle soorten geneesmiddelen een grote uitdaging. Slechts voor een fractie van de moleculen die als potentiële geneesmiddelen worden onderzocht wordt uiteindelijk een vergunning voor het in de handel brengen verleend. Het traject van identificatie van een werkzame stof tot geneesmiddelenvergunning vergt doorgaans meer dan tien jaar, maar dit proces is cruciaal om te waarborgen dat de geneesmiddelen die alom beschikbaar zijn voor patiënten in de EU werkzaam en veilig zijn. Dit betekent dat het feit dat sinds de inwerkingtreding van Verordening (EG) nr. 1394/2007 voor slechts vier geavanceerde therapieën een vergunning is verleend, op zichzelf niet op een tekortkoming in de regelgeving hoeft te wijzen.

([1]) Verordening (EG) nr. 1394/2007 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad betreffende geneesmiddelen voor geavanceerde therapie en tot wijziging van Richtlijn 2001/83/EG en Verordening (EG) nr. 726/2004 (PB L 324 van 10.12.2007, blz. 121).

De actieve betrokkenheid van universitaire ziekenhuizen bij de ontwikkeling van geavanceerde therapieën is een positieve ontwikkeling. Andere partijen die zich bezighouden met de ontwikkeling van geavanceerde therapieën zijn organisaties zonder winstoogmerk en kleine en middelgrote ondernemingen. Het is belangrijk dat het regelgevend kader bijdraagt tot het scheppen van voorwaarden waarin nieuwe geneesmiddelen gemakkelijk beschikbaar kunnen worden, terwijl tegelijkertijd een hoog niveau van bescherming van de volksgezondheid wordt gegarandeerd.

De Commissie verricht momenteel een evaluatie van de toepassing van Verordening (EG) nr. 1394/2007 in het kader van de voorbereiding van het in artikel 25 van die verordening voorgeschreven verslag. In dat verslag zal zij ingaan op de vraag hoe kan worden bevorderd dat werkzame en veilige geavanceerde therapieën beschikbaar komen voor patiënten in de EU.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-012229/13
za Komisijo
Ivo Belet (PPE), Alojz Peterle (PPE) in Glenis Willmott (S&D)
(25. oktober 2013)

Zadeva: Zdravljenje z zdravili za napredno zdravljenje

Napredno zdravljenje pacientov, pri katerem se uporabljajo namensko proizvedeno tkivo, spremenjene celice in/ali genski proizvodi (zdravila za napredno zdravljenje), in uspešna uporaba teh zdravil v zadnjem času vzbujata upanje za paciente po vsem svetu. Biotehnološka podjetja razvijajo proizvodnjo zdravil za napredno zdravljenje z uporabo alogenskih človeških celic ali tkiva oziroma nastopajo kot pogodbeni proizvajalci, ki uporabljajo pacientu prilagojen material. V skladu z obstoječo uredbo, ki velja že veliko let, je bilo dovoljenje za promet izdano za samo štiri zdravila za napredno zdravljenje, kar kaže na to, da je izpolnjevanje zahtev uredbe močno ovirano.

Tudi proizvodnja novih zdravil za napredno zdravljenje v univerzitetnih bolnišnicah je pomemben način razvijanja naprednega zdravljenja, saj se tam dognanja iz temeljnih znanstvenih raziskav prenesejo v prakso. V univerzitetnih bolnišnicah se zdravila za napredno zdravljenje večinoma razvijajo za posameznega pacienta, torej v zelo majhnem obsegu. Poleg tega napredno zdravljenje z namenskimi zdravili vključuje zelo specifične indikacije. To so niše, ki za biotehnološka podjetja ne bodo nikoli zanimive. Proizvodnja zdravil za napredno zdravljenje v univerzitetnih bolnišnicah ne pomeni konkurence za dejavnosti biotehnoloških podjetij, pač pa jih dopolnjuje.

V skladu z veljavno uredbo o zdravilih za napredno zdravljenje proizvodnjo posamezniku prilagojenih zdravil v zelo majhnem obsegu v okviru univerzitetne bolnišnice in obsežno industrijsko proizvodnjo urejajo enaka pravila oz. v njej obstaja možnost izjeme glede bolnišnic, pri kateri pa se podatki ne smejo uporabiti v znanstvene namene, klinično preskušanje ni dovoljeno, proizvodnja pa je omejena le na nerutinsko proizvodnjo.

Veljavna uredba skoraj v celoti onemogoča akademsko razvijanje naprednega zdravljenja, pri katerem se zdravila zanj razvijajo v bolnišnicah, in klinično preskušanje njihove učinkovitosti pri redkih boleznih, pri katerih je napredno zdravljenje del multimodalnih in velikokrat zapletenih protokolov zdravljenja (vključno s študijami o njegovi optimizaciji). V tem pogledu je Evropa v primerjavi z drugimi deli sveta v veliko šibkejšem položaju.

Prihodnost pa vendarle temelji na posamezniku prilagojenem zdravljenju, zato je proizvodnja zdravil za napredno zdravljenje pacientov z zelo specifičnimi potrebami v univerzitetnih bolnišnicah ključnega pomena za zagotavljanje splošnega javnega zdravja. Vrzel, ki ovira translacijske dejavnosti v univerzitetnih bolnišnicah, je treba nujno odpraviti.

Kako namerava Komisija olajšati proizvodnjo posamezniku prilagojenih zdravil za napredno zdravljenje v bolnišnicah in omogočiti izvajanje ustreznega kliničnega preskušanja v univerzitetnih bolnišnicah, da bi bilo mogoče v njih razvijati inovativno zdravljenje, ki bi nato postalo dostopno vsem evropskim državljanom, s čimer bi Evropa spet postala konkurenčna na področju inovativnega naprednega zdravljenja?

Odgovor komisarja Borga v imenu Komisije
(16. december 2013)

Promet z zdravili za napredno zdravljenje v EU ureja Uredba 1394/2007 ([1]), ki se uporablja od 30. decembra 2008.

Prenos raziskovalnih dejavnosti na področju zdravil, ki so na voljo bolnikom, predstavlja izziv za vse vrste zdravil. Le majhen del molekul, ki se preiskujejo kot potencialna zdravila, sčasoma pridobi dovoljenje za promet. Od identifikacije aktivne snovi do pridobitve dovoljenja za promet z zdravilom običajno traja več kot deset let, vendar je ta proces bistven, da se zagotovi, da so zdravila, ki so na voljo bolnikom EU, učinkovita in varna. Zato dejstva, da je bilo od začetka veljavnosti Uredbe št. 1394/2007 dovoljenje za promet izdano za samo štiri zdravila za napredno zdravljenje, ni mogoče šteti za slabo ureditev.

Dejavna udeležba univerzitetnih bolnišnic pri razvoju zdravil za napredno zdravljenje kaže na pozitiven razvoj. Drugi sektorji, ki so dejavni v razvoju zdravil za napredno zdravljenje, so nepridobitni subjekti ter mala in srednje velika podjetja. Pomembno je, da regulativni okvir prispeva k ustvarjanju pogojev, ki olajšujejo nastajanje novih zdravil, hkrati pa zagotavlja visoko raven varovanja javnega zdravja.

Komisija zdaj pri pripravi poročila v skladu s členom 25 Uredbe št. 1394/2007 ocenjuje njeno uporabo. V tem poročilu bo Komisija preučila, kako prispevati k temu, da bodo bolnikom v EU na voljo učinkovita in varna zdravila za napredno zdravljenje.

([1]) Uredba (ES) št. 1394/2007 Evropskega parlamenta in Sveta o zdravilih za napredno zdravljenje ter o spremembi Direktive 2001/83/ES in Uredbe (ES) št. 726/2004 (UL L 324, 10.12.2007, str. 121).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012229/13
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE), Alojz Peterle (PPE) and Glenis Willmott (S&D)
(25 October 2013)

Subject: ATMP (advanced therapy medicinal product) treatments

Advanced therapy treatments for patients using engineered tissue, manipulated cells and/or gene products (ATMPs) create hope for patients worldwide thanks to the recent successful applications of these products. Biotech companies are developing the manufacturing of ATMPs using allogeneic human cells or tissue, or acting as contract manufacturing organisations using patient-specific material. Under the current regulation, which has been in place for many years, only four ATMPs have received marketing authorisation, indicating that huge obstacles exist to meeting the requirements of the regulation.

The manufacturing of novel ATMPs in university hospitals provides another valuable avenue for developing advanced therapy treatments, insights from basic scientific research being translated into clinical practice in such hospitals. ATMPs in university hospitals are mostly manufactured on a per-patient basis, that is to say on a very small scale. Moreover, there are niche indications for advanced therapy treatments with ATMPs that will never be of interest to biotech companies. The manufacture of ATMPs in university hospitals is not in competition with, but complementary to, the activities of biotech companies.

Under the current ATMP regulation, the manufacturing of highly personalised ATMPs on a small scale within a university hospital is governed by the same rules as large-scale industrial manufacture, or can be conducted under 'hospital exemption'. However, in the latter case, the data cannot be used for scientific research, no clinical trials can be performed and manufacturing is restricted to 'non-routine' production.

As such, the academic development of advanced therapy treatments, where ATMPs are developed in a hospital, and the validation of their efficacy in clinical trials for orphan diseases where advanced therapy treatments are part of multimodal, often complex treatment protocols (including therapy optimisation studies), are almost entirely prevented by the current regulation on ATMP. This makes Europe much weaker in comparison with other parts of the world.

Nevertheless, the future lies in personalised treatments for patients, and ATMP manufacturing for patients with particular niche requirements in university hospitals is the key to ensuring universal public health. The gap which weakens translational pipelines in university hospitals needs to be bridged as a matter of urgency.

How does the Commission intend to facilitate the manufacture of patient-specific ATMPs in hospitals, making it possible to conduct appropriate clinical trials in university hospitals so that new innovative treatments can be developed there and subsequently made available to all European citizens, putting Europe back into a competitive position in the field of innovative advanced therapy treatments?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

The marketing of advanced therapy medicinal products in the EU is governed by Regulation 1394/2007 ([1]), which applies since 30 December 2008.

The translation of research activities into medicinal products available to patients is challenging for all type of medicinal products. Only a small fraction of the molecules investigated as potential medicinal products eventually obtain a marketing authorisation. The path from identification of an active substance to the authorisation of the medicinal product typically takes more than 10 years but this process is essential to ensure that medicines that are widely made available to EU patients are efficacious and safe. Accordingly, the fact that only four advanced therapies were granted a marketing authorisation since the entry into force of Regulation 1394/2007 cannot be considered per se as evidence of regulatory failure.

The active involvement of university hospitals in the development of advanced therapies is a positive development. Other sectors actively engaged in the development of advanced therapies are non-for-profit entities and small and medium enterprises. It is important that the regulatory framework contributes to creating conditions that facilitate the appearance of new medicinal products, while ensuring a high level of public health protection.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1394/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council on advanced therapy medicinal products and amending Directive 2001/83/EC and Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 (OJ L324, 10.12.2007, p.121).

The Commission is currently assessing the application of the regulation 1394/2007 in the context of the preparation of the report mandated under Article 25 thereof. In this report, the Commission will reflect on how to facilitate that efficacious and safe advanced therapies are made available to patients in the EU.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor P-012231/13
upućeno Komisiji
Tonino Picula (S&D)
(25. listopada 2013.)

Predmet: Potpora ribarskom sektoru

Nove odredbe Fonda za pomorstvo i ribarstvo izglasane su 23. listopada na plenarnom zasjedanju u Strasbourgu. Neke od odredbi uključuju potporu održivom ribolovu i zaštiti ribljeg fonda. Istodobno novim odredbama prestaju se poticati dodatna povećanja ribarske flote, a postojeća flota će se morati prilagoditi unaprijeđenim ekološkim i sigurnosnim standardima. Ribarima i ribarskom sektoru diljem Europske unije poslana je jasna poruka da nastupaju promjene.

I prije nego što je Fond za ribarstvo i pomorstvo podržan od strane Parlamenta, Europska komisija poticala je prekvalifikaciju ribara. 18. listopada je završio natječaj za prikupljanje projekata Europske komisije — Čuvari mora — (MARE/2013/09), kojim se ribare poticalo za izlazak iz ribarstva i bavljenje drugim poslovima vezanima uz more. Natječaj za projekte bio je otvoren za sedam zemalja članica, uključujući Hrvatsku, a budžet natječaja iznosio je svega 1.200.000,00 EUR. Opseg budžeta, kojim se inicijalno planiralo bespovratno financirati svega 4 ili 5 projekata, nije ni adekvatan ni dostatan. Planira li Komisija objavu novih programa i natječaja sličnog sadržaja, ali većeg budžeta?

Uzimajući u obzir nedavno izglasane odredbe, kakve konkretne mjere i programe Komisija planira provesti kako bi financijski potpomogla ribarima da se prilagode novim odredbama uspostavljanja uravnoteženijeg odnosa između ribarske flote i raspoloživih ribljih resursa, kao i smanjenju ribarske flote, uz istovremeno osiguravanje radnih mjesta u priobalnim zajednicama?

Odgovor gđe Damanaki u ime Komisije
(5. prosinca 2013.)

Poziv na prijavu pilot-projekata u području „Čuvari mora" temelji se na posebnoj dodjeli sredstava koja je Komisiji stavio na raspolaganje Europski parlament. Službe Komisije trenutačno ocjenjuju prijedloge projekata. Te će se aktivnosti provesti u eksperimentalne svrhe te obuhvaćati područja poput praćenja i očuvanja morskog ekosustava, skupljanja otpada i izgubljene ribolovne opreme, rekreativnih i turističkih usluga te prikupljanja podataka.

Od 2014. većina tih aktivnosti ispunjavat će uvjete za financiranje iz Europskog fonda za pomorstvo i ribarstvo (EMFF). Potpora će biti dostupna za diversifikaciju unutar i izvan sektora ribarstva kako bi se omogućili dodatni izvori prihoda za aktivne ribare te za one koji žele napustiti taj sektor i širu ribarstvenu zajednicu.

EMFF će ovisno o rezultatu pregovora između Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća vjerojatno poduprijeti diversifikaciju i otvaranje radnih mjesta. To može obuhvaćati dopunske aktivnosti poput usluga povezanih s okolišem (uključujući upravljanje, obnovu i praćenje zaštićenih područja), skupljanja otpada, obrazovnih aktivnosti i turizma te otvaranje poduzeća izvan područja komercijalnog ribarstva, ponovnu izobrazbu i prilagodbu ribarskih plovila za aktivnosti izvan ribarstva.

EMFF će najvjerojatnije nastaviti s podupiranjem Lokalnih akcijskih skupina u ribarstvu na temelju lokalnog razvoja u ribarstvenim područjima kojim upravlja lokalna zajednica. EMFF će po mogućnosti tim skupinama omogućiti odabir projekata kojima će se ojačati položaj sektora ribarstva u lancu opskrbe i lokalnom gospodarstvu ili koji će pridonijeti gospodarskoj diversifikaciji i otvaranju radnih mjesta pomoću inicijativa kao što je turizam povezan s ribarstvom.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012231/13
to the Commission
Tonino Picula (S&D)
(25 October 2013)

Subject: Support for the fisheries sector

The new rules governing the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund were approved by Parliament at its plenary sitting in Strasbourg on 23 October. Some of the rules are designed to support sustainable fishing and protect fish stocks. Under the new arrangements, moreover, the incentives for further expansion of the fishing fleet are to be removed, and the existing fleet will be called upon to adapt to advanced environmental and safety standards. Fishermen and the fisheries sector in all parts of Europe have been sent a clear message that changes are on the way.

Before Parliament voted to endorse the Maritime and Fisheries Fund, the Commission started the moves to retrain fishermen, one notable date being 18 October, the deadline for submitting applications for 'Guardians of the Sea' (MARE/2013/09), a call for proposals organised by the Commission with a view to encouraging fishermen to leave the fishing industry for other maritime occupations. The call for proposals was open to seven Member States, Croatia included, and its total budget amounted to EUR 1 200 000, a sum intended initially to finance grants for four or five projects in all, but which is neither appropriate nor sufficient. Will the Commission issue new programmes and calls for proposals covering similar subject matter, but with a larger budget?

Taking into account the newly adopted rules, what specific measures and programmes will the Commission implement in order to support fishermen financially and in that way help them adapt to the new provisions whereby the fishing fleet and the fishery resources available are to be maintained in a balanced relationship and fleets are to be scaled down, but without undermining the aim of preserving jobs in coastal communities?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2013)

The call for pilot projects in the field of 'Guardians of the Sea' is based on a special allocation made available to the Commission by the European Parliament. The project proposals are currently being evaluated by the Commission services. These actions will be of an experimental nature and cover fields such as the monitoring and conservation of the marine ecosystem, the collection of litter and lost fishing gear, leisure and tourist services and data collection.

From 2014 most of these actions will be eligible for funding under the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF). Support will be available for both diversification within and beyond the fisheries sector, to provide additional sources of income for active fishermen, as well as for those wishing to leave the sector and the wider fisheries community.

The EMFF, depending on the outcome of negotiations between the European Parliament and the Council, is likely to support the facilitation of diversification and job creation. This could include complementary activities such as environmental services — including the management, restoration and monitoring of protected areas — the collection of waste, educational activities and tourism, as well as business start-ups outside commercial fishing, re-training and the adjustment of fishing vessels for activities outside fishing.

The EMFF will most likely continue to support Fisheries Local Action Groups through community-led local development in fisheries areas. The EMFF will likely allow these groups to select projects that will strengthen the position of the fisheries sector in the supply chain and in the local economy, or that will contribute to economic diversification and job creation through initiatives such as pesca-tourism.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012233/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(28 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ανακοίνωση πακέτου εκδημοκρατισμού της Τουρκίας — Επαναλειτουργία Θεολογικής Σχολής της Χάλκης

Ο Πρωθυπουργός της Τουρκίας παρουσίασε στα τέλη Σεπτεμβρίου το λεγόμενο «πακέτο εκδημοκρατισμού» της χώρας. Σε αυτό δεν περιελήφθη εν τέλει η άρση της απαγόρευσης λειτουργίας της Θεολογικής Σχολής της Χάλκης, παρά τις μέχρι προσφάτως δηλώσεις Τούρκων αξιωματούχων περί του αντιθέτου.

Υπό το φως των ανωτέρω και δεδομένου ότι το ζήτημα του σεβασμού από το τουρκικό κράτος της θρησκευτικής ελευθερίας περιλαμβάνεται σταθερά στις εκθέσεις προόδου της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής για την Τουρκία, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς κρίνει τη μη άρση της απαγόρευσης λειτουργίας της Θεολογικής Σχολής της Χάλκης;

2. Τι ενέργειες προτίθεται να αναλάβει προς τις τουρκικές αρχές ώστε να λυθεί επιτέλους το σοβαρό ζήτημα της επαναλειτουργίας της Θεολογικής Σχολής της Χάλκης που, όσο παραμένει άλυτο, συνιστά ευθεία προσβολή του σεβασμού της θρησκευτικής ελευθερίας στη Τουρκία;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(9 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή είναι ενήμερη για το θέμα και το υπογράμμισε στη Έκθεση Προόδου για την Τουρκία του 2013: *Οι περιορισμοί στην εκπαίδευση του κλήρου παρέμειναν. Ούτε η τουρκική νομοθεσία, ούτε το σύστημα δημόσιας εκπαίδευσης προβλέπουν ανώτερη θεολογική εκπαίδευση για τις επιμέρους κοινότητες. Παρά τις εξαγγελίες των αρχών, η Ελληνορθόδοξη Θεολογική Σχολή της Χάλκης παρέμεινε κλειστή* (σ. 55).

Η Επιτροπή λυπάται για το γεγονός ότι η δέσμη μέτρων εκδημοκρατισμού του Σεπτεμβρίου δεν έχει αντιμετωπίσει το ζήτημα, και προτίθεται να ανακινήσει το ζήτημα στις τουρκικές αρχές με κάθε κατάλληλη ευκαιρία.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012233/13
to the Commission
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Announcement of Turkey democratisation package/reopening of Chakli Seminary

The Turkish prime minister presented his country's 'democratisation package' at the end of September. It does not lift the ban on the Chalki Seminary, despite recent statements by Turkish officers to the contrary.

In view of the above and given that the question of respect by the Turkish state for religious freedom is a persistent topic in European Commission progress reports on Turkey, will the Commission say:

1. What is its opinion of the failure to lift the ban on the Chalki Seminary?

2. What action does it intend to take with the Turkish authorities in order to resolve once and for all the serious issue of the reopening of the Chalki Seminary which, until such time as it is resolved, represents a direct violation of respect for religious freedom in Turkey?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(9 January 2014)

The Commission is aware of the issue and has underlined it in the Turkey Progress Report 2013: 'Restrictions on the training of clergy remained. Neither Turkish legislation nor the public education system provide for higher religious education for individual communities. Despite announcements by the authorities, the Halki (Heybeliada) Greek Orthodox seminary remained closed' (page 55).

The Commission regrets that the September democratisation package has not addressed the issue, and intends to raise it with the Turkish authorities on all appropriate occasions.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012234/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Tatsächliche Internet-Kapazität und deren regionale Verteilung

Laut einer EU-Studie erhalten Internet-Benutzer von ihren Providern nicht die Download-Geschwindigkeit, sondern nur zwei Drittel der Kapazität, für die sie zahlen. Die Mobilfunkanbieter sichern sich in den Verträgen mit Klauseln wie Bandbreitenkorridor entsprechend ab.

Naturgemäß ist die tatsächliche Übertragungsgeschwindigkeit von einer Reihe von Faktoren abhängig: Abstand von der Schaltstelle, Kabelqualität, elektrische Anlagen in der Nähe, Anzahl der Anschlüsse … Mit einem Leistungseinbruch zwischendurch kann man leben, solange dies nur selten vorkommt. In den ländlichen Regionen — also gerade dort, wo viele auf gute Anbindung angewiesen sind, um mangels lokaler Arbeitsplatzangebote ihren Lebensunterhalt mit Heimarbeit zu verdienen — klagen die User anscheinend besonders oft über mangelnde Internet-Geschwindigkeit.

1. Wurde die regionale Verteilung im Zuge besagter Studie mit untersucht?

2. Falls ja, zu welchem Ergebnis kam die Studie?

3. Falls nein, ist eine Untersuchung der regionalen Verteilung im Rahmen von Folgestudien geplant?

4. Wie ist der Stand der Aktionspläne zur besseren Internet-Erschließung ländlicher Regionen?

Antwort von Frau Kroes im Namen der Kommission
(9. Dezember 2013)

Die Leistungsbeschreibung für die von SamKnows Limited durchgeführte Studie zur Qualität der Breitbanddienste in der EU ([1]) umfasste keine Aufschlüsselung der Ergebnisse nach Regionen. Eine Aufgliederung der Ergebnisse nach städtischen und ländlichen Gebieten wurde zwar angefordert, war jedoch nicht möglich, da keine detaillierten Informationen über die Länge der Anschlussleitungen zwischen der Vermittlungsstelle und den Räumlichkeiten der Teilnehmer zur Verfügung standen. Daher war es nicht möglich, Schlussfolgerungen auf regionaler Ebene zu ziehen.

Die Berichte für 2013 und 2014 zur Qualität der Breitbanddienste werden dasselbe Format wie der Bericht für 2012 haben und deshalb ebenfalls keine Aufgliederung der Ergebnisse nach Regionen enthalten.

Die nationalen Breitbandpläne werden regelmäßig von der Europäischen Kommission überprüft ([2]) und die Fortschritte auf dem Weg zum Erreichen der Ziele der Digitalen Agenda durch den Anzeiger zur Digitalen Agenda (Scoreboard) überwacht ([3]). Die Bereitstellung eines besseren Internetzugangs für Gebiete, in denen der Markt versagt hat — was häufig ländliche Gebiete betrifft –, wird im kommenden Finanzierungszeitraum 2014-2020 hauptsächlich von den europäischen Struktur- und Investitionsfonds (ESIF) abhängig sein. Es wird davon ausgegangen, dass IKT-Infrastrukturen (Informations- und Kommunikationstechnologie) im Rahmen der künftigen ESIF über alle regionalen Kategorien hinweg zuschussfähig sein werden und ein Plan für ein nationales oder regionales Netz der nächsten Generation (NGN) dürfte bis dahin vorliegen, weil er eine Fördervoraussetzung ist.

([1]) http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&frm=1&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CDAQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fec.europa.eu%2Finformation_society%2Fnewsroom%2Fcf%2Fdae%2Fdocument.cfm%3Fdoc_id%3D2319&ei=4gOOUp_NCoLStQbgzoCgAg&usg=AFQjCNE-TnV9VFl3qeWq9wtOhywO1yV79g&bvm=bv.56987063,d.Yms

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/commission-staff-working-document-implementation-national-broadband-plans

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/scoreboard

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012234/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Actual Internet capacity and its regional distribution

According to an EU study, Internet users do not receive from their providers the download speeds they are paying for; they only receive two-thirds of the capacity. Mobile telephone operators cover themselves appropriately in their contracts with clauses referring to a bandwidth range, for example.

The actual transmission speed is naturally dependent on a range of factors: distance from the exchange, cable quality, nearby electrical installations, number of connections, etc. People can live with the occasional loss of power, provided it is only a rare occurrence. In rural regions — that is to say precisely the places where many people are dependent on good connections in order to earn their living by working at home on account of a lack of local jobs — users appear to complain particularly often of poor Internet speeds.

1. Was the regional distribution investigated as part of the aforementioned study?

2. If so, what conclusion did the study reach?

3. If not, is an investigation of the regional distribution planned in any follow-up studies?

4. What is the status of the action plans for better Internet provision for rural regions?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 2013)

The terms of reference of the Sam Knows study on Quality of Broadband in the EU ([1]) did not include a breakdown of results by regions. A split of results by urban and rural areas was requested but was not possible because detailed information on the length of the access line from the exchange to the panellists' premises was not available. As a result it was not possible to reach conclusions at regional level.

The 2013 and 2014 reports on the quality of broadband services will keep the same format as the 2012 report and will not contain any breakdown of results by regions.

National broadband plans are regularly reviewed by the European Commission ([2]), and their progress towards the Digital Agenda targets is monitored through the Digital Agenda scoreboard ([3]). Better Internet provision for areas affected by market failure — often corresponding to rural areas — in the coming 2014-2020 financing period will rely mostly on the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF). Under the future ESIF, ICT (Information and Communication Technology) infrastructures are expected to be eligible across all categories of regions and the related *ex-ante* conditionality should provide for a national or regional NGN(Next-Generation Network) plan to be in place.

([1]) http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&frm=1&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CDAQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fec.europa.eu%2Finformation_society%2Fnewsroom%2Fcf%2Fdae%2Fdocument.cfm%3Fdoc_id%3D2319&ei=4gOOUp_NCoLStQbgzoCgAg&usg=AFQjCNE-TnV9VFl3qeWq9wtOhywO1yV79g&bvm=bv.56987063,d.Yms

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/commission-staff-working-document-implementation-national-broadband-plans

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/scoreboard

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012236/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: NSA-Skandal — Mitlesen von Email-Kommunikation

In der Vergangenheit hieß es, dass die E-Mails von Gmail-Kunden lediglich auf Spam und Viren gescannt werden und für die Schaltung personalisierter Daten verwendet werden. Im Zusammenhang mit der NSA-Affäre meinte Google ganz lapidar, kein Gmail-Nutzer dürfe erwarten, dass der Inhalt persönlicher E-Mails privat bleibt.

Es muss eindeutig klargestellt werden, dass beim Versenden von E-Mails ebenso wie beim Schicken von Briefen das Postgeheimnis gilt, also kein Anbieter mitlesen darf. Ebenso haben die Kunden haben ein Recht zu erfahren, welche Nutzerdaten an Sicherheitsbehörden weitergegeben werden.

1. Welche Haltung nimmt die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang ein?

2. Wird auf EU-Ebene daran gearbeitet, dass die Kunden erfahren sollen, welche Nutzerdaten an Sicherheitsbehörden weitergegeben werden?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(17. Dezember 2013)

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-011733/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012236/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: NSA scandal — reading of emails

In the past it was said that the emails of Gmail customers were merely scanned for spam and viruses and were used for the connecting of personal data. In connection with the NSA affair, Google stated quite tersely that no Gmail user should expect the content of personal emails to remain private.

It needs to be made absolutely clear that, when sending emails, just as when sending letters, the secrecy of communications applies, that is to say no service provider may read these communications. Customers also have the right to know which user data are passed on to security authorities.

1. What is the Commission's position on this?

2. Is work being done at EU level to ensure that customers will know which user data are passed on to security authorities?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-011733/13.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012238/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: E-Government — Datensicherheit

Der intelligente Einsatz von Technologien ist sicherlich eine Möglichkeit, Kosten zu senken, und das nicht nur im grenzüberschreitenden Bereich. Dass E-Government zu mehr Effizienz führen kann, mag stimmen, und in einem gewissen Ausmaß mag auch ein Mehr an Bürgerservice dadurch entstehen. Allerdings muss gerade angesichts des jüngsten NSA-Skandals durch entsprechende Sicherheitsmaßnahmen gewährleistet sein, dass etwa die US-Sicherheitsbehörden nicht bei sämtlichen Schriftstücken gleich mitlesen und sensible Daten so in die falschen Hände gelangen.

1. Welche Begleitmaßnahmen werden im Zusammenhang mit den E-Government-Initiativen wie E-Justice usw. auf EU-Ebene ergriffen, um die Datensicherheit zu gewährleisten?

2. Welche Maßnahmen sind in diesem Zusammenhang noch geplant?

3. Inwieweit findet dieser Aspekt in der internen Kommunikation zwischen EU-Institutionen und -Agenturen Berücksichtigung?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(6. Januar 2014)

Zunächst möchte die Kommission auf den Europäischen Interoperabilitätsrahmen (EIF) für europäische öffentliche Dienste ([1]) verweisen. Die Mitgliedstaaten wurden aufgefordert, ihre nationalen Interoperabilitätsrahmen bis Ende 2013 an den EIF anzupassen, was die meisten von ihnen auch bereits getan haben. Eines der Grundprinzipien des EIF (Abschnitt 2.5) besteht darin, dass die Mitgliedstaaten Sicherheits- und Datenschutzanforderungen bei der Einrichtung europäischer öffentlicher Dienste umfassend berücksichtigen. Insbesondere umfasst der EIF ein Konzeptmodell für öffentliche Dienste, das der Notwendigkeit eines gesicherten Datenaustauschs Rechnung trägt (Abschnitt 3.2.2).

Für den Informationsaustausch mit anderen EU-Organen und Mitgliedstaaten verwendet die Kommission das hochsichere Netz sTESTA ([2]), das die Verfügbarkeit, Integrität und Vertraulichkeit der übertragenen Daten auf bestmögliche Weise gewährleistet: Es ist nicht mit dem Internet verbunden, wird durch in der EU entwickelte Verschlüsselungstechniken gesichert, die von mindestens zwei nationalen Sicherheitsbehörden in der EU zertifiziert wurden, und unterliegt strengen Sicherheitsvorgaben, die regelmäßig überprüft werden.

Bei der Entwicklung von Informationssystemen zur Unterstützung von EU-Maßnahmen wendet die Kommission Sicherheitsstandards und -vorgaben an, die sich international bewährt haben und regelmäßig überprüft werden. Nach diesen Standards muss der Eigentümer der Daten die Anforderungen hinsichtlich Vertraulichkeit und Integrität der Daten prüfen, die Daten entsprechend klassifizieren und angemessene Schutzmaßnahmen treffen.

([1]) Anhang 2 zur Mitteilung der Kommission vom 16. Dezember 2010 an das Europäische Parlament, den Rat, den Europäischen Wirtschafts- und Sozialausschuss und den Ausschuss der Regionen „Interoperabilisierung europäischer öffentlicher Dienste", KOM(2010)744 endg.

([2]) sTESTA = Secured Trans European Services for Telecommunications between Administrations.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012238/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: E-Government — data security

The intelligent use of technologies is surely one means of reducing costs, and not only in the cross-border sector. It may be true that e-Government can lead to greater efficiency, and to a certain extent it may also give rise to a better service for citizens. However, in view of the recent NSA scandal in particular, it needs to be ensured, through appropriate security measures, that the US security authorities, for example, do not immediately read all documents, thus allowing sensitive data to fall into the wrong hands.

1. What accompanying measures are being taken at EU level in connection with the e-Government initiatives, such as e-Justice, etc., to ensure data security?

2. What other measures are planned in this regard?

3. To what extent is this aspect taken into account in the internal communications between EU institutions and agencies?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(6 January 2014)

The Commission draws the Honourable Member's attention to the European Interoperability Framework (EIF) for European Public Services ([1]). Member States have been invited to align their national interoperability frameworks with the EIF by end 2013, and the majority of them have already done so. One of the underlying principles of the EIF (Section 2.5) calls on Member States to consider carefully security and privacy requirements when establishing European Public Services. More specifically, the EIF puts forward a conceptual model for such services, which addresses the need for secure exchange of data (Section 3.2.2).

As regards exchange of information between EU institutions, but also with Member States, the Commission has implemented a highly secured network called sTESTA ([2]), which guarantees in the best possible way the availability, integrity and confidentiality of the data it transports: it is not connected to the Internet; it is secured by EU-made cryptographic means certified by at least two EU national security agencies; and it implements a strict security policy which is audited on a regular basis.

When developing information systems to support EU policies, the Commission applies security standards and policies based on international best practices, which are regularly reviewed. These require the data owner to assess the requirements for data confidentiality and integrity, decide on the proper classification level and adopt adequate protective measures.

([1]) Annex 2 to the communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of Regions 'Towards interoperability for European public services' (COM(2010) 744 final) of 16 December 2010.

([2]) sTESTA = Secured Trans European Services for Telecommunications between Administrations.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-012239/13
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(28 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Finanziamenti europei per integrazione Rom

Può la Commissione indicare quante risorse siano state destinate all'Italia e alla Regione Toscana nei periodi di programmazione 2000-2006 e 2007-2013 per l'integrazione dei Rom?

Può inoltre precisare quale sia l'eventuale dotazione prevista nel prossimo Quadro finanziario pluriennale 2014-2020 a tal fine?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(29 novembre 2013)

Il Fondo sociale europeo (FSE) e il Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR) sono attuati attraverso programmi operativi (PO) sotto la responsabilità di un'autorità di gestione (AG) a livello nazionale o regionale.

I programmi operativi del FSE non hanno un bilancio dedicato per l'integrazione del popolo Rom. Queste misure sono finanziate in primo luogo dall'asse prioritario inclusione sociale (si veda la tabella in allegato). Non è quindi possibile fornire cifre sulla quota di risorse attribuite a progetti destinati specificamente ai Rom. La Commissione invita inoltre l'onorevole parlamentare a consultare la pubblicazione «European Social Fund and Roma» (il Fondo sociale europeo e Rom) ([1]).

Per quanto riguarda il periodo 2014-2020, il progetto di regolamento FSE comprende una priorità di investimento relativa alla «integrazione socioeconomica delle comunità emarginate, come i Rom». Si prevede che l'Italia presenterà il suo accordo di partnership (AP) per l'attuazione dei Fondi strutturali e di investimento europei (FSIE) durante il periodo di programmazione 2014-2020 nei prossimi mesi. L'AP dovrebbe comprendere informazioni sulla quota di risorse FSIE dedicate e sui principali risultati previsti per gli interventi nell'ambito di questa priorità di investimento.

Il Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR) cofinanzia azioni a favore dei Rom in quattro regioni della convergenza attraverso il programma operativo nazionale 2007-2013 «Sicurezza per lo sviluppo». Dal momento che i progetti costituiscono parte di una strategia generale destinata ai migranti, non è possibile fornire informazioni sui fondi specificamente destinati ai Rom. La AG Toscana ha inoltre di recente proposto di utilizzare il FESR per cofinanziare interventi integrati nel settore degli alloggi a favore dei Rom, comprendenti circa 200 persone dei comuni di Pistoia, Lucca e San Giuliano Terme.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/esf/docs/esf_roma_it.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012239/13
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: EU funding for integration of Roma

Can the Commission say how much funding has been allocated to Italy and the Region of Tuscany in the 2000-2006 and 2007-2013 programming periods for the integration of Roma people?

Can it also say what the budget might be in the next Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020 for this purpose?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(29 November 2013)

The European Social Fund (ESF) and the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) are implemented through Operational Programmes (OPs) under the responsibility of a managing authority (MA) at national or regional level.

ESF OPs do not have a dedicated budget for the integration of Roma people. Such measures are primarily funded from the social inclusion priority axis (see table at annex). It is therefore not possible to provide figures on the share of resources allocated to projects specifically targeting Roma. The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to the publication 'European Social Fund and Roma' ([1]).

As for the 2014-20 period, the draft ESF Regulation includes an investment priority dealing with the 'socioeconomic integration of marginalised communities such as the Roma'. Italy is expected to submit its Partnership Agreement (PA) for the implementation of the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) during the 2014-20 programming period in the upcoming months. The PA should include information on the share of ESIF resources dedicated to, and on the main results expected from interventions under such an investment priority.

The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) co-finances actions in favour of Roma in the four convergence regions through the 2007-2013 'Security for Development' national OP. As the projects are part of an overall strategy for migrants, it is not possible to provide information on funds specifically allocated to Roma. In addition, the Tuscany MA has recently proposed to use the ERDF to co-finance integrated housing interventions in favour of Roma, covering approximately 200 persons in the municipalities of Pistoia, Lucca and San Giuliano Terme.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/esf/docs/esf_roma_en.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-012240/13
a la Comisión
Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE)
(28 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Exclusión de menores en un programa de tiempo libre

Dos menores de 10 años de Olazagutía (Navarra) que estudian el modelo B con la mayoría de las asignaturas en lengua vasca han sido excluidas, por parte de la Mancomunidad de Alsasua, Olazagutía y Ciordia, del programa de tiempo libre en euskera Larunblai, por no estudiar en el modelo D de enseñanza íntegra en lengua vasca.

Los padres han recurrido al Defensor del Pueblo y no descartan poner en conocimiento del Defensor del Menor lo que consideran una marginación, cuando en los últimos dos años las niñas ya habían asistido al mismo programa sin ningún tipo de problema.

El artículo 14 de la Convención Europea de Derechos Humanos dice: «El goce de los derechos y libertades ha de ser asegurado sin distinción alguna, especialmente por razones de sexo, raza, color, lengua, religión, opiniones políticas u otras, origen nacional o social, pertenencia a una minoría nacional, fortuna, nacimiento o cualquier otra situación».

¿Cree la Comisión que se trata de un acto segregador, excluyente e injusto?

¿Cree la Comisión adecuado que una administración pública local aplique a sus programas criterios de exclusión por razón de lengua?

¿Cree la Comisión adecuado que un ente local pueda cohibir la libertad de los padres a elegir la educación de sus hijos mediante este tipo de exclusiones sin fundamento legal?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de diciembre de 2013)

De conformidad con el artículo 2 del Tratado de la Unión Europea, el respeto de los derechos de las personas pertenecientes a minorías constituye uno de los valores fundacionales de la Unión Europea. Además, los artículos 21 y 22 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea prohíben la discriminación basada en la pertenencia a una minoría nacional y establecen el respeto por parte de la Unión de la diversidad cultural, religiosa y lingüística.Dentro del ámbito del Derecho de la Unión Europea, la Comisión garantiza que los Estados miembros, al aplicar tal Derecho, respetan los derechos fundamentales establecidos en la Carta.

Sin embargo, tal y como se explica en la respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-006204/2013, la Comisión no tiene competencias generales en lo que respecta a las personas pertenecientes a minorías. Con respecto a la cuestión concreta del derecho de las personas pertenecientes a minorías a hablar y utilizar sus propias lenguas, cabe señalar que esta cuestión es competencia exclusiva de los Estados miembros, competencia sujeta a las garantías de derechos fundamentales del orden constitucional nacional y a las obligaciones derivadas del Derecho internacional, incluidos los instrumentos pertinentes del Consejo de Europa.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012240/13
to the Commission
Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Exclusion of children from a leisure programme

Two children under the age of 10 from Olazagutía (Navarra), who are studying under Model B with most of their subjects in the Basque language, have been excluded by the Association of Municipalities of Alsasua, Olazagutía and Ciordia from the Larunblai leisure programme in the Basque language because they are not studying under Model D, in which pupils are taught fully in Basque.

Their parents have reported the matter to the Ombudsman and they are considering informing also the Ombudsman for Children about what they consider to be an issue of marginalisation, when in the previous two years the little girls had followed the same programme without any problems.

According to Article 14 of the European Convention of Human Rights: 'The enjoyment of the rights and freedoms set forth in this Convention shall be secured without discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status.'

Does the Commission not agree that this is a segregating, exclusionary and unfair act?

Does the Commission consider it appropriate for a local public authority to apply to its programmes exclusion criteria based on language?

Does the Commission consider it appropriate for a local authority to restrict the freedom of parents to choose their children's education by means of such exclusions without any legal basis?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(4 December 2013)

According to Article 2 of the Treaty on the EU, the respect for the rights of persons belonging to minorities constitutes one of the founding values of the EU. Furthermore, Articles 21 and 22 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU prohibit discrimination based on membership of a national minority and provide for the respect by the Union of cultural, religious and linguistic diversity. Within the scope of EC law, the Commission ensures that Member States, when implementing this law, respect fundamental rights laid down in the Charter.

However, as explained in its reply to Written Question E-006204/2013, the Commission has no general powers as regards people belonging to minorities. As regards the specific issue of the right of persons belonging to minorities to speak and use their own languages, this is a competence for the Member States alone, subject to fundamental rights guarantees of the national constitutional order and obligations under international law, including the relevant instruments of the Council of Europe.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012241/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(28 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Aiuti UE al terzo mondo

Secondo un recente rapporto di un importante think tank del settore, gli aiuti europei ai paesi poveri sono in stallo a due anni dalla scadenza del programma «Obiettivi di sviluppo del Millennio» delle Nazioni Unite. Secondo il rapporto, l'ammontare degli aiuti è stato tagliato o è rimasto stabile in 19 Stati membri dell'Unione. Il rapporto prende in esame la qualità e la quantità degli aiuti dell'UE e fa un'analisi che dimostra che il deficit di finanziamento per raggiungere l'obiettivo delle Nazioni Unite si attesta oggi a 36 miliardi di euro. La UE a 27 nel 2012 ha elargito aiuti per oltre 50 miliardi di EUR, lo 0,39 % del reddito nazionale lordo dell'UE, in calo del 4 % rispetto all'anno precedente. L'aiuto dell'UE nel suo complesso è sceso al livello più basso dal 2007.

Pochi Stati membri dell'Unione vanno contro tendenza: i maggiori incrementi relativi si sono registrati in Lettonia (17 %), Lussemburgo (14 %), Polonia (14 %), Austria (8 %), Lituania (8 %) e Regno Unito (7 %). I paesi che hanno già raggiunto l'obiettivo dello 0,7 % sono Danimarca (0,8 %), Lussemburgo (1 %) e Svezia (0,99 %) e nel 2013 il Regno Unito si unirà a loro raggiungendo lo 0,7 %. Un ulteriore problema deriverebbe dal fatto che i 50 miliardi di EUR di aiuti della UE sarebbero un dato gonfiato in quanto una buona parte dei fondi non ha mai raggiunto i paesi in via di sviluppo: il rapporto svela che solo 45 miliardi di dollari (0,35 % del PIL) ha raggiunto i paesi beneficiari.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

— se intende riferire in merito ad eventuali revisioni dei programmi di stanziamento di aiuti internazionali ed eventuali provvedimenti per i Paesi inadempienti;

— se intende approfondire e riferire in merito alla questione della mancata consegna ai beneficiari degli aiuti stanziati?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(17 dicembre 2013)

Nel 2012 l'UE e i suoi Stati membri hanno continuato a essere i principali donatori mondiali, fornendo più della metà degli aiuti pubblici allo sviluppo ([1]) segnalati dai membri dell'OCSE ([2])/CAS ([3]). L'impegno dell'UE supera di gran lunga quello degli altri principali donatori ([4]).

Tuttavia, stando ai dati preliminari, la crisi economica e le severe restrizioni di bilancio cui deve far fronte la maggior parte dei paesi sviluppati hanno avuto un impatto negativo sui livelli degli APS su scala mondiale nel 2012. Per il secondo anno consecutivo, l'UE ha visto calare il proprio livello collettivo di APS, che sono passati dai 56,3 miliardi di EUR del 2011 (0,45 % dell'RNL ([5])) ai 55,2 miliardi di EUR del 2012 (0,43 % dell'RNL). Il totale degli APS dei 28 Stati membri, considerati singolarmente, è diminuito, passando da 52,8 miliardi di EUR (0,42 % dell'RNL) a 50,6 miliardi di EUR (0,39 % dell'RNL) ([6]).

La Commissione continuerà a esortare tutti gli Stati membri a rispettare i loro impegni e monitorerà i progressi compiuti dall'Unione attraverso le relazioni di responsabilità dell'UE ([7]).La Commissione valuta positivamente il fatto che, nelle Conclusioni del Consiglio sulla prima relazione annuale al Consiglio europeo sugli obiettivi in materia di aiuti allo sviluppo dell'UE (del 29 maggio 2013), gli Stati membri «riaffermano tutti i loro impegni individuali e collettivi di APS, tenendo conto della situazione di bilancio eccezionale» ([8]).

([1]) APS — Aiuti pubblici allo sviluppo.
([2]) Organizzazione per la cooperazione e lo sviluppo economico.
([3]) Comitato per l'aiuto allo sviluppo.
([4]) Va rilevato che nel 2012 anche i Paesi Bassi hanno superato lo 0,7 % di APS/RNL (0,71 %).
([5]) Reddito nazionale lordo.
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/development-policies/financing_for_development/documents/accountability-report-2013/accountability-report-2013-02_en.pdf, pag. 68.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/development-policies/financing_for_development/index_en.htm
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/development-policies/financing_for_development/documents/financing_for_dev_2013_council_conclusions_en.pdf

La Commissione non sottoscrive la dichiarazione secondo cui gli attuali livelli degli aiuti dell'UE sono «gonfiati». Alcune spese ufficiali per la gestione a livello dei donatori, l'alleggerimento del debito, le attività di sensibilizzazione al tema dello sviluppo, i programmi culturali e sociali orientati allo sviluppo, gli studenti, i rifugiati e la ricerca sono attualmente da considerarsi aiuti pubblici allo sviluppo. A questo proposito, la Commissione rimanda l'onorevole deputato alle direttive dell'OCSE/CAS in materia di notifica ([9]). Gli aiuti pubblici allo sviluppo totali non rappresentano al momento una categoria oggetto di segnalazione e l'UE non ha assunto impegni in tal senso. La Commissione non ha pertanto alcun motivo di estendere il monitoraggio a tale questione.

([9]) http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/documentupload/DCD-DAC(2013)15-FINAL-ENG.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012241/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: EU aid for the developing world

According to a recent report by a leading think tank in the sector, EU aid for poor counties has stalled two years ahead of the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals expiring. According to the report, the amount of aid has been cut or has remained unchanged in 19 EU Member States. The report looks at the quality and quantity of EU aid and presents an analysis showing that EUR 36 billion in funding is now required in order to reach the United Nations target. In 2012, the EU-27 increased aid to over EUR 50 billion, 0.39% of the EU's GDP, down by 4% from the previous year. EU aid as a whole has fallen to its lowest level since 2007.

Few EU Member States buck this trend: the largest relative increases have been seen in Latvia (17%), Luxembourg (14%), Poland (14%), Austria (8%), Lithuania (8%) and the United Kingdom (7%). The countries that have already achieved the goal of 0.7% are Denmark (0.8%), Luxembourg (1%) and Sweden (0.99%), and the United Kingdom will join them when it reaches 0.7% in 2013. Another problem is the fact that the figure of EUR 50 billion put on EU aid is inflated, since a large proportion of the funds have never reached developing countries: the report reveals that only USD 45 billion (0.35% of GDP) reaches beneficiary countries.

Does the Commission plan to comment on any revisions to international aid allocation programmes and any steps for non-compliant countries?

Does it plan to look into and report on the issue of beneficiaries not receiving allocated aid?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

The EU and its Member States remained the world's largest donor in 2012, providing more than half of the ODA ([1]) reported by the members of the OECD ([2]) DAC ([3]). The EU effort exceeds by far that of the other major donors ([4]).

However, the economic crisis and the severe budgetary constraints facing most developed countries had a negative impact on global ODA levels in 2012 according to preliminary figures. The EU has seen its collective ODA level go down for a second year in a row from EUR 56.3 billion in 2011 (0.45% of GNI ([5])) to EUR 55.2 billion in 2012 (0.43% of GNI). The total ODA of the 28 Member States alone decreased from EUR 52.8 billion (0.42% of GNI) to EUR 50.6 billion (0.39% of GNI). ([6])

The Commission will continue to call on all Member States to respect their commitments and will continue to monitor EU progress through the annual EU Accountability Reports ([7]). The Commission is pleased that, in the Council Conclusions on the 2013 Annual Report to the European Council on EU Development Aid Targets (29 May 2013), Member States 'reaffirmed all their individual and collective ODA commitments, taking into account the exceptional budgetary circumstances' ([8]).

The Commission does not subscribe to the statement about current EU aid levels being 'inflated'. Some official expenditure on donor administration, debt relief, development awareness activities, development-oriented social and cultural programmes, students, refugees and research currently qualifies as ODA. In this respect, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the OECD/DAC Reporting Directives ([9]). Total in-donor ODA is currently not a reporting category, and the EU has taken no commitments in that respect. The Commission therefore has no basis to extend monitoring to this issue.

([1]) Official Development Assistance.
([2]) Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.
([3]) Development Assistance Committee.
([4]) Note that in 2012 the Netherlands also exceeded 0.7% ODA/GNI (0.71%).
([5]) Gross National Income.
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/development-policies/financing_for_development/documents/accountability-report-2013/accountability-report-2013-02_en.pdf p. 68.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/development-policies/financing_for_development/index_en.htm
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/development-policies/financing_for_development/documents/financing_for_dev_2013_council_conclusions_en.pdf
([9]) http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/documentupload/DCD-DAC(2013)15-FINAL-ENG.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012242/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(28 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Chemioterapia: quali farmaci possono essere dannosi per la salute

Secondo recenti studi, alcuni farmaci utilizzati nelle terapie ospedaliere di lotta ai tumori potrebbero essere nocive per la salute in misura superiore agli effetti collaterali dichiarati.

Già da tempo se ne conoscono gli effetti collaterali. In campo chemioterapico, infatti, il primo e più noto fallimento dell'oncologia riguarda il farmaco DES usato per molti tipi di cancro e soprattutto per il cancro alla mammella. Questo farmaco dava effetti collaterali anche nel lungo termine ed era stato già indicato da alcuni oncologi come «farmaco pericoloso».

Nuovi studi si sono quindi incentrati sul Tamoxifen, farmaco che è andato a sostituire il DES in alcune chemioterapie, dapprima approvato dalla FIDA (autorità per i medicinali e gli alimenti degli USA) per essere usato come pillola per il controllo delle nascite, poi per la prevenzione del tumore al seno.

Questi studi indicano che questo farmaco si rivela invece promotore di neoplasie particolarmente aggressive all'utero ed al fegato, causa di fatali coagulazioni del sangue ed ostacolo a numerose altre funzioni.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, può la Commissione far sapere quale posizione intenda assumere circa l'utilizzo del suddetto farmaco in terapie chemioterapiche e se intende predisporre uno studio aggiornato sulla valutazione dei rischi e benefici derivanti dalla sua assunzione, secondo i parametri previsti dalla UE e in particolare da EMA?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(20 dicembre 2013)

Un prodotto medicinale può essere immesso sul mercato dell'UE soltanto se ha ottenuto previamente un'autorizzazione alla commercializzazione ([1]) dall'autorità competente di uno Stato membro o dalla Commissione. Un'autorizzazione alla commercializzazione è concessa per un prodotto medicinale una volta che ne sia stata valutata la qualità, sicurezza ed efficacia e che si sia effettuato un bilancio positivo rischi/benefici in relazione al suo uso. L'informazione sul prodotto, che fa parte dell'autorizzazione alla commercializzazione, indica l'uso approvato del medicinale, comprese le sue indicazioni, le controindicazioni e, se del caso, le precauzioni particolari da adottare e le avvertenze.

Dopo il rilascio dell'autorizzazione iniziale la sicurezza del prodotto è seguita lungo il suo intero ciclo di vita nel contesto della farmacovigilanza. La farmacovigilanza dell'UE è stata ulteriormente rafforzata con la revisione della legislazione nel 2010 e 2012. È stato istituito un nuovo comitato di valutazione dei rischi per la farmacovigilanza facente capo all'Agenzia europea per i medicinali, incaricato di monitorare e valutare gli indicatori di sicurezza legati all'uso dei prodotti medicinali.

Prodotti medicinali contenenti dietilstilbestrolo (DES) e tamoxifen sono stati autorizzati dagli Stati membri. I rischi legati a queste sostanze attive menzionate dall'Onorevole deputato sono noti ed essi dovrebbero pertanto essere stati trattati nell'informazione sul prodotto approvata dagli Stati membri. Per queste sostanze attive non sono stati identificati nuovi indicatori di sicurezza ([2]) ed attualmente non è previsto nessun intervento normativo a livello di UE.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 726/2004 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 31 marzo 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; direttiva 2001/83/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 6 novembre 2001, recante un codice comunitario relativo ai medicinali per uso umano, GU L 311 del 28.11.2001.

([2]) Elenco degli indicatori di sicurezza discussi a partire dal settembre 2012, http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document_listing/document_listing_000375.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac0580727d1c#section2.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012242/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Chemotherapy: which drugs may be harmful to health

According to recent studies, several drugs used in hospital-based cancer treatment could do more harm to health than the declared side effects.

The side effects have been known for some time. In chemotherapy, the main and most well-known oncological drug failure involves the drug DES, used for many types of cancer and particularly for breast cancer. This drug also has long-term side effects and has already been branded a 'dangerous drug' by some oncologists.

New studies have thus focused on tamoxifen, a drug that has replaced DES in some forms of chemotherapy, initially approved by the Food and Drug Administration in the US for use as a birth-control pill, then for preventing breast cancer.

According to these studies, this drug promotes particularly aggressive tumour growth in the uterus and in the liver, causes fatal blood clots and blocks a number of other functions.

Can the Commission say what position it plans to adopt in relation to the use of the aforementioned drug in chemotherapy and does it plan to arrange an updated study analysing the risk/benefit ratio associated with taking it, in accordance with parameters laid down by the EU, and in particular by the European Medicines Agency?

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

A medicinal product can be placed on the EU market only after a marketing authorisation has been granted ([1]) either by the competent authority of a Member State or by the Commission. A marketing authorisation is granted to a medicinal product after its quality, safety and efficacy have been evaluated and a positive benefit-risk balance related to its use has been concluded. Product information, which is part of the marketing authorisation, states the approved use of the medicine, including its indications, contraindications and as appropriate, special precautions and warnings.

After the initial authorisation, safety of the product is followed during its whole life-cycle within a framework of pharmacovigilance. EU pharmacovigilance has been further strengthened with the revision of legislation in 2010 and 2012. A new Pharmacovigilance Risk Assessment Committee at the European Medicines Agency, responsible for monitoring and assessment of safety signals related to use of medicinal products, has been established.

Medicinal products containing diethylstilbestrol (DES) and tamoxifen have been authorised by the Member States. The risks of these active substances mentioned by the Honourable Member are known, therefore it is expected that they are addressed in the product information approved by the Member States. No new safety signal on these active substances has been identified ([2]) and no EU regulatory action is currently foreseen.

([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; Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001.

([2]) List of safety signals discussed since September 2012, http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document_listing/document_listing_000375.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac0580727d1c#section2

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012243/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(28 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Nuova tecnologia per aspirare lo smog urbano

Recentemente l'OMS ha inserito lo smog nel gruppo delle sostanze cancerogene (tra cui amianto e benzene), che evidenziano un effetto sulla salute superiore a quello del fumo passivo. Tale decisione è stata presa a seguito di uno studio che, raccogliendo più di mille ricerche, dimostra chiaramente tale effetto nocivo. In particolare dallo studio si evince che l'esposizione all'inquinamento provoca il cancro ai polmoni e aumenta il rischio di contrarlo alla vescica: in media muoiono infatti circa 800.000 persone ogni anno a causa dello smog.

Inoltre, si stima che ogni cittadino europeo perda circa 8,6 mesi di vita e il dato peggiore si riscontra nella Pianura padana, dove si calcola che i cittadini perdano potenzialmente, ogni anno, 2-3 anni di vita. Questa area del Nord Italia abbracciata dal sistema montuoso delle Alpi a Nord e degli Appennini a Sud, non presenta un costante flusso di correnti d'aria tale da poter garantire il ricambio necessario per ridurre l'inquinamento. Pochi giorni fa è stata presentata una tecnologia frutto di un progetto olandese che permetterebbe di aspirare lo smog urbano. Il meccanismo comporta l'utilizzo di bobine in rame poste nel terreno allo scopo di creare un debole campo elettrostatico che attrae le particelle di particolato, creando un «vuoto» di aria pulita sopra di esse. Questo progetto è stato pensato per alcuni paesi dell'Est asiatico, come le cittadine cinesi che hanno un alto tasso di inquinamento.

Considerato che:

— si stima che una riduzione del 20 % delle concentrazioni di Pm10 e di NO_2 determinerebbe una riduzione del 30 % della mortalità a breve termine e dei ricoveri ospedalieri;

— il progetto suddetto è ancora in una fase iniziale, per cui sono necessari ulteriori 18 mesi per mettere a punto tale meccanismo;

può la Commissione riferire se:

— è a conoscenza di quest'innovazione tecnologica;

— intende finanziare e supportare lo sviluppo di questa tecnologia per impiegarla soprattutto sul territorio europeo, ed eventualmente procedere alla vendita del brevetto in Asia;

— qualora gli esiti siano positivi, ritiene utile testare tale progetto come soluzione di breve termine nelle città europee più inquinate, all'interno di una strategia globale di riduzione dell'inquinamento?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(7 gennaio 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza di questa tecnica di riduzione in quanto viene largamente utilizzata per la riduzione delle emissioni di particelle provocate dagli impianti industriali e di combustione. Tuttavia non ha ancora ricevuto informazioni sull'applicazione di questa tecnologia nell'aria ambiente. Inoltre, non sono disponibili informazioni relative all'efficacia, ai benefici e ai costi connessi all'applicazione di questa tecnologia come mezzo per la riduzione dell'inquinamento urbano. Pertanto, la Commissione non ritiene che possa rappresentare una soluzione a breve termine per questo problema.

L'UE promuove la ricerca e l'innovazione, attraverso l'attuale 7° programma quadro per la ricerca e il futuro programma Orizzonte 2020, al fine di sviluppare e applicare opzioni e strategie tecnologiche a favore di una gestione integrata delle politiche in materia di qualità dell'aria e di cambiamenti climatici negli Stati membri dell'UE. La riduzione delle emissioni alla fonte è un obiettivo primario. Pur ritenendo fondamentale elaborare e attuare le misure e le prassi più adeguate per la riduzione dell'inquinamento, la Commissione ritiene che la tecnologia specifica cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato possa avere solo un impatto limitato per affrontare il problema dell'inquinamento atmosferico su larga scala.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012243/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: New technology for vacuuming urban smog

The World Health Organisation recently added smog to the list of carcinogens (among which are asbestos and benzene) which have more of an effect on health than passive smoking. This decision was taken following a study that collated over 1 000 pieces of research, clearly demonstrating this harmful effect. In particular, the study shows that exposure to pollution causes lung cancer and increases the risk of developing bladder cancer: on average, around 800 000 people die every year because of smog.

Moreover, it is estimated that the life expectancy of every EU is shortened by around 8.6 months, but the worst statistic is found in the Po plain, where it is calculated that citizens potentially lose 2-3 years off their life every year. This part of northern Italy, enclosed by the mountain system of the Alps to the north and the Apennines to the south, does not have a constant airflow such as to enable the air exchange required to reduce pollution. A few days ago, a technology developed by a Dutch project was unveiled, which would make it possible to vacuum urban smog. The system involves the use of copper coils placed on the ground to create a weak electrostatic field that attracts particulates, creating a 'vacuum' of clean air above them. The project was conceived for several east Asian countries, such as China, which has very high levels of pollution.

It is estimated that a 20% reduction in PM10 and NO_2 concentrations would cut deaths by 30% in the short term and hospital admissions.

The aforementioned project is still in the early stages, so it will take another 18 months to develop the system.

Is the Commission aware of this technological innovation?

Will it finance and support the development of this technology in order to use it in the EU, and eventually sell the patent in Asia?

If the results are positive, does the Commission think that this project should be tested as a short-term solution in the most polluted European cities, as part of a global pollution reduction strategy?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(7 January 2014)

The Commission is aware of the abatement technique as this is widely applied to particulate matter emissions from industrial and combustion installations. It has not yet received information about this particular application on ambient air. Furthermore, no information is available related to the effectiveness, benefits and costs related to the application of this technology as a means to reduce smog in an urban environment. Therefore, the Commission does not consider the technology as a short term solution to urban smog.

The EU promotes research and innovation — through the current 7th Research Framework Programme and the future Horizon 2020 Programme — for the development and application of technological options and strategies in support of integrated air quality and climate change governance in EU Member States. The reduction of emissions at source is a primary goal. Supporting the design and implementation of the most adequate abatement strategies and practices is certainly a key objective, however the specific technology to which the question refers to may have a limited impact to tackle the problem of air pollution at large scale.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012245/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(28 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Nuovi dispositivi per il rilascio di farmaci tramite impulsi luminosi

Un'importante università americana ha recentemente messo a punto alcuni dispositivi equipaggiati con cellule sintetiche che permettono di rilasciare farmaci tramite l'utilizzo della luce.

Tali impianti, inseriti all'interno del corpo umano, sono collegati con fibre ottiche che consentono di far passare la luce e di metterle in comunicazione con le cellule sintetiche, le quali, attivate dall'impulso luminoso, rilasciano farmaci a comando o segnalano la presenza di sostanze tossiche.

Tali dispositivi sono stati sperimentati su topi diabetici, utilizzando una luce blu allo scopo di stimolare le cellule sintetiche a «fabbricare» una proteina che stimola la produzione di insulina. In un altro esperimento, le cellule sintetiche hanno emesso una luce verde fluorescente in presenza di tossine come i metalli pesanti.

Considerato che:

— l'OMS stima che nel 2030 nel mondo ci saranno 360 milioni di persone diabetiche (rispetto ai 170 milioni del 2000), con evidenti ripercussioni sulla vita dei pazienti e delle loro famiglie e sui costi e l'organizzazione dei sistemi sanitari e i test eseguiti dimostrano che i dispositivi hanno efficacemente regolato i livelli di glucosio nel sangue degli animali diabetici;

può la Commissione riferire se:

— è a conoscenza di questa ricerca scientifica;

— ritiene che l'utilizzo di tale tecnologia non riguardi solamente tale patologia, ma potrebbe divenire uno strumento estremamente utile nella cura di differenti patologie;

— ritiene opportuno sviluppare tale studio su scala più vasta, al fine di pervenire a risultati più esaustivi, rendendo utilizzabili tali impianti anche per il trattamento di altre patologie?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(11 dicembre 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza della recente pubblicazione a cura di un gruppo di ricercatori della Harvard Medical School sullo sviluppo di un nuovo dispositivo *in vivo* costituito da sensori ottici e delle relative applicazioni terapeutiche.

Sebbene i risultati di tale studio possano aprire nuove strade per la cura del diabete, è necessario compiere ulteriori progressi nelle attività di ricerca e sviluppo prima che questo dispositivo terapeutico possa essere facilmente disponibile a scopi clinici. È tuttavia prevedibile che nel lungo termine, questa tecnologia possa rivelarsi utile anche per trattare malattie diverse.

Orizzonte 2020, il nuovo programma quadro di ricerca e innovazione (2014-2020) ([1]), prevede un ulteriore sostegno alla ricerca in materia di terapie e tecnologie avanzate, in particolare nel contesto della sfida della società «sanità, cambiamenti demografici e benessere».

I fondi di ricerca dell'Unione europea sono attribuiti sulla base di inviti a presentare proposte concorrenziali pubblicati assieme ai relativi programmi di lavoro. I ricercatori interessati sono invitati a cogliere tali opportunità per proporre progetti in grado di elaborare ulteriormente la prova di concetto (*proof of concept*) e volti a stabilire se tale nuova terapia possa essere più efficace rispetto alle terapie esistenti.

([1]) www.ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm?pg=h2020-documents

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012245/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: New devices for delivering drugs via light impulses

A major US university has recently developed devices containing synthetic cells which make it possible to deliver drugs by using light.

The devices, which are implanted in the human body, are connected to optic fibres that allow light to pass through and connect them to synthetic cells, which, when activated by a light impulse, deliver drugs on command or emit a warning when toxins are detected.

The devices have been tested on diabetic mice, using a blue light to stimulate the synthetic cells to 'produce' a protein that stimulates insulin production. In another experiment, the synthetic cells emitted a fluorescent green light when toxins such as heavy metals were detected.

According to World Health Organisation estimates, 360 million people worldwide will have diabetes in 2030 (compared with 170 million in 2000), with obvious repercussions for the life of patients and their families and for the costs incurred by health systems and how they are organised. The experiments carried out show that the devices have effectively regulated blood sugar levels in diabetic animals.

Is the Commission aware of this scientific research?

Does it think that this technology can be used not only for diabetes, but could become an extremely useful instrument in treating different diseases?

Does it think this study should be developed on a wider scale, in order to obtain more comprehensive results, meaning these devices can also be used for treating other diseases?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

The Commission is aware of the recent publication by a Harvard Medical School research team on the development of a new device for *in vivo* optical-sensing and therapy applications.

Although the cited results may open a new avenue for the treatment of diabetes, further research and development will be needed before such a promising therapeutic device would be readily available for clinical use. It is, however, conceivable that in the long-term, such technology could also be useful to treat different diseases.

Horizon 2020, the next Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020), ([1]) envisages further support for research into advanced therapies and technologies, especially under its Societal Challenge 'Health, Demographic Change and Wellbeing'.

EU research funding is granted based on competitive calls for proposals published with relevant Work Programmes. Interested researchers are encouraged to make use of these opportunities to propose projects that may develop further the proof of concept and assess whether such a new therapy could be more effective than existing treatments.

([1]) www.ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm?pg=h2020-documents

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012246/13
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (NI)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Industrial wind turbines

At present, a number of issues are being raised regarding the installation of wind turbines in Ireland. The most controversial issues relate to what constitutes a safe, appropriate distance between industrial wind turbines and residential properties, and the potential environmental and health impacts on those living close to the turbines.

In light of the above, could the Commission clarify:

1. What is a safe, appropriate distance between industrial wind turbines and residential properties?

2. What potentially adverse health effects are associated with living close to industrial wind turbines?

3. Whether or not Ireland has breached the Aarhus Convention by not holding a public consultation process before contracting landowners to allow the installation of turbines on their properties, without any environmental impact assessments being carried out?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2013)

1. Apart for the Renewable Energy Directive ([1]) there is no specific EU legislation for the construction of wind farms; no European-level definition exists on what constitutes a safe or appropriate distance. When planning the location and construction of wind farms, the EU environmental legislation ([2]) needs to be taken into account.

National regulations and guidelines exist, mainly on noise levels. Ireland's Department of Environment Community and Local government provides a list ([3]) of recommended distances in relation to various impacts arising from the presence of wind farms. The Irish Wind Energy Association has also published design constraints for wind farms ([4]).

2. Scientific studies and government reports ([5]) have so far not found substantial evidence that wind turbines put public health at risk. Existing environmental planning guidelines are generally believed to be sufficient to prevent potential adverse health effects. Significant efforts are underway to reduce sound levels emitted by wind turbines. The EU-funded ENNAH coordination action concluded that 'studies are needed to quantify the impact of emerging noise sources such as high speed rail and wind turbine noise, as well as the effectiveness of intervention measures to reduce noise' ([6]).

3. Art. 6 of the Aarhus Convention is primarily concerned with public consultation in relation to development consent procedures which are distinct from prior contingent private arrangements. Any such contractual arrangements are without prejudice to correct application of the decision making procedures and their outcomes.

([1]) Directive 2009/28/EC on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources, OJ L 140, 5.6.2009.

([2]) The Birds Directive (2009/147/EC).
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:020:0007:0025:EN:PDF Directive on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (92/43/EEC).
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1992:206:0007:0050:EN:PDF
Directive on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (92/43/EEC).
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1992:206:0007:0050:EN:PDF
Directive 97/11/EC: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31997L0011:EN:NOT Directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment (2001/42/EC).
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2001:197:0030:0037:EN:PDF

([3]) http://www.environ.ie/en/Publications/DevelopmentandHousing/Planning/FileDownLoad,1633,en.pdf

([4]) http://www.iwea.com/index.cfm/page/iweabestpracticeguidelines

([5]) CMOH 2010: http://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/common/ministry/publications/reports/wind_turbine/wind_turbine.pdf
NHMRC 2010: http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/_files_nhmrc/publications/attachments/new0048_evidence_review_wind_turbines_and_health.pdf
AWEA&CanWEA 2009: http://www.transalta.com/sites/default/files/Wind%20turbine%20sound%20and%20health%20effects%20report.pdf

([6]) European Network on Noise and Health — http://www.ennah.eu/assets/files/ENNAH-Final_report_online_19_3_2013.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-012247/13
a la Comisión
Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D)
(28 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Ayudas del Fondo Social Europeo en Canarias

El principal objetivo y la mayor preocupación de la UE en estos momentos es combatir el desempleo. Para tal fin, el Fondo Social Europeo (FSE) destina fondos que se materializan a través de las políticas activas de empleo y que son gestionados por los diferentes Estados miembros. España es uno de los Estados acreedores de esos fondos.

La UE, en una estrategia de apoyo claro a la lucha contra el desempleo, ha creado para el periodo 2014-2020, un eje social del cual España recibirá 1 100 euros por desempleado.

La gestión de los fondos europeos corresponde a los Estados. Por la particular configuración del Estado español, corresponde a las Comunidades Autónomas recibir en última instancia estos fondos y gestionarlos. Estas actuaciones deben ser ejercidas siempre bajo la aplicación del principio de subsidiariedad, lo que significa que la UE delega en la medida de lo posible en los Estados miembros y en las autoridades regionales y locales. Por todo ello, la Comisión Europea no puede desentenderse cuando esos fondos no llegan a sus destinatarios.

Sin embargo, en este contexto, el Gobierno de España, uno de los Estados con más altas tasas de paro, tiene retenida a día de hoy, casi al final del ejercicio, la dotación de fondos del FSE sin haberlos distribuido y sin una causa que lo justifique.

Canarias tiene la segunda tasa de paro más alta de España, con un 35 % y casi 400 000 desempleados, siendo especialmente preocupante las tasas de desempleo entre la población joven de las islas, que llega casi al 70 %. A esta realidad hay que sumar su especificidad como Región Ultraperiférica de la UE, que provoca que nuestro mercado laboral sufra las consecuencias de unas dificultades estructurales reconocidas tanto por la legislación española, como por la Constitución de nuestro Estado, y por el Tratado de la UE —en su artículo 349 TFUE—, pero que sin embargo, no parecen ser tenidas en cuenta por el Gobierno de España.

Esta tasa de desempleo crea una fractura social en Canarias sin precedentes, por ello se requiere con toda urgencia la distribución de estos fondos y la puesta en práctica de las políticas activas de empleo en toda España, y en especial en nuestra región. Es necesario por tanto que la Comisión Europea vigile de manera más efectiva el reparto de los fondos en el Estado español, en especial los relativos al FSE, para que estos lleguen de manera urgente y sin cortapisas a sus destinatarios finales.

¿Tiene conocimiento la Comisión Europea de que las partidas del FSE destinadas a políticas activas de empleo están retenidas a fecha de hoy por el Gobierno de España, impidiendo que lleguen a sus destinatarios?

¿Prevé adoptar la Comisión algún mecanismo para subsanar la actual situación?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

En el momento presente, la Comisión no tiene información oficial sobre las asignaciones por región y por Fondo Estructural y de Inversión Europeo (FEIE) efectuadas por las autoridades españolas para el periodo de programación 2014-2020. En lo que se refiere al FSE para el periodo 2007-2013, el porcentaje de gasto se eleva al 68,32 %. La Comisión no tiene conocimiento de que se estén reteniendo fondos.

A la vista de los niveles preocupantemente elevados de desempleo y, en especial, de desempleo juvenil y de larga duración, la Comisión está realizando un estrecho seguimiento de la preparación de los acuerdos de asociación sobre los FEIE y exigirá una asignación adecuada de los fondos para poder hacer frente a los retos en materia de empleo, inclusión social y educación.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012247/13
to the Commission
Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: European Social Fund assistance for the Canaries

Measures to combat unemployment are currently the EU's principal objective and concern. To this end, the European Social Fund (ESF) is earmarking appropriations for active employment policies to be administered by the recipient Member States, including Spain.

As part of its strategy of providing firm support to contain unemployment, the EU has created a social pillar for the period 2014-2020, from which Spain is to receive EUR 1 100 for each unemployed person.

In accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, it is the responsibility of the Member States (or the autonomous communities in Spain), as final recipients, to administer the funding. In other words, the EU delegates responsibility to the Member States and the regional and local authorities. This does not, however, exempt the Commission from involvement should the funds fail to reach their intended recipients.

In this instance, the Government of Spain, one of the Member States with the highest levels of unemployment, has, almost at the end of the financial year, unjustifiably failed to release ESF appropriations for distribution.

The Canaries have the second highest unemployment rate in Spain, that is to say 35% or almost 400 000, rising to an alarming level of just under 70% among young people. Given the particular situation of the Canary Islands as an outermost EU region, their labour market also suffers the consequences of structural difficulties, as recognised under Spanish legal and constitutional provisions, as well as the EU Treaty (Article 349 TFEU). This does not, however, appear to have been taken into account by the Spanish Government.

Such high rates of unemployment are creating an unprecedented social divide in the Canaries, where it is therefore particularly urgent to distribute the funding and implement the active employment polices badly needed throughout Spain. The Commission must therefore monitor more effectively the allocation of funding within Spain, particularly ESF appropriations, ensuring that they reach their intended recipients effectively and without delay.

Is the Commission aware that ESF appropriations earmarked for active employment policies are still being withheld by the Spanish Government from their intended recipients?

Will the Commission take action to remedy matters?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 November 2013)

At present the Commission has no official information on the allocations by region and European Structural and Investment Fund (ESIF) made by the Spanish authorities for the 2014 — 2020 programming period. Regarding the ESF for the period 2007-2013, the rate of spending is at 68.32%. The Commission is not aware of funds being upheld.

In view of the very worrying levels of unemployment and especially the youth and long term unemployment, the Commission is closely following the preparation of the Partnership agreements on the ESIF and will request an adequate allocation of funds to respond to the challenges in the employment, social inclusion as well as education sectors.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012248/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Cozzolino (S&D)
(28 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Discarica «Cava Spinelli» — Quarto (NA)

Considerato che:

— tra il 2010 e il 2011 la provincia di Napoli, per far fronte al riacutizzarsi del problema dell'emergenza per la raccolta e lo smaltimento dei rifiuti solidi urbani in Campania, aveva individuato una serie di siti da adibire ad aree di stoccaggio provvisorie o a vere e proprie discariche;

— uno dei siti individuati come potenziali discariche era la cava di tufo dismessa in località Spinelli, nel Comune di Quarto (Na);

— la cava Spinelli è sita nel cuore della cosiddetta Terra dei Fuochi, il pezzo di territorio della Campania compreso tra le province di Napoli e Caserta, dove negli ultimi 20 anni sono stati smaltiti illegalmente, con l'ausilio della criminalità organizzata, rifiuti tossici e speciali provenienti dagli scarti del ciclo industriale delle aziende del nord Italia;

— la stessa cava Spinelli tra il 2008 e il 2011 è stata sottoposta a sequestro preventivo (RGNR n. 23984/08 PM) in quanto utilizzata come sito non autorizzato di smaltimento di rifiuti speciali non pericolosi (materiale di risulta da lavorazioni edili);

— nel 2011 è stato disposto il dissequestro e la giunta regionale della Campania, attraverso il decreto dirigenziale n. 131 del 14/7/2011, ha autorizzato la società Liccarblock S.a.S., con sede a Marano di Napoli, alla ricomposizione ambientale del sito;

— tutti i monitoraggi a cura dell'Arpac o di studiosi indipendenti, come il prof. Franco Ortolani, ordinario di Geologia, direttore del dipartimento di Pianificazione e Scienza del Territorio dell'Università di Napoli Federico II, hanno dimostrato l'inidoneità tecnica di cava Spinelli a ospitare una discarica per lo stoccaggio e lo smaltimento dei rifiuti solidi urbani.

Si chiede:

— se la Commissione è a conoscenza di detta situazione e se essa è presa in considerazione nell'ambito della procedura di infrazione in corso contro l'Italia;

— quali provvedimenti e iniziative intende avviare, se del caso, per la bonifica e messa in sicurezza del sito, anche nell'ambito della riprogrammazione dei fondi dell'Unione 2007-2013;

— se intende attivare, per il medesimo fine, specifici canali di finanziamento nell'ambito della prossima programmazione dei fondi dell'Unione (2014-2020).

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(18 dicembre 2013)

Per quanto riguarda la cava Spinelli a Quarto (Napoli) la Commissione osserva che, sulla base delle informazioni fornite dall'onorevole deputato, le autorità italiane hanno adottato misure volte a garantire che il sito non sia utilizzato come discarica e che sia soggetto a una ricomposizione ambientale ([1]).

Per quanto riguarda la questione generale dello smaltimento illegale di rifiuti in Campania, si rimanda l'onorevole deputato alla risposta della Commissione alle interrogazioni scritte E-12030/2013 ed E-12131/2013.

([1]) Con il decreto dirigenziale n. 131 del 14/7/2011 (pubblicato sulla gazzetta ufficiale della Regione Campania n. 48 del 25/7/2011), la giunta regionale ha autorizzato la realizzazione di un progetto volto al recupero ambientale del sito. Il decreto stabilisce esplicitamente che sul sito è vietata la realizzazione di discariche di rifiuti, durante i lavori di ricomposizione, saranno svolti dei test che saranno inviati alle autorità competenti per garantire che i materiali usati per la ricomposizione non siano contaminati.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012248/13
to the Commission
Andrea Cozzolino (S&D)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: 'Cava Spinelli' landfill in Quarto (province of Naples)

Between 2010 and 2011, in order to tackle the worsening emergency concerning the collection and disposal of solid urban waste in Campania, the Naples provincial authorities identified a number of sites to be used as temporary storage areas or as actual landfills.

One of the sites identified as a potential landfill was the decommissioned Spinelli tuff quarry, in the municipality of Quarto (province of Naples).

The Spinelli quarry is right in the middle of the 'land of fires', the area of Campania between the provinces of Naples and Caserta, where toxic and special industrial waste from companies in northern Italy has been illegally dumped for the last 20 years, in collaboration with organised criminal groups.

Between 2008 and 2011, the Spinelli quarry was under preventive seizure (General Criminal Records Registry No 23984/08 PM) for being used as an unauthorised dumping site for non-hazardous special waste (construction waste).

In 2011, the quarry was released from seizure and the Campania Regional Government adopted Executive Decree No 131 of 14/07/2011 to authorise the company Liccarblock S.a.S., based in Marano di Napoli, to carry out environmental rehabilitation of the site.

All monitoring by the Campania Regional Environmental Protection Agency (Arpac) or independent researchers, such as Prof. Franco Ortolani, professor of geology and head of the land use planning and science department of the Federico II University of Naples, has shown that the Spinelli quarry is technically unsuitable as a landfill site for storing and disposing of solid urban waste.

Is the Commission aware of this situation and has it taken it into consideration in the ongoing infringement proceedings against Italy?

What measures and initiatives will it take, as appropriate, to clean up the site and make it safe, including as part of the reprogramming of EU funds for 2007-2013?

Does it plan to open specific funding channels in the next EU funds programming period (2014-2020), for the same purpose?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(18 December 2013)

As concerns the Cava Spinelli site in Quarto (Naples), the Commission observes that, based on the information provided by the Honourable Member, the Italian authorities have taken measures aimed at ensuring that the site is not used as a landfill and that it undergoes environmental restoration ([1]).

As concerns the general issue of the illegal disposal of waste in Campania, the Honourable Member is referred to the Commission's reply to Written Questions E-12030/2013 and E-12131/2013.

([1]) By Decree N. 131 of 14/7/2011 (published on the Campania Official Journal N. 48 of 25/7/2011) the Campania Regional Government has authorised the execution of a project aimed at the environmental restoration of the site. The Decree explicitly states that the site cannot be used as a landfill and that, during the restoration works, tests will be carried out and sent to the competent authorities to ensure that the materials used for the restoration are not contaminated.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012249/13
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(28 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Chiarimenti in merito alle richieste del visto E-1 per commercio e investimento negli Stati Uniti

Da qualche tempo mi stanno giungendo, da parte di diversi cittadini europei, segnalazioni relative a difficoltà inerenti l'ottenimento del visto E1 per commercio e investimento negli Stati Uniti.

In particolare, un caso emblematico è quello di A.F., un cittadino italiano che nell'aprile 2013 decise di aprire una sua azienda negli Stati Uniti. Firmò un contratto di agenzia in esclusiva (come rappresentante monomandatario) con una delle aziende leader al mondo nel settore in cui ha sempre lavorato da otto anni a questa parte, diventando l'unico venditore autorizzato nel sud est degli Stati Uniti. Consegnati tutti i documenti per l'ottenimento del nuovo visto, A.F. ricevette risposta negativa da parte del consolato senza alcuna valida motivazione. Ora, il mancato rilascio del visto comprometterà il fatturato dell'azienda e l'attività dello stesso A.F., che negli Stati Uniti possiede un immobile e che quasi sicuramente perderà il lavoro. La vicenda di A.F. e di tutti coloro che si trovano nella sua situazione appare oggi ancora più paradossale, dal momento che con un certo entusiasmo da parte di entrambe le parti, l'Unione e gli Stati Uniti stanno avviando negoziati per quello che è stato definito il «Transatlantic Trade and investment Partnership» (TTIP), che si dovrebbe concludere con un vero accordo di libero scambio.

Pertanto, non ritiene la Commissione che simili restrizioni sui visti per gli uomini d'affari vadano nella direzione opposta rispetto all'auspicato e imminente TTIP? Infine, ha recentemente potuto constatare un aumento dei casi di mancato rilascio del visto, se possibile con dati statistici a riguardo, ed è a conoscenza di un generale inasprimento della concessione di questo tipo di visto da parte degli USA?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(12 dicembre 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza delle diverse difficoltà tra cui si dibattono gli uomini d'affari sulle due sponde dell'Atlantico ma non dispone di dati statistici sulle tendenze in merito al rilascio da parte degli Stati Uniti dei visti E-1 destinati ai cittadini dell'UE.

Nell'ambito dei negoziati per il partenariato transatlantico su commercio e investimenti (TTIP) la Commissione intende concordare misure che consentano di agevolare la mobilità dei prestatori di servizi e ritiene che le misure che consentono il trasferimento temporaneo del personale chiave presso le consociate estere, nell'ambito di una società di capitali (la cosidetta modalità 4), costituirebbero un elemento importante del futuro accordo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012249/13
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Clarifications regarding applications for the E-1 visa for trade and investment in the United States

For some time now, I have been receiving reports from a number of European citizens about the difficulties faced in obtaining an E-1 visa for trade and investment in the United States.

In particular, a prime example is the case of A.F., an Italian national who, in April 2013, decided to open a branch of his company in the United States. He signed an exclusive agency contract (as a sole agent) with one of the world's leading companies in the sector he has worked in for the last eight years, to become the only authorised seller in the south-eastern United States. Having provided all the documents to obtain the new visa, A.F. was turned down by the consulate for no good reason. Now, being denied a visa will harm the company's turnover and the business of A.F., who owns a property in the United States and is almost sure to lose his job. The case of A.F. and all those who are in his situation is now even more absurd, given that the EU and the United States, both with a certain degree of relish, are starting negotiations for what was has been dubbed the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), which should lead to a real free trade agreement.

Does the Commission therefore not think that such restrictions on visas for businesspeople are at odds with the imminent TTIP that is being sought? Lastly, has it recently noticed an increase in cases where visas have not been issued, if possible supported by statistics, and is it aware of fewer visas of this kind being issued by the United States in general?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2013)

The Commission is aware of various challenges that business people encounter on both sides of the Atlantic but does not have statistics on trends regarding issuance of E-1 visas by the United States to EU citizens.

In the framework of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) negotiations, the Commission is aiming at agreeing on measures allowing for easier mobility of service providers and considers that measures allowing the temporary transfer of key staff to foreign affiliates, within a corporation (so called mode 4), would be an important component of the future agreement.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012338/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(30. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Durchführungsverordnung Ökodesignrichtlinie — gedrosselte Leistung von Staubsaugern

Aktuellen Medienberichten zufolge werden aufgrund einer entsprechenden Durchführungsverordnung der Ökodesignrichtlinie ab September 2014 nur noch Staubsauger mit weniger als 1 600 Watt Leistung auf den Markt gebracht. Demnach dürften künftig nur noch Geräte verkauft werden, die weniger als 1 600 Watt Leistung erbringen. 2017 werden die Geräte auf 900 Watt gedrosselt. Deklariertes Ziel ist die Verringerung des Stromverbrauches. Um den Verbraucher über den Erwerb eines energieeffizienten Staubsaugers zu informieren, werden Energieverbrauchskennzeichen am Gerät angebracht. Auch kleine und mittlere Unternehmen sind dazu verpflichtet in Zukunft Etiketten anzubringen, die den Konsumentenüber über den Verbrauch des Gerätes informieren.

1. Kritikern zu Folge würde durch die gedrosselte Leistung umso öfter gesaugt werden müssen, um das übliche Ergebnis zu erzielen, was den Energieverbrauch wiederum steigere. Wie steht die Kommission dazu?

2. Welche Hersteller haben im angestrebten Segment der Niedrig-Watt-Staubsauger besonders hohe Marktanteile? Werden diese von der Umsetzung der Richtlinie profitieren?

3. Welche Auswirkungen haben die Änderungen auf KMU?

4. Werden in Zukunft auch bei anderen Geräten des täglichen Bedarfs die Leistungen gedrosselt? Wenn ja, welche Geräte sind konkret betroffen?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(18. Dezember 2013)

Die Kommission ist nicht der Ansicht, dass die Verbraucher infolge der Verordnungen zur umweltgerechten Gestaltung ([1]) und Energieverbrauchskennzeichnung ([2]) von Staubsaugern mehr Zeit für das Staubsaugen aufwenden müssen. So ist vielen Verbrauchern nicht bewusst, dass Staubsauger mit einer hohen Leistungsaufnahme oft nicht unbedingt eine bessere Saugleistung aufweisen. Neben den Vorschriften zur Leistungsaufnahme enthält die Ökodesign-Verordnung daher auch Vorgaben für die Staubaufnahme, nach denen Staubsauger mit einer schlechten Saugleistung und somit einer langen Saugdauer in der EU nicht mehr in Verkehr gebracht werden dürfen. Zudem basiert die Skala des Energieetiketts von A-G auf dem Energieverbrauch, bei dessen Berechnung sowohl die Leistungsaufnahme als auch die Staubaufnahme berücksichtigt werden, da der Energieverbrauch auch davon abhängt, wie lange gesaugt werden muss, d. h. wie wirksam ein Staubsauger arbeitet. Unionsmittel werden somit nicht verschwendet.

Modelle mit niedriger Leistungsaufnahme werden von vielen Herstellern angeboten; der Kommission liegen jedoch keine Verkaufszahlen zu einzelnen Modellen vor. Ob sich für bestimmte Hersteller ein Vorteil ergibt, hängt davon ab, wie ihre Staubsauger hinsichtlich aller Parameter abschneiden, die den Verordnungen unterliegen.

Die Verordnungen für Staubsauger werden bis 2020 voraussichtlich zu einer Verringerung des Stromverbrauchs um 19 TWh pro Jahr und somit zu jährlichen Einsparungen von ca. 3,8 Mrd. EUR für die Verbraucher in der EU führen. Die Kommission hat die Folgen für kleine und mittlere Unternehmen untersucht und dabei mögliche positive Auswirkungen auf Bauteilhersteller in der EU festgestellt ([3]).

Verordnungen über die umweltgerechte Gestaltung (Ökodesign) und die Energieverbrauchskennzeichnung wurden für dreißig breit gefasste Produktgruppen erlassen bzw. sind derzeit in Planung. Weitere Einzelheiten enthält der Ökodesign-Arbeitsplan 2012-2014 ([4]).

([1]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 666/2013 der Kommission.
([2]) Siehe Delegierte Verordnung (EU) Nr. 665/2013 der Kommission.
([3]) SWD(2013)240, S. 34.
([4]) SWD(2012)434.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012250/13
aan de Commissie
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(28 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Europese Commissie bemoeit zich met het vermogen van stofzuigers

Volgens mediaberichtgeving ([1]) en zoals ook terug te vinden in het publicatieblad van de Europese Unie ([2]) stelt de Europese Commissie eisen vast met betrekking tot het ecologisch ontwerp van stofzuigers. De zogeheten „Verordening (EU) nr. 666/2013 van de Commissie van 8 juli 2013 tot uitvoering van Richtlijn 2009/125/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad wat het vaststellen van eisen inzake ecologisch ontwerp voor stofzuigers betreft".

Eén van de nieuwe eisen waaraan stofzuigers straks moeten voldoen is een maximaal vermogen. Na augustus 2017 moet het nominale ingangsvermogen van een stofzuiger die op de markt gebracht wordt minder dan 900 Watt bedragen.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van haar verordening over het vermogen van stofzuigers?

2. Wat denkt de Commissie met deze bureaucratische idiotie te bereiken?

3. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat het te absurd voor woorden is dat de Commissie zich tot op elke vierkante millimeter wil bemoeien met de producten die mensen kopen en gebruiken? Zo nee, waarom niet? Welke kwalificatie heeft de Commissie dan wel voor haar doorgeslagen betutteling?

4. Dit is het zoveelste keer dat blijkt dat de Commissie tot niet meer in staat is dan nutteloos gemeenschapsgeld verkwisten aan de meest bizarre vormen van ambtelijk tijdverdrijf. Wanneer houdt de Commissie de eer aan zichzelf en stapt zij op?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(18 december 2013)

De Commissie deelt de mening niet dat consumenten meer tijd nodig zullen hebben om te stofzuigen als gevolg van de verordeningen inzake ecologisch ontwerp ([3]) voor stofzuigers en energie-etikettering ([4]) van stofzuigers. Vele consumenten weten namelijk niet dat stofzuigers met meer zuigkracht niet noodzakelijk betere resultaten opleveren. Naast de zuigkracht regelt de verordening inzake ecologisch ontwerp ook de stofopnameprestaties, waardoor stofzuigers met slechte reinigingsprestaties, en dus met een langere reinigingstijd, van de Europese markt zullen verdwijnen. Voorts is de energie-efficiëntieschaal A-G gebaseerd op het energieverbruik, waarvan de formule niet alleen rekening houdt met de zuigkracht, maar ook met de stofopnameprestaties. Energieverbruik is immers ook afhankelijk van de tijd die nodig is voor het schoonmaken en van de mate waarin een stofzuiger stof kan opnemen. De Commissie verkwist derhalve geen gemeenschapsgeld.

Vele fabrikanten bieden modellen met een laag vermogen aan, maar de Commissie beschikt niet over verkoopgegevens voor specifieke modellen. De vraag of sommige fabrikanten een voordeel zullen hebben, is afhankelijk van de manier waarop hun stofzuigers presteren ten aanzien van alle opgenomen parameters.

Naar verwachting zullen de verordeningen voor stofzuigers tegen 2020 leiden tot een vermindering van het elektriciteitsverbruik met 19 TWh per jaar, waarbij consumenten in de EU bij benadering 3,8 miljard euro per jaar zullen besparen. De Commissie heeft de effecten op het midden- en kleinbedrijf onderzocht en een mogelijk positief effect voor Europese producenten van onderdelen vastgesteld ([5]).

Dertig grote productgroepen worden aan regels onderworpen of komen in aanmerking voor regels inzake ecologisch ontwerp en energie-etikettering. Voor nadere bijzonderheden zie het werkplan inzake ecologisch ontwerp 2012-2014 ([6]).

([1]) http://www.hpdetijd.nl/2013-10-25/draconische-bemoeizucht-eu-uw-stofzuiger-mag-hard-zuigen/.
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:192:0024:0034:NL:PDF.
([3]) Verordening (EU) nr. 666/2013 van de Commissie.
([4]) Zie Gedelegeerde Verordening (EU) nr. 665/2013 van de Commissie.
([5]) SWD (2013) 240, p. 34.
([6]) SWD (2012) 434.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012250/13
to the Commission
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Commission's action regarding the power rating of vacuum cleaners

According to reports in the media ([1]), and as also indicated in the *Official Journal of the European Union* ([2]), the Commission is adopting requirements concerning the ecodesign of vacuum cleaners: Commission Regulation (EU) No 666/2013 of 8 July 2013 implementing Directive 2009/125/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to ecodesign requirements for vacuum cleaners.

One of the new requirements with which vacuum cleaners will soon have to comply is a maximum power rating. After August 2017, the rated input power of any vacuum cleaner placed on the market must not exceed 900 Watts.

1. Is the Commission aware of its regulation on the power rating of vacuum cleaners?

2. What does the Commission expect to achieve by means of this bureaucratic idiocy?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that it is too absurd for words that the Commission should insist on interfering in every tiny detail of the products that people buy and use? If not, why not? How would the Commission otherwise describe its wildly excessive nannying?

4. This is yet another demonstration that the Commission is incapable of anything other than wasting Community funds on the most bizarre bureaucratic pastimes. When will the Commission take the honourable way out and dissolve itself?

Question for written answer E-012338/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: Regulation implementing the Ecodesign Directive — reduced power of vacuum cleaners

According to current media reports, on account of the relevant Regulation implementing the Ecodesign Directive, from September 2014 onwards only vacuum cleaners with a power less than 1 600 W will be placed on the market. Accordingly, only appliances that deliver less than 1 600 W of power may be sold. In 2017, the power of the appliances will be reduced to 900 W The stated aim of this is to reduce electricity consumption. In order to inform consumers that they are purchasing an energy-efficient vacuum cleaner, an energy consumption label will be placed on the appliance. Small and medium-sized enterprises will in future also be obliged to apply these labels informing consumers of the energy consumption of the appliance.

1. According to critics, as a result of the reduction in power, people will have to vacuum more often in order to achieve the result they are used to, which will, in turn, increase energy consumption. What is the Commission's position with regard to this criticism?

2. Which manufacturers have a particularly large share of the market in the targeted segment of low-power vacuum cleaners? Will these manufacturers profit from the implementation of the directive?

3. What impact will the changes have on small and medium-sized enterprises?

4. Will the power also be reduced in future for other everyday appliances? If so, which specific appliances will be affected?

([1]) http://www.hpdetijd.nl/2013-10-25/draconische-bemoeizucht-eu-uw-stofzuiger-mag-hard-zuigen/
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:192:0024:0034:NL:PDF

Joint answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(18 December 2013)

The Commission does not share the view that consumers would have to spend longer time on vacuum cleaning as a result of the regulations on ecodesign ([3]) and energy labelling ([4]) of vacuum cleaners. Indeed, many consumers are not aware that vacuum cleaners with higher power do not necessarily perform better. In addition to power, the ecodesign regulation also regulates the dust pick-up performance, removing vacuum cleaners with poor cleaning performance, and thus long cleaning time, from the EU market. Further, the energy label's A-G rating is based on energy consumption, whose formula takes into account power, but also dust pick-up performance, because energy consumption depends also on how long one needs to clean and thus on how well a vacuum cleaner picks up dust. The Commission is thus not wasting Community funds.

Many manufacturers offer models with low power, but the Commission does not have sales data on specific models. Whether certain manufacturers will have an advantage would depend on how their vacuum cleaners perform with regard to all of the parameters regulated.

The regulations for vacuum cleaners are expected to lead to a reduction in electricity consumption of 19 TWh per year by 2020, saving consumers in the EU approximately 3.8 billion euro per year. The Commission investigated the impacts on small and medium-sized enterprises and identified a potential positive effect for EU producers of components ([5]).

Thirty broad product groups are regulated or considered for ecodesign and energy labelling regulation. Further detail is in the Ecodesign Working Plan 2012-2014 ([6]).

([3]) Commission Regulation (EU) No 666/2013.
([4]) Cf. Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) no 665/2013.
([5]) SWD(2013) 240, page 34.
([6]) SWD(2012) 434.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012251/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(28 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Νέα Διευρωπαϊκά Δίκτυα Μεταφορών — Ανάγκη ενημέρωσης και τεχνογνωσίας προς τις χώρες Συνοχής για την αποτελεσματικότερη απορρόφηση κοινοτικών πόρων

Η νέα πολιτική των Διευρωπαϊκών Δικτύων Μεταφορών, σε συνδυασμό με το νέο χρηματοδοτικό εργαλείο «Συνδέοντας την Ευρώπη», αποτελούν ένα από τα μεγάλα αναπτυξιακά προγράμματα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης που στόχο έχουν την απρόσκοπτη λειτουργία της Ενιαίας Αγοράς με τη δημιουργία ενός σύγχρονου, ενιαίου, λειτουργικού και αποτελεσματικού ευρωπαϊκού δικτύου μεταφορών.

Η συμβολή των ΔΕΔ-Μ στην οικονομική ανάκαμψη, τη βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη και την ενίσχυση της απασχόλησης, καθώς και στην κοινωνική και γεωγραφική συνοχή, είναι θεμελιώδους σημασίας. Η διευκόλυνση «Συνδέοντας την Ευρώπη» προβλέπει επενδύσεις 26 περίπου δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ κατά την περίοδο 2014-2020 για τη χρηματοδότηση μελετών και κατασκευής έργων που βρίσκονται σε άξονες του ΔΔΜ, την αναβάθμιση των ευρωπαϊκών υποδομών μεταφορών, την κατασκευή των ελλειπόντων κρίκων και την εξάλειψη των σημείων συμφόρησης. Τούτο περιλαμβάνει 10 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ του Ταμείου Συνοχής που προορίζονται για έργα στον τομέα των μεταφορών στις χώρες Συνοχής.

Η ΕΕ μπορεί να διαδραματίσει καθοριστικό ρόλο στο συντονισμό μεταξύ των κρατών μελών κατά το σχεδιασμό, τη διαχείριση και τη χρηματοδότηση έργων.

Με δεδομένη τη σημασία που έχει η σωστή απορρόφηση των προβλεπόμενων κοινοτικών πόρων από τις χώρες Συνοχής για την πλήρη αξιοποίηση των δυνατοτήτων που παρέχει το νέο νομοθετικό πλαίσιο των Διευρωπαϊκών Δικτύων Μεταφορών, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Ποιες δράσεις αναμένεται να αναλάβει για την πληρέστερη και όσο το δυνατόν καλύτερη προετοιμασία των χωρών Συνοχής, προκειμένου να μπορέσουν να αξιοποιήσουν πλήρως τις επενδυτικές δυνατότητες από το νέο χρηματοδοτικό εργαλείο «Συνδέοντας την Ευρώπη»;

— Στις δράσεις που έχουν ήδη προβλεφθεί, περιλαμβάνεται η πραγματοποίηση ενημερωτικών επισκέψεων και επαφών εξειδικευμένων εμπειρογνωμόνων της Επιτροπής με αρμόδιους φορείς του δημοσίου και ιδιωτικού τομέα στις χώρες της Συνοχής; Εάν ναι, τότε ποιο αναμένεται να είναι το χρονοδιάγραμμα των εν λόγω ενημερωτικών επισκέψεων;

Απάντηση του κ. Kallas εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

Κατά την προετοιμασία του προγραμματισμού της πολιτικής συνοχής για την περίοδο 2014-2020, πρέπει να πληρούνται οι εκ των προτέρων όροι, μεταξύ άλλων, και για τις επενδύσεις στον τομέα των μεταφορών. Αυτοί οι εκ των προτέρων όροι πρέπει να πληρούνται κατά την ημερομηνία υποβολής των επιχειρησιακών προγραμμάτων και, ενδεχομένως, των συμφωνιών εταιρικής σχέσης. Επίσης, οι εκ των προτέρων όροι για τις μεταφορές απαιτούν τον καθορισμό ενός συνολικού σχεδίου μεταφορών, συμπεριλαμβανομένης μιας σειράς λεπτομερών, ώριμων και εφικτών έργων, τα οποία θα αξιολογηθούν με συντονισμένο τρόπο από τις υπηρεσίες της Επιτροπής. Η κατάρτιση ενός συνολικού σχεδίου μεταφορών μπορεί να λάβει στήριξη από την τεχνική βοήθεια και, σε ειδικές περιπτώσεις, από το JASPERS (διευκόλυνση της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων που συμφωνήθηκε με την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή).

Ορισμένες μελέτες και προκαταρκτικές εργασίες για την ανάπτυξη της σειράς έργων για την περίοδο 2014-2020 χρηματοδοτούνται από το σημερινό κονδύλιο του προϋπολογισμού για τα ΔΕΔ-Μ, και μελλοντικά μπορεί να χρηματοδοτηθούν από τη διευκόλυνση «Συνδέοντας την Ευρώπη», και, συμπληρωματικά, από την τεχνική βοήθεια που συνδέεται με την εφαρμογή της πολιτικής συνοχής.

Επίσης η Επιτροπή διοργανώνει επισκέψεις στις χώρες· οι δραστηριότητες αυτές αφορούν συχνά διάφορες υπηρεσίες της Επιτροπής, εθνικές αρχές και δυνητικούς δικαιούχους και φορείς υλοποίησης, δημόσιους και ιδιωτικούς.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012251/13
to the Commission
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: New Trans-European Transport Networks/need for information and know-how on effective take-up of Community resources to be passed to cohesion countries

The new Trans-European Transport Network policy, together with the new Connecting Europe Facility, form one of the most ambitious development programmes undertaken by the European Union and is designed to enable the single market to function properly by creating a single, modern, functioning and efficient European transport network.

The contribution made by TEN-T to economic recovery, sustainable growth and employment and to social and geographical cohesion is of vital importance. The Connecting Europe Facility makes provision for investments between 2014 and 2020 totalling approximately EUR 26 billion, in order to finance studies and construct projects along TEN-T routes, upgrade European transport infrastructure, forge missing links and eliminate congestion points. It includes EUR 10 billion from the Cohesion Fund, which has been earmarked for transport projects in the cohesion countries.

The EU can play a decisive role in coordinating the Member States during the design, management and financing of projects.

In view of the importance of the proper take-up of available Community resources by cohesion countries if the full potential of the new legislative framework for Trans-European Transport Networks is to be realised, will the Commission say:

— What action does it expect to take to ensure fuller and, if possible, better preparation of cohesion countries, so that they can fully exploit the potential for investment through the new Connecting Europe Facility?

— Do actions already planned include information visits and contacts between experts from the Commission and the competent public- and private-sector agencies in the cohesion countries? If so, what is the planned timetable for information visits?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2013)

In the preparation of the 2014-2020 programming for Cohesion Policy, *Ex Ante* Conditionalities have to be fulfilled including for Transport sector investments. These *ex Ante* Conditionalities have to be fulfilled at the date of submission of the operational programmes and, where appropriate, the Partnership Agreements. These *ex Ante* Conditionalities for Transport require defining a comprehensive Transport Plan, including a detailed mature and realistic project pipeline, which will be appraised by the Commission services in a coordinated manner. The preparation of a comprehensive transport plan may be supported by Technical Assistance and, in specific cases, by JASPERS (European Investment Bank facility agreed with the Commission).

Some studies and preliminary works for the development of the project pipeline for 2014-2020 are supported by the current TEN-T Budget line, and in the future may be supported by the Connecting Europe Facility, and, complementarily, by the Technical Assistance linked to Cohesion Policy implementation.

Country visits by the Commission are also organised; these events involve often different departments in the Commission, national authorities and potential beneficiaries and promoters, both public and private.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012257/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Zypern — Reform des Bankensektors

Die Verluste der zypriotischen Banken dürften 2014 wegen der schwächeren Konjunktur und dadurch höherer Kreditausfälle steigen. Insgesamt wird erwartet, dass sich die Branche schrittweise stabilisieren und erholen wird. Der überdimensionierte Bankensektor und das derzeitige zypriotische Geschäftsmodell haben sich als problematisch erwiesen. Mittlerweile hat Zypern eine unabhängige Evaluierung der Einführung der Anti-Geldwäscherichtlinie akzeptiert. Im März musste Zypern als Gegenleistung für internationale Finanzhilfen im Volumen von zehn Milliarden Euro seinen überdimensionierten Finanzsektor umbauen. Eine große Bank wurde geschlossen, und es wurde auf g an die Einlagen der vermögenden Bankkunden zurückgegriffen. Der Einbruch am Bausektor und der Kollaps des Finanzsektors haben sich naturgemäß auch auf die Wirtschaft ausgewirkt und die Arbeitslosenquote steigen lassen.

1. Wie bewertet die Kommission den Stand der Umsetzung der Bankenreform in Zypern?

2. Gibt es hinsichtlich der Vorwürfe im Zusammenhang mit der Auslegung der Geldwäsche Richtlinie bereits Prüfungsergebnisse seitens des Europarates bzw. der Wirtschaftsprüfer von Deloitte?

3. Ist eine fristgerechte schrittweise Abschaffung bzw. Lockerung der eingeführten Kapitalverkehrskontrollen geplant?

Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission
(4. Dezember 2013)

1. Die Stabilisierung des Finanzsektors ist bereits im Gang, es wird allerdings noch dauern, bis die langfristige Tragfähigkeit wieder in vollem Umfang hergestellt ist.

2. Die Ergebnisse der unabhängigen Berater (darunter auch Deloitte) wurden für den Entwurf des mit den zyprischen Behörden vereinbarten Aktionsplans verwendet, der Teil des von diesen zugesicherten aktuellen Maßnahmenpakets ist.

3. Die zyprischen Behörden verabschiedeten am 5. August einen Fahrplan mit Eckpunkten für die Aufhebung der bestehenden Kapitalkontrollen. Der jeweils nächste Schritt bei der Lockerung hängt vom Fortschritt der Restrukturierung des Bankensystems sowie von den Auswirkungen der Maßnahmen auf die Finanzstabilität ab und folgt keinem festgelegten Zeitplan. Eine Bewertung findet im Rahmen der Umsetzungsberichte statt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012257/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Cyprus — reform of the banking sector

The losses of Cypriot banks are likely to increase in 2014 on account of the weaker economy and resulting higher credit losses. Overall, the industry is expected gradually to stabilise and recover. The inflated banking sector and the current Cypriot business model have proved to be problematic. Cyprus has now accepted an independent evaluation of the introduction of the Anti-Money Laundering Directive. In March, in return for the international financial aid amounting to EUR 10 billion, Cyprus had to restructure its inflated financial sector. One large bank was closed, and it resorted to [grabbing] the deposits of wealthy bank customers. The slowdown in the construction sector and the collapse of the financial sector have naturally also had an impact on the economy and caused the unemployment rate to rise.

1. What is the Commission's assessment of how the implementation of the banking reform is proceeding in Cyprus?

2. With regard to the accusations relating to the interpretation of the Anti-Money Laundering Directive, are there any results already available from the reviews carried out by the Council of Europe or the Deloitte auditors?

3. Is a timely, gradual abolition or relaxation of the capital controls that were introduced planned?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(4 December 2013)

1. Stabilisation of the financial sector is underway, even though the return to full long-term viability will take time.

2. The findings from the independent consultants (incl. Deloitte) were used to develop the action plan agreed with the Cypriot authorities as part of the ongoing measures that they have agreed to implement.

3. The Cypriot authorities on 5 August adopted a milestone-based roadmap for lifting exiting capital controls. Every next relaxation step is determined by progress with the restructuring of the banking system as well as by the impact of the measure on financial stability, rather than set in fixed time-frame. It will be assessed as part of the compliance reports.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012258/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Ganzjährige Sommerzeit

2007 kam die Kommission in einem Bericht über die Auswirkungen des aktuellen Systems der Sommerzeit zu dem Ergebnis, dass dieses keine negativen Auswirkungen hat und ein gewisses Maß an Energieeinsparungen bewirkt. Das österreichische Energieinstitut an der Linzer-Johannes-Kepler-Universität kam nun in einer Studie zu dem Schluss, dass die Sommerzeit in Oberösterreich energetische und wohlstandsökonomische Effekte von rund acht Mio. EUR pro Jahr mit sich bringt. Eine ganzjährige Sommerzeit würde nach Einschätzung der Wissenschaftler hingegen gut das Zehnfache generieren.

1. Wurden im Rahmen des EU-Berichts über das aktuelle System der Sommerzeitsystem Effekte einer ganzjährigen Sommerzeit berücksichtigt?

2. Falls ja, zu welchem Ergebnis kam man auf EU-Ebene?

3. Falls nein, ist die Untersuchung alternativer Systeme noch geplant?

4. Bislang gibt es auf internationaler Ebene keine Koordinierung der Regelungen über die Sommerzeit. Ist die EU angesichts der Tatsache, dass einige Länder eine Änderung der Regelung erwägen bzw. diese bereits durchgeführt haben, bemüht, für eine koordinierte Regelung innerhalb Europas zu sorgen?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(18. Dezember 2013)

Gemäß Artikel 5 der Richtlinie 2000/84/EG ([1]) zur Regelung der Sommerzeit hat die Kommission im Jahr 2007 einen Bericht ([2]) mit einer Zusammenstellung der Beiträge der Mitgliedstaaten erstellt; die ganzjährige Sommerzeit wurde darin nicht behandelt.

Kein Mitgliedstaat hat Änderungen der bestehenden Sommerzeitregelung zur Sprache gebracht. Deshalb hat die Kommission derzeit nicht die Absicht, alternative Systeme zu untersuchen.

Die Kommission ist weiterhin der Ansicht, dass die in der Richtlinie 2000/84/EG festgelegte Regelung der Sommerzeit nach wie vor zweckmäßig ist, wie sie in ihren früheren Antworten auf die schriftlichen Antworten E-004523/2013, E-9209-9802/2011 und H-103/2010 ([3]) bereits dargelegt hat.

Auf internationaler Ebene gibt es zwar keine Koordinierung der Sommerzeitregelungen, in der Union wird die Sommerzeit jedoch durch die Richtlinie 2000/84/EG insofern koordiniert, als dort festgelegt ist, dass die Sommerzeit am letzten Sonntag im März um 1:00 Uhr morgens Weltzeit beginnt (Artikel 2) und am letzten Sonntag im Oktober um 1:00 Uhr morgens Weltzeit endet.

([1]) Richtlinie 2000/87/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 19. Januar 2001, ABl. L 31 vom 2.2.2001.
([2]) KOM(2007)739 endg. vom 23.11.2007.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012258/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Summer time all year round

In 2007, in a report on the effects of the current system of summer time, the Commission came to the conclusion that it had no negative effects and to a certain extent helped to save energy. In a study, the Austrian Energy Institute at the Johannes Kepler University in Linz has now come to the conclusion that summer time in Upper Austria brings benefits in terms of energy and economic prosperity of around EUR 8 million per year. The scientists estimate, however, that summer time all year round would generate at least 10 times as much.

1. Were the effects of summer time all year round considered in the EU report on the current system of summer time?

2. If so, what conclusions were reached at EU level?

3. If not, are there still plans to investigate alternative systems?

4. As yet, there is no coordination of summer time arrangements at international level. In view of the fact that some countries are considering changing the system or have already done so, is the EU endeavouring to establish a coordinated system within Europe?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(18 December 2013)

In accordance with Article 5 of Directive 2000/84/EC on summer-time arrangements ([1]), the Commission drew up a report in 2007 ([2]) which was a compilation of the contributions received from the Member States and did not cover summer-time application all year round.

No Member State has raised the issue of changes to the existing summer-time arrangements. Therefore the Commission does not for the moment intend to investigate alternative systems.

The Commission continues to believe that the summer time arrangements as established by Directive 2000/84/EC remain suitable, as explained in previous answers to written questions E-004523/2013, E-9209-9802/2011 and H-103/2010 ([3]).

While there is no international coordination of summer-time arrangements, Directive 2000/84/EC coordinates in the Union summer-time by determining the start date of summer-time (Article 2) at 1.00 a.m. GMT on the last Sunday of March and its end date (Article 3) at 1.00 a.m. GMT on the last Sunday of October.

([1]) Directive 2000/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 January 2001, OJ L 31, 2.2.2001.
([2]) COM(2007) 739 final, 23.11.2007.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012259/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Kinderschmuggel zum Zwecke des Sozialbetrugs durch Roma und Sinti

Während das Rätsel, wie die kleine Maria in ein Roma-Lager nahe der griechischen Stadt Farsala kam, weiterhin ungelöst ist, sorgt ein ähnlicher Fall auf der Insel Lesbos für Aufsehen. Eine Roma-Familie hat versucht, einen zweieinhalb Monate alten Jungen beim Standesamt zu registrieren, ohne die erforderlichen Nachweise vorlegen zu können. Kinder als Ware, die hin und her geschoben, gehandelt und verliehen werden, sollen unter den Roma in Griechenland keine Seltenheit sein. In Südosteuropa soll es Kennern zufolge durchaus üblich sein, dass Roma-Familien Kinder weggeben, tauschen oder ausleihen, mitunter über Landesgrenzen hinweg, um Sozialbetrug zu begehen, also etwa vermehrt Kindergeld zu kassieren.

So hatte die vorgebliche Mutter von Maria, die mit zwei Ausweisen als Eleftheria Dimopoulou und Selini Sali auftrat, unter dem ersten Namen fünf und in einer anderen Gemeinde unter dem anderen Namen vier Kinder gemeldet. Ihr Mann meldete in einer dritten Gemeinde weitere fünf Kinder an. So wurden aus fünf Kindern auf dem Papier 14. Nach Angaben aus Polizeikreisen soll das Paar auf diesem Weg 2 800 EUR im Monat kassiert haben.

Bisher war es in Griechenland ein Leichtes, fremde Kinder als eigene registrieren zu lassen. Eine eidesstattliche Erklärung und zwei Zeugen reichten, um ein zu Hause geborenes Kind — selbst Jahre nach einer Geburt — beim Standesamt anzumelden. Künftig soll ein Gentest erforderlich sein.

1. Ist sich die Kommission dieses Problems bewusst?

2. Ist es in anderen Mitgliedstaaten ähnlich leicht, fremde Kinder als eigene auszugeben und somit Sozialhilfe (dann auch in anderen EU-Staaten) zu erschleichen?

3. Inwieweit wird auf EU-Ebene zusammengearbeitet, um gegebenenfalls Kinderschmuggel im Rahmen der Migration von Roma und Sinti einzudämmen?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(16. Dezember 2013)

Nach Eurostat-Angaben waren 12 % der nachweislichen oder mutmaßlichen Opfer von Menschenhandel in der EU in den Jahren 2008 bis 2010 Mädchen und 3 % Jungen.

Die Kommission ist nach wie vor zutiefst besorgt über die Opfer von Menschenhandel für Zwecke der Ausbeutung, einschließlich sexueller Ausbeutung, Kinderarbeit, illegaler Adoptionen, Zwangsehen, des Verkaufs von Kindern oder Leistungsmissbrauchs.

Die Rechtsvorschriften und die Politik der EU basieren auf den Menschenrechten, sind umfassend und tragen dem Wohl des Kindes Rechnung.

Die Richtlinie 2011/36/EU ([1]) enthält Rechtsvorschriften, die gewährleisten, dass Opfer im Kindesalter uneingeschränkten Schutz erhalten und unterstützt werden, sowie Verpflichtungen, um dem Menschenhandel durch die Reduzierung der Nachfrage vorzubeugen, die alle Formen der Ausbeutung fördert. Die Strategie der EU zur Beseitigung des Menschenhandels ([2]) enthält Pläne für eine Studie zum Thema „Kinder als stark gefährdete Gruppen".

Die Kommission wird 2014 EU-weit Sensibilisierungsmaßnahmen durchführen, die auf spezifische schutzbedürftige Gruppen wie gefährdete Frauen und Kinder, Hausangestellte, Roma-Gemeinschaften sowie Arbeitnehmer ohne Papiere abzielen. 2014 wird sie ferner Leitlinien zu Systemen zum Schutz des Kindes erstellen.

([1]) Richtlinie 2011/36/EU des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 5. April 2011 zur Verhütung und Bekämpfung des Menschenhandels und zum Schutz seiner Opfer.

([2]) Strategie der EU zur Beseitigung des Menschenhandels 2012-2016 (KOM(2012)286 endg.).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012259/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Child trafficking for the purpose of welfare fraud by Roma and Sinti

While the puzzle of how little Maria ended up in a Roma camp near the Greek town of Farsala remains unsolved, a similar case on the island of Lesbos has attracted attention. A Roma family attempted to register a two-and-a-half month old boy at the registry office, but were unable to produce the necessary documents. Children being treated as goods that are pushed from pillar to post, traded and lent out is said to be fairly common among the Roma in Greece. According to those in the know, it is quite usual in south-eastern Europe for Roma families to give away, exchange or lend out children, sometimes across national borders, in order to commit welfare fraud, in other words to claim more in child benefit.

Thus, the alleged mother of Maria, who, with two sets of identity documents, presented herself as Eleftheria Dimopoulou and Selini Sali, registered five children under the first name and, in a different municipality, four children under the second name. Her husband registered a further five children in a third municipality. Thus, five children became 14 on paper. According to police insiders, the couple are said to have pocketed EUR 2 800 per month in this way.

Up to now, it has been easy to register other people's children as one's own. A declaration under oath and two witnesses were all that was needed to register a child born at home — even years after the birth — at the registry office. In future, a genetic test is to be required.

1. Is the Commission aware of this problem?

2. Is it just as easy in other Member States to pass other people's children off as one's own and thereby dishonestly obtain social assistance (in other EU Member States, too)?

3. To what extent is there cooperation at EU level to prevent any potential child trafficking in the context of the migration of Roma and Sinti?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

According to Eurostat, in 2008- 2010, 12% of identified or presumed victims of trafficking in the EU were girls and 3% were boys.

The Commission remains deeply concerned about child victims of trafficking in human beings for any exploitative purpose, including sexual exploitation, child labour, illegal adoptions, forced marriages, child-selling or benefit fraud.

EU legislation and policy are comprehensive, human rights based and child-sensitive.

Directive 2011/36/EU ([1]) contains legal provisions ensuring unconditional protection and assistance to child victims, as well as obligations to prevent trafficking in human beings by reducing demand that fosters all forms of exploitation. The EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings ([2]), sets out plans for a study on children as high risk groups.

In 2014, the Commission will launch EU-wide awareness-raising activities targeting specific vulnerable groups, such as women and children at risk, domestic workers, Roma communities, undocumented workers. Additionally, in 2014 the Commission will develop guidelines on child protection systems.

([1]) Directive 2011/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims.
([2]) The EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016 COM(2012) 286 final.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012260/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Spuren von pharmazeutischen Produkten in Wasser

Manche Bestandteile von Arzneimittel passieren Kläranlagen praktisch unverändert, oder sie bleiben im Klärschlamm zurück, der dann als Dünger auf den Feldern aufgebracht wird. Auf diese Art werden Spuren von pharmazeutischen Produkten in Gewässern und im Trinkwasser gemessen. Owohl ihre Konzentration so gering ist, dass für Menschen kein Risiko bestehen soll, ergeben sich nachweislich Auswirkungen auf die Tierwelt. Im Rahmen des EU-Projekts PHARMAS gehen Universitäten und Pharma-Unternehmen seit 2011 der Frage nach, welche langfristigen Auswirkungen Medikamentenspuren im Wasser haben.

1. In welchem Ausmaß wird das EU-Projekt PHARMAS aus Fördertöpfen der Union unterstützt?

2. Werden im Rahmen dieses Projekts auch Auswirkungen auf die Pflanzenwelt untersucht?

3. Für welchen Zeitraum ist das Projekt ausgelegt?

4. Gibt es bereits erste (Zwischen-)Ergebnisse?

Antwort von Frau Geoghegan-Quinn im Namen der Kommission
(11. Dezember 2013)

1. Der EU-Beitrag zu dem im Zuge des Siebten Rahmenprogramms für Forschung, technologische Entwicklung und Demonstration (RP7, 2007-2013) geförderten Projekt PHARMAS beträgt 2 798 899 EUR. Insgesamt beläuft sich der Projekthaushalt auf 3 672 938 EUR.

2. Ziel des Projekts ist es, die Auswirkungen der Umweltexposition durch Spuren von Krebs- und Antibiotika-Medikamenten im Wasser auf Mensch und Tier zu erforschen. Darüber hinaus werden auch Pflanzen berücksichtigt, da sie über die Nahrungskette einen möglichen Expositionspfad für Arzneimittel darstellen können.

3. Das Projekt läuft vom 1.1.2011 bis zum 31.3.2014 (39 Monate).

4. Die Projektergebnisse werden auf der Projektwebsite unter http://www.pharmas-eu.org/ veröffentlicht.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012260/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Traces of pharmaceutical products in water

Many constituents of medicinal products pass through sewage treatment plants practically unchanged, or they remain in the sewage sludge, which is then applied to fields as fertiliser. This results in traces of pharmaceutical products being detected in water bodies and drinking water. Although their concentrations are so low that there is said to be no risk to human health, there is evidence of effects on wildlife. Within the framework of the EU project PHARMAS, universities and pharmaceutical companies have been investigating the long-term effects of traces of medicines in the water since 2011.

1. To what extent is the EU project PHARMAS supported from EU funds?

2. Are effects on plant life also being investigated within the framework of this project?

3. What is the planned time period for this project?

4. Are any initial (interim) results already available?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

1. The EU contribution for the PHARMAS project funded under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013) amounts to EUR 2 798 899. The total project budget amounts to EUR 3 672 938.

2. The project aims at assessing the effects of environmental exposure of humans and animals to the presence of anticancer and antibiotic drugs in water. Moreover, plants are taken into account as a possible route of drug exposure through foodstuffs.

3. The project lifetime is 39 months, from 1.1.2011 to 31.3.2014.

4. The available results are published on the project website: http://www.pharmas-eu.org/

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012261/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Strategie für Cloud Computing

Im Rahmen von Cloud-Computing wird eine Reihe von Dienstleistungen aus dem gesamten Spektrum der Informationstechnik angeboten. Es beinhaltet u. a. Infrastruktur (z. B. Rechenleistung, Speicherplatz), Plattformen und Software. Dabei werden Hardware oder Datenspeicher sowie Software nicht mehr selbst betrieben, sondern bei einem oder mehreren Anbietern gemietet. Die Anwendungen und Daten befinden sich dann nicht mehr auf dem lokalen Rechner. Da sich aus diesen geänderten Gegebenheiten eine Reihe von neuen Anforderungen (etwa auch im Zusammenhang mit dem Datenschutz) ergeben, hat die Kommission im September 2012 eine Strategie für Cloud-Computing vorgeschlagen.

1. Wie ist der Stand der Umsetzung der Strategie für Cloud-Computing?

2. Welche Initiativen laufen noch bzw. sind geplant, die in engem Zusammenhang mit dieser Strategie stehen?

Antwort von Frau Kroes im Namen der Kommission
(13. Dezember 2013)

Die Dienststellen der Kommission arbeiten seit September 2012 an der Umsetzung der Cloud-Computing-Strategie, in deren Mittelpunkt drei Schlüsselaktionen stehen: i) Lichten des Normendschungels; ii) Gewährleisten sicherer und fairer Vertragsbedingungen und iii) die Europäische Cloud-Partnerschaft (ECP).

Im Zuge der Schlüsselaktion 1 wurde das Europäische Institut für Telekommunikationsnormen (ETSI) beauftragt, in Zusammenarbeit mit allen einschlägigen Interessenträgern eine Bestandsaufnahme der bestehenden Cloud-Computing-Normen vorzunehmen. Das ETSI wird seine Endergebnisse bis Ende 2013 vorlegen.

Im Zuge der Schlüsselaktion 2 wurde eine Sachverständigengruppe für Mustervertragsbedingungen für Verträge mit Verbrauchern und Kleinunternehmen eingesetzt.

Ferner wurde als Betrag zu den Schlüsselaktionen 1 und 2 eine Cloud Select Industry Group (C-SIG) eingerichtet, um die Interessenträger in die Umsetzung der Strategie einzubinden. Die C-SIG-Arbeitsgruppen zu den Themen i) freiwillige Cloud-Zertifizierung, ii) Vereinbarungen über den Dienstumfang und iii) Verhaltenskodex (zum Datenschutz) sind im Jahr 2013 mehrfach zusammengekommen. Diese drei C-SIG-Arbeitsgruppen werden voraussichtlich ab Anfang 2014 greifbare Ergebnisse vorlegen.

Im Zuge der Schlüsselaktion 3 wurde im November 2012 die ECP gegründet. Die dritte Sitzung des ECP-Lenkungsausschusses fand am 14. November 2013 in Berlin statt. Zu diesem Anlass fiel auch der Startschuss für Cloud 4 Europe, ein Projekt der vorkommerziellen Auftragsvergabe. Der ECP-Lenkungsausschuss wird seine abschließenden Empfehlungen für die Entwicklung des Cloud-Computing in Europa bis zum Sommer 2014 vorlegen.

Überdies bekräftigten die europäischen Staats- und Regierungschefs auf ihrer Tagung im Oktober, dass das Cloud-Computing wichtige Grundlagen für Produktivitätssteigerungen und bessere Dienstleistungen schafft.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012261/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Cloud computing strategy

Numerous services from the whole spectrum of information technology are offered in the context of cloud computing. This includes infrastructure (e.g. processing power, storage space), platforms and software. In this case, the hardware or data storage and software are no longer operated by the users themselves, but are rented from one or more service providers. The applications and data are then no longer found on the user's local computer. As these altered circumstances give rise to a number of new requirements (including in connection with data protection), the Commission proposed a cloud computing strategy in September 2012.

1. What stage has the implementation of the cloud computing strategy reached?

2. What initiatives that are closely related to this strategy are still running or are planned?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2013)

The Commission services have been working since September 2012 on the implementation of the Cloud Computing strategy, which is based on three key actions: (i) cutting through the jungle of standards; (ii) ensuring safe and fair contract terms and conditions, and (iii) the European Cloud Partnership (ECP).

Under key action 1, the European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI) was tasked to map existing cloud computing standards in collaboration with all relevant stakeholders. ETSI will deliver the final results before the end of 2013.

Under key action 2, the expert group on model contract terms for consumers and small firms has been established.

In order to contribute towards key actions 1 and 2, a Cloud Select Industry Group (C-SIG) has been established to involve the stakeholders in the implementation of the strategy. C-SIG Working Groups on (i) voluntary cloud certification, (ii) service level agreements and (iii) code of conduct (on data protection) met several times during 2013. These three C-SIG working groups are expected to deliver tangible results in the beginning of 2014.

Under key action 3, the ECP was established in November 2012. The third meeting of the Steering Board was held on 14 November 2013 in Berlin, when the pre-commercial procurement project Cloud 4 Europe was launched. The ECP Steering Board will present final recommendations on the development of cloud computing in Europe before summer 2014.

Moreover, at the recent European Council meeting in October, the Heads of State and Government confirmed that cloud computing is an important enabler for productivity and better services.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012262/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Strategie zur Erhöhung der Gesundheitskompetenz

Es ist von grundlegender Bedeutung, dass die Bürger Gesundheitsinformationen richtig verstehen; denn wer mit diesbezüglichen Informationen nichts anfangen kann, geht weniger zu Vorsorgeimpfungen, kommt schneller ins Krankenhaus oder nimmt Medikamente falsch ein. Berechnungen des Gesundheitsökonomen John Vernon zufolge soll die USA mangelnde „health literacy" jährlich 100 bis 200 Milliarden Dollar kosten. Nach dem Europavergleich 2012 wurde die Erhöhung der Gesundheitskompetenz vom Ministerrat beschlossen. Im Wesentlichen soll das Gesundheitssystem verständlicher und patientenfreundlicher und der diesbezügliche Informationsstand des Einzelnen vergrößert werden.

1. Wie ist der Stand der Umsetzung der Strategie zur Erhöhung der Gesundheitskompetenz?

2. Für wann ist der nächste Europavergleich geplant?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(19. Dezember 2013)

Die Kommission erkennt in der EU-Gesundheitsstrategie ([1]) die Bedeutung der Gesundheitskompetenz an.

Mehrere Bestimmungen der EU-Gesundheits-, Verbraucher- und Lebensmittelvorschriften tragen zur Gesundheitskompetenz bei, da sie den Menschen helfen, Informationen im Hinblick auf gesundheitsrelevante Entscheidungen zu erhalten, zu verstehen und anzuwenden.

So zielen die EU-Rechtsvorschriften zur Information der Verbraucher über Lebensmittel ([2]) und gesundheitsbezogene Angaben über Lebensmittel ([3]) auch darauf ab, den Zugang zu klaren, konsistenten und evidenzbasierten Informationen zu verbessern. Die Tabakvorschriften ([4]) umfassen Maßnahmen zur Information potenzieller Konsumenten über die mit diesen Produkten verbundenen Gesundheitsrisiken, und die Vorschriften über Medizinprodukte ([5]) enthalten Bestimmungen hinsichtlich der Zusammenfassung der Produktmerkmale und der Lesbarkeit der Etikettierung und der Packungsbeilage.

Die Kommission erhebt regelmäßig vergleichbare Daten zur öffentlichen Gesundheit ([6]), z. B. die im Lauf der Jahre mit den Mitgliedstaaten entwickelten Gesundheitsindikatoren der Europäischen Gemeinschaft, und sie hat ein Online-Instrument (HEIDI-Datenbank) ([7]) entwickelt, um der Öffentlichkeit Zugang zu evidenzbasierten Informationen zu geben.

Die Kommission unterstützt mit EU-Mitteln außerdem eine Reihe von Projekten, wie die vom Herrn Abgeordneten genannte Europäische Studie zur Gesundheitskompetenz (European Health Literacy Survey) ([8]) und das IROHLA-Projekt zur Gesundheitskompetenz älterer Menschen ([9]), das 2012 angelaufen ist und die Gesundheitskompetenz der alternden Bevölkerung Europas verbessern will, unter anderem durch evidenzbasierte Maßnahmen, die in allen Mitgliedstaaten angewendet werden können.

Da die Ergebnisse der Europäischen Studie zur Gesundheitskompetenz noch immer aktuell und gültig sind, plant die Kommission in naher Zukunft keine neue Erhebung.

([1]) KOM(2007)630 endg.
([2]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011.
([3]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1924/2006.
([4]) Richtlinie 2001/37/EG.
([5]) Weitere Informationen unter:
http://ec.europa.eu/health/human-use/index_en.htm
([6]) Verfügbar unter:
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/health/public_health/data_public_health/database
([7]) Verfügbar unter:
http://ec.europa.eu/health/indicators/indicators/
([8]) Der Abschlussbericht kann abgerufen werden unter:
http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/documents/news/Comparative_report_on_health_literacy_in_eight_EU_member_states.pdf
([9]) Weitere Informationen unter:
http://www.irohla.eu/home/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012262/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Strategy for improving health literacy

It is fundamentally important for citizens to understand health-related information correctly, as those who are unable to get to grips with this information go less often to have preventative vaccinations, end up in hospital more readily or do not take their medication correctly. According to calculations by the health economist John Vernon, poor health literacy costs the US between USD 100 billion and USD 200 billion a year. Following a comparison survey carried out within Europe in 2012, the improvement of health literacy was agreed on by the Council. Essentially, the health system is to be made easier to understand and more patient-friendly, and the level of information provided to individuals in this regard is to be increased.

1. How far has the implementation of the strategy for improving health literacy progressed?

2. When is the next European comparison survey planned for?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

The Commission recognised the importance of health literacy in the EU Health Strategy ([1]).

Several provisions of the EU health, consumer and food legislation contribute to health literacy as they help people obtain, understand and use information to make decisions about their health and care.

For instance, EU legislation on the provision of food information to consumers ([2]) and on Health Claims made on foods ([3]) also aim at improving access to clear, consistent and evidence based information. Tobacco legislation ([4]) includes measures informing potential consumers of the health risks associated with these products, and rules governing medicinal products ([5]) include provisions on summary of products characteristics, on the packaging information and on the readability of the labelling and package leaflet.

The Commission regularly collects comparable public health data ([6]), including the European Core Health Indicators developed over the years with the Member States and has created an online tool (Heidi data-tool) ([7]) to give public access to evidence-based information.

The Commission also supports, through EU funds, a number of projects, such as the European Health Literacy Survey ([8]) mentioned by the Honourable Member and the Intervention Research on Health Literacy among Ageing population (IROHLA) project ([9]), which started in 2012 and focuses on improving health literacy for the ageing population in Europe, including by selecting evidence-based interventions that can be applied in all European Member States.

As the results of the European Health Literacy Survey are still recent and valid the Commission does not plan to launch another survey in the near future.

([1]) COM(2007) 630 final.
([2]) Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011.
([3]) Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006.
([4]) Directive 2001/37/EC.
([5]) More information at: http://ec.europa.eu/health/human-use/index_en.htm
([6]) Available at: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/health/public_health/data_public_health/database
([7]) Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/health/indicators/indicators/
([8]) Final report available at: http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/documents/news/Comparative_report_on_health_literacy_in_eight_EU_member_states.pdf
([9]) More information at: http://www.irohla.eu/home/

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012264/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Niebler (PPE)
(28. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Innergemeinschaftlicher Versandhandel und verbrauchsteuerpflichtiger Waren

Bei der Beförderung verbrauchsteuerpflichtiger Waren (z.B. Branntwein) von einem EU-Mitgliedstaat in einen anderen wird zwischen der gewerblichen Beförderung einerseits und der Beförderung durch Privatpersonen im Reiseverkehr andererseits unterschieden.

Privatpersonen, die diese Waren für ihren Eigenbedarf befördern, unterliegen dem Ursprungslandprinzip und müssen daher im Bestimmungsland keine Verbrauchsteuer mehr zahlen. Dagegen gilt bei der gewerblichen Beförderung (einschließlich des innergemeinschaftlichen Versandhandels) das Bestimmungslandprinzip, wonach die Waren erst in dem Land des Verbrauchers mit den dort gültigen Steuersätzen versteuert werden — und zwar unabhängig davon, ob die Verbrauchsteuer im Abgangsland bereits entrichtet worden ist oder nicht.

Verbrauchsteuerpflichtige Waren dürfen dann an Privatpersonen in andere EU-Mitgliedstaaten versandt werden, wenn sich der Versandhändler vor der ersten Lieferung bei den zuständigen Zoll- bzw. Steuerbehörden des jeweiligen EU-Mitgliedstaates (also des Bestimmungslandes) registriert und für die Entrichtung der Verbrauchsteuer eine Sicherheit geleistet hat. Nach Übernahme der Ware durch den Empfänger muss der Versandhändler die entsprechende Verbrauchsteuer entrichten und kann die Rückerstattung der Verbrauchsteuer des Abgangslands beantragen.

Lieferungen verbrauchsteuerpflichtiger Waren in ein Drittland sind mit wesentlich geringerem Aufwand möglich.

1. Teilt die EU-Kommission die Auffassung, dass insbesondere für kleine Versandhändler der Versand verbrauchsteuerpflichtiger Waren in einen anderen EU-Mitgliedstaat nur mit einem hohen bürokratischen Aufwand möglich ist?

2. Hält es die EU-Kommission für sinnvoll, die Bestimmungen zur Besteuerung von verbrauchsteuerpflichtiger Waren dahin gehend zu ändern, dass in den Fällen, in denen der Versand dieser Waren unterhalb der Schwellenwerte für den eigenen Verbrauch an Privatpersonen erfolgt, die Besteuerung nach dem Ursprungslandprinzip erfolgt?

Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission
(11. Dezember 2013)

1. Der Kommission ist bekannt, dass die mangelnde Harmonisierung im Bereich der Fernverkäufe (Versandhandel) (Artikel 36 der Richtlinie 2008/118/EG des Rates) hohe Kosten verursachen und den freien Warenverkehr hemmen kann.

Die Kommission hat eine Projektgruppe ([1]) aus Vertretern der Kommission und der Mitgliedstaaten eingesetzt, um zu untersuchen, wie die gegenwärtigen Regelungen zur Einhaltung der Steuervorschriften, insbesondere derer auf der Grundlage von Artikel 36 der Richtlinie 2008/118/EG, verbessert werden können. Ein erster Bericht über nachahmenswerte Verfahren im Rahmen der geltenden Regelungen wird bis Juni 2014 vorgelegt.

Nach Artikel 45 Absatz 2 der Richtlinie 2008/118/EG legt die Kommission dem Europäischen Parlament und dem Rat bis 2015 einen Bericht über die Umsetzung der Richtlinie — einschließlich der Bestimmungen zu Fernverkäufen — vor. Ist die Kommission der Auffassung, dass die derzeitige Rechtslage geändert werden muss, werden die entsprechenden Änderungen in den Bericht einbezogen.

2. Das Ursprungslandprinzip, wonach die Verbrauchsteuer im Erwerbsmitgliedstaat erhoben wird, ist eine Ausnahme von der allgemeinen Regel, dass diese Steuer im Verbrauchsmitgliedstaat anfällt.

Da einigen Mitgliedstaaten durch die Ausdehnung dieses Prinzips auf Fernverkäufe bei den Verbrauchsteuern hohe Einnahmeausfälle entstünden, würde ein Vorschlag zur Änderung der Richtlinie 2008/118/EG in diesem Sinne nach Auffassung der Kommission zu einer unverhältnismäßig starken Wettbewerbsverzerrung im Binnenmarkt führen.

([1]) Siehe http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012264/13
to the Commission
Angelika Niebler (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Intra-Union mail order and excise goods

When excise goods (e.g. spirits) are transported from one EU Member State to another, a distinction is made between commercial transport on the one hand and transport by private individuals when travelling on the other.

Private individuals who transport these goods for their own use are subject to the country of origin principle and therefore do not have to pay more excise duty in the country of destination. For commercial transport (including intra-Union mail order), however, the country of destination principle applies, according to which the goods are not taxed until they reach the country of the consumer, according to the rates in force there — and irrespective of whether or not excise duty has already been collected in the country of departure.

Excise goods can then be sent to private individuals in other EU Member States if the mail order company has registered with the competent customs and excise authorities of the relevant EU Member State (i.e. the country of destination) and lodged a security for payment of the excise duty prior to the first consignment. After receipt of the goods by the recipient, the mail order company must pay the appropriate excise duty and can request a refund of the excise duty of the country of departure.

Delivery of excise goods to a third country is possible with considerably less effort.

1. Does the Commission agree that, for small mail order companies in particular, the shipment of excise goods to another EU Member State is only possible with a great deal of red tape?

2. Would it consider it appropriate to amend the provisions concerning taxation of excise goods to the effect that, in cases where these goods are shipped to private individuals in quantities below the threshold for own consumption, they should be taxed according to the country of origin principle?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

1. The Commission is aware that a lack of procedural harmonisation in the area of distance selling (Article 36 of Council Directive 2008/118/EC) can be costly and can represent a barrier to the free movement of goods.

The Commission has established a Project Group ([1]) consisting of the Commission and representatives of the Member States to investigate how current arrangements for fiscal compliance can be improved, particularly those based on Article 36 of Directive 2008/118/EC. An initial report on best practice under the current arrangements will be produced by June 2014.

Under Article 45(2) of Directive 2008/118/EC the Commission will submit a report to the European Parliament and the Council in 2015 on the implementation of the directive, including the provisions on distance selling. Where the Commission considers changes to the current legal situation to be necessary such changes will be included in the report.

2. The country of origin principle, charging excise duty in the Member State of purchase, is an exception to the general rule by which the excise duty is chargeable in the Member State of consumption.

Given the loss of excise revenue that some Member States would suffer if this principle were extended to distance selling the Commission is of the opinion that a proposal to change Directive 2008/118/EC in this way would risk distorting the Single Market in a disproportionate way.

([1]) see http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012672/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(8 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Ragazza yemenita bruciata viva

Il 22 ottobre alcune agenzie hanno riportato la notizia di una ragazza yemenita di 15 anni bruciata viva dal padre perché avrebbe incontrato il fidanzato prima delle nozze. La ragazza viveva nel villaggio di Chabaa, nella provincia di Taiz, sull'altopiano che occupa la zona meridionale del paese. Gli abitanti del villaggio hanno riferito che il padre l'aveva sorpresa al telefono con il fidanzato. In molte parti dello Yemen, le fedeltà e tradizioni tribali prevalgono sulle leggi emanate dal governo centrale di Sanaa. Le tradizioni tribali di alcune regioni dello Yemen vietano qualsiasi contatto tra uomo e donna prima del matrimonio, mentre la povertà e preoccupazioni legate alla salvaguardia dell'onore fanno spesso sì che i genitori cerchino di maritare le figlie ancora giovanissime. I delitti d'onore non sono rari e sono numerosi i casi di figlie, mogli e sorelle uccise dai parenti maschi per aver disonorato la famiglia.

1. Quali progetti specifici nello Yemen volti ad affrontare il problema dei delitti d'onore beneficiano di contributi UE?

2. Nello Yemen il tasso di alfabetizzazione delle donne adulte non supera il 29 %. Quali provvedimenti ha adottato o intende adottare l'UE per contribuire a migliorare il tasso di alfabetizzazione femminile nei paesi che presentano marcate disparità di genere?

3. Come valutano i funzionari UE a Sanaa la risposta del governo yemenita ai casi di delitti d'onore?

Risposta congiunta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(13 dicembre 2013)

La condizione di donne e ragazze in Yemen, che continuano a essere pesantemente discriminate e vittime di violenze, suscita grande apprensione. La disparità e la discriminazione contro le donne sono un problema strutturale in Yemen che pongono il paese all'ultimo posto del *Global Gender Gap Index* del 2012, l'indice mondiale sul divario di genere.

Questa situazione inammissibile è dettata tra le altre cose dall'assenza di un quadro giuridico adeguato a tutela di donne e ragazze. Il codice penale yemenita è tuttora particolarmente indulgente verso chi commette reati contro le donne e non considera reati numerosi «delitti d'onore», tra cui i matrimoni precoci forzati e le violenze domestiche.

La questione è stata sollevata dalla AR/VP il 14 settembre 2013 in una dichiarazione in reazione alla notizia della morte di una bambina di otto anni a seguito delle lesioni riportate durante la prima notte di nozze. L'AR/VP ha ricordato la responsabilità dell'autorità yemenite che devono assolvere agli obblighi assunti nel rispetto del diritto internazionale e creare un quadro normativo che metta fine a queste pratiche esecrabili.

Nel quadro degli strumenti tematici e bilaterali e in cooperazione con la società civile, le organizzazioni internazionali e le istituzioni pubbliche, l'UE sostiene attivamente gli sforzi volti a tutelare i diritti di donne e e a creare istituzioni giudiziarie attente ai minori. La partecipazione della società civile yemenita è fondamentale per poter ottenere progressi concreti e contrastare le tradizioni tribali, sociali, religiose e locali che alimentano la discriminazione e la violenza contro donne e ragazze.

L'Unione nutre speranze per le recenti conclusioni del gruppo di lavoro sui diritti e le libertà nel quadro della Conferenza nazionale yemenita per il dialogo, che si è espresso a favore di una quota femminile del 30 % nelle istituzioni pubbliche e del ripristino dell'età minima per i matrimoni.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012265/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(28 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Arderea fetelor în Yemen

Recent, unei fete de 15 ani din Yemen i s-a dat foc de vie de către tatăl ei pentru că a avut legături cu viitorul soț înainte de nuntă.

Arderile de vii ale fiicelor, soțiilor sau surorilor reprezintă un fenomen frecvent în Yemen, ca represalii pentru „pătarea onoarei familiei", în pofida presiunilor exercitate de organizațiile internaționale și de apărătorii drepturilor omului.

Acest eveniment regretabil survine după o serie de incidente recente în care fete din Yemen au fost ucise de membrii familiilor lor din motive similare.

Asigură Comisia finanțare în Yemen cu scopul specific de a combate violența împotriva femeilor și de a garanta că se va face dreptate?

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012271/13
adresată Comisiei (Vicepreședintelui/Înaltului Reprezentant)
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(28 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: VP/HR — Arderea fetelor în Yemen

Recent, unei fete de 15 ani din Yemen i s-a dat foc de către tatăl ei pentru că a avut legături cu viitorul soț înainte de nuntă.

Arderile de vii ale fiicelor, soțiilor sau surorilor reprezintă un fenomen frecvent în Yemen, ca represalii pentru „pătarea onoarei familiei", în pofida presiunilor exercitate de organizațiile internaționale și de apărătorii drepturilor omului.

Acest eveniment regretabil survine după o serie de incidente recente în care fete din Yemen au fost ucise de membrii familiilor lor din motive similare.

Într-o declarație recentă, Înaltul Reprezentant al Uniunii pentru afaceri externe și politica de securitate a condamnat această situație și a solicitat autorităților din Yemen să ia măsuri mai eficiente pentru protecția femeilor și a fetelor.

Cum va acționa Înaltul Reprezentant al Uniunii pentru afaceri externe și politica de securitate, prin intermediul delegației UE la Sana sau prin alte mijloace, pentru a combate aceste acte atroce de violență comise împotriva fetelor din Yemen?

Răspuns comun dat de Înaltul Reprezentant/doamna vicepreședinte Ashton în numele Comisiei
(13 decembrie 2013)

UE își exprimă îngrijorarea cu privire la situația femeilor și a fetelor din Yemen, care sunt în continuare discriminate în mare măsură și pot face obiectul violențelor. Inechitatea și discriminarea structurală a femeilor în întreaga țară a condus la cel mai mare decalaj între femei și bărbați la nivel mondial, conform Indicelui global privind disparitatea de gen (*Gender Gap Index*) pe 2012.

Unul dintre motivele acestei situații inacceptabile este lipsa unui cadru juridic adecvat pentru protecția femeilor și a fetelor. Codul penal din Yemen este în continuare deosebit de permisiv în privința persoanelor acuzate de săvârșirea de infracțiuni împotriva femeilor și nu abordează o gamă largă de crime de onoare, inclusiv căsătoria timpurie forțată și violența domestică.

Problema a fost ridicată de către IR/VP în cadrul unei declarații din data de 14 septembrie 2013, ca reacție la rapoartele cu privire la moartea unei fete de 8 ani, cauzată de leziunile suferite în noaptea nunții. ÎR/VP a reamintit de responsabilitatea autorităților yemenite de a-și respecta obligațiile ce le revin în temeiul dreptului internațional și de a institui un cadru juridic pentru a combate aceste practici înfiorătoare.

UE sprijină în mod activ eforturile de protejare a drepturile femeilor și fetelor și de a institui instituții judiciare care să apere interesele copiilor, prin intermediul instrumentelor sale bilaterale și tematice și în cooperare cu societatea civilă, cu organizațiile internaționale și cu instituțiile de stat. Implicarea populației yemenite este indispensabilă pentru realizarea de progrese concrete prin abordarea tradițiilor tribale, sociale, religioase și locale care stau la baza discriminării și violenței împotriva femeilor și fetelor.

UE este încurajată de concluziile recente ale Grupului de lucru pentru drepturi și libertăți ale Conferinței pentru dialog național din Yemen, în care s-a promovat ideea ca procentul femeilor angajate în instituțiile publice să fie de 30%, precum și reinstituirea legislației care să stabilească o vârstă minimă pentru căsătorie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012265/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Burnings of Yemeni girls

Recently a 15-year-old Yemeni girl was burnt to death by her father for being in contact with her husband-to-be before their wedding.

Burnings of daughters, wives or sisters are frequent in Yemen for 'breaching family honour', despite pressure from international organisations and human rights activists.

This regrettable event comes after a series of recent incidents involving girls in Yemen being killed by members of their families for similar reasons.

Does the Commission allocate funding to Yemen specifically to combat brutality against women and girls and to ensure that justice is served?

Question for written answer E-012271/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Burnings of Yemeni girls

Recently a 15-year-old Yemeni girl was burnt to death by her father for being in contact with her husband-to-be before their wedding.

Burnings of daughters, wives or sisters are frequent in Yemen for 'breaching family honour', despite pressure from international organisations and human rights activists.

This regrettable event comes after a series of recent incidents involving girls in Yemen being killed by members of their families for similar reasons.

In a recent statement, the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy condemned the situation and urged the Yemeni authorities to take more effective action to protect women and girls.

How will the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, either through the EU delegation in Sana'a or by other means, take action to combat such atrocious acts of violence against Yemeni girls?

Question for written answer E-012672/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(8 November 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Yemeni girl burned to death

On 22 October 2013, a number of news agencies reported the case of a 15-year-old Yemeni girl who was burned to death by her father for allegedly meeting her fiancé before their wedding. The girl lived in the village of Shabaa in the southern highland province of Taez. Villagers report that the girl's father caught her on the phone to her fiancé. In many parts of Yemen, tribal loyalties and customs take precedence over the laws of the central government in Sanaa. Tribal customs in parts of Yemen prohibit contact between men and women before marriage, whilst poverty and concern for honour often mean parents try to marry off their daughters while they are still young. Honour killings are not uncommon and there have been numerous cases of daughters, wives and sisters being killed by male relatives on the grounds of dishonouring their families.

1. Which specific projects in Yemen is the EU contributing to in order to address the problem of honour killings?

2. In Yemen currently only 29% of adult women are literate. What steps is the EU taking to help improve the literacy rates of women in countries which suffer from significant gender disparities?

3. What is the assessment of EU officials in Sanaa regarding the government's response to cases of honour killings?

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

The EU is concerned about the situation of women and girls in Yemen, who remain largely discriminated and can be subject to violence. The structural inequality and discrimination of women throughout the country has led to the highest gender gap worldwide as per the Gender Gap Index in 2012.

One of the reasons for this unacceptable situation is the absence of an appropriate legal framework for the protection of women and girls. Yemen's criminal code remains particularly lenient towards those accused of having committed crimes against women and fails to address a wide range of honour crimes, including forced early marriage and domestic violence.

The issue was raised by HR/VP in a statement dated 14 September 2013, in reaction to the reports of the death of an eight year old girl from injuries sustained on her wedding night. The HR/VP recalled the responsibility of the Yemeni authorities to abide by their obligations under International Law and put in place a legislative framework to counter the horrendous practices.

The EU is actively supporting efforts to protect the rights of women and girls and to establish child friendly judicial institutions via its thematic and bilateral instruments and in cooperation with civil society, international organisations and state institutions. The involvement of Yemenis is indispensable to achieve concrete progress by tackling the tribal, social, religious and local traditions, which are the root causes of discrimination and violence against women and girls.

The EU is encouraged by the recent conclusions of the Rights and Freedoms Working Group of Yemen's National Dialogue Conference in favour of a quota of 30% of women in Public Institutions and of the reinstatement of legislation setting a minimum age for marriage.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012267/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(28 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Virusul poliomielitic — acțiuni urgente de imunizare

În decursul acestei luni s-au descoperit două cazuri suspecte de poliomielită în Siria, cu toate că boala a fost considerată eradicată în urmă cu 14 ani în această țară.

Deși nu există tratament pentru această boală, ea poate fi prevenită prin vaccinurile de imunizare administrate copilului în doze multiple la o vârstă fragedă.

Conform Inițiativei mondiale de eradicare a poliomielitei, până în prezent s-au raportat 296 de cazuri la nivel mondial în 2013.

Organizația Mondială a Sănătății (OMS) a avertizat că în momentul de față, „din cauza situației actuale, Siria prezintă un risc ridicat în ceea ce privește poliomielita și alte boli care pot fi prevenite prin vaccinare". Având în vedere că aproape 2,2 milioane de refugiați au părăsit Siria, OMS recomandă ca toate persoanele care călătoresc în zonele infectate de poliomielită sau care provin din aceste zone să fie vaccinate în mod corespunzător.

1. Având în vedere situația actuală, este Comisia pregătită pentru acțiuni urgente de imunizare în țările învecinate Siriei? Care este poziția Comisiei în ceea ce privește statele membre UE în care refugiații provenind din zonele infectate au solicitat azil?

2. În cazul în care Comisia este de acord, în ce mod prevede să contribuie la aceste acțiuni?

Răspuns dat de dna Georgieva în numele Comisiei
(17 decembrie 2013)

Comisia urmărește îndeaproape situația din Siria și din țările vecine și este în contact permanent cu OMS și organizațiile partenere din domeniul sănătății pentru a monitoriza progresele înregistrate în cadrul activităților de vaccinare în întreaga regiune.

Sub coordonarea ministerelor sănătății, a OMS și a UNICEF, a fost pregătită o strategie de răspuns la nivel regional și sunt planificate sau în curs de elaborare campanii de vaccinare sincronizate, care vizează 22 de milioane de copii cu vârste de sub 5 ani, în Siria, Egipt, Irak, Iordania, Liban, Palestina și Turcia.

În ceea ce privește finanțarea, Comisia a fost pregătită pentru o astfel de amenințare la adresa sănătății și, prin bugetul UE destinat asistenței umanitare, a angajat deja 13,5 milioane EUR pentru OMS, de la începutul conflictului. Comisia este pregătită să își sporească sprijinul, dacă este necesar. În această etapă, valoarea totală a asistenței oferite de UE ca răspuns la criza din Siria, cu caracter umanitar și de altă natură, se ridică la peste 2 miliarde EUR.

În ceea ce privește susținerea, Comisia solicită tuturor părților implicate în conflict să asigure accesul deplin și sigur al echipelor de sănătate care participă la campania de imunizare împotriva poliomielitei din Siria. De asemenea, Comisia îndeamnă părțile implicate să ia toate măsurile necesare pentru a asigura furnizarea la timp a vaccinurilor, a echipamentelor și a materialelor de vaccinare în toată țara.

În ceea ce privește statele membre, Comisia a luat măsuri în timp util, furnizând imediat informații cu privire la epidemia de poliomielită din Siria prin sistemul de alertă al UE privind bolile transmisibile. În plus, la 21 octombrie a fost prezentată o evaluare a riscurilor, care a inclus recomandări pentru țările UE care primesc solicitanți de azil din regiune. Aceste recomandări s-au concentrat pe necesitatea de a consolida activitățile de supraveghere, de a evalua situația solicitanților de azil în ceea ce privește vaccinarea și de a asigura armonizarea deplină cu recomandările OMS privind călătoriile internaționale și sănătatea.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012267/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Polio virus — emergency immunisation activities

This month in Syria, two suspected cases of polio have been detected, although the disease was thought to have been eradicated in that country 14 years ago.

Although there is no cure for this disease, it can be prevented with immunisation vaccines given to a child in multiple doses at an early age.

According to the Global Polio Eradication Initiative, 296 cases have been reported so far worldwide in 2013.

The World Health Organisation (WHO) has warned that now 'Syria is considered at high risk for polio and other vaccine-preventable diseases due to the current situation'. With almost 2.2 million refugees having fled Syria, the WHO recommends that all travellers to and from polio-infected areas should be fully vaccinated.

1. Is the Commission prepared for emergency immunisation activities in Syria's neighbour countries in view of the current situation? What is its position regarding the EU Member States where refugees from polio-infected areas have requested asylum?

2. If the Commission agrees, how will it consider contributing to these activities?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

The Commission is closely following the situation inside Syria and neighbouring countries and is in constant contact with WHO and health partners to monitor the progress of vaccination activities throughout the region.

Under the coordination of the Ministries of Health, WHO and Unicef, a regional response strategy has been prepared and synchronized vaccination campaigns — targeting 22 million children under five- are being planned or underway in Syria, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Palestine and Turkey.

Funding-wise, the Commission was prepared for such a health scare and, through the EU humanitarian budget, has already committed EUR 13.5 million to WHO since the beginning of the conflict. The Commission stands ready to increase its support if needed. At this stage, the EU's overall assistance in response to the Syria crisis, humanitarian and other, amounts to over EUR 2 billion.

In terms of advocay, the Commission calls on all parties to the conflict to ensure safe and full access of health teams participating in the polio immunization campaign in Syria. It also urges the need to take all necessary measures for the timely delivery of vaccines and vaccination equipment and supplies countrywide.

Regarding Member States, the Commission has taken timely measures, promptly reporting on the polio outbreak in Syria through the EU alerting system on communicable diseases. Furthermore, a risk assessment was presented on 21 October, including recommendations for EU countries receiving asylum-seekers from the region. These focused on the need to reinforce surveillance activities; to assess asylum-seekers' vaccination status on arrival and provide polio vaccination as needed; to fully align with WHO International Travel and Health recommendations.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012268/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(28 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Finanțarea eradicării poliomielitei

Poliomielita este o boală virală incurabilă care atacă sistemul nervos provocând în câteva ore o paralizie ireversibilă pe viață. Deși nu există tratament pentru această boală, ea poate fi prevenită prin vaccinurile de imunizare administrate copilului în doze multiple la o vârstă fragedă.

Cu toate că la un moment dat poliomielita a fost eradicată la nivel mondial, în prezent ea a redevenit endemică în trei țări (Afganistan, Nigeria și Pakistan), cazuri sporadice fiind raportate din când în când în alte locuri. Conform Inițiativei mondiale de eradicare a poliomielitei, până în prezent s-au raportat 296 de cazuri la nivel mondial în 2013.

La începutul acestui an, IMEP a lansat Planul strategic de eradicare definitivă a poliomielitei pentru perioada 2013-2018, având un buget prevăzut de 5,5 miliarde USD, cu obiectivul de a eradica boala pentru a doua oară în istorie.

Comisia a acordat 6,5 miliarde USD acestui plan cu ocazia Summitului mondial privind vaccinarea care a avut loc la Abu Dhabi în aprilie 2013, la care a participat președintele Barroso.

1. Prin intermediul cărui instrument financiar prevede Comisia să acorde această finanțare?

2. Este pregătită Comisia să majoreze suma respectivă în cazul în care este necesar? În ce măsură?

Răspuns dat de dl Piebalgs în numele Comisiei
(10 decembrie 2013)

1) Instrumentul de cooperare pentru dezvoltare va furniza resursele financiare necesare pentru îndeplinirea angajamentului de finanțare a Planului strategic aferent perioadei 2013-2018 care a fost lansat de Inițiativa mondială de eradicare a poliomielitei.

2) Nu există posibilitatea de a majora suma alocată nici din Instrumentul de cooperare pentru dezvoltare, nici din cel de al 10-lea Fond european de dezvoltare.

Cu toate acestea, astfel cum a subliniat președintele Barroso în urma conferinței de la Abu Dhabi, contribuția Comisiei Europene la actualul efort de eradicare a poliomielitei va fi structurată pe două niveluri.

La nivel de țară, în Nigeria și în Afganistan (două din cele trei țări în care poliomielita este endemică), Comisia are în vedere consolidarea sistemului de sănătate și a infrastructurii, acestea constituind principalele componente vizate de măsurile necesare în vederea îndeplinirii obiectivului de eradicare a poliomielitei.

În plus, Comisia intenționează să completeze sprijinul pe care îl acordă sistemului de imunizare prin creșterea finanțării alocate Alianței mondiale pentru vaccinuri și imunizare (GAVI).

De asemenea, Comisia dorește să invite distinsa deputată în Parlamentul European să consulte răspunsurile sale la întrebările anterioare E-011670/2012 și E-001491/2013 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012268/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Funding the eradication of polio

Polio is an incurable viral disease that attacks the nervous system, causing irreversible lifelong paralysis within a few hours. While there is no cure for this disease, it can be prevented with immunisation vaccines given to children in multiple doses in their early years.

Although, at one stage, polio had been eradicated worldwide, it is now once again endemic in three countries (Afghanistan, Nigeria and Pakistan), and sporadic cases occur from time to time elsewhere. According to the Global Polio Eradication Initiative (GPEI), 296 cases have so far been reported globally in 2013.

At the beginning of this year, GPEI launched the Polio Eradication and Endgame Strategic Plan 2013-2018, with a projected budget of USD 5.5 billion, aimed at eradicating the disease for the second time in history.

The Commission pledged USD 6.5 million to the plan at the Global Vaccine Summit in Abu Dhabi in April 2013, which President Barroso attended.

1. From which financing instrument does the Commission plan to source this funding?

2. Is the Commission ready to increase the amount if necessary? To what extent?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2013)

1. The Development Cooperation Instrument will provide the financial resources for the pledge of funding to the Global Polio Eradication Initiative (GPEI) Strategic Plan 2013-2018.

2. There is no possibility of increasing this amount either from the DCI or the 10th EDF.

However, as underlined by the President Barroso in the wake of the Abu Dhabi conference, the European Commission's future contribution to the current eradication effort will operate at two levels.

At country level, in Nigeria and Afghanistan (two of the three polio endemic countries), the Commission envisages strengthening health systems and infrastructure, which are at the core of the polio eradication objective.

In addition, the Commission intends to complement its support to the immunization system by increasing funding to the Global Alliance for Vaccine and Immunization (GAVI).

The Commission also refers the Honourable Member to the answers given to previous questions E-011670/2012 and E-001491/2013. ([1])

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

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012269/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(28 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Securitatea porturilor și a comerțului în lumina vulnerabilităților sistemelor de identificare automată

Societatea japoneză Trend Micro, activă în domeniul securității cibernetice, a publicat la 15 octombrie 2013 un raport în care erau identificate o serie de deficiențe grave în materie de securitate în ceea ce privește sistemele de identificare automată a navelor maritime (AIS), utilizate pentru a detecta locația și a identifica conținutul navelor comerciale. Societatea a constatat că aceste sisteme sunt vulnerabile în fața atacurilor informatice, fiind astfel posibil să se modifice datele privind locația navelor, să se introducă date false privind nave inexistente, să se lanseze false apeluri de tip „om la apă" și să se afișeze informații privind conținutul unei nave. Astfel de probleme de securitate pot să facă porturile din UE vulnerabile în fața traficului de produse ilegale și pot să submineze siguranța navelor statelor membre, prin creșterea gradului de risc asociat cu pirateria.

1. Ce măsuri va lua Comisia pentru a reevalua politica comună de securitate și de apărare în ceea ce privește securitatea cibernetică a porturilor din UE, astfel încât să se țină seama de amenințările emergente și aflate în continuă schimbare din domeniul securității cibernetice, vizând, în special, porturile și navele din UE?

2. Este obligatoriu pentru toate navele comerciale construite în UE sau care au un port de escală într-un stat membru al UE să dețină un sistem de identificare automată (AIS)? Ce sugestii poate face Comisia pentru a îmbunătăți sistemele utilizate, astfel încât să se ofere o protecție sporită porturilor și navelor din UE împotriva atacurilor cibernetice și a manipulării datelor?

Răspuns dat de dl Kallas în numele Comisiei
(20 decembrie 2013)

1. În conformitate cu propunerea de directivă a Comisiei privind măsuri de asigurare a unui nivel comun ridicat de securitate a rețelelor și a informației în Uniune ([1]), transportatorii maritimi și porturile adoptă măsuri adecvate de gestionare a riscurilor legate de securitatea cibernetică și raportează incidentele semnificative autorităților naționale competente.

De asemenea, se estimează că vor fi utile și recomandările privind cele mai bune practici în materie de securitate cibernetică, oferite de platforma public-privată pentru securitatea rețelelor și a informației ([2]), anunțată de strategia în materie de securitate cibernetică a Uniunii Europene ([3]).

2. În conformitate cu Directiva 2002/59/CE ([4]), toate navele comerciale cu un tonaj brut de 300 tone trebuie să fie dotate cu transpondere AIS, care să pună în aplicare obligațiile care decurg din Convenția internațională pentru ocrotirea vieții omenești pe mare (SOLAS) la nivel internațional și care sunt aplicabile oricărui tip de navă, indiferent de pavilion, care face escală într-un port din UE.

Deși Comisia împărtășește preocuparea cu privire la eventualele „atacuri cibernetice" care pot submina robustețea instrumentelor de navigație, astfel de sisteme sunt însă, în esență, instrumente de sprijin; responsabilitatea este în primul rând a comandantului și a echipajului de punte. Navigarea navei, chiar și fără sprijinul unor instrumente sofisticate, rămâne de o importanță majoră în orice situație, inclusiv în cazul eventualelor „atacuri cibernetice".

Comisia sprijină lucrările privind standardele pentru e-navigație și securitatea acesteia, prin:

— sistemul de identificare și de urmărire la mare distanță ([5]) (*Long Range Identification and Tracking* — LRIT) dezvoltat de OMI pentru aspectele specifice ale securității maritime, care poate fi folosit ca sistem complementar ([6]), în cazul în care semnalele AIS suferă interferențe.

([1]) COM(2013) 48 final. Se face referire în special la articolul 14 și la lista operatorilor de piață din anexa II.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/nis-platform-kick-meeting-working-groups
([3]) JOIN(2013) 1 final.
([4]) JO L 2008, 5.8.2002, cf. articolul 6.
([5]) EMSA operează Centru de date cooperativ LRIT UE, care cuprinde peste 35 de țări. De asemenea, Agenția găzduiește și schimbul internațional de date pentru schimbul de date privind pozițiile navelor între centrele LRIT din întreaga lume. Acest lucru rezultă din configurația inițială în cadrul OMI în scopul combaterii terorismului și a amenințărilor teroriste pe mare.
([6]) Sistemul AIS (sistem de transmisie radio deschis, utilizat pentru siguranța navigației) este dublat de sistemul LRIT (un sistem securizat, punct la punct, utilizat în scopuri de securitate).

— UE a finanțat proiecte precum ACCSEAS ([7]), care investighează aspectele legate de reziliența sistemelor PNT ([8]) și dezvoltarea de tehnologie care să contracareze amenințarea blocării sistemelor GPS.

([7]) Accessibility for Shipping, Efficiency Advantages and Sustainability, http://www.accseas.eu/
([8]) Positioning, Navigation and Timing.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012269/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Port and trade security in light of AIS vulnerabilities

Japanese cyber-defence company Trend Micro released a report on 15 October 2013 which identified serious security flaws in maritime automatic identification systems (AIS) used to track the location and contents of commercial vessels. The company found that the systems can be rather easily hacked, allowing the location of vessels to be altered, non-existent vessels added, fake 'man overboard' calls made, and information on a vessel's contents displayed. Such security issues can make EU ports vulnerable to illegal goods smuggling and risks the safety of Member State vessels by making them more susceptible to piracy threats.

1. How will the Commission re-evaluate the Common Security and Defence Policy in the area of cyber security for EU ports to reflect emerging and ever-changing cyber-security threats, notably with regard to threats posed to EU ports and vessels?

2. Are all commercial vessels built in the EU or with a port of call in an EU Member State required to have an AIS? What suggestions can the Commission make to improve the systems used in order to better protect EU ports and vessels from cyber attacks and manipulations?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(20 December 2013)

1. According to the Commission's proposal for a directive concerning measures to ensure a high level of network and information security across the Union ([1]), maritime carriers as well as ports adopt appropriate measures to manage cybersecurity risks and report significant incidents to the competent national authorities.

It is also expected that the recommendations on cybersecurity best practices delivered by the Public-Private Platform on network and information security ([2]), as announced in the Cybersecurity strategy of the European Union ([3]), will be of assistance.

2. In accordance with Directive 2002/59/EC ([4]), all commercial vessels of 300 gross tonnes must be equipped with AIS transponders, implementing obligations stemming from the Safety of Life at Sea Convention (SOLAS) at international level and applicable to any vessel irrespective of flag, calling at an EU port.

While the Commission shares the concern about possible 'cyber attacks' with the potential to undermine the robustness of navigation tools, such systems are however essentially support tools; the first line of responsibility is with the Master and the crew on the bridge. Navigating the vessel, also without the support of sophisticated tools remains of utmost importance in any situation including possible 'cyber attacks'.

The Commission supports work on standards for, and security of, e-navigation through:

— the Long Range Identification and Tracking ([5]) (LRIT) system developed in IMO for the specific aspects of maritime security which may be used as a complimentary system ([6]), should AIS signals be subject to interference.

— EU funded projects such as ACCSEAS ([7]), looking into the issue of resilient PNT systems ([8]) and the pursuit of technology to counter the threat of GPS jamming.

([1]) COM(2013) 48 final. Reference is made in particular to Article 14 and to the list of market operators laid down in Annex II.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/nis-platform-kick-meeting-working-groups
([3]) JOIN(2013) 1 final.
([4]) OJ L 2008, 5.8.2002, cf Article 6.
([5]) EMSA operates the EU LRJT cooperative Data Centre, covering over 35 countries. The Agency also hosts the International Data. Exchange for the Exchange of ship positions between LRIT data Centres around the world. This stems from the original set up. In IMO for the purposes of counteracting terrorism, and threats of terrorism, at sea.
([6]) The AIS system (open radio broadcast system used for safety of navigation) is doubled by the LRIT system (a secured, point-to-point system used for security purposes).
([7]) Accessibility for Shipping, Efficiency Advantages and Sustainability, http://www.accseas.eu/
([8]) Positioning, Navigation and Timing.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012272/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(28 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Prelungirea de către Bulgaria a interdicției privind vânzarea terenurilor către străini

În data de 22 octombrie, parlamentul bulgar a prelungit interdicția vânzării terenurilor agricole către străini până în 2020. Comisia este rugată să se pronunțe în ceea ce privește conformitatea cu Tratatul a acestei decizii.

Răspuns dat de domnul Barnier în numele Comisiei
(20 decembrie 2013)

În conformitate cu Tratatul de aderare din 2005, perioada de tranziție în care Bulgaria poate să mențină restricții discriminatorii în ceea ce privește achiziția de terenuri agricole de către resortisanți și persoane juridice din alte state membre ale UE (SEE) expiră la 31 decembrie 2013. Tratatul de aderare nu prevede posibilitatea prelungirii acestei perioade. Prin urmare, începând de la această dată, legislația bulgară privind achiziția de terenuri agricole trebuie să se conformeze legislației UE, în special dispozițiilor privind libera circulație a capitalurilor.

La 22 octombrie 2013, Parlamentul bulgar a adoptat o decizie prin care a delegat Consiliului de Miniștri competența de a adopta măsuri în vederea declarării unui moratoriu, până la 1 ianuarie 2020, asupra achiziției de terenuri agricole în Bulgaria de către persoane fizice și persoane juridice străine. Comisia înțelege că, în prezent, constituționalitatea deciziei respective este examinată de către Curtea Constituțională a Bulgariei. Totuși, în cazul în care Bulgaria continuă să interzică și după 1 ianuarie 2014 achiziționarea de terenuri agricole de către resortisanții și persoanele juridice din UE/SEE, măsurile respective vor trebui să fie examinate din perspectiva conformității lor cu prevederile legislației UE, în special cele referitoare la libera circulație a capitalurilor.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012272/13
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Bulgaria's extension of ban on sale of land to foreigners

On 22 October the Bulgarian Parliament extended the ban on the sale of arable land to foreigners until 2020. Can the Commission give its view as to this decision's compliance with the Treaty?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(20 December 2013)

According to the 2005 Accession Treaty the transitional period allowing Bulgaria to maintain discriminatory restrictions on the acquisition of agricultural land by nationals and legal persons of other EU (EEA) Member States expires on 31 December 2013. The Accession Treaty does not provide for any possibility to extend this period. Thus, as from that date Bulgarian legislation on the acquisition of agricultural land has to comply with EC law, in particular with the provisions on free movement of capital.

On 22 October 2013 the Bulgarian Parliament adopted a decision delegating the power to the Council of Ministers to adopt measures to declare a moratorium on the acquisition of agricultural land in Bulgaria by foreigners and foreign legal entities until 1 January 2020. The Commission understands that the decision is currently under review by the Bulgarian Constitutional Court. If, however, Bulgaria continues to prohibit the acquisition of agricultural land for EU/EEA nationals and legal entities after 1 January 2014, its measures will need to be assessed under EC law provisions, in particular those relating to free movement of capital.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012273/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(28 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Derularea PEAD în România

În derularea Programului european de ajutorare a persoanelor defavorizate (PEAD) în România au fost identificate o serie de deficienţe. Astfel, cantităţile şi tipurile de alimente distribuite sunt diferite în cazul fiecărui beneficiar; alimentele sunt de calitate inferioară; în unele cazuri, alimentele sunt distribuite cu foarte puţin timp înainte de data expirării termenului de valabilitate. Comisia este rugată să precizeze care sunt mijloacele legale de soluţionare a acestor deficienţe, reclamate în mod repetat de cei 350 000 de beneficiari români ai PEAD.

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloş în numele Comisiei
(5 decembrie 2013)

Cerinţele privind produsele alimentare ce urmează să fie livrate în cadrul Programului european de ajutorare a persoanelor defavorizate, cum ar fi cele referitoare la calitatea sau data expirării produselor alimentare respective, vor fi stabilite în contractul încheiat între operator şi Agenţia Română de Plăţi (APIA). În cazul în care există suspiciuni întemeiate cu privire la nerespectarea obligaţiilor contractuale de către operator, Comisia îl invită pe distinsul membru să consulte răspunsul la întrebarea scrisă E-010691/2013 ([1]) , referitor la responsabilităţile autorităţilor din statele membre şi în special la posibila cale de atac aflată sub jurisdicţia serviciilor locale de anchetă şi a instanţelor locale.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012273/13
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Implementation of PEAD in Romania

A number of deficiencies have been identified during the implementation of the European Food Aid Programme for the Most Deprived (PEAD) in Romania. This includes such things as the quantities and types of food distributed varying for each beneficiary and food being of inferior quality. In some cases, food is distributed a very short time before its shelf-life expiry date. Can the Commission explain what legal remedies are being used to rectify these deficiencies, which have been reported repeatedly by the 350 000 beneficiaries of PEAD in Romania?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2013)

The requirements on food products to be delivered in the framework of the Most Deprived Programme of the EU, such as the quality or expiry date of the food products, shall be defined in the contract concluded between the operator and the Romanian Paying Agency (APIA). In case of reasonable suspicion that the operator failed to respect its obligations arising from this contract, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-010691/2013 ([1]) on the responsibilities of Member State authorities and, in particular, the possible legal remedy falling into the jurisdiction of the local investigative authorities and the local Courts.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012274/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(28 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Virusul poliomielitic amenință din nou Europa

Centrul European de Prevenire și Control al Bolilor a transmis recent o avertizare rapidă, în care atenționează că în Siria au fost depistate cazuri de paralizie la copii din cauza poliomielitei. Riscul de revenire a bolii în Europa este extrem de mare, în condițiile în care foarte mulți refugiați sirieni se stabilesc în țările europene. Statisticile arată că 10 % din copiii nevaccinați care contractează boala mor, alți 15 % rămân cu paralizii severe pe tot parcursul vieții, iar 25 % rămân cu paralizii moderate.

În aceste condiții:

1. Ce măsuri prevede Comisia pentru a preveni răspândirea acestui virus în Europa?

2. Intenționează Comisia să impulsioneze statele membre să garanteze imunizarea la timp a tuturor nou-născuților împotriva acestei boli necruțătoare?

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(19 decembrie 2013)

Comisia monitorizează îndeaproape situația privind poliomielita în Siria, împreună cu Centrul European de Prevenire și Control al Bolilor (ECDC) și Organizația Mondială a Sănătății. La 19 octombrie 2013, Comisia a informat statele membre cu privire la izbucnirea epidemiei și a convocat o reuniune, la 21 octombrie 2013, pentru a discuta despre posibile acțiuni coordonate care trebuie întreprinse la nivelul UE.

UE, în temeiul Deciziei 1082/2013/CE ([1]) a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului, urmărește să consolideze coordonarea capacității de reacție la amenințările transfrontaliere grave la adresa sănătății, inclusiv o posibilă răspândire a virusului poliomielitic în UE, ca o consecință a situației din Siria.

Comisia organizează consultări periodice cu statele membre, prin intermediul Comitetului pentru securitate sanitară, pentru a sprijini schimbul de informații și pentru a coordona posibile măsuri la nivelul Uniunii care au drept scop reducerea la minimum a riscului răspândirii virusului poliomielitic în UE.

În prezent, pe baza consultărilor și evaluărilor realizate de OMS și ECDC, riscul reintroducerii poliomielitei în UE este scăzut. Statele membre par a fi bine pregătite și, de exemplu, au întărit măsurile de monitorizare a prezenței virusului în aer și la oameni, au activat laboratoarele naționale care se ocupă cu virusul poliomielitic și au informat personalul medical și călătorii. Imunizarea este de competența statelor membre și, în baza informațiilor comunicate prin intermediul Comitetului pentru securitate sanitară, vaccinarea împotriva poliomielitei este pusă în aplicare în mod eficient la nivel național.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:293:0001:0015:EN:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012274/13
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Recurring threat of polio virus in Europe

The European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control has recently issued an urgent warning, highlighting that cases of paralysis have been detected in children in Syria due to polio. There is an extremely high risk of the disease recurring in Europe, at a time when a huge number of Syrian refugees are settling in European countries. According to the statistics, 10% of unvaccinated children who contract the disease die, another 15% remain severely paralysed throughout their lives, while 25% remain with moderate paralysis.

In these circumstances:

1. What measures does the Commission envisage in order to prevent the spread of this virus in Europe?

2. Does the Commission intend to make Member States guarantee the timely immunisation of all newborn infants against this cruel condition?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

The Commission is monitoring closely the situation of polio in Syria, with the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) and the World Health Organisation. On 19 October 2013, the Commission informed the EU Member States about the outbreak and convened a meeting on 21 October 2013 to discuss possible coordinated actions to be taken at EU level.

The EU, under Decision 1082/2013/EC ([1]) of the European Parliament and of the Council aims to strengthen coordination of response to serious cross-border threats to health, including the case of possible spread of poliovirus in the Union as a consequence of the situation in Syria.

The Commission organises regular consultations with the Member States through the Health Security Committee to support the exchange of information and to coordinate possible measures at Union level to minimise the risk of the spread of poliovirus in the EU.

Currently, on the basis of consultations and of the WHO and ECDC assessment, the risk for reintroducing poliomyelitis in the EU appears low. Member States appear well prepared and have, for example, reinforced measures to monitor the presence of poliovirus in the environment and in persons; activated the national laboratories on poliovirus; and informed healthcare workers and travellers. Immunisation is a national competence and on the basis of the information shared through the Health Security Committee it appears that vaccination against poliovirus is implemented efficiently at national level.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:293:0001:0015:EN:PDF

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012275/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(28 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Redactarea programelor naționale de dezvoltare rurală în statele membre

Comisia este rugată să furnizeze următoarele informații:

În redactarea programelor naționale de dezvoltare rurală pentru perioada 2007-2013, câte dintre statele membre au contractat acest proces de redactare cu societăți comerciale sau alte tipuri de structuri private, respectiv câte au realizat aceste documente prin instituțiile de stat competente?

Răspuns dat de domnul Cioloş în numele Comisiei
(3 decembrie 2013)

Organizarea procesului de redactare a programelor naționale și regionale de dezvoltare rurală este responsabilitatea exclusivă a statelor membre. Comisia nu dispune de informații statistice privind acest proces. Cu toate acestea, ar trebui subliniat faptul că autoritatea de gestionare și, prin urmare, instituția guvernamentală poartă întreaga răspundere pentru conținutul și gestionarea programului, indiferent dacă a fost sau nu sprijinită în redactarea lui de o societate comercială.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012275/13
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Drafting national rural development programmes in Member States

Can the Commission provide the following information?

When drafting their national rural development programmes for the 2007-2013 period, how many Member States outsourced the drafting process to commercial companies or other types of private organisations, and how many deployed the relevant government institutions to produce these documents?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2013)

The organisation of the process to draft national and regional rural development programmes is the sole responsibility of the Member States. The Commission does not have any statistical information on this process. It should however be underlined that the Managing Authority and therefore the government insitution bears all responsibility for the content and management of the programme, independently from the fact that it might have been assisted by a commercial company in its preparation.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012276/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(28 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Definiția „condițiilor artificiale" prevăzute de Regulamentul nr. 65/2011

La articolul 4 alineatul (8) din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 65/2011 al Comisiei de stabilire a normelor de punere în aplicare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1698/2005 al Consiliului în ceea ce privește punerea în aplicare a procedurilor de control și a ecocondiționalității în cazul măsurilor de sprijin pentru dezvoltare rurală se precizează următoarele: „Fără a aduce atingere dispozițiilor speciale, nu se efectuează nicio plată către beneficiari în cazul cărora s-a stabilit că au creat în mod artificial condițiile necesare pentru a obține aceste plăți în scopul obținerii unui avantaj care contravine obiectivelor schemei de ajutor".

După cum se poate observa, definirea „condițiilor artificiale" este generică și principială, neexistând nicio detaliere a acestor „condiții artificiale", precizându-se doar interdicția de a nu contraveni obiectivelor măsurii/schemei de ajutor.

Comisia este rugată să clarifice această chestiune cu impact asupra potențialilor beneficiari și să furnizeze o definiție clară a acestor „condiții artificiale".

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloş în numele Comisiei
(10 decembrie 2013)

Comisia nu a oferit și nu intenționează să ofere o definiție clară, lipsită de ambiguități privind clauza de eludare „creată artificial", utilizată în Regulamentul (UE) nr. 65/2011 ([1]), întrucât conceptul este mult prea specific contextului. În același fel, articolul 62 din proiectul de regulament privind finanțarea, gestionarea și monitorizarea politicii agricole comune ([2]) prevede că, fără a aduce atingere dispozițiilor specifice, nu se acordă niciun avantaj prevăzut în cadrul legislației sectoriale agricole în favoarea unei persoane fizice sau juridice în privința căreia s-a stabilit că condițiile cerute în vederea obținerii acestor avantaje au fost create în mod artificial, contrar obiectivelor legislației respective.

Această poziție este sprijinită de Curtea de Justiție care, în recenta sa hotărâre privind clauza de eludare (Cauza C-434/12), a reamintit faptul că decizia privind o eventuală practică abuzivă din partea unui operator poate fi stabilită combinând două elemente: circumstanțele obiective în care scopul normelor nu este îndeplinit, în pofida respectării formale a condițiilor prevăzute de legislația UE și un element subiectiv constând în intenția de a obține un avantaj.

În primul rând, în ceea ce privește elementul obiectiv, Curtea a constatat faptul că trebuie să se examineze dacă scopul schemei de ajutor în cauză poate fi atins. În al doilea rând, în ceea ce privește elementul subiectiv, Curtea a considerat că trebuie examinat conținutul real și importanța cererii de ajutor în litigiu. Prin urmare, fiecare beneficiar trebuie să facă obiectul unei analize separate și individuale, întrucât cele două elemente introduse de Curtea de Justiție trebuie să fie examinate pe baza meritelor și particularităților fiecărui caz în parte.

([1]) JO L 25, 28.1.2011.
([2]) COM (2011) 628 final/2.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012276/13
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Definition of 'artificial conditions' laid down by Regulation (EU) No 65/2011

Article 4(8) of Commission Regulation (EU) No 65/2011 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005, as regards the implementation of control procedures as well as cross-compliance in respect of rural development support measures, stipulates the following: 'Without prejudice to specific provisions, no payments shall be made to beneficiaries for whom it is established that they artificially created the conditions required for obtaining such payments with a view to obtaining an advantage contrary to the objectives of the support scheme.'

As can be seen, a generic, abstract definition is given of 'artificial conditions', without mentioning any details of what these 'artificial conditions' are, stating only that it is prohibited to breach the objectives of the support measure/scheme.

Can the Commission clarify this issue, which has an impact on potential beneficiaries, and provide a clear definition of these 'artificial conditions'?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2013)

The Commission has not, and is not planning to provide a clear, unambiguous definition of the circumvention clause 'artificially created' used in Regulation (EU) No 65/2011 ([1]), as the concept is too context specific. Similarly, Article 62 of the draft regulation on the financing, management and monitoring of the common agricultural policy ([2]) states that without prejudice to specific provisions, no advantage provided for under the sectoral agricultural legislation shall be granted in favour of a natural or legal person in respect of whom it is established that the conditions required for obtaining such advantages were created artificially, contrary to the objectives of that legislation.

This position is supported by the Court of Justice which, in its recent judgment on the circumvention clause (Case C-434/12), reminded that an abusive practice of an operator could be established by a combination of two elements: objective circumstances in which the purpose of the rules is not achieved despite formal observance of the conditions laid down in EU legislation, and a subjective element consisting in the intention to obtain an advantage

First, as regards the objective element, the Court noted that it must be examined whether the purpose of the support scheme at stake can be achieved. Secondly, in relation to the subjective element, the Court held that the real substance and significance of the disputed aid application should be examined. Therefore, every beneficiary must be subject to a separate and individual analysis as the two elements introduced by the Court should be examined on the merits and particularities of each case.

([1]) OJ L 25, 28.1.2011.
([2]) COM(2011) 628 final/2.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012277/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 octobre 2013)

Objet: Déchets marins

Les mers et les océans deviennent progressivement les décharges de la planète; les déchets plastiques représentent 80 % des immenses plaques de déchets qui flottent dans les océans Atlantique et Pacifique et entraînent la mort de nombreuses espèces marines.

Lors de la conférence Rio + 20 sur le développement durable, un engagement a été pris au niveau mondial pour l'adoption de mesures visant, d'ici à 2025, à «réduire significativement le volume des déchets marins et prévenir ainsi les dommages au milieu côtier et marin».

Environ 10 millions de tonnes de déchets finissent chaque année dans les mers et les océans du globe. Le terme «déchets marins» couvre une gamme de matériaux ayant été délibérément jetés ou accidentellement perdus sur le littoral ou en mer, et inclut également les matériaux qui proviennent des terres, des rivières, des systèmes d'évacuation et d'assainissement ou qui sont portés par le vent. Il s'agit souvent de matériaux solides manufacturés et transformés persistants, tels que le plastique, le verre et le métal.

1. Comment la Commission compte-t-elle fixer un objectif de réduction quantitatif prioritaire à l'échelle de l'Union pour les déchets marins, comme le préconise le 7e programme d'action pour l'environnement récemment adopté?

2. La Commission dispose-t-elle de chiffres sur la masse de ce type de déchets en Europe et dans le monde?

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

La Commission analyse actuellement, dans le cadre plus vaste de ses travaux sur l'économie circulaire, les options envisageables dans la perspective d'un objectif de réduction des déchets marins. Le réexamen des objectifs de la directive-cadre relative aux déchets ([1]), de la directive concernant la mise en décharge des déchets ([2]) et de la directive relative aux emballages et aux déchets d'emballages ([3]) contribuera à ce processus.

La grande majorité des déchets marins sont d'origine tellurique, et la méthode la plus efficace consisterait à s'attaquer à ce problème à la source. C'est pourquoi la Commission a adopté récemment une proposition modifiant la directive relative aux emballages et aux déchets d'emballages ([4]) en vue de réduire l'utilisation des sacs en plastique légers, qui posent un problème particulier dans le milieu marin (voir le deuxième considérant). En ce qui concerne la directive-cadre établissant la stratégie pour le milieu marin ([5]), les États membres sont tenus, en vertu de l'article 10 de cette directive, de définir des objectifs environnementaux concernant spécifiquement les déchets marins ([6]). La Commission n'a pas l'intention de modifier cette directive.

Il existe peu de données fiables sur les quantités de déchets présentes dans le milieu marin. Dans le cas des mers et des océans de l'UE, la directive-cadre établissant la stratégie pour le milieu marin fait obligation aux États membres de mettre en place, au plus tard en octobre 2014, un programme de surveillance des déchets marins. Pour chaque mer régionale, une vue d'ensemble des sources actuelles de données sur les déchets marins est disponible dans le document thématique publié pour la Conférence internationale sur la prévention et la gestion des déchets marins dans les eaux européennes ([7]), organisée conjointement par la Commission et le gouvernement allemand en avril 2013.

([1]) Directive 2008/98/CE.
([2]) Directive 99/31/CE.
([3]) Directive 94/62/CE.
([4]) COM(2013) 761 final.
([5]) Directive 2008/56/CE.
([6]) Décision 2010/477/UE de la Commission.
([7]) http://www.marine-litter-conference-berlin.info/

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012357/13
adresată Comisiei
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(30 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Modificări propuse la legislația privind deșeurile marine

Un raport recent al Institutului pentru politica europeană în domeniul mediului, intitulat „Cum să îmbunătățim legislația UE pentru a aborda deșeurile marine", prezintă o serie de sugestii practice de reducere a deșeurilor marine ([1]).

1. Intenționează Comisia să propună modificări la Directiva-cadru „Strategia pentru mediul marin" pentru a introduce obiective cantitative la nivelul UE pentru reducerea deșeurilor marine?

2. Intenționează Comisia să introducă trimiteri specifice la deșeurile marine în legislația relevantă, cum ar fi Directiva-cadru privind deșeurile, Directiva privind ambalajele și deșeurile de ambalaje, Directiva privind vehiculele scoase din uz și Directiva privind deșeurile de echipamente electrice și electronice?

Răspuns comun dat de dl Potočnik în numele Comisiei
(13 decembrie 2013)

În prezent, în cadrul activităților sale mai ample cu privire la economia circulară, Comisia analizează opțiuni pentru stabilirea unui obiectiv în domeniul deșeurilor marine. Revizuirea obiectivelor fixate în Directiva privind deșeurile ([2]), Directiva privind depozitele de deșeuri ([3]) și Directiva privind ambalajele și deșeurile de ambalaje ([4]) va susține acest proces.

Marea majoritate a deșeurilor marine provine de pe uscat și cea mai eficientă modalitate de abordare este de a acționa la sursă. Prin urmare, Comisia a adoptat recent o propunere de modificare a Directivei privind ambalajele și deșeurile de ambalaje ([5]), care vizează reducerea utilizării pungilor de plastic fine, care constituie o problemă deosebită pentru mediul marin (a se vedea considerentul 2). În ceea ce privește Directiva-cadru privind strategia pentru mediul marin ([6]), trebuie să fie stabilite obiective de mediu specifice de către statele membre, în conformitate cu articolul 10 din această directivă ([7]). Comisia nu intenționează să modifice această directivă.

Există puține date fiabile privind cantitățile de deșeuri din mediul marin. Pentru mările UE, Directiva-cadru privind strategia pentru mediul marin prevede obligația statelor membre de a stabili monitorizarea deșeurilor marine până în octombrie 2014. Un rezumat al surselor actuale, incluzând informații privind deșeurile marine, este disponibil, pentru mări regionale, în documentul tematic publicat pentru Conferința internațională privind prevenirea și gestionarea deșeurilor marine în mările europene ([8]), organizată de Comisie, în parteneriat cu guvernul german, în aprilie 2013.

([1]) http://www.ieep.eu/publications/2013/10/how-to-improve-eu-legislation-to-tackle-marine-litter
([2]) Directiva 2008/98/CE.
([3]) Directiva 99/31/CE.
([4]) Directiva 94/62/CE.
([5]) COM(2013) 761.
([6]) Directiva 2008/56/CE.
([7]) Decizia 2010/477/UE a Comisiei.
([8]) http://www.marine-litter-conference-berlin.info/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012277/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Marine litter

Seas and oceans are gradually becoming the world's rubbish dumps; plastic waste accounts for 80% of the huge clusters of litter that float in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, resulting in the deaths of many marine species.

At the Rio + 20 conference on sustainable development, world leaders committed to adopting measures that aim to 'significantly reduce the volume of marine litter and thus prevent damage to coastal and marine environments' by 2025.

An estimated 10 million tonnes of waste end up in the planet's seas and oceans every year. The term 'marine litter' covers a range of materials that have been deliberately thrown or accidentally lost along the coast or in the sea. It also includes materials that come from soil, rivers, drainage and sewerage systems or that are carried by the wind. It is often made up of solid, durable man-made and processed materials, such as plastic, glass and metal.

1. Does the Commission plan to set an EU-wide quantitative objective for reducing marine litter as a priority, as recommended in the recently adopted 7th Environment Action Programme?

2. Does the Commission have any figures on the quantity of this type of waste in Europe and the rest of the world?

Question for written answer E-012357/13
to the Commission
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: Suggested modifications to legislation on marine litter

A recent report by the Institute for European Environmental Policy entitled 'How to improve EU legislation to tackle marine litter', puts forward a number of practical suggestions to reduce marine litter ([1]).

1. Does the Commission intend to propose modifications to the Marine Framework Strategy Directive in order to introduce EU-wide quantitative targets for marine litter reduction?

2. Does the Commission intend to introduce specific references to marine litter in relevant legislation, such as the Waste Framework Directive, the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive, the End of Life Vehicles Directive and the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Directive?

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

The Commission is currently analysing options for a marine litter target as part of its wider work on the circular economy. The review of the targets of the Waste Framework Directive ([2]), the Landfill Directive ([3]) and the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive ([4]) will support this process.

A vast majority of marine litter originates on land, and the most effective way to deal with it is at source. The Commission therefore recently adopted a proposal amending the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive ([5]), aimed at reducing use of lightweight plastic bags, which are a particular problem in the marine environment (see Recital 2). As regards the Marine Strategy Framework Directive ([6]), specific environmental targets for marine litter must be set by the Member States in line with Article 10 of that directive ([7]). The Commission does not intend to modify this directive.

([1]) http://www.ieep.eu/publications/2013/10/how-to-improve-eu-legislation-to-tackle-marine-litter
([2]) Directive 2008/98/EC.
([3]) Directive 99/31/EC.
([4]) Directive 94/62/EC.
([5]) COM(2013) 761.
([6]) Directive 2008/56/EC.
([7]) Commission Decision 2010/477/EU.

Reliable data on quantities of litter in the marine environment are scarce. For EU seas, the Marine Strategy Framework Directive obliges Member States to set-up monitoring of marine litter by October 2014. An overview of present sources with data on marine litter is available, per regional sea, in the Issue Paper published for the International Conference on Prevention and Management of Marine Litter in European Seas ([8]), which the Commission co-organised with the German Government in April 2013.

([8]) http://www.marine-litter-conference-berlin.info/

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012278/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 octobre 2013)

Objet: Robinetterie et harmonisation

Tous les matériaux en contact avec l'eau potable subissent un hydrocheck. Belgaqua référence à ce sujet des milliers de produits de différentes compositions: du tube de polyéthylène au joint dur ou mou.

Pour la robinetterie, rien de pareil n'existe. C'est étonnant, alors que la composition de votre robinet en laiton est bien un savant mélange de cuivre, zinc et de plomb. Ce dernier métal, présent également dans les anciennes canalisations, est aujourd'hui banni dans le réseau de distribution.

Le bon sens conseillera de ne jamais utiliser l'eau chaude du robinet à des fins alimentaires (café, thé, cuisson des pâtes ou légumes). La température élevée facilite en effet la solubilisation des métaux dans l'eau. Chaude ou non, on conseille aussi de la laisser couler quelque peu avant sa consommation jusqu'à ce qu'elle fraîchisse.

Si le plomb de la robinetterie est concerné au même titre que celui des canalisations, le nickel utilisé sous le revêtement des pièces chromées du robinet, cancérogène et allergénique, peut lui aussi migrer dangereusement.

En 1996, une étude menée en France avait démontré qu'au premier jet d'eau (200 ml après stagnation nocturne), dans 10 % des cas, on atteignait parfois plus de 100 µg/l de nickel en présence d'une robinetterie récente. Soit 5 fois plus que la norme acceptée dans l'UE…

La concentration en nickel dans l'eau dépend surtout de la surface des pièces nickelées/chromées exposées. Les recommandations qui suivaient l'étude demandaient de limiter autant que possible la présence de nickel en contact avec l'eau, en limitant l'usage de ce type de revêtement et en réduisant autant que possible les surfaces concernées.

En 1998, la Commission européenne a tenté d'harmoniser les dispositions nationales concernant les familles d'alliage. Que compte faire la Commission européenne à ce sujet 15 années plus tard?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(3 janvier 2014)

La directive 98/83/CE du Conseil du 3 novembre 1998 relative à la qualité des eaux destinées à la consommation humaine assure un niveau de qualité minimal acceptable.

Lors de la transposition de cette directive, les États membres doivent veiller à ce que la qualité des eaux destinées à la consommation humaine demeure dans les limites fixées par la directive. Si les États membres l'estiment nécessaire, ils peuvent adopter des dispositions réglementaires concernant les performances de produits comme les tuyauteries, les robinetteries, etc., qui peuvent avoir une incidence sur la qualité des eaux.

En 2000, la Commission, voulant faciliter la libre circulation de ces produits à l'intérieur du marché unique, a donné mandat au CEN ([1]) de demander à des experts de la normalisation d'élaborer des normes harmonisées pour l'évaluation des produits, composés de différents matériaux (par exemple, du métal, du plastique, de la céramique), qui entrent en contact avec des eaux destinées à la consommation humaine. Ce travail de normalisation a été extrêmement difficile en raison de divergences de vues entre les autorités de réglementation des États membres. La Commission a donc demandé à un petit groupe d'États membres d'étudier en détail la faisabilité d'un rapprochement des points de vue réglementaires nationaux afin de permettre l'élaboration d'un système d'évaluation européen. Si cette tentative devait échouer, la Commission devrait examiner d'autres solutions et même envisager de retirer le mandat du CEN.

Toutefois, la réussite ou l'échec de cet exercice de normalisation n'aura aucun effet direct sur la qualité des eaux destinées à la consommation humaine; c'est aux États membres qu'il incombe d'y veiller, conformément à la directive 98/83/CE.

([1]) Comité européen de normalisation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012278/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Taps and standardisation

All materials that come into contact with drinking water are subject to a hydrocheck. On this topic, Belgaqua points to thousands of products made up of different materials, from polyethene tubes to hard or soft joints.

There are no similar measures in place for taps. This is surprising, given that your brass tap is really a clever mixture of copper, zinc and lead. The latter, which can also be found in old pipes, is today banned from the distribution network.

Common sense dictates that we should never use hot water from a tap for cooking purposes (such as in coffee or tea, or for cooking pasta or vegetables). This is because the higher temperature makes it easier for metals to dissolve in the water. Hot or not, it is also recommended to run the tap for a while until the water is cool before using it.

Just as the lead used in taps is affected in the same way as that used in pipes, so the nickel used under chromium-plated tap parts, which is carcinogenic and allergenic, can also get into the water supply, causing potential harm.

In 1996, a study conducted in France demonstrated that in 10% of cases, the first jet of water to come out of a modern tap (200 ml after being left overnight) sometimes contained more than 100 µg/l of nickel. This is five times higher than the standard accepted in the EU …

The concentration of nickel in the water depends above all on how much of the nickel- or chromium-plated surface is exposed. The study recommended that the amount of nickel in contact with the water should be limited as much as possible, by reducing the use of this type of coating and by making the affected surfaces as small as possible.

In 1998, the Commission attempted to standardise national regulations on alloys. Fifteen years on, what does the Commission intend to do with regard to this issue?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(3 January 2014)

Council Directive 98/83/EC of 3 November 1998 on the quality of water intended for human consumption ensures a minimum acceptable quality level for such water.

In transposing this directive, Member States have to ensure that the quality of the water intended for human consumption remains within the limits set by the directive. If Member States consider it necessary, they can pass regulations on the performance of products like pipes, taps, etc. which may affect the quality of water.

In an attempt to facilitate the free movement of these products in the Internal market, the Commission issued in 2000 a mandate to CEN ([1]) requesting standardisation experts to elaborate harmonised standards for the assessment of products in contact with water intended for human consumption made out of different materials (e.g. metal, plastic, ceramics). This standardisation work has encountered significant difficulties due to divergent views of Member States regulators. The Commission has therefore asked a small group of Member States to explore in detail the feasibility of approximating national regulatory views to allow the development of a European assessment regime. If this attempt would not be successful, the Commission would need to examine other solutions and even consider withdrawing the CEN mandate.

However, the success or failure of the above standardisation exercise is not intended to have a direct effect on the quality of water intended for human consumption, which must be in any case ensured by Member States, in accordance with Directive 98/83/EC.

([1]) European Committee for Standardisation.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012280/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(28 octobre 2013)

Objet: Déclaration TVA simplifiée

La Commission a proposé mercredi d'introduire en 2017 une déclaration de TVA simplifiée, qui remplacerait les déclarations de TVA nationales.

On imagine volontiers que l'objectif de cette déclaration réduise les formalités administratives pour les entreprises, notamment celles opérant dans plusieurs États membres, et de faciliter le respect des obligations fiscales.

1. À combien la Commission évalue le bénéfice d'un tel plan?

2. À combien la Commission évalue-t-elle l'impact sur les emplois que le traitement de ces déclarations requiert?

3. Quel est le *modus operandi* de cette déclaration européenne simplifiée?

Réponse donnée par M. Šemeta au nom de la Commission
(29 novembre 2013)

L'objectif de la proposition de directive relative à une déclaration de TVA normalisée est de fournir une procédure simplifiée et normalisée pour les entreprises, de façon à réduire les charges administratives. Cette déclaration de TVA normalisée devrait diminuer les coûts pour les entreprises d'un montant allant jusqu'à 15 milliards d'euros par an. Elle devrait en outre contribuer à améliorer le respect des obligations en matière de TVA et partant, accroître les recettes publiques. La proposition apporte donc une contribution importante à la création d'un système de TVA plus efficace et plus étanche à la fraude.

Grâce à la réduction des charges administratives, les entreprises devraient pouvoir libérer des ressources à des fins plus productives. Des simulations par modèles réalisées dans le cadre de l'analyse d'impact accompagnant cette proposition ont montré qu'une diminution des charges administratives se traduit par un accroissement du PIB et de l'emploi ([1]).

Puisque les informations requises et la procédure de soumission seront normalisées, les entreprises pourront facilement remplir et déposer une déclaration de TVA dans plusieurs États membres. La déclaration de TVA normalisée remplacera toutes les déclarations nationales de TVA et ne comportera que cinq cases obligatoires, tout en laissant aux États membres la possibilité d'y ajouter vingt et une cases, elles aussi normalisées. La proposition encourage également le dépôt électronique, dans la mesure où les entreprises seront autorisées à soumettre leur déclaration par voie électronique selon des règles communes à l'ensemble de l'Union européenne. La déclaration de TVA normalisée devra être déposée sur une base mensuelle, sauf pour les micro-entreprises qui pourront choisir une périodicité trimestrielle.

([1]) SWD(2013) 427 final, point 6.6.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012280/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Simplified VAT declaration

On Wednesday, the Commission proposed to introduce a simplified VAT declaration in 2017, which would replace national VAT declarations.

One can easily imagine that the aim of this declaration is to reduce the administrative procedures through which businesses have to go, particularly those operating in more than one Member State, and to make it easier for them to meet their tax liabilities.

1. What benefits does the Commission believe will result from such a plan?

2. What impact does the Commission believe the need to process these declarations will have on jobs?

3. What is the *modus operandi* of this simplified European declaration?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(29 November 2013)

The aim of the proposal on a standard VAT return is to provide a simplified and standardised procedure for businesses thereby reducing administrative burdens. Such a standard VAT return is expected to cut costs for businesses by up to EUR 15 billion a year. It should also help to improve VAT compliance and therefore increase public revenues. The proposal is therefore an important contribution to creating a more efficient and more fraud proof VAT system.

By reducing administrative burdens, businesses are expected to free up resources to be used for more productive purposes. Model simulations carried out in the context of the impact assessment linked to this proposal have shown that a decrease in administrative burdens leads to an increase in GDP and employment ([1]).

Since the information and submission procedure will be standardised, businesses could easily complete and submit a VAT return in several Member States. The standard VAT return will replace all national VAT returns and will have only 5 compulsory boxes, with an option for Member States to add up to 21 additional standardised boxes. The proposal also encourages electronic filing, as businesses will be allowed to submit their return electronically according to common rules for the whole European Union. The standard VAT return should be filed on a monthly basis, except for micro-enterprises who can opt for a quarterly VAT return period.

([1]) SWD(2013) 427 final, point 6.6.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012281/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(28 octobre 2013)

Objet: Cinéma et exception culturelle

Vent debout contre la refonte de la «communication cinéma» définissant un cadre commun européen pour financer le cinéma, les cinéastes réclament que la Commission européenne «respecte le principe de l'exception culturelle».

1. La Commission confirme-t-elle que l'un de ses souhaits est qu'une région ou un État ne puisse plus soutenir, dans les conditions actuelles, un film tourné sur son territoire?

2. Le Centre national du cinéma (CNC) estime l'impact social d'une telle réforme à «10 000 à 16 000 emplois». À combien la Commission européenne l'estime-t-elle? Ces nombreuses pertes d'emplois ont-elles été prises en compte?

3. La Commission va-t-elle (enfin) valider la nouvelle TST-D, taxe payée par l'ensemble des distributeurs de chaînes de télévision (opérateurs télécoms, câblo-opérateurs, bouquets de télévision par satellite)?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(17 décembre 2013)

Le 14 novembre 2013, la Commission a adopté de nouvelles règles concernant les aides en faveur du cinéma. Ces règles sont plus généreuses que les précédentes, car elles ne couvrent pas seulement la production, mais aussi l'ensemble du processus cinématographique, depuis l'écriture des scénarios jusqu'à la diffusion auprès du public. Des intensités d'aide plus élevées que par le passé sont autorisées pour les films cofinancés par plusieurs États membres.

1. Chaque État membre ou région peut accorder une aide aux productions cinématographiques, que le tournage ait lieu sur son territoire ou non.

2. La Commission ne pense pas que l'adoption des nouvelles règles entraînera des pertes d'emplois. Il appartient aux États membres de décider s'ils souhaitent soutenir financièrement ou non le secteur audiovisuel. La Commission n'est pas en mesure de déterminer comment le Centre national du cinéma est arrivé aux chiffres indiqués. Ceux-ci pourraient résulter d'estimations réalisées par cette institution, dont la Commission n'a pas connaissance et sur lesquelles elle ne peut raisonnablement avoir une influence.

3. En ce qui concerne la nouvelle TST-D française, notifiée à la Commission le 30 juillet 2013, la Commission a décidé, le 19 novembre dernier, de ne soulever aucune objection. Une fois que les questions de confidentialité auront été clarifiées avec les autorités françaises, le texte de la décision dans la langue faisant foi sera disponible à l'adresse suivante: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/elojade/isef/index.cfm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012281/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Cinema and cultural exception

Film-makers are fiercely opposed to reform of the 'Cinema communication', which defines a common European framework for financing film-making. They are calling on the Commission to 'respect the principle of cultural exception'.

1. Can the Commission confirm whether it is happy for a region or country to no longer be able to back, under the present conditions, a film shot on its territory?

2. The Centre national du cinéma (French National Centre for Cinema) estimates the social impact of such a reform to be between '10 000 and 16 000 jobs'. What does the Commission estimate it to be? Has it taken these many job losses into consideration?

3. Will the Commission (finally) approve the new Taxe sur les services de télévision — distributeurs (TST-D), a tax paid by all distributors of television channels (including telecommunications operators, cable operators and providers of satellite TV packages)?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

On 14 November 2013 the Commission adopted new rules for film aid. These rules are more generous than the preceding ones, as they cover not only film production, but the whole film-making process from script writing till delivery to the audience. Higher aid intensities than previously are allowed for films co-financed by several Member States.

1. Each Member State or region can provide aid to film productions, whether shot on its own territory or not.

2. The Commission does not expect job losses as a consequence of the adoption of the new rules. It is up to Member States to decide whether they want to financially support the audiovisual sector. The Commission is unable to identify how the Centre national du cinéma arrived at the figures mentioned. They may be the possible consequence of plans of this institution of which the Commission is not aware and on which it cannot possibly have an influence.

3. As regards the new French TST-D, which was notified to the Commission on 30 July 2013, the Commission adopted on 19 November 2013 a decision not to raise objections. Once the confidentiality issues are clarified with the French authorities, the text of the decision in the authentic language will be available at: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/elojade/isef/index.cfm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-012282/13
an die Kommission
Heinz K. Becker (PPE)
(28. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Entscheidung über die Themenstellung des Europäischen Jahres 2014

Entsprechend einem langjährigen Usus stellt die Europäische Union jedes Jahr ein spezifisches Thema von Relevanz für das Leben der europäischen Bürger in den Mittelpunkt seiner Kommunikation nach außen. Dies war zuletzt 2012 mit dem „Europäischen Jahr des aktiven Alterns und der Generationensolidarität" und 2013 mit dem „Europäischen Jahr der Bürgerinnen und Bürger" der Fall.

Diese Themenjahre verfolgen das Ziel, die Bevölkerung für das jeweilige Thema zu sensibilisieren sowie Diskussion und Bewusstseinsbildung anzuregen. Um diesem Anspruch nachkommen zu können, bedarf es jedoch nicht nur eines besonderen Engagements der öffentlichen Behörden — europäischer wie nationaler — und der Politik, sondern auch einer möglichst breiten Einbindung der Bürger sowie der thematisch entsprechenden Organisationen der Zivilgesellschaft.

Damit diese sich jedoch konstruktiv bei den unterschiedlichen Kommunikations- und Informationsmaßnahmen eines Europäischen Jahres (z. B. Veranstaltungen, Veröffentlichungen, Websites, etc.) beteiligen und einbringen können, benötigen sie ausreichende Planbarkeit und Zeit.

Vor diesem Hintergrund ist es äußerst problematisch und auch unverständlich, dass die Europäische Kommission, die in dieser Frage das alleinige (!) Initiativrecht hat, bis zum heutigen Tage noch keinen Vorschlag für das Europäische Jahr 2014 unterbreitet hat.

Bedenkt man, dass dieser Vorschlag noch vom Europäischen Parlament und von den Mitgliedstaaten angenommen werden muss, ist mit einem rechtzeitigen Beschluss bis Jahresbeginn 2014 kaum mehr zu rechnen. Bereits jetzt ist für diverse Kommunikationskampagnen durch engagierte Bürger und Organisationen der Zivilgesellschaft faktisch keine ausreichende Vorbereitungszeit mehr vorhanden. Dies ist umso ärgerlicher, als die Union besonders im Jahr der Wahlen zum Europäischen Parlament eine kohärente und gut vorbereitete Kommunikationsstrategie dringend benötigt!

1. Wann gedenkt die Kommission, endlich ihren Vorschlag für das Europäische Jahr 2014 vorzulegen?

2. Wie plant die Kommission, den durch die Verzögerung verursachten Zeitverlust für die beteiligte Zivilgesellschaft — auch hinsichtlich der für das Fundraising nötigen Zeit — durch höhere öffentliche Haushaltsmittel in diesem Vorschlag zu kompensieren?

Antwort von Herrn Barroso im Namen der Kommission
(3. Dezember 2013)

Bei den Vorgesprächen mit den Interessenvertretern wurden verschiedene Vorschläge für die Themenstellung des Europäischen Jahres 2014 unterbreitet. Abgesehen von ihren eigenen Vorschlägen konnten sich die Interessenvertreter auf kein spezifisches Thema einigen. Angesichts dieser Tatsache und aufgrund des besonderen Umstands, dass 2014 Wahlen zum Europäischen Parlament und ein institutioneller Übergang stattfinden, hält es die Kommission für angemessener, die Maßnahmen im Zusammenhang mit dem Europäischen Jahr der Bürgerinnen und Bürger 2013 auch 2014 fortzuführen. Das Europäische Jahr der Bürgerinnen und Bürger 2013 war ein Erfolg und viele dieser Maßnahmen sind wichtig für die demokratische Mitwirkung und die Einbindung der Bürger in die Gestaltung der EU-Politik.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012282/13
to the Commission
Heinz K. Becker (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Decision on the topic for the 2014 European Year

Each year, in line with tradition, the European Union chooses a topic of relevance to European people and focuses its external communication on this topic. By way of example, 2012 was denominated 'European Year for Active Aging and Solidarity between Generations' and 2013 was the 'European Year of the Citizens'.

The aim of the thematic years is to raise awareness among the population about the chosen subject matter, stimulate debate and draw attention to the issues. In order to meet this goal, however, not only do European and national public authorities and politicians need to show particular dedication, but as many citizens as possible also need to be involved, as do civil society organisations working in areas related to that year's theme.

In order for them to be able to contribute to and participate constructively in the various communication and information measures related to the European Year (e.g. events, publications, websites, etc.), sufficient time to make plans is required.

With this in mind, it is extremely problematic and utterly incomprehensible that the Commission, which has the sole(!) right of initiative in this area, has yet to make a proposal for the 2014 European Year.

In view of the fact that the proposal must then be adopted by Parliament and the Member States, it is now highly unlikely that a decision will be taken in time for the beginning of 2014. In practice, it is already too late for diverse communication campaigns to be organised by dedicated citizens and civil society organisations. The situation is even more exasperating since 2014 is a European election year and a consistent and well-prepared communications strategy is absolutely essential.

1. When does the Commission intend to finally submit its proposal for the 2014 European Year?

2. How does the Commission plan to compensate the civil society organisations concerned for the time lost as a result of the delay (and, therefore, lost fundraising time) by increasing the funding available under the proposal?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2013)

In the preliminary discussions with interested stakeholders, different proposals for a European Year in 2014 were advanced. However, no widespread consensus for a specific theme emerged beyond the respective stakeholders advocating it. Under these circumstances, and given the specific nature of 2014 as a year of elections of the European Parliament and of institutional transition, the Commission considers that it would be more appropriate to continue actions related with the 2013 European Year of Citizens into 2014. The 2013 European year of citizens has been a success and many actions are relevant to participation in democracy and to inclusive participation in the shaping of EU policies.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012283/13
alla Commissione
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(28 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Procedure di trattamento di liquidi e oggetti proibiti negli aeroporti

In risposta agli avvenimenti dell'11 settembre 2001, seguendo l'esempio degli Stati Uniti, l'Unione europea si è dotata di una serie di misure di sicurezza volte a prevenire eventuali minacce terroristiche o atti di violenza all'interno dei circuiti aeroportuali (regolamento (CE) n. 300/2008 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, dell'11 marzo 2008, che istituisce norme comuni per la sicurezza dell'aviazione civile).

Tra le disposizioni contenute nel regolamento ve ne sono in particolare alcune, riguardanti la gestione dei controlli sul contenuto dei bagagli, che elencano gli articoli (nella fattispecie liquidi, oggetti appuntiti o potenzialmente dannosi) il cui trasporto nel bagaglio a mano non è consentito.

Tuttavia, per quanto attiene a tale problematica, nella normativa europea, anche successiva al regolamento (CE) n. 300/2008, non vi è alcun riferimento alle modalità di gestione degli articoli sequestrati. In sostanza, le disposizioni dell'UE in materia si limitano a elencare gli oggetti o prodotti non ammessi a bordo dei velivoli senza specificarne la destinazione una volta ritirati ai passeggeri. La competenza degli organi di gestione della sicurezza aeroportuale, infatti, termina nel momento in cui è impedita l'introduzione di tali prodotti nella cosiddetta «area sterile». La loro successiva gestione (come indicato, limitatamente al caso italiano, dall'Ente Nazionale per l'Aviazione Civile) è di norma assicurata dagli stessi gestori aeroportuali, che ne curano la distruzione o la successiva cessione a organismi di volontariato oppure adottano procedure differenti, che tuttavia non sono chiaramente esplicitate e, soprattutto, differiscono per ogni aeroporto.

Alla luce di ciò, può la Commissione far sapere:

— se esistono, anche se non concordate ufficialmente a livello europeo, norme e procedure comuni per la gestione dei suddetti prodotti da parte degli organismi di sicurezza aeroportuale;

— se si intende, in risposta a quanto emerso, procedere ad armonizzare i sistemi di gestione dei summenzionati prodotti, con l'obiettivo di evitare inutili sprechi e garantire la piena trasparenza dei sistemi di sicurezza.

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(16 dicembre 2013)

Scopo delle norme comuni dell'UE per la sicurezza dell'aviazione civile è prevenire atti di interferenza illecita in questo campo. Non esistono norme o procedure comuni su come i servizi di sicurezza aeroportuali debbano trattare gli articoli vietati o cosa farne una volta identificati.

Nel rispetto del principio di sussidiarietà, la Commissione ritiene che gli Stati membri siano nella posizione ideale per decidere cosa fare degli articoli vietati e a chi affidare questo compito e non giudica pertanto necessario armonizzare questo aspetto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012283/13
to the Commission
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Procedures for dealing with liquids and prohibited items at airports

In the wake of the events of 11 September 2001, the European Union, following the United States' example, adopted a series of security measures to prevent any terrorist threats or acts of violence in airports (Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2008 on common rules in the field of civil aviation security).

In particular, the regulation contains provisions on how luggage checks are to be conducted, listing the items (namely, liquids, sharp or potentially dangerous items) which cannot be carried in hand luggage.

However, in regard to this issue, European legislation, even after Regulation (EC) No 300/2008, makes absolutely no mention of the procedures for dealing with confiscated items. Essentially, EU provisions on the issue merely list the items or products that are not permitted on board aircraft, without specifying what happens to them after they have been taken off passengers. The responsibility of airport security ends when these products are stopped from entering the 'sterile area'. What happens to them next (as established, in the case of Italy, by the National Civil Aviation Authority) is usually up to airport operators themselves, which destroy them or subsequently give them to volunteer organisations, or deal with them according to different procedures. Those procedures, however, are not clearly defined and, above all, differ from one airport to the next.

— Are there any common rules and procedures, even if not officially agreed at EU level, for how airport security should deal with the aforementioned products?

— In response to what has come to light, does the Commission plan to harmonise the systems for dealing with aforementioned products, with the aim of avoiding needless waste and ensuring that security systems are totally transparent?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

The EU Aviation Security common rules seek to protect civil aviation from acts of unlawful interference. There are no common rules or procedures for how airport security should treat prohibited articles or react once they have been identified.

In line with the subsidarity principle the Commission is of the opinion that Member States are best placed to decide how prohibited articles should be subsequently treated and by whom. The Commission therefore does not see the need to harmonise this.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-012284/13
до Комисията
Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(28 октомври 2013 г.)

Относно: Тютюнопроизводството в новата ОСП

Тютюнопроизводството не получи подкрепа по време на преговорите по новата ОСП — той е сред секторите, изключени от директните плащания и от обвързано с производството подпомагане. В моята страна, България, тютюнопроизводството е основна заетост в много селски полупланински райони, където има ограничени икономически алтернативи или такива изобщо липсват. В същото време някои европейски региони като Умбрия и Кампания са успели да предоставят европейско подпомагане на тютюнопроизводителите си. Те получават агроекологични плащания, като мерките, които прилагат, са свързани с поддържане на земята в добро състояние — напояване, борба с плевелите, намаляване на азотните торове и др.

В тази връзка какви са според ЕК възможностите за подпомагане на сектора на тютюнопроизводство в новата ОСП?

По-конкретно какви са възможностите за подпомагане на тютюнопроизводството чрез агроекологични плащания по втори стълб в новата ОСП?

Може ли ЕК да даде пример за страни, които използват мерки на национално ниво за подпомагане на сектора на тютюнопроизводство и какви?

Отговор, даден от г-н Чолош от името на Комисията
(3 януари 2014 г.)

Производството на суров тютюн е напълно интегрирано в инструментите на общата селскостопанска политика. Тютюнопроизводителите могат да получават основно плащане, както и плащане за екологизиране.

С новия Регламент за единната обща организация на пазара стопаните ще имат по-големи възможности да си осигурят по-силна позиция във веригата за доставки, като учредят организации на производителите и междубраншови организации, признати от държавите членки.

В рамките на политиката за развитие на селските райони се предвиждат мерки, които държавите членки могат да прилагат за преструктуриране или диверсифициране на земеделските стопанства и за подкрепа на земеделски практики, благоприятни за околната среда. Тютюнопроизводителите могат да получат подкрепа и по агроекологични мерки, която се изчислява въз основа на загубата на доходи и допълнителните разходи, свързани с изпълнението на поетите задължения.

През 2013 г. Комисията разреши на четири държави членки, които прилагат схемата за единно плащане на площ, да изплатят на тютюнопроизводителите национални помощи, необвързани с производството: България (80,6 млн. евро), Унгария (14,9 млн. евро), Полша (48,1 млн. евро) и Румъния (7,2 млн. евро). В условията на новата обща селскостопанска политика тези държави членки могат да решат да продължат да предоставят такава помощ при същите условия, но в по-малък размер.

Понастоящем в Полша се прилага и схема за помощи под формата на субсидии за застрахователни премии в полза на тютюнопроизводството. В сектора на тютюнопроизводството обаче може да се ползват и национални помощи, които държавите членки предоставят по по-общи схеми за помощ. Държавите членки могат също така да отпускат помощи *de minimis* в сектора на тютюнопроизводството в съответствие с Регламент (ЕО) № 1535/2007 ([1]).

([1]) ОВ L 337, 21.12.2007 г.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012284/13
to the Commission
Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Tobacco growing under the new CAP

No support was provided for tobacco growing in the negotiations on the new CAP and it is one of the sectors not in receipt of direct payments or coupled support. Tobacco growing is a staple activity in many semi-mountainous regions of Bulgaria, where alternative economic opportunities are limited or simply do not exist. At the same time, some European regions, such as Umbria and Campania, have managed to provide EU support to their tobacco producers. They receive agri-environment payments as the measures they implement are connected with keeping farmland in good condition, irrigation, weed prevention and reduced use of nitrogen fertilisers, etc.

Can the Commission state, in this connection, what possibilities for support exist for the tobacco growing sector under the new CAP?

More specifically, what possibilities for support for tobacco growing are there through agri-environment payments under the second pillar of the new CAP?

Can the Commission give examples of countries that employ national-level measures for support to the tobacco sector, and state which these are?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(3 January 2014)

The production of raw tobacco is fully integrated into the general agricultural policy instruments. Farmers producing tobacco may receive the basic payment as well as the greening payment.

The new single CMO regulation will provide greater opportunities for farmers to strengthen their position in the supply chain through the formation of producer and inter-branch organisations to be recognised by Member States.

The rural development policy provides for measures which Member States can apply to restructure or diversify the agricultural holdings and to support farming practices favourable for the environment. Tobacco producers may receive the agri-environmental support, determined on the basis of the loss of income and additional costs due to the commitments made.

In 2013 the Commission has authorised decoupled national aids to be paid to tobacco producers in 4 Member States applying the single area payment scheme: Bulgaria (EUR 80.6 million, Hungary (EUR 14.9 million), Poland (EUR 48.1 million), Romania (EUR 7.2 million). Under the new CAP these Member States may decide to continue to grant this aid under the same conditions but with decreasing levels.

Poland is also currently applying an aid scheme in the form of insurance premium subsidies in favour of the tobacco sector. However, the tobacco sector might benefit from national aid granted by Member States under more general aid schemes. Member States may also grant '*de minimis*' aid to the tobacco sector in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1535/2007 ([1]).

([1]) OJ L 337, 21.12.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012285/13
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Dual taxation of income

In its 2010 communication entitled 'Removing cross-border tax obstacles for EU citizens' (COM/2010/769), the Commission identified the most pressing cross-border tax problems that citizens faced, including that of double taxation on income and capital. Currently, double taxation of citizens' income is covered by a complex web of bilateral treaties amongst the Member States.

In light of this situation, what progress has the Commission made with regard to overcoming dual taxation?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2013)

Direct taxation mainly falls under the competence of the EU Member States and the Commission is therefore confined to act within the boundaries of the powers which the Member States confer on it. Hence the Commission can make proposals for EU legislation to improve the functioning of the internal market but the proposals will only become law if EU Member States unanimously agree to them. In the absence of existing EU legislation, Member States are free to design their direct tax systems and procedures as they choose as long as their rules are not discriminatory or otherwise contrary to the Treaties. There is no provision in the EU Treaties concerning tax treaties and double taxation is not in itself considered to be contrary to EC law.

Within this framework, the Commission is currently examining possible solutions to double taxation problems that are not currently resolved by bilateral tax treaties. Following the communication to which the Honourable Member refers, the Commission identified possible solutions to double taxation in 2011 ([1]) — including a Member States' Forum, a code of conduct or a binding arbitration mechanism — which it is currently researching in detail. Furthermore, the Commission addressed a recommendation to Member States on solutions to double taxation of inheritances in 2011 ([2]).

The Commission is also studying solutions to other tax obstacles to cross-border activity of EU citizens that it identified in the 2010 Communication, such as complicated information and forms and the absence of single contact points in tax administrations. It will propose appropriate action when it has completed its research.

([1]) COM(2011) 712.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/personal_tax/inheritance/c_2011_8819 _en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012286/13
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Pollution from the Compañía Española De Petróleos (CEPSA) oil refinery

Following parliamentary questions E-000968/2011 and E-000834/2011 the Commission will be aware of the CEPSA oil refinery in San Roque, Spain. In response to these questions, the Commission noted that the operator has been investing in improvements to minimise or prevent pollution. More than two years on, pollution levels in the area are still high.

1. Does the Commission have any update on the progress being made at the site?

2. Is it satisfied that air emissions from the refinery meet EU standards?

3. Specifically, is it aware that levels of nickel pollution in the area are higher than normal?

4. What further measures does the Commission propose for working with the relevant national authorities to ensure air pollution from this site is further reduced?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

1. The Commission has not received updated information on the CEPSA oil refinery. The data on the annual emissions of pollutants are publicly available in E-PRTR ([1]).

2. Based on earlier exchanges with the Spanish authorities in 2010, the Commission has not identified any breach of the applicable EC law (in particular of the IPPC Directive 2008/1/EC ([2])).

3. As from 31 December 2012, Member States had to take all necessary measures not entailing disproportionate costs to ensure that concentrations of pollutants, including nickel, covered by non-binding target values, do not exceed those values ([3]). In the latest available yearly questionnaire related to 2012, Spain reported an exceedance of the target value of 20 ng/m^3 for nickel in ambient air ([4]) in the zone where the plant is located ([5]).

4. Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions ([6]) replaces the IPPC Directive for existing installations as from 7 January 2014. It requires permitting authorities to use the Best Available Techniques (BAT) conclusions as the reference for setting the permit conditions. Such conclusions for the refining of mineral oil and gas are planned for adoption in 2014. Within four years after their publication, the national authorities have to ensure that all permits for refineries are updated accordingly and that the installations comply with those permit conditions.

([1]) http://prtr.ec.europa.eu, the latest data concern the year 2011.
([2]) OJ L 24, 29.1.2008.
([3]) According to Article 3 of Directive 2004/107/EC.
([4]) One of the two monitoring stations measures 21 ng/m3, while the other measured 17 ng/m3.
([5]) ES0104 'Zona Industrial de Bahã a de Algeciras'.
([6]) OJ L 334, 17.12.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012287/13
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Pollution on Gibraltar's Western Beach

Western Beach in north Gibraltar borders Spain and continues to suffer from poor water quality. In Parliamentary Question E-9298/2010, the Commission's attention was drawn to the pollution there and to the fact that increased water contamination was the result of a redirected storm drain from the Spanish border town of La Linea. In the Commission's response, it expressed its willingness to facilitate the resolution of the problem.

1. In light of this, has the Commission sought a commitment from Spain to end such discharges along the coast in question?

2. Is the Commission aware of continued sewage discharges from La Linea?

3. What further action does the Commission intend to take to encourage Spain to meet its obligation to end this kind of effluent discharge, as required under Union law?

Question for written answer E-012288/13
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Reports of pollution in the Bay of Gibraltar

Could the Commission state what specific complaints it has received or been made aware of since January 2011 regarding air and bathing water pollution in the Bay of Gibraltar (often referred to in Spain as the Bahía de Algeciras)?

Could the Commission state what action it has taken as a result of these complaints?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 January 2014)

A complaint has been registered on pollution at the Western Beach (nr CHAP (2011)916). In addition, the Parliament accepted a petition regarding bathing water quality at the Western Beach (nr 258/2011).

Following the complaint and the petition, the Commission has requested information from Spain on the water pollution at the Western Beach. According to the information provided by the Spanish authorities in the context of the abovementioned investigation, the problems of the sewage systems that could influence the quality status of the beach concerned, including discharges as those mentioned by the Honourable Member, have been tackled.

In October 2013, the Commission requested updated information on these issues including data from this year's bathing water season from Spain. No information has been received yet by the Commission.

Moreover, the Commission has asked the United Kingdom to provide information on other possible causes of the pollution at the beach concerned.

The Commission would also note that it has raised its concerns on the lack of a treatment system for waste water in Gibraltar in a letter of formal notice addressed to the United Kingdom, issued on 20/06/2013.

Once Spain and the United Kingdom have replied, the Commission will be in a position to decide on how to proceed.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012289/13
adresată Comisiei
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(28 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: E-sănătate, inegalități în materie de sănătate și decalajul digital

În comunicarea sa din 2012 referitor la planul de acțiune privind e-sănătatea 2012-2020, Comisia stabilește eventualele beneficii în domeniul sănătății care ar putea fi generate de serviciile de îngrijire medicală mai inteligente, mai sigure și orientate spre pacient prestate prin dezvoltarea e-sănătății.

Comunicarea enumeră, de asemenea, principalele obstacole în calea funcționării e-sănătății, inclusiv diferențele regionale privind accesul la serviciile TIC și accesul limitat în zonele defavorizate. Inegalitățile în materie de sănătate vor apărea dacă așa-numitul decalaj digital nu este abordat în mod corespunzător ([1]).

În Acțiunea 48 din Agenda digitală 2020, Comisia subliniază faptul că statele membre trebuie să folosească fondurile structurale și fondurile de dezvoltare rurală pentru a dezvolta conexiuni de mare viteză la internet. De asemenea, Comisia se angajează „să asigure o monitorizare a implementării în statele membre în care există o programare substanțială de fonduri UE pentru TIC și/sau în care absorbția fondurilor este cea mai slabă, în special, în ceea ce privește Bulgaria, Italia, Polonia, România și Spania” ([2]).

Ce măsuri specifice ia Comisia pentru a îmbunătății ratele de absorbție în România pentru a reduce decalajul digital și inegalitățile provocate de acesta, inclusiv inegalitățile în materie de sănătate care vor apărea dacă TIC nu se dezvoltă suficient pentru a sprijini funcționarea e-sănătății?

Răspuns dat de dl Hahn în numele Comisiei
(19 decembrie 2013)

În perioada 2007-2013, Fondul European de Dezvoltare Regională (FEDER) contribuie cu aproape 400 de milioane EUR la impulsionarea utilizării TIC în România. FEDER ajută IMM-urile să aibă acces la internet și să implementeze aplicațiile economiei digitale, astfel devenind mai competitive; FEDER sprijină, de asemenea, sectorul public în dezvoltarea și creșterea eficienței serviciilor publice electronice în beneficiul întreprinderilor și al cetățenilor.

Ca măsură orizontală, proiectul RO-net sprijină instalarea unei rețele în bandă largă în zonele insuficient deservite, reducând astfel disparitățile dintre regiunile urbane și cele rurale. În mod specific, FEDER sprijină modernizarea sistemului medical din România prin: creșterea gradului de utilizare a TIC în spitale și crearea dosarelor electronice ale pacienților, facilitarea decontării electronice a serviciilor medicale de către societățile de asigurări de sănătate și încurajarea utilizării TIC de către medicii generaliști, precum și conectarea acestora din urmă la sistemele informatice publice din sectorul sănătății.

În România, implementarea generală a programelor este afectată în mod negativ de capacitatea administrativă redusă a autorităților responsabile de gestionare, precum și de slaba pregătire a proiectelor de către beneficiari. Pentru a încuraja progresul, Comisia a coordonat o serie de inițiative. Instituțiile financiare internaționale au fost invitate să contribuie la eforturile autorităților publice pentru a accelera implementarea programelor și a proiectelor. În același timp, Comisia a sprijinit guvernul României în dezvoltarea „Planului prioritar de acțiune pentru sporirea capacității de absorbție a fondurilor structurale și de coeziune”, care va servi drept foaie de parcurs pe termen scurt și mediu pentru a îmbunătăți funcționarea sistemului de fonduri structurale și pentru a stimula absorbția fondurilor.

([1]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/ehealth-action-plan-2012-2020-innovative-healthcare-21st-century
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/pillar-iv-fast-and-ultra-fast-internet-access/action-48-use-structural-funds-finance-roll-out-high

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012289/13
to the Commission
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: E-Health, health inequalities and the digital divide

In its communication of 2012 on the e-Health Action Plan 2012-2020, the Commission sets out the potential health benefits which could be derived from smarter, safer and patient- centred health services delivered through the development of e-Health.

The communication also lists the main barriers to the deployment of eHealth, including regional differences in accessing ICT services and limited access in deprived areas. Health inequalities will result if the so-called 'digital divide' is not properly addressed ([1]).

In Action 48 of the Digital Agenda 2020, the Commission stresses the need for Member States to make use of the Structural Funds and rural development funds in order to develop high-speed Internet connections. The Commission also makes a commitment to 'ensure a follow up of the implementation to those Member States where there is a substantial programming of EU funds on ICT and/or where absorption is weakest and particularly with respect to Bulgaria, Italy, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Spain' ([2]).

What specific action is the Commission taking to improve absorption rates in Romania, in order to reduce the digital divide and the inequalities it causes, including the health inequalities which will result if ICT development is not sufficient to support the deployment of e-Health?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

In the 2007-2013 period, the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) contributes almost EUR 400 million to increasing the use of ICT in Romania. The ERDF supports SMEs to connect to the Internet and implement e-economy applications and thus improve their competitiveness; the ERDF also assists the public sector to develop and increase the efficiency of electronic public services for the benefit of companies and citizens.

As a horizontal measure, the RO-net project supports the setup of the broadband network in under-served areas thus reducing disparities between urban and rural regions. Specifically, the ERDF supports the modernisation of the medical system in Romania: increasing the use of the ICT in hospitals and the creation of electronic patient records, facilitating electronic discounts with health insurance companies and encouraging ICT use by general practitioners and their interconnection to public medical IT systems.

In Romania, the overall implementation of the programmes suffers from weak administrative capacity in the managing authorities and weak preparation of projects by beneficiaries. To challenge the low progress, the Commission has coordinated several initiatives. International financial institutions were invited to reinforce the efforts of public authorities to accelerate programme and project implementation. At the same time, the Commission has supported the Romanian Government to develop the 'Priority action plan to increase the capacity to absorb structural and cohesion funds' as a short- and medium-term roadmap to improve the functioning of the Structural Funds system and to boost the absorption of funds.

([1]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/ehealth-action-plan-2012-2020-innovative-healthcare-21st-century
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/pillar-iv-fast-and-ultra-fast-Internet-access/action-48-use-structural-funds-finance-roll-out-high

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012292/13
à la Commission
Dominique Riquet (PPE)
(28 octobre 2013)

Objet: Bilan de l'expérience acquise en matière d'inspection-filtrage des Liquides, Aérosols et Gels (LAG)

Le règlement d'exécution (UE) n° 246/2013 de la Commission du 19 mars 2013 a modifié le règlement (UE) n° 185/2010 de manière à soumettre à l'inspection-filtrage, à compter du 31 janvier 2014, les liquides, aérosols et gels (LAG) achetés dans un aéroport ou à bord d'un aéronef et contenus dans un sac à témoin d'intégrité, ainsi que les LAG destinés à être utilisés au cours du voyage à des fins médicales ou répondant à un besoin diététique spécial, y compris les aliments pour bébé (article 4.1.2.2 du règlement (UE) n° 185/2010 modifié).

Le considérant n° 4 du règlement (UE) n° 246/2013 indique que *«la Commission est attachée à la suppression totale des restrictions portant sur l'emport des LAG. Sur la base de l'expérience acquise dans la mise en œuvre de l'inspection-filtrage à partir de janvier 2014, la Commission devrait réexaminer la situation à la fin de 2014 et définir, en étroite collaboration avec toutes les parties concernées, une ou plusieurs étapes supplémentaires pour réaliser cet objectif, si possible dans un délai de deux ans après la première étape»*.

Comment et à quel moment le Parlement européen sera-t-il associé à la prise de décision dans ce dossier? Comment et sur quelle période la Commission européenne envisage-t-elle d'établir le bilan de l'expérience acquise à partir de janvier 2014?

Ce bilan indiquera-t-il le coût d'une mesure qui n'apporte que peu de bénéfice aux passagers puisque ceux-ci se verront contrôler des LAG qui ne l'étaient pas jusqu'à présent (médicaments, aliments pour bébé) et encore moins à l'économie européenne puisque les produits hors-taxes qui seront, après le 31 janvier 2014, acceptés en Europe après contrôle, auront été achetés hors de l'Union européenne?

Y a-t-il un lien entre les différentes étapes mentionnées? Le bilan d'une première étape permet-il de conclure à la faisabilité d'une étape ultérieure? Quelles sont les étapes supplémentaires envisagées?

Les technologies existantes permettent-elles d'envisager une libéralisation totale de l'emport des LAG à l'horizon 2016?

Les aéroports auront-ils l'opportunité d'acheter des technologies européennes? Dans le cas inverse, ne faudrait-il pas envisager de débloquer des fonds de recherche européens?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(9 décembre 2013)

Comme le rappelle l'Honorable Parlementaire, le considérant n°4 du règlement d'exécution (UE) n° 246/2013 de la Commission indique que la Commission devrait réexaminer la situation à la fin de 2014. La Commission a lancé une étude visant à déterminer les effets de la première phase qui démarre en janvier 2014. Cette étude sera complétée par des échanges avec toutes les parties prenantes durant l'année 2014 afin d'évaluer l'incidence des diverses options et de convenir des prochaines étapes. Le Parlement européen sera associé à ce processus conformément aux procédures applicables. La Commission compte demeurer en contact étroit avec la commission des transports et du tourisme du PE pendant la phase de préparation,.

L'utilisation de technologies pour l'inspection/filtrage des liquides offre de meilleures garanties de sûreté et réduit la gêne pour les passagers. L'impact économique des mesures de sûreté fera partie des points abordés dans les consultations et dans le réexamen précités.

Les étapes sont liées. La suppression complète des restrictions fait peser un énorme risque opérationnel en raison de l'ampleur du changement. Une approche graduelle devrait permettre de faire face à tout effet potentiellement négatif sur le plan opérationnel tant pour les aéroports que pour les passagers. Une autre étape intermédiaire dans la levée des restrictions pourrait consister à autoriser les bouteilles claires, celles contenant de l'eau potable par exemple.

Même si la technologie est prête du point de vue de la sûreté, son incidence sur le plan opérationnel doit être évaluée avant que les restrictions ne puissent être assouplies. Si les conditions s'y prêtent, les restrictions pourront être remplacées par une inspection/filtrage d'ici la fin de 2016.

La plupart des constructeurs sont basés ou cotés en bourse en Europe. Le programme Horizon 2020 prévoit un appel à propositions de recherche dans les technologies innovantes concernant la sûreté aérienne.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012292/13
to the Commission
Dominique Riquet (PPE)
(28 October 2013)

Subject: Review of experience gained regarding the screening of Liquids, Aerosols and Gels (LAGs)

The Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 246/2013 of 19 March 2013 amended Regulation (EU) No 185/2010 by requiring that, as of 31 January 2014, any liquids, aerosols or gels (LAGs) purchased in an airport or on board an aircraft and contained in a security tamper-evident bag, as well as LAGs intended for use during the journey for medical purposes or specific dietary needs (including baby food), will be subject to screening (Article 4.1.2.2 of Regulation (EU) No 185/2010 amended).

Recital No 4 of Regulation (EU) No 246/2013 states that 'the Commission is committed to the full lifting of restrictions on the carriage of LAGs. On the basis of the experience gained from the implementation of screening as of January 2014, the Commission should review the situation by the end of 2014 and define, in close cooperation with all parties concerned, one or more next steps to reach this objective, if possible within the next two years following the first step.'

How and when will Parliament be involved in making a decision on this matter? How and over what period does the Commission plan to review the experience gained from January 2014?

Will this review indicate the cost of a measure that offers little benefit to passengers, who will find themselves subject to checks on LAGs that were not required up until now (such as on medication and baby food), and even less benefit to the European economy, as, after 31 January 2014, duty-free products that are accepted in Europe after security checks will have to be purchased outside of the EU?

Is there a link between the various steps mentioned? Will the review of the first step enable us to draw conclusions about the feasibility of a later step? What additional steps are envisaged?

Are existing technologies sufficient to enable us to consider a complete relaxation of restrictions on the carriage of LAGs by 2016?

Will airports have the opportunity to purchase European technologies? If not, should we not be planning the release of EU research funds?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 2013)

As the Honourable Member points out, the fourth recital of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 246/2013 states that the Commission should review the situation by the end of 2014. The Commission has initiated a study to determine the effects of the first phase starting in January 2014. This will be supplemented by exchanges with all stakeholders throughout 2014 to assess the impact of options and agree the next steps. The European Parliament will be involved in accordance with the applicable procedures. The Commission expects to remain in close contact with the European Parliament's Committee on Transport and Tourism during the preparation phase.

The use of technology to screen liquids offers a better security outcome and better passenger facilitation. The economic impact of security measures will form part of the aforementioned consultation and review.

The steps are linked. The complete removal of restrictions poses a considerable operational risk due to the scale of the change. A phased approach should allow any potentially negative operational impact on either airports or passengers to be managed. A further intermediate step to lifting the restrictions may comprise permitting clear bottles, such as drinking water.

Technology may be ready from a security perspective, but the operational impact needs to be assessed before restrictions are relaxed. If the conditions are suitable, the restrictions may be replaced by screening by the end of 2016.

Most of the manufacturers are listed or based in Europe. Horizon2020 includes a call for research into innovative technologies for aviation security.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012300/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Δαπάνες διάσωσης χωρών της Ευρωζώνης που βρίσκονται σε Μνημόνιο

Σύμφωνα με δημοσιογραφικές πληροφορίες (Εφημερίδα ΚΑΘΗΜΕΡΙΝΗ 27/10/2013), παρουσιάζεται μεγάλη ανομοιογένεια όσον αφορά τη συμβολή κρατών μελών της Ευρωζώνης στη διάσωση των οικονομιών κρατών μελών που βρίσκονται σε καθεστώς Μνημονίου. Το πιο εκπληκτικό είναι ότι οι χώρες της Μεσογείου και της περιφέρειας, που αντιμετωπίζουν μεγάλες οικονομικές δυσκολίες, εμφανίζονται να έχουν συμβάλει περισσότερο (ως ποσοστό του ΑΕΠ) σε σύγκριση με άλλες πιο ισχυρές και οικονομικά ευημερούσες χώρες. Χώρες όπως η Κύπρος, η Ισπανία, η Ιταλία και η Σλοβενία εμφανίζονται να έχουν συνεισφέρει πολύ ψηλότερο ποσοστό του ΑΕΠ σε σύγκριση με άλλες οικονομικά ισχυρές και ευημερούσες χώρες, όπως η Γερμανία, η Αυστρία και η Ολλανδία.

Καλείται η Επιτροπή να απαντήσει στα εξής ερωτήματα:

1. Με βάση επίσημα στοιχεία που κατέχει η Επιτροπή, αληθεύει ο πιο πάνω ισχυρισμός;

2. Θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να με εφοδιάσει με επίσημα συγκριτικά στοιχεία όσον αφορά τη συνεισφορά των κρατών μελών της Ευρωζώνης στη διάσωση χωρών του Μνημονίου;

3. Αν ο πιο πάνω ισχυρισμός αληθεύει, θεωρεί η Επιτροπή ότι εγείρεται θέμα δικαιότερης κατανομής του κόστους διάσωσης χωρών του Μνημονίου;

4. Ποια μέτρα προτίθεται να πάρει προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

1. Οι άμεσες ή έμμεσες κλείδες συνεισφοράς των κρατών μελών διαφέρουν σημαντικά ανάλογα με το χρησιμοποιούμενο μέσο στήριξης. Οι συνεισφορές που πραγματοποιούνται στο πλαίσιο του ΕΜΧΣ είναι σύμφωνες με την κλείδα που χρησιμοποιείται στον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ. Οι συνεισφορές στο πλαίσιο της δανειακής διευκόλυνσης για την Ελλάδα και το ΕΤΧΣ βασίζονται στην κλείδα της ΕΚΤ αλλά περιλαμβάνουν διάφορους μηχανισμούς εξισορρόπησης και μη συμμετοχής, ώστε να λαμβάνεται υπόψη η αγοραία κατάσταση του οικείου κράτους μέλους. Οι ενδεχόμενες συνεισφορές στο πλαίσιο του ΕΜΣ βασίζονται σε προσαρμοσμένη κλείδα της ΕΚΤ στην οποία έχουν ενσωματωθεί διορθώσεις για τα νέα κράτη μέλη το ΑΕΠ των οποίων είναι σημαντικά χαμηλότερο από τον μέσο όρο.

2. Βλ. παραρτήματα.

3. και 4. Είχαν ήδη ληφθεί μέτρα σε όλα τα μέσα στήριξης τα οποία επηρεάζουν άμεσα το χρέος των κρατών μελών (Δανειακή διευκόλυνση για την Ελλάδα και ΕΤΧΣ) ώστε να ληφθεί υπόψη η θέση των συνεισφερόντων κρατών που βρίσκονταν σε επισφαλή οικονομική κατάσταση κατά τον χρόνο χρησιμοποίησης του εκάστοτε μέσου στήριξης. Η χρηματοδοτική συνδρομή που χορηγείται στο πλαίσιο του ΕΜΣ και του ΕΜΧΣ δεν επηρεάζει το χρέος των κρατών μελών (ίδια λογιστική μεταχείριση με την περίπτωση συνεισφορών σε διεθνή χρηματοπιστωτικά ιδρύματα).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012300/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: Cost of rescuing euro area countries with Memorandum status

According to newspaper reports (*Kathimerini* newspaper, 27 October 2013), there is a massive disparity between the contributions made by Member States of the euro area in order to rescue the economies of Member States with Memorandum status. What is most surprising is that the Mediterranean and periphery countries, which are in huge economic difficulty, appear to have contributed more (as a percentage of GDP) than stronger countries with robust economies. Countries such as Cyprus, Spain, Italy and Slovenia appear to have contributed a much higher percentage of GDP than countries with strong and robust economies, such as Germany, Austria and the Netherlands.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Based on the official statistics held by the Commission, is the above claim true?

2. Could the Commission provide official comparative statistics on the contributions made by the Member States of the euro area in order to rescue countries with Memorandum status?

3. If the above claim is true, does it think that this raises the question of a fairer distribution of the cost of rescuing Memorandum countries?

4. What measures does it intend to take in this direction?

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

1. The direct or indirect contributing keys of Member States vary substantially according to the instrument used. The contributions under the EFSM are in line with the EU budget key. The contributions under the Greek loan facility and the EFSF are based on the ECB key, but with various balancing and stepping out formula so as to take into account the market situation of the Member State concerned. The potential contributions under the ESM are based on an adjusted ECB key, corrected for the new Member States having a GDP significantly below the average.

2. See annexes.

3 and 4. Measures were already taken in all the instruments having a direct effect on the debt of Member States (GLF and EFSF) to take into account the situation of the contributing countries in a delicate financial situation when the instrument was used. Financial assistance granted under the ESM and EFSM has no effect on the debt of Member States (same accounting treatment as for contributions to international financial institutions).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012301/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ποσοστό επιβίωσης από καρδιοαναπνευστική αναζωογόνηση

400 000 ζωές χάνονται στην Ευρώπη ετήσια, λόγω καρδιακής ανακοπής, ενώ μπορούν να σωθούν, ετήσια, 100 000 από αυτές, αν έγκαιρα εντός των 3-4 πρώτων λεπτών δοθεί καρδιοαναπνευστική αναζωογόνηση και χρησιμοποιηθούν αυτόματοι εξωτερικοί απινιδωτές.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Α. Διαθέτει συγκριτικά στοιχεία ανά χώρα μέλος της ΕΕ που να δείχνουν επακριβώς τον αριθμό των ευρωπαίων πολιτών που παθαίνουν καρδιακή ανακοπή και πόσοι από αυτούς επιβιώνουν μετά από καρδιοαναπνευστική αναζωογόνηση και χρήση απινιδωτών;

Β. Προτίθεται να εκδώσει μία σχετική οδηγία ώστε το μάθημα της καρδιοαναπνευστικής αναζωογόνησης και η χρήση απινιδωτών να διδάσκεται σε όλα τα σχολεία της ΕΕ από την ηλικία των 12 ετών και άνω, ώστε να αυξηθεί παντού το ποσοστό ενημέρωσης και, ως εκ τούτου, και το ποσοστό επιβίωσης, όπως ισχύει στην Ολλανδία και Γερμανία;

Γ. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει ώστε να προωθήσει την ιδέα για καθιέρωση μίας ετήσιας εβδομάδας αφιερωμένης στο θέμα της αντιμετώπισης της καρδιακής ανακοπής, σύμφωνα με την γραπτή δήλωση 11/2012 που ψήφισε το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, με δεδομένο ότι από εφέτος καθιερώθηκε η 16η Οκτωβρίου ως ημέρα επανεκκίνησης της καρδιάς; Θα μπορούσε να καθιερώσει την 3η εβδομάδα του Οκτώβρη γι' αυτό τον σκοπό σε όλες τις χώρες μέλη;

Απάντηση του κ. Borg εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(17 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει στοιχεία σχετικά με το ποσοστό επιβίωσης από καρδιοαναπνευστική αναζωογόνηση. Ωστόσο, η έκθεση του ΟΟΣΑ «Health at a Glance Europe 2012» ([1]) (Η υγεία της Ευρώπης το 2012 με μια ματιά), η οποία χρηματοδοτήθηκε από την ΕΕ, παρέχει ορισμένα στοιχεία σχετικά με την ενδονοσοκομειακή θνησιμότητα ύστερα από οξύ έμφραγμα του μυοκαρδίου, καθώς και την ενδονοσοκομειακή θνησιμότητα ύστερα από εγκεφαλικό επεισόδιο στο κεφάλαιο για την ποιότητα της περίθαλψης.

Η Επιτροπή δεν προτίθεται να εκδώσει οδηγία της ΕΕ που να απαιτεί από όλους τους μαθητές ηλικίας 12 ετών και άνω να εκπαιδευτούν στην καρδιοαναπνευστική αναζωογόνηση και στη χρήση απινιδωτή, καθώς το εν λόγω ζήτημα εμπίπτει στην αποκλειστική αρμοδιότητα των κρατών μελών.

Η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει τους γενικούς στόχους της γραπτής δήλωσης και επιδιώκει την ανάληψη δράσης στον τομέα αυτό στο πλαίσιο της περιορισμένης αρμοδιότητας που διαθέτει.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/reports/european/health_glance_2012_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012301/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: CPR survival rate

400 000 people a year in Europe die as a result of cardiac arrest. 100 000 of those lives could be saved if CPR is given and a defibrillator is used within the first 3 to 4 minutes.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

A. Does it have a breakdown by EU Member State of the exact number of European citizens who suffer cardiac arrest and how many of them survive following CPR and defibrillation?

B. Does it intend to issue a directive requiring all EU school pupils aged 12 and over to learn to administer CPR and use a defibrillator, in order to increase the level of knowledge and, as a result, the overall survival rate, as required in the Netherlands and Germany?

C. What does it intend to do to promote the idea of establishing a cardiac arrest awareness week, in keeping with written declaration 0011/2012 adopted by the European Parliament, especially as 16 October was established this year as European Restart a Heart Day? Perhaps the 3rd week in October could be used for that week in all the Member States?

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

The Commission does not have data on cardio pulmonary resuscitation survival rate. However, the EU-funded report Health at a Glance Europe 2012 ([1]), by the OECD, provides some data on in-hospital mortality following acute myocardial infarction and in-hospital mortality following stroke in the chapter on quality of care.

The Commission does not intend to issue a directive requiring all EU school pupils aged 12 and over to learn to administer cardio pulmonary resuscitation and use a defibrillator, because this issue falls under the exclusive responsibility of the EU Member States.

The Commission supports the general aims of the Written Declaration, and pursues action in this area within its limited competence.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/reports/european/health_glance_2012_en.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012302/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Προώθηση της γλωσσομάθειας των ευρωπαίων πολιτών

Η προώθηση της γλωσσομάθειας των ευρωπαίων πολιτών είναι σημαντικός στόχος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Καλείται η Επιτροπή να απαντήσει:

α. Πώς συγκρίνονται οι Κύπριοι πολίτες σε σχέση με τον κοινοτικό μέσο όρο όσον αφορά την ικανότητα τους να μιλούν τουλάχιστον μία ξένη γλώσσα;

β. Ποιες είναι οι χώρες με τα καλύτερα αποτελέσματα και ποια μέτρα προτείνει για να σημειωθεί πρόοδος και στις υπόλοιπες χώρες της ΕΕ;

Απάντηση της κ. Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(19 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

Σύμφωνα με μια ειδική έρευνα του Ευρωβαρόμετρου ([1]) του 2012 όσον αφορά τη γνώση ξένων γλωσσών όπως την αντιλαμβάνονται τα ίδια τα άτομα, το 76% των Κυπρίων μιλά τουλάχιστον μια ξένη γλώσσα, ενώ το αντίστοιχο μέσο ποσοστό της ΕΕ των 27 για το 2012 είναι 54%. Τα κράτη μέλη με τις καλύτερες επιδόσεις σύμφωνα με τα εν λόγω στατιστικά είναι το Λουξεμβούργο, η Λιθουανία, οι Κάτω Χώρες, η Μάλτα, η Σλοβενία, η Λετονία και η Σουηδία, με περισσότερο από το 90% των πληθυσμών τους να δηλώνει γνώση τουλάχιστον μιας ξένης γλώσσας. Όμως, η Δανία, η Εσθονία, η Σλοβακία και η Αυστρία έχουν καλύτερη επίδοση από την Κύπρο.

Τα τελευταία χρόνια, η Επιτροπή έχει καταβάλει προσπάθειες για την προώθηση της διδασκαλίας των ξένων γλωσσών και βοηθά τα κράτη μέλη που υστερούν στην γλωσσικές ικανότητες να σημειώσουν πρόοδο. Τον Νοέμβριο του 2012, η Επιτροπή ενέκρινε τη στρατηγική για τον «ανασχεδιασμό της εκπαίδευσης» στην οποία υπογράμμισε τη σημασία που έχει η γνώση ξένων γλωσσών για την απασχολησιμότητα. Επίσης, παρουσίασε στα κράτη μέλη κατευθυντήριες γραμμές σχετικά με τους παράγοντες που συμβάλλουν στην αποτελεσματική διδασκαλία των γλωσσών ([2]).

Επιπλέον, ο «ανασχεδιασμός της εκπαίδευσης» περιελάμβανε την πρόταση της Επιτροπής για την καθιέρωση ενός δείκτη αναφοράς της ΕΕ όσον αφορά τη γλωσσομάθεια. Ο δείκτης αναφοράς βασίζεται στην πρόταση της συνόδου κορυφής στη Βαρκελώνη το 2002 να παρέχεται στους Ευρωπαίους η δυνατότητα εκμάθησης δύο ξένων γλωσσών από πολύ μικρή ηλικία. Η πρόταση ορίζει ως στόχο ότι έως το 2020 στην ΕΕ τουλάχιστον το 50% των ατόμων ηλικίας 15 ετών θα πρέπει να έχει φτάσει το επίπεδο του ανεξάρτητου χρήστη στην πρώτη ξένη γλώσσα και τουλάχιστον το 75% των μαθητών της δευτεροβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης θα πρέπει να μάθει δύο ξένες γλώσσες. Η Επιτροπή συζητά ήδη με επικείμενες Προεδρίες του Συμβουλίου τον προγραμματισμό των συζητήσεων για την υιοθέτηση ενός τέτοιου δείκτη αναφοράς.

([1]) Το τμήμα Ανάλυσης της Κοινής Γνώμης της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής διεξάγει σε τακτά χρονικά διαστήματα έρευνες με τίτλο «Οι Ευρωπαίοι και οι γλώσσες τους». Οι έρευνες αυτές παρέχουν μια εικόνα των γλωσσικών γνώσεων, της εκμάθησης γλωσσών και της στάσης απέναντι στη μετάφραση και στην ΕΕ. Μέχρι στιγμής, έχουν διεξαχθεί 3 έρευνες — το 2001, 2006 και το 2012. Για περισσότερες πληροφορίες για την έρευνα του 2012, παρακαλώ επισκεφθείτε το: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_386_en.pdf

([2]) Περισσότερες πληροφορίες σχετικά με τη στρατηγική αυτή στη διεύθυνση http://ec.europa.eu/education/news/rethinking/swd372_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012302/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: Action to promote language learning among European citizens

Action to promote language learning among European citizens is an important objective of the European Union.

In view of this, will the Commission say:

(a) How do Cypriot citizens compare with the EU average in terms of their ability to speak at least one foreign language?

(b) Which countries have the best results and what measures does it propose to take in order to boost progress in the rest of the EU?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

According to a special Eurobarometer survey ([1]) from 2012 on self-reported knowledge of foreign language skills, 76% of Cypriot citizens speak at least one foreign language, whereas this figure was 54% for the EU-27 average in 2012. The best performing Member States according to the these statistics are Luxembourg, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Malta, Slovenia, Latvia and Sweden, with more than 90% of their populations reporting knowledge of at least one foreign language. However, Denmark, Estonia, Slovakia and Austria also score higher than Cyprus.

In recent years, the Commission has sought to promote the teaching of foreign languages and help Member States that lag behind in language competences to make progress. In November 2012, the Commission adopted the 'Rethinking Education' strategy, in which it highlighted the importance of foreign language skills for employability. It also presented guidance to Member States about the factors that contribute to effective language teaching. ([2])

In addition, 'Rethinking Education' included the Commission proposal for an EU benchmark on foreign languages proficiency. The benchmark is based on the 2002 Barcelona Summit proposal of providing Europeans with the opportunity of learning two foreign languages from an early age. The proposal sets as a goal that by 2020 at least 50% of 15-year-olds in the EU should attain the level of independent user in a first foreign language, and that at least 75% of pupils in lower secondary education should study two foreign languages. The Commission is currently discussing with upcoming Council Presidencies the scheduling of discussions with a view to adoption of such a benchmark.

([1]) Periodic surveys on 'Europeans and their languages' are carried out by the Public Opinion Analysis sector of the European Commission. They provide a picture of language knowledge, language learning, and attitudes to language and translation in the EU. So far, 3 surveys have been conducted — in 2001, 2006 and 2012. For more details about the 2012 survey, please refer to: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_386_en.pdf

([2]) More information about this strategy at http://ec.europa.eu/education/news/rethinking/swd372_en.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012303/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(29 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Η επιχειρηματικότητα στην ευρωπαϊκή εκπαίδευση

Η έκθεση ([1]) «Η φιλοσοφία της αποτυχίας για την Ευρώπη» του Stefan Theil, που δημοσιεύτηκε στο Institute of Public Affairs αναφέροντας συγκεκριμένα παραδείγματα από τα εκπαιδευτικά συστήματα της Γαλλίας και της Γερμανίας αλλά και στατιστικές έρευνες, καταλήγει στο συμπέρασμα ότι η επιχειρηματικότητα στην Ευρώπη αποθαρρύνεται από τα πρώτα στάδια της εκπαίδευσης. Την ίδια στιγμή, σε έρευνα του ευρωβαρόμετρου ([2]) η πλειονότητα των Ευρωπαίων (58%) που ποτέ δεν προχώρησε στην ίδρυση επιχείρησης δηλώνει πως ποτέ δεν σκέφτηκε να δραστηριοποιηθεί κατά αυτό τον τρόπο, ενώ 76% των ευρωπαίων πολιτών δεν συμμετείχε σε μάθημα ή δραστηριότητα για την επιχειρηματικότητα. Στην ίδια έρευνα διαπιστώνονται και οι σημαντικές ανισορροπίες μεταξύ των κρατών μελών όσον αφορά τη σχολική εκπαίδευση και το ενδιαφέρον για την επιχειρηματικότητα που προκάλεσε στους ερωτηθέντες. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στοχεύοντας στο ότι όλοι οι νέοι άνθρωποι θα πρέπει να επωφελούνται από τουλάχιστον μία πρακτική επιχειρηματική εμπειρία πριν από την ολοκλήρωση της εκπαίδευσης τους ([3]), τονίζει μέσω του «Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan» και της έκθεσης «Rethinking Education» τη σημασία ενσωμάτωσης της επιχειρηματικότητας σε όλα τα στάδια της εκπαίδευσης.

Δεδομένων των παραπάνω ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

α) Πώς αξιολογεί τα ευρήματα και τις αναφορές της έκθεσης του Institute of Public Affairs;

β) Πέραν των πρακτικών διασύνδεσης της επιχειρηματικότητας με την εκπαίδευση που αναφέρονται στην έκθεση «Οδηγός για εκπαιδευτές» σε ευρωπαϊκά εκπαιδευτικά ιδρύματα, διαθέτει στοιχεία για τις υστερήσεις των ευρωπαϊκών κρατών στη διασύνδεση της εκπαίδευσης και της επιχειρηματικότητας; Διαθέτει σχετικά στοιχεία για τις ανισορροπίες μεταξύ των κρατών μελών αλλά και τις υστερήσεις τους σε σχέση με τρίτες χώρες (τομείς, χώρες);

γ) Όσον αφορά στις απαραίτητες συνθήκες για τη στήριξη της επιχειρηματικής εκπαίδευσης που παρουσιάζονται στην προαναφερόμενη έκθεση, πού εμφανίζει τα μεγαλύτερα προβλήματα η Ευρώπη; Πώς επηρεάζονται οι πολιτικές στην εκπαίδευση από τις δημοσιονομικές προσπάθειες και πώς σκοπεύει να αντιδράσει η ΕΕ για να ενισχύσει τα εθνικά εκπαιδευτικά συστήματα;

Απάντηση της κ. Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(9 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Η έκθεση που αναφέρει ο κ. βουλευτής είναι μία από ορισμένες δημοσιεύσεις που ασχολούνται με παρόμοια θέματα. Σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο, υπάρχει εστίαση στην ενσωμάτωση της εκπαίδευσης στην επιχειρηματικότητα σε όλες τις βαθμίδες της εκπαίδευσης, όπως επιβεβαιώνεται στην ανακοίνωση «Ανασχεδιασμός της εκπαίδευσης» ([4]) και στο σχέδιο δράσης «Επιχειρηματικότητα 2020» ([5]). Η πρόσφατη θεματική ομάδα εργασίας για την εκπαίδευση σε θέματα επιχειρηματικότητας προσδιόρισε πέντε βασικούς παράγοντες επιτυχίας: δημιουργία εκπαιδευτών, αποτελέσματα μάθησης, πρόγραμμα σπουδών, ενδιαφερόμενα μέρη και μέτρηση.

Έχει διαπιστωθεί σημαντική πρόοδος, μένουν, όμως, πολλά να γίνουν ακόμη. Η ετήσια έκθεση παρακολούθησης της εκπαίδευσης και της κατάρτισης ([6]) αναλύει βασικούς τομείς της πολιτικής για την εκπαίδευση και την κατάρτιση, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της εκπαίδευσης σε θέματα επιχειρηματικότητας. Η μελέτη Eurydice του 2012 ([7]) ανέλυσε ενέργειες και εφαρμογή πολιτικής, προσδιορίζοντας 22 χώρες της ΕΕ με στρατηγικές ή πρωτοβουλίες. Το Ευρωβαρόμετρο Flash του 2012 ([8]) παρέχει στατιστικές πληροφορίες για την ΕΕ και τις τρίτες χώρες. Επισημαίνει ότι, ενώ το 50% των πολιτών της ΕΕ συμφωνεί ότι το σχολείο τους βοήθησε να αναπτύξουν πρωτοβουλία και επιχειρηματική συμπεριφορά, υπάρχει εντυπωσιακό εύρος απαντήσεων μεταξύ των χωρών (από το 17% στο ΗΒ έως το 65% στην Πορτογαλία· και από το 15% στην Ιαπωνία στο 64% στη Βραζιλία).

([1]) http://www.ipa.org.au/library/publication/1210833458_document_60-1_theil.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_354_en.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/promoting-entrepreneurship/files/education/entredu-manual-fv_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/news/rethinking_en.htm
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0795:FIN:en:PDF
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/progress_en.htm
([7]) http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/135EN.pdf
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_354_en.pdf

Η σημασία των επενδύσεων στην εκπαίδευση για την υποστήριξη της οικονομικής ανάπτυξης υπογραμμίστηκε στον «Ανασχεδιασμό της εκπαίδευσης». Ως συνέχεια, η Επιτροπή διοργάνωσε ένα πρώτο εργαστήριο για την ανάλυση κόστους-οφέλους και την αποτελεσματικότητα από πλευράς κόστους στη Στοκχόλμη τον Νοέμβριο του 2013, ενώ, το 2014, μια νέα υποομάδα της μόνιμης ομάδας της ΕΕ για τους δείκτες και τα σημεία αναφοράς θα ασχοληθεί επίσης με τις επενδύσεις στην εκπαίδευση.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012303/13
to the Commission
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: Entrepreneurship in European education

Stefan Theil's report 'Europe's Philosophy of Failure' ([1]), published by the Institute of Public Affairs, arrives at the conclusion, based on specific examples from the French and German educational systems and statistical surveys, that entrepreneurship is being stifled in Europe from the very first stages of education. At the same time, according to a Eurobarometer survey ([2]), the majority of Europeans who have never started a business (58%) said that it had never crossed their mind to do so and 76% of European citizens have never taken part in a course or activity about entrepreneurship. The same survey identified serious inequalities between the Member States in terms of school education and the interest it gave interviewees in becoming entrepreneurs. The European Union stresses the importance of including entrepreneurship at all levels of education in its Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan and 'Rethinking Education' report, in line with its objective that all young people should benefit from at least one business internship before completing their education ([3]).

In view of this, will the Commission say:

(a) What is its assessment of the findings and conclusions of the Institute of Public Affairs report?

(b) Apart from the practical learning and enterprise links in European education institutions referred to in the report 'A Guide for Educators', does it have data on which European states are lagging behind in terms of learning and enterprise links? Does it have data on inequalities between the Member States and the degree to which they are lagging behind third countries (sectors, countries)?

(c) What are Europe's biggest problems in terms of the preconditions to support for business education presented in the aforementioned report? How are education policies being affected by fiscal efforts and how does the EU intend to react in order to improve national educational systems?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(9 January 2014)

The report mentioned by the honourable member is one of a number of publications addressing similar topics. At European level, there is a focus on embedding entrepreneurship education at all stages of education, as confirmed in the Rethinking Education Communication ([4]) and the Entrepreneurship2020 Action Plan ([5]). The recent Thematic Working Group on Entrepreneurship Education identified five key success factors: educator development, learning outcomes, curriculum, stakeholders and measurement.

Significant progress can be seen, but there is still much work to be done. The annual Education and Training Monitor ([6]) analyses key areas of education and training policy, including entrepreneurship education. The 2012 Eurydice study ([7]) analysed policy inputs and implementation, identifying 22 EU countries with strategies or initiatives. The 2012 Flash Eurobarometer ([8]) gives statistical insight into EU and third countries. It highlights that, while 50% of EU citizens agreed that school helped them develop initiative and entrepreneurial attitude, there is a striking range of responses among countries (from 17% in the UK to 65% in Portugal; and from 15% in Japan to 64% in Brazil).

The importance of investment in education to support economic growth was highlighted in Rethinking Education. As follow up, the Commission organised a first workshop on Cost-Benefit Analysis and Cost Effectiveness in Stockholm in November 2013, while in 2014 a new sub group of the EU Standing Group on Indicators and Benchmarks will also address investment in education.

([1]) http://www.ipa.org.au/library/publication/1210833458_document_60-1_theil.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_354_en.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/promoting-entrepreneurship/files/education/entredu-manual-fv_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/news/rethinking_en.htm
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0795:FIN:en:PDF
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/progress_en.htm
([7]) http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/135EN.pdf
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_354_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012304/13
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(29 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Richiesta di misure di sostegno nei confronti di 10 mila lavoratori dell'azienda Alcatel Lucent, che rischiano di essere licenziati

La compagnia Alcatel Lucent, con sede principale a Parigi, produce hardware e software per le telecomunicazioni. In Italia, gli Headquarters e i principali laboratori sono localizzati a Vimercate, in provincia di Monza e Brianza; altri centri di ricerca e sviluppo sono situati a Battipaglia e a Rieti, mentre a Trieste è attivo uno stabilimento di produzione.

Il nome attuale della compagnia si deve alla fusione dei gruppi Alcatel e Lucent Technologies, avvenuta nel 2006.

La compagnia, che ha già ceduto diversi suoi stabilimenti ad altre aziende, ha ora annunciato di voler attuare un piano di ristrutturazione che la renda più competitiva; parte di questo piano comprende il licenziamento di 10 mila lavoratori, 600 solo a Vimercate.

Pertanto chiedo alla Commissione: è a conoscenza di finanziamenti dell'UE, diretti o indiretti, erogati a favore di questa multinazionale?

Per quanto concerne il diritto d'informazione dei lavoratori nelle imprese con più di 50 dipendenti, come intende agire la Commissione per evitare che gli impiegati di tali imprese si trovino, senza alcun preavviso, improvvisamente disoccupati?

Intende la Commissione introdurre, in occasione della prossima programmazione e della revisione del FSE, un Fondo di emergenza destinato a sostenere lavoratori come quelli dell'«Alcatel Lucent»?

Intende creare dei canali di condivisione tra le istituzioni locali/regionali e le multinazionali sulle loro strategie industriali per i diversi territori?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(19 dicembre 2013)

Stando alle informazioni in nostro possesso e al sito web «Open Cohesion» ([1]), Alcatel Lucent non ha ricevuto nessun finanziamento dai fondi strutturali europei in Italia. Ulteriori informazioni su quali organizzazioni e imprese abbiano ricevuto finanziamenti dal bilancio dell'UE possono essere reperite utilizzando il motore di ricerca istituito nell'ambito del sistema di trasparenza finanziaria disponibile su BudgWeb ([2]).

La Commissione rammenta che il datore di lavoro ha l'obbligo d'informare e consultare i lavoratori prima di prendere decisioni che li interessano in caso di ristrutturazioni di imprese o di licenziamenti collettivi, conformemente alla normativa dell'UE ed in particolare alle direttive 2002/14/CE ([3]) e 98/59/CE ([4]). Spetta alle autorità nazionali competenti assicurare che la legislazione nazionale a recepimento di tali direttive sia applicata in modo corretto ed efficace.

Obiettivo del Fondo sociale europeo (FSE) è migliorare le opportunità occupazionali, promuovere l'istruzione e l'apprendimento permanente nonché sviluppare politiche attive d'inclusione. In questa sua qualità esso non eroga un sostegno d'emergenza ai lavoratori, come ad esempio quelli alle dipendenze di Alcatel Lucent. Tuttavia, i lavoratori interessati possono beneficiare delle attività cofinanziate dall'FSE.

Il ruolo del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG) è per l'appunto quello di sostenere i lavoratori colpiti da licenziamenti su grande scala correlati alla globalizzazione.

([1]) http://www.opencoesione.gov.it/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/beneficiaries_it.htm
([3]) Direttiva 2002/14/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, dell'11 marzo 2002, che istituisce un quadro generale relativo all'informazione e alla consultazione dei lavoratori, GU L 80 del 23.3.2002.
([4]) Direttiva 98/59/CE del Consiglio, del 20 luglio 1998, concernente il ravvicinamento delle legislazioni degli Stati membri in materia di licenziamenti collettivi, GU L 225 del 12.8.1998.

Inoltre l'accordo preliminare raggiunto di recente a livello di colegislazione reintroduce la «crisi» quale criterio di ammissibilità per il periodo di programmazione 2014-2020. Se ciò verrà confermato ne conseguirà che probabilmente l'Italia potrà chiedere un sostegno per i lavoratori interessati. L'Onorevole deputato è invitato ad interpellare la persona di contatto del FEG per l'Italia ([5]) per sapere se è prevista la presentazione di una simile domanda.

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012304/13
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: Request for measures to support 10 000 Alcatel Lucent workers facing redundancy

Alcatel Lucent manufactures hardware and software for the telecommunications industry. Its head office is in Paris. The company's Italian headquarters and main research facilities are in Vimercate, in the province of Monza and Brianza, and it has further research and development centres in Battipaglia and Rieti and a production plant in Trieste.

The company derives its name from the merger between the Alcatel and Lucent Technologies groups in 2006.

It has already sold some of its facilities to other companies and has now announced its intention to implement a downsizing plan in an attempt to become more competitive. Part of this plan involves making 10 000 workers redundant, including 600 in Vimercate alone.

Does the Commission know whether this multinational has received any EU funding, either directly or indirectly?

As regards the right to information of workers in businesses with more than 50 employees, what action does the Commission intend to take to prevent employees of such businesses finding themselves suddenly unemployed without notice?

Does the Commission intend to introduce an emergency fund to support workers like those employed at Alcatel Lucent during the next programming period and European Social Fund review?

Does the Commission plan to establish channels for multinationals to communicate with local and regional bodies about their industrial strategies for different regions?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

According to the information in our possession and to the 'Open Cohesion' website ([1]), Alcatel Lucent has not received any funding from the European structural funds in Italy. Further information on which organisations and companies have received funding from the EU budget may be found by using the search engine set up within the Financial Transparency System available on BudgWeb ([2]).

The Commission recalls that the employer has to inform and consult employees before taking decisions affecting them in cases of restructuring of companies or collective redundancies, in accordance with EC law in particular Directives 2002/14/EC ([3]) and 98/59/EC ([4]). It is for the competent national authorities to ensure that the national legislation transposing these Directives is correctly and effectively applied.

The aim of the European Social Fund (ESF) is to improve employment opportunities, promote education and life-long learning, and develop active inclusion policies. As such, it does not provide emergency support to workers such as those employed by Alcatel Lucent. However, the workers concerned may benefit from the activities co-financed by the ESF.

The Globalisation Adjustment Fund's (EGF) role is precisely to support workers affected by large-scale redundancies linked to globalisation.

Moreover the preliminary agreement recently reached by the co-legislation reintroduces the 'crisis' as an eligibility criterion for the programming period 2014-2020. If confirmed, that would most likely allow Italy to apply for support for the workers concerned. The Honourable Member is advised to get in touch with the EGF Contact Person for Italy ([5]) to enquire whether such an application is being planned.

([1]) http://www.opencoesione.gov.it/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/beneficiaries_en.htm
([3]) Directive 2002/14/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2002 establishing a general framework for informing and consulting employees in the European Community, OJ L 80, 23.3.2002.
([4]) Council Directive 98/59/EC of 20 July 1998 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to collective redundancies, OJ L 225, 12.8.1998.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-012306/13
Komisi
Olga Sehnalová (S&D)
(29. října 2013)

Předmět: Změny v přepravě osob na vozíku ze strany společnosti RegioJet, a.s.

Společnost RegioJet, a.s., která je součástí společnosti Student Agency, k.s. a od roku 2011 provozuje služby v oblasti železniční přepravy v České republice a na Slovensku, umístila dne 21. 10. 2013 na své internetové stránky sdělení cestujícím, že dle smlouvy s národním železničním dopravcem České dráhy, a.s. (ČD) byla nucena objednávat plošiny pro osoby na vozíku s velkým předstihem a z tohoto důvodu se rozhodla, že od 1. 11. 2013 upustí od předražené služby ČD a umožní nástup osob na vozíku i bez předchozí objednávky. RegioJet v tomto sdělení dále uvedla, že ČD si za zapůjčení této plošiny účtují 3 630 Kč až 7 260 Kč za jednu osobu na vozíku a 36 hodin před odjezdem tato služba ČD již není k dispozici. Proto bude od 1. 11. 2013 RegioJet nakládat osoby na vozíku do vlaku pomocí členů posádky RegioJet. Podle RegioJet je výhodou to, že cestující nemusí přepravu s vozíkem objednávat s předstihem. RegioJet zároveň uvedla, že nedisponuje nízkopodlažními vlaky pro přepravu cestujících na vozíku na trase Ostrava–Praha, a proto nedoporučuje osobám na vozíku cestování vlaky RegioJet, neboť jim nemůže zajistit plný komfort. Ve vlaku sice má k dispozici 5 až 7 míst pro vozíčkáře, tato místa jsou však na chodbě u WC a podle názoru RegioJet nejsou důstojná. Společnost dále uvedla, že pohyb po vlaku na vozíku není z prostorových důvodů možný. RegioJet těmto osobám ve svém sdělení doporučila využívat vlaky společnosti Leo Express. Na závěr uvedla, že pokud se cestující na vozíku rozhodne i přes tuto skutečnost cestovat s Regiojet, může tak činit i po 1. 11. 2013.

S ohledem na platnou legislativu v oblasti železniční přepravy, především pak na nařízení Evropského parlamentu a Rady (ES) č. 1371/2007 ze dne 23. října 2007 o právech a povinnostech cestujících v železniční přepravě:

Může Komise jednoznačně konstatovat, zda v České republice došlo, nebo nedošlo k porušení evropského práva?

Upravuje platná evropská legislativa ceny za pronájem plošin a jiných nástrojů na železnici pro přepravu osob s omezenou schopností pohybu?

Jaké podmínky musí přepravce poskytující služby na železnici splnit, aby měl právo odepřít nástup cestujícím se zdravotním postižením a osobám s omezenou schopností pohybu a orientace?

Považuje Komise nástup osob na vozíku s osobní asistencí za adekvátní řešení?

Odpověď Siima Kallase jménem Komise
(23. prosince 2013)

Uplatňování a prosazování nařízení (ES) č. 1371/2007 zajišťují členské státy, které rovněž jmenují vnitrostátní orgány ([1]), jež odpovídají za správné uplatňování uvedeného nařízení ([2]).

1. Podle čl. 19 odst. 1 nařízení musí mít železniční podniky zavedena nediskriminační pravidla pro přístup platná pro přepravu zdravotně postižených osob. Podle článků 22 a 23 nařízení musí provozovatelé stanic v obsazených železničních stanicích a železniční podniky poskytnout cestujícím s omezenou schopností pohybu a orientace bezplatnou pomoc takovým způsobem, aby mohli nastoupit do vlaku nebo z něj vystoupit. Nařízení nespecifikuje prostředky (rampy nebo jiná zařízení) k poskytování takovéto pomoci. Česká republika nevyjmula z uplatňování těchto článků žádné železniční dopravní spoje. Pokud je to tedy slučitelné s platnými pravidly pro přístup, nelze pomoc osobám na vozíku při nástupu do vlaku odmítnout. Jestliže se odmítnutí železničního podniku nezakládá jasně na těchto pravidlech pro přístup, zdá se, že je to v rozporu s uvedeným nařízením. České orgány odpovědné za prosazování nařízení by měly proto posoudit, zda je toto případ společnosti RegioJet.

2. Ne.

3. Přepravu lze odepřít pouze v tom případě, že je neslučitelná s nediskriminačními pravidly pro přístup, např. když konstrukce drážních vozidel (vyrobených před zavedením stávajících pravidel pro přístup) neumožňuje přepravu osob na vozíku.

([1]) Článek 30 nařízení č. 1371/2007.
([2]) V České republice se jedná o Drážní úřad.

4. Asistence poskytovaná cestujícím na vozíku při nástupu do vlaku členy posádky může být adekvátním doplňkem požadavků na přístupnost podle článku 21 týkajícího se technických specifikací pro interoperabilitu (TSI ([3])) pro osoby s omezenou schopností pohybu a orientace. Komise však nepovažuje za adekvátní, aby zaměstnanci pomáhali osobám na vozíku tak, že je budou přenášet. Detailní pravidla a požadavky týkající se pomocných zařízení pro nastupování, ramp a zvedacích plošin jsou stanoveny v rozhodnutí Komise 2008/164/ES ([4]).

([3]) Technické specifikace pro interoperabilitu týkající se osob s omezenou schopností pohybu a orientace.

([4]) Rozhodnutí Komise 2008/164/ES ze dne 21. prosince 2007 o technické specifikaci pro interoperabilitu týkající se „osob s omezenou schopností pohybu a orientace“ v transevropském konvenčním a vysokorychlostním železničním systému, Úř. věst. L 64, 7.3.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012306/13
to the Commission
Olga Sehnalová (S&D)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: Changes affecting the transport of passengers in wheelchairs made by RegioJet a.s.

RegioJet a.s., a subsidiary company of Student Agency k.s., has been operating rail transport services in the Czech Republic and Slovakia since 2011. On 21 October 2013, RegioJet placed a notice to passengers on its website announcing that the provisions of its contract with the national rail carrier, České Dráhy a.s. (ČD), were forcing it to order ramps for passengers in wheelchairs far in advance and that it had therefore decided to stop using ČD's overpriced service and permit passengers in wheelchairs to board without prior reservation. The notice went on to say that ČD charges between CZK 3630 and CZK 7260 for the rental of such a ramp for a single passenger in a wheelchair and that this ČD service is no longer available 36 hours before the train's departure. Therefore, from 1 November 2013 passengers in wheelchairs will board with the help of RegioJet crew members. This, according to RegioJet, is good for passengers as it means that they will not have to make reservations for travel in advance. RegioJet then stated that it did not have access to low-floor trains to transport passengers using wheelchairs along the Ostrava-Prague route and that it did not advise such passengers to travel on RegioJet trains, as their comfort could not be fully guaranteed. Although there are between five and seven wheelchair places per train, these places are situated in the corridor beside the toilets and RegioJet feels that they are unsuitable. The company further stated that passengers in wheelchairs would be unable to move through the train for reasons of space. The notice recommended that such passengers use trains operated by Leo Express. In spite of this, the notice concludes by informing wheelchair users that they may still travel with RegioJet even after 1 November 2013.

With regard to current legislation on rail transport, and in particular to Regulation (EC) No 1371/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 on rail passengers' rights and obligations:

Can the Commission state with certainty whether or not European law has been breached in the Czech Republic?

Does current EU legislation regulate charges for the rental of ramps and other equipment used in transporting people with limited mobility on rail networks?

What conditions must the carrier providing rail services meet in order to have the right to refuse boarding to travellers with disabilities and limited mobility?

Does the Commission consider having staff help passengers in wheelchairs to board trains to be an adequate solution?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(23 December 2013)

Member States ensure the application and enforcement of Regulation (EC) No 1371/2007 and designate national authorities (NEB) ([1]) in charge of the correct application of the regulation ([2]).

1. Under Article 19 (1) of the regulation, RUs must set up non-discriminatory access rules for the transport of disabled persons. Under Articles 22 and 23 of the regulation, station managers at staffed stations and RUs shall provide passengers with reduced mobility assistance free of charge to enable them to board and disembark from a train. The regulation does not specify the means (ramps or other) to provide such assistance. The Czech Republic has not exempted any rail services from the application of these Articles. Therefore, if this is compatible with the applicable access rules, assistance to wheelchair users to board a train cannot be refused. If the RU's refusal is not clearly based on these access rules it would seem that it is in breach of the regulation. The Czech NEB would need to assess whether this is the case of Regio Jet.

2. No.

3. Transport can only be refused where it is incompatible with non-discriminatory access rules, e.g. where the physical design of rolling stock (manufactured before current accessibility rules were in place) does not permit to transport wheelchair users.

([1]) Article 30 of Regulation 1371/2007.
([2]) In the Czech Republic this is the Drážní úřad (Rail Authority).

4. Staff helping passengers in wheelchairs to board trains may be adequate to complement the accessibility requirements under Article 21 on Technical specifications for interoperability (TSI ([3])) for persons with reduced mobility. However, the Commission does not consider it adequate that staff assist wheelchair users by carrying them. Detailed rules and requirements regarding boarding aids, ramps and platform lifts are set out in Commission Decision 2008/164/EC ([4]).

([3]) Technical Specifications for Interoperability for persons with reduced mobility.

([4]) Commission Decision 2008/164/EC of 21 December 2007 concerning the technical specification of interoperability relating to 'persons with reduced mobility' in the trans-European conventional and high-speed rail system, OJ L64 of 7.3.2008.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub P-012309/13
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 ta' Ottubru 2013)

Suġġett: Solidarjetá fir-rigward ta' kwestjonijiet dwar il-migrazzjoni

B'referenza għall-Mistoqsija Parlamentari E-009971/2013, il-Kummissarju Malmström wieġbet li "skont l-informazzjoni miksuba minn Frontex li tirrifletti s-sitwazzjoni bejn Jannar u Awwissu 2013, ir-rotta migratorja tal-Mediterran Ċentrali esperjenzat l-akbar żidiet fil-flussi tal-immigrazzjoni meta mqabbla mal-istess perjodu tal-2012. Biex inkunu aktar preċiżi, f'dak il-perjodu nkixxfu 19 599 immigranti irregolari, ammont li jirrappreżenta żieda ta' 217 %."

Matul il-laqgħa tal-Kunsill tal-24 u l-25 ta' Ottubru 2013, l-Istati Membri impenjaw ruħhom li, f'Diċembru 2013, se jieħdu deċiżjonijiet operazzjonali konkreti fir-rigward ta' kwestjonijiet dwar il-migrazzjoni.

Fid-dawl ta' din iż-żieda kbira fil-migrazzjoni irregolari fir-reġjun tal-Mediterran:

1. il-Kummissjoni se tiżgura li l-Istati Membri jirrispettaw il-prinċipju ta' solidarjetá, u tiżgura l-kondiviżjoni obbligatorja tal-piż fost l-Istati Membri?

2. il-Kummissjoni sa liema punt lesta timbotta lill-Istati Membri jiddeċiedu dwar miżuri effettivi f'Diċembru 2013?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sra Malmström f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(4 ta' Diċembru 2013)

Il-Kummissjoni tinsab inkwetata ferm bl-avvenimenti barra mill-kosta ta' Lampedusa, kif muri biż-żjara tal-President Barroso u l-Kummissarju Malmström fuq il-gżira fid-9 ta' Ottubru 2013. F'din l-okkażjoni l-Kummissjoni tenniet l-appoġġ tagħha lill-Istati Membri li jkollhom iwettqu operazzjonijiet kumplessi ta' Tfittxija u Salvataġġ u li jirċievu numru kbir ta' migranti, inkluż billi wieġħdet total ta' EUR 30 miljun għar-rinfurzar tar-rondi fuq il-baħar u għat-tisħiħ tas-sistema tal-asil fl-Italja. Parti minn dawn il-fondi se tkun użata sabiex tiġi aġġornata l-preżenza tal-Frontex fiż-żona. Dan se jkun inkluż ma' attivitajiet ta' appoġġ eżistenti mmirati lejn l-Italja, bħall-Pjan ta' Appoġġ tal-Uffiċċju Ewropew ta' Appoġġ fil-qasam tal-Asil (EASO).

B'konformità mad-diskussjonijiet fl-aħħar Kunsill tal-Ġustizzja u Affarijiet Interni, il-Kummissjoni waqqfet Task Force speċifika għall-Mediterran taħt il-presidenza tagħha. Din it-Task Force tlaqqa' flimkien lill-Istati Membri kollha u l-aġenziji rilevanti. F'Diċembru, se tippreżenta r-riżultati tal-ħidma tagħha lill-Kunsill, inklużi azzjonijiet ġodda mmirati biex jitnaqqas ir-riskju li traġedji bħal dawn jiġru fil-futur.

Rigward il-qsim tal-piżijiet fuq livell tal-UE, l-istatistiċi juru li 70% tal-applikanti tal-asil kollha huma milqugħa minn ħames pajjiżi biss, jiġifieri l-Ġermanja, il-Belġju, Franza, ir-Renju Unit u l-Isvezja. Huwa ċar, madankollu, li l-Istati Membri fuq il-fruntiera tan-Nofsinhar huma esposti għal pressjoni migratorja partikolari u t-Task Force se tipproponi azzjoni operazzjonali biex ikompli jingħata appoġġ lil dawn il-pajjiżi li ħafna drabi jiffaċċjaw pressjonijiet f'daqqa fuq is-sistemi ta' asil u ta' akkoljenza tagħhom, inkluż billi l-Istati Membri jiġu mistiedna jagħmlu użu mill-għodod volontarji disponibbli bħar-rilokazzjoni.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012309/13
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: Solidarity regarding migration issues

With reference to Parliamentary Question E-009971/2013, Commissioner Malmström replied that 'according to the information obtained by Frontex and which reflects the situation between January and August 2013, the Central Mediterranean migratory route has recorded the greatest increases in immigration flows compared to the same period of 2012. More precisely, within that period 19 599 irregular immigrants were detected, which represents a 217% increase.'

In the Council meeting of 24 and 25 October 2013, the Member States committed to taking concrete operational decisions on migration issues in December 2013.

In view of this huge increase in irregular migration in the Mediterranean region:

1. will the Commission make sure that all the Member States respect the principle of solidarity, and ensure mandatory burden sharing among the Member States?

2. to what extent will the Commission push the Member States to decide on effective measures in December 2013?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(4 December 2013)

The Commission is deeply concerned by the events off the coast of Lampedusa, as demonstrated by the visit President Barroso and Commissioner Malmström paid to the island on 9 October 2013. On that occasion the Commission reiterated its support to Member States having to undertake complex Search and Rescue operations and receiving a large number of migrants, including by pledging a total of EUR 30 million for the reinforcement of patrolling and the strengthening of the asylum system in Italy. A part of these funds will be used in order to upgrade the Frontex presence in the area. This will come on top of existing support activities targeted at Italy, such as the Support Plan of the European Asylum Support Office (EASO).

In line with the discussions in the last Justice and Home Affairs Council, the Commission has set up a dedicated Task Force for the Mediterranean under its presidency. This Task Force brings together all Member States and relevant agencies. It will present the results of its work in December to the Council, including new actions aimed at reducing the risk of such tragedies occurring in the future.

Concerning burden sharing at the EU level, statistics show that 70% of all asylum applicants are received by just five countries, namely Germany, Belgium, France, United Kingdom and Sweden. It is clear, however, that Member States on the southern border are exposed to particular migratory pressure and the Task Force will propose operational action to continue providing support to these countries which often face sudden pressures on their asylum and reception systems, including by inviting Member States to make use of available voluntary tools such as relocation.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012312/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(29 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ποσοστά κάλυψης του εργατικού δυναμικού από Συλλογικές Συμβάσεις Εργασίας

Ο Κοινωνικός Διάλογος και οι Ελεύθερες Συλλογικές Διαπραγματεύσεις αποτελούν μια βασική συνιστώσα του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινωνικού Μοντέλου. Ακολούθως οι Συλλογικές Συμβάσεις Εργασίας ως «προϊόντα» των παραπάνω διαδικασιών καθίστανται αναγκαία συνθήκη για τη διασφάλιση της εργασιακής ειρήνης και δικαιοσύνης, για τη «σύζευξη» του ελεύθερου οικονομικού ανταγωνισμού με την κοινωνική ασφάλεια και αλληλεγγύη. Στο πλαίσιο των πολιτικών αντιμετώπισης της δημοσιονομικής κρίσης, οι χώρες που αντιμετώπιζαν τα σοβαρότερα μακροοικονομικά προβλήματα κλήθηκαν από την Τρόικα να προωθήσουν μεταρρυθμίσεις και παρεμβάσεις που αφενός αποδυνάμωναν τον κοινωνικό διάλογο και αφετέρου οδηγούσαν σε μια βίαιη αποκέντρωση του Συστήματος των Συλλογικών Διαπραγματεύσεων σε επίπεδο ατόμου (ατομικές συμβάσεις). Σε αυτήν την κατεύθυνση ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς αξιολογεί τις συνέπειες της βίαιης αποκέντρωσης των Συλλογικών Διαπραγματεύσεων στην εργατική πλευρά, όταν είναι κοινή παραδοχή ότι η σχέση εργαζόμενου-εργοδότη είναι εξ ορισμού άνιση και ετεροβαρής;

2. Κρίνει πως υπάρχει άμεση συσχέτιση των μεταρρυθμίσεων στην αγορά εργασίας με τη ραγδαία αύξηση του ποσοστού φτωχών εργαζομένων;

3. Διαθέτει στοιχεία σχετικά με τα ποσοστά κάλυψης του εργατικού δυναμικού των κρατών μελών από Συλλογικές Συμβάσεις Εργασίας;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(18 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

1. Ως γενική αρχή η Επιτροπή δεν προτείνει κανένα ιδιαίτερο επίπεδο διαπραγματεύσεων. Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 152 της ΣΛΕΕ, η Επιτροπή υποχρεούται να σέβεται την αυτονομία των κοινωνικών εταίρων και την ποικιλομορφία των συστημάτων εργασιακών σχέσεων. Είναι σημαντικό η συγκέντρωση των διαπραγματεύσεων να ιδωθεί εντός ενός ευρύτερου πλαισίου εργασιακών σχέσεων, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του συντονισμού των διαπραγματεύσεων.

2. Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί στενά την εξέλιξη της φτώχειας των εργαζομένων. Ενθαρρύνει τα κράτη μέλη να εφαρμόσουν τις κατάλληλες μεταρρυθμίσεις της εργατικής νομοθεσίας και των συστημάτων καθορισμού των μισθών, έτσι ώστε να καταστεί η αγορά εργασίας πιο ανθεκτική, να αντιμετωπιστεί ο κατακερματισμός της και η εργασιακή αβεβαιότητα, καθώς επίσης να βελτιωθεί η ποιότητα της απασχόλησης. Ειδικότερα, για να αντιμετωπιστεί το φαινόμενο των φτωχών εργαζομένων, η Επιτροπή συνιστά οι κατώτατοι μισθοί να καθορίζονται σε κατάλληλα επίπεδα, να μειωθεί το φορολογικό βάρος που επωμίζονται οι εργαζόμενοι με χαμηλά εισοδήματα, και να επεκταθούν οι παροχές λόγω εργασίας, έτσι ώστε να αυξηθεί το καθαρό εισόδημα των εργαζομένων ([1]).

Επιπλέον, το εν λόγω φαινόμενο ([2]) δεν εξαρτάται μόνο από τις ατομικές αποδοχές, αλλά και από τη σύνθεση των νοικοκυριών και το κατά πόσο απασχολούνται όλα τα μέλη του νοικοκυριού. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, η Επιτροπή συνιστά την προώθηση της απασχόλησης όσων συμπληρώνουν το εισόδημα μιας οικογενειακής εστίας και των μόνων γονέων, με την παροχή υπηρεσιών υποστήριξης (π.χ. παιδική μέριμνα), με την εξασφάλιση επαρκούς εισοδηματικής στήριξης, καθώς και με τα κατάλληλα κίνητρα και υποστήριξη στην εργασία.

3. Η έκθεση «Industrial Relations in Europe» (Εργασιακές σχέσεις στην Ευρώπη), που δημοσιεύεται δύο φορές ετησίως από την Επιτροπή ως έγγραφο εργασίας των υπηρεσιών της, περιλαμβάνει στοιχεία σχετικά με την κάλυψη των απασχολούμενων μισθωτών από συλλογικές διαπραγματεύσεις ([3]).

([1]) Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, «Στοχεύοντας σε μια ανάκαμψη με άφθονες θέσεις απασχόλησης», COM(2012)173 τελικό.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=6176
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/empl_portal/publications/Industrialrelations2012/Chap1_Chart-1.xlsx

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012312/13
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: Percentage of labour force covered by collective agreements

Social dialogue and free collective bargaining are a basic component of the European social model. Therefore, as a 'product' of the above procedures, collective agreements are a necessary precondition to peace and justice on the labour market and for 'pairing' free economic competition with social security and solidarity. Within the framework of policies to address the budgetary crisis, the Troika has called on the countries with the most serious macroeconomic problems to push forward reforms and interventions which, on the one hand, weaken social dialogue and, on the other hand, brutally decentralise the collective bargaining system to individual level (individual contracts). In view of this, will the Commission say:

1. What is its assessment of the impact of the brutal decentralisation of collective bargaining on the workers' side, when it is commonly accepted that relations between workers and employers are, by definition, unequal and one-sided?

2. Does it consider that there is a direct correlation between labour market reforms and the spiralling rate of working poor?

3. Does it have statistics on the percentage of the labour force of the Member States which is covered by collective agreements?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(18 December 2013)

1. As a general principle, the Commission does not advocate any particular level of bargaining. In line with Article 152 TFEU, it is bound to respect the autonomy of the social partners and the diversity of Industrial Relations systems. It is important to consider bargaining centralisation in a wider industrial relations context, including bargaining coordination.

2. The Commission closely monitors the development of in-work poverty. It encourages Member States to pursue adequate reforms in labour law and wage setting systems with a view to making the labour market more resilient, combating segmentation and precariousness, and improve the quality of jobs. In particular, to fight in-work poverty, the Commission advises to set minimum wages at appropriate levels, reduce the tax wedge on low-income workers, and to expand in-work benefits to boost 'take-home' pay. ([1])

Additionally, in-work poverty ([2]) does not only depend on individual wages, but also on the composition of the household and the employment participation by all household members. In this context, the Commission suggests to promote employment of second-earners and lone parents, by providing enabling services (e.g. childcare) and by ensuring adequate income support, along with appropriate incentives and support to work.

3. The Industrial Relations in Europe Report, which is published bi-annually by the Commission as a Staff Working Document, includes data on bargaining coverage of wage and salary earners in employment. ([3])

([1]) European Commission 'Towards a Job-Rich Recovery', COM(2012) 713 final, 18.4.2012.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=6176
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/empl_portal/publications/Industrialrelations2012/Chap1_Chart-1.xlsx

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-012313/13
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(29 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Emergenza causata dal batterio Xylella fastidiosa in Salento

Per la prima volta in Europa viene segnalata la presenza di un patogeno da quarantena che attacca gli ulivi.

Il nome scientifico è «Xylella fastidiosa» ed è un batterio che viene trasmesso alle piante attraverso le punture di un insetto che non è stato ancora identificato. A rischio fino ad ora sono gli ulivi impiantati in 8mila ettari tra Gallipoli e Ugento in Salento, per cui saranno abbattuti 600mila alberi. Secondo gli esperti questo batterio killer rappresenta una minaccia per l'olivicoltura europea per la velocità di propagazione con cui si sta diffondendo. A rischio, tuttavia, ci sono anche i mandorli e gli oleandri.

La situazioni è critica e gli alberi divorati da tale batterio saranno destinati inesorabilmente all'abbattimento. Sono in corso da qualche giorno drastiche potature di ulivi, per eliminare le parti disseccate degli alberi colpiti, coordinate dalla Regione Puglia e dalle associazioni di categoria.

Alla luce di ciò, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. se è informata dell'emergenza del batterio «Xylella fastidiosa» scoppiata in Salento, ma che potrebbe avere ripercussioni in tutta Europa,

2. se per far fronte all'epidemia che ha provocato l'abbattimento di 600mila ulivi è possibile utilizzare le risorse del Fondo di gestione delle crisi del settore agricolo in base al regolamento (CE) n. 1234/2007 del Consiglio (regolamento OCM unica) per risarcire i produttori danneggiati,

3. se, in base a detto regolamento, è possibile utilizzare le risorse del Fondo di gestione delle crisi del settore agricolo per disporre un piano straordinario di intervento scientifico e sanitario coordinato con la Regione Puglia e le associazioni di categoria, che hanno già avviato in Salento studi sulla «Xylella fastidiosa»,

4. se è possibile creare una banca dati europea sui genomi dei batteri patogeni delle colture per raccogliere statistiche e informazioni su batteri e forme parassitarie utilizzabili in coordinamento con gli Stati membri per futuri piani straordinari di intervento in occasione di eventuali epidemie?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(5 dicembre 2013)

1.-2. La Commissione rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alla sua risposta all'interrogazione scritta E- 012187/2013 ([1]).

3. La Commissione non ha la possibilità di intervenire nel quadro del regolamento del Consiglio (CE) n. 1234/2007.

Nell'ambito del 7° Programma quadro UE sono finanziati alcuni progetti di ricerca finalizzati alla prevenzione dell'insediamento e della diffusione di parassiti. Xylella fastidiosa è uno dei parassiti sui quali si concentra il progetto QBOL ([2]) che ha generato strumenti diagnostici per una grande quantità di parassiti soggetti a quarantena e simili, una base di dati comune di codici a barre per il DNA e le relative collezioni di riferimento.

4. La Commissione prevede di sostenere lo sviluppo di una base di dati europea del DNA di organismi nocivi alle piante, in grado di consentire una diagnosi rapida ed affidabile. Si prevede che la base giuridica per il sostegno finanziario dell'Unione sia la proposta della Commissione COM(2013)327 def. ([3]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://www.qbol.org/
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0327:FIN:EN:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012313/13
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: Emergency in the Salento area caused by the appearance of the bacterium Xylella fastidiosa

The first appearance in Europe of a quarantine plant pathogen which attacks olive trees has been reported in Italy.

The bacterium (scientific name: Xylella fastidiosa) is transmitted to plants by an insect that has yet to be identified. To date, olive groves covering 8000 hectares in the area between Gallipoli and Ugento in the Salento region have been identified as under threat, and 600 000 trees are to be destroyed in response. According to experts, this bacterium is a serious threat to European olive growers, given the pace at which the disease is spreading. The disease also attacks almond and oleander trees.

The situation is critical, as trees that are infected will ultimately have to be destroyed. Large-scale pruning of olive trees to remove the parts that have been dried out by the disease is currently in progress in the area, under the coordination of the Puglia regional authorities and producer organisations.

1. Is the Commission aware of the Xylella fastidiosa emergency in the Salento area and of its possible repercussions for Europe as a whole?

2. In response to this epidemic, which has resulted in the destruction of 600 000 olive trees, can agricultural crisis management funding under Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 (Single CMO Regulation) be used to compensate the producers affected?

3. Under that regulation, can such funding be used to set up an emergency programme of scientific research and plant health measures coordinated with the Puglia regional authorities and producer organisations, which have already initiated studies into the Xylella fastidiosa outbreak in the Salento area?

4. Would it be possible to set up a European crop pathogen genome database to centralise information on bacteria and parasites that could be used in coordination with Member States when emergency action is required in response to epidemics of this kind?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2013)

1 and 2. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-012187/2013 ([1]).

3. The Commission has no possibility to intervene in the framework of Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007.

Under the EU's 7th Framework Programme, a number of research projects are funded aiming at prevention of establishment and spread of new pests. Xylella fastidiosa is one of the target pests of the project QBOL ([2]) which has generated diagnostic tools for a large number of quarantine pests and their look-alikes, a common database of DNA barcodes, and the relevant reference collections.

4. The Commission envisages supporting the development of a European database of the DNA of harmful organisms of plants, enabling rapid and reliable diagnosis. The legal base for Union financial support is foreseen in the Commission's proposal COM(2013)327 final ([3]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://www.qbol.org/
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0327:FIN:EN:PDF

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012315/13
aan de Commissie
Mark Demesmaeker (Verts/ALE)
(29 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Taalpolitiek Europese Commissie

Als Europarlementslid ben ik een veelvuldig gebruiker van het webportaal van de Commissie, en de webportalen van de verschillende onderdelen van de Commissie (directoraten-generaal, DGs). Ik merk daarbij dat de contactgegevens op de internetpagina's van die DGs onderling verschillend zijn.

Ten eerste worden, in de Engelstalige of (als die beschikbaar is) anderstalige versie van de webportalen, vaak eentalige Franstalige adressen gebruikt voor het fysieke (post)adres van de DG in kwestie. Dat is o.a. zo voor de DGs COMM, AGRI, ENER, ENTR, SANCO, HOME, MARE, RTD, FPI, OLAF. OIB gebruikt zelfs een eentalig Franstalige kaart van Brussel om aan te geven welke gebouwen de Commissie in Brussel gebruikt, zie http://ec.europa.eu/oib/buildings_en.cfm en http://ec.europa.eu/oib/pdf/building-map_en.pdf Voorbeelden waar het wel goed verloopt, zijn DGs COMP en DGT.

Ten tweede, ook in veel Engelstalige communicatie (uitnodigingen voor conferenties, studiedagen, enz.) van de Commissie zie ik veel eentalig Franstalige adressen opduiken.

Ik zou er bij de Commissie voor willen pleiten om tweetalige (NL en FR) adressen in Engels(- en anders)talige communicatie te willen gebruiken, op de algemene webportalen of in uitnodigingen voor evenementen. Zo hoort het ook: adressen maken deel uit van de officiële nomenclatuur van Brussel dat tot nader bericht een officieel tweetalige regio is. De Commissie zou door deze praktijk elementair respect betonen voor de regio, inclusief haar Vlaamse inwoners, en voor het land waar ze te gast is.

Kan de Commissie mij zeggen of deze onderling verschillende taalpolitiek tussen de verschillende afdelingen een bewust beleid is?

Erkent de Commissie dat dit verschillend (en feitelijk incorrect) taalbeleid een gevoel van disrespect kan oproepen bij Vlaamse inwoners van Brussel?

Erkent de Commissie dat dit in de rest van Europa/wereld verkeerdelijk de indruk wekt dat Brussel een eentalig Franstalige stad is?

Kan de Commissie mij verzekeren dat de nodige aanpassingen zullen worden doorgevoerd, nl. dat de webportalen in de beschreven zin worden aangepast en dat contactgegevens en uitnodigingen in de twee officiële talen van Brussel zullen worden aangegeven? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Kan de Commissie mij verzekeren dat er een interne richtlijn zal worden uitgevaardigd die dit zal opleggen aan alle diensten van de Commissie?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(9 december 2013)

Alle afdelingen van de Commissie erkennen dat bepaalde organisatorische informatie moet worden geharmoniseerd. Dit maakt ook deel uit van het lopende webrationaliseringsprogramma waarmee de Commissie haar websites coherenter, relevanter en kostenefficiënter wil maken.

In het kader van dit programma worden de websites van de verschillende diensten van de Commissie grondig herzien. In de loop van 2014 wordt daarbij allerlei informatie gelijkgetrokken, met name over de structuur, taken en rol van die diensten. Ook de vermelding van de locatie, inclusief de vormgeving van die informatie en de gebruikte talen, wordt gestroomlijnd.

Hoewel deze verbeteringen slechts geleidelijk voor de hele Commissie kunnen worden aangebracht, zal DG Communicatie op haar eigen website de adressen van de gebouwen alvast zo snel mogelijk in het Frans en in het Nederlands publiceren. Bovendien zal DG Communicatie het werk van de webteams van alle overige directoraten-generaal van de Commissie coördineren om te zorgen voor een passende follow-up.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012315/13
to the Commission
Mark Demesmaeker (Verts/ALE)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: The Commission's language policy

As a Member of the European Parliament I am a frequent user of the Commission's web portal and those of its various directorates-general (DGs), and I have noticed that the contact details given on the various websites vary from one DG to another.

Firstly, in the English or (where available) other language versions of the web portals, monolingual French language addresses are often given for the physical (postal) address of the DG in question. This is the case with DGs COMM, AGRI, ENER, ENTR, SANCO, HOME, MARE and RTD, the service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI) and OLAF. The Office for Infrastructure and Logistics in Brussels (OIB) even uses a monolingual French-language map of Brussels to show which buildings in Brussels are occupied by the Commission. (See http://ec.europa.eu/oib/buildings_en.cfm and http://ec.europa.eu/oib/pdf/building-map_en.pdf). Examples of the correct procedure may be found on the sites of DG COMP and DGT.

Secondly, I have also noticed many monolingual French-language addresses appearing in English-language communications from the Commission (invitations to conferences, study days etc.).

I would urge the Commission to use bilingual (Dutch and French) addresses in English and other language communications, on its public web portals and in invitations to events. This is the proper way of doing things: addresses are part of the official nomenclature of Brussels, which until further notice is an officially bilingual region. This is no more than common courtesy towards the region, including its Flemish inhabitants, and towards its host country.

Can the Commission tell me whether this divergent use of languages between its various DGs is a deliberate policy?

Does the Commission acknowledge that these divergent (and in fact incorrect) practices may lead to a feeling of disrespect among the Flemish population of Brussels?

Does the Commission acknowledge that this gives the incorrect impression elsewhere in Europe and worldwide that Brussels is a monoglot French-speaking city?

Can the Commission assure me that the necessary adjustments will be made, and in particular that the web portals will be amended as I have indicated and that contact details and invitations will appear in the two official languages of Brussels? If not, why not?

Can the Commission assure me that an internal directive will be drawn up instructing all Commission departments to act accordingly?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 2013)

The need to harmonise specific organisational information has been identified across Commission services. It is part of the Commission's web rationalisation programme designed to overhaul its online presence with a view to becoming more coherent, relevant and cost-effective.

The programme includes a fundamental review of the organisation of the websites managed by the different Commission services. In this context, information provided on the services' organisational structure, their missions and role, as well as their location and the way such information is displayed, including the linguistic regime applied, will be aligned during the course of 2014.

While these improvements can only be implemented progressively across the entire Commission's web presence, DG Communication will follow-up swiftly and provide on its website the addresses of buildings in both French and Dutch. In addition, DG Communication will coordinate with the web teams of all Commission services to ensure appropriate follow-up.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-012318/13
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(29 października 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Współpraca Unii Europejskiej z Federacją Rosyjską na poziomie Komisji Europejskiej

Obecnie relacje Unii Europejskiej i Federacji Rosyjskiej znajdują się w politycznym impasie. Brak przełomowych decyzji i uzgodnień pomiędzy stronami na temat nowego porozumienia o partnerstwie i współpracy. Niemniej jednak prowadzone są bilateralne prace dotyczące różnych aspektów współpracy, jak na przykład energia. Nie sposób jednak odnaleźć w jednym miejscu skatalogowanej listy wszystkich dwustronnych ciał, grup czy instytucji zajmujących się unijno-rosyjską współpracą we wszystkich dziedzinach.

Czy Komisja może przedstawić katalog wszystkich grup roboczych, wspólnych ciał, komisji i tym podobnych gremiów, które zajmują się dwustronną współpracą pomiędzy Unią Europejską i Federacją Rosyjską?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji
(3 grudnia 2013 r.)

Kierunek stosunków UE-Rosja jest określany przez umowę o partnerstwie i współpracy, która wskazuje też główne struktury i instrumenty mające na celu rozwój tych stosunków. Obejmują one w szczególności regularne spotkania na szczycie, Stałe Rady Partnerstwa i różne formy spotkań poświęconych dialogowi politycznemu.

Spotkania o bardziej technicznym charakterze są organizowane w ramach czterech wspólnych przestrzeni. Najnowsze sprawozdanie z postępu prac dotyczących wdrażania wspólnych przestrzeni obejmuje różne dziedziny współpracy oraz wskazuje odpowiednie struktury.

Ponadto roczne sprawozdania z postępów w sprawie partnerstwa na rzecz modernizacji są źródłem szczegółowych informacji na temat najnowszych wydarzeń w różnych dziedzinach.

Wszystkie wspomniane dokumenty są publicznie dostępne pod adresem: http://eeas.europa.eu/russia/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012318/13
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: EU-Russia cooperation at Commission level

Relations between the EU and the Russian Federation are currently in a political deadlock. The two sides have failed to achieve a breakthrough decision on a new Partnership and Cooperation Agreement. Nevertheless, bilateral work is being carried out on various aspects of cooperation, such as energy. However, it is impossible to find in one place a list of all the bilateral bodies, groups and institutions involved in EU-Russia cooperation in all areas.

Can the Commission provide a list of all the working groups, joint bodies, committees and similar bodies involved in bilateral cooperation between the European Union and the Russian Federation?

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

EU-Russia relations are guided by the partnership and cooperation agreement which also defines the main structures and instruments for the development of relations. This notably includes regular Summit meetings, Permanent Partnership Councils and Political Dialogue meetings in various formats.

More technical meetings are organised in the framework of the Four Common Spaces. The latest Progress Report on the Implementation of the Common Spaces covers various fields of cooperation and also mentions the relevant structures.

Furthermore, the annual progress reports on the Partnership for Modernisation provide detailed information on latest developments in the various fields.

All the documents mentioned are publicly available at the following site: http://eeas.europa.eu/russia/

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-012319/13
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 ta' Ottubru 2013)

Suġġett: Politiki tal-għoti tad-demm diskriminatorji

L-għoti tad-demm hu att onorevoli u ta' min jammirah. Hu att li jista' jsalva l-ħajjiet ta' ħafna. Madankollu, id-donaturi tad-demm huma soġġetti għal kriterji ta' eliġibilità. Wieħed jifhem li persuni li huma f'riskju li jinfettaw id-demm ta' ħaddieħor b'mard infettiv jew malinn jekk jagħtu d-demm għandhom jiġu miżmuma milli jagħmlu dan. Ir-Rakkomandazzjoni tal-Kunsill 98/463/KE tad-29 ta' Ġunju 1998 dwar l-adegwatezza ta' donaturi tad-demm u tal-plasma u l-iskrinjar ta' demm mogħti fil-Kommunità Ewropea tagħti parir li persuni li jipparteċipaw "f'imġiba sesswali li tpoġġihom f'riskju akbar li jittrasmettu mard infettiv, inklużi dawk li għamlu sess għall-flus jew droga" jkunu ddifferiti b'mod permanenti milli jagħtu d-demm.

Xi Stati Membri jipprojbixxu lill-persuni omosesswali maskili milli jagħtu d-demm, bir-raġunament li dawn huma grupp ta' riskju għoli. Stati Membri oħrajn, bħar-Renju Unit, jinfurzaw differiment temporanju ta' eliġibilità għal irġiel li kellhom x'jaqsmu sesswalment ma' rġiel oħra fit-12-il xahar ta' qabel (leġiżlazzjoni tar-Renju Unit infurzata sa mis-7 ta' Novembru 2011).

1. Il-Kummissjoni hija konxja dwar dawn il-politiki?

2. Il-Kummissjoni taqbel mal-fehma li politiki bħal dawn huma ferm diskriminatorji?

3. Il-Kummissjoni x'azzjoni biħsiebha tieħu sabiex tiżgura li ma jkunx hemm diskriminazzjoni fil-politiki tal-għoti tad-demm?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(11 ta' Diċembru 2013)

Il-Kummissjoni tirreferi lill-Onorevoli Membru għat-tweġibiet għall-mistoqsijiet E-006484/2011 and E-006791/2012 ([1]).

F'dawn it-tweġibiet, il-Kummissjoni tfakkar li d-Direttiva tal-Kummissjoni 2004/33/EC ([2]) tistabbilixxi d-differiment ta' donaturi li "l-imġiba sesswali tagħhom tpoġġihom f'riskju għoli li jakkwistaw mard serju li jittieħed li jista" jiġi trasmess mid-demm.' Il-Kummissjoni tinnota, f'dan ir-rigward, li l-"imġiba sesswali" mhijiex l-istess bħall-"orjentazzjoni sesswali'. L-Istati Membri jridu jimplimentaw din id-Direttiva b'osservanza sħiħa tal-Karta tal-UE tad-Drittijiet Fundamentali, partikolarment l-Artikolu 21 li jipprojbixxi d-diskriminazzjoni fuq il-bażi tal-orjentazzjoni sesswali.

Il-Kummissjoni temmen li ħadd ma għandu jiġi eskluż milli jagħti d-demm mingħajr ġustifikazzjoni xierqa. Sabiex jiġu rfinati l-kriterji tad-differiment, il-Kummissjoni għalhekk tistieden lill-Istati Membri jiġbru aktar dejta dwar l-inċidenza ta" dan it-tip ta' mard f'gruppi speċifiċi tal-popolazzjoni, u jappoġġaw li-ħidma kontinwa tal-Kunsill tal-Ewropa għal dan l-għan.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/mt/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Id-Direttiva tal-Kummissjoni 2004/33/KE li timplimenta d-Direttiva 2002/98/KE tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill rigward ċerti ħtiġiet tekniċi tad-demm u tal-komponenti tad-demm , ĠU L91, 30.3.2004, p. 25. Edizzjoni Speċjali bil-Malti: Kapitlu 15 Volum 08 P. 272 — 286.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012319/13
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: Discriminatory blood donation policies

Donating blood is an act that is honourable and admirable. It is an act that can help save the lives of many. However, blood donors are subject to eligibility criteria. It is understandable that people who are at risk of infecting someone else's blood with an infectious or malignant disease if they donate blood should be prevented from doing so. Council Recommendation 98/463/EC of 29 June 1998 on the suitability of blood and plasma donors and the screening of donated blood in the European Community advises that persons who engage in 'sexual behaviour which places them at high risk of transmitting infectious diseases, including persons who have had sex in return for money or drugs' be permanently deferred from being able to donate blood.

Some Member States ban male homosexuals from donating blood, saying that they are a high-risk group. Other Member States, such as the United Kingdom, enforce a temporary deferral of eligibility for men who have had sex with another man within the previous 12 months (UK legislation enforced as of 7 November 2011).

1. Is the Commission aware of these policies?

2. Does the Commission agree with the view that such policies are highly discriminatory?

3. What action does the Commission intend to take to ensure that there is no discrimination in blood donation policies?

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

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the replies to questions E-006484/2011 and E-006791/2012 ([1]).

In these replies, the Commission recalls that Commission Directive 2004/33/EC ([2]) establishes deferral of donors 'whose sexual behaviour puts them at high risk of acquiring severe infectious diseases that can be transmitted by blood.' The Commission notes, in this respect, that 'sexual behaviour' is not identical to 'sexual orientation'. Member States must implement this directive in full respect of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, notably Article 21, which prohibits discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation.

The Commission believes nobody should be excluded from donating blood without proper justification. In order to fine-tune the deferral criteria, the Commission therefore calls on all Member States to collect more data on incidence of such diseases in specific population groups, and supports the ongoing work of Council of Europe to this end.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Commission Directive 2004/33/EC implementing Directive 2002/98/EC as regards certain technical requirements for blood and blood components, OJ L 91, 30.3.2004, p. 25.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012321/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Αποτελεσματικότητα των σχεδίων διάσωσης με δημόσιους πόρους και με ίδια μέσα

Τα αυστηρά μέτρα λιτότητας στην Ελλάδα και στην Κύπρο επιδεινώνουν την κρίση στις χώρες αυτές και θέτουν σε κίνδυνο την αποτελεσματικότητα των σχεδίων διάσωσης με δημόσιους πόρους και με ίδια μέσα, τα οποία, αντί να προωθούν την ανάπτυξη, οδηγούν σε μονόπλευρη απορρύθμιση των εργασιακών αγορών, χαλάρωση των συλλογικών συμβάσεων, αναγκαστική μείωση του κατώτατου μισθού και σημαντικές περικοπές στις συντάξεις, τις παροχές και τα επιδόματα των συνταξιούχων και άλλων ευπαθών κοινωνικών ομάδων. Παράλληλα, με τον πληθωρισμό και την αύξηση της φορολογίας, πολυάριθμες οικογένειες οδηγούνται σε συνθήκες φτώχειας και υποβάθμιση βιοτικού επιπέδου, με εκτεταμένες αρνητικές επιπτώσεις στην καθημερινή ζωή, στις οποίες συχνά περιλαμβάνονται προβλήματα ψυχικής υγείας, κατάθλιψη και αυξημένα ποσοστά αυτοκτονιών, καθώς και σημαντική μείωση στην παροχή δημόσιων υπηρεσιών.

1. Μπορεί η Επιτροπή να παράσχει συγκριτικές στατιστικές για τις χώρες της ΕΕ/της ευρωζώνης για την περίοδο 2009-2013 όσον αφορά:

— τους κατώτατους μισθούς·

— τα επίπεδα φτώχειας·

— τα επίπεδα αυτοκτονιών·

— την ποιότητα των δημόσιων υπηρεσιών;

2. Ποια συγκεκριμένα μέτρα μπορούν να ληφθούν στις χώρες της Νότιας Ευρώπης, ειδικότερα στην Κύπρο και την Ελλάδα, για να βελτιωθεί η τρέχουσα κοινωνική κατάσταση;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(23 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

1. Οι πίνακες στο παράρτημα περιέχουν στοιχεία της Eurostat σχετικά με τους θεσμοθετημένους κατώτατους μισθούς, τα ποσοστά του κινδύνου φτώχειας και τα ποσοστά αυτοκτονιών για τα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ. Δεν υπάρχουν διαθέσιμες στατιστικές πληροφορίες σχετικά με την ποιότητα των δημόσιων υπηρεσιών.

2. Η θέσπιση συστήματος κοινωνικής ασφάλειας προβλέπεται στο πλαίσιο του 2ου προγράμματος προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα. Οι αρχές σχεδιάζουν ένα πρόγραμμα βοήθειας για τους μακροχρόνια ανέργους που θα απευθύνεται στους φτωχούς, καθώς και ένα σύστημα ελάχιστου εισοδήματος που θα δημιουργηθεί σε πιλοτική βάση. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο (ΕΚΤ) στην Ελλάδα υποστηρίζει ενέργειες για την καταπολέμηση των υψηλών επιπέδων ανεργίας, ιδίως της μακροχρόνιας ανεργίας και της ανεργίας των νέων. Μεταξύ άλλων, υπάρχουν τα μέτρα που προβλέπονται στο πλαίσιο της πρωτοβουλίας «ευκαιρίες για τους νέους» και το πρόγραμμα δημοσίων έργων. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΤΠΑ) τα συμπληρώνει με τη δημιουργία θέσεων εργασίας μέσω έργων υποδομής.

Όσον αφορά την Κύπρο, το μνημόνιο συμφωνίας προβλέπει την εκτεταμένη μεταρρύθμιση του συστήματος κοινωνικής πρόνοιας που θα επιτρέψει στην Κύπρο να αντιμετωπίσει πιο αποτελεσματικά το ζήτημα των φτωχών. Το νέο σύστημα ελάχιστου εγγυημένου εισοδήματος (GMI) αναμένεται να έχει θετικό αντίκτυπο στην άμβλυνση της ακραίας φτώχειας. Επίσης, το ΕΚΤ στηρίζει την Κύπρο στην αντιμετώπιση των αναγκών των ανέργων και των αδύναμων ομάδων μέσω στοχοθετημένων μέτρων στο πλαίσιο του τρέχοντος ΕΠ του ΕΚΤ για την περίοδο 2007-2013.

Η ενίσχυση της ανάπτυξης και η δημιουργία θέσεων εργασίας αποτελούν επίσης προτεραιότητες βάσει του τρέχοντος επιχειρησιακού προγράμματος (ΕΠ) του ΕΤΠΑ που, μεταξύ άλλων, αφορούν τα έργα για τις ΜΜΕ και την επιχειρηματικότητα των νέων.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012321/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: Efficacy of bailout and bail-in plans

Severe austerity measures in Greece and Cyprus are deepening the crisis there and jeopardising the efficacy of the bailout and bail-in plans, which, rather than encouraging growth, are leading to the one-sided deregulation of labour markets, the relaxation of collective agreements, forced reduction of the minimum wage and severe cuts in pensions, benefits and subsidies for pensioners and other vulnerable groups in society. Moreover, inflation and increased taxation are pushing large numbers of families into poverty conditions and deteriorating living standards, with far-reaching adverse effects on daily life, often including mental health problems, depression and increased suicide rates, together with a marked decline in the provision of public services.

1. Can the Commission provide comparative statistics for EU/eurozone countries for the 2009-2013 period with regard to:

— minimum wages;

— poverty levels;

— suicide rates;

— quality of public services.

2. What specific measures can be taken in countries in the south of Europe, particularly Cyprus and Greece, in order to alleviate the current social situation?

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

1. The tables in annex provide Eurostat data on statutory minimum wages, at-risk-of-poverty rates, and suicide rates for EU Member States. There is no statistical information available on the quality of public services.

2. The introduction of a social safety net is foreseen in the context of the 2nd adjustment programme for Greece. The authorities are designing an assistance scheme for the long term unemployed targeted at the poor, as well as a minimum income scheme to be created on a pilot basis. The European Social Fund (ESF) in Greece supports actions to combat high levels of unemployment, particularly long-term and youth unemployment. Among others there are the measures envisaged in the framework of the Youth Opportunities Initiative and the Public Works Scheme. The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) complements this through job creation via infrastructure projects.

Concerning Cyprus the memorandum of understanding foresees a comprehensive reform of the welfare system that will allow Cyprus to better target those in need. The new guaranteed minimum income scheme (GMI) is expected to have a positive impact on mitigating extreme poverty. Also, the ESF supports Cyprus in addressing the needs of the unemployed and disadvantaged groups through targeted measures under the current 2007-2013 ESF OP.

Enhancing growth and job creation are also priorities under the current ERDF Operational Programme (OP) which, among others, focuses on projects for SMEs and for youth entrepreneurship.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012323/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Προώθηση των ζητημάτων που αφορούν το φύλο σε εποχές οικονομικής κρίσης

Σε μια εποχή λιτότητας, ύφεσης και οικονομικής κρίσης άνευ προηγουμένου, το χάσμα μεταξύ λόγων και έργων διευρύνεται. Ο αριθμός των εμποδίων, όσον αφορά την εφαρμογή της σχετικής νομοθεσίας, αυξάνεται συνεχώς, οι δε πολιτικές που αποσκοπούν στη συμφιλίωση της οικογενειακής και επαγγελματικής ζωής, καθώς και στην προώθηση των ζητημάτων φύλου μέσα από την ενίσχυση του ρόλου των γυναικών, οπισθοδρομούν σε μεγάλο βαθμό τόσο στην Ελλάδα όσο και στην Κύπρο.

1. Γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή για τις δραστικές περικοπές, τις μαζικές απολύσεις και τον περιορισμό πρόσβασης σε παροχές και υπηρεσίες ακόμη και για τις πιο ευπαθείς κατηγορίες γυναικών (γυναίκες με αναπηρίες, ανύπαντρες μητέρες, χήρες, άνεργες, εργαζόμενες μερικής απασχόλησης, πρόσφυγες, κ.λπ.);

2. Ποια μέτρα έλαβε ή προτίθεται να λάβει η Επιτροπή, προκειμένου να βοηθήσει τις χώρες αυτές, και ιδίως τις γυναίκες που ζουν εκεί, να διασφαλίσουν την κοινωνική και οικογενειακή συνοχή τους;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(3 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

1. Η Επιτροπή έχει πλήρη επίγνωση των σοβαρών προβλημάτων στον τομέα της απασχόλησης και στον κοινωνικό τομέα τόσο στην Ελλάδα όσο και στην Κύπρο, ιδίως όσον αφορά τις γυναίκες, και τα έχει επισημάνει επανειλημμένα.

Η έκθεση των εμπειρογνωμόνων σχετικά με τον αντίκτυπο της οικονομικής κρίσης στην κατάσταση των γυναικών και των ανδρών και σχετικά με τις πολιτικές για την ισότητα των φύλων ([1]) καταλήγει στο συμπέρασμα ότι «υπάρχει κίνδυνος η δημοσιονομική εξυγίανση να μειώσει τελικά τόσο τις κοινωνικές διατάξεις όσο και τη σχετική απασχόληση, με επιπτώσεις στην ισότητα των φύλων», με σημαντικές διαφορές μεταξύ των χωρών.

Στην τελευταία έκθεσή της σχετικά με την πρόοδο όσον αφορά την ισότητα μεταξύ γυναικών και ανδρών το 2012, η Επιτροπή περιγράφει εν συντομία την κατάσταση της «οικονομικής ανεξαρτησίας με ίσους όρους κατά τη διάρκεια της κρίσης» ([2]).

Στο πλαίσιο του ευρωπαϊκού εξαμήνου, η Επιτροπή διαπίστωσε ότι στην Κύπρο ([3]) είναι υψηλότερο το ποσοστό των γυναικών άνω των 65 ετών που αντιμετωπίζουν τον κίνδυνο της φτώχειας, υπογράμμισε τη μείωση του ποσοστού απασχόλησης των γυναικών και την ανάγκη να ενταθούν οι προσπάθειες σε ό, τι αφορά τη συμμετοχή των γυναικών στην αγορά εργασίας.

Όσον αφορά την Ελλάδα ([4]), η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή ([5]) επιβεβαίωσε το υψηλό ποσοστό ανεργίας των γυναικών ([6]), και ιδίως των νέων γυναικών ([7]), και επεσήμανε, μεταξύ των προκλήσεων, τις μεγάλες ανισότητες μεταξύ των φύλων όσον αφορά την απασχόληση και την ανεργία.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/130522_crisis_report_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/documents/130530_annual_report_en.pdf
([3]) Έγγραφο εργασίας των υπηρεσιών της Επιτροπής (2013)363 τελικό.
([4]) Έγγραφο εργασίας των υπηρεσιών της Επιτροπής (2013)358 τελικό.
([5]) Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή.
([6]) 28,3% το 2012.
([7]) 63,2% το 2012.

2. Η ισότητα ανδρών και γυναικών αποτελεί βασική αρχή ([8]) για όλα τα ΕΠ ([9]) που συγχρηματοδοτούνται από το ΕΚΤ. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο, το ΕΚΤ στην Ελλάδα συμβάλλει στην καθιέρωση καλύτερης ισορροπίας μεταξύ της επαγγελματικής και της οικογενειακής ζωής για τις γυναίκες που επιθυμούν να βελτιώσουν την απασχολησιμότητά τους, υποστηρίζει την αναβάθμιση των δεξιοτήτων, των προσόντων και του επιχειρηματικού πνεύματος των άνεργων γυναικών και συγχρηματοδοτεί τη δημιουργία κέντρων για γυναίκες-θύματα ενδοοικογενειακής βίας ([10]). Στην Κύπρο το ΕΚΤ συγχρηματοδότησε ειδικά μέτρα όχι μόνο για τη συμφιλίωση της επαγγελματικής και της οικογενειακής ζωής, αλλά και για την αύξηση της απασχολησιμότητας των γυναικών και τη μείωση των διαφορών στις αμοιβές των δύο φύλων ([11]).

([8]) Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 του Συμβουλίου, της 11ης Ιουλίου 2006, περί καθορισμού γενικών διατάξεων για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο και το Ταμείο Συνοχής και την κατάργηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1260/1999, ΕΕ L 210 της 31ης Ιουλίου 2006, σ. 16.
Εθνικό στρατηγικό πλαίσιο αναφοράς της Ελλάδας 2007-2013 http://www.espa.gr/elibrary/NSRF%20document_english.pdf

([9]) Επιχειρησιακά προγράμματα.

([10]) www.espa.gr

([11]) www.structuralfunds.org.cy www.mlsi.gov.cy/mlsi/sws/sws.nsf/dmlunion_en/dmlunion_en?OpenDocument

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012323/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: Promoting gender issues in times of economic crisis

At a time of austerity, recession and incomparable economic crisis, the disparity between rhetoric and practice is increasing. There are a growing number of obstacles to implementing the relevant legislation, and policies aimed at reconciling family and working life and promoting gender issues by empowering women are regressing significantly in both Greece and Cyprus.

1. Is the Commission aware of the dramatic cuts, the massive lay-offs and the restriction of access to benefits and services for even the most vulnerable women (disabled women, single mothers, widows, unemployed women, part-time workers, refugees, etc.)?

2. What practical measures has the Commission taken, or does it intend to take, to help these countries, and in particular their women, to safeguard social and family cohesion?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(3 January 2014)

1. The Commission is fully aware of the severe employment and social problems in both Greece and Cyprus, especially concerning women, and it has identified that in several occasions.

The Expert's report on the impact of the economic crisis on the situation of women and men and on gender equality policies ([1]) concludes that 'there is a threat that fiscal consolidation may ultimately reduce both the welfare provisions being made and the related employment with associated gender equality impacts', with considerable variations among countries.

In its last Report on Progress on Equality between Women and Men in 2012 ([2]), the Commission gives a short state of play of the 'equal economic independence during the crisis'.

In the context of the European Semester, the Commission identified for Cyprus ([3]) a higher at-risk-of poverty for women over 65, highlighted the decline of the female employment rate and the need to intensify efforts as regards the labour market participation of women.

For Greece ([4]), the EC ([5]) acknowledged the high unemployment rate of women ([6]) , and particularly young women ([7]) and highlighted among the challenges the high gender gaps in employment and unemployment.

2. Equality between men and women is an underlying principle ([8]) of all OPs ([9]) co-financed by the ESF. In this context ESF in Greece contributes to introducing a better balance of work and family life for women wanting to enhance their employability, supports the upgrading of skills, qualifications and entrepreneurial spirit of unemployed women and co-finances the creation of centres for female victims of domestic violence ([10]). In Cyprus ESF has co-financed not only specific measures aimed at the reconciliation of work and family life, but also at increasing female employability and reducing the gender pay gap ([11]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/130522_crisis_report_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/documents/130530_annual_report_en.pdf
([3]) SWD(2013) 363 final.
([4]) SWD(2013) 358 final.
([5]) European Commission.
([6]) 28.3% in 2012.
([7]) 63.2% in 2012.
([8]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006, of 11 July 2006, laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999, OJ L 210 of 31 July 2006, § 16.
Greek National Strategic Reference Framework 2007-2013 http://www.espa.gr/elibrary/NSRF%20document_english.pdf
([9]) Operational Programmes.
([10]) www.espa.gr
([11]) www.structuralfunds.org.cy and www.mlsi.gov.cy/mlsi/sws/sws.nsf/dmlunion_en/dmlunion_en?OpenDocument

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012326/13
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(29 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Meserii reglementate

Numărul meseriilor reglementate în statele membre diferă de la o țară la alta și există situații în care, pentru o recunoaștere în totalitate a profesiei, solicitantul este nevoit să dea un examen pentru evaluarea aptitudinilor și echivalarea studiilor făcute în alt stat UE sau trebuie să-și continue studiile și să dea examene de diferență.

În alte state, anumite profesii sunt reglementate de o asociație sau organizație și utilizarea titlului profesional respectiv nu se poate face decât în momentul în care solicitantul respectiv devine membru. Pe de altă parte, în multe state membre există, în prezent, numeroase solicitări de personal pentru asemenea meserii, care nu sunt onorate din cauza lipsei de candidați, o explicație fiind tocmai dificultatea acceptării solicitanților în meserii de acest gen.

În ce măsură are în vedere Comisia o cooperare mai strânsă cu statele membre pentru îmbunătățirea accesului la meseriile reglementate pentru cetățenii UE în alte state membre?

Răspuns dat de dl Barnier în numele Comisiei
(17 decembrie 2013)

Versiunea revizuită a Directivei privind recunoașterea calificărilor profesionale, adoptată de Parlamentul European la 9 octombrie 2013 și de Consiliu, la 15 noiembrie 2013, prevede ca statele membre să se implice într-un exercițiu de evaluare a transparenței și de evaluare reciprocă a profesiilor reglementate. Articolul 59 din noua directivă impune statelor membre să notifice Comisiei toate profesiile pe care le reglementează și să monitorizeze reglementările în vigoare pentru a stabili dacă acestea sunt compatibile cu principiul nediscriminării în funcție de naționalitate sau de locul de reședință, dacă regulamentul este justificat printr-un motiv imperativ de interes general și dacă restricțiile sunt proporționale și adecvate pentru a garanta îndeplinirea obiectivelor pe care le urmăresc. Statele membre trebuie să urmărească ulterior o evaluare reciprocă a reglementărilor lor.

În vederea pregătirii pentru efectuarea acestui exercițiu, Comisia a publicat, la 2 octombrie 2013, o comunicare ([1]) în cadrul căreia este conturat programul de lucru al acestui exercițiu de evaluare a transparenței și de evaluare reciprocă. Exercițiul de evaluare reciprocă a demarat și este preconizat să se încheie în martie 2016. Comisia va sprijini statele membre pe parcursul acestui exercițiu, care vizează facilitarea accesului la profesii și îmbunătățirea mobilității în UE.

([1]) COM(2013) 676 referitoare la Evaluarea reglementărilor naționale privind accesul la profesii.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012326/13
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: Regulated professions

The number of regulated professions differs from one Member State to another, and there are some cases where people applying for full recognition of their profession must take a test to assess their aptitude and the equivalence of the training they have received in other EU Member States, or where they must continue their studies and then sit an equivalency exam.

In other countries, certain professions are regulated by an association or organisation and the corresponding professional titles may be used only after applicants have become members of the relevant body. Many Member States are currently experiencing considerable staffing shortages in such professions, and the difficulties encountered when accepting applicants in these professions mean that few candidates are available.

To what extent is the Commission planning to cooperate more closely with the Member States in order to improve access to regulated professions for EU citizens in other Member States?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

The revised Directive on Professional Qualifications, adopted by the European Parliament on 9 October 2013 and by the European Council on 15 November 2013, foresees a transparency and mutual evaluation exercise of regulated professions involving all Member States. Article 59 of the new Directive requires Member States to notify to the Commission all the professions they regulate and to screen the regulations in place to assess whether they are compatible with the principle of non-discrimination according to nationality or place of residence, whether the regulation is justified by an overriding reason of general interest and whether the restrictions are proportionate and suitable to secure the objectives they pursue. Member States are then to pursue a mutual evaluation of each other's regulations.

To prepare for this exercise, the Commission has published on 2 October 2013 a communication ([1]) which outlines the work plan for this transparency and mutual evaluation exercise. The mutual evaluation has started and is due to end in March 2016. The Commission will support Member States during this process, which aims at facilitating access to professions and enhancing mobility in the EU.

([1]) COM(2013) 676 on Evaluating national regulations on access to professions.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-012327/13
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 ta' Ottubru 2013)

Suġġett: L-illiteriżmu fl-IT fost l-anzjani

L-Uffiċju Nazzjonali tal-Istatistika f'Malta rrapporta informazzjoni xokkanti li tgħid li 45 % tal-popolazzjoni Maltija ta' bejn il-45 u l-64 sena qatt ma użaw l-internet. Huwa wkoll stmat li 67 % tal-Maltin li għandhom 55 sena jew iktar qatt ma użaw l-internet. Konsegwentement, kważi n-nofs ta' dawk kollha ta' bejn il-45 u l-64 sena u żewġ terzi tal-popolazzjoni anzjana f'Malta huma esklużi mill-benefiċċji tal-attivitajiet online. F'soċjetà fejn l-interazzjoni qiegħda dejjem iktar issir online, dawn qed iħabbtu wiċċhom mal-esklużjoni soċjali. Dawn mhux qed jaffaċċjaw biss il-problema li jitilfu l-kuntatt ma' qraba u ħbieb, iżda qed ikunu wkoll esklużi minn servizzi online oħrajn ta' benefiċċju bħal servizzi online tal-gvern, xiri online u servizzi bankarji bl-internet.

1. Il-Kummissjoni tista' tipprovdi ċifri dwar in-numru ta' nies fl-UE li għandhom 55 sena jew aktar u li qatt ma użaw l-internet?

2. Il-Kummissjoni biħsiebha tniedi xi proġetti mmirati biex inaqqsu d-distakk diġitali bejn iż-żgħażagħ u l-anzjani u biex teduka l-anzjani dwar kif jistgħu jużaw is-servizzi online?

Tweġiba mogħtija minn Ms Kroes f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(17 ta' Diċembru 2013)

L-Onorevoli Membru qed tqajjem il-kwistjoni importanti tal-illitteriżmu informatiku fost l-anzjani. "Biex kull Ewropew ikun diġitali" hija l-viżjoni tal-Aġenda Diġitali tal-Kummissjoni biex tiżgura li ħadd ma jitħalla barra fir-rigward tal-opportunitajiet li joffri l-internet. Il-Klassifika tal-Aġenda Diġitali kontinwament tivvaulta l-progress fir-rigward tal-miri stabiliti. Dejta rilevanti ([1]) turi li l-anzjani tal-etajiet 55-64 u 65-74, 38,8 % u 61,5 % rispettivament tal-individwi fl-UE qatt ma użaw l-internet. Madankollu, hemm differenzi sinifikanti skont ir-reġjuni tal-Ewropa u r-raġunijiet ivarjaw ukoll (kopertura tal-broadband, nuqqas ta' motivazzjoni biex jużaw l-internet eċċ.).

Sabiex jitnaqqsu d-differenzi diġitali, il-Kummissjoni tappoġġa programmi li jħajru liċ-ċittadini jiksbu l-ħiliet diġitali, u tippromwovi azzjonijiet ta' riċerka u innovazzjoni ([2]) li jindirizzaw il-kwistjonijiet li jridu jitqiesu fit-tfassil ta' teknoloġija u servizzi għal kulħadd, inklużi l-anzjani. L-inklużjoni diġitali se tiġi wkoll indirizzata fil-kuntest tal-Programm ġdid ta' Riċerka u Innovazzjoni Orizzont 2020.

([1]) http://bit.ly/1ba3JCM
([2]) Il-proġett GUIDE pereżempju, żviluppa sett ta' applikazzjonijiet li jistgħu jgħinu liċ-ċittadini anzjani jissimplifikaw il-ħajja tagħhom ta' kuljum, jibqgħu mqabbda man-netwerk soċjali tagħhom u jsaħħu l-għarfien tagħhom dwar id-dinja. http://www.guide-project.eu/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012327/13
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: IT illiteracy among the elderly

The National Statistics Office in Malta has reported that a staggering 45% of Maltese people aged between 45 and 64 have never used the Internet. It is also estimated that 67% of Maltese people aged 55 and over have never used the Internet. Consequently, nearly half of those aged 45 to 64 and two thirds of Malta's elderly population are excluded from the benefits of online activities. In a society where interaction increasingly takes place online, they face social exclusion. Not only do they face the problem of losing contact with family and friends, but they are also excluded from other beneficial online services such as eGovernment services, online shopping and Internet banking.

1. Can the Commission provide figures for the number of people in the EU aged 55 or over who have never used the Internet?

2. Does the Commission plan to launch any projects aimed at tackling the digital divide between young and old and educating elderly people as to how to make use of online services?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

The Honourable Member raises the important issue of IT illiteracy among the elderly. 'Every European digital' is the vision of the Commission's Digital Agenda to ensure that nobody is left out of the opportunities that the Internet offers. The Digital Agenda Scoreboard is continuously assessing progress with respect to the set targets. Relevant data ([1]) show that regarding elderly people aged 55-64 and 65-74, 38.8% and 61.5% of individuals respectively have never used the Internet in the EU. There are, however, significant differences according to regions of Europe and the reasons also vary (broadband coverage, lack of motivation to use the Internet etc.).

In order to bridge digital gaps the Commission supports programmes stimulating citizens to acquire digital skills, and promotes research and innovation actions ([2]) addressing the set of issues that need to be taken into account when designing technology and services for everyone, including the elderly. Digital inclusion will also be addressed under the new Research and Innovation Programme Horizon 2020.

([1]) http://bit.ly/1ba3JCM
([2]) The GUIDE project for example, developed a set of applications that can help elderly citizens to simplify their daily life, stay connected in their social network and enhance their understanding of the world. http://www.guide-project.eu/

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-012329/13
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 ta' Ottubru 2013)

Suġġett: L-isport u l-attività fiżika

L-isport, u b'mod iktar ġenerali l-attività fiżika, jgħin lin-nies biex jibqgħu b'saħħithom u jnaqqas il-problema tal-piż żejjed u l-obeżità. Jgħin ukoll fil-każ ta' varjetà ta' kundizzjonijiet kroniċi li jirriżultaw minn nuqqas ta' sport u attività fiżika, bħalma huma l-mard kardjovaskulari u d-djabete, li wkoll saru problema serja ħafna fil-pajjiżi Ewropej.

L-aħħar stħarriġ tal-Ewrobarometru dwar "l-Isport u l-Attività Fiżika", ippubblikat f'Mejju 2010, wera li 40 % taċ-ċittadini tal-UE jagħmlu l-eżerċizzju fiżiku minn tal-inqas darba fil-ġimgħa. Il-Kummissjoni tippromwovi l-attività fiżika permezz ta' politiki differenti.

1. Il-Kummissjoni tista' tipprovdi statistika aġġornata dwar il-progress fil-qasam tal-isport u l-attività fiżika mill-aħħar stħarriġ tal-Ewrobarometru li sar fl-2010 'l hawn?

2. Il-Kummissjoni kif qed tgħin biex iżżid l-attività fiżika u teduka lin-nies dwar il-prevenzjoni tal-mard tal-qalb u djabete?

3. Il-Kummissjoni xi proġetti fit-tul qed tippjana li twettaq bl-għan li l-ġenerazzjoni li jmiss tkun waħda aktar b'saħħitha?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Vassiliou f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(19 ta' Diċembru 2013)

L-istħarriġ ta' segwitu għall-Ewrobarometru tal-2010 dwar l-Isport u l-Attività Fiżika għadu għaddej u r-rapport finali, li se jinkludi d-dejta aġġornata, se jiġi ppubblikat fil-bidu tal-2014.

Il-prevenzjoni tal-mard tal-qalb u d-dijabete tat-tip II prinċipalment tinkiseb bil-promozzjoni ta' dieti bnini u l-attività fiżika. Il-Kummissjoni tiffaċilita l-inizjattivi tal-Istati Membri u l-Partijiet Interessati f'dawn l-oqsma permezz tal-Istrateġija għall-Ewropa dwar kwistjonijiet ta' saħħa marbuta man-Nutriment, il-Piż Żejjed u l-Obeżità ([1]) li fiha l-attività fiżika hija l-qasam ewlieni enfasizzat.

L-esperjenzi reċenti, inkluż in-Netwerk Ewropew ta' Stadji b'Saħħithom li rċevew il-finanzjament mill-UE fil-passat, juru li l-organizzazzjonijiet sportivi jistgħu jagħtu kontribut vitali f'dan ir-rigward. L-Azzjoni Preparatorja fil-qasam tal-Isport 2009 pprovdiet finanzjament għal disa' proġetti ta' attività fiżika li ttejjeb is-saħħa (HEPA), mmexxija minn tipi varji ta' sħubijiet bejn l-għaqdiet tal-isport, is-soċjetà ċivili u l-awtoritajiet pubbliċi. Il-proġetti HEPA ser ikunu eliġibbli għal finanzjament taħt il-kapitolu tal-isport tal-programm Erasmus +.

Fuq terminu twil, il-Kummissjoni temmen bis-sħiħ fi djalogu u koordinazzjoni tal-politika fil-livell tal-UE biex tippromwovi l-politiki tal-HEPA fil-livelli kollha. Għaldaqstant, il-Kummissjoni ppreżentat proposta għal Rakkomandazzjoni tal-Kunsill dwar il-promozzjoni tal-attività fiżika li ttejjeb is-saħħa fis-setturi kollha ([2]), li ġiet adottata mill-Kunsill fis-26 ta' Novembru 2013.

Il-Grupp ta' Livell Għoli għan-Nutrizzjoni u l-Attività Fiżika ([3]) jikkontribwixxi wkoll għall-iżvilupp ta' ħidma fuq azzjonijiet komuni f'dan il-qasam.

L-Onorevoli Membru għandu mnejn li jkun interessat ukoll fit-tweġibiet tal-Kummissjoni lis-Sur Higgins dwar l-obeżità ([4]) (E-698/2012) u lis-Sur Melo dwar l-obeżità fit-tfulija ([5]) (E-07019/2013).

([1]) COM(2007) 279.
([2]) 28.8.2013, COM(2013) 603 finali.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_mt.htm
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/mt/parliamentary-questions.html
([5]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/mt/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012329/13
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: Sport and physical activity

Sport, and physical activity more generally, helps people to stay healthy and reduces the problem of overweight and obesity. It also helps with a variety of chronic conditions resulting from lack of sport and physical activity, such as cardiovascular disease and diabetes, which have also become a significant problem in European countries.

The last Eurobarometer survey on 'Sport and Physical Activity', published in March 2010, showed that 40% of EU citizens practise physical exercise at least once a week. The Commission promotes physical activity through different policies.

1. Can the Commission provide updated statistics on progress in the area of sport and physical activity since the last Eurobarometer survey in 2010?

2. How is the Commission helping to increase physical activity and educate people about ways to prevent heart disease and diabetes?

3. What long-term projects is the Commission planning with a view to making the next generation healthier?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

The follow-up survey to the 2010 Eurobarometer on Sport and Physical Activity is in progress and the final report, which will include updated data, will be published in early 2014.

The prevention of heart disease and type II diabetes is mainly achieved by promoting healthier diets and physical activity. The Commission facilitates Member States and Stakeholders initiatives in these fields through the strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health Issues ([1]) in which physical activity is a key focus area.

Recent experiences, including the European Healthy Stadia Network that received EU funding in the past, show that sport organisations can make a vital contribution in this regard. The Preparatory Action in the field of Sport 2009 provided funding for nine health-enhancing physical activity (HEPA) projects, run by various types of partnerships between sport organisations, civil society and public authorities. HEPA projects will be eligible for funding under the sport chapter of the Erasmus+ programme.

In the long term, the Commission believes firmly in EU-level dialogue and policy coordination to promote HEPA policies at all levels. Consequently, the Commission presented a proposal for a Council Recommendation on promoting health-enhancing physical activity across sectors, ([2]) which was adopted by the Council on 26 November 2013.

The High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity ([3]) also proceeds to developing work on common actions in this area.

The Honourable Member might also be interested in the Commission responses to Mr Higgins on obesity ([4]) (E-698/2012) and Mr Melo on childhood obesity ([5]) (E-07019/2013).

([1]) COM(2007) 279.
([2]) 28.8.2013, COM(2013) 603 final.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([5]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-012330/13
lill-Kummissjoni
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 ta' Ottubru 2013)

Suġġett: L-inċidenti tat-traffiku

Skont l-Uffiċċju Nazzjonali tal-Istatistika f'Malta, fit-tielet kwart tal-2013 ġew irrapportati 3 555 inċident tat-traffiku. Minkejja l-miżuri kontinwi biex jiġi limitat in-numru ta' inċidenti, din iċ-ċifra hi simili ħafna għal dik tas-sena l-oħra. Fl-2011 mietu iktar minn 30 000 persuna fit-toroq tal-UE . Il-Programm tal-Kummissjoni għas-Sikurezza fit-Toroq, li beda fl-2011, għandu l-għan li jnaqqas in-numru ta' persuni li jinqatlu f'inċidenti tat-traffiku fl-UE bejn l-2011 u l-2020.

1. Il-Kummissjoni tista' tipprovdi analiżi interim ibbażata fuq il-proċess ta' monitoraġġ għall-Programm għas-Sikurezza fit-Toroq?

2. X'inhuma l-fehmiet tal-Kummissjoni dwar ir-riżultati li nkisbu s'issa?

3. Il-Kummissjoni tista' tipprovdi analiżi tal-isforzi tal-Istati Membri biex inaqqsu n-numru ta' inċidenti tat-traffiku?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Kallas f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(16 ta' Diċembru 2013)

1. Il-Kummissjoni regolarment tiġbor u tippubblika dejta mill-Istati Membri dwar l-aċċidenti sabiex timxi lejn it-twettiq tal-għan li sal-2020 l-imwiet jonqsu bin-nofs. Anaaiżi kwantitattiva tiġi ppubblikata fuq is-sit elettroniku Europa. ([1])

2. Il-Kummissjoni tal-fehma li t-tnaqqis fl-imwiet ta' 43% bejn l-2001 u l-2010 jfisser progress konsiderevoli. Għall-perjodu sussegwenti sa tmiem l-2012, kompla t-tnaqqis fl-imwiet meta mqabbel mal-2010 u kien ta' 11%. Naturalment, huma meħtieġa sforzi ulterjuri fil-livelli varji sabiex tinżamm din it-tendenza.

3. Minbarra l-analiżi statistika msemmija fuq, għaddejja inizjattiva kontinwa biex teżamina l-pjanijiet ta' azzjoni nazzjonali kollha disponibbli tal-Istati Membri għas-sikurezza fit-toroq. L-għan huwa li tistimola l-iskambju ta' prattiki tajba bejn l-Istati Membri u biex jiġu kondiviżi t-tagħlimiet meħuda fir-rigward ta' miżuri tas-sikurezza tat-triq l-aktar effettivi.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/specialist/statistics/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012330/13
to the Commission
Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: Traffic accidents

According to the National Statistics Office in Malta, 3 555 traffic accidents were reported in the third quarter of 2013. Despite continuous measures to limit the number of accidents, this figure is very similar to that for the previous year. In 2011, more than 30 000 people died on EU roads. The Commission's Road Safety Programme, which started in 2011, aims to reduce the number of people killed by road accidents in the EU between 2011 and 2020.

1. Can the Commission provide an interim analysis based on the monitoring process for the Road Safety Programme?

2. What are the Commission's views on the results achieved so far?

3. Can the Commission provide an analysis of Member States' efforts to reduce the number of traffic accidents?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

1. The Commission regularly collects and publishes accident data from Member States to follow up on the objective to halve the number of fatalities by 2020, and a quantitative analysis is published on the Europa website ([1]).

2. The Commission takes the view that the reduction in the number of fatalities by 43% between 2001 and 2010 constitutes considerable progress. For the subsequent period to the end of 2012, the decrease in fatalities in comparison to 2010 continued further and amounted to 11%. Of course, further efforts are needed at the various levels to maintain this trend.

3. In addition to the statistical analysis mentioned above, there is an ongoing initiative to examine all available national road safety action plans in the Member States. The objective is to stimulate exchange of good practices between the Member States and to share lessons learned as to the most effective road safety measures.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/specialist/statistics/index_en.htm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012332/13
adresată Comisiei
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(29 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Valorile de referință privind aportul de energie pentru copii

Având în vedere avizele științifice emise de Autoritatea Europeană pentru Siguranța Alimentară referitoare la valorile de referință pentru energie în cadrul regimului alimentar ([1]) și la nevoile nutriționale și consumul alimentar al bebelușilor și copiilor ([2]), ambele publicate anul acesta, când va adopta Comisia actele de punere în aplicare în temeiul Regulamentului (UE) nr. 1169/2011 în ceea ce privește valorile de referință privind aportul de energie pentru copii?

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(11 decembrie 2013)

Noul Regulament (UE) nr. 1169/2011 privind informarea consumatorilor cu privire la produsele alimentare ([3]) îi solicită Comisiei să adopte acte de punere în aplicare până la anumite termene. Comisia lucrează la aceste măsuri în mod prioritar. Actul de punere în aplicare privind aportul de referință pentru grupe specifice de populație, inclusiv pentru copii, la care se face referire la articolul 36 alineatul (3) litera (c) din regulament, nu face obiectul unui termen-limită. Prin urmare, acesta nu constituie o prioritate în acest stadiu.

([1]) EFSA, Grupul pentru produse dietetice, nutriție și alergii (NDA), Aviz științific referitor la valorile de referință pentru energie în cadrul regimului alimentar, EFSA Journal 2013; 11(1):3005. Document disponibil online în limba engleză la adresa: www.efsa.europa.eu/efsajournal.

([2]) EFSA, Grupul pentru produse dietetice, nutriție și alergii (NDA), Aviz științific referitor la nevoile nutriționale și consumul alimentar al bebelușilor și copiilor în Uniunea Europeană, EFSA Journal 2013; 11(10):3408. Document disponibil online în limba engleză la adresa: www.efsa.europa.eu/efsajournal

([3]) JO L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012332/13
to the Commission
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(29 October 2013)

Subject: Energy intake reference values for children

In view of the scientific opinions issued by the European Food Safety Authority on dietary reference values for energy ([1]) and nutrient requirements and dietary intakes of infants and young children ([2]), both published this year, when will the Commission adopt implementing acts under Regulation (EC) No 1169/2011 as regards energy intake reference values for children?

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

The new Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers ([3]) requires the Commission to adopt implementing acts within set deadlines. The Commission is working on these measures as a matter of priority. The implementing act on reference intakes for specific population groups, such as children, referred to in Article 36(3)(c) of the regulation is not subject to a deadline and therefore it is not considered as a priority at this stage.

([1]) EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA), Scientific Opinion on Dietary Reference Values for energy, EFSA Journal 2013; 11(1):3005. Available online: www.efsa.europa.eu/efsajournal

([2]) EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA), Scientific Opinion on nutrient requirements and dietary intakes of infants and young children in the European Union, EFSA Journal 2013; 11(10):3408. Available online: www.efsa.europa.eu/efsajournal

([3]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012334/13
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: Eco-labelling of fish products

What progress has the Commission made in developing minimum standards for the eco-labelling of fish products? When does it expect to come forward with legislative proposals?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

In the framework of the reform of the Common market organisation for fisheries and aquaculture, the European Parliament and the Council set the approach on ecolabelling in Article 36:

'Eco-labelling reporting

After consulting Member States and stakeholders, the Commission shall, by 1 January 2015, submit to the European Parliament and to the Council a feasibility report on options for an eco-label scheme for fishery and aquaculture products, in particular on establishing such a scheme on a Union-wide basis and on setting minimum requirements for the use by Member States of a Union eco-label'.

The Commission will deliver on this reporting obligation before any potential legislative proposal.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012336/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(30 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Distorsione della concorrenza per effetto di dismissioni di beni statali

A causa della crisi economica molti Stati membri stanno eseguendo manovre economiche che includono la dismissione di beni e patrimoni statali accumulati in decenni di storia patria.

Si parla di molti beni immobili di proprietà dei demani, ma anche di importanti aziende pubbliche o partecipate con grande rilevanza strategica per il Paese, che spesso fanno emergere forti dubbi riguardo le transazioni economiche per via dei soggetti destinatari e dei prezzi sottomercato realizzati, dando l'impressione di effettuare una svendita del patrimonio comune agli amici. L'Italia ha una lunga storia di dismissioni poco chiare o di dubbia utilità economica se confrontata alle possibilità strategiche che aziende come Montedison, Telecom Italia, Eni, Alitalia, Finmeccanica o Enel hanno o avrebbero portato al sistema Paese.

Può la Commissione riferire:

— se l'immissione sul mercato a condizioni sfavorevoli di asset di importanza tale da creare poche offerte e mercati privati oligopolistici possa essere considerata come distorsione del mercato,

— se sia possibile procedere a un'armonizzazione legislativa per definire limiti rispetto a cui gli asset pubblici e partecipati possano essere considerati privatizzabili?

Risposta di Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione
(6 dicembre 2013)

La Commissione non è al corrente di eventuali piani di privatizzazione dell'Italia contrari alle norme sugli aiuti di Stato. Al riguardo va ricordato che i trattati dell'UE sono neutrali in merito alla proprietà pubblica o privata. Spetta esclusivamente agli Stati membri decidere se e quando vendere beni pubblici.

Se vendono beni pubblici, gli Stati membri devono tuttavia conformarsi alla legislazione dell'Unione, comprese la direttiva sulla trasparenza e le norme sugli aiuti di Stato.

In particolare, se gli Stati membri che vendono beni pubblici non si comportano come un «soggetto operante in economia di mercato» la vendita può comportare un aiuto di Stato che, in linea di principio, è vietato a norma del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea, a meno che non sia autorizzato dalla Commissione (o in determinate circostanze dal Consiglio) sulla base di deroghe specifiche, previste dal trattato. In linea di principio, la concessione di aiuti di Stato può essere esclusa se gli Stati membri adottano una procedura di vendita trasparente, incondizionata e non discriminatoria, come ad esempio una gara pubblica, che dovrebbe massimizzare le entrate dalla vendita.

La giurisprudenza generale e specifica relativa alla questione sarà sintetizzata in una comunicazione della Commissione sulla nozione di aiuto di Stato, che la Commissione intende pubblicare a fini di consultazione nel quadro dell'iniziativa in corso sulla modernizzazione degli aiuti di Stato. Questa comunicazione fornirà alle amministrazioni pubbliche orientamenti più dettagliati sulla questione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012336/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: Distortion of competition due to disposal of state assets

As a result of the economic crisis, many Member States are making economic moves such as disposing of state assets and property that form part of the national heritage their countries have built up over decades.

The transactions involve a large amount of government-owned real estate, but also important part- or wholly-owned public companies of major strategic importance for the countries concerned. They have attracted great scepticism due to the type of purchaser involved and the below market value prices, giving the general impression of a sell-off of public assets among friends. Italy has a long history of sell-offs that have either been less than transparent or of dubious economic benefit compared with the strategic potential that companies such as Montedison, Telecom Italia, Eni, Alitalia, Finmeccanica and Enel have or would have had for the country's economy.

Can the Commission state whether placing assets on the market on such unfavourable terms that they attract few offers or conducting private deals within an oligopoly of companies could be viewed as a distortion of the market?

Is it possible to move towards harmonised legislation that would set thresholds for the privatisation of part- or wholly-owned state assets?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2013)

The Commission is not aware of any privatisation plans by Italy that would run counter to state aid rules. In that context it should be recalled that the EU Treaties are neutral as regards private or public ownership. It is solely for the Member States to decide whether and when to sell public assets.

However, Member States have to comply with Union legislation, including the Transparency Directive and state aid rules when they sell public assets.

In particular, if Member States do not behave as a 'market economy operator' when they sell public assets, the sale could entail state aid which is in principle prohibited under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, unless authorised by the Commission (or in certain circumstances the Council) on the basis of specific derogations set out in the Treaty. The grant of state aid can normally be excluded if Member States run a transparent, unconditional and non-discriminatory sales procedure such as a public tender, which should lead to a maximisation of revenue from the sale.

The case law and jurisprudence relevant in this context will be summarised in a Commission Notice on the notion of aid, which the Commission intends to publish for consultation soon, as part of the ongoing state aid modernisation initiative. This document should provide public authorities with further guidance on this issue.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012337/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(30 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Sviluppo di innovazioni tecnologiche in ambito urbano

Sono state presentate recentemente delle innovazioni tecnologiche in ambito di «smart cities», tra cui il lampione intelligente che adegua la sua luce a seconda delle necessità, risparmia energia e segnala quando la lampada si sta esaurendo.

È stato inoltre messo a punto il tram a onda che raccoglie l'energia direttamente dal terreno e solo dove serve: tale sistema permette ai mezzi pubblici di entrare anche nei centri storici, è resistente contro pioggia e vento perché fornisce l'alimentazione solo a tratti installati nel terreno per cui quando il tram è passato si spengono, riportando la tensione a zero, consentendo di attraversare i «binari» senza nessun rischio. Tale sistema, testato a Napoli, è stato richiesto a Dubai e in Qatar e ha suscitato interesse anche a Taiwan, proprio per l'adattabilità rispetto a fenomeni atmosferici importanti.

È stato presentato anche il progetto di una rete di illuminazione pubblica da cui partono le informazioni per il controllo del traffico, calcolando i flussi e modificando la segnaletica in caso di code o incidenti. Un'unica centrale può, oltre che gestire il wi-fi nelle aree pubbliche e la rete di ricarica delle auto elettriche, ottenere informazioni anche dalle aree di raccolta rifiuti, avvertendo dov'è necessario intervenire se i cassonetti sono pieni.

È stato inoltre messo a punto un sistema sperimentale di monitoraggio delle frane che, attraverso un sistema di raccolta dati in modalità wireless, permette di tenere sotto controllo in maniera remota, grazie alle immagini accolte sul posto e altri dati, la stabilità delle zone più a rischio.

Stante che gli obiettivi prioritari in ambito energetico dell'Unione europea mirano all'efficienza energetica e all'incremento di utilizzo di energie rinnovabili e in termini di sviluppo urbanistico la tendenza è quella di realizzare le «smart cities», può la Commissione riferire se è a conoscenza delle innovazioni tecnologiche suddette e se intende supportare e promuovere l'utilizzo di queste tecnologie nelle città europee?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(17 dicembre 2013)

Sì, la Commissione ha lanciato il partenariato europeo per l'innovazione sulle città e comunità intelligenti nell'intento di promuovere investimenti in questo tipo di tecnologie, che integrano in ambito urbano innovazioni tecnologiche in materia di energia, trasporti e mobilità e TIC. Questo verrà realizzato nel quadro del programma di ricerca Orizzonte 2020 e tramite un invito a presentare impegni attualmente in fase di elaborazione. Per ulteriori informazioni si rimanda al sito Web ufficiale del partenariato: http://ec.europa.eu/eip/smartcities.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012337/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: Developing innovative urban technologies

New technologies for 'smart cities' have recently been unveiled, such as smart street lamps which adapt the amount of light according to requirements, as well as saving energy and sending a signal when their bulb is running out.

Trams operating on 'Tramwave' technology have also been developed, whereby power is transmitted at ground level and only to the section requiring power. The system means that this form of public transport can go into city centres and makes it resistant to rain and wind, as the power is supplied by lines laid under the road surface. The lines are only live while the tram is passing over and then they switch off, meaning that the 'tracks' can be crossed safely. The system has been trialled in Naples, while Dubai and Qatar have asked for it. It has also aroused interest in Taiwan, because it is ideally suited to extreme weather conditions.

A project for a public lighting grid has also been unveiled. This sends traffic control information, calculates traffic levels and adjusts signals in the event of tailbacks or accidents. A single control centre can manage Wi-Fi in public spaces and electric car charging stations, and at the same time receive information from waste collection points, sending alert signals when bins are full and need attention.

An experimental landslide monitoring system has also been developed, whereby stability in the areas most at risk can be monitored remotely via a wireless data collection network, using images acquired in situ and other information.

Given that the EU's priority objectives in the energy field are energy efficiency and increased use of renewable energies and given that developments in town planning are tending towards the creation of 'smart cities', is the Commission aware of the new technologies described above and does it intend to support and promote the use of these technologies in European cities?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

Yes. The Commission has launched the European Innovation Partnership for Smart Cities and Communities (EIP SCC) in order to promote investments in such technologies, integrating technological solutions in the urban context in the areas of energy, transport & mobility and ICT. This will be done through the Horizon 2020 Research Programme and through an Invitation for Commitments that is currently being prepared. More information can be found at the official web page of the EIP SCC: http://ec.europa.eu/eip/smartcities.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012339/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(30. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Wildschweinbestände und Schweinepest in der EU

Unabhängig von den aktuellen Ereignissen in den GUS-Ländern Russland, Weißrussland und der Ukraine ist die Gefahr der Schweinepest auch aufgrund der weiterhin stark zunehmenden Wildschweinpopulation in Mitteleuropa ein Thema. Da es dem Tier an natürlichen Feinden fehlt und sich seine Futtersituation aufgrund kürzerer Winter stets verbessert, droht das Populationsproblem trotz aller Jagdbemühungen außer Kontrolle zu geraten. Ungeachtet der finanziellen Schäden, wie sie beispielsweise die Landwirte ertragen müssen, steigt damit auch die Gefahr einer katastrophalen Schweinepest-Epidemie in Europa mit unabsehbaren Schäden für Tier und Mensch.

1. Hat die Kommission bereits eine grundlegende Strategie erarbeitet, um das Problem der Wildschweinpopulationen anzugehen? Falls ja, wie ist diese ausgestaltet, wann und wie soll eine allfällige Implementierung erfolgen?

2. Falls nein, könnte hier ein gemeinsames Forum aus Jägern, Tierschützern, Veterinären und Landesvertretern zur Ausarbeitung eines gemeinsamen Vorgehens sinnvoll sein?

3. Hat die Kommission neben der Bekämpfung der ausufernden Wildschweinpopulation auch Ideen zur Eindämmung der damit verbundenen Schweinepestgefahr für die EU?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(12. Dezember 2013)

1. Nein. Die Kommission hat noch keine grundlegende Strategie erarbeitet, um das Problem der Wildschweinpopulation anzugehen.

2. Es gibt bereits mehrere fachliche Foren, die Meinungen austauschen und Strategien im Bereich Tiergesundheit erörtern. Vor allem der Beratungsausschuss für Tiergesundheit [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/strategy/animal_health_advisory_committee_en.htm] erleichtert den Dialog mit den auf europäischer Ebene angesiedelten Vertretungsgremien, damit gewährleistet ist, dass die Ansichten und Bedürfnisse der betroffenen Kreise, darunter die in der Frage genannten, bei den Maßnahmen der Kommission berücksichtigt werden.

3. Der Kommission ist das Risiko, das von der Wildschweinpopulation im Zusammenhang mit der Übertragung der afrikanischen und der klassischen Schweinepest ausgeht, durchaus bekannt. Die geltenden harmonisierten EU-Rechtsvorschriften zur Bekämpfung beider Krankheiten enthalten auch Bestimmungen zur Eindämmung der Infektion bei Wildschweinen und zur Verhinderung der Übertragung auf Hausschweine.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012339/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: Wild boar and swine fever in the EU

Irrespective of the current events in the CIS countries of Russia, Belarus and Ukraine, the risk of swine fever is also an issue on account of the wild boar population in central Europe, which is continuing to soar. As this animal has no natural enemies and the availability of its food is continually improving on account of the shorter winters, the population problem is threatening to spiral out of control, despite all efforts to control it through hunting. Notwithstanding the financial losses that farmers, for example, have to suffer, there is also the increasing danger of a disastrous swine fever epidemic in Europe, with incalculable losses for both animals and people.

1. Has the Commission already drawn up a basic strategy for dealing with the problem of wild boar populations? If so, what form does it take, and when and how is it to be implemented, if at all?

2. If not, would a joint forum for the development of a common approach, comprising hunters, animal welfare organisations, veterinary surgeons and national representatives, be appropriate in this regard?

3. In addition to controlling the soaring wild boar population, does the Commission also have any ideas for containing the associated risk of swine fever for the EU?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2013)

1. No. The Commission has not drawn up any basic strategy for dealing with the problem of the wild boar population.

2. Several technical fora are already in place to exchange views and to discuss strategies inthe field of animal health. In particular, the Animal Health Advisory Committee [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/strategy/animal_health_advisory_committee_en.htm] facilitates dialogue with representative European bodies in order to ensure that Commission's policies take into account the views and needs of the relevant stakeholders, including those indicated in the question.

3. The Commission is fully aware of the risk posed by the wild boar population in the transmission of African and classical swine fever. Indeed the EU harmonised legislation currently in place for the control of both diseases include also provisions aimed at containing the infection in the wild boar and to prevent its transmission to domestic pigs.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012340/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(30. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Neue Medizinprodukteverordnung — Zulassungssystem — Patientensicherheit

Im Ausschuss für Umwelt und Gesundheit des Europäischen Parlamentes wurde kürzlich ein neuer Entwurf der Medizinproduktverordnung diskutiert. Verbände wie „SPECTARIS" (Deutscher Industrieverband für optische, medizinische und mechatronische Technologien) und „ZVEI" (Zentralverband Elektrotechnik- und Elektronikindustrie e. V.) sehen die neuen Vorschläge äußerst kritisch. Nicht nur die Wachstumschancen der Gesundheitswirtschaft würden mit diesem Vorschlag gefährdet, sondern auch die Patientensicherheit. Bei einer Änderung müssten Patienten damit rechnen, dass lebensrettende Medizinprodukte erst nach einer mehrjährigen Verzögerung am Markt zur Anwendung kommen dürften.

1. Wie steht die Kommission zu diesen Vorwürfen?

2. Welche Folgen haben die Neuerungen für Patienten, die in ihrer Behandlung auf Medikamente, die unter den Anwendungsbereich der neuen Verordnung fallen, angewiesen sind?

3. Welche Folgen hat die Novelle für heimische Pharmaunternehmen?

4. Der Vorschlag sieht vor, dass zahlreiche Medizinprodukte einer zusätzlichen Überprüfung unterzogen werden sollen. Für welche Produkte ist das Verfahren konkret vorgesehen?

5. Die geplante Regelung stuft zahlreiche Medizinprodukte in höhere Risikoklassen ein. Nach welchen Kriterien erfolgt diese Klassifizierung?

6. Das bestehende Zulassungssystem ist im internationalen Vergleich eines der sichersten der Welt und hat bisher ein hohes Schutzniveau auf dem europäischen Markt gewährleistet. Worin besteht die Notwendigkeit einer Neuregelung?

Antwort von Neven Mimica im Namen der Kommission
(19. Dezember 2013)

Die Kommission hat im September 2012, nach eingehender Analyse und umfangreichen öffentlichen Konsultationen, die stichhaltige Gründe für eine Überarbeitung ergaben, Vorschläge zur Überarbeitung der bestehenden Rechtsvorschriften für Medizinprodukte und In-vitro-Diagnostika vorgelegt. Zu diesen Gründen zählen z. B. die Einführung neuer Produkte, die Entwicklung der Rechtsvorschriften auf internationaler Ebene, aber auch die Erfahrungen mit der unterschiedlichen Anwendung des bestehenden Rechtsrahmens in den Mitgliedstaaten. Probleme mit Medizinprodukten, wie vor kurzem mit den PIP-Brustimplantaten, haben diese Analyse bestätigt und Schwächen bei der Aufsicht über die benannten Stellen und die Hersteller sowie bei der Rückverfolgbarkeit von Produkten offenbart. Die Vorschläge der Kommission vom September 2012 zielen auf eine höhere Patientensicherheit ab, insbesondere durch bessere Überwachung vor und nach dem Inverkehrbringen, und sollen gleichzeitig die rasche Verfügbarkeit innovativer Produkte sicherstellen und die Innovationskraft der Medizinprodukte-Industrie erhalten.

Die beiden Vorschläge werden derzeit im Rat und im Europäischen Parlaments erörtert; die interinstitutionellen Verhandlungen sollen nächstes Jahr beginnen. In diesem Zusammenhang werden die verschiedenen Elemente der Kommissionsvorschläge, die auf der Plenartagung des Parlaments vom 22. Oktober 2013 angenommenen Abänderungen sowie die Stellungnahmen des Rates diskutiert. Da die vom Ausschuss für Umwelt und Gesundheit des Europäischen Parlaments vorgeschlagenen Abänderungen nicht von der Kommission ausgehen, kann sie zu den konkreten Fragen des Herrn Abgeordneten zu diesen Abänderungen nicht Stellung nehmen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012340/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: New Medical Devices Regulation — approval system — patient safety

Parliament's Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety recently discussed a new draft Medical Devices Regulation. Associations like SPECTARIS (German industry association for optical, medical and mechano-electronic technologies) and ZVEI (Zentralverband Elektrotechnik- und Elektronikindustrie e. V. — Association of the Electrical Engineering and Electronics Industry) are extremely critical of the new proposals. Not only does this proposal jeopardise the health sector's opportunities for growth, it also puts patient safety at risk. If this amendment goes ahead, patients will have to expect life-saving medical devices to be allowed onto the market for use only after a delay of several years.

1. What is the Commission's view of these accusations?

2. What consequences will the amendments have for patients whose treatment is dependent on medicines that fall within the area of application of the new Regulation?

3. What consequences will the new Regulation have for domestic pharmaceutical companies?

4. The proposal provides for additional testing for numerous medical devices. For which devices is this procedure specifically provided for?

5. The planned Regulation places numerous medical devices in higher risk classes. What criteria were used for this classification?

6. By international standards, the existing approval system is one of the safest in the world and up to now has ensured a high level of protection on the European market. Why are new rules necessary?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

The Commission presented proposals to revise the existing legislation on medical devices and in-vitro diagnostics in September 2012 after thorough analysis and in-depth public consultations both of which pointed to compelling reasons for such revision. This included e.g. the emergence of new products, regulatory developments at the international level, but also experience with diverging application of the existing framework in the Member States. Recent problems with medical devices such as the PIP breast implants corroborated this analysis and further highlighted weaknesses in the oversight of notified bodies and of manufacturers, as well as in the traceability of devices. The Commission proposals of September 2012 aim at increasing patient safety in particular through better pre- and post-market surveillance while at the same time ensuring rapid availability of innovative devices and preserving the innovative strength of medical device industry.

The two proposals are currently subject to discussions in the Council and the Parliament and the interinstitutional negotiations are envisaged to start next year. The different elements of the Commission proposals, the amendments voted by the Parliament plenary on 22 October 2013, as well as the positions of the Council, will be discussed in this context. Considering that the amendments proposed by the Parliament's Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety do not originate from the Commission, it is not in a position to answer the detailed questions of the Honourable Member on these amendments.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012341/13
aan de Commissie
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(30 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Europese Commissie wil het watergebruik bepalen bij het doorspoelen van een toilet

Volgens mediaberichtgeving ([1]) en zoals ook terug te vinden in een conceptrapport van het Institute for Prospective Technological Studies ([2]) is de Europese Commissie van plan het watergebruik bij het doorspoelen van een toilet te gaan reguleren.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van het conceptrapport?

2. Wat denkt de Europese Commissie met deze bureaucratische idioterie te bereiken?

3. Hoe verhoudt dit onderwerp zich met de uitspraak van Baroso in de staat van de Unie 2013: „The EU-executive needs to be big on big things and smaller on smaller things."

4. Is de Europese Commissie het met de PVV eens dat het te absurd voor woorden is dat de Commissie zich keer op keer tot drie cijfers achter de komma bemoeit met produktaanbod en consumentenkeuzes? Zo nee, waarom niet? Welke kwalificatie heeft de Commissie dan wel voor haar doorgeslagen betutteling?

5. Dit is het zoveelste voorbeeld van ambtelijke bezigheidstherapie oftewel volstrekt overbodige regelgeving op kosten van de belastingbetaler. Wanneer houdt de Commissie de eer aan zichzelf en stapt zij op?

Antwoord van dhr. Potočnik namens de Commissie
(6 januari 2014)

De Commissie nodigt de geachte afgevaardigde uit om het voorstel zelf te lezen, in plaats van bepaalde berichten in de media; zij zal dan onmiddellijk gerustgesteld worden dat de Commissie geen plannen heeft om de hoeveelheid water die bij het doorspoelen van toiletten verbruikt wordt te reglementeren. Bij de maatregel in kwestie gaat het om een label op basis van vrijwilligheid, dat nuttige informatie biedt aan consumenten die een meer eco-efficiënt product willen kopen dat minder water verbruikt, waardoor zowel de milieu-effecten als de waterrekening voor huishoudens beperkt kunnen worden.

De Commissie is op de hoogte van het technische rapport waar de geachte afgevaardigde naar verwijst, dat is namelijk opgesteld door haar eigen Institute for Prospective Technological Studies. Dit onderzoek leverde belangrijke bevindingen op, die geleid hebben tot het besluit om het vrijwillige label in te voeren.

Het onderzoek toont aan dat het installeren van waterbesparende toiletten in particuliere woningen een gemiddeld huishouden een besparing van ongeveer 6 600 liter water (van drinkwaterkwaliteit) per jaar zou opleveren.

Fabrikanten kunnen een EU-Ecolabel voor hun producten aanvragen als zij die als milieuvriendelijk willen aanprijzen. Het label biedt consumenten, bedrijven en overheidsinstanties overal in de EU de zekerheid dat zij groene producten kopen. Er zijn momenteel EU-Ecolabelcriteria voor 31 groepen producten en het label wordt aangebracht op meer dan 17 000 producten. De cumulatieve voordelen zijn dus zeker niet onbeduidend, en het feit dat ondernemingen het Ecolabel op grote schaal gebruiken, wijst erop dat de invoering daarvan geen zinloos initiatief of tijdverspilling was.

Desalniettemin heeft de Commissie eerder al aangekondigd dat in 2014 een „gezonderegelgevingstoetsing" zal worden verricht met betrekking tot Ecolabels, om na te gaan of die nog steeds aan het gestelde doel beantwoorden.

([1]) http://m.euractiv.com/details.php?aid=531374.
([2]) http://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/toilets/docs/Technical_report_Ecolabel_May_2013a_revised_final.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012341/13
to the Commission
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: Commission's plans to regulate water quantities used for toilet flushing

According to media reports ([1]) as well as a technical report by the Institute for Prospective Technological Studies ([2]), the Commission plans to regulate the quantity of water used when flushing a toilet.

1. Is the Commission aware of this technical report?

2. What does the Commission hope to achieve with this bureaucratic idiocy?

3. How can this be reconciled with Barroso's State of the Union address when he said that 'The EU executive needs to be big on big things and smaller on smaller things'?

4. Does the Commission agree with the Dutch Party for Freedom that its obsession with regulating product supply and consumer choice to three decimal places is too silly for words? If not, why not? What qualification does the Commission then have for its excessive nit-picking?

5. This is the umpteenth example we have seen of 'occupational therapy for civil servants' or wholly superfluous regulation at the taxpayer's expense. When will the Commission be so kind as to resign?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 January 2014)

A reading of the Commission proposal, rather than certain media reports, would immediately reassure the Honourable Member that the Commission has no plans to regulate the quantity of water used when flushing a toilet. The measure in question is a voluntary label, providing useful information to consumers who wish to purchase a more eco-efficient product that uses less water, reducing its environmental impact as well as household water bills.

The Commission is fully aware of the technical report referred to by the Honourable Member as it was carried out by its own Institute for Prospective Technological Studies. This study provided an important evidence base for the decision for a voluntary label.

The study demonstrates that the installation of water-saving toilets in domestic buildings would bring for an average household water savings of approximately 6,600 litres of (drinking quality) water per year.

Companies may choose to apply for an EU Ecolabel for their products when they intend to market them as environmentally friendly. The label helps consumers, business and public authorities to reliably identify and purchase green products across the EU market if they so wish. EU Ecolabel criteria currently exist for 31 product groups and the label is used by companies on more than 17,000 products in the EU. The cumulative benefits are therefore far from being small, and such widespread adoption of the Ecolabel by companies suggests that there development is not a superfluous or wasteful exercise.

Nevertheless, the Commission has already announced a regulatory fitness check on Ecolabels in 2014 to systematically check their continued effectiveness.

([1]) http://m.euractiv.com/details.php?aid=531374
([2]) http://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/toilets/docs/Technical_report_Ecolabel_May_2013a_revised_final.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-012343/13
alla Commissione
Erminia Mazzoni (PPE)
(30 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Istituzione dell'Agenzia per la coesione territoriale in Italia

Visto:

lo stato dei negoziati, in corso da oltre un anno, sui nuovi regolamenti sulla politica di coesione per il periodo 2014-2020 e, in particolare, i principi di partenariato e governance multilivello di cui essi sono impregnati.

Considerando:

che il codice di condotta che la Commissione europea dovrà adottare tramite atto delegato farà da guida agli Stati membri nell'attuazione concreta del principio di partenariato;

che il principio della governance multilivello si dovrebbe tradurre in un reale coinvolgimento delle autorità regionali e locali sia nella fase di definizione che nelle fasi di attuazione e gestione dei programmi, al fine di garantire la maggiore vicinanza possibile ai cittadini e ai territori destinatari delle politiche di coesione;

che la costituenda Agenzia per la coesione territoriale in Italia dovrebbe svolgere funzioni di «raccordo con le amministrazioni statali e regionali competenti ai fini della predisposizione di proposte di programmazione», «monitoraggio sistematico e continuo dei programmi operativi», «sostegno e assistenza tecnica alle amministrazioni che gestiscono i programmi»;

che l'Agenzia «può assumere le funzioni dirette di autorità di gestione di programmi» ed esercitare poteri sostitutivi in casi di «inerzia o inadempimento» delle amministrazioni titolari.

Si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se non ritenga che l'istituzione dell'Agenzia per la coesione territoriale, così come prospettata, non rischi di minare l'applicazione concreta dei principi fondamentali di partenariato e governance multilivello, che sono alla base della politica di coesione post-2013;

2. come valuti i poteri sostitutivi che l'Agenzia assumerebbe rispetto a quelli delle autorità di gestione regionali, considerando che essa è espressione della Presidenza del Consiglio e, quindi, del Governo centrale;

3. se non ritenga che l'Agenzia rischi di tradursi in un organo «superfluo» ed eccessivamente «accentratore», che avrebbe come unico risultato l'utilizzo del fondo per l'assistenza tecnica al fine del pagamento degli stipendi.

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(2 dicembre 2013)

La Commissione non vede alcun elemento a sostegno delle riserve espresse dall'onorevole parlamentare per quanto riguarda le tre questioni sollevate nella sua interrogazione. In particolare l'Agenzia di coesione territoriale, di recente istituzione, non sembra essere in contrasto con l'articolo 5 del regolamento sulle disposizioni comuni in tema di partenariato e di governance multilivello, in base al quale ciascuno Stato membro organizza un partenariato con le competenti autorità regionali e locali, conformemente al rispettivo quadro istituzionale e giuridico.

A tale riguardo il testo della legge indica esplicitamente che l'Agenzia opererà sempre nel pieno rispetto delle competenze delle amministrazioni responsabili dei programmi e delle autorità di gestione interessate. Lo statuto dell'Agenzia, che verrà adottato entro marzo 2014, sarà inoltre approvato solo previo parere della «Conferenza permanente per i rapporti tra lo Stato, le regioni e le province autonome di Trento e di Bolzano», sede in cui vengono affrontate tutte le questioni di interesse regionale e locale legate all'UE.

Nel periodo attuale vari programmi regionali in Italia hanno sono stati oggetto di gravi problemi di gestione, al punto da rendere necessaria la costituzione di apposite task force tra le regioni, il Ministero preposto al coordinamento e la Commissione. In un gran numero di casi i sistemi di audit e di controllo dei programmi regionali non hanno inoltre funzionato correttamente. Stante quanto sopra la Commissione auspicherebbe di assistere, in futuro, ad un miglioramento del coordinamento e della sorveglianza a livello centrale sulle attività svolte dalle autorità di gestione e di audit.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012343/13
to the Commission
Erminia Mazzoni (PPE)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: Setting up of a territorial cohesion agency in Italy

Negotiations have been in progress for more than a year on the new cohesion policy regulations for the period 2014-2012, which are based on the principles of partnership and multi-level governance.

The Commission is to adopt, by means of a delegated act, a code of conduct on partnership that will provide Member States with guidance on how to implement the partnership principle.

The multi-level governance principle is intended to give regional and local authorities a real say in both the planning of programmes and their implementation and management, thus helping to anchor the whole process as firmly as possible in the communities and areas that are the target of cohesion policy.

The territorial cohesion agency that is to be set up in Italy has been set the tasks of liaising with the relevant central and regional government authorities in connection with the submission of programming proposals, of monitoring all operational programmes and of providing technical assistance and support to programmes management authorities.

Furthermore, the agency may act directly as a programme management authority and may also act in the place of programme management authorities should they fail to act or to meet their obligations.

1. Would the Commission not agree that the setting up of a territorial cohesion agency along the above lines could hamper the practical implementation of the principles of partnership and multi-level governance on which post-2013 cohesion policy is to be based?

2. What view does it take of the fact that the agency would be able to act in the place of regional management authorities, given that it will be answerable to the prime minister's office, i.e. central government?

3. Would it not agree that the agency could prove superfluous and could over-centralise operations in this area, resulting in technical assistance funding being spent on salaries rather than where it is most needed?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(2 December 2013)

The Commission does not see any element supporting the reservations expressed by the Honorable Member with respect to the three issues raised in her question. In particular, the newly established Agency for territorial cohesion does not seem to be in contradiction with the provisions of Article 5 of the Common Provisions Regulations on partnership and multilevel governance which states that each Member State will organise a partnership with the competent and regional and local authorities in accordance with their institutional and legal frameworks.

In this respect, the text of the law explicitly indicates that the agency will always operate fully respecting the competences of the administrations responsible for the programmes and the relevant managing authorities. Moreover, the statute of the agency, to be adopted by March 2014, will be approved only after having obtained the opinion of the 'Conferenza permanente per i rapporti tra lo Stato, le regioni e le province autonome di Trento e di Bolzano' which is the venue where all EU matters of relevance at regional and local level are addressed.

In the current period, several regional programmes in Italy have incurred serious management problems, to the extent that the establishment of specific task forces between the regions, the coordinating ministry and Commission was deemed necessary. Also, in a number of instances, audit and control systems of regional programmes were not functioning properly. In view of these experiences, the Commission would welcome for the future stronger coordination and monitoring at central level of the work of management and audit authorities.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012344/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: Irish national car test (NCT) legislation

Does the Commission have a view on whether it is appropriate for a vehicle which has been pre-declared off the road in accordance with domestic statutory legislation to then be issued with a vehicle roadworthiness certificate by reference to the date of registration rather than the date of testing?

Regarding whether or not to correct this position, Members States may use Article 4.2 of Directive 2009/40/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council to put in place special provisions for vehicles which are temporarily withdrawn from circulation in order to correct this anomaly so that it applies to cars which are pre-declared off the road.

Has the Irish Government been in contact with the Commission regarding this matter in order to detail those engagements?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

The Commission takes the view that it is consistent with the provisions of Directive 2009/40/EC on roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and their trailers ([1]) to link the date of roadworthiness tests to the date of first registration or first use of the vehicle concerned also in cases when the vehicle has temporarily been de-registered from the use on public roads.

According to Article 4.2 of the directive to which the Honourable Member refers, Member States may exempt from roadworthiness testing vehicles while being temporarily withdrawn from circulation. The Commission has not been in contact with the Irish Government on this matter.

([1]) OJ L 141, 6.6.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012345/13
to the Commission
Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: State aid for proposed Hinkley Point C nuclear power plant

On 21 October 2013, the UK Government announced an agreement with Électricité de France (EDF) on the key terms of a proposed investment contract to build a new nuclear power plant in South-West England: Hinkley Point C.

One of these terms is that the UK Government guarantees a 'strike price' of GBP 92.50/MWh (indexed to the Consumer Price Index) for electricity produced over the first 35 years of the plant's life.

This agreement appears to have all the features of state aid: there has been an intervention through State resources (as the UK Government is guaranteeing the strike price with public funds), the intervention gives EDF a competitive advantage on a selective basis, competition has therefore been distorted, and the intervention is likely to affect trade between Member States.

Given that Article 107 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) contains a general prohibition on state aid,

1. could the Commission confirm that the UK Government has applied to the Commission under the notification procedure in relation to this agreement?

2. could the Commission also confirm that it will open an in-depth investigation into this agreement, which gives EDF a serious advantage over its competitors in the UK energy market?

Question for written answer P-012346/13
to the Commission
Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: State aid for proposed Hinkley Point C nuclear power plant

On 21 October 2013, the UK Government announced an agreement with Électricité de France (EDF) on the key terms of a proposed investment contract to build a new nuclear power plant in South-West England: Hinkley Point C.

One of these terms is that the UK Government guarantees a 'strike price' of GBP 92.50/MWh (indexed to the Consumer Price Index) for electricity produced over the first 35 years of the plant's life.

This agreement appears to have all the features of state aid: there has been an intervention through State resources (as the UK Government is guaranteeing the strike price with public funds), the intervention gives EDF a competitive advantage on a selective basis, competition has therefore been distorted, and the intervention is likely to affect trade between Member States.

Given that Article 107 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) contains a general prohibition on state aid,

1. could the Commission confirm that the UK Government has applied to the Commission under the notification procedure in relation to this agreement?

2. could the Commission also confirm that it will open an in-depth investigation into this agreement, which gives EDF a serious advantage over its competitors in the UK energy market?

Joint answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(29 November 2013)

The UK notified a case of potential state aid to nuclear energy, in particular in relation to a nuclear plant to be built at Hinkley point C, on 22 October 2013.

The Commission is currently assessing the notification and at this stage can neither confirm nor rule out that the measure may require an in-depth investigation.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012348/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(30 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Open Knowledge Foundation

Σύμφωνα με έκθεση που δημοσίευσε πρόσφατα το Open Knowledge Foundation (Ίδρυμα για την Ανοικτή Γνώση), πολλά κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ βρίσκονται σε χαμηλές θέσεις στην σχετική κατάταξη περί ανοικτών δεδομένων του 2013. Συγκεκριμένα δε, η Κύπρος βρίσκεται στις τελευταίες θέσεις της κατάταξης (70ή), γεγονός που παραπέμπει σε σοβαρό πρόβλημα όσον αφορά την δυνατότητα πρόσβασης των πολιτών στα δημόσια δεδομένα και στην ενημέρωση. Άλλα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ όπως το Βέλγιο (59ο), η Λιθουανία (56η), η Ρουμανία (45η) η Σλοβακία (43η) και η Γερμανία (39η) βρίσκονται επίσης σε πολύ χαμηλές θέσεις, γεγονός που παραπέμπει σε σοβαρό πρόβλημα.

Τούτων δοθέντων, παρακαλείται η Επιτροπή να απαντήσει στα εξής ερωτήματα:

1. Έχει υπόψη της τα αποτελέσματα της προαναφερθείσης έρευνας;

2. Συμφωνεί με τα ευρήματα της έρευνας;

3. Σε ποιες ενέργειες προτίθεται να προβεί προκειμένου να βελτιωθεί η δυνατότητα πρόσβασης στην πληροφόρηση των ευρωπαίων πολιτών σε ολόκληρη την Ευρώπη;

Απάντηση της κ. Kroes εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(9 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί εκ του σύνεγγυς το έργο του Open Knowledge Foundation (Ίδρυμα για την Ανοικτή Γνώση) και έχει λάβει γνώση της κατάταξης περί ανοικτών δεδομένων του 2013. Η κατάταξη αυτή είναι μία μόνο μεταξύ περισσοτέρων πηγών πληροφοριών σχετικά με την εξέλιξη της πολιτικής στον τομέα των ανοικτών δεδομένων στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ.

Ο τομέας των ανοικτών δεδομένων έχει δύο κύριες πτυχές: την κυβερνητική διαφάνεια και τις οικονομικές ευκαιρίες που προκύπτουν από την περαιτέρω χρήση κυβερνητικών πληροφοριών. Σύμφωνα με τις αρμοδιότητες που ανατίθενται από τις Συνθήκες της ΕΕ, το έργο της Επιτροπής εστιάζεται στην προώθηση του δεύτερου στοιχείου, των οικονομικών ευκαιριών.

Η Επιτροπή χρησιμοποιεί διαφορετικό πίνακα αποτελεσμάτων για να εξετάσει την κατάσταση στα κράτη μέλη, τον πίνακα αποτελεσμάτων PSI (πληροφορίες του δημόσιου τομέα) (http://epsiplatform.eu/content/european-psi-scoreboard). Ο εν λόγω πίνακας εκπονήθηκε από εξωτερικό ανάδοχο με σκοπό μετρήσεις όσον αφορά το καθεστώς των ανοικτών δεδομένων και την περαιτέρω χρήση πληροφοριών του δημόσιου τομέα (κυβερνητικά δεδομένα).

Η Επιτροπή ανέλαβε ή αναλαμβάνει τις ακόλουθες πρωτοβουλίες για τη διευκόλυνση της περαιτέρω χρήσης κυβερνητικών πληροφοριών από όλους τους πολίτες της ΕΕ: πρόσφατα αναθεωρήθηκε το νομοθετικό πλαίσιο με την έκδοση της οδηγίας 2013/37/ΕΕ για την τροποποίηση της οδηγίας 2003/98/ΕΚ σχετικά με την περαιτέρω χρήση πληροφοριών του δημόσιου τομέα. Τούτο θα συμβάλει στην περαιτέρω χρησιμοποίηση πολύ περισσότερων κυβερνητικών πληροφοριών και στη μείωση των τελών που συνδέονται με την περαιτέρω χρησιμοποίηση. Καταρτίζονται μη δεσμευτικές κατευθυντήριες γραμμές προς τα κράτη μέλη σχετικά με διάφορες πτυχές της οδηγίας. Η Επιτροπή παρέχει υπηρεσίες που θα συνδράμουν τα κράτη μέλη με τη δημοσίευση κυβερνητικών πληροφοριών σε ιστότοπους δικτυακών πυλών για ανοικτά δεδομένα και εργάζεται για την ενσωμάτωση του περιεχομένου τέτοιων δικτυακών πυλών ανοικτών δεδομένων σε μια πανευρωπαϊκή υποδομή ψηφιακών υπηρεσιών χρηματοδοτούμενη από το πρόγραμμα που αφορά τη Διευκόλυνση «Συνδέοντας την Ευρώπη».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012348/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: Open Knowledge Foundation

According to a recent report published by the Open Knowledge Foundation, many EU Member States occupy low positions in the 2013 Open Data Index. More specifically, Cyprus is at the bottom of the index in 70th place, indicating that there is a serious problem there with regard to access to public data and information. Other EU Member States such as Belgium (59th place), Lithuania (56th place), Romania (45th place) Slovakia (43rd place) and Germany (39th place) are also ranked very low, once again indicating a serious problem.

The Commission is therefore asked:

1. If it is aware of the results of the index?

2. If it agrees with the index's findings?

3. What measures it intends to take in order to improve access to information for all EU citizens?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 2013)

The Commission is following the work of the Open Knowledge Foundation very closely and has seen the 2013 Open Data Index. It is one source of information among others about the evolution of policy in relation to Open Data in the EU Member States.

Open Data has two main aspects: Government transparency and economic opportunities resulting from reuse of government-held information. In line with the powers conferred in the EU Treaties, the Commission's work focuses on fostering the second element, the economic opportunities.

The Commission uses a different scoreboard in order to examine the state of play in the Member States, the PSI Scoreboard (http://epsiplatform.eu/content/european-psi-scoreboard). It has been developed by an external contractor with the purpose of measuring the status of Open Data and reuse of public sector information (government-held data).

The Commission has taken or is taking the following initiatives to facilitate reuse of government-held information to all EU citizens: Most recently, the legislative framework has been revised with the adoption of Directive 2013/37/EU revising Directive 2003/98/EC on reuse of public sector information. It will help to make much more government-held information reusable and lower charges attached to reuse. Non-binding guidelines to Member States on several aspects of the directive are being prepared. The Commission has procured services that shall help Member States with publishing government-held information on Open Data Portal websites and works towards integrating content from such Open Data Portals in a pan-European digital service infrastructure funded by the Connecting Europe Facility programme.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012349/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(30 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Popolazione di topi in Italia

Una delle riviste settimanali di informazione più seguite in Italia ha negli scorsi giorni presentato dei dati preoccupanti sulla popolazione di topi nelle maggiori città italiane. I roditori sarebbero 15 milioni a Roma, 13 milioni a Milano e 10 milioni a Napoli; in tutto il territorio nazionale sono 500 milioni e consumano 20 milioni di tonnellate di cibo l'anno. Lo stesso articolo riporta la testimonianza di veterinari secondo cui la maggior parte di questi topi sarebbe malata di peste, che fortunatamente non si trasmette all'uomo a causa della mancata promiscuità con gli stessi topi e con le pulci che trasmettono la malattia. Tuttavia le disperate condizioni economiche di un sempre maggior numero di persone, costrette spesso a dormire per strada e a cibarsi dai cassonetti dell'immondizia e aventi scarse possibilità in termini di cura delle malattie ed igiene personale, potrebbero favorire nuovi contagi.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se è al corrente di questi numeri e può confermarli;

2. in che modo monitora o invita gli Stati membri a monitorare la popolazione di roditori;

3. quali misure e quali strumenti ha adottato o ha intenzione di adottare per diminuire il rischio di un eventuale contagio di peste o altre malattie trasmissibili dai topi;

4. se ritiene che sia possibile conciliare le misure di controllo veterinario e delle nascite sui roditori presenti nelle città europee con il rispetto del benessere degli animali?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(20 dicembre 2013)

In applicazione delle norme sulla sussidiarietà la Commissione non raccoglie né monitora dati sulle popolazioni murine negli Stati membri.

Per gli stessi motivi la Commissione non ha per il momento in previsione l'attuazione di misure speciali per contrastare il rischio di malattie trasmissibili dalle specie murine.

La legislazione dell'UE sul benessere degli animali non si estende alle popolazioni murine selvatiche.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012349/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: Rat population in Italy

One of Italy's most popular weekly magazines recently published worrying figures concerning the number of rats found in Italy's largest cities. According to the magazine, there are 15 million rats in Rome, 13 million in Milan and 10 million in Naples. Across the country, there are 500 million rats which together eat 20 million tonnes of food each year. The article also quotes veterinarians who believe that most of the rats are infected with the plague. People are not at risk, fortunately, because they hardly ever come into contact with the rats themselves or the fleas which transmit the disease. Nonetheless, the fact that ever-increasing numbers of Italians are in dire financial straits, and that many of them are forced to sleep on the streets, rummage through bins for food and have little chance of receiving medical attention and maintaining proper personal hygiene, could increase the risk of new infections.

1. Is the Commission aware of these statistics? Can it confirm the accuracy of the data?

2. How does it monitor the size of the rodent population and/or request that the Member States do so?

3. What measures and/or instruments has the Commission implemented or does it intend to implement in order to reduce the risk of a possible outbreak of the plague or other diseases that can be transmitted by rats?

4. Does the Commission believe that it is possible to combine veterinary checks and measures to control the rodent population in European cities with animal welfare?

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

Applying the rules of subsidiarity, the Commission does not keep or monitor data on the rat populations in the Member States.

For the same reason,the Commission for the moment does not intend to implement special measures to control the risk related to disease that can be transmitted by rats.

EU animal welfare legislation does not cover wild rats.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012351/13
to the Commission
Daniel Hannan (ECR)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: Cyprus Memorandum of Understanding

The Cyprus bailout Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) states the following:

'By [Q4-2014], eliminate the title deed issuance backlog to less than 2 000 cases of immovable property sales contracts with title deed issuance pending for more than one year. The authorities will enhance cooperation with the financial sector to ensure the swift clearing of encumbrances on title deeds to be transferred to purchasers of immovable property, and implement guaranteed timeframes for the issuance of building certificates and title deeds; publish quarterly progress reviews of the issuance of building and planning permits, certificates, and title deeds, as well as title deed transfers and related mortgage operations throughout the duration of the programme.'

Cyprus has just published the first quarterly progress review, which does not meet the requirements of the MoU.

For instance, title deeds transferred to purchasers, among other requirements, are simply not reported. Furthermore, given the reported 3 521 quarterly title deeds 'issued' for the second quarter, which are in any case issued in the developers' names and cannot be transferred to the buyers until all encumbrances are removed, it is clear that the deadline of Q4-2014 for eliminating the backlog of over 100 000 cannot be met.

It would therefore appear that Cyprus currently has little intention of complying with the requirements of the MoU. What action is the Commission taking, or does it propose to take, to address this matter?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(4 December 2013)

It is correct that at July's first review mission of programme conditionality, the Cypriot authorities met the MoU requirements only partially on the elimination of title deed backlogs, as reflected in the September Compliance Report: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2013/pdf/ocp161_en.pdf

The Commission is currently working with the Cypriot authorities to improve the reporting so that the public is fully informed in the shortest feasible timespan.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012353/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(30 octobre 2013)

Objet: Vidéo de décapitation sur le réseau Facebook

Une vidéo controversée de décapitation, postée sur le célèbre réseau social, a finalement été ôtée par Facebook qui avait pourtant assuré, peu avant, que ce contenu était en accord avec sa nouvelle ligne de conduite à l'égard des contenus ultra-violents.

Facebook a cédé. Face à la grogne conjuguée des internautes, des associations de défense de l'enfance et même du premier ministre britannique, David Cameron, le roi des réseaux sociaux a finalement décidé, mardi 22 octobre 2013, d'ôter de sa plateforme une vidéo controversée mettant en scène la décapitation d'une femme par un homme cagoulé. Pourtant, le matin même, Facebook avait affirmé qu'il ne comptait pas retirer cette vidéo, marquant ainsi un premier revirement par rapport à l'interdiction de ce genre de contenus très violents, qui prévalait depuis mai 2013.

Sa justification? «Les utilisateurs se servent de Facebook pour partager, s'indigner et condamner certaines pratiques. Et particulièrement, quand il s'agit d'abus commis en matière de Droits de l'homme, d'actes de terrorisme ou de violence. Il ne s'agit en aucun cas de faire l'apologie de la violence». Si la vidéo avait été utilisée pour glorifier ou encourager ce type d'action, le groupe californien l'aurait interdite.

1. Comment est-il possible que le retrait d'une vidéo de décapitation ne soit pas systématique et qu'il faille négocier la disparition de ce meurtre en direct?

2. Quelle est la position européenne sur cet honteux épisode de la part de Facebook?

3. Une entrevue est-elle prévue avec les directeurs de l'entreprise à ce sujet?

4. Qu'ont entrepris les autorités européennes dans ce sens?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Kroes au nom de la Commission
(18 décembre 2013)

La Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne établit, à son article 1^er^, que la dignité humaine est inviolable. Elle doit être respectée et protégée. La Charte consacre également les principes de la liberté d'expression et de la liberté et du pluralisme des médias à son article 11. Selon l'article 51 de la Charte, ses dispositions s'adressent aux institutions et organes de l'Union dans le respect du principe de subsidiarité, ainsi qu'aux États membres uniquement lorsqu'ils mettent en œuvre le droit de l'Union.

Au niveau de l'UE, il existe des règles spécifiques encadrant les services de médias audiovisuels, inscrites dans la directive sur les services de médias audiovisuels (directive SMA). C'est au cas par cas qu'il convient de déterminer si des réseaux de médias sociaux, tels que Facebook, doivent ou non être considérés comme des fournisseurs de services audiovisuels et si des contenus diffusés par l'intermédiaire de tels réseaux sont ou non soumis à la directive SMA. Or, sur la base des informations fournies, la Commission n'est pas en mesure de conclure que le cas décrit relève bien de la directive SMA.

La Commission rencontre régulièrement un large éventail de parties prenantes du secteur et il est clair que, lors de leur prochaine réunion, elle examinera avec eux les politiques de Facebook en ce domaine eu égard au risque lié à l'exposition à une telle violence, en particulier pour les groupes vulnérables tels les enfants.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012353/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: Decapitation video on Facebook

Confronted with a barrage of complaints from Internet users, child protection organisations and even British Prime Minister David Cameron, on 22 October 2013 Facebook finally caved in and decided to take down a controversial video showing the decapitation of a woman by a masked man. That same morning, however, the world's leading social network had stated that it would not remove the video, thereby backtracking for the first time on its ban on this type of extremely violent content, which has been in force since May 2013.

The Californian company's reasoning? 'Facebook has long been a place where people turn to share their experiences, particularly when they're connected to controversial events on the ground, such as human rights abuses, acts of terrorism, and other violent events. People share videos of these events on Facebook to condemn them.' Facebook insisted that if the video had glorified or encouraged violent behaviour, it would have banned it.

1. How can the removal of a video showing a murder being committed be a matter for negotiation, and not simply automatic?

2. What is the EU's stance on this shameful incident?

3. Are there any plans to question Facebook executives?

4. What steps have the European authorities taken to arrange such an interview?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(18 December 2013)

The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union sets out in its Article 1 that human dignity is inviolable. It must be respected and protected. The Charter also enshrines freedom of expression as well as freedom and pluralism of the media in Article 11. According to Article 51 of said Charter, its provisions are addressed only to the institutions and bodies of the Union with due regard for the principle of subsidiarity and to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law.

At EU level, there are specific rules regarding audiovisual media services laid down in the Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMSD). Whether or not social media networks or content provided via such networks, such as Facebook, can be qualified as audiovisual media service providers and are subject to the AVMSD would need to be assessed in each specific case. However, based on the information provided, the Commission cannot conclude that the case described would fall into the remit of the AVMSD.

The Commission regularly meets with a broad range of stakeholders and will certainly be enquiring about Facebook's policies in this regard at its next meeting with them, given the exposure particularly for vulnerable groups including children to such violence.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012354/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(30 octobre 2013)

Objet: Label «fait maison»

En cette période ou la sécurité alimentaire est au centre de tous les débats, la Commission appuierait-elle une obligation de transparence dans le chef du restaurateur? Celui-ci ne pourrait utiliser l'appellation «fait maison» sur sa carte que si le plat est cuisiné sur place, à partir de matières premières, en respectant un certain nombre de critères stricts.

La Commission est-elle en faveur d'un label «fait maison» de ce type?

L'objectif est de prouver aux consommateurs que les plats, mets, accompagnements et sauces mentionnés n'ont pas simplement été réchauffés au four à micro-ondes, mais remplissent des critères cumulatifs. Ces critères pourraient être les suivants:

— les plats sont préparés ou élaborés entièrement dans les cuisines du restaurant ou dans l'atelier de l'établissement;

— ils sont obtenus à partir de matières premières crues issues de l'agriculture, de l'élevage ou de la pêche;

— ils ne doivent pas avoir été assaisonnés hors de l'établissement, mais peuvent avoir été parés ailleurs préalablement;

— ils ont été obtenus en utilisant uniquement les ingrédients traditionnels de la cuisine.

Dans l'affirmative, la Commission partage-t-elle l'avis que certains plats spécifiques dont la préparation est trop fastidieuse pourraient recevoir une dérogation? Dans ces cas précis, les restaurateurs pourraient donc indiquer sur la carte le nom du producteur ainsi que le lieu d'élaboration du produit. Les agences nationales de sécurité alimentaire seraient chargées du contrôle auprès des restaurateurs et autres traiteurs.

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(12 décembre 2013)

Les règles d'étiquetage des denrées alimentaires en vigueur dans l'UE ([1]) prévoient que la fourniture d'informations relatives aux denrées alimentaires non préemballées est principalement du ressort des États membres.

Le nouveau règlement (UE) nº 1169/2011 ([2]) rend obligatoire la mention des allergènes contenus dans les denrées alimentaires non préemballées, y compris celles qui sont servies dans les restaurants, les États membres étant libres d'exiger l'indication d'autres mentions obligatoires. Les règles nationales prévoyant la communication d'informations obligatoires qui vont au-delà de ce qui est actuellement requis pour les denrées alimentaires préemballées, doivent être notifiées à la Commission à l'état de projet. Tel serait le cas des informations obligatoires à fournir sur la manière dont les aliments sont préparés dans les restaurants.

L'utilisation volontaire de l'appellation «fait maison» doit se faire dans le respect de l'exigence de base selon laquelle les informations sur les denrées alimentaires ne doivent pas induire en erreur sur les caractéristiques de ces denrées et, notamment, sur leur nature, leur identité, leurs qualités et leur mode de fabrication ou d'obtention. Il incombe aux États membres de veiller à l'application de la législation de l'UE sur les denrées alimentaires ([3]) et de vérifier si ses exigences sont respectées par les exploitants du secteur.

([1]) Directive 2000/13/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 20 mars 2000 relative au rapprochement des législations des États membres concernant l'étiquetage et la présentation des denrées alimentaires ainsi que la publicité faite à leur égard (JO L 109 du 6.5.2000, p. 29).

([2]) Règlement (UE) nº 1169/2011 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 25 octobre 2011 concernant l'information des consommateurs sur les denrées alimentaires, modifiant les règlements (CE) nº 1924/2006 et (CE) nº 1925/2006 du Parlement européen et du Conseil et abrogeant la directive 87/250/CEE de la Commission, la directive 90/496/CEE du Conseil, la directive 1999/10/CE de la Commission, la directive 2000/13/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil, les directives 2002/67/CE et 2008/5/CE de la Commission et le règlement (CE) nº 608/2004 de la Commission (JO L 304 du 22.11.2011, p. 18). Le règlement (UE) nº 1169/2011 abrogera et remplacera la directive 2000/13/CE à compter du 13 décembre 2014.

([3]) Règlement (CE) nº 178/2002 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 28 janvier 2002 établissant les principes généraux et les prescriptions générales de la législation alimentaire, instituant l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments et fixant des procédures relatives à la sécurité des denrées alimentaires (JO L 31 du 1.2.2002, p. 1).

Le règlement (UE) nº 1169/2011 (article 36, paragraphe 4) permet à la Commission d'harmoniser les informations sur les denrées alimentaires fournies à titre volontaire lorsque de telles informations fournies par les exploitants du secteur alimentaire sont divergentes et susceptibles d'induire en erreur ou de dérouter les consommateurs.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012354/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: Food labelled 'made on the premises'

At a time when food safety is high on the public agenda, would the Commission support rules requiring restaurants to tell the truth about how food is prepared? The description 'made on the premises' would be reserved for dishes prepared from scratch on the spot and in accordance with strict criteria.

Is the Commission in favour of rules of this kind?

The aim would be to prove to consumers that dishes, side dishes and sauces have not simply been reheated in a microwave, but instead meet, for example, all the following criteria:

— they have been made or prepared entirely in the restaurant's kitchens or on the premises of the establishment concerned;

— they have been made using non-processed primary ingredients;

— the ingredients may have been cut and trimmed elsewhere in advance, but final cooking must be carried out on the premises;

— they have been made exclusively using traditional ingredients.

If the Commission concurs, does it also agree that certain dishes which require lengthy preparation could be granted special exemption from the rules? In such special cases, restaurant owners could instead state the name of the producer and the place of production on the menu.

National food standards agencies would be responsible for monitoring compliance with these rules by restaurants and other catering establishments.

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2013)

Under current EU food labelling rules ([1]) the provision of information related to non-prepacked food is mainly within the remit of Member States.

The new Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 ([2]) provides for mandatory allergen information on non-prepacked food, including food delivered in restaurants, whilst Member States may decide to require the provision of other mandatory particulars. National rules establishing mandatory information for non-prepacked food going beyond what is currently required for prepacked food, must be notified to the Commission at a draft stage. This would be the case concerning mandatory provision of information about how the food is prepared in restaurants.

The voluntary use of the description 'made on the premises' must comply with the basic requirement that food information must not be misleading as to the characteristics of the food and, in particular, as to the nature, identity, properties, method of manufacture or production. Member States are responsible for the enforcement of EU food law ([3]) and verify that the relevant requirements thereof are fulfilled by business operators.

([1]) Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 March 2000 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs (OJ L 109, 6.5.2000, p. 29).

([2]) Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 on the provision of food information to consumers, amending Regulations (EC) No 1924/2006 and (EC) No 1925/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council, and repealing Commission Directive 87/250/EEC, Council Directive 90/496/EEC, Commission Directive 1999/10/EC, Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, Commission Directives 2002/67/EC and 2008/5/EC and Commission Regulation (EC) No 608/2004, (OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18). Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 will repeal and replace Directive 2000/13/EC as of 13 December 2014.

([3]) Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety, (OJ L 31, 1.2.2002, p.1).

Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 (Article 36.4) enables the Commission to harmonise voluntary food information where such information is provided by food business operators on a divergent basis which may mislead or confuse consumers.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012355/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(30 octobre 2013)

Objet: Lapins en batterie

De nombreuses chaînes européennes de magasins ont décidé d'interrompre la vente de viande de lapins élevés en batterie.

La viande de lapin vendue est alors exclusivement issue de systèmes d'élevage en parcs.

Les animaux élevés en parcs bénéficient d'un espace plus large que dans les cages de batterie.

Les parcs sont par ailleurs équipés de plateaux surélevés et de cachettes, et offrent aux animaux des morceaux de bois, de foin, de paille et d'autres matériaux à ronger.

1. La Commission compte-t-elle prendre position pour la vente exclusive de lapins issus de l'élevage en parcs?

2. Possède-t-elle des statistiques sur la question: proportion de lapins en batterie vendus contre lapins en parc? Nombre de têtes?

3. La Commission songe-t-elle à promouvoir le bien-être des animaux en allant dans le sens de ces chaînes?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(3 janvier 2014)

Les agriculteurs qui élèvent des lapins pour la production de viande doivent se conformer aux dispositions de la directive 98/58/CE du Conseil concernant la protection des animaux dans les élevages ([1]), afin d'assurer que lesdits animaux ne subissent aucune douleur, souffrance ou dommage inutile.

Comme l'élevage de lapins en cages n'est pas interdit et tant que le droit de l'Union est respecté, les produits issus de ces exploitations peuvent être légalement commercialisés. Il n'existe aucune réglementation spécifique de l'UE concernant les systèmes de logement des lapins destinés à la production de viande ni aucune statistique sur le nombre de lapins détenus dans les différents systèmes d'élevage.

La Commission n'envisage pas pour le moment d'adopter une nouvelle législation sur le bien-être des animaux, quelles que soient les espèces élevées à l'intérieur de l'UE.

([1]) JO L 221 du 8.8.1998, p. 23.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012355/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: Rabbit battery farms

Many European chain stores have decided to stop selling the meat of rabbits reared on battery farms.

The rabbit meat sold thus comes exclusively from rabbits raised in parks.

Animals bred in parks have more space than those in battery cages.

The parks in question are equipped with raised platforms and hiding places and provide animals with pieces of wood, hay, straw and other materials on which they can gnaw.

1. Will the Commission take a stand in demanding that only rabbits bred in parks can be sold?

2. Does it have any relevant statistics on the matter, i.e. the proportion of battery rabbits soldin comparison with park-bred rabbits, and the numbers involved?

3. Does the Commission intend to promote animal welfare in keeping with the wishes of theabovementioned chain stores?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 January 2014)

Farmers rearing rabbits for meat production must comply with the rules laid down in Council Directive 98/58 concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes ([1]) thus ensuring animals are not caused unnecessary pain, suffering or injury.

Since rearing rabbits in cages is not prohibited and as long as existing Union law is respected products stemming from such holdings may be legally marketed. There are no specific EU rules regarding housing systems of rabbits kept for meat production and there are no statistics available on the number of rabbits kept according to different housing systems.

The Commission is currently not considering adopting any new animal welfare legislation for any of the species farmed within the EU.

([1]) OJ L 221, 8.8.1998, p.23.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-012356/13
adresată Comisiei
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(30 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Noul program „Fructe în școli”

Conform rapoartelor anuale de monitorizare ale Comisiei din 2010/2011, peste 54 000 de școli și 8,1 milioane de copii au luat parte la programul „Fructe în școli” în cele 24 de state membre participante.

Recent, CE a aprobat creșterea bugetului alocat acestui program de la 90 de milioane de euro la 150 de milioane de euro.

Având în vedere faptul că, potrivit OMS, 20 % dintre copiii și adolescenții din Europa sunt supraponderali, iar o treime dintre ei sunt obezi, acest program este extrem de binevenit, mai ales dacă vorbim și de componenta sa educațională.

Comisia a realizat un raport de impact referitor la eficiența programului până în 2012.

În acest sens, poate spune Comisia dacă a pregătit un ghid cu recomandări de punere în aplicare a acestui program pentru statele membre?

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(23 decembrie 2013)

Dată fiind diversitatea circumstanțelor naționale/regionale privind punerea în aplicare a programului de încurajare a consumului de fructe în școli, acest program trebuie să permită un anumit grad de flexibilitate.

Schimburile de opinii și de bune practici privind punerea în aplicare a programului de încurajare a consumului de fructe în școli sunt efectuate în mod periodic prin intermediul reuniunilor cu statele membre și cu părțile interesate.

În plus, Comisia lucrează în prezent la un document orientativ referitor la principiile celor mai bune practici, inclusiv pentru măsurile educative, cu ajutorul grupului de experți pentru consultanță tehnică referitoare la programul de încurajare a consumului de fructe în școli.

De asemenea, la începutul anului 2014, Comisia intenționează să prezinte o propunere de revizuire a programelor Uniunii destinate școlilor (programul de încurajare a consumului de fructe în școli și programul de distribuire a laptelui în școli), cu scopul de a furniza un cadru comun pentru a răspunde mai bine obiectivelor PAC și pentru a contribui la formarea unor obiceiuri alimentare sănătoase în rândul copiilor.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012356/13
to the Commission
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(30 October 2013)

Subject: New school fruit scheme

According to the Commission's annual monitoring reports for 2010/2011, over 54 000 schools and 8.1 million schoolchildren participated in the school fruit scheme that year in the 24 participating Member States.

The Commission recently decided to increase the funding allocated to this scheme from EUR 90 million to EUR 150 million.

Since, according to the WHO, 20% of European children and adolescents are overweight and a third of these are obese, this new scheme should be warmly welcomed, especially if one also considers its educational aspects.

The Commission has conducted an impact study on the effectiveness of the scheme for the period up to 2012.

Can the Commission state whether, in that connection, it has prepared a guide with recommendations to Member States on how best to implement the new scheme?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(23 December 2013)

Given the diversity of national/regional circumstances for the implementation of the School Fruit Scheme, the scheme has to allow for some flexibility.

Exchanges of views and best practices concerning the implementation of the School Fruit Scheme are carried out regularly through meetings with Member States and stakeholders.

In addition, the Commission is working on a guidance document concerning principles of best practice, including for educational measures, with the help of the Group of experts for technical advice on the School Fruit Scheme.

Moreover, at the beginning of 2014 the Commission intends to present a proposal on the review of the Union school schemes (School Fruit Scheme and School Milk Scheme) aiming to provide a common framework in order to better address CAP objectives and contribute to shape healthy eating habits in children.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012358/13
an die Kommission
Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE) und Mathieu Grosch (PPE)
(31. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Eigenständige Sozialvorschriften für Busfahrer, Vereinheitlichung der Bebußung von Verstößen gegen die EU-Sozialvorschriften

1. In der Abstimmung am 3. Juli 2012 (P7_TA(2012)0271) über die Änderungsanträge zu dem Vorschlag für eine Verordnung zur Änderung der Verordnung (EWG) Nr. 3821/85 über das Kontrollgerät im Straßenverkehr und zur Änderung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 561/2006 (KOM(2011)0451 — C70205/2011 — 2011/0196(COD)) wurde der Änderungsantrag 6 (neue Erwägung 21 a zu eigenständigen Sozialvorschriften für Busfahrer), eingebracht durch die EVP, namentlich Herrn Dr. Koch, von großen Teilen des Parlaments akzeptiert. In den Trilog-Verhandlungen wurde dieser Antrag und eine Reihe anderer nützlicher Vorschläge in diese Richtung nicht weiter verfolgt.

Gibt es Pläne in der Kommission, Anpassungen der Lenk- und Ruhezeiten speziell für Busfahrer im Gelegenheitsverkehr vorzunehmen?

Begründung: Die derzeitigen Regelungen nehmen mit Ausnahme der 12-Tage-Regelung (die in ihrer derzeitigen Ausgestaltung wenig Anwendung findet) keine Rücksicht auf spezielle Bedingungen im Busgewerbe. Die starren Lenk- und Ruhezeitenregelungen der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 561/2006 sind auf den Lkw ausgerichtet und verhindern, dass Bedürfnisse von Fahrgästen und Fahrern zur Geltung kommen können, und stellen somit ein großes Problem für die Branche dar.

2. Verstöße gegen die Lenk- und Ruhezeiten/die EU-Sozialverordnung werden europaweit äußerst unterschiedlich geahndet. Zudem führen teils sehr geringfügige Verstöße schnell zu hohen Bußgeldern. Durch den Anhang der Richtlinie 2009/5/EG der Kommission ist eine vereinheitlichte Kategorisierung der Verstöße bereits angelegt. In den Maßnahmenkatalogen der Mitgliedstaaten ist aber zudem nicht immer erkennbar, dass der Schwerpunkt durchgängig auf der Erhöhung der Verkehrssicherheit liegt.

Gibt es Pläne der Kommission, die auf eine EU-weit einheitliche Sanktionspraxis abzielt? Gibt es Pläne der Kommission, den Grundsatz der Verhältnismäßigkeit bei Sanktionen im Straßenverkehr EU-weit einheitlich zu definieren?

Begründung: Die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 561/2006 enthält in Artikel 19 Absätze 1 und 4 ein Verhältnismäßigkeitserfordernis. Dieses wird durch das EuGH-Urteil vom 9.2.2012 — C-210/10 — konkretisiert. Je nach der Schwere des Verstoßes muss differenziert werden. Dies ist in vielen Mitgliedstaaten offensichtlich nicht der Fall.

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(19. Dezember 2013)

1. Mit der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 561/2006 [1] wurden einheitliche Bestimmungen für den Güter- und Personenkraftverkehr festgelegt und damit die seit 30 Jahren bestehenden Sozialvorschriften im Straßenverkehr präzisiert und vereinfacht. Die Verordnung sieht Flexibilität bei den Lenkzeiten sowie eine Ausnahmeregelung bezüglich der wöchentlichen Ruhezeit bei einzelnen Gelegenheitsdiensten im grenzüberschreitenden Personenverkehr vor. Es liegt im Ermessen der Mitgliedstaaten, von dieser Ausnahme Gebrauch zu machen.

Die Kommission ist sich der Besonderheiten des Personen- und des Güterkraftverkehrs bewusst. Sie lassen allerdings nicht den Schluss zu, dass im Personenkraftverkehr tätige Fahrer weniger müdigkeitsanfällig sind als Lkw-Fahrer und für sie deshalb weniger strenge Vorschriften gelten könnten. Würden bestimmte Gruppen von Kraftfahrern von den Ruhezeitvorschriften des Güterkraftverkehrs ausgeschlossen, so würden damit neben der Straßenverkehrssicherheit noch zwei weitere Ziele der Verordnung aufs Spiel gesetzt, nämlich die Sicherheit der Fahrer und die Gewährleistung eines fairen Wettbewerbs. Unterschiedliche Regelwerke würden den Mitgliedstaaten die Durchsetzung erschweren, ohne die Sicherheit erkennbar zu verbessern.

[1] Verordnung (EG) Nr. 561/2006 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 15. März 2006 zur Harmonisierung bestimmter Sozialvorschriften im Straßenverkehr und zur Änderung der Verordnungen (EWG) Nr. 3821/85 und (EG) Nr. 2135/98 des Rates sowie zur Aufhebung der Verordnung (EWG) Nr. 3820/85 des Rates, ABl. L 102 vom 11.4.2006.

2. Die Kommission gab 2012 eine Studie ([2]) in Auftrag, um einen genauen Überblick über die in den Mitgliedstaaten angewendeten Sanktionen zu erhalten. Sie hat ergeben, dass es aufgrund der unterschiedlichen sozioökonomischen Situation in den Mitgliedstaaten und der verschiedenen Strafrechtsordnungen schwierig ist, ein europäisches Bußgeldsystem festzulegen. Die Kommission hat eine Durchführungsverordnung ([3]) über die harmonisierte Einstufung von Verstößen gegen Kraftverkehrsvorschriften erarbeitet, die Anfang 2014 verabschiedet werden soll. Diese Verordnung würde dazu beitragen, im Verhältnis zur Schwere der Verstöße stehende Sanktionen einzuführen. Ein kürzlich ergangenes Gerichtshofurteil ([4]) enthält ebenfalls Hinweise zu dem Kriterium der Verhältnismäßigkeit von Sanktionen.

([2]) Der Abschlussbericht der Studie über Sanktionen im Bereich des gewerblichen Straßenverkehrs (Study on sanctions in the field of commercial road transport) soll in den nächsten Monaten auf der Europa-Website veröffentlicht werden.

([3]) Gemäß Artikel 6 Absatz 2 Buchstabe b der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1071/2009 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 21. Oktober 2009 zur Festlegung gemeinsamer Regeln für die Zulassung zum Beruf des Kraftverkehrsunternehmers und zur Aufhebung der Richtlinie 96/26/EG des Rates, ABl. L 300 vom 14.11.2009.

([4]) Rechtssache C-210/10 Márton Urbán.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012358/13
to the Commission
Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE) and Mathieu Grosch (PPE)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Separate social legislation for bus drivers and uniform fines for infringements of EU social legislation

1. In the vote on 3 July 2012 (P7_TA(2012)0271) on the amendments to the proposal for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 3821/85 on recording equipment in road transport and amending Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 ((COM(2011)0451 — C70205/2011 — 2011/0196(COD)), large sections of Parliament accepted Amendment 6 tabled by the EPP Group, and specifically Mr Koch, inserting a new Recital 21a on separate social legislation for bus drivers. In the trilogue negotiations, however, that amendment and a number of other useful proposals along those lines have not been taken further.

Is the Commission planning to make adjustments to driving and rest periods specifically for bus drivers in connection with non-scheduled services?

Justification: With the exception of the 12-day rule, which, as it stands at present, is not applied to any great extent, current provisions make no allowances for specific conditions obtaining in the coach sector. The inflexible provisions on driving and rest periods under Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 are geared to heavy goods vehicles and prevent passengers' and drivers' needs from being met, thus constituting a major problem for the sector.

2. How infringements of driving and rest period provisions and EU social legislation are penalised varies to an extreme extent across Europe. In some cases, in addition, very minor infringements promptly result in swingeing fines. Standardised categories of infringements are set out in the annex to Commission Directive 2009/5/EC. Member States' catalogues of measures do not always make it clear, however, that the focus at all times is on increasing road safety.

Is the Commission planning to standardise penalties across the EU? Is the Commission planning to provide a standard EU definition of the principle of proportionality with regard to road transport penalties?

Justification: Under Article 19(1) and (4) of Regulation (EC) No 561/2006, penalties must be proportionate. That was spelled out in the European Court of Justice judgment of 9 February 2010 (in Case C-210/10). Distinctions must be made in the light of the seriousness of the infringements concerned. In many Member States, that is evidently not the case.

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

1. Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 ([1]) clarified and simplified the 30 year old social legislation in road transport setting out uniform rules for both goods and passenger transport. This regulation provides for flexibility as regards the driving times rules and for derogation from the weekly rest for a single occasional international carriage of passengers. It is up to the Member States to make use of this derogation.

The Commission acknowledges the specificities of passenger transport and freight transport. These do not, however, imply that drivers carrying passengers are less prone to fatigue than those carrying goods and hence could be covered by less stringent rules. Apart from road safety aspects, also two other objectives of the regulation, namely safety of drivers and fair competition, would be undermined if certain categories of drivers could not benefit from the same provisions on rest periods, as those in the haulage sector. Different sets of rules would also make it more difficult for the Member States to enforce them, with no clear additional safety benefits.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2006 on the harmonisation of certain social legislation relating to road transport and amending Council Regulations (EEC) No 3821/85 and (EC) No 2135/98 and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 3820/85 OJ L 102, 11.4.2006.

2. In 2012 the Commission launched a study ([2]) to get a detailed overview of penalties applied in Member States. It shows that due to different socioeconomic situations in Member States and various national penal systems, it is difficult to establish a European system of fines. The Commission has prepared an implementing Regulation ([3]) on the harmonised categorisation of infringements of road transport provisions, to be adopted at the beginning of 2014. This implementing Regulation would help establish penalties which are proportionate to the gravity of infringements. A recent Court of justice ruling ([4]) also provides some guidance on the criterion of proportionality of penalties.

([2]) The final report of the 'Study on sanctions in the field of commercial road transport' is to be published on the Europa website in the coming months.

([3]) In accordance with Article 6 § 2 b) of Regulation (EC) No 1071/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 establishing common rules concerning the conditions to be complied with to pursue the occupation of road transport operator and repealing Council Directive 96/26/EC, OJ L 300, 14.11.2009.

([4]) Case C-210/10 Márton Urbán.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012359/13
to the Commission
Gay Mitchell (PPE)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Temporary workers

While Directive 2008/104/EC on temporary agency work defined a minimum protection level for temporary workers, employment conditions for many temporary workers can still be precarious. Does the Commission have any plans in the pipeline for enforcing temporary workers' rights across the Union?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2013)

The Commission is checking the compliance of the national implementing provisions with Directive 2008/104/EC ([1]) on temporary agency work, in particular on the basis of information provided by the Member States on their provisions transposing the directive and any complaints alleging an infringement of the directive.

In accordance with Article 12 of the directive, the Commission is currently drawing up a report on its application, in consultation with the Member States and the social partners at EU level. The report will cover the implementation of the directive in the Member States, notably as regards the application of the principle of equal treatment and the other provisions to improve the protection of temporary agency workers. Should the Commission identify any areas of concern, it will tackle them in the appropriate way, including, where necessary, by initiating an infringement procedure.

According to a recent study ([2]) on precarious work and social rights carried out in the framework of a pilot project ([3]), temporary agency work is among the forms of employment that are most likely to be perceived as precarious. However, precariousness is the result of a combination of factors, including the welfare system in place and the worker's family situation, and thus can affect workers on any form of employment contract.

([1]) Directive 2008/104/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on temporary agency work, OJ L 327, 5.12.2008, p. 9.
([2]) Study on precarious work and social rights, 2012, carried out for the Commission by London Metropolitan University.
([3]) Pilot project 'Encourage conversion of precarious work into work with rights' carried out in 2011 and 2012.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012360/13
an die Kommission
Renate Sommer (PPE)
(31. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Auswirkung von Rapsöl auf die Gesundheit

Rapsöl gilt als preiswertes und gesundes Speiseöl. Dennoch gibt es in der Öffentlichkeit offensichtlich Zweifel an seiner gesundheitlichen Unbedenklichkeit. Es wird vermutet, dass Rapsöl nicht völlig frei von Erucasäure und deshalb insbesondere ungeeignet für die Ernährung von Kindern ist. Bei der Herstellung sollen Lösungs- und Ätzmittel verwendet werden, und durch die durch Erhitzen oxydierten ungesättigten Fettsäuren soll sich — wie auch bei Mais- und Sojaöl — die Menge der freien Radikale im Körper erhöhen. Ferner soll bei der Herstellung ein Teil des Omega-3-Gehaltes in Transfette umgewandelt werden, so dass Rapsöl letztendlich — entgegen anderslautenden Werbeaussagen — einen erheblichen Anteil an Transfettsäuren enthalten soll.

1. Ist Rapsöl völlig frei von Erucasäure?

2. Welche Chemikalien werden bei der Herstellung von Rapsöl eingesetzt, und welche Auswirkungen hat dies gegebenenfalls auf die menschliche Gesundheit?

3. Kann die Kommission die oben beschriebenen Veränderungen der Fettsäuren im Zuge des Herstellungsprozesses bestätigen?

4. Sind Zweifel an der gesundheitlichen Unbedenklichkeit von Rapsöl gerechtfertigt?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(12. Dezember 2013)

1. In der Europäischen Union werden nur Rapssorten mit einem geringen Erukasäuregehalt Verwendung in der Lebens- oder Futtermittelerzeugung verwendet. Für den menschlichen Verzehr bestimmtes Rapsöl darf — bezogen auf den Gesamtgehalt an Fettsäuren in der Fettphase — höchstens 5 % Erukasäure enthalten ([1]); in Säuglingsanfangsnahrung und Folgenahrung darf der Erukasäuregehalt 1 % des Gesamtfettgehalts nicht überschreiten ([2]). Sorten mit einem hohen Erukasäuregehalt werden nur für industrielle Zwecke verwendet.

2. Rohes Rapsöl enthält Stoffe, die aus Gründen des Geschmacks, der Stabilität, des Aussehens und der Weiterverarbeitung unerwünscht sind. Diese unerwünschten Stoffe werden durch den Raffinationsprozess eliminiert, der Nährwert bleibt jedoch erhalten. Im Raffinationsprozess werden Verarbeitungshilfen eingesetzt, so etwa Hexan beim Pressen und Zitronen- und/oder Phosphorsäure sowie Ätznatron bei der Raffination. Diese Verarbeitungshilfen werden während der weiteren Verarbeitung eliminiert. Das raffinierte Rapsöl enthält keine Rückstände dieser Verarbeitungshilfen, so dass die Verwendung von Verarbeitungshilfen im Raffinationsprozess des Rapsöls keine negativen Auswirkungen auf die menschliche Gesundheit hat.

3. Aufgrund der hohen Temperatur im letzten Schritt des Raffinationsprozesses kommt es mitunter zur Bildung von Trans-Fettsäuren. Bei Anwendung der Grundsätze guter Praxis bilden sich nicht mehr als 2 % Trans-Fettsäuren. In raffiniertem Rapsöl liegt der Gehalt an trans-Fettsäuren deutlich unter 2 %.

4. Bei Anwendung der Grundsätze guter Praxis ist die Unbedenklichkeit von raffiniertem Rapsöl gewährleistet.

([1]) Richtlinie 76/621/EWG des Rates vom 20. Juli 1976 zur Festsetzung des Höchstgehalts an Erukasäure in Speiseölen und -fetten sowie in Lebensmitteln mit Öl- und Fettzusätzen (ABl. Nr. L 202 vom 28.7.1976, S. 35).

([2]) Richtlinie 2006/141/EG der Kommission vom 22. Dezember 2006 über Säuglingsanfangsnahrung und Folgenahrung und zur Änderung der Richtlinie 1999/21/EG (ABl. L 401 vom 30.12.2006, S. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012360/13
to the Commission
Renate Sommer (PPE)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Effects of rapeseed oil on health

Rapeseed oil is considered to be an affordable and healthy cooking oil. Nonetheless, the general public clearly has doubts as to whether it is really harmless to health. Suspicions exist that rapeseed oil is not completely free from erucic acid, making its use in food for children particularly unsuitable. It is alleged that solvents and corrosives are used in its manufacture and that — as with corn oil and soya oil — heating the unsaturated fatty acids to oxidise them increases the quantity of free radicals in the body. Furthermore, a portion of the omega-3 content is said to be converted in the manufacturing process into transfats, so that at the end of the day rapeseed oil — despite publicity claims to the contrary — would seem to contain a high proportion of transfats.

1. Is rapeseed oil completely free of erucic acid?

2. Which chemicals are used in the manufacture of rapeseed oil and what are the possible effects these may have on human health?

3. Can the Commission confirm the changes described above to fatty acids in the course of the manufacturing process?

4. Are the doubts about rapeseed oil being harmless to health justified?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2013)

1. Only rapeseed varieties with low content of erucic acid are used for the rapeseed production in the European Union for food and feed purposes. Rapeseed oil intended for human consumption shall not contain more than 5% erucic acid calculated on the total level of fatty acids ([1]) and the level of erucic acid in infant formulae and follow-on formulae shall not exceed 1% of the total fat content ([2]). The varieties high in erucic acid are only used for industrial purposes.

2. Crude rapeseed oil contains substances, which are undesirable for taste, stability, appearance or further processing. These undesirable substances are removed by the refining process, while maintaining the nutritional value. Processing aids are used in the oil refining process, such as hexane during crushing and citric and/or phosphoric acid and caustic soda during refining. These processing aids are removed in subsequent processing. The refined rapeseed oil does no longer contain residues of these processing aids and therefore the use of processing aids in the refining process of rapeseed oil has no adverse health effects on human health.

3. Because of the high temperature used during the last step of the refining process, formation of trans fatty acid occurs. In case of the application of good practices during the refining process, no more than 2% of trans fatty acids are formed. In refined rapeseed oil, the trans fatty acid content is well below 2%.

4. In case of application of good practices during the refining process, the safety of refined rapeseed oil is ensured.

([1]) Council Directive 76/621/EEC of 20 July 1976 relating to the fixing of the maximum level of erucic acid in oils and fats intended as such for human consumption and in foodstuffs containing added oils and fats (OJ L 202, 28.7.1976, p. 35).

([2]) Commission Directive 2006/141/EC of 22 December 2006 on infant formulae and follow-on formulae and amending Directive 1999/21/EC (OJ L 401, 30.12.2006, p. 1).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-012361/13
an die Kommission
Renate Sommer (PPE)
(31. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Einschätzung von Angaben zu Probiotika in Lebensmitteln

Trotz zahlreicher wissenschaftlich anerkannter Studien hat die Europäische Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit (EFSA) keine gesundheitsbezogenen Werbeaussagen für Produkte, die Probiotika erhalten, zugelassen. Die betroffenen Unternehmen arbeiten daran, diese Hürde zu überwinden. Allerdings besteht die Sorge, dass sogar der bloße Hinweis „enthält Probiotika" auf Produktverpackungen verboten werden könnte, obwohl dabei keine Aussage zur Gesundheitswirkung getroffen wird. In Deutschland hat es bereits divergierende obergerichtliche Entscheidungen zum Begriff „Probiotika" und zu der Aussage „mit probiotischen Kulturen" gegeben, die zu erheblicher Rechtsunsicherheit führen.

Bei einem Verbot des Hinweises auf Probiotika auf den Produktverpackungen entfiele das Herausstellungsmerkmal, so dass bei den entsprechenden Produkten möglicherweise ein Umsatzeinbruch zu verzeichnen wäre; dies aber würde die Investitionen in die Entwicklung innovativer Lebensmittel gefährden.

1. Ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass die Bezeichnungen „enthält Probiotika" oder „probiotisch" eine nährwertbewogene Angabe im Sinne des Artikels 2 Absatz 2 Nummer 4 der Verordnung (EG) 1924/2006 sind, da die Anforderungen von Artikel 2 Absatz 2 Nummer 3 und Artikel 5 erfüllt sind?

2. Plant die Kommission, den Hinweis „enthält Probiotika" auf Produktverpackungen zu verbieten?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(12. Dezember 2013)

Gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1924/2006 über nährwert- und gesundheitsbezogene Angaben über Lebensmittel ist eine gesundheitsbezogene Angabe jede Angabe, mit der erklärt, suggeriert oder auch nur mittelbar zum Ausdruck gebracht wird, dass ein Zusammenhang zwischen einer Lebensmittelkategorie, einem Lebensmittel oder einem seiner Bestandteile einerseits und der Gesundheit andererseits besteht.

In den als Schlussfolgerungen des Ständigen Ausschusses für die Lebensmittelkette und Tiergesundheit angenommenen Leitlinien ([1]) für die Durchführung der genannten Verordnung aus dem Jahr 2007 ist erläutert, dass es sich bei einer Angabe um eine gesundheitsbezogene Angabe handelt, wenn die Bezeichnung des Stoffs oder der Stoffkategorie eine Beschreibung oder die Angabe einer Funktionsweise oder einer angedeuteten Auswirkung auf die Gesundheit enthält. In diesem Leitliniendokument ist ein konkretes Beispiel für eine solche gesundheitsbezogene Angabe genannt, und zwar *„enthält Probiotika"*, und es wird ausgeführt, dass der Verweis auf Probiotika eine Auswirkung auf die Gesundheit impliziert.

Die Mitgliedstaaten können sich bei Anwendung und Durchsetzung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1924/2006 auf diese Leitlinien stützen.

Bisher gibt es keine zulässigen gesundheitsbezogenen Angaben zu Probiotika. Nach Annahme der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 536/2013 der Kommission zur Änderung der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 432/2012 zur Festlegung einer Liste zulässiger gesundheitsbezogener Angaben über Lebensmittel ([2]) wurden mehrere gesundheitsbezogene Angaben zu Probiotika (Mikroorganismen) als nicht zulässige Angaben in das EU-Register nährwert- und gesundheitsbezogener Angaben über Lebensmittel aufgenommen.

Wir möchten darauf hinweisen, dass am 20. September 2013 die Verordnung (EU) Nr. 907/2013 der Kommission zur Festlegung von Regeln für Anträge auf Verwendung allgemeiner Bezeichnungen angenommen wurde. Bis zum heutigen Tag sind keine Anträge auf Verwendung des Begriffs „Probiotika" eingegangen. Alle künftig eingehenden Anträge werden gemäß dem Verfahren bearbeitet, das in der genannten Verordnung geregelt ist.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/labellingnutrition/claims/guidance_claim_14-12-07.pdf
([2]) ABl. L 160 vom 12.6.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012361/13
to the Commission
Renate Sommer (PPE)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Assessment of food labelling indications concerning probiotics

In spite of numerous scientifically recognised studies, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has not approved any health claims for products containing probiotics. Manufacturers are working to overcome this obstacle. They are, however, worried that they might be prohibited even from mentioning on the packaging that a product 'contains probiotics', although a bald statement of that kind says nothing about health effects. Higher courts in Germany have been handing down divergent rulings on the term 'probiotics' and the indication 'with probiotic cultures', and this is causing considerable legal uncertainty.

If it were forbidden to mention on the packaging that products contain probiotics, the selling point would be lost, and sales might fall accordingly; if that were to happen, investment in the development of novel foods would be placed in jeopardy.

1. Does the Commission consider that the indications 'contains probiotics' or 'probiotic' constitute a nutrition claim within the meaning of Article 2(2)(4) of Regulation (EC)No 1924/2006, bearing in mind that, in this case, the requirements of Article 2(2)(3) andArticle 5 are met?

2. Does it intend to ban labelling indications that a product 'contains probiotics'?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2013)

Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods states that a health claim means any claim which states, suggests or implies that a relationship exists between a food category, a food or one of its constituents and health.

The Guidance ([1]) on the implementation of the abovementioned Regulation of 2007, approved as conclusions of the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health, clarifies that a claim is a health claim if in the naming of the substance or category of substances there is a description or indication of a functionality or an implied effect on health. The Guidance document gives a concrete example of such health claim, namely 'contains probiotics' explaining that the reference to probiotics implies a health effect.

Member States may use this Guidance when applying and enforcing Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006.

To date, there are no authorised health claims on probiotics; several health claims on probiotics (micro-organisms) were included as non-authorised claims in the EU Register of nutrition and health claims made on foods following the adoption of Commission Regulation (EU) No 536/2013 amending Regulation (EU) No 432/2012 establishing a list of permitted health claims made on foods ([2]).

It should be noted that Commission Regulation (EC) No 907/2013 setting the rules for application concerning the use of generic descriptors (denominations) was adopted on 20 September 2013. No applications regarding the use of the term 'probiotics' have been received to date. Any future application will be treated in accordance with the procedure foreseen in the aforementioned Regulation.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/labellingnutrition/claims/guidance_claim_14-12-07.pdf
([2]) OJ L 160, 12.6.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012362/13
to the Commission
Linda McAvan (S&D)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Sambuca and the spirit drinks regulation

I am writing further to the Commission's answer to Written Question E-006892/2013 ([1]).

Can the Commission clarify the legal status of coloured products bearing the name 'sambuca'? Has the Commission discovered products that have been illegally labelled in this regard and, if so, what action has it taken?

Answer given by Mr Cioloș on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

According to 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 ([2]), 'Sambuca is a colourless aniseed-flavoured liqueur…'. Consequently, the absence of colour is one of the essential conditions for the conformity of the product with the definition of 'sambuca'.

However, Article (10)1 of Regulation (EC) No 110/2008 allows the use of the names of categories listed in Annex II as part of a compound terms or as an allusion provided that '… the alcohol originates exclusively from the spirit drink(s) referred to.'

Therefore, a spirit drink containing 'sambuca' and a coloured foodstuff can be described by a compound term which includes the term 'sambuca' jointly with the name of the foodstuff used (for example, 'Strawberry sambuca'), provided that all the alcohol used comes exclusively from 'sambuca'. The final product, in this case, will be coloured and the sales denomination will not be 'sambuca' but 'spirit drink' or 'liqueur', according to its composition.

The Commission has been alerted on trade of Sambuca which could be in breach of the relevant EU definition and informed the concerned Member State, who is currently enquiring. 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]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-006892&language=EN
([2]) OJ L 39, 13.2.2008, p. 16-54.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012364/13
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Alluvione di Ginosa

Il 7 e 8 ottobre scorso si è verificata una devastante alluvione nelle province di Taranto e Matera. Uno dei centri più colpiti dalla calamità naturale è stato il comune di Ginosa.

Secondo Coldiretti i danni che le piogge hanno provocato all'agricoltura locale ammontano a 50 milioni di euro, pari al 10 % della produzione lorda vendibile del territorio. Sono state colpite colture come ortaggi e fragole, appena trapiantate, con i relativi impianti, ma anche campi di uva da tavola ancora da raccogliere e agrumeti.

Anche l'amministrazione cittadina ha stimato i danni alle infrastrutture, alle strade e ai privati in 50 milioni di euro. Complessivamente quindi l'alluvione ha prodotto danni per ben 100 milioni di euro.

Si registrano in zona anche quattro decessi dovuti all'alluvione.

Alla luce di ciò, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. se esaminerà la possibilità di sovvenzione per le zone colpite dall'alluvione di cui sopra in base a quanto previsto dall'articolo 2, paragrafo 2, del regolamento (CE) n. 2012/2002 che prevede la possibilità di beneficiare dell'intervento del Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea per una zona che sia stata colpita da una catastrofe straordinaria, anche se non vengono soddisfatti i requisiti quantitativi stabiliti dalla normativa;

2. se, per il ripristino dei danni causati, soprattutto al comparto agricolo, è possibile usufruire degli stanziamenti dei Fondi strutturali;

3. se esistono progetti che sperimentano nuovi approcci di riduzione del rischio di calamità come quello sempre più frequente delle alluvioni in tutta Europa?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(16 dicembre 2013)

1. Affinché la Commissione possa determinare se i requisiti per l'intervento del Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione siano soddisfatti, le autorità nazionali dello Stato membro colpito da una catastrofe devono presentare domanda di intervento entro 10 settimane dal verificarsi dell'evento. La Commissione non può procedere alla mobilitazione del Fondo di solidarietà di propria iniziativa. Ad oggi le autorità italiane non hanno presentato domanda né comunicato l'intenzione di farlo.

2. Sebbene alcuni programmi di sviluppo rurale italiani per il periodo 2007-2013 sostengono il ripristino del potenziale agricolo danneggiato da catastrofi naturali, il programma di sviluppo rurale per la Puglia non contempla tali misure in quanto le autorità regionali non lo hanno mai richiesto. Qualora venisse presentata una domanda in questo senso, la Commissione provvederà sicuramente a valutarla nel più breve tempo possibile, tenendo conto della normativa in materia di sviluppo rurale.

3. La promozione dell'adattamento ai cambiamenti climatici, della prevenzione e della gestione dei rischi è uno degli 11 obiettivi tematici della politica di coesione per il periodo 2014-2020. In questo quadro e in relazione alle priorità che saranno fissate nei programmi pertinenti, gli Stati membri e le regioni potranno attingere al relativo sostegno finanziario al fine di investire in programmi sulla prevenzione delle alluvioni.

La direttiva sulle alluvioni ([1]) definisce un quadro per la valutazione e la gestione dei rischi di alluvioni. Le valutazioni preliminari del rischio di alluvioni erano state richieste entro la fine del 2011. Le mappe della pericolosità e del rischio di alluvioni vanno ultimate entro la fine del 2013 mentre i piani di gestione del rischio di alluvioni vanno ultimati entro la fine del 2015. Detti piani vanno riesaminati periodicamente. Compete agli Stati membri fissare gli obiettivi di riduzione dei rischi concreti e selezionare le misure tenendo conto delle condizioni locali e regionali.

([1]) Direttiva 2007/60/CE, GU L 288 del 6.11.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012364/13
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Flooding in Ginosa

On 7 and 8 October, massive flooding occurred in the provinces of Taranto and Matera, one of the areas worst hit by this natural disaster being the municipality of Ginosa.

According to the Coldiretti national farmers confederation, damage to local agriculture amounted to EUR 50 million, that is to say 10% of the region's gross marketable output. Not only vegetable crops but also recently planted strawberry beds and equipment, together with fields of unharvested table grapes and citrus groves were destroyed.

The authorities for their part have estimated at EUR 50 million the cost of damage to infrastructure, roads and private property, resulting in total losses of at least EUR 100 million.

The floods also claimed four lives in the localities affected.

In view of this:

1. Will the Commission consider the possibility of providing subsidies for the flood-stricken areas under the terms of Article 2(2) of Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002 to the effect that a region may also receive EU Solidarity Fund assistance where it has been affected by an extraordinary disaster, even when the stipulated quantitative criteria are not met?

2. Can Structural Fund resources be earmarked for damage repair, particularly in the agricultural sector?

3. Are risk containment projects being developed in response to disasters such as the increasingly frequent floods afflicting the whole of Europe?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

1. In order for the Commission to assess whether a disaster is eligible for aid from the EU Solidarity Fund, the national authorities of the affected Member State must present an application within 10 weeks of the start of the disaster. The Commission may not activate the Solidarity Fund upon its own initiative. To date, the Italian authorities have not made an application or communicated their intention of doing so.

2. Although some Italian rural development programmes for the 2007-2013 period do support the restoration of agricultural potential damaged by natural disasters, the regional rural development programme for Puglia does not include this measure; this was never requested by the regional authorities. If such a request is introduced, the Commission will certainly evaluate such demand within the shortest time possible, taking into account the legislation on rural development.

3. Promoting climate change adaption, risk prevention and management is one of the 11 thematic objectives of 2014-2020 cohesion policy. In this framework and linked to the priorities which will be set in the relevant programmes, the Member States and regions will be able to draw on the related financial support in order to invest in programmes on flood prevention.

The Floods Directive ([1]) establishes a framework for the assessment and management of flood risks. Preliminary flood risk assessments were required by the end of 2011. Flood hazard and risk maps should be completed by end of 2013 and flood risk management plans by end of 2015; these plans should be periodically reviewed. The setting of concrete risk reduction objectives and selection of measures is up to the Member States based on local and regional circumstances.

([1]) Directive 2007/60/EC, OJ L 288, 6.11.2007.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012365/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(31 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Απειλούμενα μνημεία και πολιτιστικά τοπία στην Ευρώπη

Επτά απειλούμενα μνημεία και πολιτιστικά τοπία στην Ευρώπη έχουν επιλεγεί από το Europa Nostra και το Ινστιτούτο της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων για να διασωθούν, γιατί το καθένα από αυτά λέει μια συναρπαστική ιστορία για το κοινό παρελθόν της ευρωπαϊκής οικογένειας. Ανάμεσα σ' αυτά είναι και η νεκρή ζώνη στο ιστορικό κέντρο της Λευκωσίας, όπου πολλά ιστορικά κτήρια χρήζουν αποκατάστασης.

Ερωτάται λοιπόν η Επιτροπή:

1. Από που μπορούν να αντληθούν ευρωπαϊκά κονδύλια για τη διάσωση αυτών των μνημείων που στην περίπτωση της Κύπρου καταστράφηκαν λόγω της τουρκικής εισβολής του 1974;

2. Γιατί δεν καλείται και η Τουρκία, ως χώρα εισβολέας και υπαίτιος της καταστροφής στη Νεκρή ζώνη, να συμβάλει οικονομικά σ' αυτή την προσπάθεια, την οποία η ίδια δημιούργησε, ενώ κατά οξύμωρο τρόπο απολαμβάνει η ίδια πακτωλούς ευρωπαϊκής χρηματοδότησης ως χώρα υπό ένταξη;

3. Πώς μπορεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων να βοηθήσει την Κύπρο που βρίσκεται σήμερα σε πολύ άσχημη οικονομική θέση λόγω κουρέματος καταθέσεων και άδικων αποφάσεων του Eurogroup;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Όσον αφορά την πρώτη ερώτηση, η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει την αξιότιμη κυρία βουλευτή στην απάντησή της στην προηγούμενη γραπτή ερώτηση αριθ. E-007311/13 ([1]). Προς ενημέρωση, το βραβείο πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς της ΕΕ, σκοπός του οποίου είναι η προβολή ορισμένων από τα καλύτερα επιτεύγματα της Ευρώπης όσον αφορά την φροντίδα της πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς, απονεμήθηκε το 2003 και το 2011 για σχέδια που αφορούν τη ζώνη ασφαλείας στη Λευκωσία.

Η Τουρκία, ως υποψήφια χώρα, είναι επιλέξιμη για συνδρομή στο πλαίσιο του μηχανισμού προενταξιακής βοήθειας (ΜΠΒ) για τη σταδιακή ευθυγράμμισή της με τα πρότυπα και τις πολιτικές της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης εν όψει της ένταξής της. Ωστόσο, οι χρηματοδοτικές ρυθμίσεις για την κάλυψη των δαπανών για τα έργα στα οποία αναφέρεται η αξιότιμη κυρία βουλευτής δεν εμπίπτουν στις αρμοδιότητες της Επιτροπής και βρίσκονται εκτός του πεδίου της χρηματοδότησης βάσει του ΜΠΒ.

Ο όμιλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων (ΕΤΕπ) και η Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία διεξάγουν διαπραγματεύσεις σχετικά με ένα καθεστώς στήριξης για τη χρηματοδότηση κυπριακών μικρομεσαίων επιχειρήσεων (ΜΜΕ), που αντιμετωπίζουν σοβαρές δυσχέρειες λόγω της κρίσης που πλήττει την Κύπρο. Με την χρηματοδοτική αυτή συνεισφορά στο πλαίσιο της προτεινόμενης ενέργειας της ΕΤΕπ θα καλυφθεί η έλλειψη χρηματοδότησης από την αγορά που θέτει τις ΜΜΕ υπό πίεση. Η ενέργεια αυτή θα συμβάλει στη βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη και την απασχόληση στην Κύπρο, δεδομένου ότι οι ΜΜΕ αποτελούν τη ραχοκοκαλιά της κυπριακής οικονομίας, καθώς αντιπροσωπεύουν πάνω από το 99% των επιχειρήσεων και δημιουργούν πάνω από το 80% των θέσεων απασχόλησης στην Κύπρο.

Τα θέματα που θίγει η αξιότιμη κυρία βουλευτής καταδεικνύουν για μία ακόμη φορά την ανάγκη ταχείας και συνολικής διευθέτησης του κυπριακού προβλήματος.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/el/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012365/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Threatened monuments and cultural landmarks in Europe

Seven threatened monuments and cultural landmarks in Europe have been selected for restoration by the Europa Nostra and European Investment Bank Institute, each of them with a fascinating history relating to our shared past as a European family of nations, including the buffer zone in the Nicosia city centre, where many historic buildings are in need of restoration.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission say where EU funding can be found to restore monuments such as those destroyed in Cyprus as a result of the 1974 Turkish invasion?

2. Given that Turkey, the invading force responsible for the destruction which occurred in the buffer zone, was behind this particular initiative, why is it not being called on contribute financially, particularly in view of the generous European funding that it is receiving, paradoxically enough, as an applicant country?

3. What assistance can the European Investment Bank provide for Cyprus, which is currently in dire economic straits in the wake of haircuts levied on deposits and unjust decisions by the Eurogroup?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(6 January 2014)

With regard to the first question, the Commission would kindly refer the Honourable Member to its answer to previous Written Question E-007311/13 ([1]). By way of information, the EU Cultural heritage Prize, which aims to highlight some of Europe's best achievements in heritage care, was awarded in 2003 and 2011 to projects involving the buffer zone in Nicosia.

Turkey, as a candidate country, is eligible for Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA) assistance in its progressive alignment with the standards and policies of the European Union, including EC law, with a view to membership. However, the financial arrangements to cover the costs for the projects referred to by the Honourable Member fall outside the competence of the Commission and outside the scope of IPA funding.

The European Investment Bank (EIB) Group and the Republic of Cyprus are currently negotiating a support scheme to finance Cypriot small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), which are severely hampered by the crisis affecting Cyprus. Through its funding contribution, the proposed EIB operation will address the SMEs pressing financing market gap. The operation would contribute to sustainable growth and employment in Cyprus, as SMEs are the backbone of the Cypriot economy representing more than 99% of companies and creating more than 80% of jobs in Cyprus.

The issues raised by the Honourable Member once again emphasise the urgency of reaching a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012366/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(31 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: «Έργα κοινού ενδιαφέροντος LNG και καλώδιο»

Το σχέδιο για το καλώδιο μεταφοράς ηλεκτρισμού που θα συνδέει το Ισραήλ, την Κύπρο και την Ελλάδα, όπως και η αποθήκευση υγροποιημένου φυσικού αερίου στην Κύπρο, έχουν υιοθετηθεί σε καθοριστικής σημασίας συνεδρίες σε πολιτικό επίπεδο από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και συγκεκριμένα στις 24 Ιουλίου 2013, σε συνεδρία της πολιτικής σύνθεσης του Οργάνου Λήψης Αποφάσεων («Decision Making Body»).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

α) Πώς αξιολογεί την προοπτική εξόρυξης φυσικού αερίου από την Αποκλειστική Οικονομική Ζώνη της Κύπρου;

β) Πώς αξιολογεί την προοπτική που δημιουργείται τόσο από την πιθανή σύνδεση Ισραήλ-Κύπρου-Ελλάδας όσο και την αποθήκευση υγροποιημένου φυσικού αερίου στην Κύπρο για τους ενεργειακούς σχεδιασμούς της ΕΕ;

Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(18 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

α) Σχετικά με τη θέση της ΕΕ για τις προοπτικές εξόρυξης φυσικού αερίου στην αποκλειστική οικονομική ζώνη της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας, η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει στις απαντήσεις της στις γραπτές ερωτήσεις E-007674/2013, E-001320/2013, E-009715/2013 και E-010975/2013.

β) Η αποθήκευση ΥΦΑ στη Δημοκρατία της Κύπρου και στην ευρωασιατική γραμμή διασύνδεσης έχουν αμφότερα χαρακτηριστεί ως έργο κοινού ενδιαφέροντος σύμφωνα με τον κανονισμό (ΕΕ) αριθ. 347/2013 με βάση τα οφέλη τους για την ΕΕ όσον αφορά την ολοκλήρωση της αγοράς, τον ανταγωνισμό, την ασφάλεια του εφοδιασμού και την αειφορία. Η κατάσταση αυτή τους επιτρέπει να επωφελούνται από ειδικού τύπου καθεστώς αδειοδότησης και ρυθμιστικής μεταχείρισης στο εσωτερικό της ΕΕ και, ενδεχομένως, να ζητούν χρηματοδοτική βοήθεια της ΕΕ στο πλαίσιο της διευκόλυνσης «Συνδέοντας την Ευρώπη», με την προϋπόθεση ότι συμμορφώνονται με τους όρους που περιγράφονται στον κανονισμό. Εκτός από τα ως άνω, όλες οι δυνητικές διαδρομές πρέπει να εξεταστούν και να αξιολογηθούν τόσο από πλευράς ασφάλειας ενεργειακού εφοδιασμού, όσο και από πλευράς σχετικού οικονομικού κόστους και οφελών.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012366/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: LNG and power cable projects of common interest

The power cable linking Israel, Cyprus and Greece and natural gas storage in Cyprus are projects that have been adopted at EU key political sessions, including the decision-making body meeting of 24 July 2013.

In view of this:

(a) What are the Commission's views regarding the prospect of natural gas extraction in the Cyprus Exclusive Economic Zone?

(b) What are its views concerning EU energy planning prospects offered by the projected link between Israel, Cyprus and Greece and natural gas storage in Cyprus?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(18 December 2013)

(a) Regarding the EU position concerning the prospects of natural gas extraction in the Exclusive Economic Zone of the Republic of Cyprus, the Commission refers to its answers to the written questions E-007674/2013, E-001320/2013, E-009715/2013 and E-010975/2013.

(b) The LNG Storage in the Republic of Cyprus and the EuroAsia Interconnector have both been identified as Project of Common Interest pursuant to Regulation (EU) 347/2013 in light of their benefits for the EU in terms of market integration, competition, security of supply and sustainability. This status allows them to benefit from a special permitting regime and regulatory treatment within the EU and potentially seek EU financial assistance under the Connecting Europe Facility, provided that they comply with the conditions described in the regulation. Apart from these, all potential routes should be considered and assessed both from an energy security point of view and from the point of view of their relative economic costs and benefits.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012367/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(31 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Rigassificatore di Porto Viro in provincia di Rovigo e concomitanti fenomeni di riduzione del pescato e di morìa di delfini e tartarughe nella stessa area del mar Adriatico

Circa 17 chilometri al largo della costa di Porto Levante, nel comune di Porto Viro in provincia di Rovigo, nelle immediate vicinanze del delta del Po, dal settembre 2008 esiste un'isola artificiale sulla quale è situato un rigassificatore offshore «a ciclo aperto» che riconduce il metano liquefatto allo stato gassoso utilizzando il sistema del recupero di calore dall'acqua di mare per sottrazione. L'impianto, collocato in un'area di grande valenza naturalistica, nel processo produttivo utilizza grandi quantitativi d'acqua di mare, che poi restituisce a temperature inferiori e con una maggiore presenza di cloro-derivati. Come rilevato dal WWF in un documento di approfondimento ([1]), inoltre, l'acqua di mare impiegata viene restituita sostanzialmente sterile, priva del suo contenuto di larve, gameti e sostanze nutritive, incapace di rendere all'ambiente i servizi ecosistemici che le sono propri, tra i quali, a esempio, il fungere da habitat per il plancton e lo svolgere i processi di autodepurazione, di regolazione dei cicli biogeochimici e di assorbimento di CO_2.

Il rimescolamento dell'acqua a grande velocità e forte pressione, infine, produce ingenti schiume in mare. Tali effetti sembrerebbero quindi interferire con l'ecosistema marino, in particolare con la fauna ittica, alterando il già precario equilibrio della zona del mar Adriatico interessata. Si tratta di aspetti rilevati dalle amministrazioni locali e confermati dall'ARPA (Agenzia regionale per la Prevenzione e l'Ambiente) Emilia Romagna ([2]), che destano apprensione nelle associazioni di categoria della pesca, le quali ritengono che questi possano rientrare tra le cause dell'attuale riduzione del pescato. Secondo Sauro Pari, Presidente della Fondazione Cetacea Onlus di Riccione (RN), infine, negli ultimi anni nella zona si sono verificati almeno due momenti di anomalo incremento della mortalità delle tartarughe e, recentemente, dei delfini ([3]). Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se esistano studi comunitari ovvero internazionali sugli effetti dei rigassificatori «a ciclo aperto» sull'ecosisistema marino e, in caso affermativo, a quali conclusioni siano pervenuti?

2. se ritiene che possa esservi un rapporto di causa-effetto tra l'attività dell'impianto di cui sopra e i concomitanti fenomeni di scarsità del pescato e anomala morìa di delfini e tartarughe?

3. se il fenomeno della produzione di schiume si verifichi anche altrove in presenza di rigassificatori offshore?

4. se non ritiene infine preferibile la costruzione di rigassificatori «a ciclo chiuso» che utilizzino metodi alternativi a quello del recupero del calore dall'acqua di mare, come sostiene il WWF nel documento succitato?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(9 gennaio 2014)

1. La Commissione non è a conoscenza di studi specifici a livello UE o internazionale sugli effetti dei rigassificatori «a ciclo aperto» sull'ecosistema marino.

2. Al momento la Commissione non ha elementi che dimostrino un rapporto di causa-effetto tra l'attività dell'impianto e la diminuzione degli stock ittici e/o la moria di delfini e tartarughe.

3.-4. Di conseguenza la Commissione non può esprimersi su questa materia, ma esaminerà con interesse eventuali informazioni al riguardo che l'onorevole parlamentare le farà pervenire.

([1]) Cfr. WWF, «L'utilizzo di acqua di mare negli impianti di rigassificazione del GNL. Documento di approfondimento», Trieste, 4.10.2011.
([2]) Cfr. Articolo del quotidiano locale «La Nuova Ferrara» del 21.07.2013: http://lanuovaferrara.gelocal.it/cronaca/2013/07/21/news/sul-rigassificatore-la-regione-scrive-al-ministro-orlando-1.7459753
([3]) Cfr. Relazione della Fondazione Cetacea Onlus «Emergenza Tartarughe Marine» del 22.12.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012367/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Operation of the Porto Viro regasification plant (Rovigo, Italy) and the related fall in catch levels and deaths of dolphins and turtles in the surrounding Adriatic waters

Since September 2008, an artificial island situated some 17 kilometres off the coast of Porto Levante (Porto Viro, Rovigo, Italy) and in close proximity to the Po Delta has housed an offshore regasification plant. The plant uses an 'open-loop' system to convert liquefied methane back into gas using seawater as the heating medium for vaporisation. The plant, which is located in an area of great environmental importance, uses vast amounts of seawater in the vaporisation process. The water which is then discharged back into the sea is much cooler and contains high levels of chlorine derivatives. What is more, a detailed WWF report ([1]) has revealed that this water is essentially sterile, having been stripped of larvae, fish eggs and nutrients. It cannot therefore play its natural role in the ecosystem, which would usually include providing a habitat for plankton, self-purification, regulating biogeochemical cycles and absorbing CO_2.

Lastly, discharging the water back into the sea at high speed and high pressure creates an enormous amount of sea spume. This reportedly has the effect of disrupting the marine ecosystem, and in particular fish populations, by disturbing even further the already precarious ecological balance in the relevant part of the Adriatic. The problem has been noted by the local authorities and verified by ARPA (the Emilia Romagna regional environment agency) ([2]). It is a major cause for concern to people in the fishing industry, who regard it as one of the likely causes of a decline in catch levels. According to Sauro Pari, president of the not-for-profit organisation Fondazione Cetacea (based in Riccione, Italy), in recent years there have been at least two occurrences of an unexplained rise in turtle and, more recently, dolphin deaths ([3]).

1. Have any EU or international studies been carried out on the effects of open-loop regasification on marine life and, if so, what conclusions did they reach?

2. Does the Commission take the view that there is a causal link between the plant's activities, as outlined above, and the decline in fish stocks and the deaths of dolphins and turtles?

3. Has it been confirmed that sea spume is produced at other offshore regasification plants?

4. Does it consider closed-loop regasification plants, which do not use seawater as the heating medium, to be a preferable alternative, as maintained by the WWF in its aforementioned report?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(9 January 2014)

1. The Commission is not aware of any specific EU or international studies which would have been carried out on the effects of open-loop regasification on marine life.

2. For the time being, the Commission has no evidence of such causal link between the plant's activities and the decline of fish stocks and/or death of dolphins and turtles.

3-4. Accordingly the Commission cannot pronounce itself on these questions, but looks forward to any information on this matter the Honourable Member may be able to put at its disposal.

([1]) Cf. WWF report, 'L'utilizzo di acqua di mare negli impianti di rigassificazione del GNL. Documento di approfondimento', (The use of seawater in LNG regasification plants), Trieste, 4 October 2011.

([2]) Cf. the following article, published 21 July 2013 in the local newspaper La Nuova Ferrara: http://lanuovaferrara.gelocal.it/cronaca/2013/07/21/news/sul-rigassificatore-la-regione-scrive-al-ministro-orlando-1.7459753

([3]) Cf. Fondazione Cetacea report 'Emergenza Tartarughe Marine' (Sea turtle emergency), 22 December 2009.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012368/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(31 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Attività di ricerca ed estrazione di idrocarburi nella regione dell'Emilia-Romagna, in area soggetta a rischio di subsidenza e a rischio sismico

Secondo quanto riferito nel dossier presentato sull'argomento in data 30.9.2013 dall'associazione ambientalista italiana Legambiente, la regione dell'Emilia-Romagna è oggetto di un'intensa attività di indagine del sottosuolo a fini di ricerca ed estrazione di idrocarburi, con significativo incremento negli ultimi anni. A fronte di una superficie territoriale complessiva di 22 122 km^2 (chilometri quadrati), infatti, circa 1 774,5 km^2 (pari al 9 % del totale) sono oggetto delle 37 concessioni di coltivazione già attive e circa 7 000 km^2 (pari al 33 % del totale) sono interessati da 35 permessi di ricerca, ai quali vanno ad aggiungersi le 12 ulteriori recenti richieste di permesso che riguardano 5 547 km^2. Riassumendo, qualora anche queste ultime venissero autorizzate, oltre metà del territorio regionale (e la quasi totalità della pianura) verrebbe interessata dallo svolgimento di tali attività ([1]).

Tra le possibili conseguenze ambientali di tali interventi denunciate nel dossier vi è il rischio di intensificazione del fenomeno della subsidenza ([2]) che già caratterizza l'area: i dati dei monitoraggi effettuati da ARPA (Agenzia regionale per la prevenzione e l'ambiente) Emilia-Romagna evidenziano come il fenomeno sia più significativo sulla fascia costiera, che negli ultimi 55 anni si è abbassata di 70 cm a Rimini e di oltre un metro a Cesenatico (FC). Una vasta porzione della provincia di Bologna (circa 600 km^2), inoltre, è caratterizzata da abbassamenti medi intorno a 20 millimetri annui, con zone di massimo sprofondamento (oltre 3 centimetri annui). Secondo ricerche dell'Università degli studi di Padova, infine, la subsidenza nell'arco temporale 1983-2008 ha raggiunto i 50 centimetri nella zona meridionale del delta del Po ([3]).

Si ricorda, inoltre, che l'area è stata oggetto di una serie di violenti fenomeni sismici nella primavera del 2012; in proposito si segnala che la subsidenza, pur trattandosi di diverso fenomeno geologico, può tuttavia essere uno dei fattori che aumentano la vulnerabilità degli edifici causando il cedimento dei terreni di fondazione, incrementando i danni in occasione di terremoti. Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Non ritiene che la presenza nell'area del fenomeno della subsidenza sconsigli il rilascio di un così consistente numero di autorizzazioni alle compagnie estrattive?

2. Può riferire se esistano studi unionali ovvero internazionali sull'argomento?

3. Non ritiene altresì che, dato che il fenomeno della subsidenza tende ad aggravare i danni in caso di terremoto, sia ulteriormente da sconsigliarsi lo svolgimento di attività estrattive in un'area a rischio sismico come quella in esame?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(12 dicembre 2013)

Le autorizzazioni rilasciate dagli Stati membri devono essere conformi alle prescrizioni del quadro giuridico vigente nell'UE, ivi comprese le disposizioni in materia di protezione della salute umana e dell'ambiente.

([1]) Cfr. dossier e comunicato stampa di Legambiente presenti al seguente link: http://www.24emilia.com/Sezione.jsp?titolo=Idrocarburi%2C+Legambiente%3A+stop+estrazioni&idSezione=52746.

([2]) Fenomeno di abbassamento di porzioni più o meno ampie di terreno, da attribuirsi al costipamento naturale sotto l'azione di carichi o, talora, all'attività dell'uomo rivolta all'estrazione di sostanze fluide o solide dal sottosuolo (per es. di ingenti quantità di acqua da falde freatiche, di prodotti petroliferi e di minerali).

([3]) Cfr. dichiarazioni alla stampa di Giancarlo Mantovani, direttore del consorzio di bonifica «Delta del Po», dal quotidiano locale «Il Gazzettino» di Rovigo del 20.8.2013, a pag. 9.

Nell'ambito dei lavori preparatori per una nuova iniziativa della Commissione concernente un quadro per l'estrazione sicura di idrocarburi non convenzionali sono stati realizzati alcuni studi, uno dei quali ha valutato i rischi inerenti alle attività estrattive del gas di scisto, individuando potenziali rischi di subsidenza, legata alla captazione di ingenti quantità d'acqua, e di eventi sismici associati; per entrambi i fenomeni, tuttavia, la percentuale di rischio è considerata bassa ([4]). Altri studi ([5]) indicano un rischio più elevato di subsidenza nel caso di estrazione di idrocarburi con rimozione di fluidi.

([4]) AEA, Support to the identification of potential risks for the environment and human health arising from hydrocarbons operations involving hydraulic fracturing in Europe, 2012, disponibile alla pagina http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/pdf/fracking%20study.pdf

([5]) Land Subsidence. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium on Land Subsidence, L'Aia, 16-20 ottobre 1995, in particolare W. Bertoni, G. Brighenti, G. Gambolati, G. Ricceri e F. Vuillermin, «Land subsidence due to gas production in the on — and off-shore natural gas fields of the Ravenna area, Italy»; F. Gambardella, G. Mercusa, «Land subsidence in the delta area river Po: damages and repairing works», in Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Land Subsidence, Venezia, 19-25 marzo 1984.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012368/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Hydrocarbon exploration and extraction in Emilia-Romagna, an area prone to subsidence and earthquakes

According to the information contained in the report of 30 September 2013 submitted by Legambiente, an Italian environmental association, the exploration and extraction of hydrocarbons in Emilia-Romagna has intensified significantly in the past few years. Of a total surface area of 22 122 km^2, approximately 1 774.5 km^2 (9% of the total area) are already having hydrocarbons extracted under 37 permits and approximately 7 000 km^2 (33% of the total area) are covered by 35 exploration permits, to which will be added the 12 other permits which have recently been requested, together covering 5 547 km^2. To sum up, if these most recent permit applications are granted, over half of the region's territory (and almost all of the level ground) would be affected by extraction ([1]).

One of the environmental impacts of hydrocarbon extraction denounced in the report is the risk of worsening the subsidence ([2]) for which the area is known: the monitoring data released by the Emilia-Romagna Regional Environmental Protection Agency, ARPA, demonstrate that coastal areas are more significantly affected: over the past 55 years, the land has sunk 70 cm in Rimini, and over a metre in Cesenatico, in the Province of Forli-Cesena. Furthermore, a large portion of the Province of Bologna (approx. 600 km^2) is characterised by average downward shifts of approximately 20 mm a year, with the worst-hit areas sinking more than three centimetres a year. According to research carried out at the University of Padua, there was a subsidence of 50 cm in the southern part of the Po Delta between 1983 and 2008 ([3]).

The area experienced a series of violent earthquakes during the spring of 2012. Although subsidence is a different geological phenomenon, it may make buildings more vulnerable, causing the land on which the foundations are built to sink and increasing the damage caused by earthquakes.

1. Does the Commission not agree that subsidence in the area should discourage theauthorities from granting such a large number of permits to hydrocarbon extractioncompanies?

2. Have any studies into the matter been conducted by the EU or any other international organisation?

3. Does the Commission not believe that, given that subsidence tends to worsen the damage caused by earthquakes, any further extraction applications ought to be rejected in areas at risk of earthquakes such as that under consideration?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2013)

Member States' permits must comply with the requirements of the existing legal framework in the EU, including provisions on the protection of human health and the environment.

Among the studies conducted for the Commission in the context of its preparatory work for a new initiative regarding a framework for safe and secure unconventional hydrocarbon extraction, one assessed the risks related to shale gas activities and identified subsidence, linked to high water abstraction, as a potential risk, although rated low, and thus were ranked associated seismicity risks ([4]). Other studies ([5]) suggest higher risks of subsidence in case of hydrocarbon extraction with fluid withdrawal.

([1]) Cf. report and press release by Legambiente at: http://www.24emilia.com/Sezione.jsp?titolo=Idrocarburi%2C+Legambiente%3A+stop+estrazioni&idSezione=52746

([2]) A phenomenon which consists of whole areas of land — bigger or smaller — shifting downwards as a result of either natural compaction under weight or, sometimes, human activity related to the extraction of liquids or solids from below ground (such as immense quantities of water from groundwater aquifers or of oil products or minerals).

([3]) Cf. press release by Giancarlo Mantovani, Director of the Po Delta land reclamation authority, sent to local newspaper Il Gazettino in Rovigo, 20.8.2013, p. 9.

([4]) Support to the identification of potential risks for the environment and human health arising from hydrocarbons operations involving hydraulic fracturing in Europe (AEA, 2012), available at http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/pdf/fracking%20study.pdf

([5]) Land Subsidence — Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium on Land Subsidence, held at The Hague, The Netherlands, 16-20 October 1995; Land subsidence in the delta area river Po: damages and repairing works (F. Gambardella and G.Mercusa); Land subsidence due to gas production in the on- and off-shore natural gas fields of the Ravenna area, Italy (Werther Bertoni, Giovanni Brighenti, Giuseppe Gambolati, Giuseppe Ricceri And Fiorenzo Vuillermin).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012369/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(31 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Impianti contestati e ritardi in relazione alla realizzazione del percorso «Sui Sentieri degli Ezzelini» nell'ovest della provincia di Treviso, finanziato con fondi comunitari

Nell'ovest della provincia di Treviso è in fase di realizzazione un percorso naturalistico-turistico denominato «Sui Sentieri degli Ezzelini», che si snoda lungo il fiume Muson dei Sassi e attraversa diversi comuni a partire da Resana fino a San Zenone degli Ezzelini. La prima parte del tracciato, lunga 19 chilometri, è stata inaugurata il 19 maggio 2012 ([1]). Il progetto è realizzato sotto la regia della Regione del Veneto con uno stanziamento pari a oltre un milione di euro di fondi comunitari e italiani. Il tracciato attraversa un'area tutelata all'interno del progetto «Rete Natura 2000» quale ZPS (Zona di Protezione Speciale) ai sensi della direttiva Uccelli 2009/147/CE ([2]).

In un punto in prossimità del percorso nel comune di Loria è stato recentemente realizzato un nuovo allevamento di galline ovaiole, imponente costruzione sorta sulle ceneri di un vecchio allevamento avicolo in disuso e abbandonato da molti anni, del quale è stato quadruplicato il volume complessivo. È in corso, inoltre, l'iter di approvazione per la realizzazione di un impianto per la produzione di biogas con trattamento della pollina ([3]) prodotta dall'allevamento.

La presenza del nuovo allevamento e il progetto di realizzazione del collegato impianto a biogas volto all'utilizzo della pollina sono strenuamente avversati da parte della locale cittadinanza riunita in diverse formazioni sociali ([4]), che lamenta l'impatto visivo, olfattivo e sonoro dell'allevamento e gli effetti che il futuro impianto a biogas andrà ad avere. Sempre secondo i cittadini, inoltre, la realizzazione della seconda parte del tracciato del sentiero, prorogata più volte, sarebbe in balìa di lungaggini burocratiche che mettono a rischio l'impiego dei fondi comunitari assegnati. Tutto ciò premesso:

1. Può la Commissione specificare l'ammontare complessivo e la tipologia del finanziamento comunitario assegnato al progetto e confermare i paventati rischi di perdita della parte residua dello stesso?

2. Non intende essa contattare le autorità locali al fine di verificare l'intervenuto rispetto della normativa UE di settore in relazione al già realizzato allevamento avicolo e al realizzando impianto a biogas?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(17 dicembre 2013)

1. Il progetto in questione è stato cofinanziato dal Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR) nel quadro del programma Veneto 2000-2006, azione 3.2 «Diversificazione dell'offerta turistica e prolungamento della stagionalità» per un importo totale di 73 463,42 EUR (fondi FESR 28 728,71 EUR). Stando alle informazioni trasmesse dalle autorità regionali, il progetto si è concluso ed è attualmente operativo.

2. L'attuazione del diritto dell'Unione pertiene alle autorità degli Stati membri, che hanno l'obbligo di rispettare in pieno obblighi quali quelli derivanti dalla direttiva VIA 2011/92/UE ([5]). Alla Commissione non risulta in alcun modo che tale non sia il caso per i progetti descritti dall'onorevole deputato.

([1]) Per maggiori informazioni, cfr. http://www.bibliotecacastellodigodego.it/actual_version/godego/ezzelini.php
([2]) ZPS IT3240026 «Prai di Castello di Godego».
([3]) Materiale di scarto composto da deiezioni degli allevamenti avicoli.
([4]) Cfr. in particolare il comitato «La salute è di tutti», il forum «Salviamo il paesaggio» (associazione «Italia Nostra») e l'associazione «Godego Lab». Cfr. il blog del comitato: http://saluteditutti.blogspot.it/2013/10/impianto-biogas-100-pollina-primo-in.html;
e l'articolo del quotidiano locale «La Tribuna di Treviso» del 21.9.2013:
http://tribunatreviso.gelocal.it/cronaca/2013/09/21/news/sentiero-degli-ezzelini-stop-ai-capannoni-1.7786948
([5]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 13 dicembre 2011, concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale di determinati progetti pubblici e privati Testo rilevante ai fini del SEE, GU L 26 del 28.1.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012369/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Disputed installations and delays in completion of nature trail 'Sui Sentieri degli Ezzelini' in the western part of the province of Treviso, financed with EU funding

In the western part of the province of Treviso a tourist-oriented nature trail called 'Sui Sentieri degli Ezzelini' is being built. The trail winds along the River Muson dei Sassi and crosses several municipalities from Resana to San Zeno Ezzelini. The first part of the 19-km long trail was inaugurated on 19 May 2012 ([1]). The project is being carried out under the direction of the Veneto Region with a budget of over EUR 1 million in EU and Italian funds. The route passes through an area that is protected within the Natura 2000 network as an SPA (Special Protection Area) under the Birds Directive 2009/147/EC ([2]).

At one point near the trail, in the municipality of Loria, a new farm for egg-laying hens has recently been built. It is an imposing building which has arisen from the ashes of an old disused poultry farm that had been abandoned for many years, the overall volume of which has now been quadrupled. In addition, an approval process is currently under way for the construction of a biogas production plant to treat the poultry manure produced by the farm.

The presence of the new farm and the project to build the biogas plant for the recycling of manure are being strenuously opposed by the local population, who have been setting up various protest groups ([3]). These citizens are complaining about the adverse impact the future biogas plant and the farm will have, in terms of the view, smell and noise. The citizens also maintain that the construction of the second part of the trail, which has been postponed several times, is at the mercy of administrative delays and red tape that are jeopardising the use of the EU funds allocated.

1. Can the Commission therefore specify the total amount and type of EU funding that has been allocated to the project, and confirm that there is indeed a risk of losing the remaining funds?

2. Will it not contact the local authorities in question in order to check whether the poultry farm that has already been built and the biogas plant under construction comply with the relevant EU legislation?

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

1. The project mentioned by the Honourable Member has been co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) within the framework of the 2000-2006 Veneto programme, action 3.2 'Diversificazione dell'offerta turistica e prolungamento della stagionalità' for a total amount of EUR 73 463.42 (ERDF EUR 28 728.71). According to the information provided by the regional authorities, the project is completed and operational.

2. The implementation of EC law lies with the Member States authorities, which have the obligation to apply to their full extent obligations such as those provided for by the EIA Directive 2011/92/EU ([4]). The Commission does not have any indication that this would not be the case with regard to the projects described by the Honourable Member.

([1]) For further information, see http://www.bibliotecacastellodigodego.it/actual_version/godego/ezzelini.php
([2]) SPA IT3240026 'Prai di Castello di Godego'.
([3]) In particular the 'Health is for Everyone' committee, the 'Save the Landscape' forum (Italia Nostra association) and the Godego Lab association. See committee blog: http://saluteditutti.blogspot.it/2013/10/impianto-biogas-100-pollina-primo-in.html
([4]) On the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment Text with EEA relevance, OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-012372/13
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(31 octobre 2013)

Objet: Communication cinéma — non à la libéralisation incontrôlée

Monsieur Barroso s'était déjà illustré en voulant sacrifier le secteur audiovisuel européen dans le cadre des négociations pour un partenariat transatlantique de commerce et d'investissement, prétextant que ses spécificités seraient une entrave à la croissance et à l'emploi. Il a d'ailleurs déjà exprimé clairement son point de vue sur la question: selon lui, protéger l'exception culturelle, c'est être «réactionnaire».

Les Européens ont été clairs: la libéralisation incontrôlée du secteur audiovisuel, c'est non. Alors, la Commission essaye de faire passer des mesures à la dérobée, sur d'autres dossiers. Ainsi en est-il de sa volonté de refondre totalement le régime de territorialité des aides publiques au cinéma. Si elle est revenue en partie sur sa position d'origine, la Commission ne démontre pas moins, depuis le début, sa volonté de voir le secteur du cinéma européen soumis à une libéralisation incontrôlée, au risque d'y perdre ce qui en fait la richesse. Les critiques soulèvent notamment une contestation du fondement juridique même de l'action de la Commission, pour laquelle il serait temps d'apporter une réponse claire et convaincante.

L'industrie cinématographique et audiovisuelle européenne est un miroir des spécificités culturelles des États membres; ces règles de territorialité ne sont donc en aucun cas une entrave à la libre circulation, mais, bien au contraire, un outil de dynamisation des territoires et de renforcement de notre cohésion culturelle.

Le manque flagrant de prise en compte par la Commission européenne des propositions et des critiques des professionnels du cinéma européen ne peut qu'être préjudiciable au rayonnement culturel de l'Union dans son ensemble. C'est pourquoi je demande à la Commission, en vue de la publication prévue de la nouvelle version de sa communication-cinéma, de préciser comment elle compte répondre, point par point, à chacune des critiques qui ont été avancées: quelle est l'opportunité d'une telle réforme de la territorialité des aides? Quel est son fondement juridique? Et en quoi les systèmes d'aides actuellement mis en œuvre sont-ils inefficaces?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(29 novembre 2013)

La communication sur le cinéma de 2001, qui contient les orientations de la Commission relatives aux aides d'État en faveur de la production audiovisuelle, est venue à expiration à la fin de 2012. La Commission a dès lors dû se pencher sur un nouveau régime pour lui succéder. C'est ainsi qu'elle a réexaminé, en particulier, les obligations de territorialisation des dépenses imposées par certains États membres aux bénéficiaires d'aides d'État.

Ce réexamen trouve son fondement juridique direct dans le traité qui interdit en principe les restrictions à la libre circulation des marchandises, à la libre circulation des travailleurs et à la libre prestation des services (articles 34, 36, 45 et 56 du TFUE). Les obligations de territorialisation des dépenses constituent une restriction du marché intérieur de la production audiovisuelle, que la Commission est tenue d'apprécier.

En ce qui concerne l'efficacité des régimes d'aides des États membres imposant des obligations de territorialisation des dépenses, la Commission a fait réaliser une étude externe sur les conditions de territorialité imposées à la production audiovisuelle ([1]). L'étude n'a, dans l'ensemble, donné aucun résultat probant. Elle n'a pas permis de déterminer si les effets positifs des conditions de territorialisation primaient sur les effets négatifs. En tout état de cause, le Commission reconnaît que, dans une certaine mesure, `de telles conditions peuvent être nécessaires pour maintenir une masse critique d'infrastructures, de savoir-faire et de talent en vue de la production cinématographique dans l'État membre ou la région qui octroie l'aide. Il convient toutefois de noter que plusieurs États membres ne soumettent pas leurs régimes d'aides au cinéma à des obligations de territorialisation des dépenses.

La Commission estime que la nouvelle communication sur le cinéma offre un juste équilibre entre la dimension européenne de l'industrie du cinéma et la nécessité, pour chaque pays, de préserver les ressources et compétences qui lui sont propres.

([1]) Étude de 2008 sur l'impact économique et culturel, notamment sur les coproductions, des clauses de territorialisation des régimes d'aides d'État aux films et aux productions audiovisuelles: http://ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/docs/library/studies/territ/final_rep.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012372/13
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Cinema communication — no to uncontrolled deregulation

Mr Barroso has already made abundantly clear his willingness to sacrifice the European audiovisual sector for the sake of negotiating a transatlantic trade and investment partnership, arguing that a specific cultural exemption would merely obstruct growth and employment and roundly condemning any such idea as 'reactionary'.

With the European public making equally clear its opposition to uncontrolled deregulation in the audiovisual sector, the Commission has been resorting to stealth in a bid to push through its measures in a different guise, seeking for example to rework completely territorial subsidy arrangements for the film industry. While making a number of concessions, the Commission has from the outset been manifestly determined achieve full deregulation in this sector, even at the risk of jettisoning those rare qualities that set it apart. As a result, critics are now contesting the legal basis of its actions, making a clear and convincing response all the more necessary.

The European film and audiovisual sector is an expression of cultural differences between the Member States. Far from being an impediment to freedom of movement, territorial arrangements are thus a means of enhancing their individuality while at the same time strengthening cultural cohesion.

However, the Commission's decision to ride roughshod over proposals and criticisms from European film industry representatives can only undermine Europe's cultural influence as a whole. In view of this and with regard to the forthcoming publication of its new cinema communication, what replies will the Commission make to each of the criticisms raised? What is the point of seeking to reform territorial funding arrangements? What is the legal basis for such a measure? In what way are current subsidy arrangements ineffective?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(29 November 2013)

The Commission guidance on state aid to audiovisual production, as contained in the Cinema communication of 2001, expired at the end of 2012. Therefore the Commission had to consider a successor regime. This offered the opportunity to reconsider in particular the territorial spending obligations which some Member States impose on state aid beneficiaries.

The legal basis for this review can be found directly in the Treaty, which in principle prohibits limitations of the free movement of goods, the free movement of workers, and the freedom to provide services (Articles 34, 36, 45, and 56 TFEU). Territorial spending obligations constitute a restriction of the internal market for audiovisual production which the Commission is obliged to consider.

Regarding the effectiveness of the aid schemes of Member States imposing territorial spending obligations, the Commission commissioned an external study on territorial conditions imposed on audiovisual production ([1]). Overall, the study was inconclusive. It could not demonstrate that the positive effects of territorial conditions outweighed the negative effects. In any case, the Commission acknowledges that, to a certain extent, such conditions may be necessary to maintain a critical mass of infrastructure, knowhow and talent for film production in the Member State or region granting the aid. It should however be noted that several Member States do not have territorial spending obligations in their film aid schemes.

The Commission thinks that the new Cinema communication strikes the right balance between the European dimension of the cinema industry and the need to preserve its more local resources and skills.

([1]) 2008 Study on the Economic and Cultural Impact, notably on Co-productions, of Territorialisation Clauses of state aid Schemes for Films and Audiovisual Productions, http://ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/docs/library/studies/territ/final_rep.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012373/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: CAP payment

What is the national average percentage of the CAP payment which has been withheld or withdrawn from farmers in each Member State each year for the last 10 years?

Would the Commission please provide a list of the percentages of the CAP payment which have been withheld or withdrawn from farmers in each Member State?

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

There are no comprehensive records allowing for the calculation of the percentage of the CAP payments withheld /withdrawn from the farmers. The Commission services have calculated the ratios (%) of the amounts subject to recovery procedures (at year-end) in relation to the expenditure declared in the same year. The information submitted by the Member States changed 2006 following the implementation of Regulation 885/2006 ([1]). Therefore, the ratios only cover the financial years 2006-2012. Table 1 in annex lists the average ratio per Member state while Table 2 also gives a breakdown per financial year.

Please note:

— Amounts withheld (i.e. not paid as a result of normal control procedures) are not reported to the Commission and are not reflected in the calculation.

— Amounts withdrawn, i.e. amounts which are subject to recovery procedures, may relate to administrative errors, irregularities or to other recoveries. The information available to the Commission allows only to consider any undue payments to be recovered as a consequence of irregularities within the meaning of Article 1(2) or Council Regulation (EC, Euratom) 2988/95 ([2]), including any sanctions and interests on these payments.

— Any amounts already reimbursed to the EU budget, or reused within the program ([3]), are also not reflected.

— It is not possible to determine in which financial year the undue payment for which a recovery is ongoing was made. Therefore, there is no correlation between the payments made in one specific financial year and the amounts reported as recoverable at the end of that year.

— The CAP-payments refer to the gross expenditure, i.e. before any reductions for financial corrections, clearance decisions or recoveries reimbursed to the funds, made under EAGF, EAFRD and TRDI.

([1]) OJ L 171, 23.6.2006.
([2]) OJ L 312, 23.12.1995.
([3]) EAFRD.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012380/13
to the Commission
Edward McMillan-Scott (ALDE)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Application of the industrial emissions directive and its impact on competitiveness

Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions (IED), adopted by Parliament in 2010, recasts a number of old directives including the solvent emissions directive (SED) and the integrated pollution prevention and control directive (IPPC). It became effective on 7 January 2013 for new installations and will become effective on 7 July 2015 for existing installations. The IED poses a threat to business viability and jobs in the timber treatment industry through the expanded scope of 'permits to operate'. A timber treatment business in my constituency of Yorkshire and the Humber, UK, is concerned about the IED's extension to include waterborne preservatives for plants with a 24 hour theoretical output of over 75m3. The implementation of IED licensing would increase the operating costs of the company in my constituency by GBP 5 000 in one year, on the basis that if it operated 24 hours per day its production capacity of treated timber would be in excess of $75m^3$. This assumption is wrong; if the company operated at such a level it would not have sufficient post-treatment storage space.

I have been informed that the German authorities recognise the inaccuracy of this calculation and will look at actual storage capacity rather than potential plant capacity. Therefore companies such as the one in my constituency are immediately at a competitive disadvantage compared to their European partners.

Could the Commission advise:

1. whether clear guidelines have been distributed to the Member States regarding the application of such rules?

2. whether the UK authorities are contravening any EU competition laws?

3. what avenues of appeal are open to companies which will be placed at a competitive disadvantage because of the IED?

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

1. Under the Industrial Emissions Directive 2010/75/EU ([1]),.the calculation of the capacity may take account of situations where one part of a process represents a technical restriction to the throughput. The lack of post-treatment storage space would be one such case. Further information on this can be found on the Commission's Europa website ([2]).

2. The abovementioned directives form part of the Union policy on the environment, having as legal basis Article 191 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. Article 193 of the Treaty makes it possible for Member States to maintain or introduce more stringent protective measures, provided that they are compatible with the Treaties. Such measures would not constitute breaches of EU competition law.

3. The transposition and implementation of EU legislation, including the granting of operating permits for industrial installations, fixing of administrative costs thereof, as well as the establishment of appropriate appeal mechanisms, remain the responsibility of Member States' competent authorities.

([1]) OJ L 334, 17.12.2010.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/pollutants/stationary/ippc/pdf/capacity_guidance.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012382/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Alzheimer's disease breakthrough

Earlier this month, in the United Kingdom, findings published by the Medical Research Council confirmed that the first chemical known to prevent the death of brain cells had been found. The research has subsequently been noted as a breakthrough and starting point in the fight against Alzheimer's and other neurodegenerative diseases.

1. What steps have been taken at EU level to encourage and assist research taking place across the Member States which aims to find a cure for Alzheimer's?

2. Can the Commission please highlight what action has been taken at EU level to provide effective support and assistance to those across the Member States who have been diagnosed with Alzheimer's and other neurodegenerative conditions?

3. What EU funding will be made available in the next seven years — 2014-2020 — for projects that will provide health support to patients and conduct research into finding a possible cure for Alzheimer's?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 January 2014)

Since 2007, the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Development (FP7) invested EUR 401 million in research on neurodegenerative diseases, including EUR 201 million on Alzheimer's disease. For example, the project LUPAS ([1]) aims at developing methods for diagnostic, prevention and treatment of Alzheimer's and prion diseases. The Commission also supports the Joint Programming Initiative on Neurodegenerative Diseases, in particular Alzheimer's ([2]), a Member State-led initiative that aims at increasing the impact of European research in this area by coordinating efforts across countries.

In 2009, the Commission launched its European initiative on Alzheimer's disease and other dementias ([3]). Within this framework, the EU-Health Programme co-financed between 2011 and 2013 the Joint Action ALCOVE ([4]), which developed recommendations, e.g. on the timely diagnosis of dementia. Currently, the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing is gathering public and private stakeholders from across the EU to develop and translate innovation from their regions into concrete solutions, for instance in assisting elderly people in living healthy and independent lives or in creating dementia-friendly environments.

Horizon 2020, the new EU programme for research and innovation (2014-2020), will offer further opportunities for research on neurodegenerative diseases (including Alzheimer's disease), mainly through the societal challenge 1 'Health, demographic change and well-being' ([5]), as well as through the European Research Council whose budget is planned to double.

([1]) http://www.lupas-amyloid.eu/
([2]) http://www.neurodegenerationresearch.eu/
([3]) COM(2009) 380 final of 22 July 2009.
([4]) http://www.alcove-project.eu/
([5]) For example, the draft Work Programme 2014-2015 of Societal Challenge 1 'Health, Demographic Change and Well-being' includes topics such as 'Understanding health, ageing and disease: determinants, risk factors and pathways', 'New therapies for chronic non-communicable diseases' and 'Comparing the effectiveness of existing healthcare interventions in the elderly' — just to name a few.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012383/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Milk quota compensation

Given the investment in milk quotas since their introduction, does the Commission have any plans to compensate farmers who invested heavily in milk quotas at a huge cost to their farm businesses?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2013)

Investments in milk quotas are private business decisions of farmers/entrepreneurs at their own risk.

The decision to end milk quota on 31 March 2015 was taken more than 10 years ago and regularly reconfirmed. Therefore the value of quota in those Member States where they were traded has gone down to zero or close to zero.

There is no legitimate expectation that quota would have any value beyond 2015. An investment in quota should have taken this into account.

Moreover, in the framework of the reform of the common agricultural policy, no proposals were made to grant such compensation to dairy farmers, neither by the Council, nor by the European Parliament.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012384/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Malaria vaccine

Earlier this month, UK company GlaxoSmithKline confirmed that it is seeking regulatory approval to market the world's first malaria vaccine. This development comes as trial data indicated that the vaccine had led to a decrease in the number of confirmed cases of the disease among African children.

1. What action has been taken at EU level to tackle malaria, the mosquito-borne parasitic disease which kills thousands of people across the world every year? Has the Commission given due consideration to the possibility of immunisation using a vaccine with a view to eradicating the disease?

2. What EU funding will be made available within the next EU budget for 2014-2020 to tackle the prevalence of malaria in countries outside the EU, and particularly among children and young people?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 January 2014)

The EU helps strengthen the health systems in developing countries so that they reach out to those that are most vulnerable to malaria. Interventions of proven effectiveness include early diagnosis and treatment, insecticide-treated bed nets, and indoor-residual spraying. A malaria vaccine will be an important additional tool once it will reach the market. Through the European Development Fund, the EU provides substantial financial resources to fight diseases through country programmes, via the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisations, and the WHO.

The EU further supports research to improve the treatment, diagnostic and prevention of malaria, with specific efforts to include endemic countries as participants in the projects. Through the EU Framework Programmes for Research, more than EUR 200 million has been granted to 86 malaria research projects, and the European Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership has dedicated EUR 49.4 million to malaria research.

In 2014-2020, the Commission intends to continue to give priority to malaria research and to support for effective control interventions. The aim of all EU support will remain to ensure that effective diagnostics, treatment, and vaccines are developed; that they will be accessible to the poor; and eventually used effectively to control malaria globally.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012385/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: EU military integration

In September, the EPP Group in the European Parliament endorsed a report containing proposals on the establishment of a new headquarters for EU civilian and military crisis operations and placing national stand-by forces under EU command.

In this context, what assurances can the Commission provide that, moving forward, Member States will retain complete sovereignty over defence policy, including the capacity to formulate and control their own national security strategies free from any EU obligations?

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

Effective CSDP ([1]) requires the ability of the EU to deploy the right assets at the right time and to do this effectively on the whole range of crisis management operations.

Earlier in 2013, Member States endorsed the revised suggestions for Crisis Management Operations as well as the revised Exercise Policy, both documents which aim to establish synergies and complementarity and allow for more effective EU external action. At the same time, the HR/VP's Report on CSDP, in preparation of the December 2013 European Council on Security and Defence, included several proposals and actions aimed at strengthening CSDP.

Neither of these documents refers to the prospect of establishing a new headquarters for military and/or civilian crisis operations or to placing national stand-by forces under EU command. The aim of the December 2013 European Council is to make better use of current instruments at the disposal of the EU and to simplify procedures in order to streamline decision-making procedures. Creating additional institutional structures has not been advanced as a priority by the Commission, the High Representative or by the majority of Member States.

At the same time, the Treaty on European Union (Article 42) states that the common foreign and security policy of the EU shall not prejudice the specific character of the security and defence policy of certain Member States and shall respect the obligations of those which see their common defence realised in NATO ([2]). Moreover, although CSDP has among its objectives to progressively frame a common EU defence policy, a common defence will be established, according to the revised TEU, only when the European Council will approve this unanimously.

([1]) Common Security and Defence Policy.
([2]) North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012386/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Implementation of EU Directive 2012/29/EU

EU Directive 2012/29/EU establishes the minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime. Most notably, it safeguards specific support for victims of terrorism and for those who have been trafficked for labour or sexual exploitation.

Can the Commission please provide a status report as to the uptake and implementation of this directive by the 28 Member States? In doing so, can the Commission please detail specifically those EU countries that have not implemented the directive, and cite the reasons for any disparities in compliance?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(20 December 2013)

The directive 2012/29/EU ([1]) should be implemented by Member States by 16 November 2015. The Commission is taking all necessary steps to ensure that this directive is properly implemented and applied by the Member States within the deadline.

To this end the Commission is assisting Member States in their implementation process through the organisation of experts' meetings, specific workshops on best practices in victims' protection and support. The Commission is assisting the Member States by issuing guidance documents and promoting training. The Commission is also providing financial support to projects through various funding programmes. After the expiry of the implementation period in November 2015, the Commission is ready to assume its obligations with regard to the active monitoring of Member States' compliance with this directive.

([1]) The directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012387/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Support for Thalidomide victims

The drug Thalidomide was given to pregnant women to tackle morning sickness between 1956 and 1962. By the time it was withdrawn from the market in 1962, it had resulted in the deaths of thousands of babies and infants, and almost 10 000 worldwide were born with terrible deformities and a range of disabilities attributed to the drug.

In this context, can the Commission please detail what action has — and will — be taken at EU level to provide effective support and assistance to victims of Thalidomide and their families? In doing so, can the Commission please outline what — if any — funding will be made available in the next programming period (2014-2020) to support projects that aim to tackle the legacy of Thalidomide across Europe?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2013)

The thalidomide tragedy was one of the main reasons for setting up the EU pharmaceutical legislation, which has been improved ever since to ensure that medicinal products that are placed on the market are guaranteeing high standards of quality and safety.

As stated in its reply to Parliamentary Question E-4855/2012 ([1]), the Commission is aware of the impact of the use of thalidomide during pregnancy and that some Member States have established compensation schemes for citizens that have been affected by the use of thalidomide.

Health policy, as well as the organisation and delivery of healthcare, is a Member State competence under Article 168 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. As such, injury compensation schemes are not a matter of EU competence. Therefore, the Commission is not in a position to establish a compensation scheme at the European level.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012388/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Research into the trans-generational impact of terrorism

In my constituency, Northern Ireland, almost 2 000 people were murdered during decades of Irish Republican terrorism. This inevitably brought incalculable pain and suffering to hundreds, if not thousands, of families across our region of the UK. Many were widowed, others lost parents, siblings and grandparents, but all have had to live with the dreadful reality that terrorism has presented in their lives.

In this context, can the Commission please identify any research that has been conducted at EU level to assess the trans-generational impact of terrorism upon victims and their families? In doing so, can the Commission detail whether any studies have been completed to adjudge the specific impact of trauma emanating from the loss of a loved one through terrorism on educational attainment, social inclusion and personal development?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

The Commission is cognizant of the pain and suffering brought upon the families of victims of terrorism, and recognises the long-term traumatic impact of such tragedies on households and relatives. The Commission has taken upon itself a commitment to support these families in their grieving process, which can be exemplified by the devotion of 11 March as the European Day on Remembrance of Victims of Terrorism.

Within the scope of the EU Programme for Prevention of and Fight against Crime (ISEC), the Commission has granted funding for a project carried out by the Handa Center for the Study of Terrorism and political Violence (St Andrews University, UK) ([1]), relating to the victimization experience and Victims of Political Violence (VOPV). This study, of which the results will be presented in 2014, aims among others to identify measures on how to meet the needs of families of victims.

Up to date, however, no research has been finalised to adjudge the specific impact of trauma emanating from the loss of a loved one through terrorism.

([1]) HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/RAD/4000003818.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012389/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: The political situation in Libya

More than two years after Colonel Gaddafi was deposed, Libya remains without a permanent constitution. In recent months, the political process has become paralysed by intense divisions between Islamic and secular groupings in the country's parliament. The legacy of past fighting also lives on in the form of numerous active militias which continue to control many parts of the country.

1. What steps have been taken at EU level to encourage the establishment of a democratic and fair constitution in Libya and to restore greater functionality to the political process?

2. What action has the Commission taken to promote respect for law and order, the rule of law, and support for democratic processes as essential elements of the rebuilding process in Libya?

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

The EU is concerned by the significant deterioration of both the political and security situation in Libya. The EU has underlined the need for the Libyan Government and General National Congress to work jointly to achieve a peaceful and democratic political transition.

The EU looks forward to the upcoming elections for the Constitutional Drafting Assembly and to the start of the drafting process of a new and democratic Libyan constitution. The EU has called for an inclusive and credible electoral process where all Libyans, including minorities and women, work collectively for the fulfilment of the revolution's democratic aspirations. In this regard the EU is currently providing support to the High National Electoral Commission to prepare the upcoming elections. The EU will also launch an Exploratory Mission which should advise on the possible presence of EU observers on Election Day.

A very substantial part of the overall support EU package for Libya (EUR 106 million) is directly addressing the rule of law (e.g. EUR 10 million programme on reform of the police and justice sector) as well as supporting the ongoing transitional process (e.g. EUR 3.1 million program to strengthen the capacity of emerging civil soviety organisations to deliver services and contribute to promoting good governance in Libya).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012390/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Impact of EU-Canada Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement on agriculture

Earlier this month, negotiations ended on the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) between EU and Canada. Once approved, it is claimed that this agreement will boost growth and employment through a variety of provisions, including lower trade tariffs and less red tape.

Can the Commission please confirm whether an impact assessment has been carried out to gauge the potential consequences of the EU-Canada CETA upon agriculture across the Member States? If so, can the Commission please detail any presumed benefits or disadvantages, and the timeline as regards when the legislation is likely to take effect?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(18 December 2013)

Trade Sustainability Impact Assessments, covering all relevant economic sectors concerned including agriculture, are systematically carried out whenever the EU engages on a free trade agreement negotiation. The negotiations on a Comprehensive Economic Trade Agreement (CETA) between Canada and the EU have been no exception to that principle.

The full report on CETA has been made public and can be accessed on the following Internet link: http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2011/september/tradoc_148201.pdf where all the details pertaining the information requested by the Honourable Member can be consulted.

As regards the timeline for the entry into force of the agreement, further steps have to be completed before CETA will enter into force. The negotiating parties are currently finalising the negotiation on the remaining technical issues. Once this will be completed, the text will be reviewed by legal experts (so-called legal scrubbing).

The negotiating text, finalised as described above, will be initialled by the Canadian and EU negotiators. Following authorisation of the Council for signature and conclusion of the Agreement, and after the European Parliament consent the Agreement will enter into force. According to the Commission current estimation, the Agreement will not enter into force before the end of 2015.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012391/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Uptake of advanced single farm payments

Can the Commission please identify those Member States and regions that have not availed of advanced single farm payments for the claim year 2013?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2013)

The Commission cannot provide this information now, since the verified data will not be available before the beginning of January 2014.

In accordance with Article 4(c) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 883/2006 ([1]), the advances paid by Member States for direct aids in respect of calendar year 2013 for the period from 16 October 2013 until 1 December 2013 will be communicated to the Commission on 20 December 2013 at the latest.

([1]) OJ L 171, 23.6.2006, p. 1-34.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012392/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Racism in sport

Last week, Manchester City footballer Yaya Touré alleged that he was racially abused by CSKA Moscow fans during a recent Champions League match. He subsequently met Jeffrey Webb, Head of FIFA's anti-racism task force, to discuss the incident and hear about FIFA's planned education initiative.

In this context, can the Commission please detail what steps have been taken at EU level to support the aim of eradicating racism in all sports, at all levels? In doing so, can the Commission please outline what EU funding will be available within the 2014-2020 programming period to promote the realisation of this aim?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

As indicated in reply E-000026/2013 ([1]), the Commission reviewed the situation in the Member States regarding racism in all sports through a study launched by the Fundamental Rights Agency on Sport and Racism in 2010.

In addition, under the 2010 and 2011 Preparatory Actions in the field of sport and the Lifelong Learning Programme, the Commission provided financial support to a number of prevention and education projects. These projects addressed racism and intolerance in sport and education, and involved supporters, schools and clubs.

In the framework of its structured dialogue with sport stakeholders, the Commission is in close contact with the Union of European Football Associations (UEFA) about various topics. These include the fight against racism in international competitions and at major sport events, such as EURO 2012.

In future EU programmes, and in particular Erasmus+, the fight against racism in sport will remain a priority area, with potential to support innovative projects for exchange and development of new practices.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012394/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Female drivers in Saudi Arabia

In recent days, many women in Saudi Arabia have defied the government's ban on female drivers, taking to their cars in protest. The action comes after approximately 17 000 people signed a petition calling for women to be allowed to drive and for an explanation on the current ban to be provided. Recent protests have been met by threats of sanctions by the Interior Ministry, and some women have claimed to have received intimidating phone calls from government sources.

In this context, can the Commission please detail what steps are being taken at EU level to promote an end to institutionalised discrimination against women in society in Saudi Arabia, and in other countries in the Middle East?

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

Gender-related issues are regularly discussed by the EU bilaterally with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and, at the regional level, with the Gulf Cooperation Council.

Even though the situation of women in Saudi Arabia remains problematic and often a source of concern, the EU has welcomed the decision taken by the Saudi King to appoint one third of women to the Shura Council in January 2013, the possibility for them to vote and stand for office at the 2015 Municipal elections and, more recently, the decision to grant women lawyers licenses to practice in courtrooms.

The principle of non-discrimination on the basis of gender is one of the fundamental principles of the EU. The EU is therefore of the clear view that it is unacceptable to discriminate against women in any area. The Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) sets out this principle — along with many others — in international law.

The EU believes that all states — including Saudi Arabia — should ratify and implement CEDAW, without reservations. This issue — and more generally that of discrimination vis-à-vis women in the country — was raised by EU Member States during the Universal Periodic Review that Saudi Arabia underwent at the UN Human Rights Council in 2013.

The EU will continue to discuss these matters with the Saudi authorities at all levels.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012395/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Regulation (EC) No 261/2004

Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 establishes common rules for compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of long delays and cancellation of flights within the EU.

1. What rights — including those safeguarding access to effective assistance — are afforded to air passengers in my constituency, Northern Ireland, under the provisions laid down in Regulation (EC) No 261/2004?

2. Can the Commission please detail the process by which 'extraordinary circumstances' (under which airlines may be exempt from paying compensation) are defined and assessed in any given situation under Regulation (EC) No 261/2004? What mechanism, if any, is in place to ensure that a common definition is utilised by all airlines?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 (the 'Regulation') applies to all air passengers travelling from any EU airport, or when travelling from a third country airport to an EU airport with a Community air carrier. It is applicable under certain conditions in case of flight cancellation, long delay, denied boarding or downgrading. Passengers whose flight is cancelled or who are denied boarding should be offered the choice between a reimbursement of the ticket, a re-routing at the earliest opportunity, or a re-booking at the passenger's convenience. When passengers are waiting for a re-routing or a delayed flight, they are entitled to care (phone call, refreshments, meal, accommodation, transportation to the place of accommodation). Furthermore, passengers whose flight is disrupted have the right to compensation under certain conditions, unless the cancellation or delay is due to extraordinary circumstances in the sense of the regulation.

The European Court has clarified in the Case C-549/07 (Wallentin-Herman) the notion of extraordinary circumstances ([1]). The National Enforcement Bodies (NEBs) are in charge of enforcing the regulation as interpreted by the Court. The Commission holds regular meetings with the NEBs in order to ensure a convergent application of the regulation.

The proposal for a revision of the regulation ([2]) clearly defines the term in line with the European Court's decision. Furthermore, for further legal certainty, the proposal introduces a non-exhaustive list of circumstances to be regarded as extraordinary and of circumstances to be regarded as non-extraordinary ([3]). The Commission should also be entitled to make recommendations in this respect after consulting the NEBs.

([1]) i.e. circumstances which, by their nature or origin, are not inherent in the normal exercise of the activity of the air carrier concerned and are beyond its actual control.

([2]) Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL amending Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights and Regulation (EC) No 2027/97 on air carrier liability in respect of the carriage of passengers and their baggage by air COM/2013/0130 final — 2013/0072 (COD).

([3]) Article 1(1e) of the proposal — Article 2(m) of the amended Regulation 261/2004 — and Annex 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012396/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Banning mobile phone roaming charges

The Commissioner for the Digital Agenda, Neelie Kroes, recently published proposals which would see mobile telephone roaming charges scrapped across the EU. The intention is to ban inflated fees for calls, texts and Internet access, and to ensure that EU consumers can enjoy the same charges at home and abroad.

In this context, can the Commission please respond to the following questions:

1. Can the Commission please provide an update as to the current status of its proposal to end mobile telephone roaming charges, including a predicted timeline of events with regard to the implementation of the legislation?

2. What other steps are being taken at EU level to better promote a European digital infrastructure that benefits consumers and businesses in each of the Member States?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(4 December 2013)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the answers given in reply to questions E-009826/2013 and E-007644/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-012397/13
an die Kommission
Josef Weidenholzer (S&D)
(31. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Speicherung von Fluggastdaten in Ungarn

Die ungarische Regierung baut — laut Innenstaatssekretär Károly Kontrát — eine nationale Datenbank zur Sammlung von Flugpassagierdaten auf, wofür die Europäische Union fünf Millionen Euro Fördermittel bereitstellt. Als Begründung dieses Vorhabens gibt die ungarische Regierung an, dass man der EU-Vereinbarung zum automatischen Informationsaustausch mit den USA, Kanada und Australien nachkomme, weshalb das nationale System der Speicherung und Übermittlung von Fluggastdaten entsprechend ausgebaut und kompatibel gemacht werden müsse. Im Gesetzesentwurf ist eine Speicherdauer von fünf Jahren vorgesehen.

1. Wie bewertet die Kommission das System zur Speicherung von Passagierdaten in Ungarn?

2. Hat die EU bei der Vergabe der Fördermittel die besonderen Umstände in Ungarn bedacht?

3. Hat die EU die Vergabe der Fördermittel an Auflagen gekoppelt?

4. Wie wird sichergestellt, dass das System nur dem Zweck dient, das organisierte Verbrechen und den Terrorismus zu bekämpfen?

5. Welche Konsequenzen zieht die Kommission daraus? ([1])

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(9. Dezember 2013)

1. Gemäß den der Kommission vorliegenden Informationen verfügt Ungarn bisher über kein automatisches System zur Verarbeitung von Fluggastdatensätzen (PNR-Daten).

2. Ungarn reichte im Rahmen der gezielten Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen zur Einrichtung von PNR-Zentralstellen in den Mitgliedstaaten für die Verarbeitung von PNR-Daten einen Finanzierungsantrag ein. Die gezielte Aufforderung ist Teil des Programms „Kriminalprävention und Kriminalitätsbekämpfung“ (ISEC). Der Antrag wurde von internen und externen Bewertern geprüft, und er entsprach den Förderfähigkeits-, Auswahl- und Vergabekriterien, auch im Hinblick auf die in der Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen enthaltenen Prioritäten und erwarteten Ergebnisse. Daher wurde der Antrag zur Finanzierung ausgewählt.

3. In der Finanzhilfevereinbarung zwischen der Kommission und Ungarn ist vorgesehen, dass nach der automatischen Zahlung einer Vorfinanzierung die Zwischen- und die Abschlusszahlung von der Bewertung der Umsetzung der in der Finanzhilfevereinbarung angeführten Maßnahmen abhängig ist.

4. Eine der in der Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen enthaltenen Prioritäten sieht vor, dass die Verwendung der PNR-Daten sich auf die Prävention, Aufdeckung, Ermittlung und Verfolgung terroristischer Straftaten und schwerer Kriminalität beziehen soll. Der von Ungarn auf die Aufforderung hin eingereichte Antrag entsprach dieser Priorität.

5. Die Kommission wird die Umsetzung der nationalen Projekte, die im Rahmen der Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen kofinanziert werden, genau verfolgen.

([1]) http://www.pesterlloyd.net/html/1342bigbrothereumios.html

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012397/13
to the Commission
Josef Weidenholzer (S&D)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Storage of passenger data in Hungary

According to the Secretary of State of the Ministry of the Interior, Károly Kontrát, the Hungarian Government is setting up a national database — funded to the tune of EUR 5 million by the EU — for the collection of passenger data. To justify its plans, the Hungarian Government has stated that it is complying with the EU agreement on the automatic exchange of information with the US, Canada and Australia, under which Hungary's passenger data storage and transfer system needs to be made compatible and developed accordingly. The draft law provides for a data retention period of five years.

1. What is the Commission's assessment of the Hungarian passenger data storage system?

2. Did the EU take account of the specific situation in Hungary when it allocated resources?

3. Are any conditions linked to the allocation of funding?

4. What measures are being taken to ensure that the system is used solely for the purposes of fighting organised crime and terrorism?

5. What action will the Commission take in response to this? ([1])

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 2013)

1. According to information available to the Commission, Hungary does not currently have an automated system in place for the processing of passenger name record (PNR) data.

2. Hungary submitted a funding application in reply to the targeted call for proposals to set up Passenger Information Units in Member States for the processing of PNR data. The targeted call is part of the funding programme on the 'Prevention of and Fight against Crime' (ISEC). The application was assessed by internal and external evaluators. The application met the eligibility, selection and award criteria, including the conformity with the priorities and expected results listed in the call for proposals. The application was therefore retained for funding.

3. The Grant Agreement between the Commission and Hungary foresees that, although the payment of a pre-financing is automatic, the interim payment and the payment of the balance are conditional to the assessment of the implementation of the activities detailed in the Grant Agreement.

4. One of the priorities listed in the call for proposals is that the use of PNR data should be the prevention, detection, investigation and prosecution of terrorist offences and serious crime. The application submitted by Hungary in reply to the call for proposals was in conformity with this priority.

5. The Commission will closely follow the implementation of national projects co-funded under the call for proposals.

([1]) http://www.pesterlloyd.net/html/1342bigbrothereumios.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012399/13
à la Commission
Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)
(31 octobre 2013)

Objet: Mise en danger de la loutre d'Europe dans le Lot-et-Garonne

L'usine d'enrobage LGE, située à Samazan dans le Lot-et-Garonne, est classée Installation Classée pour la Protection de l'Environnement (ICPE) et est en activité depuis 2008. Le code de l'environnement français définit ainsi les ICPE: «Les usines, ateliers, dépôts, chantiers et, d'une manière générale, les installations exploitées ou détenues par toute personne physique ou morale, publique ou privée, qui peuvent présenter des dangers ou des inconvénients soit pour la commodité du voisinage, soit pour la santé, la sécurité, la salubrité publiques, soit pour l'agriculture, soit pour la protection de la nature, de l'environnement et des paysages, soit pour l'utilisation rationnelle de l'énergie, soit pour la conservation des sites et des monuments ainsi que des éléments du patrimoine archéologique». En l'occurrence, les vapeurs de bitumes qui émanent de l'usine peuvent présenter des risques de toxicité. L'expertise de l'Agence nationale de sécurité sanitaire de l'alimentation, de l'environnement et du travail (ANSES), rendue publique le 11 septembre 2013, reconnaît d'ailleurs un risque sanitaire associé à une exposition des travailleurs au bitume.

La Société pour l'Étude, la Protection et l'Aménagement de la Nature en Lot-et-Garonne (Sepanlog), association environnementale agréée par l'État au titre de l'article 40 de la loi du 10 juillet 1976, a constaté dans le périmètre de l'usine la présence de la loutre d'Europe. Ceci est confirmé par l'attestation délivrée par l'association, datée du 24 juin 2013, sur «la réalité de la présence de cette espèce, matérialisée par la récupération d'un cadavre de femelle adulte sur la voie départementale traversant le bourg de Pont des Sables». De plus, l'installation se trouve en zone inondable et l'habitat de la loutre est mis en péril à chaque inondation. En effet, lorsque l'eau revient dans le lit de la rivière, elle y ramène les eaux potentiellement polluées du site de LGE, où ont été submergés les bassins d'orages. Cette espèce (Lutra Lutra) est protégée au niveau communautaire puisqu'elle est inscrite à l'annexe IV de la Directive Habitats (92/43/CEE) en tant « qu'espèce animale et végétale d'intérêt communautaire qui nécessite une protection stricte». Pourtant, aucune étude d'impact n'a été menée.

Comment la Commission européenne compte-t-elle s'assurer que la loutre d'Europe n'est pas mise en danger dans le Lot-et-Garonne par la proximité de cette usine?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(10 décembre 2013)

Si la puissance thermique nominale des activités de combustion à l'intérieur de l'installation excède 50 MW, cette installation relèvera du champ d'application de la directive 2008/1/CE relative à la prévention et à la réduction intégrées de la pollution (IPPC) ([1]) et de la directive 2010/75/UE sur les émissions industrielles ([2]), qui remplacera la directive IPPC à compter du 7 janvier 2014. Au titre de ces directives, les installations doivent fonctionner conformément à une autorisation délivrée par les autorités compétentes qui est assortie de valeurs limites d'émission fondées sur les meilleures techniques disponibles et destinées à prévenir et, si cela n'est pas possible, à réduire les émissions et les incidences sur l'environnement en général.

La loutre d'Europe *(Lutra lutra)* bénéficie d'un régime de protection stricte au titre de l'article 12 de la directive «Habitats» (92/43/CEE ([3])) qui interdit la détérioration ou la destruction des sites de reproduction ou des aires de repos. Les États membres peuvent déroger au régime de protection stricte pour des raisons impératives d'intérêt public majeur, y compris de nature sociale ou économique, à condition qu'il n'existe pas une autre solution satisfaisante et que la dérogation ne nuise pas au maintien, dans un état de conservation favorable, des populations des espèces concernées. Les autorités françaises ont réalisé une analyse d'impact sur l'environnement. Il ressort des documents dont dispose la Commission que la protection de la loutre d'Europe a été prise en considération au cours du processus d'aménagement. Aucune mesure spécifique n'a été jugée nécessaire car rien n'indique la présence de sites de reproduction ou d'aires de repos de la loutre d'Europe. Sur la base des informations actuelles, la Commission ne constate aucune violation de la législation.

([1]) JO L 24 du 29.1.2008.
([2]) JO L 334 du 17.12.2010.
([3]) JO L 206 du 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012399/13
to the Commission
Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: European otter under threat in Lot-et-Garonne

Located in Samazan in the Lot-et-Garonne department, the LGE coating plant is classified as an 'Installation Classée pour la Protection de l'Environnement' (ICPE) and has been operating since 2008. The French environmental code defines ICPEs as follows: 'factories, workshops, depots, work sites and, in general, all facilities operated or owned by any public or private person or entity, which might present hazards or drawbacks for the convenience of the neighbourhood, or for public health and safety, or for agriculture, or for the protection of nature and the environment, or for the rational use of energy, or for the conservation of sites and monuments or elements of the archaeological heritage'. Specifically, the bitumen fumes given off by the factory may present a toxicity risk. Furthermore, an assessment published on 11 September 2013 by the French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety (ANSES) acknowledges that workers exposed to bitumen may be subject to health risks.

The Society for the Study, Protection and Development of Nature in Lot-et-Garonne (SEPANLOG), an environmental association approved by the French State under Article 40 of the law of 10 July 1976, has recorded the presence of European otters in the area surrounding the factory. This was confirmed in a statement issued by the association on 24 June 2013, which asserts that 'this species is definitely present, as demonstrated by the discovery of the body of a female adult on the secondary road that crosses the village of Pont des Sables'. Moreover, the plant is situated on a flood plain and the otter's habitat is put at risk every time the river floods. When the water returns to the river bed, it brings with it potentially polluted water from the LGE site, where storm water tanks have been flooded. This species (Lutra Lutra) is protected at EU level because it is classified as an 'animal and plant species of Community interest in need of strict protection' under Annex IV of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC). However, no impact assessment has been carried out.

How does the Commission plan to ensure that the European otter is not put at risk in the Lot-et-Garonne department as a result of this plant?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2013)

Provided that the rated thermal input of the combustion activities within the installation exceeds 50 MW, the installation would fall under the scope of the IPPC Directive 2008/1/EC ([1]) and of Directive 2010/75/EU ([2]) on industrial emissions, which replaces the IPPC Directive as from 7 January 2014. Under those directives, installations are required to operate in accordance with a permit issued by the competent authorities including emission limit values based on the best available techniques, designed to prevent and, where that is not practicable, generally to reduce emissions and the impact on the environment as a whole.

The Otter (*Lutra lutra*) benefits from a strict protection regime under Article 12 of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC ([3])) which prohibits the deterioration or destruction of breeding sites or resting places. Member States may derogate from the strict protection regime for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature, provided that there is no satisfactory alternative and the derogation is not detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favorable conservation status. An environment impact assessment has been carried out by the French authorities. The protection of the Otter has been taken into consideration during the planning process according to documents available to the Commission. No specific measures were considered necessary as there are no indications of the presence of Otters' breeding sites or resting places. Based on current information the Commission does not identify any breach of legislation.

([1]) OJ L 24, 29.1.2008.
([2]) OJ L 334, 17.12.2010.
([3]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012400/13
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(31 octobre 2013)

Objet: Accord d'investissement UE-Chine: protection des indications géographiques

À la suite de l'établissement des relations diplomatiques entre l'Union européenne et la Chine en 1975, un partenariat stratégique sino-européen a vu le jour en 2003. Nous marquons cette année les dix ans d'une coopération toujours accrue dans de nombreux domaines tels que le commerce, les affaires étrangères ou encore le changement climatique. Ainsi, la Chine est un partenaire toujours plus important pour l'Union européenne, et elle est actuellement son deuxième partenaire commercial.

Cette relation avec la Chine n'a toutefois pas toujours été linéaire, comme en témoigne encore le récent différend commercial concernant les panneaux solaires chinois, problème qui semble aujourd'hui résolu grâce à un accord sur des prix minimums à l'importation.

Le 24 octobre dernier, le vice-premier ministre chinois Ma Kai s'est rendu à Bruxelles pour rencontrer Olli Rehn et Karel De Gucht. Cette rencontre a été l'occasion de saluer la décision prise par le Conseil le 18 octobre dernier d'adopter un mandat autorisant la Commission à entreprendre des négociations avec la Chine sur un accord d'investissement ambitieux.

Lors de l'adoption d'une résolution au début du mois à Strasbourg, nous avons fait part de nos inquiétudes et recommandations sur de nombreux sujets concernant cet accord d'investissement. Tout comme nous sommes vigilants sur l'accord entre l'Union européenne et les États-Unis, nous devons également faire preuve de prudence en ce qui concerne l'accord sino-européen.

Nous avons notamment fait état de notre préoccupation concernant les indications géographiques relatives aux produits. Il est essentiel qu'avec cet accord sino-européen, les Européens restent bien informés de la provenance des produits qu'ils consomment, et que les denrées alimentaires de qualité qui bénéficient actuellement de ces indications continuent d'être promues et protégées.

Ainsi, la Commission peut-elle dès aujourd'hui nous renseigner sur les mesures qu'elle mettra en place pour garantir les indications géographiques relatives aux produits dans le cadre de l'accord d'investissement qui va être négocié avec la Chine?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(17 décembre 2013)

La Commission fondera son action sur les directives de négociation élaborées par le Conseil et tiendra compte de la résolution du Parlement européen. L'accord d'investissement global entre l'Union et la Chine a pour principal objectif d'éliminer les obstacles à l'accès au marché et d'assurer un niveau élevé de protection des investisseurs et de leurs investissements sur les marchés de l'Union et de la Chine. Il devrait permettre de remplacer les 27 traités d'investissement bilatéraux conclus entre les différents États membres et la Chine par un accord d'investissement global avec l'Union. L'objectif est de renforcer les flux d'investissement bilatéraux en accentuant l'ouverture du marché et en mettant en place un cadre juridique plus simple, plus sûr et plus prévisible pour les investisseurs, en vue de pérenniser les relations d'investissement.

Toutefois, l'accord d'investissement global entre l'Union et la Chine n'est pas un accord de libre-échange et n'aura pas d'incidence sur le régime des échanges bilatéraux de marchandises. Il ne portera donc pas sur les indications géographiques (IG) pour les produits agricoles ou les denrées alimentaires. Cela étant dit, l'Union négocie actuellement avec la Chine un accord indépendant qui devrait assurer une protection directe des IG. Il sera annexé à l'accord global et apportera ainsi une réelle valeur ajoutée par rapport à la situation actuelle, qui consiste à suivre les procédures internes chinoises. L'Union et la Chine sont en pourparlers depuis plus de trois ans et les négociations sont désormais entrées dans leur phase finale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012400/13
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: EU-China investment agreement: protection of geographical indications

Following the establishment of diplomatic relations between the European Union and China in 1975, a Sino-European strategic partnership was set up in 2003. This year, we are marking 10 years of growing cooperation in many areas, including trade, foreign affairs and climate change. China is therefore an increasingly important partner for the European Union and is currently its second largest trading partner.

However, this relationship with China has not always been straightforward, as can be seen by the recent trade disagreement over Chinese solar panels, which now appears to have been resolved through an agreement on minimum import prices.

On 24 October 2013, the Chinese Vice-Premier, Ma Kai, visited Brussels to meet with Olli Rehn and Karel De Gucht. This meeting was an opportunity to welcome the Council's decision of 18 October 2013 to adopt a mandate authorising the Commission to enter into negotiations with China over an ambitious investment agreement.

We raised our concerns and recommendations on various topics relating to this investment agreement when a resolution was adopted in Strasbourg at the beginning of the month. Just as we are approaching the agreement between the European Union and the United States of America with care, so we must also be cautious about the Sino-European agreement.

In particular, we raised our concerns over geographical indications on products. With this Sino-European agreement, it is vital that EU citizens remain well-informed of the origin of the products that they consume and that we continue to promote and protect those quality foodstuffs that currently benefit from these indications.

Can the Commission tell us today what measures it will put in place to protect the geographical indications on products affected by the investment agreement that is going to be negotiated with China?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

The Commission will be guided by the negotiating directives given by the Council and will take into account the EP Resolution. The aim of the EU-China comprehensive investment agreement is to remove market access barriers and provide a high level of protection to investors and investments in EU and China markets. It should replace the 27 existing Bilateral Investment Treaties of individual EU Member States with China by one single comprehensive EU investment Agreement. This agreement aims at boosting two-way investment by opening market further and providing a simpler and more secure and predictable legal framework to investors for a long term investment relationship.

The EU-China comprehensive investment agreement, however, is not a free trade agreement and will not affect the bilateral trade regime for goods. It will, therefore, not cover geographical indications (GIs) for agricultural products or food. This being said, the EU is currently negotiating a stand-alone agreement on GIs with China which should offer a direct protection of GIs to be annexed to the agreement itself, thus offering a real added value in comparison to the current situation of following Chinese domestic procedures. The EU and China have been negotiating for over 3 years and the negotiations are now entering final stages.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012405/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(31 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ποσοστά αυτοκτονιών

Γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή ότι, σύμφωνα με ανακοίνωση του Υπουργού Υγείας της Ελλάδας, τα ποσοστά αυτοκτονιών αυξήθηκαν κατά 40% στο πρώτο εξάμηνο του 2011;

1. Γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή τα ποσοστά αυτοκτονιών της Ελλάδας για το 2012 και το 2013;

2. Είναι σε θέση η Επιτροπή να παράσχει συγκριτικό πίνακα με στατιστικά στοιχεία περί αυτοκτονιών σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη πριν και κατά τη διάρκεια της οικονομικής κρίσης;

Απάντηση του κ. Borg εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(16 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

Η Eurostat συλλέγει τα στοιχεία για τη «θνησιμότητα λόγω συγκεκριμένης νόσου», συμπεριλαμβανομένων των ποσοστών αυτοκτονιών και τα τελευταία διαθέσιμα στοιχεία σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο αφορούν το 2010. Δεν υπάρχουν διαθέσιμα στοιχεία για την περίοδο από το 2011. Κατά συνέπεια, η Επιτροπή δεν γνωρίζει τα ποσοστά αυτοκτονιών στην Ελλάδα και σε άλλα κράτη μέλη μεταξύ 2011 και 2013.

Στο παράρτημα δίνεται πίνακας με στοιχεία σχετικά με τα ποσοστά αυτοκτονίας για τα τελευταία πέντε έτη (2006-2010) σε επίπεδο ΕΕ. Όσον αφορά την Ελλάδα, το ποσοστό αυτοκτονιών κυμαίνεται από 3,5 (ανά 100 000 κατοίκους) το 2006 σε 3,3 το 2010. Πρέπει να σημειωθεί ότι στις 28 Νοεμβρίου 2013 έγινε αναθεώρηση στη συλλογή των στοιχείων λόγω θανάτου. Όλες οι σειρές υπολογίστηκαν εκ νέου λαμβάνοντας με βάση τον νέο «Ευρωπαϊκό πίνακα» με 86 αιτίες θανάτου και το νέο ευρωπαϊκό πρότυπο πληθυσμού όπως καταγράφηκε από την Eurostat το 2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_SDDS/EN/hlth_cdeath_esms.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012405/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Suicide rates

Is the Commission aware that in 2011 the Greek Health Minister announced that suicide rates had risen by 40% during the first half of that year?

1. Is the Commission aware of Greek suicide rates in 2012 and 2013?

2. Can it provide a comparative table of suicide data in all Member States before and during the economic crisis?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

Eurostat collects data on 'disease-specific mortality' including suicide rates and the latest European level data available refers to 2010. No data is yet available for the period as of 2011. Accordingly, the Commission is not aware of the suicide rates in Greece and other Member States between 2011 and 2013.

In annex, a table is provided with data on suicide rates for the last five years available (2006-2010) at EU level. As regards Greece, the suicide rate varied from 3.5 (per 100,000 inhabitants) in 2006 to 3.3 in 2010. It is to note that a revision took place in the data collection on causes of death on 28 November 2013. The whole series were recalculated taking into account the new 'European shortlist' of 86 causes of death and the new European standard population as defined by Eurostat in 2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_SDDS/EN/hlth_cdeath_esms.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012406/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(31 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Η οικονομική ανεξαρτησία των γυναικών

Οι περικοπές στις υπηρεσίες και τις παροχές έχουν θέσει σε κίνδυνο την οικονομική ανεξαρτησία των γυναικών, καθώς οι παροχές αποτελούν συχνά σημαντική πηγή του εισοδήματός τους και καθώς χρησιμοποιούν τις δημόσιες υπηρεσίες περισσότερο από τους άνδρες. Οι ανύπαντρες μητέρες και οι ανύπαντρες γυναίκες συνταξιούχοι υφίστανται τις μεγαλύτερες σωρευτικές απώλειες.

1. Προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να παρέμβει, δεδομένου ότι οι περικοπές στις υπηρεσίες και τις παροχές έχουν αρνητικές επιπτώσεις για τις γυναίκες;

2. Προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να λάβει κατάλληλα και αποτελεσματικά μέτρα προκειμένου να εμποδίσει τη συνέχιση αυτών των προβλημάτων;

3. Ποια ειδική καθοδήγηση παρέχει η Επιτροπή προς τα κράτη μέλη για την υποστήριξη συγκεκριμένα των ανύπαντρων μητέρων και των ανύπαντρων γυναικών συνταξιούχων;

Απάντηση της κ. Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(8 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Στην κοινή έκθεση για την απασχόληση και την έκθεση σχετικά με την πρόοδο ως προς την ισότητα μεταξύ γυναικών και ανδρών για το 2012 αναγνωρίζεται η δυσχερής κατάσταση που αντιμετωπίζουν οι ανύπαντρες μητέρες και οι ανύπαντρες γυναίκες συνταξιούχοι.

Στην ετήσια ανασκόπηση της ανάπτυξης 2014, στην οποία ορίζονται οι γενικές προτεραιότητες για το ευρωπαϊκό εξάμηνο 2014, τονίζεται ότι θα πρέπει να δοθεί προτεραιότητα στην «διευθέτηση του ζητήματος του αντικτύπου των διαφορών αμοιβών και δραστηριοτήτων μεταξύ ανδρών και γυναικών στα συνταξιοδοτικά δικαιώματα των γυναικών» και ότι «η πρόσβαση σε προσιτές υπηρεσίες μέριμνας θα βοηθήσει στη συμμετοχή των γυναικών στην αγορά εργασίας». Υπογραμμίζεται, επίσης, ότι πρέπει να χαραχθούν στρατηγικές ενεργού ένταξης, που θα περιλαμβάνουν αποτελεσματική και ενδεδειγμένη εισοδηματική στήριξη, μέτρα ενεργοποίησης, μέτρα για την αντιμετώπιση της φτώχειας, καθώς και ευρεία πρόσβαση σε οικονομικά προσιτές και υψηλής ποιότητας υπηρεσίες, όπως σε υπηρεσίες κοινωνικής ωφελείας και υγείας, στην παιδική φροντίδα, στη στέγαση και στην παροχή ενέργειας. Ήδη το 2013, με τις ειδικές ανά χώρα συστάσεις, τα κράτη μέλη καλούνται να αναπτύξουν υπηρεσίες μέριμνας, με σκοπό να αναβαθμίσουν την οικεία διαθεσιμότητα και ποιότητα και να τις καταστήσουν πιο προσιτές οικονομικά.

Επιπλέον, τα ζητήματα της ισότητας των φύλων και της άρσης των διακρίσεων λόγω φύλου πρέπει να λαμβάνονται υπόψη και να προωθούνται σε όλη την διάρκεια της προετοιμασίας και της άσκησης των δραστηριοτήτων στα πλαίσια των ευρωπαϊκών διαρθρωτικών και επενδυτικών ταμείων (ΕΔΕΤ). Ειδικές δράσεις για την βελτίωση και την προώθηση της οικονομικής ανεξαρτησίας των γυναικών και για την ανάπτυξη υπηρεσιών μέριμνας, μεταξύ άλλων, μπορούν να στηριχθούν γενικά από τα ταμεία ΕΔΕΤ και ειδικότερα από το ευρωπαϊκό κοινωνικό ταμείο (ΕΚΤ).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012406/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Women's economic independence

Cutbacks in services and benefits have compromised women's economic independence, as benefits often constitute an important source of their income and they use public services more than men. Single mothers and single female pensioners face the biggest cumulative losses.

1. Does the Commission intend to intervene, considering that cutbacks in services and benefits have a negative impact on women?

2. Does the Commission intend to take adequate and effective measures to stop all these problems occurring?

3. What specific advice does the Commission give to Member States to help single mothers and single female pensioners in particular?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(8 January 2014)

The Joint Employment Report and the report on progress on equality between women and men 2012 recognise the difficult situation of single mothers and single female pensioners.

The Annual Growth Survey 2014, which sets out the overall priorities for the European Semester 2014, highlights that priority should be given to 'addressing the impact of gender pay and activity gaps on women's pension entitlements' and that 'access to affordable care services will help the participation of women in the labour market'. It further stresses that active inclusion strategies should be developed, encompassing efficient and adequate income support, activation measures as well as measures to tackle poverty, and broad access to affordable and high-quality services, such as social and health services, childcare, housing and energy supply. In 2013, country specific recommendations already called on the Member States to develop care facilities to increase their availability, their quality and their affordability.

Moreover, gender equality and non-discrimination on the grounds of sex have to be taken into consideration and promoted throughout the preparation and implementation of the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) activities. Specific actions to improve and promote women's economic independence and to develop among other care facilities can be supported by the ESI Funds in general and by the European Social Fund (ESF) in particular.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012408/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(31 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Disoccupazione in Italia: fallimento della strategia UE 2020 e allarme delocalizzazione

Alla fine del mese di ottobre 2013 l'ISTAT ha diffuso i dati che fotografano l'andamento dell'occupazione in Italia. Quello che emerge è un quadro preoccupante: il nostro paese conquista un nuovo record negativo e registra a settembre un tasso di disoccupazione pari al 12,5 %. Si tratta del valore più alto registrato dall'inizio del calcolo, sia delle serie storiche mensili dei dati, cominciato nel gennaio 2004, sia di quelle trimestrali cominciato nel 1977. Sempre nel mese di settembre il tasso di occupazione giovanile (15-24 anni) è sceso al 16,1 %, in calo di 0,5 punti percentuali su agosto e di 2,1 su base annua. Anche in questo caso si tratta di un valore che eguaglia il minimo storico e che tradotto in pratica significa che a settembre 2013 sono occupati meno di due giovani su dieci, anche se tra gli under 25 vanno contati anche gli studenti.

Trascorsi tre anni del lancio della Strategia Europa 2020, che nelle intenzioni del legislatore comunitario avrebbe messo la crescita economica e un elevato tasso di occupazione al centro delle sue azioni, il risultato è alquanto allarmante.

Può pertanto la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

— è a conoscenza di questi dati?

— ritiene ancora valida la Strategia Europa 2020 e le sue azioni?

— intende rivedere il ruolo attribuito per la sua attuazione alle politiche di *spending review* e alle drastiche manovre di *austerity*, la cui inefficacia è dimostrata dalla sempre più difficile situazione socio economica del nostro e di altri Stati membri?

— ha valutato, invece, la possibilità di affrontare in modo concreto e risolutivo i problemi legati alla delocalizzazione, soprattutto intra UE, che hanno causato in Italia la fuga di multinazionali e PMI, incapaci di sostenere una pressione fiscale del 68,5 % e attratte dalle condizioni fiscali più allettanti di altri Stati membri del mercato unico ?

— cosa intende fare per i giovani italiani che sono oggi le prime vittime di questa crisi e rispetto ai quali la strategia Europa 2020 si è dimostrata drammaticamente inefficace?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(3 gennaio 2014)

1. La Commissione segue da vicino la situazione dell'occupazione in Italia. Il progetto di Relazione comune sull'occupazione 2014 indica importanti aumenti della disoccupazione complessiva e giovanile in Italia nel corso dell'ultimo anno oltre ad evidenziare il secondo tasso più alto di giovani disoccupati e al di fuori di ogni ciclo d'istruzione e formazione nell'UE ([1]).

2. UE2020 è una strategia decennale per la crescita e la Commissione ritiene ancora validi i suoi obiettivi. Per raggiungerli la Commissione propone la propria consulenza strategica nel contesto del Semestre europeo tramite raccomandazioni specifiche per paese rivolte agli Stati membri, Italia compresa. La Commissione ha recentemente pubblicato la sua Analisi annuale della crescita per il 2014 ([2]).

3. Con una ridotta crescita potenziale e un debito pubblico estremamente elevato la stabilità finanziaria dell'Italia e tassi d'interesse bassi dipendono dal raggiungimento e dal mantenimento del surplus primario necessario per il servizio del debito e per reagire alle improvvise turbative dei mercati finanziari. Continuando su questa via l'Italia potrebbe veder ridurre i suoi tassi d'interesse con effetti positivi per l'economia reale e l'occupazione.

([1]) COM(2013) 801 def. del 13 novembre 2013 (http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/2014/jer2014_it.pdf).
([2]) COM(2013) 800 def. del 13 novembre 2013 (http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/2014/ags2014_it.pdf).

4. La libertà di stabilimento nell'UE è consacrata nei trattati quale elemento fondamentale del mercato unico e comunque la Commissione ha raccomandato all'Italia di alleggerire l'elevato onere fiscale che grava sul lavoro e sul capitale spostando la tassazione sui consumi e sui beni immobili in modo neutrale in termini di bilancio ([3]).

5. Per lottare contro la disoccupazione giovanile la Commissione sostiene gli Stati membri, Italia compresa, nell'attuazione di una Garanzia per i giovani, in linea con la raccomandazione del Consiglio. Inoltre, nell'ambito dell'iniziativa a favore dell'occupazione giovanile, l'Italia ha ricevuto un finanziamento straordinario per un importo di 530 milioni di euro da spendere nel periodo 2014-2015 a sostegno dell'occupazione giovanile, oltre allo stanziamento FES per il 2014-2020 ([4]).

([3]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/13/st10/st10640-re01.en13.pdf
([4]) COM(2013) 144 def. del 12 marzo 2013 (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0144:FIN:IT:PDF).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012408/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Unemployment in Italy: failure of the Europe 2020 strategy and concern over relocations

At the end of October 2013, ISTAT (Italian National Institute of Statistics) published figures showing employment trends in Italy. They painted a worrying picture: unemployment in Italy is at an all-time high, with the unemployment rate standing at 12.5% in September. This is the highest since records began, both in terms of monthly figures, beginning in January 2004, and quarterly figures, beginning in 1977. September's youth employment rate (for 15 to 24-year-olds) fell to 16.1%, down 0.5 percentage points on August and 2.1 percentage points on an annual basis. Here too, this figure matches its lowest recorded level: in concrete terms, fewer than 2 young people in 10 were in employment in September 2013, although students are included among the under-25s.

The Community legislature intended the Europe 2020 strategy to place economic growth and a high employment rate at the heart of its actions. Three years on from its launch, however, the result is rather alarming.

Is the Commission aware of these figures?

Does it still consider the Europe 2020 strategy and its actions to be effective?

Will it review the role its implementation plays in spending-review policies and drastic austerity measures, whose inefficacy is demonstrated by the increasingly difficult social and economic situation in Italy and other Member States?

On the other hand, has it examined the possibility of resolving in practical terms issues relating to relocations, especially within the EU, which have prompted multinationals and SMEs to leave Italy since they were incapable of sustaining a 68.5% tax burden and were attracted by more appealing tax conditions in other Member States of the single market?

What does it plan to do for young Italians who are today the main victims of this crisis and for whom the Europe 2020 strategy has proved to be terribly ineffective?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(3 January 2014)

1. The Commission closely monitors the employment situation in Italy. The 2014 draft Joint Employment Report shows significant rises in the Italian overall and youth unemployment rates during last year, as well as the second-highest rate of young people not in employment, education or training in the EU ([1]).

2. EU2020 is a ten-year growth strategy and the Commission considers its target objectives still valid. To attain them, the Commission proposes its policy advice in the context of the European Semester through Country-Specific Recommendations to the Member States, including Italy. The Commission has recently published its Annual Growth Survey for 2014 ([2]).

3. With low potential growth and a very high public debt, Italy's financial stability and low interest rates hinge upon achieving and maintaining the primary surplus needed to cover for interest expenditure and respond to sudden shocks from financial markets. Pursuing this path could further reduce Italy's interest rates with positive effects on the real economy and employment.

4. While the freedom of establishment within the EU is enshrined in the Treaties as one fundamental element of the single market, the Commission has recommended Italy to alleviate the high tax burden on labour and capital by shifting taxation towards consumption and property, in a budgetary neutral manner ([3]).

([1]) COM(2013) 801final of 13 November 2013 (http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/2014/jer2014_en.pdf).
([2]) COM(2013), 800 final of 13 November 2013 (http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/2014/ags2014_en.pdf).
([3]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/13/st10/st10640-re01.en13.pdf

5. To combat youth unemployment, the Commission is supporting Member States, including Italy, to implement a Youth Guarantee, in line with the Council Recommendation. Also, as approved under the Youth Employment Initiative, Italy has been allocated EUR 530 million of extra funds to be spent in 2014-2015 to support youth employment, in addition to its ESF allocation for 2014-2020 ([4]).

([4]) COM(2013) 144 final of 12 March 2013 (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0144:FIN:EN:PDF).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012409/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(31 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Epatite E: aumento in Inghilterra dei contagi per via animale

Ogni anno, soprattutto in India, Asia, Africa, Medio Oriente e America centrale, 20 milioni di persone sono colpite dal virus dell'epatite E. Questo ceppo di epatite si diffonde attraverso il consumo di acqua contaminata ed è l'unico trasmissibile all'uomo dagli animali, per cui risultano particolarmente a rischio le categorie professionali che si dedicano all'allevamento.

Da un rapporto del dipartimento inglese per l'ambiente, l'alimentazione e gli affari rurali, i casi di epatite E nel Regno Unito sono aumentati del 39.5 % fra il 2011 e il 2012.

Può pertanto la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

— è essa a conoscenza dei fatti sopra descritti?

— ha essa notizie di un aumento dei casi di contagio per via animale dell'epatite E anche negli altri Stati membri?

— ritiene opportuno avviare uno studio per comparare i dati in tutta l'UE sulla diffusione di tale malattia ed emanare raccomandazioni comuni valide per tutti gli Stati membri per il controllo della stessa?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(12 dicembre 2013)

I dati sulla prevalenza e sull'incidenza dell'epatite virale E nell'UE/nel SEE non sono ancora disponibili in quanto l'epatite virale E non figura nell'elenco delle infezioni umane da riferire a livello di Unione a norma della decisione 1082/2013/CE ([1]) e nella raccolta annuale dei dati sulle zoonosi a norma della direttiva 2003/99/CE ([2]) sulle misure di sorveglianza delle zoonosi e degli agenti zoonotici. Inoltre, secondo quanto affermato nel 2011 dal gruppo di esperti scientifici sui pericoli biologici dell'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare, non sono disponibili per l'UE/il SEE informazioni dettagliate su casi di epatite virale E.

Sebbene l'Europa non sia una regione endemica per l'epatite E, casi sporadici di epatite E si sono verificati in Francia, nei Paesi Bassi, in Spagna, in Ungheria, nel Regno Unito, in Danimarca e in Norvegia, il che indica un'ampia diffusione del virus nell'Unione. Per quanto riguarda l'aumento del numero di casi di origine animale, una serie di studi recenti ha attestato una maggiore prevalenza dell'infezione nei lavoratori del settore forestale e nelle persone con un'esposizione professionale ai suini rispetto alla popolazione in generale, sebbene finora non siano disponibili cifre precise sull'incidenza di tale infezione.

Secondo i pareri sull'ispezione delle carni, formulati dal gruppo di esperti scientifici sui pericoli biologici dell'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare, l'epatite virale E non è stata identificata come un pericolo da gestire mediante la revisione dei sistemi di garanzia della sicurezza delle carni ([3]).

([1]) GU L 293 del 5.11.2013, pag. 1.
([2]) GU L 325 del 12.12.2003, pag. 31.
([3]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/it/topics/topic/meatinspection.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012409/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Hepatitis E: increase in contagion from animals in the UK

Every year, especially in India, Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Central America, 20 million people are affected by the hepatitis E virus. This strain of hepatitis is spread through consumption of contaminated water and is the only strain that is transmissible from animals to humans. People who work in animal breeding or farming are therefore especially at risk.

According to a report by the UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, the number of cases of hepatitis E in the UK rose by 39.5% between 2011 and 2012.

Can the Commission therefore answer the following questions:

— Is it aware of these facts?

— Is it aware of any increase in the number of cases of hepatitis E infection from animals in the other Member States?

— Does it not think it might be advisable to launch a study to compare data across the EU on the spread of the disease and to issue joint recommendations that apply to all Member States regarding its control?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2013)

Data on prevalence and incidence of viral hepatitis E in the EU/EEA is not readily available as viral hepatitis E is not included in the list of human infections to be reported at Union level under Decision 1082/2013/EC ([1]) and in the annual data collection on zoonoses under Directive 2003/99/EC ([2]) on monitoring of zoonoses and zoonotic agents. In addition according to the European Food Safety Authority Panel on Biological Hazards in 2011, no detailed information on viral hepatitis E cases is available for the EU/EEA.

While Europe is not an endemic region for hepatitis E, sporadic human hepatitis E cases have occurred in France, The Netherlands, Spain, Hungary, the United Kingdom, Denmark, and Norway, indicating a wide distribution of the virus in the Union. Concerning the increased number of cases from the animal source, a number of recent studies showed an increased prevalence of infection in forestry workers and people with occupational exposure to pigs as compared to the general population, although precise figures on incidence are not available so far.

According to the European Food Safety Authority Panel on Biological Hazards' opinions on meat inspection, viral hepatitis E was not identified as a hazard to be covered by revised meat safety assurance systems ([3]).

([1]) OJ L 293, 5.11.2013, p. 1.
([2]) OJ L 325, 12.12.2003, p.31.
([3]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/topics/topic/meatinspection.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012410/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(31 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Cattiva alimentazione e rischi per la salute dei cittadini europei

In un'analisi pubblicata sull'*European Journal of Cancer Prevention*, i ricercatori scozzesi dell'università di Edimburgo hanno calcolato gli effetti di circa 170 diversi tipi di alimenti tra cui frutta, verdura, carne, pesce e molti *snack*, ad alto contenuto calorico, come ad esempio cioccolatini, patatine e bibite gassate.

Gli esiti dei loro studi hanno confermato la pericolosità dell'inattività fisica, ma hanno anche introdotto nuovi sospetti sugli spuntini ricchi di zuccheri e grassi, che soprattutto i più piccoli consumano in grandi quantità.

Utilizzando i dati raccolti dello *Scottish Colorectal Cancer Study*, gli scienziati hanno confermato l'influsso negativo della «dieta occidentale» basata sul consumo di carne, grassi e zuccheri, che esporrebbe a maggiori probabilità di sviluppare un carcinoma colon-rettale.

Può pertanto la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. Intende essa approfondire le indagini scientifiche ed investire in progetti che mirino ad accertare il presunto legame tra i «cibi sospetti» e il cancro?

2. Intende essa avviare una campagna per promuovere tra i cittadini europei la consapevolezza dell'importanza di un'alimentazione sana e corretta?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(17 dicembre 2013)

La strategia europea del 2007 sugli aspetti sanitari connessi all'alimentazione, al sovrappeso e all'obesità ([1]) promuove una dieta equilibrata e stili di vita attivi tra i cittadini dell'UE e viene attuata grazie al Gruppo ad alto livello sulla nutrizione e l'attività fisica ([2]) e alla Piattaforma d'azione europea per l'alimentazione, l'attività fisica e la salute ([3]).

Il Gruppo ad alto livello sulla nutrizione e l'attività fisica ha di recente iniziato a elaborare un piano d'azione per affrontare il problema dell'obesità infantile, che coprirà il periodo 2014-2020.

La Commissione ha inoltre avviato progetti pilota volti a promuovere diete sane per le donne in stato di gravidanza, i bambini e gli anziani, e ad aumentare il consumo di frutta e verdura fresche nelle comunità locali in cui il reddito delle famiglie è inferiore al 50 % della media UE.

Il codice europeo contro il cancro, messo a punto dalla Commissione e dall'Agenzia internazionale per la ricerca sul cancro, raccomanda di aumentare il consumo quotidiano e la varietà di frutta e verdura, di mangiarne almeno cinque porzioni al giorno e di limitare il consumo di cibi contenenti grassi di origine animale. Il codice è attualmente in fase di revisione e sarà pubblicato all'inizio del 2014.

([1]) COM(2007) 279.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_it.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_it.htm

La Commissione, nell'ambito del 7° programma quadro per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico (FP7; 2007-2013), ha investito 80 milioni di euro in progetti di ricerca per capire meglio la relazione tra dieta, stile di vita e salute nel corso della vita ([4]) e per sviluppare nuovi prodotti alimentari a basso contenuto di zuccheri, sale e grassi ([5]) (6 milioni di euro) o a sostegno di attività di ricerca sui legami tra dieta e cancro come pure sui meccanismi molecolari alla base degli effetti dell'alimentazione sulla salute.

Nel quadro del programma Orizzonte 2020 proseguiranno gli studi su alimenti e regimi alimentari come principali fattori per promuovere e conservare la salute e per ridurre il rischio di sviluppare malattie.

([4]) http://www.neurofast.eu (neurobiologia integrata connessa all'assunzione alimentare, alla dipendenza dal cibo e allo stress); http://www.full4health.eu (comprendere i meccanismi cibo-intestino-cervello nel controllo della fame e della sazietà nel corso della vita al fine di migliorare la salute);
http://www.eatwellproject.eu (interventi per promuovere abitudini alimentari sane: valutazioni e raccomandazioni);
http:/www.project-earlynutrition.eu (effetti a lungo termine dell'alimentazione nei primi anni di vita sulla salute futura);
http://www.toybox-study.eu (approccio multifattoriale basato su prove scientifiche e su modelli comportamentali per capire e promuovere attività divertenti e ludiche e un'alimentazione sana in ambito prescolare come pure interventi politici allo scopo di prevenire l'obesità nella prima infanzia); http://www.preview.ning.com (prevenzione del diabete grazie a uno studio di intervento sugli stili di vita e a studi sulla popolazione in Europa e nel mondo); http://www.theobelixproject.org (interferenti endocrini obesogenici: rapporto tra l'esposizione prenatale e lo sviluppo dell'obesità più tardi nella vita); http://www.i.familystudy.eu (determinanti dei comportamenti alimentari dei bambini e degli adolescenti europei e dei loro genitori).

([5]) http://www.pleasure-fp7.com (nuovi approcci alla produzione di nuovi alimenti a basso contenuto di grassi, zuccheri e sale).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012410/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(31 October 2013)

Subject: Bad diets and the associated health risks for people in Europe

Researchers at the University of Edinburgh have published in the *European Journal of Cancer Prevention* a study which examines the effects on health of some 170 different types of foods, including fruit, vegetables, meat and fish, and a number of high-calorie snacks, such as chocolate, crisps and fizzy drinks.

The results of the study confirm the health risks associated with lack of physical exercise, but also raise new concerns over sugary and fatty snacks, which children in particular tend to consume in large quantities.

The scientists used data from the Scottish Colorectal Cancer Study to confirm the damaging effects of the 'western' diet, which is high in meat, sugar and fat and brings with it an increased risk of bowel cancer.

1. Does the Commission intend to have further research carried out and invest in projects designed to determine whether there is in fact a link between unhealthy foods and cancer?

2. Does the Commission intend to launch a campaign to raise awareness in Europe of the importance of a healthy diet?

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

The 2007 Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health Issues ([1]) promotes a balanced diet and active lifestyles among EU citizens and is implemented through the High Level Group for Nutrition and Physical Activity ([2]) and the EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health ([3]).

Recently, the High Level Group for Nutrition and Physical Activity started to develop an action plan to address childhood obesity, which will cover the period 2014-2020.

The Commission has also launched pilot projects that aim to promote healthy diets among pregnant women, children and elderly, and to increase the consumption of fresh fruit and vegetables in local communities where the household income is below 50% of the EU average.

The European Code against Cancer developed by the Commission and the International Agency for Research on Cancer, recommends increasing the daily intake and variety of vegetables and fruits, to eat at least five servings daily and to limit the intake of foods containing fats from animal sources. The Code is currently being revised and will be published in early 2014.

Under the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7; 2007-2013), the Commission has invested EUR 80 million in research projects to better understand the relationship between diet, lifestyle and health across the lifespan ([4]) and to develop new food products with a low content of sugar, salt and fat ([5]) (EUR 6 million), or to support research on the links between diet and cancer development as well as on the molecular mechanisms underlying the effects of food on health.

Horizon 2020 will continue to explore food and diet as the main factors for promoting and sustaining health and for reducing the risk of diseases development.

([1]) COM(2007) 279.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_en.htm
([4]) http://www.neurofast.eu(The integrated Neurobiology of food intake, addiction and stress); http://www.full4health.eu (understanding food-gut-brain mechanisms across the lifespan in the regulation of hunger ad satiety for health); http://www.eatwellproject.eu (Interventions to promote healthy eating habits: evaluations and recommendations).
http:/www.project-earlynutrition.eu (long-terms effects of early Nutrition on later health); http://www.toybox-study.eu (Multifactorial evidence based approach using behavioural models in understanding and promoting fun, healthy food, play ad policy for the prevention of obesity in early childhood; http://www.preview.ning.com (prevention of diabetes through lifestyle intervention and population studies in Europe ad around the world; http://www.theobelixproject.org (Obesogenic endocrine disrupting chemicals: linking prenatal exposure to the development of obesity later in life; http://www.i.familystudy.eu (Determinants of eating behaviour in European children, adolescents and their parents).
([5]) http://www.pleasure-fp7.com (Novel processing approach to develop new products low in fat, sugar and salt).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-012412/13
alla Commissione
Salvatore Caronna (S&D)
(4 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Presunta delocalizzazione dell'impresa Electrolux

Mentre l'Europa attraversa la più grave recessione degli ultimi decenni, l'industria dell'elettrodomestico è coinvolta in una massiccia trasformazione di mercato anche a seguito di un dimezzamento dei volumi di produzione.

La multinazionale svedese Electrolux ha lasciato intendere per l'immediato futuro alcune scelte strategiche che la condurranno ad una delocalizzazione nei territori della Polonia e dell'Ungheria.

Qualora tali scelte fossero confermate, le conseguenze occupazionali in molti comuni del nord-est Italia sarebbero drammatiche.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

— In che misura intende sostenere il settore degli elettrodomestici soprattutto in quei Paesi, come l'Italia, che non sono competitivi sotto il profilo della pressione fiscale e dei trattamenti retributivi e previdenziali, ma che sono all'avanguardia in materia di innovazione e tutela e diritti dei lavoratori?

— Intende essa verificare se il trasferimento di produzione, nello specifico in Polonia e in Ungheria, avverrà sulla base di aiuti di Stato assegnati da qualche autorità pubblica?

— Intende essa approfondire la legittimità di tali eventuali aiuti di Stato ai sensi del diritto dell'UE, in particolare in relazione alle regole che disciplinano la concorrenza?

Risposta di Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione
(3 dicembre 2013)

1) La Commissione è a conoscenza del problema della delocalizzazione della produzione. Nell'ambito della politica industriale europea, la Commissione ha preparato misure politiche volte a migliorare il contesto imprenditoriale riducendo gli oneri amministrativi, agevolando l'accesso ai finanziamenti, migliorando e accelerando il funzionamento della pubblica amministrazione e aprendo i mercati, affinché l'Europa considerata nel suo insieme e i singoli Stati membri diventino una destinazione attraente per la produzione e gli investimenti. La Commissione ha condotto un'analisi approfondita dell'economia italiana e ha espresso il suo parere al riguardo ([1]).

2) A parte qualche eccezione ([2]), gli Stati membri possono concedere aiuti di Stato solo dopo aver notificato tutte le nuove misure di aiuto alla Commissione. La Commissione valuta le eventuali misure connesse alla delocalizzazione dell'impresa notificate dagli Stati membri interessati o le altre informazioni eventualmente ricevute in merito ad aiuti concessi senza la sua autorizzazione preliminare.

3) Se riceve una notifica o una denuncia, la Commissione procede anzitutto a una valutazione della misura per decidere se costituisca un aiuto di Stato ai sensi dell'articolo 107, paragrafo 1, del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea (TFUE). Se la misura costituisce effettivamente un aiuto di Stato, la Commissione valuta anche la compatibilità dell'aiuto con le norme in materia di aiuti di Stato.

([1]) Raccomandazione del Consiglio sul programma nazionale di riforma 2013 dell'Italia e che formula un parere del Consiglio sul programma di stabilità dell'Italia 2012-2017; esame approfondito per l'Italia, SWD(2013)118 def. I risultati e le politiche degli Stati membri in tema di competitività nel 2012, SWD(2012)298.

([2]) Un'eccezione importante è costituita dagli aiuti (ad esempio quelli a finalità regionale) concessi alle condizioni definite dal regolamento generale di esenzione per categoria (regolamento (CE) n. 800/2008 della Commissione, del 6 agosto 2008, che dichiara alcune categorie di aiuti compatibili con il mercato comune in applicazione degli articoli 87 e 88 del trattato, GU L 214 del 9.8.2008).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012412/13
to the Commission
Salvatore Caronna (S&D)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: Suspected relocation of Electrolux

While Europe is experiencing the most serious recession in recent decades, the domestic appliances industry is witnessing a massive transformation of the market, partly because the volume produced is being halved.

The Swedish multinational Electrolux has indicated that it intends to take a number of strategic decisions in the immediate future which will involve relocation to Poland and Hungary.

If these decisions were to be confirmed, the impact on employment in many places in north-eastern Italy would be serious.

To what extent will the Commission support the domestic appliances industry, particularly in those countries such as Italy which are not competitive because of the tax burden and differing approaches to wages and social insurance but which are in the vanguard as regards innovation and protection of workers' rights?

Will the Commission check whether the relocation of production, specifically to Poland and Hungary, is to be based on state aid allocated by some public authority?

Will the Commission check the legitimacy of any such state aid in the light of EC law, with particular reference to competition rules?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2013)

1) The Commission is well aware of the issue of production relocation. Within the framework of European industrial policy, the Commission has prepared policy measures to improve the business environment by reducing the administrative burden, facilitating access to finance, improving and speeding up public administration, and opening up markets so that Europe as a whole and each of its Member States would be an attractive location for production and investment. The Commission has exhaustively analysed the Italian economy and provided its opinion in this regard ([1]).

2) With some exceptions ([2]), Member States may only grant state aid subject to prior notification of all new aid measures to the Commission. The Commission will assess the measures related to the relocation of the company, if any, if they are notified by the Member States concerned or if it receives other information concerning aid granted without prior Commission authorisation.

3) If it receives a notification or a complaint, the Commission will first assess any measure to decide whether it involves state aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). In case a measure is indeed state aid, the Commission will also assess whether the aid is compatible with the state aid rules.

([1]) Council Recommendation on Italy's 2013 national reform programme and delivering a Council opinion on Italy's stability programme for 2012-2017; In-depth review for Italy, SWD(2013) 118 final; Member States competitiveness performance and policies 2012, SWD(2012) 298.

([2]) An important exception is aid (for example regional aid) granted under the conditions established by the General Block Exemption Regulation (Commission Regulation (EC) No 800/2008 of 6 August 2008 declaring certain categories of aid compatible with the common market in application of Articles 87 and 88 of the Treaty (General block exemption Regulation) OJ L 214, 9.8.2008.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012413/13
aan de Commissie
Catherine Bearder (ALDE), Chris Davies (ALDE) en Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)
(4 november 2013)

Betreft: Squaleen

Squaleen heeft een natuurlijke antioxiderende en bevochtigende werking; het is aan te treffen in sommige groenten maar meestal wordt het gewonnen uit diepzeehaaien die een hoog gehalte daarvan in hun lever hebben, waardoor zij de hoge waterdruk op grote zeediepte kunnen weerstaan. Squaleen wordt inmiddels veel gebruikt als ingrediënt voor cosmetische producten, van lippenbalsem en huidbevochtiger tot zonnecrème.

Dit heeft tot een toename van de haaienvangst geleid; elk jaar worden er duizenden haaien gedood, waaronder ook de diepzeesoorten die toch al bedreigd zijn. Omdat er ook plantaardige bronnen zijn voor squaleen is deze slachting niet nodig. Het probleem wordt nog vergroot doordat er geen sprake is van duidelijke etikettering waaruit de consument kan opmaken of hij squaleen koopt uit haaienlever of van plantaardige herkomst.

De situatie is des te urgenter wanneer men bedenkt dat de haaien van deze soort meer tijd nodig hebben om zich voort te planten en het dus tientallen jaren kan duren voordat zij hun oude aantallen weer hebben bereikt.

Is dit een situatie die de Commissie in het oog houdt wegens de bedreiging van deze soort? Bestaan er ook plannen voor zodanige wijziging van de etiketteringvoorschriften voor cosmetische producten dat de consument kan uitmaken of het squaleen dat deze bevatten, van dierlijke of plantaardige herkomst is?

Antwoord van de heer Mimica namens de Commissie
(23 december 2013)

De Commissie verwijst de geachte Parlementsleden naar haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-011224/2013 ([1]).

De Commissie herinnert er tevens aan dat Verordening (EU) nr. 1262/2012 van de Raad tot vaststelling, voor 2013 en 2014, van de vangstmogelijkheden voor EU-vaartuigen voor bepaalde bestanden van diepzeevissen (PB L 356 van 22.12.2013) een totaal toegestane vangst (TAC) van nul vaststelt voor alle soorten diepzeehaaien in EU-wateren en internationale wateren van het noordoostelijke gedeelte van de Atlantische Oceaan.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/nl/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012413/13
to the Commission
Catherine Bearder (ALDE), Chris Davies (ALDE) and Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: Squalene

Squalene is a natural antioxidant and moisturiser that can be produced from vegetables but is more commonly extracted from deep sea sharks who have high quantities of the substance in their livers so as to withstand the atmospheric pressure of living deep under the sea. Squalene has become a very common ingredient in cosmetics ranging from lip balm to moisturiser to sun screen.

This has led to increased shark hunting, causing thousands to be killed each year, including many deep water species that are already under threat. The fact that there are plant-derived sources of squalene makes this slaughter needless. The problem is exacerbated by the lack of clear labelling indicating to consumers whether they are buying products with shark- or plant-derived squalene.

The situation can be seen as even more urgent when one realises that these species of sharks take a long time to reproduce and it may therefore take decades before previous numbers are restored.

Is this a situation that the Commission is monitoring in relation to endangered species numbers? Are there any plans to modify the rules regarding the labelling of cosmetics so consumers know if the squalene they contain is sourced from animals or plants?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(23 December 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answer to Question E-011224/2013 ([1]).

The Commission would also like to recall that Council Regulation (EU) No 1262/2012 fixing for 2013 and 2014 the fishing opportunities for EU vessels for certain deep-sea fish stocks (OJ L 356 of 22.12.2013) establishes a zero total allowable catch (TAC) for all deep-sea sharks in EU waters and in international waters of the North-East Atlantic.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012419/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(4 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ύποπτες χρηματοδοτήσεις στη Γερμανία

Σύμφωνα με πληροφορίες του γερμανικού περιοδικού SPIEGEL και σχετικές αναφορές στην ιστοσελίδα του Γερμανικού Κοινοβουλίου, γερμανική αυτοκινητοβιομηχανία χορήγησε το ποσό των 690 000 ευρώ στο κυβερνών Χριστιανοδημοκρατικό Κόμμα της Γερμανίας, με σκοπό η Γερμανική Κυβέρνηση να μπλοκάρει απόφαση της ΕΕ με την οποία θα περιοριζόταν η εκπομπή καυσαερίων των αυτοκινήτων. Πρόκειται για σοβαρούς ισχυρισμούς που αγγίζουν καίρια θέματα δεοντολογίας, και μάλιστα σε μια χώρα με ηγετικό ρόλο στην Ένωση.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι σε γνώση της οι πιο πάνω πληροφορίες και προτίθεται να ερευνήσει κατά πόσον αληθεύουν;

2. Σε περίπτωση που αληθεύουν, θεωρεί ότι εγείρονται θέματα ύποπτης διαπλοκής, διαφθοράς ή πολιτικής δεοντολογίας;

3. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει ώστε, ως θέμα αρχής, να παταχθούν τέτοια φαινόμενα στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ;

Απάντηση του κ. Šefčovič εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(13 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

Είναι τακτική της Επιτροπής να μη σχολιάζει δημοσιεύματα που εμφανίζονται στον Τύπο.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012419/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: Suspicious funding in Germany

According to an article in the German magazine *Spiegel* and information on the German Parliament website, a German automotive manufacturer has donated the sum of EUR 690 000 to the ruling Christian Democrat party in Germany, in a bid to get the German Government to block an EU decision limiting vehicle exhaust emissions. These are serious allegations concerning crucial questions of ethics, especially in a country which plays a leading role in the Union.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Has the above information comes to its attention and does it intend to investigate whether or not it is true?

2. If it is true, does it consider that questions of suspicious connections, corruption and political ethics have arisen?

3. What does it intend to do, as a matter of principle, in order to stamp out such problems in the EU Member States?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2013)

It is Commission policy not to comment on articles which appear in the press.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012424/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(4 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Η Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία έχει καταστεί αποικία της «προστάτιδος» μητέρας-πατρίδας Τουρκίας

Πρόσφατο άρθρο με τον τίτλο «Υπέρ του εποικισμού: Ζήτημα επιλογής», που δημοσιεύθηκε από την τουρκική εφημερίδα Hürriyet Daily News (επιγραμμικά, στις 28 Οκτωβρίου 2013) αναφέρει ότι το κατεχόμενο τμήμα της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας έχει καταστεί αποικία της «προστάτιδος» μητέρας-πατρίδας Τουρκίας.

Το άρθρο αναφέρει ότι «η "νέα Τουρκία" δεν κατανοεί» τι είναι ένας μακροχρόνιος εφιάλτης για τους περισσότερους Τουρκοκυπρίους, ενώ η «παλαιά Τουρκία» είχε πλήρη συνείδηση αυτών των ευαισθησιών αλλά ήταν απρόθυμη να τις αναγνωρίσει και να τις σεβασθεί, διότι «προτεραιότητα έχουν πάντα τα συμφέροντα της Τουρκίας». Ο δημοσιογράφος συνεχίζει λέγοντας ότι, ακόμη και πολλοί «παλαιοί Τουρκοκύπριοι», οι οποίοι μοιράζονται πολύ ισχυρούς δεσμούς ευγνωμοσύνης απέναντι στην «μητέρα-πατρίδα» τους, νιώθουν ότι η προστασία των συμφερόντων της Τουρκίας έχει πάντοτε προτεραιότητα έναντι της προστασίας των τουρκοκυπριακών συμφερόντων.

Πρώην Τούρκος υπουργός στη Βόρειο Κύπρο εκμυστηρεύτηκε ότι, κατά τη διάρκεια της θητείας του αισθανόταν σαν Βρετανός γενικός διοικητής σε νησιωτική αποικία. Πέραν των διαμαρτυριών που οργανώνονται συχνά από μια χούφτα Τουρκοκυπρίων έξω από την τουρκική πρεσβεία, οι Τουρκοκύπριοι κατέβηκαν δύο φορές στους δρόμους κατά τα τελευταία χρόνια, προκειμένου να καταδικάσουν τις αυταρχικές και όντως δικτατορικές συμπεριφορές της τουρκικής κυβέρνησης και την αλαζονική γλώσσα που χρησιμοποιεί ο Πρωθυπουργός Recep Tayyip Erdoğan κατά των Τουρκοκυπρίων.

1. Είναι σε γνώση της Επιτροπής αυτή η αλαζονική και δικτατορική στάση που επιδεικνύει η Τουρκία έναντι τόσο των Τουρκοκυπρίων όσο και των Ελληνοκυπρίων;

2. Ποια μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει η Επιτροπή για να διασφαλίσει ότι τέτοιου είδους στάσεις δεν θα επικρατήσουν και δεν θα επηρεάσουν τις επερχόμενες ειρηνευτικές συνομιλίες μεταξύ Ελληνοκυπρίων και Τουρκοκυπρίων;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στην απάντησή της στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-011122/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/eL/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012424/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: The Republic of Cyprus has become a colony of its 'protector' motherland Turkey

A recent article entitled 'Pro-settlement: A matter of choice' published by the Turkish Hürriyet Daily News (online, 28 October 2013) claims that the occupied part of the Republic of Cyprus has become a colony of its 'protector' motherland Turkey.

The article states that 'the "new Turkey" would not understand' what is a long-lived nightmare for most Turkish Cypriots, whereas the 'old Turkey' was fully aware of such sensitivities but reluctant to recognise and respect them because 'the interests of Turkey should always come first.' The reporter goes on to say that even most of the 'old Turkish Cypriots', who shared very strong bonds of gratitude towards their 'Motherland', felt that defending Turkey's interests was always a priority over defending Turkish Cypriot interests.

A former Turkish ambassador to northern Cyprus confessed that throughout his tenure he had felt like a British governor general on an island colony. In addition to the protests staged frequently by a handful of Turkish Cypriots in front of the Turkish embassy, Turkish Cypriots took to the streets en masse twice in recent years to condemn the bossy and indeed dictatorial attitudes of the Turkish Government and the arrogant language used by Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan against Turkish Cypriots.

1. Is the Commission aware of this arrogant and dictatorial attitude which Turkey displays towards both Turkish and Greek Cypriots?

2. What measures does the Commission intend to take to ensure that such attitudes will not prevail and affect the forthcoming peace talks between Greek and Turkish Cypriots?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(6 January 2014)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to previous Written Question E-011122/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012426/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(4 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Occultamento di ingenti quantità di rifiuti pericolosi e tossiconocivi in Italia e secretazione di importanti informazioni in materia ambientale da parte delle autorità italiane

Il 31 ottobre 2013 l'ufficio di presidenza della Camera dei Deputati italiana ha reso pubblico il verbale della «Commissione parlamentare d'inchiesta sul ciclo dei rifiuti e sulle attività illecite ad esso connesse» relativo ad una audizione del pentito di mafia Carmine Schiavone risalente al 7 ottobre del 1997.

Il verbale che mette in luce una circostanziata denuncia di occultamento illegale e sistematico di rifiuti (pericolosi, radioattivi, speciali, urbani, ospedalieri, ecc.) comprende documenti allegati utili ad individuare siti di interramento dei rifiuti avvenuti nelle regioni italiane di Campania, Lazio e Molise.

Da informazioni riportate dai mezzi di informazione si parla di 800 000 tonnellate di rifiuti occultati illegalmente anche se si potrebbe trattare di diversi milioni che risulterebbero essere arrivati dal nord Italia, Austria e Germania.

Secondo l'Istituto di Ricerche Economiche e Sociali IRES da fine anni Novanta ad oggi i clan della camorra hanno sversato, solo nel litorale domizio 341 000 tonnellate di rifiuti speciali pericolosi, 160 000 di rifiuti speciali non pericolosi e 350 000 di immondizia urbana.

Secondo l'ISDE (Associazione medici per l'ambiente) nelle aree colpite da questa attività illecita da tempo si registra un notevole aumento di casi di cancro, in determinate zone addirittura anche del 300 %, aumento dovuto a sostanze pericolose contenute nei rifiuti tossiconocivi e pericolosi smaltiti illegalmente.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

— È al corrente dello smaltimento illegale dei suddetti rifiuti e quali azioni intende intraprendere affinché in Italia vengano rispettate le normative sulla tutela della salute e della falda acquifera e sui rifiuti e le bonifiche?

— Può essa riferire se la secretazione durata ben 16 anni da parte delle autorità italiane di tale verbale, contenente importantissime informazioni di carattere ambientale che prontamente utilizzate avrebbero potuto limitare i rischi alla salute e ridurre l'inquinamento del suolo e della falda acquifera, risulti conforme alle norme dell'UE in materia di rifiuti, trasparenza delle informazioni in tema ambientale, tutela delle acque e tutela della salute?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(7 gennaio 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza del problema relativo allo smaltimento illegale di rifiuti in Italia e ha intrapreso un'azione in proposito.

Nel quadro della procedura di infrazione 2007/2195 relativa alla gestione dei rifiuti in Campania, la Commissione ha sollevato la questione dello smaltimento illegale di rifiuti pericolosi, in particolare nelle province di Napoli e Caserta. Secondo le informazioni fornite alla Commissione, nel novembre 2012 il governo italiano ha nominato un commissario straordinario per il coordinamento delle azioni volte a prevenire lo smaltimento illegale di rifiuti e a porvi rimedio.

Inoltre, nel quadro della procedura di infrazione 2003/2077 relativa alle discariche abusive su tutto il territorio italiano, nell'aprile 2013 la Commissione ha adito per la seconda volta la Corte di giustizia a norma dell'articolo 260 del TFUE, proponendo ammende nei confronti dell'Italia.

La Commissione non è in grado di stabilire se la pubblicazione tardiva del verbale dell'audizione della commissione parlamentare abbia avuto qualche conseguenza sugli sforzi del governo italiano di individuare e bonificare i siti. Il ritardo nella pubblicazione non costituisce una violazione delle normativa dell'UE in materia di rifiuti o di accesso alle informazioni di carattere ambientale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012426/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: Concealment of massive amounts of hazardous and harmful toxic waste in Italy and non-disclosure of important environmental information by the Italian authorities

On 31 October 2013, the Bureau of the Italian Chamber of Deputies published the minutes of a hearing of the Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry into the Waste Cycle and Related Illegal Activities held on 7 October 1997 with mafia turncoat, Carmine Schiavone.

The minutes, which set out a detailed exposé of the illegal and systematic concealment of waste (hazardous, radioactive, special, urban, hospital, etc.), contain attached documents which help to pinpoint sites where waste was buried in the regions of Campania, Lazio and Molise in Italy.

According to media reports, 800 000 tonnes of waste have been illegally concealed, although the figure may actually be several million tonnes, allegedly from northern Italy, Austria and Germany.

Italy's Economic and Social Research Institute (IRES) claims that since the late 1990s, Camorra clans have dumped 341 000 tonnes of hazardous special waste, 160 000 tonnes of non-hazardous special waste and 350 000 tonnes of urban waste along the Domitian coast alone.

According to the International Society of Doctors for the Environment (ISDE), cancer cases have been rising sharply for some time — by 300% in certain places — in the areas affected by this illegal activity. This increase is due to the dangerous substances in harmful toxic and hazardous waste which is dumped illegally.

Is the Commission aware of the illegal dumping of the above waste and what action will it take so that regulations on the protection of health and the water table and on waste and land reclamation are complied with in Italy?

These minutes contain extremely important environmental information which, if used immediately, could have limited health risks and reduced ground and water table pollution. Can it state whether the Italian authorities' failure to disclose them for the past 16 years complies with EU rules on waste, transparency of environmental information, the protection of water and of health?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(7 January 2014)

The Commission is aware of the problem of illegal disposal of waste in Italy and has taken legal action on this issue.

In the framework of infringement procedure 2007/2195, concerning waste management in Campania, the Commission has raised the issue of the illegal disposal of hazardous waste, in particular in the Naples and Caserta provinces. According to the information provided to the Commission, in November 2012, the Italian Government appointed a special commissioner, who has been coordinating the actions aimed at preventing and remedying the illegal disposal of waste.

Furthermore, in the framework of infringement procedure 2003/2077, concerning illegal landfills in the whole Italian territory, in April 2013 the Commission applied to the EU Court of Justice for the second time, under Art. 260 TFEU, proposing fines against Italy.

The Commission is not able to establish whether late publication of the minutes from the hearing of the Parliamentary Committee has affected the efforts of the Italian Government to identify and clean the sites. The delay in the publication does not consitute a breach of EU rules on waste or access to environmental information.

(Eestikeelne versioon)

Kirjalikult vastatav küsimus E-012427/13
komisjonile (asepresident / kõrge esindaja)
Tunne Kelam (PPE)
(4. november 2013)

Teema: VP/HR — inimõiguste olukord Kasahstanis

Kasahstani opositsiooniaktivist ja registreerimata opositsioonipartei Alga! juht Vladimir Kozlov kannab hetkel seitsme ja poole aastast vanglakaristust Petropavlovskis asuvas kinnipidamisasutuses. Vastavalt Kasahstani Vabariigi kriminaalmenetluse seadustiku artiklile 68 peaks süüdimõistetud isik kandma karistust oma vahistamiseelse viimase elukoha piirkonna kinnipidamiskohas. Sellest hoolimata paigutati Vladimir Kozlov oma viimasest elukohast Almatõst kaugel asuvasse kinnipidamisasutusse.

Kozlovi perekonna elukoha Almatõ ja Petropavlovski vahelise pika vahemaa ning keeruliste talviste ilmaolude tõttu on Kozlovi viiendat kuud lapseootel naisel Aliya Turusbekoval peagi võimatu oma abikaasat külastada. Seetõttu ei ole Kozlovil Petropavlovskis karistust kandes võimalik näha oma naist ega varsti sündivat last, kuigi tal on selleks õigus.

Peale selle väljendan muret Vladimir Kozlovi tervise pärast. Mind on teavitatud, et tal on mitmeid terviseprobleeme, sh tugev valu paremas puusaliigeses ning kõrge vererõhk, mis võib viia rabanduseni. Rahvusvahelised õigusorganisatsioonid mõistavad hukka asjaolu, et Vladimir Kozlovile ei võimaldata vajaminevat nõuetekohast arstiabi.

Võttes arvesse eespool nimetatud argumente, Vladimir Kozlovi perekonna erilist olukorda ning samuti Kasahstani Vabariigi presidendi Nursultan Nazarbayevi viimastel kuudel edendatud perekonda toetavat poliitikat, küsin kõrgelt esindajalt ja Euroopa välisteenistuselt, kas neil on olnud võimalust Kozloviga kinnipidamisasutuses kohtuda, et tema tervisliku seisundit hinnata.

Kas Euroopa Välisteenistus võtab meetmeid, et võimaldada Kozlovi üleviimine Petropavlovskist mõnda teise kinnipidamisasutusse, mis asuks lähemal tema viimatisele elukohale ja tema naise Aliya Turusbekova praegusele elukohale?

Komisjoni nimel vastanud Euroopa Liidu välisasjade ja julgeolekupoliitika kõrge esindaja ning komisjoni asepresident Ashton
(17. detsember 2013)

EL jälgib Vladimir Kozlovi juhtumit tähelepanelikult eelkõige oma Astana delegatsiooni abil, viibides kohtuasja arutamisel menetluse kõikides etappides. Pärast otsust härra Kozlovi kohtuasjas 2012. aasta oktoobris tegi liidu välisasjade ja julgeolekupoliitika kõrge esindaja ja komisjoni asepresident avalduse, milles väljendas muret karistuse ja kohtumenetluste mitme kitsaskoha üle. Delegatsioon jälgis edasikaebuse käiku Astana Ülemkohtus 2013. aasta augustis, mille järel väljendas liidu välisasjade ja julgeolekupoliitika kõrge esindaja ja komisjoni asepresidendi pressiesindaja pressikonverentsil sügavat pettumust tulemuse üle.

Delegatsioon suhtleb pidevalt härra Kozlovi abikaasa Alija Turusebkovaga ning kohtus temaga pärast edasikaebuse arutamist Ülemkohtus. Lisaks külastas kohalik inimõiguste järelevalvekomitee härra Kozlovi praeguses kinnipidamiskohas E-164/4 2013. aasta juunis. ELi delegatsioon kavatseb tõhustada oma jõupingutusi seoses vanglakülastuste ja kohtumõistmise jälgimisega ning on välja töötanud projektid, mis võimaldavad sellesse edaspidi kaasata inimõiguste kaitsjaid. Härra Kozlovi juhtumi jälgimisel on ELi delegatsioon teinud koostööd mitmete valitsusväliste organisatsioonidega, sealhulgas Kasahstani rahvusvahelise inimõiguste ja õigusriigi büroo, Aman-Saulõki ja teistega.

EL jätkab nii ametlike kui ka mitteametlike võimaluste kasutamist, et innustada Kasahstani täitma oma rahvusvahelisi kohustusi, eriti seoses kinnipeetavate õigustega, sealhulgas arstiabi tagamisega vanglates. Lisaks sellele kasutab EL peagi algavat ELi-Kasahstani inimõigustealast dialoogi, et juhtida ametiasutuste tähelepanu Kasahstani asjaomastele kohustustele.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012427/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Tunne Kelam (PPE)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Human Rights Situation in Kazakhstan

Vladimir Kozlov, the Kazakh opposition activist and leader of the unregistered opposition party Alga!, is currently serving a term of 7.5 years in a detention facility in Petropavlovsk. According to Article 68 of the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Republic of Kazakhstan, a convicted person should serve his/her sentence in a colony within the area of his/her last residence prior to his/her arrest. However, Vladimir Kozlov has been placed in a facility far away from his last place of residence, Almaty.

The long distance between Almaty, where Kozlov's family lives, and Petropavlovsk, as well as the difficult weather conditions in winter, will soon make it impossible for Mr Kozlov's wife, Aliya Turusbekova, who is in her fifth month of pregnancy, to visit her husband. Serving his term in Petropavlovsk, it will therefore be impossible for Mr Kozlov to meet his wife and soon-to-be-born child, as is his right.

Furthermore, I would like to express my concerns about Vladimir Kozlov's health. I have been informed that he suffers from numerous health problems, including a severe pain in his right hip joint and problems with high blood pressure which could lead to a stroke. International rights organisations condemn the fact that Vladimir Kozlov is not receiving the proper medical care that he needs.

Taking into account the aforementioned arguments and the specific circumstances of Vladimir Kozlov's family, as well as the pro-family policy promoted in recent months by the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, I would like to ask the High Representative and the EEAS whether they have had a chance to meet with Mr Kozlov in the detention facility so as to ascertain his state of health.

Is the EEAS taking any action in order to facilitate the transfer of Mr Kozlov from the detention facility in Petropavlovsk to another detention facility closer to his last place of residence and the current place of residence of his wife, Aliya Turusbekova?

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

The EU, particularly through its Delegation in Astana, closely monitors the case of Mr Vladimir Kozlov, including through presence at the trials in all instances. Following the outcome of the trial of Mr Kozlov in October 2012, the spokesperson of HR/VP made a statement to express concern with the sentence and several shortcomings in the judicial process. The Delegation has monitored the appeal at the Supreme Court in Astana in August 2013, which was followed by the expression of deep disappointment with the result in the press briefing by the Spokesperson of the HR/VP.

The Delegation maintains constant contact with Mr Kozlov's spouse, Mrs Aliya Turusebkova and met with Mrs Turusbekova following the Supreme Court hearing on the appeal. In addition, the local Public Monitoring Committee visited Mr Kozlov in the current place of confinement E-164/4 in June 2013. The EU Delegation plans to intensify its efforts with regard to prison visits and trial monitoring and has developed projects allowing for further involvement of human rights defenders in this regard. In monitoring Mr Kozlov's case the EU Delegation has worked with several non-governmental organisations (NGOs), including the Kazakh International Bureau for Human Rights and Rule of Law, Aman Saulyk and others

The EU continues to use both formal and informal opportunities to encourage Kazakhstan to respect its international commitments, notably with regard to rights of convicts, including ensuring medical assistance in prisons. Furthermore, the EU will use the forum provided by the approaching EU-Kazakhstan Human Rights Dialogue to bring to the attention of the authorities Kazakhstan's commitments in this regard.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012428/13
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: Number of European arrest warrants implemented

Could the Commission advise me of the total number of European arrest warrants (EAW) served in the UK to date, and a list of the Member States where these warrants originated?

Could the Commission also advise me of the number of EAWs served at the behest of the UK Government, and a list of those Member States where the warrants originated?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(20 December 2013)

The source of EU-level statistical data on the European arrest warrant (EAW) is the information provided yearly by Member States, including the UK, to the Council in response to the questions in the questionnaire on quantitative information on the practical operation of the European arrest warrant.

To date, this data has been provided by Member States for the years 2005 to 2012 and has been collated by the Council Secretariat in the following Council documents: 9005/5/06 COPEN 52; 11371/5/07 COPEN 106; 10330/2/08 COPEN 116; 9743/4/09 COPEN 87; 7551/7/10 COPEN 64; 9120/2/11 COPEN 83; 9200/7/12 COPEN 97; 7196/3/13 COPEN 34. The Honourable Member will see that the UK has furnished data for 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2010, 2011 but none for 2008 and none to date for 2012. The data provided covers the numbers of EAWs issued and received by the Member States' judicial authorities as well as statistical data on a range of other issues. It does not however capture the origin of each warrant.

Following a Commission initiative, a revised questionnaire — addressing some of the shortcomings identified in the previous format — has been agreed by Member States and will be used for the data from 2014 onwards, which will be collected by the Commission. The revised questionnaire is set out in Council document 11356/12 COPEN 97.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012429/13
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: Supremacy of EC law

Could the Commission clarify in which areas EC law is supreme over national law?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(28 November 2013)

The Intergovernmental Conference which adopted the Treaty of Lisbon recalled in Declaration (No 17) concerning primacy, annexed to the Final Act of that Conference, that 'in accordance with settled case law of the Court of justice of the European Union, the Treaties and the law adopted by the Union on the basis of the Treaties have primacy over the law of the Member States, under the conditions laid down by the said case law'.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys P-012430/13
komissiolle (Varapuheenjohtajalle / Korkealle edustajalle)
Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE)
(4. marraskuuta 2013)

Aihe: VP/HR – EU:n edustuston avaaminen Iraniin

Neuvoston vuosittaisesta selvityksestä Euroopan parlamentille yhteisestä ulko- ja turvallisuuspolitiikasta 24. lokakuuta 2013 antamassaan päätöslauselmassa parlamentti kehotti tarkastelemaan uudelleen EU:n edustustojen infrastruktuurin jakoa ja henkilöstöä, jotta varmistetaan, että unionin tehokkuus, näkyvyys ja edustus kolmansissa maissa vastaa sen poliittisia tavoitteita ja odotettavissa olevia prioriteetteja. Lisäksi on merkittävää, että parlamentti muistutti EU:n edustuston avaamista Iraniin koskevasta vaatimuksestaan. Se on nyt antanut kyseisen suosituksen kahtena peräkkäisenä vuotena. Samaan aikaan Yhdistynyt kuningaskunta ja Iran ovat lehdistötietojen mukaan ottaneet merkittävän askeleen kohti Teheranissa ja Lontoossa sijaitsevien ulkomaanedustustojensa toiminnan jatkamista asiainhoitajien tasolla.

Onko jäsenvaltioita kuultu EU:n kokonaisvaltaisesta lähestymistavasta Iraniin (kuten parlamentin mietinnöissä ja päätöslauselmissa edellytetään)?

Onko nykyisestä tilanteesta keskusteltu Teheranissa sijaitsevien EU:n suurlähetystöjen kanssa?

Tekevätkö Euroopan ulkosuhdehallinnon eri osastot minkäänlaista rakenteellista yhteistyötä asioissa, jotka koskevat EU:n suhteita Iraniin?

Korkean edustajan, varapuheenjohtaja Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(3. joulukuuta 2013)

1. Toistaiseksi jäsenvaltioita ei ole kuultu EU:n kokonaisvaltaisesta lähestymistavasta Iraniin. EU:n ja Iranin välisten suhteiden tämänhetkisessä vaiheessa keskustelu mahdollisesta edustuston avaamisesta vaikuttaa ennenaikaiselta.

2. Teheranissa sijaitseva EU:n paikallinen edustusto, josta Kreikka tällä hetkellä vastaa, järjestää säännöllisiä tapaamisia kaikkien EU:n Teheranissa sijaitsevien diplomaattisten edustustojen kanssa keskustellakseen maan poliittisesta ja taloudellisesta kehityksestä, ihmisoikeustilanne mukaan lukien.

3. Euroopan ulkosuhdehallinnossa järjestetään säännöllisesti tapaamisia Iraniin liittyviä asioita käsittelevien eri osastojen välillä, jotta voidaan varmistaa tarvittava toimintapolitiikkojen ja toimien yhteensovittaminen.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012430/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Opening of an EU delegation in Iran

In its resolution of 24 October 2013 on the Annual Report from the Council to the European Parliament on the common foreign and security policy, Parliament calls for a review of the infrastructure distribution and staffing of EU delegations in order to ensure that the Union's efficiency, visibility and representation in third countries reflects its political ambitions and expected priorities. Also, and most importantly, Parliament reiterates its demand for the opening of an EU delegation in Iran, a recommendation it has now made for two consecutive years. Meanwhile, according to press reports, Britain and Iran have taken a significant step toward resuming the work of their respective missions in Tehran and London at the level of chargés d'affaires.

What consultations with Member States, if any, have taken place regarding the EU's comprehensive approach to Iran (as stipulated in Parliament's reports and resolutions)?

Has the current situation been discussed with the EU embassies in Tehran?

Is there any form of structural cooperation between the various departments of the European External Action Service concerning issues pertaining to the EU's relations with Iran?

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

1. Consultations with Member states on an EU comprehensive approach to Iran have not taken place for the time being. At this stage of the relations between Iran and the EU, a discussion on the possible opening of a delegation seems premature.

2. The EU local representation in Tehran, which is currently ensured by Greece, holds regular meetings with all EU diplomatic missions in Tehran to discuss the political and economic developments in the country, including the Human rights situation.

3. Within the EEAS meetings are regularly taking place between the various departments dealing with Iranian issues so as to ensure the necessary coordination of the different policies and actions.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-012431/13
do Komisji
Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D)
(4 listopada 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: System TIR

Pragnę zwrócić uwagę Komisji na tzw. system TIR (Transports Internationaux Routiers) oraz obecne problemy dotyczące transportu drogowego między krajami UE a ich wschodnimi sąsiadami.

W dniu 5 lipca 2013 r. rosyjski Federalny Urząd Celny zamieścił na swojej stronie internetowej informację o jednostronnej decyzji podjętej przez dyrektora tego urzędu Andreja Beljaninowa, zgodnie z którą:

„[…] w celu zagwarantowania terminowego wpływu wszelkich należności celnych do budżetu federalnego od dnia 14 sierpnia 2013 r. obejmowanie towarów procedurą TIR ma miejsce pod warunkiem, że tranzyt celny jest zabezpieczony na mocy środków wskazanych w art. 217 §1 kodeksu celnego unii celnej".

W praktyce skuteczne wdrożenie takiego jednostronnego środka oznaczałoby, że od dnia 14 sierpnia każdy karnet TIR wykorzystywany do transportu towarów na Białoruś, do Federacji Rosyjskiej i Kazachstanu, a także przez te kraje i z tych krajów wymagałby dodatkowej krajowej gwarancji celnej. Koszty takiej gwarancji są znacznie wyższe niż cena gwarancji TIR. Przedsiębiorstwa transportowe zmuszone do nabycia tej dodatkowej gwarancji mogą podjąć decyzję o wstrzymaniu transportu TIR na granicy białoruskiej. Może to doprowadzić do zablokowania granicy UE oraz spowodować spore opóźnienia i dodatkowe koszty dla wszystkich międzynarodowych przedsiębiorstw transportu drogowego.

Ta jednostronna decyzja podjęta przez rosyjski Federalny Urząd Celny jest niezgodna z art. 4 konwencji TIR i stanowi poważne naruszenie art. 42a i art. 48. Co więcej, nowy środek kontroli jest niezgodny z art. 217.2.3 kodeksu celnego Euroazjatyckiej Wspólnoty Gospodarczej (EaWG), który jednoznacznie stanowi, że operacje tranzytowe w ramach porozumień międzynarodowych nie wymagają gwarancji.

Z uwagi na znaczenie systemu TIR dla gospodarki UE i ogromny wpływ, jaki ten nowy środek kontroli z pewnością wywrze na międzynarodowy transport drogowy, pragnę zwrócić się do Komisji o pilne złożenie protestu na ręce właściwych organów Federacji Rosyjskiej, aby doprowadzić do zniesienia owych nowych wymogów w zakresie kontroli. Wszelkie problemy należy w pierwszej kolejności omawiać na szczeblu międzynarodowym, a przed podjęciem decyzji konieczne są konsultacje ze wszystkimi zainteresowanymi stronami.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Algirdasa Šemetę w imieniu Komisji
(2 grudnia 2013 r.)

Komisja podjęła natychmiastowe działania, kiedy otrzymała informacje o decyzji Rosji, by stopniowo zawiesić konwencję TIR i wprowadzić dodatkowe lub alternatywne gwarancje. Członek Komisji odpowiedzialny za podatki i unię celną pozostaje w kontakcie z szefem rosyjskiej FSC ([1]): osobiście i w drodze wymiany listów. Służby Komisji zorganizowały telekonferencję z rosyjskimi organami celnymi oraz misję wyjaśniającą do Moskwy. Ponadto Komisja aktywnie zajmuje się tą kwestią na forach wielostronnych, m.in. skierowano pismo do Sekretarza Wykonawczego EKG ONZ ([2]), powołano specjalną sesję Rady Wykonawczej TIR, jak również przeprowadzono konsultację z Międzynarodowym Związkiem Transportu Drogowego i z państwami trzecimi graniczącymi z Rosją. Działania te były koordynowane z państwami członkowskimi.

W następstwie tych działań FSC zdecydowała się ograniczyć wdrażanie przedmiotowych środków od dnia 14 września 2013 r. do okręgów celnych Syberii i Dalekiego Wschodu oraz wprowadzić je stopniowo w pozostałych regionach do dnia 1 grudnia 2013 r. Komisja uważa przedmiotowe środki za naruszenie zapisów konwencji TIR; należy jednak odnotować, że jeśli na dzień 1 grudnia 2013 r. nie istniałyby żadne krajowe stowarzyszenia poręczające, ocena musiałaby być inna.

([1]) Federalna Służba Celna.
([2]) Europejska Komisja Gospodarcza Organizacji Narodów Zjednoczonych (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe).

W dniu 15 listopada 2013 r. przewodniczący Komisji wystosował pismo do prezydenta Putina, aby wyrazić głębokie zaniepokojenie wdrożeniem zapowiedzianych środków. Komisja będzie w dalszym ciągu podnosić tę kwestię na odpowiednich wielostronnych (tj. przed organami TIR) oraz dwustronnych forach, aby zagwarantować, że zapowiedziane przez Rosję środki będą miały możliwie ograniczony wpływ na podmioty gospodarcze w UE. Problem ten zostanie również omówiony podczas najbliższych spotkań ze stroną rosyjską oraz przy innych odpowiednich okazjach.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012431/13
to the Commission
Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: TIR system

I would like to draw the Commission's attention to the 'TIR system' (Transports Internationaux Routiers) and the current problems regarding transport by road between EU countries and their eastern neighbours.

On 5 July 2013 the Russian Federal Customs Service posted information on its website about a unilateral decision made by its head, Andrey Belyaninov, stating that:

'(…) in order to ensure full and timely payment of customs duties to the Federal budget, starting from 14 August 2013, placement of goods under the TIR procedure shall be performed under the condition that customs transit is secured by measures indicated in Article 217 §1 of the Customs Code of the Customs Union.'

In practice the effective implementation of such a unilateral measure would mean that from 14 August each TIR Carnet used to transport goods to/through/from Belarus, the Russian Federation and Kazakhstan would be subject to an additional national customs guarantee. The cost of such a guarantee is significantly higher than the cost of a TIR guarantee. Transport operators forced to buy this additional guarantee may decide to stop TIR transports at the Belarusian border. This may block the EU border and create long delays and additional costs for all international road transport operators.

This unilateral decision made by the Russian Federal Customs Service does not comply with Article 4 of the TIR Convention and is a serious violation of Article 42 bis and 48. What is more, the new control measure does not comply with Article 217.2.3 of the EurAsEC customs code which clearly stipulates that no guarantee is required for transit operations under international agreements.

Considering the importance of the TIR system for the EU economy and the great influence this new control measure will certainly have on international road transport, I should like to ask the Commission to make urgent representations to the relevant authorities in the Russian Federation in order to cancel these new control requirements. Any problems should first be discussed at international level and all stakeholders should be consulted before any decisions are made.

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(2 December 2013)

The Commission acted promptly when it was informed of Russia's decision to progressively suspend the TIR Convention and introduce additional/alternative guarantees. The Member of the Commission responsible for Taxation and Customs Union has been in contact in person and by exchange of letters with the Head of Russia's FCS ([1]). Commission services organised a teleconference with Russian Customs and a fact-finding mission to Moscow. In addition, the Commission was active in the handling of the issue at multilateral level, which included a letter to the Executive Secretary of the UNECE ([2]), a special session of the TIR Executive Board, as well as consultations with the International Road Transport Union and with non-EU members bordering Russia. These activities were coordinated with Member States.

Subsequently, the FCS decided to limit the implementation of the measures as of 14 September 2013 to the Siberian and Far East customs districts and to introduce them gradually in all other regions by 1 December 2013. The Commission regards these measures as a violation of the TIR Convention; it has to be noted, however, that as of 1 December no national guaranteeing association might exist and that in this case the assessment would have to be different.

([1]) Federal Customs Service.
([2]) United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.

On 15 November 2013 the President of the Commission sent a letter to President Putin to express serious concerns about the implementation of the announced measures. The Commission will continue to raise this issue in the appropriate multilateral (i.e. the TIR bodies) and bilateral fora with a view to ensuring that the impact of these measures for EU operators remains as limited as possible. The issue will also be discussed during upcoming meetings with the Russian side and on other appropriate occasions.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012434/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: Reform of European Arrest Warrant

In light of claims made by several Member States that it wrongly allows the extradition of EU citizens on trivial and uncertain charges, can the Commission please provide details of whether it has any plans to reform the European Arrest Warrant in the future?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(9 January 2014)

The Commission works on a continued basis to improve the European arrest warrant (EAW) system.

In its 2011 Report on the implementation of the EAW Framework Decision ([1]) the Commission stressed the efficiency of the EAW system in comparison to the previous extradition arrangements. While taking note of the EAW's success in providing an efficient way to extradite suspects in a border-free EU, the Commission also acknowledged that its operation needed to improve.

Since then the limitations of the system have been improved by the adoption of Directives on the procedural rights of suspects and accused persons. This was the case of the directives on the interpretation and translation ([2]), on the right to information on rights ([3]) and on the right of access to a lawyer ([4]), all of which have specific provisions on the EAW. The most far-reaching is the directive on the right of access to a lawyer, which reinforces the existing right to a lawyer in the executing state and makes express provision for the right of access to a lawyer in the issuing state. In November 2013 the Commission presented a package of further proposals on proposal rights ([5]) aimed also at strengthening the mutual trust amongst the judiciaries of the Member States to enable mutual recognition instruments such as the EAW to operate smoothly.

The Commission is also working via experts meetings and outreach with Member States on the timely and complete transposition of the framework Decisions that complement and provide alternatives to the EAW, namely, transfer of prisoners ([6]), European supervision order ([7]), probation and alternative sanctions ([8]), in absentia Judgments ([9]) and financial penalties ([10]).

([1]) COM(2011) 175 and SEC(2011) 430 COM.
([2]) Directive 2010/64/EU.
([3]) Directive 2012/13/EU.
([4]) Directive 2013/48/EU.
([5]) COM(2013) 820.
([6]) Framework Decision 2008/909/JHA.
([7]) Framework Decision 2009/829/JHA.
([8]) Framework Decision 2008/947/JHA.
([9]) Framework Decision 2009/299/JHA.
([10]) Framework Decision 2005/214/JHA.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012435/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: Developments in Gibraltar

The UK Ministry of Defence has confirmed that it will make representations to the Spanish Government after a Guardia Civil Patrol boat manoeuvred provocatively in Gibraltarian territorial waters as a Royal Navy vessel was being escorted through the area by the Gibraltar Squadron. The incident resulted in an armed stand-off.

In this context, can the Commission please outline what steps it will take to ensure that the sovereignty of Gibraltar, its territorial waters, and its people is upheld amidst escalating Spanish provocation in the region?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(6 January 2014)

The Commission has no competence as regards the facts mentioned in the question.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012437/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: Cases of lung cancer

In my constituency, Northern Ireland, the Public Health Agency recently confirmed that approximately 900 cases of lung cancer were diagnosed in our region of the United Kingdom every year. Smoking was confirmed as the single biggest factor in 90% of cases.

1. How many EU citizens have died as a result of lung cancer in the past five years? Can the Commission please provide a breakdown of these figures by (a) Member State and (b) age?

2. What steps are being taken at EU level to combat the underlying causes of lung cancer, and most notably, smoking?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(8 January 2014)

In the past five years, over 1.3 million EU citizens died from lung cancer (Malignant neoplasm of larynx, trachea, bronchus and lung). In the annex, the breakdown of death rates is provided by age group and by Member State.

The Commission has developed a series of initiatives to address tobacco smoking. First of all the EU has legislation on the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco products as well as legislation regulating advertising of these products. In this regard, the Commission adopted a proposal to revise and strengthen the Tobacco Products Directive in December 2012 and the co-legislators are finalising an agreement on this proposal which foresees large mandatory photo and text warnings on both sides of the pack of cigarettes and roll-your-own tobacco, and no characterising flavours allowed in these products.

Second, the 2009 Council Recommendation on smoke-free environments calls on Member States to fully protect their citizens from exposure to tobacco smoke by 2012, with a particular emphasis on the dangers of second-hand tobacco smoke for children. In February 2013 the Commission published a report on the implementation of the recommendation.

Third, since 2002, the Commission sponsored wide-ranging information and prevention campaigns related to smoking.

Finally, the European Code against Cancer provides guidelines for citizens on how to prevent certain cancers and increase the chances of cure by adopting a healthier lifestyle and taking part in screening. The first recommendation of the Code addresses the issue of smoking and lung cancer, advising citizens not to smoke. The Code is currently being updated.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012438/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: Strokes affecting young people

A global study incorporating 50 countries recently published in *The Lancet* medical journal has found that, due to rising obesity and diabetes rates, the number of strokes affecting people aged between 20 and 64 has risen by a quarter in 20 years.

The findings also concluded that people in the UK remain more likely to die as a result of a stroke than those in France, Germany or the United States.

1. In the past five years, how many EU citizens aged between 20 and 64 have died directly or indirectly as a result of suffering a stroke? Can the Commission please provide a breakdown of these figures by Member State?

2. What steps are being taken at EU level to combat the underlying causes of strokes among young people, including rising obesity and a lack of exercise?

3. What action will be taken at EU level within the new programming period (2014-2020) to tackle the prevalence of heart disease, including strokes, across the EU?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 January 2014)

The Commission collects yearly data on causes of death ([1]). In the period 2006-2010, nearly 216 000 EU citizens between 20 and 64 years died of stroke. In annex, this data is presented by Member State for the same period.

The 2007 Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health Issues ([2]) promotes a balanced diet and active lifestyles among EU citizens and encourages key stakeholders, through the High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity and the EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health, to develop action to address obesity and the lack of exercise, regarded as underlying causes of stroke.

The EU Health Programme co-funded the project SITS (Safe Implementation of Treatment of Strokes ([3])which has contributed to better access to evidence-based prevention and acute stroke treatment at more clinics in Europe.

One of the objectives of the forthcoming Health Programme 2014-2020 is the promotion of health, the prevention of disease and the support to environments for healthy lifestyles, which enables the EU to continue pursue action in this area.

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/health/public_health/data_public_health/database
([2]) COM(2007) 279.
([3]) www.sitsinternational.org

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012439/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: Flash floods in India

Earlier this month, flash floods swept through the eastern Indian states of Odisha and Andhra Pradesh, resulting in the deaths of at least 40 people.

Can the Commission please provide details of what emergency assistance it has provided to the Indian Government in light of this crisis, and identify what action it may take to support a rebuilding process in communities disproportionately affected?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2013)

The floods referred to in the Honourable Member's question were a direct consequence of the cyclone Phailin weather system. On 29 October 2013, the Commission approved an allocation of EUR 3 million for immediate and early recovery assistance for the most vulnerable victims of cyclone 'Phailin' and subsequent floods.

To help the most affected and vulnerable people's survival until the next crop and improve their resilience to future disasters, food assistance and livelihood recovery support are covered by this assistance. Fishing communities have lost assets that are indispensable for their trade and these funds also assist to replace these. The most vulnerable households are also being provided assistance to rebuild their shelter; to improve their resilience to future disasters, Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) features are being incorporated in all works. Basic health, including water/sanitation and nutrition, are also covered. Protection issues are being taken into consideration in all operations and particular care is being taken to target low caste communities as beneficiaries of this assistance.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012441/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: Motor Neurone Disease

In the past week, it has emerged that former Dutch international footballer Fernando Ricksen has been diagnosed with Motor Neurone Disease (MND), a terminal disease which causes parts of the nervous system to become damaged, ultimately causing muscle wasting and the inability to speak, walk or breathe.

In the United Kingdom, MND affects approximately 5 000 people every year.

1. How many EU citizens have died as a result of MND in the past five years? Could the Commission please provide a breakdown of these figures by (a) Member State and (b) age?

2. What steps are being taken at EU level to aid research into the causes of MND and possible treatments, and to fund projects that support those diagnosed with the disease?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(8 January 2014)

The Commission collects yearly data on causes of death. In annex, the number of deaths due to Motor Neuron Disease in the EU is presented for 2006-2010 by Member State and age group (most recent available data).

While the Commission has no specific policy on Motor Neuron Disease, patients could benefit from actions developed under the EU general rare diseases policy. The EU has supported projects on rare diseases under the EU Health Programmes since 2003. This includes support to the ORPHANET database which provides information to health professionals and patients on rare diseases including Motor Neuron Disease.

The Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013) has since 2007 invested over EUR 58 million in research on Motor Neuron Disease. This includes the collaborative project EUROMOTOR ([1]) aimed at detecting key genetic drivers of disease susceptibility and progression for Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis.

The Commission also supports the implementation of the Joint Programming Initiative on Neurodegenerative Diseases Research, a Member State-led initiative that aims at increasing the impact of European research in this area by coordinating efforts across countries.

Finally, Horizon 2020, the new EU programme for research and innovation 2014-2020, may provide further opportunities for research on this disease mainly through the pillar societal challenge 1 'Health, demographic change and well-being', as well as through the European Research Council which will continue supporting frontier research in all fields.

([1]) http://www.euromotorproject.eu/

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012448/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(4 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Γενικό Σχέδιο Υγείας

Ο τομέας της υγείας αποτελεί έναν από τους σημαντικότερους και πιο νευραλγικούς τομείς για τη σωστή λειτουργία ενός κράτους. Ωστόσο οι σοβαρές περικοπές που γίνονται στον προϋπολογισμό για την υγεία συνεπάγεται αλυσιδωτές αρνητικές επιπτώσεις στην ποιότητα της ζωής των πολιτών.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Διαθέτει συγκριτικά στοιχεία στη βάση δεικτών για τα επίπεδα της παρεχόμενης ιατροφαρμακευτικής περίθαλψης στις χώρες μέλη της ΕΕ και της Ευρωζώνης;

2. Σε ποιες από αυτές τις χώρες εφαρμόζεται ένα Γενικό Σχέδιο Υγείας (ΓΕΣΥ);

3. Γνωρίζει τις επιπτώσεις της οικονομικής κρίσης στα συστήματα υγείας των χωρών-μελών (Ελλάδα, Κύπρος, Ισπανία, Πορτογαλία) που πιέζονται από μνημονιακές πολιτικές αυστηρής λιτότητας;

4. Ποια μέτρα λαμβάνει για να επιδείξει την κοινοτική της αλληλεγγύη έμπρακτα, απαμβλύνοντας προβλήματα που προκύπτουν στις χώρες αυτές;

Απάντηση του κ. Borg εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(8 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Σύστημα Αμοιβαίας Πληροφόρησης για την Κοινωνική Προστασία (MISSOC [1]) παρέχει λεπτομερείς, συγκρίσιμες και σε τακτική βάση επικαιροποιούμενες πληροφορίες σχετικά με τα εθνικά συστήματα κοινωνικής προστασίας, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της κάλυψης των παροχών υγειονομικής περίθαλψης σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ.

Δεν υπάρχει τυποποιημένος ορισμός του τι συνιστά «γενικό σχέδιο υγείας» στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ. Ωστόσο, το νομοθετικό πλαίσιο για τα νέα ευρωπαϊκά διαρθρωτικά και επενδυτικά ταμεία για την περίοδο 2014-2020 [2] απαιτεί να ισχύει ένας «εκ των προτέρων όρος» για την υγεία εάν ένα κράτος μέλος προβλέπει να συγχρηματοδοτούνται από τα εν λόγω ταμεία εθνικές ή περιφερειακές δράσεις στον τομέα της υγείας. Συγκεκριμένα, το κράτος μέλος πρέπει να έχει σε ισχύ ένα στρατηγικό πλαίσιο πολιτικής για την υγεία.

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει τις σημαντικές πιέσεις που ασκούνται στα συστήματα υγείας στην Ελλάδα, την Κύπρο, την Ισπανία και την Πορτογαλία. Η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει τα κράτη μέλη στις προσπάθειές τους να εξασφαλίσουν κέρδη επάρκειας στα συστήματα υγείας τους διατηρώντας παράλληλα την καθολική πρόσβαση και βελτιώνοντας την ποιότητα της παροχής περίθαλψης. Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί την πρόσβαση και τα αποτελέσματα στον τομέα της υγείας χρησιμοποιώντας, μεταξύ άλλων, τα διαθέσιμα στοιχεία της Eurostat και των ευρωπαϊκών βασικών δεικτών υγείας (ECHI) [3]. Κατά περίπτωση, η Επιτροπή θέτει τα συναφή ζητήματα στις αρχές των κρατών μελών στο πλαίσιο του εν εξελίξει μόνιμου διαλόγου, ενδεχομένως επίσης και στο πλαίσιο του Ευρωπαϊκού Εξαμήνου, όπως στην περίπτωση της Ισπανίας [4].

Τα οικεία μέτρα που εφαρμόζονται στην πράξη όπως υποστηρίχθηκαν από την Επιτροπή διαφοροποιούνται από κράτος μέλος σε κράτος μέλος και μπορεί να ενσωματώνουν τις δεσμεύσεις των κρατών μελών που λαμβάνονται ως μέρος ενός σχετικού μνημονίου συμφωνίας. Η Επιτροπή παραθέτει σαν παράδειγμα την επικείμενη δέσμευση που έχει αναλάβει η Ελλάδα να εκπονήσει ένα σχέδιο δράσης για την παροχή πρόσβασης στην ασφάλιση υγείας σε ανασφάλιστους πολίτες [5].

---

[1] Βλ. http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=815&langId=el
[2] Βλ. http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/what/future/index_el.cfm
[3] Βλ. http://ec.europa.eu/health/indicators/echi/list/index_en.htm
[4] Βλ. http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/csr2013_spain_en.pdf
[5] Βλ. http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2013/pdf/ocp159_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012448/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: General Health Plan

The health sector is a key sector, which is one of the most important in a State's proper functioning. However, the radical cuts to health budgets are producing a chain of negative consequences which are having an impact on the quality of life for individuals.

Will the Commission say:

1. whether it has comparative data in the database of indicators on the levels of healthcare provided in the EU Member States and the euro area?

2. In which of these countries is a General Health Plan being implemented?

3. Is it aware of the impact of the financial crisis on the health systems of the Member States (Greece, Cyprus, Spain and Portugal) which are being pressured by Memorandum policies involving rigorous austerity?

4. What measures is the Commission taking to demonstrate its social solidarity in practice, by alleviating problems that are arising in these countries?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(8 January 2014)

The EU's Mutual Information System on Social Protection (MISSOC ([1])) provides detailed, comparable and regularly updated information about national social protection systems, including on the coverage of healthcare benefits in all EU Member States.

There is no standard definition of what constitutes a 'General Health Plan' across EU Member States. Nevertheless, the legislative framework for the new European Structural and Investment Funds 2014-2020 ([2]) requires, that, if a Member State foresees national or regional actions in health to be co-financed by these funds, an '*ex-ante* conditionality' on health is applied. Concretely, the Member State has to have a strategic policy framework for health in place.

The Commission is aware of the considerable strain health systems in Greece, Cyprus, Spain and Portugal are under. The Commission supports these Member States in their efforts to secure efficiency gains in their health systems, whilst maintaining universal access and improving the quality of care delivery. The Commission monitors access and health outcomes using, among other, available Eurostat data and the European Core Health indicators (ECHI) ([3]). Wherever relevant, the Commission raises related issues with Member State authorities as part of an ongoing standing dialogue, possibly also, as is the case for Spain ([4]), in the frame of the European Semester.

Actual relevant measures put in place, as supported by the Commission, depend from Member State to Member State and may encompass Member State commitments taken as part of a related Memorandum of Understanding. The Commission would give as an example the forthcoming commitment by Greece to prepare an action plan to provide health insurance access to uninsured citizens ([5]).

([1]) See http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=815&langId=en
([2]) See http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/what/future/index_en.cfm
([3]) See http://ec.europa.eu/health/indicators/echi/list/index_en.htm
([4]) See http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/csr2013_spain_en.pdf
([5]) See http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2013/pdf/ocp159_en.pdf

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-012449/13
aan de Raad
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(4 november 2013)

Betreft: EU-tabaksovereenkomsten en -betalingen aan lidstaten

1. Sinds 2004 hebben de Commissie en afzonderlijke lidstaten verschillende overeenkomsten gesloten met de grootste sigarettenproducten, waarin aanzienlijke jaarlijkse financiële overdrachten aan de begroting van de Unie zijn opgenomen. Kan de Raad aangeven hoe de -90,3 % van deze bedragen, waarover overeenkomst was bereikt met de Commissie, onder de afzonderlijke lidstaten werd verdeeld? Hoe is men tot dit precieze getal gekomen?

2. Hoeveel werd elk jaar sinds 2004 overgedragen aan elk van de betrokken lidstaten?

3. In deze overeenkomsten en de desbetreffende notawisseling tijdens de onderhandelingen over deze overeenkomsten, heeft het Europees Parlement aanbevolen en gevraagd dat dit bijkomende „inkomen" voor de lidstaten zou worden gebruikt voor de bestrijding van de smokkel van tabaksproducten en de instroom van namaaksigaretten. Kan de Raad voor elke lidstaat, voor elke overeenkomst en voor elk financieel jaar van de duur van de overeenkomsten aangeven welke bijkomende acties, programma's en projecten door deze financiële toewijzingen werden gefinancierd?

Antwoord
(23 december 2013)

De Raad beschikt niet over de door het geachte parlementslid gevraagde informatie, aangezien de Raad geen partij is bij deze overeenkomsten.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012449/13
to the Council
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(4 November 2013)

Subject: EU tobacco agreements and payments to Member States

1. Since 2004 the Commission and individual Member States have concluded several agreements with the major cigarette producers which include substantial financial annual transfers to the Union's budget. Could the Council indicate how the — 90.3% of these amounts which was agreed with the Commission was distributed between the individual Member States? How was this precise figure arrived at?

2. How much has been transferred each year since 2004 to each of the Member States involved?

3. In the agreements and the corresponding exchange of notes during the negotiations on these agreements, it was it was recommended and requested by the European Parliament that this extra 'income' for the Member States would be used in the fight against the smuggling of tobacco products and the influx of counterfeit cigarettes. Could the Council indicate, for each Member State and for each agreement, what extra actions, programmes and projects were financed from these financial allocations for each financial year of the duration of the agreements?

Reply
(23 December 2013)

The information requested by the Honourable Member is not available to the Council, since the Council is not party to the agreements referred to.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-012457/13
alla Commissione
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(5 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Trasporto e trattamento dei rifiuti napoletani in Olanda

Considerato che, dall'aprile 2013, dopo essersi aggiudicata l'appalto pubblico emesso dal comune di Napoli, la ditta belga Indaver si occupa dello smaltimento dei rifiuti napoletani, solo quelli classificati come urbani e non nocivi, trasportandoli al prezzo di 138 euro per tonnellata, dal porto di Napoli al termovalorizzatore di una delle sue filiali olandesi installato sul porto AZN di Moerdjik.

Considerato che l'impianto olandese Indaver, dove vengono scaricati i rifiuti del Comune di Napoli, ha due linee, una per i rifiuti urbani (forno a griglie che opera a 800°/900°) e una per i rifiuti tossici o/e nocivi (forno a tamburo rotante che opera a 1200°) e che, da quanto è dato sapere, una volta arrivati sul molo di Moerdjik, i rifiuti vengono divisi tra urbani e nocivi e inviati rispettivamente nelle apposite linee del termovalorizzatore.

Considerato che la cifra della raccolta differenziata a Napoli rimane bassissima.

Considerato che il regolamento (CE) n. 1013/2006 vieta il trasporto dei rifiuti tossici e/o nocivi in Europa.

Si chiede alla Commissione europea ed in particolare alla DG Ambiente quali sono le azioni che l'Unione europea ha messo in campo per controllare che i rifiuti trasportati da Napoli all'Olanda non siano anche del tipo nocivo e/o pericoloso e che rispettino i regolamenti europei?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(19 dicembre 2013)

Il regolamento (CE) n. 1013/2006 relativo alle spedizioni di rifiuti ([1]) non vieta la spedizione di rifiuti pericolosi all'interno dell'UE. Tali spedizioni, siano esse destinate allo smaltimento o al recupero, sono subordinate alla procedura di notifica e autorizzazione preventive scritte.

Le caratteristiche fisiche e l'identificazione dei rifiuti sono indicate nei documenti di notifica che accompagnano ciascuna spedizione. A norma di detto regolamento, una spedizione effettuata con modalità contrarie ai documenti di notifica è ritenuta illecita. Gli Stati membri sono tenuti a svolgere controlli a campione sulle spedizioni di rifiuti e a comminare sanzioni qualora una spedizione risulti illecita.

La Commissione vigila con cadenza regolare sull'attuazione del regolamento negli Stati membri. Nel caso in cui pervengano informazioni documentate circa una violazione del regolamento in uno Stato membro, la Commissione adotta le azioni necessarie per verificare la situazione di concerto con le rispettive autorità nazionali.

([1]) GU L 190 del 12.7.2006, pag. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012457/13
to the Commission
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(5 November 2013)

Subject: Transportation and treatment of waste from Naples in the Netherlands

Since winning a public procurement contract with Naples City Council in April 2013, the Belgian firm Indaver has been managing the disposal of the city's waste, restricted to waste classified as urban and non-hazardous. The firm ships the waste at a cost of EUR 138 per tonne from the port of Naples to a thermal treatment plant owned by one of its Dutch subsidiaries at the AZN site in the port of Moerdijk.

The Indaver plant in the Netherlands which receives the urban waste from Naples has two units: one for urban waste (a grate combustion incinerator, operating at 800°C/900°C) and one for toxic and/or hazardous waste (a rotary kiln incinerator, operating at 1200°C). According to reports, once the waste arrives on the quayside in Moerdijk it is separated into urban waste and hazardous waste before being sent on to the appropriate section of the thermal treatment plant.

Meanwhile, the quantity of waste separated in Naples remains extremely low.

Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 forbids the shipping of toxic and/or hazardous waste within the EU.

Can the Commission (DG Environment in particular) state what action the European Union has put in place to check whether the waste transported from Naples to the Netherlands contains any toxic and/or hazardous waste and that it complies with EU rules?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 on shipments of waste ([1]) does not prohibit the shipment of hazardous waste within the EU. Such shipments, whether destined for disposal or recovery, are subject to the procedure of prior written notification and consent. The physical characteristics and the identification of the waste are shown on the notification documents that accompany each shipment. According to the regulation, a shipment that is effected in a way contrary to the notification documents is considered to be an illegal shipment. Member States are obliged to carry out spot checks on shipments of waste and apply penalties in case a shipment is found to be illegal.

The Commission regularly monitors the implementation of the regulation in the Member States. If it receives documented information that a violation of the regulation has taken place in a Member State, it will take the necessary step to verify the situation with the respective national authorities.

([1]) OJ L 190, 12.7.2006.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012461/13
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(5 novembre 2013)

Objet: Utilisation des nouvelles technologies pour la lutte contre le chômage en Europe

À l'heure où l'Union européenne compte un nombre croissant de chômeurs, de nouvelles méthodes de recherche d'emplois se mettent en place.

En effet, il apparaît que la recherche de travail est en pleine révolution numérique.

En France, de plus en plus de demandeurs d'emplois délaissent l'établissement Pôle Emploi, chargé de la gestion des emplois sur le territoire français, pour privilégier les réseaux sociaux et des sites internet recensant certaines offres d'emploi. De même, on observe une montée en puissance des réseaux sociaux comme canaux de recrutement.

Ces sites internet sont d'autant plus appréciés que, dans un marché de l'emploi éparpillé, ils aspirent toutes les offres en ligne qui sont accessibles et les rendent lisibles par une interface simplifiée, sur ordinateur et sur mobile. De plus, ces modes de recherche d'emplois sont considérés comme plus efficaces pour une prise de contact directe et rapide.

1. Aussi, la Commission entend-elle promouvoir l'accès aux nouvelles technologies et aux réseaux sociaux afin de favoriser la fluidité de l'information sur le marché de l'emploi en Europe?

2. La Commission compte-t-elle encourager les formations au niveau européen pour la maîtrise de ces plateformes, voire également la mise en place d'un réseau européen de recherche d'emplois?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(9 janvier 2014)

La Commission travaille avec le réseau des services publics de l'emploi à la modernisation des services qu'ils proposent. Dans leur contribution à la stratégie Europe 2020 ([1]), les services publics de l'emploi ont confirmé que les services d'aujourd'hui sont par essence dépendants des technologies de l'information et que des services en ligne tels que les bases de données des services publics de l'emploi contenant des offres d'emploi peuvent être utilisées en complément d'autres moyens de communication, pour répondre aux besoins des clients. Le programme d'apprentissage mutuel de la Commission pour les services publics de l'emploi est régulièrement utilisé pour l'échange de bonnes pratiques dans ce domaine.

La promotion des compétences numériques permettant aux demandeurs d'emploi d'effectuer une recherche d'emploi en ligne est un volet des initiatives de la Commission telles que le panorama européen des compétences ou Europass, par exemple.

En ce qui concerne EURES, le réseau européen de l'emploi, dont l'objectif est de faciliter la mobilité à l'intérieur de l'UE, la Commission a mis en place une plate-forme moderne pour le portail EURES ([2]), accompagnée de nouveaux services innovants. Le nouveau portail devrait permettre l'accès à un réservoir considérablement élargi d'offres d'emploi et de CV et le processus d'appariement de la bonne personne au bon emploi sera amélioré, notamment par la mise en œuvre d'un outil de recherche sémantique et de mise en correspondance.

Le nouveau portail proposera également des informations intéressantes et pertinentes et des fonctionnalités telles que des événements virtuels et des accès aux réseaux sociaux qui inciteront les utilisateurs, en particulier les jeunes, à venir consulter le portail avant même de devenir des demandeurs d'emploi actifs.

EURES travaille parallèlement à développer sa présence sur les plateformes des médias sociaux et les conseillers EURES suivent des formations à l'utilisation des outils offerts par les médias sociaux, pour garantir que les offres d'emploi atteignent leur public, où qu'il se trouve.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=105&langId=fr
([2]) https://eures.europa.eu

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012461/13
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(5 November 2013)

Subject: Use of new technologies in Europe's fight against unemployment

At a time when the European Union has a growing number of people out of work, new ways of looking for jobs are emerging.

Indeed, it would appear that the process of looking for a job is undergoing a digital revolution.

In France, jobseekers are increasingly abandoning the Pôle Emploi, the agency responsible for managing employment across France, in favour of social networks and websites that list job advertisements. Similarly, we have seen that social networks are becoming increasingly important recruitment channels.

These websites are even more popular because, in a fragmented labour market, they pick up all accessible online advertisements and make them available via a simplified interface for computers and mobiles. Moreover, these methods of looking for a job are seen as a more efficient way of making direct contact with recruiters.

1. Does the Commission intend to promote access to new technologies and social networks in order to improve the flow of information in the European labour market?

2. Does the Commission plan to promote EU-wide training to help people get to grips with these platforms, or indeed the introduction of a European jobseekers network?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(9 January 2014)

The Commission works with the network of Public Employment Services (PES) on modernising their service delivery. In their contribution to the Europe 2020 strategy ([1]), the PES confirmed that modern service delivery has become fundamentally IT-dependent and that e-services like PES job vacancies databases can be used to complement other channels to meet clients' needs. The Commission's mutual learning programme for PES is regularly used for exchange of good practices in this area.

The promotion of e-skills enabling jobseekers to use digital job search channels is part of the Commission's skills initiatives such as the EU Skills Panorama, Europass, etc.

Within EURES, the European Jobs Network which facilitates intra-EU mobility, the Commission has put in place a modern platform for the EURES portal ([2]) and introduced new and innovative services. The new portal is expected to give access to a considerably increased pool of European job vacancies and CVs and the process of matching the right person to the right job will be improved e.g. by the implementation of a semantic search and match engine.

The new portal will also offer interesting and relevant information and features such as virtual events and social networking that will attract users, in particular young people, to come to the portal even before they are active jobseekers.

EURES is at the same time extending its presence on social media platform and EURES advisers are being trained on the use of social media tools so that job offers will reach the audience wherever they are.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=105&langId=en
([2]) https://eures.europa.eu

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012463/13
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(5 novembre 2013)

Objet: Expansion de la drogue «Slam» contenant de la méphédrone

La consommation de «Slam», défini comme la drogue du sexe, s'affiche en hausse dans plusieurs régions d'Europe, et notamment dans le Sud-Ouest de la France, dans la région du Languedoc-Roussillon. Cette drogue est faite à base de méphédrone, molécule de synthèse, interdite à la vente en France depuis décembre 2010. Ce produit a la réputation d'être un supercarburant pour des nuits sans fin et des week-ends de marathon sexuel. En effet, cette drogue permettrait de tenir deux jours sans dormir et sans manger et améliorerait les performances sexuelles et les sensations.

La méphédrone, également disponible en comprimés, pourrait facilement être achetée sur Internet malgré son interdiction.

Cette drogue comporte néanmoins de dangereux effets secondaires, physiques comme psychiques. Sa consommation engendre également une multiplication des comportements à risque et participe de manière significative à la hausse observée des contaminations au VIH et à l'hépatite C.

Pour faire face à ces dangers, la Commission compte-t-elle réglementer la circulation des produits à base de méphédrone sur le territoire européen et adopter les mesures nécessaires pour protéger les citoyens européens?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission
(8 janvier 2014)

La Commission est consciente de l'apparition fréquente et de la propagation rapide de nouvelles substances psychoactives sur le marché intérieur de l'UE. La méphédrone a fait l'objet de contrôles et de sanctions pénales dans l'Union européenne en décembre 2010, à la suite d'une proposition de la Commission.

Depuis 2005, les États membres ont notifié plus de 300 nouvelles substances psychoactives au moyen du mécanisme d'échange rapide d'informations géré par l'Observatoire européen des drogues et des toxicomanies (OEDT) et Europol. Le rythme de notification des nouvelles substances psychoactives s'est accéléré au cours des dernières années, plusieurs substances étant signalées chaque semaine.

Le 17 septembre 2013, la Commission a présenté deux propositions législatives sur les nouvelles substances psychoactives ([1]) afin de renforcer la réaction de l'UE face à ce phénomène croissant. Les propositions visent à améliorer le contrôle et l'évaluation des risques des nouvelles substances psychoactives, et à trouver des réponses plus rapides et plus proportionnées permettant de réduire la disponibilité des substances qui présentent des risques pour la santé, la société et la sécurité.

Selon les propositions de la Commission, les nouvelles substances psychoactives présentant de graves risques pour la santé, la société et la sécurité seraient soumises à des restrictions d'accès au marché dans l'ensemble de l'UE et retirées de tous les canaux de distribution, y compris l'internet. Cela signifie que leur production, leur fabrication, leur mise sur le marché, y compris leur importation dans l'Union, leur transport et leur exportation à partir de l'Union seront interdits, sauf pour des utilisations explicitement autorisées, ainsi que pour la recherche et le développement. Cette interdiction reposerait sur le droit pénal, la proposition envisageant en effet de soumettre les nouvelles substances psychoactives à haut risque aux dispositions de droit pénal applicables aux substances contrôlées dans le cadre des conventions des Nations unies sur les stupéfiants.

([1]) COM(2013) 618 final et COM(2013) 619 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012463/13
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(5 November 2013)

Subject: Rise in use of the mephedrone-based drug 'Slam'

The use of 'Slam', known as the 'sex drug', is on the rise in several areas of Europe, including in particular the Languedoc-Roussillon region in south-western France. This drug is made using mephedrone, a synthetic molecule that has been banned from sale in France since December 2010. This product has a reputation for being a 'superfuel' that enables users to stay up all night and enjoy weekends of sexual marathons. It is true that this drug allows users to stay up for two days without sleeping or eating, enhances sexual performance and heightens sensations.

Despite being a banned substance, mephedrone, which is also available in tablet form, can easily be purchased online.

However, this drug has dangerous side effects, both physical and psychological. Its use has also resulted in an increase in high-risk behaviours and has contributed significantly to the recorded rise in HIV and hepatitis C infections.

In order to combat these dangers, does the Commission plan to control the spread of mephedrone-based products across EU countries and to adopt the measures needed to protect EU citizens?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(8 January 2014)

The Commission is aware of the frequent emergence and rapid spread of new psychoactive substances in the EU internal market. Mephedrone was subjected to control and criminal sanctions across the EU in December 2010, following a proposal from the Commission.

Since 2005, Member States have notified more than 300 new psychoactive substances through the mechanism for rapid exchange of information managed by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) and Europol. The pace of notification of new psychoactive substances has accelerated in recent years, with more than one substance notified each week.

On 17 September 2013, the Commission presented two legislative proposals on new psychoactive substances ([1]), aimed at strengthening the EU response to this growing problem. The proposals seek to enhance the monitoring and risk assessment of new psychoactive substances, and to enable swifter and more proportionate answers to reduce the availability of those substances that pose health, social and safety risks.

Under the proposals, new psychoactive substances posing severe health, social and safety risks would be subjected to market restriction across the EU and withdrawn from all distribution channels, including the Internet. This means that their production, manufacture, making available on the market, including importation to the Union, transport, and exportation from the Union will be prohibited, except for explicitly authorised uses, and for research and development. This prohibition would be backed by criminal law, as the proposals envisage that new psychoactive substances posing severe risks are subjected to the criminal law provisions that apply to drugs controlled under the UN Conventions on drugs.

([1]) COM(2013) 618 final and COM(2013) 619 final.