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 309/01)

Treść Strona

E-001527/14 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission
Subject: Convention on Contact concerning Children adopted in Vilnius
Slovenské znenie 15
English version 16

E-001529/14 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission
Subject: Changes to the law in Ukraine
Slovenské znenie 17
English version 18

E-001531/14 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission
Subject: Serbia as a member of the European Union
Slovenské znenie 19
English version 20

E-001534/14 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission
Subject: Demonstrations in Egypt
Slovenské znenie 21
English version 22

E-001535/14 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission
Subject: The origin of meat in the European Union
Slovenské znenie 23
English version 24

E-001536/14 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission
Subject: Bee shortage in the European Union
Slovenské znenie 25
English version 26

E-001538/14 by David Casa to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — EU-Cuba relations
Verżjoni Maltija ... 27
English version ... 28

E-001539/14 by David Casa to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Swiss immigration quotas
Verżjoni Maltija ... 29
English version ... 30

E-001540/14 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Burmese prisoners
English version ... 31

E-001542/14 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: European health insurance cards and private healthcare
English version ... 32

E-001543/14 by Elena Băsescu to the Commission
Subject: Entry into force of Regulation (EU) No 1289/2013
Versiunea în limba română ... 33
English version ... 34

E-001544/14 by Elena Băsescu to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — EU measures to prevent piracy off the coast of Somalia
Versiunea în limba română ... 35
English version ... 36

E-001545/14 by Judith A. Merkies to the Commission
Subject: Ford's retention of records on traffic offences committed by vehicle owners
Nederlandse versie ... 37
English version ... 38

E-001546/14 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Paedophilia, the Internet and education
Versione italiana ... 39
English version ... 40

E-001547/14 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Croatian oil and damage to the environment
Versione italiana ... 41
English version ... 42

E-001548/14 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Trojans and 'domestic' cyber espionage
Versione italiana ... 43
English version ... 44

E-001549/14 by John Stuart Agnew to the Commission
Subject: The value of oxo-biodegradable plastic
English version ... 45

E-001551/14 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Destruction of Syria's chemical weapons in the Mediterranean
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 46
English version ... 47

E-001553/14 by Sandra Petrović Jakovina to the Council
Subject: Results of the referendum in Switzerland
Hrvatska verzija ... 48
English version ... 49

E-001559/14 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission
Subject: Swiss end to immigration from the EU
Nederlandse versie 50
English version 51

E-001561/14 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission
Subject: Swiss referendum on immigration and EU-Switzerland agreement on the free movement of persons
Version française 52
English version 53

E-001562/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Algerian military transport plane crashes
Versione italiana 54
English version 55

E-001566/14 by Rita Borsellino to the Commission
Subject: Landfill site on the bank of the Inganno stream
Versione italiana 56
English version 57

E-001568/14 by Jacek Włosowicz to the Commission
Subject: Ageing society in Poland and Europe
Wersja polska 58
English version 59

E-001569/14 by Jacek Włosowicz to the Commission
Subject: Restrictions on entrepreneurship in Poland
Wersja polska 60
English version 61

E-001570/14 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — EU financing of imaginary Palestinian civil servants (follow-up question)
Nederlandse versie 62
English version 63

E-001571/14 by Esther de Lange to the Commission
Subject: Recovery of allowances abroad
Nederlandse versie 64
English version 65

E-001574/14 by Andrej Plenković to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of projects for Croatia under the EU Strategy for the Danube Region (Danube Strategy)
Hrvatska verzija 66
English version 67

E-001575/14 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission
Subject: Interpretation of Article 83 TFEU
Nederlandse versie 68
English version 69

E-001576/14 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission
Subject: Bad weather in France
Version française 70
English version 72

E-002010/14 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission
Subject: Consequences of severe weather conditions for farmers in Brittany
Version française 70
English version 72

E-001577/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Freedom of information at risk in Pakistan
Versione italiana 74
English version 75

E-001578/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Financial aid for Ukraine
Versione italiana 76
English version 77

E-001579/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Council
Subject: Financial transaction tax
Versione italiana 78
English version 79

E-001580/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Update — Crisis in the brandy sector
Versione italiana 80
English version 81

E-001581/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Mobility of European students
Versione italiana 82
English version 83

E-001582/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: The MEDIA programme and European film production
Versione italiana 84
English version 85

E-001583/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Report on anti-corruption measures in Europe and European institutions
Versione italiana 86
English version 87

E-001588/14 by Claudio Morganti to the Commission
Subject: Fiscal compact and the EU's legal framework
Versione italiana 88
English version 89

E-001592/14 by Peter Jahr to the Commission
Subject: Legal conditions applying to the purchase of agricultural and forestry land in Member States
Deutsche Fassung 90
English version 91

E-001593/14 by Emer Costello, Pat the Cope Gallagher and Mairead McGuinness to the Commission
Subject: Cross-border healthcare in the EU
English version 92

E-001594/14 by Erik Bánki to the Commission
Subject: Environmental impact assessment procedure for the Roșia Montană cyanide mine project
Magyar változat 93
English version 94

E-001595/14 by Linda McAvan and Catherine Stihler to the Commission
Subject: Leisure credit schemes
English version 95

E-001596/14 by Catherine Stihler to the Commission
Subject: EU accession
English version 96

E-001600/14 by Catherine Stihler to the Commission
Subject: EU-Swiss relations
English version 97

E-001601/14 by Catherine Stihler to the Commission
Subject: Zero-hour contracts
English version 98

E-001603/14 by Nicole Sinclaire to the Commission
Subject: Value of trees
English version 99

E-001604/14 by Fiona Hall to the Commission
Subject: Study on financing for development
English version 100

E-001606/14 by Frédéric Daerden and Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme (REFIT)
Version française 101
English version 102

E-001607/14 by Zdravka Bušić to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Current situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina
Hrvatska verzija 103
English version 104

E-001608/14 by Barbara Matera to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — UN peacekeepers and sexual violence during peace missions
Versione italiana 105
English version 106

E-001610/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: EU-Cuba bilateral agreement
Versione italiana 107
English version 108

E-001611/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Legal recognition of family caregivers
Versione italiana 109
English version 110

E-001612/14 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Situation of the Copts in Egypt
Versione italiana 111
English version 112

E-001613/14 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Common Fisheries Policy: programmes for fishing operators in the Adriatic and Tyrrhenian Seas
Versione italiana 113
English version 114

E-001615/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Suspicion that blocking of Italian wine consignments in Germany breaches rules
Versione italiana 115
English version 116

E-001616/14 by Jacek Włosowicz to the Commission
Subject: Russian blackmail regarding pork embargo
Wersja polska 117
English version 118

E-001617/14 by Jacek Włosowicz to the Commission
Subject: Isolationist tendencies in Switzerland
Wersja polska 119
English version 120

E-001619/14 by Marisa Matias and Alda Sousa to the Commission
Subject: Urban waste incineration in the Azores
Versão portuguesa 121
English version 122

E-001620/14 by Sirpa Pietikäinen to the Commission
Subject: Access to interpreting services in first-line healthcare
Suomenkielinen versio ... 123
English version ... 124

E-001621/14 by Charles Tannock to the Commission
Subject: Human rights monitoring in Pakistan
English version ... 125

E-001623/14 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Availability of funding for a multi-sports centre for persons with a disability
Versione italiana ... 126
English version ... 127

E-001625/14 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Modernisation of the energy supply system at the Sports Centre affiliated to the University of Pisa
Versione italiana ... 128
English version ... 129

E-001626/14 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Adjustment and updating of energy systems in medium to large companies and public bodies: possible funding
Versione italiana ... 130
English version ... 131

E-001627/14 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Research and development for new innovative technologies and prototypes intended principally for passenger transport — possible funding
Versione italiana ... 132
English version ... 133

E-001628/14 by Hannu Takkula to the Commission
Subject: Monitoring of EU aid to the Palestinian Authority
Suomenkielinen versio ... 134
English version ... 135

E-001630/14 by Pilar Ayuso to the Commission
Subject: EU strategy on mercury
Versión española ... 136
English version ... 137

E-001634/14 by Syed Kamall to the Commission
Subject: Meged oil field
English version ... 138

E-001635/14 by Syed Kamall to the Commission
Subject: Compensation following dental work in Germany
English version ... 139

E-001637/14 by Chris Davies to the Commission
Subject: NER300 and the proposed innovation fund
English version ... 140

E-001640/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Kurdish issue in Turkey
Versione italiana ... 141
English version ... 142

E-001641/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Immigration from Turkey to the EU
Versione italiana ... 143
English version ... 144

E-001646/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Rail links in Turkey
Versione italiana 145
English version 146

E-001649/14 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Teenage suicide in Cittadella (Padua): blocking Ask.fm
Versione italiana 147
English version 148

E-001650/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Internet and broadband access
Versione italiana 149
English version 150

E-001651/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Update — Measures to support young people in the South in taking out loans
Versione italiana 151
English version 152

E-001654/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Economic crisis, unemployment and ageing of the population
Versione italiana 153
English version 154

E-001656/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Education levels in Europe
Versione italiana 155
English version 156

E-001659/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Situation in Gagauzia
Versione italiana 157
English version 158

E-001662/14 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Dispersal of hospital and sanitary waste: environmental and health emergency in the area around Malagrotta
Versione italiana 159
English version 160

E-001664/14 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Language discrimination in Belgium
Versione italiana 161
English version 162

E-001665/14 by Giancarlo Scottà to the Commission
Subject: Illegal marketing of 'Sambuca'
Versione italiana 163
English version 164

E-001667/14 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission
Subject: Commissioner Kroes: 'Worldwide Internet model'
Nederlandse versie 165
English version 166

E-001668/14 by Jacek Włosowicz to the Commission
Subject: EU-USA free trade area
Wersja polska 167
English version 168

E-001669/14 by Jacek Włosowicz to the Commission
Subject: Discrepancies between voting rights across the EU
Wersja polska 169
English version 170

E-001670/14 by Jacek Włosowicz to the Commission
Subject: Policy on the use of shale gas
Wersja polska ... 171
English version ... 172

E-001673/14 by Jacek Włosowicz to the Commission
Subject: Structural reform of the EU banking sector
Wersja polska ... 173
English version ... 174

E-001674/14 by Sari Essayah to the Commission
Subject: Medical treatment expenses incurred by pensioners living in a Member State other than their home country
Suomenkielinen versio ... 175
English version ... 176

E-001677/14 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission
Subject: Foot-dragging by the Spanish courts on environmental crime
Versión española ... 177
English version ... 178

E-001678/14 by Barbara Matera to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Negotiations between the Pakistani Government and the Taliban: implications for women's rights
Versione italiana ... 179
English version ... 180

E-001679/14 by Adam Bielan to the Commission
Subject: Poland at risk of losing EU flood prevention funding
Wersja polska ... 181
English version ... 182

E-001682/14 by Adam Bielan to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Discrimination against workers in garment factories in Cambodia
Wersja polska ... 183
English version ... 184

E-001684/14 by Adam Bielan to the Commission
Subject: New Erasmus programme guide
Wersja polska ... 185
English version ... 186

P-001687/14 by Dubravka Šuica to the Commission
Subject: EU financial aid to repair extensive flood damage in Croatia
Hrvatska verzija ... 187
English version ... 189

E-001696/14 by Dubravka Šuica to the Commission
Subject: EU financial aid to repair serious damage caused by bad weather in Gorski Kotar
Hrvatska verzija ... 187
English version ... 189

E-001689/14 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission
Subject: Operating systems and consumer rights
Versión española ... 191
English version ... 192

E-001690/14 by Raül Romeva i Rueda, Margrete Auken, Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández, Bart Staes, Catherine Grèze, Indrek Tarand, Jean Lambert, Yannick Jadot, Claude Turmes and Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission
Subject: Spanish Government's energy sector reforms
Versión española ... 193
Dansk udgave ... 194
Eestikeelne versioon ... 195
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 196
Version française ... 197
Nederlandse versie ... 198
English version ... 199

E-001693/14 by Julie Girling to the Commission
Subject: Indirect land use change (ILUC) of biofuels
English version 200

E-001694/14 by Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg to the Commission
Subject: Commission employees supervising EU-Switzerland trade
Wersja polska 201
English version 202

E-001698/14 by Francisco Sosa Wagner to the Commission
Subject: Restrictions on freedom of movement of persons: initiatives taken by Switzerland and some EU Member States
Versión española 203
English version 204

E-001699/14 by Francisco Sosa Wagner to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Handing over of personal data
Versión española 205
English version 206

E-001700/14 by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Rioting in Bosnia and Herzegovina
Deutsche Fassung 207
English version 208

E-001703/14 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Dismissal of 595 cleaners by the Greek State
Ελληνική έκδοση 209
English version 210

E-001707/14 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Proposal for a new regulation on mortgages
Versión española 211
English version 212

E-001709/14 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: Mass Purge of Judges
Ελληνική έκδοση 213
English version 214

E-001976/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Recent brawl in Turkish Parliament — effect on Turkey's accession to the EU
English version 214

E-002686/14 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Effect of the recent brawl in Turkish Parliament on Turkey's accession to the EU
English version 214

E-001713/14 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: Risk of poverty
Ελληνική έκδοση 215
English version 216

P-001714/14 by Eider Gardiazábal Rubial to the Commission
Subject: EU aid to Spain in the 2007-2013 financial framework
Versión española 217
English version 218

E-001716/14 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: Freedom of expression in Turkey
Ελληνική έκδοση 219
English version 220

E-001718/14 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission
Subject: Missing activists in Ukraine
Versiunea în limba română ... 221
English version ... 222

E-001719/14 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission
Subject: Reinforcement of fundamental rights in Armenia
Versiunea în limba română ... 223
English version ... 224

E-001720/14 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission
Subject: Stagnant reforms in Lebanon
Versiunea în limba română ... 225
English version ... 226

E-001721/14 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission
Subject: Support for victims in Ukraine
Versiunea în limba română ... 227
English version ... 228

E-001725/14 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: New biodegradable batteries for medical and scientific use
Versione italiana ... 229
English version ... 230

E-001726/14 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: New treatment for breast cancer
Versione italiana ... 231
English version ... 232

E-001727/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Risk that Turkey is becoming a tax haven
Versione italiana ... 233
English version ... 234

E-003578/14 by Ruža Tomašić to the Commission
Subject: Counterfeit goods from Turkey
Hrvatska verzija ... 235
English version ... 243

E-001728/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Sale of counterfeit goods in Turkey
Versione italiana ... 236
English version ... 240

E-001731/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Entry and exit points of Italian counterfeit goods to and from Turkey
Versione italiana ... 236
English version ... 240

E-001733/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Counterfeit toys from Turkey
Versione italiana ... 236
English version ... 240

E-001943/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Turkish customs inefficient in combating counterfeiting
Versione italiana ... 237
English version ... 241

E-001944/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Where is Turkey obtaining counterfeit Italian products for import?
Versione italiana ... 237
English version ... 241

E-001946/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: 'Made in Italy' counterfeits
Versione italiana 237
English version 241

E-001948/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Places in Turkey where counterfeit Italian products are being sold
Versione italiana 238
English version 241

E-001949/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: 'Italian-sounding' products in Turkey
Versione italiana 238
English version 242

E-001950/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Goods made in Italy which are most frequently counterfeited in Turkey
Versione italiana 238
English version 242

E-001952/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Export of counterfeit Italian goods from Turkey
Versione italiana 239
English version 242

E-001730/14 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Counterfeit honey in Turkey
Versione italiana 244
English version 245

E-001735/14 by Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă to the Commission
Subject: Integrating PhD students into the EU workforce
Versiunea în limba română 246
English version 247

E-001736/14 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission
Subject: Humanitarian assistance budget for the Central African Republic
Versiunea în limba română 248
English version 249

E-001737/14 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission
Subject: Right of minorities in Serbia to education in their mother tongue
Versiunea în limba română 250
English version 251

E-001738/14 by Elena Băsescu to the Commission
Subject: Measures regulating potential allergens
Versiunea în limba română 252
English version 253

E-001739/14 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: Environmental liability in Spain
Versión española 254
English version 255

E-001740/14 by Ole Christensen to the Commission
Subject: Use of EU Structural Fund monies to relocate Danish jobs
Dansk udgave 256
English version 258

E-002063/14 by Morten Messerschmidt to the Commission
Subject: EU Structural Fund support and job relocation
Dansk udgave 256
English version 258

E-001742/14 by Alyn Smith to the Commission
Subject: Death Abroad — You're Not Alone
English version 260

E-001743/14 by Charles Tannock to the Commission
Subject: EU Trade Descriptions Act, with reference to the clipping of audiovisual material by broadcasters
English version 261

E-001744/14 by Charles Tannock to the Commission
Subject: EU trade description law with reference to 'charity' cards
English version 262

E-001745/14 by Charles Tannock to the Commission
Subject: Levels of emigration and immigration within the EU
English version 263

E-001746/14 by Charles Tannock to the Council
Subject: Potential conflicts of interest within the rotating Presidency of the Council
English version 264

E-001747/14 by Dubravka Šuica to the Commission
Subject: Problem of pre-bankruptcy settlements in Croatia
Hrvatska verzija 265
English version 266

E-001748/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Syria's cultural heritage under threat
Versione italiana 267
English version 268

E-001750/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Diplomatic rapprochement between Beijing and Taipei
Versione italiana 269
English version 270

E-001751/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Anti-foreigner laws in Hungary
Versione italiana 271
English version 272

E-001752/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: New anti-cyberbullying app for smartphones
Versione italiana 273
English version 274

E-001753/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Learning disorders. New skills for school
Versione italiana 275
English version 276

E-001755/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Racism on the Internet
Versione italiana 277
English version 278

E-001756/14 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Measures to counter opting out of education
Versione italiana 279
English version 280

E-001759/14 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission
Subject: Statements by the President of the Commission on Scotland and the Union (1)
Versión española 281
English version 282

E-001760/14 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission
Subject: Statements by the President of the Commission on Scotland and the Union (2)
Versión española 281
English version 282

E-001761/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Results of the 50th Munich Security Conference
Deutsche Fassung 283
English version 284

E-001762/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Results of the 50th Munich Security Conference
Deutsche Fassung 283
English version 284

E-001763/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Suspected boycotting of aid convoys in Syria
Deutsche Fassung 285
English version 287

E-001764/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Suspected boycotting of aid convoys in Syria
Deutsche Fassung 285
English version 287

E-001765/14 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Crisis in the Central African Republic
Deutsche Fassung 288
English version 289

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-001527/14
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12. februára 2014)

Vec: Dohovor o styku s dieťaťom z Vilniusu

Dohovor o styku s dieťaťom bol prijatý vo Vilniuse 3. mája 2002. K ratifikácii tohto dokumentu zo strany Európskej únie však do dnešného dňa nedošlo. Keďže táto oblasť patrí medzi spoločné právomoci, členské štáty k dohovoru nemôžu pristúpiť samostatne, ale jedine spolu s Európskou úniou.

Aký je postoj Komisie k prípadnej ratifikácii Dohovoru o styku s dieťaťom z Vilniusu Európskou úniou a aké sú v tomto smere právomoci Komisie?

Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie
(7. apríla 2014)

Komisia potvrdzuje váženej pani poslankyni, že niektoré ustanovenia Dohovoru Rady Európy o styku týkajúcom sa detí spadajú podľa článku 3 ods. 2 ZFEÚ do výlučnej právomoci EÚ, a členské štáty teda nemôžu tento dohovor podpísať ani ratifikovať pred Európskou úniou.

Komisia sa domnieva, že tento dohovor, ktorého cieľom je posilnenie práv detí, rodičov a niektorých príbuzných s rodinnými väzbami na dieťa s cieľom udržiavať pravidelný kontakt, má pre Európsku úniu významnú pridanú hodnotu. Preto Komisia už v roku 2002 ([1]) navrhla, aby Spoločenstvo tento dohovor podpísalo. Bohužiaľ, ani po desiatich rokoch rokovaní v Rade sa medzi členskými štátmi nenašla jednota potrebná na prijatie návrhu, a to napriek flexibilite, ktorú prejavila Komisia pri možnom kompromise so zámerom vziať do úvahy stanoviská členských štátov, ktoré však neboli pripravené podpísať dohovor. V dôsledku toho sa Komisia v roku 2012 rozhodla svoj návrh stiahnuť ([2]). Toto rozhodnutie bolo prijaté aj na základe úvahy, že ustanovenia Dohovoru o styku týkajúcom sa detí, ktoré patria do právomoci EÚ, už pokrývajú iné európske a medzinárodné nástroje ([3]).

([1]) KOM(2002) 520, konečné znenie.

([2]) Pozri oznámenie Komisie o pracovnom programe na rok 2013 prijaté 23.10.2012 – COM(2012) 629 final – ktoré obsahuje zoznam návrhov stiahnutých pred schválením: návrh na podpísanie Dohovoru o styku týkajúcom sa detí sa nachádza na strane 19 ako bod 10.

([3]) Najmä nariadenie Rady (ES) č. 2201/2003 o právomoci a uznávaní a výkone rozsudkov v manželských veciach a vo veciach rodičovských práv a povinností („nové nariadenie Brusel II"), Haagsky dohovor o medzinárodných únosoch detí z roku 1980, Haagsky dohovor o právomoci, rozhodnom práve, uznávaní a výkone a spolupráci v oblasti rodičovských práv a povinností a opatrení na ochranu dieťaťa z roku 1996.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001527/14
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Convention on Contact concerning Children adopted in Vilnius

The Convention on Contact concerning Children was adopted in Vilnius on 3 May 2002. However, the European Union has not yet ratified the document. As this area falls within shared competence, the Member States can only accede to the convention jointly with the European Union and not individually.

What is the Commission's position regarding ratification by the European Union of the Convention on Contact concerning Children adopted in Vilnius and what are the Commission's competences in this respect?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

The Commission confirms to the Honourable Member that certain provisions of the Council of Europe Convention on Contact concerning Children fall within EU exclusive competence according to Article 3(2) TFEU and therefore Member States can neither sign nor ratify it before the European Union.

The Commission considers that this Convention, that aims at reinforcing the rights of children and parents and certain other relatives having family ties to the child to maintain contact on a regular basis, has an important added value for the European Union and therefore proposed already in 2002 ([1]) the signature of the Convention by the Community. Unfortunately, after 10 years of negotiations in the Council, the necessary unanimity between Member States for the adoption of the proposal could be not found, notwithstanding the flexibility shown by the Commission on a possible compromise aimed at taking into account the views of the Member States who were not ready to sign the Convention. As a consequence, the Commission decided in 2012 to withdraw the proposal ([2]). This decision was taken also on the basis of the consideration that the provisions under EU competence of the Contact concerning Children Convention are already covered by other EU and international instruments ([3]).

([1]) COM(2002)520 final.

([2]) See Commission's Communication on the Work Programme 2013 adopted on 23.10.2012, COM(2012) 629 final which contains the list of the withdrawals of pending proposals: the Contact with Children proposal is at page.19 under n.10.

([3]) In particular, Council Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 concerning jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in matrimonial matters and the matters of parental responsibility ('the Brussels IIa regulation'), the 1980 Hague Convention on International Child Abduction, the 1996 Hague Convention on jurisdiction, applicable law, recognition, enforcement and cooperation in respect of parental responsibility and measures for the protection of children.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-001529/14
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12. februára 2014)

Vec: Zmeny zákona na Ukrajine

Nedávno prijal ukrajinský parlament zmeny zákona zamerané na obmedzenie protivládnych demonštrácií. Príslušný návrh zákona predložila strana prezidenta Viktora Janukovyča, Strana regiónov. Tento zákon predstavuje významné riziko s ohľadom na dodržiavanie základných práv a ľudských slobôd ukrajinských občanov. Môže totiž výrazne obmedziť slobodu prejavu a slobodu zhromažďovania, čo je v modernej demokratickej spoločnosti neprijateľné.

Aký je postoj Komisie k novým represívnym zákonom Ukrajiny?

Plánuje Komisia prijať v tejto súvislosti konkrétne opatrenia?

Budú mať tieto kroky ukrajinského parlamentu vplyv na vzťahy Európskej únie a Ukrajiny?

Ak áno, aké konkrétne?

Odpoveď pána Füleho v mene Komisie
(9. apríla 2014)

Situácia na Ukrajine sa odvtedy, keď bola otázka predložená, významne zmenila. Zákony, ktoré obmedzujú slobodu prejavu a slobodu zhromažďovania, sú v modernej demokratickej spoločnosti neprijateľné. EÚ v plnej miere podporuje úsilie novej ukrajinskej vlády o stabilizáciu situácie a presadzovanie ústavných a iných reforiem, ako aj slobodné, spravodlivé a transparentné prezidentské voľby. Inkluzívna vláda, ktorej vplyv siaha ku všetkým ukrajinským regiónom a skupinám obyvateľstva s cieľom zabezpečiť plnú ochranu národnostných menšín, má zásadný význam. Najvyššou prioritou je zabezpečiť transparentnosť orgánov činných v trestnom konaní a dodržiavanie ľudských práv. Prípady týkajúce sa zastrašovania, mučenia či zmiznutia pokojných demonštrantov a neľudského alebo ponižujúceho zaobchádzania s nimi musia byť náležite vyšetrené. EÚ presadzuje reštriktívne opatrenia voči osobám, ktoré boli označené za zodpovedné za porušovanie ľudských práv alebo spreneveru štátnych finančných prostriedkov, ako aj opatrenia zamerané na podporu zmiernenia krízy na Kryme. Ukrajinská vláda opätovne potvrdila svoj záväzok usilovať sa o užšie politické pridruženie k EÚ a hospodársku integráciu s ňou Dňa 21. marca bola podpísaná politická časť dohody o pridružení s Ukrajinou. Komisia tiež predložila návrh nariadenia (7649/14; COM(2014) 166 final) o prechodných obchodných opatreniach týkajúcich sa tovaru z Ukrajiny – takzvané autonómne obchodné opatrenia, ktoré po prijatí Parlamentom a Radou umožnia Ukrajine významne profitovať z mnohých výhod, ktoré poskytuje prehĺbená a komplexná zóna voľného obchodu v očakávaní predbežného uplatňovania a plného vykonávania celej dohody o pridružení.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001529/14
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Changes to the law in Ukraine

The Ukrainian Parliament recently adopted changes to the law to restrict anti-government demonstrations. The draft law in question was put forward by President Viktor Yanukovych's Party of the Regions. This law presents a significant risk as regards respect for the basic rights and human freedoms of Ukrainian citizens. It may significantly restrict freedom of expression and freedom of assembly, which is unacceptable in a modern, democratic society.

What is the Commission's attitude to Ukraine's new, repressive laws?

Is the Commission planning to adopt specific measures in this respect?

Will these steps taken by the Ukrainian Parliament have an impact on relations between the European Union and Ukraine?

If so, what specifically?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The situation in Ukraine has evolved significantly since the question was submitted. Laws that restrict freedom of expression and freedom of assembly are unacceptable in a modern, democratic society. The EU fully supports the efforts of the new Ukrainian Government to stabilise the situation and pursue constitutional and other reforms, as well as free, fair and transparent Presidential elections. An inclusive Government that reaches out to all Ukrainian regions and population groups to ensure full protection of national minorities is essential. It is a top priority to ensure the transparency of law-enforcement bodies and respect for human rights. Cases involving intimidation, torture, disappearances, and the inhumane or degrading treatment of peaceful demonstrators must be properly investigated. The EU is pursuing restrictive measures for persons identified as responsible for human rights violations or the misappropriation of State funds, as well as measures aimed at encouraging a de-escalation of the crisis in Crimea. The Ukrainian Government has reiterated its commitment to closer political association and economic integration with the EU. On 21 March, the political part of the Association Agreement with Ukraine was signed. The Commission also proposed a draft Regulation (7649/14; COM(2014) 166 final) on transitional trade measures on Ukrainian goods — the so-called autonomous trade measures, which when adopted by Parliament and the Council, would allow Ukraine to benefit substantially from many of the advantages offered by the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area in anticipation of the provisional application and the full implementation of the entire Association Agreement.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-001531/14
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12. februára 2014)

Vec: Srbsko ako člen Európskej únie

V posledných dňoch sa oficiálne začali prístupové rokovania medzi Európskou úniou a Srbskom. Rovnako bol tiež prijatý rámec rokovaní. Náročné politické rozhovory medzi Srbskom a vládami všetkých členských štátov, ktoré musia vo všetkých etapách prístupových rokovaní vystupovať jednomyseľne, potrvajú niekoľko rokov. Doposiaľ prejavené reformné úsilie Srbska je obdivuhodné, krajina sa však bude musieť vyrovnať s mnohými náročnými otázkami presadzovania právneho štátu, demokracie, rešpektovania ľudských práv a základných slobôd, ako aj vzájomných vzťahov s ďalšími krajinami. Srbsko očakáva koniec prístupových rokovaní v časovom horizonte piatich rokov.

Je podľa názoru Komisie časový horizont úspešného ukončenia prístupových rokovaní v rozmedzí piatich rokov reálny?

Odpoveď pána Füleho v mene Komisie
(2. apríla 2014)

Prístupové rokovania medzi EÚ a Srbskom sa oficiálne začali 21. januára 2014 prvou medzivládnou konferenciou medzi EÚ a Srbskom po prijatí rokovacieho rámca Rady v decembri 2013.

Pre rokovania o pristúpení neexistuje vopred definovaný časový rámec. Aj naďalej sa bude uplatňovať zásada vlastných zásluh každej kandidátskej krajiny. Trvanie rokovaní o pristúpení bude vymedzené hlavne na základe pokroku Srbska pri plnení kritérií a pri riešení zostávajúcich výziev vo všetkých oblastiach *acquis* EÚ. Srbsko v rámci svojej oficiálnej pozície k prístupovým rokovaniam uviedlo, že má ambície pripraviť sa na členstvo do roku 2018 s cieľom vstúpiť do EÚ na začiatku ďalšieho finančného výhľadu.

Vo svojom stanovisku k žiadosti Srbska o členstvo v EÚ z októbra 2011 Komisia dospela k záveru, že Srbsko bude schopné prevziať záväzky vyplývajúce z členstva v EÚ v strednodobom horizonte vo väčšine oblastí *acquis* EÚ za predpokladu, že bude pokračovať proces zosúlaďovania právnych predpisov a že krajina bude vyvíjať ďalšie úsilie na zaistenie vykonávania a presadzovania právnych predpisov. Komisia takisto zdôraznila, že je potrebné, aby sa osobitná pozornosť venovala oblasti poľnohospodárstva a rozvoja vidieka, justície a základných práv, spravodlivosti, slobody, bezpečnosti a finančnej kontroly. Úplný súlad s *acquis* EÚ v oblasti životného prostredia a zmeny klímy bude možno dosiahnuť iba v dlhodobom časovom horizonte a bude si to vyžadovať zvýšené investície.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001531/14
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Serbia as a member of the European Union

Accession negotiations have recently officially begun between the European Union and Serbia. A negotiation framework has also been adopted. Challenging political debates between Serbia and the governments of all Member States, which have to act unanimously in all stages of the accession negotiations, will go on for several years. So far, Serbia's efforts to bring about reform have been impressive. However, the country must address many demanding issues, such as the enforcement of the rule of law, democracy, respect for human rights and basic freedoms, as well as mutual relations with other countries. Serbia expects accession negotiations to be concluded within five years.

In the Commission's opinion, is it realistic to expect the successful conclusion of accession negotiations within five years?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

Accession negotiations between the EU and Serbia have been formally opened on 21 January 2014 with the first EU-Serbia inter-governmental conference, following the adoption of the negotiating framework by the Council in December 2013.

There is no predefined timeframe for the accession negotiations. The own merits principle of each candidate country will continue to apply. The duration of accession negotiations will be defined primarily by Serbia's progress in fulfilling the benchmarks and addressing outstanding challenges in all areas of the EU *acquis*. As part of its official position on the accession negotiations, Serbia stated its ambition to finalise its preparations for membership by 2018 with a view to joining the EU by the beginning of the next financial perspective.

In its Opinion on Serbia's membership application of October 2011, the Commission had assessed that Serbia would be in a position to take on the obligations of membership in the medium term, in nearly all *acquis* fields, provided that the alignment process continues and that further efforts are made to ensure the implementation and enforcement of legislation. It also emphasised that particular attention needed to be paid to the areas of agriculture and rural development, judiciary and fundamental rights, justice, freedom and security and financial control. Full compliance with the *acquis* in the field of the environment and climate change could be achieved only in the long term and would necessitate increased levels of investment.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-001534/14
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12. februára 2014)

Vec: Demonštrácie v Egypte

V posledných dňoch dochádza v Egypte k ďalším násilnostiam a nepokojom. Protivládne protesty a bombové útoky majú už takmer 50 obetí na životoch. Vládna perzekúcia a násilie si od minuloročného zvrhnutia Muhammada Mursího vyžiadali už viac ako 1 000 obetí. K udalostiam v Egypte dochádza v dňoch tretieho výročia začiatku revolúcie, ktorá zvrhla vládu vtedajšieho prezidenta krajiny Husního Mubaraka.

Plánuje byť Komisia v súvislosti s nedávnymi udalosťami v Egypte určitým spôsobom aktívna?

Odpoveď vysokej predstaviteľky a podpredsedníčky Komisie Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(10. apríla 2014)

EÚ si je vedomá situácie v Egypte a je aj naďalej znepokojená pokračujúcou politickou polarizáciou a násilím. Vysoká predstaviteľka/podpredsedníčka Komisie vydala viacero vyhlásení, v ktorých vyjadrila poľutovanie nad stratami na životoch a zraneniami a požiadala všetky strany, aby boli čo najzdržanlivejšie. Vo svojich záveroch z 21. augusta 2013 Rada pre zahraničné veci odsúdila „jednoznačne všetky násilné činy", čo opakovane potvrdila vo svojich záveroch z 10. februára 2014, v ktorých vzhľadom na zabitie demonštrantov a príslušníkov bezpečnostných síl od 30. júna 2013 opätovne vyzýva egyptské orgány, aby vyšetrili dané prípady.

EÚ, a najmä delegácia EÚ v Káhire, dôkladne sleduje vývoj na mieste, vrátane nových právnych predpisov týkajúcich sa práva na zhromažďovanie sa a práva na organizovanie demonštrácií.

EÚ aj naďalej vyzýva na inkluzívny proces, z ktorého nie je vylúčená žiadna politická skupina, ktorá rešpektuje demokratické zásady a zriekne sa násilia, v záujme smerovania k hlboko zakorenenej a udržateľnej demokracii. Vysoká predstaviteľka niekoľkokrát navštívila Egypt a hovorila so všetkými stranami a EÚ aj naďalej ponúka svoje služby a bude viesť rozhovory so všetkými stranami.

EÚ takisto plánuje vyslať volebnú pozorovateľskú misiu s cieľom vykonávať dôkladné kontroly nadchádzajúcich prezidentských a parlamentných volieb v záujme posúdenia ich vývoja, pokiaľ ide o inkluzívnosť, transparentnosť a kredibilitu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001534/14
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Demonstrations in Egypt

In recent days in Egypt, there has been further violence and unrest. Anti-government protests and bombings have taken the lives of almost 50 people. Since the overthrow last year of Mohammed Morsi, government persecution and violence has claimed more than 1 000 victims. These recent events in Egypt coincide with the third anniversary of the start of the revolution which overthrew the government of former Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak.

Does the Commission plan on being active in any specific way in light of the recent events in Egypt?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

The EU is well aware of the situation in Egypt, and remains concerned about the continued political polarization and violence. The HR/VP has issued several statements 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' , a concept reiterated in the FAC conclusions of 10 February 2014, which, taking note of the killing of protesters and security forces since 30 June 2013, calls again on the Egyptian authorities to investigate over those episodes.

The EU, and in particular the EU Delegation in Cairo, are following the developments closely on the ground, including the new legislation regarding the right to assembly and demonstration.

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. The High Representative has been several times travelling to Egypt talking to all sides, and the EU also continues to offer its good offices and will to talk to all sides.

The EU also intends to deploy an Election Observation Mission to exert a thorough scrutiny over the forthcoming presidential and parliamentary elections, in order to assess their inclusive, transparent and credible development.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-001535/14
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12. februára 2014)

Vec: Pôvod mäsa v Európskej únii

V posledných dňoch čelila Európska únia potravinárskym škandálom, ktoré vo vysokej miere zneisťujú európskych spotrebiteľov. V tejto súvislosti je dôležitá najmä dobrá informovanosť spotrebiteľov. Nový návrh z dielne Európskej komisie, ktorý sa touto problematikou zaoberá, však čelí kritike. Ide o pôvod mäsa, o ktorom by mal byť konzument jasne a presne informovaný. Nový systém určujúci pravidlá, na základe ktorých sa má pôvod mäsa jasne a presne určiť, má totiž nedostatky.

Aký bude postoj Komisie ku kritike, na ktorej sa zhodol parlamentný Výbor pre životné prostredie, verejné zdravie a bezpečnosť potravín, že nové pravidlá na určovanie pôvodu mäsa sú nejasné a pre spotrebiteľov zavádzajúce?

Odpoveď pána Cioloșa v mene Komisie
(10. apríla 2014)

Nariadením Európskeho parlamentu a Rady (EÚ) č. 1169/2011 o poskytovaní informácií o potravinách spotrebiteľom ([1]) sa Komisia po vykonaní posúdenia vplyvu ([2]) splnomocňuje prijímať vykonávacie predpisy týkajúce sa povinného uvádzania krajiny alebo miesta pôvodu čerstvého a mrazeného mäsa ošípaných, hydiny, oviec a kôz.

Na základe tohto mandátu a výsledkov posúdenia vplyvu Komisia prijala 13. decembra 2013 vykonávacie nariadenie (EÚ) č. 1337/2013 ([3]). V ňom je stanovená požiadavka povinne uvádzať členský štát alebo tretiu krajinu chovu a zabitia zvierat na základe minimálneho chovného obdobia pre každý druh tak, aby zvieratá strávili podstatnú časť svojho života v krajine uvedenej ako miesto chovu. Nariadenie zároveň umožňuje výrobcom nahradiť označenie miesta chovu a zabitia označením za miesto pôvodu členský štát alebo tretiu krajinu, kde sa zvieratá narodili, boli chované a zabité, v prípade, že to prevádzkovateľ môže dokázať. Komisia preto nemôže súhlasiť s tým, že prijaté pravidlá sú pre spotrebiteľa nejasné alebo zavádzajúce.

Nové pravidlá, ktoré sú výsledkom prijateľného kompromisu, zaručia spotrebiteľom väčšiu transparentnosť na základe spoločných požiadaviek pre celú Úniu a prevádzkovateľom, ako aj príslušným orgánom znížia náklady a administratívnu záťaž.

Člen Komisie zodpovedný za poľnohospodárstvo a rozvoj vidieka však považuje stanovisko Parlamentu za veľmi dôležité, a preto sa zaviazal čo najskôr predložiť uznesenie Parlamentu prijaté k tejto otázke 6. februára 2014 ([4]) na diskusiu v Rade.

([1]) Ú. v. EÚ L 304, 22.11.2011, s. 18 – 63.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2013/ia_meat_origin_labelling.pdf
([3]) Ú. v. EÚ L 335, 14.12.2013, s. 19 – 22.
([4]) Uznesenie Európskeho parlamentu B7-0087/2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001535/14
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: The origin of meat in the European Union

The European Union has been rocked by a food scandal in recent days which has greatly unsettled European consumers. Consumer awareness is of utmost importance in this respect. However, the new European Commission draft which addresses this issue has faced criticism. The issue at hand is the origin of meat, about which consumers should be clearly and precisely informed. Yet the new system, laying down rules which should clearly and precisely determine the origin of meat, has its shortcomings.

What stand will the Commission take regarding the criticism, with which the European Parliament's Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety concurs, that the new rules for determining the origin of meat are unclear and misleading for consumers?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the provision of food information to consumers [1], empowers the Commission to adopt implementing rules for the mandatory indication of the country of origin or place of provenance for fresh and frozen meat from swine, poultry, sheep and goat, following an impact asessment [2].

According to this mandate, and building on the result of the impact assessment, the Commission adopted on 13 December 2013 the Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1337/2013 [3]. It provides for the compulsory indication of the Member State or third country of rearing and slaughter based on a minimum rearing period for each species so that animals have to spend the substantial part of their life in the country indicated as place of rearing. This regulation also provides for producers the option of replacing the indication of the place of rearing and of slaughter by the indication, as origin, of the Member state or third country where animals were born, reared and slaughtered when operators can prove it. Therefore, the Commission cannot agree that the adopted rules are unclear or misleading for the consumer.

The new rules come out as a satisfactory compromise, and will provide consumers with enhanced transparency on the basis of common requirements for the whole Union while limiting the costs and administrative burden for both operators and authorities.

Moreover, the Member of the Commission responsible for Agriculture and Rural Development gives high importance to the Parliament's opinion and has committed to bring its Resolution on this matter adopted the 6 of February 2014 [4] to be debated in the Council as soon as possible.

---

(1) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18-63.
(2) http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2013/ia_meat_origin_labelling.pdf
(3) OJ L 335, 14.12.2013, p. 19-22.
(4) European Parliament Resolution B7-0087/2014.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-001536/14
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12. februára 2014)

Vec: Nedostatok včiel v Európskej únii

Nedávno bola publikovaná vedecká štúdia, z ktorej vyplýva, že Európska únia disponuje nedostatkom včiel. Tento nedostatok majú viac na svedomí práve politiky, ktoré Európska únia aktívne presadzuje, konkrétne prechod k pestovaniu plodín na biopalivá. V Únii narastá potreba opeľovať čoraz väčšie množstvo rastlín a populácia včiel nerastie proporcionálne s touto potrebou. Včely ohrozujú aj zmeny klímy, zhoršovanie ich prirodzeného prostredia či šírenie chorôb. Z údajov vedcov vyplýva, že v Európskej únii chýba približne 7 miliárd včiel.

Aké konkrétne kroky zamerané na zlepšenie situácie v súvislosti s nedostatočnou populáciou včiel v Európskej únii plánuje Komisia prijať?

Odpoveď pána Borga v mene Komisie
(10. apríla 2014)

Komisia odkazuje na svoju odpoveď na písomné otázky P-012225/2013 a E-000835/2014 ([1]) o činnosti Komisie pre včely. Takisto dáva do pozornosti konferenciu pre lepšie zdravie včiel ([2]), ktorá sa bude konať 7. apríla 2014 a na ktorej sa bude diskutovať o najdôležitejších opatreniach prijatých na úrovni EÚ na podporu včiel.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/sk/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://sanco-bee-health-conference2014.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001536/14
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Bee shortage in the European Union

According to a recently published scientific study, the European Union has a bee shortage. Policies which the European Union is actively promoting are largely to blame for this shortage: specifically, the move into growing crops for biofuels. There is a growing need to pollinate an increasing number of plants in the EU and the bee population is not increasing proportionately to this need. Bees are also threatened by climate change, a deterioration of their natural habitats and the spread of disease. Scientific data suggests that there is a shortage of approximately 7 billion bees in the European Union.

What specific steps is the Commission planning to take to improve the situation of the insufficient bee population in the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

The Commission would refer to its answer to written questions P-012225/2013 and E-000835/2014 ([1]) on Commission actions for honeybees. The Commission would also mention the Conference for Better Bee Health ([2]) that will be held on 7 April 2014, where main actions undertaken at EU level to support honeybees will be discussed.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://sanco-bee-health-conference2014.eu/

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001538/14
lill-Kummissjoni (Viċi President/Rappreżentant Għoli)
David Casa (PPE)
(12 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: VP/HR — Relazzjonijiet bejn l-UE u Kuba

Wara xi snin fejn ftit li xejn kien hemm interazzjoni ma' Kuba, membri tal-Unjoni Ewropea esprimew ix-xewqa tagħhom li jniedu serje ta' taħditiet mal-Gvern Kuban fuq perjodu mhux speċifikat ta' żmien sabiex jesploraw il-potenzjal li japprofondixxu r-relazzjoni ta' bejniethom.

Fil-kuntest tal-qagħda attwali tar-relazzjonijiet bejn l-Istati Uniti u Kuba, kif ukoll fid-dawl tal-problemi li jeżistu fil-pajjiż kemm fil-qasam politiku u kemm fil-qasam tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem, liema hu, fil-fehma tar-Rappreżentant Għoli, skop realistiku għal dawn it-taħditiet? Fi kliem ieħor, liema benefiċċji sinifikanti jistgħu jinkisbu potenzjalment mill-approfondiment possibbli tar-relazzjonijiet bejn l-UE u Kuba?

Tweġiba mogħtija mir-Rappreżentanta Għolja/il-Viċi President Ashton f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(2 ta' Frar 2014)

Ftehim bilaterali għandu l-għan li jsaħħaħ ir-relazzjoni bejn l-UE u Kuba u jipprovdi qafas robust għal djalogu kostruttiv u kooperazzjoni mtejba. Ikun jista' jippromwovi l-interessi u l-valuri tal-UE f'Kuba u jiżgura l-kontinwità fil-politiki tal-UE, inkluż l-appoġġ fil-proċess attwali ta' riforma u modernizzazzjoni, il-promozzjoni tad-drittijiet u l-libertajiet fundamentali tal-bniedem kif ukoll it-tisħiħ tal-kooperazzjoni għall-iżvilupp. Id-drittijiet tal-bniedem jibqgħu fiċ-ċentru tar-relazzjoni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001538/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
David Casa (PPE)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — EU-Cuba relations

After a few years of little or no interaction with Cuba, members of the European Union have expressed a desire to launch a series of talks with the Cuban Government over an unspecified period of time to explore the potential for deepening their relationship.

Bearing in mind the state of US-Cuba relations, as well as the human rights and political problems in the country, what does the High Representative expect to be a realistic scope for these talks? In other words, what are the potential significant gains to be achieved from a possible deepening of EU-Cuba relations?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

A bilateral agreement aims to strengthen the EU-Cuba relationship and provide a robust framework for constructive dialogue and improved cooperation. It would help to promote the EU's interests and values in Cuba and ensure continuity in EU policies, including support for the ongoing reform and modernisation process, promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms as well as the strengthening of development cooperation. Human rights continue to be at the core of the relationship.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001539/14
lill-Kummissjoni (Viċi President/Rappreżentant Għoli)
David Casa (PPE)
(12 ta' Frar 2014)

Suġġett: VP/HR — Il-kwoti tal-immigrazzjoni Svizzeri

Il-ġimgħa li għaddiet, l-Isvizzera vvutat b'maġġoranza żgħira favur riformi ġodda li jintroduċu restrizzjonijiet fuq l-immigrazzjoni.

L-UE kienet wissiet lill-Isvizzera li r-relazzjoni ta' bejniethom setgħet tmur lura kieku din il-proposta kellha tidħol fis-seħħ: "Dan imur kontra l-prinċipju tal-moviment liberu tal-persuni bejn l-UE u l-Isvizzera. L-UE se teżamina l-implikazzjonijiet ta' din l-inizjattiva fuq ir-relazzjonijiet bejn l-UE u l-Isvizzera b'mod ġenerali. F'dan il-kuntest, se titqies ukoll il-pożizzjoni tal-kunsill federali dwar ir-riżultat" ([1]).

Ladarba l-Isvizzera hija attur ewlieni fix-xena internazzjonali, x'azzjonijiet qed jiġu kkunsidrati b'reazzjoni għall-kwoti tal-immigrazzjoni proposti minn dan il-pajjiż? Stabbiliet l-UE x'ikunu l-implikazzjonijiet tad-dħul fis-seħħ ta' regolamenti bħal dawn?

Tweġiba mogħtija mir-Rappreżentant Għoli/il-Viċi President Ashton f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(31 ta' Marzu 2014)

Ir-riżultat tal-vot popolari Svizzeru tad-9 ta' Frar ma jbiddilx l-*istatus quo* tal-ftehimiet eżistenti tagħna. Kemm l-UE kif ukoll l-Iżvizzera se jkomplu jonoraw l-impenji u l-obbligi internazzjonali tagħhom. *Pacta sunt servanda*. Il-Kunsill Federali Svizzeru ħabbar li se jadotta dokument kunċettwali dwar kif bi ħsiebu jimplimenta l-inizjattiva qabel is-sajf. Il-Kummissjoni Ewropea tibqa' lesta biex tisma' l-proposti tal-awtoritajiet Svizzeri. Madankollu mhijiex se tinnegozja kwoti peress li dan jiġi kontra l-prinċipju tal-moviment ħieles tan-nies

([1]) http://www.europeanvoice.com/article/2014/february/swiss-endorse-curbs-on-immigration/79609.aspx

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001539/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
David Casa (PPE)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Swiss immigration quotas

Last week, Switzerland's new reforms restricting immigration obtained a majority of votes by a very slim margin.

The EU had warned Switzerland about a potential deterioration of their relationship if this proposal were to go through: 'This goes against the principle of free movement of persons between the EU and Switzerland. The EU will examine the implications of this initiative on EU-Swiss relations as a whole. In this context, the federal council's position on the result will also be taken into account' ([1]).

Switzerland being a key player in the international arena, what actions are being considered in response to the country's immigration quotas? Has the EU determined what the implications of the establishment of such regulations will be?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(31 March 2014)

The outcome of the Swiss popular vote of 9 February does not change the status quo of our existing agreements. Both the EU and Switzerland will continue to honour their commitments and international obligations. *Pacta sunt servanda*. The Swiss Federal Council has announced to adopt a concept paper on how it intends to implement the initiative before the summer. The European Commission stands ready to listen to the Swiss authorities' proposals. It will, however, not negotiate quotas since these are contrary to the principle of free movement of persons.

([1]) http://www.europeanvoice.com/article/2014/february/swiss-endorse-curbs-on-immigration/79609.aspx

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001540/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Burmese prisoners

Last year, Burmese President Thein Sein made some positive statements regarding the release of prisoners and the end of detention of prisoners of conscience.

Dr Tun Aung, a Muslim community leader, has been sentenced to 17 years imprisonment following riots between Rakhine Buddhists and Rohingya Muslims in Maungdaw, a town in western Burma. It would appear Dr Aung actively tried to calm the crowd and played no part in the violence.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of Dr Aung's imprisonment?

2. What representations are being made regarding the continued detention of prisoners of conscience?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2014)

The EU Delegation in Yangon is in close contact with Dr Tun Aung's daughter and his lawyer. The Delegation through its regular reporting provides updates on his situation to the HR/VP and the EU Special Representative for Human Rights.

Based on information obtained by the Delegation, Dr Tun Aung was transferred from Buthidaung prison, northern Rakhine state to Insein Prison in Yangon. The transfer was in line with his request and came in response to the lobbying of international partners, including the EU. During his last visit to Myanmar in February, UN Special Rapporteur Quintana was allowed to visit Dr Tun Aung in prison.

In his contacts with senior government officials, the EU Head of Delegation regularly raises the EU's concern over the situation in Rakhine state by underscoring the need for respect for human rights, rule of law, unherited humanitarian access and by advocating the release of prisoners of conscience.

In Council conclusions on Myanmar/Burma of 16 December 2013, the EU called on the Government of Myanmar/Burma to unconditionally free all remaining prisoners of conscience and emphasised the need to put an end to all arbitrary arrests.

The EU intends to raise the situation of human rights defenders and prisoners of consciences, including the case of NGO workers detained in Rakhine state, with the Government at the first EU-Myanmar Human Rights Dialogue, which is scheduled to take place in mid-2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001542/14
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: European health insurance cards and private healthcare

The European health insurance card (EHIC) gives EU citizens visiting other Member States access to medical treatment under the same conditions and at the same cost (which is free in some countries) as people insured in that country.

Is the Commission aware, however, that visitors abroad are sometimes misdirected to private ambulance services and private hospital facilities which do not accept the EHIC? My constituents have highlighted instances in countries such as Spain and Greece of being taken to private facilities when they have sought medical assistance. This has included people being taken to private facilities further away than the local municipal health facility.

Understandably, when urgent medical assistance is being sought, many people are unaware that they are being guided towards a private enterprise and that they could instead receive public hospital treatment.

Is the Commission aware of such instances? What steps has the Commission taken in health and consumer protection legislation to ensure that those admitted to hospitals are made aware of local public emergency health facilities which could be used?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

EHIC can mainly be used within Member States' public healthcare systems and only during a temporary stay for necessary care. Hospitals are obliged to recognise the EHIC in such cases ([1]).

The Commission monitors the use of EHIC in the EU. In the majority of cases, patients presenting the EHIC receive necessary care and are reimbursed without any problem. Whenever the Commission's attention is drawn to a case where the EHIC has not been accepted, it investigates the issue with the authorities of the Member State concerned. Such investigation may lead to an infringement procedure against any Member State incorrectly applying EC law on the use of the EHIC, as it did in case of Spain ([2]).

Should the EHIC not be accepted, patients who were treated by public providers should keep all receipts for payment of treatment received. They can then apply for reimbursement to the competent health institution in either the Member State of stay or that which issued the EHIC. These institutions should give information to patients about their rights. The EHIC smartphone application and the Commission's EHIC website include, *inter alia*, the contact details for those bodies ([3]).

The rights of patients under EHIC should not be affected by alternative rights that patients enjoy under the directive 2011/24/EU ([4]). The EHIC should be recognised and accepted wherever the terms to use it are met, unless the patient explicitly requests otherwise. The directive requires Member States to set up at least one National Contact Point which also provide information on patients' entitlements.

([1]) Article 19 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 (OJ L 166, 30.4.2004) and Article 25 of Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 (OJ L 284, 30.10.2009).
([2]) See Press Release IP/13/474 at: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-474_en.htm See also IP/13/683 at: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-683_en.htm
([3]) See http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=509&langId=en
([4]) OJ L 88 of 4.4.2011.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001543/14
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(12 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Intrarea în vigoare a Regulamentului (UE) nr. 1289/2013

Ca urmare a intrării în vigoare a Regulamentului (UE) nr. 1289/2013, se instituie o procedură prin care Comisia, la sesizarea unui stat membru sau din proprie inițiativă, poate introduce pentru perioade limitate de timp obligativitatea de a deține vize pentru cetățenii unor state terțe care aplică politici diferite în acest domeniu față de statele membre UE.

Așadar, se instituie un regim de „reciprocitate" în materie de vize între Uniunea Europeană și statele terțe.

În data de 9 februarie, conform regulamentului menționat anterior, a expirat termenul până la care statele membre trebuiau să transmită Comisiei o notificare conținând o listă de state terțe incluse în anexa II din regulament, care aplică obligativitatea vizelor pentru resortisanții statului membru în cauză.

Poate informa Comisia, în urma notificărilor primite de la statele membre, câte state terțe incluse în anexa II mențin pentru unul sau mai multe state membre obligativitatea vizelor?

Care sunt măsurile avute în vedere de Comisie pentru remedierea situației? Intenționează Comisia să declanșeze din proprie-inițiativă procedura prevăzută de Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1289/2013?

Răspuns dat de Malmström în numele Comisiei
(16 aprilie 2014)

În cadrul noului mecanism de reciprocitate introdus ca parte a Regulamentului 1289/2013 ([1]) de modificare a Regulamentului 539/2001, Comisia a primit de la statele membre notificări ale unor situații de nereciprocitate în privința a cinci țări: Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Japonia și Statele Unite ale Americii.

În conformitate cu articolul 1 alineatul (4) litera (a) din Regulamentul nr. 539/2001, astfel cum a fost modificat, Comisia va publica în curând informații cu privire la aceste notificări în *Jurnalul Oficial al Uniunii Europene*. Publicarea acestor informații nu implică faptul că Comisia recunoaște că toate cazurile notificate fac într-adevăr obiectul acestei dispoziții. Este necesară o examinare suplimentară, de exemplu cu privire la cazurile în care o țară terță nu impune obligativitatea vizelor pentru cetățenii unui anumit stat membru, dar scutirea de viză pentru cetățenii acestui stat membru este temporară, fiind însă permanentă pentru cetățenii altor state membre.

([1]) Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1289/2013 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 11 decembrie 2013 (JO L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 74-80) de modificare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 539/2001 al Consiliului din 15 martie 2001 de stabilire a listei țărilor terțe ai căror resortisanți trebuie să dețină viză pentru trecerea frontierelor externe și a listei țărilor terțe ai căror resortisanți sunt exonerați de această obligație (JO L 81, 21.3.2001).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001543/14
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Entry into force of Regulation (EU) No 1289/2013

The entry into force of Regulation (EU) No 1289/2013 establishes a procedure whereby the Commission, either at the request of a Member State or on its own initiative, may temporarily introduce a visa requirement for citizens of third countries which apply different visa policies to individual EU Member States.

The regulation thus introduces a system of visa reciprocity between the European Union and third countries.

The deadline for the Member States to send the Commission a notification listing the third countries figuring in Annex II to the regulation which apply visa requirements for nationals of the Member State in question expired on 9 February 2014.

In the light of the notifications received from the Member States, can the Commission say how many third countries listed in Annex II still apply visa requirements for one or more Member States?

What steps is the Commission considering to remedy the situation? Will it implement the procedure provided for in Regulation (EU) No 1289/2013 on its own initiative?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2014)

Under the new reciprocity mechanism introduced as part of Regulation 1289/2013 ([1]) amending Regulation 539/2001, the Commission has received notifications from Member States of non-reciprocity situations with regard to five countries: Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Japan and the United States.

In accordance with Article 1(4)(a) of Regulation 539/2001 as amended, the Commission will soon publish information about these notifications in the Official Journal of the EU. The publication of this information does not imply that the Commission recognises that all the notified cases indeed are covered by this provision. Further examination is needed, for instance with regard to cases where a third country does not impose a visa requirement for citizens of a certain Member State, but where the visa waiver for the citizens of this Member State is of a temporary nature while it is permanent for citizens of other Member States.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1289/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 (OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 74-80) amending Council Regulation (EC) No 539/2001 of 15 March 2001 listing the third countries whose nationals must be in possession of visas when crossing the external borders and those whose nationals are exempt from that requirement (OJ L 81, 21.3.2001).

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001544/14
adresată Comisiei (Vicepreşedintelui/Înaltului Reprezentant)
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(12 februarie 2014)

Subiect: VP/HR — Acțiunile UE de prevenire a pirateriei în largul coastelor Somaliei

De la 1 ianuarie 2014, Uniunea Europeană a preluat pentru o perioadă de un an de zile președinția Grupului de contact privind pirateria în largul coastelor Somaliei.

Deși numărul de atacuri asupra navelor comerciale s-a diminuat foarte mult în ultimul an, totuși problema persistă, iar Cornul Africii continuă să fie o regiune instabilă din acest punct de vedere.

Obiectivul rămâne reducerea la zero a numărului de atacuri împotriva navelor comerciale în largul coastelor somaleze.

Care sunt măsurile pe care le are în vedere SEAE pentru a consolida cooperarea dintre statele participante în cadrul Grupului de contact?

Ce acțiuni suplimentare sunt avute în vedere pentru reducerea la zero a numărului de atacuri împotriva navelor comerciale din zonă și a cazurilor de luări de ostatici?

Răspuns dat de Înaltul Reprezentant/doamna vicepreședinte Ashton în numele Comisiei
(8 aprilie 2014)

Grupul de contact a fost înființat în 2009 pentru a aborda fenomenul pirateriei în largul coastelor Somaliei și este activ în acest domeniu de cinci ani. Prima inițiativă adoptată de UE în calitate de președinte al acestui grup a fost organizarea unei reuniuni strategice în vederea revizuirii atribuțiilor și a modalităților de lucru ale Grupului de contact și a sporirii implicării sale la nivel regional. Activitatea Grupului de contact trebuie să fie eficientă din punctul de vedere al costurilor, bazată pe cerere, axată pe rezultate, iar structura acestuia trebuie calibrată pentru a răspunde acestor cerințe. În urma reuniunii strategice a Grupului de contact, s-au efectuat revizuiri privind trei grupuri de lucru: primul se axează pe „consolidarea capacității maritime" în Somalia și în regiune; al doilea — „Destrămarea rețelelor piraților la țărm" — include crearea unui grup operativ pe această temă, care să reunească experți financiari și din domeniul aplicării legii și să se concentreze asupra identificării și urmăririi în justiție a căpeteniilor piraților; al treilea grup de lucru este consacrat „operațiunilor de combatere a pirateriei maritime și de atenuare a influenței acestora". Acest grup de lucru reunește reprezentanți din forțele navale, din sectorul transportului maritim și din cadrul organizațiilor navigatorilor și va elabora un program specific de prevenire pentru a împiedica atacurile piraților asupra navelor comerciale în apele din jurul Cornului Africii.

În cadrul reuniunii strategice, s-a convenit, de asemenea, să se sporească implicarea regională, precum și implicarea statelor din Orientul Îndepărtat și Orientul Mijlociu. În acest scop, a fost introdus pentru grupurile de lucru un sistem de copreședinție, extinzându-se sfera de implicare și răspundere comună la statele din regiune. Acordurile privind copreședinția vor fi finalizate în cadrul sesiunii plenare din mai a Grupului de contact.

Modificările structurale propuse a fi aduse vor fi supuse aprobării în cadrul sesiunii plenare a Grupului de contact.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001544/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — EU measures to prevent piracy off the coast of Somalia

From 1 January 2014 the European Union assumed for one year the presidency of the Contact Group on Piracy off the Coast of Somalia.

While the number of attacks on commercial vessels has greatly diminished over the last year, the problem has not gone away, particularly owing to continued instability affecting the Horn of Africa.

The objective still being sought is to eliminate entirely attacks on commercial vessels off the Somali coast.

In view of this:

What measures are being envisaged by the EEAS to step up cooperation between the countries belonging to the Contact Group?

What further measures are being envisaged to eliminate entirely attacks on commercial vessels and hostage taking within this area?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2014)

The Contact Group has been created in 2009 to deal with piracy off the Coast of Somalia and has been continuously in operation for five years. The first action the EU Presidency took was to organise a Strategy Meeting to review the functions and working modalities of the Contact Group and to increase regional involvement. The Contact Group must be cost-efficient, demand driven, focused and results-oriented and its structure must be calibrated to support those needs. The CGPCS Strategy Meeting led to the revision of three Working Groups. The first focusing on 'Maritime Capacity Building' in Somalia and the region. The second 'Disrupting Pirate Networks Ashore' includes the creation of a dedicated Task Force of law enforcement and financial experts concentrating on identifying and prosecuting the pirate kingpins, and a third WG 'Maritime counter-piracy and Mitigation operations'. This WG brings together representatives from the navies, the shipping industry and seafarers organisations and will develop a specific Prevention Agenda to prevent pirate attacks on commercial vessels in the waters around the Horn of Africa.

At the strategy Meeting it was also agreed to increase regional involvement, as well as the involvement from states from the Far East and Middle East. To this end a system of co-chairs has been introduced for the WGs, broadening the involvement and ownership to states in the region. The co-chairing arrangements will be finalised at the May Plenary of the CGPCS.

The proposed structural changes of the CGPCS are subject to the endorsement of the CGPCS Plenary.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001545/14
aan de Commissie
Judith A. Merkies (S&D)
(12 februari 2014)

Betreft: Ford houdt verkeersovertredingen eigenaars bij

Op 9 januari 2014 berichtte De Standaard dat autoproducent Ford alle gemaakte verkeersovertredingen van Ford-eigenaars bijhoudt. Ford heeft deze informatie in handen, dankzij de in de wagen ingebouwde gps-systemen. Het bedrijf verklaart tevens momenteel niets te doen met deze informatie, maar wil deze in de toekomst wel toegankelijk maken voor geïnteresseerden.

De data zouden dan verkocht worden aan partijen die zich bezighouden met verkeer, zoals de organisator van een evenement die parkeerruimte moet voorzien.

Recentelijk stemde men in de Commissie industrie, onderzoek en energie over het eCallsysteem. Het systeem zou in werking treden in 2015, en zou enkel gegevens doorgeven van het moment waarop het geactiveerd wordt.

Op het verzamelen van gegevens via het gps-systeem is Richtlijn 95/46/EG betreffende de bescherming van natuurlijke personen in verband met de verwerking van persoonsgegevens en betreffende het vrije verkeer van die gegevens van toepassing.

Deze richtlijn behandelt de bescherming van individuen bij het verwerken van persoonlijke data en bij de verspreiding hiervan.

1. Is het mogelijk dat het bewaren van de gegevens door Ford zonder formele toestemming te vragen aan de eigenaren van de wagens in strijd is met deze wetgeving?

2. Is de mogelijke verkoop van deze gegevens in strijd met Richtlijn 95/46/EG?

3. Kan de burger juridische stappen ondernemen om de verkoop van zijn gegevens te verhinderen?

4. Kan de Commissie stappen ondernemen en zodoende een voorstel doen waarin ze bepalingen oplegt aan de autofabrikanten met betrekking tot de verkoop van deze gegevens?

Antwoord van meneer Hahn namens de Commissie
(22 april 2014)

De registratie door de fabrikant van alle verkeersovertredingen van eigenaars van een bepaald automerk en mogelijk verder gebruik van die gegevens, zoals bijvoorbeeld de verkoop ervan, geldt als verwerking van persoonsgegevens. Dergelijke verwerking van persoonsgegevens moet daarom in overeenstemming zijn met de EU-wetgeving inzake de bescherming van persoonsgegevens, met name Richtlijn 95/46/EG ([1]).

Persoonsgegevens moeten op eerlijke en rechtmatige wijze worden verwerkt, voor welbepaalde, uitdrukkelijk omschreven en gerechtvaardigde doeleinden, en mogen vervolgens niet worden verwerkt op een wijze die onverenigbaar is met die doeleinden (doelbindingsbeginsel). De gegevens dienen toereikend, terzake dienend en niet bovenmatig te zijn, uitgaande van de doeleinden waarvoor zij worden verzameld en verwerkt, en mogen niet langer worden bewaard dan noodzakelijk is voor deze doeleinden (artikel 6 van Richtlijn 95/46/EG).

Artikel 7 van Richtlijn 95/46/EG voorziet in criteria voor wettige gegevensverwerking. De Commissie is van oordeel dat voor de verwerking van gegevens in het kader van deze vraag, de betrokkene op ondubbelzinnige wijze moet hebben ingestemd.

Onverminderd de bevoegdheden van de Europese Commissie als hoedster van de Verdragen, vallen het toezicht op en de handhaving van de wetgeving inzake gegevensbescherming onder de bevoegdheid van de nationale autoriteiten, met name de toezichthoudende autoriteiten voor gegevensbescherming en de rechtbanken. Autobezitters die van mening zijn dat de fabrikant hun persoonlijke gegevens niet volgens Richtlijn 95/46/EG en de nationale wetgeving ter omzetting behandelt, kunnen een formele klacht indienen bij de betrokken nationale autoriteiten voor gegevensbescherming.

([1]) Richtlijn 95/46/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 24 oktober 1995 betreffende de bescherming van natuurlijke personen in verband met de verwerking van persoonsgegevens en betreffende het vrije verkeer van die gegevens (PB L 281 van 23.11.1995, blz. 31).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001545/14
to the Commission
Judith A. Merkies (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Ford's retention of records on traffic offences committed by vehicle owners

On 9 January 2014, *De Standaard* newspaper reported that car manufacturer Ford keeps records on all traffic offences committed by owners of Fords. Ford has access to this information thanks to the GPS systems built into the vehicles. The company claims that at present it is not putting the information to any use, but that it intends to give parties who express interest access to it in future.

The data would then be sold to parties that are concerned with traffic, such as organisers of events who need to provide car parking facilities.

The Committee on Industry, Research and Energy recently voted on the eCall system. This system would enter into force in 2015, and would only pass on data pertaining to the moment at which it was activated.

Gathering of data by means of GPS systems is governed by Directive 95/46/EC on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data.

That directive deals with the protection of individuals when their personal data are processed and disseminated.

1. Is it possible that Ford's retention of such data without asking vehicle owners for their formal consent breaches this legislation?

2. Does the possible sale of these data breach Directive 95/46/EC?

3. Can individuals take legal action to prevent the sale of their data?

4. Can the Commission take steps and thus make a proposal imposing requirements on vehicle manufacturers regarding the sale of such data?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2014)

Keeping records on all traffic offences committed by owners of a specific car brand by the manufacturer and any further use of such data, as e.g. the sale of the data, constitute processing of personal data. Such processing of personal data must therefore be done in accordance with EC law on the protection of personal data, in particular Directive 95/46/EC ([1]).

Personal data must be processed fairly and lawfully, collected for specified, explicit and legitimate purposes and not be further processed in a way incompatible with those purposes (purpose limitation principle). Data must be adequate, relevant and not excessive in relation to the purposes for which they are collected and further processed as well as not kept longer than is necessary for the purposes (Article 6 of Directive 95/46/EC).

Article 7 of Directive 95/46/EC provides criteria for making the data processing legitimate. The Commission considers that for the processing of data at issue in this question the data subject must have unambiguously given his consent.

Without prejudice to the powers of the European Commission as guardian of the Treaties, the supervision and enforcement of data protection legislation falls under the competence of national authorities, in particular data protection supervisory authorities, and courts. Car owners who believe that the manufacturer processes their personal data not in conformity with Directive 95/46/EC and the national legislations implementing it may lodge formal complaints with the concerned National Data Protection Authorities.

([1]) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995, p. 31.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001546/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(12 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Pedofilia, Internet ed educazione

Il risultato shock di una ricerca realizzata dall'istituto *Ipsos* per conto dell'organizzazione *Save the Children* in occasione del *Safer Internet Day 2014* dedicato dalla Commissione alla sensibilizzazione dei più giovani a un uso corretto e consapevole della rete, rileva la gravità di una situazione che rischia di rendere inutili gli sforzi educativi. Dal sondaggio, infatti, si ricava che il 38 % degli intervistati ritiene accettabile avere rapporti con adolescenti, che il 28 % di adulti ha contatti in rete con adolescenti che non conoscono, che il 41 % è rappresentato da contatti stabiliti per primi da adolescenti e che l'81 % degli italiani pensa che le interazioni sessuali tra adulti e adolescenti siano diffuse e trovino in internet il principale strumento per iniziare e sviluppare la relazione che può sfociare in un incontro fisico. Solo il 36 % ritiene che gli adolescenti siano impreparati a gestire una relazione sessuale con un adulto, anche se l'1 % degli intervistati pensa che il rapporto potrebbe addirittura essere formativo per il minore. Secondo gli organizzatori della ricerca se un adulto accetta anche semplicemente di fare *sexting* con un minore, si sta comportando da adolescente tra gli adolescenti, assumendo una forma gravissima di deresponsabilizzazione.

Di fronte a questi dati sconfortanti, può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. Non teme che internet, in assenza di regole, rappresenti un veicolo importante per la diffusione della pedofilia?

2. Non pensa che debbano essere realizzate iniziative più efficaci per impedire che questo strumento di conoscenza diventi un mezzo diseducativo e deresponsabilizzante, non solo nei confronti dei minori, ma anche degli adulti che anziché tendere alla maturità ritornano infantilmente all'adolescenza?

3. Non considera che l'unica soluzione a questo stato di cose sia un corretto e serio processo educativo?

4. In che misura ritiene che l'Unione possa contribuire a questo processo?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(22 aprile 2014)

Al fine di combattere il rischio di crimini di matrice sessuale via internet, la direttiva sulla lotta contro l'abuso e lo sfruttamento sessuale dei minori ([1]) impone agli Stati membri di conferire il carattere di reato all'adescamento da parte di un adulto di minori che non abbiano raggiunto l'età del consenso sessuale per fissare un appuntamento allo scopo di abusare o sfruttare sessualmente un minore. Tali reati comportano una pena di almeno un anno.

Inoltre, la Commissione sovvenziona campagne educative. La direttiva impone agli Stati membri di prendere iniziative, mediante campagne di comunicazione e sensibilizzazione, programmi di istruzione e ricerca, di creare consapevolezza e ridurre il rischio che i minori possano cadere vittime di abusi e sfruttamento sessuale. Sensibilizzare è anche uno dei quattro obiettivi centrali dell'Alleanza mondiale contro l'abuso sessuale di minori online, un'iniziativa che riunisce i ministri degli Interni e della Giustizia di 52 paesi.

La Commissione sovvenziona, nell'ambito del programma «Internet più sicuro», una rete paneuropea di centri di Internet più sicuro ([2]); ciascuno di tali centri promuove a livello nazionale iniziative per sensibilizzare i minori, i genitori e gli insegnanti a saper affrontare i pericoli online, quali l'adescamento in linea o il «sexting ([3])», e usare in modo responsabile le tecnologie online. Tali centri offrono anche consulenza tramite linee di soccorso.

Infine, la Commissione sostiene numerosi progetti che sovvenzionano le attività di indagine legate allo sfruttamento sessuale dei minori via Internet delle organizzazioni nazionali e internazionali di contrasto.

([1]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 13 dicembre 2011, relativa alla lotta contro l'abuso e lo sfruttamento sessuale dei minori e la pornografia minorile, e che sostituisce la decisione quadro 2004/68/GAI del Consiglio (GU L 335 del 17.12.2011, pagg. 1-14).
([2]) http://www.saferinternet.org/
([3]) http://www.saferinternet.org/online-issues/teachers-and-educators/sexting

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001546/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Paedophilia, the Internet and education

The shocking findings of a survey conducted by Ipsos on behalf of Save the Children for Safer Internet Day 2014, organised by the Commission in order to raise awareness among children of how to use the Internet safely, point to a state of affairs that could well nullify all efforts made in this area. According to those findings, 38% of respondents consider sexual relations between adults and teenagers to be acceptable, 28% of adults have teenagers they do not know personally among their online contacts, 41% think that teenagers have a more active role in initiating such relationships than adults, and 81% believe that sexual relationship between adults and teenagers are common and see the Internet as the primary means of initiating and developing relationships that could ultimately lead to a meeting. Only 36% believe that teenagers are unable to handle a sexual relationship with an adult; 1% even think that such a relationship could be of educational value to teenagers. According to the survey's organisers, adults who become involved in 'sexting' with teenagers are abdicating their responsibility as adults and behaving like teenagers themselves.

1. In view of these worrying findings, would the Commission not agree that, in the absence of proper rules, the Internet is an enabling environment for paedophiles?

2. Would it not agree that more effective steps should be taken to ensure that, instead of helping to educate people, the Internet does not have the opposite effect, not only on teenagers, but also on adults, allowing them to shirk their responsibility and slip back into adolescence?

3. Would it not agree that the only way out of this state of affairs is to launch a carefully thought-out educational campaign?

4. To what extent could the EU contribute to such a campaign?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2014)

To address the risk of sexual crimes being committed against children through the Internet, the directive on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children ([1]) obliges the Member States to criminalise the solicitation by an adult of a child who has not reached the age of sexual consent for the purposes of arranging a meeting, in order to sexually abuse or exploit the child. Such offences have to carry a maximum penalty of at least one year.

The Commission also supports educational campaigns. The directive requires Member States to take action, through information and awareness-raising campaigns, research and education programmes, to raise awareness and reduce the risk of children becoming victims of sexual abuse or exploitation. Raising awareness is also one of the four central targets of the Global Alliance against Child Sexual Abuse Online, an initiative uniting Ministers of Interior and of Justice of 52 countries.

Under the Safer Internet Programme the Commission supports a pan-European network ([2]) of Safer Internet Centres, each of which at national level promotes awareness to minors, parents and teachers of how to manage risks online, such as online grooming and sexting ([3]), and how to use online technologies responsibly. These centres also provide helplines for advice.

Finally, the Commission backs various projects which support national and international law enforcement organisations when investigating Internet-related child sexual exploitation.

([1]) Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA; OJ L 335, 17.12.2011, p. 1-14.
([2]) http://www.saferInternet.org/
([3]) http://www.saferInternet.org/online-issues/teachers-and-educators/sexting

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001547/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(12 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Petrolio croato e danni ambientali

In seguito alle dannose ricerche della nave norvegese «Northern Explorer», che utilizza «cannonate sismiche» per cercare il petrolio, il governo croato ha indirettamente annunciato, per voce del suo ministro dell'Economia Vrdoljak, che ci sono buone possibilità che nell'Adriatico si nasconda un tesoretto energetico: un giacimento di 12 000 km/q che frutterebbe 3 miliardi di barili e 3 punti in più di PIL per Zagabria. Nell'Adriatico le trivellazioni sarebbero semplici, visto il basso fondale, e la Croazia sta già sondando il terreno per valutare chi potrebbe essere interessato. Emergono però un problema ambientale e uno politico: le «cannonate sismiche», infatti, hanno causato gravi danni all'ambiente tra cui la fuga di capodogli e delfini — i mammiferi più sensibili alle scosse — e di altri esemplari della fauna marina, con conseguente grave alterazione del già precario ecosistema dell'Adriatico. Inoltre l'Ina, azienda petrolifera croata, è per un quarto di proprietà dell'Ungherese Mol, dietro la quale ci sarebbe la russa Gazprom.

1. Non ritiene la Commissione di dover limitare le prospezioni di petrolio se effettuate con strumenti che danneggiano l'ambiente?

2. Quali politiche ha intenzione di attuare a difesa della fauna marittima?

3. Quali informazioni è in grado di fornire sulla società Mol e sui suoi eventuali legami con Gazprom?

4. In che modo intende intervenire in caso di rischio per i legittimi interessi economici ed energetici dei cittadini croati ed europei?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(11 aprile 2014)

1. Il trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea ([1]) fissa gli obiettivi di salvaguardia, tutela e miglioramento della qualità dell'ambiente. Su tale base, la direttiva sulla sicurezza delle operazioni in mare ([2]) mira a prevenire il verificarsi di incidenti gravi legati alle operazioni in mare nel settore degli idrocarburi e limitarne le conseguenze sull'ambiente marino. Perciò, al momento della concessione di una licenza, si deve accordare particolare attenzione a tutti gli ambienti marini e costieri vulnerabili, in particolare agli ecosistemi e alle zone marine protette, tra cui le zone speciali di conservazione a norma della direttiva Habitat ([3]).

2. In base all'articolo 6 della direttiva Habitat, qualsiasi progetto che possa avere un'incidenza significativa su un sito della rete Natura 2000 deve essere sottoposto a opportuna valutazione, che ne verifichi l'incidenza sugli obiettivi di conservazione del sito, e può essere autorizzato solo se non pregiudica l'integrità del sito. L'articolo 12, paragrafo 1, vieta di perturbare deliberatamente alcune specie, come l'insieme dei cetacei ([4]). La Commissione ha inoltre chiesto alle autorità croate di fornire informazioni particolareggiate sulla prospezione sismica, per valutare se è conforme alle disposizioni della direttiva.

3. Inoltre, la direttiva quadro sulla strategia per l'ambiente marino ([5]) ha lo scopo di ottenere entro il 2020 un buono stato ecologico delle acque marine dell'Unione, prendendo in considerazione una serie di elementi perturbatori ([6]). La direttiva sulla valutazione dell'impatto ambientale (VIA) ([7]) prescrive inoltre che l'autorizzazione di determinate attività ([8]) sia preceduta da una siffatta valutazione.

4. La Commissione non fornisce informazioni sugli operatori del mercato degli idrocarburi, sul loro capitale, né sui loro segreti aziendali.

5. La Commissione non ha elementi sufficienti sul presunto rischio menzionato dall'onorevole deputato e non è pertanto in grado di rispondere a questo punto dell'interrogazione.

([1]) La politica dell'UE in materia di ambiente è sancita dall'articolo 191 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:12008E191:IT:HTML
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:178:0066:0106:IT:PDF (la direttiva sulla sicurezza delle operazioni in mare è stata adottata nel giugno 2013 e si applicherà dopo che gli Stati membri l'avranno recepita nel proprio diritto interno e trascorsi determinati periodi transitori per gli operatori del settore).
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1992L0043:20070101:IT:PDF
([4]) In particolare durante il periodo di riproduzione, allevamento, ibernazione e migrazione.
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:164:0019:0040:IT:PDF
([6]) Inclusi l'inquinamento da petrolio e il rumore sottomarino.
([7]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:026:0001:0021:IT:PDF
([8]) Specificate nell'allegato I della direttiva VIA. La direttiva stabilisce inoltre che per le attività di cui all'allegato II gli Stati membri determinano con una procedura di selezione quali progetti debbano essere sottoposti a VIA.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001547/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Croatian oil and damage to the environment

Following the harmful exploration work undertaken by the Norwegian vessel 'Northern Explorer', which uses seismic blasting to search for oil, the Croatian government has indirectly announced, through Mr Vrdoljak, Minister of Economy, that there are good chances that the Adriatic has bountiful energy reserves: a field of 12 000 sq. km that could yield 3 billion barrels of oil, thereby boosting Croatia's GDP by 3%. In the Adriatic, drilling would be simple, given the shallow water, and Croatia is already trying to establish who might be interested. However, there is both an environmental and a political issue here: the seismic blasting has caused serious damage to the environment, driving out sperm whales and dolphins — the mammals that are most sensitive to shocks — and other marine life, seriously altering the Adriatic's already fragile ecosystem. In addition, INA, a Croatian oil company, is 25% owned by the Hungarian Mol Group, which it turn is linked to Russia's Gazprom.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it agree that oil exploration should be restricted, if carried out using methods that are harmful to the environment?

2. What policies does it plan to pursue to protect marine fauna?

3. What information can it provide about the Mol Group and its possible links to Gazprom?

4. How does it intend to intervene in the event of a threat to the legitimate economic and energy interests of Croatian and EU citizens?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2014)

1. The Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union ([1]) establishes the objectives of preserving, protecting and improving the quality of the environment. On this basis, the Offshore Safety Directive ([2]) aims at preventing major oil and gas accidents offshore and limiting the consequences of oil and gas activities on the marine environment. Hence when awarding licenses, special attention must be paid to any sensitive marine and coastal environments, in particular ecosystems and marine protected areas, such as the Habitats Directive ([3]) special areas of conservation.

2. According to Article 6 of the Habitats Directive, any project likely to have a significant effect on a site which is a part of the Natura 2000 network shall be subject to appropriate assessment of its implications for the site's conservation objectives and may only be authorised if it does not affect the integrity of the site. Its Article 12(1)b prohibits deliberate disturbance of some species like all cetaceans ([4]). The Commission has asked the Croatian authorities to provide detailed information on the seismic survey in order to evaluate its compliance with provisions of the directive.

3. Moreover, the Marine Strategy Framework Directive ([5]) aims at achieving Good Environmental Status in EU marine waters by 2020, considering a number of disturbances ([6]). In addition, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive ([7]) also requires an EIA to be carried out prior to authorisation of specific activities ([8]).

4. The Commission does not provide information on oil and gas market actors as well as their equity and business interests.

5. The Commission does not have sufficient details on the hypothetical threat and is therefore not in the position to answer that part of the question.

([1]) The EU environmental policy as laid down in Article 191 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:12008E191:EN:HTML
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:178:0066:0106:EN:PDF (The Offshore Safety Directive has been adopted in June 2013 and will be enforceable once transposed by Member States and after transitional periods for the industry).
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1992L0043:20070101:EN:PDF
([4]) Particularly during the period of breeding, rearing, hibernation and migration.
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:164:0019:0040:EN:PDF
([6]) Including pollution from oil and underwater noise.
([7]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:026:0001:0021:EN:PDF
([8]) As specified in Annex I of the EIA Directive. The directive also requires Member States to carry out a screening procedure to establish whether an EIA is required for activities listed in Annex II.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001548/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(12 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Trojan e spionaggio informatico «domestico»

Si vanno sempre di più diffondendo tra i privati quei software che una volta erano prerogative dello spionaggio militare o al massimo industriale: i Trojan, servizi che infettano gli indirizzi e-mail altrui permettendo l'ingresso a terzi, gli Spycell e Spyphone, software che permettono l'accesso ai telefoni cellulari. Se un tempo lo spionaggio era cosa di pochi, ora questi programmi sono accessibili a tutti, scaricandoli a basso prezzo da internet, a volte perfino gratuitamente, permettendo violazioni della privacy che vanno dalla visualizzazione di documenti e dati personali, fino allo spionaggio di foto, video, dei nostri spostamenti, utilizzando anche microfoni e videocamere dei nostri cellulari. Quello che fino a 10 anni fa poteva essere fatto solo da professionisti ora può essere fatto da chiunque.

La Commissione:

1. Come valuta la diffusione di questi strumenti?

2. Può chiarire quale sia la legislazione europea di riferimento sul tema della privacy e come questa possa arginare il fenomeno?

3. Come difende i dati sensibili dei propri dipendenti e dei propri uffici dal dilagare di questo fenomeno che può portare a danni istituzionali ed economici gravissimi?

4. Come ritiene che si possa limitare la diffusione di tali strumenti rendendoli disponibili soltanto a persone autorizzate dalla magistratura?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2014)

La Commissione è consapevole della diffusione di programmi maligni (malware) e del loro impatto sulla privacy dei cittadini europei e sull'economia nel suo complesso.

L'Unione europea dispone di un quadro giuridico che riguarda tali azioni. In particolare, a norma della direttiva 2013/40/UE relativa agli attacchi contro i sistemi di informazione, la fabbricazione, la distribuzione o la messa a disposizione in altro modo intenzionali di programmi informatici destinati principalmente all'accesso senza diritto ai sistemi di informazione può costituire reato.

Inoltre, la direttiva 2002/58/CE (direttiva e-privacy) stabilisce il principio di base della riservatezza delle comunicazioni e prevede il consenso preliminare *opt-in* per l'archiviazione o l'accesso a informazioni negli apparecchi terminali (tablet, telefoni, ecc.) degli utenti.

La Commissione costituisce — come molte altre organizzazioni governative e imprese private — un potenziale obiettivo per la pirateria informatica. Essa ha le proprie politiche in materia di sicurezza informatica, basate sulla decisione C(2006) 3602 della Commissione. Tali politiche prevedono una serie completa di misure vincolanti in materia di sicurezza che devono essere applicate a tutti i sistemi informatici e che forniscono contromisure tecniche, procedurali e organizzative. Inoltre, per affrontare gli attacchi informatici è stato elaborato un piano d'azione globale che comprende misure volte a individuare e bloccare i tentativi di spionaggio. Tale piano viene costantemente aggiornato alla luce dell'evoluzione delle minacce alla sicurezza.

Un controllo dei programmi maligni (malware) a fini legittimi effettuato dagli organi giurisdizionali non sarebbe sufficientemente efficace per prevenirne la produzione e la distribuzione illecite.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001548/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Trojans and 'domestic' cyber espionage

The use of software that was once the preserve of military intelligence, or at least industrial espionage, is becoming increasingly widespread among private individuals: Trojans, programs that infect the e-mail addresses of others, allowing access by third parties, and Spy cell phones and Spyphone software that allows access to mobile phones. At one time, espionage was only available to a few people, but now these programs are available to everyone, simply by downloading them from the Internet cheaply, and sometimes even free of charge, allowing privacy violations ranging from viewing documents and personal data to spying on our photos, videos and our movements, and even making use of the microphones and cameras in our cell phones. Ten years ago this kind of thing could only be done by professionals: now anyone can do it.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. How does it view the spread of these devices?

2. What is the basic EU legislation on the subject of privacy and how it can be used to tackle this phenomenon?

3. How does it protect the sensitive data of its employees and its offices from the spread of this phenomenon, that can inflict very serious institutional and economic damage?

4. Does it believe the spread of these devices could be checked by making them available only to persons authorised by the courts?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The Commission is aware of the spread of malware and its impact on the privacy of European citizens and the economy as a whole.

The EU has a legal framework that covers these actions. In particular, under Directive 2013/40/EU on attacks against information systems, the intentional production, distribution or otherwise making available of computer programmes primarily for the purpose of accessing information systems without right may constitute a criminal offence.

Furthermore, Directive 2002/58/EC (ePrivacy) sets forth the basic principle of confidentiality of communications and requires prior opt-in consent to store or access information in users terminal equipment (tablets, phones, etc).

The Commission is — like many other government organisations and private companies — a possible target for hacking. The Commission has its own policies on IT security, based on Commission Decision C(2006) 3602. These policies give a comprehensive set of mandatory security measures which must be implemented for all IT systems. They provide technical, procedural and organisational counter-measures. In addition, a comprehensive action plan has been developed to deal with cyber-attacks, which includes measures aimed at detecting and stopping espionage attempts. This plan is constantly updated in view of the developments in security threats.

A control of malware for legitimate purposes performed by the Courts will not be sufficiently efficient in preventing its unlawful production and distribution.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001549/14
to the Commission
John Stuart Agnew (EFD)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: The value of oxo-biodegradable plastic

As oxo-biodegradable plastic contains no heavy metals or other contaminants, and biodegrades in an entirely safe manner whether on land or in water, what role does the Commission foresee for oxo-biodegradable plastic in managing plastic waste in the environment?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(28 April 2014)

The Commission does not have any conclusive scientific information concerning the biodegradation of oxo-degradable plastic on land or in water. So far the European plastic and recycling industry has raised concerns about even small quantities of oxo-degradable plastic compromising the recycling of plastic. It is also not evident how oxo-degradable plastic could contribute to tackling the problem of microplastics in the marine environment. Therefore, on the basis of what is presently known about oxo-degradable plastic, the Commmission does not foresee any specific role forthis material in plastic waste management.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001551/14
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος)
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(12 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Καταστροφή χημικών όπλων της Συρίας στη Μεσόγειο

Ξεκίνησε, υπό την εποπτεία του ΟΗΕ και του Οργανισμού για την Απαγόρευση των Χημικών Όπλων (OPCW) η διαδικασία μεταφοράς των χημικών όπλων της Συρίας, με σκοπό την εν πλω καταστροφή τους με τη μέθοδο της υδρόλυσης, σε περιοχή της Μεσογείου, ανάμεσα στην Κρήτη, τη Λιβύη και τη Μάλτα. Ωστόσο, η έλλειψη επίσημης ενημέρωσης από τον ΟΗΕ και τον OPCW για την τοποθεσία και για τις μεθόδους που πρόκειται να χρησιμοποιηθούν, έχει εύλογα δημιουργήσει τεράστια ανησυχία για τις επιπτώσεις στο περιβάλλον. Δεδομένου ότι, σύμφωνα με δημοσιοποιηθείσες απόψεις ειδικών επιστημόνων: α) Η μέθοδος της υδρόλυσης δεν έχει ξαναδοκιμαστεί, παρά μόνο πιλοτικά και επί εδάφους, β) τα χημικά αυτά είναι σοβαρά μείγματα επικίνδυνων και τοξικών ουσιών που δεν είναι σε θέση να αδρανοποιηθούν μόνο με τη χρήση αυτής της μεθόδου, πόσο δε μάλλον να αδρανοποιηθούν σε τέτοιο βαθμό, ώστε να απορριφθούν στη θάλασσα και να μην καταστρέψουν τους ζώντες οργανισμούς,

Ερωτάται η Αντιπρόεδρος της Επιτροπής/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος για θέματα εξωτερικής πολιτικής:

Πώς σχολιάζει τις παραπάνω επισημάνσεις; Έχουν δοθεί επίσημα πλήρης λεπτομερής πληροφόρηση και γραπτές διαβεβαιώσεις από τον ΟΗΕ και τον OPCW για την ασφάλεια της διαδικασίας που έχει επιλεγεί; Αν όχι, πώς δέχθηκε να χρηματοδοτήσει την επιχείρηση, όχι μόνο νομιμοποιώντας την, αλλά και εγκαινιάζοντας νέες διεθνείς πρακτικές που πλέον θα μετατρέπουν τα διεθνή ύδατα σε ζώνες ελεύθερες από κάθε έλεγχο και περιβαλλοντικό περιορισμό;

Σε ποια απόφαση, διεθνή συνθήκη ή σύμβαση προβλέπεται αυτή η μέθοδος καταστροφής και η δυνατότητα απόρριψης αποβλήτων χημικών όπλων σε μία κλειστή θαλάσσια λεκάνη όπως αυτή της Μεσογείου;

Έχουν εξετασθεί άλλες λύσεις για την τοποθεσία καταστροφής των χημικών όπλων και μάλιστα επί εδάφους; Έχει μελετήσει τις πιθανές επιπτώσεις στο οικοσύστημα της περιοχής καθώς και τις ολέθριες συνέπειες που μπορεί να υπάρξουν για το περιβάλλον των μεσογειακών χωρών; Έχει οριστεί λιμένας καταφυγής σε περίπτωση επιπλοκής κατά τη διαδικασία υδρόλυσης; Εάν ναι, ποιος; Εάν όχι, γιατί;

Σε κάθε περίπτωση, θα υπάρχουν κλιμάκια παρατηρητών της ΕΕ, αλλά και από τις ενδιαφερόμενες μεσογειακές χώρες (Ελλάδα, Ιταλία, Μάλτα), για την επίβλεψη της όλης διαδικασίας, εφ' όσον το ζητήσουν;

Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(16 Απριλίου 2014)

Η καταστροφή των χημικών όπλων της Συρίας έχει ήδη συμφωνηθεί και εποπτεύεται από το εκτελεστικό συμβούλιο του Οργανισμού για την Απαγόρευση των Χημικών Όπλων (ΟΑΧΟ) και το Συμβούλιο Ασφαλείας των Ηνωμένων Εθνών, που έχουν λάβει όλα τα κατάλληλα μέτρα για να εξασφαλίσουν την ασφαλή και περιβαλλοντικά ορθή καταστροφή. Το σχέδιο αυτό περιέχεται σε σειρά δημοσίων εγγράφων του ΟΑΧΟ που περιλαμβάνουν σχετικές αποφάσεις του εκτελεστικού συμβουλίου του ΟΑΧΟ. Στον σχεδιασμό των επιχειρήσεων συμμετείχαν ενεργά τόσο το Πρόγραμμα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για το Περιβάλλον (UNEP), όσο και η Παγκόσμια Οργάνωση Υγείας (ΠΟΥ). Βάσει των συμβουλών του UNEP και της ΠΟΥ, η κοινή αποστολή ΟΑΧΟ/ΟΗΕ θα επιτηρεί τη διαδικασία. Η κοινή αποστολή διοργάνωσε πρόσφατα συνάντηση με τις σημαντικότερες περιβαλλοντικές ΜΚΟ ώστε να καταστήσει σαφές ότι η καταστροφή θα πραγματοποιηθεί σύμφωνα με τη διεθνή και εθνική νομοθεσία. Η υδρόλυση των πρόδρομων χημικών ουσιών, μέθοδος που εφαρμόζεται εδώ και πολλά χρόνια στις ΗΠΑ σε παρόμοιες καταστάσεις, θα πραγματοποιηθεί στη θάλασσα σε πλοίο των ΗΠΑ, Δεν θα υπάρξει απόρριψη τυχόν χημικών ουσιών ή λυμάτων τους στη θάλασσα μετά την υδρόλυση. Τα λύματα, μαζί με το υπόλοιπο των χημικών ουσιών της Συρίας, θα διατεθούν σε δύο ιδιωτικές εγκαταστάσεις που επιλέγονται μέσω ανοικτού διεθνούς διαγωνισμού. Η Γερμανία, το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο και η Φινλανδία έχουν συμφωνήσει να επεξεργαστούν τα λύματα στην επικράτειά τους. Θα πρέπει επίσης να υπογραμμιστεί ότι η ΕΕ και ορισμένα από τα κράτη μέλη της έχουν συνεισφέρει σε χρήμα και σε είδος στην εν λόγω επιχείρηση για την εξάλειψη των χημικών ουσιών της Συρίας, με στόχο να μην επαναληφθεί η χρήση τους κατά του συριακού λαού ή οπουδήποτε αλλού.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001551/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Destruction of Syria's chemical weapons in the Mediterranean

The process of transporting Syria's chemical weapons, in order to destroy them by hydrolysis at sea, in an area of the Mediterranean between Crete, Libya and Malta, has begun under the supervision of the UN and the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW). However, the lack of official information from the UN and the OPCW on the location chosen and methods to be employed has understandably generated huge concern about the environmental impact of such a move. Since, according to the published opinions of scientific specialists: a) hydrolysis has never been used before in this way, only as part of land-based pilot schemes; and b) these chemicals are compounds of hazardous and toxic substances that cannot be deactivated using only this method, let alone deactivated to such an extent that they can be discharged into the sea without destroying living organisms.

In view of the above, will the VP/HR say:

How does she view the above comments? Have the UN and the OPCW officially furnished complete and detailed information and written assurances about the safety of the chosen method? If not, how did she agree to finance the operation, thereby not only legitimising, but inaugurating new international practices which will henceforth turn international waters into areas free from any control and environmental constraints?

Which decision, international treaty or convention provides for this method of destruction and the possibility of disposing of chemical weapons waste in a closed sea basin such as the Mediterranean?

Have other options been considered as a location for destroying the chemical weapons, notably on land? Has she studied the potential impact on the ecosystem of the region and the dire consequences this may have on the environment of Mediterranean countries? Has a port of refuge been designated in case of complications during hydrolysis process? If so, which port? If not, why not?

In any case, will parties of observers from the EU but also from the Mediterranean countries concerned (Greece, Italy, Malta) be present to oversee the entire process, if they so wish?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2014)

The destruction of the Syrian chemical weapons has been agreed and is supervised by the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) Executive Council and the UN Security Council, who have taken all relevant measures in securing a safe and environmentally sound destruction. This plan is contained in a series of public OPCW documents containing relevant decisions by the OPCW Executive Council. In the planning of the operation both United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and World Health Organisation (WHO) were actively involved. Acting on the advice from UNEP and WHO, the joint OCPW/UN mission will oversee the process. The Joint Mission has recently organised a meeting with leading environmental NGOs to explain that the destruction will take place in accordance with international and national legislation. Hydrolysis of chemical precursors, a method used since many years in the US in similar situations, will take place at sea on a US ship., There will be no discharge of any chemicals or their effluent after hydrolysis into the sea. The effluent, together with the rest of the Syrian chemicals, will be disposed of at two private facilities selected through international tendering. Germany, the UK and Finland have agreed to treat the effluent on their territory. It should also be underlined that the EU and a number of its MS have been contributing financially and in kind to this operation to eliminate the Syrian chemical, aimed at preventing a repetition of their use against the Syrian people or elsewhere.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-001553/14
upućeno Vijeću
Sandra Petrović Jakovina (S&D)
(12. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Rezultati referenduma u Švicarskoj

Na nedavno održanom referendumu u Švicarskoj 50,3 % švicarskih glasača izjasnilo se za uvođenje godišnjih kvota za radnike iz svih država članica EU-a.

Ovo pitanje vrlo je važno za Hrvatsku, posebno zato što ona, kao najnovija država članica EU-a, nije još ni počela primjenjivati načelo slobode kretanja osoba, koje uključuje pravo nastanjivanja u drugoj državi članici u svrhu zaposlenja u njoj. Drugo pitanje vezano je uz diskriminaciju među državama članicama i njihovim građanima, odnosno u ovom slučaju, drugačiji tretman hrvatskih građana.

EU i Švicarska bile su blizu potpisivanja protokola uz sporazum o slobodi kretanja osoba kojim bi se postojeći sporazumi između EU-a i Švicarske proširili i na Hrvatsku.

Potrebno je naglasiti da je Švicarska preuzela obveze prema međunarodnom pravu. Sporazum o slobodi kretanja osoba i robe između EU-a i Švicarske koji je trenutno na snazi dovodi se u pitanje jer je diskriminacija među državama članicama u suprotnosti s njegovim odredbama, budući da sloboda kretanja osoba, sloboda pružanja usluga i sloboda kretanja kapitala zajedno sačinjavaju dio zajedničkog tržišta.

Imajući u vidu gore navedeno, rezultat referenduma nije samo neusklađen s brojnim postojećim sporazumima između EU-a i Švicarske, nego i ugrožava proširenje prethodno spomenutog sporazuma o slobodi kretanja osoba na hrvatske građane. To bi u konačnici moglo za posljedicu imati da hrvatski građani budu u potpunosti izostavljeni iz godišnjih kvota.

Ne dovodeći u pitanje zajedničku korist odnosa između EU-a i Švicarske, Unija ne bi smjela dopustiti diskriminirajući tretman nijednog svojeg građana.

Na posljednjem sastanku Vijeća države članice izjavile su da neće dopustiti diskriminaciju hrvatskih građana u smislu rada u Švicarskoj.

Imajući u vidu rezultate referenduma i njegove implikacije na gore navedeni sporazum, koje radnje namjerava poduzeti Vijeće, i u kojem vremenskom roku, kako bi osiguralo da ne bude diskriminacije hrvatskih građana, posebno u vezi sa zapošljavanjem, te kako bi osiguralo da se gore navedene slobode, koje predstavljaju temelje Unije, dosljedno primjenjuju na sve građane EU-a?

Odgovor
(13. svibnja 2014.)

Vijeće može potvrditi da je nakon donošenja 11. veljače 2014. Odluke Vijeća o potpisivanju Protokola uz Sporazum sa Švicarskom o slobodnom kretanju osoba u vezi sa sudjelovanjem Hrvatske u tom Sporazumu ([1]), Vijeće spremno potpisati Protokol. Međutim, Švicarska još nije službeno obavijestila EU želi li potpisati Protokol ili to nije u mogućnosti učiniti nakon referenduma 9. veljače 2014. Izjava o službenom stajalištu Švicarske o ovom pitanju očekuje se do kraja ožujka 2014.

Nakon prve rasprave Vijeća o švicarskom referendumu na sastanku 11. veljače 2014, predsjedništvo Vijeća Europske unije izjavilo je da EU od Švicarske očekuje poštovanje njezinih obveza u skladu s međunarodnim pravom. Štoviše, predsjedništvo je navelo da su četiri slobode nedjeljive i „integralan dio odnosa EU-a i Švicarske" ([2]). Predsjedništvo je potvrdilo ovo stajalište u svojem nastupu pred Europskim parlamentom 26. veljače gdje je također izjavilo da EU ne bi mogla prihvatiti diskriminaciju između svojih država članica te bi uložila sve napore za izbjegavanjem takve situacije ([3]).

Predsjedništvo je 26. veljače također izvijestilo zastupnike u Europskom parlamentu da je Vijeće povezalo sudjelovanje Švicarske u programima Erasmus+ i Obzor 2020. sa sudjelovanjem Hrvatske u Sporazumu o slobodnom kretanju osoba ([4]). Dok ne stigne obavijest Švicarske o potpisivanju Protokola, Komisija je u skladu s tim zaustavila pregovore o sudjelovanju Švicarske u dvama programima.

Vijeće će pomno pratiti razvoj događaja u Švicarskoj u odnosu na provedbu referenduma te će razmatrati daljnje korake u cjelokupnom kontekstu odnosa EU-a i Švicarske.

([1]) SL L 69, 8.3.2014., str. 2.
([2]) 6328/14.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+CRE+20140226+ITEM-006+DOC+XML+V0//HR.
([4]) Idem.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001553/14
to the Council
Sandra Petrović Jakovina (S&D)
(12 February 2014)

Subject: Results of the referendum in Switzerland

The referendum held recently in Switzerland resulted in 50.3% of Swiss voters declaring themselves in favour of implementing annual quotas for workers from all EU Member States.

This issue is of great importance for Croatia, particularly given that, as the EU's newest Member State, it has not yet even started to apply the principle of the free movement of persons, which implies the right of establishment in another Member State for the purposes of employment in that Member State. The other issue raised is that of discrimination between Member States and their citizens; in this particular case, the different treatment of Croatian citizens.

The EU and Switzerland were on the point of signing the protocol to the agreement on the free movement of persons which would extend the existing EU-Swiss agreements to Croatia.

It should be emphasised that Switzerland undertook obligations under international law. The current agreement on the free movement of persons and goods in force between the EU and Switzerland is called into question as discrimination between Member States is contrary to its provisions, since the free movement of persons, the freedom to provide services and the free movement of capital all form part of the common market.

In view of the above, the result of the referendum is not only incompatible with a number of existing EU-Swiss agreements, but also jeopardises the extension of the aforementioned agreement on the free movement of persons to Croatian citizens. It may ultimately result in Croatian citizens being left out of the annual quotas altogether.

Without questioning the mutually beneficial relations between the EU and Switzerland, the Union should not allow for discriminatory treatment against any of its citizens.

At the most recent meeting of the Council, the Member States declared that they would not allow for discrimination against Croatian citizens in terms of working in Switzerland.

In view of the result of the referendum and its implications on the abovementioned agreement, what action does the Council intend to take, and within what time frame, to ensure that there is no discrimination against Croatian citizens, particularly as regards employment, and to ensure the uniform application of all abovementioned freedoms — which represent the very foundations of the Union — to all EU citizens.

Reply
(13 May 2014)

The Council can confirm that following the adoption on 11 February 2014 of its Decision on the signing of a Protocol to the Agreement with Switzerland on the free movement of persons, regarding the participation of Croatia in that Agreement ([1]), the Council stands ready to sign the Protocol. However, Switzerland has not yet officially notified the EU as to whether it wishes to sign the Protocol, or is unable to do so following the referendum of 9 February 2014. A statement of the official position of Switzerland on the issue is expected by the end of March 2014.

After the first discussion of the Swiss referendum by the Council at its meeting on 11 February 2014, the Presidency of the Council of the European Union stated that the EU expects Switzerland to respect its obligations under international law. Furthermore, the Presidency noted that the four freedoms are indivisible and 'are an integral part of EU-Switzerland relations' ([2]). The Presidency confirmed this stance at its appearance before the European Parliament on 26 February, where it also stated that the EU could not accept discrimination between its Member States and would make every effort to avoid such a situation ([3]).

On 26 February, the Presidency also informed the Members of the European Parliament that the Council had linked the participation of Switzerland in the Erasmus+ and Horizon 2020 programmes of the EU to the participation of Croatia in the free movement of persons Agreement ([4]). Pending notification of Switzerland regarding the signing of the Protocol, the Commission has consequently put negotiations on the participation of Switzerland in the two programmes on hold.

The Council will closely follow developments in Switzerland with regard to the implementation of the referendum, and will consider further steps in the overall context of EU-Switzerland relations.

([1]) OJ L 69 of 8.3.2014, p. 2.
([2]) 6328/14.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+CRE+20140226+ITEM-006+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN
([4]) Idem.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001559/14
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(13 februari 2014)

Betreft: Zwitserse stop op immigratie uit de EU

Het besluit van Zwitserland om beperkingen te stellen aan de immigratie uit de Europese Unie heeft het debat over de vrijheid van verkeer in Europa weer aangewakkerd. Tijdens een bezoek aan het Verenigd Koninkrijk heeft Viviane Reding verklaard dat Zwitserland niet kan verwachten dat het kan blijven profiteren van de voordelen van vrije handel als het de vrijheid van verkeer niet accepteert ([1]).

1. Weet de Commissie van die uitlatingen van Viviane Reding? Heeft ze die als Commissaris gedaan of was dat een persoonlijke mening?

2. Bevat de bilaterale overeenkomst inzake het vrije personenverkeer tussen Zwitserland en de Europese Unie een vrijwaringsclausule op grond waarvan Zwitserland de instroom van immigranten tijdelijk mag beperken?

3. Als het antwoord op vraag 2 ja is, vormt die vrijwaringsclausule dan een integrerend deel van de bilaterale overeenkomst?

4. Is de Commissie het met mij eens dat Zwitserland, als zijn regering de vrijwaringsclausule zou inroepen, wat zij mag doen omdat de Zwitserse burgers haar daartoe hebben gemachtigd, niet in strijd met de bilaterale overeenkomst zou handelen?

5. Kan de Commissie aangeven in welke bijzondere bepaling van het Vaduz-Verdrag, waarbij de Europese Vrijhandelsassociatie geregeld is, staat dat het lidmaatschap van de Europese Vrijhandelsassociatie (EVA) gekoppeld is aan een bilaterale overeenkomst inzake het vrije personenverkeer tussen de EU en de EVA-landen?

6. Als zo'n bepaling er niet is, waar baseert mevrouw Reding dan haar uitlatingen op?

7. Is de Commissie het met mij eens dat de uitkomst van het Zwitserse referendum het gevolg is van het onbevredigende immigratiebeleid van de EU?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(4 april 2014)

De vrijheid van verkeer tussen Zwitserland en de EU heeft tastbare voordelen opgeleverd voor zowel burgers als economieën. Minder dan 0,2 % van de EU-burgers verblijft in Zwitserland, terwijl 7 % van de Zwitserse onderdanen in de EU wonen.

Artikel 10 van de Overeenkomst tussen de EU en Zwitserland over het vrije verkeer van personen machtigde Zwitserland ertoe het aantal nieuwe verblijfsvergunningen voor werknemers en zelfstandigen uit de Unie te beperken tijdens een periode van twaalf jaar na de inwerkingtreding van de overeenkomst. Deze mogelijkheid zal definitief vervallen op 31 mei 2014.

In het interview dat het geachte Parlementslid aanhaalt, werd naar het Vaduz-Verdrag verwezen in verband met het feit dat de Overeenkomst over het vrije verkeer van personen aan zes andere bilaterale overeenkomsten was gekoppeld (die, onder meer, ook invloed hebben op het handelsverkeer) door middel van de guillotinebepaling van artikel 22 van de overeenkomst.

De gezamenlijke reactie van de EU-instellingen en de lidstaten op de resultaten van het in februari gehouden referendum toont het belang aan van het vrije verkeer van personen en de centrale positie ervan in de interne markt.

([1]) www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/eu/10629570/Swiss-referendum.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001559/14
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Swiss end to immigration from the EU

Switzerland's decision to impose limits on immigrants from the European Union has reignited the debate on freedom of movement in Europe. On a visit to the United Kingdom, Viviane Reding said that Switzerland could not expect to retain the benefits of free trade without accepting freedom of movement ([1]).

1. Is the Commission aware of Ms Reding's statement? Did she make it as a Commissioner or was it her personal opinion?

2. Does the bilateral agreement on the free movement of persons, signed by Switzerland and the European Union, contain a safeguard clause which enables Switzerland to restrict temporarily the influx of immigrants?

3. If the answer to question 2 is yes, than does the safeguard clause constitute an integral part of the bilateral agreement?

4. Does the Commission agree with me that if the Swiss Government were to activate the safeguard clause, which it is empowered to do by the Swiss citizens, Switzerland would not be in violation of the bilateral agreement?

5. Could the Commission specify the particular provision of the Vaduz Convention, governing the European Free Trade Association, which states that membership of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) is linked to a bilateral agreement on free movement of persons between EU and EFTA states?

6. If there is no such provision, then on what facts did Ms Reding base her statement?

7. Does the Commission agree with me that the result of the Swiss referendum was due to the EU's unsatisfactory immigration policy?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

Free movement between Switzerland and the EU has brought tangible benefits for citizens and economies. Less than 0.2% of EU citizens reside in Switzerland while 7% of the Swiss nationals live in the EU.

Article 10 of the Free Movement Agreement between the EU and Switzerland authorised Switzerland to limit the number of new residence permits for EU workers and self-employed persons for up to twelve years after the entry into force of the Agreement. This possibility will definitively expire on 31 May 2014.

In the interview the Honourable Member referred to, the reference to the Vaduz Convention was made in relation to the fact that the Free Movement Agreement was linked with other six bilateral agreements (which, *inter alia*, also affect trade) by guillotine clause of Article 22 of the Agreement.

The united response by the EU institutions and the Member States to the results of the February popular initiative shows the importance of free movement of persons and its central position in the Single Market.

([1]) www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/eu/10629570/Swiss-referendum

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001561/14
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(13 février 2014)

Objet: Référendum sur l'immigration en Suisse et accord de libre circulation UE-Suisse

Les Suisses ont voté pour une limitation de l'immigration, ce qui touche directement les citoyens européens. Les réactions de la part des gouvernements de l'Union européenne vont dans le sens d'une inquiétude quant au résultat du vote helvétique, notamment sur la validité et la continuité de l'accord de libre circulation des personnes signé avec l'Union européenne, qui s'est traduit par une immigration importante d'Européens en Suisse.

1. Quelle est la position de la Commission sur cette question?

2. La Commission n'estime-t-elle pas qu'il existe une criminalisation croissante de l'immigration, tant à l'intérieur qu'à l'extérieur de l'Union?

3. Quelles mesures la Commission compte-t-elle adopter pour lutter contre cette tendance?

4. La Commission envisage-t-elle le gel des accords avec la Suisse? Quelles sont les prochaines étapes à venir?

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante Ashton au nom de la Commission
(28 avril 2014)

Pour l'heure, le référendum d'initiative populaire suisse du 9 février ne modifie pas le statu quo des accords que nous avons conclu avec la Suisse. L'UE et la Suisse continueront à honorer leurs engagements et leurs obligations internationales. *Pacta sunt servanda*.

La Commission européenne est d'avis que la libre circulation des personnes est l'une des plus grandes réalisations de l'intégration européenne et s'opposera à toute tentative de limiter ou de remettre en question cette liberté.

Le Conseil fédéral suisse a annoncé qu'il allait adopter avant l'été un document de réflexion sur la façon dont il entend mettre en œuvre l'initiative. La Commission européenne est disposée à écouter les propositions des autorités suisses. Elle n'entrera toutefois pas dans une négociation sur des quotas, étant donné que ceux-ci sont contraires au principe de libre circulation des personnes. La conformité de l'acte législatif de mise en œuvre de l'accord UE-Suisse sur la libre circulation des personnes sera examinée dès que les détails du projet d'acte législatif seront connus.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001561/14
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Swiss referendum on immigration and EU-Switzerland agreement on the free movement of persons

The Swiss have voted to restrict immigration, a measure affecting European citizens directly. Responding to the referendum result, EU governments have expressed concern, in particular about the implications for the continued existence and validity of the EU-Switzerland agreement on the free movement of persons, which has led large numbers of Europeans to emigrate to Switzerland.

1. What is the Commission's view on this matter?

2. Does not the Commission consider that immigration is increasingly being criminalised, both within and outside the EU?

3. What will the Commission do to combat this trend?

4. Is the Commission planning to suspend the agreements with Switzerland? What will happen next?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(28 April 2014)

Currently, the Swiss popular vote of 9 February does not change the status quo of our existing agreements. Both the EU and Switzerland will continue to honour their commitments and international obligations. *Pacta sunt servanda*.

The European Commission believes that the free movement of persons is one of the greatest achievements of EU integration, and will counter all attempts to limit or to call into question this freedom.

The Swiss Federal Council has announced to adopt a concept paper on how it intends to implement the initiative before the summer. The European Commission stands ready to listen to the Swiss authorities' proposals. It will, however, not negotiate quotas since these are contrary to the principle of the free movement of persons. Compliance of the implementing legislation with the EU-Swiss Agreement on the free movement of persons will be analysed once the details of the draft legislation are known.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001562/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Disastro aereo compagnia militare algerina

Una notizia pubblicata dal sito on line algerie-focus.com nella giornata odierna riporta del terribile incidente aereo occorso nel dipartimento meridionale dello Stato algerino.

Secondo i dati divulgati, sarebbero stati almeno 103 i passeggeri a bordo del velivolo, mentre le operazioni di soccorso e recupero dei corpi registrerebbero un solo superstite.

Non sono sinora disponibili ulteriori informazioni e chiarimenti in relazione alle dinamiche della sciagura aerea.

Di conseguenza, può la Commissione comunicare:

1. Maggiori informazioni sulla vicenda, le cause e le responsabilità;

2. informazioni sulla presenza di cittadini europei fra le vittime?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2014)

La Commissione europea non dispone di informazioni più dettagliate di quelle pubblicamente disponibili. L'incidente ha causato la morte di 79 persone, con un unico superstite che ha riportato gravi ferite. Tra i passeggeri, tutti militari o loro familiari, non vi erano né europei né espatriati. Ho personalmente inviato una lettera di condoglianze al ministro degli Esteri Lamamra.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001562/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Algerian military transport plane crashes

News published on the website algerie-focus.com today reports an appalling air crash in the southern district of the State of Algeria.

According to the figures disclosed, the plane was carrying at least 103 passengers and, following rescue operations and the recovery of bodies, a single survivor was recorded.

More detailed information and clarification regarding the dynamics of this air crash are not yet available.

In consequence, can the Commission disclose:

1. Further information on this matter in terms of the causes and responsibilities?

2. Information on whether European citizens were among the victims?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

The European Commission does not possess specific details beyond publically available information. The accident caused the death of 79 people; one person survived, seriously injured; all military staff or family members. No Europeans/expatriates were among the victims. I also sent a letter of condolences to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr Lamamra.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001566/14
alla Commissione
Rita Borsellino (S&D)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Discarica sul greto del torrente Inganno

Il 20 luglio 2010 l'assessorato Territorio e Ambiente della Regione Siciliana ha autorizzato la realizzazione di una discarica in un sito posto sul greto del torrente Inganno nel comune di S. Agata di Militello, vicino Messina.

L'area prescelta per la discarica è soggetta a vincoli di tipo paesaggistico e idrogeologico per l'esondabilità del torrente, che a breve distanza sfocia in mare, oltre che dal punto di vista delle frane e sismico. La discarica sorge in prossimità di aree di interesse archeologico e naturalistico definite dalla direttiva 1992/43/CEE «siti di importanza comunitaria» e si trova a meno di 500 metri da un centro abitato.

L'AIA (autorizzazione integrata ambientale) è stata rilasciata senza la valutazione di impatto ambientale (VIA) prevista dalla direttiva 85/337/CEE.

Tale discarica non rientra, peraltro, in un piano di gestione dei rifiuti della Regione Siciliana e appare sovradimensionata per i volumi cui è destinata.

Sulla base di queste informazioni, ritiene la Commissione necessario intervenire per garantire il rispetto della normativa europea in materia ambientale e a tutela della salute dei cittadini, vista la violazione della direttiva 1999/31/CE relativa alle discariche dei rifiuti, della direttiva 85/337/CEE relativa alla valutazione di impatto ambientale e alla direttiva 2008/98/CE sul riciclo dei rifiuti?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(16 aprile 2014)

Le decisioni relative all'autorizzazione delle discariche devono essere adottate dalle autorità competenti degli Stati membri. La Commissione non può interferire con tali decisioni, a meno che vi sia evidenza che esse non rispettano le pertinenti prescrizioni della legislazione dell'Unione.

Le discariche per i rifiuti urbani non sono soggette ad una procedura obbligatoria di valutazione dell'impatto ambientale (VIA) a titolo della direttiva VIA ([1]). La direttiva quadro sui rifiuti ([2]) richiede agli Stati membri, se necessario, di fornire informazioni sui criteri di riferimento per l'individuazione dei siti e la capacità dei futuri impianti di smaltimento, ma non su ciascun impianto progettato.

Sulla base delle informazioni trasmesse dall'onorevole deputato, la Commissione non ravvisa alcuna violazione della legislazione dell'Unione.

([1]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale di determinati progetti pubblici e privati, GU L 26 del 28.1.2012.
([2]) Direttiva 2008/98/CE relativa ai rifiuti, GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001566/14
to the Commission
Rita Borsellino (S&D)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Landfill site on the bank of the Inganno stream

On 20 July 2010, the Assessorate for Territory and Environment of the Sicilian region gave the green light for a landfill site to be set up on the bank of the Inganno stream in the municipality of Sant'Agata di Militello, close to Messina.

The site chosen for the landfill site has hydro-geological restrictions imposed on it (due to the stream's propensity to flood and its vicinity to the sea, as well as from the point of view of landslides and earthquakes), in addition to landscape constraints. It also happens to lie in close proximity to areas of archaeological and natural importance, as defined by Directive 1992/43/EEC on 'sites of Community importance', and is less than 500 metres from a residential area.

The Integrated Environmental Authorisation (IEA) has been issued without the requisite Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) provided for in Directive 85/337/EEC.

What is more, the landfill site does not appear in any waste management plan for the Sicilian region and also seems to be too large for the amount of waste it is intended to receive.

Taking the above into account, does the Commission deem it necessary to intervene in order to ensure compliance with European legislation on the environment and the protection of the health of its citizens, bearing in mind the contraventions of Directive 1999/31/EC on the landfill of waste, Directive 85/337/EEC on environmental impact assessment, and Directive 2008/98/EC on the recycling of waste?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2014)

The decisions about the authorisation of landfills are to be taken by the competent authorities of the Member States. The Commission cannot interfere with such decisions, unless there is evidence that they do not comply with the relevant requirements of Union law.

Landfills for municipal waste are not subject to a mandatory Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) procedure under the EIA Directive ([1]). As for the Waste Framework Directive ([2]), it requires Member States to provide information on the location criteria for site identification and on the capacity of future disposal installations if necessary, but not on each planned installation.

On the basis of the information provided by the Honourable Member, the Commission cannot identify any breach of Union legislation.

([1]) Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.
([2]) Directive 2008/98/EC on Waste, OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001568/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(13 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Starzenie się społeczeństwa w Polsce i Europie

Dane Eurostatu wskazują, że w 2020 r. osoby po 60. roku życia będą stanowić prawie 25 % ludności w Polsce. Z kolei prognoza na lata 2008-2035 opracowana przez GUS wskazuje, że w najbliższych latach wzrośnie liczba osób w najstarszych grupach wieku. Szacunkowo, w roku 2030 liczba osób w wieku 85 lat i więcej może sięgać prawie 800 tysięcy. Według ekspertów problem starzenia się społeczeństwa polskiego może wywołać kolejne fale emigracji. Według prognoz za kilka lat na 100 ludzi w wieku produkcyjnym będzie przypadało 90 osób w wieku poprodukcyjnym. W porównaniu z Niemcami, problem ten jest większy, gdyż tam ten współczynnik wynosi 60 %.

1. Jakie środki podejmuje obecnie Komisja w celu zmniejszenia tempa starzenia się społeczeństwa w Polsce i Europie?

2. Czy Komisja zamierza podjąć działania w celu zwiększenia świadomości tego problemu wśród społeczeństw europejskich?

3. Czy Komisja podejmie kroki w celu zachęcenia rządów państw Unii do zwiększenia polityki prorodzinnej, która przyczynia się do zmniejszenia starzenia społeczeństwa?

4. Jak wiadomo, w celu zmniejszenia starzenia się społeczeństwa konieczne są także ułatwienia dla imigrantów (przykładowo w Wielkiej Brytanii współczynnik dzietności wzrósł po fali imigracji z Polski). Tymczasem rząd brytyjski forsuje rozwiązania utrudniające życie imigrantom, nawet tym z krajów Wspólnoty. Jak Komisja zamierza zapobiec takim działaniom w przyszłości ze strony innych państw członkowskich?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(2 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Jak podkreśliłem w mojej odpowiedzi na pytanie pisemne P-00568/14 ([1]), Komisja przywiązuje wielkie znaczenie do zmian demograficznych oraz polityki prorodzinnej przyczyniającej się do odmłodzenia społeczeństwa. Znajduje to wyraz podczas semestru europejskiego oraz w zaleceniach dla poszczególnych krajów dotyczących między innymi polityki sprzyjającej rodzinom i zachęcającej do posiadania dzieci.

Zwiększanie świadomości jest zasadniczym narzędziem polityki demograficznej: Komisja organizuje okresowe fora, propaguje debaty oraz rozpowszechnia informacje poprzez sieć Population-Europe ([2]) oraz opracowuje prognozy i badania ([3]).

Ponadto swoboda przemieszczania się wewnątrz UE jest prawem każdego obywatela. Komisja zapewnia możliwość pełnego korzystania z tego prawa, ostatnio poprzez swój wniosek dotyczący dyrektywy ([4]) w sprawie środków ułatwiających korzystanie z praw przyznanych pracownikom w kontekście swobodnego przepływu pracowników.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/pl/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://www.population-europe.eu/
([3]) Na przykład „sprawozdanie na temat starzenia się społeczeństwa" dostępne na stronie: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/2012-ageing-report_en.htm
([4]) COM(2013) 0236 z 26.4.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001568/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Ageing society in Poland and Europe

Eurostat data show that in 2020, people over the age of 60 will account for almost 25% of Poland's population. Furthermore, predictions for the period from 2008 to 2035 made by the Central Statistical Office of Poland show that the number of people in the oldest age groups is set to grow. It is estimated that the number of people aged 85 or over could reach almost 800 000 by 2030. Experts say that the ageing of Polish society could result in further waves of emigration. It is estimated that in a few years there will be 90 people above working age for every 100 people of working age. This is worse than the situation in Germany, where this ratio is 60%.

1. What steps is the Commission currently taking to reduce the pace at which Europe and Poland's populations are ageing?

2. Does the Commission intend to take steps to raise awareness of this issue among Europeans?

3. Will the Commission adopt measures to encourage the governments of EU Member States to expand their pro-family policies, which are vital in addressing the problem of our ageing societies?

4. Another thing that is vital in addressing the problem of ageing societies is to make things easier for immigrants (e.g. in the United Kingdom's fertility rate grew after a wave of immigration from Poland). However, the UK Government is now forcing through measures to make things more difficult for immigrants, even those from other EU Member States. How does the Commission intend to counter similar actions taken by other Member States in the future?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

As outlined in my reply to Question P-00568/14 ([1]), the Commission attaches great importance to demographic challenges and family/children policies for population renewal. This comes to an expression during the European Semester and in the country specific recommendations covering among others policies in favour of families and children.

Awareness-raising is a crucial demography policy tool and the Commission organises periodical fora, fosters debate and dissemination through Population-Europe ([2]), and prepares projections and studies ([3]).

Finally, the freedom of movement within the EU is a right of each individual citizen. The Commission ensures that this right can be fully enjoyed, most recently through its proposal for a directive ([4]) on measures facilitating the exercise of rights conferred on workers in the context of freedom of movement for workers.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://www.population-europe.eu/
([3]) For instance, the 'ageing report' at http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/2012-ageing-report_en.htm
([4]) COM(2013) 236 of 26.4.13.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001569/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(13 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Ograniczenia przedsiębiorczości w Polsce

Według raportu „Warunki prowadzenia firm w Polsce 2014", opublikowanego przez Związek Przedsiębiorców i Pracodawców, w ubiegłym roku było za mało pozytywnych zmian w kluczowych obszarach prowadzenia działalności gospodarczej. Co prawda rząd wprowadził kilka zmian w ramach tzw. „Pakietu na rzecz rozwoju przedsiębiorczości", jednak zmiany są niewystarczające. W raporcie przedstawiono pozycję Polski w międzynarodowych zestawieniach konkurencyjności gospodarek. Pomimo tego, że Polska przesunęła się w większości rankingów o kilka pozycji w górę, dalej mamy za dużo barier rozwoju przedsiębiorczości. Problemy wymienione w raporcie to skomplikowany i mało wydajny system podatkowy, przerost administracji i nadmierna biurokracja. Raport zwraca także uwagę na licencjonowanie działalności i wolności inwestycji oraz konieczność uzyskania zezwoleń na inwestycje. Kolejne problemy to zbyt długi czas rozwiązywania sporów gospodarczych, uzyskiwanie zezwoleń, rejestracja nieruchomości oraz utrudnienia w zakładaniu i likwidowaniu działalności. Wszystkie te sprawy przekładają się także na korupcjogenność polskiego systemu administracyjnego.

1. Czy Komisja jest świadoma ograniczeń przedsiębiorczości przedstawionych w raporcie?

2. Czy Komisja mogłaby wystosować zalecenia i opinie dla polskiego rządu motywujące do wprowadzenia ułatwień dla przedsiębiorców?

3. Czy Komisja posiada własną analizę przedstawionych problemów w państwach Unii; jeśli nie, to, czy mogłaby taką przeprowadzić?

4. Czy planowane są w najbliższym czasie przez Komisję projekty rozporządzeń i dyrektyw ułatwiających działalność przedsiębiorców?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wiceprzewodniczącego Antonia Tajaniego w imieniu Komisji
(2 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Komisja pragnie potwierdzić, że jest świadoma sytuacji polskich przedsiębiorców.

Komisja uważnie śledzi sytuację we wszystkich państwach członkowskich, w szczególności w kwestiach dotyczących małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw (MŚP) oraz przedsiębiorczości. Zwłaszcza program „Small Business Act" dla Europy odzwierciedla wolę polityczną Komisji, aby uznać kluczową rolę MŚP w unijnej gospodarce, i po raz pierwszy wdraża kompleksowe ramy polityki UE i jej państw członkowskich na rzecz MŚP.

Przeprowadzany co roku od 2008 r. przegląd wyników MŚP jest jednym z głównych narzędzi, które Komisja wykorzystuje do monitorowania i oceny postępów państw we wdrażaniu programu „Small Business Act", uwzględniając między innymi kwestie, takie jak: przedsiębiorczość, elastyczna administracja i dostęp do finansowania. W kontekście europejskiego semestru Komisja analizuje również politykę każdego z państw członkowskich w zakresie reformy fiskalnej i strukturalnej, przedstawia zalecenia oraz nadzoruje ich wykonanie. Monitoruje się także informacje na temat realizacji planu działania na rzecz przedsiębiorczości do 2020 r. ([1]).

Podczas corocznych wizyt informacyjnych przedstawiciele Komisji i władz państw członkowskich zbierają się, aby przedyskutować te kwestie. W 2014 r. wizyta w Polsce odbyła się na początku lutego. Jej wyniki i ocena zostaną uwzględnione w ramach europejskiego semestru opisanego powyżej i opublikowane jesienią w sprawozdaniu z przeglądu wyników MŚP za 2014 r.

([1]) Bruksela, 9.1.2013 Komunikat Komisji do Parlamentu Europejskiego, Rady, Europejskiego Komitetu Ekonomiczno-Społecznego i Komitetu Regionów, Plan działania na na rzecz przedsiębiorczości do 2020 r., Pobudzanie ducha przedsiębiorczości w Europie COM(2012) 0795 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001569/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Restrictions on entrepreneurship in Poland

According to a report entitled *Warunki prowadzenia firm w Polsce 2014* ('Business conditions in Poland 2014') published by Poland's entrepreneurs' and employers' association, last year there were too few positive changes in key areas relating to the running of businesses. Although the government did introduce a number of changes as part of the 'entrepreneurship development package', those changes were insufficient. The report outlines Poland's position in the international competitiveness stakes. Despite the fact that Poland has moved up a few notches in most of the ratings, we still have too many barriers to entrepreneurship. The problems the report points to are the complex and inefficient tax system, excessive administration and too much red tape. The report also draws attention to the authorisation process that must be followed in order to operate a business and invest freely, as well as the requirement to obtain investment permits. It also takes too long to resolve commercial disputes, obtain permits and register property, and it is difficult to start up and close down businesses. All these issues also help increase the likelihood of corruption in the Polish administrative system.

1. Is the Commission aware of the restrictions on entrepreneurship outlined in the aforementioned report?

2. Could the Commission provide the Polish Government with recommendations and opinions encouraging it to introduce measures to make it easier for entrepreneurs to do business?

3. Does the Commission have its own analysis of the aforementioned problems in the Member States? If not, could it carry out such an analysis?

4. Is the Commission planning, in the near future, to draw up proposals for regulations and directives to make it easier for entrepreneurs to do business?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

The Commission would like to confirm that it is aware of the situation of Polish entrepreneurs.

The Commission closely follows the situation in all the Member States on issues affecting in particular small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and entrepreneurship. In particular, the Small Business Act for Europe (SBA) reflects the Commission's political will to recognise the central role of SMEs in the EU economy and for the first time puts into place a comprehensive SME policy framework for the EU and its Member States.

On an annual basis since 2008, the SME Performance Review is one of the main tools the Commission uses to monitor and assess countries' progress in implementing the Small Business Act (SBA), which include, *inter alia*, entrepreneurship, responsive administration and access to finance. Also within the context of the European Semester, the Commission analyses the fiscal and structural reform policies of every Member State, provides recommendations, and monitors their implementation. In addition, information on implementation of the Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan ([1]) is monitored in the same context.

Annual fact-finding missions bring together the Commission and the Member State authorities to discuss these issues. The 2014 mission to Poland was held in the beginning of February; its results and evaluation will feed into the European Semester process as described above and be published in the 2014 SME Performance Review report this autumn.

([1]) Brussels, 9.1.2013 Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions Entrepreneurship 2020 action plan Reigniting the entrepreneurial spirit in Europe COM(2012) 795 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001570/14
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter/Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(13 februari 2014)

Betreft: VP/HR — EU financiert Palestijnse fantoomambtenaren (vervolgvraag)

Tot zes jaar lang heeft de EU duizenden fantoomambtenaren in de Gazastrook betaald zonder dat zij enig werk verzetten ([1]). Op 12 februari 2014 heeft hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie antwoord gegeven op schriftelijke vraag E-014026/2013 over voornoemde kwestie. Daarin schrijft zij: „Zoals werd aangegeven in een verslag dat is gepubliceerd door de Europese Rekenkamer op 11 december 2013, zijn de problemen rond de ambtenaren die niet in Gaza kunnen werken complex wegens de omstandigheden in de Gazastrook, waar objectieve controle moeilijk is. In het verslag wordt niet verwezen naar een exact cijfer van ambtenaren die niet kunnen werken, en het is evenmin mogelijk om precies te weten over welke sectoren het gaat."

1. Hoe verantwoordt de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter überhaupt de financiering van Palestijnse (fantoom)ambtenaren als — zoals zijzelf aangeeft — objectieve controle moeilijk is en onbekend is over welke ambtenaren/sectoren het precies gaat? Deelt de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter de mening dat uit haar eigen woorden blijkt hoe dubieus deze financiering is? Zo neen, waarop baseert de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter aldus haar impliciete verwachting dat de betreffende EU-gelden uiteindelijk op correcte wijze worden gespendeerd, hoewel zij expliciet aangeeft dat objectieve controle moeilijk is — en hoe verklaart zij deze tegenstrijdigheid?

Voorts staat in het antwoord op E-014026/2013: „De ambtenaren in kwestie zijn geen fantoomambtenaren, maar voldoen aan de toelatingscriteria van het Pegase-mechanisme tussen de EU en de PA."

2. Hoe bewijst de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter dat de ambtenaren in kwestie géén fantoomambtenaren zouden zijn en aan de criteria zouden voldoen? Welke criteria betreft het hier? Hoe weet resp. kan zij weten dat de betreffende personen aan de criteria voldoen als objectieve controle moeilijk is en onbekend is over welke ambtenaren/sectoren het precies gaat?

3. Deelt de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter de mening dat het ronduit dubieuze en tegenstrijdige karakter van haar eigen woorden erop duidt dat de betreffende EU-geldstromen per direct moeten worden stopgezet? Is de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter ertoe bereid dit ook daadwerkelijk te doen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(10 april 2014)

Alle punten die het geachte Parlementslid aanhaalt, worden behandeld in het antwoord van de Commissie en de HV/VV op het verslag (ERK SP 14/2013).

De verwijzing naar de ontvankelijkheidscriteria voor financiering heeft betrekking op de criteria die werden vastgelegd door het PEGASE-mechanisme, dat bepaalt wie in aanmerking komt als begunstigde. Om in aanmerking te komen voor het PEGASE-programma moeten ambtenaren onder meer aan de volgende ontvankelijkheidscriteria voldoen: de begunstigde moet op de loonlijst staan bij de Palestijnse Autoriteit voor de maand in kwestie; enkel basislonen en -pensioenen worden gedekt; managers en consultants komen niet in aanmerking; veiligheidsdiensten en civiele politie komen niet in aanmerking; personen die werkzaam zijn bij ngo's, vakbonden, religieuze of politieke organisaties of het Palestijnse Persagentschap komen ook niet in aanmerking.

Met betrekking tot de specifieke kwestie van de EU-financiering voor werknemers in de Gazastrook die niet in staat zijn te werken op grond van de politieke situatie, zijn de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter en de Commissie, zoals beschreven in bovengenoemde officiële antwoorden aan de Rekenkamer, overeengekomen om overleg te plegen met de Palestijnse Autoriteit, waarbij de bezwaren van het Hof aan bod zouden komen en de PA tezelfdertijd haar werknemers in Gaza zou kunnen blijven steunen.

([1]) http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/7e6d1c9e-61b8-11e3-aa02-00144feabdc0.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001570/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — EU financing of imaginary Palestinian civil servants (follow-up question)

For up to six years, the EU has been paying thousands of imaginary civil servants in the Gaza Strip without them doing any work ([1]). On 12 February 2014, Vice-President/High Representative Ashton, on behalf of the Commission, answered Written Question E-014026/2013 on the above subject. In her reply, she wrote: 'As outlined in a report published by the European Court of Auditors on 11 December 2013, the issues surrounding the civil servants who may be unable to work in Gaza are complex in the circumstances of the Gaza Strip where objective verification is difficult. The report does not quote a precise figure of civil servants prevented from working, nor is it possible to be known with precision what sectors are most affected.'

1. How can the Vice-President/High Representative possibly justify the funding of Palestinian civil servants who may be imaginary if — as she herself indicates — objective verification is difficult and it is not known with precision what civil servants/sectors are affected? Does the Vice-President/High Representative agree that it is clear from her own words how dubious this funding is? If not, on what does the Vice-President/High Representative base her implied expectation that the EU funds concerned will ultimately be expended correctly, although she explicitly states that objective verification is difficult — and how does she account for this contradiction?

The answer to Question E-014026/2013 also states: 'The civil servants in question are not imaginary but meet the eligibility criteria established under the PEGASE Mechanism between the EU and the PA.'

2. How can the Vice-President/High Representative prove that these civil servants are not imaginary and that they meet the criteria? To what criteria is she referring? How does she — or can she — know that the people concerned meet the criteria if no objective verification is possible and it is not known exactly which civil servants/sectors are affected?

3. Does the Vice-President/High Representative agree that the nothing short of dubious and contradictory nature of her own words indicates that the EU funding concerned ought to be halted immediately? Will the Vice-President/High Representative in fact take this action? If not, why not?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

All the points raised by the Honourable Member are covered in the reply by the Commission and HR/VP to the report (ECA SP 14/2013).

Concerning the eligibility criteria, this refers to the criteria established by the PEGASE mechanism which determines the eligible beneficiaries. In order to benefit from the PEGASE programme, civil servants need to comply with certain eligibility criteria including the following; the beneficiary must be on the payroll list of the Palestinian Authority for that particular month; only basic salaries and pensions are covered; managerial position and consultants are not eligible; security forces and civil police are ineligible; employees working in non-governmental organisations, trade unions, religious or political bodies or working in the Palestinian News Agency are also not eligible.

Concerning the specific issue of EU funding to workers in the Gaza Strip who are unable to work due to the political situation, as outlined in the abovementioned official replies to the Court, the HR/VP and the Commission have agreed to enter into discussions with the Palestinian Authority that would take into account the concerns of the Court while allowing the PA to continue supporting its employees in Gaza.

([1]) http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/7e6d1c9e-61b8-11e3-aa02-00144feabdc0.html

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001571/14
aan de Commissie
Esther de Lange (PPE)
(13 februari 2014)

Betreft: Terugvorderen toeslagen in het buitenland

In de brief van 15 januari 2014 gericht aan de leden van de Tweede Kamer in Nederland stelt staatssecretaris van Financiën Weekers dat het mogelijk is alle toeslagen terug te vorderen. Voor de invordering van toeslagschuld in het buitenland is bijstand van het betreffende land noodzakelijk. Voor de terugvordering van toeslagen binnen de EU wordt gebruikgemaakt van Verordening (EG) nr. 884/2004. Voor de terugvordering van kinderopvangtoeslag, zorgtoeslag en kindgebonden budget kan worden verzocht aan andere lidstaten bijstand te krijgen. De huurtoeslag valt echter niet onder de reikwijdte van deze verordening.

Kan de Commissie uitleggen waarom het terugvorderen van huurtoeslag niet valt onder de reikwijdte van Verordening (EG) nr. 884/2004?

Geldt dit alleen voor Nederland of valt de huurtoeslag van andere Europese lidstaten ook niet onder de reikwijdte van de verordening? Zo ja, welke lidstaten zijn dat?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(2 april 2014)

De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid naar haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E 625/2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001571/14
to the Commission
Esther de Lange (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Recovery of allowances abroad

In a letter of 15 January 2014 to Members of the House of Representatives of the Netherlands, State Secretary for Finance Weekers states that it is possible to recover all allowances. In order to recover allowances owed to the authorities by people abroad, it is necessary to seek the assistance of the country concerned. In order to recover allowances within the EU, use is made of Regulation (EC) No 884/2004. In order to recover childcare allowance, care allowance and the child-related budget, other Member States can be asked to assist. However, rental support does not fall within the scope of this regulation.

Can the Commission explain why the recovery of rental support does not fall within the scope of Regulation (EC) No 884/2004?

Does this only apply to the Netherlands, or does rental support from other EU Member States likewise not fall within the scope of the regulation? If so, to which Member States does this apply?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E 625/2014.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-001574/14
upućeno Komisiji
Andrej Plenković (PPE)
(13. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Provedba projekata za Hrvatsku u okviru Strategije EU-a za dunavsku regiju (Dunavska strategija)

Slijedom usvajanja Strategije EU-a za dunavsku regiju na Europskom vijeću 24. lipnja 2011., njezina provedba se, na temelju Akcijskog plana, bazira na 4 stupa suradnje (1. Povezivanje; 2. Očuvanje okoliša; 3. Izgradnja prosperiteta; 4. Jačanje institucionalnih kapaciteta i sigurnosti).

Zanima me ocjena Europske komisije o provedbi Strategije EU-a za dunavsku regiju u Republici Hrvatskoj, koja je kao podunavska država postala članicom EU-a prije 7 mjeseci.

Kakve su procjene Europske komisije za financiranje projekata u okviru aktualnog Višegodišnjeg financijskog okvira (2014. — 2020.) putem kohezijske politike, odnosno definiranja glavnih područja suradnje kroz Partnerski sporazum i njegove implikacije na provedbu hrvatskih prioriteta u okviru Dunavske strategije (promet, gospodarstvo, okoliš, civilno društvo)?

Odgovor g. Hahna u ime Komisije
(9. travnja 2014.)

1. Hrvatska je aktivno uključena u provedbu Strategije EU-a za dunavsku regiju te je iskazala poseban interes za razvoj klastera i poduzetničko učenje, s naglaskom na tržišne inovacije. Hrvatsko Ministarstvo poduzetništva i obrta zaduženo je (zajedno s pokrajinom Baden-Württemberg) za koordinaciju prioritetnog područja konkurentnosti. Kao jedan od primjera, Hrvatska je u tom kontekstu u rujnu 2012. u Vukovaru organizirala radionicu posvećenu klasterima. Na široj razini, Hrvatska je osim toga predana i ostvarenju projekata u skladu s prioritetima Dunavske strategije. Ta predanost postojala je i u razdoblju 2007. — 2013. kada su područja obuhvaćena temeljnim prioritetima te Strategije, primjerice zaštita okoliša, promet, malo i srednje poduzetništvo te istraživačka suradnja, dobivala potporu iz pretpristupnih i postpristupnih programa. Konkretni projekti uključivali su unapređenje vodovodne i kanalizacijske infrastrukture gradova Osijeka i Vukovara, potporu razmjeni informacija o rijeci Savi, pripremu razvoja luka u Vukovaru, Osijeku i Slavonskom Brodu te osnivanje inovacijske agencije u Zagrebu. Daljnji s time povezani primjeri jesu SEECEL — Regionalni centar za razvoj poduzetničkih kompetencija zemalja jugoistočne Europe i DTC-ovi — centri za prijenos tehnologija u dunavskoj regiji, a koji se financiraju u suradnji s Baden-Württembergom.

2. U pogledu priprema za razdoblje 2014. — 2020. Komisija još nema podrobne informacije o potencijalnim financijskim sredstvima koja će se namijeniti Dunavskoj strategiji. Unatoč tomu, od Hrvatske se traži da u svoje sporazume o partnerstvu te relevantne programe uključi makroregionalnu perspektivu i u skladu s time osigura usklađenost projekata koji se financiraju iz fondova EU-a s njezinim odredbama.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001574/14
to the Commission
Andrej Plenković (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Implementation of projects for Croatia under the EU Strategy for the Danube Region (Danube Strategy)

Following the adoption of the EU Strategy for the Danube Region on 24 June 2011, its implementation under the action plan has been based on four pillars of cooperation: connectivity, protecting the environment, building prosperity, and strengthening institutional capacities and security.

I would like to hear the Commission's assessment of the implementation of the EU Strategy for the Danube Region in Croatia — a country in the Danube Basin which became an EU Member States seven months ago.

What are the Commission's estimates regarding the use of cohesion policy to fund projects under the multiannual financial framework (2014-2020), with reference to defining the main areas of cooperation through a partnership agreement and to such an agreement's implications for the implementation of Croatian priorities under the Danube Strategy (transport, economy, environment, civil society)?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

1. Croatia has been actively involved in the implementation of the EU Strategy for the Danube Region and has shown a particular interest in cluster development and entrepreneurial learning, focusing on market innovation. The Croatian Ministry of Entrepreneurship and Crafts is coordinating (with Baden-Württemberg) the priority area on Competitiveness. In this context, Croatia has organised a Cluster Workshop in Vukovar in September 2012, as just one example of its work. More globally, Croatia is also committed to delivering projects in line with the priorities of the Danube Strategy. This commitment already existed in the 2007-13 period, when the pre- and post-accession programmes supported projects in the areas of environmental protection, transport and SME and research cooperation, which fall under the core priorities of the strategy. Specific projects included improving water and wastewater infrastructure in Osijek and Vukovar, supporting river information services on the Sava, preparing the development of Vukovar, Osijek and Slavonski Brod ports, and establishing an Innovation Agency in Zagreb. A further linked development is in SEECEL — South East European Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning and the Danube Transfer Centres, which received funds in cooperation with Baden-Württemberg.

2. As regards the preparation of the 2014-2020 period, the Commission does not yet have detailed information about the potential financial resources dedicated to the Danube Strategy. Nevertheless, both in its partnership agreement and in the relevant programmes, Croatia is asked to include the macro-regional perspective and consequently to ensure that projects financed through EU funds are in line with the included provisions.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001575/14
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(13 februari 2014)

Betreft: Interpretatie van artikel 83 VWEU

In een studie van het Directoraat-generaal Intern Beleid van het Europees Parlement, getiteld „Developing a Criminal Justice Area in the European Union" ([1]), staat dat het voor de afbakening van de legitieme toepassingssfeer van een EU-strafrecht noodzakelijk is dat er op EU-niveau een autonome definitie van „ernstig misdrijf" wordt ontwikkeld.

1. Hoe interpreteert de Commissie artikel 83, lid 1, van het VWEU?

2. Is de in dat lid beschreven procedure ook van toepassing op de definitie van ernstig misdrijf, of alleen maar op de afzonderlijke misdrijven die uitputtend worden opgesomd in dat lid?

3. Zo ja, welke wetgevingsprocedure zal van toepassing zijn, de bijzondere of de gewone?

4. Is de Commissie van plan om met een voorstel voor de definitie van het begrip „ernstig misdrijf" te komen?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(4 april 2014)

Artikel 83, lid 1, van het Verdrag staat de Raad toe om met eenparigheid van stemmen en na goedkeuring door het Europees Parlement, bij besluit vast te stellen welke andere vormen van criminaliteit aan de in dit lid genoemde criteria voldoen. Deze procedure heeft betrekking op andere vormen van bijzonder zware criminaliteit met een grensoverschrijdende dimensie die voortvloeit uit de aard of gevolgen van deze strafbare feiten, of uit een bijzondere noodzaak om deze op gemeenschappelijke basis te bestrijden. Artikel 83, lid 1, van het VWEU staat de Europese wetgever niet toe om het concept „zware criminaliteit" in abstracto te definiëren.

De Commissie is niet van plan wetgeving voor te stellen met betrekking tot de definitie van „ernstige criminaliteit".

([1]) Study nr. PE 493.043.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001575/14
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Interpretation of Article 83 TFEU

In a study published by Parliament's Directorate General for Internal Policies entitled 'Developing a Criminal Justice Area in the European Union' ([1]), it is stated that, for the purposes of determining the legitimate reach of an area of EU criminal justice, an autonomous definition of the term 'serious crime' needs to be developed at EU level.

1. How does the Commission interpret Article 83(1) TFEU?

2. Does the procedure described in the abovementioned paragraph apply to the definition of serious crime as well, or just to individual offences which are exhaustively mentioned in this paragraph?

3. If so, which legislative procedure will be applicable, the special or the ordinary?

4. Does the Commission plan to publish a proposal on the definition of serious crime?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

Article 83(1) of the Treaty allows the Council, acting unanimously after obtaining consent of the Parliament, to adopt a decision identifying other areas of crime than those enumerated in that paragraph. This procedure covers other areas of particularly serious crime with a cross-border dimension resulting from the nature or impact of such offences or from a special need to combat them on a common basis. Article 83(1) TFEU does not provide the EU legislator with a basis to define the concept of 'serious crime' in abstracto.

The Commission does not intend to propose legislation concerning the definition of 'serious crime'.

([1]) Study no. PE 493.043.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001576/14
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(13 février 2014)

Objet: Intempéries en France

Depuis le 15 décembre 2013, cinq épisodes significatifs d'intempéries ont été recensés en Bretagne. Les départements bretons du Finistère, du Morbihan, de l'Ille-et-Vilaine et de la Loire-Atlantique ont été touchés par de fortes marées, pluies, vents violents et inondations. L'état de catastrophe naturelle devrait être établi par le gouvernement français après les inondations en Bretagne.

Trois départements du sud-est de la France — les Bouches-du-Rhône, les Alpes-Maritimes et le Var — connaissent aussi de graves intempéries qui ont provoqué plusieurs victimes.

Les intempéries qui touchent plusieurs départements français pèsent sur l'activité économique, les populations et les infrastructures de manière sévère. Parmi les secteurs touchés, l'agriculture prévoit de lourdes pertes lors des prochaines récoltes. Des sols gorgés d'eau, des centaines d'hectares de champs inondés, les intempéries auront forcément des conséquences sur les rendements des prochaines récoltes. On s'attend à des pertes de 40 % pour certaines productions.

Par ailleurs, les épisodes d'intempéries deviennent fréquents dans plusieurs pays de l'UE.

1. La Commission va-t-elle fournir une aide d'urgence aux secteurs économiques, dont le secteur agricole, touchés par les intempéries?

2. Quelles sont les mesures mises en place pour protéger les populations, secteurs économiques et infrastructures face aux catastrophes provoquées par des semaines d'intempéries?

3. Quelles sont les mesures que l'Union européenne compte prendre pour octroyer une aide financière aux agriculteurs qui en ont déjà besoin?

4. Existe-t-il un fonds d'aide d'urgence face aux calamités climatiques?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002010/14
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(20 février 2014)

Objet: Agriculteurs bretons face aux intempéries

La Bretagne a subi de plein fouet les intempéries de ces deux derniers mois. Au-delà des problèmes d'isolement de certains agriculteurs, la production commence à pâtir des tempêtes incessantes et les agriculteurs bretons s'inquiètent des répercussions sur leurs productions.

Après deux mois de tempêtes et d'inondations qui ont provoqué d'importants dégâts sur des bâtiments agricoles, les terres et les champs de culture, les agriculteurs bretons sont confrontés à de réelles difficultés, notamment dans le Morbihan. L'élevage ainsi que la production céréalière et légumière sont menacés car les conséquences économiques directes ne sont pas encore évaluables et ne seront visibles qu'au printemps, au moment des récoltes.

1. La Commission a-t-elle fourni une aide d'urgence aux agriculteurs bretons afin de pallier le manque à gagner dû aux intempéries?

2. Existe-t-il un fonds européen d'aide aux activités agricoles et d'élevage pour faire face aux pertes liées au climat? Si ce n'est pas le cas, comment la Commission envisage-t-elle d'octroyer des aides aux professionnels de l'agriculture et de l'élevage confrontés à des pertes de production, et donc de revenus, causées par des conditions climatiques difficiles?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission

(10 avril 2014)

Le concours financier du Fonds de solidarité de l'Union européenne (FSUE) ne pourrait être obtenu qu'à la suite d'une demande déposée par un État membre concernant les coûts de certains types d'opérations d'urgence, y compris les phénomènes climatiques défavorables. La Commission pourrait alors évaluer si les conditions requises pour mobiliser le FSUE sont réunies ([1]). La politique de développement rural fournit une aide aux investissements visant à reconstituer un potentiel agricole endommagé par des catastrophes naturelles. En 2014, pour autant que l'autorité compétente de l'État membre concerné reconnaisse formellement qu'une catastrophe naturelle a effectivement eu lieu, une aide peut être accordée au titre des mesures suivantes:

— la mesure 126 ([2]) dans les PDRH ([3]), en ayant recours au Feader ([4]) pour la période 2007-2013 ou pour la période 2014-2020 sur la base des mesures de transition ([5]);

— la mesure équivalente ([6]) dans les PDR régionaux pour la période 2014-2020, une fois qu'ils auront été approuvés.

Pour aider les agriculteurs touchés par des conditions climatiques extrêmes, la Commission a autorisé en 2013 les États membres à verser aux agriculteurs des avances de paiements directs pouvant atteindre jusqu'à 50 % des montants, et jusqu'à 80 % en ce qui concerne les producteurs de viande bovine ([7]). Pour les demandes qui seront déposées en 2014, les États membres ont toute latitude pour décider du paiement d'avances sans avoir à fournir de justification particulière mais en étant subordonnés aux mêmes exigences de contrôle qu'en 2013.

À partir de 2014, les PDR peuvent proposer un soutien pour les instruments de gestion des risques ([8]). Le soutien au moyen de l'assurance des récoltes par l'intermédiaire du règlement OCM ([9]) pour le secteur des fruits et légumes et le secteur vitivinicole est un autre moyen de contribuer à sauvegarder les revenus des producteurs lorsque ceux-ci sont touchés par des phénomènes météorologiques défavorables.

De manière plus générale, la stratégie de l'UE dans le domaine de l'adaptation (adoptée en 2013) vise à promouvoir une Europe plus résiliente face au changement climatique, en encourageant les actions au niveau national, une prise de décision mieux informée, ainsi qu'une plus grande résilience face au changement climatique dans les secteurs vulnérables.

([1]) Dommages supérieurs à 3,7 milliards d'euros; répercussions graves et durables sur les conditions de vie, l'environnement naturel ou l'économie, dans une ou plusieurs régions ou dans un ou plusieurs pays. Ces conditions sont établies à l'article 2 du règlement (CE) n° 2012/2002. L'aide financière pourrait par exemple être utilisée pour les opérations de nettoyage, de réparation des infrastructures indispensables ainsi que pour l'assistance à la population. les dégâts assurables ne sont en principe pas couverts par le FSUE.

([2]) Article 20, point b) vi) du règlement (CE) n° 1698/2005 — la reconstitution du potentiel de production agricole endommagé par des catastrophes naturelles et la mise en place de mesures de prévention appropriées.

([3]) Programme de Développement Rural Hexagonal 2007-2013.

([4]) Fonds européen agricole pour le développement rural.

([5]) Les articles 1er et 3 du règlement (UE) n° 310/2013 du Parlement européen et du Conseil — pour autant que les demandes de soutien soient déposées avant l'adoption des PDR régionaux pour la période 2014-2020.

([6]) L'article 18 du règlement (UE) n° 1305/2013 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 17 décembre 2013 — Reconstitution du potentiel de production agricole endommagé par des catastrophes naturelles et des événements catastrophiques et mise en place de mesures de prévention appropriées.

([7]) Règlement d'exécution (UE) n° 46/2013 de la Commission. Cela concerne les paiements directs énumérés à l'annexe I du règlement (CE) n° 73/2009. Pour les demandes déposées en 2013, cela s'applique à partir du 16 octobre 2013 sous les conditions de contrôle prévues.

([8]) Les articles 37 à 39 du règlement (UE) n° 1305/2013 — assurance, fonds de mutualisation, instrument de stabilisation des revenus.

([9]) L'article 33, paragraphe 3, point h), du règlement (UE) n° 1308/2013 — Programmes opérationnels des organisations de producteurs dans le secteur des fruits et légumes; L'article 49 pour le secteur vitivinicole.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001576/14
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Bad weather in France

Five significant episodes of bad weather have been recorded in Brittany since 15 December 2013. The Breton départements of Finistère, Morbihan, Ille-et-Vilaine and Loire-Atlantique have been affected by heavy tides, rain, violent winds and flooding. The French Government is expected to declare a natural disaster following the floods in Brittany.

Three départements in south-east France — Bouches-du-Rhône, Alpes-Maritimes and Var — are also experiencing periods of severe weather which have caused several deaths.

Businesses, local people and infrastructure are suffering badly from the bad weather in a number of French départements. Farming, just one of the sectors affected, expects to see heavy losses during the next harvest. Water-saturated soil, hundreds of hectares of fields flooded, crop yields this year are bound to be affected by the bad weather. Losses could be as high as 40% for some crops.

What is more, bad weather events are becoming more frequent in a number of EU countries.

1. Will the Commission provide emergency aid for those economic sectors, including farming, affected by this bad weather?

2. What measures have been introduced to protect local people, economic sectors and infrastructure from the disastrous effects of weeks of bad weather?

3. What steps will the European Union take to provide financial assistance for farmers in need?

4. Is there an emergency aid fund for climate-related disasters?

Question for written answer E-002010/14
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Consequences of severe weather conditions for farmers in Brittany

Brittany has borne the full brunt of the severe weather conditions of the last two months. On top of the problems faced by some farms as a result of their remoteness, they now have incessant storms to contend with, and there are concerns about the repercussions for crops and livestock.

After two months of storms and flooding, which have caused serious damage to farm buildings, the land and fields, farmers in Brittany, and in the Morbihan region in particular, are in real trouble. Both livestock farming and cereal and vegetable production have been affected, although the full economic impact will not be known until the spring, when the harvest takes place.

1. Will the Commission provide farmers in Brittany with emergency aid in order to compensate them for the losses suffered as a result of severe weather conditions?

2. Is there a European support fund for livestock and arable farmers to cover weather-related losses? If not, how does the Commission intend to provide financial support to arable and livestock farmers when adverse weather conditions lead to losses of production and, hence, losses of income?

Joint answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission

(10 April 2014)

The EU Solidarity Fund (EUSF) could grant financial assistance only following an application from a Member State for dealing with the costs of certain types of emergency operations, including adverse climatic events. The Commission will then assess whether the conditions for mobilising EUSF assistance are met ([1]). Rural development policy provides support for investments to restore agricultural potential damaged by natural disasters. In 2014, on the condition that competent authority of the MS concerned formally recognises the occurrence of a natural disaster, support could be granted through:

— Measure 126 ([2]) in the PDRH ([3]), either using EAFRD ([4]) 2007-2013 or 2014-2020 under transition rules ([5]);

— The equivalent measure ([6]) in the regional RDPs 2014-2020 once they are approved.

To help farmers affected by extreme weather conditions, in 2013 the Commission authorised MS to pay advances of direct payments to farmers up to 50% of the amounts and up to 80% for beef and veal producers ([7]). For applications to be made in 2014, MS have the flexibility to decide on the payment of advances, without the need for a particular justification, but subject to the same control requirements as in 2013.

From 2014, the RDPs can offer support for risk management tools ([8]). Support through harvest insurance under the CMO regulation ([9]) in the fruit and vegetables and wine sectors is another way to help safeguarding producers' incomes where these are affected by adverse climatic events.

At a broader level, the EU Adaptation Strategy (adopted in 2013) aims at promoting a more climate resilient Europe, by promoting national actions, a better informed decision-making, and more climate resilience in vulnerable sectors.

([1]) Damage above EUR 3.7 billion EUR; serious repercussions on living conditions, the natural environment or the economy in one or more regions or one or more countries. The conditions are laid down in Article 2 of Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002. Financial aid could be used for example for operations as cleaning up, repair of essential infrastructure as well as for assistance to the population. Insurable damages are in principle not covered by the EUSF.

([2]) Article 20, point b) vi) of Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 — Restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters and introduction of appropriate prevention actions.

([3]) Programme de Développement Rural Hexagonal 2007-2013.

([4]) European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development.

([5]) Articles 1 and 3 of Regulation (EU) No 1310/2013 of the European Parliament and the Council — provided the requests for support are made before the approval of the regional RDPs 2014-2020.

([6]) Article 18 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 of the European Parliament and the Council of 17 December 2013 — Restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters and catastrophic events and introduction of appropriate prevention actions.

([7]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 946/2013. This concerns the direct payments listed in Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 73/2009. For applications made in 2013, it applies from 16 October 2013 under control conditions.

([8]) Articles 37-39 of Regulation (UE) No 1305/2013 — insurance, mutual funds, income stabilisation tool.

([9]) Article 33(3)(h) of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 — operational programmes of producer organisations in the fruit and vegetables sector; Article 49 for the wine sector.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001577/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Libertà di informazione a rischio in Pakistan

Lo scorso 17 gennaio, in Pakistan, alcuni uomini armati hanno aperto il fuoco contro un furgone di una rete televisiva pachistana, uccidendo tre impiegati. Il fatto evidenzia l'intento del gruppo talebano TTP, che ha rivendicato l'attentato, di minare la libertà e l'indipendenza della stampa del paese.

Ancora più preoccupante è il fatto che un impiegato della rete televisiva abbia poi avviato una sorta di negoziato informale offrendo maggiore copertura al messaggio del gruppo talebano, in cambio di maggiore sicurezza.

Questa sorta di «svendita» dell'attività giornalistica nasce dalla preoccupazione per l'incolumità dei giornalisti, ma senza dubbio mina l'idea stessa di media indipendenti e autonomi, ponendo problemi di natura etica e rischiando di trasformare l'attività giornalistica in propaganda.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se è a conoscenza degli eventi descritti;

2. se intende intraprendere delle azioni in materia e avviare un dialogo con il governo pachistano, anche alla luce della relazione del Parlamento europeo sulla libertà della stampa e dei media nel mondo?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(22 aprile 2014)

L'AR/VP è a conoscenza delle efferate uccisioni dei tre dipendenti di Express News TV.

Reporter senza frontiere annovera il Pakistan tra i paesi più pericolosi del mondo per i giornalisti. Il Pakistan figura inoltre al 158° posto su 179 paesi secondo l'indice 2014 della libertà di stampa . Le violenze a danno dei giornalisti destano seria preoccupazione. Oltre ai gruppi armati, che costituiscono la minaccia principale per i giornalisti pakistani, vi sono denunce di abusi commessi dai militari contro i giornalisti che criticano il loro operato. La delegazione dell'UE a Islamabad ha già espresso preoccupazione per la libertà di stampa in Pakistan nei contatti con le autorità nazionali e continuerà a farlo.

Nel corso del 2014 la questione sarà sollevata anche nell'ambito del dialogo sui diritti umani UE-Pakistan, insistendo sull'importanza di investire in una democrazia a tutti gli effetti, che sia caratterizzata da responsabilità pubblica, rispetto dello Stato di diritto e tutela dei diritti umani.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001577/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Freedom of information at risk in Pakistan

On 17 January a group of armed men in Pakistan opened fire against the van of a Pakistani television network, killing three employees. This incident demonstrates the intention of the Taliban group TTP, which has claimed responsibility for the attack, to undermine the freedom and independence of the press in that country.

Still more concerning is the fact that an employee of the same television network subsequently instigated informal negotiations with the Taliban group, offering increased coverage for their message in exchange for greater security.

This kind of 'sell-out' of journalistic activity originates from anxiety for the safety of journalists, but undoubtedly undermines the fundamental notion of an independent and autonomous media, poses ethical problems and risks changing journalistic activity into propaganda.

In the light of the above, can the Commission tell us:

1. whether it is aware of the events described above;

2. whether it intends to take action on this matter and instigate dialogue with the Pakistani Government in the light of the report of the European Parliament on the freedom of the press and media throughout the world?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2014)

The HR/VP is aware of the appalling killings of the three Express News TV employees.

Reporters without Borders rate Pakistan as one of the most dangerous countries in the world in which to be a journalist. Pakistan is ranked 158th out of 179 countries in the 2014 press freedom index. Violence against journalists is a major concern. Although the biggest threat to Pakistani journalists is armed groups, there are also allegations of abuses committed by the military against journalists who report critically on their actions. The EU-Delegation in Islamabad has and will continue to raise concerns with the Pakistani authorities about freedom of expression in Pakistan.

The matter will also be included in the EU's 2014 human rights dialogue with Pakistan, where the importance of investing in deep democracy, that is to say: accountability, respect for the rule of law and protection of human rights, will be stressed.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001578/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Sostegno finanziario all'Ucraina

Il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante ha recentemente affermato in un'intervista che l'UE sta studiando misure di supporto di breve periodo per sostenere le difficoltà finanziarie dell'Ucraina, inasprite dall'instabile situazione politica del paese. Tali aiuti dovrebbero essere poi seguiti da un sostegno più corposo ma collegato a riforme strutturali e alla condizionalità del Fondo monetario internazionale.

Alla luce di ciò, può il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante chiarire:

1. quale sia stato l'esito degli incontri tenuti nelle ultime settimane con gli esponenti del governo ucraino e dell'opposizione?

2. se intende recarsi nuovamente in Ucraina o accogliere una delegazione di manifestanti ucraini per capire a fondo le ragioni delle loro proteste e studiare insieme alle autorità ucraine delle risposte alle loro esigenze?

3. se intende annunciare nuove proposte di intesa politica collegate al sostegno finanziario europeo verso l'Ucraina?

4. se intende studiare sanzioni nei confronti dell'Ucraina, così come affermato da alcuni esponenti del governo tedesco?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(20 maggio 2014)

L'FMI e il governo dell'Ucraina hanno annunciato di aver raggiunto un'intesa da cui dovrebbe scaturire un accordo di stand-by di 14-18 miliardi di dollari per contribuire a stabilizzare la situazione economica e finanziaria dell'Ucraina. L'UE partecipa agli sforzi internazionali e si è impegnata a sostenere la transizione, promuovere le riforme e favorire uno sviluppo inclusivo a vantaggio dell'intera popolazione ucraina. Le misure dell'UE potrebbero convogliare nei prossimi anni un sostegno complessivo pari a 11 miliardi di euro provenienti dal bilancio UE e dalle istituzioni finanziarie internazionali (IFI) con sede nell'Unione. L'UE ha inoltre firmato i capitoli politici dell'accordo di associazione con l'Ucraina e applica preferenze commerciali autonome per consentire al paese di beneficiare prima possibile, e in misura sostanziale, della zona di libero scambio globale e approfondito. L'UE applica misure restrittive nei confronti delle persone identificate come responsabili dell'appropriazione indebita di fondi statali ucraini e delle persone che minacciano la sovranità, l'integrità territoriale e l'indipendenza dell'Ucraina. Con l'incoraggiamento dell'UE, il governo ucraino si è impegnato a garantire la natura rappresentativa e inclusiva delle strutture governative, in modo da riflettere la diversità regionale, a garantire la piena tutela dei diritti delle persone appartenenti a minoranze nazionali, a intraprendere una riforma costituzionale, a indagare su tutte le violazioni dei diritti umani e su tutti gli atti di violenza, a lottare contro l'estremismo e a organizzare elezioni presidenziali libere, eque e trasparenti. Nell'immediato le priorità di Kiev sono ripristinare la stabilità macroeconomica e lottare contro la corruzione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001578/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Financial aid for Ukraine

The High Representative/Vice-President recently confirmed in an interview that the EU is working on a short-term financial aid plan to help Ukraine overcome an economic crisis made worse by the ongoing political unrest in the country. This aid could then be followed by more substantial support, but this would be dependent on Ukraine implementing structural reforms and on IMF conditionality.

1. In light of the above, can the High Representative/Vice-President reveal the outcome of the meetings held in recent weeks with representatives from the Ukrainian Government and from the opposition?

2. Does she intend to return to Ukraine, or to receive a delegation of Ukrainian demonstrators, in order to fully understand the reasons for their protests and to work with the Ukrainian authorities to respond to their demands?

3. Does she intend to announce fresh proposals for a political agreement linked to European financial aid for Ukraine?

4. Will she consider imposing sanctions on Ukraine, as advocated by several representatives of the German Government?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(20 May 2014)

The IMF and the Government of Ukraine have announced agreement expected to result in a USD 14-18 billion Stand-by Arrangement to help stabilise Ukraine's economic and financial situation. The EU is contributing to international efforts, and has committed to assist with the transition, encourage reforms and support inclusive development to benefit all Ukrainians. Altogether EU measures could bring overall support of EUR 11 billion in coming years from the EU budget and EU based international financial institutions (IFIs). In addition, the EU has signed the political chapters of the Association Agreement with Ukraine and is implementing autonomous trade preferences to allow Ukraine to benefit substantially from a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area as soon as possible. The EU is pursuing restrictive measures against persons identified as responsible for misappropriation of Ukrainian State funds, as well as those responsible for undermining Ukraine's sovereignty, territory integrity and independence. With the encouragement of the EU, the Ukrainian Government has committed to ensure the representative nature and inclusiveness of governmental structures, reflecting regional diversity, to ensure the full protection of the rights of persons belonging to national minorities, to undertake constitutional reform, to investigate all human rights violations and acts of violence, to fight extremism, and to hold free, fair and transparent Presidential elections. Immediate priorities for Kyiv are to restore macroeconomic stability and address corruption.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001579/14
al Consiglio
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Tassazione sulle transazioni finanziarie

È di questi giorni la notizia che Francia e Germania stanno cercando di raggiungere una posizione comune sul tema della tassazione sulle transazioni finanziarie, da presentare durante il prossimo summit ministeriale franco-tedesco del 19 febbraio. Il coincidente semestre di presidenza greca potrebbe fungere da ulteriore stimolo sul tema, dal momento che la Grecia è uno degli Stati membri favorevoli a proseguire la cooperazione in materia e che alcuni esponenti del governo ellenico hanno annunciato di voler adottare una posizione comune entro giugno.

Nel frattempo la Commissione ha fatto sapere, la scorsa settimana, che un forte indirizzo politico è necessario per proseguire lungo il percorso aperto nel febbraio 2013.

I proventi della nuova tassazione potrebbero essere usati in diversi settori, ma ancora non vi è un accordo sulla loro eventuale destinazione.

Alla luce di ciò, può il Consiglio chiarire:

1. se ritiene che l'adozione di una posizione comune entro giugno sia realizzabile?

2. se si è raggiunto un consenso in merito alla destinazione dei proventi della tassa in questione?

3. se si è raggiunto un consenso sulla soglia di tale tassa?

Risposta
(13 maggio 2014)

Il 28 settembre 2011, la Commissione ha adottato una proposta di direttiva del Consiglio concernente un sistema comune d'imposta sulle transazioni finanziarie e recante modifica della direttiva 2008/7/CE ([1]). In sede di Consiglio non si è raggiunta l'unanimità necessaria a procedere con tale imposta e il 29 giugno 2012 il Consiglio europeo è giunto alla conclusione che la direttiva proposta non sarebbe stata adottata dal Consiglio entro un termine ragionevole ([2]).

Undici Stati membri hanno tuttavia espresso la propria disponibilità a procedere all'istituzione della suddetta imposta nel quadro della cooperazione rafforzata. Il 22 gennaio 2013, il Consiglio ha adottato una decisione che autorizza una cooperazione rafforzata nel settore dell'imposta sulle transazioni finanziarie ([3]), su proposta della Commissione e previa approvazione del Parlamento europeo.

Il 14 febbraio 2013, la Commissione europea ha pertanto presentato una proposta di direttiva del Consiglio che attua la cooperazione rafforzata ([4]).

Una prima lettura tecnica del testo è stata completata durante la presidenza lituana.

È in corso il dibattito sulla direttiva proposta e in sede di Consiglio non si è ancora raggiunta una posizione sulle questioni sollevate dall'onorevole deputato.

([1]) Doc. 14942/11.
([2]) Doc. EUCO 76/12.
([3]) GU L 22 del 25.1.2013, pag. 11.
([4]) Doc. 6442/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001579/14
to the Council
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Financial transaction tax

According to recent reports, France and Germany are seeking to reach common ground on the financial transaction tax, with discussions scheduled to take place at the next Franco-German ministerial summit on 19 February. The fact that the Greeks recently assumed the rotating EU Presidency could give further impetus to negotiations on this issue, since Greece is one of the Member States in favour of continued cooperation on financial transaction tax, and several representatives of the Greek Government have expressed hope of adopting a common position with other participating Member States by June.

In the meantime, the Commission stated last week that a strong political steer will be needed to ensure continuation of the process that began in February 2013.

The revenue from this new tax could be used in various sectors, but as yet no agreement has been reached as to how it will be distributed.

1. In light of the above, does the Council believe that it is realistic to expect a common position to have been adopted among participating Member States by June?

2. Has an agreement been reached as to how revenue from this tax will be appropriated?

3. Has an agreement been reached on the threshold of the tax?

Reply
(13 May 2014)

On 28 September 2011, the Commission adopted a proposal for a Council Directive on a common system of financial transaction tax and amending Directive 2008/7/EC ([1]). The unanimity required in the Council to proceed with this tax was not achieved and the European Council concluded on 29 June 2012 that the proposed Directive would not be adopted by the Council within a reasonable period ([2]).

However, eleven Member States expressed their willingness to proceed with this tax under enhanced cooperation. On 22 January 2013, the Council adopted a decision authorising enhanced cooperation in the area of financial transaction tax ([3]), on a proposal from the Commission and after obtaining the consent of the European Parliament.

On 14 February 2013, the European Commission thus tabled a proposal for a Council Directive implementing this enhanced cooperation ([4]).

A first technical read-through of the text was completed under the Lithuanian Presidency.

Deliberations on the proposed Directive are ongoing and a position has not been reached within the Council on the questions raised by the Honourable Member.

([1]) 14942/11.
([2]) EUCO 76/12.
([3]) OJ L 22 of 25.1.2013, p. 11.
([4]) 6442/13.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001580/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento — Crisi nel settore dell'acquavite di vino

Relativamente alla mia precedente interrogazione E-5180/2010, dispone oggi la Commissione di aggiornamenti in merito alle pratiche messe in evidenza all'epoca e a eventuali analisi di conformità e misure della Commissione?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione
(21 marzo 2014)

La Commissione desidera richiamare l'attenzione dell'onorevole deputato sulla risposta già data all'onorevole De Castro (interrogazione scritta E-010922/2012 ([1])). È stato infatti già precisato che le autorità francesi, rispondendo al parere motivato in data 24 aprile 2012, avevano comunicato alla Commissione la decisione di revocare, a partire dal 1º agosto 2012, l'autorizzazione di commercializzare acquaviti e distillati ottenuti da vini di decantazione delle fecce con le denominazioni «acquaviti di vino» e «distillati di vino». Una copia della corrispondenza ufficiale, volta a informare gli operatori della normativa applicabile al fine di imporre la cessazione di tale pratica per la campagna successiva, era allegata alla risposta.

In risposta a un'ulteriore richiesta della Commissione di garanzie sull'efficacia della decisione annunciata, le autorità francesi avevano apportato chiarimenti sull'organizzazione amministrativa e tecnica della misura di revoca dell'autorizzazione. Avevano infatti precisato che dal 1º agosto 2012 le distillerie non avrebbero più potuto disporre di scorte né vendute né oggetto di contratto.

Date le suddette garanzie delle autorità francesi, il 30 maggio 2013 la Commissione ha deciso di archiviare il caso, ma può rassicurare l'onorevole deputato della propria vigilanza qualora una nuova denuncia recasse la prova del persistere della situazione contestata.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001580/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Update — Crisis in the brandy sector

Further to my previous Question E-5180/2010, can the Commission provide updates on the practices highlighted at that date and possible conformity analyses and measurements carried out by the Commission?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(21 mars 2014)

La Commission voudrait attirer l'attention de l'Honorable Parlementaire sur la réponse déjà fournie à M. De Castro pour la question écrite E-010922/2012 ([1]). En effet, il a été déjà précisé que, dans leur réponse, par note du 24 avril 2012, à l'avis motivé, les autorités françaises ont informé la Commission de leur décision de mettre fin à l'autorisation de la commercialisation, sous la dénomination «eau-de-vie de vin» et «distillat de vin», des eaux-de-vie et distillats produits à partir des vins de décantation des lies, à compter du 1er août 2012. Une copie des courriers officiels visant à informer les opérateurs de la réglementation applicable, de manière à imposer l'arrêt de cette pratique pour la campagne suivante était jointe à la réponse.

En réponse à une demande ultérieure de la Commission de donner des assurances sur l'effectivité de la décision annoncée, les autorités françaises ont donné des éclaircissements sur l'encadrement administratif et technique de la mesure de retrait d'autorisation. Ainsi les autorités françaises ont précisé qu'à compter du 1er aout 2012 les distilleries ne disposeront plus de stocks ni vendus ni contractualisés.

En vue de ces assurances données par les autorités françaises, la Commission a le 30 mai 2013 pris la décision de clôturer l'affaire mais elle peut rassurer l'Honorable Parlementaire qu'elle resterait vigilante au cas où une nouvelle plainte viendrait à démontrer la persistance de la situation dénoncée.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001581/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Mobilità degli studenti europei

Nel gennaio 2014 è stato pubblicato il primo European mobility scoreboard, redato dal network statistico Eurydice della Commissione europea e che misura l'impegno dei governi degli Stati membri nel promuovere periodi di studio all'estero per i propri studenti.

Lo scoreboard si concentra su cinque aree chiave di azione dei governi, vale a dire la disseminazione di informazioni e supporto tra gli studenti, la preparazione nelle lingue straniere, il livello di borse di studio e finanziamenti, il riconoscimento del valore degli studi all'estero e il supporto finanziario specifico per gli studenti provenienti dalle fasce di reddito più basse.

Dallo scoreboard sono emersi due dati di particolare interesse: innanzitutto non è stato possibile compilare una comparazione in merito ai sistemi amministrativi e agli ostacoli che essi possono porre alla mobilità degli studenti; in secondo luogo, la situazione economica degli studenti meno benestanti è emersa come il principale ostacolo alla mobilità di questi studenti.

Con riguardo a questi risultati, può la Commissione chiarire se intende promuovere dei piani d'azione o pubblicare delle linee guida indirizzate agli Stati membri, che mirino a ridurre l'incidenza di questi due ostacoli sulla mobilità degli studenti europei che desiderano seguire corsi di studio fuori dal proprio paese di residenza?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(7 aprile 2014)

Lo studio di fattibilità per la creazione di un tabellone della mobilità e il primo tabellone prodotto nel quadro di questo studio avevano lo scopo di valutare la posizione degli Stati membri in rapporto alle disposizioni della raccomandazione del Consiglio del 28 giugno 2011 «Youth on the move» — che promuove la mobilità dei giovani per l'apprendimento ([1]). Lo studio e il primo tabellone si concentrano sul settore dell'istruzione superiore, in cui la mobilità è più sviluppata, e sulle politiche nazionali nel campo dell'istruzione.

Il punto 4 della raccomandazione del Consiglio invita gli Stati membri a risolvere, ove possibile, le questioni amministrative relative alle difficoltà connesse con l'ottenimento di visti e permessi di soggiorno per i residenti non-UE che desiderino fruire di un'opportunità di apprendimento in uno Stato membro e a ridurre gli oneri amministrativi per promuovere la mobilità per l'apprendimento. A livello dell'UE, tali questioni sono attualmente disciplinate dalla direttiva 2004/114/CE ([2]). La relazione di attuazione della Commissione (COM(2011) 587 final) ha sottolineato un certo numero di carenze nell'applicazione di questa direttiva e nel marzo 2013 la Commissione ha proposto una rifusione della legislazione (COM(2013) 151 final), in particolare allo scopo di migliorare le condizioni degli studenti di paesi terzi, degli alunni delle scuole, dei tirocinanti e volontari non retribuiti, oltre che dei ricercatori. Sono attualmente in corso negoziati relativi alla rifusione.

Il punto 8 della raccomandazione del Consiglio invita gli Stati membri a fornire aiuti adeguati alle esigenze specifiche dei discenti svantaggiati. Il sostegno agli studenti rientra nella responsabilità delle autorità nazionali e il primo tabellone della mobilità evidenzia i diversi approcci nazionali in questo settore. A livello dell'UE, il nuovo programma Erasmus+ fornisce un sostegno aggiuntivo agli studenti e agli altri discenti provenienti da contesti svantaggiati.

([1]) GU C 199 del 7.7.2011, pag. 1.
([2]) Direttiva 2004/114/CE relativa alle condizioni di ammissione dei cittadini di paesi terzi per motivi di studio, scambio di alunni, tirocinio non retribuito o volontariato.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001581/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Mobility of European students

January 2014 saw the publication of the first European mobility scoreboard, prepared by the European Commission's statistical network Eurydice and measuring the commitment of the governments of Member States to the promotion of periods of study abroad for its students.

The scoreboard focuses on five key action areas for governments, namely the dissemination of information and support for students, foreign language preparation, the level of grants and financial support, recognition of the value of learning abroad and targeted financial support for students from the lower income brackets.

The scoreboard has revealed two facts of particular interest: firstly, it has not been possible to formulate a comparison of the administrative systems and the obstacles they may pose to student mobility, and secondly, the economic position of the less well-off students emerged as the primary obstacle to their mobility.

In the light of these findings, can the Commission clarify whether it intends to promote action plans or publish guidelines targeting Member States with a view to a reduction in the incidence of these two obstacles to the mobility of European students wishing to follow educational courses outside their country of residence?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

The feasibility study into creating a mobility scoreboard and the first scoreboard produced as part of this study aimed to assess the position of Member States in relation to the provisions of the Council Recommendation of 28 June 2011 'Youth on the move' — promoting the learning mobility of young people ([1]). The study and first scoreboard focus on the area of higher education, where mobility is most developed, and on national education policies.

Point 4 of the Council Recommendation calls on Member States to resolve administrative issues that create difficulties in obtaining visas for third-country nationals and to reduce administrative burdens in order to promote their learning mobility. At EU level these issues are currently governed by Directive 2004/114/EC ([2]). The Commission's implementation report (COM(2011) 587 final) highlighted a number of weaknesses in the application of this directive and in March 2013 the Commission proposed a recast of the legislation (COM(2013) 151 final), in particular with a view to improving conditions for third-country students, school pupils, unremunerated trainees and volunteers, as well as researchers. Negotiations on this recast are on-going.

Point 8 of the Council Recommendation invites Member States to provide targeted support for disadvantaged learners. Student support is the responsibility of national authorities and the first mobility scoreboard reveals a diversity of national approaches in this area. At EU level, the new Erasmus+ programme provides additional support for students and other learners from disadvantaged backgrounds.

([1]) OJ C 199, 7.7.2011, p. 1.
([2]) Directive 2004/114/EC on the conditions of admission of third-country nationals for the purposes of studies, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001582/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Programma MEDIA e film di produzione europea

L'annuale manifestazione cinematografica Berlinale ha visto la partecipazione di circa 30 film prodotti grazie al ricorso ai finanziamenti europei (circa 2,2 milioni EUR) previsti dal programma MEDIA, parte di Europa Creativa. Ciò dimostra la validità dei finanziamenti nel settore culturale e il ruolo che la cultura svolge sia come elemento collante dell'UE che come forza civile che l'Unione europea è in grado di proiettare a livello globale. Al festival partecipano infatti oltre trecentomila visitatori e ventimila professionisti del settore cinematografico provenienti da 124 diversi paesi, oltre che quasi quattromila giornalisti.

Alla luce di questo grande successo, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. Se abbia già effettuato delle stime relative al numero di progetti che potranno godere dei finanziamenti europei tramite il programma MEDIA;

2. a quanto ammonta il volume totale di finanziamenti a disposizione?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2014)

Il programma Europa creativa ha una dotazione di 1,46 miliardi di euro nel settennio 2014-2020. Conformemente all'articolo 24 del regolamento (UE) n. 1295/2013 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che istituisce il programma Europa creativa ([1]), il 56 % del bilancio del programma sarà destinato al sotto-programma MEDIA.

Nel 2014 la Commissione europea prevede di sostenere circa 80 iniziative di formazione per gli operatori dell'audiovisivo nonché lo sviluppo di circa 160 opere audiovisive e 80 *slate* (pacchetti di progetti di sviluppo). Essa sosterrà anche lo sviluppo di circa 20 videogiochi, di circa 50 progetti di programmazione televisiva e di 4-7 fondi per coproduzioni internazionali. Inoltre, riceveranno sostegno 50-60 strumenti di mercato e impresa per gli operatori dell'audiovisivo e più di 1200 progetti relativi alla distribuzione di film europei non nazionali nelle sale cinematografiche e online. Il sostegno andrà anche ad una rete di cinema.

([1]) GU L 347 del 20.12.2013, pag. 221.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001582/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: The MEDIA programme and European film production

The annual Berlin International Film Festival this year featured around 30 films that had received European funding (around EUR 2.2 million in total) via the MEDIA programme, which forms part of Creative Europe. This proves the value of funding in the cultural sector, and shows how culture is capable not only of bringing together everyone in the EU, but also of demonstrating to the rest of the world the collective strength of its people. Indeed, the Berlin festival was attended by more than 300 000 members of the public and 20 000 film industry professionals from 124 different countries, as well as almost 4 000 journalists.

1. In the light of this huge success, has the Commission estimated how many projects could benefit from European funding through the MEDIA programme?

2. Can the Commission state how much funding is available in total?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The Creative Europe programme has a budget of EUR 1.46 billion over the 7 years 2014-2020. According to Article 24 of the regulation (EU) No 1295/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Creative Europe Programme ([1]), 56% of this budget will be allocated to the MEDIA Sub-programme.

In 2014 the European Commission plans to support approximately 80 training initiatives for audiovisual professionals as well as the development of an estimated 160 audiovisual works and 80 slates (packets of development projects). It will also support the development of around 20 video games, approximately 50 TV programming projects and 4-7 international co-production funds. In addition, 50-60 market and business tools for audiovisual professionals and more than 1 200 projects for the distribution of European non-national films in cinema and online as well as one cinema network will be supported.

([1]) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 221.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001583/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Rapporto sulle misure contro la corruzione in Europa e istituzioni europee

Secondo Emily O'Reilly, neoeletta Mediatore europeo, il recente rapporto sulla corruzione negli Stati membri dell'UE manca di un capitolo chiave, vale a dire quello relativo alle performance delle istituzioni europee. A detta della Commissione, questa omissione è stata volontaria e dettata dal fatto che vi era il rischio di non essere imparziali.

Le istituzioni europee, in realtà, presentano delle performance di alto livello in quanto a lotta alla corruzione, al di sopra della media degli Stati membri, per cui potrebbe essere auspicabile monitorare che queste performance non peggiorino nel tempo, anche alla luce delle preoccupazioni di quanti nutrono timore nei confronti del complesso sistema di lobby e organizzazioni che ruotano intorno alle istituzioni europee, preoccupazioni peraltro già ridotte tramite il Registro di trasparenza.

Alla luce di queste considerazioni, si chiede alla Commissione se intenda, nel prossimo rapporto, introdurre un capitolo dedicato alle istituzioni europee?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2014)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-001685/2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001583/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Report on anti-corruption measures in Europe and European institutions

According to Emily O'Reilly, the newly elected European Mediator, the recent report on corruption in EU Member States lacks a key chapter on the performance of the European institutions. According to the Commission, this omission was deliberate and dictated by a risk of partiality.

The European institutions in fact present a high-level performance, above the average for Member States, in terms of the fight against corruption. It may therefore be advisable to monitor the situation to ensure that this performance does not deteriorate over time, especially in the light of fears surrounding the complex system of lobbying and the organisations revolving around the European institutions, although such concerns have already been reduced through the Transparency Register.

In the light of the above observations, the Commission is asked whether it intends to introduce a chapter devoted to the European institutions in its next report?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-001685/2014.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001588/14
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Fiscal compact e ordinamento UE

L'articolo 16 del trattato sulla stabilità, sul coordinamento e sulla governance nell'unione economica e monetaria, comunemente noto come Fiscal Compact, stabilisce che «al più tardi entro cinque anni dalla data di entrata in vigore del presente trattato, sulla base di una valutazione dell'esperienza maturata in sede di attuazione, sono adottate in conformità del trattato sull'Unione europea e del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea le misure necessarie per incorporare il contenuto del presente trattato nell'ordinamento giuridico dell'Unione europea».

Può la Commissione specificare meglio il significato di questo articolo?

Conformemente ai Trattati, le modifiche dovrebbero avvenire seguendo le procedure previste dall'articolo 48 del Trattato sull'Unione europea: sarà questa la procedura che verrà intrapresa per inquadrare il Fiscal Compact all'interno del quadro giuridico dell'UE?

In tal caso, perché si è scelto un modo differente, un escamotage irregolare, per modificare il contenuto dei Trattati, come ho più volte sottolineato anche in precedenti interrogazioni e lettere, nelle quali portavo a conoscenza l'importante opera del Professor Guarino su questo argomento?

Il ricorso all'articolo 48 per la modifica dei Trattati prevede in quest'ambito che via sia obbligatoriamente l'unanimità in seno al Consiglio, oppure è previsto anche che possano essere prese decisioni che consentono al Consiglio di deliberare a maggioranza qualificata in questo settore?

In caso di approvazione, le misure previste varrebbero poi anche per i Paesi membri dell'Unione che non hanno sottoscritto il Fiscal Compact?

Se invece non si farà riferimento all'articolo 48, come sarebbe già dovuto in realtà avvenire, vi sono altri modi per cui questo trattato intergovernativo possa entrare a far parte dell'ordinamento giuridico comunitario?

Risposta di José Manuel Barroso a nome della Commissione
(28 aprile 2014)

La Commissione ricorda che non è parte del trattato sulla stabilità, sul coordinamento e sulla governance nell'unione economica e monetaria (TSCG) e che non può fornire un'interpretazione autorevole delle sue disposizioni.

L'articolo 16 del TSCG rispecchia la volontà delle parti contraenti di affrontare le questioni contemplate dal trattato all'interno del quadro giuridico dell'Unione europea e secondo il cosiddetto «metodo comunitario».

Alcune disposizioni del TSCG potrebbero essere incorporate nel diritto dell'Unione mediante l'adozione di una normativa derivata. Di fatto, alcune disposizioni dei cosiddetti regolamenti «two-pack» hanno già incorporato parte del TSCG nel diritto dell'Unione.

Altre disposizioni del TSCG potrebbero invece richiedere modifiche dei trattati UE, nel qual caso si dovrebbe seguire la procedura di cui all'articolo 48 del TUE. Qualsiasi modifica dei trattati UE dovrebbe essere ratificata da tutti gli Stati membri.

La Commissione non può prevedere quale sarebbe la natura di queste disposizioni e a quali Stati membri si applicherebbero.

Per quanto riguarda la compatibilità del TSCG con i trattati UE, la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato alla sua precedente risposta all'interrogazione E-010892/2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001588/14
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Fiscal compact and the EU's legal framework

Article 16 of the Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance in the Economic and Monetary Union provides that 'Within five years, at most, of the date of entry into force of this Treaty, on the basis of an assessment of the experience with its implementation, the necessary steps shall be taken, in accordance with the Treaty on the European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, with the aim of incorporating the substance of this Treaty into the legal framework of the European Union.'

Can the Commission clarify what this article means?

In accordance with the Treaties, the amendments would have to be adopted by means of the procedures laid down in Article 48 TEU: will this be the procedure used to incorporate the Fiscal Compact into the EU's legal framework?

If so, why has a different approach been opted for, an irregular ruse, with a view to amending the substance of the Treaties, as I have on several occasions pointed out in previous questions and letters drawing attention to the important work of Professor Guarino on this subject?

In this context, if Article 48 is applied in order to amend the Treaties, will unanimity be required within the Council or is it anticipated that decisions may also be taken permitting the Council to act by a qualified majority in this sector?

In the event of their approval, would the proposed measures also apply to Member States which have not signed the Fiscal Compact?

If, on the other hand, no reference is made to Article 48, as ought in reality already to have been done, are there any other ways in which this intergovernmental treaty can become part of the Community legal order?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(28 April 2014)

The Commission recalls that it is not a party to the Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance in the Economic and Monetary Union (TSCG) and that it cannot provide an authoritative interpretation of its provisions.

Article 16 of the TSCG reflects the willingness of the Contracting Parties to address the issues covered by this treaty within the European Union legal framework and through the so-called 'Community method'.

On the one hand, some provisions of the TSCG could be incorporated in EC law through the adoption of secondary law. Some provisions of the so-called Two-Pack Regulations have indeed already incorporated part of the TSCG in EC law.

On the other hand, other provisions of the TSCG could possibly require modifications of the EU Treaties, in which cases the procedure provided for by Article 48 TEU would have to be followed. Any change to the EU Treaties would require ratification by all Member States.

The Commission is not in a position to anticipate what could be the nature of these provisions and to which Member States they would apply.

As regards the compatibility of the TSCG with the EU Treaties, the Commission refers to its previous answer to Question E-010892/2012.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001592/14
an die Kommission
Peter Jahr (PPE)
(13. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Gesetzliche Voraussetzung für den Erwerb land- und forstwirtschaftlicher Grundstücke in den Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union

In welchen Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union unterliegen der land- und forstwirtschaftliche Bodenmarkt und damit die Veräußerung und die Verpachtung land- und forstwirtschaftlicher Grundstücke besonderen gesetzlichen Vorschriften?

Welche konkreten gesetzlichen Regelungen im Bereich des landwirtschaftlichen Grundstücksrechts gibt es in den europäischen Mitgliedstaaten (bzw. in Teilen der Mitgliedstaaten), nach denen Nicht-Landwirte oder Nicht-Ortsansässige mit Beschränkungen beim Grunderwerb belegt sind? Unter welchen gesetzlichen Voraussetzungen sind der Erwerb und die Verpachtung land- und forstwirtschaftlicher Grundstücke jeweils möglich, und unter welchen gesetzlichen Voraussetzungen sind der Erwerb und die Verpachtung jeweils ausgeschlossen?

Sofern Beschränkungen existieren: Wie werden dabei Landwirt und Ortsansässigkeit in den jeweiligen landesgesetzlichen Vorschriften definiert/normiert?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(1. April 2014)

Die Gesetze der Mitgliedstaaten betreffend den Erwerb und die Verpachtung land- und forstwirtschaftlicher Grundstücke müssen dem EU-Recht entsprechen, insbesondere im Hinblick auf die Freizügigkeit des Kapitalverkehrs und die Niederlassungsfreiheit. Beschränkungen dieser im Vertrag niedergelegten Freiheiten sind nur zulässig, sofern sie ausreichend begründet sind und den Grundsatz der Verhältnismäßigkeit und Nichtdiskriminierung gemäß dem EU-Recht beachten. Beschränkungen sind in ihrem jeweiligen Zusammenhang zu betrachten, wobei zu berücksichtigen ist, dass sich die politischen Ziele und Umstände innerhalb der EU unterscheiden können.

Die Kommission überprüft gegenwärtig die Situation in den Mitgliedstaaten, in denen die aufgrund der Beitrittsverträge von 2003 und 2005 gewährten Übergangsfristen am 31. Dezember 2013 abgelaufen sind bzw. am 30. April 2014 ablaufen werden. Die Kommission ergreift alle erforderlichen Maßnahmen, um zu gewährleisten, dass mögliche Beschränkungen dem EU-Recht vollständig entsprechen.

Was die gesetzlichen Vorschriften der Mitgliedstaaten betrifft, so ist die Kommission der Auffassung, dass die Behörden der einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten am besten in der Lage sind, vollständige Informationen über ihre einschlägigen Gesetze und Vorschriften auf nationaler, regionaler und kommunaler Ebene zu geben. Die Kommission verfügt über keine umfassenden Informationen über derartige Vorschriften.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001592/14
to the Commission
Peter Jahr (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Legal conditions applying to the purchase of agricultural and forestry land in Member States

Which Member States have specific laws governing the agricultural and forestry land market and hence the sale and leasing of agricultural and forestry land?

Under what specific arrangements in the agricultural land law in force in Member States (or parts thereof) are restrictions imposed on non-farmers or non-residents as regards the purchase of land? Under what legal conditions may agricultural and forestry land be purchased and leased, and under what conditions are such transactions prohibited?

In cases where there are restrictions, how are the terms 'farmer' and 'residence' defined or regulated in the land laws concerned?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(1 April 2014)

National legislation governing the acquisition and lease of agricultural and forestry land has to respect EC law, in particular the free movement of capital and the freedom of establishment. Restrictions to these Treaty freedoms are only acceptable if they are duly justified and comply with the principle of proportionality and non-discrimination under EC law. Restrictions are to be assessed within their given context, taking into consideration that policy objectives and circumstances may vary across the EU.

The Commission is currently monitoring the situation in Member States where the transitional period granted under the 2003 and 2005 Accession Treaties expired on 31 December 2013 or expires on 30 April 2014. The Commission will take all appropriate actions in order to ensure that any possible restrictions fully comply with EC law.

As regards Member States' legislation, the Commission considers that the authorities of the individual Member States are in the best position to give complete information on their relevant national, regional and local laws and regulations. The Commission does not have comprehensive information on such legislation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001593/14
to the Commission
Emer Costello (S&D), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE) and Mairead McGuinness (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Cross-border healthcare in the EU

Directive 2011/24/EU on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare was adopted on 9 March 2011 by Parliament and the Council. The deadline for transposition agreed by these two institutions was 25 October 2013. More than three months after this deadline, many Member States appear not to have established the legislative mechanisms necessary to fully implement the directive. Swift implementation is particularly important for patients with rare diseases such as primary immunodeficiency, where access to expert care abroad can be life-saving.

As the report from the Commission is not due until 25 October 2015, can the Commission update Parliament on the status of the transposition in the 28 Member States?

What action has the Commission taken, or is it considering taking, to ensure that all Member States transpose this directive?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(28 March 2014)

The Commission has not yet received transposition notifications from all 28 Member States.

For Member States who have not yet notified the Commission of national measures completely transposing Directive 2011/24/EU on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare ([1]), the Commission has launched the procedures laid down in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union with regard to failure to transpose EU legislation.

With regard to those transposition measures which have been received, the Commission is currently carrying out a detailed assessment of whether these measures fully and adequately transpose the measures contained within the directive. Where the Commission believes that the notified national measures do not adequately transpose the directive, it will, have recourse to the procedures laid down in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union with regard to failure to transpose EU legislation.

These steps represent the full range of actions available to the European Commission where there is a failure to transpose a directive.

([1]) OJ L 88, 4.4.2011.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001594/14
a Bizottság számára
Bánki Erik (PPE)
(2014. február 13.)

Tárgy: A verespataki cianidos bányászati projekttel kapcsolatos KHV-eljárás

A verespataki projekt környezeti hatásvizsgálatának elkészítésével kapcsolatos állítólagos szabálytalanságokról szóló, 0344/2006. számú petícióra adott válaszában a Bizottság azt állítja, hogy az egyes köz- és magánprojektek környezetre gyakorolt káros hatásainak vizsgálatáról szóló irányelv („KHV-irányelv") a verespataki aranybányászati projektre nem alkalmazandó, mivel az engedélyezési kérelmet Románia uniós csatlakozását megelőzően nyújtották be.

Ezenkívül – ugyanebben a dokumentumban – a Bizottság azt is kijelenti, hogy amennyiben Románia uniós csatlakozását követően újabb engedélyezési kérelmet is nyilvántartásba vesznek ugyanerre a projektre, vagy a projekt olyan részeire vonatkozóan, amelyek az első kérelemben nem szerepeltek, akkor a KHV-irányelv alkalmazandóvá válik.

Információim szerint 2010-ben (azaz Románia uniós csatlakozását követően) a verespataki projekttel kapcsolatos KHV-eljárás újraindult, mivel a korábbi urbanisztikai tanúsítványt bírósági határozat semmisítette meg.

1. A fenti jogi hátteret tekintetbe véve, valamint szem előtt tartva a Roșia Montană Gold Corporation által benyújtott új urbanisztikai tanúsítványon alapuló, újraindult KHV-eljárást, alkalmazandó-e a KHV-irányelv a verespataki aranybányászati projekttel kapcsolatos, jelenleg folyó KHV-eljárásra?

2. Ha nem, miért nem?

3. Rendelkezik-e a Bizottság bármilyen információval a folyamatban lévő KHV-eljárás jelenlegi állásáról, különösen a végső határozat várható időpontját illetően?

Janez Potočnik válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2014. április 2.)

A Bizottság szeretné a tisztelt képviselő figyelmébe ajánlani az E-014199/2013. számú írásbeli kérdésre ([1]) adott válaszát.

A Bizottság nincs abban a helyzetben, hogy előre jelezze, a román hatóságok mikor hozzák meg végleges döntésüket.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001594/14
to the Commission
Erik Bánki (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Environmental impact assessment procedure for the Roșia Montană cyanide mine project

In its answer to Petition 0344/2006 on alleged irregularities in the completion of the environmental impact assessment (EIA) for the Roșia Montană project, the Commission states that the directive on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment (the EIA Directive) is not applicable to the Roșia Montană gold mine project, as the request for development consent was submitted before Romania's accession to the EU.

Furthermore, in the same document the Commission also suggests that the EIA Directive will be applicable to any new requests for development consent which are registered after Romania's accession to the EU in respect of the same project or components of the project that were not initially included.

According to my information, in 2010 (after Romania's accession to the EU) the EIA procedure for the Roșia Montană project was restarted because a court ruling had annulled the previous urban development certificate.

1. In light of the above legal background, and bearing in mind the restarted EIA procedure on the basis of a new urban development certificate filed by the Roșia Montană Gold Corporation, is the EIA Directive applicable to the current ongoing EIA procedure for the Roșia Montană gold mine project?

2. If not, why not?

3. Does Commission have any information on the state of play as regards the ongoing EIA procedure, in particular the expected date of the final decision?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-014199/2013 ([1]).

The Commission is not in a position to say when the Romanian authorities will take their final decision.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001595/14
to the Commission
Linda McAvan (S&D) and Catherine Stihler (S&D)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Leisure credit schemes

Complaints regarding leisure credit schemes have risen dramatically in the UK, according to the UK European Consumer Centre (ECC). These leisure credits can cost up to GBP 15 000 and are exchanged for leisure products such as holiday accommodation, spa days and theatre trips. The schemes are often promoted as a way of trading in a timeshare or holiday club membership, but if people then change their mind they may be unable to cancel their contract. According to the UK ECC this new product falls outside the scope of the Timeshare Directive and consumers therefore have none of the protections given by this legislation if they enter into contracts for this type of product.

Can the Commission therefore inform us of what it is doing to address this rising problem of leisure credit schemes? Will the problem of leisure credit schemes be addressed in the Commission's upcoming review of the Timeshare Directive?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

Directive 2008/122/EC replaced the previous timeshare Directive 94/47/EC and covers also contracts for long-term holiday products (LTHP), such as holiday club memberships, under which the consumer acquires primarily the right to obtain discounts in respect of holiday accommodation for a period of more than one year. The directive provides for a number of safeguards for the consumers of such products, including the right to full information, the right of withdrawal, the requirement for consumer's payment to be divided in equal annual instalments and the right to terminate the contract when receiving invitation to pay each successive instalment.

The Commission is aware that certain traders attempt to circumvent these strong consumer protection rules, for example, by misleading claims that their products are not covered by Directive 2008/122/EC. However, the directive applies whenever the particular contract falls under the objective criteria set in the directive regardless of any such claims. As regards the statement published by the ECC UK regarding 'leisure credit scheme' contracts, the Commission understands it as a warning to consumers since certain contracts of this type are not covered by the directive's rules on LTHP because they do not primarily concern holiday accommodation. However, each contract, regardless of the name given to it by the trader, needs to be assessed on an individual basis in order to decide on the applicability of Directive 2008/122/EC.

The evaluation of the application of the directive is currently underway and the Commission will report to the European Parliament and the Council in due time.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001596/14
to the Commission
Catherine Stihler (S&D)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: EU accession

Can the Commission confirm that any new Member State will be obliged to adopt the euro and join the Schengen area as part of its accession to the EU?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2014)

The EU's enlargement policy is based on candidate countries meeting the requirements of membership set out in the Copenhagen criteria and the Treaty. In accordance with Article 119 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU, new Member States are committed to adopting the euro once they meet the necessary conditions. The Treaty also defines a set of criteria which need to be met before a Member State can eventually adopt the euro. Until then, the new Member States participate in the Economic and Monetary Union as a Member State with a derogation from the use of the euro and shall treat their exchange rates as a matter of common concern.

The Schengen *acquis* was integrated into the framework of the EU by the Treaty of Amsterdam. In accordance with the Protocol on the Schengen *acquis* attached to the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU all new Member States must accept the Schengen *acquis* in full.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001600/14
to the Commission
Catherine Stihler (S&D)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: EU-Swiss relations

What action is the Commission taking following the decision by the Swiss people to cap the number of EU citizens able to work in Switzerland? What will be the implications for future EU-Swiss relations?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2014)

As a consequence of the referendum, the Swiss legislator now has three years to adopt the necessary implementing legislation for the intiative which aims to introduce annual quantitative limits to immigration. Compliance of the implementing legislation with the EU-Swiss Agreement on the free movement of persons as well as any possible initiatives will be analysed once the details of the draft legislation are known. In the meantime, the Swiss Federal Council has assured the EU that it will continue to fulfil its existing international obligations.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001601/14
to the Commission
Catherine Stihler (S&D)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Zero-hour contracts

What action is the Commission taking to tackle the growing use of zero-hour contracts which exploit the low-paid, most often in caring professions, in which women are disproportionately represented?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

There are no rules at EU level specifically regulating the issue of zero-hour contracts. Zero-hour workers fall, in principle, within the scope of EU labour law and are entitled to paid annual leave in proportion to the time worked. At present, the Commission has no plans to take action specifically to address the issue of zero-hour contracts. Member States are, of course, free to adopt national rules to prevent the use and/or abuse of such contracts.

As regards the impact of this form of employment, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Parliamentary Question E-9517/2013. As a recent note from the UK House of Commons states, statistics on zero-hours contracts are very limited and estimates of their use vary widely ([1]). On the basis of the available data in the UK, the health sector appears to be one of areas where zero-hour contracts are most likely to be used, as the Honourable Member points out, alongside the hotels and restaurants sector and the education sector. The Commission is not aware of any other study on the specific effect of zero-hour employment on women.

([1]) House of Commons, 'Zero-hours contracts', Standard Note SN/BT/6553, 20 December 2013, p. 3.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001603/14
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Value of trees

The Good Agricultural and Environmental Conditions (GAEC) framework refers to 'avoiding the encroachment of unwanted vegetation on agricultural land.' (Annex III to Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009).

Could the Commission advise me as to what constitutes 'unwanted vegetation'? Specifically, do trees fall into this category?

Would the Commission agree with the argument that trees, as well as having an aesthetic value, also provide a natural defence against flooding, as their roots enable the rapid absorption of water?

Answer given by M. Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

According to Article 6(2) of regulation (EC) No 73/2009 [1], Member States have to implement the Good Agricultural and Environmental Condition (GAEC) on the basis of standards foreseen under Annex III of the same regulation.

Therefore, Member States have to define a GAEC on 'Avoiding the encroachment of unwanted vegetation on agricultural land'. The purpose of this GAEC is to maintain in suitable conditions the agricultural land and consequently to control the weed and the undesirable bushes or shrubs extension. For this purpose, Member States have some flexibility to specify the scope of GAEC taking into account the specific characteristics of the area concerned, including soil and climatic conditions. So in few Member States e.g. Baltic countries where risk of land abandonment is an issue, invasive trees can be included under the scope of this GAEC.

Nevertheless, GAEC cannot be defined in contradiction with the relevant EU legislation as the protection of habitats especially under Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 [2] and Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 [3].

Trees can also provide a natural defence against flooding, as underlined in the New EU forest Strategy COM(2013) 659. Agroforestry can optimise the benefits created when trees and/or shrubs are combined with crops and can help to cope with growing challenges, such as flooding. The Forest Strategy calls on Member States to integrate sustainable forestry practices in the River Basin Management Plans under the Water Framework Directive and in the Rural Development Programmes.

---

[1] OJ L 30, 31.1.2009.
[2] OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.
[3] OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001604/14
to the Commission
Fiona Hall (ALDE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Study on financing for development

On 14 February 2014 a study entitled 'Financing for development post-2015: Improving the contribution of private finance' was presented to Parliament's Committee on Development, in the presence of the Commission. This study, which had been requested by the committee, raised a number of questions about the use of private finance for development. A key area of concern was that of leveraging, i.e. using public funds to leverage private finance for development. Evidence was cited suggesting that private investment apparently leveraged by public funds would in many cases have happened anyway, without any such public finance incentives. Furthermore, the study indicated that there are certain functions which only public finance can appropriately perform.

What is the Commission's response to the issues raised by this study?

Does the Commission have any intention of addressing the concerns raised above?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(14 April 2014)

International public finance represents only a fraction of the resources available to meet the needs of developing countries. One of the tools used by the EU to maximise the impact of our actions is blending, the combination of EU grants with additional resources from public and private financiers. At the moment about 90% of grant contributions to blending projects leverage public finance.

Blending projects are subject to a thorough analysis involving EU departments and delegations, including the assessment of the added value of the EU grant which has to be justified for each project.

With public resources limited, the Commission sees the use of grants as a catalyst for private financing, such as support to local businesses. The Commission wants to exploit this possibility while carefully considering the added value of public money as well as potential risks, such as market distortion.

The Commission agrees that public and private finance have different functions. In its July 2013 Communication ([1]) it made it clear that 'private finance is fundamentally different from public finance: it follows private interests and does not per se pursue public policy goals'. However, private investment is the key driver of growth and development and can as such contribute to public goals; given its sheer size, even small shifts in private investment priorities and modalities can bring significant public benefits.

In the EU Blending Platform, in which the EP is an observer, work on how to best exploit the potential of catalysing private financing is foreseen for later in 2014.

([1]) COM(2013)531 final.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001606/14
à la Commission
Frédéric Daerden (S&D) et Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 février 2014)

Objet: Programme pour une réglementation affûtée et performante (REFIT)

Le 2 octobre 2013, la Commission européenne a publié une communication intitulée «Programme pour une réglementation affûtée et performante (REFIT): résultats et prochaines étapes», dans laquelle elle envisage notamment de ralentir le rythme de propositions législatives relatives à la santé et à la sécurité des travailleurs, d'alléger les obligations d'information et de consultation des entreprises et de reporter l'introduction dans le droit européen du contenu d'accords entre partenaires sociaux européens.

Le Parlement européen, pendant la séance plénière du 4 février 2014, lors du vote sur le rapport «Caractère adéquat, subsidiarité et proportionnalité de la réglementation de l'UE — Mieux légiférer», a notamment adopté un amendement contraire à cette démarche, dont le texte est le suivant: «souligne que l'évaluation de l'impact des nouvelles réglementations sur les PME ou les grandes entreprises ne peut avoir pour effet de discriminer les travailleurs en fonction de la taille de leur entreprise et ne peut entraîner de régression des droits fondamentaux des travailleurs, en ce compris les droits à l'information et à la consultation, les conditions de travail, le bien-être au travail et les droits en matière de sécurité sociale, et ne peut faire obstacle à une amélioration de ces droits ni à l'amélioration de leur protection sur le lieu de travail face aux anciens et nouveaux risques professionnels».

Consciente de la légitimité à favoriser nos entreprises par un cadre juridique stable, clair et efficace, une majorité du Parlement européen a cependant soutenu ce texte pour deux raisons fondamentales:

1. La protection de la santé des travailleurs ne représente pas un poids pour nos économies, mais au contraire un renforcement de leur capacité de travail.

2. L'information et la consultation régulière des travailleurs de l'entreprise, ainsi que le respect du dialogue social européen, permettent de mieux anticiper les changements de contexte commercial et économique dans un secteur ou dans une entreprise donnée.

Comment la Commission compte-t-elle prendre en compte la position exprimée par le Parlement européen lors de ce vote dans ses prochaines démarches d'allègement de la charge administrative sur nos entreprises?

Réponse donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission
(8 avril 2014)

Le programme pour une réglementation affûtée et performante (REFIT) vise à débusquer les charges administratives, les incohérences, les lacunes ou les dispositions inefficaces. Une attention particulière est portée à l'éventuelle charge réglementaire liée aux modalités de mise en œuvre de la législation de l'UE. Le programme REFIT devrait permettre de faire en sorte que le cadre réglementaire de l'Union soit pertinent, cohérent, efficace et efficient. Le respect des principes de subsidiarité et de proportionnalité dans le processus décisionnel européen est assuré dans le cadre de ce programme, qui ne remet pas en question les grands objectifs établis de longue date.

L'analyse coût-avantage exigée par le programme REFIT a pour but de s'assurer que les avantages de la réglementation de l'UE l'emportent sur les coûts. Elle doit également démontrer que les mesures s'inscrivent dans la logique des objectifs de l'UE et sont prises de manière plus efficace et plus efficiente au niveau de cette dernière qu'à l'échelon national, régional ou local.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001606/14
to the Commission
Frédéric Daerden (S&D) and Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme (REFIT)

On 2 October 2013, the European Commission published a communication entitled 'Regulatory Fitness and Performance (REFIT): Results and Next Steps', in which it intends, in particular, to slow the rate of legislative proposals relating to workers' health and safety, to alleviate the obligation of companies to inform and consult, and to postpone the introduction into European law of the content from agreements reached between European social partners.

During the plenary session of 4 February 2014, in the vote on the report 'EU regulatory fitness and subsidiarity and proportionality — better lawmaking', the European Parliament notably adopted an amendment that stands contrary to this approach, the text of which is as follows: 'stresses that evaluating the impact of new regulations on SMEs or on large companies must neither result in discrimination between workers on the basis of the size of the companies that employ them nor erode workers' fundamental rights, including the right to information and consultation, or their working conditions, wellbeing at work and rights to social security, nor must it hinder improvements to these rights or their safeguarding at the workplace in the face of existing and new risks connected with work.'

Aware of the legitimacy of supporting our companies by means of a stable, clear and efficient legal framework, a majority in the European Parliament supported this text for two fundamental reasons, however:

1. the protection of workers' health does not represent a burden for our economies but, on the contrary, enhances their capacity to work;

2. regularly informing and consulting employees in the company and respecting European social dialogue makes it possible to more effectively anticipate changes in the commercial and economic environment in a sector or a given company.

How does the Commission intend to take account of the position taken by the European Parliament during this vote in the next steps it takes towards alleviating the administrative burden on our companies?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2014)

The Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme (REFIT) aims to identify burdens, inconsistencies, gaps and ineffective measures. Attention is paid to possible regulatory burden related to how EU legislation is implemented. REFIT should ensure that the EU regulatory framework is relevant, coherent, effective and efficient. REFIT applies the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality in EU decision-taking. It does not call into question established policy objectives.

The cost/benefit analysis required by REFIT has the purpose of ensuring that the benefits of EU regulation exceed the costs. It also needs to demonstrate that action aligns with the objectives of the EU and is most effectively and efficiently taken at the EU level, rather than through actions at the national, regional or local levels.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-001607/14
upućeno Komisiji (potpredsjednici/Visokoj predstavnici)
Zdravka Bušić (PPE)
(13. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: VP/HR — Trenutno stanje u Bosni i Hercegovini

Potpuno sam svjesna teškog socijalnog stanja u Bosni i Hercegovini, nezadovoljstva radnika bez plaća te frustracija mladih ljudi bez ikakve perspektive.

Međutim, unatoč svemu tome, moramo imati na umu da su trenutni nemiri i vandalizmi u Bosni i Hercegovini prouzrokovani i drugim problemima osim onih socijalnih i gospodarskih. U tom smislu postavila bih dva pitanja:

1. Što Europska unija može poduzeti kako bi zaštitila prava manjina i prava Hrvata kao najmalobrojnijeg konstitutivnog naroda u Bosni i Hercegovini?

2. Je li Europska unija svjesna da, dok se nagađa i pretpostavlja što se zapravo zbiva u Bosni i Hercegovini, određeni procesi polako ulaze na zadnja vrata?

Odgovor g. Fülea u ime Komisije
(11. travnja 2014.)

U okviru praćenja procesa stabilizacije i pridruživanja kao i postupka pretpristupanja, EU procjenjuje prava manjina u Bosni i Hercegovini (BiH). U Izvješću o napretku iz listopada 2013. ([1]) navodi se da je „pravni okvir za zaštitu manjina uglavnom utvrđen, no provedbu treba poboljšati. Utjecaj državne razine i Vijeća za nacionalne manjine entiteta na kreiranje politike ostaje slab."

Bosanski Hrvati u zemlji uživaju visoku razinu zaštite zbog statusa jednog od konstitutivnih naroda. S druge strane, Europski sud za ljudska prava u predmetu Sejdić-Finci utvrdio je da postoji diskriminacija protiv „drugih" kada je riječ o njihovoj mogućnosti kandidiranja na izborima za Predsjedništvo i Dom naroda BiH.

Komisija je bila aktivna tijekom 2013. i početkom 2014. kako bi pomogla političkim čelnicima pronaći rješenje za ovo pitanje, uključujući i na nekoliko proširenih sastanaka u Bruxellesu, Budimpešti, Pragu i Sarajevu. Zbog kontinuirane nemogućnosti postizanja dogovora između političkih čelnika, Komisija je obustavila napore u olakšavanju tog postupka. Sada institucije Bosne i Hercegovine moraju poduzeti korake za prestanak kršenja svojih međunarodnih obveza. Nije jasno što uvažena zastupnica misli osvrtanjem na procese koji se „uvode na mala vrata". Proces proširenja i pristupnih pregovora jasan je i transparentan te je definiran u brojnim zaključcima Vijeća i pregovaračkim okvirima.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001607/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Zdravka Bušić (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Current situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

I am fully aware of the difficult social conditions in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the dissatisfaction of unpaid workers and the frustrations of young people with no prospects at all.

However, in spite of all of this, we must bear in mind that the current disorder and vandalism in Bosnia and Herzegovina are the result of problems that are not all social or economic in nature. In this connection:

1. What steps can the EU take to defend the rights of minorities and of Croats, who constitute the least numerous of Bosnia and Herzegovina's constituent peoples?

2. Is the EU aware that, while people speculate and make assumptions about what is going on in Bosnia and Herzegovina, certain processes are gradually entering by the back door?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2014)

In the framework of monitoring under the Stabilisation and Association as well as the pre-accession process, the EU assesses the rights of minorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). The progress report of October 2013 ([1]) states that 'the legal framework for the protection of minorities is largely in place, but implementation needs to improve. The influence of the State-level and Entity National Minority Councils over policy-making remains weak.'

Bosnian-Croat citizens in the country have a very high level of protection due to the status as one of the constituent peoples. By contrast, the European Court on Human Rights in the Sejdić-Finci case has found that there is discrimination against the 'others' as far as their eligibility to stand for elections to the Presidency and the House of Peoples of BiH is concerned.

The Commission has been active during 2013 and early 2014 in order to help political leaders to find a solution to this issue including in several extended meetings in Brussels, Budapest, Prague and Sarajevo. Due to the persistent lack of agreement among the political leaders the Commission ended the facilitation efforts. It now remains up to the institutions of Bosnia and Herzegovina to take action in order to end the violations of its international obligations. It is not clear what the Honourable Member means by referring to processes 'entering by the back door'. The process of enlargement and accession negotiations is clear and transparent and has been defined in numerous Council conclusions and negotiating frameworks.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001608/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — I caschi blu e le violenze sessuali durante le missioni di pace

I caschi blu sono impegnati in numerose missioni di pace nel mondo e il loro compito è di ripristinare la normalità politica e civile tra le popolazioni che versano in condizioni disperate.

Negli ultimi anni però arrivano sempre più denunce di episodi di violenze sessuali che alcuni caschi blu commettono su donne e bambine. Atti terribili che consistono in favori sessuali in cambio di cibo e che vedono le bambine attirate da offerte di latte e biscotti o da un giro in automobile.

In diversi casi, donne e ragazze si sono ritrovate sole, con figli nati da stupri e con conseguenze sociali devastanti a causa del disonore subito. Spesso, infatti, queste donne sono state ripudiate dalle loro tribù e dalle loro famiglie e sono state costrette a prostituirsi per riuscire a mantenere i figli nati dalle violenze.

Grazie alle denunce presentate da importanti organizzazioni internazionali per la tutela dei diritti umani quali Amnesty International e Human Rights Watch (HRW) sono state avviate le prime indagini nel 2005.

Tali violenze orribili e inaspettate hanno macchiato l'immagine dell'Onu, la cui missione è di aiutare e difendere le popolazioni. In questi casi ci troviamo di fronte a soprusi che riguardano donne che vivono già in situazioni precarie a causa delle conseguenze delle guerre civili.

L'Onu ha avviato inchieste interne e a quanto pare tali fenomeni non hanno modo di cessare.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. è l'Alto Rappresentante a conoscenza delle iniziative che l'Onu sta mettendo in atto per scovare e processare i responsabili delle violenze sessuali? Può l'Alto Rappresentante avere informazioni sui risultati che l'Onu sta ottenendo con le sue indagini e su come intende punire i responsabili?

2. È possibile verificare che non ci siano in questi casi azioni di copertura per nascondere gli episodi di stupro?

3. Quali misure può mettere in atto un soggetto forte come l'UE all'interno delle Nazioni Unite per fare luce su tali vicende, garantendo una maggiore tutela alle donne di questi paesi?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2014)

Le Nazioni Unite perseguono una politica di «tolleranza zero» in materia di sfruttamento e abuso sessuale. La strategia dell'ONU nei casi di comportamento indegno o in quelli di sfruttamento e abuso sessuale comprende misure di prevenzione delle violazioni, applicazione delle norme di condotta ONU e azioni correttive.

Le principali misure di prevenzione sono adottate nelle missioni sul campo, accompagnate da significative iniziative di formazione e di sensibilizzazione. Al fine di garantire che gli incidenti possano e debbano essere segnalati, sono stati istituiti inoltre dei meccanismi di segnalazione e di reclamo nelle missioni e, in collaborazione con le Nazioni Unite e le ONG partner, all'interno delle comunità.

Se si verificano incidenti, le Nazioni Unite intervengono per garantire che l'avanzamento delle denunce sui presunti incidenti sia monitorato e valutato attentamente, che le denunce siano esaminate nel più breve tempo possibile e, se del caso, che si ricevano informazioni su come le persone coinvolte siano state incriminate dalle autorità nazionali competenti. L'ONU può rimpatriare le persone coinvolte e sospenderle da future operazioni di mantenimento della pace.

Il Segretario Generale presenta una relazione annuale sulle misure speciali per la protezione dallo sfruttamento sessuale e dall'abuso sessuale, che contiene i dati relativi alle denunce e fornisce informazioni sulle azioni intraprese per prevenire e affrontare il problema dello sfruttamento e dell'abuso sessuale da parte del personale dell'ONU. Il sito cdu.unlb.org, predisposto dall'Unità di Condotta e Disciplina delle Nazioni Unite, fornisce ulteriori statistiche su tutte le denunce, aggiornate mensilmente.

Visto l'elevato numero di caschi blu ONU stanziati nel mondo per il mantenimento della pace, sarà impossibile evitare del tutto questi riprovevoli incidenti, dai quali nessuna organizzazione può considerarsi immune. A partire dal 2007 l'UE e gli Stati membri hanno costantemente lavorato di concerto con l'ONU su aspetti riguardanti la condotta e la disciplina, sostenendo lo sviluppo e l'adozione di politiche ad esse connesse e l'UE continua ad impegnarsi in questa direzione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001608/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — UN peacekeepers and sexual violence during peace missions

UN peacekeepers are deployed on many peace missions around the world. Their task is to restore political and civil normality to populations in desperate conditions.

In recent years, however, there have been increasing reports of episodes of sexual violence which some UN peacekeepers commit against women and young girls. These terrible acts consist of sexual favours exchanged for food. Young girls are attracted by offers of milk and biscuits or car rides.

In a number of cases, women and girls have ended up alone, with children born from rape. The social consequences are devastating, because of the dishonour suffered. Often, in fact, these women are repudiated by their tribes and families and have to prostitute themselves to maintain the children born of these acts of violence.

Prompted by reports presented by important international human rights organisations such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch (HRW), the first investigations were opened in 2005.

Such horrible and unexpected violence has tarnished the image of the UN, whose mission is to help and defend people. In these cases we encounter abuses of power affecting women who already live in precarious situations, due to the consequences of civil wars.

The UN has launched internal inquiries, and apparently there is no way of stopping these incidents.

In the light of the above, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is the High Representative aware of the initiatives which the UN is taking to detect and try those responsible for sexual violence? Can the High Representative find out what results the UN is achieving from its inquiries, and how it plans to punish those responsible?

2. Is it possible to check that there are no cover-ups of rape in these cases?

3. What steps can a powerful entity such as the EU institute within the United Nations to spotlight these matters and guarantee better protection for women in these countries?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

The UN has a zero tolerance policy with respect to sexual exploitation and abuse. Its strategy to address misconduct and sexual exploitation and abuse comprises measures of prevention of misconduct, enforcement of UN standards of conduct, and remedial action.

Key prevention measures are taken in field missions, with training and awareness-raising playing a major part. Reporting and complaint mechanisms have also been established in missions and in collaboration with UN and NGO partners in communities to ensure that incidents can and will be reported.

When incidents occur, the UN takes steps to ensure that progress in addressing reported allegations is monitored and measured closely, that allegations are investigated as quickly as possible and, when warranted, that information is received on how individuals were held accountable by their own competent authorities. The UN may repatriate the individuals concerned and ban them from future peacekeeping operations.

The Secretary-General issues an annual report on special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and sexual abuse which presents data on allegations and provides information on actions taken to prevent and address sexual exploitation and abuse by UN personnel. The Conduct and Discipline website cdu.unlb.org further provides statistics, updated monthly on all allegations.

With the large number of UN peacekeepers deployed around the world, such deplorable cases will likely never be entirely prevented, and no organisation is immune. The EU and EU Member States have always worked with the UN on issues around conduct and discipline and supported the development and adoption of related policies since 2007 and remains fully committed to continuing this effort.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001610/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Accordo bilaterale UE-Cuba

All'inizio di questa settimana, i ministri degli Affari esteri dei 28 Stati membri hanno dato il via libera al rilancio delle trattative tra Unione europea e Cuba per un accordo politico-economico. Le relazioni tra UE e Cuba erano state interrotte dalla prima nel 2003, quando il governo dell'isola caraibica aveva imprigionato 75 dissidenti cubani, fino al 2008, quando lo scarceramento di questi ultimi aveva portato a riaprire i contatti con l'Havana. Gli Stati membri si sono spesso mostrati divisi riguardo all'intavolare negoziati per accordi bilaterali con Cuba, tanto che 15 Stati membri hanno deciso di percorrere questa strada individualmente. Gli oppositori premono soprattutto affinché il governo cubano ponga più attenzione al rispetto dei diritti umani.

Dato che sarà la Commissione a sedere al tavolo dei negoziati in rappresentanza dell'UE, può chiarire:

1. Quando i negoziati prenderanno ufficialmente il via?

2. Quali settori intende includere nell'accordo bilaterale?

3. Che genere di misure intende proporre per garantire il rispetto dei diritti umani?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(4 aprile 2014)

L'AR/VP ha informato il governo cubano dell'offerta dell'UE di negoziare un accordo bilaterale, approvata il 10 febbraio dal Consiglio Affari esteri. Il 6 marzo il ministro degli Esteri cubano ha inviato all'AR/VP una lettera in cui accettava l'offerta. Si stanno organizzando i negoziati, che potrebbero iniziare prossimamente.

L'accordo comprenderà i tre pilastri di tutti gli accordi internazionali conclusi dall'UE: dialogo politico, cooperazione e scambi commerciali. Un accordo bilaterale rafforzerà le relazioni UE-Cuba e fornirà un solido quadro per un dialogo costruttivo e una migliore cooperazione. L'accordo contribuirà a promuovere gli interessi e i valori dell'Unione a Cuba e garantirà la continuità degli obiettivi delle politiche dell'Unione, tra cui il sostegno all'attuale processo di riforma e di modernizzazione, la promozione dei diritti umani e delle libertà fondamentali e la cooperazione allo sviluppo.

Abbiamo sollevato a più riprese le questioni più preoccupanti in materia di diritti umani, come gli arresti temporanei e le restrizioni alla libertà di espressione e di riunione. I diritti umani rimarranno un elemento centrale delle relazioni tra l'UE e Cuba. Queste tematiche sono trattate nell'ambito del dialogo politico UE-Cuba, che si svolge periodicamente a diversi livelli all'Avana e in Europa, e figureranno tra i principi di base, nonché tra gli elementi essenziali, dell'accordo bilaterale. Ci si aspetta da Cuba che faccia la sua parte, specie per quanto riguarda la questione dei diritti umani. Il ritmo dei negoziati dipenderà da questo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001610/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: EU-Cuba bilateral agreement

At the beginning of this week, the Foreign Affairs Ministries of 28 Member States gave the green light for a revival of negotiations between the European Union and Cuba for a political/economic agreement. Relations between the EU and Cuba were interrupted by the former in 2003, when the government of the Caribbean island imprisoned 75 Cuban dissidents, until 2008, when the release of those prisoners led to a reopening of contacts with Havana. Member States have shown themselves divided with regard to the instigation of negotiations for bilateral agreements with Cuba, in as far as 15 Member States have decided to pursue this path individually. The opponents above all urge the Cuban Government to pay more attention to respect for human rights.

Given that the Commission will be sitting at the negotiating table in representation of the EU, can it answer the following questions:

1. When will the negotiations officially begin?

2. What sectors does the Commission intend to include in the bilateral agreement?

3. What kind of measures does the Commission intend to propose to ensure respect for human rights?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

The HR/VP informed the Cuban Government of the EU offer to negotiate a bilateral agreement, approved by the Foreign Affairs Council on 10 February. On 6 March, the Cuban Foreign Minister in a letter to the HRVP accepted this offer. Negotiations are being arranged and could start soon now.

The agreement would cover the three usual pillars of EU international agreements: political dialogue, cooperation and trade. A bilateral Agreement would strengthen the EU-Cuba relationship and provide a robust framework for constructive dialogue and improved cooperation. It will help to effectively promote EU interests and values in Cuba and ensure continuity in EU policies objectives including support for the ongoing reform and modernisation process, the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms as well as development cooperation.

We have consistently raised human rights concerns such as the temporary arrests and the limitations imposed on the freedom of expression and assembly. Human rights issues will remain at the core of this relationship. These questions are addressed within the framework of the EU-Cuba political dialogue, taking place regularly at different levels in Havana and in Europe. And they will be among the basic principles — and the essential elements — of the bilateral Agreement. Cuba is expected to do what is necessary on its side, especially on the question of human rights. The pace of our negotiations will reflect this.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001611/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Riconoscimento giuridico dei family caregivers

Dinanzi a fattori quali l'innalzamento della speranza di vita — che interessa soprattutto le società occidentali — e la progressiva diffusione di malattie croniche e disabilitanti, la figura del cosiddetto family caregiver assume una certa rilevanza garantendo servizi continuativi, difficilmente reperibili altrimenti.

Alla luce di tale consapevolezza, l'UE ha inteso conferire riconoscimento giuridico ai caregivers, mediante misure specificamente dedicate.

Ciononostante, in alcuni Paesi — fra i quali l'Italia — non è stata accordata attenzione e tutela giuridica alla categoria summenzionata.

Tale atteggiamento aggrava ulteriormente la condizione di precarietà nella quale versano donne e uomini che prestano il proprio servizio di cura a favore di un familiare, annullando, in tal modo, le personali opportunità lavorative e relazionali.

Dinanzi a tale situazione, si intende chiedere alla Commissione:

1. maggiori delucidazioni in merito alla questione; in particolar modo, un'informativa relativa alla condizione dei caregivers negli altri Stati membri, rilevandone affinità o differenze con l'esempio italiano;

2. eventuali interventi — contemplabili dalla Commissione — volti alla promozione di una maggiore sensibilità nei confronti degli assistenti familiari e al riconoscimento del loro status giuridico.

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(2 aprile 2014)

L'erogazione di assistenza di lungo periodo rientra nelle responsabilità degli Stati membri. Questi dispongono tuttavia di obiettivi comuni concordati in tema di accessibilità, qualità e sostenibilità finanziaria dell'assistenza di lungo periodo nel contesto della loro cooperazione in seno al comitato per la protezione sociale ([1]). La Commissione sostiene gli Stati membri nei loro sforzi e ha cofinanziato recentemente due progetti assieme all'OCSE in tema di assistenza di lungo periodo. La relazione OCSE/CE *Help Wanted — Providing and paying for long-term care* ([2]) comprende capitoli sull'impatto che la prestazione di assistenza ha sui familiari che la esercitano e sulle politiche a sostegno dei family caregiver, relazione che presenta anche informazioni sull'organizzazione del lavoro e dei permessi per assistere familiari non autonomi e sul sostegno finanziario ai family caregiver nei paesi OCSE.

Il Sistema di informazione reciproca sulla protezione sociale nell'UE (MISSOC) fornisce a sua volta informazioni comparabili e regolarmente aggiornate sui sistemi nazionali di protezione sociale. Esso comprende una tabella sinottica delle prestazioni disponibili per il caregiver ([3]).

Il pacchetto di investimenti sociali adottato nel febbraio 2013 comprende un documento di lavoro dei servizi della Commissione in tema di assistenza di lungo periodo ([4]). In esso si discute l'importante contributo che recano alla società i family caregiver e si sottolineano le difficoltà che essi si trovano ad affrontare in termini di costi d'opportunità (situazione reddituale, diritto a pensione, problemi sanitari, ecc.). La Commissione sostiene il comitato per la protezione sociale nella preparazione di una relazione sull'assistenza di lungo periodo che dovrebbe essere adottata nel maggio 2014. La relazione si soffermerà anche sulla situazione dei family caregiver.

([1]) Il CPS funge da veicolo per gli scambi in cooperazione tra gli Stati membri e la Commissione europea nel quadro del metodo di coordinamento aperto in tema di inclusione sociale, assistenza sanitaria e assistenza di lungo termine nonché di pensioni.
([2]) http://www.oecd.org/els/health-systems/helpwantedprovidingandpayingforlong-termcare.htm http://www.oecd.org/els/health-systems/good-life-in-old-age.htm
([3]) http://www.missoc.org/MISSOC/INFORMATIONBASE/COMPARATIVETABLES/MISSOCDATABASE/comparativeTableSearch.jsp
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=en

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001611/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Legal recognition of family caregivers

Due to factors such as the increase in life expectancy (primarily affecting western societies) and the progressive spread of chronic and incapacitating illnesses, the role of the family caregiver, who provides on-going services otherwise difficult to source, has assumed a certain importance.

In the light of this awareness, the EU has expressed an intention to accord legal recognition to caregivers through dedicated measures.

However, in some countries, including Italy, the abovementioned category has not been accorded legal recognition or status.

This attitude exacerbates the precarious condition in which men and women providing care to a family member find themselves and takes away their employment and relationship opportunities.

In the face of this situation, can the Commission:

1. provide further clarification on this matter, in particular an overview of the status of caregivers in other Member States and an indication of similarities or differences by comparison with the Italian example;

2. consider measures to promote awareness with regard to family caregivers and acknowledgement of their legal status.

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

Long-term care provision is a responsibility of Member States. These have, however, agreed common objectives on the accessibility, quality and financial sustainability of long-term care in the context of their cooperation in the Social Protection Committee ([1]). The Commission supports Member States in their efforts and has recently co-financed two projects with OECD on long-term care. The OECD/EC report 'Help Wanted — Providing and paying for long-term care' ([2]) includes chapters on the impact of caring on family carers and policies to support family carers which present also information on the leave and work arrangements and the financial support for family carers in OECD countries.

The EU's Mutual Information System on Social Protection (MISSOC) provides also detailed, comparable and regularly updated information about national social protection systems. It includes a comparative table on benefits for the carer ([3]).

The Social Investment Package adopted in February 2013 includes a Commission Staff Working Document on long-term care ([4]). It discusses the important contribution made by family carers to society and points to the difficulties they are facing in terms of opportunity costs (income situation, pensions entitlement, health problems etc.). The Commission supports currently the Social Protection Committee in preparing a report on long-term care to be adopted in May 2014. The report will also look into the situation of family carers.

([1]) The SPC serves as a vehicle for cooperative exchange between Member States and the European Commission in the framework of the Open Method of Coordination on social inclusion, healthcare and long-term care as well as pensions.
([2]) http://www.oecd.org/els/health-systems/helpwantedprovidingandpayingforlong-termcare.htm
http://www.oecd.org/els/health-systems/good-life-in-old-age.htm
([3]) http://www.missoc.org/MISSOC/INFORMATIONBASE/COMPARATIVETABLES/MISSOCDATABASE/comparativeTableSearch.jsp
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=en

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001612/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Situazione dei copti in Egitto

I copti, cristiani egiziani nativi, costituiscono una minoranza che rappresenta circa il 10 % della popolazione egiziana. Sono stati storicamente bersaglio di discriminazione e degli attacchi degli estremisti islamici in Egitto. La situazione, che sembrava essersi normalizzata, è precipitata nuovamente a partire dall'ottobre 2011 con l'inizio della «primavera araba». Per l'intera durata della rivoluzione egiziana si è assistito ad un crescente numero di aggressioni mortali nei confronti dei copti. La situazione della minoranza copta è tragica e lo dimostrano i numerosi fatti di cronaca che li vedono bersaglio degli attacchi degli estremisti islamici. La provincia di Al Minya è stata la prima area oggetto di attacchi dopo la rivolta di gennaio 2011. Si sono verificati diversi episodi di aggressioni mortali, sequestri di bambini e case e negozi sono stati razziati. A Delga, i copti sono stati costretti a lasciare le loro terre o a venderle per un prezzo irrisorio alle forze islamiche. In Assiut si sono registrati costanti attacchi alle chiese copte. Questi sono solo alcuni dei gravissimi episodi di intolleranza religiosa avvenuti a danno della minoranza cristiana negli ultimi anni in Egitto. L'Unione europea, da sempre impegnata nella promozione e nella difesa dei diritti umani, tra cui quelli delle minoranze, ha l'obbligo di intervenire a difesa delle popolazioni perseguitate, per garantire il rispetto dei diritti umani e delle libertà fondamentali in Egitto.

Premesso tutto ciò, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. come intende agire per garantire il rispetto dei diritti umani e delle libertà fondamentali, in particolar modo con riferimento al rispetto di questi da parte dei paesi terzi con cui l'Unione stipula accordi commerciali o di cooperazione?

2. Qual è il suo parere riguardo la persecuzione dei copti in Egitto?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(4 aprile 2014)

L'UE è a conoscenza delle vessazioni subite da diverse minoranze religiose nel mondo, esprime profonda preoccupazione al riguardo e condanna ogni forma di intolleranza, discriminazione e violenza nei confronti delle persone per motivi di religione o di credo, ovunque queste abbiano luogo e indipendentemente dalla religione.

Nel caso dell'Egitto, l'AR/VP ha ripetutamente invitato le autorità nazionali a garantire la libertà di religione e di credo nel paese. La delegazione dell'UE al Cairo segue da vicino i casi di violenza settaria e nei suoi contatti con le autorità egiziane insiste sull'importanza di evitare discriminazioni per motivi religiosi.

Per promuovere il rispetto della libertà di religione e di credo in Egitto, l'UE collabora con tutte le parti interessate nel paese e con le organizzazioni regionali e internazionali che condividono i suoi valori e i suoi obiettivi su questo tema.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001612/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Situation of the Copts in Egypt

The native Egyptian Christian Copts constitute a minority representing around 10% of the Egyptian population. They have historically been the target of discrimination and attacks from Islamic extremists in Egypt. Although the situation had apparently normalised, it came to a head again in October 2011 with the beginning of the 'Arab Spring'. Throughout the Egyptian revolution we have seen a growing number of fatal attacks on Copts. The situation of the Coptic minority is tragic, as demonstrated by multiple news items which depict them as a target of attacks from Islamic extremists. The province of Al Minya was the first area to be subject to attacks after the revolt in January 2011. There have been a number of fatal attacks, children have been kidnapped and shops and homes looted. In Delga, the Copts were forced to abandon their land or sell it to the Islamic forces at a derisory price. In Assiut, constant attacks on Coptic churches have been recorded. These are but some examples of the episodes of severe religious intolerance perpetrated against the Christian minority in Egypt in recent years. The European Union, ever committed to the promotion and defence of human rights, including the rights of minorities, has an obligation to intervene in defence of persecuted populations to ensure respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in Egypt.

In full consideration of the above, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What action does the Commission intend to take to ensure respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, in particular by third countries with whom the Union has entered into trade or cooperation agreements?

2. What is the opinion of the Commission on the persecution of Copts in Egypt?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

The EU is aware and concerned about the constraints that different religious minorities face in the world and condemns all forms of intolerance, discrimination and violence against persons because of their religion or belief, wherever it takes place and regardless of the religion.

In the case of Egypt, the HR/VP has repeatedly called on the Egyptian authorities to ensure freedom of religion or belief in the country. The EU Delegation in Cairo is closely following cases of sectarian violence and emphasises the importance of avoiding discrimination on religious grounds in its contacts with Egyptian authorities.

In order to support the improvement of freedom of religion or belief in Egypt, the EU is engaging with the relevant stakeholders in the country as well as with the regional and international organisations sharing EU's values and objectives in this respect.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001613/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Politica comune della pesca: programmi per gli operatori del settore nel Mar Tirreno ed Adriatico

La recente riforma della nuova politica comune della pesca dell'UE mira ad affrontare i diversi problemi che affliggono il settore ittico. Inoltre, il Fondo Europeo per gli Affari Marittimi e la Pesca (FEAMP) con un budget di circa EUR 6.5 miliardi per il periodo 2014-2020 mira a sostenere il settore della pesca dell'UE e delle politiche marittime. La destinazione dei fondi al settore della pesca sarà quindi determinante per il futuro del settore e l'effettiva attuazione della riforma della Politica Comune della Pesca, compresi gli obiettivi che mirano a porre fine alla pesca eccessiva e garantire la ricostituzione degli stock ittici. Il Parlamento europeo ha chiesto come priorità un incremento degli aiuti pubblici per il recupero degli stock ittici, una migliore raccolta dati, maggiori controlli e una corretta applicazione della normativa, con il fine di creare un sistema in grado di consentire una pesca sostenibile. Inoltre, la riforma prevede nuove norme relative alla commercializzazione, che consentiranno ai consumatori di essere maggiormente informati sulla zona di cattura e sul tipo di attrezzo utilizzato per la cattura del pesce acquistato.

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. quali sono i programmi e le risorse effettivamente disponibili per gli operatori del settore ittico, in particolar modo del Mar Tirreno e del Mar Adriatico?

2. può fornire un quadro generale dell'impatto della nuova politica comune della pesca relativamente ai rapporti commerciali nel settore ittico con i paesi terzi?

Risposta di Maria Damanaki a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2014)

Per quanto riguarda i programmi, spetterà a ciascuno Stato membro dell'UE presentare un programma operativo inteso a conseguire sia gli obiettivi nazionali che gli obiettivi generali fissati a livello dell'Unione dalla nuova politica comune della pesca. Poiché il Mar Adriatico e il Mar Tirreno sono condivisi tra vari Stati membri dell'UE, la Commissione verificherà che i programmi nazionali non siano in contrasto fra loro e che siano adeguati a far fronte ai problemi della pesca in tali zone. Gli importi effettivi di cui potranno beneficiare gli operatori saranno fissati dalla Commissione mediante un atto di esecuzione dopo l'adozione formale del regolamento FEAMP.

Per soddisfare la domanda del mercato l'Unione dipende in larga misura dalle importazioni. La politica commerciale dell'UE che disciplina le importazioni deve essere coerente con i principi della politica comune della pesca, che è volta a garantire la sostenibilità delle attività di pesca e la redditività economica dei settori della pesca e dell'acquacoltura. La politica commerciale dell'UE mira al tempo stesso a raggiungere un equilibrio tra la domanda dei consumatori, un'offerta adeguata (compresa un'offerta competitiva per l'industria di trasformazione) e gli interessi dei produttori dell'UE. Nel negoziare gli accordi commerciali preferenziali la Commissione promuove attivamente comportamenti sostenibili sotto il profilo sociale e ambientale. I partner commerciali dell'UE devono inoltre aderire alle convenzioni e agli accordi internazionali vigenti sulla governance marittima (convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sul diritto del mare, accordo delle Nazioni Unite sugli stock ittici, codice di condotta della FAO per una pesca responsabile, accordo FAO sulle misure di competenza dello Stato di approdo intese a prevenire, scoraggiare ed eliminare la pesca illegale, non dichiarata e non regolamentata, partecipazione alle pertinenti organizzazioni regionali per la pesca o cooperazione con le stesse).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001613/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Common Fisheries Policy: programmes for fishing operators in the Adriatic and Tyrrhenian Seas

The recent reform of the EU's new Common Fisheries Policy is designed to tackle the various problems afflicting the fishing sector. Furthermore, the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF), which has a budget of around EUR 6.5 billion for the 2014-2020 period, is intended to support the EU fishing sector and maritime policies. The allocation of funds to the fishing sector will hence be determinant for the future of that sector and the effective implementation of reform of the common fisheries policy, including the goals of eliminating overfishing and guaranteeing the replenishment of fish stocks. The European Parliament has, as a matter of priority, requested an increase in public aid for the recovery of fish stocks, improvements in data acquisition, heightened controls and a proper application of regulations with a view to the creation of a system conducive to sustainable fishing. The reform also defines new standards on marketing, which will enable consumers to be better informed on catch zones and the type of fishing gear used to catch the fish they are buying.

In full consideration of the above, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What programmes and resources are effectively available to fishing operators, in particular in the Adriatic and Tyrrhenian Seas?

2. Can the Commission provide an overview of the impact of the new Common Fisheries Policy on commercial relations with third countries in the fishing sector?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

In terms of programmes, it will be up to each EU Member State to submit an operational programme designed to attain both the country's objectives and the general goals set at Union level by the new Common Fisheries Policy. Since the Adriatic and Tyrrhenian seas are shared between various EU countries, the Commission will verify that the national programmes do not clash and are fit to tackle the problems of the fisheries sector in those areas. In terms of the actual amounts made available to operators, these will be set by the Commission through an implementing act after the formal adoption of the EMFF Regulation.

The EU is strongly dependant on imports to meet market demand. Our trade policy regulating imports should be consistent with the principles of the common fisheries policy, which seeks to ensure the sustainability of fisheries and the economic viability of the fishing and aquaculture industries. By the same token, our trade policy aims to strike a balance between consumer demand, adequate supply (which includes competitive supply for the processing industry), and the interests of EU producers. The Commission actively pursues, in the negotiation of preferential trade agreements, socially and environmentally sustainable behaviours. In addition, we insist that EU trade partners adhere to the international conventions and agreements on maritime governance that are in force (UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, UN Fish Stocks Agreement, FAO Code of Conduct on Responsible Fisheries, FAO Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing, participation in and/or cooperation with relevant Regional Fisheries Management Organisations).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001615/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Sospetto di irregolarità sul blocco di alcune partite di vino italiano in Germania

Alcune cantine italiane stanno vivendo con grave difficoltà il tema delle esportazioni di vino in Germania. Da un anno a questa parte si susseguono contestazioni su vini sfusi importati in Germania e oggi è stato pubblicato un ulteriore articolo sulla stampa tedesca con ragioni sociali delle aziende coinvolte in questo «scandalo» in merito a un presunto annacquamento di vino Montepulciano e Trebbiano DOC biologico 2012. Nello specifico la zona interessata è il Land del Rheinland-Pfalz (Renania Palatinato). La repressione frodi che effettua le analisi ha sede a Treviri e fa riferimento a valori di una banca dati non meglio precisata. La banca dati per la valutazione è unica, ha sede a Stresa e i dati dovrebbero essere unici per tutta l'Europa. Pertanto, non si riesce a capire come un identico prodotto venga valutato in modo diverso dallo Stato italiano e da quello tedesco. Le contro analisi effettuate in Italia (Laboratorio ICRF di San Michele all'Adige — (Trento) non sono state tenute in considerazione.

In questo modo, con il solo «sospetto di annacquamento», sono state bloccate diverse partite di alcune cooperative italiane, note per le loro qualità e serietà. La situazione è ulteriormente aggravata dal fatto che la repressione frodi tedesca ha avviato, basandosi sulla sola presunzione di un sospetto annacquamento, un depistaggio e diffuso mala-informazione sugli importatori, comunicando i nomi delle aziende sospettate e creando così un notevole danno di immagine a molti produttori italiani.

Alla luce di quanto esposto si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se è a conoscenza della questione in oggetto e quali misure intende adottare per contrastare questo genere di frodi;

2. di verificare a quale banca dati la repressione frodi faccia riferimento e se sia legittimo un ricorso a questa, anziché a quella basata a Stresa;

3. se il blocco delle partite di vino sia da considerarsi legittimo e se sia possibile per i produttori ottenere un rimborso a copertura del danno economico da esso provocato.

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2014)

La Commissione non è stata informata in modo specifico della situazione descritta nell'interrogazione. Comunque, spetta agli Stati membri effettuare controlli per verificare che il vino immesso sul mercato rispetta la normativa del settore vitivinicolo e in particolare le norme di produzione.

Per rilevare le adulterazioni mediante annacquamento è stata istituita, ai sensi dall'articolo 87 del regolamento (CE) n. 555/2008 della Commissione, del 27 giugno 2008 ([1]), una banca di dati analitici gestita dal Centro comune di ricerca. Tale banca dati contribuisce ad armonizzare l'interpretazione dei risultati ottenuti dai laboratori ufficiali degli Stati membri che utilizzano i propri dati.

In determinati casi giustificati possono essere di applicazione disposizioni nazionali specifiche che consentono di sospendere un trasporto di vino a fini di controllo e che prevedono la possibilità di ottenere un indennizzo.

([1]) GU L 170 del 30.6.2008, pag. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001615/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Suspicion that blocking of Italian wine consignments in Germany breaches rules

Some Italian wine cellars are encountering serious difficulty exporting wine to Germany. For a whole year, there have been successive objections to bulk wines imported into Germany. Today another article was published in the German press, quoting the names of companies involved in this 'scandal' of alleged adulteration with water of 2012 organic Montepulciano and Trebbiano DOC wine. The specific region concerned is Rheinland-Pfalz (Rhineland-Palatinate). The fraud office conducting the analysis is based in Trier and refers to figures from an unspecified database. There is only one database for this evaluation. It is based in Stresa, and the data should be the same Europe-wide. Therefore it is unclear how an identical product can be differently assessed by the authorities in Italy and Germany. Further tests carried out in Italy, at the ICRF laboratory in San Michele all'Adige (Trento), were ignored.

Thus consignments from several Italian cooperatives, of known quality and good standing, have been blocked on mere 'suspicion of adulteration.' The situation is exacerbated by the widespread and misleading information on the importers released by the German fraud office, based solely on the presumption of adulteration. This has included the names of suspect companies, and has done considerable harm to the image of many Italian winegrowers.

In the light of the above, the Commission is asked:

1. if it is aware of this issue, and what action it intends to take to counter this type of fraud;

2. to check which database the fraud office refers to, and if it is lawful to refer to this rather than to the one based in Stresa;

3. and if the blocking of consignments of wine can be deemed lawful, and if it is possible for the winegrowers to obtain compensation for the economic loss it has caused.

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(9 avril 2014)

La Commission n'a pas été informée spécifiquement de la situation décrite dans la question. De toute façon, il revient aux États membres d'effectuer des contrôles afin de vérifier que le vin mis sur le marché respecte la règlementation vitivinicole et notamment les règles de production.

Pour la détection d'adultération par addition d'eau, une banque de données analytique gérée par le Centre Commun de Recherche européen a été établie conformément à l'article 87 du règlement de la Commission (CE) n°555/2008 ([1]) du 27 juin 2008. Cette banque de donnée permet d'aider à harmoniser l'interprétation des résultats obtenus par les laboratoires officiels des États membres qui utilisent leurs propres données.

Des dispositions nationales particulières permettant de suspendre un transport de vin à des fins de contrôle et la possibilité d'obtenir des compensations dans des cas justifiés peuvent s'appliquer.

([1]) JO L 170 du 30.06.2008, p. 1.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001616/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(13 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Szantaż Rosji w sprawie embarga na wieprzowinę

Rosja domaga się od Unii Europejskiej wprowadzenia embarga na wieprzowinę, lecz tylko z Polski i państw bałtyckich. Według nieoficjalnych informacji urzędnicy Komisji Europejskiej powiedzieli, że Moskwa chce podzielić kraje Unii. Według agencji ITAR-TASS, szef rosyjskiej Federalnej Służby Nadzoru Weterynaryjnego i Fitosanitarnego Siergiej Dankwert zażądał od Komisji wprowadzenia embarga na wieprzowinę tylko dla Polski i krajów bałtyckich. Jednak zgodziłby się on na eksport z innych państw Unii. Rzecznik komisarza ds. zdrowia odmówił korespondentce RMF FM Katarzynie Szymańskiej-Borginion oficjalnego komentarza. Dziennikarka dowiedziała się także nieoficjalnie, że Komisja Europejska wywierała nacisk na Polskę, aby Polska wprowadziła u siebie strefę buforową, tym samym wstrzymując swój eksport wieprzowiny.

1. Jak słusznie zauważył główny weterynarz kraju Janusz Związek, jest niedopuszczalne, aby unijne zasady zezwalały na poświęcenie jednego kraju dla uratowania innych. Dlaczego Komisja ulega Rosji i nie chce walczyć o interesy Unii Europejskiej jako całości?

2. Dlaczego odmawia się polskim dziennikarzom udzielenia komentarza w tak ważnej dla Polski sprawie. Czy Komisja zapomniała o art. 11 § 3 Traktatu o Unii Europejskiej: „Komisja Europejska prowadzi szerokie konsultacje z zainteresowanymi stronami w celu zapewnienia spójności i przejrzystości działań Unii”?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(1 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Od momentu wprowadzenia wspomnianego bezprecedensowego zakazu Komisja stoi na stanowisku, że wznowienie wywozu wieprzowiny z Unii do Federacji Rosyjskiej musi objąć wszystkie państwa członkowskie. Jedynym wyjątkiem od tej zasady powinny być obszary, na których wprowadzono ograniczenia zgodnie z przepisami właściwego prawodawstwa Unii.

Komisja podtrzymuje to stanowisko, które jest zgodne z zasadami handlu międzynarodowego, i wielokrotnie wzywała już wszystkie państwa członkowskie do zachowania jedności i powstrzymania się od zawierania umów dwustronnych z Rosją.

Wbrew pojawiającym się w mediach informacjom, do których nawiązuje Szanowny Pan Poseł, Federacja Rosyjska nie otrzymała oficjalnego wniosku dotyczącego zgody na utrzymanie zakazu tylko w odniesieniu do niektórych państw członkowskich.

Komisja nie zamierza w każdym razie poświęcić interesu niektórych państw członkowskich poprzez uzgodnienie ograniczeń wywozu z tych państw, aby w ten sposób uzyskać korzyści dla innych państw członkowskich i spełnić nieuzasadnione żądania państw trzecich.

Działania Komisji w odniesieniu do negocjacji z Rosją są w pełni przejrzyste: Komisja codziennie przekazuje wszelkie informacje na ten temat Głównym Lekarzom Weterynarii we wszystkich państwach członkowskich.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001616/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Russian blackmail regarding pork embargo

Russia is demanding that the European Union introduce an embargo on pork, but only on pork from Poland and the Baltic States. According to unofficial information, Commission officials have said that Moscow wishes to create divisions among the EU Member States. According to the ITAR-TASS news agency, the head of the Russian Federal Service for Veterinary and Phytosanitary Supervision, Sergey Dankvert, has demanded that the Commission introduce an embargo on pork originating exclusively in Poland and the Baltic States. They would, however, permit exports from other Member States. The spokesperson for the Commissioner for Health refused to make an official comment to Katarzyna Szymańska-Borginion, correspondent for RMF FM. The correspondent also found out from unofficial sources that the Commission has been exerting pressure on Poland to establish a buffer zone within its own territory in order to halt its own exports of pork.

1. As Poland's Chief Veterinary Officer Janusz Związek astutely observed, EU rules may under no circumstances be used to throw one Member State under the bus in order to save the others. Why is the Commission giving in to Russia and refusing to fight for the interests of the European Union as a whole?

2. Why is it refusing to provide Polish journalists with comments on an issue of such greatimportance for Poland? Has the Commission forgotten about Article 11(3) of the Treatyon European Union, which says that 'the European Commission shall carry out broadconsultations with parties concerned in order to ensure that the Union's actions arecoherent and transparent'?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(1 April 2014)

The Commission's position since the introduction of this unprecedented ban is that EU pork exports to the Russian Federation must resume from all the Member States with the only exception to those areas subjected to restrictions in accordance with the provisions of the relevant Union legislation.

The Commission maintains this position which is in line with the international trade rules and has repeatedly urged all Member States to preserve unity and refrain from bilateral arrangements with Russia.

Despite the media information the Honourable Member is referring to, no official proposal has been received by the Russian Federation for agreeing in maintaining the ban only on part of the Member States.

The Commission is, in any case, not willing to sacrifice certain Member States by agreeing on restrictions to their exports for the benefit of the others in order to satisfy unjustified demands by third countries.

The Commission acts in full transparency as regards its negotiations with Russia on the issue and is sharing all information with the Chief Veterinary Officers of all Member States on a daily basis.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001617/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(13 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Tendencje izolacyjne w Szwajcarii

W Szwajcarii odbędzie się referendum na temat ograniczenia imigracji, może to doprowadzić do konfliktu z Unią Europejską na dużą skalę. Szwajcaria przez lata była otwarta na imigrantów, obecnie ma proporcjonalnie więcej cudzoziemców niż jakikolwiek kraj w Europie. Jedna czwarta mieszkańców ośmiomilionowego kraju to imigranci. Sytuacja ta może się wkrótce zmienić; Szwajcarska Partia Ludowa (SVP) chce zamknąć granice kraju. W chwili pisania odpowiedzi na tę interpelację wyniki referendum będą już znane. Nawet jeśli zmiany nie zostaną wprowadzone, to według mnie problem pozostaje, gdyż tendencje antyimigracyjne w Szwajcarii pozostają silne i prędzej czy później może dojść do zamknięcia szwajcarskich granic.

1. Wygrana SVP wiąże się z wprowadzeniem kwot imigracyjnych. Granice państwa nie zostaną całkowicie zamknięte, jednak takie rozwiązanie jest niezgodne z porozumieniem z Unią Europejską o swobodnym przepływie osób. To z kolei przekłada się na konieczność opuszczenia strefy Schengen przez Szwajcarię.

2. Czy Komisja mogłaby wpłynąć na społeczeństwo Szwajcarii poprzez działania informacyjne, tak aby zmniejszyć tendencje izolacyjne w tym kraju?

3. Czy Komisja zdaje sobie sprawę z powagi sytuacji? Mam na myśli to, że Unia Europejska nie może zgodzić się na ewentualne ustępstwa wobec Szwajcarii. Szwajcaria nie może negocjować nowych warunków wolnego przepływu osób. Z pewnością ustępstwo wobec Szwajcarii spowoduje falę takich żądań ze strony innych państw, np. Wielkiej Brytanii.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(2 kwietnia 2014 r.)

W następstwie przeprowadzonego dnia 9 lutego w Szwajcarii referendum dotyczącego wprowadzenia rocznych limitów ilościowych w zakresie „imigracji" do szwajcarskiej konstytucji wprowadzono nowe przepisy. Stosowne kwoty miałyby być ustalane na podstawie szwajcarskiego interesu gospodarczego oraz zapewniałyby pierwszeństwo obywatelom Szwajcarii. Jednak nowe przepisy wymagają wdrożenia za pomocą aktów prawnych. Przewidują one „renegocjację oraz dostosowanie umów międzynarodowych, które są sprzeczne z nowym artykułem" w ciągu trzech lat po zatwierdzeniu inicjatywy. W międzyczasie UE i Szwajcaria będą kontynuować stosowanie zawartych umów. Szwajcaria będzie również nadal stowarzyszona ze strefą Schengen.

Komisja Europejska przekazuje zwykle informacje na temat korzyści osiąganych przez Szwajcarię z tytułu korzystania z rynku wewnętrznego i swobodnego przemieszczania się za pośrednictwem delegatury Unii Europejskiej w Szwajcarii. Niemniej podczas kampanii Komisja powstrzymała się od ingerowania w krajową debatę poprzedzającą referendum.

Komisja Europejska podkreśla, że swobodny przepływ osób jest podstawową, niezbywalną zasadą zarówno w ramach UE, jak i w zakresie stosunków UE ze Szwajcarią.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001617/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Isolationist tendencies in Switzerland

Switzerland is set to hold a referendum on reducing immigration which may bring it into major conflict with the European Union. Switzerland has been open to immigrants for many years, and it currently has proportionately more foreign residents than any other country in Europe. One-quarter of the residents of this country of eight million are immigrants. However, this situation could soon change, as the Swiss People's Party (SVP) is seeking to close the country's border. By the time the response to this question is being written, the results of this referendum will already be known. Even if the changes are introduced, the problem will remain. After all, anti-immigration tendencies remain pronounced in Switzerland, and, sooner or later, they could lead to the Swiss borders being closed.

1. A victory for the SVP would be synonymous with the introduction of immigration quotas. Although the country's borders would not be totally closed, such a step would be in violation of Switzerland's agreement with the EU on the free movement of persons. This would inevitably require Switzerland's departure from the Schengen zone.

2. Can the Commission influence Swiss public opinion through awareness-raising activities, with a view to reducing that country's isolationist tendencies?

3. Does the Commission appreciate the gravity of the situation? What I am saying is that the European Union cannot countenance making any concessions vis-à-vis Switzerland. Switzerland may not negotiate new conditions for the free circulation of persons. Any concessions towards Switzerland would surely lead to a tidal wave of similar demands from other states, such as the United Kingdom.

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

The popular vote in Switzerland of 9 February in favour of an introduction of annual quantitative limits to 'immigration' introduced new provisions into the Swiss constitution. Quotas would be determined on the basis of Swiss economic interest, and would have to grant preference to Swiss citizens. However, the new provisions require implementation by means of legislation. They provide for 'the renegotiation and adaptation of international agreements which are contrary to the new article' within three years following acceptance of the initiative. In the meantime, the EU and Switzerland will continue applying the agreements they concluded. The Swiss association to Schengen will also continue being applied.

The European Commission provides usually information on the benefits of the internal market and free movement for Switzerland through the European Union Delegation to Switzerland. During the campaign nonetheless, it refrained from interfering in the domestic debate preceding the referendum.

The European Commission affirms that the free movement of persons is a fundamental, non-negotiable principle both for the EU and for the EU's relations with Switzerland.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001619/14
à Comissão
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) e Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(13 de fevereiro de 2014)

Assunto: Incineradores de resíduos urbanos nos Açores

No passado mês de junho, a Quercus, Associação Nacional de Conservação da Natureza, enviou uma queixa à Comissão Europeia contra o Estado português, dando conhecimento do incumprimento da Diretiva relativa à Avaliação do Impacto Ambiental, no caso do projeto incinerador de resíduos urbanos da Associação de Municípios da Ilha de São Miguel nos Açores (AMISM), bem como do incumprimento da Diretiva relativa aos Resíduos (esta enviada no mês de julho).

Apesar de as queixas apenas fazerem alusão ao projeto do incinerador em São Miguel, outro projeto de incinerador está também em marcha na Ilha Terceira (com uma primeira adjudicação já a ser feita). De referir que só a infraestrutura de incineração em São Miguel poderá atingir os 94 milhões de euros, tendo a AMISM estimado necessitar de 10 milhões de euros, sendo os restantes garantidos por fundos comunitários.

As queixas enviadas pela Quercus — subscritas por nós — fazem alusão a duas violações particulares:

a) Incumprimento das taxas de reciclagem — A Declaração de Impacto Ambiental emitida pelo Governo Regional obriga a AMISM a reciclar 50 % dos materiais recicláveis e 50 % dos resíduos orgânicos até 2020, mas o Estudo de Impacto Ambiental do incinerador refere que a AMISM apenas irá reciclar 30,7 % dos materiais recicláveis e 13,4 % dos resíduos orgânicos até 2020;

b) Inversão da hierarquia para a gestão de resíduos (em que a reciclagem deve surgir a montante da valorização energética). Tal inversão só seria válida caso tivesse sido efetuado, e aprovado, um estudo de análise de ciclo de vida que a justifique, algo que não foi feito e que, como, tal constitui uma violação da Diretiva relativa aos Resíduos.

Apesar dos vários alertas da Quercus, dos apelos do Bloco de Esquerda —Açores, apesar dos projetos alternativos apresentados, como a construção de centrais de tratamento mecânico e biológico, e de centrais de valorização orgânica (projetos significativamente mais económicos e mais amigos do ambiente), que aliás um parecer interno do Governo Regional dos Açores revela ser favorável, nada parece deter aqueles que querem levar estes projetos avante.

Como tal, perguntamos à Comissão se:

1. Está a par das queixas enviadas pela Quercus? Se sim, em que ponto se encontra o processo?

2. Vai permitir que fundos comunitários financiem este projeto, que viola legislação nacional e diretivas europeias? Ou, confirmando os incumprimentos, pretende bloquear o financiamento dos projetos?

3. Vai a Comissão, dentro das suas competências, atuar ou não junto do Governo português, de modo a apurar responsabilidades e garantir que todas as disposições legislativas são cumpridas?

4. Tendo em conta as políticas que tendo vindo a promover em matéria de ambiente, e sabendo que existem alternativas viáveis, concorda/apoia a Comissão a construção destas incineradoras?

Resposta dada pelo Comissário Europeu para a Ciência e Investigação, Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão
(16 de abril de 2014)

A Comissão está atualmente a avaliar as alegações apresentadas pelos autores da denúncia. Caso esta avaliação revele a existência de indícios de uma infração do direito comunitário do ambiente, a Comissão dará início a uma investigação com vista a recolher informações pertinentes do Estado-Membro. Com base nos resultados dessa investigação, a Comissão decidirá o seguimento a dar a esta denúncia, o que poderá incluir a abertura de um processo de infração.

Apesar de a incineração ser uma opção de gestão de resíduos legítima no âmbito da diretiva-quadro relativa aos resíduos ([1]), deve ser dada prioridade a outras opções sempre que possível, em consonância com a hierarquia de resíduos aí estabelecida. Os objetivos revistos para a reciclagem e a eliminação da deposição de resíduos em aterros serão adotados nas próximas semanas. A Comissão assegurará que todos os requisitos previstos pela legislação da UE em matéria ambiental sejam cumpridos neste caso. Todavia, uma vez verificado o cumprimento das disposições em vigor, a decisão última relativa à autorização das infraestruturas de incineração em causa continuará a ser da competência das autoridades portuguesas.

Em todos os casos, o cumprimento das regras e das políticas da UE é uma condição para o cofinanciamento de qualquer projeto elegível para financiamento comunitário.

([1]) Diretiva 2008/98/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 19 de novembro de 2008, relativa aos resíduos e que revoga certas diretivas (JO L 312 de 22.11.2008, p. 3-30).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001619/14
to the Commission
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) and Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Urban waste incineration in the Azores

In June 2013, Quercus, the Portuguese National Association for the Conservation of Nature, submitted to the Commission a complaint against the Portuguese state for infringement of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive in the case of the urban waste incinerator project being carried out by the Association of Municipalities of the Island of São Miguel (AMISM) in the Azores, and a further complaint about infringement of the Waste Directive (submitted in July 2013).

Although the complaints only refer to the incinerator project in São Miguel, another incinerator project is under way on the island of Terceira, with the first contract already being awarded. It is worth noting that the incineration infrastructure in São Miguel alone may be as much as EUR 94 million, of which the AMISM estimates it needs to put up EUR 10 million, with the remainder being provided by Community funds.

The complaints presented by Quercus, which we endorse, refer to two specific infringements:

(a) failure to comply with recycling rates: the regional government's environmental impact declaration requires the AMISM to recycle 50% of recyclable material and 50% of organic waste until 2020, but the incinerator's environmental impact assessment states that the asociation will only recycle 30% of recyclable material and 13.4% of organic waste up to this date.

(b) inversion of the waste management hierarchy (in which recycling should take place ahead of energy recovery): such inversion is only valid if a study analysing the life-cycle has been carried out and approved, which is not so in this case, making it an infringement of the Waste Management Directive.

Despite several warnings from Quercus, appeals from the Bloco de Esquerda-Azores and the presentation of alternative projects such as the construction of mechanical and biological treatment centres and organic waste processing plants (which would be significantly more economical and environmentally-friendly) which furthermore received a favourable opinion in an internal report by the regional government of the Azores, nothing seems to deter those seeking to implement the incinerator projects.

We therefore ask the Commission:

1. Is it aware of the complaints submitted by Quercus? If so, what stage has been reached in addressing them?

2. Will it allow Community funds to be used to finance this project, which violates Portuguese national law and European directives? Will it block funding for the project if the infringements are confirmed to have taken place?

3. Will the Commission take action within its competences vis-à-vis the Portuguese Government, in order to determine responsibilities and ensure that all legal requirements are met?

4. Given the policies it is currently promoting with regard to the environment, and in the knowledge that viable alternatives exist, does the Commission agree with/support the construction of these incineration plants?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2014)

The Commission is currently assessing the allegations brought forward by the complainants. Should this assessment reveal the existence of indications of an infringement of EU environmental law, the Commission will launch an investigation to gather the relevant information from the Member State. In light of the results of such an investigation, the Commission will decide on the appropriate course of action for this complaint, which might include the opening of an infringement procedure.

While incineration is a legitimate waste management option under the Waste Framework Directive ([1]), other options should be prioritised, whenever possible, under the waste hierarchy established therein. Revised targets for increasing targets for recycling and eliminating landfills will be adopted in the coming weeks. The Commission will ensure that all the requirements under EU environmental legislation are met in this case. However, once compliance with those provisions has been verified, the ultimate decision to authorise the incineration plants in question remains with the Portuguese authorities.

In all cases, compliance with EU rules and policies is a condition for the co-financing of any project eligible for EU funding.

([1]) Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste and repealing certain Directives — OJ L 312, 22.11.2008, p. 3-30.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-001620/14
komissiolle
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(13. helmikuuta 2014)

Aihe: Tulkkipalvelujen saatavuus ensihoidossa

YK:n vammaisten oikeuksia koskevan sopimuksen 9 ja 25 artiklassa varmistetaan vammaisten yhdenvertainen kohtelu terveydenhuollon palveluissa. Kuulovammaiselle henkilölle tuottaa kuitenkin vaikeuksia saada tulkkipalvelua terveysasemien ensiavussa virka-aikojen ulkopuolella. Euroopan kuurojen liiton tutkimuksessa viime vuodelta ilmeni, että juuri tulkkipalvelujen saatavuus on kuulovammaisille yksi suurimmista esteistä ensiavun saamisessa (European Union of the Deaf: 2013 UNCRDP Report).

Miten komissio aikoo taata, että ensihoidossa turvataan tulkkipalvelut vuorokauden ympäri kaikissa jäsenmaissa?

Aikooko komissio ottaa tulkkipalvelujen saatavuuden huomioon valmisteilla olevassa esteettömyyssäädöksessä sekä YK:n vammaisten oikeuksia koskevan sopimuksen toimeenpanossa?

Viviane Redingin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(3. huhtikuuta 2014)

Komissio tukee jäsenvaltioita sen varmistamisessa, että vammaisilla on yhtäläiset mahdollisuudet saada terveydenhoitoa. Tämän se tekee puuttumalla syrjintään ja edistämällä saavutettavuutta Euroopan vammaisstrategian 2010–2020 avulla.

Komissio ei aio ryhtyä toimiin sen varmistamiseksi, että tulkkauspalveluita tarjottaisiin osana ensiapua. Euroopan unionin toiminnasta tehdyn sopimuksen 168 artiklan mukaan jäsenvaltiot vastaavat terveyspalveluiden ja sairaanhoidon järjestämisestä ja tarjoamisesta.

Komissio jatkaa työtä kehittääkseen saavutettavuutta koskevaa eurooppalaista säädösaloitetta (European Accessibility Act), joka tukisi perustavaroiden ja -palveluiden saavutettavuutta. Näin se pyrkii myös helpottamaan vammaisten henkilöiden yhteiskuntaan osallistumista ja integroitumista ja heidän mahdollisuuksiaan käyttää palveluita.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001620/14
to the Commission
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Access to interpreting services in first-line healthcare

Articles 9 and 25 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities provide for persons with disabilities to receive equal treatment in healthcare. However, people with impaired hearing experience difficulties in obtaining interpreting services outside the opening hours of first-line healthcare departments. Research conducted last year by the European Union of the Deaf revealed that the unavailability of interpreting services was one of the biggest obstacles to obtaining such care (European Union of the Deaf: 2013 UNCRDP Report).

What will the Commission do to ensure that interpreting services are available in first-line healthcare around the clock in all Member States?

Will the Commission take the availability of interpreting services into account in the forthcoming legislation on accessibility and in implementing the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2014)

Through the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 the Commission supports the Member States in efforts to ensure equal access to healthcare for people with disabilities, by tackling discrimination and enhancing accessibility.

The Commission does not intend to take action to ensure the availability of interpreting services in first-line healthcare. According to Article 168 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Member States are responsible for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care.

The Commission continues to work on the European Accessibility Act (EAA) to facilitating the provision of accessible mainstream goods and services. In this way, it will also facilitate the participation and integration of persons with disabilities in society and their access to services.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001621/14
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Human rights monitoring in Pakistan

Following the announcement in December 2013 that Pakistan would become the 10th country to benefit from the EU's Generalised Scheme of Preferences Plus (GSP+) initiative, it has recently been confirmed that Pakistan has also agreed to establish a 'special cell' on human rights as part of the agreement.

It is understood that the special cell will operate as a project called 'Promotion of Human Rights in Pakistan' and will be overseen by the Ministry of Law, Justice and Human Rights. It is reported that the EU will fund the entire project and that EU officials will monitor the cell's progress and actively assist in pursuing the cases of abuse that are uncovered.

The Pakistani Government estimates that the GSP+ scheme will add an additional USD 1.2 billion in export gains in the first year alone, suggesting that this scheme is of significant importance to the Pakistani economy.

1. Can the Commission confirm that the aforementioned special cell on human rights is to be established in Pakistan? Are its establishment and effectiveness conditions for Pakistan retaining its GSP+ status?

2. Can the Commission confirm that the project will be funded by the EU and what size of budget has been allocated?

3. Can the Commission state which directorate will oversee this project? How will the designated directorate interact with the EU's existing mission in Pakistan?

4. What criteria will be used to measure the success of the project?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2014)

The news article '"Special cell" planned for monitoring human rights' published in Dawn on 20 January erroneously reported that a special cell would be set up with EU funding as part of Pakistan's accession to GSP+. A corrective note was sent to the newspaper by the EU Delegation to Pakistan.

A project entitled 'Promotion of Human Rights in Pakistan' is under negotiation and will start during the first half of 2014. This is a capacity building project that will support federal and provincial government institutions, as well as independent human rights institutions, in fulfilling their respective mandates in promoting and protecting human rights. The project will be implemented by the UN and has a budget of EUR 4.5 million, of which 1.2 million is co-funded by Denmark.

The EU Delegation to Pakistan will oversee the project on behalf of DG DEVCO and Danida.

The project is currently being finalised and will contain a detailed logical framework with specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-bound indicators to measure progress on its objective.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001623/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Realizzazione di un centro polisportivo per persone con disabilità: possibili finanziamenti

La strategia dell'Unione europea sulla disabilità è volta a rafforzare la partecipazione delle persone disabili alla società e all'economia e a migliorare il pieno esercizio dei loro diritti. In particolare, la strategia deve contribuire a garantire l'accessibilità di organizzazioni, strutture e servizi, inclusi quelli sportivi e culturali. È necessario, pertanto, sviluppare le possibilità di finanziamento europeo per sostenere progetti diretti all'abbattimento di barriere architettoniche in impianti preesistenti e alla costruzione di nuovi impianti sportivi accessibili e utilizzabili da persone disabili. Nello specifico, questo progetto, vede la volontà di un ente privato di realizzare un centro polisportivo che possa essere fruibile da soggetti disabili, su un terreno edificabile situato nel senese (Poggibonsi). Qualora finanziato, il progetto prevede la possibilità di costituire partenariati con soggetti pubblico-istituzionali.

Premesso tutto ciò, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. se esistono finanziamenti diretti a sostenere questo progetto?

2. Sono presenti analoghe iniziative europee volte a sostenere tale tipo di progetti?

3. Qual è il quadro generale sulla situazione relativa all'attuazione degli obiettivi della Strategia europea sulla disabilità 2010-2020?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2014)

La Commissione desidera attirare l'attenzione dell'onorevole deputato sulla risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-005798/2013.

Migliorare l'accessibilità, fra le altre cose, alle strutture educative, sportive e culturali è uno degli obiettivi principali della strategia dell'Unione europea sulla disabilità per il periodo 2010-2020 ([1]).

L'accessibilità per le persone con disabilità sarà uno dei criteri da osservare nel definire gli interventi co-finanziati dai Fondi strutturali, e di cui tenere conto durante le varie fasi dell'attuazione. Conformemente al principio di gestione concorrente, la Commissione non finanzia direttamente progetti come quello menzionato dall'onorevole deputato. Per maggiori informazioni su un possibile co-finanziamento di specifici progetti, la Commissione invita l'onorevole deputato a contattare direttamente la competente autorità di gestione in Toscana ([2]). «Erasmus+: Sport», che fissa come priorità l'inclusione sociale dei disabili attraverso lo sport, può sostenere solo progetti ed eventi transnazionali. Inoltre, gli enti privati non sono ammissibili alle sovvenzioni. In ogni Stato membro vi è un'autorità di gestione nazionale che si occupa di questi finanziamenti.

Esempi di investimenti co-finanziati dai Fondi strutturali in Italia nel periodo 2007-2013 sono disponibili all'indirizzo:
http://www.opencoesione.gov.it/.

Informazioni analoghe a livello UE sono disponibili all'indirizzo: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/projects/stories/index_it.cfm.

È attualmente in corso un esame dell'attuazione delle varie azioni della strategia dell'Unione europea sulla disabilità 2010-2020, allo scopo di riferire, nel 2014, sui progressi compiuti nella realizzazione dei suoi obiettivi.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/disabilities/disability-strategy/index_en.htm
([2]) Direzione generale per lo Sviluppo economico, Via Luca Giordano 13, 50132 Firenze, e-mail: autoritagestionecreo@regione.toscana.it

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001623/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Availability of funding for a multi-sports centre for persons with a disability

The EU Disability Strategy seeks to help persons with a disability to take an active part in social and economic life and to enjoy their rights to the full. A key part of this is ensuring that facilities and services, including sports and cultural facilities, are accessible to persons with a disability. More EU funding therefore needs to be made available for projects seeking to allow persons with a disability to use sports facilities, either by removing architectural barriers in existing facilities or constructing new, purpose-built facilities. The project in question is for a multi-sports centre accessible to persons with a disability that a private body wishes to build on a vacant plot of land in Poggibonsi in the province of Siena. If funding can be found, partnership arrangements can subsequently be entered into with public bodies.

1. Can the Commission say whether funding is available for this project?

2. Are any other forms of support available at EU level for projects of this kind?

3. How much progress has been made towards meeting the objectives set for the EU Disability Strategy 2010-2020?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The Commission would also like to draw the Honourable Member's attention to its reply given to Written Question E-005798/2013.

Improving accessibility of *inter alia* education, sports and cultural facilities and services is one of the key objectives of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([1]).

Accessibility for persons with disabilities shall be one of the criteria to be observed in defining operations co-financed by the Structural Funds and to be taken into account during the various stages of implementation. In line with the principle of shared management, the Commission does not directly fund projects like the one mentioned by the Honourable Member. For more information on a possible co-financing of specific projects, the Commission invites the Honourable Member to contact directly the relevant Managing Authority in the region of Tuscany ([2]). Through 'Erasmus+: Sport' where social inclusion of people with a disability through sport is a priority, only transnational projects and events can be supported. Moreover, private bodies are not eligible for grants. In each Member State there is a national managing authority in charge of such funding.

Examples of investments co-financed by Structural Funds in Italy over the 2007-2013 period are available at: http://www.opencoesione.gov.it/

Similar information at EU level is available at: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/projects/stories/index_en.cfm

A review of the implementation of the various actions of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 is on-going with a view to report in 2014 on progress made towards meeting the objectives set for the strategy.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/disabilities/disability-strategy/index_en.htm
([2]) Directorate-General for Economic Development, Via Luca Giordano 13, 50132 Firenze, E-mail.: autoritagestionecreo@regione.toscana.it

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001625/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Ammodernamento del sistema di approvvigionamento energetico del Centro Universitario Sportivo di Pisa

Il Centro Universitario Sportivo di Pisa ha mostrato interesse ad acquistare e installare lampade a LED al fine di rendere più efficiente e meno dispendioso il sistema di approvvigionamento energetico e, in particolare, i sistemi d'illuminazione delle numerose strutture sportive presenti. Tale Centro avrebbe la possibilità di coinvolgere e far partecipare anche l'Università degli Studi di Pisa. Le lampade a LED, a parità di prestazioni luminose, offrono elevata efficienza a bassissimo consumo. Ulteriori vantaggi sono collegati alla lunga durata di funzionamento (i LED ad alta emissione arrivano a circa 50 000/60 000 ore), ai bassi costi di manutenzione e all'elevato rendimento.

Premesso che il risparmio energetico e l'ottimizzazione dei sistemi di approvvigionamento energetico sono una priorità dell'Unione europea, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. quali programmi o progetti sono previsti a sostegno di attività di rinnovamento dei sistemi di approvvigionamento energetico nella nuova programmazione 2014-2020;

2. se è a conoscenza di eventuali progetti analoghi finanziati attraverso fondi europei;

3. qual è il quadro generale della situazione.

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(7 aprile 2014)

1. La tematica dell'efficienza energetica figurerà tra le principali priorità del programma 2014-2020 per la Toscana che sarà cofinanziato dal Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR) ed è attualmente in corso di preparazione ad opera dell'amministrazione regionale.

2. I progetti finalizzati all'efficienza energetica potrebbero beneficiare di un cofinanziamento del FESR a valere sulla terza priorità del programma 2007-2013 per la Toscana. Per ulteriori informazioni sui progetti specifici cofinanziati nell'ambito di tale priorità la Commissione invita l'Onorevole deputata a mettersi direttamente in contatto con l'autorità di gestione competente ([1]).

3. Esempi di investimenti cofinanziati dai Fondi strutturali in Italia nel periodo 2007-2013 sono consultabili all'indirizzo:
http://www.opencoesione.gov.it/

Informazioni analoghe a livello di UE sono disponibili all'indirizzo:
http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/projects/stories/index_en.cfm

---

([1]) Direzione generale per lo Sviluppo economico, Via Luca Giordano 13, 50132 Firenze autoritagestionecreo@regione.toscana.it.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001625/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Modernisation of the energy supply system at the Sports Centre affiliated to the University of Pisa

The Sports Centre affiliated to the University of Pisa has shown an interest in purchasing and installing LED lamps in order to make its energy supply system, and especially the lighting systems in its many sports buildings, more efficient and less wasteful in terms of energy use. There is also the chance that the University of Pisa itself could follow the Sports Centre's lead and install similar systems in its own buildings. LED lamps offer the same quality of lighting as other types of lights, but consume a fraction of the energy and are thus more efficient. They also have long service lives (high-emission LEDs can last for around 50 000 to 60 000 hours), cost little to maintain, and give high levels of performance.

Given that the European Union has made energy-saving and the optimisation of energy supply systems one of its key priorities, can the Commission:

1. specify what programmes or projects are in the pipeline to support efforts to modernise energy supply systems during the new 2014-2020 programming period?

2. indicate whether it is aware of any similar projects that are being financed by European funds?

3. provide a general overview of the situation?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

1. Energy efficiency will feature as one of the main priorities of the 2014-2020 programme for Tuscany that will be co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and is currently being prepared by the regional administration.

2. Projects targeting energy efficiency could benefit from ERDF co-funding under the 3rd priority of the 2007-2013 programme for Tuscany. For more information on specific projects co-financed under this priority, the Commission invites the Honourable Member to contact directly the relevant managing authority ([1]).

3. Examples of investments co-financed by the Structural Funds in Italy over the 2007-2013 period are available at: http://www.opencoesione.gov.it/

Similar information at the EU level is available at: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/projects/stories/index_en.cfm

---

([1]) Directorate-General for Economic Development, Via Luca Giordano 13, 50132 Firenze autoritagestionecreo@regione.toscana.it

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001626/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Adeguamento e modernizzazione dei sistemi energetici di aziende di medie o grandi dimensioni ed enti pubblici: possibili finanziamenti

L'intenzione di adeguare e modernizzare i propri sistemi di approvvigionamento energetico è stata manifestata da diverse aziende di medie o grandi dimensioni ed enti pubblici nell'area di Pisa, Lucca, Pistoia e Firenze. I soggetti in questione stanno valutando l'opportunità di effettuare investimenti per l'installazione di impianti fotovoltaici, solari, termici, led e generatori di calore ad alta efficienza e risparmio energetico. A tal fine, ove risulti necessario, le aziende si dimostrano disponibili a realizzare forme di collegamento attraverso reti d'impresa. Inoltre, è prevista la possibilità di realizzare accordi di partenariato tra le aziende suddette ed istituti di ricerca. L'efficienza energetica e l'investimento in fonti di energia rinnovabile si dimostrano obiettivi in grado di provocare vantaggi concreti, quali la riduzione delle emissioni di CO_2 e la consistente diminuzione della dipendenza energetica dell'Unione europea dalle importazioni di energia.

Alla luce di quanto premesso, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se esistono bandi di finanziamento per questo progetto;

2. se sono presenti analoghe iniziative europee volte a sostenere tale tipo di progetti;

3. quali programmi o progetti sono previsti per l'adeguamento e la modernizzazione dei sistemi di approvvigionamento energetico nella nuova programmazione 2014-2020?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2014)

1. Nell'ambito di Orizzonte 2020 e della sua parte «Energia sicura, pulita ed efficiente» sono presenti diversi inviti a presentare proposte che potrebbero essere adatti per l'idea di progetto di cui trattasi ([1]).

2. Sì

3. Il bilancio pluriennale dell'Unione europea per il periodo 2014-2020 tiene adeguatamente conto dell'importanza della politica energetica. In tale periodo le priorità di finanziamento saranno le infrastrutture, la tecnologia e l'innovazione, l'efficienza energetica e le fonti rinnovabili e il miglioramento della sicurezza nucleare. Orizzonte 2020, e nello specifico la sua parte «Energia sicura, pulita ed efficiente», è il più importante programma a sostegno del cambiamento e dell'aggiornamento dei sistemi di approvvigionamento energetico.

([1]) Ad esempio potrebbero essere indicati gli inviti per «EE 18 —2014/15».
http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/calls/h2020-ee-2015-1-ppp.html;.
«LCE 2 — 2014/2015».
http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/1138-lce-02-2015.html
o «LCE 3 — 2014/2015».
http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/1127-lce-03-2014.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001626/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Adjustment and updating of energy systems in medium to large companies and public bodies: possible funding

A number of medium to large companies and public bodies in and around Pisa, Lucca, Pistoia and Florence have announced their intention of adjusting and updating their energy supply systems. They are considering investment in photovoltaic, solar and thermal installations and efficient low energy LED lighting and heat generators, as well as networking arrangements where necessary. Consideration is also being given to partnership agreements between the companies concerned and research institutes. Energy efficiency and investment in renewable energy could result in real benefits, such as a cut in CO_2 emissions and a substantial reduction in EU dependence on energy imports.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission say whether any calls for funding have been made for this project?

2. Have any initiatives been taken at European level to promote projects of this nature?

3. What programmes or projects are being envisaged to adapt and update energy supply systems for the 2014-2020 programming period?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

1. Within Horizon 2020 and its 'Secure, clean and efficient energy' part there are several calls, which might be suitable for the project idea in question ([1]).

2. Yes.

3. The importance of energy policy is well reflected in the multiannual EU budget for 2014-20. Funding priorities over this period will be infrastructure, technology and innovation, energy efficiency and renewables, and improving nuclear safety. Horizon 2020 in its part 'Secure, clean and efficient energy' is the main program supporting change and update of energy supply systems.

([1]) For example a call to 'EE 18-2014/15' http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/calls/h2020-ee-2015-1-ppp.html 'LCE 2- 2014/2015' http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/1138-lce-02-2015.html or 'LCE 3 — 2014/2015' or http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/1127-lce-03-2014.html could be relevant.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001627/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Sviluppo e ricerca di nuove tecnologie innovative e di prototipi principalmente nel settore del trasporto di persone: possibili finanziamenti

Diverse aziende operanti nelle zone di Pisa, Lucca, Pistoia, Prato e Firenze hanno manifestato la necessità di reperire fondi per lo sviluppo e la ricerca di nuove tecnologie innovative e di prototipi, principalmente nel settore del trasporto di persone. La ricerca e lo sviluppo di tecnologie innovative settore del trasporto di persone richiede indubbiamente un adeguato supporto economico in termini di finanziamenti da parte dell'Unione europea, anche in vista degli obiettivi a lungo termine che prevedono, entro il 2050, una sostanziale rivoluzione nei trasporti urbani e interurbani.

Pertanto, le suddette aziende, hanno intenzione di investire nella ricerca di tecnologie innovative nel settore del trasporto di persone, contribuendo così al raggiungimento degli ambiziosi obiettivi posti in materia dalla programmazione di lungo periodo. Inoltre, i dati relativi al settore dei trasporti (settore che impiega direttamente dieci milioni di persone e rappresenta il 5 % circa del prodotto interno lordo dell'UE) dimostrano l'importanza di investimenti diretti allo sviluppo del settore.

Premesso ciò, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se esistono bandi o finanziamenti per imprese intenzionate ad effettuare ricerca per lo sviluppo di nuove tecnologie e prototipi nel settore del trasporto di persone;

2. se esistono programmi o progetti di finanziamento inerenti a tale materia nella nuova programmazione 2014-2020;

3. qual è il quadro generale della situazione relativa a tale settore?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(2 aprile 2014)

1. Per oltre due decenni i successivi programmi quadro europei per la ricerca e lo sviluppo hanno sostenuto le tecnologie per il trasporto di persone su strada in settori quali sistemi di propulsione avanzati, sicurezza, veicoli più leggeri e uso di energie alternative (veicoli elettrici, biocarburanti, carburanti sintetici e gas naturale). Nel 2008, fra le dieci misure proposte nella Comunicazione sul piano europeo di ripresa economica ([1]), è stata lanciata l'Iniziativa europea per le auto verdi-EGCI ([2]), un importante partenariato pubblico-privato per la ricerca e l'innovazione.

2. Orizzonte 2020, il programma quadro dell'UE per la ricerca e l'innovazione (2014-2020), consentirà di sostenere la ricerca in materia di trasporto di persone su strada nell'ambito della sfida per la società «Trasporti intelligenti, verdi e integrati» ([3]). Continuerà a sostenere l'innovazione nei settori dei motori avanzati, della sicurezza dei passeggeri e dei pedoni, della produzione competitiva e dell'uso di energie alternative. Finanzierà inoltre l'Iniziativa europea per i veicoli verdi-EGVI ([4]), che succederà all'EGCI e che è progettata per garantire la leadership europea dei veicoli del futuro, basati su energie alternative, dei quali accelererà la diffusione in Europa. In particolare, nell'invito 2014 a presentare proposte in merito all'iniziativa EGVI, è previsto un tema specifico sui veicoli leggeri elettrici e ibridi, dai ciclomotori ai quadricicli leggeri.

3. I trasporti e l'energia sono sfide determinanti per l'Europa ed è necessario il coinvolgimento delle industrie europee affinché progrediscano la ricerca e l'innovazione nel settore. I produttori europei di veicoli per il trasporto di persone devono affrontare una situazione difficoltosa: la crisi economica in Europa sposta i mercati e i fabbricanti di veicoli fuori dall'Europa. I posti di lavoro sono quindi sotto pressione. La ricerca e l'innovazione sono quantomai necessarie per assicurare la competitività del settore.

([1]) European Green Cars Initiative — http://ec.europa.eu/research/transport/road/green_cars/index_en.htm
([2]) COM(2008) 800 definitivo del 26.11.2008.
([3]) Si possono ottenere informazioni sulle attuali possibilità di finanziamento dal portale dedicato alla ricerca e all'innovazione: http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.htm
([4]) European Green Vehicles Initiative — http://www.egvi.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001627/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Research and development for new innovative technologies and prototypes intended principally for passenger transport — possible funding

A number of companies in and around Pisa, Lucca, Pistoia, Prato and Florence have acknowledged the need to raise funds for research and development in the field of new innovative technologies and prototypes, principally in the passenger transport sector. In this connection, EU support will undoubtedly be needed to achieve long-term objectives such as the substantial restructuring of urban and inter-urban transport services by 2050.

The companies in question accordingly intend to focus on innovative technological research with a view to achieving ambitious long-term objectives regarding passenger transport, which generates 10 million jobs and represents around 5% of the EU gross domestic product, underlining the importance of direct investment in this sector.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission say whether tendering procedures have been organised or funding made available for companies seeking to carry out research for the development of new passenger transport technologies and prototypes?

2. Have funding programmes or projects for this sector been drawn up for the 2014-2020 programming period?

3. Can it outline the general situation in this sector?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

1. Successive European Framework Programmes for research and development have been supporting road passenger transport technologies for over two decades in areas such as advanced powertrains, safety, lighter vehicles, and the use of alternative energies (electric vehicles, bio-fuels, synthetic fuels and natural gas). In 2008, an important research and innovation Public-Private Partnership, the EGCI ([1]), was launched as one of the ten measures proposed in the communication on the European economic recovery plan ([2]).

2. Horizon 2020, the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020), will support research on road passenger transport through the 'Smart, green and integrated transport' societal challenge ([3]). It will continue to support innovation in advanced engines, safety of passengers and pedestrians, competitive production, and the use of alternative energies. It will also fund the successor to the EGCI, the EGVI ([4]), which has been designed to ensure European leadership in vehicles of the future based on alternative energies and will accelerate their deployment in Europe. In particular, a specific topic on electric and hybrid light vehicles, from mopeds to light quadricycles, is included in the 2014 call of the EGVI.

3. Transport and Energy are major challenges for Europe and European industries' involvement is necessary to bring forward research and innovation in the field. European passenger vehicle manufacturers are facing a challenging situation: the economic crisis in Europe shifts markets and vehicle manufacturers to outside Europe. Jobs are therefore under pressure. Research and innovation are needed to ensure the sector's competitiveness.

([1]) European Green Cars Initiative — http://ec.europa.eu/research/transport/road/green_cars/index_en.htm
([2]) COM(2008)800, 26.11.2008.
([3]) Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained through the Research and Innovation Participant Portal — http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.htm
([4]) European Green Vehicles Initiative — http://www.egvi.eu/

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-001628/14
komissiolle
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(13. helmikuuta 2014)

Aihe: EU:n palestiinalaishallinnolle antaman tuen valvonta

EU:n taloudellisen tuen turvin palestiinalaishallinto on voinut palkata virkamiehiä Gazan alueella, vaikka nämä eivät teekään aina työtään virkansa edellyttämällä tavalla. On jopa väitetty, että heidän roolinsa on toimia lähinnä vain Fatahin kannattajina Hamasin hallinnoimalla Gazan alueella. Myös Euroopan tilintarkastustuomioistuin on äskettäin kiinnittänyt raportissaan huomiota tähän. On vaikea nähdä, millä tavoin taloudellisen tuen antaminen palestiinalaishallinnolle vastaa EU-tuelle asetettuja tavoitteita, jos varoja käytetään epätarkoituksenmukaisesti. On valitettavaa, mikäli EU:n antama talousapu mahdollistaa huonon hallintotavan jatkumisen, korruption ja muun epädemokraattisen toiminnan.

Kuinka hyvin komissio on selvillä, millä tavalla palestiinalaishallinnon EU:lta saama tuki käytetään?

Mitä komissio aikoo tehdä avustusvarojen käytön valvonnan tehostamiseksi ja niiden käytön tarkoituksenmukaisen käytön varmistamiseksi?

Onko komissiolla mahdollisuuksia ohjata EU-tuen kohdentamista tarkemmin, niin että se tulisi aina käytetyksi EU:n arvojen ja tavoitteiden mukaisesti?

Onko komission mahdollista käyttää taloustuen myöntämistä pakotteena kehityksen ohjaamiseksi, niin että demokraattinen ja korruptiosta vapaa hallintotapa juurtuisi palestiinalaisalueilla?

Štefan Fülen komission puolesta antama vastaus
(9. huhtikuuta 2014)

Komissio kehottaa arvoisaa parlamentin jäsentä tutustumaan vastauksiin, jotka komissio on antanut samaa asiaa koskeviin kirjallisiin kysymyksiin E-13394/13, E-14026/13, P-14034/13, E-14195/13, E-14320/13, E-14347/13, E-80/14, E-508/14 ja P-526/14 ([1]).

Viimeksi mainitussa kohdassa arvoisa parlamentin jäsen viittaa ilmeisesti siihen, että tuelle olisi asetettava ehtoja, mitä myös Euroopan tilintarkastustuomioistuin on suositellut. Komission ja Euroopan ulkosuhdehallinnon tarkoituksena on sitoa EU:n palestiinalaishallinnolle antama suora taloudellinen tuki tiukemmin osaksi syvällistä politiikkavuoropuhelua. Palestiinalaishallinnolle annettavan tuen täytäntöönpanoon liittyvien erityisten ja hankalien olosuhteiden vuoksi on kuitenkin tietoisesti päätetty olla ottamatta käyttöön muodollisia ehtoja.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001628/14
to the Commission
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(13 February 2014)

Subject: Monitoring of EU aid to the Palestinian Authority

Thanks to financial aid from the EU, the Palestinian Authority has been able to pay officials in the Gaza area, though they do not always do the work their position requires. It has even been claimed that their role is to act mainly as Fatah supporters in the Hamas-ruled Gaza area. The European Court of Auditors has also recently drawn attention to this in its report. It is hard to see in what way supplying financial aid to the Palestinian Authority meets the objectives of EU aid, if the resources are not used as intended. It is regrettable if EU financial aid permits continued maladministration, corruption and other undemocratic activities.

How well is the Commission informed of how the aid received by the Palestinian Authority from the EU is used?

What does the Commission propose to do to improve the effectiveness of monitoring the use of aid funds and to ensure they are used as intended?

Does the Commission have any possibilities for allocating EU aid more accurately, so that it is always used in accordance with EU values and objectives?

Is it possible for the Commission to use the granting of financial aid as a sanction to guide development so that democratic and corruption-free governance can take root in the Palestinian territories?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-13394/13; E-14026/13; P-14034/13; E-14195/13; E-14320/13; E-14347/13; E-80/14, E-508/14 and P-526/14 on the same subject ([1]).

Concerning the last point, the Honourable Member apparently refers to the use of conditionality, which has also been recommended by the European Court of Auditors. The Commission and the EEAS will increase the alignment of the EU's direct financial support to the Palestinian Authority with more in-depth policy dialogue. However, it is a deliberate choice not to introduce formal conditionality, due to the unique and difficult circumstances in which aid to the Palestinian Authority is implemented.

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

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001630/14
a la Comisión
Pilar Ayuso (PPE)
(14 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Estrategia de la UE sobre el mercurio

A finales de 2011 se aprobó la modificación de la Directiva 1999/31/CE relativa a los criterios para el almacenamiento de mercurio metálico considerado residuo. Con esta modificación se establecen los requisitos técnicos que debe cumplir el almacenamiento temporal de mercurio durante un periodo de entre uno y cinco años.

Faltaría, por tanto, la adopción de requisitos para el almacenamiento permanente de residuos de mercurio. La Comisión afirma que para el establecimiento de dichos requisitos es necesario tener en cuenta las actuales actividades de investigación.

¿Qué actividades de investigación se están llevando a cabo en la EU en relación con la eliminación del mercurio? ¿En qué plazo prevé la Comisión que podrían establecerse los requisitos legales para el almacenamiento definitivo de residuos de mercurio? ¿Cuáles son los próximos pasos que dará la Comisión en relación con la estrategia de la UE sobre el mercurio?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de abril de 2014)

Como paso siguiente en relación con la estrategia de la Unión sobre el mercurio, la Comisión está estudiando propuestas sobre las adaptaciones de la legislación de la UE que resultan necesarias a la luz del Convenio de Minamata sobre el mercurio, en particular la revisión del Reglamento (CE) nº 1102/2008 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 22 de octubre de 2008, relativo a la prohibición de la exportación de mercurio metálico y ciertos compuestos y mezclas de mercurio y al almacenamiento seguro de mercurio metálico ([1]). Esa revisión respondería a la necesidad de establecer criterios específicos para el almacenamiento permanente de mercurio metálico considerado residuo. Es probable que se adopte una propuesta legislativa a principios de 2015.

La Comisión ha promovido la investigación sobre la eliminación de productos contaminados con mercurio en el contexto de diversos programas marco pasados y en curso. Por ejemplo, el proyecto actual Illuminate ([2]), financiado con arreglo al PM7 ([3]), tiene por objeto mejorar de forma significativa la eficiencia de la recogida, el reciclado y la recuperación de material de las bombillas eléctricas y reducir así la emisión de mercurio al medio ambiente.

El Programa Marco de Investigación e Innovación Horizonte 2020 (2014-2020) financiará asimismo la investigación y la innovación para el desarrollo y la aplicación de soluciones innovadoras que contribuyan a la gestión y el tratamiento de materiales de residuos, incluido el mercurio. En la convocatoria de propuestas específica sobre «Residuos: Un recurso para reciclar, reutilizar y recuperar las materias primas» del Programa Marco Horizonte 2020 (2014-2015) ([4]) figuran diversos temas que abordan opciones ecoinnovadoras para la gestión de los residuos por lo que respecta a los flujos de residuos tanto urbanos como industriales.

([1]) DO L 304 de 14.11.2008.
([2]) http://www.illuminate-project.com/
([3]) Séptimo Programa Marco de Investigación y Desarrollo Tecnológico.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/calls/h2020-waste-2014-two-stage.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001630/14
to the Commission
Pilar Ayuso (PPE)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: EU strategy on mercury

An amendment to Directive 1999/31/EC, concerning criteria for the storage of metallic mercury considered as waste, was approved at the end of 2011. The amendment set out the technical requirements applying to temporary storage of mercury for between one and five years.

The requirements for permanent storage of mercury waste still need to be adopted therefore. The Commission says that current research has to be taken into account in establishing these requirements.

What research is being carried out in the EU in connection with disposal of mercury? When does the Commission envisage being able to establish legal requirements for final storage of mercury waste? What are the next steps the Commission will take in connection with the EU's strategy on mercury?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

As next step in connection with the EU's strategy on mercury, the Commission is considering proposals on necessary adaptations of EU legislation in the light of the Minamata Convention on Mercury, including a review of Regulation (EC) No 1102/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2008 on the banning of exports of metallic mercury and certain mercury compounds and mixtures and the safe storage of metallic mercury ([1]). The need for specific criteria for the permanent storage of metallic mercury considered as waste would be addressed by this review. A legislative proposal is likely to be adopted early in 2015.

The Commission has been promoting research on the disposal of mercury contaminated products in the context of past and on-going Framework Programmes. For instance the on-going 'Illuminate' project ([2]), funded under FP7 ([3]), aims at significantly improving the efficiency of collection, recycling and material recovery in light bulbs and thus reduce the emission of mercury to the environment.

Research and innovation for the development and implementation of innovative solutions contributing to the management and treatment of waste materials, including mercury, will also be supported under the 2014-2020 Framework Programme for Research and Innovation Horizon 2020. Topics addressing eco-innovative waste management options for both industrial and urban waste streams are included in the specific call for proposals on 'Waste: a Resource to Recycle, Reuse and Recover Raw Materials' of the Horizon 2020 Work Programme 2014-2015 ([4]).

([1]) OJ L 304, 14.11.2008.
([2]) http://www.illuminate-project.com/
([3]) Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/calls/h2020-waste-2014-two-stage.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001634/14
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Meged oil field

I have been contacted by a constituent who is concerned that Palestine is not being allowed to access and use its natural resources.

My constituent tells me that there is an oil field in the Israeli village of Meged, close to the Green Line, and that the Meged field went operational in 2011. She says that the oil well could be sitting on exploitable reserves as large as 3.53 billion barrels.

My constituent tells me that it is unclear how much of this new-found oil wealth actually belongs to Israel. She says that, according to the Oslo Accords, Israel is obliged to coordinate any exploration for natural resources in shared territory with the Palestinian authorities. She also says that they should reach an agreement on how to divide the benefits.

My constituent also believes that Israel is preventing the Palestinians from exploiting other key natural resources by acquiring them for itself or by making them inaccessible to the Palestinians through movement restrictions and by classifying areas as military zones.

Given that allowing the Palestinians to access these resources will increase its budget and reduce the need for foreign aid, could the Commission confirm whether or not it has raised this issue with the Israeli Government? If not, does it intend to discuss this with the Israeli authorities to see if a resolution can be found which allows both sides to benefit from the natural resources in the region?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

The HR/VP is aware of the issue and that, while at present activities appear to be restricted to exploration, the EU was united (all member states voting in favour) in its support for UN General Assembly Resolution 68/235 on 20 December 2013 (http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/68/235) on the 'Permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan over their natural resources.'

This resolution reaffirmed 'the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people over their natural resources, including land, water and energy resources.' It demanded that, 'Israel, the occupying Power, cease the exploitation, damage, cause of loss or depletion and endangerment of the natural resources in the Occupied Palestinian Territory.' It recognised 'the right of the Palestinian people to claim restitution as a result of any exploitation, damage, loss or depletion, or endangerment of their natural resources resulting from illegal measures taken by Israel' and requested the Secretary General of the UN to report to the next session of the General Assembly on the cumulative impact of the exploitation, damage and depletion by Israel of natural resources in the oPt.

The EU will continue to raise these issues, including within the UN, and is pressing for these issues to be dealt with within the framework of final status negotiations.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001635/14
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Compensation following dental work in Germany

I have been contacted by a constituent who is seeking medical compensation following dental work which he underwent in Braunschweig, Germany.

My constituent tells me that he is currently undergoing corrective dental treatment in London. He has been informed that the German dentist performed implant dental work without following standard dental procedures. My constituent has been advised to seek compensation.

My constituent tells me that he has been sending letters and emails to the German dentist since August 2013 but has not yet received any response. He also sent a complaint form, the consent forms and other documentation to the Zahnärztekammer Niedersachsen dental association in Braunschweig in early November 2013 to ask if they could follow up his correspondence with the German dentist.

My constituent received a reply from the Zahnärztekammer Niedersachsen saying that the German dentist had rejected my constituent's allegations and that the arbitration committee is not able to assist him.

Given that my constituent is undergoing remedial dental treatment following this implant dental work in Germany, could the Commission confirm whether or not my constituent is eligible to seek compensation under EC law? If so, how can my constituent request this compensation?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

The Commission informs the Honourable Member that claims concerning medical malpractice are subject to substantive national law. By way of consequence, EU does not cover compensation in such cases.

Nevertheless, from an EC law perspective if the constituent decides to bring legal actions for compensation of damages against the dentist, the rules of the Brussels I Regulation ([1]) apply to determine the court competent for the case and the rules of the Rome I ([2]) and the Rome II ([3]) Regulations to determine the applicable law.

The constituent of the Honourable Member may wish to consult the 'European Judicial Atlas in Civil Matters'. This Atlas provides citizens with a user-friendly access to information relevant for judicial cooperation in civil matters. With the Atlas users can easily identify the competent courts or authorities to which they may apply for certain purposes.

It is available at: http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/judicialatlascivil/html/index_en.htm

Furthermore, the Commission draws the attention of the constituent to the website of the 'European Judicial Network in civil and commercial matters'. It contains a large quantity of information about various aspects of civil and commercial law such as jurisdiction of the courts, bringing a case to court, applicable law, service of documents, taking of evidence and mode of proof, enforcement of judgments or simplified and accelerated procedures.

It is available at: http://ec.europa.eu/civiljustice/index_en.htm

---

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 of 22 December 2000 on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters, OJ L 12, 16.1.2001, p. 1.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 593/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008 on the law applicable to contractual obligations (Rome I), OJ L 177, 4.7.2008, p. 6.
([3]) Regulation (EC) No 864/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 July 2007 on the law applicable to non-contractual obligations (Rome II), OJ L 199, 31.7.2007, p. 40.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001637/14
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: NER300 and the proposed innovation fund

Will the Commission indicate when it expects to complete the allocation of funds for carbon capture and geological storage and innovative renewable energy projects from the NER300 financial mechanism?

In the event that approved projects are unable to proceed, how will the available funds be redistributed?

In its 2030 climate and energy communication, the Commission proposes exploring the concept of an expanded NER300 system after 2020 to direct Emission Trading Scheme revenues towards the demonstration of innovative low carbon technologies.

Does the Commission recognise that there is a potential funding gap between the completion of the NER300 allocations and the launch of any such proposed new innovation fund? If so, how does the Commission intend to fill this gap? Is the Commission prepared to consider bringing forward proposals for the launch of such an innovation fund?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

1. The funds of the NER 300 programme are distributed to projects selected through two calls for proposals; the first of them took place in 2010 and the second one is ongoing. The Commission expects to adopt the Award Decision under the second call for proposals by June 2014.

2. In the event that awarded projects are unable to proceed, any remaining funds must be returned to the Member States, pursuant to Article 11(6) of the NER 300 Decision ([1]).

3. In its recent Communication 'A policy framework for climate and energy in the period from 2020 to 2030' ([2]) the European Commission outlines that the concept of an expanded NER 300 system will be explored by the Commission in the post-2020 climate and energy framework as a means of directing revenues from the ETS towards the demonstration of innovative low-carbon technologies in the industry and power generation sectors.

For the 2014-2020 period, the Union is ramping up investment in energy and climate related research and innovation. Under Horizon 2020, the new Union research and innovation programme, close to EUR 6 billion will be dedicated to energy efficiency, to secure, clean and low carbon technologies and to smart cities and communities for actions spanning from research to first-of-its-kind commercial plants.

([1]) Commission Decision 2010/670/EU.
([2]) COM(2014) 15 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001640/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Questione curda in Turchia

1. Può la Commissione fornire informazioni dettagliate circa la questione curda in Turchia?

2. Può la Commissione confermare che il pacchetto di riforme presentato qualche mese orsono non consta di garanzie costituzionali per l'identità curda e per i diritti politici e culturali?

3. Può infine indicare qual è attualmente il ruolo dell'UE nella questione curda?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2014)

Il governo turco ha avviato un processo di pace mirato a porre fine al terrorismo e alle violenze nel sud-est del paese e a spianare la strada verso una soluzione della questione curda. Il processo è tuttora in corso.

La Commissione sostiene pienamente i negoziati in corso mirati a porre termine a un conflitto che negli ultimi trent'anni ha causato un numero molto elevato di vittime e accoglie inoltre con favore il sostegno trasversale dei partiti e della società civile a tale iniziativa. La Commissione ha più volte ribadito che il processo di pace va perseguito in buona fede da entrambe le parti.

Il 30 settembre 2013 il governo ha annunciato un pacchetto di democratizzazione, che comprende l'ammissione dello svolgimento di attività politiche in lingue diverse dal turco, l'istruzione in lingue diverse dal turco nelle scuole private, l'abolizione delle sanzioni penali per l'uso delle lettere Q, X e W utilizzate in curdo e la ridenominazione dei villaggi nei nomi anteriori al colpo di stato militare del 1980. Il 2 marzo il Parlamento turco ha adottato una legge che attua le suddette misure.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001640/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Kurdish issue in Turkey

1. Can the Commission provide detailed information concerning the Kurdish issue in Turkey?

2. Can the Commission confirm that the package of reforms presented a few months ago contains no constitutional guarantees regarding Kurdish identity and the political and cultural rights of the Kurds?

3. What role is the EU currently playing in the context of the Kurdish issue?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The Turkish government has started a peace process aiming to end terrorism and violence in the Southeast of the country and to pave the way for a solution of the Kurdish issue. This process is on-going.

The Commission gives its full support to the on-going talks aimed at ending a conflict which has claimed far too many victims in the past three decades. It also welcomes the cross-party and civil society support for this initiative. The Commission has repeatedly underlined that the peace process should be pursued in good faith on all sides.

On 30 September 2013 the government announced a democratisation package. The package includes allowing the conduct of political activity in languages other than Turkish, education in languages other than Turkish in private schools, the removal of criminal sanctions for the use of the letters Q, X and W used in Kurdish and the change of names of villages back to the versions which preceded the 1980 military coup. The Turkish Parliament adopted on 2 March a law implementing the abovementioned measures.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001641/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Immigrazione dalla Turchia in Europa

Alla luce del dato secondo cui in Germania la comunità turca consta di circa 3 milioni di persone, si chiede alla Commissione di far conoscere, in dettaglio, qual è la presenza di cittadini turchi in ogni Stato membro?

Risposta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(4 aprile 2014)

In base ai dati di Eurostat ([1]), alla fine del 2012 il numero di cittadini turchi che detenevano un permesso di residenza valido di durata di almeno tre mesi negli Stati membri dell'UE-27 era di 1.954.945. Ripartite per Stato membro, le cifre sono le seguenti:

Stato membro	Numero
Belgio	34 892
Bulgaria	5 204
Repubblica ceca	1 520
Danimarca	28 755
Germania	1 468 939
Estonia	144
Irlanda	895
Grecia	1 314
Spagna	2 737
Francia	189 370
Italia	21 927
Cipro	73
Lettonia	217
Lituania	232
Lussemburgo	294
Ungheria	2 092
Malta	228
Paesi Bassi	40 616
Austria	106 261
Polonia	4 163
Portogallo	540
Romania	8 469
Slovenia	112
Slovacchia	347
Finlandia	6 258
Svezia	11 297
Regno Unito	18 049

([1]) Dati di fine 2012 sui cittadini turchi nell'UE-27.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001641/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Immigration from Turkey to the EU

It has been reported that the Turkish community in Germany now numbers around three million. In light of this, could the Commission provide detailed information on the number of Turkish citizens living in each of the Member States?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

According to Eurostat data ([1]), at the end of 2012, the number of Turkish citizens holding a valid residence permit with a duration of at least three months in the EU-27 Member States was 1 954 945. By Member State the numbers were as follows:

Member State	Number
Belgium	34 892
Bulgaria	5 204
Czech Republic	1 520
Denmark	28 755
Germany	1 468 939
Estonia	144
Ireland	895
Greece	1 314
Spain	2 737
France	189 370
Italy	21 927
Cyprus	73
Latvia	217
Lithuania	232
Luxembourg	294
Hungary	2 092
Malta	228
Netherlands	40 616
Austria	106 261
Poland	4 163
Portugal	540
Romania	8 469
Slovenia	112
Slovakia	347
Finland	6 258
Sweden	11 297
United Kingdom	18 049

([1]) Data end of 2012 on Turkish citizens in EU-27.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001646/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Linee ferroviarie in Turchia

Il Ministro dei Trasporti turco ha annunciato che da qui al 2023 la Turchia investirà 45 miliardi di dollari per la costruzione di 10 000 km di linee ferroviarie ad alta velocità e 4 000 km di linee ferroviarie convenzionali.

Lo scorso ottobre è stato inoltre inaugurato il tunnel Marmaray, tunnel sottomarino che unisce la sponda europea e quella asiatica del Bosforo a Istanbul. L'Europa sarà quindi, di fatto, sempre più collegata alla Turchia anche per via ferroviaria.

La Commissione può precisare se per la costruzione di queste linee ferroviarie l'UE ha contribuito finanziariamente?

In caso affermativo, a quanto ammontano i finanziamenti elargiti?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(4 aprile 2014)

Finora l'UE ha sostenuto finanziariamente due progetti ferroviari in Turchia, entrambi cofinanziati con la Banca europea per gli investimenti (BEI):

Köseköy — sezione di Gebze della linea ad alta velocità che collega Ankara ad Istanbul. Nonostante il nome del progetto, questa sezione non è una linea ad alta velocità, poiché ha una velocità di costruzione di 160 km/h. Il progetto riguarda principalmente l'ammodernamento del corridoio esistente.

Il finanziamento dell'UE ammonta a 136 milioni di EUR.

Linea ferroviaria Irmak — Karabük — Zonguldak: si tratta di una linea convenzionale per il trasporto merci che collega Ankara a Zonguldak, sul Mar Nero.

Il finanziamento dell'UE ammonta a 188 milioni di EUR.

L'UE non ha contribuito al finanziamento del tunnel Marmaray.

Nel periodo 2014-2020 i finanziamenti UE per il settore dei trasporti turco saranno destinati prevalentemente alla riforma del settore, in linea con l'agenda sul cambiamento climatico e con l'obiettivo di un'economia a basse emissioni di carbonio, e alla connettività con la rete transeuropea.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001646/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Rail links in Turkey

The Turkish Minister of Transport has announced that between now and 2023 Turkey will invest USD 45 billion in building 10 000 km of high-speed rail links and 4000 km of conventional rail links.

A further rail link, the Marmaray tunnel under the Bosphorus Strait, connecting the European and Asian parts of Istanbul, was opened in October 2013. These new rail links will bring Turkey even closer to the European Union.

Can the Commission say whether any EU funding has been provided for these rail links, and if so, how much?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

The EU has so far provided financial support to two railway projects in Turkey, both jointly financed with the European Investment Bank (EIB).

— Köseköy — Gebze section of Ankara — İstanbul High Speed Line. In contrast to the name of the project, this section is not a high speed line. Its design speed is 160 km/h and it mainly consists of modernisation of the existing corridor.

The EU finances EUR 136 million.

— Irmak — Karabük — Zonguldak Railway Line; this is a conventional freight line connecting Ankara to Zonguldak located on the Black Sea cost.

The EU finances EUR 188 million.

The EU has not participated in the financing of the Marmara tunnel.

In 2014-2020 the focus of the EU financing in the area of transport in Turkey will mainly be on reforming the sector in line with the climate change agenda and the objective of the low carbon economy as well as the connectivity with the Trans-European network.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001649/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Suicidio di una adolescente a Cittadella (PD): chiusura di Ask.fm

Il social network Ask.fm, già noto per essere collegato ai suicidi di Clara Puglesey, Erin Galagher e Jessica Laney, torna tristemente alla ribalta dopo che a Cittadella (in provincia di Padova) Nadia, una ragazzina quattordicenne, ha deciso di togliersi la vita, istigata dagli altri frequentatori della *community*. Ask.fm è un sito tra più diffusi in Europa: 60milioni sono gli utenti stimati (tutti nascosti dietro l'anonimato) e 1 milione gli iscritti italiani. Iscriversi è facile: basta dichiarare di avere compiuto 13 anni o accedere dal proprio profilo Facebook. In seguito, chi decide di unirsi alla *community* si sottopone a un'intervista collettiva. Si passa dalle domande banali finanche a quelle più intime e provocatorie, da ingenue battute a pesanti commenti che, con il passare del tempo, diventano vere e proprie persecuzioni telematiche fatte di violenti insulti e minacce. Ask.fm avrebbe un team di sicurezza atto a controllare quei contenuti «che violano i termini di servizio», ma non risultano commenti (contenenti insulti o minacce di morte) che siano stati cancellati.

Gli adolescenti costituiscono un gruppo particolarmente vulnerabile in rete e necessitano di misure specifiche di protezione da qualsiasi tipo di comportamento o contenuto dannoso presente nei social network, nelle chat o nei motori di ricerca che possa condurre a casi di autolesionismo o di suicidio tra i minori. Preso atto che nelle mie interrogazioni E-009525/2013 «Tutela dei minori sul web: autorizzazione dei genitori per l'apertura di account sui social network» ed E-008323/2013 «Diffamazioni sui social network: in aumento il numero delle vittime» avevo già portato all'attenzione della Commissione il problema,

la Commissione:

1. Intende intervenire per mettere fine al «Far West» del web, mettendo a punto una seria e ferrea legislazione europea in materia di sicurezza digitale, che sappia prevenire e perseguire tutti quei reati — ingiurie, minacce, diffamazione, stalking, violenza privata, istigazione al suicidio — che ogni giorno corrono sul web?

2. Intende intervenire presso i singoli Stati membri, affinché Ask.fm sia oscurato definitivamente, considerato il suo continuo coinvolgimento in queste tragedie?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(3 aprile 2014)

La Commissione europea condanna tutti i comportamenti online offensivi e dannosi.

La Commissione ha istituito e sostiene una rete paneuropea di centri «Internet più sicuro» che forniscono assistenza tramite call center nei vari paesi e si rivolgono a ragazzi, genitori e insegnanti sensibilizzandoli sulla gestione dei rischi di Internet. Nel maggio 2013 tale rete ha reso disponibile una scheda informativa sull'utilizzo di Ask.fm, con cui ha creato un partenariato, e sulle impostazioni di privacy del social network.

Il sito e le sue funzioni di sicurezza sono stati sottoposti a una verifica completa e indipendente, in seguito alla quale Ask.fm ha informato la Commissione delle modifiche apportate e del lancio del centro di sicurezza ([1]). Ask.fm ha inoltre dichiarato che i suoi moderatori gestiscono tutte le denunce di atti di bullismo, molestie o domande inopportune entro 24 ore dalla segnalazione. Il pulsante *Blocca utente* permette di bloccare la ricezione di domande o commenti cattivi da un determinato utente.

L'autoregolamentazione offre soluzioni immediate e flessibili per tecnologie, servizi e modelli di utente in costante evoluzione. Mediante la coalizione CEO ([2]) e le diverse iniziative di cooperazione tra i centri «Internet più sicuro» della rete INSAFE e con le imprese del settore, la Commissione si sforza di rendere internet un luogo migliore per i bambini ([3]).

Il mese europeo della sicurezza informatica è un ulteriore esempio di come l'azione preventiva possa contribuire ad accrescere la consapevolezza dei cittadini circa i rischi e le minacce presenti in Rete. Inoltre, la Commissione cofinanzia, nell'ambito del programma dell'UE per la salute, un'azione congiunta per la salute e il benessere mentale ([4]) che coinvolge 25 Stati membri, il cui unico obiettivo è proporre un quadro d'azione per la prevenzione dei suicidi, compresi quelli legati a internet.

([1]) http://ask.fm/about/safety/about-company
([2]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/node/61973
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/european-strategy-deliver-better-internet-our-children
([4]) http://www.mentalhealthandwellbeing.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001649/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Teenage suicide in Cittadella (Padua): blocking Ask.fm

The social network Ask.fm has once again made the headlines for all the wrong reasons following the tragic suicide of a 14-year old Italian girl in Cittadella in the province of Padua. The website has already become notorious for being linked to the suicides of Ciara Pugsley, Erin Gallagher and Jessica Laney and now another girl, Nadia, has ended her own life after being incited to do so by other members of the online community. With its number of (anonymously registered) users estimated at 60 million, Ask.fm is one of the most widely visited websites in Europe and boasts 1 million Italian members. Registration is a very simple process: all users have to do is declare to be over the age of 13 or sign up through their Facebook profile. Once this is done and the user has joined the community, they submit themselves to a public Q&A session which can encompass everything from trivial questions to those of a more intimate and provocative nature, and from naïve jokes to more serious comments. Over time, these can become a genuine form of online harassment characterised by violent threats and insults. Although Ask.fm claims to have a security team moderating content that 'violates the terms of service', comments containing insults or death threats are still not being deleted.

Special measures are needed to protect teenagers from all forms of offensive behaviour or content on social networks, chatrooms and search engines, as they represent a group that is particularly vulnerable on the Internet and could be pushed to self-harm or even suicide after falling victim to cyberbullies' actions. Taking account of the fact that this issue has already been brought to the attention of the Commission in my questions E-009525/2013 'Protection of children on the web — parents' permission to open accounts on social networks' and E-008323/2013 'Rising number of victims of defamation on social networks':

1. Does the Commission intend to intervene and bring the lawless nature of the Internet to an end by establishing a set of hard-and-fast European regulations on digital security, capable of preventing and prosecuting these crimes (insults, threats, defamation, stalking, domestic violence, instigations to suicide) which take place online on a daily basis?

2. Does it intend to take direct action in individual Member States to block Ask.fm for good, due to its continued involvement in these tragedies?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2014)

The European Commission condemns all forms of offensive and harmful behaviour online.

The Commission set up and supports a pan-European network of Safer Internet Centres, providing support through national networks of helplines and promoting awareness to minors, parents and teachers of how to manage risks online. The network has produced in May 2013 an information sheet about how to use ask.fm and its privacy settings and has also partnered with ask.fm.

Ask.fm underwent a full and independent audit of its site and its safety features, and has informed the Commission about the implemented changes and the launch of their safety centre ([1]). Ask.fm further reported that their moderators are committed to dealing with any reports of bullying, harassment or inappropriate questions within 24-hours of a report being made. With the *Block User Button* users can opt out from receiving nasty questions or comments.

Self-regulation provides immediate and flexible solutions to constantly changing technologies, services and user patterns. The Commission endeavours through the CEO Coalition ([2]) as well as through the different partnerships between IN-SAFE, national Safer Internet Centres and with industry to make the Internet a better place for children ([3]).

The European Cybersecurity Month is yet another example of how preventive action can contribute to citizens' awareness of risks and threats faced on the Internet. In addition, the Commission co-finances from the EU-Health Programme a Joint Action Mental Health and Well-being ([4]), involving 25 Member States, which has as one aim to propose an action framework for preventing suicides, including those related to the Internet.

([1]) http://ask.fm/about/safety/about-company
([2]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/node/61973
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/european-strategy-deliver-better-Internet-our-children
([4]) http://www.mentalhealthandwellbeing.eu/

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001650/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Accesso a Internet e banda larga

Nel 2012, il 54,8 % della popolazione italiana a partire dai sei anni utilizza Internet. Di questa fetta, il 33,5 % lo fa quotidianamente. La quota di famiglie che ha una connessione super veloce a banda larga è del 55 %.

È rintracciabile poi un certo divario generazionale: la quasi totalità dei giovani tra i 15 e i 24 anni (90 %) si connette al web, più della metà lo fa tutti i giorni. Tra le famiglie costituite da sole persone, di 65 anni e oltre, appena il 12,2 % dispone di una connessione a banda larga, mentre tra le famiglie con almeno un minorenne la quota sale all'84,8 %.

Alla luce di questi dati, può la Commissione fornire dati analoghi relativi agli altri paesi dell'Unione europea?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(2 aprile 2014)

La Commissione monitora regolarmente i mercati europei della banda larga e l'uso di internet. Ogni anno Eurostat effettua un'ampia indagine, che coinvolge tutti gli Stati membri, sull'uso delle TIC da parte di famiglie e singoli utenti. L'indagine fornisce un quadro dettagliato dell'uso di internet da parte dei diversi gruppi sociali. Le informazioni, non sempre esaustive per tutte le fasce d'età, sono accessibili dalla banca dati Eurostat, che riporta anche diverse suddivisioni dei dati. Nell'allegato l'onorevole deputato troverà i dati per il 2013 relativi all'utilizzo di internet negli ultimi 3 mesi precedenti la conduzione del sondaggio (percentuale di utenti per le diverse fasce di età) ([1]), nonché i dati per il 2013 sull'accesso a internet e sulle connessioni a banda larga nei 28 Stati membri, in Norvegia, in Islanda e in Turchia ([2]).

Per accedere ai dati, l'onorevole deputato è invitato a consultare la banca dati Eurostat all'indirizzo:
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/information_society/introduction/

([1]) Cfr. http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/information_society/data/database (Individuals — Internet use (isoc_ci_ifp_iu))
([2]) Cfr. http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/4-18122013-BP/EN/4-18122013-BP-EN.PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001650/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Internet and broadband access

According to data collected in 2012, 54.8% of Italians aged six and over use the Internet, with 33.5% of users going online every single day. Regarding broadband access, 55% of Italian households have a superfast broadband connection.

The data reveals a clear generational gap: almost all young people between the ages of 15 and 24 (90%) surf the web, with more than half doing so every day. Just 12.2% of households consisting solely of people aged 65 and over have a broadband connection, whereas the figure rises to 84.8% for households with at least one person under 18.

In light of this information, can the Commission provide similar data relating to other countries in the European Union?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

The Commission regularity monitors European broadband markets and the use of the Internet. Eurostat conducts a major survey on ICT usage in households and by individuals covering all Member States every year. This survey presents a detailed view of Internet use by different groups of the society. Different breakdowns can also be obtained from the database although data is not always complete for all age groups. In the annex, the Honourable Member will find the data for 2013 on Internet use in the last 3 months: percentage of individuals for the different age breakdown [1] and the data for 2013 on Internet access and broadband connections for the EU28 plus Norway, Iceland and Turkey [2].

To access the data, the Honourable Member may consult the Eurostat database at:
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/information_society/introduction/

---

[1] See http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/information_society/data/database (Individuals — Internet use: isoc_ci_ifp_iu).
[2] See: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/4-18122013-BP/EN/4-18122013-BP-EN.PDF

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001651/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento — Misure a sostegno dei giovani del Sud che contraggono un mutuo

In merito all'interrogazione E-011212/2011 dell'interrogante, può la Commissione chiarire se sono in vista ulteriori proposte legislative nel settore dei contratti di credito per immobili che possano aiutare i giovani che desiderino acquistare un immobile a scopo abitativo?

Può la Commissione far sapere se dispone di dati relativi alla contrazione di questo genere di contratti differenziati per fasce di età e area geografica?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(14 aprile 2014)

La direttiva sul credito ipotecario ([1]) è entrata in vigore il 20 marzo 2014. La direttiva mira a garantire pratiche di prestito responsabili in Europa e rappresenta un primo passo verso l'istituzione di un mercato ipotecario unico a livello dell'UE. Gli Stati membri disporranno di 24 mesi per recepirla nei rispettivi ordinamenti giuridici nazionali. Dopo tre anni dal recepimento la Commissione rivedrà la direttiva e valuterà se il suo obiettivo è ancora di attualità.

La direttiva sul credito ipotecario non prevede disposizioni in materia di prestiti ipotecari «sociali» e riguarda invece i mutui ipotecari tradizionali, che costituiscono la maggioranza del mercato. Prestiti ipotecari «sociali» o incentivi volti a facilitare l'accesso a un mutuo ipotecario per le fasce meno abbienti (ad esempio, le famiglie giovani o i nuovi acquirenti) sono spesso disponibili a livello nazionale.

La Commissione non dispone di dati relativi alle domande di mutui ipotecari. La Banca centrale europea (BCE) e le banche centrali nazionali raccolgono dati in materia di crediti ipotecari a fini macroeconomici. Tuttavia risulta che le relazioni della BCE si basino in generale su dati aggregati, senza distinguere per fasce di età e aree geografiche. Anche organizzazioni del settore privato quali l'European credit research institute ([2]) e l'European Mortgage Federation ([3]) esaminano sistematicamente i dati sui mutui ipotecari.

([1]) Direttiva 2014/17/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 4 febbraio 2014, in merito ai contratti di credito ai consumatori relativi a immobili residenziali (GU L 60 del 28.2.2014, pag. 34).
([2]) http://www.ecri.eu
([3]) http://www.hypo.org/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001651/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Update — Measures to support young people in the South in taking out loans

With reference to Question E-011212/2011, can the Commission clarify whether further legislative proposals are expected in the property loan sector to assist young people wishing to purchase a residential property?

Can the Commission disclose whether it has figures, differentiated by age bracket and geographical area, on successful applications for such loans?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(14 April 2014)

The Mortgage Credit Directive (MCD) ([1]) entered into force on 20 March 2014. The MCD aims to ensure responsible lending practices across Europe and marks a first step towards the establishment of an EU-wide Single Mortgage Market. Member States will have 24 months to transpose the directive into national law. Three years after its transposition the Commission will review the directive and assess whether its scope remains appropriate.

The MCD does not include provisions relating to 'social' mortgage loans and targets conventional mortgages instead, which make up the majority of the market. 'Social' mortgage loans or incentive schemes to facilitate access to a mortgage for the financially less well off (e.g. young families or first time buyers) can often be found at national level.

The Commission has no mortgage loan application figures at its disposal. The European Central Bank (ECB) and National Central Banks collect mortgage data for macroeconomic purposes. The ECB reporting, however, seems in general to be based on aggregated figures with no distinction made between age brackets and geographical areas. Private sector organisation such as ECRI ([2]) and the European Mortgage Federation (EMF) ([3]) also regularly examine mortgage figures.

([1]) Directive 2014/17/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 February on credit agreements for consumers relating to residential immovable property (OJ L 60, 28.2.2014, p. 34).
([2]) http://www.ecri.eu
([3]) http://www.hypo.org/

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001654/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Crisi economica, disoccupazione e invecchiamento della popolazione

Gli effetti della crisi economica si fanno ancora sentire in Italia, dove solo il 61 % della popolazione attiva ha un posto di lavoro: - 14 % rispetto all'obiettivo europeo del 75 % nel 2020, mentre la disoccupazione di lunga durata ha raggiunto il 52,2 %. A peggiorare la situazione è un tasso di invecchiamento della popolazione tra i più alti in Europa, con 148,6 persone anziane ogni 100 giovani. A questo dato si accosta la mortalità media maschile che ha raggiunto i 79 anni, mentre quella femminile gli 84.

Considerando questi dati, può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. dispone di dati equivalenti per gli altri Stati membri dell'Unione europea?

2. Intende avviare nuovi programmi di finanziamento per progetti di invecchiamento attivo?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2014)

1. Dati armonizzati sui tassi di occupazione per gli altri Stati membri e l'UE sono disponibili sul sito di Eurostat ([1]).

La Strategia Europa 2020 stabilisce un obiettivo occupazionale per l'UE nel suo insieme pari al 75 %. I dati relativi al quarto trimestre del 2013 non sono ancora disponibili per tutti gli Stati membri ([2]). Nel terzo trimestre il tasso di occupazione nell'UE si situava al 68,8 %. Per i singoli Stati membri gli obiettivi sono stati differenziati per tener conto delle loro circostanze specifiche e dei diversi punti di partenza. Per l'Italia l'obiettivo è fissato al 69 %, mentre il valore riscontrato è pari al 59,7 % nel terzo trimestre del 2013.

L'Italia ha una delle speranze di vita più elevate, superata soltanto dalla Svezia per la speranza di vita maschile e dalla Francia e dalla Spagna per la speranza di vita femminile ([3]).

2. Nell'ambito dell'agenda europea rinnovata per l'apprendimento degli adulti, adottata nel 2011, gli Stati membri sono stati invitati adaccrescere le opportunità di apprendimento per gli adulti più anziani nel contesto delle strategie di invecchiamento attivo. La Commissione non prevede di proporre nuovi finanziamenti per le politiche di invecchiamento attivo.

Progetti a promozione dell'invecchiamento attivo possono essere finanziati a valere su programmi come quelli dei fondi sociali e di investimento europei, sul programma UE per l'occupazione e l'innovazione sociale, sul programma Erasmus + o su Orizzonte 2020 (Sfida societale 1).

L'invito 2014 a presentare proposte di comunità della conoscenza e dell'innovazione facenti capo all'Istituto europeo di tecnologia e innovazione comprende anche l'aspetto dell'innovazione a sostegno della vita sana e dell'invecchiamento attivo. La Commissione ha prodotto anche in cooperazione con il Comitato delle regioni e con la AGE Platform Europe un opuscolo in cui si elencano i programmi di finanziamento per aiutare le autorità pubbliche e gli stakeholder a sviluppare iniziative in materia di invecchiamento attivo ([4]), e iniziative affini sono portate avanti dal Programma comune a sostegno di una vita attiva e autonoma e dal Partenariato europeo per l'innovazione sull'invecchiamento attivo e in buona salute.

([1]) Cfr. Eurostat, Popolazione e condizioni sociali (tabella lfsi_emp_q).
([2]) I dati completi per il quarto trimestre del 2013 e i dati annuali 2013 dovrebbero essere pubblicati il 10 aprile.
([3]) Cfr. Eurostat, Popolazione e condizioni sociali (tabella tps00025).
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=6480&type=2&furtherPubs=no

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001654/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Economic crisis, unemployment and ageing of the population

The effects of the economic crisis are still being felt in Italy, where only 61% of the active population has a job: -14% compared with the European objective of 75% by 2020, while long-term unemployment has reached 52.2%. The situation is worsened by an ageing rate which is among the highest in Europe, with 148.6 elderly people for every 100 young people. This figure must be viewed alongside an average male mortality of 79, compared with an average female mortality of 84.

In consideration of these figures, the Commission is asked the following questions:

1. Does the Commission have equivalent data for other European Union Member States?

2. Does the Commission intend to launch new funding programmes for active ageing projects?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

1. Harmonised data on employment rates for other Member States and EU are available on Eurostat's website ([1]).

The Europe 2020 strategy sets the employment rate target for the EU as a whole at 75%. Data for the 4th quarter of 2013 are not yet available for all Member States ([2]). In the 3rd quarter the employment rate for the EU stood at 68.8%. For the individual Member States the targets have been differentiated to take into account their particular circumstances and distinct starting positions. For Italy the target is set at 69%, while its observed value was 59.7% in the 3rd quarter of 2013.

Italy has one of the highest life expectancies — only passed by Sweden for male life expectancy, and France and Spain for female life expectancy ([3]).

2. Under the renewed European Agenda for adult learning, adopted in 2011, Member States were invited to enhance learning opportunities for older adults in the context of active ageing. The Commission is not planning to propose new funding dedicated to active ageing.

Projects promoting active ageing can be funded under programs such as the European Structural and Investment Funds, EU Programme for Employment and Social Innovation, Erasmus +, Health Programme or Horizon 2020 (Societal Challenge 1).

The 2014 Call for Knowledge and Innovation Communities of the European Institute for Technology and Innovation covers innovation for healthy living and active ageing. The Commission has also produced in cooperation with the Committee of the Regions and the AGE Platform Europe a brochure listing funding programs to help public authorities and stakeholders to develop initiatives relating to active ageing ([4]), so does the Active and Assisted Living Joint Programme and the European Innovation Partnership for Active and Healthy Ageing.

([1]) See Eurostat, Population and social conditions (table lfsi_emp_q).
([2]) Complete data for the 4th quarter of 2013 and annual 2013 data are scheduled for dissemination on 10 April.
([3]) See Eurostat, Population and social conditions (table tps00025).
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=6480&type=2&furtherPubs=no

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001656/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Livelli di istruzione in Europa

Secondo dati del 2012, il 43,1 % della popolazione italiana tra i 25 e i 64 anni ha conseguito la licenza di scuola media come titolo di studio più elevato. Inoltre, il 17,6 % dei 18-24enni ha abbandonato gli studi prima di conseguire il titolo di scuola media superiore. In generale, la permanenza dei giovani all'interno del sistema di formazione, anche dopo il termine dell'istruzione obbligatoria, è pari all'81,3 % tra i 15-19enni e al 21,1 % tra i 20-29enni.

I dati relativi agli studi universitari dicono invece che il 21,7 % dei 30-34enni italiani ha conseguito un titolo di studio universitario o equivalente.

In Italia l'incidenza della spesa in istruzione e formazione sul PIL è pari al 4,2 %.

Alla luce di questi dati, potrebbe la Commissione fornire dati analoghi e aggiornati relativi agli altri Stati membri dell'UE?

Risposta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(4 aprile 2014)

Dati comparabili sulla popolazione dei paesi UE con riferimento al parametro del massimo livello di studio e di formazione conseguito (compresa l'istruzione secondaria inferiore e l'istruzione terziaria), dati sull'indicatore Europa 2020 «tasso di abbandono della scuola e della formazione», nonché dati sulle spese pubbliche generali nell'istruzione sono disponibili per il pubblico sul sito web Eurostat ([1]).

Per questi indicatori, i dati 2012 per i paesi UE si trovano nell'allegato. Per ciascun indicatore l'allegato fornisce un link sulla pertinente tabella online; sulla base di dati online sono disponibili dati sui vari anni con le relative ripartizioni, nonché chiarimenti metodologici (concetti, definizioni, diffusione di frequenze, gestione della qualità).

D'altro canto, Eurostat non dispone di dati su quanto tempo i giovani rimangono nel sistema d'istruzione al di là del periodo obbligatorio.

Oltre alle statistiche pubblicate da Eurostat, la relazione di monitoraggio del settore dell'istruzione e della formazione ([2]) della DG Istruzione e cultura (DG EAC) fornisce ulteriori analisi sull'istruzione e la formazione in Europa.

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/tools/et-monitor_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001656/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Education levels in Europe

According to 2012 figures, 43.1% of the Italian population between the ages of 25 and 64 obtained the lower secondary educational certificate as their highest qualification. Moreover, 17.6% of 18-24 year olds abandoned their studies before obtaining the higher secondary educational certificate. In general, the length of time young people remain within the education system beyond the compulsory education period amounts to 81.3% for young people between the ages of 15 and 19 and 21.1% for young people between the ages of 20 and 29.

However, figures for university studies reveal that 21.7% of Italians between the ages of 30 and 34 have obtained a university or equivalent educational qualification.

In Italy, the incidence of expenditure on training and education on GDP is 4.2%.

In the light of these figures, can the Commission provide comparable up-to-date figures for other EU Member States?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

Comparable data for EU countries on the population by educational attainment level (including lower secondary and tertiary education), data on the Europe 2020 indicator 'early leavers from education and training' as well as data on general government expenditure on education are publicly available on the Eurostat website ([1]).

For these indicators, 2012 data for EU countries are attached in annex. For each indicator this annexe provides a link to the relevant online table; in the online database additional years and breakdowns are available as well as methodological explanations (such as concepts, definitions, frequency of dissemination, quality management).

In contrast, Eurostat does not possess any data that measure the length of time young people remain within the education system beyond the compulsory education period.

In addition to the statistics published by Eurostat, the Education and Training Monitor ([2]) of DG Education and Culture (DG EAC) provides further analysis on education and training in Europe.

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/tools/et-monitor_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001659/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Situazione della Gagauzia

La Gagauzia è un piccola regione autonoma della Moldova, di 1 832 chilometri quadrati, abitata da 155 mila persone di origine turca, russofona e di fede cristiano-ortodossa, con forti legami culturali con la Russia più che con la Moldova. Il 2 febbraio 2014 in questa regione si è svolto un referendum dalla dubbia legittimità in cui si chiedeva alla cittadinanza se preferisse l'associazione della Moldova con l'UE o con la Russia, e se ritenesse che la Gagauzia avesse il diritto all'indipendenza. Al primo quesito la maggioranza dei votanti (97,2 %) ha preferito la Russia all'UE, mentre al secondo il 98,2 % dei votanti ha risposto esprimendosi in favore dell'indipendenza.

Secondo alcune voci, l'intera campagna è stata sponsorizzata dalla Russia per alterare i deboli equilibri politici dell'Est Europa in un momento in cui la crisi in Ucraina e la prossima nascita dell'Unione eurasiatica stanno esacerbando le relazioni dell'UE con il vicinato orientale.

Alla luce di quanto descritto, intende la Commissione adoperarsi diplomaticamente per avviare un dialogo con le autorità della regione e con la popolazione al fine di evitare l'ulteriore deteriorarsi della questione e acquietare i sentimenti nazionalisti? Nel caso, come intende agire?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(5 giugno 2014)

Il 23 gennaio 2014 il commissario per l'allargamento e la politica di vicinato Štefan Füle si è recato in Gagauzia, dove ha incontrato il governatore della regione. Da allora la Gagauzia è stata oggetto di particolare attenzione da parte dei diplomatici UE nel paese, di visitatori di alto livello originari dell'Unione e, ultimamente, delle massima autorità moldove. Il 25 aprile, ad esempio, il presidente moldovo Timofti ha invitato il Vicepresidente dell'Assemblea popolare della Gagauzia a partecipare al suo incontro con il commissario Füle a Praga. La Gagauzia figura anche tra i destinatari specifici delle campagne di informazione del governo moldovo relative all'Unione europea e al futuro accordo di associazione.

La regione autonoma della Gagauzia beneficia inoltre da anni dei programmi di assistenza dell'UE tra cui, più di recente, progetti finanziati dall'Unione nel campo dell'efficienza energetica e delle energie rinnovabili che hanno permesso di creare posti di lavoro sostenibili presso le comunità rurali. Nel 2013 l'Alta Rappresentante e la Commissione hanno elaborato un programma specifico comprendente progetti volti a rafforzare la fiducia nella regione, che sarà operativo prossimamente.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001659/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Situation in Gagauzia

Gagauzia is a small autonomous region of Moldova, with an area of 1832 km^2. Its 155 000 Russian-speaking inhabitants are of Turkish origin and orthodox Christian faith, with strong cultural links with Russia rather than Moldova. On 2 February 2014, a referendum of dubious legitimacy was held in that region, asking citizens whether they preferred Moldova to associate with the EU or with Russia and whether they thought Gagauzia had a right to independence. On the first question, the majority of voters (97.2%) preferred Russia to the EU whilst, on the second, 98.2% of voters declared themselves in favour of independence.

According to some, the whole campaign was sponsored by Russia to alter the fragile political balance in Eastern Europe at a time when the crisis in Ukraine and the forthcoming emergence of the Eurasian Union are exacerbating the EU's relations with its eastern neighbours.

In the light of the above, does the Commission intend to take diplomatic steps to start a dialogue with the region's authorities and population in order to avoid further deterioration in the situation and appease nationalist feelings? If so, how does it plan to proceed?

Answer given by Commissioner Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

The Commissioner for Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy, Štefan Füle, visited Gagauzia on 23 January 2014, where he met with the Governor of the region. Since then, the region has been given special attention by EU diplomats in the country as well as by high-level EU visitors, and now by the highest Moldovan authorities. On 25 April, for instance, Moldovan President Timofti invited the Deputy Speaker of the Gagauz People's Assembly to join his meeting wih Commissioner Füle in Prague; besides, Gagauzia is a specific target of the Moldovan government's information campaigns on the European Union and the future Association Agreement.

For several years now, the Gagauz autonomous region has also been a recipient of EU assistance programmes; for instance, it has benefitted in the recent period from EU-sponsored energy efficiency and renewables projects, which have led to sustainable job creation in rural communities. In 2013, the High Representative and the Commission put together a specific programme of confidence-building projects for the region, which will be operational soon.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001662/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Dispersione di rifiuti ospedalieri e sanitari: emergenza ambientale e sanitaria nell'area circostante Malagrotta

L'ondata di maltempo abbattutasi sulla città di Roma e sulla Regione Lazio, nella settimana compresa tra il 28 gennaio e il 4 febbraio, ha comportato ingenti danni. In particolar modo, nella zona di Malagrotta, l'esondazione del Rio Galeria ha provocato l'allagamento dell'intera area dello stabilimento di Ponte Malnome, di proprietà di AMA, l'azienda municipalizzata di Roma che si occupa dei rifiuti, facendo fuoriuscire su tutta l'area circostante, compresi terreni di proprietà privata, tutti i rifiuti ospedalieri lì stoccati per essere poi trasferiti all'impianto d'incenerimento. Tali rifiuti ospedalieri, tra i quali farmaci scaduti, siringhe, sacche di sangue, garze e materiale medico, sono sparsi sui terreni coltivati e nelle falde acquifere circostanti. Le operazioni di bonifica iniziate dopo le alluvioni hanno subito evidenziato i possibili danni derivanti dalla presenza di ingenti quantitativi di rifiuti ospedalieri pericolosi sui terreni coltivati circostanti, ma a tutt'oggi non risulta chiaro quali iniziative il Comune di Roma abbia intrapreso per mettere in sicurezza tutta l'area e salvaguardare la salute dei cittadini.

Premesso ciò, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se è a conoscenza della situazione e se ha chiesto chiarimenti alle Autorità competenti locali;

2. quali misure possono essere attivate ai sensi della direttiva 2004/35/CE sulla responsabilità ambientale, in termini di prevenzione, riparazione dei danni e messa in sicurezza del territorio;

3. quali azioni possono essere intraprese per verificare le eventuali responsabilità, relative ad errori o negligenze dell'Amministrazione e delle Autorità competenti;

4. di fornire un quadro normativo in materia di sicurezza dei luoghi di stoccaggio dei rifiuti ospedalieri pericolosi e non, ed eventualmente verificare se siano state intraprese tutte le misure atte a salvaguardare lo stato dei luoghi.

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2014)

1. La Commissione non era al corrente della situazione descritta dall'onorevole parlamentare.

2. Ai sensi della direttiva sulla responsabilità ambientale ([1]) gli operatori che svolgono una delle attività professionali di cui all'allegato III della direttiva (che comprendono fra l'altro le operazioni di gestione dei rifiuti) sono oggettivamente responsabili per le azioni preventive e correttive e ne sopportano integralmente i costi (secondo il principio «chi inquina paga»). Va rilevato che la direttiva non si applica ai casi cagionati da «un fenomeno naturale di carattere eccezionale, inevitabile e incontrollabile».

3. Spetta alle autorità italiane garantire la corretta osservanza della normativa ambientale europea in Italia. Allo stato attuale la Commissione non ha motivo di ritenere che le autorità competenti non prenderanno le misure necessarie per rimediare alla situazione che si è verificata.

4. La direttiva 2008/98/CE ([2]) istituisce un quadro normativo per la gestione dei rifiuti. Il suo articolo 17 dispone che la gestione dei rifiuti pericolosi avvenga in modo responsabile, anche per quanto riguarda lo stoccaggio, ottemperando all'obbligo di protezione della salute umana e dell'ambiente di cui all'articolo 13 della medesima direttiva.

([1]) Direttiva 2004/35/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sulla responsabilità ambientale in materia di prevenzione e riparazione del danno ambientale, GU L 143 del 30.4.2004.
([2]) GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001662/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Dispersal of hospital and sanitary waste: environmental and health emergency in the area around Malagrotta

The wave of bad weather which hit the city of Rome and Lazio region in the week between 28 January and 4 February caused immense damage. In particular, in the area of Malagrotta, the river Galeria burst its banks, flooding the entire Ponte Malnome site owned by AMA, the Rome municipal environment agency responsible for waste management, with the result that all the hospital waste stored there prior to transfer to the incineration plant spilled over into the whole surrounding area, including privately owned land. This hospital waste, including out-of-date drugs, syringes, blood bags, gauze and medical materials, has spread over farmland and into the nearby aquifers. The drainage operations begun after the floods quickly showed the potential damage deriving from the presence of huge quantities of hazardous hospital waste on the surrounding farmland but to date it is not clear what initiatives the municipality of Rome has undertaken to make the whole area secure and safeguard citizens' health.

In the circumstances, the Commission is asked:

1. whether it is aware of the situation and whether it has sought clarification from the competent local authorities;

2. what measures can be taken pursuant to Directive 2004/35/EC on environmental liability, in terms of prevention, remedying the damage and making the area safe;

3. what action can be taken to check any potential liability arising from errors or negligence by central government and the competent authorities;

4. to provide a regulatory framework in respect of the security of places where hazardous and non-hazardous hospital waste is stored and, if possible, to verify that all appropriate steps have been taken to safeguard the condition of such places.

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

1. The Commission was not aware of the situation referred to by the Honourable Member.

2. Pursuant to the Environmental Liability Directive ([1]) (ELD), operators carrying out occupational activities listed in Annex III (which includes *inter alia* waste management operations) are strictly liable to take the necessary preventive and remedial actions and to bear the full costs (polluter-pays principle) of these actions. It must be pointed out that the ELD does not apply in the occurrence of 'a natural phenomenon of exceptional, inevitable and irresistible character'.

3. It is for the Italian authorities to ensure that the European environmental law is applied correctly in the Republic of Italy. At this stage, the Commission has no reason to believe that the competent authorities will not take the necessary measures to address this issue.

4. Directive 2008/98/EC ([2]) establishes a regulatory framework for the management of waste. Its Article 17 provides for a responsible management of hazardous waste, including its storage, having regard to the duty of care obligation laid down in Article 13 of the same Directive.

([1]) Directive 2004/35/EC on environmental liability with regard to the prevention and remedying of environmental damage, OJ L 143, 30.4.2004.
([2]) OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001664/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Discriminazioni linguistiche in Belgio

Sono sempre più numerose le segnalazioni di persone residenti nel Regno del Belgio che riscontrano numerosi problemi con documenti ufficiali della polizia, di enti locali, di avvocati, notai e liberi professionisti, in lingua unicamente fiamminga. Il paese ha un'antica tradizione multilingue, se oltre ai due idiomi principali — il francese e il fiammingo — contiamo anche le minoranze linguistiche lussemburghesi e germanofone nei pressi dei confini. Sebbene la maggioranza della popolazione sia in grado di intendere e parlare entrambe le lingue, nella capitale vi sono numerose persone provenienti da diversi Stati membri, che lavorano all'interno delle istituzioni europee o nel settore privato.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. in quale modo può favorire la diffusione di testi e documenti ufficiali il più inclusivi possibili in un'Europa sempre più caratterizzata dal plurilinguismo?

2. Quali iniziative prende a difesa delle minoranze linguistiche e quali regolamenti europei sono in vigore in tale settore?

3. Se ha mai valutato l'apertura, presso alcune delle sue sedi istituzionali, di sportelli di consulenza amministrativa e linguistica per aiutare i dipendenti dell'UE a rapportarsi con la pubblica amministrazione belga?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2014)

La Commissione non ha competenza per intervenire nella questione menzionata nell'interrogazione. Compete unicamente alle autorità nazionali e regionali interessate determinare quale lingua usare ai fini dell'erogazione di servizi pubblici.

La Carta dei diritti fondamentaili dell'Unione europea recita esplicitamente che l'UE rispetta la diversità linguistica. In particolare, le istituzioni dell'UE sono vincolate al rispetto dell'articolo 41 della Carta relativo al diritto a una buona amministrazione il quale riconosce il diritto di ogni individuo di rivolgersi alle istituzioni dell'Unione in una delle lingue dell'UE e di ricevere una risposta nella stessa lingua.

La Commissione porta avanti inoltre una politica di multilinguismo che promuove l'apprendimento delle lingue affinché ogni cittadino europeo sia in grado di comunicare in due lingue straniere. In proposito, la Commissione sostiene ed integra le politiche nazionali nel campo dell'istruzione.

La Commissione riconosce la necessità di fornire assistenza al personale dell'UE nei suoi contatti con le autorità belghe (carte d'identità, immatricolazione dell'automobile …) ma anche in relazione alla loro integrazione sociale a Bruxelles e, a tal fine, fornisce al proprio personale informazioni nel merito. La Commissione ha concluso diversi accordi a livello di servizi con il SEAE, il Consiglio, il Comitato delle regioni e il Comitato economico e sociale europeo affinché anche il loro personale possa beneficiare di tali servizi. La Commissione offre inoltre al proprio personale una formazione linguistica che è spesso aperta al personale delle altre istituzioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001664/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Language discrimination in Belgium

There are more and more of reports of people resident in Belgium having numerous problems with official documents being issued by the police, local bodies, lawyers, notaries and the liberal professions in Flemish only. The country has a long tradition of multilingualism if, in addition to the two main languages — French and Flemish — we also count the Luxembourgish and Germanophone linguistic minorities in border areas. Although the majority of the population is able to understand and speak both languages, there are many people in the capital who come from other Member States to work in European institutions or in the private sector.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What can it do to promote the use of official documents and texts that are as inclusive as possible in a Europe that is increasingly multilingual?

2. What steps is it taking to protect linguistic minorities and what European regulations are in force in this respect?

3. Has it ever considered opening administrative and language advisory desks in some of its institutions' offices to help EU employees in their communications with the Belgian authorities?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

The Commission has no competence as regards the matters mentioned in the question. It is the responsibility solely of the national and regional authorities concerned to determine what languages they use in the provision of public services.

The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union explicitly states that the EU shall respect linguistic diversity. In particular, EU institutions are bound by Article 41 of the Charter on the right to good administration which recognises the right of every person to be able to write to EU institutions in any of the EU languages and to receive a reply in that same language.

The Commission also pursues a Multilingualism policy which promotes language learning, with the aim that every European citizen should be able to communicate in two foreign languages. In this regard, it supports and complements national educational policies.

The Commission recognises that there is a need to provide assistance to EU staff as regards their contacts with the Belgian authorities (identity cards, car registration…) but also in relation to their social integration in Brussels and, to this effect, it provides information on all such issues for staff. The Commission has concluded service-level agreements with the EEAS, the Council, the Committee of the Regions and the Economic and Social Committee so that their staff may also benefit from these services. Furthermore, the Commission offers language training to its staff, which is also open to staff of other institutions.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001665/14
alla Commissione
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Commercializzazione di Sambuca illegale

I criteri presenti nell'Allegato II del Regolamento (CE) n. 110/2008 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio stabiliscono che la bevanda spiritosa definita «Sambuca» deve essere un liquore incolore aromatizzato all'anice, deve avere un tenore naturale di anetolo compreso tra 1g/l e 2g/l e deve avere, inoltre, un volume alcolometrico minimo pari al 38 %.

Nonostante siano trascorsi più di sei mesi dalla risposta alla mia interrogazione E-004582, nella quale il commissario Dacian Cioloş dichiarava che la Commissione avrebbe esaminato la questione e adottato i necessari provvedimenti, anche prendendo contatti con gli Stati membri interessati, recenti indagini costatano la persistenza in commercio di prodotti che, pur riportando la definizione «Sambuca», non sono in realtà conformi a uno o più dei criteri prima citati. In particolare, si evidenzia la diffusa presenza di bottiglie di liquore colorato definito come «Sambuca» e aromatizzato alla fragola, banana, menta o liquirizia. Queste contraffazioni causano un duplice risvolto negativo: da una parte arrecano danni di immagine alla vera Sambuca, dall'altra attirano al consumo i più giovani per le loro caratteristiche visive e gustative.

Le segnalazioni continuano a pervenire soprattutto dal mercato britannico, a dispetto delle due circolari diramate, a luglio e a settembre 2013, dal DEFRA (Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs), in cui si allertavano le autorità di controllo sul commercio illegale di bottiglie di «Sambuca» contraffatte.

Ben sapendo che il controllo delle bevande spiritose e dell'adozione delle misure necessarie a garantire la conformità delle stesse alle norme dell'UE è una responsabilità degli Stati membri, si chiede alla Commissione di comunicare:

1. Se dispone di un resoconto delle segnalazioni, delle misure intraprese e dei risultati ottenuti finora dagli Stati membri;

2. Se la neo-costituita task force sulle frodi alimentari, operante all'interno della DG SANCO, è al corrente e ha preso in gestione la questione;

3. Quali siano le ulteriori azioni che intende intraprendere al fine di migliorare i risultati nella lotta a questa pratica commerciale illegale che, come specificato precedentemente, oltre ad arrecare un danno d'immagine alla vera Sambuca, attrae al consumo i più giovani.

Risposta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2014)

In sede di Comitato per le bevande spiritose, gli Stati membri sono stati informati della possibile presenza sul mercato di «sambuca» non conforme alla pertinente definizione di cui all'allegato II del regolamento (CE) n. 110/2008 ([1]).

I servizi della Commissione hanno anche tenuto contatti con il Regno Unito, dove si commercializzano alcune bevande spiritose colorate recanti la denominazione «Sambuca».

Si rimanda l'onorevole deputato alla risposta data dal commissario per l'agricoltura e lo sviluppo rurale, a nome della Commissione, all'interrogazione scritta E-012362/2013 ([2]) riguardo all'impiego di denominazioni di vendita per bevande spiritose, quale «sambuca», nell'etichettatura.

Si rileva inoltre che a tutt'oggi i servizi della Commissione non hanno ricevuto dagli Stati membri nessuna *ulteriore* specificazione sul luogo e *sull'entità* della commercializzazione di bottiglie di bevande spiritose recanti abusivamente il termine «sambuca».

Recentemente la Commissione ha assegnato risorse specifiche al gruppo incaricato dei controlli sull'applicazione della normativa sulla catena alimentare, per rafforzare il sistema di controllo dell'Unione contro le frodi alimentari. Ciò ha consentito ai servizi della Commissione di avviare una serie di iniziative volte a migliorare la capacità delle autorità competenti degli Stati membri di individuare e contrastare le pratiche fraudolente, in particolare creando una rete di autorità nazionali competenti incaricate dell'assistenza e della cooperazione amministrativa ai sensi degli articoli da 36 a 40 del regolamento (CE) n. 882/224 ([3]). La Commissione ritiene che il miglioramento della cooperazione transfrontaliera fra le autorità nazionali di controllo sia fondamentale per affrontare potenziali pratiche fraudolente negli Stati membri.

([1]) GU L 39 del 13.2.2008, pag. 1.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html
([3]) Regolamento (CE) n. 882/2004 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 29 aprile 2004, relativo ai controlli ufficiali intesi a verificare la conformità alla normativa in materia di mangimi e di alimenti e alle norme sulla salute e sul benessere degli animali (GU L 165 del 30.4.2004).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001665/14
to the Commission
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Illegal marketing of 'Sambuca'

The criteria set out in Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 110/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council stipulate that the spirit drink called Sambuca must be a colourless aniseed-flavoured liqueur, with a natural anethole content of not less than 1 gram per litre and not more than 2 grams per litre, and a minimum alcoholic strength by volume of 38%.

It is now more than six months since the Commission answered my Written Question E-004582/2013, in which Commissioner Dacian Cioloş said the Commission would examine the issue and take the necessary action, including contacting the Member States concerned. However, recent investigations indicate continuing sales of products that are labelled as 'Sambuca' but do not in fact comply with one or more of the aforementioned criteria. There is, in particular, evidence of the widespread presence of bottles of coloured liqueur labelled as 'Sambuca' and flavoured with strawberry, banana, mint or liquorice. These counterfeits have negative implications in two ways: they are damaging the image of the real Sambuca, and they are attracting younger consumers because of their colour and flavour.

Reports continue to come in, particularly from the UK market, despite the two circulars issued by DEFRA (Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs) in July and September 2013, which alerted the supervisory authorities to the illegal marketing of bottles of counterfeit 'Sambuca'.

Although I am aware that it is Member States' responsibility to control spirit drinks and to take the necessary action to ensure that they comply with EU rules, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does it have a record of the reports made, actions undertaken and results achieved so far by the Member States?

2. Is the newly formed task force on food fraud, operating within DG SANCO, up to date and taking the matter in hand?

3. What further action does the Commission intend to take to improve results in combating this illegal commercial practice, which, as stated above, is not only damaging the image of the real Sambuca but is also attracting younger consumers?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

In the context of the meetings of the Committee for Spirit Drinks, Member States have been informed about the possible presence on the market of 'Sambuca' not compliant with the relevant definition established in Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 110/2008 ([1]).

Moreover, the Commission services have been in contact with the United Kingdom, where some coloured spirit drinks bearing the term 'Sambuca' are marketed.

The Honourable Member may refer to the answer given by the Member of the Commission responsible for Agriculture and Rural Development, on behalf of the Commission, to Written Question E-012362/2013 ([2]) as regards the use of sales denominations for spirit drinks, such as 'Sambuca', for labelling purposes.

In addition, it is worthwhile to specify that to this date, the Commission services have not received from the Member States any further precise indication about the marketing place where — and the extent to which — bottles of spirit drinks illegally bearing the terms 'Sambuca' have been found.

The Commission has recently allocated dedicated resources to the team in charge of enforcement issues in relation to food chain legislation, with the aim of contributing to the strengthening of the EU control system against food fraud. This has enabled the Commission services to launch a number of initiatives aimed at improving the capability of the Member States' competent authorities to detect and counter fraudulent practices, in particular through the creation of a network of national competent authorities in charge of administrative assistance and cooperation pursuant to Articles 36 to 40 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 ([3]). The Commission is of the view that improving cross border cooperation among national enforcers is the key to addressing potential fraudulent practices in the Member States.

([1]) OJ L 39, 13.2.2008.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([3]) Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules (OJ L 165, 30.4.2004).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001667/14
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(14 februari 2014)

Betreft: Eurocommissaris Kroes: „Wereldwijd internetmodel"

Eurocommissaris Kroes stelt dat het beheer van het internet niet meer door de Amerikanen zou moeten worden gedomineerd. Volgens haar zou het beter zijn als er geleidelijk een wereldwijd model komt, waarin ook Europa een grotere rol speelt. Recente onthullingen over grootschalige internetspionage hebben de leidende positie van de Verenigde Staten in twijfel getrokken, aldus Kroes. „Onze fundamentele vrijheden en mensenrechten zijn niet onderhandelbaar. Zij moeten online worden beschermd" ([1]).

1. Hoe legt de Commissie uit dat het huidige internetmodel klaarblijkelijk niet zou functioneren — enerzijds de door haar aangehaalde „grootschalige internetspionage" wél en anderzijds níet in ogenschouw nemende?

2. Hoe ziet de Commissie het door haar voorgestelde „wereldwijde internetmodel" concreet voor zich? Waarop baseert zij haar stellingname dat dit „een beter model" zou zijn? Welke concrete „grotere rol" zou Europa daar volgens haar in moeten spelen, en waarom? Welke positieve gevolgen zou dit hebben?

3. Hoe ziet de Commissie in het door haar voorgestelde „wereldwijde internetmodel", naast Europa en de Verenigde Staten, de participatie van andere „grootmachten", zoals China, India en Rusland?

4. Hoe rijmt de Commissie de door haar nagestreefde „grenzeloze internetvrijheid" met de ACTA-overeenkomst?

Antwoord van mevrouw Kroes namens de Commissie
(7 april 2014)

De Commissie is van mening dat bepaalde problemen aangepakt moeten worden in het huidige beheersmodel, dat beter rekening moet houden met het mondiale karakter van het internet. Daarom heeft de Commissie een aantal maatregelen voorgesteld in haar Mededeling over het internetbeleid en -governance. Deze omvatten de invoering van een samenhangend geheel van beginselen met betrekking tot internetgovernance, in overeenstemming met de grondrechten en de democratische waarden; het versterken van het Forum voor internetbeheer; het duidelijk definiëren van de plaats van overheden in het multistakeholdermodel; het naar de wereld toe openstellen van de ICANN en de IANA; het verder versterken van het multistakeholdermodel van internetgovernance, gebaseerd op de principes van „goed bestuur".

Met betrekking tot andere „grootmachten" en derde landen in het algemeen is het belangrijk om contacten te leggen met belanghebbenden die nog niet hebben besloten of zij een puur intergouvernementele of een meer inclusieve, multistakeholderbenadering willen voor het beheer van het internet, en om een heldere en constructieve agenda voor te stellen, waaraan zij zich kunnen verbinden.

Wat betreft internetvrijheid en ACTA heeft de Commissie eind december 2012 besloten haar verzoek aan het Hof van Justitie van de Europese Unie in te trekken dat betrekking had op een advies over de vraag of de handelsovereenkomst ter bestrijding van namaak (ACTA) verenigbaar is met de Europese Verdragen en in het bijzonder met het Handvest van de grondrechten van de Europese Unie. De Commissie besloot het verzoek in te trekken aangezien er geen realistische kans was dat het Europees Parlement akkoord zou gaan met het voorgestelde Verdrag. De Commissie zal terdege rekening houden met de bezorgdheid van het Parlement bij onderhandelingen over toekomstige internationale overeenkomsten.

([1]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2664/Nieuws/article/detail/3595587/2014/02/12/Kroes-minder-Amerikaanse-dominantie-op-internet.dhtml.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001667/14
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Commissioner Kroes: 'Worldwide Internet model'

Commissioner Kroes states that the Internet should no longer be dominated by the Americans. In her view, it would be better if a worldwide model were gradually established, in which Europe would also play a bigger role. Recent revelations about large-scale Internet spying have called the USA's leading position into question, in her view. 'Our fundamental freedoms and human rights are not negotiable. They must be protected on line.' ([1])

1. How does the Commission explain that the current Internet model evidently does not work — on the one hand bearing in mind the 'large-scale Internet spying' to which it refers and on the other hand disregarding that?

2. How, in practical terms, does the Commission anticipate that its proposed 'worldwide Internet model' would work? On what does it base its assertion that this would be a 'better model'? What specific 'bigger role' does it believe that Europe should play in it, and why? What positive effects would this have?

3. Under the 'worldwide Internet model' which the Commission proposes, what role does the Commission anticipate being played by 'great powers' other than Europe and the USA, for example China, India and Russia?

4. How does the Commission believe that it will be possible to reconcile the 'unlimited Internet freedom' which it seeks with the ACTA Agreement?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

The Commission believes that there are challenges to be addressed in the current governance model, which needs to better take into account the global nature of the Internet. For this reason the Commission has proposed a number of actions in its communication on Internet Policy and Governance. These include establishing a coherent set of Internet governance principles, consistent with fundamental rights and democratic values; strengthening the Internet Governance Forum; clearly defining the role of public authorities in the multi-stakeholder context; globalising ICANN and IANA; further strengthening the multi-stakeholder model for Internet governance on the basis of principles of 'good governance'.

Regarding other 'great powers' and third countries in general, it is important to reach out to those which have not yet decided whether they favour a purely inter-governmental or a more inclusive, multi-stakeholder approach to Internet governance, and propose a clear and constructive engagement agenda.

As regards Internet freedom and ACTA, the Commission decided in the end of December 2012 to withdraw its request to the European Court of Justice to give its opinion on whether the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) is compatible with the European Treaties, in particular with the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. The Commission decided to withdraw the request as there was no realistic chance that the European Parliament would agree to the proposed treaty. The Commission will duly take into account the concerns expressed by the Parliament when negotiating future international agreements.

([1]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2664/Nieuws/article/detail/3595587/2014/02/12/Kroes-minder-Amerikaanse-dominantie-op-Internet.dhtml

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001668/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(14 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Strefa wolnego handlu pomiędzy Unią Europejską a USA

Podczas negocjacji z USA w sprawie umowy o wolnym handlu Unia Europejska zaoferuje zniesienie taryf na niemal wszystkie towary importowane ze Stanów Zjednoczonych. Komisja Europejska zaoferuje zniesienie 96 proc. taryf importowych. Zaproponowane zostaną dwie kategorie przejściowe, obejmujące kolejne 3 proc. towarów, z trzyletnim i siedmioletnim okresem zniesienia taryf, co ma pozwolić unijnemu przemysłowi na dostosowanie się do nowej sytuacji. W tych przejściowych kategoriach mogą się znaleźć pojazdy użytkowe i niektóre produkty rolne. Czwarta kategoria obejmie wrażliwe produkty, takie jak wołowina, wieprzowina i drób, na które taryfy zostaną utrzymane, ale USA otrzymają większe kwoty eksportowe. Wielkość tych kwot ma być określona w późniejszym terminie.

W związku z powyższym pragnę zapytać:

1. Czy Komisja zdaje sobie sprawę, że w wyniku utworzenia strefy wolnego handlu pomiędzy Unią Europejską a Stanami Zjednoczonymi, rynek europejski zostanie zalany olbrzymią ilością tanich produktów z USA np. żywnością GMO, które jako tańsze zaczną wypierać z rynku produkty regionalne?

2. Czy Komisja podjęła odpowiednie kroki, aby transatlantyckie partnerstwo w dziedzinie handlu i inwestycji nie było umową ACTA wprowadzoną tylnymi drzwiami?

3. Dlaczego Komisja uwzględnia w transatlantyckim partnerstwie w dziedzinie handlu i inwestycji system rozstrzygania sporów między inwestorami a państwem?

4. Czy transatlantyckie partnerstwo w dziedzinie handlu i inwestycji będzie oznaczać, że amerykańskie normy ochrony danych będą przeważać nad normami unijnymi lub je podważać?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Karela De Guchta w imieniu Komisji
(2 kwietnia 2014 r.)

1. Nadrzędnym celem wszystkich negocjacji prowadzonych przez UE w obszarze handlu i inwestycji jest zapewnienie trwałych korzyści społeczeństwom, obywatelom i przedsiębiorstwom unijnym. Powyższe odnosi się również do rokowań w sprawie transatlantyckiego partnerstwa handlowo-inwestycyjnego (TTIP); nie dojdzie zatem do ograniczenia norm krajowych w zakresie ochrony środowiska, ochrony prywatności, bezpieczeństwa i zdrowia oraz strategii zmierzających do ochrony konsumentów w imię promowania handlu i inwestycji. Negocjacje nie doprowadzą do uchylenia norm unijnych zapisanych w istniejącym prawodawstwie. Ponadto Komisja skrupulatnie weźmie pod uwagę specyfikę unijnych rynków rolnych, zapewniając szczególne traktowanie produktów wrażliwych.

2. Transatlantyckie partnerstwo handlowe i inwestycyjne nie wprowadzi umowy ACTA tylnymi drzwiami. Bardziej szczegółowe wyjaśnienia w tym zakresie można znaleźć na stronie internetowej Komisji ([1]).

3-4. Komisja pragnie odesłać Szanownego Pana Posła do swoich wcześniejszych odpowiedzi udzielonych odpowiednio na pytania E-014439/2013, E-012850/2013 i E-013439/2013.

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/july/tradoc_151673.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001668/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: EU-USA free trade area

During the negotiations with the USA on a free trade area the EU will offer to lift tariffs on almost all goods imported from the US. The Commission will offer to lift 96% of existing import tariffs. Two transitional categories will be proposed for a further 3% of goods, covering periods of three and seven years until tariffs are lowered, in order to allow EU industry to adapt. Those categories could include commercial vehicles and some agricultural products. The fourth category will cover sensitive products such as beef, pork and poultry, on which tariffs will be maintained but the US will be granted larger export quotas. Those quotas will be set at a later date.

1. Does the Commission realise that the opening of an EU-US free trade area will result in the EU market being flooded with cheap US goods, such as GMO foods, which, because of their low cost, will drive regional products off the market?

2. Has the Commission taken the necessary steps to ensure that the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership is not actually 'ACTA through the back door'?

3. Why is the Commission looking at an investor-state dispute settlement system as part of the trade and investment partnership arrangements?

4. Will the partnership result in US data protection standards prevailing over EU standards or EU standards being undermined?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

1. All EU trade and investment negotiations are conducted with the overarching aim of bringing benefits to EU societies, citizens and companies in a sustainable way. The same applies to the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) negotiations: domestic environmental, privacy, safety and health standards, and policies to protect consumers will not be lowered to promote trade and investment. EU standards, as enshrined in the existing legislation; will not be negotiated away. Moreover, the Commission will carefully take into account the specifics of EU agricultural markets and special treatment will be provided for sensitive products.

2. TTIP will not introduce ACTA through the backdoor. A more detailed explanation in this regard can be found on the Commission's website ([1]).

3 and 4. The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the answers already provided to questions E-014439/2013, E-012850/2013 and E-013439/2013, respectively.

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/july/tradoc_151673.pdf

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001669/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(14 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Równe prawa głosu dla wszystkich członków Unii Europejskiej

Komisja Europejska opublikowała wytyczne dla państw członkowskich, w których obowiązują przepisy powodujące utratę prawa do głosowania w wyborach krajowych przez obywateli, którzy skorzystali z prawa do swobodnego przemieszczania się w UE. Obecnie przepisy tego rodzaju stosuje się w pięciu państwach członkowskich (Dania, Irlandia, Cypr, Malta i W. Brytania).

Choć zgodnie z obowiązującymi traktatami UE w kompetencji państw członkowskich leży określenie, kto jest uprawniony do głosowania w wyborach krajowych, takie praktyki, polegające na pozbawianiu praw wyborczych, mogą źle wpływać na korzystanie z prawa do swobodnego przemieszczania się. Pozbawianie praw wyborczych kłóci się również z podstawowym założeniem obywatelstwa UE, zgodnie z którym obywatelom ma z zasady przysługiwać więcej praw, a nie tych praw ubywać.

Główne uzasadnienie dla przepisów pozbawiających praw wyborczych, czyli brak wystarczających więzi z krajem pochodzenia wśród obywateli zamieszkujących za granicą, wydaje się przestarzałe w dzisiejszym zintegrowanym świecie.

W związku z powyższym pragnę zapytać:

1. Jeżeli Komisja rekomenduje obywatelom, którzy korzystają z prawa do swobodnego przemieszczania się, zachować prawo do głosowania w wyborach krajowych, gdy wykażą oni niesłabnące zainteresowanie życiem politycznym w swoim kraju, to jakie konkretne kryteria państwa członkowskie powinny wprowadzać do oceny tego zainteresowania?

2. W jaki konkretny sposób i kiedy państwa członkowskie powinny informować obywateli o warunkach i praktycznych ustaleniach dotyczących zachowania prawa do głosowania w wyborach krajowych?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(7 maja 2014 r.)

Zalecenie Komisji w sprawie zapobiegania konsekwencjom pozbawiania praw wyborczych obywateli Unii korzystających z prawa do swobodnego przemieszczania się, do którego odnosi się Szanowny Pan Poseł, zostało przyjęte w dniu 29 stycznia 2014 r. ([1]). Komisja zachęca w tym zaleceniu zainteresowane państwa członkowskie do zapewnienia obywatelom, którzy korzystają z należnego im prawa do swobodnego przemieszczania się, możliwości utrzymania prawa do głosowania w wyborach krajowych, jeśli wykażą oni ciągłe zainteresowanie życiem politycznym w państwie członkowskim, którego są obywatelami. W przyjętym wraz z zaleceniem komunikacie ([2]) Komisja wskazała, że w odniesieniu do odpowiednich kryteriów przekazywania dowodów na istnienie więzi tego rodzaju, pozytywne działanie ze strony obywateli takie jak złożenie wniosku o pozostawienie w rejestrze wyborców należy uznać za wystarczające w tym celu – co wydaje się także najprostszym i najmniej uciążliwym rozwiązaniem dla samych obywateli.

W tym samym komunikacie Komisja podkreśliła konieczność zapewnienia, że obywatele przemieszczający się lub zamieszkali w innym państwie członkowskim otrzymają odpowiednie informacje na temat warunków, na jakich mogą zachować swoje prawo do głosowania. Komisja stwierdziła, że informacje te mogłyby być rozpowszechniane za pomocą ulotek, audycji lub ukierunkowanych kampanii informacyjnych prowadzonych przez konsulaty, ambasady i organizacje ekspatriantów.

([1]) Dz.U. L 32 z 1.2.2014, s. 34.
([2]) Zapobieganie konsekwencjom pozbawiania praw wyborczych obywateli Unii korzystających z prawa do swobodnego przemieszczania się, COM(2014) 0033 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001669/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Discrepancies between voting rights across the EU

The Commission has published guidelines for the Member States containing provisions which will result in a loss of voting rights in national elections for citizens who have availed themselves of the right to freedom of movement in the EU. Similar regulations are currently in force in five Member States: Denmark, Ireland, Cyprus, Malta and the United Kingdom.

Although the Treaties stipulate that it is up to the Member States to decide who has the right to vote in national elections, such practices — amounting to disenfranchisement — might have a negative impact on people exercising their right of free movement. Depriving people of voting rights also contradicts the guiding principle of EU citizenship, namely that citizens should as a rule be granted more rights, rather than rights becoming scarcer.

The main justification for the regulations depriving people of their voting rights, namely people living abroad having insufficient ties to their country of origin, seems out of date in today's integrated world.

1. If the Commission recommends that people availing themselves of the right to freedom of movement should maintain their voting rights for national elections if they show an unbroken interest in the political life of their country of origin, what specific criteria should the Member States introduce to gauge that interest?

2. Exactly how and when should the Member States tell citizens about the conditions and practical arrangements for retaining their right to vote in national elections?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(7 May 2014)

The recommendation 'Addressing the consequences of disenfranchisement of Union citizens exercising their rights to free movement', to which the Honorary Member refers, was adopted on 29 January 2014 ([1]). In this recommendation the Commission has invited the Member States concerned to enable their nationals who make use of their free movement rights to retain their right to vote in national elections — if they demonstrate a continuing interest in the political life of their country. In its communication ([2]) adopted together with the recommendation, the Commission pointed out that as regards suitable criteria to provide evidence of such ties, a positive action on the part of the individuals such as their application to remain registered on the electoral roll should be considered as sufficient for this purpose — and would appear to be the simplest and least cumbersome solution for the citizens themselves.

In the same Communication the Commission stressed the need to ensure adequate information for citizens moving to or residing in another Member State about the conditions under which they can retain their voting rights. The Commission underlined that this information could be made available in leaflets, broadcasts and targeted information by consulates, embassies and expatriates' organisations.

([1]) OJ L32, 1.2.2014, p. 34.
([2]) Addressing the consequences of disenfranchisement of Union citizens exercising their right to free movement, COM(2014) 33 final.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001670/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(14 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Polityka odnośnie wykorzystania gazu łupkowego

Gaz łupkowy jest tańszą alternatywą dla węgla i korzystniejszą w obniżeniu emisji gazów cieplarnianych niż energia ze źródeł odnawialnych. Zastąpienie węgla gazem naturalnym, emitującym przy spalaniu około połowę mniej gazów niż węgiel, może mieć znacznie szybszy wpływ niż energia ze źródeł odnawialnych, takich jak słońce czy wiatr. Jednakże na przeszkodzie wprowadzenia zmian stoi przede wszystkim polityka lokalna. Rewolucja, jaka dokonała się w Stanach Zjednoczonych przy wprowadzeniu gazu łupkowego, doprowadziła do energicznego lobbowania w Brukseli przedstawicieli branży i państw, takich jak Wielka Brytania i Polska, które przekonują, że ich konkurencyjność została zmiażdżona, ponieważ ceny gazu w Europie są o trzy, cztery razy wyższe niż w Stanach Zjednoczonych.

W wyniku tego, Europa stoi na straconej pozycji w stosunku do Stanów Zjednoczonych.

W związku z powyższym pragnę zapytać:

1. Jakie jest zdanie Komisji temat zastąpienia węgla gazem naturalnym?

2. Dlaczego w przeciwieństwie do Stanów Zjednoczonych Komisja Europejska nie planuje dążyć do uzyskania niezależności energetycznej?

3. Dlaczego poprzez politykę lokalną ogranicza się konkurencyjność Polski oraz Wielkiej Brytanii w stosunku do Stanów Zjednoczonych?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Günthera Oettingera w imieniu Komisji
(2 kwietnia 2014 r.)

1. Zastąpienie węgla gazem ziemnym, w tym gazem ze złóż łupków, może przyczynić się do przekształceń w sektorze energetycznym w perspektywie krótko- do średnioterminowej, pod warunkiem że gaz będzie zastępował bardziej emisyjne paliwa kopalne, a nie będzie zastępował odnawialnych źródeł energii, zaś emisje gazów cieplarnianych spowodowane procesem wydobycia zostaną odpowiednio ograniczone. W każdym razie długoterminowy cel dekarbonizacji unijnego systemu energetycznego będzie wymagał stałej poprawy efektywności energetycznej, oszczędności energii oraz większego wykorzystania technologii niskoemisyjnych, w szczególności odnawialnych źródeł energii.

2. Polityka energetyczna UE opiera się na zasadach konkurencji oraz dywersyfikacji źródeł energii, z uwzględnieniem dalszej eksploatacji lokalnych źródeł energii zgodnie z zasadami zrównoważonego rozwoju. UE wierzy w globalny, otwarty, sprawnie funkcjonujący rynek, obejmujący dostawy energii z wielu różnych źródeł, tak aby nie występowało uzależnienie od jednego dostawcy lub grupy dostawców.

3. Odpowiedź na to pytanie pozostaje w gestii państw członkowskich.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001670/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Policy on the use of shale gas

Shale gas is a cheaper alternative to coal and more beneficial in terms of reducing greenhouse gases than energy from renewable sources. Substituting coal for natural gas, which when burned emits about half the greenhouse gas of coal, can have a significantly faster impact than energy from renewable sources, such as solar or wind power. However, local politics in particular is standing in the way of change. The revolution that has taken place in the United States with the introduction of shale gas has led to vigorous lobbying in Brussels by industry representatives and countries such as the UK and Poland, who argue that they are being made uncompetitive by gas prices in Europe which are three or four times higher than in the United States.

As a result, Europe is at a competitive disadvantage compared to the United States.

In this connection:

1. What is the Commission's view on the substitution of coal with natural gas?

2. Why, unlike in the United States, is the Commission not seeking to achieve energy independence?

3. Why is Polish and UK competitiveness in relation to the United States being restricted by local politics?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

1. The substitution of coal with natural gas, including from shale formations, can play a role in the transformation of the energy sector in the short to medium term provided it substitutes more carbon intensive fossil fuels, does not replace renewable energy sources and greenhouse gas emissions associated with the extraction process are properly mitigated. In any case, the long term objective of decarbonising the EU energy system will require continued improvement of energy efficiency, energy savings and increased uptake of low carbon technologies, in particular renewable energies.

2. The EU's energy policy is based on the principles of competition and diversification of energy sources, including the further exploitation of sustainable indigenous energy sources. The EU believes in an global, open, well-functioning market, including energy supply from a wide range of sources so that there is no dependence on one single supplier or group of suppliers.

3. This question is for the Member States in question to answer.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001673/14
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(14 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Reforma strukturalna unijnego sektora bankowego

Komisja Europejska zaproponowała nowe przepisy zakazujące największym i najbardziej złożonym bankom podejmowania ryzykownej działalności, jaką jest handel instrumentami finansowymi i towarami na własny rachunek. Zgodnie z tymi przepisami organy nadzoru będą również mogły nakazać tym bankom wydzielenie określonych, potencjalnie ryzykownych rodzajów działalności handlowej od przyjmowania depozytów, jeżeli prowadzenie tej działalności zagraża stabilności finansowej. Wraz z powyższymi przypisami Komisja przyjęła środki towarzyszące, których celem jest zwiększenie przejrzystości niektórych transakcji dokonywanych w równoległym systemie bankowym. Środki te stanowią uzupełnienie podjętych dotychczas szerszych reform w celu wzmocnienia sektora finansowego UE.

Przepisy zawarte we wniosku w sprawie reformy strukturalnej banków w UE będą mieć zastosowanie tylko do największych i najbardziej złożonych banków w UE, prowadzących działalność handlową na dużą skalę.

W związku z powyższym pragnę zapytać:

1. Dlaczego Komisja odpowiada się za zakazem handlu na własny rachunek instrumentami finansowymi i towarami, który nie tylko pociąga za sobą wiele zagrożeń, lecz także nie przynosi wymiernych korzyści klientom banku ani gospodarce ogółem?

2. Jeżeli banki będą mogły wykazać zgodnie z wymogami właściwego organu nadzoru, że ryzyko wynikające z danego rodzaju działalności jest ograniczone za pomocą innych środków niż przewidują przepisy, czy zdaniem Komisji nie będzie prowadziło to do nadużyć i wykorzystywania luk w przepisach?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Michela Barniera w imieniu Komisji
(14 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Wniosek w sprawie środków strukturalnych zwiększających odporność instytucji kredytowych UE obejmuje kwestię ewentualnych luk prawnych i obejść wspomnianych przez Szanownego Pana Posła. Wiosek dokładnie określa ramy osądu nadzoru na podstawie danego przypadku i zapewnia organom nadzorczym ograniczony margines wyodrębnienia działalności, jeśli odnośne progi zostaną przekroczone i jeśli zostaną spełnione określone warunki.

Wniosek stanowi, że właściwe organy muszą wymagać wyodrębnienia, jeżeli działalność handlowa banków i związane z nią rodzaje ryzyka wskazują na przekroczenie określonych progów i spełniają określone warunki dotyczące wskaźników. Jeżeli bank wykaże w sposób zadowalający właściwy organ, że działalność ta nie stanowi zagrożenia dla stabilności finansowej Unii, biorąc pod uwagę cele proponowanego rozporządzenia, właściwy organ może odstąpić od wyodrębnienia działalności.

Banki będą potrzebowały silnych argumentów, aby przekonać właściwe organy, że stabilność finansowa oraz cele określone w rozporządzeniu nie są zagrożone. Formalna decyzja w sprawie wyodrębnienia zostałaby podjęta przez organ nadzorczy po przeprowadzeniu konsultacji z Europejskim Urzędem Nadzoru Bankowego. Ponadto wspomniane właściwe organy będą musiały wyjaśnić i ujawnić swoją decyzję dotyczącą odstąpienia od wyodrębnienia działalności. Poza obligatoryjnym wyodrębnieniem działalności wspomnianym powyżej, właściwy organ byłby uprawniony do wymagania wyodrębnienia określonej działalności handlowej, jeżeli uzna, że jakakolwiek działalność handlowa zagraża stabilności finansowej banku lub Unii, biorąc pod uwagę każdy z celów proponowanego rozporządzenia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001673/14
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Structural reform of the EU banking sector

The Commission has proposed new rules banning the biggest and most complex banks from engaging in risky activities, namely proprietary trading in financial and commodity instruments. Under these rules, supervisory authorities will also be able to require banks to separate certain potentially risky kinds of trading activities from their deposit-taking business if the pursuit of such activities would compromise financial stability. Together with these provisions, the Commission has adopted accompanying measures aimed at increasing the transparency of certain transactions conducted in the shadow banking system. These measures supplement the broader reforms undertaken to date aimed at strengthening the EU financial sector.

The proposed rules on structural bank reform in the EU will apply only to the biggest and most complex banks in the EU engaged in large-scale trading activities.

If banks are able to show, in accordance with the requirements of the relevant supervisory authorities, that the risk resulting from the types of activity concerned is limited by means other than those provided for in the rules, does the Commission not think that this will lead to abuse and exploitation of loopholes in the rules?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(14 April 2014)

The proposal on structural measures improving the resilience of EU credit institutions tackles any possible loopholes and circumventions mentioned by the Honourable Member. It carefully frames the case by case basis supervisory judgment and gives a limited margin for supervisors to wave separation if the respective threholds are exceeded and certain conditions are met.

The proposal states that the competent authorities must require separation if the trading activities of banks and the related risks are found to exceed certain thresholds and meet certain conditions linked to the metrics. If the bank demonstrates to the satisfaction of the competent authority that these activities do not endanger the Union financial stability, taking into account the objectives of the proposed Regulation, the competent authority may decide not to require separation.

Banks will need solid arguments to convince the competent authorities that financial stability and the objectives set out in the regulation are not compromised. The formal decision for separation would be taken by supervisor, after consulting the European Banking Authority. Furthermore, the competent authority in question would need to explain and disclose its decision not to separate. Finally, apart from the mandatory separation mentioned above, the competent authority would be given the power to require separation of a particular trading activity if it considers that any trading activity/activities threaten(s) the financial stability of the bank or of the Union, taking into account any of the objectives of the proposed Regulation.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-001674/14
komissiolle
Sari Essayah (PPE)
(14. helmikuuta 2014)

Aihe: Toisessa jäsenvaltiossa asuvien eläkeläisten sairaanhoitokustannukset

Asetuksen (EY) N:o 883/2004 24 artiklan mukaan toisessa jäsenvaltiossa asuva eläkeläinen on oikeutettu luontoisetuuksiin siinä jäsenvaltioissa, jossa hän asuu. Tässä tapauksessa luontoisetuuksien kustannuksista vastaa joko se jäsenvaltio, jonka lainsäädännön nojalla eläkeläinen on oikeutettu luotoisetuuksiin, tai mikäli näitä jäsenvaltioita on useampi, se, jonka lainsäädännön alaisuuteen eläkeläinen on kuulunut pisimpään. On kuitenkin ilmennyt, että Ranskassa peritään ”contribution sociale” -vero mm. joistakin ulkomailta saaduista eläkkeistä. Contribution sociale -veron tarkoitus on kattaa mm. sairaanhoidon kustannukset, vaikka nämä kustannukset jo kattaa asetuksen (EY) N:o 883/2004:n mukaan toinen jäsenvaltio, mikäli eläkeläisen S1 tai E121 -lomake on rekisteröity hänen asuinmaassaan. Erityisesti ongelmia tuottavat yksityiset eläkkeet, jotka saamieni tietojen mukaan tulkitaan Ranskassa usein sijoitustuotoiksi eikä eläketuloiksi ja siten tulevat kyseisen contribution sociale -verotuksen piiriin. Saamieni tietojen mukaan myös paikallisten verotoimistojen käytännöissä on tässä asiassa eroja Ranskassa. Yllä esitetty tilanne estää EU:n perusvapauksiin kuuluvan EU-kansalaisten vapaan liikkuvuuden toteutumisen.

Mihin toimenpiteisiin komissio aikoo ryhtyä, ettei Ranska toimi EU:n asetusten vastaisesti ja peri EU-kansalaisilta veroa, jonka tarkoituksena on kattaa kustannukset, jotka Ranska kuitenkin jo perii toiselta jäsenvaltiolta?

László Andorin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(10. huhtikuuta 2014)

Komissio on tietoinen ongelmasta, johon arvoisa parlamentin jäsen viittaa, ja on aloittanut rikkomusmenettelyn Ranskaa vastaan EU:n lainsäädännön ja erityisesti sosiaaliturvajärjestelmien yhteensovittamisesta annetun asetuksen (EY) N:o 883/2004 noudattamatta jättämisen vuoksi. Jos Ranskan viranomaiset perivät kiinteän omaisuuden perusteella yleisen sosiaaliturvamaksun henkilöiltä, jotka omistavat kiinteää omaisuutta Ranskassa mutta joiden kotipaikka ei ole siellä ja joihin ei sovelleta Ranskan sosiaaliturvajärjestelmää, ne näyttävät rikkovan mainitun asetuksen 11 artiklassa säädettyä periaatetta siitä, että henkilöt, joihin asetusta sovelletaan, ovat vain yhden jäsenvaltion lainsäädännön alaisia.

Ranskan Conseil d'État on kuitenkin pyytänyt ennakkopäätöstä (asia C-623/13) asetuksen (ETY) N:o 1408/71 soveltamisesta siltä osin, kun se liittyy pääomatuloista perittäviin sosiaalimaksuihin. Komissio ottaa huomioon mainitussa asiassa annettavan tuomion päättäessään tähän liittyvistä lisätoimista. Tuomiota ei kuitenkaan todennäköisesti anneta ennen vuoden 2014 loppua.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001674/14
to the Commission
Sari Essayah (PPE)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Medical treatment expenses incurred by pensioners living in a Member State other than their home country

Under Article 24 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 pensioners living in a Member State other than their home country are entitled to benefits in kind in their Member State of residence. The cost in such cases is borne either by the Member State under whose legislation a pensioner is entitled to benefits or, if that point applies to several Member States, by the one to whose legislation the pensioner has been subject for longest. It has, however, emerged that French social security tax (the 'contribution sociale') is levied on some pensions paid from abroad. The purpose of the social security tax is, among other things, to finance medical treatment expenses, although, by virtue of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004, those costs will be covered by other Member States if pensioners' S1 or E121 forms have been registered in their country of residence. Problems arise especially in connection with private pensions, which in France, as I have learned, are often taken to be returns on investment, as opposed to pension income, and are consequently included in the social security tax base. According to my information, the practice in France regarding this matter varies from one local tax office to the next. The situation described above is impeding free movement, one of the basic freedoms that EU citizens enjoy.

What steps will the Commission take to prevent France from contravening EU regulations and making EU citizens pay a tax intended to cover costs recoverable in any event from other Member States?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

The Commission is aware of the problem to which the Honourable Member refers and has initiated an infringement procedure against France for a breach of EC law, and in particular of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems. By making liable for payment of social security contributions on real estate persons who own real estate in France but who do not reside in that Member State and are not subject to the French social security system, the French authorities seem to be in breach of the principle laid down in Article 11 of that regulation to the effect that persons to whom it applies are to be subject to the legislation of a single Member State only.

However, the French *Conseil d'État* has referred a request for a preliminary ruling (Case C-623/13) on the application of Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 as regards the levying of social charges on income from assets. The Commission will take account of the outcome of that ruling, which is not expected before the end of 2014, when deciding on any further action in this case.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001677/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(14 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Lentitud de la justicia y delitos medioambientales

El pasado 6 de febrero el Tribunal Supremo del Reino de España ha emitido una sentencia en la cual declara la ilegalidad del complejo turístico Marina Isla de Valdecañas, en la provincia de Cáceres, que incluye dos hoteles, 200 villas de lujo, un campo del golf y un puerto deportivo. El complejo se encuentra situado en terrenos incluidos en la Red Natura 2000 ([1]). Esta sentencia se ha pronunciado tras casi una década de trámites en los tribunales, cuando la construcción del complejo está bastante avanzada ([2]).

El Tribunal Supremo avala la sentencia anterior del Tribunal Superior de Justicia de Extremadura en la cual se declaraba nulo el Decreto de la Junta de Extremadura que amparaba el proyecto de complejo turístico declarándolo Plan de Interés Regional. Además, la decisión del Tribunal Supremo confirma las resoluciones del TSJ de Extremadura que ordenaron la «reposición de los terrenos a que se refieren las mencionadas actuaciones a la situación anterior a la aprobación de dicho proyecto y los actos que se hubieran ejecutado con fundamento en el mismo».

Este tipo de casos no es inhabitual en el Reino de España, donde las causas por delito medioambiental se retrasan durante años, amparándose los promotores en la política de hechos consumados. Muchas veces, como en este caso, con la colaboración de las autoridades. Ello ha llevado a que las administraciones públicas gocen casi de impunidad frente a la violación de las leyes medioambientales.

1. ¿Conoce la Comisión los hechos?

2. ¿Qué opinión le merece a la Comisión que la resolución en los tribunales del Reino de España de los delitos medioambientales se alargue tanto en el tiempo?

3. ¿Piensa la Comisión tomar alguna iniciativa ante el Gobierno del Reino de España para evitar que casos como el descrito puedan volver a pasar?

4. ¿Cómo piensa evitar la Comisión que en el Reino de España se apliquen políticas de hechos consumados en temas de protección del medioambiente?

5. Visto además que este tipo de sentencias no se suelen cumplir, ¿va a realizar la Comisión un seguimiento del cumplimiento de la sentencia?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de abril de 2014)

La Comisión no tiene conocimiento de la sentencia concreta a que hace referencia Su Señoría, ni de que en España se produzcan retrasos en los fallos de los tribunales en asuntos de carácter medioambiental.

La Comisión no tiene ninguna base para pensar que la sentencia del Tribunal Supremo de España no se vaya a respetar, por lo que no tiene intención de plantear el asunto ante España.

([1]) http://www.prontuario.org/cgpj/es/Poder_Judicial/Tribunal_Supremo/Noticias_Judiciales/El_Tribunal_Supremo_confirma_la_ilegalidad_del_complejo_turistico_extremeno_Marina_Isla_de_Valdecanas
([2]) http://www.islavaldecanas.com/html/index.php

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001677/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Foot-dragging by the Spanish courts on environmental crime

The tourist resort Marina Isla de Valdecañas in the province of Caceres, which comprises hotels, 200 luxury villas, a golf course and a marina, was declared illegal by a Spanish Supreme Court ruling of 6 February 2014. The resort is located within a Natura 2000 protected area ([1]). The ruling comes after almost a decade of court proceedings, and at this stage the resort is already close to completion ([2]).

The Supreme Court has confirmed the validity of a previous judgment issued by Extremadura's High Court, which overturned the Government of Extremadura's Decree safeguarding the tourist resort project as a regional interest plan. The decision of the Spanish Supreme Court also confirms the Extremadura High Court ruling that the land must be restored to the same condition as prior to the approval of the project and the resultant works.

Cases like this are not unusual in Spain, where legal proceedings on environmental crimes can be dragged out for years, giving promoters time to complete projects so that a *fait acompli* policy can later be applied. Often, as with this case, the authorities collude in prolonging proceedings. Government bodies are therefore able to violate environmental law with virtual impunity.

1. Is the Commission aware of the above?

2. What is the Commission's opinion regarding the delays in Spanish court rulings in matters of environmental crime?

3. Does the Commission plan on taking action to persuade the Spanish Government to prevent further occurrences of this problem?

4. How does the Commission plan to prevent the application of fait accompli policies in environmental protection cases in Spain?

5. Since this kind of ruling is usually ignored in Spain, will the Commission follow up on the matter to ensure that the ruling is complied with in this case?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2014)

The Commission is not aware of the specific judgment described by the Honourable Member nor is it aware of delays in Spain with regard to court rulings in environmental matters.

The Commission has no basis for assuming that the ruling of the Spanish Supreme Court will not be respected and does not propose to raise the matter with Spain.

([1]) http://www.prontuario.org/cgpj/es/Poder_Judicial/Tribunal_Supremo/Noticias_Judiciales/El_Tribunal_Supremo_confirma_la_ilegalidad_del_complejo_turistico_extremeno_Marina_Isla_de_Valdecanas
([2]) http://www.islavaldecanas.com/html/index.php

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001678/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(14 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Negoziazioni tra il governo del Pakistan e il gruppo militante talebano e effetti sui diritti delle donne

Il governo del Pakistan guidato dal primo ministro Nawaz Sharif ha avviato il 6 febbraio i negoziati con Tehreek-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP), il gruppo militante talebano che ha provocato le ondate di violenza in Pakistan. Sono state più di 100 le persone morte in attacchi talebani nel Paese, inclusi soldati, nel solo mese di gennaio. Migliaia di persone sono state uccise da quando il TTP si è affermato nel 2007.

Nel corso dei negoziati, i rappresentanti del Tehreek-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP), hanno riferito che non vi è alcuna possibilità di pace in Pakistan finché il governo non adotta la sharia e finché le forze militari americane non si ritireranno completamente dall'Afghanistan.

Tali negoziati non devono compromettere la tutela dei diritti umani sia in Afghanistan sia in Pakistan.

In Pakistan l'età minima per dare il consenso al matrimonio non è ancora 18 anni come in molti altri Paesi e, secondo Human Rights Watch, il 70-80 % delle donne pakistane ha subito e subisce violenze tra le mura domestiche.

L'Unione europea è da molto tempo impegnata per i diritti delle donne in tutto il mondo ma occorre fare di più per il Pakistan.

Può l'Alto Rappresentante precisare:

1. se il SEAE sta monitorando i negoziati tra il governo del Pakistan e il gruppo militante talebano;

2. quali questioni l'UE considera accettabili in tali negoziati e quali iniziative intende adottare per fare pressione sul governo pakistano e spingerlo ad allinearsi agli impegni internazionali in materia dei diritti umani, fondamentali in particolare per la protezione delle donne in Pakistan;

3. l'UE può prendere in considerazione l'idea di bloccare i fondi previsti per il Pakistan se tale Paese sceglie di seguire le condizioni stabilite dai talebani nelle negoziazioni;

4. inoltre, ciò che scaturirà da queste negoziazioni riuscirà a garantire che le iniziative in tutela dei diritti delle donne non subiscano una battuta d'arresto?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(22 aprile 2014)

L'UE segue con attenzione, attraverso la sua delegazione in Pakistan, l'andamento del dialogo tra il governo del Pakistan e il TTP. Finora sono stati organizzati pochi incontri tra le parti, che non hanno permesso di compiere progressi degni di nota. I continui atti di violenza perpetrati dal TTP e/o dalle sue ali scissioniste hanno indotto il governo a sospendere i negoziati, che potrebbero però riprendere prossimamente.

Il governo del Pakistan ha ribadito più volte la necessità di condurre i negoziati nel rispetto della Costituzione nazionale, che garantisce determinati diritti fondamentali quali la libertà di espressione e la libertà di religione. L'UE continuerà a insistere, nell'ambito del dialogo strategico con il Pakistan, dei dialoghi specifici sui diritti umani e dell'SPG+, affinché il governo garantisca che i negoziati non violino in nessun modo gli impegni internazionali assunti dal Pakistan in materia di diritti umani, compresi quelli relativi ai diritti delle donne e dei minori. I diritti delle donne rimangono una tematica di fondamentale importanza per l'UE in Pakistan e una questione che viene sistematicamente sollevata dala delegazione dell'UE e dalle ambasciate degli Stati membri a Islamabad. L'UE sostiene inoltre i diritti delle donne attraverso una serie di progetti nel campo dello sviluppo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001678/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Negotiations between the Pakistani Government and the Taliban: implications for women's rights

On 6 February 2014 the Pakistani Government, led by Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, entered into negotiations with Tehreek-e-Taliban (TTP), the Taliban militant group behind the waves of violence that have rocked Pakistan in recent years. In January 2014 alone, more than 100 people, including soldiers, died in Taliban attacks in Pakistan. Since the TTP was formed in 2007, thousands of people have been killed.

During the negotiations, TTP representatives ruled out any possibility of peace in Pakistan until the government agreed to adopt sharia law and all US troops had been pulled out of Afghanistan.

These negotiations cannot be allowed to compromise human rights in Afghanistan or in Pakistan.

Unlike in many other countries, the legal age of consent for marriage has not yet been raised to 18 in Pakistan, and, according to Human Rights Watch, 70-80% of Pakistani women have suffered domestic violence.

The EU has been working to protect the rights of women worldwide for many years, but it needs to do more for the women of Pakistan.

Can the Vice-President/High-Representative:

1. say whether the European External Action Service is monitoring the negotiations between the Pakistani Government and the TTP?

2. say what the EU regards as suitable matters for negotiation and how it intends to put pressure on the Pakistani Government to come into line with international human rights commitments, which are essential for protecting women in Pakistan?

3. say whether the EU will consider freezing funding to Pakistan if the Pakistani Government gives in to the Taliban's demands?

4. give an assurance that women's rights will not be taken off the political agenda as a result of these negotiations?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2014)

The EU is closely following developments related to the dialogue between the Government of Pakistan and the TTP through the EU's Delegation to Pakistan. Until now, only a few meetings have been held between the two sides with no substantial progress. Negotiations are currently suspended by the Governent due to continued violence by the TTP and/or splinter groups, but may be resumed soon.

The Government of Pakistan has repeatedly stressed that negotiations would have to take place within the framework of the Constitution of Pakistan, which guarantees certain fundamental rights, including freedom of speech and freedom of religion. In the framework of the Strategic Dialogue with Pakistan — as well as in specific dialogues on human rights and GSP+ — the EU will continue to stress the need for the Government of Pakistan to ensure that nothing in the negotiations infringes Pakistan's international human rights commitments, including those concerning the rights of women and children. Women's rights remain a crucial issue for the EU in Pakistan, and one which is raised continuously by the EU's Delegation and Member States' embassies in Islamabad. The EU also supports women's rights through a number of development projects.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001679/14
do Komisji
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(14 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: W sprawie ryzyka utraty przez Polskę unijnych funduszy na walkę z powodzią

Z dostępnych w polskich mediach informacji wynika, że w poważnym stopniu zagrożone są przyznane Polsce fundusze na politykę przeciwpowodziową. Przedmiotem sprawy ma być kwota przekraczającą półtora miliarda złotych. Jako przyczynę podaje się wykorzystywanie środków niezgodnie z Ramową Dyrektywą Wodną. Zdaniem znawców problemu prace przeciwpowodziowe w Polsce polegają głównie na pogłębianiu koryt rzecznych, co ma nie tylko nie zmniejszać zagrożenia powodzią, ale skutkować dodatkowo pogorszeniem jakości wód oraz stwarzać zagrożenie dla organizmów żywych, w tym ryb o znaczeniu gospodarczym. Na tej podstawie Komisja wniosła sprawę przeciwko Polsce do ETS oraz wydała opinię uzasadnioną, mogącą skutkować zablokowaniem środków.

W oparciu o powyższe proszę o informacje:

1. W jak wysokim stopniu, w ocenie Komisji, polskie władze rozdysponowały otrzymane środki niezgodnie z unijnymi regulacjami?

2. Czy przedstawiciele polskiego rządu współpracują z właściwymi instytucjami europejskimi w celu osiągnięcia porozumienia gwarantującego dalsze finansowanie projektów przeciwpowodziowych?

3. Czy w ocenie Komisji w następstwie źle prowadzonych inwestycji przeciwpowodziowych ryzyko wystąpienia zagrożeń powodzi mogło ulec zwiększeniu?

4. Jakie konsekwencje dla fauny i flory polskich rzek mogą, zdaniem unijnych ekspertów, rodzić prace związane z pogłębianiem koryt?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(2 kwietnia 2014 r.)

1. Komisja nie posiada informacji na temat potencjalnych kwot środków UE przyznanych przez Polskę na projekty mające na celu zapobieganie powodziom, które mogłyby być niezgodne z przepisami UE. Polskie władze przeprowadzają obecnie taką ocenę na wniosek Komisji.

2. Komisja i polskie władze współpracują w celu wznowienia współfinansowania projektów na rzecz zapobiegania powodziom. Ramowa dyrektywa wodna (RDW) jest jednym z najbardziej ambitnych i kompleksowych aktów prawodawstwa UE, a jej transpozycja jest trudnym zadaniem dla wielu państw członkowskich UE. Dlatego Komisja uważnie śledzi proces przyjęcia w Polsce nowej ustawy Prawo wodne.

3. Istnieje możliwość, że w wyniku inwestycji zmierzających do zapobiegania powodziom nastąpi wzrost zagrożenia powodziowego, a mianowicie w przypadku gdy dana inwestycja nie będzie opierać się na planowaniu strategicznym obszaru dorzecza (ocena ryzyka powodziowego, mapowanie i planowanie przestrzenne). Nieprzemyślane inwestycje mające na celu zapobieganie powodziom mogą zwiększać ryzyko powodziowe w innych częściach dorzecza np. na dolnych odcinkach rzek.

4. Prace pogłębiarskie mogą poważnie wpływać na morfologię dna rzek i stref nadbrzeżnych i w związku z tym na florę i faunę ekosystemu wodnego, a tym samym na stan ekologiczny części wód ([1]). Zgody na jakąkolwiek fizyczną modyfikację zbiorników wodnych, która może powodować pogorszenie stanu ekologicznego, można udzielić jedynie w przypadku, gdy spełnione są warunki określone w art. 4 ust. 7 ramowej dyrektywy wodnej, między innymi warunek zakładający, że dane rozwiązanie stanowi najlepszy wariant środowiskowy służący do osiągnięcia zamierzonego celu.

([1]) Zobacz wykaz elementów jakości określonych w definicji stanu ekologicznego zawarty w załączniku V do ramowej dyrektywy wodnej.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001679/14
to the Commission
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Poland at risk of losing EU flood prevention funding

Reports in the Polish media suggest that the flood prevention funding granted to Poland is seriously under threat. The amount involved is said to be in excess of one and a half billion złoty. The reason given is that funding is not being used in accordance with the Water Framework Directive. Those familiar with the issue think that flood prevention measures in Poland primarily consist of dredging to make rivers deeper, which, apparently, not only fails to minimise the threat of flooding but also has an adverse effect on water quality, putting living organisms (including valuable fish) at risk. The Commission has brought an action against Poland on this issue before the European Court of Justice and issued a reasoned opinion which could result in the funding being blocked.

With this in mind:

1. To what extent, in the Commission's view, have the Polish authorities allocated funding in a way that is not in line with EU rules?

2. Are Polish Government representatives working with the relevant European institutions with a view to reaching an agreement to ensure the continued financing of flood prevention projects?

3. Does the Commission take the view that the risk of flooding might increase as a result of poor flood prevention investments?

4. In the opinion of EU experts, what consequences can dredging work have on the flora and fauna of Poland's rivers?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

1. The Commission does not yet have information on the potential amounts of EU funding allocated by Poland to flood prevention projects which might be not compliant with EU legislation. The Polish authorities are currently carrying out such an assessment at the Commission's request.

2. The Commission and Polish authorities are cooperating in order to resume co-financing of flood prevention projects. The Water Framework Directive (WFD) is one of the most ambitious and comprehensive pieces of EU legislation and its transposition is a challenging task for several EU Member States. The Commission is therefore closely following the adoption process of the new Water Law in Poland.

3. It is possible that flood risk increases as a result of flood prevention investments, when the investments are not based on river basin strategic planning (flood risk assessment, mapping and planning). Ill-conceived flood prevention investment can increase flood risk in other parts of the river basin eg downstream.

4. Dredging can severely affect the morphology of river beds and the riparian area and can therefore impact on the flora and fauna of the aquatic ecosystem and hence on the ecological status of the water body ([1]). Any physical modification of water bodies which is liable to cause deterioration of ecological status can only be authorised if the conditions of Article 4(7) of the WFD are fulfilled, among others that there is no better environmental option to achieve the intended objective.

([1]) see Water Framework Directive Annex V for the list of quality elements included in the definition of ecological status.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001682/14
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(14 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – W związku z dyskryminacją pracowników fabryk odzieżowych w Kambodży

Władze Kambodży dopuszczają się poważnych naruszeń praw człowieka, podejmując działania przeciwko pracownikom sektora odzieżowego. Organizacje monitorujące sytuację zatrudnionych zwracają uwagę na przypadki zastraszania, dyskryminacji polegającej na nieuzasadnionym zwalnianiu bądź nieprzedłużaniu umów czasowych, a nawet stosowanie przemocy fizycznej. Działania te mają na celu torpedowanie prób zakładania związków zawodowych oraz zwalczanie już funkcjonujących. Sytuacja jest o tyle przykra, że zrzeszający ok. 650 tys. pracowników przemysł odzieżowy Kambodży dostarcza produktów znanym światowym, w tym również europejskim (jak H&M) markom.

W trosce o bezpieczeństwo pracowników oraz konieczność zagwarantowania ich praw zwracam się do Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel z następującymi pytaniami:

1. Czy i jakie działania za pośrednictwem europejskiej dyplomacji podejmowane są (bądź były) względem władz w Phnom Penh, w celu wywarcia nacisku prowadzącego do zaprzestania dyskryminacyjnych praktyk?

2. Czy europejskie przedsiębiorstwa wytwarzające produkty w Kambodży podejmują własne, bądź we współpracy z instytucjami europejskimi, działania na rzecz poprawy sytuacji pracowników przemysłu tekstylnego w tym państwie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(24 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca odsyła Szanownego Pana Posła do odpowiedzi na pytania pisemne P-113/2014 oraz E-313/2014. Należy dodać, że kwestie, do których odnosi się zapytanie, zostaną poruszone podczas 8. posiedzenia wspólnego komitetu UE-Kambodża, jak również podczas posiedzeń jego trzech powiązanych podgrup: ds. współpracy na rzecz rozwoju, handlu i rozwoju instytucjonalnego, ds. reformy administracyjnej, reformy systemu prawnego i sądownictwa, a także ds. praworządności i praw człowieka.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001682/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Discrimination against workers in garment factories in Cambodia

The Cambodian authorities are engaged in serious human rights violations against workers in the garment sector. Organisations monitoring the situation of workers are highlighting instances of intimidation, discrimination in the form of unfair dismissal or refusal to extend temporary contracts, and even the use of physical violence. These actions are aimed at torpedoing efforts to form new trade unions and combating existing ones. The situation is all the more regrettable as, with around 650 000 workers, the Cambodian garment industry provides products to well-known global and European brands such as H&M.

In the interest of workers' safety and the need to ensure their rights, I would like to ask the Vice-President/High Representative the following:

1. Is the European diplomatic service taking any action — or does it plan to do so — vis-à-vis the authorities in Phnom Penh to bring the discriminatory practices to an end?

2. Are European companies which make products in Cambodia taking action, alone or in cooperation with the European institutions, aimed at improving the situation of textile industry workers there?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2014)

The HR/VP kindly refers the Honourable Member to the replies to written questions P-113/2014 and E-313/2014. It should be added that the issues in question will be addressed during the 8th EU-Cambodia Joint Committee, as well as its three related subgroups on Development Cooperation, Trade and Institution Building, Administrative Reform, Legal and Judicial Reform, Governance and Human Rights.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001684/14
do Komisji
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(14 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: W sprawie nowego przewodnika po programie Erasmus

Jednym z mechanizmów integracji obywateli krajów Wspólnoty jest program edukacyjny Erasmus. O jego sukcesie świadczy choćby to, że na dofinansowanie w jego ramach różnych organizacji w bieżącym roku Komisja planuje przeznaczyć 1,8 mld EUR. Erasmus ma połączyć pod jednym szyldem dotychczasowe programy edukacyjne, szkoleniowe, sportowe oraz kierowane bezpośrednio do młodzieży. Jest to bardzo ambitny cel, który wymaga precyzyjnych i zrozumiałych informacji dla obywateli. Tymczasem opracowany przez Komisję przewodnik po programie Erasmus opublikowany został wyłącznie w języku angielskim.

W związku z powyższym chciałbym zapytać, czy planowane jest oficjalne tłumaczenie przewodnika na pozostałe języki urzędowe Unii Europejskiej oraz w jakim czasie to nastąpi? Proszę również o informację, czy decyzja o publikacji wyłącznie w jednym języku podyktowana była chęcią jak najszybszego udostępnienia zasad programu obywatelom, czy też wynika z zaniedbań, bądź innych pobudek.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Androullę Vassiliou w imieniu Komisji
(7 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Komisja uprzejmie prosi szanownego Pana Posła o zapoznanie się z odpowiedzią udzieloną na pytania wymagające odpowiedzi na piśmie o numerach: E-000509/2014; E-000550/2014; P-000721/2014; E-000916/2014; E-001179/2014; E-001532/2014; P-002468/2014 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001684/14
to the Commission
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: New Erasmus programme guide

The Erasmus education programme is one of the integration mechanisms available to EU citizens. Its success is evident from the fact that this year the Commission is planning to allocate EUR 1.8 billion towards the funding of various organisations under the programme. Erasmus will link together current educational, training and sports programmes and those aimed directly at young people under a common framework. This is a very ambitious goal, one which calls for precise, comprehensible information to be made available to citizens. However, the Commission has produced an Erasmus programme guide which has been published only in English.

Are there plans to translate the guide into the other official EU languages at any time in the future? Would the Commission also please state whether the decision to publish the guide in only one language was based on a desire for information on the programme to be available to citizens as quickly as possible, or whether it was a result of neglect or happened for some other reason?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written questions E-000509/2014; E-000550/2014; P-000721/2014; E-000916/2014; E-001179/2014; E-001532/2014; P-002468/2014 ([1]).

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

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor P-001687/14
upućeno Komisiji
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(14. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Financijska pomoć EU-a za velike štete prouzročene poplavama u Hrvatskoj

Nakon vremenskih nepogoda uzrokovanih snijegom i ledom, Hrvatsku su proteklih dana zahvatile obilne kiše koje su uzrokovale poplave i materijalnu štetu diljem zemlje. Najkritičnije je u Zagrebačkoj, Sisačko-moslavačkoj, Karlovačkoj i Ličko-senjskoj županiji, što ne znači da u drugim županijama nije bilo štete prouzročene ovom prirodnom katastrofom. Poplavljene su stotine kuća diljem Hrvatske, a vodostaji rijeka u Hrvatskoj i dalje su iznimno visoki te je npr. Kupa s 824 cm dosegla svoj najviši vodostaj u posljednjih 40 godina. Zbog opasnosti od poplava pripadnici Oružanih snaga RH stigli su u Letovanić i pomažu stanovnicima čiji su domovi ugroženi. Karlovački župan Ivan Vučić danas je proglasio elementarnu nepogodu za područje grada Karlovca i općine Vojnić zbog nastalih materijalnih šteta uzrokovanih poplavama.

Može li se Komisija izjasniti:

1. Na koju pomoć može računati Hrvatska za popravljanje oštećenih zgrada i javne infrastrukture te oporavak područja koja su zahvatile poplave, a sve u cilju osiguranja sigurnosti građana te osnovnih uvjeta za život?

2. Mogu li se sredstva Europskog fonda za solidarnost putem tijela Vlade RH iskoristiti za sanaciju poplavljenih područja i mogu li stanovnici pogođenih područja računati na promptno djelovanje institucija EU-a?

3. Koji se drugi izvori financiranja mogu iskoristiti kako bi se uništena infrastruktura mogla sanirati?

4. Postoje li sredstva u proračunu EU-a koja bi jedinice lokalne samouprave mogle koristiti za prevenciju ovakvih katastrofa s ciljem izgradnje nasipa i sustava za odvodnju?

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-001696/14
upućeno Komisiji
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(14. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Financijska pomoć EU-a za velike štete prouzročene vremenskim neprilikama u Gorskom kotaru

Ekstremno niske temperature, led i snijeg uzrokovali su milijunske štete u Gorskom kotaru prije nekoliko dana kada su tisuće kućanstava ostale bez opskrbe električnom energijom. Taj dio Hrvatske bio je okovan ledom, a oštećeni su dalekovodi, obiteljski nasadi, niskonaponska mreža i šume. Budući da se gospodarstvo ovog kraja temelji na drvnoj industriji, nastala šteta je velika. Vrtići i škole bili su također zatvoreni. Situacija se trenutno normalizira te se Gorski kotar oporavlja od posljedica prirodne katastrofe. Još uvijek se radi na uspostavi prometa, cjelovite opskrbe električnom energijom i telekomunikacijskim vezama. Zbog velike štete uzrokovane ledom, snijegom i niskim temperaturama župani Primorsko-goranske i Karlovačke županije proglasili su elementarnu nepogodu za određena područja. Razmjer katastrofe najbolje se potvrđuje time da je potrebno sanirati gotovo cijelu elektromrežu Gorskog kotara. Sanacija će trajati mjesecima, dok će za obnovu šuma biti potrebno i više desetljeća.

Može li se Komisija izjasniti:

1. Na koju pomoć može računati Hrvatska za sanaciju oštećenih dalekovoda, niskonaponskih mreža, obiteljskih nasada i šuma na područjima koja su zahvatili hladnoća, led i snijeg, a sve u cilju osiguranja sigurnosti građana te osnovnih uvjeta za život?

2. Mogu li se sredstva Europskog fonda za solidarnost putem tijela Vlade RH iskoristiti za sanaciju stradalih područja i mogu li stanovnici pogođenih područja računati na promptno djelovanje institucija EU-a?

3. Koji se drugi izvori financiranja mogu koristiti za sanaciju uništene infrastrukture i šuma u Gorskom kotaru?

Odgovor g. Hahna u ime Komisije

(3. travnja 2014.)

1. Mjere oporavka i obnavljanja nakon kriznih situacija mogle bi u razdoblju od 2014. do 2020. biti prihvatljive za sufinanciranje iz europskih strukturnih i investicijskih fondova. Hrvatska mora u skladu s primjenjivim pravilima EU-a procjenom rizika prirodnih katastrofa i katastrofa izazvanih djelovanjem čovjeka utvrditi prioritete za navedeno sufinanciranje. Očekuje se da će hrvatska nadležna tijela procjenu rizika dovršiti do kraja 2015. To znači da bi se u praksi sufinanciranje iz europskih strukturnih i investicijskih fondova u tom području moglo osigurati tek nakon 2015.

2. Samo na temelju zahtjeva koji hrvatska nadležna tijela moraju podnijeti u roku od deset tjedana od prve štete može se procijeniti bi li Fond solidarnosti EU-a mogao intervenirati da se šteta nadoknadi. Hrvatska nadležna tijela najavila su da razmatraju podnošenje navedenog zahtjeva. Komisija je u kontaktu s hrvatskim nadležnim tijelima te pruža smjernice i savjete za pripremu zahtjeva.

3. Izvori financiranja navode se u prvom i drugom odgovoru.

4. Izgradnja nasipa i sustava odvodnje mogla bi se poduprijeti iz europskih strukturnih i investicijskih fondova. U tu je svrhu potrebno imati strategiju navedenu u odgovoru na prvo pitanje. Ako Hrvatska namjerava ulagati prije dovršetka strategije, prioriteti ulaganja, njihovi očekivani rezultati i pokazatelji morali bi u okviru programa biti dobro definirani i opravdani na temelju analize rizika od poplava kako bi se kasnije mogli smatrati prihvatljivima za financiranje iz sredstava EU-a.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001687/14
to the Commission
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: EU financial aid to repair extensive flood damage in Croatia

After suffering severe weather in the shape of snow and ice, Croatia has in recent days been affected by heavy rain, which has led to flooding and material damage all over the country. The situation is most critical in the counties of Zagreb, Sisak-Moslavina, Karlovac, and Lika-Senj, but that does not mean that other counties have not been damaged by this natural disaster. Hundreds of houses are flooded in every part of Croatia, and river levels in Croatia and beyond are exceptionally high: the Kupa, for example, has risen to 824 cm, its highest level in the last 40 years. Because of the danger of flooding, members of the Croatian armed forces have gone to Letovanić, where they are helping residents whose homes are threatened. The neighbourhood of the city of Karlovac and the municipality of Vojnić have been declared disaster areas by the Karlovac County Prefect, Ivan Vučić, on account of the material damage caused by the flooding.

1. What sort of aid can Croatia expect to help it repair damaged buildings and public infrastructure and carry out the necessary recovery operations in areas affected by flooding so as to guarantee public safety and basic living conditions?

2. Could money from the European Solidarity Fund, channelled through Croatian government agencies, be used to clean up flooded areas? Can the inhabitants of the damaged areas expect swift action by the EU institutions?

3. What other sources of funding could be used to reconstruct demolished infrastructure?

4. Could funding be provided under the EU budget to help local authorities prevent disasters of this kind by building dykes and drainage systems?

Question for written answer E-001696/14
to the Commission
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: EU financial aid to repair serious damage caused by bad weather in Gorski Kotar

Extremely low temperatures, ice, and snow have caused damage amounting to millions in Gorski Kotar; a few days ago thousands of households were left without electricity. This part of Croatia was ice-bound, and power transmission lines, family plantations, the low-voltage network, and forests have been damaged. Given that the regional economy is based on the timber and wood industry, the damage is severe. Crèches and schools have also been closed. The situation has for the time being returned to normal, and Gorski Kotar is recovering from the consequences of the natural disaster. Work is still continuing in order to restore transport services, a full power supply, and unbroken telecommunications links. Because of the extensive damage caused by ice, snow, and low temperatures, the Primorje-Gorski Kotar and Karlovac county prefects have declared certain parts of their territory a disaster area. The scale of the disaster is best illustrated by the fact that practically the whole of the Gorski Kotar electricity grid needs repairing. The repairs will take months, but it will be several decades before woodlands have regenerated.

1. What kind of aid can Croatia expect to help it repair the damage to power transmission lines, the low-voltage network, family plantations, and forests in the areas stricken by cold, ice, and snow and hence guarantee public safety and basic living conditions?

2. Could money from the European Solidarity Fund, channelled through Croatian government agencies, be used to finance reconstruction in the disaster area? Can the inhabitants of the affected areas expect swift action by the EU institutions?

3. What other sources of funding could be used to rebuild and regenerate the infrastructure and woodlands that have been destroyed in Gorski Kotar?

Joint answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2014)

1. Disaster recovery and rehabilitation actions could be eligible for co-financing from the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds during the 2014-2020 period. In line with the applicable EU rules, the priorities for such co-financing need to be confirmed by the Croatian risk assessment of natural and man-made disasters. The Croation authorities are expected to finalise this risk assessment by end-2015. This means that, in practice, ESI co-financing in this field could only be provided after 2015.

2. Whether the EU Solidarity Fund could intervene to help make good the damage of the disaster can only be assessed on the basis of an application to be submitted by the Croatian authorities within 10 weeks of the occurrence of the first damage. The Croatian authorities have announced that they are considering submitting such an application. The Commission is in contact with the Croatian authorities and is providing guidance and advice for the preparation of the application.

3. The sources of funding are mentioned in replies 1 and 2.

4. The ESI Funds could support building dykes and drainage systems. This requires having in place the strategy referred to in the answer to question 1. If Croatia intends to invest ahead of the finalisation of the strategy, the priorities for investments, their expected outcomes and indicators should be well defined in the programme and justified on the basis of risk analysis of floods in order to be considered eligible for EU funding later on.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001689/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(14 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Sistemas operativos y derechos de los consumidores

Las grandes empresas del ámbito de las tecnologías de la comunicación están cambiando el modelo de negocio y de relación con los usuarios. Hasta ahora los usuarios/consumidores podían mantener sus datos, calendarios, etc. en un servidor local y sincronizarlos en sus diferentes soportes sin problemas. El nuevo sistema operativo de Apple, Mavericks, impide la sincronización de los diferentes soportes informáticos (iPhone o iPad) directamente por medio de un cable y obliga a realizar la sincronización a través de una cuenta iCloud, es decir, en la nube. Microsoft también está caminando hacia ese tipo de prácticas. No impide la sincronización a través de cable en local, pero sus sistemas Windows 8 y 8.1 amedrentan a los usuarios que así lo quieren hacer con un aviso en pantalla que dice: «no recomendado».

Estas prácticas, además de impedir o dificultar la capacidad de elección de los consumidores, presentan problemas de seguridad y privacidad. Por otra parte pueden acarrear un mayor gasto en los servicios de Internet para el usuario, al necesitar éste siempre una conexión a la red para acceder a los propios datos. En cierto sentido, los consumidores pierden el control de sus propios datos.

¿Es consciente la Comisión de este problema?

¿Considera que los derechos de los usuarios están debidamente protegidos en este tipo de prácticas?

¿Cree la Comisión que la libertad de elección de los consumidores/usuarios está garantizada?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de abril de 2014)

La Comisión Europea está al corriente de los cambios en los modelos de negocio de las empresas de programas informáticos a que se refiere Su Señoría.

El Derecho de la UE en materia de protección de los consumidores no impide que las empresas adapten esos modelos, pero exige que se informe debidamente de ello a los consumidores. En efecto, la Directiva 97/7/CE sobre la venta a distancia y la Directiva 2005/29/CE sobre las prácticas comerciales desleales obligan a los comerciantes a facilitar información sobre las principales características de su oferta. La Directiva 2011/83/UE sobre los derechos de los consumidores, que sustituirá a la Directiva 97/7/CE en junio de 2014, requiere específicamente información sobre la funcionalidad y la interoperabilidad de los productos digitales.

Como Su Señoría sabrá seguramente, las cláusulas contractuales abusivas impuestas por el comerciante, en particular en lo que respecta a la posibilidad de hacer cambios unilaterales en el contrato, pueden ser impugnadas en virtud de la Directiva 1993/13/CE sobre las cláusulas abusivas en los contratos.

Los derechos de los consumidores en relación con los productos en la nube se abordan también en la propuesta de normativa común de compraventa europea [COM(2011) 635], que prevé un alto nivel de protección de los consumidores al comprar productos digitales. Además, el Grupo de Expertos en Contratos de Computación en Nube, recientemente creado,tiene por objeto determinar unas cláusulas contractuales seguras y justas para los servicios de computación en nube destinados a los consumidores y las pequeñas empresas, incluidas las salvaguardias de protección de los datos personales.

La Directiva 95/46/CE sobre la protección de datos se aplica al tratamiento de datos personales. Las propuestas en curso de negociación sobre una reforma general del Derecho de la UE en materia de protección de datos [COM(2012) 11, COM(2012) 10] aspira a reforzar en mayor medida los derechos de los ciudadanos en el ámbito digital.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001689/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Operating systems and consumer rights

The big communication technology companies are changing their business model and the form of their relations with users. Until now users/consumers have been able to keep their data, calendars, etc. on a local server and sync them to their devices without problems. With the new Apple operating system, Mavericks, devices (an iPhone or an iPad) cannot be synced directly by cable; instead, syncing has to be done through an iCloud account. Microsoft too is moving towards practices of this kind. It does not prevent local syncing by cable, but, when users wish to do this, its Windows 8 and 8.1 systems scare them by flashing an onscreen warning that it is not recommended.

In addition to ruling out or impeding consumer choice, these practices pose problems as regards security and privacy. They may also, as far as Internet services are concerned, be more expensive for users, who need to be connected at all times in order to access their data. In a way, consumers are losing control over their data.

Is the Commission aware of this problem?

Does it consider that users' rights are properly protected when practices of this type are employed?

Does it believe that consumers/users are being guaranteed freedom of choice?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2014)

The European Commission is aware of the changes in software companies' business models which the Honourable Member refers to.

EC law on consumer protection does not prevent companies from adapting their business models. It requires however that consumers are properly informed. Indeed, Directives 97/7/EC on Distance Selling and 2005/29/EC on Unfair Commercial Practices require traders to provide information on the main characteristics of their offer. Directive 2011/83/EU on Consumer Rights, which will replace Directive 97/7/EC in June 2014, requires specifically information on functionality and interoperability of digital products.

As the Honourable Member might be aware, unfair contract terms imposed by the trader, notably as regards the possibility of making unilateral changes to the contract, can be challenged on the basis of the Unfair Contract Terms Directive 1993/13/EC.

Consumer rights regarding products in the cloud are also addressed in the proposal for a Common European Sales Law (COM(2011) 635), which provides a high level of consumer protection when buying digital products. Furthermore a recently established expert group on Cloud Computing Contracts aims to identify safe and fair contract terms and conditions for cloud computing services for consumers and small firms, including safeguards for the protection of personal data.

When personal data are being processed, Directive 95/46/EC on Data Protection applies. The proposals under negotiation for a comprehensive reform of the EU data protection legislation (COM(2012) 11, COM(2012) 10) aim at further strengthening citizens' rights in the digital area.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001690/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE), Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE), Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE) y Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(14 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Reforma energética del Gobierno español

El pasado mes de julio de 2013, el Gobierno español aprobó un paquete legislativo conocido como la «Reforma energética» ([1]).

Considerado que los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea tienen como objetivo conseguir un 20 % de producción energética mediante energías renovables para el 2020 tal y como contempla la Directiva de Energías Renovables (2009/28/CE);

Considerando que esta reforma se caracteriza por defender y mantener las energías sucias en el sistema energético español, atacar a las energías renovables y dar continuidad a los beneficios económicos de las 5 grandes compañías eléctricas españolas;

Considerando que la reforma elimina el régimen especial de las energías renovables y termina, de forma retroactiva, con el apoyo al desarrollo de las renovables; teniendo en cuenta que beneficia a las tecnologías sucias, dando incentivos como los pagos por disponibilidad y capacidad a las centrales de gas de ciclo combinado de las grandes compañías;

Considerando que dicha reforma penaliza el autoconsumo imponiendo peajes adicionales, incluso en casos de autoconsumo completo de la electricidad producida, cuando no hay ningún uso de la red, medida que hace inviable autoproducir energía en domicilios particulares y que beneficia a los grandes productores;

Considerando que la reforma no se preocupa por terminar con el déficit de tarifa (política recomendada por la UE) ya que no aborda las principales causas de su generación y culpa a las energías renovables de éstos, generando un aumento injusto de la factura eléctrica;

¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre la reforma energética aprobada en España en julio 2013 y sobre las medidas derivadas de la reforma citadas anteriormente? ¿Qué mecanismos tiene la Comisión para garantizar que, por parte de los órganos competentes y responsables, se exige el cumplimiento de la normativa comunitaria relativa a las energías renovables? ¿Piensa actuar la Comisión para asegurar el cumplimiento de la Directiva 2009/28/CE?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de abril de 2014)

La reforma del sistema eléctrico español pretende eliminar el enorme déficit tarifario eléctrico y garantizar la estabilidad financiera del sistema, en consonancia con las recomendaciones específicas para el país y el Programa Nacional de Reformas de España. La reforma tiene el potencial de alcanzar un equilibrio del sistema y prevé aportaciones de todas las principales partes interesadas (productores de electricidad y empresas de distribución, consumidores y Estado).

La Comisión es consciente de que aún no han sido definitivamente aprobados todos los instrumentos jurídicos de la reforma del sector eléctrico, incluido el nuevo régimen de ayudas para los actuales proyectos de energías renovables. Por lo tanto, la Comisión sigue evaluando la compatibilidad jurídica de la reforma del sector eléctrico (Ley 24/2013) con el Derecho de la UE, incluida la Directiva 2009/28/CE, con vistas a estudiar nuevas actuaciones legales de la UE, en caso necesario.

La Comisión ha expresado a las autoridades españolas sus dudas iniciales relativas al nuevo reglamento sobre energía para autoconsumo. En consonancia con el espíritu y las disposiciones de la legislación de la UE, la Comisión cree que el autoconsumo debe fomentarse de un modo rentable y equilibrado, ya que contribuye a reducir las pérdidas de la red, evita las inversiones a largo plazo en nueva capacidad de generación, aumenta el rendimiento energético y contribuye a reducir la dependencia energética del país.

([1]) http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/09/business/energy-environment/renewable-energy-in-spain-is-taking-a-beating.html?_r=0

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001690/14
til Kommissionen
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE), Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE), Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE) og Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(14. februar 2014)

Om: Den spanske regerings energireform

I juli 2013 vedtog den spanske regering en lovgivningspakke, der skulle reformere energisektoren ([1]).

Den Europæiske Unions medlemsstater har sat sig som mål, at 20 % af energiproduktionen skal være baseret på vedvarende energikilder inden 2020, som det er fastlagt i direktivet om anvendelsen af energi fra vedvarende energikilder (2009/28/EF);

Den ovennævnte reform er et udtryk for forsvar og bibeholdelse af de snavsede energiformer i det spanske energisystem, et angreb på de vedvarende energikilder og beskyttelse af Spaniens fem største elektricitetsleverandørers økonomiske fordele.

Reformen eliminerer den særlige ordning for vedvarende energikilder og sætter en stopper for støtten til udvikling af disse energikilder, hvilket er et tilbageskridt. Den gavner de beskidte teknologier, idet den giver incitamenter såsom betaling for leveringsdygtighed og kapacitet til gasfyrede kombinerede kraftværker drevet af store virksomheder.

Reformen straffer også selvforsyning ved at pålægge ekstra afgifter, herunder i tilfælde, hvor al den energi, der produceres, er til eget forbrug, uden at der er nogen forbindelse til nettet. Denne foranstaltning går det økonomisk umuligt for husholdninger at producere deres egen energi, hvilket de store producenter nyder godt af.

Denne reform bestræber sig ikke på at få bugt med tarifunderskuddet (en politik, som EU anbefaler), idet den ikke tager fat på de centrale årsager til dette underskud og skyder skylden på de vedvarende energikilder, hvilket medfører urimeligt høje elektricitetsregninger.

Hvad mener Kommissionen om den reform af energisektoren, som blev vedtaget i Spanien i juli 2013, og om de ovennævnte foranstaltninger, der er afledt af denne reform? Hvilke mekanismer råder Kommissionen over til at sikre, at de relevante kompetente myndigheder overholder EU-bestemmelserne om vedvarende energi? Agter Kommissionen at sikre, at direktiv 2009/28/EF overholdes?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Günther Oettinger
(2. april 2014)

Reformen af det spanske elektricitetssystem skal fjerne det store underskud i forbindelse med elpriserne og sikre systemets finansielle stabilitet i overensstemmelse med de landespecifikke henstillinger og det spanske nationale reformprogram. Reformen kan bidrage til at skabe balance i systemet, idet alle de vigtigste interessenter skal bidrage (elproducenter og distributionsselskaber, forbrugere og staten).

Kommissionen har konstateret, at alle retsakterne i reformplanen for elsektoren endnu ikke er blevet endeligt vedtaget, herunder den nye støtteordning for eksisterende projekter vedrørende vedvarende energi. Derfor har Kommissionen endnu ikke afsluttet sin vurdering af den juridiske overensstemmelse mellem reformplanen for elsektoren (lov 24/2013) og EU-lovgivningen, herunder direktiv 2009/28/EF, med henblik på at se på, om der eventuelt er behov for yderligere EU-retlige foranstaltninger.

Kommissionen har givet udtryk for betænkeligheder over for de spanske myndigheder med hensyn til de nye regler om eget energiforbrug. I overensstemmelse med ånden i EU-lovgivningen mener Kommissionen, at eget forbrug skal fremmes på en omkostningseffektiv og balanceret måde, da det bidrager til at reducere netværkstab, undgå langsigtede investeringer i ny produktionskapacitet, øge energieffektiviteten, og bidrage til at reducere landets energiafhængighed.

([1]) http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/09/business/energy-environment/renewable-energy-in-spain-is-taking-a-beating.html?_r=0.

(Eestikeelne versioon)

Kirjalikult vastatav küsimus E-001690/14
komisjonile
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE), Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE), Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE) ja Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(14. veebruar 2014)

Teema: Hispaania valitsuse energiareform

Hispaania valitsus kiitis 2013. aasta juulis heaks energiareformi nimelise õigusaktide paketi ([1]).

Euroopa Liidu liikmesriikide eesmärk on saavutada 2020. aastaks 20 % energia tootmine taastuvatest energiaallikatest, nagu on sätestatud Euroopa taastuvenergia direktiivis (2009/28/EÜ).

Eespool nimetatud reformi iseloomustab saastava energia kaitsmine ja selle säilitamine Hispaania energiasüsteemis, taastuvenergia ründamine ja Hispaania viie suurema elektrifirma majanduskasu põlistamine.

Reformiga kaotatakse taastuvenergia kohta kehtiv erikord ja lõpetatakse tagasiulatuvalt taastuvenergia arengu toetamine. Reformiga soositakse saastavaid tehnoloogiaid, näiteks kehtestades stiimuleid, nagu suurettevõtjate kombineeritud tsükliga gaasielektrijaamade reservide ja võimsuse eest makstavad subsiidiumid.

Reformiga karistatakse omatarbimise eest, kehtestades sellele täiendavaid makse, kaasa arvatud toodetava elektrienergia täielik omatarbimine, kui puudub igasugune võrgu kasutamine, nii et iseseisev elektritootmine eramajades muutub ebaotstarbekaks ja kasu saavad suurtootjad.

Reformiga ei seata eesmärgiks tariifipuudujäägi lõpetamist (poliitika, mida soovitab Euroopa Liit), kuna ei pöörata tähelepanu selle nähtuse peamistele põhjustele, vaid süüdistatakse selles taastuvenergiat, mis on kaasa toonud elektriarvete ebaõiglase tõusu.

Milline on komisjoni arvamus Hispaanias 2013. aasta juulis heaks kiidetud energiareformi ja eelnimetatud reformist tulenevate meetmete kohta? Milliste mehhanismidega kavatseb komisjon tagada, et pädevad ja vastutavad asutused rakendaksid ühenduse taastuvenergia alaseid norme? Kas komisjon kavatseb võtta meetmeid, et tagada direktiivi 2009/28/EÜ kohaldamine?

Komisjoni nimel vastanud Hr Oettinger
(2. aprill 2014)

Vastavalt riigipõhistele soovitustele ja Hispaania riiklikule reformikavale on Hispaania elektrienergiasüsteemi reformi eesmärk kõrvaldada suur elektrienergia tariifipuudujääk ja tagada süsteemi finantsstabiilsus. Reformiga saaks süsteemi tasakaalustada ja näha ette kõigi peamiste sidusrühmade (elektritootjad ja jaotusettevõtjad, tarbijad ja riik) panused.

Komisjon mõistab, et mitte kõik elektrienergiasektori reformi õiguslikud vahendid (sealhulgas olemasolevate taastuvenergiaprojektide uus toetuskava) ei ole praeguseks lõplikult vastu võetud. Seepärast hindab komisjon jätkuvalt elektrienergiasektori reformi õigusaktide kooskõla (seadus 24/2013) ELi õigusaktidega, sh direktiiviga 2009/28/EÜ, eesmärgiga kaaluda vajaduse korral täiendavaid ELi õiguslikke meetmeid.

Komisjon on avaldanud Hispaania ametiasutustele algseid kahtlusi seoses energia omatarbimist käsitleva uue määrusega. Kooskõlas ELi õigusaktide sätetega on komisjon arvamusel, et omatarbimist tuleks edendada kulutasuvalt ja tasakaalustatult. Omatarbimine aitab vähendada võrgukadusid, vältida pikaajalisi investeeringuid uude tootmisvõimsusse, suurendada energiatõhusust ning vähendada riigi energiasõltuvust.

([1]) http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/09/business/energy-environment/renewable-energy-in-spain-is-taking-a-beating.html?_r=0.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001690/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE), Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE), Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE) και Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(14 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ενεργειακή μεταρρύθμιση της ισπανικής κυβέρνησης

Τον παρελθόντα Ιούλιο του 2013, η ισπανική κυβέρνηση ενέκρινε δέσμη νομοθετικών μέτρων, γνωστή ως «Ενεργειακή Μεταρρύθμιση» ([1]).

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι τα μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στοχεύουν στην επίτευξη της παραγωγής 20% της ενέργειας από ανανεώσιμες πηγές, μέχρι το 2020, όπως προβλέπεται από την οδηγία για τις ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας (2009/28/ΕΚ)·

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι χαρακτηριστικό της μεταρρύθμισης αυτής είναι η υπεράσπιση και διατήρηση ρυπογόνων μορφών ενέργειας που υπάρχουν στο ισπανικό σύστημα ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας, και το χτύπημα των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας, εξασφαλίζοντας τη συνέχιση της παροχής οικονομικών οφελών στις 5 μεγάλες ισπανικές εταιρείες ηλεκτρισμού·

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι η μεταρρύθμιση εξαλείφει το ειδικό καθεστώς για τις ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας και τερματίζει, με αναδρομική ισχύ, τη στήριξη της ανάπτυξης των ανανεώσιμων πηγών· λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι η ρύθμιση αυτή ωφελεί τις ρυπογόνες τεχνολογίες μέσω της παροχής κινήτρων, όπως οι πληρωμές για διαθεσιμότητα και δυναμικότητα των μονάδων φυσικού αερίου συνδυασμένου κύκλου, των μεγάλων επιχειρήσεων·

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι η μεταρρύθμιση αυτή πλήττει την κατανάλωση για ιδία χρήση μέσω της επιβολής πρόσθετων τελών, ακόμη και σε περιπτώσεις κατανάλωσης ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας αποκλειστικά για ίδια χρήση όταν δεν υπάρχει καθόλου χρήση του δικτύου, μέτρο που καθιστά μη βιώσιμη την αυτόνομη παραγωγή ενέργειας σε ιδιωτικές κατοικίες και αυτό προς όφελος μεγάλων παραγωγών·

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι η μεταρρύθμιση δεν αποσκοπεί στον τερματισμό του δασμολογικού ελλείμματος (πολιτική που συνιστάται από την ΕΕ) και ότι δεν αντιμετωπίζει τις βασικές αιτίες της παραγωγής και πλήττει αυτές τις ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας, προξενώντας άδικη αύξηση της τιμής του ρεύματος·

Ποιά είναι η άποψη της Επιτροπής για την ενεργειακή μεταρρύθμιση που εγκρίθηκε στην Ισπανία τον Ιούλιο του 2013 και για τα μέτρα που απορρέουν από την προαναφερθείσα μεταρρύθμιση; Ποιους μηχανισμούς διαθέτει η Επιτροπή για να εξασφαλίσει ότι τα αρμόδια και υπεύθυνα όργανα θα απαιτήσουν την εφαρμογή της κοινοτικής νομοθεσίας για τις ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας; Προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να αναλάβει δράση για να εξασφαλίσει τη συμμόρφωση με την οδηγία 2009/28/ΕΚ;

Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(2 Απριλίου 2014)

Στόχος της μεταρρύθμισης του ισπανικού συστήματος ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας είναι να εξαλειφθεί το μεγάλο έλλειμμα στις τιμές ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας και να διασφαλιστεί η χρηματοοικονομική σταθερότητα του συστήματος, σύμφωνα με τις ειδικές για τη χώρα συστάσεις και το ισπανικό εθνικό πρόγραμμα μεταρρυθμίσεων. Η μεταρρύθμιση είναι δυνατόν να επαναφέρει το σύστημα σε ισορροπία και προβλέπει συνεισφορές από τα κυριότερα ενδιαφερόμενα μέρη (παραγωγοί και εταιρείες διανομής ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας, καταναλωτές και το κράτος).

Εξ όσων γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή, δεν έχουν ακόμη εγκριθεί οριστικά όλα τα νομικά μέσα για τη μεταρρύθμιση του τομέα της ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του νέου καθεστώτος στήριξης των υφιστάμενων έργων στον τομέα της ενέργειας από ανανεώσιμες πηγές. Ως εκ τούτου, η Επιτροπή αξιολογεί ακόμα τη νομική συμβατότητα της μεταρρύθμισης του τομέα της ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας (νόμος 24/2013) με τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ, στην οποία συγκαταλέγεται η οδηγία 2009/28/ΕΚ, με σκοπό να εξετάσει το ενδεχόμενο ανάληψης περαιτέρω νομικών μέτρων από την ΕΕ, αν κριθεί αναγκαίο.

Η Επιτροπή έχει εκφράσει στις ισπανικές αρχές τις αρχικές ανησυχίες της σχετικά με το νέο κανονισμό για την ιδιοκατανάλωση ενέργειας. Σύμφωνα με το πνεύμα και τις διατάξεις της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ, η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι η ιδιοκατανάλωση πρέπει να προωθηθεί με αποτελεσματικό από άποψη κόστους και ισόρροπο τρόπο, καθώς συμβάλλει στη μείωση των απωλειών του δικτύου, στην αποφυγή μακροπρόθεσμων επενδύσεων σε νέα δυναμικότητα ηλεκτροπαραγωγής, στην αύξηση της ενεργειακής απόδοσης και στον περιορισμό της ενεργειακής εξάρτησης της χώρας.

([1]) http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/09/business/energy-environment/renewable-energy-in-spain-is-taking-a-beating.html?_r=0

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001690/14
à la Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE), Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE), Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE) et Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(14 février 2014)

Objet: Réforme du secteur de l'énergie du gouvernement espagnol

En juillet 2013, le gouvernement espagnol a adopté un ensemble de mesures législatives appelé «Réforme énergétique» ([1]).

Les États membres de l'Union européenne se sont fixé comme objectif de parvenir à produire 20 % de leur énergie au moyen d'énergies renouvelables d'ici à 2020, comme le prévoit la directive 2009/28/CE relative aux énergies renouvelables.

Cette réforme se distingue par le fait qu'elle défend et préserve les énergies polluantes dans le système énergétique espagnol, attaque les énergies renouvelables et permet le maintien des avantages économiques des cinq grandes compagnies d'électricité espagnoles.

La réforme abroge le régime spécial des énergies renouvelables et supprime, avec effet rétroactif, l'aide au développement des énergies renouvelables. Elle favorise les technologies polluantes en encourageant, par le biais de subventions versées pour les réserves et les capacités, les centrales mixtes fonctionnant au gaz recyclé des grandes compagnies.

La réforme pénalise l'auto-approvisionnement en imposant des péages supplémentaires, y compris lorsque toute l'électricité produite est consommée à la source sans aucune sollicitation du réseau, rendant inintéressante l'autoproduction d'énergie par les particuliers et favorisant ainsi les grands producteurs.

La réforme n'a pas pour objectif de mettre un terme au déficit tarifaire (politique préconisée par l'Union européenne) car elle n'aborde pas les motifs principaux de ce déficit et les impute aux énergies renouvelables, provoquant une augmentation injuste de la facture électrique.

Que pense la Commission de la réforme du secteur de l'énergie adoptée par l'Espagne en juillet 2013 et des mesures décrites plus haut qui en découlent? Quels mécanismes la Commission peut-elle mettre en œuvre pour exiger des instances compétentes et responsables qu'elles appliquent la directive européenne relative aux énergies renouvelables? La Commission envisage-t-elle d'intervenir pour assurer l'application de la directive 2009/28/CE?

Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission
(2 avril 2014)

La réforme du secteur espagnol de l'électricité vise à mettre un terme à l'important déficit tarifaire et à garantir la stabilité financière du secteur, conformément aux recommandations spécifiques et au programme national de réforme de l'Espagne. La réforme, qui est susceptible de rétablir l'équilibre du secteur, prévoit la participation de toutes les principales parties prenantes (producteurs d'électricité et entreprises de distribution, consommateurs et État).

La Commission croit savoir que les instruments juridiques liés à la réforme du secteur de l'électricité n'ont pas encore tous été définitivement adoptés, notamment le nouveau régime de soutien aux projets existants en matière d'énergies renouvelables. Par conséquent, elle continue d'évaluer la compatibilité juridique de la réforme du secteur de l'électricité (loi 24/2013) avec la législation de l'UE, notamment la directive 2009/28/CE, afin d'envisager, le cas échéant, d'autres mesures juridiques de l'UE.

La Commission a informé les autorités espagnoles de ses préoccupations initiales concernant le nouveau règlement relatif à l'autoconsommation d'énergie. Conformément à l'esprit et aux dispositions de la législation de l'UE, elle estime qu'il y a lieu de promouvoir l'autoconsommation d'une manière qui soit économiquement avantageuse et équilibrée, car elle contribue à réduire les pertes de réseau, à éviter les investissements à long terme dans de nouvelles capacités de production, à augmenter l'efficacité énergétique et à réduire la dépendance énergétique du pays.

([1]) http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/09/business/energy-environment/renewable-energy-in-spain-is-taking-a-beating.html?_r=0.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001690/14
aan de Commissie
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE), Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE), Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE) en Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(14 februari 2014)

Betreft: Energiehervorming van de Spaanse regering

In juli 2013 heeft de Spaanse regering een wetgevingspakket goedgekeurd, de zogenoemde „energiehervorming" ([1]).

Overwegende dat de lidstaten van de Europese Unie zich hebben verbonden aan een streefcijfer van 20 % voor het aandeel energie uit hernieuwbare bronnen in het totale energiegebruik tegen 2020, zoals is neergelegd in de richtlijn hernieuwbare energie (2009/28/EG);

Overwegende dat deze hervorming wordt gekenmerkt door de verdediging en het behoud van vervuilende energie in het Spaanse energiestelsel, alsook door een aanval op hernieuwbare energiebronnen en de voortzetting van de economische voordelen voor de vijf grote Spaanse elektriciteitsbedrijven;

Overwegende dat de hervorming de bijzondere regeling voor hernieuwbare energiebronnen schrapt en met terugwerkende kracht een einde maakt aan de ondersteuning van de ontwikkeling van hernieuwbare energiebronnen, gezien het feit dat de hervorming ten goede komt aan vervuilende technologieën door de inzet van stimuli, zoals beschikbaarheids- en capaciteitsbetalingen voor de gascentrales met gecombineerde cyclus van de grote bedrijven;

Overwegende dat deze hervorming zelfbevoorrading bestraft door aanvullende heffingen op te leggen, zelfs wanneer de geproduceerde elektriciteit volledig voor eigen gebruik dient, als er geen enkel gebruik van het netwerk wordt gemaakt: een maatregel die het onmogelijk maakt voor particuliere huishoudens om zelf energie te produceren en die de grote producenten begunstigt;

Overwegende dat de hervorming niet tot doel heeft een einde te maken aan het tarieftekort (een door de EU aanbevolen beleidsmaatregel), aangezien in de hervorming de belangrijkste oorzaken van het ontstaan van dit tekort niet worden aangepakt en de hernieuwbare energiebronnen de schuld krijgen van dit fenomeen, hetgeen een onrechtvaardige verhoging van de elektriciteitsrekening tot gevolg heeft;

Wat denkt de Commissie van de in juli 2013 in Spanje goedgekeurde energiehervorming en van bovengenoemde maatregelen die voortvloeien uit de hervorming? Over welke mechanismen beschikt de Commissie om ervoor te zorgen dat de bevoegde en verantwoordelijke organen ertoe worden verplicht de communautaire regelgeving met betrekking tot hernieuwbare energie na te leven? Is de Commissie van plan stappen te ondernemen om ervoor te zorgen dat Richtlijn 2009/28/EG wordt nageleefd?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(2 april 2014)

De hervorming van het Spaanse elektriciteitsstelsel heeft tot doel om een einde te maken aan het grote tekort dat samenhangt met de elektriciteitstarieven en om de financiële stabiliteit van het stelsel te waarborgen, in overeenstemming met de landspecifieke aanbevelingen en het Spaanse nationale hervormingsprogramma. Door middel van de hervorming, waartoe al de voornaamste belanghebbenden (elektriciteitsproducenten, distributiebedrijven, consumenten en de staat) zullen bijdragen, kan het stelsel opnieuw in evenwicht worden gebracht.

De Commissie begrijpt dat nog niet alle juridische instrumenten van de hervorming van de elektriciteitssector definitief zijn vastgesteld, waaronder de nieuwe steunregeling voor bestaande projecten op het gebied van hernieuwbare energie. Daarom onderzoekt de Commissie momenteel de juridische verenigbaarheid van de hervorming van de elektriciteitssector (wet 24/2013) met de betrokken EU-wetgeving, met inbegrip van Richtlijn 2009/28/EG, met het oog op eventuele verdere juridische stappen door de EU.

De Commissie heeft aan de Spaanse autoriteiten haar bezorgdheid meegedeeld over de nieuwe wetgeving inzake energieproductie voor eigen verbruik. In overeenstemming met de geest en de bepalingen van de EU-wetgeving, is de Commissie van mening dat energieproductie voor eigen verbruik op een kosteneffectieve en evenwichtige wijze moet worden bevorderd, aangezien het bijdraagt tot de vermindering van netverliezen, het voorkomen van langdurige investeringen in nieuwe productiecapaciteit, het verhogen van de energie-efficiëntie en de grotere energie-onafhankelijkheid van een lidstaat.

([1]) http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/09/business/energy-environment/renewable-energy-in-spain-is-taking-a-beating.html?_r=0

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001690/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE), Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE), Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE), Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE) and Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Spanish Government's energy sector reforms

In July 2013 the Spanish Government approved a legislative package to reform the country's energy sector ([1]).

The EU Member States have set themselves the target of generating 20% of their energy from renewable sources by 2020, as envisaged in the Renewable Energy Directive (2009/28/EC).

The above-mentioned reform effectively defends and perpetuates the use of dirty forms of energy in the Spanish system, undermines renewable energies and shores up the already strong economic position of Spain's five biggest electricity providers.

The reform does away with the special arrangements for renewable energies and retroactively puts an end to support for the development of these energies. It benefits dirty technologies by providing incentives such as availability and capacity payments to combined cycle gas power stations operated by the large firms.

The reform also penalises self-supply by imposing additional charges, including in cases where the totality of the power generated is consumed at source without first being fed into the grid. This measure makes it financially unviable for individual households to produce their own energy, playing into the hands of large producers.

The reform does nothing to address the tariff deficit (a policy advocated by the EU) or its root causes, and instead penalises households which produce renewable energy by pushing up their electricity bills unfairly.

What view does the Commission take on the energy sector reforms approved by Spain in July 2013 and the aforementioned measures stemming from them? What mechanisms does the Commission have at its disposal to ensure that the relevant competent authorities comply with EU rules on renewable energies? Does it intend to take action to ensure compliance with Directive 2009/28/EC?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

The reform of the Spanish electricity system aims to eliminate the large electricity tariff deficit and to ensure the financial stability of the system, in line with the country specific recommendations and the Spanish National Reform Programme. The reform has the potential to bring the system into equilibrium and foresees contributions from all the main stakeholders (electricity producers and distribution companies, consumers and the state).

The Commission understands that not all legal instruments of the electricity sector reform have yet been finally adopted, including the new support scheme for existing renewable energy projects. Therefore the Commission is still assessing the legal compatibility of the electricity sector reform (Act 24/2013) with EU legislation, including Directive 2009/28/EC, with a view to consider further EU legal action if necessary.

The Commission has expressed to the Spanish authorities initial concerns regarding the new regulation on energy self-consumption. In line with the spirit and provisions of EU legislation, the Commission believes that self-consumption should be promoted in a cost-effective and balanced way, as it contributes to reducing network losses, avoiding long term investments in new generation capacity, increasing energy efficiency, and contributing to reducing the country's energy dependency.

([1]) http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/09/business/energy-environment/renewable-energy-in-spain-is-taking-a-beating.html?_r=0

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001693/14
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Indirect land use change (ILUC) of biofuels

On 9 September 2013, two days prior to the plenary vote on Parliament's Indirect Land Use Change Report (ILUC — the biofuels dossier), an email was sent to MEPs and advisors in the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety Committee and the Industry, Research and Energy Committees by a member of Commissioner Hedegaard's cabinet, co-signed by a member of Commissioner Oettinger's cabinet. The email contained several unpublished ILUC studies carried out by the Commission's Joint Research Centre. The email was claimed to have been sent 'given the interest' from MEPs involved in the ILUC file negotiations. Based on the content of that email, I wish to ask the following questions.

1. Given that the email sent by Commissioner Hedegaard's cabinet clearly states that 'changes to the text [of the studies] might still occur', and given that the studies were not agreed within the Commission, does the Commission agree that providing such unfinished reports to MEPs is inappropriate?

2. As the unfinished JRC studies 'do not represent the official views of the Commission', does the Commission believe that it is appropriate to send emails to MEPs with information that does not represent the official views of the Commission? Also, does the Commission believe that leaking such unfinished studies to aid the political objectives of Commission services damages the reputation of the JRC and undermines Parliament's independence?

3. Has the Commission launched an investigation into these actions and/or any disciplinary procedures against those JRC staff members who were found to have deliberately leaked these unfinished studies to the various Commission services, including those in Commissioner Hedegaard's cabinet?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

The Commission received a request from Members of the European Parliament on 5 September 2013 to provide details of a draft report of the Joint Research Centre (JRC) which included the most recent sensitivity analysis on the estimated greenhouse gas emissions from indirect land use change (ILUC) conducted by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). This request was made to the Commission ahead of the report's formal publication in order to inform the Parliament's deliberations on the ILUC proposal.

It is the Commission's institutional obligation to ensure that the co-legislators are fully informed. Commissioners Hedegaard and Oettinger found it appropriate to forward the draft report not only to the requestors of such information but also to other MEPs and advisors in the ENVI and ITRE Committees.

The report was distributed with the caveat that changes to the text might still occur given its draft form. In order to highlight the JRC's role to provide independent, evidence-based scientific and technical support to the EU institutions to inform policy decisions, JRC reports are often published with the caveat that they do not necessarily represent the Commission's views.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001694/14
do Komisji
Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D)
(14 lutego 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Pracownicy Komisji nadzorujący handel UE-Szwajcaria

Unia Europejska jest głównym partnerem handlowym Szwajcarii; w 2012 r. wartość obustronnego handlu towarów wyniosła ok. 230 mld EUR, a wartość handlu usługami kolejne 130 mld EUR.

Ze względu na ekonomiczne znaczenie, jakie mają stosunki między UE a Szwajcarią, zwracam się do Komisji z następującymi pytaniami:

1. Ilu pracowników zatrudnionych na pełny etat nadzoruje codzienne funkcjonowanie dwustronnych umów o handlu zawartych między UE a Szwajcarią? Jak ma się liczba tych pracowników do liczby personelu nadzorującego codzienne funkcjonowanie umów o handlu zawartych między UE a pozostałymi członkami Europejskiego Obszaru Gospodarczego (EOG)?

2. Czy Komisja uważa, że taka liczba personelu jest wystarczająca? Jeżeli nie, to czy istnieją plany zwiększenia w przyszłości liczby personelu Komisji zajmującego się dwustronnymi stosunkami handlowymi z państwami EOG?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(4 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Zarządzanie dwustronnymi umowami handlowymi pomiędzy UE a Szwajcarią i UE a państwami EFTA należącymi do EOG jest odpowiedzialnością dzieloną pomiędzy ESDZ i służbami Komisji Europejskiej. Obecnie jest kilkunastu urzędników, którzy poza innymi obowiązkami zajmują się jednocześnie umowami o handlu z państwami EOG-EFTA i Szwajcarią. Ponadto czasami w taką pracę angażowani są inni urzędnicy, tacy jak bezpośredni przełożeni, prawnicy oraz pracownicy zapewniający specjalistyczną wiedzę techniczną lub pracownicy odpowiedzialni za szereg tematów specjalistycznych (np. oznaczenia geograficzne, produkcja ekologiczna, owoce i warzywa, wino i napoje spirytusowe).

Jak dotychczas służby, którym przydzielono zarządzanie umowami, z powodzeniem gwarantują prawidłowe wdrażanie tych umów. Obecnie nie planuje się zwiększenia liczby personelu zarządzającego dwustronnymi stosunkami handlowymi UE ze Szwajcarią i państwami EOG-EFTA.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001694/14
to the Commission
Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Commission employees supervising EU-Switzerland trade

The EU is Switzerland's main trading partner; in 2012 bilateral trade in goods was worth roughly EUR 230 billion and trade in services another EUR 130 billion.

Given the importance of the economic relations between the EU and Switzerland, I ask the Commission:

1. how many full-time employees see to the day-to-day running of the bilateral trade agreements between the EU and Switzerland? How does this figure compare to the number of staff members who see to the day-to-day running of the trade agreements between the EU and the other members of the European Economic Area (EEA)?

2. does the Commission consider the staff allocation to be sufficient? If not, are there plans to increase the number of Commission personnel managing EU bilateral trade relations with EEA countries in the future?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

The management of the bilateral trade agreements between the EU and Switzerland and the EU and the EEA EFTA States is a shared responsibility between the EEAS and the European Commission Services. There is approximately a dozen of officials dealing amongst other commitments equally with EEA EFTA and Switzerland trade related agreements. In addition, a number of other officials, such as line managers, legal officers as well as staff providing technical expertise or responsible for a number of specific subjects (e.g. geographical indications, organic production, fruits and vegetables, wine and spirit drinks) are occasionally involved.

Until now, the services allocated to the management of the agreements have succeeded in ensuring the correct implementation of those same agreements. There are currently no plans to increase the number of personnel managing EU bilateral trade relations with Switzerland and the EEA EFTA Countries.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001698/14
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(14 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Restricciones a la libertad de circulación de personas. Iniciativa de Suiza y de algunos Estados miembros de la UE

Recientemente, los ciudadanos suizos decidieron en referéndum imponer cuotas de entrada a los extranjeros, lo que afectará directamente a los ciudadanos europeos que deseen vivir y trabajar en Suiza. La introducción de un sistema de cupos permitirá, además, limitar el derecho a los beneficios sociales y a la reagrupación familiar de los europeos.

La Unión Europea y Suiza han firmado a los largo de los últimos años acuerdos bilaterales que cubren diversas áreas, entre ellas, su pertenencia al espacio Schengen de libre circulación. La Comisión Europea ha reaccionado con contundencia, expresando su preocupación y avisando que «examinará las implicaciones que tiene esta iniciativa en el conjunto de las relaciones entre la UE y Suiza». El estupor y la desconfianza política del Ejecutivo comunitario se ha trasladado a los Estados miembros, quienes se han apresurado a denunciar, como es cierto, que el incumplimiento de los acuerdos bilaterales repercutirá negativamente, no solo a nivel económico, sino también en materia de educación o de I+D+i.

Es inevitable observar el paralelismo que existe entre la respuesta dada por los ciudadanos suizos y las iniciativas anunciadas por algunos países de la Unión para controlar la entrada de ciudadanos europeos de determinada nacionalidad en sus territorios (E-000085/2014). La reacción del resto de Estados miembros y de la propia UE no fue tan contundente al conocerse unas iniciativas que podrían menoscabar el concepto de ciudadanía europea.

Por todo ello, pregunto a esta Comisión,

1. ¿Tiene previsto impulsar algún tipo de iniciativa concreta para hacer valer el contenido de los acuerdos bilaterales suscritos con Suiza y evitar mayores perjuicios para la UE?

2. ¿Considera necesario emprender algún tipo de acción para evitar que iniciativas como las anunciadas por algunos Estados miembros, destinadas a obstaculizar la entrada de determinados ciudadanos europeos, impidan la consolidación de la ciudadanía europea?

Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de mayo de 2014)

La votación popular de Suiza, el 9 de febrero, en favor de la introducción de límites cuantitativos anuales a la «inmigración», añadió directamente nuevas disposiciones a la Constitución de Suiza, lo que podría tener graves consecuencias en las relaciones entre dicho país y la Unión Europea. Sin embargo, el nuevo artículo solo surtirá efecto una vez se adopte la legislación de aplicación necesaria en un plazo de tres años a partir de la aceptación de la iniciativa. Entretanto, la UE y Suiza siguen vinculadas por los acuerdos que celebraron, incluida la asociación de Suiza al espacio Schengen, y la Comisión Europea seguirá garantizando la correcta aplicación de los acuerdos bilaterales existentes. La Comisión también ha manifestado claramente, en respuesta a los resultados del referéndum, que el principio de libre circulación, en cuanto elemento esencial de las cuatro libertades de la UE, no es negociable.

En lo referente a la defensa del derecho de los ciudadanos de la UE, desde un punto de vista más general, a circular y residir libremente en los Estados miembros de la UE, la Comisión reafirmó recientemente su importancia y beneficios en su Comunicación de 25 de noviembre de 2013 titulada «Libre circulación de los ciudadanos de la UE y de sus familias: cinco medidas clave» ([1]).

Además, la Comisión ha seguido una política de aplicación rigurosa a fin de alcanzar la plena y correcta transposición y aplicación en toda la Unión Europea de las normas de la UE en materia de libre circulación. Como consecuencia de los procedimientos de infracción iniciados en los últimos años, la mayoría de los Estados miembros han adoptado, o se han comprometido a hacerlo pronto, las disposiciones necesarias para la plena y correcta transposición de las normas sobre libre circulación de la UE. La Comisión no dudará en proseguir su acción para defender este derecho fundamental de los ciudadanos de la UE siempre que sea necesario.

([1]) Libre circulación de los ciudadanos de la UE y de sus familias: cinco medidas clave, COM(2013) 837 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001698/14
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Restrictions on freedom of movement of persons: initiatives taken by Switzerland and some EU Member States

Swiss citizens have voted recently in a referendum to impose entry quotas on foreigners, something that will have a direct effect on EU citizens who want to live and work in Switzerland. The introduction of a quota system will, moreover, allow restrictions to be placed on the rights of Europeans to social security benefits and family reunification.

The European Union and Switzerland have signed bilateral agreements covering a variety of fields in recent years. These include Switzerland's membership of the Schengen area of free movement. The Commission did not mince its words in its reaction to the news, speaking of its concern and warning that 'it will examine the implications of this initiative on EU-Swiss relations as a whole'. The amazement and political misgivings felt by the Commission have been echoed by the Member States, which rushed to condemn the fact, of which there can be no doubt, that breaching the bilateral agreements will not just have an adverse effect at economic level, but also on education or RDI.

Parallels will inevitably be drawn between this response by Swiss citizens and the moves announced by some EU countries to control the arrival on their territory of EU citizens who are nationals of certain specific countries (E-000085/2014). Neither the remaining Member States nor the EU itself were as severe in their reaction to these moves which could tarnish the concept of EU citizenship.

1. Is the Commission planning to promote a tangible initiative of some kind to ensure that what has been laid down in the bilateral agreements signed with Switzerland is respected and that no further injury is done to the EU?

2. In regard to the moves by some Member States designed to make it difficult for certain specific EU citizens to enter their territory, does the Commission believe action of some kind is needed to ensure such moves do not hinder the growth of a stronger sense of EU citizenship?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(7 May 2014)

The popular vote in Switzerland of 9 February in favour of an introduction of annual quantitative limits to 'immigration' immediately introduced new provisions into the Swiss constitution which potentially have serious consequences for European Union-Switzerland relations. However, the new article only takes effect once the necessary implementing legislation is adopted within a timeframe of three years following acceptance of the initiative. In the meantime, the EU and Switzerland continue to be bound by the agreements they concluded, including Swiss association to Schengen, and the European Commission will continue to ensure proper implementation of the existing bilateral agreements. The Commission has also made clear in response to the outcome of the referendum that the principle of free movement as an essential element of the EU's four freedoms is non-negotiable.

As regards upholding the right of EU citizens to move and reside freely in EU Member States more generally, the Commission recently reaffirmed the importance and the benefits of free movement of EU citizens in its communication of 25 November 2013 on 'Free movement of EU citizens and their families: Five actions to make a difference' ([1]).

The Commission has also been pursuing a rigorous enforcement policy with a view to achieving the full and correct transposition and application of EU free movement rules across the EU. As a result of the infringement proceedings launched in the last few years, most Member States adopted or committed to swiftly adopt the provisions necessary to fully and correctly transpose the EU free movement rules The Commission will not hesitate to further pursue its action to uphold this fundamental right of the EU citizens where necessary.

([1]) Free Movement of EU Citizens and their Families: Five Actions to Make a Difference, COM(2013) 837 final.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001699/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(14 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Entrega de datos personales

Seis de las grandes empresas tecnológicas de servicios en Internet han publicado las cifras de las peticiones de datos de sus usuarios por parte del Gobierno estadounidense, que se han incrementado de manera notable. Esta información generó ayer una protesta ciudadana a través de los distintos cauces que ofrece Internet.

Desde el momento en que se conocieron esas actividades, trasladé a la Vicepresidenta (E-006696/2013) y a la Comisión (E-006729/2013) mi preocupación por que se estuvieran incumpliendo las medidas mínimas de protección de datos establecidas en la legislación europea, con los graves riesgos que ello supondría para las libertades fundamentales de expresión y comunicación.

Por ello, deseo preguntar a la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante:

¿Ha realizado la Vicepresidenta alguna nueva actuación? ¿Sigue existiendo en la Comisión el Grupo de trabajo de alto nivel UE-EE.UU. que me anunció en su respuesta? ¿Ha adoptado alguna medida concreta?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(23 de abril de 2014)

La Comisión remite a su Señoría a su respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-12421/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001699/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Handing over of personal data

Six of the major technology companies providing Internet services have published figures for US Government data requests linked to their users, which have increased considerably. This information immediately generated popular protest across the Web.

When these activities were first revealed, I communicated to the Vice-President/High Representative (E-006696/2013) and the Commission (E-006729/2013) my concern that this could constitute a breach of the minimum safeguards for data protection laid down in European law, with serious consequences for the fundamental right to freedom of expression and communication.

I therefore wish to ask the Vice-President/High Representative:

Has the Vice-President/High Representative taken any further action? Is the high-level EU-US working group on data protection, to which she referred in her reply, still in existence? Has it taken any specific action?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-12421/13.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001700/14
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(14. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Ausschreitungen in Bosnien und Herzegowina

Am Freitag, den 7.2.2014 ist eine Protestwelle gegen Armut, Arbeitslosigkeit und die als korrupt und ineffizient wahrgenommene Politik in Sarajevo in Bosnien eskaliert. Insgesamt standen in drei Städten Regierungsgebäude in Flammen.

Die Arbeitslosenquote in Bosnien liegt bei mehr als 44 Prozent. Nach amtlichen Angaben lebt ein Fünftel der 3,8 Millionen Bosnier in Armut, viele leiden Hunger. In Tuzla, einst ein wichtiger Industriestandort, gingen auch Beschäftigte von privatisierten und pleitegegangenen ehemaligen Staatsbetrieben auf die Straße, die seit Monaten keinen Lohn mehr bekommen haben.

Auf der Homepage des Auswärtigen Dienstes der EU (EEAS) ist zu lesen, dass die Europäische Union (EU) derzeit über zehn Sonderbeauftragte (EUSR) in verschiedenen Ländern und Regionen der Welt verfügt, darunter einen in Bosnien. Des Weiteren heißt es: „Die EUSR dienen der Förderung der Politik und der Interessen der EU in konfliktträchtigen Regionen und Ländern und übernehmen eine aktive Rolle bei den Bemühungen um die Konsolidierung von Frieden, Stabilität und Rechtsstaatlichkeit."

Peter Sørensen wurde am 18. Juli 2011 als Nachfolger des österreichischen Diplomaten Valentin Inzko zum EU-Sonderbeauftragten in Bosnien und Herzegowina ernannt. Sein Mandat läuft vom 1. September 2011 bis zum 30. Juni 2015. Es beruht auf den folgenden politischen Zielen der Union in Bosnien und Herzegowina: „Weitere Fortschritte beim Stabilisierungs- und Assoziierungsprozess, um ein stabiles, lebensfähiges, friedliches, multiethnisches und geeintes Bosnien und Herzegowina zu verwirklichen, das in Frieden mit seinen Nachbarn kooperiert und seinen Weg in Richtung einer Unionsmitgliedschaft unbeirrbar fortsetzt."

1. Ist die Hohe Vertreterin angesichts der aktuellen Lage in Bosnien der Meinung, dass die bisherige EU-Politik erfolgreich war?

2. Was wurde vonseiten der EU verabsäumt, um die offensichtlichen Missstände zu beseitigen und eine positive Entwicklung des Landes einzuleiten?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(22. April 2014)

Die jüngsten Massenproteste in Bosnien und Herzegowina geben Anlass zur Sorge. Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin reiste am 11./12. März nach Sarajewo, wo sie mit Vertretern der Regierungsstellen und der Zivilgesellschaft zusammentraf und zu Ruhe und verantwortungsvollen Maßnahmen im Hinblick auf die öffentlichen Proteste aufrief.

Generell sei darauf hingewiesen, dass Bosnien und Herzegowina im Stabilisierungs- und Assoziierungsprozess verankert ist, der Ende der 1990er Jahre zur Unterstützung der Stabilisierung und Vorbereitung auf einen möglichen Beitritt zur EU eingeleitet wurde.

In Bosnien und Herzegowina zählt besonders die GASP/GSVP-Militäroperation EUFOR/ALTHEA zu den Instrumenten, die zur Förderung der Stabilität eingesetzt werden. Insgesamt ist die EU in Bosnien und Herzegowina durch den EU-Sonderbeauftragten, der zugleich Delegationsleiter ist, vertreten. Die EU unterstützt die Behörden von Bosnien und Herzegowina bei der Bewältigung der innenpolitischen Herausforderungen und bei der Annäherung an die EU, die Hauptverantwortung liegt jedoch bei der politischen Führung des Landes.

Sie hat die Gewaltakte im Zusammenhang mit den Protesten unlängst verurteilt und dabei gleichzeitig betont, dass friedliche Proteste legitim sind und die Forderungen der Demonstranten nach sozioökonomischen Reformen ernst genommen werden müssen.

Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin rief die lokalen Behörden und Politiker allgemein dazu auf, ihre Kräfte zu bündeln, damit sie mehr leisten können, anstatt weniger Anstrengungen zu fordern. Konkret mahnte sie, die Bemühungen stärker auf die Bewältigung der unmittelbaren sozioökonomischen Herausforderungen im Land auszurichten. Die EU fordert die Institutionen von Bosnien und Herzegowina auf, einen Dialog mit den Bürgern aufzunehmen. Außerdem müssen sie konkrete Initiativen ergreifen, um die Korruption und die Defizite im Bereich der Menschenrechte und Rechtsstaatlichkeit im Einklang mit den Empfehlungen des Fortschrittsberichts 2013 für Bosnien und Herzegowina ([1]) anzugehen. Die EU ist bereit, Bosnien und Herzegowina hierbei zu unterstützen, doch lokale Eigenverantwortung und politischer Wille sind auch in Zukunft unerlässlich.

([1]) Arbeitsdokument der Kommissionsdienststellen, KOM(2013)700 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001700/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Rioting in Bosnia and Herzegovina

On Friday, 7 February 2014, a wave of protests escalated in Sarajevo, in Bosnia, against poverty, unemployment and a political system regarded as corrupt and inefficient. Government buildings were set ablaze in three towns in total.

The unemployment rate in Bosnia tops 44%. According to official figures, one fifth of the 3.8 million Bosniaks live in poverty; many go hungry. In Tuzla, once a major industrial centre, workers not paid for months by former state-owned firms which have been privatised and have collapsed took to the streets.

The website of the European External Action Service states that the European Union (EU) currently has 10 Special Representatives (EUSR) in different countries and regions of the world, including one in Bosnia. It is also stated that 'The EUSRs promote the EU's policies and interests in troubled regions and countries and play an active role in efforts to consolidate peace, stability and the rule of law.'

Succeeding the Austrian diplomat Valentin Inzko, Peter Sørensen was appointed EU Special Representative in Bosnia and Herzegovina on 18 July 2011. His mandate runs from 1 September 2011 to 30 June 2015. It is based on the following EU policy objectives in Bosnia and Herzegovina: 'continued progress in the Stabilisation and Association Process, with the aim of a stable, viable, peaceful and multiethnic and united BiH, cooperating peacefully with its neighbours and irreversibly on track towards membership of the Union.'

1. In the light of the current situation in Bosnia, does the High Representative consider that EU policy to date has been successful?

2. What has the EU failed to do in order to rectify the things which are clearly wrong there and bring about a positive development for the country?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2014)

The recent public protests in BiH have raised concerns. HR/VP travelled to Sarajevo on 11/12 March and met with the BiH authorities and civil society urging calm and responsible action in reply to the public protests.

More generally, it must be recalled that BiH is anchored in the Stabilisation and Association Process (SAP) developed in the late 1990's aiming at supporting stabilisation and prepare for possible accession to the EU.

Specifically in BiH, among the tools aiming at stability is the CFSP/CSDP EUFOR/ALTHEA military mission. More generally, the EU is represented in BiH by a 'double hatted' EUSR/Head of Delegation. The EU assists BiH authorities in overcoming challenges to the domestic political situation and progress on the EU path, but the main responsibility lies with BiH political leaders.

Most recently, the EU has condemned the acts of violence in connection with the protests while also underlining that peaceful protests are legitimate and that the demands by the protesters for socioeconomic reforms must be taken seriously.

The HR/VP conveyed an overall message that local authorities and leaders must join forces so that they can deliver more, rather than asking to do less. More concretely HR/VP urged that there must be a stronger focus on addressing the immediate socioeconomic challenges in the country. The EU urges BiH institutions to engage in a dialogue with citizens. Concrete initiatives also need to be undertaken by BiH authorities to address corruption, deficiencies in the area of human rights and rule of law, in line with the findings and recommendations in the 2013 Bosnia and Herzegovina Progress Report ([1]). The EU is ready to assist BiH but local ownership and political will remain indispensable.

([1]) Commission Staff Working Document COM(2013) 700 final.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001703/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(14 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Απόλυση 595 καθαριστριών από το Ελληνικό Δημόσιο

Με την απόφαση Αριθ. Δ6Α 1139968 ΕΞ 2013, τον Σεπτέμβριο του 2013, καταργήθηκαν 595 θέσεις καθαριστριών του Ελληνικού Υπουργείου Οικονομικών, όσο και των κατά τόπους εφοριών, τελωνείων κ.λπ. Το προσωπικό αυτό, που είχε συμβάσεις αορίστου χρόνου, μερικής απασχόλησης και αμείβονταν με μισθούς ύψους 325 ευρώ, τέθηκε σε διαθεσιμότητα και αναμένεται να απολυθεί σε οκτώ μήνες από την λήψη της παραπάνω απόφασης.

Δεδομένου ότι οι σε διαθεσιμότητα εργαζόμενες ενημερώθηκαν ότι η απόφαση απόλυσής τους είναι σε εφαρμογή της πρόβλεψης του Μνημονίου για μείωση του προσωπικού του δημόσιου τομέα,

ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποιος είναι ο αριθμός των εργαζομένων που η ελληνική κυβέρνηση έχει δεσμευτεί να απολύσει από τον δημόσιο τομέα, βάσει του 2ου προγράμματος Δημοσιονομικής Προσαρμογής για τα έτη 2013 και 2014 και έπειτα; Πώς κατανέμονται χρονικά;

2. Ποια πρέπει να είναι τα χαρακτηριστικά των προς απόλυση υπαλλήλων; Περιλαμβάνονται οι 595 καθαρίστριες που θα απολυθούν μετά την λήξη του 8μήνου διαθεσιμότητας μεταξύ των απολυμένων υπαλλήλων που προσμετρούνται για την επίτευξη του παραπάνω στόχου;

3. Δεδομένου ότι όλοι οι σε διαθεσιμότητα και προς απόλυση υπάλληλοι είναι αποκλειστικά γυναίκες, θεωρεί η Επιτροπή ότι η παραπάνω απόφαση συνιστά παραβίαση της αρχής της μη διάκρισης λόγω φύλου, και συγκεκριμένα της οδηγίας 76/207/ΕΟΚ, που μεταξύ άλλων στο άρθρο 5 αναφέρει ότι η αρχή της ίσης μεταχείρισης αφορά και στην απόλυση;

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη την πάγια νομολογία του Ευρωπαϊκού Δικαστηρίου, μεταξύ άλλων στην Υπόθεση C-196/02 που αφορούσε σε διάκριση λόγω φύλου εις βάρος καθαριστριών στον ΟΤΕ, προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να ερευνήσει αν πράγματι συντρέχει παραβίαση του κοινοτικού δικαίου;

Απάντηση του κ. Kallas εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(24 Απριλίου 2014)

1. Η μεταρρύθμιση της δημόσιας διοίκησης περιλαμβάνει ολοκληρωμένα και φιλόδοξα μέτρα για τον εκσυγχρονισμό του δημόσιου τομέα και των διαδικασιών, τη μείωση του διοικητικού φόρτου και τη βελτίωση της ποιότητας των δημόσιων υπηρεσιών, προς όφελος του έλληνα πολίτη. Η Ελλάδα βρίσκεται σε καλό δρόμο για να επιτύχει τη μείωση της απασχόλησης της γενικής κυβέρνησης κατά 150 000 άτομα εντός της καθορισθείσας προθεσμίας, στα τέλη του 2015, συνδυάζοντας ένα κανόνα μείωσης ([1]) με ένα πρόγραμμα για την ενθάρρυνση της κινητικότητας και μια προσπάθεια να εντοπιστούν πειθαρχικές υποθέσεις και να επιταχυνθεί η ολοκλήρωση της σχετικής διαδικασίας. Οι αποχωρήσεις που συμφωνήθηκαν το 2013, δηλ. 5 000 εργαζόμενοι (σωρευτικά από το 2013) μέχρι τα τέλη Μαρτίου 2014, 9 000 μέχρι τον Ιούνιο και ένα σωρευτικό σύνολο 15 000 μέχρι τα τέλη του 2014, δεν συνυπολογίζονται για την επίτευξη των γενικών στόχων του προγράμματος, δεδομένου ότι όσοι αποχωρούν από τον δημόσιο τομέα θα αντικατασταθούν από νέο, ειδικευμένο προσωπικό ([2]).

2. Η απόφαση που αναφέρει ο κ. βουλευτής δεν συνεπάγεται αυτόματες απολύσεις. Αυτοί οι υπάλληλοι θα αξιολογηθούν βάσει ενός κεντρικά καθορισμένου πλαισίου αξιολόγησης και θα έχουν την ευκαιρία να βρουν άλλη εργασία, σύμφωνα με τις ικανότητες και τις ανάγκες της διοίκησης, εντός οκτώ μηνών. Μόνον όσοι δεν ανακατανέμονται θα αποχωρήσουν.

3. Το άρθρο 2 παράγραφος 1 στοιχείο β) της οδηγίας 2006/54/ΕΚ απαγορεύει τις έμμεσες διακρίσεις μεταξύ ανδρών και γυναικών στον τομέα της απασχόλησης και της εργασίας, αλλά προβλέπει επίσης ότι μια μεροληπτική πρακτική δικαιολογείται αντικειμενικά από ένα θεμιτό σκοπό, εάν τα μέσα για την επίτευξη του σκοπού αυτού είναι πρόσφορα και αναγκαία. Η οδηγία έχει μεταφερθεί στο ελληνικό εσωτερικό δίκαιο με τον νόμο 3896/2010. Ο έλεγχος της εφαρμογής σε ατομικές περιπτώσεις της εθνικής νομοθεσίας για τη μεταφορά οδηγιών είναι κατ' αρχήν αρμοδιότητα των εθνικών αρχών και δικαστηρίων που έχουν την εξουσία να διασφαλίζουν ότι γίνονται σεβαστά τα δικαιώματα των πολιτών.

([1]) Μόνο 1 υπάλληλος μπορεί να προσληφθεί για κάθε 5 συνταξιοδοτήσεις.
([2]) Για περισσότερες λεπτομέρειες, βλ. «Σχέδιο κινητικότητας και αποχωρήσεις» πίνακας, σ. 216, διατίθεται στη διεύθυνση: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_/publications/occasional_paper/2013/pdf/ocp159_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001703/14
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(14 February 2014)

Subject: Dismissal of 595 cleaners by the Greek State

By Decision No D6A 1139968 EX 2013 of September 2013, 595 cleaning posts were abolished in the Greek Finance Ministry and local tax offices, customs posts, etc. The staff, who had open-ended, part-time contracts and received wages of EUR 325 a month, have been suspended and are expected to be dismissed eight months after the issuing of this decision.

Given that the employees who have been suspended have been informed that the decision to dismiss them forms part of measures to implement the MoU provision to reduce the number of public sector workers,

Will the Commission say:

1. What number of workers has the Greek Government pledged to sack from the public sector under the second fiscal adjustment programme in 2013 and 2014 and beyond? How are these numbers broken down over time?

2. What should be the characteristics of the employees who are to be dismissed? Do the 595 cleaners who will be fired at the end of the 8-month period of suspension form part of the employees that need to be made redundant to attain the target number?

3. Given that all the suspended employees who are to be made redundant are without exception female, does it consider that the above decision infringes the principle of non-discrimination on grounds of sex, in particular of Directive 76/207/EEC, which provides, *inter alia*, in Article 5 that the principle of equal treatment also relates to dismissal?

Taking into account the consistent case law of the Court of Justice, *inter alia* in Case C-196/02 relating to sexual discrimination against cleaners with the OTE (the Hellenic Telecommunications Organisation), does the Commission intend to investigate whether indeed there has been a breach of Community law?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2014)

1. The public administration reform includes comprehensive and ambitious measures to modernise the public sector and its procedures, reduce administrative burden and increase quality of public services to the benefit of Greek citizens. Greece is well on track to deliver the decrease in general government employment by 150 000, by the deadline set at the end of 2015, combining an attrition rule ([1]), with a scheme to foster mobility and an effort to identify disciplinary cases and accelerate their resolution. The exits agreed in 2013, i.e. 5 000 employees (cumulative since 2013) by end-March 2014, 9 000 by June, and a cumulative total of 15,000 by end-2014, do not count towards the overall programme target, as those exiting the public sector will be replaced with new, qualified staff ([2]).

2. The decision mentioned by the Honourable Member does not imply automatic layoffs. These employees will be assessed within a centrally-defined evaluation framework and have the opportunity to find another job, in line with their competences and the needs of the administration, within eight months. Only those who are not reallocated will exit.

3. Article 2.1(b) of Directive 2006/54/EC prohibits indirect discrimination between men and women in the field of employment and occupation, but also provides that a discriminatory practice can be objectively justified by a legitimate aim if the means for achieving that aim are appropriate and necessary. The directive has been transposed in Greece through Act N 3896/2010. The control of the application to individual cases of the national law implementing Directives is in principle the task of the national authorities and courts which have the power to ensure that citizens' rights are respected.

([1]) Only 1 employee can be hired for every 5 retirements.
([2]) For more details, please see 'Mobility and Exit Scheme' table, p. 216, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2013/pdf/ocp159_en.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001707/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(17 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Propuesta de nuevo Reglamento sobre hipotecas

El problema de los desahucios, debido a las elevadas cifras de paro y a los numerosos impagos de hipotecas, supone un grave problema para miles de familias en el Estado español. El 11 de junio de 2013 el Parlamento Europeo aprobó un informe en el que se pedía a los Estado miembros que diesen alternativas al desahucio e incluyesen la posibilidad de la dación en pago para las familias en situación de quiebra, es decir, que impidiesen que las familias desahuciadas siguieran teniendo que devolver sus créditos hipotecarios y por lo tanto, garantizasen que estas familias tuvieran una nueva oportunidad ([1]). El Parlamento de Cataluña aprobó por unanimidad una propuesta para legislar la dación en pago, pero el pasado 12 de febrero de 2014 la propuesta fue desestimada en el Congreso de los Diputados. La diputada Meritxell Roigé afirmó que la situación en el Estado español es «una anomalía europea», ya que juntamente con Hungría, Malta y Chipre son los únicos que no han legislado sobre este tema ([2]). La diputada Lourdes Ciuró recordó que hasta el FMI y el BCE han destacado que el Estado español «se ha quedado a medio camino» en lo relativo a medidas contra los desahucios y a dar una segunda oportunidad a las familias afectadas ([3]).

Actualmente, cuando un banco expropia una vivienda por impago de la hipoteca, el ciudadano se queda sin la vivienda y sigue teniendo la deuda pendiente ¿No cree la Comisión que es una situación injusta y que se debe garantizar «una segunda oportunidad» a los ciudadanos?

El pasado mes de diciembre el Parlamento Europeo aprobó la Directiva de Hipotecas, que contiene recomendaciones a los Estados miembros ([4]). Para que todos los ciudadanos europeos estén protegidos por un marco legal más justo sobre este tema, propongo a la Comisión que elabore un Reglamento de Hipotecas para que sea de obligado cumplimiento por todos los Estados miembros. ¿Está de acuerdo la Comisión con esta propuesta?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de abril de 2014)

El artículo 28 de la Directiva 2014/17/UE ([5]) obliga a los Estados miembros a adoptar medidas para alentar a los prestamistas a que se muestren razonablemente tolerantes antes de iniciar un procedimiento de ejecución. También les solicita que, en aquellos casos en que la deuda no quede saldada al término del procedimiento de ejecución (sin perjuicio de la obligación de obtención del mejor precio por la propiedad objeto de ejecución), garanticen la adopción de medidas para facilitar el reembolso con el objetivo de proteger a los consumidores. Además, este artículo prevé que las partes en un contrato de crédito pueden acordar expresamente que la devolución o transferencia al prestamista de la garantía o de los ingresos procedentes de la venta de la garantía basten para reembolsar el crédito.

La aplicación de estos principios por parte de los Estados miembros se supervisará estrechamente durante la fase de transposición, teniendo en cuenta el Derecho contractual y los procedimientos judiciales nacionales. Los Estados miembros aplicarán dichas medidas a partir del 21 de marzo de 2016. La Comisión revisará la Directiva tres años después de su transposición y evaluará la necesidad de nuevas medidas a escala de la Unión para la fase postcontractual de los contratos de crédito. Toda posible iniciativa en este ámbito deberá tener en cuenta las necesidades de los consumidores y la perspectiva de estabilidad financiera.

([1]) http://www.eldiario.es/economia/Eurocamara-opcion-dacion-familias-quiebra_0_142086060.html
([2]) http://www.convergencia.cat/fitxa_noticies.php?news_ID=31345
([3]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2013/08/02/vivienda/1375444840_237151.html
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/es/news-room/plenary/2013-12-09/8
([5]) Directiva 2014/17/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 4 de febrero de 2014, sobre los contratos de crédito celebrados con los consumidores para bienes inmuebles de uso residencial (DO L 60 de 28.2.2014, p. 34).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001707/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Proposal for a new regulation on mortgages

Thousands of families in Spain are facing the serious problem of being evicted from their homes, as a consequence of high levels of unemployment and mortgage defaulting. On 11 June 2013, Parliament approved a report which asked Member States to provide alternatives to eviction and to allow the possibility of dation in payment for families faced with bankruptcy; in other words, to prevent evicted families from being saddled with mortgage payments and enable them to make a fresh start ([1]). The Autonomous Parliament of Catalonia unanimously approved a proposal to legalise dation in payment; however, on 12 February 2014 the proposal was rejected by the lower house of the Spanish Parliament. The Catalan MP Meritxell Roigé has noted that the situation in Spain is 'a European anomaly' as Spain, Hungary. Malta and Cyprus are the only Member States not to have legislated in this field ([2]). Another Catalan MP, Lourdes Ciuró, recalled that even the International Monetary Fund and the European Central Bank have pointed out that Spain has only gone half-way in taking steps to halt evictions and give the families involved a second chance ([3]).

At present, when a bank repossesses a property because the owner is unable to pay the mortgage, the latter loses the property but is still liable for the mortgage payments. Does the Commission not think that this is unfair and that these people should be guaranteed a second chance?

In December 2013, the European Parliament approved the Mortgage Credit Directive, which contains recommendations to the Member States ([4]). To ensure that all European citizens are protected by a fairer legal framework in this field, I propose that the Commission draft a Mortgage Credit Regulation, which should be binding on all Member States. Does the Commission agree with this proposal?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2014)

Article 28 of Directive 2014/17/EU ([5]) obliges Member States to adopt measures to encourage creditors to exercise reasonable forbearance before foreclosure proceedings are initiated and requires them to ensure that, where outstanding debt remains after foreclosure proceedings (despite the obligation of best efforts price for the foreclosed property), measures are in place to facilitate repayment in order to protect consumers. In addition this Article foresees that parties to a credit agreement can expressly agree that return or transfer to the creditor of the security or proceeds from the sale of the security is sufficient to repay the credit.

The implementation of these principles by Member States will be closely monitored during the transposition phase, taking account of national contract law and judicial procedures. Member States will have to apply those measures from 21 March 2016. The Commission will undertake a review of the directive three years after its transposition and assess whether additional measures are necessary at Union level with regard to the post-contractual stage of credit agreements. Any possible initiative in this field will have to take into account the consumers' needs as well as the financial stability perspective.

([1]) http://www.eldiario.es/economia/Eurocamara-opcion-dacion-familias-quiebra_0_142086060.html
([2]) http://www.convergencia.cat/fitxa_noticies.php?news_ID=31345
([3]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2013/08/02/vivienda/1375444840_237151.html
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/news-room/content/20131206IPR30025/html/New-mortgage-rules-to-be-properly-enforced-EU-wide
([5]) Directive 2014/17/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 February 2014 on credit agreements for consumers relating to residential immovable property (OJ L 60, 28.2.2014, p. 34).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001709/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(17 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Μαζικές εκκαθαρίσεις δικαστών

Άλλοι 166 Τούρκοι δικαστές μετατέθηκαν την Τρίτη, με απόφαση του Ανώτατου Συμβουλίου Δικαστών και Εισαγγελέων (HSYK), στη σκιά του πολιτικο-οικονομικού σκανδάλου στο οποίο έχει βυθιστεί η κυβέρνηση του Πρωθυπουργού Ρετζέπ Ταγίπ Ερντογάν. Μεταξύ αυτών, περιλαμβάνονται σημαντικοί δικαστές της Κωνσταντινούπολης, της Άγκυρας και της Σμύρνης, 6 000 περίπου αστυνομικοί και εκατοντάδες δικαστές, που είτε έχουν μετατεθεί, είτε απολυθεί μετά την αποκάλυψη, στα μέσα Δεκεμβρίου, του σκανδάλου διαφθοράς στο οποίο εμπλέκονται πρόσωπα προσκείμενα στο κυβερνών Κόμμα Δικαιοσύνης και Ανάπτυξης (AKP). Ο Ερντογάν κατηγορεί τον ισλαμιστή ιεροκήρυκα Φετχουλάχ Γκιουλέν ότι εκμεταλλεύεται την επιρροή του στην Αστυνομία και τη Δικαιοσύνη για να εξυφάνει μια «συνωμοσία» εναντίον της κυβέρνησης με στόχο την αποσταθεροποίηση της Τουρκίας ενόψει των περιφερειακών εκλογών της 30ής Μαρτίου και των προεδρικών εκλογών που θα διεξαχθούν τον Αύγουστο.

1. Πώς σχολιάζει η Επιτροπή τις εξελίξεις στην Τουρκία;

2. Τι αναμένει από τον Τούρκο Πρωθυπουργό να πράξει;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(16 Απριλίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή είναι πλήρως ενήμερη για τα θέματα που έθιξαν τα Αξιότιμα Μέλη του Κοινοβουλίου και παρακολουθεί εκ του σύνεγγυς τις εξελίξεις.

Η Επιτροπή έχει εκφράσει επανειλημμένα τις σοβαρές της ανησυχίες όσον αφορά την ανεξαρτησία και την αμεροληψία του δικαστικού σώματος και τη διάκριση των εξουσιών στην Τουρκία. Η Επιτροπή θα εξακολουθήσει να παρακολουθεί τις εξελίξεις και θα αναφερθεί σχετικά στην επικείμενη έκθεση προόδου που έχει προγραμματιστεί για τον Οκτώβριο.

Η Τουρκία, ως χώρα που διαπραγματεύεται την προσχώρησή της στην ΕΕ, οφείλει να λάβει όλα τα αναγκαία μέτρα για την εξασφάλιση του κράτους δικαίου στη χώρα.

Πρόσφατα γεγονότα υπογράμμισαν την ανάγκη για προσέγγιση με την Τουρκία και όχι για απομάκρυνση. Η πρόοδος των διαπραγματεύσεων προσχώρησης και η πρόοδος στο πεδίο των δημοκρατικών μεταρρυθμίσεων είναι δύο πλευρές του ίδιου νομίσματος.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001709/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Mass Purge of Judges

A further 166 Turkish judges were transferred on Tuesday, 11 February, by decision of the Supreme Board of Judges and Prosecutors (HSYK) in the wake of the political and financial scandal which has engulfed the government of Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan. Prominent judges in Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir, some 6 000 policemen and hundreds of other judges have been either transferred or dismissed since the eruption in mid-December of the corruption scandal involving persons close to the ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP). Erdoğan accuses Islamist preacher Fethullah Gülen of exploiting his influence among the police and the judiciary to hatch a 'conspiracy' against the government in order to destabilise Turkey in the run-up to the regional and presidential elections scheduled for 30 March and the month of August, respectively.

1. What is the Commission's view on developments in Turkey?

2. What does it expect the Turkish Prime Minister to do?

Question for written answer E-001976/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(20 February 2014)

Subject: Recent brawl in Turkish Parliament — effect on Turkey's accession to the EU

Does the Commission intend to review the accession timetable for Turkey as a candidate country given the recent brawl in Turkey's Parliament between two competing parties over a plan to reform the nation's top judicial body?

Question for written answer E-002686/14
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(6 March 2014)

Subject: Effect of the recent brawl in Turkish Parliament on Turkey's accession to the EU

In the view of the Commission, is Turkey still considered as subscribing to fully democratic European values as outlined in the Copenhagen criteria?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2014)

The Commission is fully aware of the issues mentioned by the Honourable members and follows developments closely.

The Commission has expressed, on a number of occasions, its serious concerns as regards the independence and impartiality of the judiciary and the separation of powers in Turkey. The Commission will continue to monitor developments and report on this issue in its forthcoming Progress report scheduled for October.

Turkey, as a country negotiating its accession to the EU, needs to take all necessary steps to guarantee rule of law in the country.

Recent events have underlined the need for more, rather than less, engagement with Turkey. Progress in accession negotiations and progress in democratic reforms are the two sides of the same coin.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001713/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(17 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Κίνδυνος φτώχειας

Σύμφωνα με ένα πρόσφατο άρθρο που δημοσιεύθηκε από την Επιτροπή, ένας στους τέσσερις Ευρωπαίους είναι σε κίνδυνο φτώχειας. Η φτώχεια αυξάνεται συνεχώς, ακόμη και αν μειωθεί η ανεργία, και έτσι καθίσταται απίθανο να αντιστραφούν τα υπάρχοντα επίπεδα φτώχειας. Η εργασία μερικής απασχόλησης και οι χαμηλοί μισθοί συμβάλλουν ακόμα περισσότερο στη διεύρυνση του χάσματος μεταξύ φτωχών και πλουσίων.

1. Ποια ειδικά προληπτικά μέτρα λαμβάνει η Επιτροπή για να κλείσει το χάσμα μεταξύ πλουσίων και φτωχών και να σταματήσει την περαιτέρω αύξηση των επιπέδων φτώχειας;

2. Δεδομένου ότι υπάρχει μια άμεση συσχέτιση ανάμεσα στην ανεργία και τα επίπεδα φτώχειας, ποια συγκεκριμένα μέτρα έχει λάβει η Επιτροπή για την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας (ιδίως μεταξύ των νέων) και τη δημιουργία θέσεων εργασίας σε όλη την Ευρώπη; Πόσο επιτυχής υπήρξε στην αντιμετώπιση και των δύο αυτών προβλημάτων;

3. Ποια μέτρα έχει λάβει η Επιτροπή για να εξασφαλίσει ότι το να έχει κάποιος μια δουλειά συνεπάγεται στην πράξη ένα αξιοπρεπές βιοτικό επίπεδο;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(9 Απριλίου 2014)

1. Ο στόχος της μείωσης της φτώχειας στο πλαίσιο της στρατηγικής «Ευρώπη 2020» υπογραμμίζει τη σημασία που έχει το θέμα της κοινωνικής ένταξης για τις προτεραιότητες πολιτικής της ΕΕ. Αυτό εκφράζεται και στις εκκλήσεις προς τα κράτη μέλη, που διατυπώνονται στις ετήσιες επισκοπήσεις της ανάπτυξης και στις ειδικές ανά χώρα συστάσεις, ως μέρος του ευρωπαϊκού εξαμήνου, για να εφαρμόσουν ενεργητικές στρατηγικές ένταξης. Στη «δέσμη των κοινωνικών επενδύσεων» παρέχονται οδηγίες για τη βελτίωση της αποτελεσματικότητας των συστημάτων κοινωνικής προστασίας. Για την περίοδο 2014-2020 ένα ελάχιστο μερίδιο από τα ταμεία κοινωνικής συνοχής είναι δεσμευμένο για το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο, από το οποίο τουλάχιστον 20% θα δοθεί για την ενίσχυση της κοινωνικής ένταξης. Στο πλαίσιο της επιτροπής κοινωνικής προστασίας πραγματοποιείται η θεματική και πολυμερής επιτήρηση των μεταρρυθμίσεων της κοινωνικής πολιτικής των κρατών.

2. Ο στόχος της στρατηγικής «Ευρώπη 2020» ως προς την απασχόληση, οι ετήσιες επισκοπήσεις της ανάπτυξης και οι ειδικές ανά χώρα συστάσεις για τις πολιτικές που αφορούν την αγορά εργασίας δείχνουν πόση σημασία δίνεται στην καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας σε επίπεδο ΕΕ. Η δέσμη μέτρων για την απασχόληση του 2012 περιείχε πρωτοβουλίες σε επίπεδο ΕΕ και οδηγίες για την ενίσχυση της δημιουργίας θέσεων εργασίας, την αποκατάσταση της δυναμικής των αγορών εργασίας και τη βελτίωση της διακυβέρνησης σε επίπεδο ΕΕ.

Η δέσμη μέτρων για την απασχόληση των νέων του 2012 οδήγησε στην έκδοση σύστασης του Συμβουλίου για τη θέσπιση εγγυήσεων για τη νεολαία (Απρίλιος 2013), στην ευρωπαϊκή συμμαχία για θέσεις μαθητείας (Ιούλιος 2013) και στην έκδοση σύστασης του Συμβουλίου για ένα ποιοτικό πλαίσιο για τις περιόδους άσκησης (Μάρτιος 2014).

Τα ταμεία ESIF ([1]), ιδίως το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο και η πρωτοβουλία για την απασχόληση των νέων εξασφαλίζουν σημαντική ενίσχυση για την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας, ιδίως των νέων.

3. Η Επιτροπή κατευθύνει τα κράτη μέλη σχετικά με τους τρόπους αντιμετώπισης της φτώχειας των εργαζομένων μέσω του ευρωπαϊκού εξαμήνου. Ο καθορισμός αξιοπρεπών ημερομισθίων, καθώς και η εφαρμογή στοχευμένων μειώσεων στη φορολογία της εργασίας για τους χαμηλόμισθους βοηθούν στην πρόληψη της φτώχειας των εργαζομένων ([2]).

([1]) Ευρωπαϊκά Διαρθρωτικά και Επενδυτικά Ταμεία.

([2]) COM(2012)173 τελικό.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001713/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Risk of poverty

According to a recent article published by the Commission, one in four Europeans is at risk of poverty. Poverty continuously increases even if unemployment falls, therefore making it unlikely that these poverty levels will be reversed. Part-time work and low wages contribute even more to widening the gap between the poor and rich.

1. What specific preventive measures and action is the Commission taking to close the gap between poor and rich and to halt further rises in poverty levels?

2. As there is a direct correlation between unemployment and poverty levels, what specific action has the Commission taken to combat unemployment (especially among young people) and to create jobs throughout Europe? How successful has it been in tackling both of these problems?

3. What action is it taking to ensure that having a job actually entails a decent standard of living?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

1. The Europe 2020 poverty reduction target underlines the importance of social inclusion within the wider EU policy agenda. This is also expressed in calls on Member States to implement active inclusion strategies in the Annual Growth Surveys and in country specific recommendations as part of the European Semester. The Social Investment Package provides guidance to improve the effectiveness of social systems. For 2014-2020 a minimum share of the social cohesion funds is dedicated to the European Social Fund, at least 20% of which is earmarked to support social inclusion. Thematic and multilateral surveillance of Member States' social policy reforms takes place in the Social Protection Committee.

2. The Europe 2020 employment target, the annual growth surveys and country specific recommendations on labour market policies demonstrate the importance given to the fight against unemployment at EU level. The 2012 Employment Package provided EU-level initiatives and guidance to support job creation, restoring the dynamics of labour markets and improving EU governance.

The 2012 Youth Employment Package led to a Council Recommendation on the Youth Guarantee (April 2013), the European Alliance for Apprenticeship (July 2013) and a Council Recommendation on a Quality Framework for Traineeships (March 2014).

The ESIF ([1]), in particular the European Social Fund and Youth Employment Initiative provide substantial support to fighting unemployment, in particular of the young.

3. The Commission gives guidance to Member States on how to tackle in-work poverty through the European Semester. Setting wages at appropriate levels, as well as implementing targeted reductions in labour taxation for low-wage earners help prevent poverty among workers ([2]).

([1]) European Structural and Investment Funds.
([2]) COM(2012) 173 final.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-001714/14
a la Comisión
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial (S&D)
(17 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Ayudas de la UE a España durante el marco financiero 2007-2013

La campaña para las elecciones europeas está a punto de comenzar en España. En los momentos actuales, es aún más necesario que informemos exhaustivamente a los ciudadanos de los beneficios que les aporta su pertenencia a la Unión Europea a fin de equilibrar la imagen negativa que continuamente se vierte en los medios de comunicación o en los discursos nacionalistas o directamente anti europeístas.

Una de las áreas en las que los ciudadanos españoles pueden apreciar estos beneficios es en las ayudas que España ha recibido del presupuesto comunitario en los últimos años.

¿Podría la Comisión facilitar la cuantía de los compromisos contraídos por el presupuesto comunitario durante el marco financiero 2007-2013, desglosando los datos por Comunidades Autónomas, en los ámbitos siguientes?

— Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional — Fondo Social Europeo

— Fondo de Cohesión

— Política Agrícola Común — Desarrollo rural — Fondo Europeo de Pesca

— Life+

— Programa Marco de Investigación

— Educación y Formación Permanente y, en particular, Erasmus (incluyendo el número de beneficiarios)

— Fondo Europeo de Ajuste a la Globalización

— Créditos del área de Libertad, Seguridad y Justicia

— Programas del área de Ciudadanía (Cultura, MEDIA, Juventud en Acción, etc.)

Respuesta del Sr. Lewandowski en nombre de la Comisión
(1 de abril de 2014)

En el anexo a esta respuesta, Su Señoría encontrará información sobre los compromisos y asignaciones del presupuesto comunitario durante el marco financiero 2007-2013, desglosados en la medida de lo posible por comunidades autónomas y localidades españolas, en los ámbitos de financiación solicitados.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001714/14
to the Commission
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial (S&D)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: EU aid to Spain in the 2007-2013 financial framework

The European election campaign is about to begin in Spain. It is now more necessary than ever to provide citizens with detailed information on the benefits that EU membership brings in order to offset the negative image that is constantly portrayed in the media and in nationalist or frankly anti-European speeches.

One of the areas where Spanish citizens can see tangible benefits is the aid that Spain has received from the Community budget in recent years.

Could the Commission list the amounts of commitments made by the Community budget during the 2007-2013 financial framework, with a breakdown of the figures by autonomous community, in the following areas:

— European Regional Development Fund — European Social Fund

— Cohesion Fund

— Common agricultural policy — rural development — European Fisheries Fund

— Life+

— Research Framework Programme

— Education and lifelong learning, in particular Erasmus (including the number of beneficiaries)

— European Globalisation Adjustment Fund

— Appropriations in the field of freedom, security and justice

— Citizenship programmes (culture, MEDIA, Youth in Action, etc.)?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(1 April 2014)

The Honourable Member can find information in Annex to this reply on commitments and allocations made by the Community budget in the 2007-2013 financial framework broken down, to the extent possible, by autonomous Spanish regions and localities in the requested funding areas.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001716/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(17 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ελευθερία έκφρασης στην Τουρκία

Η τουρκική κυβέρνηση έχει διορίσει τον Αχμέτ Τζεμαλετίν Τσελίκ, πρώην στέλεχος της κρατικής υπηρεσίας πληροφοριών, ως επικεφαλής του διοικητικού συμβουλίου τηλεπικοινωνιών της Τουρκίας. Ανάμεσα στα πέντε πρωταρχικά του καθήκοντα, όπως παρατίθενται στον σχετικό ιστότοπο, είναι η υποκλοπή τηλεφωνημάτων. Πέραν τούτου, την περασμένη εβδομάδα το τουρκικό Κοινοβούλιο τού έδωσε νέες εξουσίες φραγής ιστοτόπων για ιδιωτικούς λόγους, χωρίς την υποχρέωση να έχει ληφθεί προηγουμένως δικαστική εντολή.

Η ΕΕ, οι ΗΠΑ και το Συμβούλιο της Ευρώπης έχουν ήδη εκφράσει την ανησυχία τους σχετικά με το ζήτημα της ελευθερίας έκφρασης. Η κυβέρνηση Ερντογάν επιδιώκει με ζήλο να εξαλείψει τις διαρροές και την απειλή δημιουργίας «παράλληλου κράτους» με τη βοήθεια του διοικητικού συμβουλίου τηλεπικοινωνιών.

1. Ποια είναι η άποψη της Επιτροπής σχετικά με το πολύ σοβαρό ζήτημα του διορισμού πρώην στελέχους της κρατικής υπηρεσίας πληροφοριών ως επικεφαλής του διοικητικού συμβουλίου τηλεπικοινωνιών της Τουρκίας και της πολιτικής ανάμιξης στην καθημερινή λήψη αποφάσεων τεχνικού χαρακτήρα;

2. Ποια είναι η άποψη της Επιτροπής για τον ενδεικτικό αυταρχισμού ισχυρισμό του Ερντογάν περί συνομωσίας που έχει επηρεάσει την τουρκική οικονομία, μετά την υποβάθμιση της πιστοληπτικής ικανότητας της Τουρκίας από τη «Standard and Poor»;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Απριλίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή δεν σχολιάζει επί της ουσίας τυχόν διορισμούς στην τουρκική δημόσια διοίκηση.

Όσον αφορά τους ισχυρισμούς περί διαφθοράς, η Επιτροπή υπογράμμισε την ανάγκη διασφάλισης της ανεξαρτησίας και της αμεροληψίας των ερευνών από τις αστυνομικές και δικαστικές αρχές. Ως υποψήφια χώρα που δεσμεύθηκε να προαγάγει το κράτος δικαίου, η Τουρκία οφείλει να λάβει όλα τα αναγκαία μέτρα για να εξασφαλίσει ότι οι ισχυρισμοί παρατυπιών αντιμετωπίζονται χωρίς διακρίσεις ή προτιμήσεις, με διαφανή και αμερόληπτο τρόπο.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001716/14
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Freedom of expression in Turkey

The Turkish Government has appointed Ahmet Cemalettin Çelik, a former National Intelligence Organisation official, as head of Turkey's telecoms directorate. His top five duties listed on its website include tapping telephones. Moreover, the Turkish Parliament gave him new powers last week to block web pages for private reasons without first having to obtain a court order.

The EU, the US and the Council of Europe have already expressed concern about the issue of freedom of expression. Erdoğan's government is keen to extirpate leaks and eliminate the threat of a 'parallel state' with the help of the telecoms directorate.

1. What is the Commission's view of the very serious issue of appointing a former national intelligence official as head of the Turkish telecoms directorate and of the political meddling in day-to-day technocratic decisions?

2. What does the Commission think of Erdoğan's authoritarian counter-claims of a conspiracy that have cast a shadow on Turkey's economy, followed by Standard and Poor's downgrading Turkey's rating?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

The Commission does not comment on the merits of individual appointments in the Turkish administration.

With regard to the corruption allegations, the Commission has highlighted the need to guarantee the independence and impartiality of investigations by the police and judiciary. As a candidate country committed to the rule of law, Turkey needs to take all the necessary measures to ensure that allegations of wrongdoing are addressed without discrimination or preference in a transparent and impartial manner.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001718/14
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(17 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Militanți dați dispăruți în Ucraina

În urma escaladării protestelor din Ucraina, diferite canale mass media au informat despre o serie de dispariții din rândurile protestatarilor.

Recent, Human Rights Watch a invitat autoritățile ucrainene să ancheteze în mod urgent dispariția lui Dmitri Bulatov, care, potrivit spuselor familiei și prietenilor, a dispărut la 22 ianuarie 2014. Bulatov este un militant proeminent și lider al AutoMaidan, un convoi de automobiliști care patrulează orașul pentru a-i proteja pe protestatari. Dispariția sa subită a survenit după o serie de amenințări și câteva încercări ale poliției de a-l interoga cu privire la implicarea AutoMaidan în actele de violență comise la 1 decembrie 2013.

1. Ce acțiuni au fost întreprinse de către Comisie pentru a asigura că guvernul Ucrainei localizează și eliberează toți militanții care au fost dați dispăruți?

2. Poate Comisia institui o procedură de siguranță care ar asigura o reacție mai rapidă în ceea ce privește protejarea drepturilor fundamentale ale omului pentru oricare din țările care au început negocierile pentru semnarea unui Acord de asociere cu Uniunea Europeană?

Răspuns dat de dl Füle în numele Comisiei
(4 aprilie 2014)

UE cunoaște cazul lui Dmitri Bulatov și s-a implicat, în cooperare cu reprezentanțele locale ale UE în Kiev, în asigurarea transferului în siguranță în Lituania în scopul asistenței medicale. UE și-a exprimat în mod clar punctul de vedere în acest caz și în cazuri similare prin declarațiile ÎR/VP și ale Consiliului UE și a făcut apel, în mod sistematic, la investigarea urgentă și independentă a tuturor cazurilor de încălcare a drepturilor omului.

Timp de mai mulți ani, UE a menținut un sistem de ajutor de urgență pentru apărătorii drepturilor omului aflați în pericol, precum și o politică pe termen mai lung de protecție și de cooperare cu aceștia. Instrumentul european pentru democrație și drepturile omului este principalul instrument de finanțare al UE în acest sens. Ofițerii de legătură ai UE privind apărătorii drepturilor omului, care sunt desemnați din rândul diplomaților UE din fiecare țară terță, au rolul de puncte de acces și sunt principalele persoane de contact pentru apărătorii drepturilor omului.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001718/14
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Missing activists in Ukraine

Following the escalation of the protests in Ukraine, a number of disappearances from the protester lines have been reported through various media channels.

Recently, Human Rights Watch has called on the Ukrainian authorities urgently to investigate the disappearance of Dmitri Bulatov, who, according to family and friends, has been missing since 22 January 2014. Bulatov is a prominent activist and leader of the AutoMaidan, a convoy of motorists which patrols the city to protect the protesters. His sudden disappearance came after a number of threats and a couple of police attempts to question him about the involvement of AutoMaidan in the violence on 1 December 2013.

1. What actions were taken by the Commission in order to ensure that the Ukrainian Government tracks down and releases all activists who are reported as missing?

2. Can the Commission establish a safety procedure which would ensure a faster reaction in protecting basic human rights in the countries pending at least the signature of an association agreement with the EU?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

The EU is aware of the case of Dmitri Bulatov and was involved, in cooperation with local EU representations in Kiev, in ensuring safe transfer to Lithuania for medical care. The EU was outspoken on this and other similar cases through the HR/VP Statements and the Council of the EU has been calling systematically for urgent and independent investigation of all human rights violations.

For several years, the EU has maintained a system of urgent aid to human rights defenders at risk as well as a longer term policy of protection and cooperation with them. The European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights is the main EU funding tool in this regard. The EU Liaison Officers on Human Rights Defenders, who are designated among EU diplomats in each third country , serve as the entry points and the main contact persons for HRDs.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001719/14
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(17 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Consolidarea drepturilor fundamentale în Armenia

Conform raportului pe 2013 a organizației Amnesty International privind Armenia, libertatea de expresie și violența împotriva femeilor figurează printre îngrijorările în materie de drepturi ale omului.

La 20 decembrie 2013, Comisia a anunțat adoptarea unui pachet de 41 de milioane de euro în sprijinul dezvoltării societății civile și al dezvoltării regionale în Armenia. O parte din această sumă este destinată pentru consolidarea rolului societății civile armene în monitorizarea implementării reformelor din țară și pentru promovarea participării Armeniei la programele UE și la cooperarea cu agențiile UE.

În condițiile actuale, ce măsuri ia Comisia pentru a sprijini libertatea de exprimare și pentru a preveni/reduce violența împotriva femeilor?

Răspuns dat de dl Füle în numele Comisiei
(9 aprilie 2014)

Pachetul de măsuri 2013 pentru Armenia va sprijini rolul societății civile în promovarea și monitorizarea reformelor. Acțiunile se vor concentra în special pe dezvoltarea capacităților și pe activități de promovare a protecției drepturilor omului, inclusiv cu privire la preocupările exprimate de doamna deputat.

În plus, UE a acordat Armeniei asistență prin intermediul Grupului consultativ, oferind acesteia consiliere privind modernizarea politicii în domeniul drepturilor omului și a cadrului instituțional al țării. UE a promovat libertatea de exprimare a opiniilor minorităților și, mai recent, s-a axat pe elaborarea unei legi privind violența în familie și pe sprijinirea instituțiilor naționale responsabile de asigurarea egalității de șanse și de tratament între femei și bărbați. De asemenea, Uniunea Europeană sprijină rolul femeilor în cadrul procesului democratic prin intermediul unui proiect care facilitează participarea femeilor la guvernanța locală. Au fost, de asemenea, lansate proiecte tematice care sprijină emanciparea socială și economică a femeilor în Armenia și inițiativele antreprenoriale ale femeilor. Delegația UE a lansat un proces pentru integrarea dimensiunii de gen în cadrul asistenței acordate de UE.

În plus, în cadrul noii perioade de programare pentru asistența UE pentru Armenia (2014-2017), protecția drepturilor omului constituie unul dintre domeniile prioritare avute în vedere pentru acțiunile în domeniul justiției.

Libertatea de exprimare, egalitatea de șanse și de tratament între femei și bărbați și violența în familie sunt, de asemenea, evidențiate în mod regulat în dialogul politic și strategic al UE cu Armenia, inclusiv în cadrul dialogului anual privind drepturile omului.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001719/14
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Reinforcement of fundamental rights in Armenia

According to Amnesty International's 2013 annual report on Armenia, among the major issues in that country raising concern over human rights are freedom of expression and violence against women.

On 20 December 2013, the Commission announced the adoption of a package of EUR 41 million to support civil society and regional development in Armenia. Part of this budget is aimed at reinforcing the role of Armenian civil society in monitoring the implementation of the country's reform agenda and promoting Armenia's participation in EU programmes and cooperation with EU agencies.

In the current conditions, what action will the Commission take to support the protection of freedom of expression and to prevent/reduce violence against women?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The 2013 EU package for Armenia will support the role of civil society in promoting and monitoring reforms. Actions will focus in particular on capacity development and advocacy in the area of human rights, including the concerns raised by the Honourable Member.

In addition, EU assistance through the EU Advisory Group has provided advice on upgrading the human rights policy and institutional framework in Armenia. It has promoted freedom of expression for minority views and more recently focused on the development of a law on domestic violence and support to national institutions responsible for gender equality. The European Union also supports the role of women in the democratic process through a project facilitating women's participation in local governance. Meanwhile, thematic projects target the social and economic empowerment of women in Armenia and female entrepreneurship. The EU Delegation has launched a process for gender mainstreaming in EU assistance.

Moreover, during the new programming period for EU assistance to Armenia (2014-2017), human rights protection is one of the proposed priority areas of intervention within the justice sector.

Freedom of expression, gender equality and domestic violence are also regularly highlighted through the EU political and policy dialogue with Armenia, including the annual Human Rights Dialogue.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001720/14
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(17 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Stagnarea reformelor din Liban

Potrivit organizației Human Rights Watch, Libanul întâmpină greutăți în tranziția sa către o societate stabilă. Una dintre cauzele acestei situații o constituie deschiderea frontierelor pentru refugiații care încearcă să părăsească Siria. Răpirile și atacurile cu bombe care au avut loc la Beirut și Tripoli au reprezentat prețul pe care a trebuit să-l plătească Libanul în 2013 pentru această măsură. La acesta se adaugă și faptul că ONU nu le-a acordat refugiaților un sprijin financiar deplin, chiar dacă Libanul a fost încurajat să-și mențină frontierele deschise.

Un alt motiv îl constituie faptul că, din 2013, această țară a funcționat fără guvern. Un guvern este necesar pentru a permite realizarea de reforme ale sistemului judiciar și stabilizarea ratelor criminalității, apărând astfel lucrătorii migranți și femeile migrante.

1. Investighează Uniunea Europeană cu privire la modul în care au fost utilizate fondurile destinate să vină în sprijinul Libanului?

2. În ce mod acordă Uniunea Europeană sprijin Libanului pentru dezvoltarea unei guvernări stabile?

Răspuns dat de dl Füle în numele Comisiei
(3 aprilie 2014)

1. Fondurile acordate de UE pentru asistență externă în Liban și în alte părți sunt monitorizate prin sistemul de Raport privind gestionarea asistenței externe și prin evaluările intermediare și finale, în corelație cu vizitele ad hoc de monitorizare axată pe rezultate la nivel de proiect. Experții UE în domeniul umanitar monitorizează constant calitatea, raportul cost-eficacitate și impactul asistenței umanitare a UE. Toate intervențiile în materie de ajutor extern fac obiectul unui audit efectuat de auditori acreditați, iar partenerii de implementare au obligația raportării financiare și operaționale periodice.

2. Uniunea Europeană s-a angajat să sprijine stabilitatea în Liban și a alocat resurse considerabile pentru a contribui la găsirea unor soluții la problemele legate de securitate, de afluxul de refugiați, precum și de dezvoltarea economică și socială. UE rămâne principalul donator în favoarea Libanului.

În ceea ce privește buna guvernanță în special, UE a sprijinit diversele scrutine electorale în Liban cu programe, a căror eficiență a fost recunoscută. În prezent UE sprijină democrația prin asistența pe care o acordă pentru organizarea următoarelor scrutine electorale. Mai mult, legitimitatea democratică a Parlamentului Libanului a fost, de asemenea, consolidată prin programul „Promovarea stabilizării politice și a reconcilierii naționale în Liban". Un alt program, „Consolidarea drepturilor omului și a democrației în Liban", se axează pe îmbunătățirea rezultatelor în domeniul drepturilor omului în Liban prin sprijinirea, printre altele, a cetățeniei active. Programele în domeniul drepturilor omului și consolidarea rolului actorilor nestatali și a autorităților locale în Liban includ proiecte care au scopul de a îmbunătăți responsabilitatea democratică în comunitățile de refugiați palestinieni prin activism social sau prin sprijin pentru autoritățile locale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001720/14
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Stagnant reforms in Lebanon

According to Human Rights Watch, Lebanon is facing a tough transition towards a stable society. One of the reasons for this is the open border for refugees trying to escape from Syria. Kidnappings and bombings in Beirut and Tripoli were the price Lebanon had to pay for this in 2013. There is also a lack of full financial support from the UN for the refugees, even though Lebanon has been encouraged to keep its borders open.

Another reason is the fact that there has been no government since 2013. A government is needed to enable judicial reforms and stabilise the crime rates, thereby protecting migrant workers and women.

1. Is the EU investigating how the funds to help Lebanon were used?

2. How is the EU supporting Lebanon in developing stable governance in the country?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2014)

1. EU external assistance funding in Lebanon and elsewhere is monitored through the External Assistance Management Report system and mid-term and final evaluations, combined with ad hoc Results-Oriented Monitoring visits at project level. EU humanitarian field experts are regularly monitoring the quality, cost-effectiveness and the impact of the EU humanitarian assistance. All external aid interventions are subject to auditing by accredited auditors and regular financial and operational reporting is required from the implementing partners.

2. The EU is committed to supporting the stability of Lebanon and has allocated substantial resources to help respond to problems related to security, inflow of refugees as well as economic and social development. The EU remains the main donor to Lebanon.

Regarding good governance in particular, the EU has supported various elections in Lebanon with programmes, the efficiency of which has been recognised. The EU is currently supporting democracy through assistance to the organisation of the next elections. Furthermore, the democratic legitimacy of Lebanon's Parliament has also been strengthened through the 'Promoting Political Stabilisation and National Reconciliation in Lebanon' programme. Another programme, 'Reinforcing Human Rights and Democracy in Lebanon', focuses on improving Lebanon's human rights record by supporting, among others, an active citizenship. Programmes in the area of human rights and strengthening non-state actors and local authorities in Lebanon include projects to improve democratic accountability in Palestinian refugee communities through social activism or support to local authorities.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001721/14
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(17 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Sprijin pentru victimele din Ucraina

După intensificarea protestelor din Ucraina, diferite canale mass media au informat despre o serie de abuzuri comise împotriva protestatarilor. La 23 ianuarie 2014, Human Rights Watch a declarat că Oleksandra Khailak, o militantă ce făcea parte din serviciul medical voluntar al mișcării de protest, a fost arestată de către poliție, deposedată de toate efectele personale și abandonată într-o pădure de lângă Kiev. De asemenea, la 21 ianuarie, doi activiști, Ihor Lutsenko și Iuri Verbitski, au fost răpiți și bătuți de agresori necunoscuți. Cel dintâi se află în prezent în spital, iar cel din urmă a fost găsit mort.

Conflictul din Ucraina s-ar putea termina cu încheierea, la un moment dat, a unui acord politic, însă cicatricele lăsate de acesta asupra victimelor și familiilor lor vor persista pentru lungă vreme după aceea. În acest context, ar putea Comisia răspunde la următoarele întrebări:

1. Cum a reacționat, în ce privește adoptarea unor măsuri concrete, la abuzurile și actele de violență comise de guvernul Ucrainei împotriva unor protestatari proeminenți din EuroMaidan?

2. Cum va asigura că, după caz, militanții răniți, precum și familiile celor decedați, vor primi ajutor medical sau sprijin financiar de la guvernul Ucrainei?

Răspuns dat de dl Füle în numele Comisiei
(20 mai 2014)

UE condamnă toate formele de violență comise de oricare dintre părți și își exprimă profunda compasiune pentru victimele violențelor din Ucraina. Este de maximă importanță să se ancheteze în mod corespunzător cazurile de intimidare și tortură, tratament inuman sau degradant și dispariții de persoane. Grupul consultativ internațional, creat de curând, din cadrul Consiliului Europei, va avea un rol foarte important în acest sens. UE are în vedere măsuri restrictive împotriva persoanelor care se fac răspunzătoare de încălcări ale drepturilor omului sau de însușirea ilegală a unor fonduri de stat, precum și împotriva celor care contribuie la subminarea suveranității și a integrității teritoriale a Ucrainei. UE și-a manifestat disponibilitatea de a facilita, cu deplina participare a părții ucrainene, o soluție pașnică și negociată la această situație de criză și de a asigura respectarea integrală a principiilor și obligațiilor care decurg din dreptul internațional. UE salută angajamentul guvernului ucrainean de a asigura caracterul reprezentativ și incluziv al structurilor guvernamentale, reflectând astfel diversitatea regională, de a asigura protecția deplină a drepturilor persoanelor care aparțin minorităților naționale, de a îndeplini reforma constituțională, de a investiga toate cazurile de încălcare a drepturilor omului și toate actele de violență, de a combate extremismul și de a organiza alegeri prezidențiale libere, corecte și transparente. Restabilirea ordinii publice și garantarea faptului că organele de aplicare a legii sunt eficiente, transparente și că respectă drepturile omului, sunt priorități de maximă importanță.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001721/14
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Support for victims in Ukraine

Following the intensification of the protests in Ukraine, a number of abuses against protesters have been reported through various media channels. On 23 January 2014 Human Rights Watch stated that Oleksandra Khailak, an activist from the protest movement's volunteer medical service, was detained by the police, stripped of all her belongings and abandoned in a forest near Kyiv. Similarly, on 21 January, two activists, Ihor Lutsenko and Yuri Verbitsky, were kidnapped and beaten by unknown attackers. The former is currently in hospital, while the latter was found dead.

The conflict in Ukraine may end in a political agreement at some point, but its scars on the victims and their families will remain for a long time after. In light of this, could the Commission respond to the following:

1. How has it reacted, in terms of concrete measures, to the abuses and violence that the Ukrainian Government has committed against prominent EuroMaidan protesters?

2. How will it ensure that wounded activists, as well as the families of the deceased, will receive healthcare or financial support from the Ukrainian Government, where necessary?

Answer given by Commissioner Füle on behalf of the Commission
(20 May 2014)

The EU condemns all forms of violence perpetrated by any party and expresses deep sympathy for victims of violence in Ukraine. The proper investigation of cases involving intimidation, torture, disappearances, and inhumane or degrading treatment is of the upmost importance. The recently launched Council of Europe International Advisory Panel will play an important role in this regard. The EU is pursuing restrictive measures against persons responsible for human rights violations or misappropriation of State funds, as well as those contributing to undermining the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine. The EU has underlined its readiness to facilitate a peaceful, negotiated solution to the crisis with the full ownership of Ukrainians, and to ensure full respect for the principles of and obligations under international law. It welcomes the Ukrainian government's commitment to ensure the representative nature and inclusiveness of governmental structures, reflecting regional diversity, to ensure the full protection of the rights of persons belonging to national minorities, to undertake constitutional reform, to investigate all human rights violations and acts of violence, to fight extremism, and to hold free, fair and transparent Presidential elections. Restoring public order and ensuring that law-enforcement bodies are efficient, transparent and respect human rights, are top priorities.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001725/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(17 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Nuove batterie biodegradabili per usi medici e scientifici

Una ricerca svolta da un'università statunitense ha portato alla realizzazione di un nuovo tipo di batteria biocompatibile, fabbricata a partire dall'inchiostro prodotto dalle seppie.

Si tratta di una batteria agli ioni di sodio costituita da melina e ossido di manganese, che si decompongono senza liberare sostanze tossiche. La melanina impiegata deriva proprio dall'inchiostro dei cefalopodi. Gli studiosi hanno scoperto che la melanina presente in natura ha una maggiore capacità di immagazzinare la carica elettrica rispetto a quella di sintesi, grazie alla sua nanostruttura semiconduttiva.

Il primo utilizzo ipotizzato per questa nuova tecnologia è in campo medico: si prevede di utilizzarla per la creazione di dispositivi che rilasciano medicine. Questi potrebbero essere ingeriti come normali compresse e, essendo dotati di particolari sensori, sarebbero in grado di rilasciare i farmaci dopo essere entrati nell'intestino, evitando il contatto dei principi attivi con i succhi gastrici dello stomaco. I ricercatori sostengono che la batteria non possa deteriorarsi durante il viaggio all'interno dell'organismo prima che il principio attivo sia azionato, in quanto il degrado avviene in settimane o addirittura mesi.

In alternativa, gli studiosi pensano di utilizzare questa nuova tecnologia nei casi di fuoriuscita di petrolio: si ipotizza di rilasciare nel mare dispositivi dotati di tali batterie che comunichino tra loro e siano in grado di inviare anche messaggi ai ricercatori.

Considerato che:

— per le sue capacità biodegradabili, la batteria menzionata permette di ridurre l'impatto ambientale connesso allo smaltimento degli accumulatori convenzionali;

— per quanto riguarda il suo impiego in ambito medico, potrebbe essere utile per ovviare ai problemi legati alle iniezioni (indispensabili in caso di farmaci che non possono essere assunti per via orale);

si chiede alla Commissione se:

1. ritiene che tale scoperta possa effettivamente offrire un contributo in un'ottica di sostenibilità e riduzione dell'impatto ambientale e, in caso affermativo, intenda sostenere un utilizzo di tale batteria in luogo della tipologia tradizionale?

2. Considera utile l'impiego di questa tecnologia per i fini medici o scientifici illustrati?

3. Intende incoraggiare e sostenere studi internazionali europei su questo tema?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(28 aprile 2014)

La direttiva 2006/66/CE ([1]), modificata dalla direttiva 2013/56/UE ([2]), autorizza l'immissione sul mercato di tutte le batterie che ne soddisfano i requisiti e, di conseguenza, consente l'uso di diversi tipi di batterie per applicazioni diverse.

La direttiva impone agli Stati membri, sul cui territorio sono stabiliti produttori, di promuovere la ricerca e migliorare l'efficienza ambientale complessiva delle batterie durante tutto il loro ciclo di vita, nonché di sviluppare batterie contenenti minori quantità di sostanze pericolose.

La Commissione sostiene azioni di ricerca e innovazione principalmente attraverso inviti a presentare proposte pubblicati nell'ambito del programma quadro di ricerca e innovazione Orizzonte 2020 ([3]). Da un certo numero di settori del programma (ad es. eccellenza scientifica, leadership industriale) potrebbero emergere progetti di ricerca innovativi in questa nuova tecnologia.

([1]) GU L 226 del 26.9.2006, pag. 1.
([2]) GU L 329 del 10.12.2013, pag. 5.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001725/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: New biodegradable batteries for medical and scientific use

Research carried out by an American university has resulted in the production of a new type of biocompatible battery, manufactured from ink produced by cuttlefish.

The battery in question is a sodium-ion battery comprising melanin and manganese oxide, which break down without releasing toxic substances. The melanin used is in fact derived from the ink of cephalopods. Researchers have discovered that, thanks to its semi-conductive nanostructure, naturally occurring melanin has a greater electrical charge storage capacity than synthetic melanin.

The first use contemplated for this new technology is in the medical field. It is planned to use it to create medicine delivery devices which can be ingested in the same way as normal tablets and, being fitted with special sensors, would be capable of releasing drugs after entering the intestine, hence avoiding contact between the active ingredients and gastric juices in the stomach. The researchers maintain that the battery will not deteriorate as it passes through the body before the active ingredient is activated, given that degradation will take place over a period of weeks or even months.

Alternatively, the researchers envisage using this new technology in the event of oil spillage. It is proposed to release into the sea devices fitted with these batteries which will communicate with one another and also be able to send messages to the researchers.

Considering that:

— due to its biodegradable capacities, the battery described above makes it possible to reduce the environmental impact associated with the disposal of conventional storage batteries;

— as regards its use in a medical context, it could be useful to circumvent problems associated with injections (essential in the case of drugs which cannot be taken orally).

The Commission is asked whether:

1. It considers that this discovery can effectively contribute to sustainability and a reduction in the environmental impact and, if so, does it intend to support the use of this battery rather than the traditional type of battery?

2. It considers the application of this technology to the medical or scientific purposes described above to be of use?

3. It intends to encourage and support European international studies on this subject?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(28 April 2014)

Directive 2006/66/EC ([1]) as amended by Directive 2013/56/EU ([2]) allows the placing on the market of all batteries meeting the directive's requirements and thus allows the use of many different types of batteries for different applications.

The directive requires Member States with battery manufacturers on their territory to promote research and encourage improvements in the overall environmental performance of batteries throughout their life cycle as well as to develop batteries containing smaller quantities of dangerous substances.

The Commission supports research and innovation actions mainly through calls for proposals published under its Framework Programme for Research and Innovation Horizon 2020 ([3]). This program has a number of areas (e.g. Excellent Science, Industrial Leadership) from which innovative research projects on this new technology could emerge.

([1]) OJ L 226, 26.9.2006.
([2]) OJ L 329, 10.12.2013.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001726/14
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(17 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Nuova terapia per la cura del tumore al seno

Ogni anno in Italia si ammalano di tumore al seno circa 45 000 donne: di queste 35 000 guariscono, ma 10-12 000 svilupperanno nel tempo un tumore metastatico. Recentemente è stata sviluppata una nuova terapia nel trattamento del tumore al seno in stadio avanzato grazie ad un farmaco mirato per il carcinoma mammario in fase avanzata, positivo al recettore per gli estrogeni e HER2 negativo.

Quando è in stadio avanzato, questo tumore solo raramente può essere guarito definitivamente e nella maggior parte dei casi viene cronicizzato attraverso l'impiego di molti farmaci antitumorali oggi a disposizione.

Questa nuova terapia arricchisce l'armamentario terapeutico a disposizione del medico e permette di cambiare il paradigma, andando oltre il tradizionale binomio chemioterapia-ormonoterapia. Infatti — secondo quanto dichiarano gli esperti — è una terapia a bersaglio molecolare che ha come target la proteina mTOR bloccandola e permettendo, così, da un lato di rallentare la crescita e la diffusione del tumore e, dall'altro, di indebolirne la resistenza alla terapia ormonale, onde ottenere una migliore qualità della vita, minore progressione della malattia e buon profilo di tollerabilità.

Stante che il tasso di sopravvivenza a 5 anni per il carcinoma al seno allo stadio 0 è del 93 %, allo stadio I è all'88 %, allo stadio II è compreso tra il 74-81 %, mentre allo stadio IV crolla al 15 % (dati del National Cancer Data Base) e che questo divario denuncia l'urgenza di mettere in campo nuove terapie per rallentare la progressione della malattia, assicurando alle donne una più lunga sopravvivenza con la migliore qualità di vita possibile, può la Commissione far sapere se intende acquisire e valutare i risultati di tale studio e investire nello sviluppo delle innovazioni in tale campo?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(24 marzo 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza degli studi pubblicati sulle riviste «New England Journal of Medicine» e «European Journal of Cancer» a cui si riferisce l'onorevole parlamentare ([1]), ([2]), ([3]).

Per scelta politica la Commissione non valuta i risultati di progetti di ricerca individuali che non riguardino direttamente la sua attività di finanziamento.

Il settimo programma quadro per le attività di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazione (2007-2013) ha fornito sostegno per un importo superiore a 100 milioni di EUR per approcci di ricerca collaborativa e di frontiera sul cancro al seno, in materia di diagnosi precoce, meccanismi di resistenza e nuovi trattamenti.

Orizzonte 2020, il programma quadro per la ricerca e l'innovazione (2014-2020) ([4]), offrirà opportunità di finanziare la ricerca sulla prevenzione, la diagnosi precoce e il trattamento del cancro, compreso il cancro al seno, nel quadro dell'obiettivo «Salute, cambiamento demografico e benessere» contenuto nella priorità «Sfide per la società» ([5]).

I finanziamenti dell'UE per la ricerca sono concessi in seguito a inviti a presentare proposte su base concorrenziale e dopo una valutazione *inter pares* indipendente. Le informazioni sulle attuali possibilità di finanziamento si possono ottenere consultando il portale dedicato alla ricerca e all'innovazione ([6]).

([1]) Baselga et al. (2012). New Engl J Med 366(6):520-9.
([2]) Campone et al (2013) Eur J Cancer 49, 2621-2632.
([3]) http://www.italiasalute.it/copertina.asp?Articolo_id=12496
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0809:FIN:IT:PDF
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001726/14
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: New treatment for breast cancer

Each year in Italy, around 45 000 women fall ill with breast cancer: of these, 35 000 recover, but 10-12 000 will develop a metastatic tumour over time. Recently, a new treatment for advanced stage breast cancer has been developed thanks to a drug which targets advanced stage mammary carcinoma, oestrogen receptor positive and HER2 negative.

Once at an advanced stage, a tumour of this kind can only rarely be permanently eliminated and in the majority of cases is treated as chronic through use of the many different anti-tumour drugs currently available.

This new treatment enriches the therapeutic toolbox at the disposal of the physician and makes it possible to change the paradigm and go beyond the traditional chemotherapy-hormone therapy combination. In fact, according to the experts, this is a molecular therapy which targets and blocks the mTOR protein, making it possible, firstly to slow the growth and spread of the tumour, and secondly to weaken its resistance to hormonal therapy, in order to achieve a better quality of life, slower progression of the illness and good tolerability.

In view of the fact that the 5-year survival rate is 93% for stage 0 breast cancer, 88% for stage I and 74-81% for stage II, plummeting to 15% at stage IV (data from the National Cancer Database) and that this differential reveals the urgency of implementing new treatments to slow the progress of the illness, providing women with a longer survival with the best quality of life possible, can the Commission tell us whether it intends to acquire and evaluate the findings of this study and invest in the development of innovations in this field?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(24 March 2014)

The Commission is aware of the studies published in the journals 'New England Journal of Medicine' and 'European Journal of Cancer' referred to by the Honourable Member. ([1]), ([2]), ([3]).

As a matter of policy, the Commission does not assess the results of individual research projects that do not relate directly to its funding activities.

The 7th Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013) provided support in an amount exceeding EUR 100 million for frontier and collaborative breast cancer research approaches on early diagnosis, resistance mechanisms and novel treatments.

Horizon 2020 — The framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([4]), will offer opportunities to support research on the prevention, early diagnosis and treatment of cancer, including breast cancer, through the 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' societal challenge ([5]).

EU research funding is granted on the basis of competitive calls for proposals, following an independent peer-review evaluation. Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained through the Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([6]).

([1]) Baselga et al (2012). New Engl J Med 366(6):520-9.
([2]) Campone et al (2013) Eur J Cancer 49, 2621-2632.
([3]) http://www.italiasalute.it/copertina.asp?Articolo_id=12496
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0809:FIN:EN:PDF
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001727/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(17 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Rischio che la Turchia diventi un paradiso fiscale

La Turchia potrebbe rientrare nella lista nera dei paradisi fiscali che sarà stilata dall'Ocse.

Come intende la Commissione intervenire per far sì che le competenti autorità turche attuino i necessari provvedimenti, sia normativi sia operativi, per impedire e/o bloccare le attività che prefigurano la trasformazione della Turchia in un paradiso fiscale così da rendere inevitabile il suo inserimento nella black list dell'Ocse?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(4 aprile 2014)

La Commissione europea non dispone di informazioni da cui risulti che la Turchia potrebbe diventare un paradiso fiscale. La Turchia è stata oggetto di una valutazione inter pares approfondita ad opera del forum mondiale dell'OCSE sulla trasparenza e lo scambio di informazioni a scopi fiscali, che ha esaminato il quadro normativo turco in termini di trasparenza, scambio di informazioni e applicazione pratica. La relazione della valutazione inter pares, che è stata pubblicata nell'aprile 2013, ha classificato la Turchia come «parzialmente conforme». La Turchia deve dar seguito alle raccomandazioni contenute nella relazione con una relazione sulle misure adottate.

Il 6 dicembre 2012 la Commissione ha inoltre pubblicato una raccomandazione concernente misure destinate a incoraggiare i paesi terzi ad applicare norme minime di buona governance in materia fiscale ([1]), a cui tutti i partner dell'UE sono invitati ad aderire. La Commissione esorterà a mettere in pratica queste raccomandazioni in tutte le sedi appropriate.

([1]) C(2012) 8805 def. del 6.12.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001727/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Risk that Turkey is becoming a tax haven

Turkey could be included on the blacklist of tax havens prepared by the OECD.

How does the Commission intend to ensure that the competent Turkish authorities implement the necessary measures, regulative or operational, to prevent and/or block the activities which will turn Turkey into a tax haven, hence making its inclusion on the OECD blacklist inevitable?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

The European Commission does not have any information suggesting that Turkey may become a tax heaven. Turkey has undergone the in-depth peer review process of the OECD's Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes. This review studies the Turkish regulatory framework for transparency and exchange of information and the practical implementation of that framework. The peer review report was published in April 2013 and the overall rating for Turkey was 'Partially Compliant'. Turkey should answer to the recommendations in the report with a follow-up report on the steps undertaken.

The Commission issued also its own Recommendation of 6 December 2012 regarding measures intended to encourage third countries to apply minimum standards of good governance in tax matters ([1]), to which all EU partners in particular are called to commit. The Commission will encourage to follow-up these recommendations in the appropriate fora.

([1]) C(2012) 8805 final of 6.12.2012.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-003578/14
upućeno Komisiji
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(24. ožujka 2014.)

Predmet: Krivotvorena roba iz Turske

U svom stajalištu o prijedlogu Uredbe Parlamenta i Vijeća o izmjeni Uredbe Vijeća (EZ) br. 207/2009 o žigu Zajednice Parlament je podržao prijedlog Komisije kojim se naglašava da bi nositelj žiga EU-a trebao imati pravo spriječiti treće strane da u carinsko područje Unije unose robu koja na tom području nije puštena u slobodan promet ako takva roba dolazi iz trećih zemalja i bez odobrenja nosi žig koji je u biti jednak žigu EU-a registriranom za tu robu.

Pritisak na vanjske granice Unije iz Turske ne vrše samo ilegalni migranti i kriminalne skupine koje organiziraju trgovinu ljudima i drogom preko naših granica, već i rastuća količina krivotvorene robe koja preplavljuje europsko tržište.

Premda su hrvatski represivni i carinski organi posebno aktivni i uspješni u zapljeni takve robe, sami teško mogu podnijeti takav pritisak na najdužu vanjsku kopnenu granicu Unije.

Stoga želim znati koje preventivne mjere Komisija planira poduzeti u svrhu sprječavanja dolaska krivotvorene robe iz Turske u EU. Koje je konkretne mjere Komisija dosad poduzela u suradnji s turskom vladom kako bi s turske strane borba protiv krivotvorenja i krijumčarenja bila učinkovitija te hoće li to uzeti kao kriterij u razmatranju daljnje europske perspektive te države?

Odgovor g. Fülea u ime Komisije
(24. travnja 2014.)

Komisija je svjesna da je u Turskoj potrebno unaprijediti provedbu prava intelektualnog vlasništva (PIV).

Raspravu o pitanjima prava intelektualnog vlasništva u Turskoj Komisija je pokrenula i u okviru pristupnih pregovora (poglavlja 7. i 29.) i u okviru Sporazuma o carinskoj uniji između EU-a i Turske. S tim u vezi, Komisija upućuje uvaženog zastupnika na Izvješće o napretku Turske iz 2013 [1].

Osim toga, Komisija je u suradnji s Turskom osnovala Radnu skupinu za prava intelektualnog vlasništva, osobito kako bi se pokušala unaprijediti provedba suzbijanja piratske i krivotvorene robe. U sastancima sudjeluju i predstavnici industrije EU-a te svoje razloge za zabrinutost iznose izravno predstavnicima turskih tijela.

Komisija trenutačno razmatra mogućnost pružanja pomoći Turskoj Instrumentom za tehničku pomoć i razmjenu informacija, posebice u području žigova, uključujući pravosudne i upravne metode za borbu protiv krivotvorenja i povezanih povreda prava. Ured za usklađivanje na unutarnjem tržištu (OHIM) održat će seminare u Turskoj u travnju 2014.

Uredbom EU-a br. 608/2013 utvrđuju se uvjeti i postupci za djelovanje carinskih tijela u borbi protiv povreda prava intelektualnog vlasništva. Carinskim akcijskim planom EU-a za razdoblje 2013. — 2017. unaprijedit će se sredstva koja su na raspolaganju carinskim tijelima kako bi mogla uspješno suzbijati najnovije načine povrede prava intelektualnoga vlasništva. Komisija je u suradnji s državama članicama pokrenula aktivnosti u cilju bolje provedbe prava intelektualnog vlasništva, uključujući aktivnosti povezane s paketima i poštanskim prometom te unaprjeđenje upravljanja rizicima u carinskim pitanjima.

---

[1] http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001728/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(17 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Vendita di prodotti contraffatti in Turchia

È la Commissione a conoscenza del fatto che in Turchia:

1. la principale modalità di vendita dei prodotti contraffatti è la vendita al dettaglio, effettuata nelle strade, nei mercati rionali o nei negozi per turisti, da ambulanti notturni, nonché nei retrobottega o ai piani superiori dei negozi, ma anche nei supermercati e persino negli hotel a 4 e 5 stelle;

2. falsi negozi outlet si trovano inoltre nelle periferie di Istanbul;

3. quali canali di smercio dei prodotti falsificati non vanno sottovalutati Internet e le ordinazioni tramite catalogo con consegna a domicilio?

Come valuta tale situazione che fa della Turchia un «paradiso» della contraffazione?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001731/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(17 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Localizzare l'entrata e l'uscita dei prodotti italiani contraffatti in Turchia

È la Commissione al corrente del fatto che i prodotti italiani contraffatti vengono sia contrabbandati che importati in Turchia ed esportati dalla Turchia dichiarando eventualmente alle dogane prodotti generici o in minor quantità di quella effettivamente trasportata?

È la Commissione al corrente del fatto che alcune delle rotte principali del contrabbando sono: Istanbul-Sirnak Nord dell'Iraq, Istanbul-Edirne-Balcani, Istanbul-Sarp-Russia, Gaziantep-Siria, e che il confine con l'Iran è un passaggio strategico per il contrabbando?

È la Commissione a conoscenza del fatto che le spedizioni in automezzi, aerei e bagagli personali sono i metodi più utilizzati, ma che la merce falsificata giunge anche via nave nei container?

È la Commissione consapevole del fatto che sempre più frequentemente l'invio di piccoli quantitativi di merce contraffatta avviene tramite corrieri espressi che di norma non conoscono e non controllano il contenuto dei pacchi spediti?

Quali iniziative la Commissione ha attuato e/o intende attuare in proposito perché tale traffico venga efficacemente contrastato?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001733/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(17 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Giocattoli contraffatti dalla Turchia

In Turchia si ha una minore produzione di giocattoli originali rispetto all'entità dei prodotti contraffatti. La quantità di prodotti presenti sul mercato è costituita da una molteplicità di articoli, che vanno dai videogames all'oggettistica più varia, ai gadget portanti la riproduzione di personaggi noti ai bambini perché protagonisti dei cartoni animati prediletti, ai giochi di società e da tavolo.

Il rischio maggiormente temuto dagli operatori del mercato è, infatti, quello riguardante la tossicità o comunque la pericolosità di alcuni giocattoli contraffatti che, nella maggior parte dei casi, purtroppo sfuggono ai controlli di qualità e non rispecchiano i requisiti sanitari previsti dalle leggi vigenti.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione fornire dati aggiornati circa la contraffazione in Turchia, divisi per prodotti?

Può inoltre indicare in quale percentuale i giocattoli contraffatti raggiugono il mercato europeo dalla Turchia?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001943/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Dogane turche inefficienti contro la contraffazione

Premesso che in Turchia vi sono 18 uffici centrali e 145 uffici doganali periferici e che in tali uffici non si svolge un benché minimo controllo anti-contraffazione;

— che le dogane che i trafficanti di prodotti falsificati sembrano prediligere sono ubicate ad Istanbul, Antalya, Mersin, Iskenderun e Samsun e che le dogane di Ipsala, al confine con la Grecia, e di Kapikule, al confine con la Bulgaria, sono altri importanti nodi attraverso i quali passa la merce contraffatta.

Quali iniziative anti-contraffazione intende attuare la Commissione europea per far sì che la Turchia adotti misure adeguate di rafforzamento dei controlli da parte dei suoi uffici doganali?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001944/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Da dove la Turchia importa prodotti italiani contraffatti

È la Commissione europea al corrente del fatto che:

— i paesi dai quali viene importata in Turchia la maggior quantità di prodotti italiani contraffatti sono senza dubbio i paesi asiatici come Corea, Taiwan, Thailandia e Cina, soprattutto per quanto riguarda gli orologi;

— si importano prodotti italiani falsificati anche dai paesi dell'est europeo, dalla Russia e dagli Emirati arabi uniti;

— la merce italiana contraffatta arriva infine anche dalla Siria e dal Nord Africa, Egitto in particolare?

Quali iniziative a tutela degli autentici prodotti italiani intende la Commissione chiedere alla Turchia?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001946/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Contraffazione del «Made in Italy»

Premesso che:

i prodotti italiani sono i più contraffatti sul mercato turco;

le imprese italiane raramente intraprendono delle azioni legali, non avendo alcuna fiducia nell'obiettività dei tribunali turchi.

Quali iniziative intende attuare la Commissione per far sì che il sistema giudiziario della Turchia offra migliori garanzie di tutela dei prodotti europei e in particolare italiani, contro la contraffazione dei loro prodotti effettuata in Turchia?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001948/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Dove sono venduti in Turchia i prodotti italiani contraffatti

Premesso che:

— per quanto riguarda la vendita di prodotti italiani falsificati in Turchia, essa si concentra a Istanbul e nelle località turistiche della costa sud-occidentale;

— che per quanto riguarda Istanbul, nel Gran Bazar, ad Eminonu, Ortakoy, Kadikoy e Istiklal Caddesi, è possibile trovare qualsiasi tipo di prodotto. Sulla Bagdad Caddesi si trovano soprattutto mobili, mentre l'abbigliamento è reperibile a Osmanbey, Laleli, Merter, e Taksim; a Taksim si trovano anche occhiali da sole, orologeria e profumeria, così come a Kadikoy e Ortakoy. A Kasim Pasa si trovano abiti e scarpe. Magliette, profumi e accessori moda sono anche venduti dagli ambulanti in prossimità dell'imbarco di Kabatas. Le parti meccaniche e i ricambi automobilistici contraffatti sono comuni ad Aksaray;

— che le località turistiche le cui vie sono piene di negozi del falso si trovano nei seguenti distretti: Aydin, Mugla, Ankara, Antalya, Izmir;

— che tra gli altri centri della Turchia non sono escluse dal mercato di prodotti contraffatti Ankara, Gaziantep ed altre città di una certa grandezza;

— che nei centri espositivi di Istanbul, Konya, Izmir può accadere che i contraffattori espongano negli stand accanto a quelli dei titolari dei prodotti originali.

La Commissione europea intende intervenire affinché il governo turco disponga adeguate misure per combattere efficacemente, in tali zone, la commercializzazione dei prodotti contraffatti?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001949/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Italian sounding in Turchia

Si interroga la Commissione europea per sapere se sia al corrente del fatto che:

— in Turchia esiste anche il fenomeno dell'*Italian sounding*;

— esso riguarda soprattutto i servizi di ristorazione, i prodotti alimentari e non solo;

— numerosi ristoranti si pregiano di essere italiani, usando nomi evocativi del nostro Paese, ma propongono menu i cui piatti di italiano hanno solo il nome e spesso neppure quello: non è raro trovare scritto nei menù di costosi ristoranti sul Bosforo ad Istanbul «spaghetti», «linguine» e similari.

La Commissione intende chiedere alla Turchia urgenti provvedimenti per stroncare il fenomeno dell'*Italian sounding*, estremamente lesivo degli interessi economici dell'Italia e della stessa immagine di qualità dei prodotti italiani?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001950/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Il made in Italy più contraffatto in Turchia

Il settore italiano più colpito dalla contraffazione in Turchia è quello del tessile/abbigliamento. La contraffazione si estende anche ai seguenti settori: accessori in pelle, come borse e cinture, calzaturiero, occhiali da sole, gioielleria, orologeria, cosmesi e profumeria.

Quali iniziative ha realizzato la Commissione a tutela dei prodotti italiani del settore e con quali risultati?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001952/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Esportazione dalla Turchia di prodotti italiani contraffatti

La Commissione europea è a conoscenza del fatto che:

i prodotti italiani contraffatti esportati dalla Turchia sono destinati principalmente ai Balcani e ai Paesi dell'Est europeo e moltissimi sono diretti in Russia?

Il resto delle esportazioni si dirige verso l'Unione europea, in particolare Gran Bretagna e Polonia (entrando dalla Grecia, dalla Bulgaria, dalla Romania, da Cipro verso Cipro Nord), gli Emirati Arabi e i Paesi del Golfo (specialmente l'Iraq), Ucraina, Iran, Israele, Giordania, Libano e il Nord Africa?

La Commissione, in ordine a ciò, quali iniziative intende attuare per stroncare l'esportazione dalla Turchia di prodotti italiani contraffatti?

Risposta congiunta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(24 aprile 2014)

La Commissione è consapevole della necessità di migliorare l'applicazione dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale (DPI) in Turchia.

La Commissione solleva le questioni connesse ai DPI in Turchia sia nell'ambito dei negoziati di adesione (capitoli 7 e 29) che nell'ambito dell'accordo sull'unione doganale UE-Turchia. A tale riguardo, la Commissione invita l'onorevole deputato a consultare la sua relazione del 2013 sui progressi compiuti dalla Turchia ([1]).

La Commissione ha inoltre istituito con la Turchia un gruppo di lavoro sui DPI, incaricato in particolare di migliorare le misure prese da questo paese per lottare contro le merci usurpative o contraffatte. L'industria UE partecipa alle riunioni ed esprime le proprie preoccupazioni direttamente alle autorità turche.

La Commissione sta valutando la possibilità di fornire alla Turchia, attraverso lo strumento di assistenza tecnica e scambio di informazioni, un'assistenza specifica nel campo dei marchi commerciali comprendente i metodi giudiziari e amministrativi per combattere la contraffazione e le infrazioni connesse. L'Ufficio per l'armonizzazione nel mercato interno (UAMI) organizzerà seminari in Turchia ad aprile 2014.

Il regolamento (UE) n. 608/2013 stabilisce le condizioni e le procedure per gli interventi delle autorità doganali volti a combattere le violazioni dei DPI. Il piano d'azione doganale 2013-2017 dell'UE mira ad aggiornare gli strumenti di cui dispongono le autorità doganali per contrastare efficacemente le principali tendenze in materia di violazione dei DPI. Insieme agli Stati membri, la Commissione ha sviluppato attività finalizzate a una migliore applicazione dei DPI, anche per quanto riguarda il traffico postale e attraverso una migliore gestione dei rischi doganali.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001728/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Sale of counterfeit goods in Turkey

Is the Commission aware that in Turkey:

1. the main method of selling counterfeit goods is retail selling in the street, local markets or tourist shops, by night-time street vendors, in back-rooms or on upper floors of shops, but also in supermarkets and even 4-5 star hotels;

2. false retail outlets are also found on the outskirts of Istanbul;

3. the Internet and catalogue ordering with home delivery should not be underestimated as channels for the sale of fake goods?

How does the Commission evaluate this situation, which is turning Turkey into a counterfeiting 'haven'?

Question for written answer E-001731/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Entry and exit points of Italian counterfeit goods to and from Turkey

Is the Commission aware that Italian counterfeit goods are smuggled or imported to Turkey and exported from Turkey and that a customs declaration of generic goods or goods in a lesser quantity than those effectively carried may be made?

Is the Commission aware that the main smuggling routes include: Istanbul-Sirnak, north of Iraq, Istanbul-Edirne-Balcani, Istanbul-Sarp-Russia, Gaziantep-Syria, and that the border with Iran is a strategic smuggling pathway?

Is the Commission aware that such goods are most commonly transported by road, air and in personal baggage, but that fake goods also arrive on board container ships?

Is the Commission aware that small consignments of counterfeit goods are increasingly delivered by express carriers, who in general neither know nor control the contents of the packages carried?

What action has the Commission taken and/or what action does it intend to take on this matter to ensure that this traffic is effectively countered?

Question for written answer E-001733/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Counterfeit toys from Turkey

In Turkey, the volume of original toys produced is lower than the volume of counterfeit products. The goods on the market comprise a multiplicity of items, ranging from video-games to a variety of souvenir items, gadgets containing reproductions of personalities known to children as the heroes of their favourite cartoons, parlour and board games.

The risk most feared by market operators is in fact the risk of toxicity or indeed the dangers posed by certain counterfeit toys which unfortunately, in the majority of cases, evade quality controls and fail to meet the health standards required under current legislation.

In consideration of the above, can the Commission provide up-to-date figures on counterfeiting in Turkey, broken down according to product?

Can the Commission also indicate the percentage of counterfeit toys reaching the European market from Turkey?

Question for written answer E-001943/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Turkish customs inefficient in combating counterfeiting

Given that Turkey has 18 central offices and 145 local customs offices and that these offices are not even implementing minimal controls to combat counterfeiting;

— and that the customs points that traffickers of fake goods seem to favour are in Istanbul, Antalya, Mersin, Iskenderun and Samsun, and that the customs points in Ipsala, on the border with Greece, and Kapikule, on the border with Bulgaria, are other important passing points for counterfeit goods,

what steps does the European Commission intend to take to combat counterfeiting and ensure that Turkey takes appropriate measures to strengthen the checks conducted by its customs offices?

Question for written answer E-001944/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Where is Turkey obtaining counterfeit Italian products for import?

Does the European Commission know:

— that the countries from which Turkey imports the largest quantities of Italian counterfeit products, especially watches are, without doubt, Asian, e.g. Korea, Taiwan, Thailand and China?

— that forged Italian products are also imported from the East European countries, Russia and the United Arab Emirates?

— and, finally, that counterfeit Italian goods are also arriving from Syria and North Africa, especially Egypt?

What initiatives is the Commission planning to ask Turkey to adopt to protect genuine Italian products?

Question for written answer E-001946/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: 'Made in Italy' counterfeits

Given that:

— the most common counterfeits on the Turkish market are of Italian products;

— Italian companies rarely take legal action because they have no faith whatsoever in the objectiveness of the Turkish courts,

what steps does the Commission intend to take to ensure that the Turkish justice system provides better guarantees to protect European and, in particular, Italian products against counterfeits manufactured in Turkey?

Question for written answer E-001948/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Places in Turkey where counterfeit Italian products are being sold

Given that:

— the sale of fake Italian products in Turkey is concentrated in Istanbul and tourist areas along the south-west coast;

— in Istanbul, it is possible to find all sorts of products in the Grand Bazaar, in Eminonu, Ortakoy and Kadikoy, and on Istiklal Caddesi. On Bagdat Caddesi you will find mostly furniture, while clothing is available in Osmanbey, Laleli, Merter and Taksim. You will also find sunglasses, watches and perfumes in Taksim, as well as in Kadikoy and Ortakoy. In Kasimpasa you will find suits and shoes. Jumpers, perfumes and fashion accessories are also sold by pedlars close to the Kabatas embarkation area. Counterfeit engine parts and spares are commonly for sale in Aksaray;

— there are tourist areas whose streets are full of shops selling fake items in the following places: Aydin, Mugla, Ankara, Antalya and Izmir;

— other places in Turkey where counterfeit products are being sold include Ankara, Gaziantep and other largish towns;

— it sometimes happens that counterfeit products are displayed on stands alongside those selling original products at exhibition centres in Istanbul, Konya and Izmir;

does the European Commission intend to intervene to ensure that the Turkish Government takes appropriate action to effectively combat the sale of counterfeit products in these areas?

Question for written answer E-001949/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: 'Italian-sounding' products in Turkey

Is the European Commission aware:

— of the phenomenon of 'Italian-sounding' products in Turkey?

— that this phenomenon concerns restaurants and food products in particular, though not exclusively?

— that many restaurants claim to be Italian, using names that suggest they are so, but offer menus whose Italian dishes are Italian only in name, and often not even that? It is not uncommon to see dishes such as 'spaghetti' and 'linguine' on the menus of expensive restaurants on the Bosphorus in Istanbul.

Does the Commission intend to call on Turkey to take urgent steps to put an end to the phenomenon of 'Italian-sounding' products, which is highly damaging both to Italy's economic interests and to the high-quality image of Italian products?

Question for written answer E-001950/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Goods made in Italy which are most frequently counterfeited in Turkey

The Italian industry hardest hit by counterfeiting in Turkey is textiles and clothing. Counterfeiting also affects the the following sectors: leather accessories, such as bags and belts, footwear, sunglasses, jewellery, cosmetics and perfumes.

What steps has the Commission taken to protect Italian goods in these sectors, and with what results?

Question for written answer E-001952/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(19 February 2014)

Subject: Export of counterfeit Italian goods from Turkey

Is the European Commission aware that:

Italian counterfeit goods exported from Turkey are destined primarily for the Balkans and Eastern European countries and many are bound for Russia?

The remainder of these exports are destined for the European Union, in particular Great Britain and Poland (entering from Greece, Bulgaria, Romania and Cyprus via Northern Cyprus), the United Arab Emirates and Gulf States (especially Iraq), Ukraine, Iran, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon and North Africa?

With reference to the above, what measures does the Commission intend to take to stamp out the export of counterfeit Italian products from Turkey?

Question for written answer E-003578/14
to the Commission
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(24 March 2014)

Subject: Counterfeit goods from Turkey

In its Opinion on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Regulation (EC) No 207/2009 on the Community trade mark, Parliament supported the Commission's proposal, which states that 'right holders may prevent third parties from bringing goods from non-EU countries into Union customs territory, whether released for free circulation or otherwise, if these, without authorisation, bear a trade mark essentially identical to one registered in respect of goods of the same type'.

It is not only illegal immigrants and criminal organisations trafficking humans and drugs across our borders who are putting pressure on the EU's border with Turkey: a growing number of counterfeit goods are also flooding the European market.

Although Croatian law enforcement and customs authorities are particularly active and successful in seizing such goods, it is difficult for them to cope with the pressure coming from the EU's longest external land border on their own.

In this connection, what preventive measures does the Commission plan to take in order to prevent counterfeit goods from entering the EU from Turkey? What specific measures has the Commission already taken, in cooperation with the Turkish Government, with a view to making Turkey's efforts to combat counterfeiting more effective? Will this issue be taken into consideration when Turkey's future European prospects are assessed?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2014)

The Commission is aware that enforcement of intellectual property rights (IPR) needs improving in Turkey.

The Commission raises the issues of IPR in Turkey both in the framework of accession negotiations (Chapters 7 and 29) and under the EU — Turkey Customs Union agreement. In this respect, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the 2013 Progress Report on Turkey ([1]).

In addition, the Commission has set up an IPR working group with Turkey, in particular to try and improve Turkey's enforcement against pirated and counterfeit goods. EU industry also participates in the meetings and raises its concerns directly with the Turkish authorities.

The Commission is currently considering the possibility of providing assistance to Turkey through the Technical Assistance Information Exchange Instrument, specifically in the area of trademarks, including judicial and administrative methods for fighting counterfeit and relevant infringements. In April 2014 the Office for Harmonisation in the internal market (OHIM) will deliver seminars in Turkey.

EU Regulation No 608/2013 sets out the conditions and procedures for action by the customs authorities to combat IPR infringement. The EU Customs Action Plan 2013 to 2017 is to upgrade customs authorities' tools to successfully address major trends in infringing IPR. The Commission, together with Member States, has developed activities to better enforce IPR, including in parcel and postal traffic and through strengthening customs risk management.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001730/14
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(17 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Miele contraffatto in Turchia

La Turchia è il secondo paese produttore e esportatore di miele, dopo la Cina, mentre il mercato di tale prodotto è stato caratterizzato da diffusi fenomeni di contraffazione (miele miscelato con additivi o sciroppi).

Quali misure di controllo intende la Commissione operare sul miele importato in UE dalla Turchia?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2014)

Il termine «miele» può essere applicato esclusivamente ad un prodotto che soddisfi la definizione e i criteri di composizione del miele stabiliti nella direttiva 2001/110/CE ([1]) relativa al miele, indipendentemente dal fatto che esso sia prodotto nell'UE o importato da un paese terzo come la Turchia. L'aggiunta fraudolenta di sciroppo di zucchero è una forma di adulterazione nota in tutto il mondo, ma non è facile da individuare e provare. Le difficoltà nel merito sono legate soprattutto alla diversa composizione dei mieli a seconda della loro origine florale, nonché ai limiti dei metodi di laboratorio che rendono difficoltoso individuare in modo inequivocabile l'adulterazione.

Gli Stati membri hanno la responsabilità di effettuare controlli per verificare che il miele immesso sul mercato dell'UE, sia esso prodotto nell'UE o importato da paesi terzi, sia conforme alla pertinente legislazione unionale.

La Commissione sta attualmente esaminando le prassi adottate dagli Stati membri ai fini dei controlli ufficiali del miele per assicurare l'ottemperanza alle disposizioni della direttiva 2001/110/CE prima di decidere eventuali interventi (ad esempio, in forma di piani coordinati di controllo conformemente all'articolo 53 del regolamento (CE) n. 882/2004 ([2])).

([1]) GU L 10 del 12.01.2002.

([2]) Regolamento (CE) n. 882/2004 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 29 aprile 2004, relativo ai controlli ufficiali intesi a verificare la conformità alla normativa in materia di mangimi e di alimenti e alle norme sulla salute e sul benessere degli animali (GU L 165 del 30.4.2004, pag. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001730/14
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Counterfeit honey in Turkey

Turkey is the world's second largest honey producer and exporter after China, but the market for this product is subject to widespread counterfeiting (honey mixed with additives or syrups).

What control measures does the Commission intend to implement on honey imported to the EU from Turkey?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

The term 'honey' can only be applied to a product meeting the definition and composition criteria for honey laid down in the directive 2001/110/EC ([1]) relating to honey, whether it is produced in the EU or it is imported from third countries like Turkey. Fraudulent addition of sugar syrup is a worldwide-known adulteration but is not easy to detect and prove. Difficulties lay especially in the diverse composition of honeys according to their floral origin and in the limitations of laboratory methods to detect adulteration unequivocally.

Member States are responsible for carrying controls to verify that honey placed on the EU market, whether produced in the EU or imported from third countries, is compliant with the relevant EU legislation.

The Commission is currently looking at practices in Member States' official controls on honey to ensure compliance with the provisions of the directive 2001/110/EC before deciding on any further action (for instance in the form of coordinated control plans in accordance with Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 ([2])).

([1]) OJ L 10, 12.01.2002.

([2]) Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules (OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1).

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001735/14
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(17 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Integrarea doctoranzilor pe piața forței de muncă din UE

Europa 2020 reprezintă strategia prin care Europa dorește să combată efectele crizei și să permită transformarea UE într-o economie inteligentă, durabilă și favorabilă incluziunii, caracterizată prin niveluri ridicate de ocupare a forței de muncă, productivitate și coeziune socială. Una dintre prioritățile strategiei vizează domeniul cercetării, inovării și dezvoltării inteligente. În Europa, cheltuielile din PIB destinate sectorului de cercetare-dezvoltare reprezintă 2%, fiind mai mici decât sumele alocate în SUA, 2,6% și mai ales Japonia, 3,4%. Analiștii apreciază că situația este determinată în mod deosebit de ponderea scăzută a sectorului privat în zonă, inclusiv în ceea ce privește sectorul universitar și high-tech și determină o parte importantă a decalajului față de SUA.

Deși activitatea doctoranzilor poate constitui un indicator de calitate pentru universitățile europene, mai ales în contextul situării pe un loc de top în clasamentele internaționale pentru instituțiile de învățământ superior, inserția doctoranzilor în domeniul cercetării la nivelul UE este uneori dificilă.

În plus, mulți absolvenți de studii doctorale părăsesc Europa, tocmai pentru că nu se pot integra pe piața forței de muncă europene.

Cum intenționează Comisia să coreleze aceste aspecte — creșterea ponderii recrutării doctoranzilor, mai ales de către sectorul privat, pentru ca aceștia să rămână în Europa, și majorarea investițiilor în cercetare din PIB la nivelul UE de la 2% în prezent la 3% în 2020 — tocmai pentru a permite Uniunii să își atingă obiectivele incluse în Strategia 2020?

Răspuns dat de dna Geoghegan-Quinn în numele Comisiei
(7 aprilie 2014)

Numărul noilor absolvenți de doctorat în UE a crescut semnificativ de la aproximativ 72 000 în 2000 la aproximativ 115 000 în 2010. Există date care arată că, în prezent, în Franța, Germania și Regatul Unit peste 50 % din titularii de doctorat ocupa locuri de muncă în afara mediului academic. În colaborare cu experți din acest domeniu, Comisia a identificat șapte „Principii privind studiile doctorale inovatoare” pentru promovarea excelenței, formarea competențelor transferabile și expunerea la industrie. Consiliul a aprobat aceste principii și a invitat statele membre să ofere sprijin financiar.

Bugetul în valoare de 6,1 miliarde EUR alocat acțiunilor Marie Skłodowska-Curie din cadrul programului Orizont 2020 va permite recrutarea în programe de înaltă calitate din Europa a aproximativ 25 000 de candidați la doctorat până în 2020. Aceste programe vor oferi experiență în afara mediului academic, dezvoltând competențe care îmbunătățesc șansele de angajare a absolvenților de doctorat. În plus, Consiliul European pentru Cercetare (CEC), cu un buget de 13,1 miliarde EUR în cadrul programului Orizont 2020, sprijină cercetarea de frontieră întreprinsă la inițiativa cercetătorilor în toate domeniile.

În ceea ce privește intensitatea C&D în UE, după ce s-a menținut constantă la aproximativ 1.85 % între 2000 și 2007, a crescut la 2.01 % în 2009 și a atins 2,06 % în 2012. Dacă statele membre își îndeplinesc obiectivele naționale, acest procent se poate ridica la 2,6 % în 2020. Progresele înregistrate în ultimii ani în direcția atingerii obiectivului de 3 %, deși relativ lente, sunt rezultatul politicilor la nivelul UE și al statelor membre de promovare și stimulare a investițiilor private în C&D, precum și de protejare și promovare a finanțării publice a C&D în conformitate cu principiul de consolidare fiscală favorabilă creșterii.

Comisia a subliniat în Analiza anuală a creșterii pentru 2014 ([1]) faptul că statele membre trebuie să găsească modalități de protejare sau de promovare a cheltuielilor publice care consolidează potențialul de creștere al acestora, de exemplu investițiile în cercetare și inovare (C&I).

([1]) COM(2013)800, 13.11.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001735/14
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Integrating PhD students into the EU workforce

Europe 2020 is the strategy via which Europe aims to combat the effects of the crisis and turn the EU into a smart, sustainable and inclusive economy delivering high levels of employment, productivity and social cohesion. One of the strategic priorities is the area of smart research/innovation and growth. In Europe, 2% of GDP is earmarked for research and development, which is less than the amounts allocated in the USA (2.6%) or, especially, in Japan (3.4%). Analysts consider that this situation has arisen in particular because private-sector involvement in this field has tailed off, including in the university and high-tech sector, which largely explains why Europe is lagging behind the USA.

While the work done by PhD students points to the quality of European universities, especially when one considers their standing in the international rankings of higher education establishments, it is sometimes difficult for PhD students to find work as researchers in the EU.

What is more, many students leave Europe once they have completed their PhD, precisely because they cannot find employment on the European job market.

How does the Commission intend to dovetail these considerations — i.e. to increase the proportion of PhD students hired, especially by the private sector, so that they stay in Europe, and to raise the percentage of GDP invested in research from the current 2% to 3% in 2020 — precisely so as to enable the EU to achieve the objectives contained in the 2020 strategy?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

The number of new doctoral graduates in the EU has risen significantly from around 72 000 in 2000 to around 115 000 in 2010. Evidence shows that in France, Germany and the UK over 50% of all PhD degree holders now take up jobs outside academia. Working with experts in this area, the Commission identified seven 'Principles for Innovative Doctoral Training' to foster excellence, transferable skills training and exposure to industry. The Council endorsed these principles and called on Member States to provide financial support.

The Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions Horizon 2020 budget of EUR 6.1 billion will enable around 25 000 doctoral candidates to be recruited by 2020 to high-quality programmes in Europe. These will provide experience outside academia, hence developing employability skills amongst PhD holders. Moreover, the ERC, with a Horizon 2020 budget of EUR 13.1 billion, is supporting investigator-driven frontier research across all fields.

As regards the EU R&D intensity, after remaining flat at around 1.85% between 2000 and 2007, it rose to 2.01% in 2009 and only reached 2.06% in 2012. If Member States meet their national targets, it could amount to 2.6% in 2020. The progress towards the 3% target in recent years, although slow, results from policies at EU and Member State level to foster and leverage private investment in R&D, and to protect and promote public R&D funding in line with the principle of growth-friendly fiscal consolidation.

The Commission stressed in its Annual Growth Survey 2014 ([1]) that Member States need to find ways to protect or promote public spending that reinforces their growth potential, as is the case for R&I investments.

([1]) COM(2013) 800, 13.11.2013.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001736/14
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(17 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Bugetul destinat asistenței umanitare în Republica Centrafricană

Conform ultimelor date publicate de SEAE pe 17 ianuarie 2014, actuala criză din RCA afectează 4,6 milioane de locuitori ai statului, majoritatea copii, și a determinat strămutarea în interiorul țării a 886 000 de persoane.

În 2013 s-au alocat 76 de milioane de euro pentru asistența umanitară în Republica Centrafricană, din care 39 de milioane de euro de la Comisie, restul provenind de la statele membre.

În urma agravării conflictului din RCA la sfârșitul anului 2013, miniștrii de externe ai statelor membre au decis, în cadrul Consiliului Afaceri Externe din 20 ianuarie 2014, să declanșeze o operațiune militară în capitala Bangui. În acest context, Directoratul pentru Asistență Umanitară a anunțat un sprijin adițional de 366 de milioane de euro pentru operațiuni umanitare.

Având în vedere creșterea substanțială a bugetului alocat pentru asistența umanitară în RCA,

1. Ce măsuri a planificat Comisia pentru utilizarea eficientă și transparentă a fondurilor?

2. În raport cu programele din 2013, ce modificări are Comisia în vedere pentru a obține rezultatele așteptate?

Răspuns dat de dna Georgieva în numele Comisiei
(2 aprilie 2014)

Direcția Generală Ajutor Umanitar și Protecție Civilă (DG ECHO) a anunțat că, de la începutul lunii decembrie 2013, va majora bugetul alocat asistenței umanitare în RCA la 45 de milioane EUR. Suma de 366 de milioane EUR reprezintă totalul contribuțiilor provenite din partea diferiților participanți la reuniunea la nivel înalt privind criza centrafricană organizată la 20 ianuarie, sumă destinată asistenței umanitare, dar și dezvoltării și stabilizării situației din regiune. A se vedea comunicatul de presă: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-14-41_fr.htm

Comisia are un birou la Bangui format din asistenți tehnici responsabili de monitorizarea proiectelor finanțate de DG ECHO. Ținând cont de agravarea crizei și de majorarea bugetului, prezența Comisiei la Bangui a fost consolidată în două feluri: prin recrutarea unui al doilea asistent tehnic și prin asigurarea prezenței constante, prin rotație, a unui al treilea asistent tehnic, precum și a unui ofițer de securitate, ca urmare a deteriorării situației la începutul lunii decembrie.

Comisia publică pe pagina de internet a DG ECHO proiectele care beneficiază de sprijin financiar, indicând în același timp partenerii implicați în procesul de punere în aplicare a acestora, precum și sumele alocate fiecărui proiect. DG ECHO evaluează în mod constant nevoile umanitare și își adaptează în consecință modul de alocare a sprijinului financiar pentru a răspunde nevoilor prioritare ale persoanelor celor mai vulnerabile.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001736/14
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Humanitarian assistance budget for the Central African Republic

The most recent information published by the EEAS on 17 January 2014 shows that the current crisis in CAR is affecting 4.6 million people, more than half of them children, and that there are now 886 000 internally displaced persons in the country.

In 2013, a sum of EUR 76 million was allocated to humanitarian assistance in the Central African Republic, EUR 39 million being provided by the Commission and the remainder by the Member States.

Following the worsening of the conflict in CAR at the end of 2013, the Foreign Ministers of the Member States decided at the Foreign Affairs Council of 20 January 2014 to launch a military operation in the capital, Bangui. The Directorate for Humanitarian Aid has announced in this context that EUR 366 million would be provided in additional support for humanitarian operations.

Bearing in mind the substantial increase in the budget allocated for humanitarian assistance in CAR:

1. What plans has the Commission made to ensure that the funds are used efficiently andtransparently?

2. What changes will the Commission make by comparison with the 2013 programmes inorder to obtain the expected results?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par Mme Georgieva au nom de la Commission
(2 avril 2014)

La Direction Générale pour l’Aide Humanitaire et la Protection Civile (DG ECHO) a annoncé qu’elle portait son budget dédié à l’aide humanitaire en RCA à EUR 45 millions depuis le début du mois de décembre 2013. Le montant de EUR 366 millions représente la somme des contributions des différents participants à la réunion de haut niveau sur la crise centrafricaine tenu le 20 janvier, montants dédiés à l’aide humanitaire mais également au développement et à la stabilisation. Voir le communiqué de presse ci-après: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-14-41_fr.htm

La Commission a un bureau à Bangui composé d’assistants techniques en charge du suivi des projets financés par la DG ECHO. Compte tenu de l’aggravation de la crise et de l’augmentation des budgets, la présence à Bangui a été renforcée de deux façons: recrutement d’un deuxième assistant technique, et présence constante, sur base rotative, d’un troisième assistant technique ainsi que, depuis la détérioration de la situation début décembre, d’un officier de sécurité.

La Commission publie via le site de la DG ECHO les projets qui ont été soutenus financièrement en indiquant les partenaires de mise en œuvre ainsi que les montants attribués à chacun d’entre eux. La DG ECHO évalue de manière constante les besoins humanitaires et adapte l’attribution de ses financements en conséquence afin de répondre aux besoins prioritaires des populations les plus vulnérables.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001737/14
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(17 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Dreptul minorităților din Serbia de a studia în limba maternă

În martie 2013, 1 617 elevi din județele Bor și Zajecar din Serbia au cerut să le fie respectat dreptul de a studia în limba maternă, limba română. Alți 1500 de elevi din județele Branicevo, Pomoravski și Podunavski au optat și ei pentru a studia în limba maternă.

Pentru a putea deschide negocierile de aderare referitoare la capitolul 23 (drepturile fundamentale ale omului), autoritățile sârbe au anunțat în octombrie 2013 că au introdus în școli ore în limba vlahă pentru minoritatea română din Valea Timocului, limbă nerecunoscută însă de România.

În contextul în care pe 21 ianuarie 2014 a avut loc prima ConferinMonica Luisa Macoveiță Interguvernamentală UE — Serbia, ce măsuri a pregătit Comisia pentru a asigura respectarea dreptului minorităților de a studia în limba maternă?

Răspuns dat de dl Füle în numele Comisiei
(10 aprilie 2014)

Comisia Europeană monitorizează îndeaproape situația minorităților din Serbia, inclusiv accesul la drepturile garantate de constituție, cum ar fi învățământul în limbile minorităților. Comisia apreciază eforturile Serbiei de a începe să asigure o punere în aplicare mai consecventă a legislației sale referitoare la protecția minorităților pe teritoriul său, inclusiv a dispozițiilor privind introducerea treptată a unor cursuri în limbile minorităților în zonele în care există o astfel de solicitare din partea populației. Comisia are contacte constante pe acest subiect cu Înaltul Comisar pentru Minorități Naționale al OSCE, precum și cu Comitetul consultativ al Consiliului Europei privind Convenția-cadru pentru protecția minorităților naționale (CCMN).

Comisia speră ca, în cursul procesului de negociere, Serbia să continue să asigure accesul la învățământ în limbile minorităților, în conformitate cu angajamentele asumate în temeiul legislației europene la care este parte, respectiv Convenția-cadru pentru protecția minorităților naționale (CCMN) a Consiliului Europei și Carta europeană a limbilor regionale sau minoritare.

Comisia va continua să monitorizeze îndeaproape eforturile Serbiei de a garanta protecția minorităților pe parcursul procesului de aderare a acestei țări la UE, în special în cadrul capitolului 23, „Sistemul judiciar și drepturile fundamentale”.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001737/14
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Right of minorities in Serbia to education in their mother tongue

In March 2013, 1 617 pupils in the districts of Bor and Zaječar in Serbia called for their right to education in their mother tongue, Romanian, to be respected. A further 1 500 pupils in the districts of Braničevo, Pomoravski and Podunavski have also opted to study in their mother tongue.

In order to enable accession negotiations to be opened on Chapter 23 (fundamental rights), the Serbian authorities announced in October 2013 that they had introduced school lessons in the Vlach language for the Romanian minority in the Timočka Krajina region, even though the Vlach language is not recognised by Romania.

Bearing in mind that the first EU-Serbia Intergovernmental Conference was held on 21 January 2014, what steps is the Commission planning to take to ensure that the right of minorities to education in their mother tongue is respected?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

The European Commission closely monitors the situation of minorities in Serbia, including access to the constitutionnally guaranteed rights, such as education in minority languages. The Commission has positively taken note of Serbia's efforts to start ensuring a more consistent implementation of its legislation related to minority protection thoughout its territory, including the progressive introduction of courses in minority languages in areas where there was such a demand from the populations. The Commission has been in regular contact with the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities as well as with the Council of Europe Advisory Committee of the framework Convention on National Minorities (FCNM) in this respect.

During the negotiation process, the Commission expects from Serbia to further provide education in minority languages, in line with its commitments under the relevant European legislation it is party to, namely the Council of Europe FCNM as well as the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages.

The Commission will continue to closely follow Serbia's efforts to ensure the protection of minorities thoughout the country's EU accession process, specifically in Chapter 23 'Judiciary and Fundamental Rights'.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001738/14
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(17 februarie 2014)

Subiect: Reglementarea substanțelor cu potențial alergen

În data de 14 februarie 2014, Comisia a lansat o consultare publică cu privire la parfumurile alergene. În comunicatul aferent, se arată faptul că între 1 și 3% din populația Europei prezintă o alergie cutanată la parfumuri, iar ca urmare a concluziilor Comitetului științific pentru siguranța consumatorilor și în urma consultărilor publice, serviciile Comisiei vor propune interzicerea substanțelor identificate ca fiind periculoase, precum și obligația de etichetare individuală a alergenilor suplimentari.

Lista de substanțe care sunt interzise în produsele cosmetice, precum și lista substanțelor permise sub rezerva unor anumite restricții din cadrul Regulamentului privind produsele cosmetice trebuie revizuite periodic.

În acest sens, are în vedere Comisia demararea unei noi consultări publice în vederea actualizării acestor liste în ceea ce privește potențialii alergeni prezenți în vopselele de păr?

Dacă se ia în calcul posibilitatea interzicerii celor trei substanțe considerate nesigure din componența parfumurilor (HICC, atranolul și cloroatranolul), intenționează Comisia să revizuiască și criteriile referitoare la parafenilendiamină, care a stat la baza unor alergii severe, în ciuda reglementării procentului de substanță maxim admisă în vopselele de păr (6%)?

Răspuns dat de dl Mimica în numele Comisiei
(4 aprilie 2014)

În cadrul procesului de evaluare a siguranței, necesar în cazul tuturor vopselelor de păr utilizate în Uniune, Comitetul științific pentru siguranța consumatorilor a analizat siguranța tuturor substanțelor pentru vopsirea părului, enumerate în prezent în anexa III la Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1223/2009 („regulamentul privind produsele cosmetice”), inclusiv parafenilendiamina. De asemenea, Comitetul a evaluat potențialul de sensibilizare al substanțelor individuale.

Pe baza celor mai recente descoperiri științifice, concentrația maximă autorizată pentru parafenilendiamină, atunci când este aplicată pe păr, a fost redusă la 2 % în temeiul Directivei 2009/130/CE a Comisiei, ale cărei dispoziții se aplică începând cu luna iulie a anului 2010.

În ceea ce privește potențialul de sensibilizare al vopselelor de păr evaluate, Directiva 2009/134/CE a Comisiei impune adăugarea de avertismente suplimentare mai puternice pe etichetele tuturor produselor oxidante pentru vopsirea părului, pentru a informa mai bine consumatorii cu privire la posibilele efecte adverse ale vopsirii părului și a reduce riscul pentru consumatori de apariție a unor reacții alergice la produsele de vopsire a părului. Din noiembrie 2011, aceste avertismente suplimentare trebuie să figureze pe toate produsele oxidante pentru vopsirea părului introduse pe piața UE.

În momentul de față, ținând cont de legislația instituită recent în ceea ce privește obligativitatea avertismentelor și de reglementarea utilizării parafenilendiaminei, Comisia nu intenționează să revizuiască lista substanțelor potențial alergene din vopselele de păr și nici criteriile care reglementează utilizarea parafenilendiaminei.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001738/14
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Measures regulating potential allergens

A communication concerning a public survey regarding allergenic perfumes, launched by the Commission on 14 February 2014 indicates that perfumes provoke skin allergies among 1-3% of European consumers and that, in the light of the findings of the Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety and following public consultations, the Commission intends to propose a ban on substances identified as dangerous and introduce compulsory individual labelling requirements in respect of additional allergens.

The list of substances banned from use in cosmetic products and those subject to restrictions under the regulation on cosmetic products must be periodically reviewed.

In this connection, is the Commission envisaging fresh public consultation in order to update the list of potential allergens in hair dyes?

In view of the possibility of banning three perfume ingredients that are considered unsafe (HICC, atranol and chloroatranol) does the Commission intend to review the criteria regarding paraphenylenediamine, which, despite restrictions regarding the maximum admissible level in hair dyes (6%), has provoked severe allergic reactions?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

In the process of safety assessment required for all hair dyes used in the Union, the Scientific Committee on Consumers Safety looked at the safety of all hair dye substances currently listed in Annex III of Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 ('Cosmetics Regulation'), including paraphenylenediamine. The committee also assessed the sensitizing potential of individual substances.

Based on the latest scientific findings, the maximum authorised concentration for paraphenylenediamine, when applied to hair, was decreased to 2% by Commission Directive 2009/130/EC whose provisions apply since July 2010.

Concerning the sensitizing potential of the assessed hair dyes, Commission Directive 2009/134/EC imposes stronger additional warnings on the labels of all oxidative hair dye products in order to better inform the consumer of the possible adverse effects of hair colouring with the aim of lowering the risk of allergic reactions to hair dye products among consumers. As from November 2011 all oxidative hair dye products placed on the EU market must bear these additional warnings.

Taking into account the legislation which has been put in place recently in terms of obligatory warning statements and regulation of paraphenylenediamine, the Commission does not intend to review the list of potential allergens in hair dyes or the criteria for paraphenylenediamine regulation at this stage.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001739/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(17 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Responsabilidad ambiental en España

Considerando que la Directiva 2004/35/CE sobre responsabilidad ambiental tiene como base el principio de que «quien contamina, paga» y su objetivo principal es el de prevenir y reparar daños al medio ambiente.

Considerando que en 2007 el Gobierno español aprobó la Ley 26/2007 que trasponía la Directiva 2004/35/CE y que obligaba a decenas de miles de empresas potencialmente contaminantes a contratar avales o fianzas para pagar cualquier accidente del que pudieran ser responsables.

Considerando que se ha modificado la Ley 26/2007. Teniendo en cuenta que la reforma del Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente exime al 98 % de las 320 000 empresas potencialmente contaminantes a las que se obligaba a contratar estos seguros siendo obligatorio ahora tan solo para 5 470 empresas.

Considerando que, a diferencia de lo que ocurría antes, cuando era la Administración la que determinaba la responsabilidad de cada empresa, ahora el operador que esté obligado a constituir la garantía será el que «determine su cuantía a partir de la realización del análisis de riesgos de su actividad, y quien comunique a la autoridad competente la constitución de la misma», quedando todo en manos de las empresas.

Considerando que, si hay una póliza suscrita, uno puede asegurarse de que el culpable pague por lo que contamina, y, si no, hay que ir a los tribunales a exigírselo.

1. ¿Conocía la Comisión la reforma impulsada por el Gobierno español?

2. ¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre la reforma emprendida por el Gobierno español?

3. ¿Considera que esta reforma puede poner en peligro el cumplimiento del principio de que «quien contamina, paga» y la correcta aplicación de la Directiva sobre responsabilidad ambiental?

4. ¿Qué medidas pretende emprender la Comisión ante esta reforma?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(9 de abril de 2014)

El proyecto de ley que modifica la Ley 26/2007 española por la que se traspone la Directiva 2004/35/CE sobre responsabilidad medioambiental ([1]) no ha sido adoptado todavía. Parece reducir el nivel de la garantía financiera para algunos operadores en comparación con la situación actual prevista en la legislación española. En principio, la modificación propuesta no infringiría las disposiciones de la Directiva, dado que el artículo 14, apartado 2, de dicha Directiva contempla la posibilidad de un enfoque progresivo, un límite máximo de garantía financiera y la exclusión de actividades de bajo riesgo.

No obstante, no se ha realizado un examen de la conformidad del proyecto de ley ya que esto solo será posible después de su adopción y comunicación a la Comisión.

([1]) DO L 143 de 30.4.2004.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001739/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Environmental liability in Spain

Directive 2004/35/EC on environmental liability is based on the principle that 'the polluter pays' and its main aim is to prevent and remedy environmental damage.

In 2007, the Spanish Government passed Law 26/2007, transposing Directive 2004/35/EC and forcing thousands of potentially polluting enterprises to set aside bonds or securities to cover the cost of any future accident for which they might be responsible.

Law 26/2007 has since been amended. The reform carried out by the Ministry for Agriculture, Food and the Environment exempts 98% of the 320 000 enterprises listed as potentially polluting from the insurance which they were previously required to take out. Only 5 470 enterprises are now required to do this.

Unlike under the previous system, in which the government was responsible for deciding each company's liability, it is now down to the operator required to take out the guarantee to 'determine its amount on the basis of an analysis of the risks inherent to the activity of the enterprise and to notify the competent authority that the guarantee has been set up', thereby leaving everything in the operator's hands.

If a guarantee has been taken out, it is possible to ensure that the guilty party pays for the pollution they have caused. If it has not, redress must be sought through legal action.

1. Is the Commission aware of the reform carried out by the Spanish Government?

2. What is the Commission's opinion of this reform?

3. Does it see this reform as endangering compliance with the principle of 'the polluter pays' and correct implementation of the directive on environmental liability?

4. What steps does the Commission intend to take in response to this reform?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

The draft Law amending the Spanish Law 26/2007 transposing Directive 2004/35/EC on environmental liability ([1]) has not yet been adopted. It appears to reduce the level of financial security for some operators further than is at present the case under Spanish law. Such a modification would not in principle infringe the directive given that a gradual approach, with a ceiling for financial guarantee and the exclusion of low-risk activities, is possible pursuant to Article 14(2) of the directive.

However, an examination of the draft Law's conformity has not been done and will only be possible after adoption and communication to the Commission.

([1]) OJ L 143, 30.4.2004.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001740/14
til Kommissionen
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(17. februar 2014)

Om: Brug af midler fra EU's strukturfonde til udflytning af danske arbejdspladser

Kommissionen er gjort opmærksom på, at en række navngivne danske virksomheder har brugt støttemidler fra EU's strukturfonde til at medfinansiere udflytning af en række danske arbejdspladser til Polen ([1]).

Den praksis er, jf. forordning (EF) nr. 1083/2006, betragtning 42, samt den nye forordning (EU) nr. 1303/2013, betragtning 92, ikke i overensstemmelse med hensigten i EU-reglerne.

Udflytningen af arbejdspladser har haft store negative konsekvenser for de mange arbejdstagere, der som følge af udflytningen har mistet deres job i Danmark. Kan Kommissionen derfor oplyse, hvad den vil foretage sig i nærværende sag?

Vil Kommissionen videre, eftersom denne sag ikke er den første af sin slags, oplyse, hvilke skridt den fremover vil tage for at forhindre lignende uhensigtsmæssig brug af EU-midler? Vil Kommissionen herunder forholde sig til:

1. om der er brug for ekstra monitorering af, hvad støttemidlerne bliver brugt til, så der i fremtiden kan skrides ind, før arbejdspladsudflytningen er en realitet?

2. om virksomhederne, såfremt de har gjort sig skyldige i misbrug af EU-midler, blot skal betale disse tilbage, eller om sagen vil få konsekvenser for virksomhederne i form af et bødeforlæg og eventuel fratagelse af muligheden for at søge om midler fra EU's strukturfonde i fremtiden?

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002063/14
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(21. februar 2014)

Om: Støtte fra EU's strukturfonde og udflytning af arbejdspladser

I Danmark har Fagforeningen 3F beskyldt en række virksomheder, der først har opnået støtte fra EU's strukturfonde for siden at flytte arbejdspladser ud af Danmark til Polen, for at bryde EU's regler. Det drejer sig blandt andet om LM Wind Power, Royal Greenland og Flügger.

Det bemærkes i den forbindelse, at EU-støtte ikke må give støtte med henblik på udflytning af arbejdspladser. Dog beskyldes virksomhederne for at have været kreative. Spørgeren har ikke kendskab hertil, men ønsker, at Kommissionen undersøger sagen.

Ifølge kritikere er pengene gået til at støtte virksomhedernes udflytning af arbejdspladser fra Danmark til Polen, hvor lønningerne er langt lavere, og at det har ført til, at danske arbejdspladser er gået tabt.

Eksempelvis har Royal Greenland købt og udviklet en storskalafabrik i Polen i 2006, som en del af en større ekspansionsstrategi inden for flere typer fiskeproduktion. Hertil blev der tildelt EU-midler af to omgange i 2006 og 2008 på i alt 53 millioner kroner. Den samlede investering var på 250 millioner. Senere besluttede virksomheden at flytte den danske rødspætteproduktion til Polen, hvilket medførte et tab på 110 danske arbejdspladser. Tilsvarende har LM Wind Power til Danmarks Radio forklaret, at »den byggede sin nye fabrik i Polen 2008, året før man søgte støtte fra EU og uafhængigt af denne. Støtten på 10 millioner kroner bidrog til at opgradere produktionsudstyr og introducere ny teknologi og til at oplære deres ansatte i Polen i betjening af disse. LM Wind Power medgiver, at dens nye fabrik i Polen siden 2009 har produceret enkelte af de samme vinger som på de danske fabrikker. Og virksomheden fastholder at have overholdt reglerne, fordi der ikke er tale om udflytning af produktion« ([2]).

Spørgeren skal på den baggrund anmode kommissionen om at indlede en undersøgelse af, hvorvidt de omtalte virksomheder har overholdt reglerne, eller om der er sket omgåelse? I sidstnævnte tilfælde bedes Kommissionen oplyse, dels hvad man agter at gøre i de konkrete sager, men også hvad man vil foretage sig for at undgå, at lignende tilfælde gentager sig fremtiden?

([1]) http://www.fagbladet3f.dk/temaer/polsk_jobfest/6215704d06ff4b6fb4b071743a3087a1-20140214-eu-truer-med-at-krve-millioner-tilbage.
([2]) http://www.dr.dk/Nyheder/Penge/2014/02/12/141644.htm

Samlet svar afgivet på Johannes Hahn på Kommissionens vegne

(2. maj 2014)

1. Kommissionen støtter ikke brugen af strukturfonde på en måde, der opfordrer til eller fremmer udflytning af arbejdspladser til en anden medlemsstat. Ud fra princippet om delt forvaltning er projektudvælgelse, vurdering, opfølgning og evaluering de nationale programmyndigheders ansvar, og de er i sidste ende ansvarlige for at sikre, at ingen lovstridig udflytning finder sted.

I forbindelse med de specifikke sager, der er omtalt i skriftlig forespørgsel E-002063/2014, har Kommissionen kontaktet de relevante programmyndigheder i Polen og afventer svar. Når dette forløb er afsluttet og efter at have vurderet al information til rådighed, vil Kommissionen afgøre, hvorvidt der er behov for yderligere handling. Dette kunne omfatte at bede de relevante programmyndigheder om at trække EU-midlerne tilbage.

2. Under de igangværende forhandlinger om planlægningen af EU's midler for perioden 2014-2020 kræver Kommissionen, at programmyndighederne sikrer sig, at EU-støtte til større virksomheder ikke giver markante tab af arbejdspladser i andre dele af EU. Derfor kræver Kommissionen, at de nationale myndigheder, der er ansvarlige for programmeringen af EU-fondene, indbygger sikkerhedsforanstaltninger i de operationelle programmer, som forhindrer brugen af EU-midler til projekter, der giver markante tab af arbejdspladser andre steder i EU.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001740/14
to the Commission
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Use of EU Structural Fund monies to relocate Danish jobs

It has been pointed out to the Commission that a number of named Danish firms have used EU Structural Fund monies to co-finance the relocation of Danish jobs to Poland ([1]).

This practice is not in accordance with the purpose of the EU rules concerned (cf. Recital 42 in Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 and Recital 92 in new Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013).

Relocation has had major adverse consequences for the many workers who have lost their jobs in Denmark. Can the Commission therefore say what it proposes to do in this connection?

As this is not the first such instance, will the Commission furthermore say what steps it will take in future to prevent similar inappropriate use of EU monies? In this connection will the Commission say:

1. whether there is a need for additional monitoring of the use to which monies are put, so that, in future, action can be taken before jobs are actually relocated?

2. whether firms which have made improper use of EU funding will simply be required to pay it back or whether, as a result of their actions, financial penalties will be imposed on them and, possibly, they will no longer be allowed to apply for EU Structural Fund monies in future?

Question for written answer E-002063/14
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(21 February 2014)

Subject: EU Structural Fund support and job relocation

In Denmark, the trade union 3F has accused a number of firms of violating EU rules by first obtaining EU Structural Fund support and then relocating jobs from Denmark to Poland. The firms include LM Wind Power, Royal Greenland and Flügger.

It should be noted in this connection that EU support may not be provided in order to relocate jobs. The firms are accused of having been creative, however. I have no knowledge of that, but should like the Commission to investigate the matter.

Detractors say that monies have been used to fund job relocation from Denmark to Poland, where pay rates are much lower, resulting in a loss of Danish jobs.

For instance, Royal Greenland purchased and extended a large plant in Poland in 2006 as part of a large-scale expansion strategy within a number of fish production lines. In that connection, a total of DKK 53 million in EU monies was allocated — in two stages — in 2006 and 2008. The total investment volume was DKK 250 million. The firm subsequently decided to shift Danish plaice production to Poland, resulting in a loss of 110 jobs in Denmark. LM Wind Power has given a similar account to the Danish Broadcasting Corporation, stating that it built its new plant in Poland in 2008 and, unrelated to that, applied for EU support the year before. According to the firm, the DKK 10 million in funding covered part of the cost of upgrading production equipment, introducing new technology and training its workforce in Poland to operate the facilities. LM Wind Power concedes that, since 2009, the new plant in Poland has produced some of the same turbine blades as the Danish plants. The firm maintains that it has complied with the rules, however, since production has not been relocated ([2]).

In the light of the above, will the Commission launch an investigation into whether the firms referred to have complied with the rules or have circumvented them? If the rules have been circumvented, what does the Commission intend to do not only with regard to the specific cases concerned, but also in order to prevent similar occurrences in the future?

([1]) http://www.fagbladet3f.dk/temaer/polsk_jobfest/6215704d06ff4b6fb4b071743a3087a1-20140214-eu-truer-med-at-krve-millioner-tilbage
([2]) http://www.dr.dk/Nyheder/Penge/2014/02/12/141644.htm

Joint answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(2 May 2014)

1. The Commission does not support the use of Structural Funds in a way that would encourage or facilitate the relocation of jobs to another Member State. Under the shared management principle, project selection, appraisal, follow up and evaluation are the responsibility of the national programme authorities who are ultimately responsible for ensuring that no prohibited relocation takes place.

In relation to the specific cases raised in Written Question E-002063/2014, the Commission has contacted the relevant programme authorities in Poland and is awaiting a reply. At the end of this process, and after assessing all the information at its disposal, the Commission will decide whether other actions are necessary. This could include asking the relevant programme authorities to withdraw the EU funds.

2. During the ongoing negotiations concerning the programming of EU funds for the 2014-2020 period, the Commission insists that programme authorities assure themselves that EU support for large companies does not cause substantial job losses in other parts of the EU. To that end, the Commission requires that the national authorities responsible for the programming of EU Funds include in the operational programmes safeguards preventing the use of EU funds to support projects which result in substantial job losses elsewhere in the EU.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001742/14
to the Commission
Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Death Abroad — You're Not Alone

I have recently been contacted by the Scottish charity Death Abroad — You're Not Alone (DAYNA). The charity works with the families of those who die unexpectedly overseas and campaigns for greater support for individuals who find themselves in this awful situation.

Can I ask the Commission what rights currently exist for the families of victims who die in other Member States? Furthermore, what work has the Commission already done on this matter?

Does the Commission agree that this is an area in which an extension of EU legislation to ensure a minimum and equal level of service from all Member States would be an important step forward in assisting bereaved families in such a difficult and stressful time?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(14 April 2014)

In 2010 the Commission identified the difficulty experienced by EU citizens to obtain recognition in the Union of civil status documents concerning e.g. death ([1]). To remedy this, it put forward on 24 April 2013 a proposal for a regulation that should streamline procedures for acceptance of public documents in the EU by removing obligations such as the apostille ([2]). The proposal also provides for multilingual standard forms the citizens may request, for example in case of death, to save on translation costs.

Repatriation of mortal remains is governed by the 1937 Berlin Agreement and the 1973 Strasbourg Agreement signed in the context of the Council of Europe. In the absence of harmonisation, Member States are competent for concluding bilateral agreements in this field in conformity with EC law. To date, 21 Member States have ratified either of these agreements and are thus sharing the same rules on the subject.

Member States who are parties to these agreements are obliged to implement them in a manner compatible with the internal market principles enshrined in the Treaty and notably its Article 56. According to Article 16 of the Services directive ([3]), which covers also funeral services, Member States can only impose requirements on services providers from other Member States if such requirements are non-discriminatory, based on overriding reasons of general interest (public policy, public safety, public health and protection of the environment) and proportionate.

([1]) Action 2 of the 2010 Report on Citizenship of the Union: 'Dismantling the obstacles to the exercise of rights'. Citizens of the Union COM(2010) 603 final — http:// ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/com_2010_603_fr.pdf
([2]) http:// eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0228:FIN:FR:PDF
([3]) Directive 2006/123/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 on services in the internal market.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001743/14
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: EU Trade Descriptions Act, with reference to the clipping of audiovisual material by broadcasters

A key feature of consumer protection law is that the consumer is protected against inaccurate descriptions of a product. Someone who buys a train ticket from London to Southampton or from Munich to Augsburg does not expect to be required to disembark six or eight miles before reaching the stated destination. Similarly, someone who buys a 400 gram tin of soup does not expect to discover that it contains only 380 grams.

Consumer protection and the principles underlying it have been taken increasingly seriously within the EU in recent years and should be considered one of the Commission's successes. However, there is one grey area of EC law that is in need of addressing. The removal of significant sections of television series or films, including parts of the end credits, is becoming more and more frequent. In an overwhelming majority of cases, the broadcaster does not inform the viewer of these cuts, thus preventing the viewer from appreciating the production as it was originally designed to be appreciated.

Moreover, these cuts are often made to make time for the greatly increasing number of commercials that broadcasters choose to impose on their viewers, which, ironically, has resulted in a significant decline in TV audience numbers.

1. The European Commission states that 'consumer and marketing legislation […] mainly covers unfair commercial practices and consumer contract law, such as misleading advertising and unfair contract terms'. Does the Commission believe that it is compatible with EU consumer protection law for broadcasters to cut out sections of audiovisual product without first informing the audience?

2. Does the Commission believe that TV broadcasters are subject to different commercial standards from those applied to industrial producers or manufacturers?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

The Audiovisual Media Services Directive ([1]) provides that 'Member States shall ensure, where television advertising or teleshopping is inserted during programmes, that the integrity of the programmes and the rights of the right holders are not prejudiced' (Article 20(1)). The aim of this article is to protect viewers against excessive advertising and safeguard the integrity and economic value of programmes in the interest of the rights holders. According to the Commission's interpretative communication on television advertising, in case of split screen advertising during the end credits, consent from the holders of the rights to the programme during which split screen advertising is to be broadcast would be required ([2]).

With regard to possible implications for the moral rights of right holders, it should be noted that they should be exercised according to the legislation of the Member States and the provisions of international conventions, in particular the Berne Convention ([3]). Such rights remain outside the scope of Directive 2001/29/EC (Recital 19).

In any case, Article 23(1) of the AVMS Directive provides that 'the proportion of television advertising spots within a given clock hour shall not exceed 20%', i.e. broadcasters may not broadcast advertising and teleshopping spots in excess of 12 minutes per hour in order to guarantee that viewers are not exposed to excessive amounts of advertising. According to the Commission's interpretative communication provisions on the hourly duration of advertising could also apply in full to split screen advertising.

([1]) 'AVMS' Directive, 2010/13/EU, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:095:0001:0024:EN:PDF
([2]) As explained in the Commission's interpretative communication on television advertising: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2004:102:0002:0011:EN:PDF
([3]) Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works http://www.wipo.int/treaties/en/text.jsp?file_id=283698

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001744/14
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: EU trade description law with reference to 'charity' cards

In its December 2013 issue, the consumer magazine *Which?* pointed out that income from the sale of charity cards in the UK only made up a relatively small proportion of the funds that actually went to charity. This is particularly problematic in the case of Christmas cards, where a purchaser may erroneously believe that most or all of the money used to purchase the item goes to charity. The magazine noted that in the case of Christmas cards, the share being donated to charity rarely exceeded 20%, and in one case was approximately 6.5%.

The magazine also examined charity credit cards and concluded that there were far more efficient ways of donating. It also calculated that a person using an MBNA 'charity' card, which donates a proportion of customer expenditure to a designated charity, would have had to spend over GBP 129 000 in one year to donate as much as the average British adult donates over the same period.

Evidently, if charities were to engage in commercial production themselves, this would raise a number of legal competition issues because of their tax advantages. Nevertheless, the issue of commercial card producers misleading their customers is one that needs to be addressed.

1. Does the Commission believe that describing a Christmas card or any other kind of card as a 'charity' card, when less than 20% or even 10% of the sale price goes to charity, constitutes a misdescription of the product or a misleading of the public under the current EU trade description laws?

2. Can the Commission confirm that under existing EC law manufacturers and vendors are not under any obligation to prominently display the proportion of the purchase price that will be given to charity? If so, does the Commission have any plans to introduce legislation in this area?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

Charities engaging in commercial practices as well as any other trader marketing or selling their products should comply with the requirements of Directive 2005/29/EC on unfair commercial practices ([1]).

The directive would for instance come into play if an advertisement for charities' Christmas cards displayed false information on the real share being donated to the charity out of the price of the card. This being said, nothing in the directive requires charities themselves or the traders selling their products to specifically inform consumers about the share of the price that effectively goes to charity.

The Commission does not plan to propose legislation requiring vendors to prominently display the proportion of the price of a product given to charity.

([1]) Directive 2005/29/EC on unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal market, OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p.22-39.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001745/14
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Levels of emigration and immigration within the EU

In the UK, it has been difficult to accurately gauge levels of net inward migration or the number of overstayers since the decision was made to discontinue the practice of keeping records of all those leaving the UK. Now reintroduced, the British Government has pledged to remedy this in order to have accurate figures on those entering and leaving the UK.

Member States which have signed the Schengen Agreement, however, do not keep records of all those travelling within the Schengen Area. If the UK is to remain in the EU after renegotiating the terms for this, it would be in the interest of all those involved to have access to accurate emigration and immigration figures within the Schengen Area and, in particular, those of the UK's neighbouring countries such as France, Belgium and the Netherlands.

1. Can the Commission indicate whether Eurostat relies exclusively on data provided by the Member States or whether it uses its own data sources or estimates where accurate data is difficult to obtain?

2. Can the Commission indicate whether this is an obligation for those Member States which are in the Schengen Area, and if not, whether the Commission believes that this should be an obligation of membership?

3. Can the Commission also indicate whether such records are also available to Europol for analysis purposes?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2014)

1. Eurostat compiles migration statistics based on harmonised concepts and definitions, only using data provided by the Member States.

2. The Commission recalls that on the basis of the relevant Council Decision ([1]), the United Kingdom takes part only in some provisions of the Schengen *acquis* (e.g. aspects of police cooperation, with the exception of aspects related to borders).

3. Pursuant to Article 21(d) of the Schengen Borders Code ([2]), the abolition of border control at internal borders does not affect the possibility for the Member States to provide by law for an obligation on third-country nationals to report their presence on their territory under conditions established by Article 22 of the Schengen Implementing Convention ([3]). When introduced by a Member State, this obligation would apply to all third-country nationals who have legally entered its territory either on entry or within three working days.

The Commission does not consider that it should be mandatory for the Member States to impose such a reporting obligation as in practice many Member States do not apply it and it is difficult to verify compliance. There is also no clear evidence that this would have a significant impact on identifying irregularly staying persons.

4. In so far as it is necessary for the achievement of its objectives — to support to Member States in preventing and combating organised crime and terrorism — Europol can process information and intelligence received from Member States, on their own initiative or at its request. The monitoring of migration flows is not among Europol's tasks, but access to certain data could be justified in the context of investigations if it is in the remit of serious and organised crime and terrorism.

([1]) 2000/365/EC: Council Decision of 29 May 2000 concerning the request of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to take part in some of the provisions of the Schengen *acquis*; OJ L 131, 1.6.2000, p. 43-47.

([2]) Regulation (EC) No 562/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2006 establishing a Community Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders (Schengen Borders Code); OJ L 105, 13.4.2006, p. 1-32.

([3]) The Schengen *acquis* — Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985 between the Governments of the States of the Benelux Economic Union, the Federal Republic of Germany and the French Republic on the gradual abolition of checks at their common borders; OJ L 239, 22.9.2000 p. 19-62.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001746/14
to the Council
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Potential conflicts of interest within the rotating Presidency of the Council

According to the satirical magazine *Private Eye*, the Greek Government has accepted over EUR 2 million in corporate sponsorship to assist it with its Presidency of the Council, including sponsorship from two of Greece's largest banks.

Throughout this Council term, the Greek Presidency is of course expected to preside over new laws in the Council which, if enacted, will be in the public interest. However, the fact that some of its country's largest corporations are sponsoring the presidency presents a potential conflict, similar to the one which occurred during the last Council Presidency under Lithuania, which received funding from various big corporations.

1. Can the Council specify if special EU funds, if any, are available to Member States, particularly smaller ones with limited budgets, to cover the administrative costs of holding the Presidency?

2. Can the Council account for all the funding that has been made available to Member States responsible for the last six rotating Council Presidencies?

Reply
(14 April 2014)

There are no funds from the Council budget available to cover administrative costs for Member States holding the Council Presidency.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-001747/14
upućeno Komisiji
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(17. veljače 2014.)

Predmet: Problem predstečajnih nagodbi u Republici Hrvatskoj

Kod predstečajnih nagodbi, na način kako se one provode u Hrvatskoj, plan financijskog restrukturiranja sastavlja dužnik. Dužnik, osim što sastavlja plan financijskog restrukturiranja, sam utvrđuje i potraživanja svih vjerovnika te vjerovnici nemaju mogućnost provjeriti potraživanja ostalih vjerovnika među kojima su i potraživanja povezanih društava samog dužnika. Tako o sudbini potraživanja većine vjerovnika odlučuje najčešće sam dužnik sa svojim povezanim tvrtkama i Ministarstvo financija, a ne većina vjerovnika. U tim planovima u većini se slučajeva dio dugova prema državi otpisuje, a otpisi dosežu čak i više od dvije trećine potraživanja. Time se predstečajne nagodbe rješavaju na štetu države.

Arbitrarno otpisivanje dugova na ime poreza i ostalih davanja državi, bez ikakvog ekonomskog opravdanja, moglo bi biti prikazano kao državna potpora dužnicima, koja ih stavlja u povoljniji položaj na tržištu.

Od stjecanja članstva u Europskoj uniji za odobravanje državnih potpora i provedbu njihova nadzora više nije zadužena Agencija za zaštitu tržišnog natjecanja, već Europska komisija.

Potpore koje su dodijeljene prije ulaska u Uniju, a primjenjuju se i nakon ulaska, prema Ugovoru o pristupanju smatraju se novim potporama i Europska komisija može pokrenuti njihov nadzor te dodijeljene potpore moraju biti vraćene ako nisu u skladu s pravilima Europske unije.

Ovakva praksa pokazuje da država na sebe preuzima veći teret nego što je na to spreman privatni vjerovnik, što je jasna indicija da se radi o državnoj potpori dužniku.

U slučaju da postoji sumnja da se u pojedinim predstečajnim nagodbama otpisom dugova zapravo dodjeljuje državna potpora, tada je prema pravilima konkretan program potrebno dostaviti Europskoj komisiji na prethodno odobrenje. Potpore dodijeljene bez odobrenja moraju biti vraćene.

Može li mi Komisija obrazložiti je li takva praksa sukladna propisima s obzirom na to da otvara vrata mogućim pogodovanjima? Iz tog bih razloga željela znati kako i koliko često Europska komisija nadgleda provođenje predstečajnih nagodbi?

Odgovor g. Almunije u ime Komisije
(9. travnja 2014.)

U skladu s postojećom sudskom praksom sudova Unije, ekonomske transakcije javnih tijela ne stvaraju prednost za njihove partnere i stoga ne predstavljaju državnu potporu ako se provode u skladu s uobičajenim tržišnim uvjetima. Za transakcije koje se navode u pitanju razvijen je tzv. „test privatnog vjerovnika" kako bi se utvrdilo uključuje li reprogram duga od strane javnih vjerovnika državnu potporu, pri čemu se ponašanje javnog vjerovnika uspoređuje s ponašanjem zamišljenog privatnog vjerovnika koji se našao u sličnom položaju.

Prema tome, opisana bi praksa mogla uključivati državnu potporu ako je država članica prihvatila podmirenje duga koje privatni vjerovnik ne bi prihvatio. U tom je smislu potrebno uzeti u obzir i protučinjenično stanje stečaja, odnosno što bi vjerovnici, uključujući javne vjerovnike, primili iz stečajne mase.

Relevantna sudska praksa i teorija bit će sažeta u obavijesti Komisije o pojmu potpore, koju je Komisija objavila za savjetovanje 17. siječnja ove godine kao dio tekuće inicijative modernizacije državnih potpora. Tim bi se dokumentom tijelima javne vlasti trebale pružiti dodatne smjernice o tom pitanju.

Komisija zasada nije upoznata s primjerima dodjele državne potpore u okviru predstečajne nagodbe u Hrvatskoj. Međutim, hrvatski joj se sud obratio sa sličnim pitanjem i Komisija će mu dati smjernice.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001747/14
to the Commission
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Problem of pre-bankruptcy settlements in Croatia

Pre-bankruptcy settlements are implemented in Croatia in such a way that the financial restructuring plan is drawn up by the debtor. In addition to that, the debtor alone determines all the creditors' claims, and creditors have no possibility of checking on each other's claims, including those of companies linked to the debtor. Consequently, what happens to claims is usually decided by the debtor and its associated companies, together with the Ministry of Finance, and not by the majority of the creditors. Under most financial restructuring plans a portion of the debt to the state is written off, and these write-offs can total more than two thirds of the amount claimed. Pre-bankruptcy settlements thus work to the disadvantage of the state.

The arbitrary writing-off of debts for the purposes of tax and other levies payable to the state is economically untenable and could be termed state aid to debtors to the extent that it is putting them in a favourable market position.

Since Croatia joined the EU, granting and overseeing state aid have been a matter not for the Croatian Competition Agency, but for the European Commission.

Aid allocated before accession to the EU and used afterwards is, for the purposes of the Accession Treaty, considered new aid, and the Commission is allowed to exercise supervision. If aid has been allocated in breach of EU rules, it must be paid back.

The fact that, as the above practice shows, the state is shouldering a bigger burden than any private creditor is prepared to do amounts to clear evidence that debtors are, in this way, receiving state aid.

Where it is suspected that individual pre-bankruptcy settlements and debt write-offs are in fact to be used as a channel for state aid, the particular plan concerned must be submitted to the Commission for prior authorisation. Aid allocated without authorisation must be returned.

Is the practice described above in accordance with the rules, bearing in mind that it is opening the door to favouritism? In view of that last point, in what way and how often has the Commission supervised the implementation of pre-bankruptcy settlements?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2014)

According to settled case law of the Union Courts, economic transactions carried out by a public body do not confer an advantage on its counterpart, and therefore do not constitute aid, if they are carried out in line with normal market conditions. With regard to transactions as described in the question, the so-called 'private creditor test' has been developed to examine whether debt renegotiations by public creditors involve state aid, comparing the behaviour of a public creditor to that of hypothetical private creditors that find themselves in a similar situation.

Therefore the practice as described in the question could entail state aid, if indeed a Member State accepted debt-settlements that a private creditor would not have accepted. In this regard, the counterfactual of a bankruptcy and what the creditors, including public creditors, would have received from the insolvency estate also has to be taken into account.

The case law and jurisprudence relevant in this context will be summarised in a Commission Notice on the notion of aid, which the Commission published for consultation on 17 January this year, as part of the ongoing state aid modernisation initiative. This document should provide public authorities with further guidance on this issue.

To date, the Commission is not aware of cases in which Croatia granted state aid in the context of a pre-bankruptcy settlement. It has however been consulted by a Croatian Court on a similar question and will provide guidance to this Court in due course.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001748/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Beni culturali a rischio in Siria

La guerra civile siriana, oltre alla tragedia umanitaria, nasconde anche una tragedia di natura culturale: migliaia di opere artistiche sono state infatti gravemente danneggiate, a volte in maniera irrecuperabile. Il minareto della moschea di Aleppo, il suq medievale, il mosaico bizantino della moschea degli Omayyadi a Damasco, i mosaici bizantini ad Apamea e i musei di Aleppo e di Deir ez-Zor sono solo alcuni dei tesori vittime della guerra.

Oltre però ai danni accidentali, occorre sottolineare una vera e propria iconoclastia portata avanti dai combattenti islamici fondamentalisti. Le opere d'arte sono state prese di mira anche con armi pesanti e alcuni specialistici temono in particolare per le prime opere cristiane e le opere romane e greche. Tra i siti distrutti da questi fondamentalisti figurano i rilievi scolpiti a Shash Hamnda, un cimitero romano nella provincia di Aleppo e le statue scolpite sul fianco di una vallata ad al-Qatora.

Alla luce di questi eventi, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. se è a conoscenza di questa vera e propria iconoclastia;

2. se intende agire al fine di porre termine a queste attività e proteggere i beni culturali siriani sia dagli attacchi mirati che dai danni collaterali involontari del conflitto?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(15 aprile 2014)

La Commissione è al corrente delle minacce che l'attuale conflitto rappresenta per lo straordinario patrimonio culturale siriano, che da marzo 2011 ha subito danni considerevoli, con casi sempre più numerosi di monumenti importanti distrutti, saccheggio e distruzione di beni culturali mobili e interruzione della pratica e della trasmissione del patrimonio culturale immateriale del paese. L'UE ha espresso preoccupazione per la distruzione del patrimonio culturale siriano anche nelle conclusioni del Consiglio Affari esteri.

Sebbene l'obiettivo principale della sua risposta al conflitto siriano sia stato quello di attenuare le sofferenze umane e l'impatto della crisi sulla popolazione, la Commissione è consapevole che il patrimonio culturale del paese rimane un simbolo estremamente importante dell'identità e dell'unità siriane e continuerà a costituire un fattore fondamentale per le attività economiche connesse al turismo, indipendentemente dal futuro assetto della Siria.

Per questo motivo la Commissione sostiene dal 2013 l'UNESCO e i suoi principali partner internazionali con un progetto da 2,5 milioni di EUR volto a 1) monitorare e valutare meglio la situazione del patrimonio culturale siriano, 2) arginare la distruzione e la perdita di tale patrimonio mediante azioni di sensibilizzazione a livello nazionale e internazionale e 3) fornire assistenza tecnica e sviluppare le capacità delle principali parti interessate in Siria e nei paesi limitrofi per tutelare in modo più efficace il patrimonio culturale nazionale e impedirne il traffico illecito e la distruzione.

A dicembre 2013 il Consiglio ha inoltre adottato una decisione e un regolamento che vietano il commercio da e verso l'UE di beni appartenenti al patrimonio culturale siriano rimossi illegalmente dalla Siria dal 9 maggio 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001748/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Syria's cultural heritage under threat

In addition to the obvious human tragedy resulting from the civil war being waged in Syria, there is another, less obvious tragedy of a cultural nature, with thousands of works of art having been severely damaged, sometimes irreparably so. The minaret of the Great Mosque of Aleppo, medieval souk in Aleppo, the Byzantine mosaic in the Great Mosque of Damascus and those in the city of Apamea, and the museums in Aleppo and Deir ez-Zor are just some of the countless treasures that have been destroyed by the fighting.

However, in addition to such collateral damage, attention must be drawn to the wave of destruction being perpetrated by iconoclastic Islamic fundamentalist fighters. Works of art are even being fired on by heavy artillery, and several experts are particularly fearful for the prospects of early Christian works and ancient Roman and Greek works. The treasures that have so far been desecrated by these fundamentalists include the relief sculptures at the Shash Hamdan Roman cemetery near Aleppo, and the statues carved out of the sides of a valley at al-Qatora.

1. Is the Commission aware of this wave of destruction currently being perpetrated by iconoclasts?

2. Does it intend to take any action in order to bring this destruction to an end and protect Syria's cultural heritage from both deliberate, targeted attacks and involuntary collateral damage resulting from the fighting?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(15 April 2014)

The Commission is aware of the threats to Syria's cultural heritage caused by the ongoing conflict. Syria harbours exceptional cultural wealth that has suffered considerable damage since March 2011, with growing evidence of destruction of important monuments, looting and destruction of its movable cultural heritage and rupture in the practice and transmission of its intangible heritage. The EU has also expressed its concerns about the destruction of Syria's cultural heritage in Foreign Affairs Council conclusions.

While the bulk of the Commission's response to the Syrian conflict has been focused on alleviating human suffering and mitigating the impact of the crisis on the Syrian population, the Commission is also aware that Syria's cultural heritage remains a very important symbol of Syrian identity and unity, and will remain a highly valuable asset for economic activities related to tourism in any future Syria.

That is why the Commission started supporting Unesco and its main international partners in 2013 through a EUR 2.5 million project on this topic. The objectives of this project are to (1) better monitor and assess the Syrian cultural heritage situation, (2) mitigate the destruction and loss of Syrian cultural heritage through national and international awareness-raising efforts, and (3) provide technical assistance and build the capacities of the main stakeholders in Syria and in the neighbouring countries to protect Syria's cultural heritage better and prevent illicit trafficking and destruction.

Furthermore, in December 2013, the Council adopted a decision and Regulation that prohibits trade to and from the EU of Syrian cultural properties which have been unlawfully removed from Syria since 9 May 2011.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001750/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Riavvicinamento diplomatico tra Pechino e Taipei

Questa settimana è avvenuto uno storico incontro tra i rappresentanti della Repubblica Popolare Cinese e la Repubblica di Cina a Nanchino, ex-capitale della Cina repubblicana. Si tratta di un momento estremamente importante, dal momento che per la prima volta la RPC ha accettato di riconoscere la legittimità di un ministro taiwanese.

Le relazioni nello stretto di Formosa sono andate migliorando già dal 2008, quando Taiwan scelse un presidente propenso a un disgelo con Pechino. A Nanchino sono stati ripristinati i «tre collegamenti» (navali, postali e aerei) ed è stato stabilito che i cittadini cinesi potranno visitare Taiwan sia come turisti, sia come studenti o investitori. Da alcune indiscrezioni pare che sia stata già approvata la creazione di due uffici di rappresentanza nelle rispettive capitali, una proposta in precedenza fortemente respinta da Pechino.

Alla luce di questo incontro, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. come accoglie i recenti sviluppi delle relazioni sino-taiwanesi?

2. intende partecipare attivamente alla riappacificazione e al reciproco riconoscimento tra i due Stati?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(28 aprile 2014)

1. Si invita l'onorevole deputato a consultare la dichiarazione sul miglioramento delle relazioni tra le due sponde dello Stretto rilasciata dal portavoce dell'Alta Rappresentante dell'UE Catherine Ashton il giorno della riunione di Nanchino (http://eeas.europa.eu/statements/docs/2014/140211_01_en.pdf).

2. Per quanto riguarda la sua «politica di una sola Cina», l'UE continua a sostenere le iniziative volte a promuovere il dialogo, la cooperazione pratica e la fiducia tra le due sponde dello Stretto di Taiwan.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001750/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Diplomatic rapprochement between Beijing and Taipei

A historic meeting took place this week between representatives of the Chinese People's Republic and the Republic of China in Nanjing, the former capital of Republican China. This is an extremely important moment, since it is the first time the CPR has agreed to acknowledge the legitimacy of a Taiwanese minister.

Relations in the Taiwan Straits have been improving since 2008, when Taiwan chose a president in favour of a thaw with Beijing. In Nanjing, the 'three links' (shipping, postal and air) were renewed and it was agreed that Chinese citizens may visit Taiwan as either tourists, students or investors. Some leaks suggest that the establishment of two representative offices in the respective capitals has already been approved, a proposal Beijing has hitherto forcefully rejected.

In the light of that meeting, can the Commission clarify:

1. its views on the recent developments in Sino-Taiwanese relations?

2. if it intends to play an active part in reconciliation and mutual recognition between the two States?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(28 April 2014)

1. Please see the statement made by the Spokesperson of EU High Representative Catherine Ashton on improving Cross-Strait relations, issued on the day of the meeting in Nanjing (http://eeas.europa.eu/statements/docs/2014/140211_01_en.pdf).

2. With due regard to its One China Policy, the EU continues to encourage initiatives aimed at promoting dialogue, practical cooperation and confidence building between the two sides of the Taiwan Strait.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001751/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Legge anti-stranieri in Ungheria

La situazione politica in Ungheria desta ulteriori preoccupazioni alla luce di due recenti episodi relativi all'inasprimento delle regole anti-stranieri e all'epurazione dalle istituzioni di chi non è allineato.

Recentemente è stata votata una legge che introduce il carcere fino a cinque anni per chi aggira la legge del 1994 che vieta agli stranieri di comprare terreni in Ungheria. Una legge che molti hanno tentato di eludere facendo comprare immobili o terreni da ungheresi che si impegnavano — con clausole segrete — a girare i beni al legittimo proprietario se fosse cambiata la legge. Il governo ha ulteriormente rafforzato la norma per colpire tutti quei contadini stranieri (austriaci e tedeschi soprattutto) che hanno affittato i terreni. In tal modo, secondo il governo austriaco, circa 200 contadini austriaci rischiano il carcere.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, può la Commissione chiarire se la proposta di legge in esame non violi le quattro libertà fondamentali del funzionamento del mercato interno e in particolare la libertà di stabilimento?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2014)

La legislazione che disciplina l'acquisto e l'affitto dei terreni agricoli deve rispettare il diritto dell'UE e in particolare la libera circolazione dei capitali e la libertà di stabilimento. Le restrizioni a queste libertà sancite dal trattato sono accettabili soltanto se giustificate per motivi d'interesse pubblico e se rispettano i principi di proporzionalità e di non discriminazione stabiliti dalla Corte di giustizia europea in diverse occasioni.

I servizi della Commissione hanno monitorato strettamente gli sviluppi della legislazione ungherese sui terreni agricoli. In tale contesto, è stato esaminato il quadro legislativo (Legge CXXII del 2013 e la relativa normativa) che sarà applicabile per quanto riguarda l'acquisto dei terreni dopo il periodo transitorio previsto dal trattato di adesione che scade il 30 aprile 2014. Inoltre, i servizi stanno valutando le recenti modifiche di legge che interessano i contratti esistenti, compreso l'articolo 108 della legge CCXII del 2013 che stabilisce la cessazione di determinati usufrutti al 1° maggio 2014 e la legge VII del 2014 che riguarda taluni contratti illegali e la relativa modifica del Codice penale.

Nel caso in cui la Commissione giungesse alla conclusione che queste o altre misure ungheresi in questo settore non rispettano il diritto dell'UE verrà intrapresa la relativa azione come opportuno.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001751/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Anti-foreigner laws in Hungary

The political situation in Hungary has sparked further concerns in recent days, following two separate incidents stemming from the increased tightening of the country's anti-foreigner regulations, with the authorities relentlessly persecuting anyone who does not comply with them.

The Hungarian Government has recently approved a law that imposes prison sentences of up to five years on anyone who bypasses the 1994 law prohibiting foreigners from buying Hungarian land. Many non-Hungarians have attempted to bypass the latter law by purchasing houses or land from Hungarian citizens who then promised them — through contracts drawn up in secret — that the assets would be transferred to their rightful owner if and when the law was changed. The Hungarian Government has also imposed stricter measures on the leasing of Hungarian farmland, in a move that will affect every single foreign tenant farmer (primarily from Austria and Germany) in the country. As a result, around 200 Austrian farmers are now facing prison sentences, according to the Austrian Government.

In light of the above, can the Commission clarify whether or not the draft legislation detailed above constitutes a breach of the four fundamental freedoms of the single market, and especially of the freedom of establishment?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2014)

Legislation governing the acquisition and lease of agricultural land has to respect EC law, in particular the free movement of capital and the freedom of establishment. Restrictions to these Treaty freedoms are only acceptable if they are justified for public interest reasons and comply with the principles of proportionality and non-discrimination as set out on numerous occasions by the European Court of Justice.

The Commission services have been monitoring the developments in Hungarian legislation on agricultural land closely. In this context, the legislative framework (Act CXXII of 2013 and related legislation) that will be applicable to the acquisition of land after the transitional period provided by the Accession Treaty expires on 30 April 2014 is being scrutinised. In addition, the Services are assessing recent legislative changes that affect existing contracts, including §108 of Act CCXII of 2013 terminating certain usufructs on 1 May 2014 as well as Act VII of 2014 concerning certain unlawful contracts and the related amendment of the Penal Code.

Should the Commission come to the conclusion that these or other Hungarian measures in this field do not respect EC law, it will take action, as appropriate.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001752/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Nuova app per smartphone contro il ciberbullismo

Quello del bullismo su internet è un fenomeno ormai dilagante che, nonostante l'attenzione dei media e dei cittadini europei, non ha ancora visto una risposta incisiva da parte dei governi nazionali e dall'Unione europea.

Il fenomeno sta raggiungendo dimensioni preoccupanti: basti pensare che negli Stati Uniti, dove la presenza degli adolescenti in rete è massiccia, oltre il 40 % dei giovanissimi ammette di essere vittima di forme di violenza psicologica tramite internet. Il fenomeno desta preoccupazione perché il distacco provocato dall'assenza del contatto diretto, o ancor più la totale anonimità garantita da alcuni siti, creano la tendenza a comportamenti verbalmente violenti e all'istigazione.

Venire allo scoperto non è facile per le vittime: il timore di ritorsioni, la vergogna, la frustrazione spingono le vittime a non informare gli adulti, favorendo la libertà di azione degli aggressori.

Una soluzione per far fronte a questo genere di molestie elettroniche potrebbe offrirla una nuova app per smartphone che si propone di facilitare la segnalazione di abusi tramite la possibilità di catturare screenshot dei comportamenti dannosi online, inviarli a un gruppo selezionato di adulti di fiducia e accedere a linee telefoniche di assistenza, conservando l'anonimato. Il software è stato presentato lo scorso autunno negli USA ed è stato da poco adottato in via sperimentale nel distretto scolastico di Kenilworth, nel New Jersey.

Alla luce di quanto detto, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. se è a conoscenza di questa applicazione;

2. se è a conoscenza di altri strumenti simili;

3. se ritiene che questo genere di applicazione possa rappresentare un modello efficace nella lotta contro il bullismo online?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(3 aprile 2014)

La Commissione condivide la posizione dell'onorevole deputato. Il bullismo online è un rischio sempre maggiore per i più giovani. È necessario che i bambini sviluppino le giuste competenze per partecipare in tutta sicurezza alla società digitale.

La Commissione ha istituito e cofinanzia i centri «Internet più sicuro», presenti in tutti gli Stati membri, il cui compito principale è sensibilizzare i più giovani, gli insegnanti e i genitori circa i possibili rischi ai quali sono esposti i ragazzi in Rete, fornendo loro gli strumenti per difendersi. Tali centri gestiscono un servizio telefonico di assistenza che fornisce consigli a ragazzi, genitori e insegnanti su come affrontare eventuali problemi che si presentano online, incluso il cyberbullismo.

La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'app citata dall'onorevole deputato, appositamente concepita per l'utilizzo in ambiente scolastico. Nell'ambito del progetto #DeleteCyberbullying ([1]), finanziato dalla Commissione, è in corso lo sviluppo di un'app che spiega agli utenti il problema del bullismo online e verifica quanto sono informati sull'argomento.

Le app possono essere uno dei mezzi per combattere il cyberbullismo. Per contrastare in modo efficace i rischi associati a contatti e contenuti online dannosi, è necessario ricorrere a una combinazione di soluzioni, quali attività di sensibilizzazione, formazione e istruzione, autoregolamentazione, strumenti tecnici e imposizione del rispetto delle leggi, là dove esistono.

([1]) http://deletecyberbullying.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001752/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: New anti-cyberbullying app for smartphones

Online bullying is now rife on the Internet, and even though it has received widespread media coverage and been roundly condemned by the European public, it has still not been decisively addressed by national governments and the European Union.

The phenomenon is growing increasingly alarming: in the United States, for instance, where huge numbers of teenagers surf the web, over 40% of young people have revealed that they have suffered psychological abuse over the Internet. The issue is being made worse by the sense of detachment felt between cyberbully and victim, stemming from the fact that they are not in direct contact with each other (and made even greater by the cloak of total anonymity offered by certain websites), which thus emboldens the cyberbully to make violent threats and taunts.

It is not at all easy for victims to tell adults what they are going through, with the fear of reprisals, shame or frustration making them more inclined to keep silent and thus allow their tormentors to continue unabated.

One way of combating this electronic form of harassment could be to offer victims the new smartphone app that has recently been developed in the United States. This app makes it easier for victims to report any abuse they suffer, by making it possible for them to take screenshots of any offensive online behaviour and then send them to a designated group of trusted adults. It also gives them access to telephone helplines so they can remain anonymous when reporting any cyberbullying. The app was unveiled last autumn, and has just started a trial phase in schools in Kenilworth, New Jersey.

1. Is the Commission aware of the app described above?

2. Is it aware of any other similar items of software?

3. Does it believe that this form of app could prove to be an effective prototype in the fight against cyberbullying?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2014)

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's concern. Cyberbullying has become an increasing online risk among young people. Children need to develop the right skills to take part safely in the digital society.

The Commission set up and co-funds Safer Internet Centres in all Member States, whose main task is to raise awareness among young people, teachers and parents, regarding the possible risks young people may encounter online and empower them to deal with these risks. The Centres run helplines for young people, parents, and teachers if they need advice on any issue they face online, including cyberbullying.

The Commission is aware of the app described that is specially designed to work within a school district. The #DeleteCyberbullying ([1]) project, funded by the Commission is in the process of developing an app that explains to its users the issue of (cyber)bullying and also tests their knowledge.

An app can be part of the solution to tackle cyberbullying. Awareness-raising, training and education, self-regulation and technical tools and enforcement of legal provisions, where they exist, can in combination help to tackle effectively the risks associated to harmful content and contacts online.

([1]) http://deletecyberbullying.eu/

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001753/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Disturbi dell'apprendimento. Nuove competenze per la scuola

Alla luce di indagini promosse da associazioni, esperte del settore, si rileva come il problema del disturbo dell'apprendimento non abbia, a tutt'oggi, sempre una risposta proficua da parte dell'ente scolastico e dei suoi operatori. In particolare, emerge la necessità di costituire competenze ad hoc per le agenzie educative, di modo da permettere l'individuazione del disagio e predisporre opportuni strumenti, non penalizzanti nei riguardi del discente.

Questa realtà si riscontra in diversi contesti europei, non in ultimo in Italia.

Di conseguenza, alla luce di quanto sopra, si intende chiedere alla Commissione:

1. di indicare ulteriori studi relativi al problema, che rendano uno scenario della situazione vigente negli altri Stati membri, sottolineandone somiglianze e differenze;

2. di illustrare misure ed interventi posti in essere precedentemente, allo scopo di affrontare adeguatamente il problema;

3. di indicare eventuali strategie che abbiano prodotto esiti positivi in diversi contesti europei.

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(11 aprile 2014)

Le difficoltà di apprendimento e le loro manifestazioni cliniche più gravi che sono di solito denominate disturbi dell'apprendimento sono tra i principali fattori che influiscono sulla resa degli studenti. Non si tratta di una questione puramente didattica. Per ovviarvi occorre il coinvolgimento dei servizi medici, di sanità pubblica e sociali. Come l'Onorevole deputato ben saprà, conformemente all'articolo 165 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea la responsabilità del contenuto e dell'organizzazione dei sistemi di istruzione e formazione è di esclusiva competenza degli Stati membri.

Con l'Azione Jean Monnet del programma Erasmus+ l'UE sostiene i lavori dell'Agenzia europea per lo sviluppo dell'istruzione per studenti disabili ([1]). Si tratta di un'organizzazione indipendente istituita dagli Stati membri che funge da piattaforma collaborativa per le questioni legate allo sviluppo di soluzioni per i discenti con bisogni educativi speciali. L'Agenzia agevola la raccolta, il trattamento e il trasferimento di informazioni per l'intera Europa e per i singoli paesi ed offre agli Stati membri l'opportunità di apprendere gli uni dagli altri. Si rinvia l'Onorevole deputato al sito web di questa organizzazione per informazioni sui lavori dell'Agenzia in merito al quesito sollevato.

([1]) https://www.european-agency.org/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001753/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Learning disorders. New skills for school

In the light of investigations commissioned by specialist associations, it is clear that, even now, the problem of learning disorders does not always receive a helpful response from education authorities and their operators. In particular, there is a need to establish ad hoc skills for schools, in order to identify the difficulty and put suitable tools in place which do not penalise the learner.

This situation is found in various European contexts, not just Italy.

Consequently, in the light of the above, the Commission is asked to:

1. point to further studies of the issue which give a picture of the current position in the other Member States, highlighting similarities and differences;

2. illustrate measures and steps taken previously with a view to coping with the issue;

3. point to any strategies which have had positive outcomes in different European contexts.

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2014)

Learning disabilities and their more severe clinical manifestations which are usually referred to as learning disorders are some of the major factors affecting students' academic performance. This is not a purely educational issue. Addressing it requires the involvement of medical, public-health and social services. At the same time, the Honourable Member will be aware that, in accordance with Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the responsibility for the content and organisation of education and training systems rests entirely with Member States.

Through the Jean Monnet action of the Erasmus+ programme, the EU supports the work of the European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education ([1]). It is an independent self-governing organisation established by the Member States which acts as a collaborative platform for issues regarding the development of provisions for learners with special educational needs. The Agency facilitates the collection, processing and transfer of European-level and country-specific information and offers Member States the opportunity to learn from each other. The Honourable Member is referred to the website of this organisation for information on the Agency's work on the issues raised in the question.

([1]) https://www.european-agency.org/

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001755/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Razzismo in rete

Uno studio dell'ultima ora, condotto da un importante istituto di ricerca, ha sottolineato la diffusione del vocabolario razzista in rete, in particolar modo sui social network, quali ad esempio twitter.

Nello specifico, si monitorano le interazioni occorse in rete per un determinato lasso di tempo considerando principalmente un Paese europeo che, comunque, sembra riflettere una tendenza generale.

Tale tema investe una serie di aspetti di rilevanza sociale, che riguardano integrazione, cittadinanza, pari opportunità, impiego dei nuovi mezzi di comunicazione e socializzazione, istruzione. Di conseguenza, è certamente rilevante nell'ambito delle politiche europee.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Può fornire informazioni su ulteriori studi in merito al tema segnalato, capaci di ampliare il raggio delle consapevolezze emerse dalla ricerca di cui sopra?

2. Può informare relativamente ad azioni specifiche, interventi contemplati dalla Commissione per affrontare e gestire il fenomeno del razzismo in rete?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(7 aprile 2014)

La Commissione rammenta che l'articolo 9 della decisione quadro 2008/913/GAI sulla lotta contro talune forme ed espressioni di razzismo e xenofobia mediante il diritto penale prevede che gli Stati membri adottino le misure necessarie per garantire che la loro giurisdizione si estenda ai casi in cui il comportamento sia posto in essere mediante un sistema di informazione e in cui l'autore di tale comportamento o i materiali usati in tale sistema si trovino sul loro territorio.

La relazione della Commissione sull'attuazione della decisione quadro, pubblicata il 27 gennaio 2014, fa espresso riferimento ai problemi derivanti dai discorsi di istigazione all'odio su internet.

Inoltre, la Commissione ha discusso il problema specifico di tali discorsi durante la 6ª riunione del gruppo di esperti degli Stati membri sull'attuazione della decisione quadro, tenutasi nel dicembre 2013. Tuttavia, come è stato sottolineato in varie risposte precedenti a domande analoghe, il compito di indagare, perseguire e processare i singoli casi di presunta istigazione all'odio è e rimarrà di competenza delle autorità nazionali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001755/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Racism on the Internet

A very recent study by a major research institution has stressed the spread of racist language on the Internet, especially social networks such as Twitter.

Interaction on the web is specifically monitored for a given period of time and focusing mainly on one European country, though this does seem to reflect a general trend.

The topic touches on a number of aspects of social relevance. These are: integration, citizenship, equal opportunities, use of new means of communication and socialisation and education. It is therefore certainly relevant in the context of European policies.

In the light of the above, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Can it supply information on other studies of the topic referred to, which would extend the scope of the findings from the above research?

2. Can it provide information on specific action and intervention which it is considering to tackle and manage the phenomenon of online racism?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(7 April 2014)

The Commission points out that Article 9 of Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law stipulates that Member States shall take the necessary measures to ensure that their jurisdiction extends to cases where the conduct is committed through an information system and the offender or materials hosted in that system are found within its territory.

The Commission's report on the implementation of the framework Decision, published on 27 January 2014, makes express reference to the challenges posed by online hate speech.

Furthermore, the Commission has debated the specific question of online hate speech during the 6th Member State Expert Group Meeting on implementation of the framework Decision in December 2013. However, as has been pointed out in several previous replies to similar questions, it is, and will remain, the competence of national authorities to investigate, prosecute and try individual cases of alleged hate speech.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001756/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 febbraio 2014)

Oggetto: Misure a contrasto della dispersione scolastica

La dispersione scolastica costituisce ancora oggi un problema di non poca rilevanza.

Il numero di minori che abbandonano gli studi precocemente, durante il percorso formativo obbligatorio, e di studenti che decidono di non intraprendere l'esperienza universitaria fa registrare un dato penalizzante nei riguardi di concetti quali diritto allo studio e formazione del capitale umano.

Relativamente a tale fenomeno, alcuni Paesi europei presentano uno scenario poco felice.

A tal proposito, l'Italia ha recentemente predisposto un programma di contrasto alla dispersione scolastica, che incentiva, nelle scuole, l'adozione di strategie atte ad arginarne la portata.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Può indicare recenti studi sulla dispersione scolastica?

2. Può illustrare misure e strategie poste in essere da diversi Stati membri, rivelatesi efficaci?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(4 aprile 2014)

Un ampio corpus di ricerche è disponibile sulle cause e i possibili rimedi dell'abbandono scolastico precoce. Le ricerche più recenti comprendono: lo studio 2011 «Ridurre il numero di abbandoni prematuri della scuola nell'UE» ([1]), commissionato dal Parlamento europeo; la relazione «L'abbandono prematuro della scuola: lezioni ricavate dalla ricerca per i decisori politici» ([2]), redatta da NESSE ([3]) nel 2011 per la Commissione; e il prossimo studio «Prevenire l'abbandono scolastico precoce in Europa: lezioni ricavate dall'istruzione destinata agli adulti», di ECORYS ([4]) per la Commissione. La Commissione effettua regolari controlli e redige relazioni sugli sviluppi nel settore dell'abbandono scolastico precoce nell'UE, anche attraverso l'analisi annuale della crescita ([5]) e la relazione di monitoraggio del settore dell'istuzione e della formazione ([6]).

Nel 2011 il Consiglio ha adottato raccomandazioni sulle politiche adottate per ridurre l'abbandono scolastico precoce ([7]). Un gruppo di lavoro tematico, che operava nel contesto del metodo aperto di coordinamento e che comprendeva rappresentanti di quasi tutti gli Stati membri, della Norvegia, dell'Islanda, e della Turchia ha analizzato le politiche adottate contro

l'abbandono scolastico precoce tra il 2011 e il 2013. Nella sua relazione finale ([8]), pubblicata nel novembre 2013, il gruppo di lavoro conferma che alcuni paesi, come i Paesi Bassi, che hanno adottato strategie globali sono riusciti a ridurre i tassi di abbandono scolastico precoce in modo sostenibile. La relazione identifica le condizioni essenziali per sviluppare e attuare queste politiche con successo e propone numerose buone prassi.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2011/460048/IPOL-CULT_ET(2011)460048_EN.pdf
([2]) http://www.nesse.fr/nesse/nesse/activities/reports.
([3]) Network of Experts in Social Sciences of Education and Training.
([4]) ECORYS è una società europea di ricerca e consulenza.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/annual-growth-surveys/index_en.htm
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/tools/et-monitor_en.htm
([7]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32011H0701 %2801 %29:EN:NOT
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework/doc/esl-group-report_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001756/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Measures to counter opting out of education

Opting out of education remains a problem of some relevance today.

The number of children who drop out of education early, during the compulsory school years, and of students who decide that the experience of going to university is not for them, detract from ideals such as the right to education and the training of human capital.

The scenario in some European countries is unfortunate in this regard.

Italy has recently set up a programme to counter opting out of education. This provides an incentive for schools to adopt strategies designed to limit its scale.

In the light of the above, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Can it identify any recent studies of opting out of education?

2. Can it illustrate measures and strategies set up by various Member States which have proved effective?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2014)

A large body of research is available regarding causes of and possible remedies to early school leaving (ESL). Most recent research includes: the 2011 study 'Reducing early school leaving in the EU' ([1]), commissioned by the European Parliament; the report 'Early school leaving: lessons from research for policy-makers' ([2]), authored by NESSE ([3]) in 2011 for the Commission; and the forthcoming study 'Preventing ESL in Europe: lessons learned from second chance education', authored by ECORYS ([4]) for the Commission. The Commission regularly monitors and reports on developments in ESL in the EU, including through the Annual Growth Survey ([5]) and the Education and Training Monitor ([6]).

In 2011 the Council adopted recommendations on policies to reduce ESL ([7]). A Thematic Working Group, operating within the context of the Open Method of Coordination and representing nearly all MS, Norway, Iceland, and Turkey, worked on policies against ESL between 2011 and 2013. Its final report ([8]), published in November 2013, confirms that countries, such as the Netherlands, which have adopted comprehensive strategies succeeded in curtailing ESL rates sustainably. The report identifies key conditions for developing and implementing such policies successfully and proposes numerous good practices.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2011/460048/IPOL-CULT_ET(2011)460048_EN.pdf
([2]) http://www.nesse.fr/nesse/nesse/activities/reports
([3]) Network of Experts in Social Sciences of Education and Training.
([4]) ECORYS is a European research and consultancy company.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/annual-growth-surveys/index_en.htm
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/tools/et-monitor_en.htm
([7]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32011H0701%2801%29:EN:NOT
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework/doc/esl-group-report_en.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001759/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(17 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Declaraciones del Presidente de la Comisión sobre Escocia y la Unión (1)

En declaraciones efectuadas a la televisión pública británica (BBC), el Presidente de la Comisión, Sr. Durão Barroso, ha declarado que la adhesión de Escocia a la Unión en caso de votar por la independencia es «extremadamente difícil, si no es imposible» ([1]).

¿Considera la Comisión que estas declaraciones del Sr. Durão Barroso ayudan a fomentar el espíritu y acerbo europeo en estos momentos de auge del euroescepticismo, especialmente en Gran Bretaña?

¿En qué razones se basa el Sr. Durão Barroso para querer expulsar de la Unión a territorios que cumplen con los criterios de Copenhague y son europeístas al mismo tiempo que se negocia la adhesión de Estados que tienen dificultades para cumplirlos?

¿Cree la Comisión que las declaraciones del Sr. Durão Barroso son compatibles con el principio democrático que es el pilar de la UE?

¿Cree la Comisión que las declaraciones del Sr. Durão Barroso son adecuadas y que se ajustan a la política de la misma de no interferir en los procesos democráticos y electorales de los Estados miembros?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001760/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(17 de febrero de 2014)

Asunto: Declaraciones del Presidente de la Comisión sobre Escocia y la Unión (2)

En declaraciones efectuadas a la televisión pública británica (BBC), el Presidente de la Comisión, Sr. Durão Barroso, ha declarado que la adhesión de Escocia a la Unión en caso de votar por la independencia es «extremadamente difícil, si no es imposible» ([2]).

¿En qué punto de los Tratados y demás legislación de la Unión se basa el Sr. Durão Barroso para amenazar con la pérdida de ciudadanía a actuales ciudadanos y ciudadanas de la Unión que quieren seguir siéndolo?

En razón a los argumentos esgrimidos por el Sr. Durão Barroso parece que la Unión se debe más a los Estados que a los ciudadanos que la conforman y a su voluntad democráticamente expresada. ¿Está la Comisión de acuerdo con esa percepción? ¿En razón a qué argumentos?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Barroso en nombre de la Comisión
(3 de abril de 2014)

El Presidente Barroso dejó claro que sus comentarios en respuesta a una pregunta de una entrevista en televisión no hacían referencia a las disposiciones constitucionales internas específicas del Reino Unido ni de ningún otro Estado miembro. Expresó su respeto por el actual proceso democrático y recordó que corresponde a los escoceses y a los ciudadanos británicos decidir sobre el futuro de Escocia.

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a sus respuestas a las preguntas parlamentarias E-008133/2012, P-009756/2012 y P-009862/2012 ([3]).

([1]) http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-scotland-politics-26215963
([2]) http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-scotland-politics-26215963
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/es/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001759/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Statements by the President of the Commission on Scotland and the Union (1)

In statements to the British public television broadcaster (BBC) the President of the Commission, Mr Durão Barroso, has said that the adhesion of Scotland to the EU, in the event that it voted for independence, would be 'extremely difficult, if not impossible' ([1]).

Does the Commission consider that these statements by Mr Durão Barroso help to foment the European spirit and heritage in these times of growing euro-scepticism, particularly in Great Britain?

On what grounds does Mr Durão Barroso base his wish to expel from the Union territories that are pro-European and fulfil the Copenhagen criteria, when at the same time negotiations are taking place for the adhesion of States that are finding it difficult to comply with them?

Does the Commission believe that these statements by Mr Durão Barroso are compatible with the democratic principle that is the foundation of the EU?

Does the Commission believe that these statements by Mr Durão Barroso are appropriate and comply with its policy of not interfering in Member States' internal democratic and electoral processes?

Question for written answer E-001760/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Statements by the President of the Commission on Scotland and the Union (2)

In statements to the British public television broadcaster (BBC) the President of the Commission, Mr Durão Barroso, has said that the adhesion of Scotland to the EU, in the event that it voted for independence, would be 'extremely difficult, if not impossible' ([2]).

On what provision of the EU Treaties and other legislation does Mr Durão Barroso base his position in order to threaten current citizens of the Union, who wish to stay that way, with the loss of their citizenship?

On the basis of the arguments used by Mr Durão Barroso it would appear that the Union owes more to Member States than to the citizens who form it and their democratically expressed wishes. Does the Commission agree with this assessment? On the basis of what arguments?

Joint answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2014)

President Barroso made clear that his comments in response to a question in a TV interview did not relate to the specific internal constitutional arrangements of the United Kingdom or any other Member State. He expressed his respect for the on-going democratic process and recalled it is for the Scottish people and for the British citizens to decide on the future of Scotland.

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its replies to parliamentary questions E-008133/2012, P-009756/2012, and P-009862/2012 ([3]).

([1]) http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-scotland-politics-26215963
([2]) http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-scotland-politics-26215963
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001761/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Ergebnisse aus der 50. Sicherheitskonferenz

Im Anschluss an die 50. Münchner Sicherheitskonferenz ist klar geworden, dass sich Europa im globalen Kontext mit zahlreichen brisanten politischen Herausforderungen konfrontiert sieht. Die Ereignisse in der Ukraine haben in bedauerlichen Ausmaßen die Aktualität dieser Herausforderungen gezeigt.

1. Waren auf der 50. Münchner Sicherheitskonferenz VertreterInnen der Europäischen Kommission zugegen?

2. Wenn ja, hat es nach Ansicht der Kommission Ergebnisse oder Erkenntnisse gegeben, die für die europäische Agenda von Bedeutung sind? Welche?

3. Welche Möglichkeiten sieht die Kommission, die Ergebnisse dieser Veranstaltung für die europäische Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik zu nutzen oder umzusetzen?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001762/14
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Ergebnisse aus der 50. Sicherheitskonferenz

Im Anschluss an die 50. Münchner Sicherheitskonferenz ist klar geworden, dass sich Europa im globalen Kontext mit zahlreichen brisanten politischen Herausforderungen konfrontiert sieht. Die Ereignisse in der Ukraine haben in bedauerlichen Ausmaßen die Aktualität dieser Herausforderungen gezeigt.

1. Waren auf der 50. Münchner Sicherheitskonferenz VertreterInnen der Kommission zugegen?

2. Wenn ja, hat es nach Ansicht der Kommission Ergebnisse oder Erkenntnisse gegeben, die für die europäische Agenda von Bedeutung sind? Welche?

3. Welche Möglichkeiten sieht die Kommission, die Ergebnisse dieser Veranstaltung für die europäische Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik zu nutzen oder umzusetzen?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(16. Mai 2014)

1. Die Europäische Union war auf der 50. Münchner Sicherheitskonferenz mit der Teilnahme des Präsidenten des Europäischen Rates Van Rompuy und der Hohen Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin der Kommission auf höchster Ebene vertreten.

2. Die Münchner Sicherheitskonferenz ist ein wertvolles Forum, in dem führende Politiker, hochrangige Beamte und andere Entscheidungsträger informell zusammenkommen, um die zahlreichen Herausforderungen im Bereich der Sicherheit zu erörtern, mit denen sich die Welt gegenwärtig konfrontiert sieht und von denen die meisten ganz oben auf der EU-Agenda für auswärtiges Handeln stehen. Die Eindrücke und Meinungen der Teilnehmer sind zwar im Allgemeinen in persönlicher Eigenschaft formuliert, tragen jedoch mit Sicherheit dazu bei, das Blickfeld der EU in Bezug auf diese Herausforderungen zu erweitern. Die Münchner Sicherheitskonferenz dient der EU auch als Plattform zur Förderung ihrer Standpunkte zu solchen Fragen sowie zum informellen bilateralen Austausch mit den wichtigsten Gesprächspartnern.

3. Die Gemeinsame Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik der Union, einschließlich der Gemeinsamen Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik wird im Einklang mit den Verträgen vom Rat festgelegt und vom Hohen Vertreter und den Mitgliedstaaten umgesetzt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001761/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Results of the 50th Munich Security Conference

In the wake of the 50th Munich Security Conference it has become clear that the EU faces many daunting global political challenges. Events in Ukraine have made the pressing nature of these challenges only too plain.

1. Were Commission representatives present at the 50th Munich Security Conference?

2. If so, in the Commission's view did the conference produce results or insights which are relevant to the EU's agenda? What results and insights?

3. What scope does the Commission see for drawing on the results of the conference in implementing the European Security and Defence Policy?

Question for written answer E-001762/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Results of the 50th Munich Security Conference

In the wake of the 50th Munich Security Conference it has become clear that the EU faces many daunting global political challenges. Events in Ukraine have made the pressing nature of these challenges only too plain.

1. Were Commission representatives present at the 50th Munich Security Conference?

2. If so, in the Commission's view did the conference produce results or insights which are relevant to the EU's agenda? What results and insights?

3. What scope does the Commission see for drawing on the results of the conference in implementing the European Security and Defence Policy?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2014)

1. The EU was represented at 50th MSC at the highest level with the presence of the President of the European Council Van Rompuy and of the HR/VP.

2. The MSC is a valuable forum where world leaders, top officials and other decision-makers can informally meet and discuss the many security challenges the world faces today, most of which figure high on the agenda of the Union's external action. The insights and opinions of participants, while being generally expressed in their personal capacities, do certainly help to widen the EU's understanding of these challenges. The MSC also provides a platform for the EU to promote its views on such issues and to have informal bilateral exchanges with key interlocutors.

3. In accordance with the Treaties, the common foreign and security policy of the Union, including the Common Security and Defence Policy, is defined by the Council and put into effect by the High Representative and the Member States.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001763/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Mutmaßliche Boykotte von Hilfskonvois in Syrien

Offenbar kommt es auch in letzter Zeit vermehrt unter anderem zu bürokratischen Schikanen, um zu verhindern, dass Hilfskonvois für Zivilisten ihre Bestimmungsorte erreichen. Es wird vermutet, dass es sich hierbei um strategische Maßnahmen der Konfliktparteien handelt. Ganz offenbar werden hier auch Verbrechen gegen das Völkerrecht verübt.

1. Wie bewertet die Kommission den Status und eine mögliche Handhabe des Sicherheitsrates der Vereinten Nationen?

2. In den Medien wird berichtet, dass die zu verschiedenartigen Interessen der fünf Vetomächte ein Grund für die offenbar zu passive Vorgehensweise seien.

2.1 In welchen Punkten verortet die Kommission diese „verschiedenartigen Interessen", oder sieht die Kommission die Problematik für das zögerliche Handeln an anderer Stelle?

2.2 Inwieweit sieht die Kommission Möglichkeiten für Europa, in diesem „Interessenkonflikt" vermittelnd tätig zu sein und so einen Beitrag zur Bewältigung der inakzeptablen humanitären Situation in Syrien zu leisten?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001764/14
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Mutmaßliche Boykotte von Hilfskonvois in Syrien

Offenbar kommt es auch in letzter Zeit vermehrt unter anderem zu bürokratischen Schikanen, um zu verhindern, dass Hilfskonvois für Zivilisten ihre Bestimmungsorte erreichen. Es wird vermutet, dass es sich hierbei um strategische Maßnahmen der Konfliktparteien handelt. Ganz offenbar werden hier auch Verbrechen gegen das Völkerrecht verübt.

1. Wie bewertet die Hohe Vertreterin den Status und eine mögliche Handhabe des Sicherheitsrates der Vereinten Nationen?

2. In den Medien wird berichtet, dass die zu verschiedenartigen Interessen der fünf Vetomächte ein Grund für die offenbar zu passive Vorgehensweise seien.

2.1 In welchen Punkten verortet die Hohe Vertreterin diese „verschiedenartigen Interessen", oder sieht sie die Problematik für das zögerliche Handeln an anderer Stelle?

2.2 Inwieweit sieht die Hohe Vertreterin Möglichkeiten für Europa, in diesem „Interessenskonflikt" vermittelnd tätig zu sein und so einen Beitrag zur Bewältigung der inakzeptablen humanitären Situation in Syrien zu leisten?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(22. April 2014)

Die EU arbeitet mit den Vereinten Nationen und anderen internationalen Partnern zusammen, um zu ermöglichen, dass die humanitäre Hilfe in Syrien die Bedürftigen erreicht. Die EU hat mehrfach direkten Kontakt mit den syrischen Behörden sowie mit internationalen und regionalen Förderern des Regimes und den Oppositionskräften aufgenommen, um den Hilfskonvois den Übertritt über Trennungslinien und Grenzen zu erleichtern.

Einige EU-Mitgliedstaaten haben kürzlich die einstimmige Annahme der Resolution 2139 des Sicherheitsrates der Vereinten Nationen unterstützt, in der gefordert wird, dass sämtliche Maßnahmen zur Verbesserung der humanitären Lage vor Ort getroffen werden und dass ein Mechanismus zur monatlichen Überprüfung der Fortschritte geschaffen wird. Die EU begrüßt die am 22. Februar 2014 angenommene Resolution und wird alle Maßnahmen unterstützen, die zu ihrer vollständigen Umsetzung beitragen. Die EU ruft insbesondere alle Konfliktparteien auf, einen sicheren, ungehinderten und unverzüglichen Zugang zu allen Menschen in Not zu gewährleisten, auch über die Konfliktlinien und Grenzen hinweg. Die EU setzt sich außerdem über alle erdenklichen Kanäle für Folgendes ein: rasche Beendigung der Belagerungen in ganz Syrien und Einlegung „humanitärer Pausen" durch alle Seiten zur Sicherstellung eines ungehinderten Zugangs von humanitärer Hilfe und medizinischer Versorgung zu allen belagerten und schwer zu erreichenden Gebieten, Achtung des humanitären Völkerrechts, Gewährleistung des Schutzes von Zivilpersonen und der Sicherheit der humanitären Helfer sowie sichere, diskriminierungsfreie Fortbewegung von Zivilpersonen innerhalb Syriens, über die Landesgrenzen hinweg und überall, wo ihnen unmittelbare Gefahr droht.

Seit im November letzten Jahres die hochrangige Gruppe für humanitäre Herausforderungen in Syrien ins Leben gerufen wurde, ist die EU aktives Mitglied. Diese Gruppe, in der Mitglieder vertreten sind, die Einfluss auf die Konfliktparteien haben, wird im Einklang mit der neuen Resolution weitere Schritte unternehmen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001763/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Suspected boycotting of aid convoys in Syria

Even recently, there appears to have been an increasing amount of bureaucratic chicanery, among other things, aiming to prevent aid convoys for civilians from reaching their destinations. It is suspected that this is part of strategic measures taken by the parties to the conflict. International law is quite clearly being violated here as well.

1. How would the Commission assess the situation and potential involvement of the United Nations Security Council?

2. It is reported in the media that one reason for what is clearly an overly passive approach is the excessively diverging interests of the five veto powers.

2.1. In what areas does the Commission believe that these 'diverging interests' are at play, or does the Commission consider that the problems behind the hesitation to take action are attributable to something else?

2.2. To what extent does the Commission believe that there are opportunities for Europe to act as a mediator in this 'conflict of interests', and thus make a contribution towards addressing the unacceptable humanitarian situation in Syria?

Question for written answer E-001764/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Suspected boycotting of aid convoys in Syria

Even recently, there appears to have been an increasing amount of bureaucratic chicanery, among other things, aiming to prevent aid convoys for civilians from reaching their destinations. It is suspected that this is part of strategic measures taken by the parties to the conflict. International law is quite clearly being violated here as well.

1. How would the High Representative assess the situation and potential involvement of the United Nations Security Council?

2. It is reported in the media that one reason for what is clearly an overly passive approach is the excessively diverging interests of the five veto powers.

2.1. In what areas does the High Representative believe that these 'diverging interests' are at play, or does the High Representative consider that the problems behind the hesitation to take action are attributable to something else?

2.2. To what extent does the High Representative believe that there are opportunities for Europe to act as a mediator in this 'conflict of interests', and thus make a contribution towards addressing the unacceptable humanitarian situation in Syria?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2014)

The EU has been working with the UN and other international partners on enabling humanitarian access in Syria. The EU has repeatedly reached out directly to the Syrian authorities as well as to international and regional supporters of the regime and the opposition forces to facilitate cross-line and cross-border entry for humanitarian convoys.

Some EU member states have recently supported a successful passage, on a unanimous vote, of the UNSC resolution 2139, which calls for all measures to improve the humanitarian situation on the ground and envisions a monthly progress review mechanism. The EU welcomes the resolution adopted on 22 February 2014 and will support all measures leading to its full implementation. The EU, in particular, calls on all parties to the conflict to ensure safe, unhindered and immediate access to all people in need, including across conflict lines and borders. The EU also continues to advocate through all possible channels for: the prompt lifting of sieges throughout Syria and the implementation of 'humanitarian pauses' by all sides, to allow for the unhindered delivery of humanitarian aid and medical care to all besieged and hard to reach areas; the respect of International Humanitarian Law (IHL), the protection of civilians and the safety of humanitarian personnel; and the safe passage of civilians without discrimination within Syria, across its borders and wherever they are in imminent danger.

The EU has, since its inauguration in November last year, been an active member of the High Level Group on Humanitarian Challenges in Syria. The work of this group, which contains members with influence on the parties to the conflict, will undertake further steps adjusted to the new resolution.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001765/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17. Februar 2014)

Betrifft: Krise in der Zentralafrikanischen Republik

Aus einem politischen Motiv heraus, dem Putsch gegen die amtierende Regierung im Jahr 2013, haben sich offenbar schwerwiegende und beständig zunehmende Konflikte zwischen Christen und Muslimen entwickelt. Laut Medienberichten seien die Kontingente ausländischer Soldaten aus der Afrikanischen Union und Frankreich, die sich dort im UN-Einsatz befinden, mit der Situation überfordert.

1. Welche Mittel stehen der Kommission zur Verfügung, um den Konflikt möglichst auf politischer Ebene und friedlich zu lösen?

2. Inwiefern sieht die Kommission hier Verstöße gegen bestehende Abkommen mit der Zentralafrikanischen Republik, vor allem im Hinblick auf die Einhaltung der Menschenrechte, des Völkerrechts und der Rechtsstaatlichkeit?

3. In Medienberichten wird davon gesprochen, 500 EU-Soldaten in der Hauptstadt zum Schutz der Flüchtlinge am Flughafen zu stationieren. Ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass diese Anzahl der Situation entsprechend ausreichend ist und dass auch keine außerordentliche Gefährdung besteht?

4. Welche humanitären Hilfsaktionen unterstützt die Europäische Union in diesem Krisengebiet, in dem von hunderttausenden Flüchtlingen die Rede ist?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(24. Juni 2014)

Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-1766/2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001765/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(17 February 2014)

Subject: Crisis in the Central African Republic

A politically motivated move — the rebellion against the incumbent government in 2013 — has given rise to what are clearly serious and constantly escalating conflicts between Christians and Muslims. According to media reports, the contingents of foreign soldiers from the African Union and France, who have been deployed there by the UN, are struggling to control the situation.

1. As far as is possible, what means does the Commission have at its disposal to resolve the conflict on a political level and in a peaceful manner?

2. To what extent does the Commission believe that there have been breaches of existing agreements with the Central African Republic in this context, particularly with regard to respecting human rights, international law and the rule of law?

3. There is talk in media reports of 500 EU soldiers being stationed in the capital city in order to protect the refugees at the airport. Does the Commission believe that this number is sufficient to respond to the situation and that there is not an exceptional level of risk involved?

4. What humanitarian aid programmes is the European Union supporting in this crisis zone in which mention can be made of hundreds of thousands of refugees?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-1766/2014.