

Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union

C 179



Ausgabe
in deutscher Sprache

Mitteilungen und Bekanntmachungen

57. Jahrgang

12. Juni 2014

Inhalt

IV Informationen

INFORMATIONEN DER ORGANE, EINRICHTUNGEN UND SONSTIGEN STELLEN DER
EUROPÄISCHEN UNION

Europäisches Parlament

ANFRAGEN ZUR SCHRIFTLICHEN BEANTWORTUNG MIT ANTWORT

2014/C 179/01

Anfragen der Mitglieder des Europäischen Parlaments zur schriftlichen Beantwortung und die
entsprechenden Antworten eines Organs der Europäischen Union

1

(Siehe Hinweis für den Leser)

DE

Hinweis für den Leser

Diese Veröffentlichung enthält Anfragen der Mitglieder des Europäischen Parlaments zur schriftlichen Beantwortung und die entsprechenden Antworten eines Organs der Europäischen Union.

Jede Anfrage und ihre Antwort werden zunächst in der Originalsprache und anschließend in den eventuellen Übersetzungen angegeben.

In einigen Fällen kann es vorkommen, dass die Antwort in einer anderen Sprache verfasst ist als die Anfrage. Dies hängt von der Arbeitssprache des Gremiums ab, das mit der Beantwortung beauftragt wurde.

Die vorliegenden Anfragen und Antworten werden gemäß den Artikeln 117 und 118 der Geschäftsordnung des Europäischen Parlaments veröffentlicht.

Alle Anfragen und Antworten sind auf der Internetseite des Europäischen Parlaments (Europarl) unter der Rubrik „parlamentarische Anfragen“ verfügbar:

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

ABKÜRZUNGEN DER FRAKTIONEN

PPE Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)

S&D Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialisten und Demokraten im Europäischen Parlament

ALDE Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa

Verts/ALE Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz

ECR Europäische Konservative und Reformisten

GUE/NGL Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke

EFD Fraktion „Europa der Freiheit und der Demokratie“

NI Fraktionslos

IV

(Informationen)

INFORMATIONEN DER ORGANE, EINRICHTUNGEN UND SONSTIGEN
STELLEN DER EUROPÄISCHEN UNION

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

ANFRAGEN ZUR SCHRIFTLICHEN BEANTWORTUNG MIT ANTWORT

Anfragen der Mitglieder des Europäischen Parlaments zur schriftlichen Beantwortung
und die entsprechenden Antworten eines Organs der Europäischen Union

(2014/C 179/01)

Inhalt	Seite
E-009652/13 by Fiona Hall to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Research funding for poverty-related and neglected diseases English version	25
P-009653/13 by Esther Herranz García to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Measures to counter China's threat to impose restrictions on European wines Versión española English version	26 27
P-009654/13 by Francesco Enrico Speroni to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Malta accused of violating international law Versione italiana English version	28 29
E-009655/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Council <i>Subject:</i> Flow of Russian deposits from Cyprus to other Member States or territories of other EU countries Ελληνική έκδοση English version	30 32
E-009656/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Flow of Russian deposits from Cyprus to other Member States or territories of other EU countries Ελληνική έκδοση English version	33 34
E-009657/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Council <i>Subject:</i> Danger of non-European — in particular Russian — interests controlling the Bank of Cyprus Ελληνική έκδοση English version	35 36

E-009658/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Danger of non-European — in particular Russian — interests controlling the Bank of Cyprus	
Ελληνική έκδοση	37
English version	38
E-009659/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Increase in poverty in the EU	
Ελληνική έκδοση	39
English version	41
E-009660/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Forest fires in Mediterranean EU Member States	
Ελληνική έκδοση	42
English version	43
E-009661/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Incorrect reference by the Commission, in the Greek text of its answer to a written question, to the 'Greek Cypriot side' instead of to the official Republic of Cyprus	
Ελληνική έκδοση	44
English version	45
E-009662/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Flights from the UK to the illegal airport of ERCAN, in occupied Cyprus	
Ελληνική έκδοση	46
English version	47
P-009663/13 by Pablo Zalba Bidegain to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Parents' and children's rights	
Versión española	48
English version	49
P-009664/13 by Paul Rübig to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Review of the directive on the restriction of the use of certain hazardous substances (RoHS Directive)	
Deutsche Fassung	50
English version	52
P-009665/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Number and cost of translators	
Deutsche Fassung	53
English version	54
E-009666/13 by Christofer Fjellner to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Gambling infringements	
Svensk version	55
English version	56
E-009667/13 by Mojca Kleva Kekuš to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Women's rights in the Eastern Partnership countries	
Slovenska različica	57
English version	58
E-009668/13 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Legal action against the companies whose actions gave rise to the financial crisis	
Versión española	59
English version	60
E-009669/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Number and cost of translators at the Council	
Deutsche Fassung	61
English version	62
E-009670/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Number and cost of Commission expert groups	
Deutsche Fassung	63
English version	64

E-009672/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Buildings

Version française	65
English version	66

E-009673/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Impact of the Commission's air traffic management plan on employment

Version française	67
English version	68

E-009674/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Waste processing

Version française	69
English version	70

E-009675/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Authorisation of eleven GMOs

Version française	71
English version	72

E-009676/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Premises searched at Orange

Version française	73
English version	74

E-009678/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Ridiculous projections

Version française	75
English version	77

E-009679/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* EU cost files

Version française	78
English version	79

E-009680/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* The electric car market — has it gone flat?

Version française	80
English version	81

E-009682/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Dispute with Latin America

Version française	82
English version	83

E-009684/13 by Andrea Zannoni to the Commission*Subject:* Bird flu in north-eastern Italy, propagation risk at live bird markets and possible infringement of EC law

Versione italiana	84
English version	85

E-009685/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission*Subject:* Rapid intervention by Frontex in Italy

Versione italiana	86
English version	87

E-009686/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission*Subject:* Turkey's refusal to award study grants to demonstrators

Versione italiana	88
English version	89

E-009687/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission*Subject:* Albania — deserving of official EU candidate status?

Versione italiana	90
English version	91

E-009688/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission*Subject:* Danger posed by fundamentalists

Versione italiana	92
English version	93

E-009689/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission*Subject:* Butterfly mortality in Europe

Versione italiana	94
English version	95

E-009690/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission*Subject:* Establishment and powers of the European Public Prosecutor's Office

Versione italiana	96
English version	97

E-009691/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission*Subject:* Cost of the European Public Prosecutor's Office

Versione italiana	98
English version	99

E-009692/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission*Subject:* Exports to Europe of South African citrus fruit contaminated with the plant disease Citrus Black Spot

Versione italiana	100
English version	101

E-009693/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission*Subject:* Cultivation and trafficking of drugs in Albania and Europe

Versione italiana	102
English version	103

P-009694/13 by Bart Staes to the Commission*Subject:* State aid to export credit agencies

Nederlandse versie	104
English version	105

P-009695/13 by Claudio Morganti to the Commission*Subject:* Purchase of trains — Region of Tuscany

Versione italiana	106
English version	107

E-009696/13 by Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo to the Commission*Subject:* Oil prospecting in the Canary Islands

Versión española	108
English version	109

E-009697/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission*Subject:* Questions E-005821/2010 and E-005858/2010

Ελληνική έκδοση	110
English version	111

P-009698/13 by George Lyon to the Commission*Subject:* Update: Enforcement of Directive 2008/120/EC on the protection of pigs — ban on individual sow stalls

English version	112
-----------------------	-----

P-009699/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* PRISM and EU citizens

Version française	113
English version	114

E-009700/13 by Nicole Sinclair to the Commission*Subject:* Ricoh Arena

English version	115
-----------------------	-----

E-009701/13 by Monika Panayotova to the Commission

Subject: Resources allocated to Bulgaria for the new programming period 2014-2020 under the EU's structural and investment funds

българска версия	116
English version	118

E-009702/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission

Subject: Pension reform in France

Version française	120
English version	121

E-009703/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Council

Subject: Croatia — European arrest warrant

Version française	122
English version	123

E-009704/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission

Subject: Polish publishing industry

Version française	124
English version	125

E-009705/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission

Subject: Collateral (finance)

Version française	126
English version	127

E-009706/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission

Subject: Asset encumbrance

Version française	128
English version	129

E-009707/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission

Subject: 'Anti-Roma' wall in Košice, Slovakia

Version française	130
English version	131

E-009708/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission

Subject: Gibraltar — Spain against the United Kingdom

Version française	132
English version	133

P-009709/13 by Lara Comi to the Commission

Subject: Immigration crisis — conflict in Syria

Versione italiana	134
English version	135

P-009710/13 by Elena Băsescu to the Commission

Subject: Impact of the revision of the directive on the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco and related products

Versiunea în limba română	136
English version	137

P-009711/13 by Mikael Gustafsson to the Commission

Subject: The Tigris valley

Svensk version	138
English version	139

E-009712/13 by Carmen Romero López to the Commission

Subject: VAT exemption

Versión española	140
English version	141

E-009713/13 by Ingeborg Gräßle to the Commission*Subject:* Additional information in connection with OLAF's annual report for 2012

Deutsche Fassung	142
English version	144

E-009714/13 by Ingeborg Gräßle to the Commission*Subject:* Follow-up: Answer relating to removal expenses; Question E-006329/2013

Deutsche Fassung	146
English version	147

E-009715/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission*Subject:* Exploitation of Cypriot hydrocarbon resources

Ελληνική έκδοση	148
English version	149

E-009716/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission*Subject:* The Cyprus problem

Ελληνική έκδοση	150
English version	151

E-009717/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission*Subject:* Tax increases

Ελληνική έκδοση	152
English version	153

E-009718/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Franco-German dispute over car air-conditioning coolant

Version française	154
English version	155

E-009719/13 by Csaba Sándor Tabajdi, Kinga Göncz, Zita Gurmai and Edit Herczog to the Commission*Subject:* Reasons for the suspension of Cohesion Fund payments to Hungary

Magyar változat	156
English version	158

E-009720/13 by Peter van Dalen to the Commission*Subject:* Air quality and harmful fumes on aircraft

Nederlandse versie	160
English version	161

E-009721/13 by Marta Andreasen to the Commission*Subject:* Presentation of budget information in spreadsheet format

English version	162
-----------------------	-----

E-009722/13 by Marta Andreasen to the Commission*Subject:* Commission's financial transparency system

English version	163
-----------------------	-----

E-009723/13 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission*Subject:* Follow-up question in connection with Question E-005136/2013

Deutsche Fassung	164
English version	165

E-009724/13 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission*Subject:* Follow-up question in connection with Question E-002690/2013

Deutsche Fassung	166
English version	167

E-009725/13 by Theodoros Skylakakis to the Commission*Subject:* The financing by the NSRF of employment programmes in municipalities in Greece

Ελληνική έκδοση	168
English version	169

E-009726/13 by Ryszard Antoni Legutko to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Discrimination against Poles on EU labour market	
Wersja polska	170
English version	172
E-009848/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Policy on immigrants in certain EU countries	
Wersja polska	170
English version	172
E-009728/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Tightening up of Russian controls on food products imported from Poland	
Wersja polska	174
English version	175
E-009729/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Reports of a secret deal between Saudi Arabia and Russia	
Wersja polska	176
English version	177
E-009730/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Recovery of agricultural aid by the Commission	
Version française	178
English version	179
E-009731/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Fishing quotas for 2013	
Version française	180
English version	181
E-009733/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Subsidies paid to Chinese solar manufacturers	
Version française	182
English version	183
E-009734/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The European Union endorses dumping by China	
Version française	184
English version	185
E-009735/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Madagascar: unfreezing of EU aid	
Version française	186
English version	188
E-009736/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Madagascar: unfreezing of EU aid	
Version française	186
English version	188
E-009737/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Disastrous coal-only energy policy	
Version française	190
English version	191
E-009740/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Reward for mounting a coup d'état	
Version française	192
English version	193
E-009741/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Daimler: air-conditioning coolant	
Version française	194
English version	195

E-009742/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> 2014 — International Year of Family Farming	
Version française	196
English version	197
E-009743/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Costa Concordia in Venice	
Version française	198
English version	199
E-009744/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Merger between American Airlines and US Airways	
Version française	200
English version	201
E-009746/13 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Protection of children's rights and freedoms	
Nederlandse versie	202
English version	203
E-009747/13 by Glenis Willmott to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European School Milk Scheme	
English version	204
E-009748/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Extradition trial of political refugee Aleksandr Pavlov	
Versión española	205
English version	206
E-009749/13 by Mojca Kleva Kekuš to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Women in top media jobs	
Slovenska različica	207
English version	208
E-009750/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Media freedom in danger	
Version française	209
English version	211
E-011758/13 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> UK Government attacks on media freedom	
Slovenské znenie	210
English version	211
E-009751/13 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Situation in Syria and world war	
Versión española	212
English version	215
E-009752/13 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Situation in Syria — Commission's position	
Versión española	212
English version	215
E-009760/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Conflict in Syria and EU involvement	
Deutsche Fassung	214
English version	215
P-009753/13 by Dubravka Šuica to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Youth unemployment	
Hrvatska verzija	217
English version	218

E-009754/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Council*Subject:* Document translations at the Council

Deutsche Fassung	219
English version	220

E-009755/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission*Subject:* Document translations at the Commission

Deutsche Fassung	221
English version	222

E-009756/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Council*Subject:* External translations

Deutsche Fassung	223
English version	224

E-009757/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission*Subject:* External translations

Deutsche Fassung	225
English version	226

E-009758/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Council*Subject:* Days lost to strikes by Council officials

Deutsche Fassung	227
English version	228

E-009759/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Days lost to strikes by European External Action Service (EEAS) officials

Deutsche Fassung	229
English version	230

E-009761/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission*Subject:* Impact of India's food programme

Deutsche Fassung	231
English version	232

E-009762/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission*Subject:* Fair distribution of food

Deutsche Fassung	233
English version	235

E-009763/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission*Subject:* Risk of forest fires in the EU

Deutsche Fassung	236
English version	237

E-009764/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission*Subject:* Tax havens

Ελληνική έκδοση	238
English version	239

E-009765/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission*Subject:* Increase in unemployment in Cyprus

Ελληνική έκδοση	240
English version	241

E-009766/13 by Gaston Franco to the Commission*Subject:* Explosion risk on the premises of dry-cleaning firms

Version française	242
English version	243

E-009767/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Weaknesses of development banks

Version française	245
English version	247

E-009768/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Making WiFi more readily available

Version française	249
English version	250

E-009770/13 by Judith Sargentini to the Commission*Subject:* eCall chip in vehicles

Nederlandse versie	251
English version	252

E-009771/13 by Philippe De Backer to the Commission*Subject:* Recommendations concerning Belgium's national reform programme 2013 — broadband

Nederlandse versie	253
English version	254

P-009772/13 by Gaston Franco to the Commission*Subject:* Environment and sustainable development education in the EU

Version française	255
English version	256

E-009773/13 by Dubravka Šuica to the Commission*Subject:* Breaches of EU citizens' privacy

Hrvatska verzija	257
English version	258

E-009774/13 by Syed Kamall to the Commission*Subject:* Alleged ban on Iranian state TV channels

English version	259
-----------------------	-----

E-009775/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission*Subject:* EU-wide problem of cyber bullying

Versione italiana	260
English version	262

E-009776/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Drug trafficking in Algeria

Versione italiana	263
English version	265

E-009777/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Deliberate targeting of Egyptian Coptic Christians

Versione italiana	266
English version	267

E-009778/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Assassination of Tunisian secular politician

Versione italiana	268
English version	269

E-009779/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Protection of archaeological heritage plundered in Egypt

Versione italiana	270
English version	271

E-009780/13 by Mojca Kleva Kekuš to the Commission*Subject:* E-health services

Slovenska različica	272
English version	273

P-009781/13 by Oleg Valjalo to the Commission*Subject:* Commission dispute with Croatia regarding the European Arrest Warrant

Hrvatska verzija	274
English version	275

E-009782/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
Subject: Child abuse and sexual harassment in Turkey	
Ελληνική έκδοση	276
English version	277
E-009783/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
Subject: Turkey's democratisation package	
Ελληνική έκδοση	278
English version	280
E-011262/13 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission	
Subject: 'Democratization and Human Rights Package' from the Turkish Government	
Nederlandse versie	279
English version	280
E-009784/13 by Brian Simpson to the Commission	
Subject: Accompanying measures for sugar protocol countries	
English version	282
E-009785/13 by Dubravka Šuica to the Commission	
Subject: Frequency interference problem on the Croatian coast	
Hrvatska verzija	283
English version	284
E-009786/13 by Syed Kamall to the Commission	
Subject: South Tyrol transport pass	
English version	285
E-009787/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
Subject: Are Bayer and Syngenta determined to kill bees?	
Version française	286
English version	287
E-009788/13 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission	
Subject: Humanitarian crisis in Syria	
Version française	288
English version	289
E-009789/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
Subject: Artificial sweeteners — new risks to human health compared to natural sugar	
Versione italiana	290
English version	291
E-009790/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
Subject: The thyroid gland: benefits of iodine-rich food and effects of environmental pollution	
Versione italiana	292
English version	293
E-009791/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
Subject: Recovery of assets illegally hidden away by the former regimes in Egypt, Libya and Tunisia	
Versione italiana	294
English version	296
E-009792/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
Subject: Toxic substances in Chinese-made clothing — what are the risks and what legal protection is available?	
Versione italiana	298
English version	300
E-009793/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
Subject: Protection of legal status of the Free Port of Trieste	
Versione italiana	302
English version	303

E-009794/13 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission*Subject:* Missing section of motorway between Koper (Slovenia) and the Croatian border

Deutsche Fassung 304

English version 305

E-009795/13 by Fiona Hall to the Commission*Subject:* Infringement procedures 2003-2013

English version 306

E-009796/13 by Fiona Hall to the Commission*Subject:* Addax Bioenergy plantation in Sierra Leone

English version 307

E-009797/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission*Subject:* Norwegian licences for the extraction of hydrocarbons

Wersja polska 308

English version 309

E-009798/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Restrictions announced on supplies of Russian oil to Belarus

Wersja polska 310

English version 311

E-009799/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Widespread persecution of Christians in Egypt

Wersja polska 312

English version 313

E-009800/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission*Subject:* Consequences of the 'trade war' between Russia and Ukraine

Wersja polska 314

English version 315

P-009801/13 by Francesco Enrico Speroni to the Commission*Subject:* Material for election missions not produced locally or in the Union

Versione italiana 316

English version 317

P-009802/13 by Anna Záborská to the Commission*Subject:* Reconciliation of work, private and family life — definitions of 'family life' and 'private life'

Slovenské znenie 318

English version 319

E-009803/13 by Anna Záborská to the Council*Subject:* Reconciliation of work, private and family life — definitions of 'family life' and 'private life'

Slovenské znenie 320

English version 321

E-009804/13 by Jutta Steinruck to the Commission*Subject:* Difficulty of organising youth exchanges between Germany and France

Deutsche Fassung 322

English version 323

E-009805/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells, Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, Raül Romeva i Rueda and Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission*Subject:* Twitter account of language activist Jaume Flor shut down — possible violation of freedom of expression for ideological and political reasons

Versión española 324

English version 325

E-009806/13 by Lara Comi to the Commission*Subject:* Competition in the sale of liquids at airports

Versione italiana 326

English version 327

E-009807/13 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission*Subject:* Persecution of the Coptic community in Egypt

Deutsche Fassung 328

English version 329

E-009808/13 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission*Subject:* Prism/surveillance programmes and EU legislation

Deutsche Fassung 330

English version 331

E-009810/13 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission*Subject:* Processed animal proteins and risks to human health and food safety

Deutsche Fassung 332

English version 334

E-009811/13 by Charles Tannock to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR- Criminal charges against Andrew Hall in Thailand

English version 335

E-009812/13 by Philippe Boulland to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Organisation by the European Union of a peace conference

Version française 336

English version 337

E-009813/13 by Philippe Boulland to the Commission*Subject:* Use of R1234yf coolant in motor vehicle air-conditioning systems

Version française 338

English version 339

E-009814/13 by Filip Kaczmarek to the Commission*Subject:* Extension of Russian broad-gauge railway

Wersja polska 340

English version 341

E-009815/13 by Filip Kaczmarek to the Commission*Subject:* Compulsory psychiatric treatment in Belarus

Wersja polska 342

English version 344

E-009831/13 by Marek Henryk Migalski to the Commission*Subject:* Sentencing of Belarusian psychiatrist

Wersja polska 342

English version 344

P-009816/13 by Erminia Mazzoni to the Commission*Subject:* Banning of biodegradable bags

Versione italiana 345

English version 346

E-009818/13 by Jo Leinen to the Commission*Subject:* Promoting German-Arabic children's literature

Deutsche Fassung 347

English version 348

E-009819/13 by Jo Leinen to the Commission*Subject:* Funding for a resource recovery facility under Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006

Deutsche Fassung 349

English version 350

E-009820/13 by Jörg Leichtfried to the Commission*Subject:* Direct debiting the deposit on hire cars

Deutsche Fassung 351

English version 353

E-009821/13 by Gay Mitchell to the Commission	
Subject: EU and private sector engagement in development cooperation	
English version	355
E-009822/13 by George Lyon to the Commission	
Subject: Update: Implementation of Council Directive 1999/74/EC of 19 July 1999 laying down minimum standards for the protection of laying hens	
English version	356
E-009824/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
Subject: Banning IP tracking	
Version française	357
English version	358
E-009825/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
Subject: Aubagio	
Version française	359
English version	360
E-009826/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
Subject: Maintaining roaming	
Version française	361
English version	362
E-009827/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
Subject: Commission sounds the death knell for net neutrality	
Version française	363
English version	364
E-009829/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
Subject: 9% more funding for European political parties	
Versione italiana	365
English version	366
E-009830/13 by Patricia van der Kammen and Lucas Hartong to the Commission	
Subject: EU speed limiters	
Nederlandse versie	367
English version	368
P-009832/13 by Salvador Garriga Polledo to the Commission	
Subject: Dutch tax lease system — opening of investigation	
Versión española	369
English version	370
P-009833/13 by Cornelia Ernst to the Commission	
Subject: Age limit for teachers in ESF-funded projects	
Deutsche Fassung	371
English version	372
P-009834/13 by Wojciech Michał Olejniczak to the Commission	
Subject: Labelling of GMO-free food products	
Wersja polska	373
English version	374
E-009835/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
Subject: Independence of the new regulatory body in Spain	
Versión española	375
English version	376
E-009836/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
Subject: Sale of industrial shares to a state body by a bailed-out bank	
Versión española	377
English version	378

E-009837/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission*Subject:* Funding of purchasing bodies by Sareb

Versión española 379

English version 380

E-009838/13 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission*Subject:* Train crash near Santiago de Compostela and rail safety measures in the EU

Versión española 381

English version 382

E-009839/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission*Subject:* Squandering of public funds in Cantabria

Versión española 383

English version 384

E-009840/13 by Theodoros Skylakakis to the Commission*Subject:* Outstanding pension rights

Ελληνική έκδοση 385

English version 386

E-009841/13 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission*Subject:* Fourth directive on company accounts

English version 387

E-009842/13 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission*Subject:* Airport development fees

English version 388

E-009843/13 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Hmong people in Laos

English version 389

E-009844/13 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission*Subject:* Social charges and EU regulations

English version 390

E-009845/13 by Marina Yannakoudakis to the Commission*Subject:* Commission funding for Guinea and the problem of female genital mutilation (FGM)

English version 391

E-009846/13 by Georgios Stavrakakis to the Commission*Subject:* Level of payments as of 31 July 2013

Ελληνική έκδοση 392

English version 393

E-009847/13 by Crescenzo Rivellini to the Commission*Subject:* Statements by the mafia informer Schiavone — waste in Campania

Versione italiana 394

English version 395

E-009849/13 by Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă to the Commission*Subject:* Wine tourism

Versiunea în limba română 396

English version 397

E-009850/13 by Mojca Kleva Kekuš to the Commission*Subject:* UN Convention on the Rights of Older Persons

Slovenska različica 398

English version 399

E-009851/13 by Michael Cramer to the Commission*Subject:* Compliance with the Århus Convention in Member States

Deutsche Fassung 400

English version 401

E-009852/13 by Vilija Blinkevičiūtė to the Commission*Subject:* Discrimination against the hard-of-hearing as regards access to information

Tekstas lietuvių kalba	402
English version	403

E-009853/13 by Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo and Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission*Subject:* Submersion of concrete blocks in the Bay of Algeciras

Versión española	404
English version	405

E-009854/13 by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission*Subject:* EU compensation to cover the cost of medical care for illegal immigrants in Greece

Ελληνική έκδοση	406
English version	407

E-009855/13 by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission*Subject:* Export subsidies for Turkish aquaculture products

Ελληνική έκδοση	408
English version	409

E-009856/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Food insecurity in Egypt

Versione italiana	410
English version	411

E-009857/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Yemeni girl forced into marriage

Versione italiana	412
English version	413

E-009858/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Situation in Zimbabwe

Versione italiana	414
English version	415

E-009859/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Moroccan student imprisoned for insulting the king

Versione italiana	416
English version	417

E-009860/13 by Fiorello Provera to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — al-Nusra's control of Syria's strategic assets

Versione italiana	418
English version	419

E-009861/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Saharan Jihadist groups form an alliance

Versione italiana	420
English version	421

E-009862/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Increased Saudi funding to the Egyptian Government

Versione italiana	422
English version	423

E-009863/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Zimbabwe — alleged plans to export uranium to Iran

Versione italiana	424
English version	425

E-009864/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Council*Subject:* Alleged Al-Qaeda plots against Europe's rail networks

Versione italiana	426
English version	427

E-009865/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Council*Subject:* Alleged Iranian-backed hit squads operating in the UAE

Versione italiana	428
English version	429

E-009866/13 by Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Gaston Franco, Jo Leinen and Margrete Auken to the Commission*Subject:* Deforestation and loss of biodiversity

Dansk udgave	430
Deutsche Fassung	431
Version française	433
Nederlandse versie	435
English version	437

E-009867/13 by Hannu Takkula to the Commission*Subject:* Blacklisting the military wing of Hezbollah

Suomenkielinen versio	438
English version	439

E-009868/13 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission*Subject:* Follow-up to Written Question E-006902/2013 on the Recovery and Resolution Directive: how to cause a flood of bankruptcies

Nederlandse versie	440
English version	441

E-009869/13 by Gaston Franco to the Commission*Subject:* EU-US dialogue on chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) risks

Version française	442
English version	443

E-009870/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission*Subject:* 'Empty prisons' decree — legitimacy and alternative measures

Versione italiana	444
English version	445

E-009873/13 by Marco Scurria to the Commission*Subject:* Adjustment of directive on water for human consumption

Versione italiana	446
English version	447

E-009874/13 by Csanád Szegedi to the Commission*Subject:* Integration of Roma

Magyar változat	448
English version	449

E-009875/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission*Subject:* Human right to water and sanitation

Versão portuguesa	450
English version	451

E-009876/13 by Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission*Subject:* Increased drug use in Portugal

Versão portuguesa	452
English version	454

E-009877/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission*Subject:* Spate of fires in Portugal

Versão portuguesa	455
English version	456

E-009878/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission*Subject:* Dismissals in the Portuguese banking sector, allegedly imposed by the Commission

Versão portuguesa	457
English version	458

E-009879/13 by Sari Essayah to the Commission*Subject:* Inclusion of defibrillators in the compulsory first aid equipment carried on aircraft

Suomenkielinen versio	459
English version	460

E-009880/13 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica and Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission*Subject:* Competition in the Spanish Professional Football League

Versión española	461
English version	462

E-009881/13 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission*Subject:* Organisational problems concerning the Capital of Culture in 2016

Versión española	463
English version	464

E-009882/13 by Elisabeth Köstinger and Ingeborg Gräßle to the Commission*Subject:* Third parties accompanying Members of the Commission on mission

Deutsche Fassung	465
English version	466

E-009883/13 by Csanád Szegedi to the Commission*Subject:* Spread of infectious diseases in the EU

Magyar változat	467
English version	468

E-009884/13 by Csanád Szegedi to the Commission*Subject:* Building more cycle paths in the EU

Magyar változat	469
English version	470

E-009885/13 by Csanád Szegedi to the Commission*Subject:* Prevention and treatment of chronic respiratory diseases

Magyar változat	471
English version	473

E-009886/13 by Csanád Szegedi to the Commission*Subject:* Survival of Hungarian-language radio in Serbia

Magyar változat	475
English version	476

P-009887/13 by Czesław Adam Siekierski to the Commission*Subject:* EU-US negotiations on free trade agreement

Wersja polska	477
English version	478

E-009888/13 by Ingeborg Gräßle to the Council*Subject:* Follow-up measures: progress in the fight against tax havens — the tax agreement with Liechtenstein

Deutsche Fassung	479
English version	480

E-009889/13 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission*Subject:* The case of LARCO GMMSA

Ελληνική έκδοση	481
English version	482

E-009890/13 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission*Subject:* Ministerial decree on the application of the formula for calculating the energy efficiency of incineration plants with reference to climatic conditions

Versione italiana	483
English version	484

E-009891/13 by Kathleen Van Brempt to the Commission*Subject:* Record transfer fees for footballers and compliance with rules on state aid

Nederlandse versie	485
English version	486

E-009892/13 by Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Registration with general practitioners in more than one Member State	
Versão portuguesa	487
English version	488
E-009893/13 by Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Support for stockbreeders' organisations	
Versão portuguesa	489
English version	490
E-009895/13 by Małgorzata Handzlik to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Regulation on mandatory vehicle equipment — informing the public	
Wersja polska	491
English version	492
P-009896/13 by Georgios Koumoutsakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Emergency measures to cope with the expected increase in the number of Syrian refugees	
Ελληνική έκδοση	493
English version	494
P-009897/13 by Keith Taylor to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Rights of ports regarding trade in live animals	
English version	495
E-009898/13 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo, Alejandro Cercas and Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Unfair labour practices in internship contracts in the financial services sector	
Versión española	496
English version	497
E-009899/13 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo, Luis Yáñez-Barnuevo García, Alejandro Cercas and Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Sustainability of football in the European Union	
Versión española	498
English version	499
E-009900/13 by Andrés Perelló Rodríguez to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Extraction of hydrocarbons in Valencia	
Versión española	500
English version	501
E-009901/13 by Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto and María Muñoz De Urquiza to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Protecting the rights of the LGBT community in Russia	
Versión española	502
English version	503
E-009902/13 by Bernd Lange to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Effects of exposure to power lines in the EU	
Deutsche Fassung	504
English version	505
E-009903/13 by Nicole Sinclair to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Reclassification of electronic cigarettes as medicinal products	
English version	506
E-009904/13 by Gaston Franco to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VAT rates on large recreational vessels distorting competition between France and Italy	
Version française	507
English version	508
E-009905/13 by Gaston Franco to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Interference between terrestrial digital television and 4G signals	
Version française	509
English version	510

E-009907/13 by Lambert van Nistelrooij and Esther de Lange to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Waste in the health service: combating needlessly large packaging	
Nederlandse versie	511
English version	512
E-009909/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Dispute over the Ilhas Selvagens exclusive economic zone — 2	
Versão portuguesa	513
English version	515
E-009917/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Dispute over the Selvagens Islands EEZ — 1	
Versão portuguesa	513
English version	515
P-009910/13 by Liam Aylward to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Legality of low user standing changes in the energy market	
English version	517
P-009911/13 by Romana Jordan to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Guaranteeing energy feed-in tariffs in Croatia	
Slovenska različica	518
English version	519
E-009912/13 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Illegal subsidies for renewable energies (follow-up question)	
Nederlandse versie	520
English version	522
E-009913/13 by Tonino Picula and Davor Ivo Stier to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Institutional equality of Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina	
Hrvatska verzija	524
English version	525
E-009914/13 by Matteo Salvini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Clarification requested regarding the postponement of the EU goal to abolish roaming charges	
Versione italiana	526
English version	527
E-009915/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Consequences of the Federal Reserve's quantitative easing policy	
Versione italiana	528
English version	529
P-009918/13 by Tarja Cronberg to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The EU's common forestry strategy	
Suomenkielinen versio	530
English version	531
E-009919/13 by Salvador Sedó i Alabart to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The link between religion and culture in Europe	
Versión española	532
English version	533
E-009920/13 by Salvador Sedó i Alabart to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Situation of the Uyghur people	
Versión española	534
English version	535
E-009921/13 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo, Alejandro Cercas, Ricardo Cortés Lastra, Luis Yáñez-Barnuevo García, Carmen Romero López, Antonio Masip Hidalgo and María Muñoz De Urquiza to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Social welfare benefits and tax obligations of emigrants in the EU	
Versión española	536
English version	538

E-009922/13 by Burkhard Balz and Peter Simon to the Commission*Subject:* SEPA online direct debit mandate

Deutsche Fassung	539
English version	540

E-009923/13 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission*Subject:* Fickle interpretation of the Treaty by European Central Bank

Nederlandse versie	541
English version	542

E-009924/13 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission*Subject:* European Commission — saviour of human rights

Nederlandse versie	543
English version	544

E-009925/13 by Alyn Smith to the Commission*Subject:* Buyer's premium

English version	545
-----------------------	-----

E-009926/13 by François Alfonsi and Michèle Rivasi to the Commission*Subject:* Combating the dumping of oil in the Mediterranean Sea

Version française	546
English version	548

E-009927/13 by Philip Claeys to the Commission*Subject:* Turkish Prime Minister maintains that use of teargas is in line with the EU *acquis*

Nederlandse versie	549
English version	550

E-009928/13 by Lucas Hartong and Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission*Subject:* Follow-up questions concerning subsidies granted to Egypt (3)

Nederlandse versie	551
English version	553

E-009929/13 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission*Subject:* Erdoğan angry with EU

Nederlandse versie	555
English version	556

E-009930/13 by Lucas Hartong to the Commission*Subject:* Providing assistance to the Committee on Cultural Heritage in Cyprus

Nederlandse versie	557
English version	559

E-009931/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — increase in the activities of the Russian army

Wersja polska	560
English version	561

E-009932/13 by Marek Józef Gróbarczyk to the Commission*Subject:* Question to the European Commission regarding the fulfilment of its obligation to report to Parliament and the Council

Wersja polska	562
English version	563

E-009933/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission*Subject:* Exclusion of homeless people and discrimination against them by the EU

Versão portuguesa	564
English version	565

E-009934/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission*Subject:* EU funding of international gas pipeline construction projects

Versão portuguesa	566
English version	567

E-009936/13 by Paweł Robert Kowal to the Commission*Subject:* Problems encountered by Polish citizens working in the Netherlands

Wersja polska	568
English version	569

P-009937/13 by Hermann Winkler to the Commission*Subject:* VAT on passenger transport

Deutsche Fassung	570
English version	571

P-009938/13 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission*Subject:* Implementation in Greece of legislation regarding the sale of food past its expiration date

Ελληνική έκδοση	572
English version	574

P-009939/13 by Corien Wortmann-Kool to the Commission*Subject:* Strike by German lock-keepers

Nederlandse versie	576
English version	577

E-009940/13 by Mariya Gabriel to the Commission*Subject:* Non-absorption of Rural Development Programme funds in Bulgaria

българска версия	578
English version	579

E-009942/13 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission*Subject:* Drones and EU legislation

Versión española	580
English version	581

E-009943/13 by Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández to the Commission*Subject:* Dam in the Bergantes River basin

Versión española	582
English version	583

E-009944/13 by Elena Băsescu to the Commission*Subject:* Directive on improving the gender balance among non-executive directors of companies listed on stock exchanges and related measures

Versiunea în limba română	584
English version	585

E-009945/13 by José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra to the Commission*Subject:* EU-Mercosur Association Agreement

Versión española	586
English version	587

E-009946/13 by Ingeborg Gräßle to the Commission*Subject:* Work and costs involved in administering the tobacco agreements

Deutsche Fassung	588
English version	589

E-009947/13 by Maria Eleni Koppa to the Commission*Subject:* National tensions in Croatia

Ελληνική έκδοση	590
English version	591

E-009948/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission*Subject:* 'Meeting of minds' of undertakings restrict competition of streaming services

Svensk version	592
English version	593

E-009949/13 by Brian Simpson to the Commission*Subject:* Animal welfare — exemption from cross-compliance rules

English version	594
-----------------------	-----

E-009950/13 by Romana Jordan, Ivo Belet and Pilar del Castillo Vera to the Commission*Subject:* Financing of patents in the European Union

Versión española	595
Nederlandse versie	596
Slovenska različica	597
English version	598

E-009951/13 by Catherine Stihler to the Council*Subject:* Syria

English version	599
-----------------------	-----

E-009952/13 by Catherine Stihler to the Commission*Subject:* Syria

English version	600
-----------------------	-----

E-009953/13 by Catherine Stihler to the Commission*Subject:* Gibraltar

English version	601
-----------------------	-----

E-009954/13 by Catherine Stihler to the Commission*Subject:* Neonicotinoids

English version	602
-----------------------	-----

E-009955/13 by Catherine Stihler to the Commission*Subject:* Toddler milk

English version	603
-----------------------	-----

E-009958/13 by Michel Dantin to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Democratic elections in Haiti

Version française	604
English version	605

E-009959/13 by Jean Louis Cottigny to the Commission*Subject:* Diane 35® contraceptive pill

Version française	606
English version	607

E-009960/13 by Jean Louis Cottigny and Gilles Pargneaux to the Commission*Subject:* Contamination of the Japanese marine food chain

Version française	608
English version	609

E-009961/13 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission*Subject:* Planning of safety works and a new road system along the length of the River Entella and reclamation of an area of land along the river mouth

Versione italiana	610
English version	611

E-009962/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission*Subject:* Parent 1 and Parent 2 on Italian school forms — Gender equality policies and Community policies

Versione italiana	612
English version	613

E-009963/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission*Subject:* Request for EU and EGF intervention to support cement company workers in the Province of Padua

Versione italiana	614
English version	616

E-009964/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission*Subject:* China: Anti-dumping

Versión española	618
English version	619

E-009965/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission

Subject: National heritage

Versión española	620
English version	621

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009652/13
to the Commission
Fiona Hall (ALDE)
 (27 August 2013)

Subject: Research funding for poverty-related and neglected diseases

The recently published report *Priority Medicines for Europe and the World 2013 Update* states that for neglected tropical diseases 'new mechanisms to promote the translation of basic research into clinically important products remain a priority'. The report also identifies research gaps in the field of poverty-related diseases such as malaria, tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS, and explains that since 2004 public-private partnerships such as the Innovative Medicines Initiative (IMI) and product development partnerships have played an increasing role in early, translational and product development research.

The Commission has stated that in future the bulk of clinical research for product development will be funded through the European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership EDCTP2 programme and that additional research on poverty-related and neglected diseases (PRNDs) could also be addressed under IMI2.

It has also been noted that a memorandum of understanding has been signed with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

— Can the Commission explain how much of the budget for PRNDs will be allocated in the coming years to the various mechanisms, such as EDCTP2, IMI2 and Horizon 2020 calls?

— How will the Commission ensure that the IMI's Strategic Research Agenda addresses PRNDs as a research priority, taking into consideration the persistent market failure for many of these diseases and the governance of the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations (EFPIA)?

— How will the Commission promote collaboration between the IMI and product development partnerships?

— Could the Commission further explain the specific actions that will be developed with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and how these will be financed?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
 (9 October 2013)

1. The Commission provided substantial financial support to research on poverty-related and neglected diseases (PRND) through the European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership (EDCTP, 2003-2012) ⁽¹⁾ and under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013), mainly through the Health Cooperation theme, the Innovative Medicines Initiative (IMI) ⁽²⁾, the European Research Council (ERC) ⁽³⁾ and Marie Curie Actions ⁽⁴⁾. Since 2007, EUR 810 million of EU funding was invested through EDCTP (EUR 184 million) and under FP7 (EUR 626 million).

2. For Horizon 2020, the Commission will continue to support research on PRND by taking into account recent research developments for setting funding priorities in the annual work programmes. The Strategic Research Agenda of IMI2 refers to support the development of vaccines against PRND and addresses the global emergence of antimicrobial resistances.

3. Any legal entity regardless of its place of establishment and international organisations may participate in activities funded under Horizon 2020. However, like any other legal entity, Product Development Partnerships have to comply with the rules set for Horizon 2020 and the conditions laid down in the annual work programme.

4. The Commission will cooperate with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation mainly through open coordination approaches and by pooling resources for commonly agreed funding priorities or jointly-funded activities, in particular through the EDCTP2 programme.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.edctp.org/>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.imi.europa.eu/>

⁽³⁾ <http://erc.europa.eu/>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/research/mariecurieactions/>

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-009653/13
a la Comisión**

Esther Herranz García (PPE)

(28 de agosto de 2013)

Asunto: Medidas contra la amenaza china de restricción de vino europeo

De acuerdo con la respuesta recibida por la Comisión Europea, en la que expone que es consciente de la importancia que reviste la amenaza china de restricción de vino europeo y en la que hace hincapié en que ayudará al sector vitivinícola de la UE a que defienda sus intereses, ¿cuáles son las medidas concretas en las que está trabajando la Comisión para proteger al sector vitivinícola europeo a las que se refiere en su respuesta a la pregunta P-006601/2013 del pasado 12 de julio de 2013?

¿Ha calculado la Comisión las consecuencias exactas y ha cuantificado económicamente los daños ya causados al sector desde el anuncio de las restricciones, así como la amenaza que ello supone para el futuro de este sector, que se sitúa como el tercer mercado más importante en China después de los EE.UU. y Rusia?

Respuesta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión

(18 de septiembre de 2013)

La Comisión ya ha adoptado una serie de medidas concretas para ayudar al sector vitivinícola europeo en el marco de las investigaciones de defensa comercial efectuadas por China. En primer lugar, ya intervino activamente en las consultas previas con China, con el resultado de que este país redujo el número de presuntos sistemas de subvenciones objeto de la investigación. Además, la Comisión presentó observaciones formales a China subrayando las deficiencias observadas en la solicitud presentada por la industria vitivinícola china que puso en marcha la investigación. Asimismo, la Comisión apoyó activamente a las empresas vitivinícolas de la UE en el proceso de registro, vital para ejercer sus derechos de defensa en el procedimiento pendiente, y también cooperó estrechamente con las autoridades chinas en el muestreo para seleccionar las empresas de la UE que serán investigadas individualmente. La Comisión seguirá ayudando a las empresas seleccionadas a responder a los cuestionarios recibidos de China.

Es imposible cuantificar con precisión los efectos negativos que el simple inicio de investigaciones de defensa comercial puede, sin duda, tener en el comercio. Las investigaciones antidumping y antisubvenciones se encuentran actualmente en su fase inicial y todavía no se han adoptado medidas. Por todo ello es prematuro calcular los posibles daños que pueden sufrir los exportadores de vino de la UE.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-009653/13
to the Commission**

Esther Herranz García (PPE)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: Measures to counter China's threat to impose restrictions on European wines

In light of the Commission's reply to Written Question P-006601/2013 of 12 July 2013, in which it states that it is aware of the importance of China's threat to restrict imports of European wine and stresses that it will assist the EU's wine industry in defending its interests, what concrete steps does the Commission plan to take in order to protect the European wine sector?

Has the Commission calculated the precise impact and established the extent of the economic damage already suffered by the wine industry since the restrictions were announced, as well as quantifying the threat posed to the future of this sector, which has China as its third largest market, after the US and Russia?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission

(18 September 2013)

The Commission has already taken a number of concrete steps in order to assist the European wine sector in the context of the ongoing trade defence investigations carried out by China. First, the Commission already actively intervened in the pre-initiation consultations with China as a result of which China narrowed down the number of alleged subsidy schemes targeted by the investigation. Furthermore, the Commission submitted formal comments to China in order to highlight the weaknesses identified in the application made by the Chinese wine industry which triggered the investigation concerned. The Commission also actively assisted the EU wine companies in the registration procedure, the completion of which is vital for the exercise of their rights of defence in the pending proceedings, and also closely cooperated with the Chinese authorities in the context of the sampling procedure in order to select the EU companies that will be individually investigated. The Commission will continue in the future to assist those selected companies in answering the questionnaires they received from China.

Even if the mere initiation of Trade Defence investigations may indeed have some negative effects on trade, it is impossible to precisely establish their impact. The anti-dumping and anti-subsidy investigations are currently in their initial phases and no measures have been taken so far. The calculation of any potential damage which could be suffered by the EU wine exporters is therefore currently premature.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-009654/13
alla Commissione**

Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)

(28 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: Accuse di violazione di norme da parte della Repubblica maltese

La Commissaria agli Affari interni avrebbe accusato Malta di violazione di norme per il divieto di attracco della nave Salmis.

Può dire la Commissione quali sarebbero le norme violate e se, conseguentemente, è stata avviata la procedura di infrazione? In caso di risposta negativa, può precisare per quale ragione?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione

(23 settembre 2013)

Il 6 agosto 2013 la commissaria responsabile per gli Affari interni ha dichiarato che, dopo le operazioni di soccorso dei migranti ad opera dalla petroliera M/T Salmis, la cosa più importante era fornire assistenza alle persone trattate in salvo e garantire la loro sicurezza. La commissaria ha sollevato la questione di una possibile violazione del diritto internazionale, tenendo conto della protezione dei migranti. Conformemente al trattato, la Commissione può avviare procedimenti d'infrazione in casi di violazione del diritto dell'Unione. Il trattato non conferisce alla Commissione il potere di avviare procedure d'infrazione unicamente sulla base del diritto internazionale.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-009654/13
to the Commission**

Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: Malta accused of violating international law

The Commissioner for Home Affairs has apparently accused Malta of violating international law by preventing the tanker, *Salamis* from docking.

Which international laws were breached and have infringement proceedings been opened as a result? If not, why not?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission

(23 September 2013)

In her statement of 6 August 2013, the Member of the Commission responsible for Home Affairs considered that after the tanker M/T *Salamis* had come to the rescue of the migrants, the most important thing was to assist the rescued persons and to ensure their safety. The Commissioner cautioned against a possible violation of international law, having in mind the protection of these migrants. According to the Treaty, the Commission may launch infringement proceedings in case of violation of Union law. The Treaty does not give the Commission the competence to launch infringement proceedings solely on the basis of international law.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009655/13

προς το Συμβούλιο

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)

(28 Αυγούστου 2013)

Θέμα: Διαρροή ρωσικών καταθέσεων από την Κύπρο προς άλλα κράτη μέλη ή επικράτειες άλλων ευρωπαϊκών κρατών

Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία της Ρωσικής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας, κατά την περίοδο της τραπεζικής κρίσης στην Κύπρο και μετά την απόφαση για κούρεμα των καταθέσεων παρατηρήθηκε τεράστια διαρροή ρωσικών καταθέσεων από τις τράπεζες της Κύπρου προς τις τράπεζες άλλων κρατών μελών ή σε φορολογικούς παραδείσους που ανήκουν σε κράτη μέλη. Συγκεκριμένα, Ρώσοι καταθέτες διοχέτευσαν, κατά το πρώτο τρίμηνο του 2013, μέσα σε τόσο σύντομο χρονικό διάστημα 31,6 δις δολάρια προς τις Βρετανικές Παρθένες Νήσους, σε σύγκριση με μόλις 6,7 δις δολάρια κατά το ίδιο τρίμηνο του 2012. Διοχέτευσαν επίσης 13,9 δις δολάρια σε τράπεζες του Λουξεμβούργου, σε σύγκριση με μόλις 0,26 δις δολάρια το αντίστοιχο τρίμηνο του 2012. Αντίθετα, οι ρωσικές καταθέσεις στην Κύπρο μειώθηκαν από 21,13 δις δολάρια τον Δεκέμβριο του 2012 σε μόλις 2,72 δις δολάρια το τέλος Μαρτίου 2013.

Ερωτάται το Συμβούλιο.

1. Είναι ενήμερο σχετικά με τις εξελίξεις αυτές και πώς ερμηνεύει τις τεράστιες αυτές ροές κεφαλαίων μέσα σε τόσο σύντομο χρονικό διάστημα;
2. Θεωρεί ότι μπορεί να σχετίζονται με την κρίση στο τραπεζικό σύστημα της Κύπρου και τις αποφάσεις για το κούρεμα των καταθέσεων;
3. Μπορεί να διαβεβαιώσει ότι όλες οι μεταφορές κεφαλαίων έγιναν νόμιμα και ότι δεν υπάρχουν θέματα ξεπλύματος χρήματος ή άλλες παράνομες πράξεις;
4. Γιατί τα ρωσικά κεφάλαια που στην Κύπρο θεωρούνταν ανεπιθύμητα και βλαπτικά από την Ένωση, γίνονται τόσο ευπρόσδεκτα σε άλλα κράτη μέλη, χωρίς η Ένωση να αντιδρά όπως έπραξε στην Κύπρο;
5. Προτίθεται να διερευνήσει το σοβαρό αυτό θέμα και να φερθεί ακριβοδίκαια ή θα συνεχίσει να εφαρμόζει δύο μέτρα και δύο σταθμά στις σχέσεις του με τα κράτη μέλη;

Απάντηση

(5 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Στις 25 Μαρτίου 2013, η Ευρωομάδα εξέφρασε ικανοποίηση για τα σχέδια πολιτικής που παρουσίασαν οι κυπριακές αρχές και συμφώνησε με τα μέτρα για την αναδιάρθρωση του χρηματοπιστωτικού τομέα όπως αναφέρονται στο παράρτημα της δήλωσης της Ευρωομάδας της 25ης Μαρτίου 2013 ⁽¹⁾. Τα μέτρα αυτά θέτουν τη βάση για την αποκατάσταση της βιωσιμότητας του χρηματοπιστωτικού τομέα. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, διασφαλίζουν όλες τις καταθέσεις κάτω των 100 000 ευρώ, σύμφωνα με τις αρχές της ΕΕ.

Η απόφαση 2013/236/ΕΕ του Συμβουλίου της 25ης Απριλίου 2013 που απευθύνεται στην Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία σχετικά με ειδικά μέτρα για την αποκατάσταση της χρηματοπιστωτικής σταθερότητας και της βιώσιμης ανάπτυξης ⁽²⁾ θέτει τα στοιχεία ενός τριετούς προγράμματος μακροοικονομικής προσαρμογής που αποσκοπεί στην αποκατάσταση της ευρωστίας του τραπεζικού τομέα, στη συνέχιση της διαδικασίας δημοσιονομικής εξυγίανσης και στη στήριξη της ανταγωνιστικότητας και της βιώσιμης και ισόρροπης ανάπτυξης.

Στις 13 Μαΐου 2013, η Ευρωομάδα χαίρετις την ολοκλήρωση των ανεξάρτητων αξιολογήσεων συμμόρφωσης με το πλαίσιο καταπολέμησης της νομιμοποίησης προσόδων από παράνομες δραστηριότητες στην Κύπρο. Τα θεσμικά όργανα της τρόικας υπέβαλαν τα κυριότερα πορίσματά τους στην Ευρωομάδα, ενώ συστάσεις για τη διόρθωση των αδυναμιών περιλήφθηκαν στο σχέδιο δράσης κατά της νομιμοποίησης προσόδων από παράνομες δραστηριότητες, το οποίο συμφωνήθηκε μεταξύ της τρόικας και των κυπριακών αρχών κατά την πρώτη αναθεώρηση που πραγματοποιήθηκε δυνάμει του άρθρου 1 παράγραφος 2 της απόφασης του Συμβουλίου 2013/236/ΕΕ.

⁽¹⁾ Οι δηλώσεις της Ευρωομάδας είναι διαθέσιμες στην ηλεκτρονική διεύθυνση: <http://www.eurozone.europa.eu/eurogroup>

⁽²⁾ ΕΕ L 141 της 28.5.2013, σ. 32.

Στην ανακοίνωσή της στις 13 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013, η Ευρωομάδα εξέφρασε ικανοποίηση για τη συνέχιση της σταδιακής χαλάρωσης των διοικητικών μέτρων που είχαν ληφθεί από τις κυπριακές αρχές λόγω της μοναδικής και εξαιρετικής κατάστασης που αντιμετωπίζει ο χρηματοπιστωτικός τομέας της Κύπρου, έκρινε ότι οποιαδήποτε περαιτέρω χαλάρωση των μέτρων πρέπει να συμμορφώνεται προς τον οδικό χάρτη της 8ης Αυγούστου 2013 και δήλωσε ότι αναμένει την ταχεία υλοποίηση του σχεδίου δράσης κατά της νομιμοποίησης προσόδων από παράνομες δραστηριότητες.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009655/13
to the Council**

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: Flow of Russian deposits from Cyprus to other Member States or territories of other EU countries

According to the Russian Central Bank, during the banking crisis in Cyprus and after the decision to perform a haircut on deposits, there was a huge exodus of Russian deposits from banks in Cyprus to banks in other Member States or in tax havens belonging to Member States. More specifically, Russian depositors transferred during the first quarter of 2013 — a very short period of time for such a large sum — USD 31.6 billion to the British Virgin Islands, compared with just USD 6.7 billion in the same quarter of 2012. In addition USD 13.9 billion was channelled into Luxembourg banks, compared with just USD 0.26 billion in the same quarter of 2012. By contrast, Russian deposits in Cyprus fell from USD 21.13 billion in December 2012 to just USD 2.72 billion at the end of March 2013.

In view of the above, will the Council say:

1. Is it aware of these developments and how does it interpret these huge capital flows in such a short space of time?
2. Does it take the view that they may be related to the crisis in the banking system in Cyprus and the decision to perform a haircut on deposits?
3. Can it confirm that all the capital transfers were legitimate and that there are no issues of money laundering or other illegal acts?
4. Why is Russian capital, which the Union considered undesirable and harmful in Cyprus, so welcome in other Member States, without the Union reacting as it did in Cyprus?
5. Will it investigate this serious matter and behave even-handedly, or will it continue to apply double standards in its relations with the Member States?

Reply

(5 November 2013)

On 25 March 2013, the Eurogroup welcomed the policy plans presented by the Cyprus authorities and agreed to the measures for restructuring the financial sector as specified in the annex to its statement of 25 March 2013 ⁽¹⁾. These measures form the basis for restoring the viability of the financial sector. In particular, they safeguard all deposits below EUR 100 000 in accordance with EU principles.

Council Decision 2013/236/EU of 25 April 2013 addressed to Cyprus on specific measures to restore financial stability and sustainable growth ⁽²⁾ set out the elements of a three-year macroeconomic adjustment programme aimed at restoring the soundness of Cyprus' banking industry, continuing the process of fiscal consolidation and supporting competitiveness and sustainable and balanced growth.

On 13 May 2013, the Eurogroup welcomed the completion of the independent assessments of compliance with the anti-money laundering framework in Cyprus. The Troika institutions have reported the key findings to the Eurogroup, and recommendations to rectify deficiencies were integrated in the anti-money laundering action plan agreed between the Troika institutions and the Cypriot authorities at the time of the first review carried out in accordance with Article 1(2) of Council Decision 2013/236/EU.

In its statement of 13 September 2013, the Eurogroup welcomed the fact that the Cypriot authorities would continue to gradually relax administrative measures that the Cyprus authorities had decided to introduce in view of the unique and exceptional situation of Cyprus' financial sector, considered that further relaxation would be in line with the roadmap of 8 August 2013 and looked forward to the swift implementation of the anti-money laundering action plan.

⁽¹⁾ Eurogroup statements can be found at <http://www.eurozone.europa.eu/eurogroup>

⁽²⁾ OJ L 141, 28.5.2013, p. 32.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009656/13

προς την Επιτροπή

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)

(28 Αυγούστου 2013)

Θέμα: Διαρροή ρωσικών καταθέσεων από την Κύπρο προς άλλα κράτη μέλη ή επικράτειες άλλων ευρωπαϊκών κρατών

Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία της Ρωσικής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας κατά την περίοδο της τραπεζικής κρίσης στην Κύπρο και μετά την απόφαση για κούρεμα των καταθέσεων, παρατηρήθηκε τεράστια διαρροή ρωσικών καταθέσεων από τις τράπεζες της Κύπρου προς τράπεζες άλλων κρατών μελών ή σε φορολογικούς παραδείσους που ανήκουν σε κράτη μέλη. Συγκεκριμένα, Ρώσοι καταθέτες διοχέτευσαν, κατά το πρώτο τρίμηνο του 2013, μέσα σε τόσο σύντομο χρονικό διάστημα 31,6 δις δολάρια προς τις Βρετανικές Παρθένες Νήσους, σε σύγκριση με μόλις 6,7 δις δολάρια κατά το ίδιο τρίμηνο του 2012. Διοχέτευσαν επίσης 13,9 δις δολάρια σε τράπεζες του Λουξεμβούργου, σε σύγκριση με μόλις 0,26 δις δολάρια το αντίστοιχο τρίμηνο του 2012. Αντίθετα, οι ρωσικές καταθέσεις στην Κύπρο μειώθηκαν από 21,13 δις δολάρια τον Δεκέμβριο του 2012 σε μόλις 2,72 δις δολάρια το τέλος Μαρτίου 2013.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή.

1. Είναι ενήμερη σχετικά με τις εξελίξεις αυτές και πως ερμηνεύει τις τεράστιες αυτές ροές κεφαλαίων μέσα σε τόσο σύντομο χρονικό διάστημα;
2. Θεωρεί ότι μπορεί να σχετίζονται με την κρίση στο τραπεζικό σύστημα της Κύπρου και τις αποφάσεις για το κούρεμα των καταθέσεων;
3. Μπορεί να διαβεβαιώσει ότι όλες οι μεταφορές κεφαλαίων έγιναν νόμιμα και ότι δεν υπάρχουν θέματα ξεπλύματος χρήματος ή άλλες παράνομες πράξεις;
4. Γιατί τα ρωσικά κεφάλαια που στην Κύπρο θεωρούνταν ανεπιθύμητα και βλαπτικά από την ΕΕ, γίνονται τόσο ευπρόσδεκτα σε άλλα κράτη μέλη, χωρίς η ΕΕ να αντιδρά όπως έπραξε στην Κύπρο;
5. Προτίθεται να διερευνήσει το σοβαρό αυτό θέμα και να φερθεί ακριβοδίκαια ή θα συνεχίσει να εφαρμόζει δύο μέτρα και δύο σταθμά στις σχέσεις της με τα κράτη μέλη;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής

(5 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει σε τι ύψος ανέρχονται οι εκροές των ρωσικών άμεσων ξένων επενδύσεων (ΑΞΕ) του πρώτου τριμήνου του 2013, όπως αναφέρεται στην ερώτηση. Το ποσό των ρωσικών ΑΞΕ που διοχετεύθηκε σε αυτό το διάστημα προς την Κύπρο ανερχόταν σε 2,7 δισεκατομμύρια δολάρια, δηλαδή κάτω από το μέσο όρο που ήταν περίπου 5 δις. δολάρια ανά τρίμηνο τα τελευταία έτη.

Το άρθρο 63 της ΣΛΕΕ απαγορεύει τους περιορισμούς στις κινήσεις κεφαλαίων μεταξύ κρατών μελών και τρίτων χωρών. Εφόσον οι επενδύσεις βασίζονται σε υγιή οικονομικά κριτήρια, είναι ευπρόσδεκτες και μπορεί να έχουν επωφελές αποτέλεσμα για όλους, ήτοι για τις αποδέκτριες χώρες και τους επενδυτές

Η Επιτροπή δεν είναι ενήμερη για τυχόν παράνομες μεταφορές κεφαλαίων και είναι βέβαιη ότι οι κυπριακές αρχές θα διερευνήσουν οποιοδήποτε ύποπτες περιπτώσεις. Σε ευρύτερο επίπεδο, η Επιτροπή συνεργάζεται με τους εταίρους της Κύπρου και της Τρόικας με στόχο την τυχόν αναγκαία βελτίωση του καθεστώτος που αφορά την καταπολέμηση της νομιμοποίησης εσόδων από παράνομες δραστηριότητες στην Κύπρο.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009656/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(28 August 2013)

Subject: Flow of Russian deposits from Cyprus to other Member States or territories of other EU countries

According to the Russian Central Bank, during the banking crisis in Cyprus and after the decision to perform a haircut on deposits, there was a huge exodus of Russian deposits from banks in Cyprus to banks in other Member States or in tax havens belonging to Member States. More specifically, Russian depositors transferred during the first quarter of 2013 — a very short period of time for such a large sum — USD 31.6 billion to the British Virgin Islands, compared with just USD 6.7 billion in the same quarter of 2012. In addition USD 13.9 billion was channelled into Luxembourg banks, compared with just USD 0.26 billion in the same quarter of 2012. By contrast, Russian deposits in Cyprus fell from USD 21.13 billion in December 2012 to just USD 2.72 billion at the end of March 2013.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Is it aware of these developments and how does it interpret these huge capital flows in such a short space of time?
2. Does it take the view that they may be related to the crisis in the banking system in Cyprus and the decision to perform a haircut on deposits?
3. Can it confirm that all the capital transfers were legitimate and that there are no issues of money laundering or other illegal acts?
4. Why is Russian capital, which the Union considered undesirable and harmful in Cyprus, so welcome in other Member States, without the Union reacting as it did in Cyprus?
5. Will it investigate this serious matter and behave even-handedly, or will it continue to apply double standards in its relations with the Member States?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2013)

The Commission is aware of the amounts of Russian outward foreign direct investment (FDI) in the first quarter of 2013 referred to in the question. The amount of Russian FDI directed to Cyprus in that time was USD 2.7 billion, below the average of around USD 5 billion per quarter in recent years.

Article 63 TFEU prohibits restrictions on the movement of capital between Member States and third countries. As long as investments are based on sound economic criteria, they are welcomed and can provide a win-win outcome for recipient countries and investors.

The Commission is not aware of any illegality in the capital transfers and is confident that the Cypriot authorities would investigate any areas of suspicion. At a wider level, the Commission is working with Cyprus and the Troika partners to make any necessary improvement in the anti-money laundering regime in Cyprus.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009657/13

προς το Συμβούλιο

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)

(28 Αυγούστου 2013)

Θέμα: Κίνδυνος ελέγχου της Τράπεζας Κύπρου από εξωευρωπαϊκά, ρωσικά συμφέροντα

Μια παράπλευρη συνέπεια των εντελώς λανθασμένων, κατά την άποψή μου, αποφάσεων του Eurogroup και του κουρέματος των καταθέσεων που επιβλήθηκε στην Κύπρο είναι και ο διαφαινόμενος κίνδυνος η κύρια συστημική τράπεζα του νησιού να περιέλθει στα χέρια ξένων, εξωευρωπαϊκών συμφερόντων, και δη ρωσικών.

Τον κίνδυνο η Τράπεζα Κύπρου να καταλήξει τελικά σε ρωσικά χέρια επισημαίνει σε άρθρο της και η New York Times. Όπως αναφέρει χαρακτηριστικά, «όταν οι Ευρωπαίοι ηγέτες σχεδίαζαν το σκληρό πακέτο διάσωσης της Κύπρου τον Μάρτιο, επευφημούσαν το τέλος ενός οικονομικού μοντέλου που στηρίχθηκε στο ρωσικό χρήμα. Οι πλούσιοι Ρώσοι που είχαν χρήματα στις προβληματικές τράπεζες της Κύπρου έχασαν δισεκατομμύρια. Όμως, παρά το άσχημο πλήγμα που δέχθηκαν, οι Ρώσοι είναι πλέον σε θέση να πάρουν κάτι που μέχρι προ τινος είχε ξεφύγει ακόμα και από τους πιο θρασεείς ολιγάρχες της Μόσχας: τον έλεγχο ενός συστημικού τραπεζικού ιδρύματος στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση».

Στην περίπτωση της Κύπρου, όπως αναφέρει η εφημερίδα, δημιουργήθηκαν «ακούσιες συνέπειες», αφού ενώ ο δεδηλωμένος στόχος της ΕΕ ήταν να «εξαλείψουν» το «βρόμικο» ρωσικό χρήμα από τις προβληματικές τράπεζες της μεγαλονήσου, τελικά έβαλαν τους Ρώσους ακόμα βαθύτερα στο χρηματοοικονομικό σύστημα της Ευρώπης, δίνοντάς τους πλειοψηφικό μερίδιο — στα χαρτιά τουλάχιστον — της Τράπεζας Κύπρου.

Οικονομικοί και νομικοί κύκλοι της Κύπρου εκτιμούν ότι το ποσοστό που θα κατέχουν οι Ρώσοι μεγαλομέτοχοι στην Τράπεζα Κύπρου θα κυμαίνεται μεταξύ 53% και 60%.

Ερωτάται το Συμβούλιο:

1. Ήταν ενήμερο του πιο πάνω κινδύνου όταν λαμβάνονταν οι αποφάσεις για κούρεμα των κυπριακών καταθέσεων;
2. Θεωρεί ότι όντως δημιουργούνται κίνδυνοι για την κυπριακή και την ευρωπαϊκή οικονομία από τον ενδεχόμενο έλεγχο της κύριας συστημικής τράπεζας της Κύπρου από τους λεγόμενους Ρώσους ολιγάρχες;
3. Αν η απάντηση στο ερώτημα 2 είναι θετική, μπορεί να κατονομάσει ποιοι είναι οι κίνδυνοι αυτοί και να εξηγήσει γιατί αγνοήθηκαν κατά τη λήψη των σχετικών αποφάσεων;
4. Μετά την εξέλιξη αυτή συνειδητοποιεί πλέον το Συμβούλιο ότι οι αποφάσεις για την Κύπρο ήταν πρόχειρες και λανθασμένες και ότι είχαν καταστροφικά αποτελέσματα ή μήπως εξακολουθεί ακόμη να πιστεύει στην ορθότητα των αποφάσεων;

Απάντηση

(5 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Στις 25 Μαρτίου 2013, η Ευρωομάδα εξέφρασε ικανοποίηση για τα σχέδια πολιτικής που παρουσίασαν οι κυπριακές αρχές και συμφώνησε με τα μέτρα για την αναδιάρθρωση του χρηματοπιστωτικού τομέα όπως αναφέρονται στο παράρτημα της δήλωσης της Ευρωομάδας της 25ης Μαρτίου 2013 ⁽¹⁾. Τα μέτρα αυτά θέτουν τη βάση για την αποκατάσταση της βιωσιμότητας του χρηματοπιστωτικού τομέα. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, διασφαλίζουν όλες τις καταθέσεις κάτω των 100 000 ευρώ, σύμφωνα με τις αρχές της ΕΕ.

Η απόφαση 2013/236/ΕΕ του Συμβουλίου της 25ης Απριλίου 2013 που απευθύνεται στην Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία σχετικά με ειδικά μέτρα για την αποκατάσταση της χρηματοπιστωτικής σταθερότητας και της βιώσιμης ανάπτυξης ⁽²⁾ θέτει τα στοιχεία ενός τριετούς προγράμματος μακροοικονομικής προσαρμογής που αποσκοπεί στην αποκατάσταση της ευρωσταίας του τραπεζικού τομέα, στη συνέχιση της διαδικασίας δημοσιονομικής εξυγίανσης και στη στήριξη της ανταγωνιστικότητας και της βιώσιμης και ισόρροπης ανάπτυξης.

Στις 13 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013, η Ευρωομάδα σημείωσε με ικανοποίηση ότι η Τράπεζα Κύπρου εξήλθε από το καθεστώς εξυγίανσης στις 30 Ιουλίου. Το γεγονός αυτό αποτελεί ορόσημο για την αποκατάσταση της εμπιστοσύνης στον κυπριακό χρηματοπιστωτικό τομέα.

⁽¹⁾ Οι δηλώσεις της Ευρωομάδας είναι διαθέσιμες στην ηλεκτρονική διεύθυνση: <http://www.eurozone.europa.eu/eurogroup>

⁽²⁾ ΕΕ L 141 της 28.5.2013, σ. 32.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009657/13
to the Council**

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: Danger of non-European — in particular Russian — interests controlling the Bank of Cyprus

One side effect of the Eurogroup's — in my view, completely misguided — decisions and the haircut on deposits imposed in Cyprus is the risk that the main systemic bank on the island may fall into the hands of foreign, non-European, especially Russian, interests.

The New York Times has also published an article pointing out the risk that the Bank of Cyprus may finally end up in Russian hands. As it tellingly notes: 'When European leaders engineered a harsh bailout deal for this tiny Mediterranean nation in March, they cheered the end of an economic model fueled by a flood of cash from Russia. Wealthy Russians with money in Cyprus's sickly banks lost billions. But the Russians, though badly bruised, are now in a position to get something that has previously eluded even Moscow's most audacious oligarchs: control of a so-called systemic financial institution in the European Union.'

In the case of Cyprus, as the newspaper states, this strategy has generated 'unintended consequences', since, while the EU's declared objective was to 'banish...dirty Russian money' from Cyprus's troubled banks, it has pulled Russians even deeper into Europe's financial system by giving them majority ownership, at least on paper, of the Bank of Cyprus

Financial and legal circles in Cyprus estimate the stake held by major Russian shareholders in the Bank of Cyprus at between 53% and 60%.

In view of the above, will the Council say:

1. Was it aware of the above risk when the decisions were taken to perform a haircut on Cypriot deposits?
2. Does it believe that the possible control of the main systemic bank in Cyprus by the so-called Russian oligarchs really represents a danger for the economy of Cyprus and the EU?
3. If the answer to question 2 is in the affirmative, can it identify what these risks are and explain why they were ignored when the relevant decisions were taken?
4. In the light of this development, does the Council now realise that the decisions on Cyprus were mistaken and not sufficiently thought through and that they have had disastrous consequences, or does it still believe that they were the right decisions to take?

Reply

(5 November 2013)

On 25 March 2013, the Eurogroup welcomed the policy plans presented by the Cyprus authorities and agreed to the measures for restructuring the financial sector as specified in the annex to its statement of 25 March 2013 ⁽¹⁾. These measures form the basis for restoring the viability of the financial sector. In particular, they safeguard all deposits below EUR 100 000 in accordance with EU principles.

Council Decision 2013/236/EU of 25 April 2013 addressed to Cyprus on specific measures to restore financial stability and sustainable growth ⁽²⁾ set out the elements of a three-year macroeconomic adjustment programme aimed at restoring the soundness of Cyprus' banking industry, continuing the process of fiscal consolidation and supporting competitiveness and sustainable and balanced growth.

On 13 September 2013 the Eurogroup noted with satisfaction that the Bank of Cyprus had been taken out of resolution on 30 July. That marked an important milestone for restoring confidence in the Cypriot financial sector.

⁽¹⁾ Eurogroup statements can be found at <http://www.eurozone.europa.eu/eurogroup>

⁽²⁾ OJ L 141, 28.5.2013, p. 32.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009658/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(28 Αυγούστου 2013)

Θέμα: Κίνδυνος ελέγχου της Τράπεζας Κύπρου από εξωευρωπαϊκά, ρωσικά συμφέροντα

Μια παράπλευρη συνέπεια των εντελώς λανθασμένων, κατά την άποψή μου, αποφάσεων του Eurogroup και του κουρέματος των καταθέσεων που επιβλήθηκε στην Κύπρο είναι και ο διαφαινόμενος κίνδυνος η κύρια συστημική τράπεζα του νησιού να περιέλθει στα χέρια ξένων, εξωευρωπαϊκών συμφερόντων, και δη ρωσικών.

Τον κίνδυνο η Τράπεζα Κύπρου να καταλήξει τελικά σε ρωσικά χέρια επισημαίνει σε άρθρο της και η New York Times. Όπως αναφέρει χαρακτηριστικά, «όταν οι Ευρωπαίοι ηγέτες σχεδιάζαν το σκληρό πακέτο διάσωσης της Κύπρου τον Μάρτιο, επευφημούσαν το τέλος ενός οικονομικού μοντέλου που στηρίχθηκε στο ρωσικό χρήμα. Οι πλούσιοι Ρώσοι που είχαν χρήματα στις προβληματικές τράπεζες της Κύπρου έχασαν δισεκατομμύρια. Όμως, παρά το άσχημο πλήγμα που δέχθηκαν, οι Ρώσοι είναι πλέον σε θέση να πάρουν κάτι που μέχρι προ τινος είχε ξεφύγει ακόμα και από τους πιο θρασεείς ολιγάρχες της Μόσχας: τον έλεγχο ενός συστημικού τραπεζικού ιδρύματος στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση».

Στην περίπτωση της Κύπρου, όπως αναφέρει η εφημερίδα, δημιουργήθηκαν «ακούσιες συνέπειες», αφού ενώ ο δεδηλωμένος στόχος της ΕΕ ήταν να «εξαλείψουν» το «βρόμικο» ρωσικό χρήμα από τις προβληματικές τράπεζες της μεγαλονήσου, τελικά έβαλαν τους Ρώσους ακόμα βαθύτερα στο χρηματοοικονομικό σύστημα της Ευρώπης, δίνοντάς τους πλειοψηφικό μερίδιο — στα χαρτιά τουλάχιστον — της Τράπεζας Κύπρου.

Οικονομικοί και νομικοί κύκλοι της Κύπρου εκτιμούν ότι το ποσοστό που θα κατέχουν οι Ρώσοι μεγαλομέτοχοι στην Τράπεζα Κύπρου θα κυμαίνεται μεταξύ 53% και 60%.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή.

1. Ήταν ενήμερη του πιο πάνω κινδύνου όταν λαμβάνονταν οι αποφάσεις για κούρεμα των κυπριακών καταθέσεων;
2. Θεωρεί ότι όντως δημιουργούνται κίνδυνοι για την κυπριακή και την ευρωπαϊκή οικονομία από τον ενδεχόμενο έλεγχο της κύριας συστημικής τράπεζας της Κύπρου από τους λεγόμενους Ρώσους ολιγάρχες;
3. Αν η απάντηση στο ερώτημα 2 είναι θετική, μπορεί να κατονομάσει ποιοι είναι οι κίνδυνοι αυτοί και να εξηγήσει γιατί αγνοήθηκαν κατά τη λήψη των σχετικών αποφάσεων;
4. Μετά την εξέλιξη αυτή συνειδητοποιεί πλέον η Επιτροπή ότι οι αποφάσεις για την Κύπρο ήταν πρόχειρες και λανθασμένες και ότι είχαν καταστροφικά αποτελέσματα ή μήπως εξακολουθεί ακόμη να πιστεύει στην ορθότητα των αποφάσεων;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Οι κυπριακές αρχές είναι αυτές που αποφασίζουν σχετικά με την οργάνωση της εκπροσώπησης των μετόχων στην Τράπεζα Κύπρου και θα πρέπει να εξασφαλίζουν την κατάλληλη ισορροπία μεταξύ των δικαιωμάτων των μετόχων αφενός και πιθανών θεμάτων διακυβέρνησης αφετέρου, ιδίως από τη στιγμή που, μετά την αναδιάρθρωση, πολλοί καταθέτες είναι πλέον μέτοχοι.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009658/13
to the Commission**

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: Danger of non-European — in particular Russian — interests controlling the Bank of Cyprus

One side effect of the Eurogroup's — in my view, completely misguided — decisions and the haircut on deposits imposed in Cyprus is the risk that the main systemic bank on the island may fall into the hands of foreign, non-European, especially Russian, interests.

The New York Times has also published an article pointing out the risk that the Bank of Cyprus may finally end up in Russian hands. As it tellingly notes: 'When European leaders engineered a harsh bailout deal for this tiny Mediterranean nation in March, they cheered the end of an economic model fueled by a flood of cash from Russia. Wealthy Russians with money in Cyprus's sickly banks lost billions. But the Russians, though badly bruised, are now in a position to get something that has previously eluded even Moscow's most audacious oligarchs: control of a so-called systemic financial institution in the European Union.'

In the case of Cyprus, as the newspaper states, this strategy has generated 'unintended consequences', since, while the EU's declared objective was to 'banish...dirty Russian money' from Cyprus's troubled banks, it has pulled Russians even deeper into Europe's financial system by giving them majority ownership, at least on paper, of the Bank of Cyprus

Financial and legal circles in Cyprus estimate the stake held by major Russian shareholders in the Bank of Cyprus at between 53% and 60%.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Was it aware of the above risk when the decisions were taken to perform a haircut on Cypriot deposits?
2. Does it believe that the possible control of the main systemic bank in Cyprus by the so-called Russian oligarchs really represents a danger for the economy of Cyprus and the EU?
3. If the answer to question 2 is in the affirmative, can it identify what these risks are and explain why they were ignored when the relevant decisions were taken?
4. In the light of this development, does the Commission now realise that the decisions on Cyprus were mistaken and not sufficiently thought through and that they have had disastrous consequences, or does it still believe that they were the right decisions to take?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(25 October 2013)

It is for the Cypriot authorities to decide on the organisation of the representation of shareholders in Bank of Cyprus and to strike the appropriate balance between shareholders rights and the potential governance issues, especially as a lot of depositors are now shareholders further to the restructuration.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009659/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(28 Αυγούστου 2013)

Θέμα: Αύξηση της φτώχειας στην ΕΕ

Είναι κοινή πεποίθηση ότι, λόγω της συνεχιζόμενης οικονομικής κρίσης, το φαινόμενο της φτώχειας σημειώνει ραγδαία αύξηση σε πολλά κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης. Στις αρχές του 2012, η Επιτροπή ανακοίνωσε την πρόθεσή της να διεξαγάγει έρευνα για χαρτογράφηση της φτώχειας στην ΕΕ, με στόχο την καλύτερη κατανόηση και αποτελεσματικότερη αντιμετώπιση του φαινομένου.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει ολοκληρωθεί η έρευνα αυτή; Αν ναι, είναι σε θέση, με βάση τα ευρήματα της έρευνας, να παράσχει συγκριτικά στοιχεία για τη φτώχεια στα κράτη μέλη;
2. Πώς εξελίσσεται διαχρονικά το επίπεδο της φτώχειας στην ΕΕ τα τελευταία χρόνια, ιδιαίτερα μετά την εκδήλωση της οικονομικής κρίσης το 2008;
3. Η Κύπρος, χώρα με παραδοσιακά υψηλό ποσοστό ατόμων κάτω από το όριο της φτώχειας, ιδιαίτερα μεταξύ των ατόμων τρίτης ηλικίας, αντιμετωπίζει σήμερα δραματική αύξηση του επιπέδου φτώχειας. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει η Επιτροπή για απάμβλυνση του φαινομένου, το οποίο δημιουργεί αφόρητες συνθήκες για μεγάλο μέρος του πληθυσμού;
4. Κατά τη διαμόρφωση του πακέτου μέτρων για διάσωση της κυπριακής οικονομίας, λήφθηκαν καθόλου υπόψη οι αναμενόμενες επιπτώσεις των μέτρων στο επίπεδο της φτώχειας στη χώρα; Αν ναι, πώς εξηγεί η Επιτροπή τη συνεχιζόμενη ραγδαία αύξηση του επιπέδου της φτώχειας στη χώρα;
5. Υπάρχουν παραδείγματα καλών πρακτικών σε κράτη μέλη, τα οποία θα μπορούσαν να αξιοποιηθούν και σε άλλα κράτη μέλη;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(23 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

1. Το τρέχον σχέδιο χαρτογράφησης της φτώχειας αφορά τη χωροταξική κατανομή του κινδύνου φτώχειας σε αναλυτικότερο επίπεδο, δηλαδή (NUTS3 και LAU1) σε σχέση με το επίπεδο για το οποίο υπάρχουν στοιχεία της ESTAT σχετικά με το εισόδημα. Το έργο αυτό δεν έχει ολοκληρωθεί και δεν παρέχει συγκριτικά στοιχεία σχετικά με τη φτώχεια στα κράτη μέλη.
2. Η ΕΕ και τα κράτη μέλη έχουν αναπτύξει μια ολοκληρωμένη στρατηγική τόσο σε ευρωπαϊκό όσο και σε εθνικό επίπεδο, ώστε να διασφαλιστεί η άμεση μείωση της φτώχειας και του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού. Η κρίση και οι μεγάλες προσπάθειες δημοσιονομικής εξυγίανσης σε πολλά κράτη μέλη δημιούργησαν ανησυχίες σχετικά με την αύξηση της φτώχειας. Το 2011, τέσσερα εκατομμύρια περισσότερα άτομα βρέθηκαν αντιμέτωπα με τον κίνδυνο της φτώχειας ή του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού στην ΕΕ σε σύγκριση με το 2008.
3. Όσον αφορά τη φτώχεια και ιδίως τη φτώχεια των ηλικιωμένων, το μνημόνιο συνεννόησης για τους ειδικούς όρους της οικονομικής πολιτικής, προβλέπει ότι η Κύπρος θα κάνει μεταρρυθμίσεις στις υφιστάμενες κοινωνικές παροχές και θα βελτιώσει τους στόχους της. Το νέο σύστημα ελάχιστου εγγυημένου εισοδήματος⁽¹⁾, το οποίο θα αντικαταστήσει το υπάρχον σύστημα δημοσίων βοηθημάτων, αναμένεται να έχει θετικό αντίκτυπο στην άμβλυνση της ακραίας φτώχειας.
4. Οι στατιστικές για τη φτώχεια και τον κοινωνικό αποκλεισμό μετά το 2011 δεν είναι ακόμη διαθέσιμες για την Κύπρο, ωστόσο τα επίπεδα της φτώχειας ενδέχεται να επηρεάζονται. Όσον αφορά το σύστημα κοινωνικής πρόνοιας, το πρόγραμμα δίνει έμφαση στο ζωτικής σημασίας ρόλο του ως διχτυού ασφαλείας, προωθώντας την αποτελεσματικότητά του μέσω του εξορθολογισμού, της βελτιωμένης διοικητικής ικανότητας και της καλύτερης στόχευσης των παροχών.

⁽¹⁾ GMI.

5. Η δέσμη μέτρων για τις κοινωνικές επενδύσεις της Επιτροπής ⁽²⁾ παρουσιάζει μια νέα ατζέντα για την κοινωνική πολιτική που θα βοηθήσει τα κράτη μέλη να ολοκληρώσουν τις διαρθρωτικές μεταρρυθμίσεις που απαιτούνται για να διασφαλιστεί ότι η ΕΕ θα εξέλθει από την κρίση ισχυρότερη, πιο συνεκτική και πιο ανταγωνιστική. Χαρακτηριστικά παραδείγματα προσέγγισης κοινωνικών επενδύσεων αναπτύσσονται στο σχετικό φυλλάδιο ⁽³⁾.

⁽²⁾ Δέσμη μέτρων για τις κοινωνικές επενδύσεις — 2013.

⁽³⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=7515&type=2&furtherPubs=yes>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009659/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(28 August 2013)**

Subject: Increase in poverty in the EU

It is widely accepted that there has been a big increase in poverty in many EU Member States due to the ongoing economic crisis. At the beginning of 2012, the Commission had announced its intention of conducting a survey to map poverty in the EU in order to better understand the phenomenon and combat it more effectively.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Has this survey been completed? If so, can it use the findings of this survey to provide comparative data on poverty in the Member States?
2. How has the level of poverty in the EU increased in recent years, particularly since the onset of the financial crisis in 2008?
3. Cyprus, a country which has traditionally had a high proportion of persons living below the poverty line, particularly among the elderly, is currently facing a dramatic increase in poverty levels. What will it do to mitigate this phenomenon, which is making life extremely difficult for a large part of the population?
4. When the rescue package was being put together to save the economy of Cyprus, was any account taken of the likely impact of the measures on the level of poverty in the country? If so, how can the Commission explain the fact that poverty levels in the country are continuing to soar?
5. Do any examples exist of good practices in some Member States which could be applied in other Member States?

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

1. The current project on poverty mapping is about tracking spatial distribution of at-risk-of-poverty at a more detailed level, i.e. (NUTS3 and LAU1) than the level for which ESTAT data on income exist. The maps will be finished by the end of 2013. Dissemination activities will start in 2014. However, the maps are not intended to compare data on poverty.
2. An integrated strategy to fight poverty and social exclusion has been developed at both European and national level. The crisis and the large fiscal consolidation efforts have led to growing inequalities. In 2011, there were four million more people at risk of poverty or social exclusion in the EU compared to 2008.
3. Concerning poverty and especially poverty among the elderly, the memorandum of understanding on Specific Economic Policy Conditionality foresees that Cyprus will reform the existing social benefits, also improving their targeting. The new guaranteed minimum income scheme ⁽¹⁾ replacing the existing public assistance scheme is expected to have a positive impact on mitigating extreme poverty.
4. Poverty and social exclusion statistics after 2011 are not yet available for Cyprus, but poverty levels are likely to be affected. With respect to the welfare system, the programme puts emphasis on its crucial role as safety net, promoting its efficiency via streamlining, improved administrative capacity and better targeting.
5. The Commission's Social Investment Package ⁽²⁾ outlines a new social policy direction helping the Member States to carry out the structural reforms needed to ensure that the EU comes out of the crisis stronger, more cohesive and more competitive. Examples of the social investment approach are explained in the relevant brochure ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ GMI.

⁽²⁾ COM(2013) 83 final.

⁽³⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=7515&type=2&furtherPubs=yes>

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009660/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(28 Αυγούστου 2013)

Θέμα: Δασικές πυρκαγιές σε Μεσογειακά κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση διατηρεί Ταμείο Αλληλεγγύης, προκειμένου να ανταποκρίνεται σε περιπτώσεις φυσικών καταστροφών σε κράτη μέλη.

Στο παρελθόν, το ταμείο αυτό ενεργοποιήθηκε σε κάποιες περιπτώσεις για την αντιμετώπιση των συνεπειών, μεταξύ άλλων, και μεγάλων πυρκαγιών.

Επειδή στα μεσογειακά κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης, το φαινόμενο των δασικών πυρκαγιών είναι πολύ διαδεδομένο, ιδιαίτερα κατά την καλοκαιρινή περίοδο λόγω της ξηρασίας και των υψηλών θερμοκρασιών, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποιο το ύψος των διαθέσιμων πόρων του Ταμείου για το υπόλοιπο του 2013 και κατά πόσο αυτό κρίνεται ικανοποιητικό για αντιμετώπιση της κατάστασης;
2. Υπο ποίες προϋποθέσεις ένα κράτος μέλος μπορεί να επωφεληθεί από τους πόρους του Ταμείου;
3. Είναι δυνατή η αξιοποίηση πόρων του Ταμείου για αποκατάσταση ζημιών εξαιτίας των πυρκαγιών, καθώς και για την αναδάσωση καμένων δασικών εκτάσεων;
4. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει η Επιτροπή ώστε να υπάρξει μια αποτελεσματική πολιτική αντιμετώπισης του φαινομένου των καταστροφικών δασικών πυρκαγιών;
5. Η Κύπρος, η οποία υπέστη αριθμό μεγάλων πυρκαγιών το φετινό καλοκαίρι, μπορεί να ζητήσει οικονομική βοήθεια από το Ταμείο, υπό ποίες προϋποθέσεις και μέχρι ποίου ποσού;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Καμία αίτηση δεν έχει παραληφθεί σχετικά με τις δασικές πυρκαγιές ή την ξηρασία κατά τη διάρκεια αυτού του έτους. Ο μέγιστος ετήσιος προϋπολογισμός του Ταμείου Αλληλεγγύης το 2013 ανέρχεται σε 1 δισεκατομμύριο ευρώ από τον οποίο προς το παρόν, περισσότερο από το 50% είναι ακόμη διαθέσιμο. Κατά πόσον αυτό θα είναι επαρκές για να αντιμετωπιστούν οι φετινές πυρκαγιές των δασών, αυτό θα μπορούσε μόνο να ειπωθεί εάν και όταν οι πληγείσες χώρες υποβάλουν αιτήσεις ενίσχυσης. Η Επιτροπή δεν μπορεί να ενεργοποιήσει το Ταμείο Αλληλεγγύης με δική της πρωτοβουλία.

Το Ταμείο μπορεί να ενεργοποιηθεί σε περίπτωση μείζονος φυσικής καταστροφής σε ένα κράτος μέλος ή μια χώρα που βρίσκεται σε διαδικασία διαπραγμάτευσης της προσχώρησής της στην Ένωση, ύστερα από αίτηση της ενδιαφερόμενης χώρας. «Μείζων» θεωρείται η συνολική άμεση ζημία άνω του 0,6% του ακαθάριστου εθνικού εισοδήματος της πληγείσας χώρας ή 3 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ σε τιμές 2002. Σε πολύ εξαιρετικές περιπτώσεις, υπό συγκεκριμένους όρους, το Ταμείο μπορεί να ενεργοποιηθεί για καταστροφές για ζημιές κάτω από το όριο. Η ενίσχυση από το Ταμείο Αλληλεγγύης μπορεί να χρησιμοποιηθεί για τις δημόσιες ενέργειες έκτακτης ανάγκης, όπως η αποκατάσταση βασικών υποδομών. Η αναδάσωση δεν συμπεριλαμβάνεται.

Οι κυπριακές αρχές μπορεί να υποβάλουν αίτηση ενίσχυσης εντός της προθεσμίας των 10 εβδομάδων από την έναρξη της καταστροφής. Τα ποσά της ενίσχυσης καθορίζονται βάσει της ζημίας που προκλήθηκε. Η Επιτροπή είναι πρόθυμη να παράσχει καθοδήγηση.

Το ΕΓΤΑΑ ⁽¹⁾ παρέχει υποστήριξη για την πρόληψη των δασικών πυρκαγιών και την αποκατάσταση. Στο πλαίσιο της κοινής διαχείρισης, τα κράτη μέλη και οι περιφέρειες αποφασίζουν τον τρόπο που θα χρησιμοποιούν το ΕΓΤΑΑ και την προτεραιότητα που θα δώσουν στην πρόληψη των δασικών πυρκαγιών και ενεργειών αποκατάστασης. Ο κανονισμός της Επιτροπής για την αγροτική ανάπτυξη για την περίοδο 2014-2020 ⁽²⁾ προβλέπει τη συνέχιση της χρηματοδότησης για τις δραστηριότητες πρόληψης και αποκατάστασης ζημίας στα δάση που καταστράφηκαν από πυρκαγιές και άλλες φυσικές καταστροφές.

⁽¹⁾ Ευρωπαϊκό Γεωργικό Ταμείο Αγροτικής Ανάπτυξης.

⁽²⁾ COM(2011)627/3.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009660/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(28 August 2013)**

Subject: Forest fires in Mediterranean EU Member States

The European Union maintains a Solidarity Fund to respond to natural disasters in Member States.

In the past, this Fund has been used in some cases to address the consequences of major fires, *inter alia*.

Given that forest fires are very common in the Mediterranean Member States of the Union, especially during the summer due to the drought and high temperatures, will the Commission say:

1. What amount of funding is still available from the Fund for the remainder of 2013, and will this be sufficient to deal with the situation?
2. Under what conditions may a Member State receive resources from the Fund?
3. It is possible to use Fund resources to repair damage caused by fires, and for the reforestation of forestry land affected by fires?
4. What measures will it take to ensure that there is an effective policy in place to tackle the phenomenon of catastrophic forest fires?
5. Can Cyprus, which has suffered a number of major fires this summer, apply for assistance from the Fund? If so, under what conditions and what amount can it seek?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(21 October 2013)**

No application relating to forest fires or drought has been received during this year. The maximum annual allocation of the Solidarity Fund in 2013 is EUR 1 billion of which more than half is still available at this moment. Whether this will be sufficient to deal with this year's forest fires could only be said if and when the affected countries have presented applications for aid. The Commission may not activate the Solidarity Fund upon its own initiative.

The Fund can be activated if a major natural disaster occurs in a Member State or country in the process of negotiating its accession to the Union following an application by the country concerned. 'Major' meaning total direct damage in excess of 0.6% of the affected country's gross national income or 3 EUR billion in 2002 prices. Very exceptionally, under specific conditions, the Fund can be mobilised for disasters with damage below the threshold. Aid from the Solidarity Fund may be used for public emergency operations such as the restoration of essential infrastructure. Reforestation is not eligible.

The Cypriot authorities may apply for aid within the deadline of 10 weeks of the start of the disaster. Amounts of aid are determined on the basis of the damage caused. The Commission stands ready to provide guidance.

The EAFRD ⁽¹⁾ provides support for forest fire prevention and restoration. In the framework of shared management, it is the Member States and regions that decide how to use the EAFRD and the priority they give to forest fire prevention and restoration actions. The Commission's Rural Development Regulation proposal for 2014-2020 ⁽²⁾ proposes continued funding for activities preventing and restoring forest damage from fires and other natural disasters.

⁽¹⁾ European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development.

⁽²⁾ COM(2011) 627/3.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009661/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(28 Αυγούστου 2013)

Θέμα: Λανθασμένη αναφορά Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής σε ελληνοκυπριακή πλευρά αντί στην επίσημη Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία

Σε απάντηση στη γραπτή ερώτησή μου αρ. E-006481/2013 με θέμα: «Πώληση υποκαταστημάτων κυπριακών τραπεζών στην Τράπεζα Πειραιώς», η Επιτροπή αναφέρει μεταξύ άλλων, επί λέξει, τα ακόλουθα:

«η Τρόικα ενθάρρυνε την ελληνική και την ελληνοκυπριακή πλευρά να διαπραγματευθούν την πώληση των εν λόγω υποκαταστημάτων».

Θεωρώ την αναφορά σε «ελληνοκυπριακή πλευρά» ως εξαιρετικά ατυχή και δυνάμενη να δημιουργήσει λανθασμένες εντυπώσεις, με σοβαρές πολιτικές παρενέργειες, τόσο για την Κύπρο όσο και για την ίδια την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Όπως γνωρίζετε, η Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία, χώρα — ισότιμο μέλος της ΕΕ, δέχεται αφόρητες πιέσεις και απειλές από μια υποψήφια για ένταξη χώρα, την Τουρκία. Η αναφορά σε ελληνοκυπριακή πλευρά και η αμφισβήτηση της οντότητας της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας σε επίσημα έγγραφα της ΕΕ πλήττει τα συμφέροντα της Κύπρου και εξυπηρετεί τα επεκτατικά και διχοτομικά σχέδια της Τουρκίας σε βάρος ενός κράτους μέλους.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή.

1. Θεωρεί πολιτικά θεμιτή τη χρήση του όρου «ελληνοκυπριακή πλευρά» σε ένα επίσημο κείμενο στο οποίο σαφώς θα έπρεπε να γίνεται αναφορά στην Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία;
2. Αν η συμπερίληψη του όρου έγινε από λάθος, είναι έτοιμη η Επιτροπή να απολογηθεί και να επανορθώσει το σφάλμα της;
3. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει ώστε μελλοντικά να αποφεύγονται τέτοια σοβαρά λάθη που θα μπορούσαν να διασαλεύσουν τις σχέσεις μεταξύ της Ένωσης και ενός κράτους μέλους;

Απάντηση της κ. Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή εκφράζει τη βαθύτατη λύπη της για την εσφαλμένη χρήση του όρου «η ελληνοκυπριακή πλευρά» αντί του όρου «η κυπριακή πλευρά» στη μετάφραση προς την ελληνική γλώσσα, της απάντησής της στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-006481/2013 και επιβεβαιώνει ότι επρόκειτο για καθαρά μεταφραστικό σφάλμα.

Μια διορθωμένη έκδοση του κειμένου έχει ήδη αποσταλεί στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο.

Οι υπηρεσίες της Επιτροπής καταβάλλουν κάθε δυνατή προσπάθεια για να διασφαλίσουν την ποιότητα των κειμένων τους και σφάλματα όπως αυτά που εντόπισε η κυρία Βουλευτής, είναι πράγματι πολύ σπάνια. Παρ' όλα αυτά, η Επιτροπή συνεχώς προσπαθεί να παράγει έγγραφα υψίστης ποιότητας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009661/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(28 August 2013)

Subject: Incorrect reference by the Commission, in the Greek text of its answer to a written question, to the 'Greek Cypriot side' instead of to the official Republic of Cyprus

In the Greek-language version of its answer to my written question No. E-006481/2013 on the 'Sale of Cypriot bank branches to Piraeus Bank' the Commission stated *inter alia*, verbatim: '... the Troika encouraged the Greek side and the Greek Cypriot side to negotiate a sale of these branches.'

The reference in the Greek version to the '*Greek Cypriot side*' is extremely unfortunate and liable to create a false impression, with serious political repercussions, both for Cyprus and for the European Union itself. As you will be aware, the Republic of Cyprus — a full member of the EU — is being subjected to unacceptable pressure and threats from a candidate country, namely Turkey. The reference to the '*Greek Cypriot side*' and the calling into question of the existence of the Republic of Cyprus in official EU documents affects the interests of Cyprus and serves Turkey's expansionist and partitionist plans against a Member State.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it consider politically legitimate the use of the term '*Greek Cypriot side*' in an official document which should clearly refer to the Republic of Cyprus?
2. If the inclusion of the term was an error, is the Commission prepared to apologise and rectify its error?
3. What will it do to prevent in future serious errors of this kind that could undermine relations between the Union and a Member State?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2013)

The Commission deeply regrets the erroneous use of the term 'the Greek Cypriot side' instead of 'the Cypriot side' in the translation into Greek of its answer to Written Question E-006481/2013 and confirms that this was a purely linguistic error.

A corrected version of the text has already been sent to the European Parliament.

The Commission services strive to ensure the quality of their texts, and errors such as that identified by the Honourable Member are very rare indeed. Nevertheless, the Commission is constantly intensifying its efforts to produce documents of the highest quality.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009662/13

προς την Επιτροπή

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)

(28 Αυγούστου 2013)

Θέμα: Πτήσεις αεροσκαφών από Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο προς παράνομο αεροδρόμιο ERCAN, στην κατεχόμενη Κύπρο

Δημοσιογραφικές πληροφορίες αναφέρουν ότι από βρετανικά αεροδρόμια (Stansted, Manchester, Glasgow) πραγματοποιούνται πτήσεις της τουρκικής αεροπορικής εταιρείας PEGASUS προς το παράνομο αεροδρόμιο ERCAN, στο κατεχόμενο από τουρκικά στρατεύματα τμήμα της Κύπρου. Οι πτήσεις αυτές, εκτός του ότι είναι παράνομες, θέτουν και σε κίνδυνο την ασφάλεια της αεροναυσιπλοΐας στην περιοχή, αφού παραβιάζουν το FIR Λευκωσίας και άλλα δικαιώματα της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι σε γνώση της οι πληροφορίες αυτές;
2. Ποιες οι ευθύνες της Τουρκίας, μιας υπό ένταξη χώρας, που επιτρέπει τις παράνομες δραστηριότητες της εταιρείας PEGASUS, μεταξύ Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου και Κύπρου;
3. Ποιος θα φέρει την ευθύνη σε περίπτωση που η απαράδεκτη αυτή κατάσταση οδηγήσει σε αεροπορικό δυστύχημα στην περιοχή;
4. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει η Επιτροπή για τερματισμό της απαράδεκτης αυτής κατάστασης;
5. Τι προνοεί ο Διεθνής Νόμος και κανονισμοί σε τέτοιες περιπτώσεις;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής

(5 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στην απάντησή της στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-005383/2013 και στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-005343/2013 ⁽¹⁾.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009662/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(28 August 2013)

Subject: Flights from the UK to the illegal airport of ERCAN, in occupied Cyprus

It has been reported in the press that the Turkish airline PEGASUS is operating flights from UK airports (Stansted, Manchester, Glasgow) to the illegal airport of ERCAN, in the part of Cyprus occupied by Turkish troops. These flights are not only illegal, they also pose a threat to air traffic in the region, since they violate Nicosia FIR and other rights of the Republic of Cyprus.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Is it aware of this information?
2. What share of the responsibility lies with Turkey, a candidate country, which allows the illegal operations of PEGASUS airlines between the UK and Cyprus?
3. Who will be responsible in the event that this unacceptable situation results in a plane crash in the region?
4. What will the Commission do to end this unacceptable situation?
5. What is stipulated by international laws and regulations in such cases?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2013)

The Commission would kindly refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-005383/2013 and to Written Question E-005343/2013 ⁽¹⁾.

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

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-009663/13

a la Comisión

Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE)

(28 de agosto de 2013)

Asunto: Derechos de los menores

Cada vez se dan más situaciones de parejas o matrimonios entre europeos y japoneses con hijos comunes que, cuando se da el caso de la ruptura de la pareja o del matrimonio por cualquier causa, los derechos tanto de los progenitores como de los hijos se ven seriamente mermados o incluso anulados, debido a que la legislación japonesa prevé que, en tal caso, solo uno de los progenitores ostente en exclusiva la patria potestad sobre los menores, privando incluso al otro progenitor del más mínimo derecho de visita a menos que el otro progenitor lo consienta voluntariamente.

Al parecer, el Parlamento japonés aprobó el pasado mes de mayo la ratificación por su parte de la Convención de la Haya contra el Secuestro Infantil Parental, suscrito ya por un centenar de países, si bien no entrará en vigor hasta 2014. No tiene carácter retroactivo y tampoco supone ningún cambio en la legislación nipona relativa al Derecho Civil de Familia que contemple de alguna forma algún tipo de régimen de visitas en estos casos por parte del progenitor no custodio.

En un caso concreto, por ejemplo, el Juzgado de Primera Instancia 8 de Pamplona (Navarra, España) ha dictado un auto por el que exige a un padre español entregar a sus hijos menores a su ex mujer nipona para que ostente ella la guardia y custodia en exclusiva sobre los hijos menores comunes con su consiguiente traslado a Japón y sin que quede amparado estrictamente el posible derecho de visitas del padre, al no estar contemplado tal derecho en la legislación japonesa y al no poder hacer ejecutar el padre las resoluciones judiciales europeas en materia de familia en Japón.

En el marco de las negociaciones UE-Japón sobre el nuevo Tratado de Libre Comercio, que como sabemos, puede y debe recoger aspectos relacionados con el respeto a los derechos humanos y asuntos relativos al Derecho Internacional Civil, ¿tiene intención la UE de exigir a Japón un cambio en su legislación civil interna que proteja los derechos tanto de los hijos menores como de los progenitores no custodios, en cuanto al régimen de visitas del progenitor no custodio se refiere, en los casos de ruptura matrimonial o de pareja entre un nacional japonés y un europeo con hijos comunes entre ellos?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión

(1 de octubre de 2013)

La Comisión acoge favorablemente la decisión de Japón de suscribir el Convenio sobre los aspectos civiles de la sustracción internacional de menores. Este hecho, largamente esperado, reforzará el marco jurídico internacional destinado a proteger los derechos del niño en las disputas transfronterizas. La UE participó en algunas de las gestiones diplomáticas para incitar a Japón a suscribir el Convenio como continuación de iniciativas anteriores.

No obstante, el objetivo del Convenio es garantizar la rápida devolución de niños retenidos o separados de sus padres indebidamente mediante un sistema de cooperación entre autoridades centrales; no aborda la concesión de regímenes de visitas. Por tanto, sin perjuicio de los efectos positivos que se prevén de esta suscripción, esta no eliminará todas las fuentes de dificultades de los matrimonios mixtos. A tenor del Derecho Civil de Familia nipón, en los procedimientos de divorcio solo se concede la custodia a uno de los progenitores y el otro no tiene derecho a que se le fije un régimen de visitas. Así, cabe la posibilidad real de que uno de los progenitores separe indefinidamente al hijo del otro progenitor como resultado de un divorcio.

Informamos a Su Señoría que, no obstante, tampoco a nivel de la UE existe una normativa que rijan la concesión de la custodia y regule el régimen de visitas, que están aún reglamentados por la legislación nacional de los Estados miembros. El llamado «Reglamento Bruselas II bis ⁽¹⁾» establece reglas para forzar la aplicación de los regímenes de visitas en los procedimientos transfronterizos entre Estados miembros, pero solo cuando ya los hayan establecido los órganos judiciales nacionales.

Por la misma razón, y dado que este asunto no está relacionado con cuestiones comerciales, la Comisión no tiene intención de abordar esta cuestión en las negociaciones de un Acuerdo de Libre Comercio con Japón.

⁽¹⁾ Reglamento (CE) n° 2201/2003 del Consejo, de 27 de noviembre de 2003, DO L 338 de 23.12.2003, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009663/13
to the Commission
Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE)
 (28 August 2013)

Subject: Parents' and children's rights

An increasing number of Europeans who have children with Japanese nationals are seeing both their own and their children's rights severely curtailed or even denied when their partnership or marriage breaks down for whatever reason. That is because Japanese law stipulates that, in such cases, parental responsibility will be granted to only one of the parents, thereby denying the other parent visitation rights unless the custodial parent decides otherwise.

It would seem that in May the Japanese Parliament joined some one hundred other countries in ratifying the Hague Convention against Parental Child Abduction, though it will only come into force in 2014. However, the Convention has no retroactive effect and does not alter Japanese family law in any way that would provide for some kind of visitation rights for non-custodial parents in these cases.

In one such case, for example, the Pamplona Court of First Instance No 8 (Navarre, Spain) issued an order requiring a Spanish father to hand over his children to his Japanese ex-wife, thereby giving her sole guardianship and custody over the children. The children went to live in Japan and the father was granted no visitation rights, as no such right is provided for in Japanese law and as European court decisions cannot be enforced on family matters in Japan.

The EU-Japan negotiations on the new free trade agreement can and must address issues relating to human rights and international civil law. In that context, will the EU urge Japan to change its civil law in order to ensure that the rights of children born to mixed European-Japanese couples are safeguarded if their parents' partnership or marriage breaks down and that non-custodial parents are granted visitation rights?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
 (1 October 2013)

The Commission welcomes Japan's decision to accede to the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction. This long-awaited development will strengthen the international legal framework aimed at protecting child's rights in cross-border disputes. The EU participated in some of the diplomatic demarches to encourage Japan to accede to the Convention as a follow-up of previous initiatives.

However, the aim of the Convention is to ensure the prompt return of wrongfully removed or retained children through a system of cooperation among central authorities; it does not deal with the granting of visiting rights. Therefore, notwithstanding the foreseeable positive effects of this accession, it will not remove all sources of difficulties for mixed marriages. Pursuant to Japanese family law, in divorce proceedings, only one parent will have parental authority and no visiting rights are granted to the other. Thus, it may indeed happen that the child is indefinitely separated by one of the parents as a result of a divorce.

We would like to inform the Honourable Member that, however, even at EU level, no legislation covers the granting of custody and the exercise of visiting rights, which are still governed by national law of the Member States. The so-called 'Brussels IIa regulation' ⁽¹⁾ sets out rules to enforce visiting rights in cross-border procedures between Member States, but only when they are already granted by national judicial authorities.

For the same reason and since this matter is not trade related, the Commission does not intend to address this issue in the Free Trade Agreement negotiations with Japan.

⁽¹⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 of 27 November 2003, OJ L 338, 23.12.2003, p. 1.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-009664/13
an die Kommission
Paul Rübzig (PPE)
(28. August 2013)

Betrifft: Überprüfung der Richtlinie zur Beschränkung der Verwendung bestimmter gefährlicher Stoffe (Restriction of Hazardous Substances-Richtlinie-RoHS)

Im Dezember 2010 einigten sich das Europäische Parlament und der Ministerrat auf eine Änderung der RoHS-Richtlinie 2002/95/EG in Bezug auf die Verordnung über gefährliche Stoffe in Elektro- und Elektronikgeräten (RoHS-Recast). Das Europäische Parlament einigte sich gemeinsam mit dem Ministerrat darauf, den Geltungsbereich der Richtlinie bis zum 22. Juli 2014 (Art. 24) einer Überprüfung zu unterziehen. Um die in Artikel 1 festgelegten Ziele zu erreichen, soll gemäß Artikel 6 der Richtlinie die Liste der Stoffe, insbesondere die Liste der Stoffe in Erwägungsgrund 10, einer eingehenden Bewertung unterzogen werden. Berater der Kommission schlagen in diesem Kontext zum wiederholten Male eine lange Liste von Stoffen für eine neuerliche Überprüfung vor, obwohl letztere bei der Annahme der Richtlinie vom Parlament entschieden abgelehnt wurde.

Kann die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang die folgenden Fragen beantworten:

1. Was gedenkt die Europäische Kommission zu tun, um das Ergebnis der lang und gründlich geführten Diskussion über die Neufassung der RoHS-Richtlinie zu respektieren und insbesondere dem Wunsch des Europäischen Parlaments, keine lange Liste vorzulegen, nachzukommen?
2. Wie gedenkt die Kommission, im Rahmen der RoHS-Richtlinie — zum Beispiel durch die Schaffung einer langen Liste von Stoffen — unnötige wirtschaftliche Schäden zu vermeiden? Hat die Kommission im Zusammenhang mit der RoHS-Richtlinie oder anderen Teilen der Gesetzgebung eine Untersuchung unter den Stakeholdern vorgenommen, die die wirtschaftlichen Auswirkungen der zu überprüfenden aufgelisteten Stoffe darlegt.
3. Haben die Kommission oder die Berater der Kommission berücksichtigt oder in ihre Überprüfung miteinbezogen, welche Auswirkung der angedachte Ansatz einer langen Liste auf den transatlantischen Handel hat?
4. Wie steht die Europäische Kommission zu der Forderung des Europäischen Parlaments nach einer Vereinfachung der Umsetzung der RoHS-Richtlinie und der Vermeidung von Doppelgleisigkeiten im Hinblick auf REACH?
5. Aus welchem Grund wurden die Stakeholder nicht von Beginn an in die Entwicklung der Methodik der Berater miteinbezogen? Beschäftigt die Kommission ihre Berater mit dem gleichen Grad an Transparenz, welcher auch seitens des Parlamentes und Rates erwartet wird?

Antwort von Herrn Potočník im Namen der Kommission
(1. Oktober 2013)

Bei der von dem Herrn Abgeordneten angesprochenen Liste handelt es sich um ein Inventar von Stoffen in elektrischen und elektronischen Geräten (EEG), das nur den Ausgangspunkt des Überprüfungsprozesses bildet. Es handelt sich nicht um eine lange Liste von Stoffen, die einer Neubewertung unterzogen werden.

Die Arbeit der Kommission zur Überprüfung des Geltungsbereichs der Richtlinie erfolgt in drei Stufen: Erstellung eines Inventars, Bestimmung der vorrangig zu berücksichtigenden Stoffe durch eine Vorbewertung und Bewertung nur derjenigen Stoffe, die sich als vorrangig herausgestellt haben.

Alle Legislativvorschläge der Kommission werden vor der Annahme und der Weiterleitung an die Mitgesetzgeber einer strengen Folgenabschätzung unterzogen.

Das Inventar der chemischen Stoffe in elektrischen und elektronischen Geräten ist ein erster Schritt in diesem Prozess. Die Vorgehensweise ist mit den Interessenträgern, die von Beginn an in das Projekt eingebunden waren, eingehend erörtert worden. Die Durchführung des Projekts ist transparent, und alle diesbezüglichen Informationen sind allgemein zugänglich ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/rohs_eee/review/index_en.htm

Bei der Vorbewertung werden alle verfügbaren REACH-Informationen berücksichtigt, wobei insbesondere auf die Kriterien für Altgeräte gemäß Artikel 6 Absatz 1 eingegangen wird; insofern wird eine Doppelgleisigkeit im Hinblick auf REACH vermieden.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-009664/13
to the Commission**

Paul Rübzig (PPE)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: Review of the directive on the restriction of the use of certain hazardous substances (RoHS Directive)

In December 2010 the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers agreed on an amendment to the Restriction of Hazardous Substances Directive 2002/95/EC with respect to the use of hazardous substances in electrical and electronic equipment (RoHS recast). The European Parliament agreed with the Council to subject the scope of the directive to review by 22 July 2014 (Article 24). With a view to achieving the objectives set out in Article 1 of the directive, Article 6 lays down that the list of substances, in particular the list of substances in recital 10, shall be subject to a thorough assessment. The Commission's advisers are once again proposing, in this context, a long list of substances for re-evaluation, although this was decisively rejected by Parliament when the directive was adopted.

The Commission is requested to answer the following questions in this connection:

1. What action does the European Commission intend to take in order to respect the outcome of the long and thorough discussion of the recast of the RoHS Directive and in particular to comply with the European Parliament's wish that a long list of substances should not be presented?
2. How does the Commission intend to prevent unnecessary economic damage arising in the context of the RoHS Directive — for example as a result of drawing up a long list of substances? Has the Commission conducted an assessment amongst stakeholders, in the context of the RoHS Directive or other sections of the legislation, to show the economic impact of the substances listed for review?
3. Has the Commission or its advisers considered or included in their review the impact which the proposed approach of a long list will have on transatlantic trade?
4. What is the Commission's position on Parliament's demands for the implementation of the RoHS Directive to be simplified and for duplication with regard to REACH to be avoided?
5. Why were stakeholders not brought in from the beginning in developing the methodology used by the advisers? Does the Commission insist on the same degree of transparency with its advisers as is expected from the Parliament and Council?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission

(1 October 2013)

The list referred to by the Honourable Member is an inventory of substances in electrical and electronic equipment (EEE) and only the starting point for the review process. It does not constitute a long list of substances for re-evaluation.

The Commission's work on the review of the scope of the directive is based on a three-step approach; producing an inventory, prioritising the substances through a pre-assessment and assessing only those substances that score high in the prioritisation.

All Commission legislative proposals are subject to rigorous impact assessment before adoption and dispatch to the co-legislators.

The inventory of chemical substances in EEE is the first step in its process. The approach has been discussed in great detail with stakeholders, which have been involved in the project from the very beginning. The project handling is transparent and all project information is publicly available. ⁽¹⁾

The pre-assessment step in the process takes all available REACH information into account and focuses on the waste related criteria listed in Article 6 (1), and therefore avoids any duplication with REACH.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/rohs_eee/review/index_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-009665/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(28. August 2013)

Betrifft: Anzahl und Kosten von Übersetzern

Im Jahr 2012 arbeiteten 1 474 Übersetzer im Übersetzungsdienst der Europäischen Kommission ⁽¹⁾.

1. Wie viele verbeamtete und zeitbedienstete Übersetzer beschäftigte der Dienst jeweils in den Jahren 2009, 2010 und 2011?
2. Welche Kosten fielen jeweils in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012 für die Übersetzung von Dokumenten durch den Dienst der Kommission an?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(17. September 2013)

Die Zahl der im Übersetzungsdienst der Kommission beschäftigten Übersetzer betrug 1 512 im Jahr 2009, 1 533 im Jahr 2010 und 1 494 im Jahr 2011.

Die Gesamtkosten der Übersetzung der Kommission in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012 betrugen jeweils etwa 330 Mio. EUR. Darin enthalten sind die Kosten für Übersetzer, Support/Verwaltungsaufgaben (wie Koordinierung, Fortbildung, Ressourcenmanagement, Informationstechnologie und Kommunikation) sowie Infrastruktur (Gebäude, Strom, Wasser usw.). Sie umfassen außerdem die Kosten für externe Übersetzung und externe Mitarbeiter.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/whoweare/translation_figures_de.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-009665/13
to the Commission**

Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: Number and cost of translators

In 2012, 1 474 translators worked in the Commission's translation service ⁽¹⁾.

1. How many officials and temporary staff were employed as translators in the service in 2009, 2010 and 2011?
2. What was the cost of document translation by the Commission service in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission

(17 September 2013)

The number of translators employed in the Commission's translation service was 1512 in 2009, 1533 in 2010, and 1494 in 2011.

The overall cost of translation in the Commission in each of the years 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 was approximately EUR 330 million. This figure includes the cost of translators, support/administrative services (such as coordination, training, resource management, information technology and communication), and infrastructure (buildings, electricity, water etc.). It also includes the cost of external translation services and external staff.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/whoweare/translation_figures_en.pdf

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-009666/13
till kommissionen
Christofer Fjellner (PPE)
(28 augusti 2013)

Angående: Brott mot lagstiftningen om hasardspel

Kommissionen har meddelat att den kommer att se över alla pågående förfaranden avseende överträdelser av lagstiftningen om hasardspel. Överträdelseförfaranden har pågått mot ett antal medlemsstater, bl.a. Sverige och Tyskland, sedan 2008.

För hasardspel på nätet och tekniska föreskrifter för spelautomater måste medlemsstaterna i enlighet med direktiv 98/34/EG meddela vilken nationell lagstiftning som gäller. Enligt detta förfarande granskar kommissionen sedan huruvida de nationella lagarna är förenliga med EU-lagstiftningen.

För att man ska kunna garantera en effektiv tillämpning av EU:s lagstiftning måste överträdelseförfaranden leda till sanktioner mot medlemsstater vars nationella lagstiftning om hasardspel står i strid med EU-lagstiftningen eller som inte i vederbörlig ordning underrättar kommissionen om sina respektive lagar.

1. Håller kommissionen för närvarande på att se över alla pågående överträdelseförfaranden, inbegripet de mot Sverige och Tyskland?
2. Om inte, planerar kommissionen att göra så under 2013, i enlighet med vad som meddelats av ansvarig kommissionsledamot?

Svar från Michel Barnier på kommissionens vägnar
(30 oktober 2013)

Kommissionen håller för närvarande på att se över alla pågående överträdelseförfaranden och klagomål inom området för speltjänster. I sitt meddelande En övergripande europeisk ram för onlinespel ⁽¹⁾, som antogs den 23 oktober 2012, tillkännagav kommissionen att den kommer att påskynda slutförandet av sin bedömning av nationella bestämmelser i de pågående överträdelseärendena och klagomålen och vidta åtgärder där så är nödvändigt. Efter antagandet av meddelandet kontaktade kommissionen medlemsstaterna mot vilka det finns pågående överträdelseförfaranden och klagomål ⁽²⁾ och begärde de rättsliga och (uppdaterade) faktauppgifterna som är nödvändiga för bedömning av om nationella bestämmelser om hasardspel är förenliga med EU-lagstiftningen. Kommissionen håller på att färdigställa sin bedömning och kommer att vidta nödvändiga åtgärder i rätt tid.

⁽¹⁾ KOM(2012) 596 slutlig.

⁽²⁾ Totalt utreder kommissionen mer än 75 registrerade fall av klagomål och överträdelseförfaranden mot 20 medlemsstater, de flesta i samband med onlinespel.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009666/13
to the Commission**

Christofer Fjellner (PPE)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: Gambling infringements

The Commission has announced a review of all pending infringement proceedings concerning gambling law. Infringement proceedings against a number of Member States, including Sweden and Germany, have been open since 2008.

With regard to online gambling and technical provisions for gambling machines, Member States have to notify their gambling laws in accordance with Directive 98/34/EC. Under this procedure, the Commission then scrutinises their conformity with EC law.

For the purposes of effective EC law enforcement, infringement proceedings must lead to sanctions against Member States whose national gambling provisions are in breach of EC law or which fail to notify the Commission of their respective laws as required.

1. Is the Commission currently reviewing all pending infringement proceedings, including those against Sweden and Germany?
2. If not, is the Commission planning to do so in 2013, as announced by the Commissioner?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(30 October 2013)

The Commission is currently reviewing all pending infringement proceedings and complaints in the area of gambling services. In its communication 'Towards a comprehensive European framework for online gambling' ⁽¹⁾, adopted on 23 October 2012, the Commission announced that it will accelerate the completion of its assessment of national provisions in the pending infringement cases and complaints and take enforcement action wherever necessary. Following the adoption of the communication, the Commission services contacted the Member States against whom infringement cases and complaints are open ⁽²⁾ and requested the legal and (updated) factual information necessary for the assessment of compatibility of national gambling rules with EC law. The Commission is now finalising its assessment and will take necessary action in due time.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 596 final.

⁽²⁾ In total, the Commission is investigating more than 75 registered complaints and infringement cases against 20 Member States, most of them in the area of online gambling.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-009667/13

za Komisijo

Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)

(28. avgust 2013)

Zadeva: Pravice žensk v državah vzhodnega partnerstva

Prihodnja ekonomska konkurenčnost in blaginja držav vzhodnega partnerstva sta močno odvisni od sposobnosti teh držav, da uporabijo svojo delovno silo, kar naj bi vključevalo povečano udeležbo žensk na trgu dela.

Podjetništvo med ženskami predstavlja dragocen vir rasti in novih delovnih mest. Zaradi tega je pomembno, da države vzhodnega partnerstva investirajo v podjetništvo med ženskami in omogočijo enostaven dostop do financiranja in večjo razpoložljivost programov mentorstva, usposabljanja in izobraževanja.

Kako Komisija prispeva k zagotavljanju ugodnejših pogojev za podjetnice?

Ali je Komisija v državah vzhodnega partnerstva sprožila posebne programe, ki bi bili namenjeni večanju števila žensk na trgu dela?

Odgovor g. Füleja v imenu Komisije

(23. oktober 2013)

Leta 2012 so bile v okviru indeksa politik za MSP ⁽¹⁾ („SME Policy Index“), ki poroča o napredku pri izvajanju akta za mala podjetja za Evropo v regiji vzhodnega partnerstva, partnerske države pozvane, naj razvijejo usmerjene politike in konkretne pobude v podporo podjetništvu med ženskami. Poleg tega je bila poudarjena potreba po izboljšanju statistike v podporo ustreznemu odločanju.

Sodelovanje med partnerskimi državami in državami članicami poteka v okviru posebnega odbora za MSP v okviru platforme vzhodnega partnerstva za gospodarsko povezovanje in zbliževanje s politikami EU. Poleg tega Komisija upravlja več projektov, katerih cilj sta izboljšanje enakosti spolov in krepitev vloge žensk, med drugim z izboljšanjem dostopa do poslovnih priložnosti in znanj.

V Armeniji na primer EU podpira t. i. klub oziroma omrežje poslovnih žensk. V Azerbajdžanu je podjetnicam na voljo usposabljanje o upravljanju manjših kreditov. V Gruziji je revnim kmetovalkam v gorski regiji Lentekhi zagotovljena podpora za izboljšanje kakovosti in trženja tradicionalnih ekološko pridelanih živil ter za ustanovitev lastnega malega podjetja. V Ukrajini sodelujemo z nacionalnim združenjem delodajalcev in zvezo sindikatov, da bi zagotovili ustrezno podporo materam, ki so se po starševskem dopustu pripravljene vrniti na delo.

Poleg tega sta programa Erasmus Mundus in Tempus velikemu številu žensk iz regije vzhodnega partnerstva omogočila študij in pridobivanje izkušenj na področju raziskav v EU ter tako izboljšala njihove poklicne možnosti.

⁽¹⁾ Mala in srednje velika podjetja.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009667/13
to the Commission**

Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: Women's rights in the Eastern Partnership countries

The future economic competitiveness and prosperity of the Eastern Partnership countries depend crucially on their ability to utilise fully their labour resources, which would involve the increased participation of women in the labour market.

Entrepreneurship among women represents a valuable source of growth and job creation. It is therefore important that the Eastern Partnership countries invest in entrepreneurship among women, as well as facilitate access to finance and ensure greater availability of mentorship schemes, training and education.

How is the Commission contributing to the creation of more favourable conditions for female entrepreneurs?

Has the Commission launched any specific programmes in Eastern Partnership countries which focus on increasing the number of women in the labour market?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission

(23 October 2013)

In 2012, the 'SME ⁽¹⁾ Policy Index' — reporting on progress in the implementation of the Small Business Act for Europe in the Eastern Partnership region — urged partner countries to develop focused policies and concrete initiatives in support of women's entrepreneurship. It also stressed the need for improved statistics to underpin corresponding decision making.

Cooperation among partner countries and Member States takes place within the framework of a dedicated SME Panel under the EaP Platform on 'Economic integration and convergence with EU policies'. The Commission also runs several projects aimed at improving gender equality and women's empowerment, including by improved access to business opportunities and skills.

In Armenia, for example, the EU supports the 'business women club/network'. In Azerbaijan, training is offered to women entrepreneurs on small credit management. In Georgia, poor women farmers in the mountain region of Lentekhi receive support to improve the quality and marketing of traditional organic food and start their own small business. In Ukraine, we work with the national Confederation of Employers and the Federation of Trade Unions to support mothers willing to go back to work after parental leave.

In addition, the Erasmus Mundus and Tempus programmes allowed a significant number of women from the Eastern Partnership region to improve their career perspectives thanks to study and research experience in the EU.

⁽¹⁾ Small and medium-sized enterprise.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009668/13
a la Comisión**

Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)

(28 de agosto de 2013)

Asunto: Acciones legales contra las compañías responsables del origen de la crisis financiera

El Fiscal General de los Estados Unidos, Eric Holder, aseguró en una entrevista concedida al diario *The Wall Street Journal* el pasado 20 de agosto que el Departamento de Justicia está ultimando la presentación de nuevas acciones legales contra las empresas del sector financiero que tuvieron responsabilidades en el origen de la crisis financiera.

Como ya pregunté cuando la fiscalía de Estados Unidos decidió presentar cargos contra determinadas agencias de calificación de crédito por la negligente calificación de bonos hipotecarios (cfr. pregunta E-001316/2013 de 7 de febrero), ¿va a promover la Comisión alguna iniciativa a nivel europeo en esta materia?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión

(25 de octubre de 2013)

En su respuesta a la pregunta E-001316/2013, la Comisión describió la Autoridad Europea de Valores y Mercados (en lo sucesivo, «AEVM») como la entidad supervisora de las agencias de calificación crediticia que desarrollan su actividad en la EU. La AEVM tiene todos los poderes de supervisión respecto de las agencias de calificación crediticia ⁽¹⁾. Por lo tanto, teniendo en cuenta las competencias que le han sido atribuidas, la AEVM es la autoridad competente que puede adoptar las medidas oportunas en materia de supervisión. Hasta la fecha, la Comisión no ha recibido información específica por lo que se refiere a la posible infracción del Reglamento ACC.

Además, el artículo 31 del Reglamento ACC prevé que la autoridad competente de un Estado miembro que considere que una agencia de calificación crediticia incumple el Reglamento y que esas infracciones son lo suficientemente graves y persistentes como para incidir de forma significativa en la protección de los inversores o en la estabilidad del sistema financiero de ese Estado miembro pueda solicitar que la AEVM suspenda el uso, con fines reglamentarios, de las calificaciones crediticias por las instituciones financieras. A la Comisión no le consta ninguna solicitud de este tipo hasta ahora.

⁽¹⁾ Reglamento (UE) n° 513/2011 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 11 de mayo de 2011, por el que se modifica el Reglamento (CE) n° 1060/2009 sobre las agencias de calificación crediticia (DO L 145 de 31.5.2011).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009668/13
to the Commission**

Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: Legal action against the companies whose actions gave rise to the financial crisis

In an interview with *The Wall Street Journal* on 20 August 2013, the United States Attorney General, Eric Holder, stated that the Department of Justice was putting the finishing touches to lawsuits against financial sector companies which played a role in bringing about the financial crisis.

As per my question of 7 February 2013 (E-001316/2013), drafted when the United States Department of Justice announced its intention to file lawsuits against certain credit rating agencies on the grounds of negligence concerning mortgage bond ratings, does the Commission intend to take any similar action in Europe?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(25 October 2013)

In its reply to E-001316/2013, the Commission described the role of the European Securities and Markets Authority (hereafter referred to as ESMA), as the supervisor of credit rating agencies operating within the EU. ESMA has all supervisory powers towards credit rating agencies ⁽¹⁾. Therefore, in view of its attributed competences, ESMA is the competent authority that can take supervisory action as appropriate. The Commission has to date not received specific information as regards potential violations of the CRA regulation.

Moreover, Article 31 of the CRA regulation provides for the possibility for a competent authority of a Member State to request ESMA to suspend the use of credit ratings for regulatory purpose by financial institutions, where it considers that there have been important breaches of the regulation and that these breaches have had a significant impact on the protection of investors or on the stability of the financial system in that Member State. To date, the Commission is not aware of any such requests.

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EU) No 513/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2011 amending Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009 on credit rating agencies, OJ L 145, 31.5.2011.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009669/13

an den Rat

Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(28. August 2013)

Betrifft: Anzahl und Kosten von Übersetzern im Rat

Der Sprachendienst des Rates beschäftigte Ende 2009 mehr als 650 Übersetzer ⁽¹⁾.

1. Wie viele verbeamtete und zeitbedienstete Übersetzer beschäftigte der Dienst jeweils in den Jahren 2010, 2011 und 2012?
2. Welche Kosten fielen jeweils in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012 für die Übersetzung von Dokumenten durch den internen Übersetzungsdienst des Rates an?

Antwort

(25. November 2013)

Die Zahl der Übersetzer in der Direktion Übersetzung des Rates ist leicht gesunken und belief sich im Jahr 2012 auf ungefähr 630.

Die Kosten für die Übersetzung von Dokumenten durch die Direktion Übersetzung des Rates betrugen in jedem der genannten Jahre ungefähr 130 Mio. EUR. In diesem Betrag sind die Kosten für die Übersetzer, die Unterstützungs-/Verwaltungsdienste (wie Koordination, Schulungen, Ressourcenverwaltung, Informationstechnologie und Kommunikation) und die Infrastruktur (Gebäude, Elektrizität, Wasser usw.) enthalten.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/contacts/languages-%281%29/the-language-service-of-the-council-general-secretariat.aspx?lang=de>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009669/13
to the Council**

Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: Number and cost of translators at the Council

At the end of 2009, the Council's language service employed more than 650 translators ⁽¹⁾.

1. How many officials and temporary staff were employed as translators in the service in 2010, 2011 and 2012?
2. What was the cost of document translation by the Council's in-house translation service in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012?

Reply

(25 November 2013)

The number of translators in the Translation Directorate of the Council has decreased slightly to reach approximately 630 in 2012.

The cost of document translation by the Translation Directorate of the Council in each of these years was approximately EUR 130 million. This figure includes the cost of translators, support/administrative services (such as coordination, training, resource management, information technology and communication), and infrastructure (buildings, electricity, water etc.).

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/contacts/languages-%281%29/the-language-service-of-the-council-general-secretariat.aspx?lang=en>

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009670/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(28. August 2013)

Betrifft: Anzahl und Kosten von Expertengruppen der Kommission

Im „Register der Expertengruppen der Kommission und anderer ähnlicher Einrichtungen“ ⁽¹⁾ werden gegenwärtig 787 aktive Expertengruppen geführt.

1. Wie viele aktive Expertengruppen gab es jeweils in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012?
2. Welche Kosten fielen in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012 durchschnittlich für die Einsetzung und laufenden Kosten einer Expertengruppe an?
3. Was waren die höchsten und die niedrigsten Kosten, die in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012 für die Einsetzung und laufenden Kosten einer Expertengruppe anfielen?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(8. Oktober 2013)

Das Register der Expertengruppen der Kommission und anderer ähnlicher Einrichtungen unterliegt ständigen Veränderungen; jede Woche werden Gruppen eingerichtet, aufgehoben, geändert, vorübergehend ausgesetzt oder reaktiviert. Die Anzahl der Gruppensitzungen sowie die laufenden Kosten der Gruppen hängen von verschiedenen Faktoren ab und variieren jährlich von Gruppe zu Gruppe.

In Anbetracht der vorstehenden Ausführungen ist die Kommission außerstande, für die Beantwortung einer schriftlichen Anfrage die langwierigen und kostspieligen Recherchen anzustellen, die erforderlich wären, um dem Herrn Abgeordneten die erbetenen Informationen über die Anzahl und die durchschnittlichen laufenden Kosten der aktiven Expertengruppen in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012 bereitzustellen.

Die Einsetzung einer Expertengruppe gehört zu den Verwaltungsaufgaben der Kommission und geht mit keinen zusätzlichen Kosten einher.

⁽¹⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm?Lang=DE>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009670/13
to the Commission**

Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: Number and cost of Commission expert groups

The 'Register of Commission Expert Groups and Other Similar Entities' ⁽¹⁾ currently lists 787 active expert groups.

1. How many active expert groups were there in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012?
2. In 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012, on average, what was the cost of setting up an expert group and what were the running costs?
3. In 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012, what was the highest and lowest cost of setting up an expert group and what were the highest and lowest running costs?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission

(8 October 2013)

The Register of Commission Expert Groups and Other Similar Entities undergoes constant changes; every week groups are created, removed, modified, put on hold or reactivated. The numbers of groups' meetings, as well as their running costs depend on different factors and vary greatly from one group to another and from one year to another.

In light of the above, the Commission cannot undertake, for the purpose of answering a written question, the lengthy and costly research that would be required to provide the Honourable Member with the information requested on the number and average running costs of active groups in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012.

Setting up an expert group is part of the Commission's administrative work and, as such, it does not entail additional costs.

⁽¹⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm?Lang=EN>

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009672/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 août 2013)

Objet: Bâtiments

La Commission européenne recueille les avis des citoyens, des entreprises, des ONG et des autorités publiques sur la manière de réduire l'incidence des bâtiments sur l'environnement et d'utiliser plus efficacement les ressources.

Les participants sont invités à s'exprimer sur les problématiques du secteur: rendre les bâtiments plus durables, créer des débouchés écologiques pour les entreprises, stimuler la demande, utiliser plus efficacement les matériaux, mesurer la performance environnementale des bâtiments via l'instauration de critères communs, l'accès aux données, etc. Ces avis devront tenir compte des différents impacts environnementaux de ce secteur en termes, par exemple, de consommation d'eau ou de production de déchets.

1. La Commission pourrait-elle indiquer quel est le calendrier prévu?
2. Quelles sont les pistes de la Commission en la matière?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočník au nom de la Commission
(16 octobre 2013)

La consultation publique s'est achevée le 1^{er} octobre. La Commission va maintenant analyser les résultats, traiter d'autres informations et préparer la communication qui devrait être adoptée au printemps 2014.

Les domaines examinés et faisant l'objet de la consultation publique sont disponibles à l'adresse suivante:
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/consultations/buildings_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009672/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 August 2013)**

Subject: Buildings

The Commission is seeking the views of members of the public, companies, NGOs and public authorities on ways of reducing the environmental impact of buildings and making more efficient use of resources.

Participants are being asked to express their views on problems facing the construction industry, for example how to make buildings more sustainable, create green markets for businesses, drum up demand, use materials more efficiently and measure the environmental performance of buildings by laying down common criteria, providing access to data, etc. They will have to take account of the ways in which buildings have an impact on the environment, for example through water consumption or the production of waste.

1. Can the Commission say when the public consultation will be completed?
2. What approach is it taking to these matters?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(16 October 2013)**

The public consultation on Sustainable Buildings closed on the 1st of October. The Commission will now analyse the results as well as process other information and prepare the communication, as announced in the Resource Efficiency Roadmap ⁽¹⁾, which should be adopted in spring 2014.

The consultation seeks to gather views and additional information on the possible introduction of EU wide measures to achieve better environmental performance of buildings. This includes topics such as resource use and related environmental impacts all along the life-cycle of buildings. Further information may be found on the Commission's website: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/consultations/buildings_en.htm

⁽¹⁾ COM(2011) 0571.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009673/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 août 2013)

Objet: Conséquences sur l'emploi du plan aérien

Mercredi 10 juillet 2013, la Commission européenne a annoncé un investissement de 600 millions d'euros destiné à désencombrer l'espace aérien européen.

1. Quel est l'objectif de l'opération?
2. Quelles sont les prévisions?
3. La Commission confirme-t-elle vouloir tripler la capacité et réduire de moitié les coûts de gestion du trafic aérien?
4. La Commission a-t-elle effectué une analyse sur les conséquences socio-économiques et plus précisément sur les pertes d'emplois?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(22 octobre 2013)

1. SESAR est un projet qui vise à moderniser et à améliorer les performances du système de gestion du trafic aérien (ATM) de l'UE. Il forme le pilier technologique du ciel unique européen. SESAR comprend trois phases pour définir, développer et diffuser des technologies et des procédures ATM innovantes et harmonisées. Le plan directeur ATM européen ⁽¹⁾ constitue la feuille de route pour la réalisation de ces trois phases.
2. La mise en œuvre du plan directeur va permettre le déploiement de technologies et de procédures ATM innovantes et harmonisées destinées à améliorer les performances du système ATM européen. La contribution financière proposée (600 millions d'euros) pour les activités de développement menées par l'entreprise commune SESAR va permettre de poursuivre le projet SESAR durant la période 2014-2020 et de mettre en œuvre le plan directeur dans les délais.
3. Le ciel unique européen a pour objectif, avec l'aide de SESAR, de tripler la capacité aérienne, de diminuer de moitié les coûts de gestion du trafic aérien, d'améliorer la sécurité dans un rapport de 1 à 10 et de réduire de 10 % les incidences de chaque vol sur l'environnement.
4. Selon de récentes estimations, la mise en œuvre en temps voulu du plan directeur devrait apporter 419 milliards d'euros au PIB de l'UE et créer quelque 328 000 emplois: 42 000 emplois dans le secteur du transport aérien, 116 000 emplois indirects et 170 000 emplois induits ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/transport/air/sesar/european_atm_en.htm

⁽²⁾ Étude de l'entreprise commune SESAR sur ses retombées macroéconomiques: <http://www.sesarju.eu/news-press/news/new-macroeconomic-study-sesar-mckinsey-873> (en anglais).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009673/13
to the Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: Impact of the Commission's air traffic management plan on employment

On Wednesday, 10 July 2013, the Commission announced a EUR 600 million investment to decongest European airspace.

1. What is the aim of the plan?
2. What is its expected outcome?
3. Can the Commission confirm that it wishes to triple airspace capacity and halve air traffic management costs?
4. Has the Commission analysed the socioeconomic implications, particularly with regard to job losses?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission

(22 October 2013)

1. SESAR is the EU's air traffic management (ATM) modernisation project and the EU's Single European Sky's (SES) technological pillar contributing to a better performing ATM system. It comprises a cycle of three processes that define, develop and deploy innovative and harmonised ATM technologies and procedures. The common roadmap for these processes is the European ATM Master plan ⁽¹⁾.
2. The implementation of the Master Plan will lead to the deployment of innovative and harmonised ATM technologies and procedures aiming at improving the performance of the European ATM system. The proposed financial contribution (EUR 600 million) to the SESAR development activities carried out by the SESAR Joint Undertaking will ensure the continuation of the SESAR cycle in the period 2014-2020 and the timely implementation of the Master Plan.
3. SES, with SESAR's contribution, aims to increase the current ATM systems' ability to handle three times more flights at half the current ATM costs, but also to increase safety by a factor of 10 and reduce by 10% each flight's impact on the environment.
4. Based on recent estimates, the timely implementation of the Master Plan is expected to contribute EUR 419 billion to the EU GDP generating some 328 000 jobs: 42 000 additional jobs in the air transport industries; 116 000 by indirect impacts and 170 000 by induced impacts ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/transport/air/sesar/european_atm_en.htm

⁽²⁾ SJU study on the macroeconomic impact of SESAR, <http://www.sesarju.eu/news-press/news/new-macroeconomic-study-sesar-mckinsey-873>

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009674/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(28 août 2013)

Objet: Traitement des déchets

La Commission européenne a annoncé hier de nouvelles mesures visant à lutter contre les transferts illicites de déchets des pays de l'Union européenne vers des pays en développement africains ou asiatiques. Ces mesures sont le résultat d'une consultation publique durant laquelle les parties intéressées se sont déclarées largement favorables à une législation plus stricte, notamment concernant les inspections des transferts.

1. Quel est le pourcentage et le nombre de tonnes des transferts de déchets effectués par les États membres à destination des pays en développement qui seraient contraires à la réglementation internationale?
2. Ces transferts sont-ils liés aux coûts de traitement et d'élimination pratiqués dans ces pays, nettement plus faibles que ceux pratiqués au sein de l'Union?
3. À quelles cadences se feront les inspections périodiques par les États membres, fondées sur les risques, couplées à un renforcement de la coopération entre les différentes autorités compétentes et une meilleure formation des inspecteurs?
4. Quels sont les avantages économiques directs escomptés par la Commission pour les États membres et les industriels, notamment par la suppression des coûts d'assainissement et de rapatriement des déchets illicites?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočník au nom de la Commission

(15 octobre 2013)

La proposition législative de la Commission visant à renforcer les inspections et l'application du règlement (CE) n° 1013/2006 concernant les transferts de déchets ⁽¹⁾ a été adoptée le 11 juillet 2013 et est actuellement examinée par les colégislateurs (le rapporteur du PE, le député européen Bart Staes).

1. Selon des estimations reposant sur une étude menée dans la majorité des États membres de l'UE par l'IMPEL (réseau de l'Union européenne pour l'application et le respect du droit de l'environnement), 20 % à 25 % des transports de déchets contrôlés sur la période 2008-2011 étaient illicites. En 2012, ce pourcentage a dépassé les 25 % ⁽²⁾. En 2011, une étude a estimé le tonnage des transferts illicites à plus de 2,8 millions de tonnes par an ⁽³⁾.
2. L'analyse d'impact de la Commission publiée avec cette proposition a établi que les différences très importantes de coûts font partie des principaux facteurs incitant au transfert illicite de déchets ⁽⁴⁾.
3. L'objectif de cette proposition est de renforcer la planification des inspections fondées sur les risques, en s'appuyant sur des dispositions spécifiques relatives à la coopération entre les différentes autorités, à la formation des inspecteurs et à la possibilité d'exiger des justificatifs auprès des exportateurs suspectés de transferts illicites de déchets. La fréquence des inspections fondées sur les risques devrait varier selon les États membres. Toutefois, dans l'ensemble de l'UE, les contrôles devraient augmenter. L'analyse d'impact de la Commission accompagnant cette proposition envisage un scénario prévoyant environ 20 000 inspections par an dans l'ensemble de l'UE.
4. Une réponse a été donnée par la Commission à la dernière question de l'Honorable Parlementaire dans la réponse à la question E-9004/2013.

⁽¹⁾ JO L 190 du 12.7.2006.

⁽²⁾ Pour de plus amples informations, veuillez consulter la page <http://impel.eu/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/impel-enforcement-actions-iii-year-1-final-report-amended-mn-080713.pdf>

⁽³⁾ Assessment and guidance for the implementation of EU waste legislation in Member States, BiPRO, 16 novembre 2011, <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/shipments/reports.htm>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/shipments/news.htm>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009674/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 August 2013)**

Subject: Waste processing

The Commission has announced measures to combat illegal waste shipments from EU Member States to developing countries in Africa and Asia. These measures reflect the outcome of a public consultation procedure during which stakeholders expressed broad support for stricter EU legislation, in particular on waste shipment inspections.

1. What percentage of waste shipments from Member States to developing countries contravene international rules and what is the total volume (in tonnes) of waste involved?
2. Are these shipments being made in order to take advantage of the significantly lower costs of waste processing and disposal in developing countries as compared to the EU?
3. How frequently will Member States carry out risk-based inspections, and will these inspections be backed by closer cooperation between competent authorities and better training of inspectors?
4. In the Commission's view, what direct economic benefits will accrue to Member States and industry, in particular through the avoidance of clean-up and repatriation costs?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2013)**

The Commission's legislative proposal to strengthen the inspections and enforcement of Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 on shipments of waste ⁽¹⁾ was adopted on 11 July 2013 and is now under consideration by the co-legislators (EP rapporteur, Bart Staes, MEP).

1. According to estimates based on a study carried out in the majority of EU MS by IMPEL, the European Union Network for the Implementation and Enforcement of Environmental Law, between 20-25% of transports containing waste that were inspected during 2008-2011 were illegal. During 2012, this rate increased to above 25%. ⁽²⁾ In 2011, a study estimated the tonnage of illegal shipments to more than 2,8 million tonnes per year. ⁽³⁾
2. The Commission's impact assessment published with the proposal found that such cost differences are among the most important drivers for illegal waste shipments. ⁽⁴⁾
3. The aim of the proposal is to increase risk-based inspection planning, backed up by specific provisions relating to cooperation between different authorities, training of inspectors and possibilities to require evidence from suspected illegal waste exporters. The frequency of risk-based inspections is expected to vary between Member States, however, in the EU as a whole these inspections are expected to increase. The Commission's impact assessment for the proposal mentions as a possible scenario around 20,000 inspections per year throughout the EU.
4. The Honourable Member's final question was answered by the Commission in its reply to Question E-9004/2013.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 190, 12.7.2006.

⁽²⁾ See <http://impel.eu/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/IMPEL-Enforcement-Actions-III-Year-1-FINAL-Report-amended-MN-080713.pdf> for more information.

⁽³⁾ Assessment and guidance for the implementation of EU waste legislation in Member States, BiPRO, 16 November 2011. <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/shipments/reports.htm>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/shipments/news.htm>

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009675/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 août 2013)

Objet: Autorisation de onze OGM

Selon l'association Inf'OGM, les États membres, réunis le jeudi 11 juillet 2013 au sein du Comité d'appel, n'ont à nouveau pas atteint de majorité qualifiée pour accepter ou rejeter trois propositions d'autorisation d'OGM présentées par la Commission européenne.

La réunion du Comité permanent de la chaîne alimentaire et de la santé animale n'avait en effet pas permis de trancher lors d'un précédent vote qui avait eu lieu le 10 juin. La France, notamment, avait voté contre ces autorisations. Suivant la procédure, les trois propositions avaient donc été présentées au Comité d'appel.

Ces demandes d'autorisation concernent plusieurs groupes de plantes génétiquement modifiées de Monsanto et destinées à être importées, transformées et utilisées pour l'alimentation humaine et animale, dont le maïs SmartStax et le pollen issu du maïs MON810 ⁽¹⁾. Inf'OGM souligne que «si la Commission européenne venait à autoriser ce pollen cet été, la question du miel contaminé ⁽²⁾ par du pollen issu de maïs MON810 serait — légalement du moins — réglée, sous couvert de respecter les règles d'étiquetage».

1. Quand la Commission arbitrera-t-elle ce dossier?
2. Où en sont les analyses et les conclusions provisoires?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(17 octobre 2013)

1. Après le vote du Comité permanent de la chaîne alimentaire et de la santé animale (CPCASA), les trois décisions ont été soumises à la commission de recours le 11 juillet 2013, qui n'a pas donné d'avis. Conformément au règlement n° 182/2011 ⁽³⁾, il appartient maintenant à la Commission de décider d'accorder l'autorisation.
2. Les organismes génétiquement modifiés (OGM) couverts par les trois décisions ont reçu un avis favorable de l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) ⁽⁴⁾.

De plus, la Commission a consulté l'EFSA à plusieurs reprises sur la pertinence des nouveaux arguments scientifiques portés à son attention au sujet de ces OGM et sur de nouvelles publications scientifiques. L'EFSA a conclu que ces données n'apportaient aucun élément scientifique nouveau qui n'ait pas été déjà pris en considération par le groupe OGM de l'EFSA, ou qui invalide les conclusions de son évaluation des risques précédente.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.actu-environnement.com/ae/news/OGM-mais-MON810-Monsanto-moratoire-arrete-16-mars-2012-Conseil-Etat-AGPM-UFS-Unaf-Greenpeace-18974.php4>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.actu-environnement.com/ae/news/etiquetage-pollen-miel-ogm-constituant-commission-europeenne-16626.php4>

⁽³⁾ Règlement (UE) n° 182/2011 établissant les règles et principes généraux relatifs aux modalités de contrôle par les États membres de l'exercice des compétences d'exécution par la Commission, JO L 55 du 28.2.2011, p. 13.

⁽⁴⁾ <http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2010-00928>.

(<http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2012-00988>).

(<http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2011-01130>).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009675/13
to the Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: Authorisation of eleven GMOs

According to the association Inf'OGM, the Member States, meeting on Thursday, 11 July 2013 in the Appeal Committee, again failed to achieve the qualified majority needed to approve or reject three proposals for the authorisation of GMOs which had been brought forward by the Commission.

No decision had been reached either in the vote at the previous meeting of the standing committee on the food chain and animal health, held on 10 June. France, in particular, had voted against the authorisations. In line with procedure, the three proposals had thus been submitted to the Appeal Committee.

The requests for authorisation relate to several groups of Monsanto genetically modified plants intended for importation, processing and use in human foodstuffs and animal feeds, including SmartStax maize and the pollen from MON810 maize⁽¹⁾. Inf'OGM has stressed that if the Commission were to grant authorisation for that pollen this summer, the issue of honey being contaminated with pollen from MON810 maize⁽²⁾ would not arise — at least in legal terms — on the supposition that the rules on labelling had been respected.

1. When will the Commission reach a decision on this matter?
2. What is the state of play as regards the analyses and provisional conclusions?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(17 October 2013)

1. After the vote in the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health (SCFAH), the 3 decisions were submitted to the Appeal Committee on 11 July 2013, where no opinion was delivered. In accordance with the regulation (EU) No 182/2011⁽³⁾, it is now for the Commission to decide on the authorisation.

2. The Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) covered by the 3 decisions have received a favourable opinion from the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)⁽⁴⁾.

In addition, the Commission has consulted EFSA at different occasions on the relevance of new scientific arguments brought to its attention as regards these GMOs, and on new scientific publications. EFSA concluded that these do not bring any new scientific elements not having already been considered by the EFSA GMO panel, or that would invalidate the conclusions of its previous risk assessment.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.actu-environnement.com/ae/news/OGM-mais-MON810-Monsanto-moratoire-arrete-16-mars-2012-Conseil-Etat-AGPM-UFS-Unaf-Greenpeace-18974.php4>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.actu-environnement.com/ae/news/etiquetage-pollen-miel-ogm-constituant-commission-europeenne-16626.php4>

⁽³⁾ Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 laying down the rules and general principles concerning mechanisms for control by Member States of the Commission's exercise of implementing powers; L 55/13, 28.2.2011.

⁽⁴⁾ <http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2010-00928>
<http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2012-00988>
<http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2011-01130>

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009676/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 août 2013)

Objet: Perquisition Orange

La Commission européenne confirme avoir entamé le 9 juillet dernier des perquisitions chez certains opérateurs de services Internet, les soupçonnant d'abus de position dominante sur le marché de gros de la fourniture d'accès à Internet. Ce marché de l'interconnexion permet à des opérateurs de s'échanger du trafic pour maintenir notamment leur qualité de service auprès des internautes. On parle de peering.

1. Les perquisitions surprises portent-elles sur ce point?
2. Ces perquisitions sont-elles une étape préliminaire qui vise à recueillir des éléments dans le cadre d'une suspicion de pratiques anti-concurrentielles?

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

La Commission est en mesure de confirmer que le 9 juillet 2013, elle a procédé à des inspections inopinées dans les locaux de plusieurs entreprises de télécommunications fournissant des services d'accès à Internet dans plusieurs États membres. Elle craint que les entreprises concernées n'aient enfreint les règles de l'UE interdisant les abus de position dominante ⁽¹⁾.

Les acteurs d'Internet établissent entre eux des interconnexions au moyen d'un ensemble de services de gros afin de couvrir toutes les destinations possibles sur Internet. La connectivité Internet permet à des acteurs du marché (p. ex. des fournisseurs de contenus) de se connecter à Internet pour pouvoir fournir leurs services et produits au détail. Ce service est essentiel au fonctionnement d'Internet et pour permettre à l'utilisateur final d'accéder à des contenus en ligne indépendamment de la localisation du fournisseur et avec la qualité de service requise.

Les inspections inopinées constituent une étape préliminaire dans les procédures portant sur des pratiques anticoncurrentielles présumées. Le fait que la Commission organise ces inspections ne signifie pas que les entreprises sont coupables d'un comportement anticoncurrentiel et ne préjuge pas de l'issue de l'enquête proprement dite. Orange, l'une des entreprises concernées, a décidé de contester la légalité de l'inspection dans l'affaire T-402/13, qui est actuellement pendante devant la Cour.

⁽¹⁾ Voir http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-681_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009676/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 August 2013)**

Subject: Premises searched at Orange

The Commission has confirmed it carried out searches on 9 July 2013 on the premises of certain Internet service operators suspected of abuse of dominant position on the wholesale Internet access market. The connectivity market allows operators to exchange traffic in order to maintain the quality of their service to Internet users. This is known as peering.

1. Was this the motive for these surprise searches?
2. Were these searches a preliminary step in order to collect information in regard to suspected anti-competitive practices?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(25 October 2013)**

The Commission can confirm that on 9 July 2013, it carried out unannounced inspections at the premises of a number of telecommunications companies active in the provision of Internet connectivity in several Member States. The Commission has concerns that the companies concerned may have violated EU antitrust rules that prohibit the abuse of a dominant market position ⁽¹⁾.

Internet players interconnect with each other through a combination of wholesale services to cover all possible Internet destinations. Internet connectivity allows market players (e.g. content providers) to connect to the Internet so as to be able to provide their services or products at the retail level. This service is crucial for the functioning of the Internet and for end users' ability to access Internet content irrespective of the location of the provider and with the necessary quality of service.

Unannounced inspections are a preliminary step into suspected anticompetitive practices. The fact that the Commission carries out unannounced inspections does not mean that the companies are guilty of anti-competitive behaviour nor does it prejudice the outcome of the investigation itself. Orange, one of the companies concerned, decided to challenge the legality of the inspection in Case T-402/13 which is currently pending before the Court.

⁽¹⁾ See http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-681_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009678/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(28 août 2013)

Objet: Prévisions farfelues

La Cour des comptes européenne a passé au peigne fin les projets de construction et de rénovation de routes réalisés entre 2000 et 2013 dans certains pays d'Europe avec un soutien financier communautaire. Et les conclusions sont assez alarmantes sur l'utilisation des fonds européens.

Sur la période concernée, le Fonds européen de développement régional (FEDER) et le Fonds de cohésion ont mobilisé 65 milliards d'euros en cofinancement pour soutenir des projets d'infrastructures routières. La Cour s'est penchée sur une petite fraction d'entre eux, soit 24 chantiers d'envergure, plus de 3 milliards d'euros, en Allemagne, Grèce, Espagne et Pologne, pour déterminer si leurs objectifs avaient été atteints à un prix raisonnable. Il faut noter que ces quatre pays ont été retenus car ils ont drainé environ 62 % des fonds de l'Union alloués au cofinancement des routes entre 2000 et 2013.

Le principal point positif est que ces projets ont tous entraîné une réduction des temps de parcours et un renforcement de la sécurité routière. Mais tous n'ont pas la même légitimité économique. En moyenne, les coûts totaux par millier de mètre carré atteignaient 287 043 euros en Allemagne, mais 496 208 euros en Espagne, alors que rien n'indique que les coûts de main-d'œuvre puissent expliquer cette différence. En outre, les prévisions de trafic de la plupart des projets étaient loin de la réalité, ce qui a conduit à plusieurs options inappropriées, comme le choix d'une autoroute, bien plus coûteuse, à la place d'une voie express. Sur dix-neuf projets bénéficiant de données suffisantes pour effectuer des projections de trafic, les différences étaient inférieures de moins de 20 % par rapport aux prévisions pour cinq d'entre eux, de 21 à 50 % pour onze autres et de plus de 51 % dans les trois derniers cas! Il faut cependant noter que les plus gros écarts avec la réalité ont été constatés en Allemagne, et non en Europe du Sud ou en Pologne.

1. Quelle est la réaction de la Commission?
2. Par rapport au plan initial, l'augmentation des coûts a été de 23 % en moyenne: comment la Commission l'explique-t-elle?
3. Sur les vingt-quatre projets contrôlés, seuls sept ont été réalisés au prix initial, ou presque: comment expliquer ces écarts de coût incompréhensibles?
4. Comment expliquer des prévisions aussi farfelues? Comment éviter de tels écueils?

Réponse donnée par M. Hahn au nom de la Commission

(18 octobre 2013)

1. La conclusion générale de la Cour est que «les projets de construction routière contrôlés ont tous entraîné une réduction des temps de parcours et un renforcement de la sécurité routière», ce qui est l'objectif majeur des projets de construction routière cofinancés par l'UE et le rapport montre que cet objectif a largement été atteint.
2. Des projets complexes peuvent connaître des dépassements de coûts et des retards car les routes construites présentent des caractéristiques différentes. Les conditions géomorphologiques difficiles, la complexité de la conception et de la réalisation des projets, les aspects environnementaux, etc. doivent également être pris en considération dans l'évaluation de l'exécution des projets. L'Honorable Parlementaire est invité à consulter la Cour des comptes pour plus de détails sur les dépassements de coûts.
3. L'Honorable Parlementaire est invité à s'adresser directement à la Cour des comptes, dans la mesure où c'est la Cour qui a contrôlé ces projets spécifiques.

4. Selon la Commission, le rapport de la Cour ne conclut pas que les prévisions sont farfelues. Les transports sont une demande induite et dépendent fortement de la situation économique. Il se peut que la récession économique ait eu une incidence sur le niveau et la composition des flux de trafic qui devraient être soigneusement évalués, notamment le pourcentage de camions, d'autobus, de motocyclettes etc. Des facteurs externes, tels que le prix du pétrole, pourraient influencer le choix du mode de transport et le «trafic moyen journalier annuel» du projet. Les pics saisonniers pourraient également faire l'objet d'une évaluation. En outre, les projets d'infrastructure routière ont une durée de vie prévue d'environ 30 ans. Ainsi, les flux de trafic devraient idéalement être évalués sur l'ensemble de la durée de vie, et pas seulement sur les premières années d'utilisation. Les prévisions de trafic reposent sur cette perspective à long terme. Le rapport de la Cour présente les prévisions calculées sur une moyenne annuelle, tandis que les pics saisonniers pourraient être considérablement plus élevés.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009678/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 August 2013)

Subject: Ridiculous projections

The European Court of Auditors has taken a fine toothcomb to road building and renovation projects carried out between 2000 and 2013 in selected countries in Europe with the aid of subventions from the European Union. The conclusions reached about use of EU funds are fairly alarming.

During this period, the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the Cohesion Fund paid out EUR 65 billion in co-financing for road infrastructure projects. The Court has examined just a small fraction of these projects, namely 24 major — over EUR 3 billion — roadwork sites in Germany, Greece, Spain and Poland, to determine whether they had been successfully completed at a reasonable price. These four countries were chosen because between 2000 and 2013 they drained off approximately 62% of the EU's co-financing funds for roads.

The main positive point is that all these road projects have resulted in shorter driving times and enhanced road safety. But the same cannot be said of them all in financial terms. While total costs per 1 000 square metres averaged out at EUR 287 043 in Germany, they came to EUR 496 208 in Spain, with nothing to suggest that labour costs might account for this difference. Moreover, traffic projections for most of the projects were far from accurate, which led to inappropriate choices being made on several occasions, such as opting for a motorway, which is much more expensive, instead of an express way. Out of 19 projects where there was sufficient data for traffic projections, in only 5 cases were actual traffic figures less than 20% below the projected figures. In 11 cases the difference was 21% to 50% below the projected figures and in the last three cases the difference was more than 51% below projections! However it should be noted that the biggest discrepancies were found in Germany, not in southern Europe or Poland.

1. What is the Commission's reaction to this?
2. Costs rose by 23% on average above the original plans: how does the Commission explain this?
3. Only 7 of the 24 projects examined were completed at or near to their original cost: what is the explanation for these incomprehensible differences?
4. How can such ridiculous projections be explained? How can pitfalls like this be avoided?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(18 October 2013)

1. The Court's overall conclusion is that 'All audited road projects provided travelling time savings and improved road safety.' This is the major objective of EU co-financed road construction projects and the report shows that this objective has been largely achieved.
2. Complex projects may face cost and time overruns because the roads built have different characteristics. Difficult geomorphological conditions, complexity of project design and construction, environmental aspects etc. have to be taken into account when assessing the delivery of projects. The Honourable Member is invited to consult the Court of Auditors for more details about the cost overruns.
3. The Honourable Member is invited to address this question to the Court of Auditors, since the Court audited the specific projects.
4. The Commission does not consider that the Court's report concludes that projections are ridiculous. Transport is a derived demand and has a strong link with the economic situation. The economic slowdown may have affected both the level and the composition of traffic flows, which should be carefully assessed (percentage of lorries, buses, motorbikes, etc). External factors such as the fuel price may have an influence on transport choices and on the 'annual average daily traffic' of the project. Seasonal peaks should also be evaluated. In addition, road infrastructure projects have an expected lifetime of some 30 years. Thus, traffic flows should ideally be evaluated over the whole lifetime, and not only on the first few years of usage. Traffic forecasts take this longer perspective into consideration. The Court's report presents the forecasts measured on an annual average, while seasonal peaks may be significantly higher.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009679/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 août 2013)

Objet: Fichiers européens des coûts

Le censeur des comptes européens a procédé à plusieurs recommandations à la Commission pour mieux contrôler, à l'avenir, l'utilisation des fonds alloués.

1. Que pense la Commission de la proposition qui consiste à ce que l'exécutif communautaire comprenne pourquoi il existe de telles différences de coûts de construction entre États membres.
2. Ensuite, il est préconisé de subordonner les aides à l'existence d'objectifs clairs, mais aussi de mettre en œuvre les solutions techniques optimales, ce qui est loin d'être le cas. Quelle est votre réaction?
3. La Commission compte-t-elle examiner la possibilité de créer, à l'échelle de l'Union européenne, une base de données contenant des informations sur les prix unitaires à l'intention des ingénieurs chargés d'estimer le coût de nouveaux projets, afin d'aider les bénéficiaires à baisser le prix de leurs offres?

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

1. La Commission approuve cette recommandation. Elle a déjà lancé plusieurs études des coûts unitaires ces dernières années et continuera à le faire.
2. Les aides financières sont déjà subordonnées à l'existence d'objectifs précis et de solutions techniques optimales. Les projets routiers (comme tous les autres projets) doivent avoir des objectifs clairs s'accompagnant d'indicateurs appropriés, ce qui est déjà le cas pour les grands projets. De fait, pendant la période en cours, ces informations sont demandées dans la description des grands projets ainsi que dans l'analyse coûts/avantages. De plus, la sélection de solutions techniques efficaces par rapport au coût fait partie intégrante de l'étude de faisabilité de chaque grand projet, ce qui devrait aboutir au choix des meilleures solutions. Les propositions de la Commission relatives aux fonds structurels et d'investissement européens pour la prochaine période prévoient un cadre de performance global et une conditionnalité qui contribueront à ce que les futurs projets routiers soient subordonnés à des objectifs clairs accompagnés d'indicateurs.
3. La Commission examinera la question de la mise à disposition d'informations plus détaillées sur les coûts unitaires dans la mise à jour du guide de la Commission sur l'analyse coûts/avantages. Elle fait cependant remarquer que l'existence d'une telle base de données n'est pas un élément suffisant en soi pour réduire les prix des offres. Les coûts de construction dépendent de différents facteurs, tels que le profil de la route, les spécifications techniques et les normes, les pratiques en matière de passation de marchés et le mode de gestion de projet. En outre, les directives européennes concernant les marchés publics visent à garantir le respect du principe de concurrence loyale et ouverte dans l'ensemble de l'UE, tout en assurant le meilleur rapport qualité/prix.

La Commission renvoie également aux réponses pertinentes données par le rapport spécial de la Cour des comptes européenne concernant les routes. ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ (Rapport spécial n° 5/2013 http://www.eca.europa.eu/Lists/ECADocuments/SR13_05/SR13_05_FR.PDF).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009679/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 August 2013)**

Subject: EU cost files

The European Court of Auditors has made several recommendations to the Commission on how to improve monitoring in the future of how funds are used.

1. What does the Commission think of the suggestion that it should know why construction costs differ so much from one Member State to another?
2. Next, it recommends making financial aid dependent upon the existence of clear goals, and that optimal technical solutions should be implemented, which is far from being the case at present. What is the Commission's reaction to this?
3. Will the Commission examine the possibility of creating a database at EU level of information on unit prices, to be used by engineers estimating the cost of new projects, in order to help beneficiaries reduce the price of their tenders?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2013)**

1. The Commission agrees with this recommendation. It has already undertaken several unit cost studies in recent years and will continue to do so.
2. Financial assistance is already dependent on the existence of clear goals and optimal technical solutions. Road projects (as all other projects) should have clear objectives accompanied by appropriate indicators, which is already the case for major projects. In the current period, this information is required as part of the description of major projects, as well as of the cost benefit analysis. Furthermore, the selection of cost effective technical solutions is part of the feasibility study for each major project, which should result in selecting the best solutions. The Commission proposals for the European Structural and Investment Funds for the next period contain a comprehensive performance framework and conditionality which will help in ensuring that future road projects will contain clear objectives accompanied by indicators.
3. The Commission will consider the issue of making available more detailed unit cost information in the update of the Commission's Guide to cost benefit analysis. It notes however that the existence of such a database is not a sufficient element in itself to reduce tender prices. The cost of construction depends on various elements, such as road alignment, technical specifications and standards, procurement practices and project management modes. In addition, the EU Directives on public procurement aim to ensure the principles of fair and open competition throughout the EU, as well as ensuring the best value for money.

The Commission also refers to the relevant replies given to the Court's Special Report on Roads. ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ Special Report No 5/2013 http://www.eca.europa.eu/Lists/ECADocuments/SR13_05/SR13_05_EN.PDF

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009680/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(28 août 2013)

Objet: Panne sèche pour les voitures électriques

Faible autonomie, prix élevés, absence de bornes de chargement: le marché des voitures électriques ne décolle pas. Les chiffres de vente sont catastrophiques. La fontaine est tarie. La voiture électrique reste en panne dans les showrooms. En Belgique, pour les six premiers mois de 2013, à peine plus d'une centaine d'unités ont été immatriculées; 128 selon les chiffres communiqués par la Febiac. Un peu plus si on y tient compte des Kangoo utilitaires. Soit près de quatre fois moins qu'une année auparavant, sur la même période. Et encore, dans cette liste, on ajoute aux modèles purement électriques ceux qui bénéficient d'un moteur d'appoint, comme l'Opel Ampera, la Chevrolet Volt ou la Fisker Karma. Attention, les hybrides simples n'y sont pas. Elles connaissent, elles, un succès plus fort.

En mai dernier, il s'est vendu à peine 2 558 voitures électriques, selon un rapport de l'industrie. Ce qui représente 0,25 % seulement du marché automobile, et guère plus qu'un an auparavant (0,21 %). Moyenne minable que ne dépassent que la France (0,46 %), les Pays-Bas (0,59 %) et la Norvège, exception notable dans ce paysage désolé, avec 2,90 % de voitures électriques.

1. Comment la Commission explique-t-elle cette débâcle?
2. La Commission compte-t-elle changer la donne?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission

(17 octobre 2013)

Le volume total de ventes de voitures demeure globalement faible en raison de l'atonie de l'activité économique. En l'absence de systèmes de primes à la casse importants, la confiance des consommateurs ne semble pas rebondir. Cela devrait changer bientôt dès que la demande de remplacement de véhicules repartira. De plus, les mesures de stimulation de la demande dans les différents États membres devraient être la clé de l'orientation des préférences futures des consommateurs en termes d'achat, ce qui devrait aboutir à l'adoption par le marché de véhicules économes en énergie. Cependant, les voitures électriques sont en compétition directe avec d'autres véhicules à carburant alternatif ⁽¹⁾, représentant des segments du marché qui connaissent également une croissance, alors que les véhicules à moteur à combustion traditionnel profitent actuellement d'une diminution des prix du pétrole.

L'application du plan d'action CARS 2020 ⁽²⁾ est essentielle à cet égard. En particulier, le financement au niveau de l'UE ⁽³⁾ devrait assurer un investissement permanent dans la mise au point de technologies innovantes. Mais la Commission est attachée au principe de neutralité technologique. Cela dit, ces initiatives peuvent apporter les solutions technologiques susceptibles d'améliorer le développement des cellules électriques et de prolonger la vie des batteries, et donc d'accroître l'attractivité de la flotte de véhicules électriques. La mise en œuvre effective du paquet «Énergie propre pour les transports», ⁽⁴⁾ conjointement avec la bonne application des lignes directrices de la Commission relatives aux incitations financières pour des véhicules propres et économes en énergie ⁽⁵⁾, devrait avoir un effet supplémentaire de façonnement du marché qui accélérera la mise en place d'une infrastructure pour les carburants de substitution et l'introduction sur le marché de véhicules à carburant alternatif plus efficaces et accroîtra aussi la demande de voitures électriques.

⁽¹⁾ Par exemple propane, hydrogène, gaz naturel.

⁽²⁾ COM(2012) 636 final.

⁽³⁾ En tant qu'élément de l'initiative Horizon 2020 de la Commission et de l'instrument de partage des risques de la BEI.

⁽⁴⁾ COM(2013) 17 final.

⁽⁵⁾ SWD(2013) 27 final.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009680/13
to the Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: The electric car market — has it gone flat?

Short battery lives, high prices and a lack of charging points are combining to prevent the electric car market from taking off. Sales figures are dire, demand has dried up and the cars are sitting idle in showrooms. In Belgium, barely more than a hundred cars were registered in the first six months of 2013 — 128 according to the Belgian Automobile and Cycle Federation — a handful more if Kangoo vans are counted. That is just over a quarter of the number sold in the same period the previous year. What is more, that list includes not only purely electric cars, but also models with an ancillary power source, such as the Opel Ampera (known as the Chevrolet Volt in the US) or the Fisker Karma. It does not include hybrids, however, which are more successful.

In May 2013, according to an industry report only 2 558 electric cars were sold throughout Europe. That figure represents a mere 0.25% of total car sales, and only a tiny increase on the previous year's figure of 0.21%. Only three countries are bucking this pitiful trend: France (0.46%), the Netherlands (0.59%) and Norway, which is by far the best of a bad bunch (2.9%).

1. What is the Commission's explanation for this woeful state of affairs?
2. How does the Commission intend to reverse the trend outlined above?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission

(17 October 2013)

The total volume of car sales remains broadly depressed by the sluggish economic activity. In the absence of major scrapping schemes, consumer confidence does not seem to rebound. This is expected to change as soon as the replacement demand surges. Moreover demand stimulation measures in different Member States should be regarded as key for shaping future purchasing preferences of consumers, hopefully leading to the market uptake of energy-efficient vehicles. However, electric cars are in direct competition with other alternative fuel vehicles ⁽¹⁾, the segments that equally experience growth, while the vehicles with traditional combustion engines currently benefit from decreasing oil prices.

The implementation of the CARS 2020 Action plan ⁽²⁾ is central to the issue. In particular, the funding at EU level ⁽³⁾ should ensure continuous investment in the development of breakthrough technologies. The Commission, however, is attached to the principle of technological neutrality. That being said, these initiatives can bring about the necessary technological solutions that can improve both the development of electric cells and the life of batteries and thus increase the appeal of the electrical fleet. The effective implementation of the Clean Power for Transport ⁽⁴⁾ package, jointly with a correct implementation of the Commission Guidelines on financial incentives for clean and energy efficient vehicles ⁽⁵⁾, should bring about the additional market shaping effect accelerating the build-up of alternative fuel infrastructure, the market introduction of more efficient alternative fuel vehicles and spur the intensifying demand also for electric cars.

⁽¹⁾ e.g. propane, hydrogen, natural gas.

⁽²⁾ COM(2012) 636 final.

⁽³⁾ As a part of the Commission's Horizon 2020 initiative and EIB's Risk Sharing Instrument.

⁽⁴⁾ COM(2013) 17 final.

⁽⁵⁾ SWD(2013) 27 final.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009682/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 août 2013)

Objet: Conflit avec l'Amérique latine

Les présidents des pays du Mercosur font front commun. Tous ont soutenu l'initiative du Venezuela, de la Bolivie et du Nicaragua d'octroyer l'asile politique à Edward Snowden, écrivait le 15 juillet 2013 le quotidien *Kommersant*.

Les dirigeants sud-américains ont demandé aux États-Unis de cesser leurs activités d'espionnage cybernétique et menacé d'évoquer cette question lors d'une prochaine réunion du Conseil de sécurité de l'ONU. Pour le moment ces pays envisagent de rappeler leurs ambassadeurs en Europe.

Les chefs d'État sud-américains ont annoncé leur volonté d'accueillir l'analyste fugitif de la CIA lors du sommet du Mercosur à Montevideo. Ils ont notamment indiqué que l'asile constituait un «droit imprescriptible de tout pays que personne n'est en mesure de limiter ou d'enlever».

Le Mercosur est une entité économique et politique qui regroupe l'Argentine, le Brésil, l'Uruguay et le Venezuela — la Bolivie, la Colombie, le Pérou, le Chili et l'Équateur sont membres associés. L'objectif de l'organisation consiste à promouvoir le commerce libre et la circulation des marchandises, des populations et des devises entre les États-membres.

Les leaders du Mercosur jugent les actions des États-Unis pour obtenir l'extradition d'Edward Snowden comme «révoltantes et inacceptables». Après l'incident à propos de l'avion du président bolivien, les membres du Mercosur ont décidé de rappeler pour consultation leurs ambassadeurs en Espagne, en France, en Italie et au Portugal. Ces diplomates ne reviendront à leurs postes qu'après des excuses officielles de la part de l'Europe.

1. Quelle est votre réaction face à la demande adressée par les autorités sud américaines aux États Unis?
2. Quelle est votre réaction au rappel de plusieurs ambassadeurs sud américains en Europe vers leur pays d'origine?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(17 octobre 2013)

Après la révélation des activités présumées de surveillance menées par l'Agence de sécurité nationale des États-Unis et portant atteinte aux droits des citoyens européens, l'Union européenne et les États-Unis d'Amérique ont mis en place un groupe de travail ad hoc pour traiter les questions relatives à la protection des données qui relèvent de la compétence de l'UE. La première réunion s'est tenue les 22 et 23 juillet derniers, à Bruxelles. Une autre réunion devrait être organisée à Washington au cours des prochaines semaines. La Commission européenne fera rapport au Conseil et au Parlement européen en octobre. Dans ce contexte, la Commission ne voit pas la nécessité de s'exprimer sur les demandes adressées par des pays tiers.

À la suite du sommet de juillet à Montevideo, les dirigeants du Mercosur ont convenu de rappeler temporairement, à des fins de consultation, leurs ambassadeurs bilatéraux auprès d'un certain nombre de pays européens. Les pays du Mercosur n'ont pas rappelé leurs ambassadeurs auprès de l'UE. La Commission tient à souligner qu'elle entretient des relations de longue date, étroites et solides avec tous les partenaires d'Amérique latine et des Caraïbes de l'Union européenne.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009682/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 August 2013)

Subject: Dispute with Latin America

The *Kommersant* newspaper of 15 July 2013 reported that the presidents of the Mercosur countries were united in their support for the decision of Venezuela, Bolivia and Nicaragua to offer political asylum to Edward Snowden.

The South American leaders have called on the United States to end its online espionage activities and threatened to raise the question at a future meeting of the UN Security Council. They are currently envisaging the recall of their ambassadors from Europe.

At the Mercosur Summit held in Montevideo, South American Heads of State announced their willingness to shelter the fugitive CIA analyst, arguing that the inalienable right of every State to grant asylum could be neither restricted nor curbed.

Mercosur is an economic and political entity composed of Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay and Venezuela, while Bolivia, Colombia, Peru, Chile and Ecuador are associate members. Its purpose is to promote free trade and the movement of goods, people and currency between its member countries.

Mercosur leaders have condemned as repugnant and inadmissible efforts by the United States to obtain the extradition of Edward Snowden. Following the incident involving the aircraft carrying the Bolivian President, its members decided to recall for consultation their ambassadors from Spain, France, Italy and Portugal and not allow them to return until such time as official apologies are forthcoming from Europe.

1. What view do you take of the demand addressed to the United States by the South American authorities?
2. What view do you take of the recall of a number of South American ambassadors from Europe to their countries of origin?

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

Following the revelations of alleged US National Security Agency surveillance activities affecting the rights of EU citizens, the EU and the US established an ad-hoc working group to deal with data protection issues falling under the competence of the EU. The first meeting was held on 22-23 July in Brussels. Another meeting is to be scheduled in Washington in the coming weeks. The Commission will report to the Council and the Parliament in October. The Commission sees no need to express views on demands of third countries in this context.

Following the July Summit in Montevideo, Mercosur leaders agreed to temporarily recall their bilateral ambassadors to a number of European countries for consultation. Mercosur ambassadors to the EU were not recalled. The Commission wishes to stress that it has longstanding, broad based and solid relations with all Latin American and Caribbean partners of the Union.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009684/13
alla Commissione**

Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)

(28 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: Influenza aviaria nel Nordest Italia e fiere degli uccelli come veicolo potenziale di diffusione del virus. Possibili violazioni della normativa dell'Unione

Come riferito nella precedente interrogazione ⁽¹⁾, nel corso del corrente mese di agosto in tre allevamenti dell'Emilia Romagna ⁽²⁾ sono stati rilevati focolai del virus dell'influenza aviaria che hanno portato le autorità a sopprimere ben 732 000 galline ovaiole e tacchini, mentre in Veneto ⁽³⁾, in via preventiva, sono state sopprese 200 000 galline. Al fine di evitare il contagio, una delle precauzioni adottate dalle autorità competenti è stata di decretare il divieto di movimentazione di volatili vivi. In Italia in questo periodo hanno luogo diverse fiere degli uccelli che comportano la movimentazione di migliaia di volatili come i germani reali ⁽⁴⁾, anatra nella quale, stando ai dati del ministero della Salute, è stato più volte riscontrato il virus dell'influenza aviaria. Nonostante la situazione di emergenza, in Veneto domenica scorsa 25/8 si sono svolte le seguenti fiere degli uccelli: a Montebelluna (TV) e ad Annone Veneto (VE); le prossime si terranno il 1°/9 a Gaiarine (TV), l'8/9 a Cisano Bardolino (VR) e il 27/10 a Godega Sant'Urbano (TV). In Lombardia il 31/8 a Casnigo (BG), il 1°/9 a Bienno (BS) e a Cantello (VA) e l'8/9 a Gussago (BS). In Toscana il 31/8 a Ponte Cappiano (FI), il 7/9 a Santa Croce sull'Arno (PI), l'8/9 a Capannoli Valdera (PI), il 23/9 a Terranuova B. (AR), il 29/9 a Crespina (PI) e a Montopoli in Val D'Arno (PI), il 6/10 a Pian di Scò (AR) e il 21/11 a Santa Croce sull'Arno (PI). In Friuli Venezia Giulia si terrà una fiera il 1°/9 a Brugnera (PN) e a Cividale (UD), l'8/11 a Tricesimo (UD) e il 15/11 a Porcia (PN). Anche in Emilia Romagna erano previste fiere: il 7/9 a Brisighella (RA) e il 28/9 a Sant'Arcangelo di Romagna (RN) ma questa regione, l'unica in Italia, ha deciso di annullare questo tipo di manifestazioni.

Lo scrivente, in data 25 agosto, ha visitato la fiera di Montebelluna accertando l'assenza di controlli e la presenza di centinaia di uccelli selvatici e di allevamento, fra i quali decine di anatre molte delle quali appartenenti alla specie del germano reale. Molti degli espositori e dei venditori, nonché gli stessi visitatori, provenivano da fuori provincia e regione.

Può la Commissione riferire se queste manifestazioni sono compatibili con le norme dell'Unione in materia di prevenzione dell'aviaria e se ritiene di chiedere alle autorità italiane il blocco di queste rischiose movimentazioni di uccelli?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione

(14 ottobre 2013)

L'Italia sta applicando la normativa dell'UE ⁽⁵⁾ per controllare un recente focolaio di influenza aviaria ad alta patogenicità che è finora stato contenuto con successo nelle province di Ferrara e Bologna della regione Emilia Romagna. La direttiva prevede che si istituisca una zona di protezione avente un raggio di 3 km e una zona di sorveglianza avente un raggio di 10 km intorno a ogni focolaio confermato. In tali zone sono vietati fiere, mercati, esposizioni o altri raduni di pollame o altri volatili in cattività.

Le norme dell'UE non obbligano le autorità italiane a vietare fiere, mercati o altri raduni di pollame o altri volatili in cattività nel resto del territorio al di là delle zone di protezione e di sorveglianza istituite.

⁽¹⁾ Depositata in data 26 agosto 2013.

⁽²⁾ A Ostellato (FE), a Mordano (BO) e a Portomaggiore (FE).

⁽³⁾ A Occhiobello (RO).

⁽⁴⁾ Nome scientifico *Anas platyrhynchos*.

⁽⁵⁾ Direttiva 2005/94/CE del Consiglio, del 20 dicembre 2005, relativa a misure comunitarie di lotta contro l'influenza aviaria e che abroga la direttiva 92/40/CEE (GU L 10 del 14.1.2006, pag. 16).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009684/13
to the Commission**

Andrea Zaroni (ALDE)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: Bird flu in north-eastern Italy, propagation risk at live bird markets and possible infringement of EC law

As indicated in a previous question ⁽¹⁾, the bird flu virus was detected on three poultry farms in Emilia Romagna in August 2013 ⁽²⁾, leading to the destruction of 732 000 laying hens and turkeys, while in Veneto ⁽³⁾ 200 000 hens had to be destroyed as a preventive measure. One of the precautions taken by the authorities to avoid contagion was to prohibit the movement of live birds. In Italy, a number of bird markets are normally held over this period, involving the movement of thousands of birds such as the mallard ⁽⁴⁾, a species in which, according to the Health Ministry, the bird flu virus has been detected on a number of occasions. Despite the emergency, a number of bird markets were held in Veneto last Sunday, 25 August, at Montebelluna (TV) and Annone Veneto (VE), the next ones being scheduled for 1 September at Gaiarine (TV), 8 September at Cisano Bardolino (VR) and 27 October at Godega Sant'Urbano (TV). In Lombardy, they are scheduled for 31 August at Casnigo (BG), 1 September at Bienno (BS) and Cantello (VA) and 8 September and at Gussago (BS); in Tuscany, they are scheduled for 31 August at Ponte Cappiano (FI), 7 September at Santa Croce sull'Arno (PI), 8 September at Capannoli Valdera (PI), 23 September at Terranuova B. (AR), 29 September at Crespina (PI) and Montopoli in the Val D'Arno (PI), 6 October at Pian di Scò (AR) and 21 November at Santa Croce sull'Arno (PI); in Friuli Venezia Giulia, they are scheduled for 1 September at Brugnera (PN) and Cividade (UD), 8 November at Tricesimo (UD) and 15 November at Porcia (PN). Only Emilia Romagna, where markets have been scheduled for 7 September at Brisighella (RA) and 28 September at Sant'Arcangelo di Romagna (RN), has decided to cancel.

On 25 August, on visiting the Montebelluna market, the questioner noted the absence of any inspection procedures despite the presence of hundreds of wild and domestic fowl, including dozens of ducks and a large percentage of mallard, with many exhibitors, sellers and visitors coming from outside the province and region.

In view of this:

Can the Commission say whether the holding of these markets is in accordance with Community rules regarding the prevention of bird flu and will it call on the Italian authorities to halt the circulation of birds in this manner, given the risks involved?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(14 October 2013)

Italy is applying EU legislation ⁽⁵⁾ to control the recent outbreak of highly pathogenic avian influenza that has so far been successfully contained in the Provinces of Ferrara and Bologna in the Region of Emilia Romagna. The directive foresees the establishment of a protection zone of a 3km radius and a surveillance zone of a 10km radius around each confirmed outbreak. In these zones fairs, markets, shows or other gatherings of poultry or other captive birds are prohibited.

The EU rules do not oblige the Italian authorities to prohibit fairs, markets or other gatherings of poultry or other captive birds in the rest of the territory beyond the established protection and surveillance zones.

⁽¹⁾ Tabled on 26 August 2013.

⁽²⁾ At Ostellato (FE), Mordano (BO) and Portomaggiore (FE).

⁽³⁾ At Occhiobello (RO).

⁽⁴⁾ *Anas platyrhynchos*.

⁽⁵⁾ Council Directive 2005/94/EC of 20 December 2005 on Community measures for the control of avian influenza and repealing Directive 92/40/EEC (OJ L 10, 14.1.2006, p. 16).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009685/13

alla Commissione

Mario Borghezio (NI)

(28 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: Interventi rapidi di Frontex in Italia

In Italia si assiste all'afflusso di numerosi sbarchi di clandestini provenienti dal Nord Africa.

L'articolo 8 bis del regolamento Frontex relativo agli interventi rapidi sostiene che «su richiesta di uno Stato membro che si trovi a far fronte a pressioni urgenti ed eccezionali, specie in caso di afflusso massiccio alle frontiere esterne di cittadini di paesi terzi che tentano di entrare illegalmente nel territorio di tale Stato membro, l'Agenzia può inviare per un periodo limitato nel territorio dello Stato membro richiedente una o più squadre europee di guardie di frontiera ("squadre"), per la durata necessaria, in conformità dell'articolo 4 del regolamento (CE) n. 863/2007».

Vista la straordinarietà della situazione in cui versano le coste meridionali dell'Europa, in particolare quelle italiane, la Commissione è a conoscenza se l'Agenzia Frontex ha ricevuto da parte dello Stato italiano una richiesta di intervento rapido e/o di un rafforzamento dell'assistenza tecnica e operativa?

La Commissione promuove da sempre la solidarietà e la condivisione delle responsabilità tra Stati membri per quanto concerne la gestione dei crescenti flussi migratori. Tuttavia, la normativa vigente non le consente di imporre agli Stati membri quote vincolanti per l'ammissione dei migranti da accogliere.

La Commissione ha intenzione di introdurre tali vincoli? Nel frattempo, la Commissione come intende coniugare il cosiddetto «burden sharing» nonché il principio di solidarietà fra gli Stati dell'Unione europea se non vi è alcuna normativa che li regoli?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione

(4 novembre 2013)

Al fine di affrontare le condizioni d'instabilità nel Mediterraneo in modo efficace, FRONTEX ha riesaminato tutte le operazioni in corso, che coprono essenzialmente tutte le principali rotte migratorie nel Mediterraneo. Ciò ha determinato la proroga dei periodi di attuazione delle operazioni congiunte Hermes e AENEAS ospitate dall'Italia. Finora l'Italia non ha chiesto l'invio di squadre di intervento rapido alle frontiere, ma l'Agenzia è in contatto permanente con le autorità italiane al fine di valutare la situazione e fornire un'adeguata assistenza operativa. Per evitare ulteriori perdite di vite umane in mare, nel corso della riunione del Consiglio «Giustizia e affari interni» svoltasi il 7 e l'8 ottobre 2013 la Commissione ha proposto agli Stati membri l'avvio di una robusta operazione congiunta coordinata da Frontex nel Mediterraneo, volta a migliorare il monitoraggio, l'identificazione e infine il salvataggio delle imbarcazioni. Le modalità e l'incidenza sul bilancio di tale operazione devono ancora essere definite.

La Commissione non può imporre agli Stati membri contingenti obbligatori o limitare il numero di immigranti irregolari che dovrebbero essere ammessi nel territorio nazionale dopo la loro individuazione ai confini esterni o in acque internazionali. Tuttavia, essa ha ripetutamente invitato gli Stati membri ad agire in uno spirito di solidarietà e di condivisione delle responsabilità, promuovendo anche sistemi di ricollocazione volontaria per i rifugiati, che consentano di evitare che la capacità di accoglienza di uno Stato membro sia sollecitata oltre misura. Finora, un sistema di questo tipo è stato posto in atto solo per Malta.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009685/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(28 August 2013)**

Subject: Rapid intervention by Frontex in Italy

Numerous illegal immigrants from North Africa have been landing in Italy.

Article 8a of the Frontex Regulation concerning rapid intervention operations states that ‘at the request of a Member State faced with a situation of urgent and exceptional pressure, especially the arrival at points of the external borders of large numbers of third-country nationals trying to enter the territory of that Member State illegally, the Agency may deploy for a limited period one or more European border guard teams (hereinafter referred to as “teams”) on the territory of the requesting Member State, for the appropriate duration, in accordance with Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 863/2007’.

Given the exceptional situation along Europe’s southern coastline, particularly in Italy, does the Commission know whether the Frontex Agency has received a request from the Italian Government for rapid intervention and/or increased technical and operational assistance?

The Commission has always sought to encourage solidarity and shared responsibility between Member States in dealing with the growing influx of migrants. However, it is not, under current legislation, authorised to impose binding limits on the number of migrants who may be admitted into the Member States.

Does the Commission intend to introduce such limits? In the meantime, how does it intend to implement the principles of burden sharing and solidarity between EU Member States in the absence of any regulatory provisions?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(4 November 2013)**

In order to address the volatile situation in the Mediterranean effectively, Frontex has reviewed all ongoing operations, which are covering essentially all major migration routes across the Mediterranean Sea. This resulted in the extension of the implementation periods of Joint Operations Hermes and Aeneas hosted by Italy. Until now Italy has not requested the deployment of rapid border intervention teams, but the Agency is in permanent contact with the Italian authorities in order to assess the situation and provide for appropriate operational assistance. In order to further prevent loss of life at sea, the Commission has proposed to the Member States at the meeting of the JHA Council held on 7-8 October 2013, launching a robust Frontex-coordinated joint operation in the Mediterranean, focusing on better tracking, identification and thus eventual rescue of boats. Modalities and budget implication of such operation still have to be worked out.

The Commission cannot impose on Member States obligatory quotas or limit the number of irregular immigrants who should be admitted to their territory following their detection at the external borders or at international waters. However, it has repeatedly called on Member States to act in the spirit of solidarity and responsibility sharing, including promoting voluntary relocation schemes for refugees from Member States whose reception capacity is overstretched. To date, such a scheme has only been put in place for Malta.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009686/13

alla Commissione

Mario Borghezio (NI)

(28 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: Rifiuto della Turchia di concedere borse di studio ai manifestanti

Il notiziario online turco *Hurriyet* riferisce che, secondo quanto reso noto dal Kyk (l'ente pubblico incaricato di sostenere finanziariamente gli studenti meno abbienti), coloro che si impegnano in azioni di «resistenza, boicottaggio, occupazione, scrittura o pittura (in spazi pubblici) ovvero cantano slogan» non potranno ottenere borse di studio in quanto le citate attività violano «il diritto all'educazione».

Il testo della comunicazione riporta che non saranno idonei alla concessione del finanziamento non solo coloro che compiono atti di vandalismo volti a danneggiare gli spazi pubblici oppure atti di terrorismo, ovvero che si aggirano con oggetti che possano destare sospetto, ma anche coloro che semplicemente manifestano in maniera aperta qualche forma di protesta «nelle istituzioni educative frequentate, negli annessi quali dormitori studenteschi, fuori dalle sedi scolastiche e dai dormitori, individualmente o collettivamente».

Tutti i comportamenti specificati nel documento sono stati definiti come «violazioni del diritto allo studio».

È la Commissione a conoscenza della citata decisione da parte del Kyk?

Non ritiene la Commissione che un simile provvedimento leda i principi di libertà di associazione e di espressione?

Nella sua comunicazione COM(2012)0600 del 10 ottobre 2012 la Commissione sosteneva la necessità di rivedere la legge sulle manifestazioni.

Sa la Commissione se tale revisione è avvenuta?

Risposta di Stefan Füle a nome della Commissione

(28 ottobre 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza del regolamento del 2004 dello YURTKUR, l'ente che gestisce il credito e gli alloggi per gli studenti dell'istruzione superiore, modificato nel 2008, che stabilisce le condizioni per la cancellazione di borse di studio o prestiti a studenti implicati in atti penalmente perseguibili. Alla Commissione non risulta che siano state apportate ulteriori modifiche a tale regolamento.

La Turchia deve ancora rivedere e chiarire meglio l'applicazione della legge che regola le manifestazioni e i comizi. Il 30 settembre 2013 il primo ministro Erdoğan ha annunciato un pacchetto di misure di democratizzazione, tra cui modifiche alla suddetta legge che garantiscano un approccio più partecipativo nell'organizzazione delle manifestazioni. La Commissione continuerà a seguire da vicino la questione.

In generale, la Commissione sottolinea che la Turchia, in quanto paese che sta negoziando la una futura adesione all'UE, dovrà rispettare pienamente il diritto alla libertà di espressione, di riunione e di associazione, nel rispetto delle norme europee. Nella sua relazione 2013 sullo stato di avanzamento pubblicata il 16 ottobre ⁽¹⁾, la Commissione fornisce una valutazione dettagliata sul rispetto dei criteri politici da parte della Turchia.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009686/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(28 August 2013)**

Subject: Turkey's refusal to award study grants to demonstrators

The online news Turkish newspaper Hurriyet has reported that, according to Kyk (the public body responsible for providing financial support to low-income students), those who engage in any 'resistance, boycotts, sit-ins, graffiti or painting (in public areas), or who chant slogans' will not be able to obtain student grants, since such activities are in breach of 'the right to education'.

The text of the announcement states that not only will those who commit acts of vandalism to damage public areas, or acts of terrorism, or those who roam around with suspicious objects, be ineligible for grants, but so will those who simply protest openly, in some way, 'in educational institutions, in annexes such as student dormitories, or outside schools, universities or dormitories, either individually or collectively.'

All such types of behaviours set out in the document have been defined as 'violations of the right to education.'

Is the Commission aware of this decision by Kyk?

Does the Commission not agree that such a measure would infringe the principles of freedom of association and of expression?

In its communication COM(2012) 0600 of 10 October 2012, the Commission maintained that the law on demonstrations needed to be revised.

Does the Commission know whether such revision has taken place?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(28 October 2013)**

The Commission is aware of the 2004 regulation of Higher Education Credit and Hostels Institution (YURTKUR), amended in 2008, which stipulates the conditions under which scholarships or loans are to be terminated if the beneficiaries are involved in criminal acts. The Commission is not aware of any amendments made to this regulation.

Turkey still needs to revise and introduce clarity to the application of the law on demonstrations and meetings. Prime Minister Erdoğan on 30 September 2013 announced a set of democratisation measures which includes future amendments to the law to ensure a more participatory approach during the organisation of demonstrations. The Commission will continue to follow the issue closely.

On a general basis, the Commission underlines that Turkey, as a country negotiating future EU Membership, will need to fully respect the right to freedom of expression, assembly and association in line with European standards. The Commission has given a detailed assessment on respect for the political criteria in Turkey in its 2013 Progress Report published on 16 October ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009687/13

alla Commissione

Mario Borghezio (NI)

(28 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: Albania: compatibilità dello status di candidato ufficiale all'UE

Fonti di stampa rivelano che l'Albania potrebbe ottenere lo status di candidato ufficiale all'UE entro il prossimo dicembre. A tal fine si chiede:

1. L'Albania è vincolata agli impegni assunti nell'ambito dell'accordo di stabilizzazione e associazione (ASA) siglato nel 2006. La Commissione può specificare quali sono questi impegni e se sono effettivamente rispettati?
2. In quanto paese pre-candidato, l'Albania beneficia dal 2007 dei finanziamenti dello strumento di preadesione (IPA). A quanto ammontano tali finanziamenti e come sono stati utilizzati?
3. Dal 1992 l'Albania appartiene all'OCI (Organizzazione della cooperazione islamica) che ha come finalità la salvaguardia degli interessi e lo sviluppo delle popolazioni musulmane nel mondo. La Commissione non ritiene vi siano incongruenze con quelle che sono le radici cristiane dell'Europa?
4. È noto che la pubblica amministrazione albanese è stata il braccio operativo della politica e che in questi anni l'economia albanese si è retta in gran parte sullo scambio di favori con la politica e il «fai da te»: c'è quindi uno stretto legame politica-corruzione, come affermato dal neo-premier Edi Rama. Il PIL — oltre ad omettere che un'importante componente dell'economia nazionale era di provenienza illecita — sta rallentando, passando dal 6,1 nel 2008 all'1,8 % per il 2013. Oggi la crisi attraversa anche l'economia albanese: come intende la Commissione affrontare questo grave problema aggravato dal sistema di corruzione che vige in Albania?
5. In tema di criminalità organizzata e traffico di esseri umani, armi e stupefacenti, sono noti i rapporti dei criminali albanesi con quelli dei paesi confinanti (Italia compresa). Come intende la Commissione monitorare questa situazione?

Risposta di Stefan Füle a nome della Commissione

(25 ottobre 2013)

Gli accordi di stabilizzazione e associazione (ASA) individuano gli obiettivi comuni finalizzati a promuovere la stabilità politica, economica e istituzionale e la cooperazione regionale, gettando le basi per l'integrazione europea dei Balcani occidentali. Inoltre i suddetti accordi prevedono la creazione di una zona di libero scambio tra l'UE, i suoi Stati membri e i paesi interessati. Nel complesso, l'Albania sta attuando correttamente gli impegni assunti nell'ambito dell'ASA e, tra l'altro, ha ridotto o abolito i dazi all'importazione e all'esportazione e gli ostacoli al commercio come specificato nell'accordo.

In materia di politica estera, l'Albania si è sostanzialmente allineata alle posizioni degli Stati membri. L'Albania è uno Stato laico e mantiene una politica di buone relazioni interconfessionali, che si fonda sul rispetto e sulla tolleranza reciproci.

Per quanto concerne le preoccupazioni espresse dall'onorevole parlamentare in merito alla corruzione e alla criminalità organizzata, la Commissione lo rimanda alla relazione sui progressi compiuti dall'Albania ⁽¹⁾, in cui queste problematiche vengono affrontate in modo dettagliato.

Inoltre, nel dicembre 2012 il Consiglio ha individuato nell'Albania un paese prioritario per potenziare e razionalizzare la cooperazione nella lotta contro la tratta degli esseri umani. Nel quadro dello strumento di assistenza preadesione (IPA) la Commissione fornisce assistenza tecnica alle autorità albanesi, in particolare per migliorare le capacità in materia di applicazione della legge, protezione dei testimoni e controlli alle frontiere e la lotta contro il riciclaggio di denaro e la criminalità economica.

Ulteriori informazioni sull'IPA sono disponibili sul sito della Commissione ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/al_rapport_2013.pdf

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/instruments/funding-by-country/albania/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009687/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(28 August 2013)

Subject: Albania — deserving of official EU candidate status?

According to press reports, Albania could be awarded official EU candidate status by December. With this in mind, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is Albania bound by commitments under the Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) signed in 2006? If so, what are these commitments and have they been honoured?
2. Has Albania, as a pre-accession country, been receiving funding under the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA) since 2007? If so, how much funding has been awarded and how has it been used?
3. Albania has been a member of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) since 1992. The aim of that organisation is to protect the interests and the development of Muslim communities worldwide. Does the Commission not feel this to be out-of-keeping with the Christian roots of Europe?
4. The Albanian public administration is known to be the operational arm of politics and the Albanian economy has recently come to revolve around political favours and ad hoc politics, which means that politics is closely tied to corruption, as has been confirmed by the new premier, Edi Rama. GDP — besides not including a large slice of national product that is of illegal origin — is stalling, and has dropped from 6.1% in 2008 to 1.8% in 2013, with the crisis now also affecting the Albanian economy. How does the Commission intend to address this serious problem, which is being exacerbated by the corruption that reigns in Albania?
5. As regards organised crime and the trafficking of human beings, arms and drugs, it is well known that Albanian criminal networks have links with those in neighbouring countries (including Italy). How does the Commission plan to monitor that situation?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(25 October 2013)

The Stabilisation and Association Agreements (SAA) identify common objectives aiming at fostering political, economic and institutional stability and regional cooperation, setting the basis for the European integration of the western Balkans. Furthermore, they provide for the establishment of a free trade area between the EU and its Member States and the countries concerned. Overall, Albania is implementing well the commitments under the SAA, and, among other things, has reduced or abolished import and export duties and trade barriers as specified in the agreement.

In foreign policy matters, Albania has generally aligned with the positions of Member States. Albania is a secular state and maintains a policy of good interfaith relations based on mutual respect and tolerance.

As regards the concerns relating to corruption and organised crime raised by the Honourable Member, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its Progress Report on Albania ⁽¹⁾, which covers those issues in detail.

Albania has also been identified by the Council in December 2012 as a priority country for strengthening and streamlining cooperation in addressing trafficking in human beings. Under the instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) the Commission provides technical assistance to the Albanian authorities, notably to improve law-enforcement capacities, witness protection and border controls, and the fight against money laundering and economic crime.

Further information on IPA can be found on the web page of the Commission ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/al_rapport_2013.pdf

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/instruments/funding-by-country/albania/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009688/13

alla Commissione

Mario Borghezio (NI)

(28 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: Pericolo fondamentalisti

Il quotidiano serbo Nase Novine scrive che, recentemente, i servizi segreti serbi (Bia) hanno arrestato in un villaggio vicino ad Arandjelovac (50 km a sud di Belgrado) quattro presunti estremisti islamici wahabiti (il wahabismo è una delle correnti più fondamentaliste dell'Islam sunnita) e un militare serbo in pensione. Nella perquisizione della casa di quest'ultimo hanno trovato grandi quantità di armi automatiche, bombe e munizioni.

La Serbia ha ottenuto lo status di paese candidato all'UE: in vista di ciò, come intende la Commissione intervenire affinché questi focolai di estremisti islamici vengano debellati?

Risposta di Stefan Füle a nome della Commissione

(22 ottobre 2013)

La Commissione europea esercita un monitoraggio rigoroso sugli sviluppi relativi allo Stato di diritto registrati nei paesi candidati all'adesione, compresa la Serbia. Attraverso un'assistenza finanziaria specifica nell'ambito dello strumento di preadesione (IPA), la Commissione aiuta i paesi che aspirano ad aderire all'Unione ad allineare il diritto nazionale con la normativa UE in materia di giustizia, libertà e sicurezza, favorendo inoltre lo sviluppo delle loro capacità e competenze, in stretta collaborazione con gli Stati membri e con organismi specializzati quali Europol.

Per quanto riguarda il caso a cui si riferisce l'interrogazione, la Commissione è al corrente dell'arresto di presunti membri del movimento wahabita, all'inizio di agosto, nell'ambito di un'azione condotta dalla polizia serba nella parte centrale del paese. Alla Commissione risulta che la polizia e la magistratura serba stiano indagando su questi fatti.

La Commissione riferirà ulteriormente sulle questioni attinenti alla giustizia, alla libertà e alla sicurezza, compresa la lotta alla criminalità organizzata, nella relazione sui progressi compiuti dalla Serbia, che sarà pubblicata il 16 ottobre 2013.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009688/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(28 August 2013)**

Subject: Danger posed by fundamentalists

The Serbia daily newspaper 'Nase Novine' has recently reported the arrest by the Serbian secret services (BIA) of four suspected Islamic fundamentalists belonging to the Wahhabi (ultra-conservative Sunni) movement, together with a Serbian ex-serviceman, in a village close to Arandjelovac (50 km south of Belgrade). The ex-serviceman's home was found to contain large quantities of automatic weapons, bombs and ammunition.

Given that Serbia is now officially an applicant for EU accession, how does the Commission intend to ensure that such Islamic fundamentalist cells are effectively eradicated?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(22 October 2013)**

The European Commission closely monitors the developments in the area of the rule of law in EU-candidate countries including in Serbia. Overall, the Commission supports through dedicated financial assistance under the Instrument of Pre-accession (IPA) EU-aspiring countries to align their legislation with EU legislation on justice, freedom and security issues, as well as to develop their capacities and expertise, in close cooperation with EU Member States and expert bodies such as Europol.

Regarding the case mentioned, the Commission was informed about a Serbian police action in central Serbia in early August that led to the arrest of alleged members of the Wahhabi movement. The Commission understands that the Serbian police and judiciary are currently investigating the case.

The Commission will continue to report on justice, freedom and security issues, including the fight against organised crime, in the upcoming progress report on Serbia, to be released on 16 October 2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009689/13

alla Commissione

Mario Borghezio (NI)

(28 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: Moria di farfalle in Europa

Da uno studio dell'Agenzia Europea per l'Ambiente si deduce che se non si troveranno soluzioni per mantenere l'habitat delle farfalle, molte specie di esse potrebbero scomparire.

Il brusco calo delle farfalle si spiega in due modi: da un lato, gli insetti sono vittime dell'agricoltura intensiva che utilizza grandi quantità di pesticidi; dall'altro, il venir meno dell'allevamento in certe campagne fa scomparire le superfici di prato (favorevoli agli impollinatori) che vengono invase dal sottobosco e dagli alberi.

Come intende la Commissione intervenire in difesa dell'ecosistema, per la sopravvivenza delle farfalle nel territorio europeo?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione

(22 ottobre 2013)

La strategia dell'UE sulla biodiversità fino al 2020 ⁽¹⁾ predispone un quadro d'azione per arrestare e invertire la tendenza all'estinzione delle farfalle. Le azioni previste contrastano le pratiche agricole non sostenibili, l'utilizzo intensivo del suolo, la frammentazione degli habitat, le specie invasive e la perdita di biodiversità. L'elemento centrale della strategia è la piena attuazione della direttiva Uccelli ⁽²⁾ e della direttiva Habitat ⁽³⁾, soprattutto per quanto riguarda la gestione efficace dei siti Natura 2000, che prevede la conservazione di specie di farfalle a rischio di estinzione nell'UE. Circa il 40 % della rete terrestre di Natura 2000 è costituito da terreni agricoli.

La politica agricola comune offre agli Stati membri l'opportunità di attuare misure di sostegno alla biodiversità. Ad esempio, è stata ampliata la definizione di superficie di prato ammissibile ai pagamenti diretti per includere, nel prossimo periodo di finanziamento, un maggior numero di pascoli, che sono un habitat importante per le farfalle. L'inverdimento dei pagamenti diretti contribuirà a migliorare gli habitat sui seminativi nelle aree di interesse ecologico. I pagamenti aggiuntivi previsti nel quadro delle misure agro-ambientali dei programmi di sviluppo rurale possono incoraggiare gli agricoltori a propendere per scelte che tutelano la biodiversità e, quindi, le farfalle. Gli Stati membri inoltre sono tenuti ad adottare le misure necessarie per incentivare una difesa fitosanitaria a basso apporto di pesticidi, tramite la difesa integrata, che sarà obbligatoria dal 1° gennaio 2014 ⁽⁴⁾.

Altre priorità della strategia prevedono lo sviluppo di infrastrutture verdi, il ripristino degli ecosistemi e la proposta di un nuovo strumento legislativo sulle specie esotiche invasive ⁽⁵⁾. La strategia prevede inoltre azioni destinate a migliorare la conoscenza degli ecosistemi e dei relativi servizi (ad esempio per l'impollinazione), che dovrebbero avere effetti positivi sulla gestione dei terreni agricoli a vantaggio delle farfalle.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/comm2006/pdf/2020/comm_2011_244/1_IT_ACT_part1_v2.pdf

⁽²⁾ Direttiva 2009/147/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 30 novembre 2009, relativa alla conservazione degli uccelli selvatici.

⁽³⁾ Direttiva 92/43/CEE del Consiglio, del 21 maggio 1992, relativa alla conservazione degli habitat naturali e seminaturali e della flora e della fauna selvatiche (GU L 206 del 22.7.1992).

⁽⁴⁾ Direttiva 2009/128/CE del Consiglio, del 21 ottobre 2009, che istituisce un quadro per l'azione comunitaria ai fini dell'utilizzo sostenibile dei pesticidi.

⁽⁵⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/invasivealien/docs/proposal/it.pdf>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009689/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(28 August 2013)**

Subject: Butterfly mortality in Europe

A study by the European Environment Agency suggests that unless ways are found to maintain butterfly habitats, many species could be lost.

There are two explanations for the sharp decline in butterfly populations: firstly, butterflies are victims of intensive farming, which uses large quantities of pesticides; secondly, because farms have been abandoned in some rural areas, grasslands (favourable sites for pollinators) are gradually becoming overgrown with scrub and trees.

What will the Commission do to protect the ecosystem in order to ensure the survival of butterflies in Europe?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(22 October 2013)**

The EU 2020 Biodiversity Strategy ⁽¹⁾ provides a framework for action to halt and reverse the loss of butterflies in the EU. Relevant actions include addressing unsustainable agricultural practices, intensive land-use, habitat fragmentation, species decline and invasive species. At the core of the strategy is the full implementation of the Birds ⁽²⁾ and Habitats ⁽³⁾ Directives, especially the effective management of Natura 2000 sites, which provides for the conservation of butterfly species of EU conservation concern. About 40% of the terrestrial Natura 2000 network is farmland.

The Common Agricultural Policy provides opportunities to Member States to support biodiversity-related measures. The definition of grasslands eligible for direct payments has been widened, allowing the inclusion of more pasture land, an important habitat for butterflies, in the next financing period. Greening of the direct payments will provide opportunities to improve habitats on arable land in Ecological Focus Areas. Top-up payments under the agri-environment measure of Rural Development Programmes may also encourage farmers to opt for more biodiversity-orientated options that benefit butterflies. Moreover, Member States shall take the necessary measures to promote low pesticide-input management with integrated pest management which will be obligatory from 1 January 2014 ⁽⁴⁾.

Other relevant priorities under the strategy include the development of green infrastructure, restoration of ecosystems and the new proposed instrument on Invasive Alien Species ⁽⁵⁾. The strategy also foresees actions to improve our understanding of ecosystems and their services (e.g. pollination), which should also be beneficial to the management of farmland for butterflies.

⁽¹⁾ [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/comm2006/pdf/2020/1_EN_ACT_part1_v7\[1\].pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/comm2006/pdf/2020/1_EN_ACT_part1_v7[1].pdf)

⁽²⁾ Council Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds.

⁽³⁾ Council Directive 92/43/EEC, of 21 May 1992, on the protection of natural habitats and wild fauna and flora. OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

⁽⁴⁾ Council Directive 2009/128/EC of 21 October 2009 establishing a framework for Community action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticides.

⁽⁵⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/invasivealien/docs/proposal/en.pdf>

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009690/13

alla Commissione

Mario Borghezio (NI)

(28 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: Istituzione e competenza della Procura europea

Si stima che ogni anno l'Unione perde almeno 500 milioni di euro in entrate e spese per presunti casi di frode. Per non consentire l'impunità di coloro che derubano il contribuente europeo, la Commissione ha proposto di istituire una nuova Procura europea.

La nuova Procura europea avrebbe il compito di colmare le lacune esistenti tra i sistemi penali dei paesi europei, le cui competenze si arrestano ai confini nazionali, e gli organi dell'UE, che non hanno il potere di svolgere indagini penali.

La Procura sarà integrata nei sistemi giudiziari nazionali e dotata di procuratori europei delegati, che svolgeranno le indagini e avvieranno le azioni penali nel rispettivo Stato membro avvalendosi del personale nazionale e applicando le leggi nazionali. Un unico procuratore europeo garantirà che i singoli procuratori delegati seguano un approccio uniforme in tutti i paesi.

La Commissione non ritiene che con la Procura europea siano elusi i principi di sussidiarietà, di attribuzione e di proporzionalità (articolo 5 del TUE), rafforzati con il trattato di Lisbona?

Pare che, con l'istituzione della Procura europea, l'attuale Ufficio antifrode, l'OLAF, venga depotenziato e che non sarà più responsabile delle indagini amministrative nei casi di frode a danno dell'Unione o di ulteriori reati che ledono gli interessi finanziari dell'UE.

Perché la Commissione, anziché creare un ennesimo organo europeo rischiando di sovrapporre comunque competenze e deleghe, non potenzia il già esistente OLAF incaricandolo delle mansioni previste per la Procura europea?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione

(24 ottobre 2013)

Il trattato impone una protezione efficace ed equivalente degli interessi finanziari dell'Unione (articolo 325 del TFUE) e prevede la possibilità di istituire una Procura europea competente per individuare, perseguire e rinviare a giudizio gli autori di reati che ledono tali interessi (articolo 86 del TFUE). Il trattato stabilisce altresì che la Procura europea sia istituita a partire da Eurojust, il che suggerisce l'esistenza di uno stretto legame tra i due organi. Sulla base di queste disposizioni è evidente che il principio di attribuzione è rispettato purché venga dimostrata la necessità di un'azione a livello dell'UE, necessità sottolineata chiaramente nella valutazione d'impatto ⁽¹⁾ che accompagna la proposta della Commissione.

Il modello decentrato di Procura europea proposto dalla Commissione rispetta i sistemi giuridici nazionali: si basa sulle procure e sui servizi investigativi nazionali, richiede l'osservanza della legislazione nazionale e garantisce la competenza processuale degli organi giurisdizionali nazionali. La proposta pertanto riflette pienamente i principi di proporzionalità e sussidiarietà.

L'OLAF resterà responsabile delle indagini amministrative nei settori che esulano dalle competenze della Procura europea. Pur non svolgendo più indagini amministrative nei casi di frode a danno dell'Unione o di altri reati che ledono gli interessi finanziari dell'Unione, l'OLAF potrà prestare assistenza alla Procura europea, su richiesta di quest'ultima (come fa già attualmente con i pubblici ministeri nazionali).

⁽¹⁾ SWD(2013)274 del 17.7.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009690/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(28 August 2013)

Subject: Establishment and powers of the European Public Prosecutor's Office

It is estimated that each year the Union loses at least EUR 500 million in revenue and expenditure due to presumed cases of fraud. In order not to allow those who rob European taxpayers to go unpunished, the Commission has proposed setting up a new European Public Prosecutor's Office.

The new European Public Prosecutor would have the task of bridging existing gaps between the criminal justice systems of EU countries — whose powers stop at national borders — and EU bodies, which do not have the power to conduct criminal investigations.

The Public Prosecutor's Office will be incorporated into national legal systems and will have 'European Delegated Prosecutors', who will carry out investigations and will initiate prosecutions in the relevant Member State, making use of national staff and applying national laws. A single European Public Prosecutor will ensure that the individual delegated prosecutors take a uniform approach in all countries.

Does the Commission not agree that with the establishment of a European Public Prosecutor the principles of subsidiarity, conferral and proportionality (Article 5, TEU), as strengthened by the Treaty of Lisbon, will no longer be complied with?

It would appear that, with the establishment of the European Public Prosecutor, the current Anti-Fraud Office, OLAF, will be weakened and will no longer be responsible for administrative investigations in cases of fraud against the Union, or of further crimes which damage the financial interests of the EU.

Why does the Commission, rather than set up yet another European body with the risk of overlapping responsibilities and powers, not reinforce the existing OLAF and make it responsible for the tasks that have been allocated to the European Public Prosecutor?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(24 October 2013)

The Treaty requires an effective and equivalent protection of the financial interests of the EU (Article 325 TFEU) and foresees the possibility of establishing an EU Office with the competence to investigate, prosecute and bring to justice offences against these interests (Article 86 TFEU). The Treaty requires that the Office will be established from Eurojust which suggests close links between the two bodies. On the basis of these provisions it is clear that the principle of conferral is respected subject to demonstrating the need for action at the EU level. The Impact Assessment ⁽¹⁾ accompanying the Commission proposal illustrates the clear need for such an action.

The decentralised model of the European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO) proposed by the Commission respects national justice systems: it builds on national prosecution and investigation services, it requires compliance with national law and ensures that the offences will be dealt with by national courts in the trial phase. The proposal therefore fully reflects the principles proportionality and subsidiarity.

OLAF will remain responsible for administrative investigations in areas which don't fall within the competence of the EPPO. While OLAF will no longer carry out administrative investigations into EU fraud or other crimes affecting the financial interests of the EU, it may in the future provide assistance to the EPPO on request (as it already does today to national prosecutors).

⁽¹⁾ SWD(2013) 274, 17.7.2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-00969/ 1 3

alla Commissione

Mario Borghezio (NI)

(28 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: Costi della Procura europea

Circa l'istituzione della Procura europea, si apprende che l'intera struttura si avvarrà di risorse esistenti, per cui non dovrebbe comportare costi aggiuntivi rilevanti.

Inoltre, l'ufficio del pubblico ministero europeo deve avere una struttura decentrata costituita dalla procura europea, quattro procuratori europei e procuratori europei delegati, in ciascuno Stato membro.

La Commissione può specificare:

1. Quali sono i costi aggiuntivi non rilevanti ai quali si fa cenno?
2. Dove dovrebbe essere la sede centrale della Procura europea e quale struttura dovrebbe utilizzare?
3. Chi si assume i costi della struttura centrale e a carico di chi sono quelli delle strutture decentrate?
4. A carico di chi sono gli emolumenti dei vari procuratori?
5. Con quali criteri sono selezionati i procuratori europei delegati e non?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione

(29 ottobre 2013)

L'istituzione della Procura europea comporterà costi supplementari limitati per l'Unione o gli Stati membri, perché i suoi servizi amministrativi saranno gestiti da Eurojust e le sue risorse proverranno da organismi già esistenti come l'OLAF. La scheda finanziaria legislativa che accompagna la proposta della Commissione contiene maggiori particolari al riguardo ⁽¹⁾.

I rappresentanti degli Stati membri, riuniti a livello di capi di Stato o di governo a Bruxelles il 13 dicembre 2003, hanno fissato la sede della Procura europea a Lussemburgo, conformemente alle conclusioni della presidenza del Consiglio europeo.

Alla stregua degli altri organismi dell'Unione europea, la Procura europea avrà un bilancio proprio che ne coprirà le spese di esercizio, compresi i costi relativi agli uffici. Nel capo VII della proposta della Commissione figurano ulteriori dettagli sulla procedura di bilancio della Procura europea.

I procuratori europei delegati, i quattro sostituti e il personale di sostegno saranno soggetti allo statuto dei funzionari e al regime applicabile agli altri agenti. Le loro retribuzioni saranno coperte dal bilancio della Procura europea. I procuratori europei delegati manterranno il proprio status di pubblici ministeri nazionali, ma riceveranno un compenso per il lavoro svolto per la Procura europea.

Conformemente agli articoli da 8 a 10 del regolamento proposto, il procuratore europeo, i sostituti e i procuratori europei delegati devono riunire le condizioni richieste per l'esercizio delle alte funzioni giurisdizionali e possedere una grande esperienza in materia di azione penale.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2013)534, pag. 50.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-00969/ 13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(28 August 2013)

Subject: Cost of the European Public Prosecutor's Office

As regards the establishment of the European Public Prosecutor's Office, it has been stated that the entire structure will be based on existing resources, so should not result in substantial additional costs.

Furthermore, the European Public Prosecutor's Office is supposed to have a decentralised structure consisting of the European Public Prosecutor's office itself and four European Prosecutors and European Delegated Prosecutors in each Member State.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What exactly are the non-substantial additional costs mentioned?
2. Where is the European Public Prosecutor's Office likely to be based and what facilities will it use?
3. Who will bear the costs of the headquarters and who will bear those of the decentralised facilities?
4. Who will pay the salaries of the various prosecutors?
5. Under what criteria will the European Prosecutors and European Delegated Prosecutors be selected?

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

The European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO) will generate limited additional costs for the Union or the Member States as its administration services will be handled by Eurojust and its resources will come from existing entities such as OLAF. Further details are set out in the Legislative Financial Statement accompanying the Commission proposal ⁽¹⁾.

The Representatives of the Member States, meeting at Head of State or Government level in

Brussels on 13 December 2003 determined the seat of the European Public Prosecutor's Office in accordance with the conclusions of the Presidency of the European Council to be in Luxembourg.

Like any other European Union body, the EPPO will have its own budget which will cover the costs of its functioning, including the costs of the offices. Further details on the EPPO's budgetary procedure are set out at Chapter VII of the Commission proposal.

The European Delegated Prosecutors, the four deputies and support staff of the office will be under the provisions of the Staff Regulations and the Conditions for Employment of Other Servants. Their salaries will be paid from the budget of the Office. The European Delegated Prosecutors will keep their status as national prosecutors but will receive compensation for work done for the EPPO.

As foreseen by the proposed Regulation (Articles 8-10) the European Public Prosecutor, the Deputies and the European Delegated Prosecutors shall possess the qualification required for appointment to high judicial office and relevant prosecutorial experience.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2013) 534, page 50 and following.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009692/13

alla Commissione

Mario Borghezio (NI)

(28 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: Agrumi sudafricani contaminati da fitopatia CBS esportati in Europa

Recentemente è emerso il caso degli agrumi sudafricani affetti da fitopatia CBS («citrus black spot», o macchia nera degli alimenti).

Questi agrumi, circa il 50 % della produzione sudafricana, sarebbero esportati anche nell'UE e avrebbero quindi possibili ripercussioni sulla salute dei cittadini.

Si è appreso inoltre che l'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare (EFSA) avrebbe stilato una relazione sui reali rischi di contaminazione della CBS nell'area europea.

Pare però che l'Unione europea potrebbe essere più flessibile circa l'allentamento delle restrizioni imposte agli agrumi sudafricani.

La Commissione conosce i dettagli della relazione dell'EFSA circa la problematica degli agrumi sudafricani affetti da fitopatia CBS?

La Commissione può specificare:

- quali agrumi sono interessati da tale fitopatia?
- Quali potrebbero essere le conseguenze sulla salute dei cittadini?
- Qual è la posizione dell'UE circa le restrizioni di importazione di questi prodotti?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione

(14 ottobre 2013)

La macchiatura degli agrumi è una malattia fungina degli agrumi provocata dalla «Guignardia citricarpa». Questo fungo colpisce solo i frutti e le piante di agrumi e non ha conseguenze per la salute umana.

I portatori della macchiatura degli agrumi sono frutti come le arance, i limoni, i pompelmi o i mandarini.

Il territorio dell'UE è esente dalla macchiatura degli agrumi; l'introduzione di questa malattia nell'UE costituirebbe una grave minaccia per le aree di produzione degli agrumi. La legislazione dell'UE in materia di fitosanità, vale a dire la direttiva 2000/29/CE del Consiglio ⁽¹⁾, disciplina pertanto la macchiatura degli agrumi al fine di evitare la sua introduzione da paesi terzi e la sua diffusione nel territorio dell'UE.

Un'analisi del rischio fitosanitario della macchiatura degli agrumi è attualmente effettuata dall'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare al fine di valutare i requisiti UE attualmente vigenti. Si prevede che il parere dell'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare sarà espresso entro la fine del 2013. In base ai risultati di questa valutazione, se necessario, gli attuali requisiti fitosanitari saranno rivisti.

⁽¹⁾ GUL 169 del 10.7.2000, pag.1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009692/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(28 August 2013)

Subject: Exports to Europe of South African citrus fruit contaminated with the plant disease Citrus Black Spot

The issue has recently emerged of South African citrus fruit carrying the plant disease Citrus Black Spot.

The citrus fruit in question, which accounts for around 50% of South African production, is said to have been exported to areas including the EU, with potential repercussions for public health.

The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has drawn up a report on the actual risks of CBS spreading to Europe.

It would seem, however, that the EU might be considering greater flexibility as regards lifting the restrictions on South African citrus fruit.

Does the Commission know the details of the EFSA report concerning South African citrus fruit carrying the plant disease CBS?

Can the Commission specify:

- which types of citrus fruit carry that disease?
- what the consequences could be for public health?
- what the EU's stance is with regard to import restrictions on those products?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 October 2013)

Citrus black spot is a fungal disease of citrus caused by 'Guignardia citricarpa'. This fungus only affects citrus plants and fruits, and does not have any consequences for human health.

Citrus black spot may be carried by citrus fruit such as orange, lemon, grapefruit or soft citrus.

The EU territory is free from citrus black spot and its introduction into the EU would pose a serious threat to the EU's citrus-producing areas. Therefore, the EU plant health legislation, i.e. Council Directive 2000/29/EC ⁽¹⁾, regulates citrus black spot in order to avoid its introduction from third countries and spread within the EU.

A pest risk analysis of citrus black spot is being carried out by the European Food Safety Authority in order to evaluate the current EU requirements. The opinion of the European Food Safety Authority is expected to be delivered by the end of 2013. Based on the outcome of this evaluation, the current phytosanitary requirements will be revised, if needed.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 169, 10.7.2000, p.1.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009693/13

alla Commissione

Mario Borghezio (NI)

(28 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: Coltivazione e traffico di droga in Albania e in Europa

Al termine di una missione finalizzata alla localizzazione delle piantagioni di cannabis in Albania, si evidenzia che la coltivazione di marijuana in Albania è una vera e propria industria da miliardi di euro, dove solo nel villaggio di Lazarat, nel sud del paese, a ridosso del confine con la Grecia, il prodotto finito frutterebbe 4,5 miliardi di euro l'anno, poco meno del 50 per cento del PIL nazionale albanese.

Lazarat è un'unica area di produzione che da sola si estende su 319 ettari di terreno coltivati di cannabis, che producono oltre 900 tonnellate di prodotto finito che, immesse sul mercato europeo al prezzo al dettaglio pari a 5 euro al grammo, equivalgono a circa 4,5 miliardi di euro.

Il direttore generale della polizia albanese ha dichiarato che le forze dell'ordine albanesi sono intervenute distruggendo le coltivazioni in 108 piantagioni e che sono state arrestate 23 persone.

Come valuta la Commissione questa situazione in relazione al traffico di droga che coinvolge altri Stati membri dell'UE?

Visto che l'Albania potrebbe ottenere lo status di paese candidato ufficiale all'UE entro il prossimo mese di dicembre, come intende intervenire la Commissione?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione

(31 ottobre 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza della coltivazione di cannabis in Albania.

La Commissione non attua misure operative di contrasto, ma sostiene la cooperazione tra le autorità degli Stati membri nella lotta contro la criminalità organizzata e il traffico di stupefacenti. La Commissione sostiene inoltre le attività delle competenti agenzie dell'UE, quali Europol, Eurojust e Frontex, nel coordinare e assistere la cooperazione antidroga a livello transfrontaliero, in particolare mediante il ciclo delle politiche dell'UE volte a contrastare la criminalità organizzata e le forme gravi di criminalità internazionale, che vede tra le sue priorità il traffico di droga e i Balcani occidentali.

Una priorità della strategia dell'Unione europea in materia di droga 2013-2020 ⁽¹⁾ e del relativo piano d'azione 2013-2016 è la cooperazione con alcuni paesi candidati potenziali come l'Albania. La strategia e il piano di azione prevedono la cooperazione tra l'UE e i paesi candidati potenziali, segnatamente per quanto riguarda la condivisione dell'intelligence e lo scambio delle migliori pratiche, il potenziamento delle capacità di lotta agli stupefacenti e lo sviluppo di competenze nei paesi di origine e di transito.

Compiere ulteriori sforzi significativi nella lotta contro il crimine organizzato, in particolare conseguendo una solida serie di risultati in questo campo, è una delle priorità chiave formulate nella «Strategia di allargamento e sfide principali per il periodo 2013-2014» pubblicata il 16 ottobre. Il nuovo approccio al sistema giudiziario, ai diritti fondamentali e a giustizia, libertà e sicurezza contemplato nei quadri di negoziazione dei paesi candidati garantisce che lo Stato di diritto sia al centro dell'intero processo di adesione sin dalle prime fasi.

⁽¹⁾ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/it/12/st17/st17547.it12.pdf>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009693/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
 (28 August 2013)

Subject: Cultivation and trafficking of drugs in Albania and Europe

A mission to locate cannabis plantations in Albania has found growing marijuana in that country to be a billion-euro industry. In one village alone — that of Lazarat, in the south of Albania on the border with Greece — processed cannabis brings in EUR 4.5 billion each year, which is equivalent to a little under 50% of the GDP for the whole of Albania.

Solely in Lazarat, which is a single-crop area, there are 319 hectares under cannabis. These yield over 900 tonnes of a finished product that sells at EUR 5 per gramme on the European market, amounting to a total of EUR 4.5 billion.

The Chief Inspector of the Albanian Police Force has stated that the Albanian police have destroyed 108 plantations and made 23 arrests.

How does the Commission view this situation in the light of drugs trafficking involving EU Member States?

What action will it take in view of the fact that Albania could be awarded official EU candidate status by December?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
 (31 October 2013)

The Commission is aware of the cannabis cultivation taking place in Albania.

While the Commission itself does not undertake operational law enforcement measures, it supports the cooperation between Member States' authorities in combating organised crime and drug trafficking. It also supports the work of relevant EU agencies such as Europol, Eurojust or Frontex in coordinating and assisting cross-border anti-drug cooperation, notably within the EU policy cycle for organised and *serious international* crime, where drug trafficking and the western Balkans are among the current priorities.

The EU Drug Strategy 2013-2020 ⁽¹⁾ and its implementing Action Plan on Drugs (2013-2016) identify cooperation with potential candidate countries such as Albania as a priority. They envisage cooperation between the EU and potential candidate countries, notably concerning 'intelligence-sharing and the exchange of best practices' and the 'strengthening of counter-narcotics capacity and developing expertise of source and transit countries'.

Make further determined efforts in the fight against organised crime, including towards establishing a solid track record in this area is one of the key priorities set out in the 'Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2013-2014', published on 16 October. The new approach to judiciary and fundamental rights and justice, freedom and security in candidate countries' negotiating frameworks ensures that the rule of law is at the heart of the whole accession process from its earliest stages.

⁽¹⁾ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st17/st17547.en12.pdf>

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-009694/13

aan de Commissie
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(28 augustus 2013)

Betreft: Staatssteun aan exportkredietinstellingen

De Nationale Delcredere dienst ontving in 2011 1,2 miljard euro aan staatssteun. Zij zou hiervoor voldoen aan de voorwaarden uit artikel 87, lid 1 van het EG-Verdrag.

Naar aanleiding van een discussie over een exportkredietverzekering die de Nationale Delcredere dienst toekende aan een Belgische onderneming in opdracht van de Staat, verklaart de dienst dat de „betrokken beslissingen en bijhorende documenten kaderen in commerciële procédés en niet als administratieve beslissingen of het uitoefenen van openbare bestuursfuncties kunnen worden beschouwd.”

1. Wettelijk gezien is de Nationale Delcredere dienst een overheidsbedrijf maar in de praktijk voert zij commerciële procédés uit terwijl ze tegelijk een beroep doet op overheidssteun om haar bedrijfsuitgaven zelf te financieren. Voldoet de Delcredere dienst hiermee aan de voorwaarden uit art. 87, lid 1 van het EG-Verdrag?
2. Is de Commissie van oordeel dat de steunmaatregel op ernstige wijze de markt verstoort aangezien de Nationale Delcredere dienst commerciële procédés uitvoert, vergelijkbaar met private maatschappijen zoals Atradius en Coface, maar voor haar bedrijfsuitgaven, in tegenstelling tot de private maatschappijen, staatssteun en -garanties ontvangt?
3. Kan de Commissie duidelijkheid verschaffen over de juiste interpretatie van de wetgeving en over de toepassing ervan in andere Europese landen? Is de Commissie van oordeel dat het hier wel degelijk gaat om commerciële procédés en niet om administratieve beslissingen of het uitoefenen van openbare bestuursfuncties?
4. Is de Commissie, indien nodig, bereid een onderzoek in te stellen naar de concurrentievervalsing van de Nationale Delcredere dienst?

Antwoord van de heer Almunia namens de Commissie

(24 september 2013)

De Commissie acht het voor het goede functioneren van de interne markt van cruciaal belang om concurrentievervalsingen uit de weg te ruimen die in de sector exportkredietverzekering wordt veroorzaakt door staatssteun wanneer er concurrentie speelt tussen publieke of door de overheid gesteunde exportkredietverzekeraars en private exportkredietverzekeraars. De Commissie onderscheidt tussen verhandelbare en niet-verhandelbare risico's. Verhandelbare risico's zijn risico's waarvoor er in beginsel particuliere verzekeringscapaciteit beschikbaar is. Kortlopende exportkredietrisico's op debiteuren in alle lidstaten (behalve Griekenland) en in bepaalde OESO-landen zijn, in beginsel en in de huidige stand van zaken, verhandelbaar.

In haar mededeling van 2012 betreffende staatssteun in de sector kortlopende exportkredietverzekering ⁽¹⁾ geeft de Commissie de nodige aanwijzingen over hoe zij de artikelen 107 en 108 van het Verdrag in dit verband uitlegt en toepast in deze sector. Die mededeling legt vast welke voorwaarden vervuld moeten zijn wanneer publieke verzekeraars de markt voor exportkredietverzekering van verhandelbare risico's willen betreden. De Commissie heeft de beginselen voor overheidsoptreden in deze sector voor het eerst vastgelegd in haar mededeling van 1997 ⁽²⁾ (die nadien is gewijzigd en werd verlengd tot eind 2012). Indien de Nationale Delcredere Dienst verhandelbare kortlopende exportkredietrisico's verzekert, moet deze de desbetreffende mededelingen in acht nemen. Mocht de Commissie een klacht ontvangen dat onrechtmatige steun wordt verleend, dan zal zij deze onderzoeken in het licht van de inhoudelijke en procedurele regels op het gebied van staatssteun. Recentelijk heeft de Commissie twee diepgaande onderzoeken afgerond (die er na een klacht gekomen waren) over steun die Delcredere ⁽³⁾ en SACE BT ⁽⁴⁾ van hun respectieve publieke moedermaatschappijen hadden gekregen.

⁽¹⁾ PB C 392 van 19.12.2012, blz. 1.

⁽²⁾ PB C 281 van 17.9.1997, blz. 4.

⁽³⁾ Steunmaatregel SA.23420.

⁽⁴⁾ Steunmaatregel SA.23425.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009694/13
to the Commission
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
 (28 August 2013)

Subject: State aid to export credit agencies

In 2011, the Belgian export credit agency 'Nationale DelcredereDienst' received EUR 1.2 bn in state aid. It was claimed that it met the conditions for this laid down in Article 87(1) of the EC Treaty.

Following a discussion of export credit insurance which the Nationale DelcredereDienst extended to a Belgian undertaking on the instructions of the State, the Nationale DelcredereDienst has stated that 'the decisions concerned and the documents pertaining to them fall within the context of commercial procedures and cannot be regarded as administrative decisions or the performance of public administrative functions'.

1. From the legal point of view, the Nationale DelcredereDienst is a State undertaking, but in practice it engages in commercial procedures while at the same time using state aid to finance its commercial expenditure itself. Does the agency therefore meet the conditions laid down in Article 87(1) of the EC Treaty?
2. Does the Commission consider that the aid measure seriously distorts the market, bearing in mind that the Nationale DelcredereDienst engages in commercial procedures comparable to those carried out by private companies such as Atradius and Coface, but — unlike the private companies — receives state aid and State guarantees for its commercial expenditure?
3. Can the Commission indicate the correct interpretation of the legislation and its application in other European countries? Does the Commission consider that the procedures in question are indeed commercial procedures and not administrative decisions or the performance of public administrative functions?
4. Will the Commission, if necessary, investigate the distortion of competition by the Nationale DelcredereDienst?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
 (24 September 2013)

The Commission considers it essential for a well-functioning of the internal market to remove competition distortions due to state aid in the export-credit insurance sector where there is competition between public or publicly supported export-credit insurers and private ones. The Commission makes a distinction between marketable and non-marketable risks. Marketable risks are those for which in principle a private insurance capacity is available. Short-term export-credit risks related to debtors established within all the Member States (except Greece) and in certain OECD countries are, in principle and at present time, marketable.

In its 2012 Communication relating to state aid in the short-term export-credit insurance sector ⁽¹⁾, the Commission provides guidance about its interpretation of Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty and their application to this sector. It lays down the conditions that must be fulfilled when State insurers want to enter the export-credit insurance market for marketable risks. The Commission had first laid down the principles for State intervention in this sector, in its 1997 Communication ⁽²⁾ (subsequently amended and prolonged until end 2012). If the Nationale Delcredere Dienst insures marketable short term export-credit risks, it must comply with the relevant afore mentioned Communications. In case the Commission receives a complaint alleging the grant of unlawful aid, it will examine it in accordance with state aid substantive and procedural rules. Recently, the Commission has concluded two in depth investigations, which were initiated following a complaint, concerning support measures granted to Ducroire ⁽³⁾ and SACE BT ⁽⁴⁾ by their respective state-owned parent companies.

⁽¹⁾ OJ C 392, 19.12.2012.

⁽²⁾ OJ C 281, 17.9.97, p. 4.

⁽³⁾ SA.23420.

⁽⁴⁾ SA.23425.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-009695/13
alla Commissione**

Claudio Morganti (EFD)

(28 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: Treni acquistati dalla Regione Toscana

Rispondendo alla mia interrogazione E-009501/2012 dell'ottobre scorso sull'acquisto di alcuni treni da parte della Regione Toscana, la Commissione si impegnavo a prendere contatto con le autorità italiane per chiedere loro di fornire chiarimenti e informazioni supplementari sulla vicenda.

Nel frattempo, lo scorso luglio il TAR (Tribunale Amministrativo Regionale) del Lazio, accogliendo un ricorso presentato da una società concorrente, ha bloccato l'aggiudicazione dell'appalto alla società che era stata scelta in base ad un'indagine di mercato internazionale commissionata dalla Regione Toscana a Trenitalia.

Alla luce di questi nuovi sviluppi, può la Commissione indicare quali siano i risultati delle sue indagini in merito?

Può indicare inoltre se sia stata commessa una violazione della normativa europea in materia di appalti pubblici?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione

(1° ottobre 2013)

A seguito dell'interrogazione scritta n. E-009501/2012 dell'ottobre 2012, i servizi della Commissione hanno contattato le autorità italiane ai fini di un'indagine volta ad appurare se la procedura di acquisto di alcuni treni di Trenitalia sulla base di uno studio di mercato internazionale commissionato dalla Regione Toscana costituisse una violazione delle norme dell'UE in materia di aggiudicazione di appalti. Nel marzo 2013 le autorità italiane hanno informato i servizi della Commissione che tale procedura era stata chiusa senza aggiudicare l'appalto e che era stato deciso di includere l'acquisto dei dieci treni diesel in una procedura negoziata più ampia per la fornitura di 40 treni avviata da Trenitalia nel dicembre 2012.

Sulla base delle informazioni fornite dalle autorità italiane, la Commissione ritiene che quest'ultima procedura non violi le norme dell'UE in materia di aggiudicazione di appalti.

Per quanto riguarda le circostanze del luglio 2013 cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare, la Commissione non dispone di sufficienti elementi di informazione per poter formulare osservazioni.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-009695/13
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(28 August 2013)**

Subject: Purchase of trains — Region of Tuscany

In its answer to my Written Question E-009501/2012 of October 2012 on the Region of Tuscany's purchase of some trains, the Commission undertook to contact the Italian authorities and ask them to furnish further information and clarifications about the matter.

Meanwhile, in July 2013 the Regional Administrative Court in Lazio (the TAR) upheld an appeal brought by a rival company and stopped the award of the contract to the company chosen on the basis of an international market study commissioned by the Region of Tuscany from Trenitalia.

In light of these new developments, what have the Commission's investigations into the matter found?

Has EU legislation on public procurement been infringed in any way?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(1 October 2013)**

Following the Written Question E-009501/2012 of October 2012, the Commission's services took contact with the Italian authorities in order to investigate whether the procedure to purchase ten diesel trains on the basis of an international market study commissioned by the Region of Tuscany from Trenitalia was in violation of EU public procurement rules. In March 2013, the Italian authorities informed the Commission's services that this procedure had been closed without awarding a contract and that it had been decided to include the purchase of the ten diesel trains within a larger negotiated procedure for the supply of 40 trains launched by Trenitalia in December 2012.

On the basis of the information provided by the Italian authorities, the Commission does not consider that this latter procedure violates EU public procurement rules.

As for the events of July 2013 reported by the Honourable Member, the Commission does not have sufficient elements in hands to bring additional comments.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009696/13
a la Comisión**

Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)

(29 de agosto de 2013)

Asunto: Prospecciones petrolíferas en Canarias

El ministro de Industria, Energía y Turismo del Gobierno de España ha anunciado que Repsol iniciará en el segundo semestre de 2014 las prospecciones petrolíferas autorizadas en las costas de Lanzarote y Fuerteventura. Según ha comentado, los sondeos comenzarán una vez que el Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente apruebe la declaración de impacto ambiental, que se encuentra en periodo de información pública hasta el 25 de septiembre. Asimismo, ha indicado que en el caso de que en estos sondeos se hallara petróleo o gas, las extracciones podrían comenzar en el primer semestre de 2015.

En su respuesta de 5 de julio de 2013, la Comisión indicaba que sus servicios estaban clarificando con las autoridades españolas algunas decisiones relacionadas con las obligaciones previstas en la Directiva 94/22/CE sobre las condiciones para la concesión y el ejercicio de las autorizaciones de prospección, exploración y producción de hidrocarburos, tanto en relación con la aplicación general de dicha legislación en España como, más en concreto, con su aplicación respecto a los permisos otorgados.

¿Ha tomado la Comisión Europea alguna decisión al respecto? ¿Está analizando la Comisión Europea la posibilidad de que se pudiera vulnerar la legislación ambiental comunitaria de protección del medio marino?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión

(14 de octubre de 2013)

Como consecuencia de las denuncias dirigidas a la Comisión, relativas a la correcta aplicación de la Directiva 94/22/CE ⁽¹⁾ sobre las condiciones para la concesión y el ejercicio de las autorizaciones de prospección, exploración y producción de hidrocarburos en España, la Comisión ha examinado las cuestiones planteadas.

Basándose en la documentación y la información recibidas hasta el momento tanto de parte de las autoridades españolas como en el marco de las denuncias pertinentes antes citadas de entidades públicas y privadas, la Comisión no ha probado la existencia de una infracción de la legislación de la UE.

⁽¹⁾ Directiva 94/22/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 30 de mayo de 1994, sobre las condiciones para la concesión y el ejercicio de las autorizaciones de prospección, exploración y producción de hidrocarburos, Diario Oficial L 164 de 30.6.1994.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009696/13
to the Commission**

Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: Oil prospecting in the Canary Islands

The Spanish Ministry of Industry, Energy and Tourism has announced that Repsol has been given permission to begin oil prospecting off the coasts of Lanzarote and Fuerteventura in the second half of 2014. The Ministry says that drilling will start as soon as the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and the Environment has approved the Environmental Impact Statement, which is currently out for public consultation until 25 September 2013. It has also stated that should the exploratory drilling strike oil or gas, then extraction could begin in the first half of 2015.

In its answer of 5 July 2013, the Commission said that its services were clarifying with the Spanish authorities some of the decisions in relation to obligations under Directive 94/22/EC on the conditions for granting and using authorisations for the prospection, exploration and production of hydrocarbons, both as regards the general implementation of that legislation in Spain as well as, specifically, its application for the licences granted.

Has the Commission taken any decisions in this regard? Is it examining the possibility that this may breach EU environmental laws on the protection of the marine environment?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission

(14 October 2013)

Following complaints addressed to the Commission, regarding the correct application of Directive 94/22/EC ⁽¹⁾ on the conditions for granting and using authorisations for the prospection, exploration and production of hydrocarbons in Spain, the Commission has examined the issues raised.

Based on documents and information received so far from both the Spanish authorities and in the context of abovementioned relevant complaints from public and private entities, the Commission has not established any breach of EU legislation.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 94/22/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 1994 on the conditions for granting and using authorisations for the prospection, exploration and production of hydrocarbons, Official Journal L 164, 30/06/1994.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009697/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 Αυγούστου 2013)

Θέμα: Απάντηση της Επιτροπής στις ερωτήσεις μου E-005821/2010 και E-005858/2010

Σε γραπτή απάντηση στις ερωτήσεις μου με αριθμό E-005821/2010 και E-005858/2010, η Επιτροπή αναφέρει, μεταξύ άλλων, ότι:

1. Αποδοκιμάζει κάθε καταστροφή στη θρησκευτική και πολιτιστική κληρονομιά στο βόρειο τμήμα της Κύπρου.
2. Τον Μάρτιο του 2010, η Επιτροπή ξεκίνησε μελέτη στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος χρηματοδοτικής βοήθειας προς την τουρκοκυπριακή κοινότητα προκειμένου να εκπονηθεί ένας κατάλογος της ακίνητης πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς της Κύπρου σύμφωνα με κοινή μεθοδολογία.
3. Η Επιτροπή είναι πρόθυμη να εξετάσει αν μπορεί να παρασχεθεί περαιτέρω βοήθεια, αφού προηγουμένως ολοκληρωθεί με επιτυχία η μελέτη κατά τα τέλη του 2010.

Επειδή οι φωνές διαμαρτυρίας για καταπίεση των θρησκευτικών ελευθεριών και καταστροφή της πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς στο κατεχόμενο τμήμα της Κύπρου συνεχίζουν να αυξάνονται, καλείται η Επιτροπή, συμπληρωματικά προς την αρχική της απάντηση, όπως με ενημερώσει για τα ακόλουθα:

1. Θεωρεί ότι έχει έκτοτε υπάρξει οποιαδήποτε πρόοδος στο θέμα του σεβασμού της πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς και των θρησκευτικών ελευθεριών των εγκλωβισμένων χριστιανών στο κατεχόμενο τμήμα της Κύπρου;
2. Έχει ολοκληρωθεί η μελέτη της Επιτροπής για την ακίνητη πολιτιστική κληρονομιά στην κατεχόμενη Κύπρο, και ποια τα ευρήματά της;
3. Προφανώς η έκφραση αγαθών προθέσεων εκ μέρους της Επιτροπής δεν είναι αρκετή για επίλυση προβλημάτων. Ερωτάται, συνεπώς, η Επιτροπή, κατά πόσο είναι σήμερα σε θέση να υλοποιήσει την εκφρασθείσα πρόθεσή της για παραχώρηση περαιτέρω βοήθειας, τι είδους βοήθεια μπορεί να παραχωρήσει και μέχρι ποίου ύψους;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(23 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή θέτει τακτικά το θέμα της θρησκευτικής ελευθερίας στην τουρκοκυπριακή κοινότητα και θα συνεχίζει να το προβάλλει κατά περίπτωση, υπογραμμίζοντας την εξέχουσα σημασία του σεβασμού της ελευθερίας θρησκευματος και πεποιθήσεων.

Το 2010, η ΕΕ χρηματοδότησε μια μελέτη με θέμα την ακίνητη πολιτιστική κληρονομιά της Κύπρου μέσω του οικείου προγράμματος βοήθειας για την τουρκοκυπριακή κοινότητα και έπειτα από αίτημα του Κοινοβουλίου. Η μελέτη, ως συμβολή στο έργο της δικαιοδικής τεχνικής επιτροπής για την πολιτιστική κληρονομιά που λειτουργεί υπό την αιγίδα του ΟΗΕ, κατέληξε στη σύνταξη καταλόγου με περισσότερα από 2 300 μνημεία πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς, καθώς και την κατάρτιση περίπου 700 δελτίων/διαγραμμάτων απογραφής και τη διεξαγωγή 121 τεχνικών αξιολογήσεων, με ανάλυση της υφιστάμενης κατάστασης των μνημείων, και την κοστολόγηση της αποκατάστασής τους. Η μελέτη συνεκτίμησε τη σημασία και τον επείγοντα χαρακτήρα της απαιτούμενης αποκατάστασης.

Ακολουθώντας την εν λόγω μελέτη, οι ηγέτες των δύο κοινοτήτων συμφώνησαν σε έναν κατάλογο 40 μνημείων σε ολόκληρο το νησί όσον αφορά έργα προτεραιότητας ⁽¹⁾. Με βάση το έγγραφο αυτό, η δικαιοδική τεχνική επιτροπή προσδιόρισε το 2012 έντεκα θέσεις πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς, σε ολόκληρο το νησί, όπου πρέπει να ληφθούν επείγοντα μέτρα.

Βάσει του προγράμματος βοήθειας για το 2012 που αφορά την τουρκοκυπριακή κοινότητα, η ΕΕ διέθεσε 2 εκατ. ευρώ για τη στήριξη των δραστηριοτήτων της δικαιοδικής τεχνικής επιτροπής. Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί τις αποφάσεις της τεχνικής επιτροπής σχετικά με τα μνημεία που πρόκειται να αποκατασταθούν και να προστατευτούν. Χάρη στη χρηματοδότηση της ΕΕ, ολοκληρώθηκαν τον Απρίλιο του 2013 τα επείγοντα έργα για το τέμενος Δένειας/Denya.

Βάσει του προγράμματος βοήθειας για το 2013, η ΕΕ έχει δεσμευθεί να συνεχίσει τη στήριξη των εργασιών της εν λόγω δικαιοδικής επιτροπής με πιθανή περαιτέρω συνεισφορά ύψους 2 εκατ. ευρώ.

⁽¹⁾ Ο κατάλογος περιλαμβάνει 25 εκκλησίες, οκτώ τζαμιά, τρία λουτρά, το κάστρο της Αμμοχώστου/πύργου του Οθέλλου, ένα μοναστήρι, έναν μεντρεσέ, και ένα υδραγωγείο/μύλο.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009697/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 August 2013)

Subject: Questions E-005821/2010 and E-005858/2010

In its written answer to my questions E-005821/2010 and E-005858/2010, the Commission indicated that:

1. It deplored any damage to religious and cultural heritage in the northern part of Cyprus;
2. In March 2010, it had launched a study under the financial aid programme for the Turkish Cypriot Community to compile a list of immovable cultural heritage of Cyprus according to a common methodology.
3. It was ready to see if further assistance could be provided, once the first study had been successfully completed by the end of 2010;

In view of the constantly growing concern being expressed at the restriction of religious freedom and destruction of the cultural heritage in the occupied part of Cyprus, can the Commission provide the following additional information:

1. Does it consider that any progress has since been made regarding respect for the cultural heritage and religious freedom in the Christian enclaves of occupied Cyprus?
2. Has the Commission study concerning the immovable cultural heritage in occupied Cyprus been completed and what are its findings?
3. Clearly statements of good intentions by the Commission will not alone resolve any problems. To what extent therefore is it now able to live up to its undertaking to provide additional assistance? What would be the nature and amount of such assistance?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(23 October 2013)

The Commission regularly raises the issue of freedom of religion or belief with the Turkish Cypriot community and will continue to take up this issue as appropriate, stressing the paramount importance of respecting it.

In 2010, the EU financed a study on the immovable cultural heritage of Cyprus through its aid programme for the Turkish Cypriot community and at the request of Parliament. The study, in support of the bi-communal technical committee on Cultural Heritage operating under UN auspices, led to a list of more than 2 300 cultural heritage sites, the preparation of around 700 inventory charts and the carrying out of 121 technical assessments, analysing the current conditions of the monuments, and restoration costing needs. The study took into account the importance and the urgency of the needed restoration.

Following this study, both community leaders agreed on an island-wide list of 40 monuments for priority works ⁽¹⁾. Based on this document, the bi-communal technical committee identified, in 2012, eleven cultural heritage sites throughout the island in need of emergency measures.

Under the 2012 Aid Programme for the Turkish Cypriot community, the EU has provided EUR 2 million for the support of activities of the bi-communal technical committee. The Commission follows the decisions of the committee on the monuments to be restored and protected. Thanks to EU funding, emergency work was completed for the Deneia/Denya Mosque in April 2013.

Under the 2013 Aid Programme, the Commission is committed to continue supporting the work of the committee with a likely further contribution of EUR 2 million.

⁽¹⁾ The list includes 25 churches, eight mosques, three baths, the Famagusta citadel/Othello tower, one monastery, one madrasa, and one aqueduct/mill house.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009698/13
to the Commission
George Lyon (ALDE)
(29 August 2013)

Subject: Update: Enforcement of Directive 2008/120/EC on the protection of pigs — ban on individual sow stalls

Directive 2008/120/EC on the protection of pigs bans the use of individual sow stalls and requires that untethered sows be kept in groups for the first four weeks after insemination until the week before farrowing, as of 1 January 2013.

In its response to Written Question E-011604/2012, given on 20 February 2013, asking for an update on compliant Member States following the entry into force of the ban, the Commission stated that it 'expects more Member States to fully comply with group housing of sows within the coming months'.

The Commission's latest information published in August 2013 indicates that infringement proceedings have been initiated against nine Member States.

Can the Commission provide an update on what infringement proceedings have been initiated and what steps it can take to improve compliance?

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

With regard to which infringement procedures have been initiated the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Question E-3275/2013 ⁽¹⁾.

The Commission is currently assessing the answers given by the Member States to its letter requesting summaries of action taken on the issue of group housing of sows ⁽²⁾. Given the administrative procedure for infringements any further steps taken against a Member State or States may at the earliest occur in October 2013.

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

⁽²⁾ Council Directive 2008/120/EC laying down minimum standards for the protection of pigs; OJ L 47, 18.2.2009, p. 5.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-009699/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 août 2013)

Objet: PRISM pour le citoyen européen

1. Concernant l'affaire PRISM, la Commission voudrait-elle expliquer dans quelle mesure les législations américaines sont ou non en accord avec le droit international européen?
2. Voudrait-elle exposer, et ce sans détour, quelles sont les répercussions claires et précises du programme PRISM sur la protection de la vie privée des citoyens européens?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Reding au nom de la Commission

(30 septembre 2013)

La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à prendre connaissance de sa réponse à la question écrite E-007934/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009699/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 August 2013)

Subject: PRISM and EU citizens

1. With regard to PRISM, would the Commission please explain to what extent US laws either are or are not in line with EU international law?
2. Could the Commission state plainly what exactly are the repercussions of the PRISM programme for the privacy of EU citizens?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(30 September 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-007934/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009700/13
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclair (NI)
(29 August 2013)

Subject: Ricoh Arena

The Ricoh Arena is situated in Coventry, United Kingdom, and an ERDF sign is displayed on the building. This arena seems to be part of the Foleshill Gas Works ERDF project.

Coventry City Council received two ERDF grants in 2003 (GBP 4 750 000.00 plus VAT) in relation to the Foleshill Gas Works project. To my 'Freedom of Information' request submitted to Coventry City Council, I received a reply on 20 August 2013 stating: 'Coventry City Council received two ERDF grants. On the 29th August 2003 the Council received GBP 4,750,000.00 plus VAT to assist the purchase of the site from HBG Holdings Limited. This grant was not used for the construction of the arena'.

In a UK Government document on ERDF funding ⁽¹⁾, it is stated that 'ERDF funding was used to support eligible areas of economic development. This included the state-of-the-art exhibition and conference facilities, a number of public transport initiatives and also the development of pedestrian archways which were built under the railway line to provide better access for all to the arena and also to job opportunities which have been created due to the overall development'.

Could the Commission please confirm under what grounds an application was made for ERDF funding, and what the money was used for in relation to the Foleshill Gas Works project (where the Ricoh Arena is situated and the ERDF sign is displayed)? Could the Commission indicate the exact percentage of its support in relation to the other partners?

Does the Commission have a final audit of how the money was spent, and could it provide me with a copy of this information?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(16 October 2013)

The project, as funded through the West Midlands objective 2 programme was known as the 'Foleshill Gas Works Site, Coventry Arena project'. The passage cited by the Honourable Member was from the then Government Office's 'Celebrating Success' brochure.

The project was split between two priorities within the programme; Strategic Regeneration and Removing Barriers to Markets, Employment & Training.

The first of these priorities saw a European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) grant awarded solely towards the costs of the conference and exhibition activity within the Arena development and the associated land preparation and car parking costs. This was separate from the football stadium. The banqueting facilities are located beneath the football stadium and these costs were excluded from the total eligible expenditure.

The second priority awarded a grant to support the creation of two bus hubs which enabled two public transport initiatives to take place. These initiatives included the realignment of over 20 bus routes to improve the accessibility of the facilities — previously there had been no bus access. The route changes enabled local people to access the facilities and jobs that had been created. It opened up the former gasworks site, and particularly the Ricoh Arena, to bus transport.

The costs mentioned by the Honourable Member were the costs as originally foreseen. The actual total grant paid using ERDF funding came to GBP 4,614,348 (split GBP 4,028,677 and GBP 585,671 respectively) which represents a 15% rate of ERDF co-financing.

The Commission does not have a final audit report on this project.

⁽¹⁾ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/91905/ERDF_West_Midlands_celebrating_success_2000_to_2006_ERDF_programme.pdf

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-009701/13

до Комисията

Monika Panayotova (PPE)

(29 август 2013 г.)

Относно: Средствата за България през новия програмен период 2014—2020 г. по линия на европейските структурни и инвестиционни фондове

В българското публично пространство съществува разнопосочна информация по отношение на обема от средства, с които България ще разполага през новия програмен период 2014—2020 г. по линия на европейските структурни и инвестиционни фондове.

Съгласно индикативното разпределение на средствата, публикувано на страницата на Генерална дирекция „Регионална политика“ на ЕК, България следва да разполага със 7,1 млрд. евро за кохезия през новия програмен период (вкл. средствата за трансгранично сътрудничество, средствата по Инструмента за свързване на Европа, както и тези, заделени под формата на резерв). Следователно обемът от средства е номинално повече в сравнение с разполагаемия ресурс по седемте оперативни програми за периода 2007—2013 г. — общо 6,7 млрд. евро. Същевременно, обаче, настоящото българско правителство разпространява в публичното пространство непълна и неточна информация за обема от средства по линия на Кохезионната политика през новия програмен период, твърдейки, че той ще е по-нисък от гореспоменатите суми. Това от своя страна оказва негативно влияние върху общественото мнение и създава усещането за по-малко разполагаеми средства за българските граждани и България, което не отговаря на действителността.

Поради тази причина уточнението за индикативната сума, определена за България по линия на европейските фондове за периода 2014—2020 г. е изключително важно с оглед на високия процент на доверие и подкрепа на българските граждани и особено на младите хора към Европа — 70 % от младите хора в страната одобряват членството на България в ЕС, по данни към август 2013 г. на Националния център за изучаване на общественото мнение, и над 54 % от българските граждани, според Евробарометър — повече, отколкото гражданите на която и да е друга държава членка.

В тази връзка може ли ЕК да предостави справка с общата индикативна сума, предвидена за България по линия на политиката за сближаване, общата селскостопанска и рибарска политика, както и индикативна разбивка по отделни програми/фондове/инструменти? Какви са предстоящите стъпки и срокове за приключване на преговорите с България по Споразумението за партньорство и оперативните програми, за да се избегне рискът от късен старт в изпълнението им, какъвто за съжаление беше налице в началото на настоящия програмен период?

Отговор, даден от г-н Налп от името на Комисията

(29 октомври 2013 г.)

На 22 юли Комисията информира българските власти относно финансовата рамка по политиката на сближаване за периода 2014-2020 г.

В рамките на политиката на сближаване България отговаря на условията за получаване на 6 764 млн. EUR по цени от 2011 г. ⁽¹⁾, в т.ч. 2 018 млн. EUR от Кохезионния фонд, 4 601 млн. EUR за по-слабо развитите региони (от ЕФРР и ЕСФ) и 145 млн. EUR в рамките на ЕТС ⁽²⁾. Тези суми не са окончателни, тъй като все още не е постигнато споразумение относно резервния фонд за изпълнение и Фонда за европейско подпомагане на най-нуждаещите се лица. Поради това окончателната сума ще бъде малко по-ниска.

По отношение на ОСП ⁽³⁾ финансовата рамка за развитието на селските райони в България през следващия период ще възлиза на 2 079 млн. EUR по цени от 2011 г. ⁽⁴⁾, след като бъде приет Регламентът на Европейския парламент и на Съвета относно подпомагането на развитието на селските райони от ЕЗФРСР ⁽⁵⁾.

Размерът на средствата, които ще бъдат предоставени по линия на ЕФМДР ⁽⁶⁾, не е известен, тъй като преговорите с държавите членки все още не са приключили.

⁽¹⁾ По текущи цени общата сума ще бъде 7 638 млн. EUR.

⁽²⁾ Европейско териториално сътрудничество.

⁽³⁾ Обща селскостопанска политика.

⁽⁴⁾ 2 339 млн. EUR по текущи цени.

⁽⁵⁾ Европейски земеделски фонд за развитие на селските райони.

⁽⁶⁾ Европейски фонд за морско дело и рибарство.

С оглед постигане на плавен преход от настоящия към следващия програмен период бяха започнати подготвителни действия през месец Февруари. Официалните преговори би следвало да протекат с ускорени темпове непосредствено след приемането на РОР ⁽⁷⁾, което ще позволи програмите по кохезионната политика да бъдат изпълнени възможно най-скоро.

В актуалния проект за споразумение за партньорство, получен на 30 август, българските власти представиха списък от програми с индикативно разпределение на средствата, предоставени от европейските структурни и инвестиционни фондове. Очаква се проектопрограмите да бъдат получени през следващите месеци. Окончателната финансова рамка за програмите и фондовете ще бъде определена в рамките на продължаващите преговори между България и Европейската комисия.

⁽⁷⁾ Регламент за общоприложимите разпоредби.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009701/13
to the Commission**

Monika Panayotova (PPE)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: Resources allocated to Bulgaria for the new programming period 2014-2020 under the EU's structural and investment funds

A range of conflicting information is available in the Bulgarian public domain on the volume of financing that Bulgaria stands to receive in the new programming period 2014-2020 under the EU's structural and investment funds.

According to the indicative allocations published on the website of the Commission's Directorate-General for Regional Policy, Bulgaria can count on EUR 7.1 billion in cohesion funding in the new programming period (including cross-border cooperation funding under the Connecting Europe Facility and funds placed in reserve). That volume of financing is consequently a nominal one, especially in comparison to the resources available under the seven operational programmes for the period 2007-2013, which total EUR 6.7 billion. At the same time, however, the current Bulgarian Government is putting out into the public domain incomplete and inaccurate information on the volume of cohesion funding available in the new programming period, claiming that it will be less than the amounts quoted above. This in turn is adversely affecting public opinion and creating the feeling that less funding will be available for Bulgarians and Bulgaria, which is not actually the case.

It is therefore extremely important — in view of the high level of confidence and support among Bulgarians, and particularly young Bulgarians, vis-à-vis Europe — that the indicative amount of EU funding set for Bulgaria for the period 2014-2020 be stated precisely. 70% of young people in Bulgaria approved of their country's membership of the EU according to statistics from the National Centre for Public Opinion Research from August 2013, as did over 54% of Bulgarians according to Eurobarometer, which is more than in any other Member State.

In this connection, can the Commission provide information on the overall indicative amount earmarked for Bulgaria under the cohesion policy and the common agricultural and fisheries policies, giving an indicative breakdown by individual programme, fund and instrument? What are the next stages and deadlines in the negotiations with Bulgaria on the partnership and operational programmes, with a view to avoiding the risk of their late implementation — as was unfortunately the case at the start of the current programming period?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(29 October 2013)

The Commission informed the Bulgarian authorities on 22 July of the financial allocation for 2014-2020 cohesion policy.

Bulgaria is eligible for EUR 6 764 million in 2011 prices ⁽¹⁾ for cohesion policy, comprising EUR 2 018 million Cohesion Fund, EUR 4 601 million for less developed regions (i.e. ERDF and ESF) and EUR 145 million under ETC ⁽²⁾. Amounts are still provisional, pending an agreement on the performance reserve and the Fund for European Aid to the most deprived. The final amount will therefore be slightly lower.

As regards the CAP ⁽³⁾, the rural development allocation to Bulgaria for the next period amounts to EUR 2 079 million in 2011 prices ⁽⁴⁾, subject to the adoption of the regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on support for rural development by the EAFRD ⁽⁵⁾.

The allocations under the EMFF ⁽⁶⁾ are not known yet as negotiations with Member States are still ongoing.

Preparations have started in February to facilitate an orderly transition from the present to the next period. Official negotiations should be able to progress quickly once the CPR ⁽⁷⁾ is adopted, allowing implementation of cohesion policy programmes as soon as possible.

⁽¹⁾ In current prices the total amount will be EUR 7 638 million.

⁽²⁾ European Territorial Cooperation.

⁽³⁾ Common Agricultural Policy.

⁽⁴⁾ EUR 2 339 million in current prices.

⁽⁵⁾ European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development.

⁽⁶⁾ European Maritime and Fisheries Fund.

⁽⁷⁾ Common Provision Regulation.

In the latest draft Partnership Agreement, received on 30 August, the Bulgarian authorities provided a list of programmes with indicative allocations of support from ESI Funds. Draft programmes are expected in the months to come. The final allocations to the programmes and funds will be determined in the context of the ongoing discussions between Bulgaria and the Commission.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009702/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 août 2013)

Objet: Réforme des retraites en France

Les recommandations économiques ⁽¹⁾ de la Commission à la France, adoptées par les États membres en juillet, mettaient l'accent sur la nécessité d'assurer la stabilité des finances publiques, mais aussi de réduire le coût du travail en France. La Commission avait notamment insisté sur la nécessité d'éviter de recourir à une hausse des cotisations patronales. L'idée est «d'éviter une nouvelle détérioration de la compétitivité des entreprises françaises et de leur capacité à créer des emplois», a rappelé le porte-parole.

Le gouvernement français a précisément décidé de faire porter une bonne part de l'effort de financement des retraites sur une hausse des cotisations sociales de 0,3 point à l'horizon 2017, tant pour les salariés que les employeurs, ce qui a suscité la grogne du patronat.

1. La Commission encourage-t-elle la voie prise par le gouvernement français?
2. Quelle est son analyse?

Mercredi, le ministre du Travail, Michel Sapin, a promis une compensation pour les entreprises sous la forme d'un «transfert progressif» vers un autre mode de financement d'une partie des cotisations patronales aux branches famille et maladie de la Sécurité sociale.

3. Quelle est la position de la Commission sur ce point?

Réponse donnée par M. Rehn au nom de la Commission
(22 octobre 2013)

Les recommandations adressées par le Conseil à la France en juillet dernier ⁽²⁾ soulignaient la nécessité d'assurer la correction du déficit excessif d'une manière durable d'ici à 2015, afin de garantir la stabilité des finances publiques. Elles mettaient également en exergue la nécessité de prendre des mesures pour réduire le coût du travail en vue de rétablir la compétitivité des entreprises françaises.

En ce qui concerne la réforme des retraites, le Conseil a préconisé l'adoption de mesures destinées à équilibrer durablement le système des retraites, en insistant sur la nécessité d'éviter une augmentation des cotisations sociales. Dans ce contexte, la Commission a salué le projet de réforme des retraites, qui vise à réduire le déficit du système d'ici à 2020, mais déplore que jusqu'à cette date, les efforts reposent essentiellement sur une hausse des cotisations de sécurité sociale et non sur une réduction des dépenses, ce qui va contribuer à alourdir la charge fiscale déjà élevée et à accroître le coût du travail.

Elle se félicite de l'engagement du gouvernement de compenser entièrement l'augmentation des coûts de main-d'œuvre par une réduction des cotisations familiales. Elle salue également l'annonce faite par le gouvernement de «transférer progressivement» les cotisations sociales pesant sur le travail vers d'autres formes de fiscalité. Ce transfert serait en principe conforme aux recommandations du Conseil, bien que ni la réduction annoncée du coût du travail les années suivantes ni la solution de financement de remplacement n'aient encore été précisées.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.euractiv.com/fr/services-financiers/la-commission-examine-les-reform-news-528139>

⁽²⁾ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/fr/13/st10/st10635-re01.fr13.pdf>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009702/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
 (29 August 2013)

Subject: Pension reform in France

The Commission's economic recommendations to France ⁽¹⁾, which were endorsed by the Member States in July, stressed the need to guarantee the stability of public finances and reduce the cost of labour in France. The Commission placed particular emphasis on the need to avoid any increase in employers' contributions. Its spokesperson recalled that the idea is to prevent any further deterioration in the competitiveness of French businesses and their capacity to create employment.

The French Government has in fact decided to base a large part of its efforts to fund pensions on a 0.3% increase in social security contributions by 2017 for both workers and employers, which has been ill-received by the latter.

1. Does the Commission support the approach taken by the French Government?
2. How does it assess the situation?

On Wednesday, the French Labour Minister, Michel Sapin, promised compensation for businesses in the form of a 'gradual transfer' to another funding model, whereby part of employers' contributions would be covered by the family and sickness headings of social security.

3. What is the Commission's position on this issue?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
 (22 October 2013)

The Council's country specific recommendations for France last July ⁽²⁾ stressed the need to ensure a correction of the excessive deficit in a sustainable manner by 2015 in order to guarantee the stability of public finances. They also highlighted the need to take action to lower the cost of labour in France in order to restore the external competitiveness of French companies.

Regarding the pension reform, the Council called for measures to bring the system into balance in a sustainable manner, insisting on the need to avoid increasing social contributions. Against this background, the Commission welcomed the draft pension reform, which aims at reducing the system's deficit by 2020 but regreted that up to 2020 the effort is mainly based on increases in social security contributions instead of focusing on expenditure savings, as this will further increase the already high tax burden and the cost of labour,

The Commission welcomes the commitment by the government to fully offset the increase in labour costs by reducing family contributions. Besides, the Commission welcomes the announcement made by the government of a further 'gradual transfer' of social contributions weighing on labour toward other forms of taxation. Such a transfer would be, in principle, in line with the Council's recommendations, although neither the announced reduction in the cost of labour in the subsequent years nor the alternative funding solution have been specified yet.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.euractiv.com/euro-finance/france-placed-eu-reform-scrutiny-news-528132>

⁽²⁾ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/13/st10/st10635-re01.en13.pdf>

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009703/13

au Conseil

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 août 2013)

Objet: Croatie: mandat d'arrêt européen

Un texte législatif a été adopté par la Croatie le 28 juin, juste avant son entrée dans l'UE. Celui-ci prévoit que les mandats d'arrêt européens ne peuvent s'appliquer pour des crimes commis avant 2002. Sont ainsi exclus ceux commis à l'époque yougoslave et pendant la guerre serbo-croate (1991-1995). Cette législation est surnommée la loi Perkovic, du nom d'un ex-responsable de la branche croate des services de renseignement yougoslaves (UDBA), recherché en Allemagne dans le cadre d'une enquête sur l'assassinat d'un dissident croate en 1983, près de Munich.

En 2008, la justice allemande a émis un mandat d'arrêt européen contre J. Perkovic, accusé d'avoir organisé cette exécution. Le refus croate de l'extrader explique l'absence de la chancelière Merkel aux cérémonies d'adhésion, fin juin, au prétexte d'un «agenda serré». Le premier ministre croate a estimé que la loi européenne était «tordue» et «discriminatoire». Il souligne que la Croatie n'est pas le seul pays membre à avoir limité la portée du mandat d'arrêt européen.

Le Conseil compte-t-il mettre ce dossier à l'ordre du jour? Estime-t-il que des sanctions sont nécessaires ou estime-t-il faire valoir les arguments croates sur une jurisprudence en la matière?

Réponse

(28 octobre 2013)

Le Conseil tient à préciser que c'est à la Commission européenne qu'il incombe de contrôler l'application du droit de l'Union européenne, y compris les traités d'adhésion. Il appartient donc à la Commission de se prononcer sur la question soulevée par l'Honorable Parlementaire, et il ne serait pas opportun que le Conseil s'exprime à ce sujet.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009703/13
to the Council**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(28 August 2013)

Subject: Croatia — European arrest warrant

A legislative text was adopted by Croatia on 28 June 2013, immediately before its entry into the EU, stipulating that European arrest warrants shall not be applicable to crimes committed before 2002. This effectively covers crimes committed during the Yugoslav period and the Serbo-Croatian war (1991-1995). The law is known as the Perkovic law, after a former head of the Croatian branch of the Yugoslav secret services (UDBA), who is wanted in Germany in relation to the assassination of a Croatian dissident near Munich in 1983.

In 2008, a German court issued a European arrest warrant for Josip Perkovic, who is accused of masterminding the execution. Croatia's refusal to extradite Perkovic explains Chancellor Merkel's absence from Croatia's accession ceremony at the end of June 2013, on the pretext of an 'overloaded agenda'. The Croatian Prime Minister has labelled the European law 'twisted' and 'discriminatory' and has emphasised that Croatia is not the only Member State to have limited the scope of the European arrest warrant.

Does the Council intend to include this matter in its agenda? Does it see a need to penalise Croatia, or consider that Croatia's arguments should be tested against existing case history in this field?

Reply

(29 October 2013)

The Council would point out that it is the European Commission which is responsible for overseeing the implementation of European Union law, including accession treaties. The issue raised by the Honourable Member is therefore a matter for the Commission, and it would not be appropriate for the Council to express a view on the matter.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009704/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 août 2013)

Objet: Éditeurs de livres en Pologne

En juillet dernier, les éditeurs polonais faisaient part de leurs préoccupations relatives aux prix des livres, et à la baisse de leurs bénéfices, consécutive selon eux à la hausse de la TVA, passée de 0 à 5 %. Cette mesure est entrée en vigueur le 1^{er} janvier 2013. Les éditeurs souhaitent limiter les remises sur les livres pendant une période indéterminée, afin de limiter les pertes.

Si le respect des règles de concurrence préside aux décisions de la Commission, celle-ci peut parfois déroger à la règle si le commerce entre les États n'est pas touché par ces nouvelles mesures restrictives. Le cas allemand dit «Sammelrevers» est ainsi l'un de ceux qui avaient conduit la Commission à accepter une fixation des prix: la Börsenverein des Deutschen Buchhandels (association des libraires et éditeurs allemands), le groupe d'édition Random House GmbH et le libraire Koch, Neff & Oetinger GmbH avaient été inquiétés par une plainte du libraire autrichien Libro AG et du libraire belge Proxis. Ces derniers se considéraient dans leur droit en vendant des best-sellers allemands à des prix inférieurs à celui fixé en Allemagne, et dénonçaient un possible embargo de la part des éditeurs allemands.

La Commission avait alors statué en faveur d'une limitation des remises, lorsque le consommateur final était en Allemagne: «L'engagement précise que pour parler de non-respect, il convient qu'un libraire allemand lié par le prix fixe prenne l'initiative de ne pas respecter le système du prix fixe, éventuellement par l'intermédiaire ou avec l'aide d'un libraire étranger».

Qu'en est-il ici?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission

(24 octobre 2013)

Les conventions collectives sectorielles ou la législation peuvent tenter de fixer le prix de vente au détail des livres. Cela dit, pour déterminer si une loi ou une convention collective est contraire aux règles de concurrence de l'UE, il faut prendre en compte toute une série d'éléments factuels, juridiques et économiques.

Dans l'affaire allemande «Sammelrevers» de 2002, la Commission avait examiné les accords passés entre éditeurs et libraires, mais n'avait pas statué définitivement à leur égard. Elle avait conclu, sur la base des faits de l'espèce, que, compte tenu du fait que les parties intéressées s'étaient formellement engagées à garantir la liberté de vente directe transfrontière de livres allemands à des consommateurs finals en Allemagne, le régime en cause n'avait pas d'incidence notable sur le commerce entre États membres et que, par conséquent, il ne relevait pas des règles de concurrence de l'Union ⁽¹⁾.

En ce qui concerne l'éventuelle initiative polonaise qui viserait à fixer des prix minimums pour les livres, la Commission n'a pas été saisie d'une plainte officielle concernant le droit de la concurrence ni ne dispose d'éléments qui lui permettraient d'apprécier ses effets potentiels sur le commerce entre États membres.

Les dispositions nationales en matière de fixation du prix des livres peuvent aussi violer les dispositions du traité relatives à la libre circulation des marchandises si elles ont un caractère discriminatoire ⁽²⁾. Dans le cas des livres électroniques, la législation nationale se doit notamment d'être compatible avec la libre circulation des services et la liberté d'établissement. Dans la mesure où une telle législation comporte des restrictions aux libertés garanties au sein du marché intérieur, ces restrictions doivent être appropriées à la poursuite d'objectifs stratégiques clairement identifiés et proportionnées à ces objectifs. Il convient de garder à l'esprit le fait que l'État membre doit apporter la preuve que ces exigences sont satisfaites.

La Commission reste déterminée à garantir le plein respect du droit de la concurrence et des règles du marché intérieur de l'UE dans le secteur de l'édition et suit de près l'évolution de la situation dans ce secteur.

⁽¹⁾ Communiqué de presse IP/02/461.

⁽²⁾ Voir, par exemple, l'arrêt de la Cour de justice du 30 avril 2009 dans l'affaire C-531/07 au sujet du régime «Sammelrevers».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009704/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
 (29 August 2013)

Subject: Polish publishing industry

In July 2013, Polish book publishers voiced concerns at the price of books and the impact they claimed new rules which had increased VAT from 0% to 5% as from 1 January 2013 were having on their profits. They are now calling for minimum prices to be set for their books in an attempt to keep their losses to a minimum.

Although the Commission must take decisions which are consistent with competition rules, it may occasionally make an exception as long as trade between Member States is not affected by the new restrictions. The German 'Sammelrevers' case is one instance of the Commission agreeing to allow price fixing: the Börsenverein des Deutschen Buchhandels (German Publishers and Booksellers Association), the publishing group Random House GmbH and the bookseller Koch, Neff & Oetinger GmbH were unhappy about a complaint brought by two European booksellers, Libro AG (Austrian) and Proxis (Belgian), who believed they had the right to sell German bestsellers at prices lower than those set in Germany and expressed their dismay at the threat of an embargo by German publishers.

The Commission ultimately ruled in favour of the German restriction on discounts:

'The Undertaking makes it clear that for circumvention to take place it would require a German bookseller bound by the fixed price to take the initiative of circumventing the price fixing possibly by means of or with the help of a foreign bookseller.'

Does the ruling also apply to the Polish publishing industry?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
 (24 October 2013)

Industry-wide agreements or legislation may attempt to set the retail price for books. That said, whether a law or an agreement is contrary to EU competition rules depends on a range of factual, legal and economic elements.

In the 2002 German 'Sammelrevers' case, the Commission examined but did not take a definitive view regarding the agreements between publishers and booksellers. It concluded on the facts of the case that, in light of the undertaking given by the parties involved that guaranteed the freedom of direct cross-border selling of German books to final consumers in Germany, the relevant agreements did not have an appreciable effect on trade between Member States, and therefore fell outside EU competition rules ⁽¹⁾.

As regards the possible Polish initiative to set minimum prices for books, the Commission has neither received a formal complaint relating to competition law nor does it have any elements at its disposal to assess its possible effect on trade between Member States.

National provisions on book pricing might also infringe Treaty provisions on free movement of goods if they are discriminatory ⁽²⁾. In case of e-books, national legislation should be compatible in particular with the free movement of services and the freedom of establishment. To the extent that such legislation contains restrictions on internal market freedoms, these restrictions must be suitable to attain recognised policy objectives and be proportionate to those objectives. It should be borne in mind that the Member State has to prove that those requirements are fulfilled.

The Commission remains committed to ensuring the full respect of the EU competition law and internal market rules in the publishing sector and closely monitors relevant developments.

⁽¹⁾ Press release IP/02/461.

⁽²⁾ See e.g. judgment of the Court of Justice of 30 April 2009 in Case C531/07 concerning the Sammelrevers scheme.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009705/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 août 2013)

Objet: Question du collatéral

1. La Commission s'interroge-t-elle sur la limitation de l'amplitude d'un actif proposé en collatéral? Le problème est que celui-ci passe de main en main un trop grand nombre de fois, au point qu'on ne sait plus, finalement, qui détient quoi et qu'on ne connaît plus les risques associés.
2. Que propose, dans ce contexte, la Commission pour améliorer la traçabilité du marché du collatéral?
3. Que pense-t-elle d'une régulation formelle?
4. La Commission partage-t-elle l'avis que la réutilisation ou les techniques d'optimisation du collatéral conduisent à une plus grande interconnexion au sein du secteur financier, à des risques de contagion entre les secteurs, à des effets procycliques en réponse à des chocs sur les prix ou à des dégradations de participants de marché ou de titres de collatéral?

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(25 octobre 2013)

Depuis le commencement de la crise financière, la législation de l'UE, par exemple le règlement sur l'infrastructure du marché européen (EMIR) ou la directive sur les exigences de fonds propres, donne au collatéral une place centrale dans les opérations de marché, afin de réduire le risque de contrepartie. La relative rareté du collatéral de premier ordre a motivé certaines pratiques du marché, qui ont un impact sur la façon de se procurer du collatéral et sur les conditions contractuelles de celui-ci. Il s'agit notamment des réhypothèques, de la transformation de collatéral et de l'optimisation de collatéral. Ces pratiques peuvent réduire la transparence et aggraver les risques.

La Commission a publié le 4 septembre 2013 une communication sur le secteur bancaire parallèle, qui établit une feuille de route et examine, entre autres sujets, les risques liés à la réutilisation du collatéral. Cette réutilisation génère des chaînes dynamiques où le même titre est prêté plusieurs fois, impliquant souvent plusieurs intervenants. Il peut en résulter une augmentation du niveau de levier et un renforcement du caractère procyclique du système financier, qui devient vulnérable aux paniques (runs) et aux mouvements soudains de réduction du levier.

La Commission prend également une part active aux travaux concernant les opérations de financement sur titres dans le cadre du Conseil de stabilité financière et du Conseil européen du risque systémique. L'opacité des marchés du financement sur titres complique l'identification des droits de propriété («qui possède quoi?») et le suivi de la concentration des risques. Plus particulièrement, la Commission a entrepris depuis plusieurs années de réexaminer la législation européenne sur les valeurs mobilières, de façon à mieux répondre à la question du «qui possède quoi?» dans l'UE. Les fruits de ce travail devraient lui permettre d'élaborer une politique qui relève tous les défis d'ordre réglementaire identifiés.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009705/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 August 2013)**

Subject: Collateral (finance)

1. Is the Commission exploring the possibility of imposing limits on the value of assets used as collateral? The problem here is such assets change hands so many times that ultimately it is no longer clear who owns what and who is bearing the risks involved.
2. How does the Commission intend to improve the traceability of collateral?
3. Does the Commission see scope for formal regulation in this area?
4. Does the Commission agree that the re-use of collateral and the use of collateral optimisation techniques may lead to a greater degree of mutual exposure in the financial sector, cross-sector contagion risks, pro-cyclical effects in the event of price shocks and the downgrading of financial institutions or asset-backed securities?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(25 October 2013)**

Since the beginning of the financial crisis, EU legislation, such as the European Market Infrastructure Regulation or the Capital Requirements Directive, has called for collateral to become a central part of market operations in order to reduce counterparty risk. The relative scarcity of high quality collateral has driven certain market practices which impact on where collateral is sourced from and on what terms. These include rehypotheation, collateral transformation and optimisation. Such practices can reduce transparency and increase risks.

The Commission has published a communication on shadow banking on 4 September 2013. It sets out a roadmap and *inter alia* looks at the risks of collateral reuse. Collateral reuse generates dynamic chains in which the same security is lent several times, often involving many actors. This can contribute to an increase in leverage and procyclicality of the financial system, making it vulnerable to bank runs and sudden deleveraging.

The Commission is also closely involved in the work on securities financing transactions at the Financial Stability Board and the European Stability Risk Board. The lack of transparency in securities financing markets makes it difficult to identify 'who owns what' and to monitor concentration risks. More specifically, the Commission has been reviewing securities laws for several years with a view to addressing the issue of 'who owns what' in the EU. The progress of this work should enable the Commission to develop a policy that meets all identified regulatory challenges.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009706/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 août 2013)

Objet: Encombrement des actifs

La dette non sécurisée coûtant plus cher, les banques ont accru ces dernières années leur financement collatéralisé: covered bonds, dont l'encours a triplé en France entre 2007 et 2011, RMBS aux États-Unis, pension livrée (repo) pour le financement des activités de marché. Une part croissante des actifs du bilan des banques se trouve donc «encombrée», c'est-à-dire mobilisée pour sécuriser une catégorie de créanciers, jusqu'à 50 % dans le cas des banques hypothécaires d'Europe du Nord.

Que pense la Commission de l'idée d'inciter les banques à transmettre aux superviseurs des détails sur l'encombrement de leurs actifs?

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission

(25 octobre 2013)

La Commission partage ce point de vue. Elle a donc pleinement soutenu, pendant la négociation du paquet CRD IV, l'introduction d'une obligation de déclaration prudentielle concernant les actifs grevés. L'article 100 du règlement (UE) n° 575/2013 du 26 juin 2013 fait obligation aux banques de déclarer à leurs autorités de surveillance toute forme de charges grevant leurs actifs. En vertu de ce règlement, l'Autorité bancaire européenne (EBA) doit aussi élaborer un projet de norme technique d'exécution définissant des modèles communs de déclaration des actifs grevés, que toutes les banques de l'UE devront utiliser. L'EBA a déjà soumis un projet à consultation et devrait présenter sous peu son projet de norme technique d'exécution à la Commission pour adoption.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009706/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 August 2013)

Subject: Asset encumbrance

Since unsecured debt is a more expensive option than collateralised debt, banks have in recent years been increasing the latter, be this in the form of covered bonds — the rates for which tripled in France between 2007 and 2011 — RMBS in the United States or repurchasing (repo) for financing market activities. A growing proportion of banks' balance sheet assets are hence being 'encumbered', or in other words used to secure a certain category of creditor. In the case of Northern European mortgage banks this can be at rates of up to 50%.

What does the Commission think of the idea of encouraging banks to communicate their asset encumbrance details to the banking supervisors?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(25 October 2013)

The Commission agrees with this point of view and therefore fully supported the inclusion of a supervisory reporting requirement regarding encumbered assets during the negotiations of the CRD IV package. Article 100 of Regulation (EU) 575/2013 of 26 June 2013 requires banks to report all forms of encumbrance of assets to their supervisors. According to this regulation, the European Banking Authority (EBA) is also required to prepare a draft implementing technical standard defining common reporting templates on asset encumbrance reporting that all banks in the EU must use. EBA has already consulted on a draft and is expected to submit the draft implementing technical standard for endorsement by the Commission shortly.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009707/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 août 2013)

Objet: Un mur anti-Roms

La construction d'un mur anti-Roms, qui entraîne «la ségrégation» d'une partie de la population, est en contradiction avec la raison d'être même du titre de «Capitale européenne de la culture». La construction de barrières physiques est une véritable honte et constitue une rupture avec les valeurs sur lesquelles notre Union européenne est fondée. Qu'en est-il du respect de la dignité humaine et des droits humains?

Il faut savoir que le mur anti-Roms de Košice est le huitième mur de ce type érigé depuis 2009 dans cette région et le 14^e dans le pays, selon le site d'information romovia.sme.sk.

1. La Commission a-t-elle obtenu une réponse à sa demande de destruction «sans délai» d'un mur en béton anti-Roms érigé récemment à Košice?
2. Dans la négative, des sanctions seront-elles prises?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Reding au nom de la Commission

(25 octobre 2013)

La Commission a reçu une réponse du maire de Košice expliquant que le mur de séparation a été érigé illégalement par une entité de la ville sur laquelle la municipalité n'a pas de prise et que des poursuites appropriées vont être engagées. La Commission a demandé à être tenue informée du suivi.

La mise en œuvre des programmes culturels prévus dans le cadre de la manifestation Capitale européenne de la culture relève des autorités nationales et locales. Toutefois, la Commission veillera, dans les limites de ses compétences, à ce que l'action soit mise en œuvre conformément à la décision qui l'a instituée ⁽¹⁾.

De surcroît, le rejet de toute forme de racisme, y compris des barrières mentales et physiques, et l'octroi des mêmes droits à tous les citoyens et à toutes les communautés étant aujourd'hui les objectifs pour l'Europe qui devraient être les mêmes pour tous les États membres, la Commission a demandé à la République slovaque de concrétiser les mesures relatives aux Roms que celle-ci s'était engagée à mettre en œuvre dans sa stratégie nationale d'intégration des Roms. La Commission continuera de suivre de près l'évolution sur le terrain et poursuivra les échanges bilatéraux avec les autorités slovaques sur les progrès accomplis

⁽¹⁾ Décision n° 1622/2006/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009707/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 August 2013)**

Subject: 'Anti-Roma' wall in Košice, Slovakia

The building of an anti-Roma wall in Košice, which effectively segregates one section of the population from the other, is at odds with everything that the title 'European Capital of Culture' is supposed to embody. Erecting physical barriers between people is a disgrace and violates the principles on which the EU is founded. How on earth can the building of this wall be reconciled with the concepts of human dignity and human rights?

According to the website romovia.sme.sk, the wall in Košice is the eighth of its kind to be erected in the region since 2009 and the fourteenth in the country as a whole.

1. Has the Commission received a response to its request for the anti-Roma wall to be pulled down 'without delay'?
2. If not, will it impose penalties?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(25 October 2013)**

The Commission received an answer from the Mayor of Košice explaining that the segregation wall was erected illegally by a city entity over which the municipality has no control and that appropriate legal action would follow. The Commission asked to be kept informed about the follow-up.

The implementation of the cultural programmes foreseen in the framework of a European Capital of Culture is the responsibility of the national and local authorities. However, the Commission will ensure, within the remit of its competences, that the action is implemented according to the decision establishing it ⁽¹⁾.

In addition, as rejecting all forms of racism, including mental or physical walls, and granting the same rights to all citizens and communities are today's objectives for Europe and should be the same for all its Member States, the Commission called on the Slovak Republic to implement the Roma related measures it committed to in its National Roma Integration Strategy to support Roma inclusion. The Commission will keep monitoring closely what is taking place on the ground, and will pursue bilateral exchanges with the Slovak authorities, on progress made.

⁽¹⁾ Decision 1622/2006/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of the EU.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009708/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 août 2013)

Objet: Gibraltar — Espagne vs Royaume-Uni

L'Espagne et le Royaume-Uni ont un différend diplomatique depuis que les autorités de Gibraltar, territoire britannique, ont coulé au large de leurs côtes des blocs de béton formant un récif artificiel. L'Espagne affirme qu'il s'agit d'une entrave au travail de ses pêcheurs. Depuis, de longues files d'attente se sont formées à la frontière entre l'Espagne et Gibraltar, ce dernier ayant immédiatement accusé Madrid d'avoir multiplié les contrôles par mesure de représailles.

Le gouvernement espagnol a réaffirmé qu'il «ne renoncerait pas» à ces contrôles, affirmant qu'ils sont, d'une part, obligatoires, puisque Gibraltar, comme le Royaume-Uni, n'est pas membre de l'espace Schengen, et, d'autre part, nécessaires pour lutter contre la contrebande, de tabac notamment.

On ne peut que regretter l'échec des récents efforts diplomatiques.

1. La Commission, en tant que gardienne des traités, compte-t-elle enquêter?
2. Quelles sont les mesures que la Commission peut prendre pour régler ce litige?
3. Une décision peut-elle être prise au plus vite afin d'éviter l'intensification d'une crise qui apporterait de l'eau au moulin des eurosceptiques?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Malmström au nom de la Commission

(4 octobre 2013)

La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à se référer aux réponses qu'elle a données aux questions écrites E-009281/2013 de M. Daniel Hannan et E-009591/2013 de M^{me} Diane Dodds.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009708/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 August 2013)

Subject: Gibraltar — Spain against the United Kingdom

The authorities in Gibraltar, a British territory, have sunk concrete blocks off the coast, forming an artificial reef and resulting in a diplomatic row between Spain and the United Kingdom. Spain maintains that this is impeding fishing. Since then, there have been long queues at the border between Spain and Gibraltar, with Gibraltar immediately accusing Spain of stepping up checks by way of reprisals.

The Spanish Government has reaffirmed that it will not abandon the checks, claiming that they are both mandatory (since neither Spain nor the United Kingdom is a member of the Schengen Area) and necessary (in order to combat smuggling, especially tobacco smuggling).

It is regrettable that recent diplomatic efforts have failed.

1. Is the Commission, as the guardian of the Treaties, intending to investigate?
2. What action can the Commission take to settle this dispute?
3. Can a decision be taken as quickly as possible so as to prevent the crisis from worsening, since that would benefit the eurosceptics' cause?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(4 October 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Question E-009281/2013 by Mr Daniel Hannan and E-009591/2013 by Mrs. Diane Dodds.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-009709/13

alla Commissione

Lara Comi (PPE)

(29 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: Emergenza immigrazione — Conflitto in Siria

Premesso che:

- la situazione siriana sta peggiorando di ora in ora a causa della guerra civile e il rischio di un intervento militare sembra sempre più concreto e imminente;
- dalla stampa si apprende che sta aumentando vertiginosamente il numero delle persone in fuga da questo paese che vanno ad aggiungersi a quelle provenienti dall'Egitto che, lungo le rotte del Mediterraneo, sbarcano in Italia;
- secondo i dati diffusi dal Viminale, nei primi otto mesi del 2013 gli sbarchi in Italia sarebbero stati 2872, mentre restano senza risposta le grida di allarme lanciate da amministratori locali e operatori del settore che evidenziano l'impossibilità per l'Italia di accogliere nuove ondate di profughi senza aiuti concreti dall'Europa;
- Malta si è già rifiutata di offrire accoglienza a numerosi migranti nonostante le forti pressioni europee;
- l'articolo 80 TFUE prevede espressamente che le politiche relative ai controlli alle frontiere, all'asilo e all'immigrazione — e la loro attuazione — siano governate «dal principio di solidarietà e di equa ripartizione della responsabilità tra gli Stati membri, anche sul piano finanziario. Ogniqualvolta necessario, gli atti dell'Unione adottati [...] contengono misure appropriate ai fini dell'applicazione di tale principio».

Tutto quanto sopra premesso, si chiede:

1. Stante la situazione attuale della Siria, quali misure urgenti e preventive intende la Commissione intraprendere per far fronte alla potenziale emergenza profughi che aggraverebbe una situazione già insostenibile per alcuni Stati membri i quali, a causa della posizione geografica, sono lasciati pressoché soli a gestire questa drammatica situazione che ha risvolti sociali e per la sicurezza interna dei cittadini europei?
2. Al di là dell'emergenza in atto, come intende la Commissione dare concreta e stabile attuazione ai principi di solidarietà e di equa ripartizione della responsabilità tra gli Stati membri e con quali azioni, ai sensi dell'articolo 80 TFUE?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione

(27 settembre 2013)

La Commissione segue con apprensione l'evolvere degli eventi in Siria ed è conscia che l'afflusso di cittadini siriani sta mettendo sotto pressione una serie di Stati membri. Finora sono state sollecitate soprattutto la Germania e la Svezia, ma anche altri Stati membri alle frontiere del Mediterraneo sono esposti al rischio di flussi improvvisi.

Sin dallo scoppio della crisi la Commissione ha monitorato la situazione e ha creato una rete Frontex-EASO per lo scambio di informazioni sugli arrivi nell'UE. Su richiesta della Commissione, l'EASO ha convocato una serie di riunioni pratiche di cooperazione per individuare le misure atte a assicurare un livello coerente di protezione all'interno dell'UE. Frontex aiuta gli Stati membri a gestire i flussi migratori indotti dalla crisi. La Commissione garantisce inoltre un più ampio sforzo umanitario, in collaborazione con gli Stati membri. In tal senso l'Unione è il principale donatore impegnato a rispondere ai bisogni a fronte della diaspora siriana.

Quanto all'Italia, il paese è assistito dall'EASO tramite uno speciale piano di sostegno, convenuto a giugno 2013, e beneficia di finanziamenti d'emergenza per 2 milioni di euro dal Fondo europeo per i rifugiati. Il governo italiano ha inoltre la possibilità di chiedere nuovi fondi e l'EASO, che ha un mandato d'emergenza, può mobilitare altri strumenti.

Quanto alla necessità di assicurare la solidarietà e l'equa ripartizione delle responsabilità, rimando alla comunicazione della Commissione sulla solidarietà all'interno dell'UE e alla recente relazione della Commissione europea sull'immigrazione e l'asilo che dedica un'intera sezione alla solidarietà nell'UE ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2013)422 def.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-009709/13
to the Commission**

Lara Comi (PPE)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: Immigration crisis — conflict in Syria

The civil war in Syria is making conditions in the country worse by the hour and military intervention seems ever more likely and imminent. Press reports speak of a dramatic rise in the number of people fleeing the country, adding to the numbers of refugees crossing the Mediterranean from Egypt to land in Italy.

Figures from the Italian Ministry of the Interior put the number of refugees landing in Italy in the first eight months of 2013 at 2 872. However, the cries of alarm from local officials and operators in the sector who point out that Italy simply cannot cope with new waves of refugees without tangible aid from the European Union, have met with no response.

Malta has already refused to accept large numbers of migrants, despite strong pressure from the EU to do so.

Article 80 TFEU provides expressly that policies on border checks, asylum and immigration — and their implementation — shall be governed by ‘the principle of solidarity and fair sharing of responsibility, including its financial implications, between the Member States. Whenever necessary, the Union acts adopted [...] shall contain appropriate measures to give effect to this principle’.

1. The situation in Syria being what it is at present, what urgent precautionary measures will the Commission be taking to tackle this potential refugee crisis which will only aggravate a situation that is already unsustainable for those Member States which, because of their geographical situation, are left to manage more or less alone this dramatic situation and the social and domestic security implications it has for EU citizens?
2. Looking beyond the current crisis, how and through what actions does the Commission plan to ensure that the principles of solidarity and fair sharing of responsibility between Member States are put into practice with lasting effect, pursuant to Article 80 TFEU?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission

(27 September 2013)

The Commission follows with concern the unfolding of events in Syria and is aware of the situation of pressure the inflow of Syrian nationals has generated in some Member States. So far, Germany and Sweden have received a majority of applications, but other Member States, on the Mediterranean border, are exposed to possible sudden flows.

Since the set of the crisis the Commission has been monitoring the situation by establishing a network including Frontex and EASO, in order to exchange information on the arrivals in the EU. EASO, upon request of the Commission, has organised a series of practical cooperation meetings to discuss steps to be taken to ensure a consistent level of protection within the EU. Frontex is supporting Member States in managing migratory flows triggered by the crisis. This complements a wider humanitarian effort that the Commission is pursuing together with Member States. In this respect, the European Union is the largest donor addressing the needs emerging from the displacement of Syrian nationals.

As far as Italy is concerned, EASO is providing assistance through a Special Support Plan which was agreed in June 2013. This was compounded by the disbursement of EUR 2 million in emergency funds from the European Refugee Fund. Upon request of the Italian Government, additional funds could be made available and EASO could trigger further instruments under its emergency mandate.

On the necessity to ensure solidarity and fair sharing of responsibility let me refer you to the Commission Communication on intra-EU solidarity and the recently published report by the European Commission on Migration and Asylum which contains a section devoted to solidarity at the EU level ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2013) 422 final.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-009710/13

adresată Comisiei

Elena Băsescu (PPE)

(29 august 2013)

Subiect: Impactul revizuirii Directivei privind fabricarea, prezentarea și vânzarea tutunului și a produselor aferente

În luna iulie, Comisia pentru mediu, sănătate publică și siguranță alimentară a Parlamentului European a votat Raportul referitor la propunerea de Directivă privind fabricarea, prezentarea și vânzarea tutunului și a produselor aferente. Printre propunerile votate de Comisia ENVI se numără interzicerea țigaretelor de tip „slim”, precum și a aditivilor care dau impresia că produsele din tutun au efecte benefice asupra sănătății. Plenul Parlamentului European urmează a se pronunța asupra propunerii de directivă în toamna acestui an.

Care ar fi impactul economic, dar mai ales la nivelul sănătății populației, al interzicerii țigaretelor de tip „slim” și a celor care conțin diverse arome? A realizat Comisia studii care să cuantifice numărul fumătorilor de țigarete „slim” la nivel european? Întrebarea este justificată mai ales de faptul că în unele state membre, proporția fumătorilor de astfel de țigarete este mai ridicată decât în altele, lucru ce ar putea conduce la un impact diferit de la stat la stat.

Nu în ultimul rând, cum evaluează Comisia posibilitatea, invocată în special de reprezentanții industriei tutunului, ca traficul ilicit de țigări să crească în urma unor astfel de măsuri?

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei

(18 septembrie 2013)

După cum s-a subliniat în evaluarea impactului efectuată de Comisie ⁽¹⁾, prezentarea și forma țigaretelor pot influența modul în care este perceput riscul asociat acestora. Țigaretetele subțiri sunt adesea percepute de către tineri ca fiind mai puțin dăunătoare, cu o politică de marketing care vizează mai ales femeile tinere. De asemenea, există dovezi conform cărora țigaretetele cu arome caracteristice pot facilita adoptarea obiceiului de a fuma prin mascarea aromelor de tutun mai neplăcute, atrăgând astfel în special consumatorii tineri.

În pofida faptului că piața țigaretelor este în declin, în ansamblul ei, pentru țigaretetele cu mentol și pentru cele subțiri cota de piață a crescut în ultimii ani: cota de piață a țigaretelor mentolate a crescut în UE la aproximativ 5 % din totalul vânzărilor, iar volumul vânzărilor de țigarete subțiri a crescut cu 30 % între 2006 și 2010, cu o creștere de 50 % a cotei de piață.

Se estimează că măsurile propuse vor duce la o scădere de 2 % a consumului pe o perioadă de cinci ani.

Riscul ca efectul interzicerii anumitor produse să fie subminat de comerțul ilicit rămâne limitat. Propunerea Comisiei cuprinde măsuri care au ca scop reducerea comerțului ilicit prin intermediul unui sistem de urmărire și localizare și al unor caracteristici de securitate, care ar trebui să contribuie în mod eficient la reducerea acestui tip de comerț.

⁽¹⁾ Documentul de lucru al serviciilor Comisiei (2012) 452 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009710/13
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(29 August 2013)

Subject: Impact of the revision of the directive on the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco and related products

In July, the European Parliament's Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI) adopted the report on the proposal for a directive on the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco and related products. One of the suggestions adopted by the ENVI Committee involves banning 'slim' cigarettes, as well as additives which give the impression that tobacco is beneficial to health. The European Parliament is to vote on the proposal for a directive in plenary this autumn.

What economic — and more especially public health — impact will the banning of 'slim'-type cigarettes and aromatised cigarettes have? Has the Commission conducted any studies to ascertain how many Europeans smoke 'slim'-type cigarettes? This is an especially important question since more people smoke this type of cigarette in some Member States than in others, meaning that the impact may vary from one country to another.

Last but not least, how does the Commission view the claim, made notably by the representatives of the tobacco industry, that such a ban would act as a spur to the illegal trafficking of cigarettes?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(18 September 2013)

As outlined in the Commission's impact assessment ⁽¹⁾, the presentation of cigarettes and their individual shape can influence the perception of risk. Slim cigarettes are often perceived as less harmful by young people, with targeted marketing towards young women. Likewise, evidence presented shows that cigarettes with characterising flavours can facilitate the uptake of smoking by masking harsher tobacco flavours, thereby attracting in particular young consumers.

Despite an overall declining market for cigarettes, the market share of menthol cigarettes and slims has increased in recent years: the share of mentholated cigarettes has grown in the EU to approximately 5% of the total sales, and sales volumes of slim cigarettes have increased by 30% between 2006 and 2010, with a 50% increase in market share.

The proposed measures are expected to lead to a 2% decrease in consumption over 5 years.

The risk that the prohibition of certain products may be circumvented through illicit trade remains limited. The Commission proposal contains measures aimed at reducing illicit trade through a tracking and tracing system and security features, which are expected to effectively contribute to a reduction of such trade.

⁽¹⁾ SWD (2012) 452 final.

(Svensk version)

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande P-009711/13
till kommissionen**

Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)

(29 augusti 2013)

Angående: Tigrisdalen

Vår civilisations vagga, Tigrisdalen, riskerar att dränkas för evigt. Den turkiska staten fortsätter sina planer att genomföra ett av världens största och skadligaste dammprojekt i det gamla Mesopotanien. Staden Hasankeyf och 10 000 år gamla lämningar kommer att dränkas om dammen blir verklighet. De miljömässiga konsekvenserna blir omfattande och allvarliga. 70 000 människor, framför allt kurder, kommer att fördrivas från sina hem.

Projektet strider mot internationell rätt och har fördömts av Världsbanken. Tidigare europeiska banker och företag, bland annat svenska Skanska, har dragit sig ur på grund av att dammprojektet bryter mot så många internationella konventioner.

Jag anser att EU måste agera mycket kraftfullt mot den turkiska regeringen för att stoppa detta vansinnesprojekt. Att kräva ett stopp för dammbygget borde vara ett av de krav som EU bör ställa som villkor för turkiskt medlemskap i EU.

Vad har kommissionen hittills gjort i denna fråga?

Vilka åtgärder avser kommissionen vidta om Turkiet fortsätter med dammprojektet?

Anser kommissionen att ett stopp för dammbygget borde fogas till villkoren för ett turkiskt medlemskap i EU?

Svar från Štefan Füle på kommissionens vägnar

(25 september 2013)

Kommissionen hänvisar parlamentsledamoten till svaret på den tidigare skriftliga frågan E-010687/2012 ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm>

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-009711/13
to the Commission**

Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: The Tigris valley

The cradle of our civilisation, the Tigris valley, is at risk of being permanently inundated. The Turkish State is persisting with its plans to carry out one of the largest and most damaging dam projects in the world in the region that used to be Mesopotamia. The town of Hasankeyf and 10 000 year old remains will be submerged if the dam is built. The environmental impact will be large-scale and serious. 70 000 people, mainly Kurds, will be driven away from their homes.

The project is contrary to international law and has been condemned by the World Bank. Previously, European banks and undertakings, including the Swedish-based Skanska, have withdrawn from the dam project because it violates so many international conventions.

I consider that the EU should make very forceful representations to the Turkish Government to stop this crazy project. The EU ought to demand that the building of the dam should cease as one of its conditions for Turkey's membership of the EU.

What has the Commission done in this regard so far?

What measures will the Commission take if Turkey continues with the dam project?

Does the Commission consider that halting the building of the dam should be added to the conditions for Turkey's accession to the EU?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission

(25 September 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to previous Written Question E-010687/2012 ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm>

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009712/13
a la Comisión**

Carmen Romero López (S&D)

(29 de agosto de 2013)

Asunto: Exención del IVA

El artículo 132, letra i) de la Directiva 2006/112/CE del Consejo, de 28 de noviembre de 2006, relativa a las exenciones de IVA dice expresamente:

«la educación de la infancia o de la juventud, la enseñanza escolar o universitaria, la formación o el reciclaje profesional, así como las prestaciones de servicios y las entregas de bienes directamente relacionadas con estas actividades, cuando sean realizadas por Entidades de Derecho público que tengan este mismo objeto o por otros organismos a los que el Estado miembro de que se trate reconozca que tienen fines comparables;»

Sin embargo, la transposición de la Directiva por el Reglamento de ejecución (EU) n° 282/2011 limita, en su artículo 44, las exenciones que la Directiva establece a las actividades curriculares necesarias para la adquisición o actualización de conocimientos a efectos profesionales, siendo así que las letras g), h), i), m) y n) del artículo 132 de la Directiva deben entenderse, como dice la Directiva, en beneficio de las actividades que son complementarias a la educación e incluso de las actividades de asistencia social como están siendo los comedores de los centros públicos que en tiempos de crisis se ven abocados a cubrir la manutención de los alumnos en los términos que las familias no puedan permitirse.

¿Cree la Comisión que el Reglamento ha hecho una interpretación correcta de la Directiva?

¿Cree que el Gobierno español debe modificar el Reglamento para dar cabida a estas actividades complementarias como exentas de IVA, teniendo en cuenta el evidente interés general de dichas actividades?

Respuesta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión

(1 de octubre de 2013)

El artículo 44 del Reglamento de Ejecución (UE) n° 282/2011 («el Reglamento») no persigue definir plenamente el alcance de la exención prevista en el artículo 132, apartado 1, letra i), de la Directiva 2006/112/CE («la Directiva del IVA»). Por el contrario, solo tiene por objeto velar por que los Estados miembros apliquen de manera uniforme los conceptos de «formación o reciclaje profesional» utilizados en dicha disposición, lo que se ajusta al considerando 5 del Reglamento, según el cual sus disposiciones «... incluyen normas específicas que responden a cuestiones concretas planteadas en materia de aplicación, y tienen por objeto dar, en toda la Unión, un trato uniforme a esos casos particulares únicamente. Por lo tanto, no pueden hacerse extensivas a otros supuestos y, dada su formulación, deben aplicarse de manera restrictiva».

El artículo 132, apartado 1, letra i), de la Directiva del IVA es más amplio que el artículo 44 del Reglamento, ya que además de la formación y el reciclaje profesional, contempla también actividades tales como «la educación de la infancia o de la juventud, la enseñanza escolar o universitaria». Puesto que el artículo 44 del Reglamento no pretende aplicar el artículo 132, apartado 1, letra i), de la Directiva del IVA en su totalidad, no obstaculiza ni impide ese ámbito de aplicación más amplio de la Directiva del IVA.

El Reglamento constituye un acto del Consejo que es directamente vinculante para los Estados miembros y en el que el Reino de España no puede introducir una modificación de forma unilateral. Este Reglamento solo puede modificarse mediante acuerdo unánime de todos los Estados miembros en el seno del Consejo, a propuesta de la Comisión⁽¹⁾. En lo que respecta al artículo 44 del Reglamento, la Comisión no ve ninguna necesidad de modificarlo. Además, en lo que respecta a los servicios mencionados en la pregunta, la Comisión se remite a su respuesta escrita a la pregunta E-005758/2013.

⁽¹⁾ Artículo 397 de la Directiva del IVA.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009712/13
to the Commission**

Carmen Romero López (S&D)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: VAT exemption

Article 132(i) of Council Directive 2006/112/EC of 28 November 2006 referring to transactions exempt from VAT states expressly:

‘the provision of children’s or young people’s education, school or university education, vocational training or retraining, including the supply of services and of goods closely related thereto, by bodies governed by public law having such as their aim or by other organisations recognised by the Member State concerned as having similar objects;’

In laying down measures for this directive, Article 44 of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 282/2011 restricts the exemptions established in the directive to instruction needed to acquire or update knowledge for vocational purposes. However the directive makes it clear that the provisions in Article 132(g), (h), (i), (m) and (n) are intended to benefit activities that are complementary to education, and forms of welfare, i.e. school canteens which, in times of crisis, provide a decent meal for pupils from families who would not otherwise have the means for this.

Does the Commission think that the directive has been properly interpreted in the regulation?

Does it think that the Spanish Government should amend the regulation in order to exempt these complementary activities from VAT, bearing in mind that they are clearly of general interest?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission

(1 October 2013)

Article 44 of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 282/2011 (‘the regulation’) does not aim at fully defining the scope of the exemption in Article 132(1)(i) of Directive 2006/112/EC (‘the VAT Directive’). On the contrary, it only aims at ensuring that the notions of ‘vocational training or retraining’ used in that provision are applied uniformly by the Member States. This is in line with Recital (5) of the regulation, according to which its provisions

‘... contain specific rules in response to selective questions of application and are designed to bring uniform treatment throughout the Union to those specific circumstances only. They are therefore not conclusive for other cases and, in view of their formulation, are to be applied restrictively’.

Article 132(1)(i) of the VAT Directive is wider than Article 44 of the regulation, since in addition to vocational training or retraining it also covers activities such as ‘the provision of children’s or young people’s education, school or university education’. As Article 44 of the regulation is not seeking to implement Article 132(1)(i) of the VAT Directive in its entirety, it does not hinder or obstruct that wider scope of the VAT Directive.

The regulation is a Council act which is directly binding on Member States and to which the Kingdom of Spain cannot unilaterally introduce an amendment. That regulation can be amended only by unanimous agreement of all Member States within the Council upon a proposal of the Commission ⁽¹⁾. With regard to Article 44 of the regulation, the Commission does not find any need for an amendment. Further, regarding the services cited in the question, the Commission refers to its written answer to E-005758/2013.

⁽¹⁾ Article 397 of the VAT Directive.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009713/13

an die Kommission

Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)

(29. August 2013)

Betrifft: Ergänzende Informationen zum OLAF Jahresbericht 2012

1. In welchen Ländern fanden die auf Seite 21 des OLAF Jahresbericht 2012 geschilderten On-the-spot-Checks statt?
2. In früheren Jahresberichten hat das OLAF angegeben, in welchen Ländern und in welchen Bereichen es während des Jahres ermittelte. Kann das OLAF dies auch für 2012 tun?
3. Da in vergangenen Berichtsperioden die durchschnittliche Dauer der Ermittlungen auf Basis der geschlossenen Fälle (exklusive der noch offenen Fälle am Jahresende) berechnet wurde: wie hoch war die durchschnittliche Ermittlungsdauer bei den 2012 abgeschlossenen Ermittlungen? Wie hoch war sie 2011 und 2010?
4. Wie lange hat das OLAF in den 2012 abgeschlossenen Ermittlungen in den Ermittlungsarten external, internal, coordinated and criminal assistance cases im Jahr 2012
 - a. inklusive der noch geöffneten Fälle am Jahresende ermittelt?
 - b. exklusive der noch geöffneten Fälle am Jahresende ermittelt?
5. In früheren Jahresberichten hat das OLAF angegeben, aus welchem Jahr, es finanzielle, gerichtliche, disziplinarische und administrative Empfehlungen abgegeben hat. Kann das OLAF dies auch für das Jahr 2012 tun?
6. In früheren Jahresberichten hat das OLAF angegeben, wie hoch die wiedereingezogenen Beträge in den einzelnen betroffenen Ermittlungsbereichen waren. Kann das OLAF dies auch für 2012 tun?
7. In früheren Jahresberichten hat das OLAF angegeben, aus welchen Gründen Gerichte der Mitgliedstaaten OLAF-Fälle nicht weiterverfolgt haben. Kann das OLAF dies auf für das Jahr 2012 tun?
8. In früheren Jahresberichten hat das OLAF angegeben, wie viele Fälle aktiver Ermittlungen in welchen EU Institutionen am Ende des Jahres stattfanden. Kann das OLAF dies auch für das Jahr 2012 tun?

Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission

(25. Oktober 2013)

1. Das OLAF ⁽¹⁾ führte im Jahr 2012 in 18 Mitgliedstaaten ⁽²⁾ Kontrollen vor Ort durch.
2. Der Jahresbericht 2012 des OLAF enthält Angaben zu laufenden Untersuchungen und Koordinierungsverfahren nach Sektoren ⁽³⁾. Ein Großteil der Untersuchungen des OLAF ist grenzüberschreitender Art und betrifft Wirtschaftsteilnehmer aus mehr als einem Mitgliedstaat. Nach Mitgliedstaaten aufgeschlüsselte Statistiken sind deshalb potenziell irreführend.

⁽¹⁾ Europäisches Amt für Betrugsbekämpfung.

⁽²⁾ Belgien, Deutschland, Frankreich, Griechenland, Italien, Lettland, Litauen, Malta, die Niederlande, Österreich, Polen, Rumänien, Slowakei, Spanien, Tschechische Republik, Ungarn, das Vereinigte Königreich und Zypern. Ferner nahm das OLAF 2012 im Rahmen von Informationsbesuchen zu Untersuchungszwecken in Drittländern auch Vor-Ort-Kontrollen in Lesotho und Guyana vor.

⁽³⁾ Schaubild 10, Seite 19 des OLAF-Jahresberichts 2012.

3.-4. Im Jahresbericht 2011 des OLAF ⁽⁴⁾ wurde eine Änderung der Art und Weise, wie die durchschnittliche Dauer der Untersuchungen/Koordinierungsverfahren berechnet wird, erläutert. Diese Änderung wurde vorgenommen, um sich ein besseres Bild von der Effizienz des OLAF zu machen und verlässlichere Statistiken zu erhalten ⁽⁵⁾. Hinsichtlich der durchschnittlichen Dauer der Untersuchungen im Zeitraum 2010-2012 verweist die Kommission die Frau Abgeordnete auf den Jahresbericht 2012 des OLAF ⁽⁶⁾.

5. Im Jahr 2012 hat das OLAF 199 Empfehlungen abgegeben. Bei der Mehrzahl davon handelte es sich — entsprechend dem Auftrag des OLAF, die finanziellen Interessen der EU zu schützen, — um finanzielle Empfehlungen. Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete diesbezüglich auf den Jahresbericht 2012 des OLAF ⁽⁷⁾.

6. Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete auf den Jahresbericht 2012 des OLAF ⁽⁸⁾.

7. Die in früheren Jahresberichten enthaltenen Statistiken über Fälle, die von Gerichten weiterverfolgt wurden, basierten auf der Struktur des Amtes vor der Umstrukturierung des Jahres 2012. Das OLAF überarbeitet derzeit die Grundlage für seine Berichte über Maßnahmen, die im Anschluss an seine Empfehlungen von einzelstaatlichen Justizbehörden ergriffen werden. Ziel dieser Überarbeitung ist eine transparentere und kohärentere Darstellung der Daten, wodurch besser widerspiegelt wird, welche Maßnahmen von den Justizbehörden der Mitgliedstaaten aufgrund der Empfehlungen des OLAF ergriffen werden.

8. Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete auf den Jahresbericht 2012 des OLAF ⁽⁹⁾. Es gibt 95 Fälle, an denen Organe, Einrichtungen und Agenturen der EU beteiligt sind. Die größte Anzahl betrifft die EK ⁽¹⁰⁾, gefolgt von EP ⁽¹¹⁾ und EAD ⁽¹²⁾.

⁽⁴⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/reports-olaf/2011/olaf_report_2011_de.pdf

⁽⁵⁾ Die Dauer der Untersuchungsphase schließt in den derzeit verwendeten Berechnungen die Dauer der während des Berichtszeitraums abgeschlossenen und der am Ende des Berichtszeitraums noch offenen Fälle ein. Diese Parameter wurden auf 2007 zurückgerechnet, um die Indikatoren vergleichbar zu machen — siehe Schaubild 10 und Fußnote 8 auf Seite 19 des Jahresberichts 2011 des OLAF:

http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/reports-olaf/2011/olaf_report_2011_de.pdf und Schaubild 11 auf Seite 20 des Jahresberichts 2012 des OLAF: http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/reports-olaf/2012/olaf_report_2012_de.pdf. Seit der Umstrukturierung des OLAF im Jahr 2012 führt das Amt entweder eine Untersuchung oder ein Koordinierungsverfahren durch. Die durchschnittliche Dauer der offenen Fälle wurde unter Berücksichtigung dieser Änderung neu berechnet. Zusätzliche Informationen zum Unterschied zwischen Untersuchung und Koordinierungsverfahren, siehe: http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/gip/gip_18092013_en.pdf

⁽⁶⁾ Zur durchschnittlichen Dauer von Untersuchungen und Koordinierungsverfahren, siehe Schaubilder 11 und 12, S. 20.

⁽⁷⁾ Tabelle 5, S. 21, und Schaubild 14, S. 22.

⁽⁸⁾ Tabelle 8, S. 24.

⁽⁹⁾ Tabelle 10, S. 19.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Europäische Kommission.

⁽¹¹⁾ Europäisches Parlament.

⁽¹²⁾ Europäischer Auswärtiger Dienst.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009713/13
to the Commission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
 (29 August 2013)

Subject: Additional information in connection with OLAF's annual report for 2012

1. In which countries did the on-the-spot checks referred to on page 21 of OLAF's annual report for 2012 take place?
2. In previous annual reports, OLAF has identified the countries and areas in which it had investigated during the year in question. Can OLAF also do so for 2012?
3. For earlier reporting periods, the average duration of investigations was calculated by reference to cases closed (i.e. excluding cases still open at year-end). What, accordingly, was the average duration of investigations closed in 2012? What was the average duration in 2011 and 2010?
4. With regard to investigations closed in 2012, how long did OLAF investigate in external, internal, coordinated and criminal assistance cases in 2012
 - (a) including cases still open at year-end?
 - (b) excluding cases still open at year-end?
5. In previous annual reports, OLAF has specified the years in which it issued financial, judicial, disciplinary and administrative recommendations. Can OLAF also do so for 2012?
6. In previous annual reports, OLAF has specified the amounts recovered in each investigative area concerned. Can OLAF also do so for 2012?
7. In previous annual reports, OLAF has stated why OLAF cases have not been followed up by Member State courts. Can OLAF also do so for 2012?
8. In previous annual reports, OLAF has given the number of cases in which investigations were ongoing, and in which EU institutions, at year-end. Can OLAF also do so for 2012?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
 (25 October 2013)

1. In 2012, OLAF ⁽¹⁾ carried out on-the-spot checks in 18 Member States (MS) ⁽²⁾.
2. OLAF's annual report (AR) 2012 provides information on open investigation and coordination cases by sector ⁽³⁾. A large part of OLAF's investigations is of a transnational nature and concerns economic operators from more than one MS. Therefore, attempts at giving statistics by MS are potentially misleading.
- 3-4. In the OLAF AR 2011 ⁽⁴⁾, it is explained that the way of calculating the average duration of investigation/coordination cases has changed. The change was done to better reflect the efficiency of OLAF and provide more reliable statistics ⁽⁵⁾. Concerning the average duration of investigations 2010-2012, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the OLAF AR 2012 ⁽⁶⁾.

⁽¹⁾ The European Anti-Fraud Office.

⁽²⁾ Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Spain and the United Kingdom. In 2012 in the framework of investigative missions to the third countries, OLAF carried out also on-the-spot controls in Lesotho and Guyana.

⁽³⁾ Chart 10, page 19 of the OLAF annual report 2012.

⁽⁴⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/reports-olaf/2011/olaf_report_2011_en.pdf

⁽⁵⁾ The duration of the investigative phase in the currently used calculations includes the duration of cases closed during the reporting period and those still open at the end of the reporting period. These parameters have been recalculated back to 2007 in order to make the indicators comparable — see chart 10 and footnote (8) on page 19 in the OLAF annual report 2011: http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/reports-olaf/2011/olaf_report_2011_en.pdf and in the chart 11 on the page 20 in the OLAF annual report 2012: http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/reports-olaf/2012/olaf_report_2012_en.pdf.

Since the OLAF reorganisation 2012, the Office conducts only either an investigation or a coordination case. The average duration of the open cases has been recalculated according to this change. For further information concerning distinction into investigation and coordination case, see: http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/gip/gip_18092013_en.pdf

⁽⁶⁾ Chart 11 and 12, p. 20 for the information on average duration of investigation and coordination cases.

5. OLAF issued in 2012 199 recommendations of which the majority are of a financial nature, reflecting OLAF's mandate to protect the financial interests of the EU. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the OLAF AR 2012 ⁽⁷⁾.

6. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the OLAF AR 2012 ⁽⁸⁾.

7. The statistics on judicial follow-up presented in previous annual reports were based on the Office's structure before the reorganisation of 2012. OLAF is working on reviewing the basis upon which it reports on the actions taken by national judicial authorities following its recommendations. The intention of this review is to present the data in a more transparent and coherent manner which will reflect better the measures taken by MS' judicial authorities on the basis of the OLAF recommendations.

8. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the OLAF AR 2012 ⁽⁹⁾. There are 95 cases with EU institutions, bodies and agencies involved. The largest number is in the EC ⁽¹⁰⁾, followed by the EP ⁽¹¹⁾ and the EEAS ⁽¹²⁾.

⁽⁷⁾ Table 5, p. 21 and chart 14, p. 22.

⁽⁸⁾ Table 8, p. 24.

⁽⁹⁾ Chart 10, p. 19.

⁽¹⁰⁾ The European Commission.

⁽¹¹⁾ The European Parliament.

⁽¹²⁾ The European External Action Service.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009714/13

an die Kommission

Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)

(29. August 2013)

Betrifft: Follow-Up: Antwort zu Umzugskosten, Anfrage E-006329/213

In ihrer Antwort auf die Anfrage E-006329/2013 nach Umzugskosten verweist die Kommission auf einen nicht funktionierenden Link. Darüber hinaus bietet das Arbeitsdokument zum Haushaltsentwurf 2014, auf das die Kommission verweist, nicht alle Informationen nach denen gefragt wurde. Daher erneut folgende Fragen:

1. Wie vielen Bediensteten der Kommission und deren Familien wurden im Jahr 2012 die Umzugskosten innerhalb der EU erstattet? Wie viele Personen waren das?
2. Für Umzüge aus welchen EU-Staaten fielen die höchsten Umzugskosten an? Für wie viele Begünstigte?
3. Für Umzüge in welche EU-Staaten fielen die höchsten Umzugskosten an? Für wie viele Begünstigte?
4. Wie 1.: Wie vielen Bediensteten der Kommission und deren Familien wurden im Jahr 2012 die Umzugskosten an ihren Arbeitsort in die EU/an ihren Arbeitsort in Drittstaaten erstattet? Wie viele Personen waren das?
5. Wie 2.: Für Umzüge aus welchen Drittstaaten fielen die höchsten Umzugskosten an? Für wie viele Begünstigte?
6. Wie 3.: Für Umzüge in welche Drittstaaten fielen die höchsten Umzugskosten an? Für wie viele Begünstigte?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission

(31. Oktober 2013)

Der außerhalb der Organe funktionierende Link, über den die von der Frau Abgeordneten erbetenen Informationen abrufbar sind, lautet wie folgt: www.ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/documents/2014/DB2014_WD_VI_en.pdf

Da die Fragen der Frau Abgeordneten noch eingehender sind, ist die Kommission derzeit nicht in der Lage, die zu Beantwortung erforderlichen Nachforschungen durchzuführen.

Im Übrigen möchte die Kommission die Frau Abgeordnete darauf hinweisen, dass sich mit Inkrafttreten des neuen Statuts am 1. Januar 2014 die derzeit auf die Bediensteten der europäischen Organe anwendbaren Vorschriften zu den Umzugskosten ändern werden.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009714/13
to the Commission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(29 August 2013)**

Subject: Follow-up: Answer relating to removal expenses; Question E-006329/2013

In its answer to Question E-006329/2013 in connection with removal expenses, the Commission provides a link which does not work. Furthermore, the 2014 draft budget working document referred to by the Commission does not contain all the information asked for. I therefore again put the following questions:

1. How many members of Commission staff and their families received reimbursement for expenses for relocation within the EU in 2012? How many individuals did this involve?
2. For relocation from which Member States were the costs the highest? For how many persons?
3. For relocation to which Member States were the costs the highest? For how many persons?
4. As for question 1.: How many members of Commission staff and their families received reimbursement for expenses for relocation to their place of work in the EU / in non-EU countries in 2012? How many individuals did this involve?
5. As for question 2.: For relocation from which non-EU countries were the costs the highest? For how many persons?
6. As for question 3.: For relocation to which non-EU countries were the costs the highest? For how many persons?

(Version française)

**Réponse donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission
(31 octobre 2013)**

Le lien accessible à l'extérieur des institutions permettant de trouver les informations demandées par l'Honorable parlementaire est le suivant: www.ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/documents/2014/DB2014_WD_VI_en.pdf

S'agissant des questions plus détaillées posées par l'Honorable parlementaire, la Commission n'est pas en mesure d'entreprendre actuellement les recherches que cela nécessiterait.

Par ailleurs, la Commission se permet d'appeler l'attention de l'Honorable parlementaire sur le fait que l'entrée en vigueur du nouveau statut le 1^{er} janvier 2014 modifiera les règles applicables actuellement au personnel des institutions européennes en matière de frais de déménagement.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009715/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 Αυγούστου 2013)

Θέμα: Εκμετάλλευση κυπριακών κοιτασμάτων υδρογονανθράκων

Στην απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής στο ερώτημά μου με αριθμό E-007674/2013, αναφέρεται πως η διευθέτηση του Κυπριακού θα ανοίξει ένα ευρύ φάσμα επιλογών για την εκμετάλλευση των κοιτασμάτων υδρογονανθράκων με τον πλέον συμφέροντα από οικονομική άποψη τρόπο, προς όφελος όλων των Κυπρίων.

Καλείται η Επιτροπή όπως επεξηγήσει πιο αναλυτικά και πιο συγκεκριμένα:

1. Ποιο είναι αυτό το «ευρύ φάσμα επιλογών»;
2. Ποιος είναι, κατά την άποψή της ο πιο συμφέρων τρόπος από οικονομικής άποψης για εκμετάλλευση των κοιτασμάτων υδρογονανθράκων;
3. Πώς είναι δυνατή μια σωστή, δίκαιη και βιώσιμη διευθέτηση του Κυπριακού, όταν η κατοχική Τουρκία καιροφυλαχτεί να εκμεταλλευτεί τα κοιτάσματα υδρογονανθράκων προς δικό της όφελος και απειλεί ασύστολα και διαρκώς την Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία;
4. Έχει πειστεί ο κ. Oettinger πως θα αφενδί απρόσκοπτα η Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία να αξιοποιήσει τα κοιτάσματα υδρογονανθράκων προς όφελος των Κυπρίων, χωρίς υπόσκαψη από τρίτους που τα επιβουλεύονται; Πώς μπορεί η ΕΕ να διασφαλίσει κάτι τέτοιο;

Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Η εξερεύνηση των κοιτασμάτων φυσικού αερίου και πετρελαίου στην περιοχή της Ανατολικής Μεσογείου θα μπορούσε να μεταβάλει την κατάσταση που επικρατεί στη συγκεκριμένη περιοχή από γεωπολιτική και οικονομική άποψη.

Τα επιβεβαιωμένα κοιτάσματα και οι ανακαλύψεις που βρίσκονται υπό αξιολόγηση δηλώνουν αφενός ότι υπάρχει αρκετό αέριο για την κάλυψη των εγχώριων ενεργειακών αναγκών και αφετέρου ότι ορισμένες χώρες έχουν τη δυνατότητα να εξάγουν πετρέλαιο και φυσικό αέριο στις παρακείμενες χώρες της περιοχής και στην ΕΕ.

Οι ανακαλύψεις αυτές είχαν ως αποτέλεσμα την εκπόνηση σχεδίων εξαγωγής υγροποιημένου φυσικού αερίου (LNG), πλωτού υγροποιημένου φυσικού αερίου (FLNG) και πετρελαιοαγωγών τόσο από το Ισραήλ όσο και από την Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία με πολλούς διαφορετικούς τρόπους. Η εκτίμηση του οικονομικά αποδοτικότερου τρόπου επαφίεται στην ευχέρεια των ενδιαφερόμενων χωρών αφού πρώτα λάβουν υπόψη όλες τις παραμέτρους και τα πιθανά σενάρια.

Ένας σημαντικός παράγοντας για την τελική επιλογή των «τρόπων μεταφοράς και των διαδρομών» θα είναι το κατά πόσο οι εταιρείες παραγωγής φυσικού αερίου έχουν επαρκή βεβαιότητα, ώστε να επενδύσουν σημαντικά κεφάλαια σε έργα που σχετίζονται με υποδομές για την εξαγωγή αερίου προς την Ευρώπη ή προς τις χώρες της περιοχής.

Η ΕΕ εκδηλώνει έντονο ενδιαφέρον για την ασφαλή, βιώσιμη και ειρηνική εκμετάλλευση των ενεργειακών πόρων στην περιοχή αυτή. Η ΕΕ θα καταβάλει κάθε δυνατή προσπάθεια για να εξασφαλίσει ότι οι εξελίξεις στον τομέα της ενέργειας στην περιοχή αυτή προάγουν την εποικοδομητική συνεργασία μεταξύ των χωρών της περιοχής, τα κοινά έργα και την αμοιβαία εμπιστοσύνη.

Σχετικά με τη θέση της ΕΕ όσον αφορά τις σχέσεις της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας με την Τουρκία στο πλαίσιο της εξερεύνησης υδρογονανθράκων, η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξίοτιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στις απαντήσεις της στις γραπτές ερωτήσεις E-007674/2013 και E-001320/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009715/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 August 2013)

Subject: Exploitation of Cypriot hydrocarbon resources

In his answer given on behalf of the Commission to my Question E-007674/2013, Mr Oettinger indicates that a settlement in Cyprus would open up a range of options for the exploitation of hydrocarbon resources in the economically most advantageous way for the benefit of all Cypriots.

Can the Commission provide more detailed and specific information in order to clarify the following:

1. What does the wide range of options comprise?
2. What does it consider to be the most economically advantageous way of exploiting the hydrocarbon resources?
3. How is a proper, fair and sustainable settlement in Cyprus possible, given that the Turkish occupiers are simply awaiting an opportunity to exploit the hydrocarbon resources for their own ends, openly and continually seeking to intimidate the Republic of Cyprus?
4. Is Mr Oettinger satisfied that the Republic of Cyprus will be able to exploit its hydrocarbon resources for the benefit of Cypriots unhindered by third parties with designs on these resources? How can the EU guarantee that this would be the case?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2013)

The exploration of the gas and oil deposits in the East Mediterranean region could change the situation in this region geopolitically and economically.

Proven reserves and discoveries currently under appraisal in the region indicate enough gas to cover domestic energy needs and the potential for some countries to export volumes to adjacent countries in the region and to the EU.

This has prompted the drafting of LNG, FLNG and pipeline export plans from both Israel and the Republic of Cyprus through many different paths. Which of them is the most economically efficient way is up to the countries concerned to assess after having taken into account all parameters and possible scenarios.

An important factor for the final choice of the 'transportation means and routes' will be whether gas producing companies have the confidence to make major capital investments in projects linked with gas exporting infrastructure towards Europe or towards the countries in the region; unsolved political problems within or between countries of the region make the scale and costs of the investments even higher.

The EU has a keen interest in the safe, sustainable and peaceful exploitation of energy resources in this region. The EU will do all it can to ensure that energy developments in this region build upon constructive collaboration between the countries in the region, joint projects and mutual trust.

Regarding the EU position concerning to the relations of the Republic of Cyprus with Turkey in the context of the exploration of hydrocarbons, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Questions E-007674/2013 and E-001320/2013.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-00967/ 173

προς την Επιτροπή

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)

(29 Αυγούστου 2013)

Θέμα: Κυπριακό πρόβλημα

Έχω παρατηρήσει πως σε αρκετές απαντήσεις της Επιτροπής σε ερωτήματα που έχω υποβάλει αναφορικά με το Κυπριακό και τις διαρκείς παραβιάσεις ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων από την κατοχική Τουρκία στη χώρα μου, ειθίσται να επαναλαμβάνεται μια στερεότυπη αναφορά πως: «Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος σε πρότερες απαντήσεις όπου τονίζεται η ανάγκη ταχείας και ολοκληρωμένης διευθέτησης του Κυπριακού, μεταξύ των ηγετών της ελληνοκυπριακής και τουρκοκυπριακής κοινότητας, υπό την αιγίδα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Θεωρεί το Κυπριακό πρόβλημα δικαιοσυνη διαφορά ή θέμα εισβολής και κατοχής της Τουρκίας κατά της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας, χώρας μέλους του ΟΗΕ, του ΣτΕ, της ΕΕ και άλλων διεθνών οργανισμών;
2. Ποιος ευθύνεται, κατά τη γνώμη της, για τη μη επίλυση του Κυπριακού, 39 χρόνια μετά την τουρκική εισβολή κατά της Κύπρου;
3. Γιατί τηρεί μια τόσο ανεκτική στάση απέναντι στην κατοχική Τουρκία, που ουσιαστικά ισοδυναμεί με αποενοχοποίηση της τελευταίας, για σωρεία εγκλημάτων κατά της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας;
4. Γιατί άφησε την Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία έρμαιο της τουρκικής βουλιμίας, που στην πράξη σημαίνει δημογραφική αλλοίωση των κατεχομένων, παράνομο εποικισμό και τουρκοποίηση;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής

(22 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει θερμά τόσο από πολιτική όσο και από τεχνική άποψη τις προσπάθειες που καταβάλλουν οι ηγέτες των δύο κοινοτήτων στην Κύπρο και τα Ηνωμένα Έθνη για συνολική διευθέτηση του Κυπριακού.

Επίσης, η Επιτροπή ενθαρρύνει όλα τα μέρη να συμβάλουν ώστε να εδραιωθεί θετικό κλίμα μεταξύ των κοινοτήτων. Τα οφέλη της επανένωσης υπερισχύουν των τυχόν παραχωρήσεων που θα χρειαστεί να γίνουν προς αυτόν τον σκοπό.

Επιπλέον, η Επιτροπή έχει ζητήσει επανειλημμένως από την Τουρκία να συμβάλει θετικά και με συγκεκριμένο τρόπο στη συνολική διευθέτηση του Κυπριακού.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-00967/ 173
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 August 2013)

Subject: The Cyprus problem

It has come to my attention that a number of the Commission's answers to questions I have tabled regarding the Cyprus problem and the continual human rights violations committed by the Turkish occupying forces in my country repeat a routine statement along the following lines : 'The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to previous answers which emphasised the need for a rapid and comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem between the leaders of the Greek Cypriot and the Turkish Cypriot communities, under the auspices of the United Nations.'

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it believe that the Cyprus problem is a bi-communal dispute or a matter of the invasion and occupation by Turkey of the Republic of Cyprus, a state which is a member of the UN, the CoE, the EU and other international organisations?
2. Who is responsible, in its opinion, for the failure to reach a settlement of the Cyprus problem, 39 years after the Turkish invasion of Cyprus?
3. Why does it maintain such a forbearing attitude towards the occupying power, Turkey, which is essentially tantamount to absolving it from culpability for a host of crimes against the Republic of Cyprus?
4. Why has it left the Republic of Cyprus a prey to Turkish rapaciousness, which in practice means an alteration of the demographic situation in the occupied territories, illegal colonisation and Turkification?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(22 October 2013)

The Commission strongly supports politically and technically the efforts of the leaders of the two communities in Cyprus and the UN to reach a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus issue.

The Commission also encourages all parties to contribute to establishing a positive climate between the communities. The benefits of reunification will outweigh any concessions that will need to be made to this end.

The Commission, at various instances, has also called on Turkey to contribute in concrete terms and positively to a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus issue.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009717/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 Αυγούστου 2013)

Θέμα: Αύξηση φόρων

Η Γαλλία έχει φτάσει σε σημείο που δεν μπορεί πλέον να αυξήσει φόρους χωρίς να βλάψει την ανάπτυξη και να οδηγήσει σε μείωση θέσεων εργασίας, δήλωσε στην εβδομαδιαία εφημερίδα *Le Journal du Dimanche* ο Επίτροπος Οικονομικών και Νομισματικών Υποθέσεων, Όλι Ρεν.

Τα σχέδια του Φρανσουά Ολάντ για φόρους 6 δισ. ευρώ το 2014 έχουν εξοργίσει τις επιχειρήσεις και τα νοικοκυριά και έχουν ωθήσει το ΔΝΤ να προειδοποιήσει ότι περαιτέρω αυξήσεις στους φόρους θα εμποδίζουν την εύθραυστη οικονομική ανάκαμψη της χώρας.

Ερωτηθείς εάν οι αυξήσεις φόρων θα πρέπει να σταματήσουν, ο κ. Ρεν δήλωσε:

«Απολύτως. Οι αυξήσεις φόρων στη Γαλλία έχουν φτάσει στο μοιραίο σημείο τους. Η επιβολή νέων φόρων θα έσπαζε την ανάπτυξη και θα επιβάρυνε την απασχόληση. Η πειθαρχία στον προϋπολογισμό πρέπει να προέλθει από μείωση των δημοσίων δαπανών και όχι από νέους φόρους».

Ερωτάται λοιπόν ο Επίτροπος:

1. Γιατί δεν έχει προβεί σε παρόμοιες δηλώσεις για την Ελλάδα και την Κύπρο;
2. Δεν έχουν φτάσει σε μοιραίο σημείο τα μέτρα λιτότητας και οι φόροι στις χώρες αυτές;
3. Δεν έχουν καταστραφεί οι προοπτικές τους για ανάπτυξη;
4. Δεν έχουν καταστραφεί οι προοπτικές τους για απασχόληση;
5. Τι προτείνει η Επιτροπή; πιο συγκεκριμένα; για αναστροφή του αρνητικού κλίματος και επανεκκίνηση της οικονομίας των χωρών αυτών;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Η Γαλλία, όπως άλλωστε οι περισσότερες ευρωπαϊκές χώρες, αντιμετωπίζει την πρόκληση που συνιστά η μείωση του αυξανόμενου δημόσιου χρέους. Ωστόσο, οι χώρες του προγράμματος, όπως η Ελλάδα και η Κύπρος, αντιμετωπίζουν μια σειρά ιδιαίτερων προβλημάτων, γεγονός που καθιστά δύσκολη τη σύγκριση μεταξύ των χωρών που δεν υπάγονται στο πρόγραμμα και των χωρών του προγράμματος. Σε αυτό οφείλονται οι ριζικές διαφορές όσον αφορά τις διαδικασίες επιτήρησης και την παροχή συμβουλών σε θέματα πολιτικής.

Οι συστάσεις προς τη Γαλλία που πρότεινε η Επιτροπή και ενέκρινε το Συμβούλιο δεν προτρέπουν σε αύξηση των φόρων, αλλά σε μετατόπιση της φορολογικής επιβάρυνσης από την εργασία στην περιβαλλοντική φορολογία ή την κατανάλωση, καθώς και σε διεύρυνση των φορολογικών βάσεων.

Παρά την εκτεταμένη χρήση φορολογικών μέσων για την εξυγίανση των δημόσιων οικονομικών Ελλάδας και Κύπρου, ο δείκτης φορολογίας προς το ΑΕΠ των χωρών αυτών εκτιμάται σε περίπου 33% και 34% αντίστοιχα για το 2013, σύμφωνα με τις εαρινές προβλέψεις της Επιτροπής για το 2013, ενώ ο μέσος όρος της ζώνης του ευρώ παραμένει περίπου 41%. Αντίθετα, ο δείκτης φορολογίας προς το ΑΕΠ της Γαλλίας υπερβαίνει το 46% και αποτελεί έναν από τους πιο υψηλούς δείκτες στη ζώνη του ευρώ. Οι έμμεσοι φορολογικοί συντελεστές στην Ελλάδα και την Κύπρο, οι οποίοι μετρούν την μέση φορολογική επιβάρυνση σε διάφορα είδη οικονομικών εσόδων ή δραστηριοτήτων (δηλαδή στην εργασία, την κατανάλωση και το κεφάλαιο), είναι επίσης σαφώς χαμηλότεροι από το μέσο όρο της ΕΕ.

Για την αποκατάσταση υγιών δημόσιων οικονομικών και την οικονομική ανάκαμψη των οικονομιών τους, τόσο η Ελλάδα όσο και η Κύπρος οφείλουν να εφαρμόσουν, εκτός των μέτρων για την εξυγίανση των δημόσιων οικονομικών τους, διαρθρωτικές μεταρρυθμίσεις για τη στήριξη της ανταγωνιστικότητας και της βιώσιμης και ισόρροπης ανάπτυξης, όπως περιγράφεται στο μνημόνιο συμφωνίας που υπεγράφη από τον ΕΜΣ και τις δύο χώρες.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009717/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 August 2013)

Subject: Tax increases

In an interview with the French weekly 'Le Journal du Dimanche', Olli Rehn, Commissioner for economic and monetary affairs, warned that France could now no longer increase taxes without destroying economic growth and employment prospects.

Companies and households alike are incensed by the EUR 6 billion tax package announced by François Hollande for 2014, prompting the IMF to caution against further tax increases the grounds that they will compromise the country's fragile economic recovery.

Asked whether tax increases must be halted, Mr Rehn replied that this was indeed the case, adding that tax levels in France had reached a fateful point and that new taxes would destroy growth and undermine job creation. He argued that budgetary discipline must come from a reduction in public spending and not from new taxes.

In view of this:

1. Why has the Commissioner not issued similar statements in respect of Greece and Cyprus?
2. Have austerity measures and tax levels not reached a 'fateful point' in these countries also?
3. Have their growth prospects not been destroyed?
4. Have their employment prospects not been destroyed?
5. What specific measures does the Commission intend to take to revive the flagging economies of these two countries?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(25 October 2013)

France, — as most EU countries — faces the challenge of reducing mounting public debt. However, programme countries such as Greece and Cyprus face a very distinct set of problems, which makes a comparison of non-programme and programme countries difficult. That is why both surveillance procedures and policy advice differs fundamentally.

The recommendations proposed by the Commission and adopted by the Council for France do not favour tax hikes but rather a shift in taxation from labour to environmental taxation or consumption and a broadening of tax bases.

Although tax instruments were extensively used in Greece and Cyprus for restoring the health of their public finances, the tax-to-GDP ratio in Greece and Cyprus is estimated at around 33% and 34% for 2013 respectively according to Commission 2013 spring forecast, while the euro-area average is set to remain at around 41%. In contrast, the tax-to-GDP ratio in France is above 46%, among the very highest in the euro-area. The implicit tax rates in Greece and Cyprus, which measure the effective average tax burden on different types of economic income or activities (i.e. on labour, consumption and capital), are also clearly below the EU average.

For restoring sound public finances and reviving their economies both Greece and Cyprus need to implement — in addition to measures to consolidate their public finances — structural reforms to support competitiveness and sustainable and balanced growth, as outlined in the memorandum of understanding signed by the ESM with both countries.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009718/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 août 2013)

Objet: Différend automobile franco allemand

Antonio Tajani, commissaire chargé de l'industrie et de l'entrepreneuriat, a engagé une procédure de précontentieux contre l'Allemagne à la mi-juin et a donné dix semaines aux autorités allemandes pour se mettre en règle, à savoir jusqu'en septembre.

La France aurait violé l'article 34 sur la libre circulation en décidant d'interdire l'immatriculation des modèles Mercedes Classe A, Classe B et CLA produits depuis juin avant que la Commission n'ait statué, a-t-on souligné de source communautaire.

Néanmoins, la Commission estime que le groupe Daimler est lui aussi en infraction, car tous les nouveaux modèles commercialisés en 2013 doivent être équipés depuis le 1^{er} janvier d'un nouveau gaz réfrigérant moins polluant pour les systèmes de climatisation.

1. Quelle est la position de la Commission?
2. Comment compte-t-elle régler le différend?
3. Le litige est-il quantifiable?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission

(17 octobre 2013)

La Commission examine actuellement la réponse présentée par les autorités allemandes à sa lettre «PILOT» en ce qui concerne la mise en œuvre de la directive 2006/40/CE sur les systèmes de climatisation mobiles. Si des éléments attestant de la violation du droit de l'UE devaient apparaître, la Commission prendrait alors les mesures qu'elle jugerait appropriées.

S'agissant de la mesure de sauvegarde notifiée par la France le 26 juillet 2013 au titre de l'article 29 de la directive 2007/46/CE, la Commission est en train de consulter les parties concernées conformément à la procédure prévue au dit article. Le 1^{er} août 2013, elle a envoyé un courrier à la France, à l'Allemagne et à la société Daimler pour demander des informations complémentaires, qu'elles a entretemps reçues, puis, le 6 septembre 2013, elle a consulté d'autres États membres au sein du comité technique pour les véhicules à moteur. La Commission tirera ses conclusions sur la base de ces concertations et informera les parties concernées en conséquence.

La Commission estime que la situation actuelle de non-conformité à la directive sur les systèmes de climatisation mobiles cause un double préjudice, à la fois en termes d'incidence sur le climat (l'objectif de la directive) et de distorsion de la concurrence vis-à-vis des fabricants qui respectent la directive. Cet aspect n'a pas encore été chiffré.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009718/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 August 2013)**

Subject: Franco-German dispute over car air-conditioning coolant

In mid-June Antonio Tajani, Commissioner with responsibility for industry and entrepreneurship, instituted preliminary infringement proceedings against Germany and gave the country 10 weeks (i.e. until September) to come into line.

According to EU sources, France has acted in breach of Article 34 on freedom of movement in refusing to register Mercedes A-, B- and CLA-Class cars manufactured since June 2013 until such time as the Commission has ruled on the matter.

The Commission nonetheless takes the view that the Daimler group is also in breach of EC law, which requires new models placed on the market since 1 January 2013 to be fitted with air-conditioning systems using a new, more environment-friendly coolant.

1. What is the Commission's position on this matter?
2. How does it intend to settle the dispute between France and Germany?
3. How much money is at stake here?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2013)**

The reply submitted by the German authorities to the Commission's PILOT letter in respect of the enforcement of Directive 2006/40/EC on mobile air-conditioning (MAC), is currently under assessment by the Commission. Should evidence of a breach of EC law emerge, the Commission would then take any action deemed appropriate.

On the notification of a safeguard measure by France on 26 July 2013, under Article 29 of Directive 2007/46/EC, in accordance with the procedure provided in the same Article, the Commission is consulting the parties concerned. It sent on 1 August 2013 a letter to France, Germany and Daimler for additional information, which it has now received, and consulted other Member States at the Technical Committee-Motor Vehicles on 6 September 2013. The Commission will draw its conclusions based on these discussions and will inform the concerned parties accordingly.

The Commission considers that the current situation of non-compliance with the MAC Directive is provoking dual damage in terms of the impact on our climate (the objective of the directive) and the competitive distortion that has ensued in relation with the manufacturers that comply with the directive. This has not yet been monetised.

(Magyar változat)

**Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-009719/13
a Bizottság számára**

Tabajdi Csaba Sándor (S&D), Göncz Kinga (S&D), Gurmai Zita (S&D) és Herczog Edit (S&D)
(2013. augusztus 29.)

Tárgy: A Magyarország számára folyósítandó kohéziós források felfüggesztésének okai

A magyar közvélemény aggodalommal értesült 2013. augusztus közepén a Magyarország számára folyósítandó uniós támogatások felfüggesztéséről. Az Európai Unió kohéziós forrásai – különösen a gazdasági válság idején – kiemelt jelentőséggel bírnak a magyar gazdaság és társadalom fejlődésében, uniós átlaghoz való felzárkózásában. Az Európai Bizottság szerint Magyarországon 2009 óta az állami beruházások 97%-a valósult meg uniós támogatásból.

Lázár János illetékes államtitkár nyilatkozata szerint az Európai Bizottság egy 2012-es vizsgálatra hivatkozva a Magyarországon működő 15 operatív programból 13 esetében befagyasztotta a kifizetéseket. A magyar közvélemény azonban nem rendelkezik elegendő információval az Európai Bizottság döntését illetően.

A magyar közvélemény teljes joggal várja el mind az Európai Bizottságtól, mind a magyar kormánytól a hiteles tájékoztatást. Az Európai Bizottság döntéseinek átláthatósága fontos a lakosság bizalmának megnyerése érdekében. Erre hivatkozva felelős európai parlamenti képviselőkként a következő kérdésekre várjuk az Európai Bizottság sürgős válaszát:

1. Pontosan milyen szabálytalanságok merültek fel az uniós vizsgálat során, mekkora összeget érinthet az Európai Bizottság döntése?
2. Mely operatív programok esetében függesztették fel a kifizetéseket?
3. Mikor és milyen formában tájékoztatták és értesítették hivatalosan a magyar kormányzatot a hiányosságokról és a pénzek befagyasztásáról?
4. A talált szabálytalanságok arányban állnak-e a felfüggesztett támogatások, illetve a büntetés mértékével?
5. Milyen eszközei és lehetőségei vannak a Bizottságnak a magyar közvélemény minél szélesebb körének hiteles tájékoztatására, amelyekkel elősegítheti, hogy ezekről az ügyekről hamarabb értesüljön a lakosság? Élt-e a Bizottság ezekkel az eszközökkel?

Johannes Hahn válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. október 23.)

1. A Bizottság súlyos megkülönböztető gyakorlatokat tárt fel a közbeszerzési eljárásokban, amelyek jelentősen korlátozták a magyarországi piaci versenyt. Ez súlyos hiányosságot jelent a magyarországi programok irányítási és kontrollrendszerében, ezért a Bizottság 10 program ⁽¹⁾ esetében korrekciós intézkedésekre kötelezte Magyarországot.

Azonnali hatállyal 157 millió EUR értékű pénzügyi korrekciót kellett végrehajtani, és a jövőbeni kifizetésekből további összegeket kell levonni. Ezek az összegek azonban ugyanazon program keretében más projektekre újra felhasználhatóak.

2. Az érintett magyarországi programokra folyósított kifizetéseket nem függesztették fel, hanem ideiglenesen leállították azokat. Mivel Magyarország végrehajtotta az előírt korrekciókat, a Bizottság 2013. szeptember 13-án úgy döntött, megkezdődhet a korábban visszatartott kifizetések Magyarország számára történő folyósítása.
3. Miután 2012 októberében súlyos megkülönböztető gyakorlatokat tárt fel a közbeszerzési eljárásokban, a Bizottság 2012 novemberében, illetve későbbi leveleiben tájékoztatta Magyarországot a kifizetések megszakításának okairól és a kapcsolódó következtetésekről.

⁽¹⁾ A környezetvédelemre és az energiára, a közlekedésre, illetve a szociális infrastruktúrára vonatkozó operatív program, továbbá 7 regionális operatív program.

4. A talált szabálytalanságok természetével és súlyával a pénzügyi korrekció szintjének kell arányban állnia. A javasolt pénzügyi korrekció arányos, és mértékének meghatározása a pénzügyi korrekciókra vonatkozó iránymutatások ⁽⁷⁾ alapján történt.

5. Miután a Bizottság és Magyarország 2013. szeptember 9-én megállapodásra jutott a korrekciós intézkedésekről, egy sajtótájékoztató keretében azonnal tájékoztatták erről a nyilvánosságot. A Bizottság hivatalos párbeszédet folytat a tagállamokkal, és a programhatóságok számára előírja az érdekelt harmadik felek tájékoztatását.

⁽⁷⁾ A Bizottság 2011. október 19-i COM(2011) 7321 határozata az 1083/2006/EK rendelet 99. cikkének (2) bekezdése szerinti pénzügyi korrekciók meghatározása során a bizottsági szolgálatok által alkalmazandó alapelvekre, kritériumokra és javasolt értékhatárookra vonatkozó iránymutatásokról.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009719/13
to the Commission**

Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D), Kinga Göncz (S&D), Zita Gurmai (S&D) and Edit Herczog (S&D)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: Reasons for the suspension of Cohesion Fund payments to Hungary

In mid-August 2013, the Hungarian public learned with concern that EU support for Hungary was being suspended. Particularly at a time of economic crisis, cohesion funding from the EU is extremely important to the development of the Hungarian economy and society and in helping to bring them up to the EU average. According to the Commission, since 2009, 97% of State investment in Hungary has been made by drawing on EU support.

According to a statement by János Lázár — the state secretary responsible — the Commission froze payments in 13 cases in the 15 operative programmes being carried out in Hungary, invoking an investigation conducted in 2012. However, Hungarian public opinion does not have sufficient information concerning the Commission's decision.

Hungarian public opinion quite rightly expects both the Commission and the Hungarian Government to provide reliable information. Transparency of Commission decisions is important in order to gain the confidence of the population. As responsible Members of the European Parliament, therefore, we urgently seek from the Commission answers to the following questions.

1. Exactly what kind of irregularities were identified during the EU investigation, and how large a sum may be affected by the Commission decision?
2. In the case of which operational programmes have payments been suspended?
3. When and in what form was the Hungarian Government officially informed of the shortcomings and of the freezing of the funds?
4. Are the irregularities which have been identified proportionate to the amount of support which has been suspended, i.e. to the punishment?
5. What means and instruments does the Commission have at its disposal to provide trustworthy information to the broadest possible spectrum of Hungarian public opinion, so that the population can obtain information about these matters more swiftly? Has the Commission used these instruments?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(23 October 2013)

1. The Commission detected serious discriminatory practices in public procurement procedures which significantly limited competition on the market in Hungary. This constitutes a serious deficiency in the management and control system of the Hungarian programmes and therefore the Commission required corrective measures from Hungary on 10 programmes ⁽¹⁾.

A financial correction of approximately EUR 157 million has to be applied immediately and further amounts will have to be deducted from future expenditure. These amounts can however be reused for other projects within the same programmes.

2. The payments to the Hungarian programmes concerned were not suspended, but temporarily put on hold. As Hungary implemented the required corrections, the Commission decided on 20 September 2013 that the payments withheld earlier can be resumed to Hungary.

3. Following the detection of the serious discriminatory practice in public procurement procedures in October 2012, the Commission communicated the reasons and the conclusion of the interruption of payments to Hungary in November 2012 and in subsequent letters.

4. It is the level of the financial correction which shall be proportionate to the nature and gravity of the irregularities found. The proposed financial correction is proportionate and established on the basis of the Guidelines on financial corrections ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Environment and Energy OP, Transport OP, Social Infrastructure OP, 7 Regional OPs.

⁽²⁾ Commission decision C(2011) 7321 of 19 October 2011, on the approval of guidelines on the principles, criteria and indicative scales to be applied by Commission in determining financial corrections under Article 99 (2) of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006.

5. After agreement on the corrective measures was reached between the Commission and Hungary on 9 September 2013, this was immediately reported to the public in a press conference. The Commission communicates officially with the Member States and requires that the programme authorities inform interested third parties.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009720/13

aan de Commissie

Peter van Dalen (ECR)

(29 augustus 2013)

Betreft: Luchtkwaliteit en rook in vliegtuigen

In Nederland dient deze week voor het eerst een juridische procedure over de gevolgen van giftige stoffen in de lucht van vliegtuigcabines. Een piloot daagt zijn werkgever, onder meer over zijn gezondheidsklachten die volgens de piloot zijn veroorzaakt door langdurige blootstelling aan giftige stoffen (TCP's) in de cabinelucht. Het proces wordt nauwgezet gevolgd door nationale en internationale media, omdat wereldwijd meer vliegtuigpersoneel gezondheidsklachten wijt aan blootstelling aan giftige stoffen in de cabinelucht. Tegelijkertijd is in Duitsland bekend geworden dat zich op twee vluchten incidenten hebben voorgedaan doordat het cabinepersoneel onwel werd van de cabinelucht. Voorts zijn in de afgelopen weken diverse vliegtuigen naar hun vertrekhaven teruggekeerd vanwege rook in de cabine en de cockpit.

1. Heeft de Commissie kennis genomen van de juridische procedure in kwestie bij de Rechtbank Amsterdam, alsmede van de uitkomsten van het onderzoek van het Duitse Federale Luchtvaartbureau over de oorzaken van twee luchtvaartincidenten?
2. Heeft de Commissie in kaart gebracht hoeveel Europese werknemers in de luchtvaart gezondheidsklachten toedichten aan giftige stoffen in de cabinelucht? En hoe vaak een incident in de luchtvaart zich voordoet als gevolg van de slechte luchtkwaliteit en rook in cockpit en cabine? Zo nee, is de Commissie bereid deze cijfers in kaart te brengen?
3. Is de Commissie bereid onderzoek te doen naar de luchtkwaliteit in vliegtuigen, met name naar de mogelijke aanwezigheid van een schadelijke hoeveelheid giftige stoffen? En is de Commissie bereid onderzoek te doen naar de oorzaken van de incidenten met rook in de cabine en de cockpit? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie

(10 oktober 2013)

Het Europees Agentschap voor de veiligheid van de luchtvaart (EASA) oefent toezicht uit op de door het Duitse federale Bureau voor onderzoek van luchtvaartongevallen (BFU) uitgevoerde onderzoeken aan de hand van de door het BFU ingediende rapporten. Noch de Commissie, noch het EASA beschikken op dit moment over specifieke informatie over de lopende juridische procedure in Amsterdam.

De Commissie is niet op de hoogte van gezondheidsklachten door de luchtkwaliteit in de cabine of cockpit. Het EASA ziet toe op de rapportering van incidenten op basis van informatie uit verschillende bronnen, waaronder rapporteringssystemen en evaluaties van vliegtuig- en motorenfabrikanten. Hoewel er verschillen zijn naargelang het land, het type toestel en de exploitant, blijft het aantal incidenten in het algemeen zeer laag en gaat het meestal niet om ernstige incidenten. Slechts enkele gevallen waarin bemanningsleden onwel werden, zijn officieel onderzocht door instanties voor onderzoek naar vliegtuigongevallen. Het totale aantal gerapporteerde incidenten (met inbegrip van alle kleine incidenten) wordt door het EASA op één of minder per 100 000 vliegingen geraamd.

Hoewel geen enkele van de tot dusver afgeronde studies gezondheidsproblemen door de luchtkwaliteit in de cabine aan het licht heeft gebracht, onderzoekt de Commissie op dit moment op basis van een voorstel van het EASA of het thema luchtkwaliteit in de cabine kan worden opgenomen in het meerjarig werkprogramma Horizon 2020. Dit voorstel omvat onder meer de ontwikkeling en het testen van systemen voor de monitoring van de lucht en de verwijdering van schadelijke stoffen, die gemakkelijk in bestaande toestellen zouden kunnen worden ingebouwd.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009720/13
to the Commission**

Peter van Dalen (ECR)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: Air quality and harmful fumes on aircraft

This week a court case, the first of its kind, is being heard in the Netherlands concerning the harmful effects of aircraft cabin fumes, proceedings having been brought by a pilot against his employers for health problems allegedly caused by long-term exposure to such fumes (TCPs). The details of the case have caught the attention of the national and international media, particularly in view of concerns being expressed by airline crews worldwide regarding health problems arising in this connection. In Germany there have been two reported incidents of cabin crews being adversely affected and in recent weeks a number of aircraft have had to return to their airport of departure because of cabin and cockpit fumes.

1. Is the Commission aware of the legal proceedings taking place in Amsterdam and the findings of the German Federal Aviation Bureau regarding the causes of the above incidents?
2. Does the Commission know how many European airline staff members are suffering from health problems attributed to cabin and cockpit fumes and poor air quality on aircraft? Does it know how frequently air traffic is disrupted by such incidents? If not, will it compile the relevant statistics?
3. Will the Commission call for an investigation into air quality on aircraft and possibly harmful levels of contamination by cabin and cockpit fumes? Will it investigate the reasons for such incidents? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission

(10 October 2013)

The investigations conducted by the German Federal Bureau of Aircraft Accident Investigation (BFU) are monitored by the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) on the basis of the reports transmitted by BFU. With regard to the legal proceeding taking place in Amsterdam neither the Commission nor EASA have specific information at this stage.

The Commission is not aware of a health case that was demonstrated as being caused by occupational exposure to cabin or cockpit air. EASA is already monitoring the reporting of incidents based on information available from various sources including reporting systems and reviews made with aeroplane and engine manufacturers. Although there are variations depending on the country, the aircraft type, the operator, globally the rate of events remains very low and the majority of reported events are of low severity. Only few cases involved a reporting of crew impairment and were subject to official investigation by aircraft accident investigation boards. The overall rate of reported events (including all the minor events) is still estimated by EASA to be of the order of magnitude of one event or less per 100.000 flight hours.

Although none of the studies completed so far have revealed an occupational health issue from cabin air exposure, the Commission, following an EASA proposal, is currently examining the possibility to include a thematic area on cabin air quality in the Horizon 2020 multiannual work programme. The development and testing of systems for air monitoring and removal of potential contaminants, which could be easily integrated into the design of existing aircraft, are part of this proposal.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009721/13
to the Commission**

Marta Andreasen (ECR)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: Presentation of budget information in spreadsheet format

The 2014 draft budget for the institutions, as presented in Doc 2, consists of more than 1 800 lines, and this excludes the many subtotals which appear in the published versions.

When euro cents are included — as they are in outcome data — the numbers presented can run into 14 digits. The maximum number of digits commonly available on a desktop calculator is 12.

Moreover, the budget goes through a number of draft phases as it proceeds through the legislative process.

Could the Commission explain why the EU general budget is not available for download in spreadsheet format from the Commission website?

The budget is only available in PDF format to the general public. Before final adoption it is only distributed as a Word file within Parliament. The budget is clearly prepared in spreadsheet format, and so in the interest of transparency and in order to compare budgets across different years more easily, the presentation of data in Excel or other spreadsheet formats would be very useful.

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission

(4 October 2013)

The web publication of the EU annual budget is a joint activity of the Commission, the Council and the Parliament for which the Office of Publication (OP) is in charge. OP manages a specific software application (CIBA) containing all the data which is regularly updated and reflects each stage of the budget negotiations (updates following each amending budget and/or letter, positions the respective institutions). Upon request the Office of Publication can provide an excel version of the budget. A copy of such excel file, which was generated by Office of Publication through the CIBA application following a request of a citizen, is enclosed.

OP is currently improving the Budget-online web page and plan to provide such tables through a new Open Data Portal.

The Commission publishes a downloadable excel version of the executed budget, which comes as a complementary document of the annual financial report. In order to increase the possibility of comparisons the data for the present Multiannual Financial Framework are presented in an interactive form on the following web address:
http://ec.europa.eu/budget/figures/interactive/index_en.cfm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009722/ 3
to the Commission
Marta Andreasen (ECR)
(29 August 2013)

Subject: Commission's financial transparency system

The Commission's financial transparency system contains the following caveats in annex to the 2012 financial data released:

'Please note that important changes had to be implemented in the Financial Transparency System (FTS) following the entry into force of the EU new Financial Regulation and its rules of application. These have an impact on the publication of financial year 2012 data onwards. The main changes are as follows:

No information on public procurement contracts lower than EUR 15 000 will be published. In practice the number of items may decrease substantially. It may happen that information on a given beneficiary was provided through FST in 2011, but it is not provided for 2012 even though the sums contracted by the same beneficiary were similar in volume on both occasions.

There will be no more confidential names of beneficiaries, where the text "confidential" or "natural person" appeared instead of the beneficiary's name. The publication shall be waived if the disclosure risks threatening the rights and freedoms of individuals concerned as protected by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union or harm the commercial interests of the beneficiary'.

The data for 2011 totalled 83 346 rows and amounted to EUR 20 208 249 724. The data for 2012 totalled 55 329 rows and amounted to EUR 20 493 684 889. There was a small increase in financial terms over the previous year but the level of transactions reported decreased considerably (by 33.6 %).

Could the Commission please state:

1. The number and value of payments excluded on the grounds of being for public procurement contracts with a value of less than EUR 15 000;
2. The number and total value of payments excluded on confidentiality grounds;
3. The number and value of payments excluded because both of the above conditions apply.

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(16 October 2013)

Through FTS the Commission publishes information on amounts committed and not on payments, except in the case of provisional commitments where both amounts are published. Indeed, changes had to be implemented following the entry into force of the EU new Financial Regulation and its rules of application (RAP) as of 1 January 2013. See details of amounts published in 2011 and 2012 in Table I of the annex.

1. 17 579 commitments worth EUR 41 867 537.66, along with payments worth EUR 49 489 722.59 (corresponding to 20 284 lines of detail), were excluded on the grounds of being related to procurement contract with a value of less than EUR 15 000. See details in Table II of the annex.
 2. 174 commitment positions worth EUR 59 453 246.37 were excluded from publication on confidentiality grounds.
 3. Among contracts excluded from FTS publication based on the EUR 15 000 threshold, 310 commitment positions worth EUR 581 283.51 were encoded as 'publication waived'.
-

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009723/13

an die Kommission

Franz Obermayr (NI)

(29. August 2013)

Betrifft: Nachfolgefrage E-005136/2013

Die Kommission ist in Ihrer Antwort auf die Anfrage E-005136/2013 nicht auf die 4. Frage eingegangen, deswegen wird nochmals um die Beantwortung folgender Frage gebeten:

Wie viel Geld erhalten Bulgarien und Rumänien jährlich von der EU, um im Rahmen von EU-Projekten in diesen Ländern vor Ort die Lebenssituation der Roma- und Sinti-Bevölkerung zu verbessern?

Antwort von Johannes Hahn im Namen der Kommission

(23. Oktober 2013)

Über die finanzielle Unterstützung der EU für Rumänien und Bulgarien zur Verbesserung der Lebensbedingungen der Gemeinschaften von Roma und Sinti liegt uns keine jährliche Kostenaufstellung vor.

In Bulgarien wurden für den gesamten Zeitraum 2007-2013 10 Mio. EUR aus den EU-Fonds (7 Mio. EUR aus dem EFRE und 3 Mio. EUR aus dem ESF) für ein Pilotvorhaben zur sozialen Eingliederung marginalisierter Gemeinschaften, darunter der Gemeinschaft der Roma, bereitgestellt. Die Pilotinitiative basiert auf einem integrierten Konzept, das den Bau moderner Sozialwohnungen für benachteiligte Gruppen sowie die Durchführung von Programmen für Bildung, Qualifizierung und Beschäftigung mit dem Ziel der langfristigen und nachhaltigen Integration dieser Gruppen umfasst.

In Rumänien werden voraussichtlich neun Pilotprojekte zur Entwicklung von Wohnraum, sozialen Zentren, Bildung-/Gesundheits- und Beschäftigungsinfrastruktur für die Roma-Bevölkerung im Rahmen des regionalen operationellen Programms Unterstützung aus dem EFRE erhalten. Das Gesamtbudget für diese Pilotprojekte, die in drei Gebieten (Cluj, Braila, Galati) durchgeführt werden, beläuft sich auf etwa 11 Mio. EUR.

Schließlich profitiert die Roma-Bevölkerung in den beiden Ländern auch von anderen Investitionen, z. B. in die Verbesserung der sozialen Infrastruktur, sowie von integrierten Stadtentwicklungsmaßnahmen.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009723/13
to the Commission**

Franz Obermayr (NI)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: Follow-up question in connection with Question E-005136/2013

In its answer to Question E-005136/2013, the Commission did not address question 4.

Accordingly how much money do Bulgaria and Romania receive every year from the EU to improve the Roma and Sinti communities' living conditions there through EU projects?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(23 October 2013)

As regards the EU financial support for Romania and Bulgaria to improve the Roma and Sinti communities' living conditions, a yearly breakdown is not available.

In Bulgaria EUR 10 million of EU funds (EUR 7 million ERDF and EUR 3 million ESF) has been allocated for the whole 2007-2013 period for a pilot exercise targeting the social inclusion of marginalised communities, including Roma. The pilot initiative is based on an integrated approach, which includes the construction of modern social housing for disadvantaged groups together with the implementation of education, qualification and employment programmes aimed at the long-term sustainable integration of these groups.

In Romania, nine pilot projects for developing housing, social centres, educational/health and employment infrastructure, targeting Roma population are expected to receive ERDF support through the Regional Operational Programme. These pilots have an estimated total budget of EUR 11 million and will be implemented in three areas (Cluj, Braila, Galati).

Finally, the Roma population in the two countries is also benefiting from other investments such as the improvement of social infrastructure and integrated urban development actions.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009724/13

an die Kommission

Franz Obermayr (NI)

(29. August 2013)

Betrifft: Nachfolgefrage E-002690/2013

Die Kommission hat in ihrer Antwort auf die Anfrage E-002690/2013 auf den EU-Rahmen für nationale Strategien hingewiesen. In diesem Zusammenhang wird um die Beantwortung folgender Zusatzfragen gebeten:

1. Wie viel Geld fließt insgesamt aus dem ESF und dem EFRE für die Integration der Roma bzw. Unterstützung konkreter Projekte für Roma-Gemeinschaften an die einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten, aufgeschlüsselt nach den jeweiligen Ländern?
2. Wie viele EU Fördermittel bekommt Österreich für die Unterstützung der Roma in Österreich?

Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission

(21. Oktober 2013)

1. Im Europäischen Struktur- und Investitionsfonds (ESIF) gibt es keine ausdrücklich den Roma vorbehaltene Kategorie; daher erstatten die Mitgliedstaaten auch nicht Bericht über die Unterstützung aus dem ESIF, die speziell den Roma zugute kommt. In manchen Mitgliedstaaten ist es sogar verboten, die ethnische Herkunft zu erfassen. Auf der Grundlage der Berichte der Mitgliedstaaten zu der weiter gefassten Priorität „Konzepte für die Eingliederung oder Wiedereingliederung von benachteiligten Personen in das Erwerbsleben; Bekämpfung von Diskriminierung beim Zugang zum Arbeitsmarkt und beim Vorankommen auf dem Arbeitsmarkt und Förderung der Akzeptanz von Unterschiedlichkeit am Arbeitsplatz“ könnte man eine ungefähre Summe im Rahmen des ESF schätzen, da die meisten Programme zur Integration der Roma in diese Priorität fallen; allerdings gehören dazu auch andere Programme. Dieser Priorität sind bis Ende 2012 insgesamt 7,8 Mrd. EUR zugewiesen. Zusätzlich wäre die Finanzierung von Maßnahmen zu berücksichtigen, die benachteiligten Personengruppen allgemein — d. h. auch den Roma — zugutekommen; allerdings gehören zu den Begünstigten auch hier wieder nicht ausschließlich die Roma. Was die Unterstützung aus dem EFRE betrifft, so wurden 17,9 Mrd. EUR für Infrastrukturinvestitionen in den Bereichen Bildung, Gesundheit, Wohnung, Kinderbetreuung und Soziales bereitgestellt, wodurch der Zugang der Roma-Gemeinschaften zu Grundversorgungsleistungen verbessert werden könnte.

2. Wie oben ausgeführt, liegen für den derzeitigen Programmplanungszeitraum (2007-2013) keine genauen Zahlen zur Unterstützung der Roma in Österreich aus dem ESF vor. Es gibt Unterstützung für Migranten, insbesondere im Rahmen der Prioritäten „Aktive Einbeziehung der arbeitsmarktfremsten Menschen“ und „Territoriale Beschäftigungspakte“ des operationellen Beschäftigungsprogramms, allerdings werden die Roma nicht ausdrücklich als Zielgruppe genannt.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009724/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(29 August 2013)**

Subject: Follow-up question in connection with Question E-002690/2013

In its answer to Question E-002690/2013, the Commission made reference to the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies. In that connection:

1. What ESF and ERDF funding is received, in total, by the Member States, broken down by country, for Roma integration and/or for support for specific projects for Roma communities?
2. How much EU funding does Austria receive for Roma support there?

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

1. No specific category of the European Structural and Investment Funds, ESIF support is earmarked for Roma people. The Member States do not report on ESIF funding for Roma and some Member States even prohibit the registration of people's ethnic origin. An approximate ESF figure could be deduced from Member State reports on the broader priority Pathways to integration and re-entry into employment for disadvantaged people; combating discrimination in accessing and progressing in the labour market and promoting acceptance of diversity at the workplace, which includes most Roma inclusion programmes, but not to the exclusion of others. Up to the end of 2012, EUR 7.8 billion was committed to that priority. In addition, the funding of measures benefiting disadvantaged people in general, of whom Roma are one target group, should be taken into account, though the beneficiaries include non-Roma. Concerning the ERDF support EUR 17.9 billion has been allocated to education-, health-, housing-, childcare-, and social infrastructure investments, which may contribute to better access to basic services by Roma communities.
2. As explained above, no precise figures are available for ESF support for Roma in Austria for the current programming period (2007-13). Although Roma are not mentioned as a specific target group, there is support for migrants, in particular under the Employment operational programme priorities Integration of persons furthest from the labour market and Territorial Employment Pacts.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009725/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(29 Αυγούστου 2013)

Θέμα: Χρηματοδότηση από το ΕΣΠΑ προγραμμάτων απασχόλησης σε Δήμους της Ελλάδας

Η ελληνική κυβέρνηση ανακοίνωσε πρόγραμμα συνολικού κόστους 216 εκ. ευρώ, για την πρόσληψη 50 000 ανέργων στους Δήμους της χώρας και σε δημόσιες υπηρεσίες, με σύμβαση 5 μηνών, μέσω του Οργανισμού Απασχόλησης Εργατικού Δυναμικού, η οποία θα χρηματοδοτηθεί από κονδύλια του ΕΣΠΑ και περιλαμβάνεται στο ελληνικό πρόγραμμα δημοσίων επενδύσεων. Σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα στον ελληνικό Τύπο, ήδη από τις 16 Απριλίου, μέσω e-mail, η τρόικα ζητούσε από την ηγεσία του Υπουργείου Εργασίας να ξεκινήσει «μέχρι τις αρχές του καλοκαιριού» το πρόγραμμα κοινωφελούς εργασίας σε δήμους (ως τον ... ύστατο εργοδότη). Είναι χαρακτηριστικό ότι η τρόικα θεωρεί ότι «τα προγράμματα αυτά μπορούν να εφαρμοστούν σε τομείς όπως η κοινωνική εργασία, η παιδοκομία και οι περιβαλλοντικές βελτιώσεις σε τουριστικές περιοχές και αποτελούν κεντρική συνιστώσα του ευρύτερου προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής, ιδίως δε στο πλαίσιο της αντιμετώπισης των αυξανόμενων οικονομικών και κοινωνικών προβλημάτων που προκαλεί η ανερχόμενη μακροχρόνια ανεργία απουσία ενός γενικού δικτύου ασφαλείας» και ζητά την «κατά το δυνατόν συντομότερη έναρξη ενός προγράμματος αυτού του είδους», υπογραμμίζοντας ότι «θα στηρίξει σε σημαντικό βαθμό πολλά άτομα και νοικοκυριά, τη στιγμή που ο ιδιωτικός τομέας δεν είναι ακόμη σε θέση να δημιουργήσει επαρκή αριθμό εργασιακών θέσεων».

Με βάση τα ανωτέρω ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Υιοθετεί τις ανωτέρω απόψεις, και ιδίως την άποψη ότι ο ιδιωτικός τομέας δεν είναι σε θέση να δημιουργήσει επαρκή αριθμό θέσεων εργασίας και, αν ναι, τι κάνει για την ενίσχυση του ιδιωτικού τομέα ο οποίος πληρώνει εξωφρενικά, σε σχέση με την υπόλοιπη Ευρώπη, επιτόκια και υπερφορολογείται;

Με ποια κριτήρια επελέγη αυτό το πρόγραμμα, αντί για τη διάθεση του ποσού αυτού για την ανάπτυξη πρόσθετων αντίστοιχων προγραμμάτων στον ιδιωτικό τομέα της ελληνικής οικονομίας, που θα είχαν μεγαλύτερη προστιθέμενη αξία στο ΑΕΠ, θα οδηγούσαν σε ουσιαστική βελτίωση των γνώσεων και δεξιοτήτων των ανέργων για επαρκείς στο άμεσο μέλλον θέσεις εργασίας και πιθανότητα μετατροπής μέρους των προσωρινών αυτών θέσεων σε μόνιμες θέσεις εργασίας;

Με ποια κριτήρια η επιδότηση των συγκεκριμένων εργασιών θεωρείται δημόσια επένδυση;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(24 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή συμφωνεί με το Αξιότιμο Μέλος ότι η ενίσχυση του ιδιωτικού τομέα αποτελεί βασικό στοιχείο για την εξασφάλιση της διατηρήσιμης ανάπτυξης και της δημιουργίας θέσεων απασχόλησης στην Ελλάδα και η ΕΕ στηρίζει ευρύ φάσμα μεταρρυθμίσεων προς την κατεύθυνση αυτή. Αυτές περιλαμβάνουν μέτρα για τη διευκόλυνση της χρηματοδότησης των ΜΜΕ, όπως η σταθεροποίηση του τραπεζικού συστήματος, η χρηματοδότηση των κεφαλαίων κίνησης μέσω των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων και των διάφορων μέσων της ΕΤΕ και ένα νέο μη τραπεζικό χρηματοπιστωτικό ίδρυμα. Επιπλέον, το ελληνικό πρόγραμμα προσαρμογής περιλαμβάνει μέτρα για τη βελτίωση του επιχειρηματικού περιβάλλοντος, μεταξύ άλλων μέσω της μείωσης του χρόνου και του κόστους που απαιτείται για τη σύσταση εταιρείας, της απλούστευσης των διαδικασιών αδειοδότησης, της διευκόλυνσης των εμπορικών συναλλαγών, καθώς και μέσω βελτιώσεων του δικαστικού συστήματος.

Το πρόγραμμα δημοσίων έργων που αναφέρει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος, το οποίο χρηματοδοτείται από τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία, δεν αντικαθιστά όλες αυτές τις δράσεις, αλλά έχει εγκριθεί επιπρόσθετα προς αυτές. Η Επιτροπή πιστεύει ότι ένα καλοσχεδιασμένο πρόγραμμα δημοσίων έργων, που απευθύνεται στους μακροχρόνια ανέργους και το οποίο θα ανταποκρίνεται στις ανάγκες του δημόσιου τομέα για την υλοποίηση βραχυπρόθεσμων έργων σε τομείς όπως η ψηφιοποίηση δεδομένων ή το εκπαιδευτικό σύστημα, αποτελεί χρήσιμο μέτρο προσωρινής φύσεως σε ένα πλαίσιο στο οποίο η ζήτηση παραμένει υποτονική ενώ ο πλήρης αντίκτυπος των διαρθρωτικών μεταρρυθμίσεων στην απασχόληση και την παραγωγικότητα δεν έχει γίνει ακόμη πλήρως αισθητός. Η συμμετοχή στο πρόγραμμα θα προσφέρει ευκαιρίες εργασίας για τους μακροχρόνια ανέργους και θα περιλαμβάνει κατάρτιση σε συγκεκριμένες δεξιότητες ανάλογα με τη φύση της εκάστοτε θέσης, οι οποίες μπορούν να προστεθούν στα ήδη υπάρχοντα προσόντα του εργαζομένου.

Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί εκ του σύνεγγυς την εφαρμογή του προγράμματος και θα εξακολουθεί να το πράττει ώστε να εξασφαλιστεί ότι ο σχεδιασμός του προγράμματος και η επιλογή των έργων και των δικαιούχων είναι απολύτως διαφανής και βασίζεται σε αντικειμενικά κριτήρια ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Το πρόγραμμα υλοποιείται μέσω μιας σειράς ξεχωριστών προσκλήσεων. Στον δικτυακό τόπο του Οργανισμού Απασχόλησης Εργατικού Δυναμικού (ΟΑΕΔ), το Αξιότιμο Μέλος μπορεί να βρει περισσότερες πληροφορίες, καθώς και τις προσκλήσεις, οι οποίες έχουν ήδη δημοσιευθεί: <http://www.oaed.gr/index.php?lang=el>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009725/13
to the Commission**

Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: The financing by the NSRF of employment programmes in municipalities in Greece

The Greek Government has unveiled a programme costing a total of EUR 216 million to hire 50 000 unemployed persons in Greek municipalities and public services on five-month contracts through the Greek Manpower Employment Organisation; it will be financed from NSRF funds and included in the Greek public investment programme. According to reports in the Greek press, as early as 16 April the Troika had asked the heads of the Ministry of Labour, by email, to launch 'by early summer' a community service programme in municipalities (as the ...employer of last resort). Typically, the Troika believes that 'these programmes can be applied to fields such as social work, childcare and environmental improvements in tourist areas and will be a key component of the broader economic adjustment programme, particularly in the context of addressing the growing economic and social problems caused by rising long-term unemployment in the absence of a general safety net' and calls for 'a programme of this kind to be launched as soon as possible', stressing that 'it will provide extensive support for many individuals and households, since the private sector is not yet in a position to generate a sufficient number of jobs.'

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Does it espouse the above views, especially the notion that the private sector is not in a position to create a sufficient number of jobs? If so, what is it doing to strengthen the private sector which is paying interest rates that are astronomically high compared to the rest of Europe and is being overtaxed?

According to which criteria was this programme selected? Instead, an equivalent amount could have been spent on developing more similar programmes in the private sector of the Greek economy: this would have generated greater added value in terms of the GDP and have led to a substantial improvement in the knowledge and skills of the unemployed relevant to shortly-to-be-available jobs; some of these temporary jobs could then have been converted into permanent ones.

According to which criteria is the subsidisation of such work considered a public investment?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(24 October 2013)

The Commission agrees with the Honourable Member that strengthening the private sector is key to ensure sustainable growth and employment creation in Greece and the EU is supporting a wide range of reforms in this direction. This includes measures to facilitate SME financing, such as the stabilisation of the banking system, the financing of working capital with structural funds and different EIB instruments and a new non-bank financial institution. In addition, the Greek adjustment programme includes measures to improve the business environment, including through the reduction of time and costs to create a company, simplification of licensing, trade facilitation and improvements in the judicial system.

The public works scheme funded with structural funds mentioned by the Honourable Member does not replace, but has been adopted in addition to all these actions. The Commission believes that a well-designed public works scheme targeted to the long-term unemployed and addressing the needs of the public sector to realise short-term projects in such areas like data digitalisation or the education system, is a useful measure of a temporary nature in a context where demand is still sluggish and the full impact of structural reforms on jobs and productivity has not yet fully materialised. Participation in the scheme will provide a job opportunity for the long-term unemployed involving training on job-specific skills that would add to the employee's qualifications.

The Commission is closely monitoring the implementation of the programme and will continue to do so in order to ensure that the design of the programme and the selection of projects and beneficiaries are fully transparent and based on objective criteria ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ The programme is being implemented through a number of separate calls. The Honourable Member will find additional information and the calls already published in the website of the Greek manpower agency OAED: <http://www.oaed.gr/index.php?lang=el>

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009726/13
do Komisji**

Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)

(29 sierpnia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Dyskryminacja Polaków na rynku pracy Unii Europejskiej

Art. 45 traktatu o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej mówi o fundamentalnych swobodach UE, w tym o swobodzie przepływu osób. Uzupełnieniem art. 45 jest dyrektywa o prawie obywateli Unii i członków oraz ich rodzin do swobodnego przemieszczania się i pobytu na terytorium państw członkowskich.

Niestety to fundamentalne prawo jest coraz częściej podważane przez polityków poszczególnych państw Unii Europejskiej; i tak 9 września br. na wniosek holenderskiego ministerstwa pracy i polityki społecznej ma odbyć się szczyt, na którym będą poszukiwane rozwiązania mające na celu ograniczenie możliwości zatrudniania obywateli Unii Europejskiej pochodzących z części wschodniej wspólnoty.

Te zinstytucjonalizowane działania realizowane w Holandii przez lewicową Partię Pracy niestety nie są odosobnione. Podobne działania cechujące się niechęcią do obywateli Polski są prowadzone przez Partię Pracy w Wielkiej Brytanii, o czym głośno było na Wyspach na początku sierpnia br., kiedy politycy tej partii skrytykowali brytyjskie sieci handlowe za przyjęcie do pracy 800 polskich pracowników.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się z pytaniem:

Jakie działania zamierza podjąć Komisja w obronie art. 45 traktatu o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej?

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009848/13
do Komisji**

Adam Bielan (ECR)

(3 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Polityka wobec imigrantów w niektórych krajach UE

Unia Europejska umożliwia obywatelom zamieszkiwanie i podejmowanie pracy we wszystkich krajach członkowskich. Komisja także (m.in. w odpowiedzi na jedno z moich wcześniejszych zapytań) podkreśla, że prawo do swobodnego przepływu jest jednym z najważniejszych i najcenniejszych praw w Unii. Tymczasem w kilku państwach wciąż dają się zaobserwować działania wymierzone przeciwko zagranicznym pracownikom. Sytuacja taka dotyczy w zasadniczym stopniu obywateli Polski.

Przykładowo w Holandii, z inicjatywy tamtejszego resortu pracy i polityki społecznej, niebawem ma się odbyć szczyt poświęcony sprawom imigrantów z krajów postkomunistycznych. Wicepremier Lodewijk Asscher domaga się ograniczenia zatrudniania obcokrajowców. Partia na rzecz Wolności postuluje natomiast m.in. zakaz osiedlania się imigrantów w Hadze.

Również w Wielkiej Brytanii minister ds. imigracji miał potępiać krajowe sieci handlowe za zatrudnianie w dużej liczbie polskich pracowników, choć sytuacja taka wynika głównie z braku chęci podejmowania podobnej pracy ze strony Brytyjczyków. Burmistrz Londynu pytał zaś, dlaczego w punktach gastronomicznych nie pracują londyńczycy.

W obliczu coraz bardziej widocznej antyimigracyjnej nagonki w tych krajach, zwracam się z prośbą o odpowiedź:

1. Czy Komisja rozważa podjęcie stosownej interwencji, celem zastopowania przywołanych wyżej oraz podobnych działań dyskryminacyjnych ze strony przedstawicieli władz krajów członkowskich?
2. Jakie stanowisko zajmuje Komisja wobec zorganizowania przez władze Holandii wydarzenia politycznego o wymiarze wyraźnie nakierowanym przeciwko zagranicznym obywatelom?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji*(21 października 2013 r.)*

Komisja nie może podjąć bezpośrednich działań wobec wspomnianych polityków w związku z wypowiedziami na temat zatrudniania pracowników z innych państw UE. Wielokrotnie podkreślała jednak, że swobodny przepływ pracowników jest korzystny zarówno dla gospodarki, jak i rynku pracy, ponieważ pozwala dopasować podaż umiejętności do popytu na rynku na pracy. Ponadto regularnie wzywa, by przedstawić twarde dowody w postaci danych statystycznych na poparcie takich negatywnych publicznych oświadczeń. Komisja wielokrotnie potwierdzała, że swoboda przemieszczania się jest jedną z podstawowych wolności, której nie można ograniczać. Jeżeli zostaną wprowadzone jakiegokolwiek ograniczenia niezgodne z unijnymi przepisami, jako strażnik Traktatu Komisja podejmie niezbędne kroki.

Komisja pragnie również odesłać szanownego Pana Posła do odpowiedzi udzielonej na pytanie E-9936/2013⁽¹⁾ w podobnej sprawie.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/pl/parliamentary-questions.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009726/13
to the Commission**

Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: Discrimination against Poles on EU labour market

Article 45 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union establishes a number of fundamental freedoms, including freedom of movement for persons. Those provisions are supplemented by the directive on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States.

This fundamental right is, regrettably, increasingly being undermined by national politicians. For example, on a proposal from the Dutch Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, a summit is to be held on 9 September 2013 to look for ways of restricting access to the Dutch labour market for EU citizens from eastern Member States.

Institutionalised discrimination of this kind is not the sole preserve of the Dutch Labour Party, however. Similar behaviour, indicative of a negative attitude to Polish citizens, has also been shown by the UK Labour Party, which sparked off a controversy in the country in early August when politicians from the party criticised large British retailers for taking on 800 Polish workers.

In view of the above, how does the Commission intend to uphold Article 45 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union?

**Question for written answer E-009848/13
to the Commission**

Adam Bielan (ECR)

(3 September 2013)

Subject: Policy on immigrants in certain EU countries

The European Union allows citizens to live and work in any Member State. The Commission (including in its answer to a previous question of mine) has also emphasised that the right to free movement is one of the most important and most precious rights in the EU. Despite this, however, foreign workers are still encountering discrimination in some countries. This is a situation that particularly affects Polish citizens.

In the Netherlands, for example, a summit — the brainchild of the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment — is apparently soon to be held, devoted to issues surrounding immigrants from the former Communist countries. Deputy Prime Minister Lodewijk Asscher has called for a curb on the employment of foreigners, while the Party for Freedom is calling for immigrants to be prevented from moving to The Hague.

In the UK, the Minister for Immigration has apparently hit out at British businesses for employing large numbers of Polish workers, even though the main reason the vacancies exist is because not enough British people are willing to take on the kinds of jobs concerned. The Mayor of London, for his part, has asked why there are no Londoners working in restaurants and cafés.

Given the increasingly blatant witch-hunt that is being conducted against immigrants in these countries:

1. Is the Commission considering taking appropriate steps to put a stop to discrimination such as that mentioned above on the part of representatives of the authorities in the Member States?
2. What stance is the Commission taking with regard to the fact that the authorities in the Netherlands are organising a political event the focus of which is clearly anti-foreigner?

Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission*(21 October 2013)*

The Commission cannot take direct action against the politicians in question for their statements on the recruitment of workers from other EU countries. It has, however, repeatedly stressed that the free movement of workers benefits both the economy and the labour market by allowing the skills available to be matched with labour market demand. It also regularly asks for hard statistical evidence to be produced to back up such negative public statements. The Commission has repeatedly confirmed that free movement is a fundamental freedom which cannot be restricted. Should any restriction be introduced which is not in line with EC law, the Commission would take the necessary steps as the Guardian of the Treaty.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to the answer it gave to Question E-9936/2013 ⁽¹⁾ on a similar matter.

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

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009728/13
do Komisji**

Adam Bielan (ECR)

(29 sierpnia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Zaostrezenie rosyjskiej kontroli produktów spożywczych importowanych z Polski

Rosyjska Federalna Służba Nadzoru Weterynaryjnego i Fitosanitarne zarządziła ścisłą kontrolę wszystkich partii mięsa wieprzowego importowanych z Polski. Wyraziła również zastrzeżenia odnośnie produktów rolnych, w tym owoców miękkich. Jest to procedura, po którą rosyjskie władze sięgają po raz kolejny w ostatnich latach.

Kontrole miały wykryć bakterie w produktach mięsnych pochodzących z Hiszpanii. Odnośnie owoców zaś, zastrzeżenia dotyczą holenderskich malin. Towary te były jedynie dostarczone przez polskie firmy handlowe i spedycyjne. Perspektywa objęcia embargiem polskich producentów wydaje się zatem kuriozalna. Tymczasem rosyjskie media wieszczą początek wojny handlowej z Polską.

Wobec powyższego proszę o informacje w następujących kwestiach:

1. Czy Komisja potwierdza zastrzeżenia rosyjskich służb sanitarnych, dotyczące nieprawidłowości w zakwestionowanych produktach spożywczych pochodzących z Hiszpanii i Holandii? Czy ich obecność na europejskim rynku nie stanowi zagrożenia dla obywateli UE?
2. Jakie stanowisko względem Rosji zajmuje Komisja w przedmiotowej sprawie?
3. Czy zakwestionowanie, przez kraj trzeci, produktu spożywczego pochodzącego z któregośkolwiek państwa członkowskiego, nie powinno być traktowane jako zastrzeżenie wobec całej Wspólnoty, w której obowiązuje przecież swobodny przepływ towarów? Jaka jest argumentacja Komisji w tym zakresie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonio Borga w imieniu Komisji

(14 października 2013 r.)

Władze polskie poinformowały, że przedstawiły władzom rosyjskim gwarancje w zakresie przeprowadzania w Polsce ścisłych kontroli mięsa wieprzowego i produktów z wieprzowiny wywożonych do Rosji w konsekwencji jednego stwierdzonego przypadku niezatwierdzonego załadunku i etykietowania produktów z Hiszpanii, które nie zostały dopuszczone do wywozu na terytorium Rosji, a także kilku innych nieprawidłowości, które wystąpiły ostatnio i zostały uznane przez Polskę. Brak kwalifikowalności przedmiotowych produktów z Hiszpanii związany jest z restrykcjami nałożonymi przez Rosję, wobec których Komisja zgłosiła sprzeciw, ponieważ Rosja nie wskazała powiązanego zagrożenia dla bezpieczeństwa żywności.

Zgodnie z wiedzą Komisji, do tej pory władze rosyjskie nie podjęły środków ograniczających wobec wieprzowiny z całego terytorium Polski ani nie zastosowały w tym zakresie ścisłych kontroli. W czerwcu 2013 r. władze niderlandzkie powiadomiły za pośrednictwem systemu wczesnego ostrzegania o niebezpiecznej żywności i paszach (RASFF) o wykryciu podczas kontroli wewnętrznej w przedsiębiorstwie norowirusa w partii mrożonych malin z Polski przetwarzanych w Niderlandach. Dzięki RASFF powiadomiono o tym fakcie państwa, które otrzymały przedmiotowe produkty, w tym Rosję, tak aby mogły podjąć odpowiednie działania ze względu na możliwe zagrożenie dla bezpieczeństwa żywności. Nie zgłoszono żadnego przypadku choroby wywołanej norowirusem u ludzi w powiązaniu z tą sprawą. Komisja nie posiada informacji o środkach podjętych przez Rosję w odniesieniu do wszystkich owoców z Polski na skutek tego przypadku.

System bezpieczeństwa żywności w UE opiera się na wspólnych zasadach w celu utrzymania tego samego poziomu bezpieczeństwa i jednocześnie zapewnienia swobodnego przepływu towarów na terytorium UE. Na powyższym przykładzie można stwierdzić, że istnieje wysoki poziom współpracy między państwami członkowskimi w przypadku ostrzeżenia o zagrożeniu dla bezpieczeństwa żywności, co jest istotnym elementem skuteczności systemu bezpieczeństwa żywności w UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009728/13
to the Commission
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(29 August 2013)

Subject: Tightening up of Russian controls on food products imported from Poland

The Russian Federal Service for Veterinary and Phytosanitary Surveillance has ordered strict controls to be carried out on all consignments of pork imported from Poland. It has also expressed reservations about other agricultural products, including soft fruits. This is a tactic which the Russian authorities have used repeatedly in recent years.

The checks were apparently to detect bacteria in meat products coming from Spain. And the reservations to do with fruit concern Dutch raspberries. Yet these are products which are merely supplied by Polish trading and freight forwarding companies. So the prospect of an embargo against Polish producers seems strange. At the same time the Russian media are talking about the start of a trade war with Poland.

1. Can the Commission confirm the reservations expressed by Russia's health authorities concerning problems with certain foods from Spain and the Netherlands? Does their presence on the EU market not also present a danger to EU citizens?
2. What is the Commission's position in this matter with respect to Russia?
3. When a third country raises questions about a food product originating in any Member State, should this not be treated as a reservation regarding the entire EU, since the free movement of goods applies? What is the Commission's stance in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 October 2013)

The Polish authorities informed that they have provided guarantees to the Russian authorities on reinforced controls in Poland over pork and pork products exported to Russia following one case of non-approved loading and labelling of products from Spain, which were not allowed for export to Russia, as well as several other recent irregularities which Poland recognised. The lack of eligibility of the concerned products from Spain is linked to restrictions imposed by Russia, which the Commission disputes as Russia has not identified the related food safety risk.

To the knowledge of the Commission, to date, the Russian authorities have not taken restrictive measures or applied reinforced controls on pork from the whole territory of Poland.

In June 2013, the Dutch authorities, through the EU Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF), notified the detection, during a company's own check, of norovirus in a batch of frozen raspberries from Poland, processed in The Netherlands. Thanks to the RASFF, this finding was communicated to countries which have received the products, including Russia, so that appropriate action could be taken considering the food safety issue at stake. No case of norovirus type illness in humans associated to this case was reported. The Commission is not aware of measures taken by Russia regarding all fruits from Poland following this episode.

The EU food safety system is based on common rules in order to maintain the same level of safety while allowing free circulation of goods in the EU territory. As illustrated by the above example, there is a high level of cooperation between Member States in case of food safety alert, which is an essential element for the efficiency of the EU food safety system.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009729/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)**

Adam Bielan (ECR)

(29 sierpnia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Informacje dotyczące tajnego porozumienia saudyjsko-rosyjskiego

Brytyjski dziennik „The Telegraph” opublikował informacje dotyczące niejawnych rozmów prezydenta Rosji Władimira Putina z szefem wywiadu Arabii Saudyjskiej w sprawie interesów naftowych. Według ujawnionych informacji, Saudyjczycy mieli zaoferować kremlowskim partnerom porozumienie przewidujące kontrolę nad globalnym rynkiem ropy i zabezpieczenie rosyjskich kontraktów gazowych, w zamian za wycofanie poparcia Moskwy dla syryjskiego reżymu Bashara al-Assada. Gospodarz Kremla miał rzekomo ofertę odrzucić.

Mając na uwadze znaczenie produktów energetycznych, wprost przekładających się na sprawy związane z polityką i gospodarką, również krajów Wspólnoty, proszę o informacje:

1. Czy, zdaniem Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel, wzmiankowane porozumienie mogło stanowić realne zagrożenie dla bezpieczeństwa energetycznego krajów UE?
2. Czy i w jaki sposób ESDZ monitoruje działania Arabii Saudyjskiej w zakresie światowego handlu ropą naftową? Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel jest na bieżąco informowana odnośnie strategii Rijadu w tej kluczowej kwestii?
3. Saudyjski wysłannik, w przytoczonej rozmowie z rosyjskim prezydentem, miał powoływać się również na pełne poparcie Stanów Zjednoczonych dla swojej misji. Czy i w jaki sposób ewentualne potwierdzenie tego faktu może rzutować na relacje Bruksela-Waszyngton? Czy europejska dyplomacja jest uprzedzana o podobnych krokach podejmowanych przez administrację prezydenta Baracka Obamy?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu
Komisji**

(23 października 2013 r.)

Unia z uwagą śledzi rozwój sytuacji w Arabii Saudyjskiej, m.in. za pośrednictwem swojej delegatury w Rijadzie, w szczególności w odniesieniu do kwestii związanych z energią.

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca jest na bieżąco informowana o aktualnych wydarzeniach w Arabii Saudyjskiej, a jej spotkania z urzędnikami tego kraju, w tym w ramach spotkań na szczeblu ministerialnym między UE a Radą Współpracy Państw Zatoki, dają możliwość podjęcia kwestii dwustronnych, regionalnych i globalnych.

Wysokiej przedstawiciel/wiceprzewodniczącej znane są doniesienia prasowe dotyczące możliwego porozumienia między Arabią Saudyjską i Rosją. Fakty te nie zostały jednak jeszcze potwierdzone a, jak szanowny Pan Poseł wie, Unia nie komentuje doniesień prasowych.

W odniesieniu do stanowiska krajów partnerskich, które nie jest znane UE, zachęca się szanownego Pana Posła, by skierował pytanie do odnośnych krajów.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009729/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Adam Bielan (ECR)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Reports of a secret deal between Saudi Arabia and Russia

The British newspaper *The Telegraph* has reported that Russian President Vladimir Putin and Saudi Arabia's intelligence chief have held secret talks about oil interests. The revelations suggest that the Saudis offered the Kremlin a deal to control the global oil market and safeguard Russia's gas contracts in exchange for withdrawing its backing from the Assad regime in Syria. Mr Putin is said to have rejected the offer.

Given the vital significance of energy products, in that they have a direct impact on politics and economics, as well as on the EU Member States themselves:

1. Does the Vice-President/High Representative take the view that a deal such as that mentioned above could pose a real threat to the EU Member States' energy security?
2. Does the EEAS monitor Saudi Arabia's activities in connection with the global trade in oil? If so, how? Is the Vice-President/High Representative kept informed as to the Saudi strategy on this extremely important issue?
3. During his talks with the Russian President, the Saudi envoy allegedly claimed that he was speaking with the full backing of the United States. If this were to be confirmed, could it have an effect on relations between Brussels and Washington? If so, in what way? Is the European diplomatic service aware of any similar steps taken by the Obama administration?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(23 October 2013)

The EU is attentively following the situation in Saudi Arabia, including through its Delegation in Riyadh, in particular with respect to energy issues.

The HR/VP is kept informed of developments as regard Saudi Arabia and her meetings with Saudi officials, including in the framework of the EU-Gulf Cooperation Council Ministerial Meetings, are an opportunity to address bilateral, regional and global issues.

The HR/VP is aware of press reports regarding a possible deal between Saudi Arabia and Russia but these facts have not been confirmed and, as the Honourable Member would know, it is an EU policy not to comment on press reports.

In addition, with respect to positions taken by partner countries the EU is not aware of, the EU invites the Honourable Member to direct his questions to the concerned countries.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009730/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 août 2013)

Objet: Commission récupère ses aides agricoles

La Commission réclame 180 000 000 d'euros d'aides agricoles à plusieurs États membres en règlement de "dépenses irrégulières effectuées par ceux-ci au titre de la politique agricole de l'Union". L'impact financier réel s'élève à 169 000 000 d'euros, certains remboursements ayant déjà été réalisés.

1. De quels pays s'agit-il?
2. Quelle est la ventilation de ces sommes?
3. Quelles sont les raisons principales?
4. Les sommes récupérées sont-elles reversées au budget de l'Union? Spécifiquement au budget lié à l'agriculture? Si non, pourquoi?

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

1. La décision d'exécution de la Commission 2013/433/UE ⁽¹⁾ concerne quinze États membres: la Belgique, le Danemark, l'Allemagne, l'Irlande, la Grèce, l'Espagne, la France, l'Italie, la Lituanie, le Luxembourg, la Hongrie, la Pologne, la Slovaquie, la Finlande et le Royaume-Uni.
2. La ventilation du montant des corrections financières par État membre figure dans le tableau 1.
3. Les raisons de ces corrections financières peuvent être consultées dans l'annexe à la décision 2013/433/UE.
4. Toutes les recettes provenant des corrections financières imposées aux États membres sont reversées au budget (agricole) de l'UE. Ces recettes sont considérées comme des recettes affectées au financement des dépenses du FEAGA. Dans le budget 2013, les recettes affectées au financement des dépenses du FEAGA étaient estimées à 1 533 000 000 euros. Sur cette somme, 500 000 000 euros ont été alloués au financement de dépenses relatives au marché, et notamment aux fonds opérationnels des organisations de producteurs, et 1 033 000 000 euros ont été affectés au financement d'aides directes découplées, et notamment au régime de paiement unique.

⁽¹⁾ JO L 219 du 15.8.2013.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009730/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 August 2013)**

Subject: Recovery of agricultural aid by the Commission

The Commission is claiming back EUR 180 million in agricultural aid from a number of Member States in settlement of 'EU agricultural policy funds, unduly spent by Member States'. The real financial impact amounts to EUR 169 million, some of the amounts having already been reimbursed.

1. Which countries are involved?
2. What is the breakdown of these amounts?
3. What are the main reasons for this?
4. Will the amounts recovered be paid back into the EU budget? Is so, specifically into the agriculture budget? If not, why?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2013)**

1. The Commission Implementing Decision 2013/433/EU ⁽¹⁾ concerns fifteen Member States: Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Greece, Spain, France, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia, Finland and the United Kingdom.
2. The breakdown of the amount of financial correction by Member States is shown in the Table 1.
3. The reasons for the financial corrections can be found in the annex to the decision 2013/433/EU.
4. All receipts originating from financial corrections imposed on Member States are paid back into the EU (agricultural) budget. These receipts are designated as revenue assigned to the financing of EAGF expenditure. In the 2013 budget, assigned revenue of EUR 1 533 million was estimated to be available for EAGF expenditure. Out of this amount, EUR 500 million was allocated to the funding of market related expenditure and specifically to the operational funds for producer organisations and EUR 1 033 million to the funding of decoupled direct aids and specifically to the single payment scheme.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 219 of 15.8.2013.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009731/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 août 2013)

Objet: Quotas de pêche 2013

Comme tous les ans, la Commission européenne vient de réactualiser les quotas de pêche accordés aux États membres pour l'année 2013 à la lumière de la surpêche de l'année précédente.

1. Combien de flottes ont dépassé leurs quotas en 2012?
2. Quelles sont-elles?
3. Quelles sont les pénalités pour chacune d'entre elles?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Damanaki au nom de la Commission

(3 octobre 2013)

1. 14 États membres ont dépassé leurs quotas en 2012.
2. Les États membres concernés sont les suivants: Belgique, Chypre, Allemagne, Danemark, Espagne, France, Royaume-Uni, Grèce, Irlande, Lituanie, Pays-Bas, Pologne, Portugal et Roumanie.
3. Les déductions de quotas, qui ne sont pas des sanctions mais des mesures de conservation, sont mentionnées, pour chaque pays, dans le règlement d'exécution (UE) n° 770/2013 tel que publié au Journal officiel L 215 du 10 août 2013.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009731/13
to the Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: Fishing quotas for 2013

As it does every year, the Commission has just updated the fishing quotas allocated to Member States for the year 2013 in the light of overfishing in the previous year.

1. How many fleets exceeded their quotas in 2012?
2. Which ones are they?
3. What are the penalties for each of them?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission

(3 October 2013)

1. 14 Member States have overfished their quotas in 2012.
 2. The Member States concerned are : Belgium, Cyprus, Germany, Denmark, Spain, France, United Kingdom, Greece, Ireland, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal and Romania.
 3. The individual deductions of quotas, which are not penalties but conservation measures, are mentioned in Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 770/2013 as published in Official Journal L 215 dated 10 August 2013.
-

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009733/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 août 2013)

Objet: Subventions versées aux fabricants chinois de panneaux solaires

La liste des subventions chinoises examinées par la Commission européenne s'étale sur de nombreuses pages. Elles peuvent prendre la forme de rabais sur l'achat de matières premières et d'électricité, de subventions à la vente ou de financements bancaires, ce qui a créé une énorme surcapacité de production et soutient des entreprises qui ne seraient pas concurrentielles sans cela, affirme EU ProSun dans un communiqué.

Quelle est la réaction de la Commission?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission

(27 septembre 2013)

La Commission a mené une enquête sur l'octroi de telles subventions dans le cadre de la procédure antisubventions concernant les importations de modules photovoltaïques en silicium cristallin et leurs composants essentiels originaires de la République populaire de Chine. Cette enquête a été ouverte le 8 novembre 2012.

La Commission a examiné dans le détail toutes les allégations formulées par ProSun, envoyé des questionnaires et des courriers additionnels au gouvernement chinois et aux exportateurs et vérifié leurs réponses lors de contrôles sur place, en Chine. Après analyse de toutes les informations contenues dans le dossier, la Commission a publié ses premières conclusions le 27 août 2013. Toutes les parties intéressées (y compris le gouvernement chinois, les exportateurs, les producteurs de l'Union européenne, les importateurs, les fournisseurs et les utilisateurs) disposent d'un délai pour présenter leurs observations sur ces conclusions. La Commission prendra en considération ces observations pour déterminer les mesures définitives à prendre dans le cadre de cette enquête. Ces mesures seront proposées au Conseil, qui prendra la décision finale. Le règlement établissant celle-ci doit être publié au *Journal officiel de l'Union européenne* le 5 décembre 2013 au plus tard.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009733/13
to the Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: Subsidies paid to Chinese solar manufacturers

The list drawn up by the Commission of the subsidies granted by China to its solar panel manufacturers runs to several pages. These subsidies may take the form of discounts on the purchase price of raw materials and electricity, subsidies on sales or financing by banks, and this has created a huge overcapacity in production and shores up companies that otherwise would not be competitive, according to a statement by EU ProSun.

What is the Commission's response to this?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission

(27 September 2013)

The Commission investigated the provision of subsidies in its anti-subsidy proceeding concerning imports of crystalline silicon photovoltaic modules and key components originating in the People's Republic of China. This investigation was initiated on 8 November 2012.

The Commission thoroughly examined all the allegations made by ProSun, dispatched questionnaires and additional letters to Chinese Government and exporters and verified their responses during on-the-spot verification visits in China. After analysing all the information contained in the file, the Commission on 27 August 2013 published its preliminary findings. All interested parties (including the Government of China, exporters, EU producers, importers, suppliers and users) have a period of time to comment on these findings. The Commission will then consider these comments and determine what definitive action should be taken in the investigation. This action will be proposed to the Council, which will take the final decision. The final decision must be published in the *Official Journal of the European Union* by 5 December 2013 at the latest.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009734/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 août 2013)

Objet: L'Union cautionne le dumping chinois

La Commission européenne a annoncé mercredi avoir bouclé son enquête anti-dumping et anti-subsidations concernant les exportations de panneaux solaires chinois.

Soucieuses d'éviter une guerre commerciale, la Commission européenne et les autorités chinoises sont parvenues fin juillet à un accord provisoire sur le volet anti-dumping de cette enquête.

1. L'accord a permis de mettre fin aux taxes anti-dumping provisoires imposées depuis début juin par l'Union aux exportateurs chinois. Ce n'est pas une bonne nouvelle a priori. Qu'a obtenu la Commission en échange pour protéger les emplois européens?
2. Qu'en est-il du fait que les producteurs chinois n'ont toujours pas accepté de s'acquitter de droits anti-dumping de 47,6 %?
3. Cet accord ne résout en rien ce problème de subventions, car rien dans le texte n'oblige le gouvernement chinois à y mettre fin. Comment réagit la Commission à notre suggestion d'appeler l'Union à imposer des taxes douanières pour compenser les effets de ces subventions et inciter la Chine à mettre fin à ces pratiques anti-commerciales?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission

(23 octobre 2013)

1. La Commission est parvenue à une solution avec la Chine dans le volet antidumping de l'enquête concernant les exportations de panneaux solaires. En juillet, les fournisseurs chinois ont offert un engagement de prix volontaire consistant à maintenir leurs prix au-dessus d'un certain seuil ne causant pas de préjudice à l'industrie de l'UE. En échange, en deçà d'un certain niveau, les importations des entreprises participant à ce mécanisme sont exemptées des droits antidumping qui ont été imposés le 6 juin. Cette solution est bonne pour l'emploi et la croissance dans l'Union européenne et respectueuse des règles du commerce international. Elle rétablira la stabilité sur le marché européen en maintenant un niveau de prix stable.
2. L'acceptation de l'engagement de prix ne signifie pas la fin des droits antidumping provisoires. Les importations des entreprises chinoises qui n'ont pas offert d'engagement de prix resteront soumises à des droits antidumping. Les droits provisoires actuels seront en vigueur pendant six mois et la décision de les maintenir définitivement doit être prise par le Conseil avant le 5 décembre prochain.
3. En ce qui concerne l'enquête antisubsidations parallèle, la Commission analysera soigneusement toutes les informations recueillies et les prendra en considération dans sa proposition au Conseil. Pour autant que toutes les conditions légales soient remplies et que l'existence de subventions soit confirmée, la Commission proposera des mesures visant à compenser les effets préjudiciables des subventions chinoises sur l'industrie de l'UE. Le Conseil devra aussi prendre une décision finale sur le volet antisubsidations de cette affaire d'ici au 5 décembre prochain.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009734/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 August 2013)

Subject: The European Union endorses dumping by China

The European Commission announced on Wednesday that it has completed its anti-dumping and anti-subsidy investigation in respect of Chinese solar panel exports.

Anxious to avoid provoking a trade war, the Commission and the Chinese authorities reached a provisional agreement on the anti-dumping aspect of this investigation at the end of July.

1. Under this agreement, the provisional anti-dumping duties imposed on Chinese exporters by the EU from the start of June were ended. In itself this is not necessarily good news. What has the Commission secured in return from the Chinese in order to protect jobs in Europe?
2. What will be done about the fact that Chinese producers have still not agreed to pay the 47.6% anti-dumping duties that were imposed?
3. As for the subsidies issue, the agreement resolves nothing since there is no requirement in the text for the Chinese Government to put an end to subsidies. What does the Commission think of our proposal to call on the European Union to impose customs duties so as to offset the effect of these subsidies and encourage China to terminate these anti-free trade practices?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(23 October 2013)

1. The Commission has reached a solution with China on the solar panels anti-dumping case. In July the Chinese suppliers offered a voluntary price undertaking — a commitment to keep their prices above a certain floor that does not unfairly harm the EU industry. In return, within a certain level, imports from the companies participating in this arrangement do not have to pay the anti-dumping duties which were imposed on 6 June. This solution is good for EU jobs and growth, and respectful of international trade rules. It will restore stability in the European market with a sustainable price level.
 2. The acceptance of the price undertaking does not mean that the provisional anti-dumping duties have ended. Imports from Chinese firms who did not offer an undertaking will still have to pay the anti-dumping duties. The current provisional duties will be in force for 6 months, and a decision on whether to continue with duties definitively has to be taken by the Council before 5 December this year.
 3. With regard to the ongoing parallel anti-subsidy investigation, the Commission will carefully analyse all the information gathered and will take it into consideration in its proposal to the Council. Provided all the legal conditions are met and the existence of subsidisation is confirmed, the Commission will propose measures to offset the injurious effect of Chinese subsidies on the EU industry. A final decision on the anti-subsidy element of this case has also to be taken by the Council by 5 December this year.
-

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009735/13
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 août 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Madagascar: dégel des aides européennes

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante s'est réjouie des progrès récents accomplis à Madagascar, après la publication par la Cour électorale spéciale de la liste définitive des candidats à l'élection présidentielle et de l'adoption, par la Commission électorale nationale indépendante pour la transition (CENIT), d'un nouveau calendrier électoral permettant d'organiser les élections présidentielles et législatives cette année.

Le porte-parole de la vice-présidente de la Commission déclare par ailleurs qu'elle «félicite les acteurs malgaches qui ont permis de débloquent le processus électoral», tout en affirmant le soutien de l'Union européenne à la médiation pour la sortie de crise menée par Joaquim Chissano, ancien président du Mozambique, et Ramtane Lamamra, Haut commissaire du Conseil de paix et de sécurité de l'Union africaine.

Principal bailleur de fonds du programme d'appui au processus électoral à Madagascar (PACEM), l'Union européenne a gelé ses aides dans l'attente du dénouement du blocage politique des élections.

1. Pourquoi, dès lors, à l'heure de la rédaction de cette question, les fonds européens destinés au PACEM n'auraient-ils toujours pas été «dégelés», et ce malgré les affirmations de la vice-présidente de la Commission? Cette information a été d'ailleurs relayée par les autorités malgaches.

2. La Commission estime-t-elle qu'une renégociation de ces fonds s'impose à présent? La première attribution des fonds de l'Union est l'impression du bulletin unique. Étant donné que l'impression des bulletins de vote sera prise en charge par la Commission électorale nationale indépendante d'Afrique du Sud, il faudrait réaffecter les fonds de l'Union à d'autres domaines techniques, comme l'éducation électoral.

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009736/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 août 2013)

Objet: Madagascar: dégel des aides européennes

La Commission s'est réjouie des progrès récents accomplis à Madagascar après la publication par la Cour électorale spéciale de la liste définitive des candidats à l'élection présidentielle et de l'adoption, par la Commission électorale nationale indépendante pour la transition (CENIT), d'un nouveau calendrier électoral permettant d'organiser les élections présidentielles et législatives cette année.

Le porte-parole de la vice-présidente de la Commission déclare par ailleurs qu'elle «félicite les acteurs malgaches qui ont permis de débloquent le processus électoral», tout en affirmant le soutien de l'Union européenne à la médiation pour la sortie de crise menée par Joaquim Chissano, ancien président du Mozambique, et Ramtane Lamamra, Haut commissaire du Conseil de paix et de sécurité de l'Union africaine.

Principal bailleur de fonds du programme d'appui au processus électoral à Madagascar (PACEM), l'Union européenne a gelé ses aides dans l'attente du dénouement du blocage politique des élections.

1. Pourquoi, dès lors, à l'heure de la rédaction de cette question, les fonds européens destinés au PACEM n'auraient-ils toujours pas été «dégelés», et ce malgré les affirmations de la vice-présidente de la Commission? Cette information a été d'ailleurs relayée par les autorités malgaches.

2. La Commission estime-t-elle qu'une renégociation de ces fonds s'impose à présent? La première attribution des fonds de l'Union est l'impression du bulletin unique. Étant donné que l'impression des bulletins de vote sera prise en charge par la Commission électorale nationale indépendante d'Afrique du Sud, il faudrait réaffecter les fonds de l'Union à d'autres domaines techniques, comme l'éducation électoral.

**Réponse commune donnée par Mme Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la
Commission**
(10 octobre 2013)

Le versement des fonds européens octroyés au PNUD/PACEM, qui avait été gelé en raison du manque de progrès constaté dans le processus électoral entre début mai 2013 et le milieu du mois d'août 2013, est entièrement revenu à la normale. Ainsi que le porte-parole de la haute représentante/vice-présidente l'a indiqué, l'UE a confirmé son plein soutien au processus électoral, tant politiquement que sur le plan financier.

Une renégociation de l'accord de contribution conclu avec le PNUD en faveur du PACEM n'est pas nécessaire. L'impression des bulletins est en effet financée par le PACEM (grâce à des fonds de l'UE), la promesse de financement de l'Afrique du Sud ne s'étant pas concrétisée.

L'UE n'a jamais suspendu son soutien financier au PACTE (Projet d'appui à la crédibilité et à la transparence des élections), géré par un consortium d'organisations non gouvernementales (ONG), qui a poursuivi ses activités dans le domaine du suivi des médias et de la prévention des conflits.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009735/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Madagascar: unfreezing of EU aid

The Vice-President/High Representative welcomed the recent progress in Madagascar following the publication by the Special Electoral Court of the final list of candidates for the presidential election and the adoption by the Independent National Electoral Commission for the Transition (CENIT) of a new electoral timetable to hold presidential and legislative elections this year.

The spokesperson for the Commission Vice-President also said that she 'commends the Malagasy stakeholders who helped unlock the electoral process', and expressed the EU's support for the mediation efforts to end the crisis headed by Joaquim Chissano, the former President of Mozambique, and Ramtane Lamamra, the High Commissioner for Peace and Security of the African Union.

The European Union, which is the major donor of funding for the programme to support the electoral process in Madagascar (PACEM), froze its aid pending the outcome of the political deadlock over the elections.

1. Why, then, at the time of writing, has EU funding for the PACEM not been unfrozen, despite the statements by the Commission Vice-President? The relevant information was reported by the Malagasy authorities.

2. Does the Commission believe there is now a need to renegotiate these funds? The first allocation of EU funds was for printing the single ballot paper. Given that the printing of the ballot papers will be handled by the Independent National Electoral Commission of South Africa, the EU funds concerned should be reallocated to other technical areas, such as electoral education.

Question for written answer E-009736/13

to the Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: Madagascar: unfreezing of EU aid

The Commission welcomed the recent progress in Madagascar following the publication by the Special Electoral Court of the final list of candidates for the presidential election and the adoption by the Independent National Electoral Commission for the Transition (CENIT) of a new electoral timetable to hold presidential and legislative elections this year.

The spokesperson for the Commission Vice-President also said that she 'commends the Malagasy stakeholders who helped unlock the electoral process', and expressed the EU's support for the mediation efforts to end the crisis headed by Joaquim Chissano, the former President of Mozambique, and Ramtane Lamamra, the High Commissioner for Peace and Security of the African Union.

The European Union, which is the major donor of funding for the programme to support the electoral process in Madagascar (PACEM), froze its aid pending the outcome of the political deadlock over the elections.

1. Why, then, at the time of writing, has EU funding for the PACEM not been unfrozen, despite the statements by the Commission Vice-President? The relevant information was reported by the Malagasy authorities.

2. Does the Commission believe there is now a need to renegotiate these funds? The first allocation of EU funds was for printing the single ballot paper. Given that the printing of the ballot papers will be handled by the Independent National Electoral Commission of South Africa, the EU funds concerned should be reallocated to other technical areas, such as electoral education.

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

The implementation of the EU funding provided to UNDP/PACEM, put on hold due to the lack of positive progress of the electoral process from early May 2013 until mid of August 2013, has been fully normalised. As stated by the HR/VP Spokesperson, the EU has confirmed its full support to the electoral process both politically and financially.

There is no need to renegotiate the contribution agreement with the UNDP for the PACEM. The printing of ballot papers is financed by the PACEM (with EU funding) as the South African intention to cover the cost did not materialise.

The EU funding to PACTE (Programme d'Appui à la Crédibilité et Transparence des Elections) managed by a Consortium of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) has never been put on hold and has continued its activities in the field of media monitoring and conflict prevention.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009737/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 août 2013)

Objet: Politique catastrophique du tout-charbon

Un nouveau conflit, révélé le 22 août par Euractiv, vient du fait que la Pologne envisage de construire deux nouvelles unités de production dans une centrale à charbon, et que celle-ci n'a pas été évaluée selon les critères du CSC (captage et stockage du carbone), technologie qui a fait l'objet d'une directive et sur laquelle s'appuie la Commission pour décarboner les sources d'énergies européennes d'ici 2050.

1. Quelle est la réaction de la Commission?
2. Selon la Commission, par cette décision de construire deux nouvelles unités dans la centrale d'Opole, le pays ne compromet-il pas l'évolution de son mix énergétique?
3. Dès lors, n'y a-t-il pas un risque de nouvelles procédures d'infraction?
4. La Commission compte-t-elle inciter les autorités à se conformer aux règles de l'UE?

Opole est un test pour vérifier si nos politiques sont valables ou si elles n'existent que sur le papier. De fait, si la Commission n'intervient pas, le droit européen en matière d'objectifs énergétiques en serait certainement affaibli.

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Hedegaard au nom de la Commission
(21 octobre 2013)

1-3-4. La Commission a été saisie d'une plainte à ce sujet et recueille actuellement des informations pour déterminer les éléments factuels et juridiques liés au projet de construction de deux nouvelles unités dans la centrale électrique d'Opole. En outre, une procédure d'infraction à l'encontre de la Pologne pour non-communication des mesures nationales de transposition de la directive CSC ⁽¹⁾ est en cours depuis juillet 2011. Pour de plus amples informations, l'Honorable Parlementaire est invité à se référer à la réponse de la Commission à la question du PE E-009110/2013 ⁽²⁾.

2. La Commission ne se prononce pas sur la question du bouquet énergétique de la Pologne. Les États membres ont le droit de choisir les sources d'énergie qu'ils exploitent sur leur territoire et la structure générale de leur approvisionnement énergétique.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2009/31/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 23 avril 2009.

⁽²⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009737/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 August 2013)**

Subject: Disastrous coal-only energy policy

On 22 August 2013, EurActiv reported the existence of a new conflict, arising from Poland's plan to build two new production units in a coal-powered energy plant and the fact that the project has not been assessed according for carbon capture and storage (CCS) readiness. CCS technology has been addressed in a directive and forms the basis for the Commission's efforts to decarbonise Europe's energy sources by 2050.

1. What is the Commission's response to this news?
2. Does the Commission agree that by deciding to build two new units in the Opole energy plant, Poland is compromising the development of its energy mix?
3. Does this make the launch of further infringement procedures likely?
4. Does the Commission intend to urge the authorities to comply with EU rules?

The Opole plant is a test of whether our policies are enforceable, or exist only on paper. If the Commission fails to intervene in this case, European law relating to energy targets will undoubtedly be weakened by it.

**Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(21 October 2013)**

1, 3, 4. The Commission has received a complaint on this issue and is currently gathering information to determine facts and law concerning the case of the planned two new units at the Opole power plant. In addition, there is an ongoing infringement case for non-communication of national measures transposing the CCS Directive ⁽¹⁾ against Poland, which was launched in July 2011. For additional details the Honourable Member is referred to the Commission's reply to the EP Question E-009110/2013 ⁽²⁾.

2. The Commission does not comment on the issue of Poland's energy mix.. Member States have the right to choose which energy sources they exploit on their territory and the general structure of their energy supply.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2009/31/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 23 April 2009.
⁽²⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html#sidesForm>

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009740/13
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 août 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Putschiste récompensé

Amadou Haya Sanogo, auteur du coup d'État du 22 mars 2012 qui a mis fin au régime d'Amadou Toumani Touré, semble avoir récolté le fruit de son putsch. Du grade de capitaine, il vient de se voir «bombardé» au grade de général de corps d'armée. D'aucuns estiment que lui et ses éléments récoltent ainsi les fruits de leur putsch, bien qu'il s'agisse d'un crime imprescriptible en République du Mali.

1. Les autorités européennes n'estiment-elles pas que cette promotion constitue un précédent dangereux au Mali, puisqu'il s'agit d'une récompense accordée à quelqu'un qui a renversé un président démocratiquement élu et l'ensemble des autres institutions de la République?
2. Quelle est la position des autorités européennes?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission

(25 novembre 2013)

D'importants progrès politiques ont été réalisés au Mali depuis le début des opérations militaires internationales en janvier 2013: l'adoption, fin janvier, d'une feuille de route pour la transition, qui a permis la reprise progressive de la coopération au développement; la signature avec les groupes armés du nord du Mali d'un accord préliminaire de paix le 18 juin et la large victoire électorale d'Ibrahim Boubacar Keïta en août, illustrant la volonté de changement politique des Maliens.

Dans ce contexte, l'UE reste déterminée à continuer à soutenir le retour complet à l'ordre constitutionnel, à la paix et à la sécurité, par la tenue d'élections législatives le 24 novembre 2013 ainsi que par l'instauration de pourparlers de paix et la mise en œuvre d'une réconciliation nationale qui englobent l'ensemble de la société. Elle continuera également à soutenir la réforme du secteur de la sécurité et la consolidation des bases démocratiques des forces de défense dans le cadre de la mission militaire de formation de l'UE et d'autres initiatives complémentaires.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009740/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Reward for mounting a coup d'état

Amadou Haya Sanogo, who led the coup d'état on 22 March 2012 that put an end to Amadou Toumani Touré's regime, appears to have benefited from his actions. He was recently catapulted from the rank of captain to lieutenant-general. Some take the view that he and his followers are now benefiting from their coup despite its being a crime not subject to the statute of limitations in Mali.

1. Do the EU authorities not take the view that this promotion is a dangerous precedent in Mali, since it represents a reward to an individual who overthrew a democratically elected president and all other institutions in Mali?
2. What is the position of the EU authorities?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(25 November 2013)

Important political progress has been made in Mali since international military operations started in January 2013: a Transition Road Map was adopted in late January which enabled the gradual resumption of development cooperation; a preliminary peace agreement was signed with armed groups from the north of Mali on 18 June; Ibrahim Boubacar Keïta's clear electoral victory at the presidential elections in August showed the Malian people's wish for political change.

In this context, the EU remains determined to continue its support to full return to constitutional order, peace and security through the holding of legislative elections on 24 November 2013 and inclusive peace talks and national reconciliation. It will also continue to support the security sector reform and the consolidation of the democratic foundations of the defence forces through the EU military Training Mission and other complementary initiatives.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009741/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 août 2013)

Objet: Daimler: fluide réfrigérant

Le gouvernement allemand a salué mercredi dernier la décision, en France, du Conseil d'État de suspendre l'interdiction dans l'Hexagone de la commercialisation de certains modèles du constructeur automobile allemand Daimler (DAI.XE).

1. La Commission s'est-elle assurée de la sûreté du nouveau fluide réfrigérant pour climatisation recommandé en Europe, à l'origine du litige entre Daimler et Paris?
2. Dans l'affirmative, qu'en est-il?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission

(17 octobre 2013)

La Commission renvoie l'Honorable Parlementaire à la réponse qu'elle a donnée à la question E-008870/2013 sur le même sujet.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009741/13
to the Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 August 2013)

Subject: Daimler: air-conditioning coolant

The German Government has welcomed the recent suspension by France's Council of State of the ban on sales of some Daimler cars in France.

1. Has the Commission satisfied itself that the new air-conditioning coolant recommended for use in the EU, which was the cause of the dispute between Daimler and the French authorities, is safe?
2. If it has, can it provide further details?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission

(17 October 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the reply to Question E-008870/2013 on the same subject.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009742/13
à la Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 août 2013)

Objet: 2014 — Année de l'agriculture familiale

La déclaration de l'ONU fera de 2014 l'Année internationale de l'agriculture familiale.

Que prévoit la Commission dans ce cadre?

Réponse donnée par M. Ciolos au nom de la Commission

(7 octobre 2013)

La Commission organise le 29 novembre 2013 à Bruxelles une conférence intitulée «Agriculture familiale: un dialogue en faveur d'une agriculture plus durable et plus résiliente en Europe et dans le monde». Cette conférence a pour principal objectif de valoriser l'agriculture familiale en tant que modèle rural durable et d'aborder certains des problèmes essentiels auxquels sont confrontées les exploitations familiales, ainsi que de déterminer la meilleure manière de soutenir ce modèle agricole. Elle s'adresse aux agriculteurs, aux organisations d'agriculteurs, à la société civile et aux organisations non gouvernementales d'Europe. Les résultats de la conférence viendront alimenter les nombreuses manifestations qui seront organisées en Europe et dans le monde durant l'année internationale de l'agriculture familiale 2014.

La Commission a lancé en août 2013 une consultation en ligne sur le «Rôle de l'agriculture familiale: principaux enjeux et priorités pour l'avenir». Les citoyens, les organisations non gouvernementales et les pouvoirs publics de l'Union européenne et d'ailleurs sont invités à contribuer à cette consultation qui sera clôturée le 11 octobre 2013.

La Commission entend participer activement aux nombreuses manifestations en rapport avec l'agriculture familiale prévues en 2014, et notamment la Conférence régionale européenne de la FAO qui se tiendra du 1^{er} au 4 avril 2014 à Bucarest (Roumanie).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009742/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 August 2013)**

Subject: 2014 — International Year of Family Farming

The United Nations has declared 2014 to be the International Year of Family Farming.

How does the Commission intend to mark this event?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(7 October 2013)**

The Commission is organising a conference 'Family Farming: A dialogue towards more sustainable and resilient farming in Europe and the world' on 29 November 2013 in Brussels. Its main objective is to highlight the value of family farming as a sustainable rural model and to delve into some key challenges for family farms as well the best means of supporting this agricultural model. The target audience are farmers, farmers' organisations, civil society and non-governmental organisations from Europe. The Conference event will feed into the many events which will be organised in Europe and beyond during the International Year of Family Farming 2014.

The Commission launched in August 2013 an e-consultation on 'The role of family farming, key challenges and priorities for the future'. Citizens, non-governmental organisations and public authorities in the European Union and beyond are invited to contribute to this consultation which closes on 11 October 2013.

The Commission intends to be an active contributor to the numerous events related to family farming that will be organised in 2014, notably the FAO European Regional Conference which will be held between 1-4 April 2014 in Bucharest, Romania.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009743/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 août 2013)

Objet: Costa Concordia à Venise

D'immenses bateaux de croisière frôlent le littoral de la lagune de Venise. Vu les récents événements liés à la catastrophe du Costa Concordia et les nombreuses victimes de cette tragédie, la Commission compte-t-elle réagir?

La Commission a-t-elle détecté d'autres endroits où une fréquentation trop proche des côtes constitue un réel danger?

Quelles compagnies sont dans le collimateur de la Commission?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(1^{er} octobre 2013)

Les questions relatives aux navires évoluant à proximité ou, le cas échéant, trop près du littoral relèvent, par définition, de la compétence de l'État côtier concerné.

Au lendemain de l'accident du Costa Concordia, les autorités italiennes ont introduit des dispositions nationales applicables aux eaux territoriales et aux zones côtières sensibles telles que la lagune de Venise, en ce compris des mesures de restriction du trafic. La Commission croit savoir que, si la législation nationale interdit de façon générale aux navires de plus de 40 000 tonnes de naviguer dans la lagune de Venise (bassin de Saint-Marc et canal de la Giudecca), il y est prévu par ailleurs que cette interdiction ne devienne effective que lorsque les autorités auront trouvé d'autres solutions de transit. En attendant, les autorités locales définiront des mesures minimales de sécurité au cas par cas (par exemple, obligation d'utiliser deux remorqueurs et de disposer de deux pilotes locaux à bord).

La Commission ne dispose pas d'informations concernant des lieux particuliers où des navires s'approcheraient trop du littoral.

La Commission ne surveille aucune compagnie maritime en particulier à cet égard. Le secteur des croisières maritimes s'est engagé à se conformer à la planification obligatoire du voyage suite à l'accident du Costa Concordia, parallèlement à d'autres changements opérationnels liés à la sécurité. Ces avancées se sont par la suite traduites par une modification des dispositions pertinentes de l'Organisation maritime internationale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009743/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 August 2013)

Subject: Costa Concordia in Venice

Huge cruise liners come in very close to the coastline of the lagoon around Venice. In view of the recent case of the Costa Concordia disaster and its many victims, what action does the Commission intend to take to respond to this state of affairs?

Has the Commission detected other places where real danger is posed by ships coming in too close to the shore?

What shipping companies is the Commission focusing its sights on?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(1 October 2013)

By definition, any question of vessels sailing close or possibly too close to the shore is an issue within the competence of the coastal state concerned.

In the aftermath of the Costa Concordia accident the Italian authorities have introduced national provisions in territorial waters and sensitive coastal areas such as the lagoon of Venice which include traffic restrictions. The Commission understands that while the national legislation provides in general for the prohibition of navigation in the lagoon of Venice (San Marco basin and Giudecca channel) for vessels over 40.000 tonnes, it also specifies that the prohibition will be effective only when the authorities have identified alternative transit solutions. Meanwhile local authorities will define the minimum safe measures on a case by case (e.g. compulsory use of two tugs and two local pilots on board).

The Commission does not have any information regarding particular places where vessels are reportedly sailing too close to the shore.

The Commission does not focus on any particular shipping company in this regard. The cruise ship industry has committed to mandatory route planning following the Costa Concordia accident along with other safety related operational changes and this has subsequently been enacted by a change of the relevant provisions of the International Maritime Organisation.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009744/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 août 2013)

Objet: Fusion AMR/US Airways

1. Quelle est la position de la Commission sur la fusion d'American Airlines et d'US Airways?
2. Le monopole ainsi obtenu sur certaines lignes n'est-il pas de nature potentiellement toxique?

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

La Commission a approuvé sous conditions la concentration des compagnies aériennes US Airways et American Airlines le 5 août 2013 ⁽¹⁾. L'évaluation de la Commission a principalement porté sur l'incidence de la concentration sur les consommateurs européens, raison pour laquelle ce sont les liaisons transatlantiques au départ ou à destination de l'EEE qui ont été examinées.

Après une étude approfondie, la Commission a estimé que la concentration soulevait de sérieux doutes en ce qui concerne la liaison Londres (Heathrow)-Philadelphie, pour laquelle seules US Airways et American Airlines ⁽²⁾ proposaient des vols sans escale. Afin de dissiper ces doutes sérieux, les parties se sont notamment engagées à céder un créneau par jour à un autre transporteur sur la liaison Londres (Heathrow)-Philadelphie et à conclure des accords de portée étendue concernant le transport de passagers en transit afin d'inciter un nouveau concurrent à entrer sur le marché de cette liaison. Compte tenu de ces engagements importants, la Commission est arrivée à la conclusion que la transaction proposée n'entraverait pas de manière significative l'exercice d'une concurrence effective dans l'EEE ou dans une partie substantielle de celui-ci.

Le 13 août 2013, le ministère américain de la justice a déposé une plainte visant à empêcher l'opération de concentration. D'une part, celle-ci diminuerait substantiellement la concurrence sur le marché du transport aérien commercial aux États-Unis pour plus de mille liaisons intérieures sans escale et avec une escale sur lesquelles les parties sont en concurrence. D'autre part, elle aboutirait à une augmentation du prix des billets d'avion et à une réduction de l'offre. Un procès opposant les compagnies aériennes au ministère américain de la justice et à plusieurs États américains doit avoir lieu le 25 novembre 2013.

⁽¹⁾ La version non confidentielle de la décision, dans laquelle figurent également les engagements, peut être consultée sur le site de la Commission : http://ec.europa.eu/competition/mergers/cases/decisions/m6607_20130805_2012_3270644_EN.pdf (en anglais seulement). Le communiqué de presse est disponible à l'adresse suivante : http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-764_fr.htm

⁽²⁾ Par le biais de vols assurés par son partenaire British Airways.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009744/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 August 2013)**

Subject: Merger between American Airlines and US Airways

1. What is the Commission's position on the merger between American Airlines and US Airways?
2. Would not the resulting monopoly on some routes be potentially toxic?

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

The Commission conditionally approved the merger of US Airways and American Airlines on 5 August 2013 ⁽¹⁾. The Commission's assessment focused on the impact the merger would have on European consumers, so the routes under scrutiny were the transatlantic routes having one end in the EEA.

After a thorough review, the Commission concluded that the merger raised serious doubts as regards the London (Heathrow) — Philadelphia route, where only US Airways and American Airlines ⁽²⁾ were offering non-stop services. To address these serious doubts, the parties committed, among others, to release a daily slot for another carrier to operate on the London (Heathrow) — Philadelphia route and to provide far-reaching feeder arrangements to induce entry by a new competitor on the route. In light of these comprehensive commitments, the Commission concluded that the proposed transaction would not significantly impede effective competition in the EEA or a substantial part of it.

On 13 August 2013, the US Department of Justice (DoJ) filed a complaint to block the merger on the basis that it would substantially lessen competition for commercial air travel on more than a thousand non-stop and one-stop domestic routes throughout the US on which the parties compete, as well as result in higher airfares and less service. A trial pitting the airlines against the DoJ and several US states is scheduled for 25 November 2013.

⁽¹⁾ The non-confidential version of decision including the commitments can be found on the Commission website at http://ec.europa.eu/competition/mergers/cases/decisions/m6607_20130805_20212_3270644_EN.pdf
The Press Release can be found at http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-764_en.htm

⁽²⁾ By means of flights operated by its partner British Airways.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009746/13

aan de Commissie

Auke Zijlstra (NI)

(30 augustus 2013)

Betreft: Bescherming van de rechten en vrijheden van kinderen

In haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-003127/2011 stelt commissaris Reding dat de bescherming en bevordering van de rechten van het kind voor de Commissie een prioriteit is. Voorts verzekert de commissaris dat zij veel aandacht zal besteden aan de situatie van bijzonder kwetsbare kinderen, zoals in de steek gelaten of ouderloze kinderen.

1. Welke stappen onderneemt de Commissie om ervoor te zorgen dat alle rechten en vrijheden van kinderen, zoals gewaarborgd door het Europees Verdrag tot bescherming van de rechten van de mens, worden geëerbiedigd?
2. Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat zij zich verzet en optreedt tegen elke vorm van onrecht en misbruik ten aanzien van kinderen die haar ter kennis komt?
3. Is de Commissie van oordeel dat de vrijheden van de EU-burgers, zoals de vrijheid van meningsuiting en de vrijheid van godsdienst, op het hele grondgebied van de EU afdoende gewaarborgd zijn?
4. Is de Commissie van mening dat door EU-burgers geadopteerde kinderen dezelfde rechten genieten als kinderen die van geboorte EU-burger zijn? Geldt het Europees Verdrag tot bescherming van de rechten van de mens evenzeer voor geadopteerde kinderen, ook al komen ze uit een derde land?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie

(5 november 2013)

1. Binnen de grenzen van haar bevoegdheden maakt de Commissie gebruik van alle tot haar beschikking staande instrumenten om de eerbiediging van de rechten van het kind te bevorderen en om ervoor te zorgen dat de belangen van het kind centraal staan in alle maatregelen en in elk beleid van de EU overeenkomstig het EU-Handvest van de grondrechten.
2. Binnen haar bevoegdheden is de Commissie sterk begaan met de bescherming van kinderen en jongeren tegen alle vormen van geweld⁽¹⁾. De Unie heeft ten aanzien van de rechten van het kind echter geen algemene bevoegdheden en kan niet in alle individuele gevallen tussenbeide komen.
3. De vrijheid van meningsuiting is een onderdeel van de belangrijkste pijlers van onze democratische samenlevingen. Het derde jaarverslag over de toepassing van het Handvest geeft een overzicht van de toepassing ervan door de instellingen van de EU en de lidstaten.
4. Kinderen die uit derde landen zijn geadopteerd, genieten dezelfde rechten als kinderen die door geboorte EU-burgers zijn. De toepasselijkheid van de meeste fundamentele rechten in het Handvest is niet afhankelijk van de nationaliteit van de betrokken persoon. Doordat adoptiebeslissingen die niet in het kader van het Verdrag van Den Haag van 1993 inzake interlandelijke adoptie worden uitgevoerd, niet wederzijds worden erkend, kan het voor een kind echter moeilijk zijn het staatsburgerschap te verwerven van de adoptieouders die in een lidstaat verblijven, of dat van hun gewone verblijfplaats (waarvan zij niet het staatsburgerschap bezitten).

⁽¹⁾ Zie: Een EU-agenda voor de rechten van het kind, COM(2011) 60, definitief, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=celex:52011dc0060:nl:NOT>.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009746/13
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(30 August 2013)

Subject: Protection of children's rights and freedoms

Commissioner Reding, in her answer to Written Question E-003127/2011, states that the protection and promotion of the rights of children is a priority of the Commission. The Commissioner further ensures Members that she will pay considerable attention to the situation of children who are particularly vulnerable, such as those who have been abandoned or orphaned.

1. What steps is the Commission taking in order to ensure that all the rights and freedoms of children, as guaranteed by the European Charter of Human Rights, are respected?
2. Can the Commission confirm that it speaks out and acts against all injustice and abuse of children, of which it becomes aware?
3. Does the Commission think that the freedoms of EU citizens, such as the freedom of speech and the freedom of religion, are guaranteed properly throughout the whole territory of the EU?
4. Does the Commission think that the children adopted by EU citizens enjoy the same rights as those children who are EU citizens by birth? Is the European Charter of Human Rights applicable to adopted children in the same way, even if they come from a third country?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2013)

1. Within the boundaries of its competences the Commission uses all the instruments at its disposal to promote the respect for the rights of the child, to ensure that the child's best interests are at the centre of all relevant EU actions and policies, in line with the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights.
2. Within its competences, the Commission is strongly committed to the protection of children and young people against all forms of violence ⁽¹⁾. However, the Union does not have general powers in respect of the rights of the child nor can it intervene in all individual cases.
3. Freedom of expression and freedom of speech constitute part of the essential foundations of our democratic societies. The third Annual Report on the Application of the Charter provides an overview of its implementation by EU institutions and Member States.
4. Children adopted from third countries enjoy the same rights of children who are EU citizens by birth. The applicability of most of the fundamental rights contained in the Charter does not depend on the nationality of the person concerned. It may however happen that, due to the lack of mutual recognition of adoption decisions not carried out under the legal framework of the 1993 Hague Convention on Inter-country adoption, it could be difficult for the child to acquire the citizenship of the adoptive parents resident in a Member State or the citizenship of the adoptive parents' habitual residence (of which they do not have citizenship).

⁽¹⁾ See: An EU Agenda for the Rights of the Child COM/2011/0060 final, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011DC0060:en:NOT>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009747/13
to the Commission
Glenis Willmott (S&D)
(30 August 2013)

Subject: European School Milk Scheme

The European School Milk Scheme is intended to encourage children to consume healthy dairy products containing important vitamins and minerals, and to develop a lasting habit of doing so. Milk and yoghurt are supplied to school children at reduced prices.

In 2011 the UK Government, or its agents, Multi Resource Marketing Ltd, returned to the Commission GBP 2 641 271.08 in funds that had been claimed under this scheme, as is noted in Hansard of the House of Commons, 22 Apr 2013 — Column 771W.

— Bearing this in mind, how much aid is available to each Member State under the European School Milk Scheme?

— How much aid was paid and/or claimed by each Member State under the European School Milk Scheme in each of the last 10 years?

— What communication was received from the UK Government or its agents prior to, or following, the reimbursement of GBP 2 641 271.08 to the Commission?

— What steps is the Commission taking to increase the uptake of this scheme by Member States?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(7 October 2013)

The EU aid for the School Milk Scheme (SMS) is not fixed as an envelope per Member State, but is set according to Art. 102 of Council Reg.(EC) 1234/2007 at the level of EUR 18.15/100 kg of milk with a maximum of 0.25 l of milk equivalent per pupil per school day.

The amounts paid per Member State are displayed in the annex. They differ from the annual notifications received from Member States, because payments refer to the financial year, while Member States' notifications refer to the school year. In addition, claims can be submitted after the end of a school year and payments usually occur around two months after the claims are lodged.

When a Member State during its regular control/audit of the implementation of a shared management CAP instrument, such as the SMS, finds out that payments have to be recovered for non-respect of the rules in force, this is done on a regular basis and included in the monthly declarations for reimbursements from the EAGF. A Member State is not obliged to inform the Commission in advance of such corrections.

The SMS's Regulation ⁽¹⁾ was changed in 2008, extending the list of eligible products and the target group. The programme is currently being evaluated by an external contractor. The results are expected to be published in October/November 2013. Besides, an impact assessment is being conducted on the general framework of school programmes (School Milk and School Fruit Schemes). It is expected to be finalised at the earliest at the end of 2013.

⁽¹⁾ Commission Regulation (EC) No 657/2008 of 10 July 2008 laying down detailed rules for applying Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 as regards Community aid for supplying milk and certain milk products to pupils in educational establishments.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009748/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(30 de agosto de 2013)

Asunto: VP/HR — Juicio de extradición del refugiado político Alexander Pavlov

La etapa final del juicio de extradición del ciudadano y refugiado político kazajo, Alexander Pavlov, antiguo jefe de seguridad del disidente kazajo Mujtar Abliazov, se celebró ante la Audiencia Nacional en Madrid el 18 de julio de 2013. El 22 de julio de 2013 se adoptó la decisión de conceder la extradición de Alexander Pavlov a Kazajistán. Esta decisión ha sido recurrida.

El caso de Alexander Pavlov reviste una importancia particular ya que se inscribe en una operación de caza y captura más amplia de miembros de la oposición organizada por el Gobierno de Kazajistán que se está registrando en toda Europa. Los opositores políticos del Presidente kazajo, Nursultan Nazarbayev, que se han visto obligados a huir al extranjero para escapar de la persecución política, están siendo llevados ante los tribunales europeos para ser extraditados. Las autoridades kazajas se sirven de acusaciones de delitos tales como actividades terroristas, tentativas de derrocamiento del gobierno y fraude financiero como pretexto devolver al país a los refugiados políticos y a sus familias, donde corren peligro de verse sometidos a torturas, tratos inhumanos y a un juicio injusto.

El Sr. Pavlov solicitó asilo político en España. Lamentablemente, le fue denegado alegando la decisión del Centro Nacional de Inteligencia (CNI). La decisión de denegar el asilo político ha sido recurrida para poder tener en cuenta los hechos y la información que no examinaron en el marco de la decisión del CNI.

Teniendo en cuenta lo anteriormente expuesto, y sobre la base de los casos registrados recientemente en Italia en relación con la deportación de Alma Shalabayeva y Alua Abliazova a Kazajistán, y en Polonia, donde Muratbek Ketebayev, un opositor político del régimen kazajo y antiguo colega de Mujtar Abliazov, fue detenido y contra quién Kazajistán también ha presentado una orden de detención de Interpol, ¿podría indicar la Vicepresidenta / Alta Representante si está al tanto del caso de Alexander Pavlov y si el Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior (SEAE) tiene intención de adoptar medidas para evitar su extradición a Kazajistán?

En caso afirmativo, ¿qué medidas tiene intención de adoptar el SEAE para velar por que Alexander Pavlov no sea extraditado a Kazajistán, país en el que corre el riesgo de verse sometido a torturas y malos tratos?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(22 de octubre de 2013)

La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta ha tomado buena nota de los temas planteados en la pregunta y está muy atenta a la evolución del asunto de Aleksandr Pavlov, antiguo jefe de seguridad de Mukhtar Ablyazov. La Comisión recuerda que hay dos procesos pendientes, uno referido al asunto de extradición y otro a al recurso contra la decisión de denegar la solicitud de asilo del Sr. Pavlov.

La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta continúa muy atenta a este asunto y a otros similares. Se aprovechan todas las ocasiones oficiales y oficiosas para alentar a Kazajistán a respetar sus obligaciones internacionales y, en especial, la Convención contra la Tortura y Otros Tratos o Penas Crueles, Inhumanos o Degradantes y su Protocolo facultativo, en los que es parte Kazajistán.

La UE plantea, y lo seguirá haciendo, las cuestiones relacionadas con los derechos humanos en su diálogo político con Kazajistán de forma coherente y a todos los niveles y, en particular, en el marco del diálogo anual sobre derechos humanos.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009748/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)

(30 August 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Extradition trial of political refugee Aleksandr Pavlov

The final stage of the extradition trial of the Kazakh citizen and political refugee, Aleksandr Pavlov, former security chief to the Kazakh dissident Mukhtar Ablyazov took place before the Audiencia Nacional (Spanish National Court) in Madrid on 18 July 2013. On 22 July 2013, the decision was taken to grant the extradition of Aleksandr Pavlov to Kazakhstan. This decision to grant extradition is currently being appealed.

Aleksandr Pavlov's case is of particular importance because it is part of the wider hunt for opposition members initiated by the Kazakh Government, which is taking place throughout Europe. Political opponents of Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev who have been forced to run abroad to escape political persecution are now being taken to European courts for extradition. Kazakh authorities use allegations of offences such as terrorist activity, attempted overthrow of government, and financial fraud as pretexts to bring political refugees and their families back to the country, where they are in danger of torture, inhumane treatment and unfair trial.

Mr Pavlov requested political asylum in Spain. Unfortunately his efforts were denied, based on the decision of the Centro Nacional de Inteligencia (CNI — National Intelligence Centre). The decision to deny political asylum is currently being appealed in order to allow for the facts and information that were not considered in the CNI's decision to be analysed and addressed.

In light of the above information, and taking into account recent cases in Italy regarding the deportation of Alma Shalabayeva and Alua Ablyazova to Kazakhstan, and in Poland, where Muratbek Ketebayev, a political opponent of the current Kazakh regime and former colleague of Mukhtar Ablyazov, was arrested and against whom Kazakhstan has also presented an Interpol arrest warrant, is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the case of Aleksandr Pavlov and does the European External Action Service (EEAS) intend to take any actions in order to prevent his extradition to Kazakhstan?

If so, what actions does the EEAS intend to take to make sure that Aleksandr Pavlov is not extradited to Kazakhstan; a country in which he is at risk of torture and ill-treatment?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(22 October 2013)

The HR/VP has taken good note of the issues raised in the question, and is following closely the developments of the case of Mr Aleksandr Pavlov, former security chief of Mukhtar Ablyazov. The Commission notes that there are two procedures pending, in the extradition case and against the decision to decline Mr Pavlov's request for asylum.

The HR/VP continues to monitor very closely this and other similar cases. Formal and informal opportunities are used to encourage Kazakhstan to respect its international obligations, notably the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and its Optional Protocol that Kazakhstan is a state party to.

The EU raises and will continue to raise human rights issues in its political dialogue with Kazakhstan consistently and at all levels and in particular, in the framework of the annual Human Rights Dialogue.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-009749/13

za Komisijo

Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)

(30. avgust 2013)

Zadeva: Ženske na vodilnih medijskih položajih

Zadnja študija Evropskega inštituta za enakost spolov je pokazala, da v EU ženske v javnih medijihasedajo le 22 odstotkov vodilnih položajev, v zasebnih medijskih ustanovah pa le 12 odstotkov. Sicer predstavljajo skoraj polovico zaposlenih, vendar prevlada moških v medijih ne ovira samo tistih žensk, ki si želijo napredovati v svojem poklicu, ampak zmanjšuje tudi možnost, da bi vplivale na vsebino v sektorju, ki ima tako pomembno vlogo, kot je oblikovanje javnega mnenja. Stalna premajhna zastopanost žensk namreč lahko vpliva na vse, kar vidimo, slišimo ali preberemo v medijih.

Kaj namerava Komisija narediti, da bi ob upoštevanju nedavnih ugotovitev spodbudila enakost spolov v medijskem sektorju in povečala ozaveščenost o vlogi žensk na najvišjih medijskih položajih?

Odgovor Viviane Reding v imenu Komisije

(29. oktober 2013)

Ena od prednostnih nalog strategije Komisije za enakost žensk in moških (2010–2015) ⁽¹⁾ je spodbujanje enake zastopanosti pri odločanju. Komisija podpira zadevne akterje pri izboljševanju razmer, in sicer s političnim dialogom, razvojem skupnih kazalnikov na ravni EU za merjenje napredka, dejavnostmi ozaveščanja, spodbujanjem in izmenjavo dobre prakse ter finančno podporo. Poleg tega je Komisija za izboljšanje nizke zastopanosti žensk v upravnih odborih 14. novembra 2012 sprejela predlog direktive o zagotavljanju uravnotežene zastopanosti spolov med neizvršnimi direktorji družb, ki kotirajo na borzi ⁽²⁾. Komisija tudi spremlja razmere na različnih področjih, zajetih v njeni zbirki podatkov o ženskah in moških na vodilnih položajih ⁽³⁾.

Kar zadeva sektor informacijskih in komunikacijskih tehnologij (IKT), je Komisija nedavno objavila poročilo o ženskah, dejavnih v sektorju IKT, ki utemeljuje gospodarske in druge prednosti večje udeležbe žensk v digitalnem sektorju, ter se skupaj z deležniki s kampanjami ozaveščanja dejavno zavzema za njihovo večjo zastopanost.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/document/index_en.htm

⁽²⁾ COM(2012)0614 final.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/gender-decision-making/database/index_en.htm; http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/index_sl.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009749/13
to the Commission**

Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)

(29 August 0912)

ŽuSlrjtc Women in top media jobs

The recent study of the European Institute for Gender Equality shows that women hold only 22% of management positions in the public media, and only 12% of such positions in the private media organisations in the EU. Despite the fact that women make up for nearly half of the workforce, the dominance of men in the media not only presents an obstacle to women who want to advance in their profession, it also restricts women's ability to influence content in a sector with such an important role — shaping the public opinion. The continued under-representation of women namely has the potential to influence everything we see, hear or read in the media.

Following the recent findings, how is the Commission planning to promote gender equality in the media business and raise awareness about the role of women in top media jobs?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(0: OjtoSer 0912)

The Commission's Strategy for Equality between Women and Men (2010-2015) ⁽¹⁾ has amongst its priorities the promotion of equal representation in decision-making. The Commission supports the various actors involved to improve the situation through political dialogue, development of common indicators at EU level to measure progress, awareness-raising activities, promotion and exchange of good practices, financial support. Moreover, to address the particular under-representation of women on corporate boards, the Commission adopted a proposal for a directive on improving the gender balance among non-executive directors of companies listed on stock exchanges on 14.11.2012 ⁽²⁾. The Commission also monitors the situation in the various fields covered by its database on women and men in decision-making ⁽³⁾.

As regards the ICT (information and communication technologies) sector in particular, the Commission has recently published a report on 'women active in the ICT sector', providing a business and policy case for an increased participation of women in digital jobs, and actively promotes the issue, with stakeholders, in awareness-raising campaigns.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/document/index_en.htm

⁽²⁾ COM(2012) 614 final.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/gender-decision-making/database/index_en.htm; http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/index_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009750/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(30 août 2013)

Objet: La liberté des médias en danger

Alan Rusbridger, rédacteur en chef du quotidien *The Guardian* à l'origine des divulgations du lanceur d'alerte américain, Edward Snowden, a révélé dans sa tribune la semaine dernière que les autorités britanniques avaient obligé son journal à détruire des documents fournis par l'ancien employé de la CIA, dont les révélations ont mis en lumière un gigantesque programme américain d'écoutes et de surveillance qui a choqué le monde entier et donné lieu à des réactions de colère en Europe.

Quelle est la réaction de la Commission?

Réponse commune donnée par M^{me} Reding au nom de la Commission

(20 novembre 2013)

La liberté d'expression et d'information ainsi que le pluralisme des médias sont des droits consacrés dans l'article 11 de la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne. L'article 51, paragraphe 1, de la Charte prévoit que ses dispositions s'adressent aux institutions et organes de l'Union, ainsi qu'aux États membres uniquement lorsqu'ils mettent en œuvre le droit de l'Union.

Concernant les programmes de surveillance des États-Unis, la Commission renvoie l'Honorable Parlementaire à sa réponse à la question écrite E-009773/13.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011758/13

Komisii

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)

(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Britské vládne útoky na slobodu médií

V uplynulom období vyšlo najavo, že významný britský denník bol pod tlakom britskej vlády niekoľko mesiacov. Stalo sa tak potom, ako denník písal o programe PRISM. Jeden z novinárov bol dokonca zadržiatvaný a vypočúvaný deväť hodín, než bol bez obvinenia prepustený. Možno povedať, že je minimálne hanbou, ak britské úrady zastrašujú významný mienkotvorný denník a zároveň robia nátlak na nezávislých novinárov.

Aké kroky môže podniknúť Komisia, aby bolo možné takémuto nekalému konaniu adekvátnym a účinným spôsobom zabrániť?

Spoločná odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie

(20. novembra 2013)

Sloboda prejavu a právo na informácie, ako aj pluralita médií sú hodnoty chránené článkom 11 Charty základných práv Európskej únie. Podľa článku 51 ods. 1 uvedenej charty sú jej ustanovenia určené pre inštitúcie a orgány Únie a tiež pre členské štáty výlučne vtedy, ak vykonávajú právo Únie.

Pokiaľ ide o programy sledovania zo strany USA, Komisia si dovoľí váženú pani poslankyňu odkázať na svoju odpoveď na písomnú otázku E-009773/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009750/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(30 August 2013)

Subject: Media freedom in danger

Alan Rusbridger, editor of *The Guardian* newspaper, which spearheaded revelations by US whistleblower Edward Snowden, last week revealed in a column that the British authorities forced his newspaper to destroy material leaked by the former CIA employee whose revelations uncovered a massive American eavesdropping programme that shocked the world and triggered angry reactions from Europe.

What is the Commission's reaction?

Question for written answer E-011758/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: UK Government attacks on media freedom

It recently emerged that an important UK daily newspaper has come under pressure from the UK Government for some months. This happened after the newspaper wrote about the PRISM programme. One journalist was even detained and interrogated for nine hours before being released without charge. It is at the very least shameful for the UK authorities to be threatening an important opinion-forming daily newspaper and to be putting pressure on independent journalists.

What steps can the Commission take to adequately and effectively prevent such dishonourable behaviour?

Joint answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(20 November 2013)

Freedom of expression and information as well as media pluralism are values protected by Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. According to Article 51(1) of the said Charter, its provisions are addressed to the institutions and bodies of the Union and to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law.

On US surveillance programmes, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-009773/13.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009751/13
a la Comisión**

Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)

(30 de agosto de 2013)

Asunto: Situación en Siria y conflicto bélico global

Vista la evolución del conflicto sirio y los acontecimientos ocurridos estas últimas semanas en la guerra civil en Siria, como el aparente uso de armas químicas, algunos analistas han levantado voces de alarma indicando que podemos estar a las puertas de un conflicto bélico a nivel global ⁽¹⁾.

Señalan dichos analistas que una intervención en Siria por parte de potencias como EE.UU. y/o miembros de la Unión Europea como Francia y Gran Bretaña implica un enfrentamiento directo con Rusia y, probablemente, con China. Y, con mucha posibilidad, un enfrentamiento global y, quizás, nuclear con esos países.

En vista de que el conflicto sirio se está desarrollando en las fronteras de la Unión y que su evolución puede poner en peligro a la ciudadanía de la misma Unión, ¿comparte la Comisión la opinión de dichos analistas en el sentido de que la guerra civil siria podría convertirse en un conflicto bélico global?

¿Qué pasos concretos está dando la Unión para intentar evitar que el conflicto civil sirio devenga en un conflicto global que pueda poner en peligro a la ciudadanía de la Unión?

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009752/13
a la Comisión**

Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)

(30 de agosto de 2013)

Asunto: Situación en Siria y posición de la Comisión

Los acontecimientos ocurridos estas últimas semanas en la guerra civil en Siria, como el aparente uso de armas químicas, han producido un gran cambio en la situación.

Países como EE.UU. y algunos miembros de la Unión Europea, como Gran Bretaña o Francia, amenazan con intervenir directamente en el conflicto si se demuestra que el Gobierno sirio ha utilizado armas químicas. Estas amenazas están creciendo en intensidad e incluso en la prensa se citan supuestos planes de intervención.

En vista al agravamiento de la situación en Siria y teniendo en cuenta que la evolución del conflicto puede poner en riesgo la seguridad de la Unión Europea al estar desarrollándose en sus fronteras, ¿está la Comisión, y concretamente la Alta Representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad, Catherine Ashton, realizando algún tipo de consulta entre los Estados miembros de cara a consensuar una posición común ante una posible intervención militar en Siria por parte de terceros países y/o miembros de la Unión Europea?

¿Considera la Comisión que una intervención militar podría facilitar la resolución del conflicto y la consecución de un Estado democrático donde todas las minorías culturales, lingüísticas y religiosas fuesen respetadas?

¿Cuáles considera la Comisión que deberían ser las condiciones mínimas que pudiesen justificar de alguna manera una intervención militar en Siria?

**Respuesta conjunta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de octubre de 2013)**

El 17 de septiembre de 2013, la alta representante y vicepresidenta expuso el punto de vista de la UE, acordado en la reunión informal de los Ministros de Asuntos Exteriores de la UE de 7 de septiembre de 2013, en el sentido de que la Unión se mantiene unida en su condena con la mayor firmeza de los ataques químicos, los cuales constituyen violaciones del Derecho internacional y crímenes de guerra y contra la humanidad. También hizo hincapié en que no pueden dejarse impunes y en que sus responsables deben responder por ellos.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.scribd.com/doc/163141949/Geo-estrategia-AL-BORDE-DEL-ABISMO-Es-Geo-Strategy-AT-THE-EDGE-OF-THE-ABYSS-Es-Geo-Estrategia-AMILDEGL-ERTZEAN-Es>

La alta representante y vicepresidenta se ha congratulado del acuerdo entre los Estados Unidos y Rusia y ha reiterado su llamamiento para que el Consejo de Seguridad de las Naciones Unidas asuma sus responsabilidades llegando a un rápido acuerdo sobre una resolución eficaz que autorice el proceso. La Unión Europea apoya plenamente la aplicación inmediata del plan acordado.

La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta insta a todos los interlocutores de la comunidad internacional a aprovechar esta oportunidad para alcanzar un mayor consenso en torno a una solución política negociada del conflicto que ponga fin al sufrimiento del pueblo sirio.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009760/13
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)**

Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(30. August 2013)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Syrien-Konflikt und EU-Beteiligung

Medienberichten zufolge bereiten die EU-Mitgliedstaaten Großbritannien und Frankreich einen militärischen Einsatz gegen Syrien vor.

1. Wie bewertet die Hohe Vertreterin die geplanten militärischen Alleingänge Großbritanniens und Frankreichs?
2. Steht den Vorbereitungen Frankreich und Großbritanniens ein gemeinsamer EU-weiter Einsatz entgegen?
3. Falls ja: Würde dieser Einsatz auch ohne UN-Mandat stattfinden?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission

(25. Oktober 2013)

Am 17. September 2013 brachte die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin die Auffassung der EU zum Einsatz von Chemiewaffen, auf die sich die EU-Außenminister auf dem informellen Treffen vom 7. September 2013 verständigt hatten, zum Ausdruck und betonte, dass die EU einvernehmlich und auf das Schärfste den Angriff mit Chemiewaffen verurteilt, der eine Verletzung des Völkerrechts, ein Kriegsverbrechen und ein Verbrechen gegen die Menschlichkeit darstellt. Sie bekräftigte erneut, dass es keine Straflosigkeit geben dürfe und die Urheber der Angriffe zur Rechenschaft gezogen werden müssten.

Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin begrüßte die Übereinkunft zwischen den Vereinigten Staaten und Russland und appellierte erneut an den UN-Sicherheitsrat, seine Verantwortung zu übernehmen und sich schnell auf eine wirksame Resolution zu verständigen, mit der das weitere Vorgehen gebilligt wird. Die EU unterstützt uneingeschränkt die sofortige Umsetzung des vereinbarten Plans.

Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin forderte alle Partner in der internationalen Gemeinschaft dazu auf, die Gelegenheit zu nutzen, um einen breiteren Konsens für eine politische Verhandlungslösung des Konflikts zu erreichen und dem Leiden des syrischen Volkes ein Ende zu setzen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009751/13
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
 (30 August 2013)

Subject: Situation in Syria and world war

Given the developments of the Syrian conflict and recent events in the civil war in Syria, such as the apparent use of chemical weapons, some analysts have sounded the alarm, saying that we could be on the verge of a global war ⁽¹⁾.

The analysts point out that intervention in Syria by powers such as the US and/or EU Member States such as France and Britain will involve a direct confrontation with Russia and, probably, China. It is highly likely that this could lead to a global — and perhaps nuclear — confrontation with those countries.

Given that the Syrian conflict is unfolding on the borders of the Union and that its evolution could put EU citizens at risk, does the Commission share the analysts' opinion that the Syrian civil war could become a global war?

What specific steps is the EU taking to try to prevent the Syrian civil war from turning into a world war that would be a threat to EU citizens?

Question for written answer E-009752/13
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
 (30 August 2013)

Subject: Situation in Syria — Commission's position

The events of recent weeks in the civil war in Syria and the apparent use of chemical weapons have changed the situation considerably.

Countries such as the United States and some members of the European Union, including the United Kingdom and France, are threatening to intervene directly in the conflict if it is proven that the Syrian Government has used chemical weapons. These threats are growing and even the press are reporting alleged engagement plans.

In view of the worsening situation in Syria and given that the evolution of the conflict could jeopardise the security of the European Union, since it is taking place at its borders, is the Commission — and more specifically the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Catherine Ashton — carrying out any kind of consultation among the Member States with a view to agreeing on a common position regarding possible military intervention in Syria by third countries and/or members of the European Union?

Does the Commission believe that military intervention would facilitate the settlement of the conflict and the achievement of a democratic state where all cultural, linguistic and religious minorities are respected?

What, in the Commission's view, should be the minimum conditions that might somehow justify military intervention in Syria?

Question for written answer E-009760/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
 (30 August 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Conflict in Syria and EU involvement

According to media reports, the United Kingdom and France, which are EU Member States, are preparing to take military action against Syria.

1. What view does the High Representative take of the independent military action being envisaged by the United Kingdom and France?

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.scribd.com/doc/163141949/Geo-estrategia-AL-BORDE-DEL-ABISMO-Es-Geo-Strategy-AT-THE-EDGE-OF-THE-ABYSS-Es-Geo-Estrategia-AMILDEGL-ERTZEAN-Es>

2. Are their preparations being countered by a joint EU action?
3. If so, would the action be allowed to go ahead even without a UN mandate?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(25 October 2013)

On 17 September 2013 the HR/VP stated the view of the EU, agreed at the informal meeting of the EU foreign ministers of 7 September 2013, that the EU stands united in condemning, in the strongest terms, the chemical attack which constitutes a violation of international law, a war crime, and a crime against humanity. She reiterated that there could be no impunity and perpetrators of the attacks must be held accountable.

The HR/VP has welcomed the agreement between the United States and Russia, and repeated a call on the UN Security Council to assume its responsibilities in agreeing swiftly on an effective resolution that would authorise the process. The EU fully supports the immediate implementation of the agreed plan.

The HR/VP has called on all partners in the international community to seize the momentum to reach a broader consensus for a negotiated political solution to the conflict in order to end the suffering of the Syrian people.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor P-009753/13
upućeno Komisiji
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(30. kolovoza 2013.)

Predmet: Nezaposlenost mladih

S provedbom inicijative usmjerene na povećanje zapošljavanja mladih putem Garancije mladima, Europska će unija imati 6 milijardi EUR dostupnih unutar prve dvije godine predstojećeg financijskog okvira (2014. do 2020.).

Nezaposlenost među mladim ljudima do 29 godina starosti u Hrvatskoj i dalje neprestano raste. U 2009. stopa nezaposlenosti bila je 32 %, dok je u 2012. porasla na 34,6 % te se očekuje da će se ovaj trend nastaviti do kraja 2013. Hrvatska je 1. srpnja 2013. počela provoditi sigurnosne mjere za mlade ljude te su trenutno na snazi 23 mjere usmjerene u pružanje prilika mladim ljudima da poboljšaju svoje vještine i da se pripreme za zapošljavanje.

1. Koji je iznos sredstava predviđenih za Hrvatsku u sklopu ovog programa?
2. S obzirom na trenutnu situaciju i na provedbu Garancije mladima u Hrvatskoj, može li Komisija preporučiti bilo kakve druge mjere koje bi mogle doprinijeti smanjenju nezaposlenosti mladih u Hrvatskoj?

Odgovor g. Andorona u ime Komisije
(26. rujna 2013.)

1.) Suzakonodavci EU-a i dalje raspravljaju o osnovi za utvrđivanje raspodjele proračunskih sredstava po regiji/državi članici u okviru Inicijative za zapošljavanje mladih (YEI). Pregovori o tom pitanju trebali bi završiti krajem rujna. U svakom slučaju, osim moguće dodjele sredstava u okviru Inicijative za zapošljavanje mladih, Hrvatska će moći koristiti znatne iznose iz Europskog socijalnog fonda (ESF) kako bi pridonijela provedbi programa Jamstva za mlade.

2.) Komisija pozdravlja činjenicu da je Hrvatska uvela aktivne političke mjere za tržište rada i donijela program Jamstvo za mlade kako bi riješila pitanje nezaposlenosti mladih.

Mjerama koje mogu pridonijeti smanjenju nezaposlenosti mladih u Hrvatskoj trebala bi se podržati učinkovitija integracija mladih na tržište rada te ublažiti učinak nezaposlenosti mladih.

U okviru programa Jamstvo za mlade trebalo bi se usredotočiti na zapošljavanje mladih i razvoj ljudskog kapitala uz moguće povezivanje s aktivnostima uključivanja u društvo.

Mjere su dogovorene u okviru trenutačnog programskog razdoblja (2007. — 2013.) programa ESF-a te se pregovara da se uključe u buduće okvire gdje će barem tri tematska cilja biti važna za borbu protiv nezaposlenosti mladih: a) promicanje održivog i kvalitetnog zapošljavanja i poticanje mobilnosti radne snage; b) ulaganje u obrazovanje, vještine i cjeloživotno učenje; c) promicanje društvene uključenosti i borba protiv siromaštva.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-009753/13
to the Commission
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(30 August 2013)**

Subject: Youth unemployment

With the implementation of the initiative aimed at increasing youth employment through the Youth Guarantee, the European Union will have EUR 6 billion available within the first two years of the upcoming financial framework (2014 to 2020).

In Croatia, unemployment among young people up to 29 years of age is still steadily growing. In 2009 the unemployment rate was 32% while in 2012 it rose to 34.6%, and it is expected that this trend will continue until the end of 2013. Croatia started to implement safeguards for young people on 1 July 2013, and there are currently 23 measures in place aimed at enabling young people to improve their skills and to prepare for employment.

1. What is the amount of funds earmarked for Croatia under this programme?
2. In view of the present situation and the implementation of the Youth Guarantee in Croatia, can the Commission recommend any other measures that can contribute to reducing youth unemployment in Croatia?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(26 September 2013)**

1. The EU co-legislators are still discussing the basis for determining the budgetary allocations per region/Member State under the YEI. The negotiations on this issue are expected to be finalised later in September. In any case, besides a possible allocation under the YEI, Croatia will be able to use substantial amounts under the ESF to support the implementation of the Youth guarantee.

2. The Commission welcomes that Croatia introduced several measures addressing young people, in the framework of active labour market policy measures and recently adopted Youth Guarantee schemes.

Measures that can contribute to reducing youth unemployment in Croatia should provide support for more effective youth integration into the labour market as well as mitigate persisting effects of youth unemployment.

Youth guarantee should focus on youth employability and the development of human capital, with possible synergies with social inclusion activities.

Measures have been negotiated within the framework of the current programming period (2007-13) ESF programme and are being negotiated within the future framework, where at least three thematic objectives will be relevant for fighting youth unemployment: (a) promoting sustainable and quality employment and supporting labour mobility; (b) investing in education, skills and lifelong learning; (c) promoting social inclusion and combating poverty.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009754/13

an den Rat

Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(30. August 2013)

Betrifft: Dokumentübersetzungen beim Rat

Der Sprachendienst des Rates beschäftigte Ende 2009 mehr als 650 Übersetzer ⁽¹⁾.

1. Verfügt der Rat über Daten dazu, wie viele Seiten Dokumente in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012 durch den internen Übersetzungsdienst übersetzt wurden?
2. Verfügt der Rat über Daten dazu, wie viele Seiten Dokumente in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012 durch externe Übersetzungsdienstleister für den Rat übersetzt wurden?

Antwort

(25. November 2013)

Die Zahl der von der Direktion Übersetzung des Rates übersetzten Seiten ist während dieses Zeitraums kontinuierlich gestiegen und lag im Jahr 2012 bei ungefähr 1 300 000 Seiten.

Die Gesamtzahl der extern übersetzten Seiten belief sich im Jahr 2009 auf beinahe 5 500 Seiten. In der Folge ist diese Zahl kontinuierlich gesunken und betrug im Jahr 2012 rund 250 Seiten.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/contacts/languages-%20%29/the-language-service-of-the-council-general-secretariat.aspx?lang=de>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009754/13
to the Council**

Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(30 August 2013)

Subject: Document translations at the Council

At the end of 2009, the Council's language service employed more than 650 translators ⁽¹⁾.

1. Does the Council have figures for the number of pages translated by its in-house translation service in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012?
2. Does the Council have figures for the number of pages translated for it by external service providers in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012?

Reply

(25 November 2013)

The number of pages treated by the Translation Directorate of the Council increased continually over this period to reach approximately 1,300,000 pages in 2012.

The total number of pages translated externally was almost 5,500 pages in 2009. Since then, that number has dropped steadily and was approximately 250 in 2012.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/contacts/languages-%281%29/the-language-service-of-the-council-general-secretariat.aspx?lang=en>

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009755/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
 (30. August 2013)

Betrifft: Dokumentübersetzungen bei der Kommission

Im Jahr 2012 arbeiteten 1 474 Übersetzer im Übersetzungsdienst der Europäischen Kommission ⁽¹⁾.

1. Verfügt die Kommission über Daten dazu, wie viele Seiten Dokumente in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012 durch den internen Übersetzungsdienst übersetzt wurden?
2. Verfügt die Kommission über Daten dazu, wie viele Seiten Dokumente in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012 durch externe Übersetzungsdienstleister für die Kommission übersetzt wurden?

Antwort von Androulla Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
 (4. Oktober 2013)

Die nachstehende Tabelle enthält die vom Herrn Abgeordneten gewünschten Angaben. Spalte 2 zeigt die Anzahl der Seiten, die in den jeweiligen Jahren von externen Dienstleistern übersetzt wurden, mit denen die Kommission Verträge geschlossen hat. Spalte 3 enthält die Anzahl der vom Übersetzungsdienst der Kommission übersetzten Seiten.

Jahr	Externe Dienstleister	Übersetzungsdienst	Insgesamt
2009	430 246	1 231 441	1 661 687
2010	516 776	1 343 571	1 860 347
2011	587 481	1 524 453	2 111 934
2012	413 844	1 346 771	1 760 615

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/contacts/languages-%281%29/the-language-service-of-the-council-general-secretariat.aspx?lang=de>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009755/13
to the Commission**

Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(30 August 2013)

Subject: Document translations at the Commission

In 2012, 1 474 translators worked in the Commission's translation service ⁽¹⁾.

1. Does the Commission have figures for the number of pages translated by its in-house translation service in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012?
2. Does the Commission have figures for the number of pages translated for it by external service providers in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission

(4 October 2013)

The Honourable Member will find below a table containing the information requested. The second column gives the number of pages translated in the respective years by external service providers with which the Commission has contracts. The third column gives the number of pages translated by staff in the Commission's translation service.

Year	External service providers	In-house translation	Total
2009	430.246	1.231.441	1.661.687
2010	516.776	1.343.571	1.860.347
2011	587.481	1.524.453	2.111.934
2012	413.844	1.346.771	1.760.615

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/contacts/languages-%281%29/the-language-service-of-the-council-general-secretariat.aspx?lang=en>.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009756/13

an den Rat

Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(30. August 2013)

Betrifft: Externe Übersetzungsdienstleistungen

Der Sprachendienst des Rates beschäftigte Ende 2009 mehr als 650 Übersetzer ⁽¹⁾.

1. Reichten die Kapazitäten des internen Übersetzungsdienstes in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012 aus, um allen Dokumentübersetzungsanforderungen nachzukommen?
2. Wie viel Geld wurde in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012 für externe Übersetzungsdienstleistungen ausgegeben?

Antwort

(25. November 2013)

Da die Nachfrage nach Übersetzungen stets über der derzeitigen Produktionskapazität liegt, verfolgt die Direktion Übersetzung des Rates eine Politik der „Kerndokumente“ mit dem Ziel, den Schwerpunkt hauptsächlich auf die Dokumente zu legen, die für die Interessen der europäischen Bürger und die Beratungen des Rates wesentlich sind.

Im Jahr 2009 war der Betrag, der von der Direktion Übersetzung des Rates für externe Übersetzungen ausgegeben wurde, außergewöhnlich hoch und belief sich auf beinahe 440 000 EUR. In der Folge nahm dieser Betrag kontinuierlich ab und lag im Jahr 2012 bei ungefähr 20 000 EUR. In diesem Betrag sind die Kosten im Zusammenhang mit der Verwaltung und der Qualitätskontrolle von externen Übersetzungen nicht enthalten.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/contacts/languages-%20%29/the-language-service-of-the-council-general-secretariat.aspx?lang=de>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009756/13
to the Council**

Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(30 August 2013)

Subject: External translations

At the end of 2009, the Council's language service employed more than 650 translators ⁽¹⁾.

1. In 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012, was the capacity of the in-house translation service sufficient to meet all document translation requests?
2. How much was spent in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 on external translations?

Reply

(25 November 2013)

As the demand for translation constantly exceeds its current production capacity, the Council's Translation Directorate follows a 'core documents' policy which aims at focusing mainly on the documents essential to the interests of European citizens and to the Council proceedings.

In 2009 the amount spent on external translations by the Translation Directorate of the Council was exceptionally high at almost EUR 440,000. Subsequently, this amount continually decreased and was approximately EUR 20,000 in 2012. This figure does not include costs related to the management and the quality control of external translations.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/contacts/languages-%281%29/the-language-service-of-the-council-general-secretariat.aspx?lang=en>

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009757/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
 (30. August 2013)

Betrifft: Externe Übersetzungsdienstleistungen

Im Jahr 2012 arbeiteten 1 474 Übersetzer im Übersetzungsdienst der Europäischen Kommission ⁽¹⁾.

1. Reichten die Kapazitäten des internen Übersetzungsdienstes in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012 aus, um allen Dokumentübersetzungsanforderungen nachzukommen?
2. Wie viel Geld wurde in den Jahren 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012 für externe Übersetzungsdienstleistungen ausgegeben?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
 (10. Oktober 2013)

Die Kapazitäten der Generaldirektion Übersetzung der Kommission reichten nicht aus, um das Übersetzungsaufkommen im genannten Zeitraum intern bewältigen zu können. Daher musste ein Teil der Übersetzungsaufträge an externe Dienstleister vergeben werden, insbesondere, um Spitzen aufzufangen.

In der nachfolgenden Tabelle sind die Kosten der im Zeitraum 2009-2012 extern übersetzten Aufträge aufgelistet:

Jahr	EUR
2009	12 865 571
2010	14 938 146
2011	17 236 451
2012	12 704 177

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/contacts/languages-%281%29/the-language-service-of-the-council-general-secretariat.aspx?lang=de>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009757/13
to the Commission**

Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(30 August 2013)

Subject: External translations

In 2012, 1 474 translators worked in the Commission's translation service ⁽¹⁾.

1. In 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012, was the capacity of the in-house translation service sufficient to meet all document translation requests?
2. How much was spent in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 on external translations?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission

(10 October 2013)

The internal resources of the Commission's translation service were not sufficient to cover all translation requests during this period. Therefore, a part of these requests had to be outsourced to external contractors, especially at the busiest periods.

The costs of external translations during the period 2009-12 are summarised below:

Year	EUR
2009	12 865 571
2010	14 938 146
2011	17 236 451
2012	12 704 177

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/contacts/languages-%281%29/the-language-service-of-the-council-general-secretariat.aspx?lang=en>

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009758/13

an den Rat

Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(30. August 2013)

Betrifft: Streiktage der Beamten des Rates

Für Juni 2013 hatten die Beamten des Rates und der Kommission einen Streik angekündigt.

1. An wie vielen Tagen streikten Teile der Beamtenschaft des Rates jeweils in den Jahren 2010, 2011 und 2012?
2. Wie viele Beamte streikten jeweils an diesen Tagen?
3. An wie vielen Diensttagen streikten einzelne Beamte des Rates durchschnittlich in den Jahren 2010, 2011 und 2012?

Antwort

(5. November 2013)

In den Jahren 2010 und 2011 gab es keine Streiks. Im Jahr 2012 wurde an einem Tag, und zwar am 8. November gestreikt; an diesem Streik beteiligten sich 1 652 Beamte.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009758/13
to the Council**

Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(30 August 2013)

Subject: Days lost to strikes by Council officials

Council and Commission officials gave notice of strike action in June 2013.

1. How many days were lost to strikes by Council officials, as a body, in 2010, 2011 and 2012 respectively?
2. How many officials took part in strike action on each of those days?
3. How many days were lost to strikes by individual Council officials, on average, in 2010, 2011 and 2012 respectively?

Reply

(5 November 2013)

No strikes took place in 2010 and 2011. In 2012, there was one day of strike action on 8 November, in which 1 652 officials took part.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009759/13
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)**

Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(29. August 0912)

3etBütfVP/HR — Streiktage der Beamten des Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienstes (EAD)

Im Juni 2013 haben die Beamten verschiedener EU-Organe gestreikt.

1. An wie vielen Tagen streikten Teile der Beamtenschaft des EAD jeweils in den Jahren 2011 und 2012?
2. Wie viele Beamte streikten jeweils an diesen Tagen?
3. An wie vielen Diensttagen streikten einzelne Beamte des EAD durchschnittlich in den Jahren 2011 und 2012?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission

(: . OktobeB0912)

1. Im Jahr 2011 gab es keinen Streik. Im Jahr 2012 fand im EAD ein halbtägiger Streik statt, an dem sich 264 Bedienstete (Beamte, Bedienstete auf Zeit, Vertragsbedienstete) beteiligten. Dadurch gingen 132 Arbeitstage verloren.
2. 264.
3. Im Zeitraum 2011-2012 verzeichnete der EAD lediglich einen halbtägigen Streik; daher beträgt die durchschnittliche Streikdauer je teilnehmenden Bediensteten einen halben Tag. Gemessen an der Gesamtzahl der Bediensteten im Juni 2013 betrug die durchschnittliche Streikdauer je Bediensteten im Jahr 2012 0,5 Stunden.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009759/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(29 August 0912)

3uShtc VP/HR — Days lost to strikes by European External Action Service (EEAS) officials

In June 2013, officials at various EU institutions took strike action.

1. How many days were lost to strikes by EEAS officials, as a body, in 2011 and 2012 respectively?
2. How many officials took part in strike action on each of those days?
3. How many days were lost to strikes by individual EEAS officials, on average, in 2011 and 2012 respectively?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(: OjtoSer 0912)

1. In 2011 there was no strike. In 2012 the EEAS registered one strike action of half a day with 264 officials (officials, temporary agents, contract agents) participating. The total work time concerned is equivalent to 132 days.
 2. 264.
 3. The EEAS only registered one half day strike action in the period 2011-2012; therefore the average duration per participating official is half a day. Compared to the overall staff figures of June 2013 the average strike duration is 0.5 hours per staff member in 2012.
-

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009761/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(30. August 2013)

Betrifft: Effekte des indischen Ernährungsprogramms

Die indische Regierung hat ein Ernährungsprogramm aufgesetzt, nach dem zukünftig rund 820 Millionen Inder ein Recht auf bezahlbare Grundnahrungsmittel haben. Dieses Programm soll die Ernährungslage für viele Inder verbessern, die bisher von Nahrungsmittelengpässen bedroht waren. Nach Ansicht der indischen Regierung stellt das Programm einen großen Beitrag zur Bekämpfung des globalen Hungerproblems dar.

1. Ist die Kommission an dem Projekt finanziell, beratend oder anderweitig beteiligt?
2. Welche Effekte erwartet die Kommission für die weltweiten Nahrungsmittelpreise?
3. Welche Effekte erwartet die Kommission für andere Entwicklungsländer mit weniger Finanzkapital? Wird sie besondere Programme auflegen, um in solchen Ländern die Grundversorgung zu unterstützen?
4. Welche Effekte erwartet die Kommission für die Nahrungsmittelpreise in der EU? Wird sie Subventionsprogramme wie insbesondere die Agrarsubventionen überprüfen beziehungsweise neu fokussieren, um einer weltweiten Nahrungsmittelknappheit entgegenzuwirken?

Antwort von Herrn Piebalgs im Namen der Kommission
(16. Oktober 2013)

1) Da Indien sich zu einem Land mit mittlerem Einkommen entwickelt hat, lässt die EU ihre bilaterale Entwicklungshilfe an die indische Regierung auslaufen. Für den Zeitraum 2014-2020 sind keine neuen finanziellen Zusagen vorgesehen. Indien bleibt jedoch weiterhin förderfähig für thematische und regionale Finanzhilfen.

2), 3a) und 4a): Nachdem die indischen Exekutive Anfang Juli 2013 das Gesetz zur nationalen Ernährungssicherheit verabschiedet hat, dürfte sich die Zahl der Menschen erhöhen, die Lebensmittelsubventionen von der Regierung erhalten. Angesichts der großen Zahl unbekannter Faktoren in Bezug auf die genaue Funktionsweise dieses Programms ist es aktuell schwierig für die Kommission, die möglichen Auswirkungen des indischen Gesetzes auf die Nahrungsmittelpreise weltweit und die Preise in bestimmten Regionen der Welt einzuschätzen. Die Kommission beobachtet die Entwicklung jedoch aufmerksam, auch vor dem Hintergrund der Ergebnisse der Ministerkonferenz der Welthandelsorganisation (WTO) auf Bali.

3b) Es ist nicht Politik der Kommission, den Kauf von Grundnahrungsmitteln zu finanzieren. Anstatt Grundnahrungsmittel zu liefern, zielt die Entwicklungshilfe der EU im landwirtschaftlichen Bereich darauf ab, das landwirtschaftliche Potenzial zu entwickeln und die Produktions- und Vermarktungsbedingungen zu verbessern.

4b) Der Rat der EU und das Europäische Parlament erzielten im Juni 2013 eine politische Einigung über das Reformpaket der gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik der EU 2014-2020. Die neu reformierte gemeinsame Agrarpolitik (GAP) dient der Bewältigung globaler Herausforderungen im Bereich der Ernährungssicherheit. Sie fördert die nachhaltige Erzeugung landwirtschaftlicher Produkte, während die Verwendung handelsverzerrender Instrumente mit Sanktionen belegt wird. So können z. B. Ausfuhrsubventionen ausschließlich unter außergewöhnlichen Marktbedingungen verwendet werden.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009761/13
to the Commission**

Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(30 August 2013)

Subject: Impact of India's food programme

The Indian Government has drawn up a food programme under the terms of which some 820 million Indians will be entitled to buy basic foodstuffs at affordable prices. The programme aims to increase food security for many Indians who have faced the threat of food shortages in the past. According to the Indian Government, the programme will make a significant contribution to the fight against global hunger.

1. Is the Commission participating in the project in any way, for example by providing funding or advice?
2. What impact does the Commission expect the programme to have on global food prices?
3. What impact does the Commission expect the programme to have on other, less prosperous developing countries? Does the Commission intend to develop specific programmes to improve the supply of basic foodstuffs in such countries?
4. What impact does the Commission expect the programme to have on food prices in the EU? Will it review and/or refocus subsidy schemes — in particular agricultural subsidies — in an effort to address the problem of a global food shortage?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission

(16 October 2013)

1) As India has developed to become a middle-income country, the EU is phasing out its bilateral development aid to the Government of India with no new financial commitments foreseen for the 2014-2020 period. India will nevertheless remain eligible to thematic and regional funding.

2), 3a) and 4a) The Indian National Food Security Bill, which was passed by the Indian executive branch early July 2013, is expected to increase the number of people who will receive food subsidies from the Government. Given the large number of unknown factors in relation to the precise functioning of this programme, it is difficult at this stage for the Commission to assess the possible impact of the Indian bill on global food prices, and prices in specific world regions. The Commission is however monitoring the issue, including in the context of the outcome of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) Bali Ministerial Conference.

3b) The Commission policy is not to finance the purchase of basic foodstuffs. Instead of basic foodstuffs supply, EU development aid in the agricultural sector is aimed to develop agriculture potential and to improve production and commercialisation conditions.

4b) The EU Council and Parliament reached a political deal on the reform package of the EU Common Agricultural Policy 2014-2020 in June 2013. The new reformed Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) aims to address global food security challenges. It encourages sustainable production of agricultural products while disciplining the use of trade distorting instruments, like for example export subsidies which can be used under exceptional market condition only.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009762/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
 (30. August 2013)

Betrifft: Gerechte Verteilung von Nahrungsmitteln

Die Ernährungs- und Landwirtschaftsorganisation der Vereinten Nationen (FAO) hat wiederholt betont, dass es keine globale Nahrungsmittelknappheit gibt, sondern dass die vorhandenen Nahrungsmittel nur besser verteilt werden müssen.

1. Stimmt die Kommission dieser Analyse zu?
2. Bei welchen Grundnahrungsmitteln ist die EU ein Nettoimporteur und bei welchen ein Nettoexporteur?
3. Welche Maßnahmen sieht die Kommission als nötig an, um eine gerechtere Verteilung von Nahrungsmitteln zu erreichen?
4. Welche EU-Politikbereiche fördern die gerechte Verteilung von Nahrungsmitteln und welche könnten möglicherweise zu einer ungleichen Verteilung beitragen? Welchen Effekt haben nach Ansicht der Kommission insbesondere die EU-Agrarsubventionen auf die weltweite Nahrungsmittelproduktion und -nachfrage?
5. Gibt es derzeit außerhalb von Nothilfeprogrammen und Nahrungsmittelspenden EU-Programme, die entweder Maßnahmen entwickeln oder durchführen, um eine gerechte Verteilung der global vorhandenen Nahrungsmittel zu fördern?

Antwort von Herrn Ciolos im Namen der Kommission
 (22. Oktober 2013)

1. Die EU arbeitet eng mit der FAO bei allen vier Dimensionen der Ernährungssicherheit zusammen, nämlich Verfügbarkeit von Nahrungsmitteln, Zugang und Qualität sowie Stabilität der Nahrungsversorgung. Die Kommission stimmt mit der FAO in ihrer Analyse überein, dass mangelnde Ernährungssicherheit auch mit einem fehlenden Zugang zu Nahrungsmitteln, einschließlich Problemen ihrer Verteilung, zusammenhängt.
2. An landwirtschaftlichen Grunderzeugnissen ist die EU Nettoexporteur von Fleisch, Milchprodukten und Getreide, wohingegen sie in geringem Maße Nettoimporteur von Frischgemüse und in relativ großem Umfang Importeur von Obst (zumeist tropischen Früchten) ⁽¹⁾ ist.
3. Der EU-Politikrahmen für Ernährungssicherheit ⁽²⁾ konzentriert sich, da die große Mehrheit der Armen und Hungernden der Dritten Welt weiterhin in ländlichen Gebieten lebt, auf die Unterstützung von Kleinbauern, um so einen Beitrag zur Verbesserung von deren Einkommensmöglichkeiten zu leisten und auf diese Weise für die Bevölkerung den Zugang zu Nahrungsmitteln zu erleichtern. Die EU unterstützt in diesem Zusammenhang die von den jeweiligen Ländern betriebenen eigenen Politiken zur Förderung der lokalen kleinbäuerlichen Landwirtschaft, wobei sie die Auffassung vertritt, dass ein geeignetes Gleichgewicht zwischen der Förderung von einheimischer Nahrungsmittelerzeugung sowie der Deckung des Nahrungsbedarfs durch Handel und regionale Integration der Agrarmärkte zu größerer Ernährungssicherheit führen kann.
4. Mit Blick auf die Handels- und Entwicklungsmöglichkeiten der weniger entwickelten Länder beschreibt der EU-Bericht 2011 über die Politikkohärenz im Interesse der Entwicklung ⁽³⁾ die kontinuierliche Reform der gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik mit ihrer Abkehr von handelsverzerrenden Maßnahmen und anerkennt die positiven Auswirkungen sowohl der Entkopplung zwischen Beihilfen und Produktion als auch der bedeutenden Verringerung der Exportsubventionen. Derzeit wird ein neuer solcher Bericht erarbeitet.

⁽¹⁾ Eine Analyse des EU-Agrarhandels im Jahr 2012 ist abrufbar unter: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/trade-analysis/map/2013-1_en.pdf

⁽²⁾ Ein EU-Politikrahmen zur Unterstützung der Entwicklungsländer bei der Verbesserung der Ernährungssicherheit, KOM(2010)127 endg.

⁽³⁾ EU-Bericht 2011 über die Politikkohärenz im Interesse der Entwicklung, SEK(2011)1627 endg.

5. Die wichtigsten EU-Programme mit dem Ziel eines verbesserten Zugangs zu Nahrungsmitteln in der Europäischen Union sind das Programm zur Nahrungsmittelverteilung an Bedürftige in der EU und das Schulmilch- und Schulobstprogramm. Was die EU-Entwicklungszusammenarbeit anbelangt, so bilden eine nachhaltige Landwirtschaft und die Ernährungssicherheit Schlüsselprioritäten der langfristigen politischen Agenda der EU und werden in den Programmen der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit des nächsten MFR 2014-2020 einen bevorzugten Platz einnehmen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009762/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
 (30 August 2013)

Subject: Fair distribution of food

The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) has repeatedly pointed out that there is no global food shortage, but that the available food needs to be distributed more fairly.

1. Does the Commission agree with this analysis?
2. The EU is a net importer of some basic foodstuffs and a net exporter of others. Can the Commission say which they are?
3. What steps does the Commission believe should be taken in order to ensure that food is distributed more fairly?
4. Which EU policies foster the fair distribution of food and which could contribute to its unfair distribution? In particular, what impact do EU agricultural subsidies have on global food supply and demand?
5. Apart from emergency aid programmes and food donation schemes, are there currently any EU programmes under which measures to promote the fair distribution of the world's food are being developed or implemented?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
 (22 October 2013)

1. The EU works closely with FAO on all four dimensions of food security: availability, access, quality and stability. The Commission agrees with the FAO analysis that food insecurity is also linked to lack of access to food, including its distribution.
2. Out of the basic agricultural products, EU is a net exporter of meats, dairy and cereals, a small net importer of fresh vegetables and relatively large importer of fruits (mostly tropical) ⁽¹⁾.
3. The EU policy framework on food security ⁽²⁾ focuses on support for small-scale farmers, as the vast majority of the poor and hungry still live in rural areas, thus helping to improve their income-earning opportunities and enhancing access to food. The EU supports countries' own policies on local small-scale farming and considers that an appropriate balance between support to national production, trade and regional integration can lead to greater food security.
4. With respect to the trade and development opportunities of developing countries, the EU 2011 Report on Policy Coherence for Development ⁽³⁾ describes the continuous reform of the common agricultural policy away from trade-distorting measures and acknowledges the positive impact of both decoupling subsidies from production and the major reduction of export subsidies. A new report is currently under preparation.
5. The main EU programmes focusing on access to food in the EU are the Food distribution programme for the most deprived persons in the Union and School Milk and Fruit Schemes. With regard to EU development cooperation, sustainable agriculture and food and nutrition security are key priorities of the EU's long-term agenda and will feature prominently in the development cooperation programmes in the next MFF 2014-2020.

⁽¹⁾ An analysis of the 2012 EU agricultural trade is available under:

http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/trade-analysis/map/2013-1_en.pdf

⁽²⁾ An EU policy framework to assist developing countries in addressing food security challenges, COM(2010)127 final.

⁽³⁾ EU 2011 Report on Policy Coherence for Development, SEC(2011) 1627 final.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009763/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(30. August 2013)

Betrifft: Waldbrandgefahr in der EU

In den USA wüten derzeit, wie bereits in den vergangenen Jahren, gigantische Waldbrände. Innerhalb von zehn Tagen sind allein im Bundesstaat Kalifornien 180 000 Hektar Waldfläche abgebrannt.

1. Besteht auch in der EU die Gefahr ähnlich großflächiger Waldbrände?
2. In welchen europäischen Regionen ist das Risiko von Waldbränden besonders groß?
3. Gibt es EU-weite Maßnahmen wie Kooperationsprogramme, Erfahrungsaustauschprogramme oder eine staatenübergreifende forstwirtschaftliche Koordination, um der Waldbrandgefahr zu begegnen?
4. Welche grenzüberschreitenden Maßnahmen, die derzeit noch nicht oder nicht mehr existieren, sieht die Kommission als notwendig oder wünschenswert an, um Waldbrandgefahren zu begegnen?

Antwort von Herrn Potočník im Namen der Kommission
(11. Oktober 2013)

Jedes Jahr treten in der EU etwa 50 000 Brände auf, die sich über eine Fläche von rund 500 000 ha ausbreiten. Im Jahr 2013 haben Brände allein in Portugal innerhalb von weniger als zwei Wochen mehr als 80 000 ha erfasst.

In Europa ist die Gefahr von Waldbränden am höchsten im Mittelmeerraum, wo sich beinahe 85 % der gesamten Brandfläche befindet. Die größten Schäden treten in Portugal, Spanien, Italien und Griechenland und in geringerem Umfang in Frankreich auf.

Zwar gibt es bislang keine EU-weiten Forstbewirtschaftungsprogramme, aber das Europäische Waldbrandinformationssystem (EFFIS ⁽¹⁾) der Europäischen Kommission spielt eine wichtige Rolle bei der Verbesserung der Zusammenarbeit bei der Brandvorbeugung und -bekämpfung in Europa. Es liefert vergleichbare Daten, insbesondere zu Bränden in Grenzgebieten, die den Ländern und dem Notfallabwehrzentrum (ERC) der Kommission zur Verfügung gestellt werden, wodurch die Zusammenarbeit bei Hilfsmaßnahmen im Katastrophenschutz erleichtert wird. Außerdem hat das ERC während der Waldbrandsaison 2013 wöchentlich Videokonferenzen mit den am stärksten waldbrandgefährdeten Mitgliedstaaten abgehalten und ein wöchentliches Rundschreiben zum Thema Waldbrände (Forest Fires Bulletin) herausgegeben. Waldbrandexperten aus den Mitgliedstaaten, die jeden Sommer zum ERC abgeordnet werden, unterstützen die Arbeit des Zentrums und pflegen regelmäßige Kontakte zu den nationalen Katastrophenschutzbehörden. Außerdem arbeiten einige Länder im Rahmen von bilateralen Abkommen über Regelungen zur gegenseitigen Hilfe zusammen.

Die Kommission hat in ihrem Vorschlag für eine Überprüfung des EU-Katastrophenschutzmechanismus ⁽²⁾, der sich gegenwärtig in der Abschlussphase der Diskussionen zwischen dem Europäischen Parlament und dem Rat befindet, eine Aufstockung der Mittel vorgeschlagen, um der zunehmenden Häufigkeit und Schwere von Katastrophen und der Notwendigkeit stärkerer Vorbeugungs-, Vorsorge- und Bekämpfungsmaßnahmen Rechnung zu tragen.

⁽¹⁾ EFFIS ist ein Archiv und eine Plattform für den Erfahrungsaustausch zwischen den Ländern. Die Kommission veranstaltet vor und nach den Brandbekämpfungsmaßnahmen Treffen mit den nationalen Vertretern der für Waldbrand- und Katastrophenschutz zuständigen Behörden, um die bereits bestehende Zusammenarbeit weiter zu stärken und die während der Brandschutz- und Brandbekämpfungseinsätze gesammelten Erfahrungen auszutauschen.

⁽²⁾ KOM(2011)0934 endgültig.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009763/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
 (30 August 2013)

Subject: Risk of forest fires in the EU

As in previous years, massive forest fires are once more ravaging the USA and have destroyed 180 000 hectares of forest within 10 days in the State of California alone.

1. Is the EU also at risk of forest fires on a similar scale?
2. Which regions of Europe are most at risk?
3. Have EU-wide forest management programmes been initiated with a view to promoting cooperation, exchanges of experience or cross-border coordination for the prevention and containment of forest fires?
4. What cross-border forest fire prevention and containment initiatives which have not yet been launched or have now been discontinued does Commission regard as necessary or advisable?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
 (11 October 2013)

On average there are some 50,000 fires annually in the EU covering around 500,000 ha. So far in 2013, in Portugal only fires have burnt an area of over 80,000 ha in less than two weeks.

In Europe, the Mediterranean region suffers the highest risk of fire and accounts for nearly 85% to the total area burnt. The countries where the damage is highest are Portugal, Spain, Italy and Greece, and to a lesser extent France.

While there have not been any EU-wide forest management programmes, the European Commission's European Forest Fire Information System (EFFIS ⁽¹⁾) plays an important role in enhancing cooperation in fire prevention and fire fighting in Europe. It provides comparable information, especially on fires taking place in border regions, which is made available to the countries and to the Commission's Emergency Response Centre (ERC), which facilitates cooperation in civil protection assistance interventions. In addition, during the 2013 forest fire season the ERC has organised a weekly videoconference with the most fire-prone Member States and issued a weekly Forest Fires Bulletin. Forest fire experts from Member States who are seconded to the ERC every summer contribute to its work and maintain regular contacts with national civil protection authorities. Moreover, countries also cooperate via bi-lateral agreements setting up mutual assistance schemes.

In its proposal for a revision of the EU Civil Protection Mechanism ⁽²⁾, currently in its last steps of discussions between the European Parliament and the Council, the Commission proposed an increase in resources to reflect the increased frequency and intensity of disasters and the need for more robust prevention, preparedness and response policies.

⁽¹⁾ EFFIS is a repository and a platform for exchanges of experiences among countries. The Commission organises meetings with the national representatives from forest fires and civil protection services before and after the fire campaigns in order to enhance the cooperation already established and to exchange information on the experiences during the fire protection and fire fighting operations.

⁽²⁾ COM(2011)0934 final.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009764/13

προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(30 Αυγούστου 2013)

Θέμα: Φορολογικοί παράδεισοι

Σε συνέχεια της ανακοίνωσης σχετικά με τη χρηστή διακυβέρνηση όσον αφορά τους φορολογικούς παραδείσους και τον επιθετικό φορολογικό σχεδιασμό που πραγματοποιήθηκε από την Επιτροπή τον Δεκέμβριο του 2012, είναι σε θέση η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, να με ενημερώσει για την πρόοδο όσον αφορά την συλλογή μετρήσιμων συγκριτικών αποτελεσμάτων από τα κράτη μέλη για το ύψος της εκτιμώμενης φοροδιαφυγής εσόδων ευρωπαίων πολιτών σε φορολογικούς παραδείσους; Ποια είναι η περίπτωση της Ελλάδας; Ποια είναι τα επόμενα βήματα της Επιτροπής αναφορικά με την συνεργασία της ΕΕ με τρίτες χώρες που αποτελούν φορολογικούς παραδείσους;

Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή έχει συζητήσει επανειλημμένα με τα κράτη μέλη σε επίπεδο Συμβουλίου τις συστάσεις της για τον επιθετικό φορολογικό σχεδιασμό ⁽¹⁾ και για μέτρα που έχουν στόχο την ενθάρρυνση τρίτων χωρών ώστε να εφαρμόζουν τα ελάχιστα πρότυπα χρηστής διακυβέρνησης στον φορολογικό τομέα ⁽²⁾.

Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει στη διάθεσή της νέα στοιχεία για τη φοροδιαφυγή ή τον επιθετικό φορολογικό σχεδιασμό, ούτε γενικά ούτε συγκεκριμένα για την περίπτωση της Ελλάδας. Η υλοποίηση των συστάσεων, καθώς και ευρύτερα ζητήματα που σχετίζονται με τον επιθετικό φορολογικό σχεδιασμό και τη χρηστή διακυβέρνηση στον φορολογικό τομέα παρακολουθούνται από την πλατφόρμα για τη χρηστή διακυβέρνηση στον φορολογικό τομέα ⁽³⁾, η οποία συνεδρίασε για πρώτη φορά στις 10 Ιουνίου 2013. Η δεύτερη συνεδρίαση της πλατφόρμας πραγματοποιήθηκε στις 16 Οκτωβρίου 2013. Η Επιτροπή θα υποβάλει έκθεση σχετικά με την υλοποίηση των συστάσεων μέχρι το 2015.

⁽¹⁾ C(2012)8806 τελικό.

⁽²⁾ C(2012)8805 τελικό.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/pr_taxgoods.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009764/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(30 August 2013)

Subject: Tax havens

Following the announcement on good governance in respect of tax havens and the aggressive tax planning undertaken by the Commission in December 2012, can the Commission provide an update on progress in gathering measurable comparative results from Member States regarding the estimated amount of income tax evasion practised by European citizens in tax havens? What is the situation in Greece? What steps will the Commission take next regarding EU cooperation with third countries that are tax havens?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(21 October 2013)

The Commission has discussed its Recommendations on aggressive tax planning ⁽¹⁾ and regarding measures intended to encourage third countries to apply minimum standards of good governance in tax matters ⁽²⁾, on various occasions with Member States at Council level.

The Commission does not have any new data related to tax evasion or aggressive tax planning, either in general or specifically in relation to Greece. The implementation of the recommendations and wider issues related to aggressive tax planning and tax good governance are being monitored by the Platform for Tax Good Governance ⁽³⁾ which met for the first time on 10 June 2013. A second meeting of the Platform took place on 16 October 2013. The Commission will report on the implementation of the recommendations by 2015.

⁽¹⁾ C(2012) 8806 final.

⁽²⁾ C(2012) 8805 final.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/pr_taxgoods.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009765/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(30 Αυγούστου 2013)

Θέμα: Αύξηση της ανεργίας στην Κύπρο

Σύμφωνα με τα στοιχεία του Eurostat, τον Ιούνιο του 2013, οι δείκτες της ανεργίας στην Κύπρο σκαρφάλωσαν στο 17,3%, σε σύγκριση με 11,7% τον αντίστοιχο μήνα του 2012, ποσοστό που είναι το μεγαλύτερο σε όλη την ΕΕ. Εκ πρώτης όψεως αυτό αποδίδεται στην πρωτοφανή οικονομική κρίση που μαστιίζει την Κύπρο, ιδιαίτερα μετά τον περασμένο Μάρτιο και την άδικη απόφαση του Eurogroup. Ωστόσο, αυτό οφείλεται και στην αποτυχία να ληφθούν στοιχειώδη απαραίτητα μέτρα για περιορισμό της απασχόλησης ξένου εργατικού δυναμικού (κοινοτικών και υπηκόων τρίτων χωρών) που θα είχαν ως άμεσο επακόλουθο την ταυτόχρονη και ισοδύναμη αύξηση της απασχόλησης χιλιάδων Κυπρίων ανέργων. Την ίδια στιγμή, χώρες όπως η Βουλγαρία, η Ρουμανία και η Πολωνία, με ποσοστό ανεργίας 12,7%, 7,5% και 10% αντίστοιχα, θεωρούν υψηλή την ανεργία τους και εξάγουν ανεμπόδιστα τους υπηκόους τους στην Κύπρο.

Ερωτάται λοιπόν η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς μπορεί μια χώρα που μαστιίζεται από την οικονομική κρίση και της οποίας η ανεργία σημείωσε πρωτοφανείς ρυθμούς αύξησης εντός του 2012-2013, να απασχολεί ταυτόχρονα ένα υψηλό ποσοστό ξένου δυναμικού (που σε πολλές επιχειρήσεις αγγίζει τα όρια του 80-90%) και να μην μπορεί να παρέμβει δραστικά για περιορισμό του φαινομένου;
2. Δεν είναι άδικο στην Κύπρο, με ποσοστό ανεργίας 37,8% μεταξύ των νέων κάτω των 25 ετών, οι επιχειρήσεις, ιδιαίτερα στην τουριστική βιομηχανία και στο εμπόριο, να απασχολούν δεκάδες χιλιάδες νέους προερχόμενους από τρίτες χώρες, αλλά και από χώρες της ΕΕ, ενώ οι νέοι της Κύπρου να αναγκάζονται να ξενιτευτούν για να βρουν εργασία;
3. Πώς ερμηνεύεται το γεγονός ότι τον Ιούλιο του 2013, στο μέσο της τουριστικής περιόδου, είναι εγγεγραμμένοι στον τομέα της ξενοδοχειακής και επισιτιστικής βιομηχανίας 3 706 άνεργοι ενώ οι επιχειρήσεις απασχολούν χιλιάδες ξένων εργαζομένων;
4. Μήπως το Ευρωπαϊκό κεκτημένο, εμπεριέχει πρόνοιες ή προσωρινές αποκλίσεις για αντιμετώπιση τέτοιων ανισοτήτων;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Η αρχή της ελεύθερης κυκλοφορίας των εργαζομένων που ορίζεται στο άρθρο 45 της ΣΛΕΕ εγγυάται την ίση μεταχείριση των υπηκόων της ΕΕ και της Κύπρου όσον αφορά την πρόσβαση στην αγορά εργασίας. Δεν υπάρχει δυνατότητα παρέκκλισης από το εν λόγω κανόνα.

Όσον αφορά την πρόσβαση των υπηκόων τρίτων χωρών στις αγορές εργασίας των κρατών μελών, κάθε κράτος μέλος είναι αρμόδιο να καθορίσει τον αριθμό των εισερχόμενων υπηκόων στην επικράτεια του από τρίτες χώρες με σκοπό την αναζήτηση εργασίας, είτε πρόκειται για εργαζομένους είτε για αυτοαπασχολούμενους. Τα κράτη μέλη είναι επίσης αρμόδια να εξασφαλίζουν ότι τηρούνται οι τυπικές διαδικασίες στην αγορά εργασίας και ένα ελάχιστο επίπεδο εργασιακών συνθηκών.

Η Επιτροπή σημειώνει ότι η εισροή ξένων εργαζομένων στην Κύπρο φαίνεται να έχει μειωθεί κατά την πιο πρόσφατη περίοδο ⁽¹⁾, ακολουθώντας τη μείωση της ζήτησης σε εργατικό δυναμικό.

Τέλος, όπως αποδεικνύεται σε αρκετές εκδόσεις της Επιτροπής ⁽²⁾, οι εργαζόμενοι μετανάστες γενικά συμβάλλουν στην άμβλυνση των ελλείψεων στις χώρες υποδοχής, συχνά στη βαθμίδα χαμηλών προσόντων της κλίμακας θέσεων εργασίας. Στην Κύπρο, η επαγγελματική κατανομή των μεταναστών από τρίτες χώρες δείχνει ότι οι μετανάστες έχουν συμπληρωματικό ρόλο στους Κύπριους υπηκόους και δεν τους υποκαθιστούν ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Για παράδειγμα, σύμφωνα με στοιχεία της Eurostat, ο αριθμός πρώτων τίτλων διαμονής που εκδόθηκαν για αμειβόμενες δραστηριότητες από την Κύπρο σε υπηκόους τρίτων χωρών, μειώθηκε κατά 43% μεταξύ του 2010 (11 917) και 2012 (6 889). Επιπλέον, τα στοιχεία από την έρευνα εργατικού δυναμικού, υποδηλώνουν ότι ο συνολικός αριθμός υπηκόων της ΕΕ που εργάζεται στην Κύπρο μειώθηκε κατά 9% κατά το τελευταίο έτος (από 55 100 το δεύτερο τρίμηνο του 2012 σε 46 400 το δεύτερο τρίμηνο του 2013).

⁽²⁾ Απασχόληση στην Ευρώπη 2008, Κεφάλαιο 2 και 3, απασχόληση και κοινωνικές εξελίξεις στην Ευρώπη Έκθεση 2011, κεφάλαιο 6.

⁽³⁾ Σύμφωνα με την έρευνα εργατικού δυναμικού της ΕΕ, το 2012, το 75% των υπηκόων τρίτων χωρών που εργάζονταν στην Κύπρο, απασχολήθηκαν σε στοιχειώδη επαγγέλματα (ISCO 9), ενώ το 80% των Κυπρίων υπηκόων που ήταν άνεργοι είχαν υψηλό (ISCED 5-6) ή μεσαίο (ISCED 3-4) επίπεδο εκπαίδευσης. Επιπλέον, το 66% των υπηκόων των τρίτων χωρών που εργάζονται στην Κύπρο, εργάστηκαν στον τομέα των οικιακών υπηρεσιών (NACE P) ενώ ο τομέας αυτός αντιπροσωπεύει μόνο το 6% της συνολικής απασχόλησης στην Κύπρο και περίπου το 0,2% των Κυπρίων υπηκόων.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009765/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
 (30 August 2013)

Subject: Increase in unemployment in Cyprus

According to Eurostat data, in June 2013 the unemployment rate in Cyprus rose to 17.3%, compared to 11.7% in the same month of 2012, which is the highest rate in the entire EU. At first glance this is attributable to the unprecedented economic crisis in Cyprus, especially after the unjust decision taken by the Eurogroup last March. However, this is also due to a failure to take indispensable basic measures to limit the employment of foreign labour (EU and third country nationals) that would directly lead to a simultaneous and equivalent increase in employment so that thousands of unemployed Cypriots would find jobs. At the same time, countries such as Bulgaria, Romania and Poland, with an unemployment rate of 12.7%, 7.5% and 10% respectively, consider their unemployment rates high and freely 'export' their nationals to Cyprus.

In view of the above, will the Commission say :

1. How can a country beset by the economic crisis where unemployment has increased by an unprecedented amount in 2012-2013, employ a high percentage of foreign workers (in many businesses they account for almost 80-90% of the workforce) and be unable to take drastic measures to curb this phenomenon?
2. It is not unfair to Cyprus, which has an unemployment rate of 37.8 % among young people under 25 years of age, that businesses, especially in the tourist industry and trade, employ tens of thousands of young people from third countries, and also from EU countries, while young Cypriots are forced to migrate to find work?
3. How does it interpret the fact that in July 2013, in the middle of the tourist season, 3 706 unemployed were registered in the hotel and catering industry, even though tourist businesses employed thousands of foreign workers?
4. Does the European *acquis* contain any provisions or temporary derogations to address such anomalies?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
 (22 October 2013)

The principle of free movement of workers set out in Article 45 TFEU guarantees equal treatment of EU and Cypriot nationals as far as access to the labour market is concerned. There is no possibility of a derogation from that rule.

As regards access by third-country nationals to the Member States' labour markets, each Member State is competent to determine the volumes of admission of third-country nationals coming from third countries to their territory in order to seek work, whether employed or self-employed. The Member States are also competent for ensuring that labour market formalities and minimum working conditions are respected.

The Commission notes that the inflow of foreign workers into Cyprus appears to have diminished in the most recent period ⁽¹⁾, in line with the fall in labour demand.

Finally, as shown in several Commission reports ⁽²⁾, migrant workers generally contribute to easing shortages in the receiving countries, often at the low-skill end of the jobs spectrum. In Cyprus, the occupational distribution of third-country migrants suggests that they are complementary to Cypriot nationals rather than substitutes ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ For instance, according to Eurostat data, the number of first residence permits issued for remunerated activities by Cyprus to third-country nationals has decreased by 43% between 2010 (11,917) and 2012 (6,889). Moreover, data from the Labour force survey indicates that the overall number of EU nationals working in Cyprus has decreased by 9% over the last year (from 55,100 in 2012Q2 to 46,400 in 2013Q2).

⁽²⁾ Employment in Europe 2008, Chapter 2 and 3, Employment and Social developments in Europe Review 2011, Chapter 6.

⁽³⁾ According to EU-Labour force survey, in 2012, 75% of the third-country nationals working in Cyprus were employed in elementary occupations (ISCO 9) while 80% of Cypriot nationals being unemployed had a high (ISCED 5-6) or medium (ISCED 3-4) level of education. Moreover, 66% of the third-country nationals working in Cyprus were employed in the domestic services sector (NACE P) while this sector represents only 6% of the overall employment in Cyprus and around 0.2% for the Cypriots nationals.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009766/13
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(30 août 2013)

Objet: Risque d'explosion dans les entreprises de nettoyage à sec

En France, l'arrêté du 5 décembre 2012 modifiant l'arrêté du 31 août 2009 relatif aux prescriptions générales applicables aux installations classées pour la protection de l'environnement soumises à déclaration sous la rubrique n° 2345 relative à l'utilisation de solvants pour le nettoyage à sec et le traitement des textiles ou des vêtements, a favorisé la reconnaissance de tous les solvants pouvant être utilisés en remplacement du perchloroéthylène et a allégé les obligations relatives à la sécurité incendie pour les installations utilisant les solvants alternatifs.

Considérant que cet arrêté ne permet pas de maîtriser le risque d'explosion dans les entreprises de nettoyage à sec, le syndicat professionnel FNET (Fédération nationale de l'entretien des textiles) a déposé un recours devant le Conseil d'État pour faire appliquer les principes de précaution et de prévention en vue de protéger les salariés, la clientèle et les voisins des pressings. Le risque d'explosion lié aux solvants hydrocarbonés serait confirmé par plusieurs explosions et incendies de machines à Portet-sur-Garonne en 2012, à Montpellier et en Seine-et-Marne.

Les professionnels pointent du doigt le produit ISANE IP 175, solvant hydrocarbure combustible, utilisé dans les nouvelles machines et pour lequel l'évaluation du danger et des risques se révèle compliquée. Ce nouveau solvant serait susceptible de former une atmosphère explosible. De plus, l'analyse des risques ne serait pas conforme à l'article R.4411-73 du code du travail, l'usage fait de ce produit chimique dans les activités de nettoyage à sec n'étant pas indiqué à la rubrique 1.2. Utilisation de la substance/préparation, comme le précise l'annexe II du règlement (CE) n° 1907/2006 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 18 décembre 2006 (REACH).

1. La Commission considère-t-elle que les solvants hydrocarbonés utilisés dans les entreprises de nettoyage à sec instaurent un nouveau type de danger, à savoir le risque d'explosion?
2. Est-elle au courant d'autres cas d'explosion en Europe?
3. Quelles mesures compte-t-elle proposer pour renforcer l'évaluation des risques relatifs à l'utilisation de ces produits et garantir la sécurité des salariés, des clients et des voisins des pressings?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(21 octobre 2013)

1. Concernant la protection des travailleurs, l'article 6 de la directive 89/391/CEE ⁽¹⁾ oblige l'employeur à prendre les mesures nécessaires pour éviter, évaluer et combattre les risques.

La prévention des explosions est particulièrement importante pour la santé et la sécurité des travailleurs. La directive 1999/92/CE ⁽²⁾ impose aux employeurs l'obligation de prendre des mesures pour empêcher ou maîtriser la formation d'atmosphères explosives. Conformément à l'article 4 de la directive 1999/92/CE, les employeurs doivent traiter les risques spécifiques créés par des atmosphères explosives en effectuant une évaluation globale des risques.

Cette exigence s'applique également à l'usage professionnel des solvants hydrocarbonés tels que le produit ISANE IP 175, qui est un agent nettoyant et dégraissant. Les risques professionnels potentiels liés à l'utilisation de ces produits sont connus. Ils doivent être évalués correctement par l'employeur dans chaque cas particulier. Sur la base de cette évaluation, les mesures de protection et de prévention appropriées doivent alors être mises en place.

2. La Commission n'a pas été informée de cas d'explosions dûs à l'usage de solvants hydrocarbonés dans des entreprises de nettoyage à sec.
3. La directive 89/391/CEE s'applique à tous les secteurs d'activités et précise que l'employeur est tenu d'assurer la sécurité et la santé des travailleurs dans tous les aspects liés au travail. La directive 1999/92/CE complète les dispositions générales de la directive 89/391/CEE. Ces deux directives ont été transposées et mises en œuvre dans le droit français. Les autorités nationales compétentes, qui sont en général les inspections du travail, sont responsables au premier chef de l'application de la législation nationale et, si nécessaire, de l'application de sanctions appropriées.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 89/391/CEE du Conseil du 12 juin 1989, concernant la mise en œuvre de mesures visant à promouvoir l'amélioration de la sécurité et de la santé des travailleurs au travail, JO L 183 du 29.6.1989, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ Directive 1999/92/CE du 16 décembre 1999 concernant les prescriptions minimales visant à améliorer la protection en matière de sécurité et de santé des travailleurs susceptibles d'être exposés au risque d'atmosphères explosives, JO L 23, du 28.1.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009766/13
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
 (30 August 2013)

Subject: Explosion risk on the premises of dry-cleaning firms

In France, the entry into force of the decree of 5 December 2012 amending that of 31 August 2009 laying down general rules applicable to facilities classified for environmental protection purposes and covered by the declaration under heading No 2345 concerning the use of solvents for dry-cleaning and the treatment of textiles or clothing led to official authorisation being given for the use of all solvents which are substitutes for perchloroethylene and to the relaxation of the fire-safety requirements to be met by facilities using alternative solvents.

Taking the view that the provisions of the new decree would not rule out the risk of explosions on the premises used by dry-cleaning firms, the FNET, the professional association representing such firms, lodged an appeal with the Council of State seeking the application of the precautionary principle and the principle of prevention with a view to protecting workers, customers and people living in the vicinity of dry cleaners. The FNET argued that the risks associated with the use of hydrocarbon solvents had been confirmed by a number of explosions and fires involving dry-cleaning equipment in Portet-sur-Garonne in 2012, in Montpellier and in the department of Seine-et-Marne.

Industry representatives are pointing the finger at one specific product, ISANE IP 175, a combustible hydrocarbon solvent which is employed in the latest types of dry-cleaning equipment and whose use poses risks which are as yet difficult to assess. It is claimed that the new solvent gives off fumes which create an explosive atmosphere. What is more, the risk analysis carried out was reportedly not consistent with Article R.4411-73 of the Labour Code, on the grounds that the way this chemical is used in dry-cleaning activities is not described under heading 1.2., Use of the substance/preparation, as required by Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 (REACH).

1. Does the Commission take the view that the hydrocarbon solvents used by dry-cleaning firms are creating a new type of danger, i.e. an explosion risk?
2. Is it aware of other cases involving explosions in Europe, in addition to those cited above?
3. What measures will it propose in order to improve the way in which the risks associated with the use of such products are assessed, in an effort to guarantee the safety of workers, customers and people living in the vicinity of dry cleaners?

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

1. As far as the protection of workers is concerned, Article 6 of Directive 89/391/EEC ⁽¹⁾ requires the employer to take the necessary measures to avoid, evaluate and combat risks.

Explosion prevention is of particular importance to occupational health and safety. Directive 1999/92/EC ⁽²⁾ imposes on the employer the obligation to take measures, in order to prevent or control explosive atmospheres. According to Article 4 of Directive 1999/92/EC the employer should address the specific risks arising from explosive atmospheres by carrying out an overall assessment.

This requirement applies equally to the occupational use of hydrocarbon solvents such as ISANE IP 175, which is a cleaning and degreasing agent. The potential occupational risks related to the use of such products are known. They must be assessed properly by the employer in every single case. Based on that assessment, the appropriate protective and preventive measures should then be put on place.

2. The Commission has not been informed of any explosion resulted by the usage of hydrocarbon solvents in dry-cleaning firms.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 89/391/EEC of 12 June 1989 on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of workers at work, OJ L 183, 29.6.1989.

⁽²⁾ Directive 1999/92/EC of 16 December 1999 on minimum requirements for improving the safety and health protection of workers potentially at risk from explosive atmospheres, OJ L 23, 28.1.2000.

3. Directive 89/391/EEC applies to all sectors of activity and stipulates that it is the employer's duty to ensure the safety and health of workers in every aspect related to the work. Directive 1999/92/EC supplements the general provisions of Directive 89/391/EEC. Both Directives have been transposed and implemented in French law. The competent national authorities, which are in general the labour inspectorates, are primarily responsible for enforcing the implementation of national legislation and, where necessary, applying suitable penalties.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009767/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(30 août 2013)

Objet: Points faibles des banques de développement

Pour rester première pourvoyeuse d'aide au développement malgré la crise, l'Union européenne se rapproche des banques de développement (BEI, BERD, AFD, KfW) et d'autres agences bilatérales.

Ensemble, elles financent de grands projets d'infrastructures, notamment d'énergie ou de transports, ce qui constitue une manière pour l'UE d'augmenter l'impact de son aide au développement sans accroître ses dépenses. Les Européens paient l'assistance technique (études d'impact, aide institutionnelle) et subventionnent les projets afin de faciliter l'octroi de prêts par les institutions financières.

Selon la BEI, l'expérience montre qu'un euro donné sous forme de bonification d'intérêt ou d'assistance technique dans le fonds UE-Afrique pour les infrastructures permet de lever 13 euros de prêts. La Commission européenne vante même un effet multiplicateur allant dans certains cas jusqu'à 30 euros et projette de relever les enveloppes de ces véhicules de financement à partir de 2014. Une plateforme européenne réunissant la Commission, les États et les institutions financières européennes a été créée en décembre 2012 pour étudier les moyens d'utiliser ce type de financement à bon escient et à plus grande échelle. Cette technique dite de «mixage» permet d'accélérer les décaissements européens habituellement lents. Les institutions financières soumettent directement des projets de financement à la Commission et aux États qui prennent la décision finale.

1. Comment la Commission compte-t-elle augmenter l'efficacité et la transparence des procédures de sélection des projets et de suivi des opérations?
2. Comment la Commission va-t-elle les rationaliser et les améliorer?
3. La Commission partage-t-elle l'avis que le nombre d'institutions financières associées provoque une organisation de ces facilités d'investissement qui laisse à désirer?
4. Que répond la Commission à ceux qui décrivent le guichet unique?
5. La Commission partage-t-elle l'avis selon lequel:
 - le profil des bailleurs de fonds — principalement des entreprises européennes — entraîne un biais dans le montage des projets?
 - faute de critères de sélection extra-financiers, l'impact sur la lutte contre la pauvreté n'est pas clairement établi?
 - la logique financière semble alors l'emporter sur celle du développement?

Réponse donnée par M. Piebalgs au nom de la Commission

(21 octobre 2013)

1.-2. Le financement mixte est soumis à des règles et à des procédures semblables à celles en vigueur pour d'autres modes de mise en œuvre. La Commission, les États membres et les délégations de l'UE participent à la sélection des projets. Des informations sur les mécanismes régionaux de cofinancement de l'UE («mécanismes de financement») sont publiées dans les rapports annuels ⁽¹⁾. Le suivi est la règle, tant au niveau du projet qu'à celui du mécanisme. La plateforme européenne de financement mixte pour la coopération extérieure est actuellement le théâtre d'un vif débat sur les différentes possibilités de rationaliser et d'améliorer encore les processus de sélection et le suivi.

3. Le nombre d'institutions financières associées n'influe pas sur la rapidité des procédures. Une participation plus large amène des idées de projet plus innovantes, augmente le potentiel de coopération et de cofinancement, permet de répondre plus efficacement aux besoins des pays partenaires, renforce la compétitivité des conditions de financement et améliore l'efficacité de l'aide.

⁽¹⁾ Voir le site internet d'EuropeAid: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/news/2012-12-12-platform-blending-funds_en.htm (en anglais seulement).

4. Bien que les mécanismes de financement maximisent l'efficacité et la qualité du financement mixte, ils ne constituent pas des guichets uniques. Ils s'inscrivent dans le cadre de coopération extérieure de l'UE. Avant leur soumission, les projets de financement mixte sont préparés conjointement par les institutions financières, les pays partenaires et les délégations de l'UE, comme les projets traditionnels, la différence étant que les tâches techniques peuvent être déléguées aux institutions financières.

5. Les mécanismes de financement sont mis en place au sein de programmes et de projets régionaux et doivent répondre aux objectifs politiques européens et aux critères d'impact et de durabilité. Même si les objectifs de l'Union européenne sont primordiaux, les aspects financiers et extra-financiers des projets n'en sont pas moins évalués. Les opérations de financement mixte visent à catalyser l'investissement public et privé pour contribuer au développement dans les pays partenaires.

Lorsque la mise en œuvre de projets est confiée aux institutions financières, il est notamment exigé que soient respectées les règles internationales en matière de passation de marché, ce qui interdit tout biais en faveur d'entités européennes.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009767/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(30 August 2013)**

Subject: Weaknesses of development banks

To keep its position as the leading provider of development aid despite the crisis, the European Union has taken to working with the development banks (EIB, EBRD, AFD, KfW) and other bilateral agencies.

Together they finance major infrastructure projects, in particular in the energy and transport sectors, giving the EU the opportunity to enhance the impact of its development aid without increasing its expenditure. The EU covers the cost of technical assistance (impact assessment, institutional aid) and subsidises projects so as to facilitate the provision of loans by the financial institutions.

According to the EIB, experience demonstrates that one euro given in the form of interest-rate subsidy or technical assistance in the EU-Africa Infrastructure Trust Fund allows EUR 13 to be raised in loans. The European Commission claims there is a multiplier effect of as much as EUR 30 in some cases, and is proposing to increase the envelopes for these funding vehicles with effect from 2014. A European platform bringing together the Commission, the Member States and European financial institutions was set up in December 2012 in order to examine ways of using this type of funding efficiently and on a large scale. This technique, known as 'blending', speeds up the customarily slow process of disbursement by the EU. The financial institutions submit funding projects directly to the Commission and the Member States, who take the final decision.

1. How does the Commission propose to increase the efficiency and transparency of the procedures for selecting projects and monitoring operations?
2. How will the Commission rationalise and improve these procedures?
3. Does the Commission share the view that so many financial institutions are associated with these arrangements that the investment facilities cannot be organised properly?
4. What is the Commission's response to critics of the one-stop shop approach?
5. Does the Commission share the view that:
 - the profile of the donors – mainly European enterprises – creates a bias in the setting up of projects?
 - in the absence of non-financial selection criteria, there is no clear assessment of the impact on the fight against poverty?
 - the result is that financial logic seems to win out over the logic of development?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(21 October 2013)**

1. & 2. Blending is subject to rules and procedures similar to those for other implementation modes. Project selection involves the Commission, Member States and EU delegations. Information on EU regional blending facilities ('facilities') is published in annual reports ⁽¹⁾. Monitoring is carried out as standard practice, at project and facility level. In the EU Platform for Blending in External Cooperation intensive debate is taking place, looking at options to further streamline and enhance selection processes and monitoring.

3. The number of Financial Institutions (FIs) involved does not slow down procedures. Wider participation leads to more innovative project ideas, potential for cooperation and co-financing, a more effective response to partner countries' needs, competitive financing conditions and higher aid effectiveness.

4. While the facilities maximise the efficiency and quality of blending, they are no one-stop shops. They are embedded in the EU external cooperation framework. Before submission, blending projects are prepared jointly by FIs, partner countries and EU delegations, like in traditional projects, with the difference that technical tasks may be delegated to FIs.

⁽¹⁾ See the EuropeAid website: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/news/2012-12-12-platform-blending-funds_en.htm

5. The facilities are established within regional programmes and projects and must be in line with EU policy objectives and impact and sustainability criteria. While EU objectives are paramount, both financial and non-financial aspects of projects are assessed. Blending operations aim to catalyse public and private investment as a means to support development in partner countries.

When the implementation of projects is delegated to FIs it is inter alia required that international procurement standards are applied, which prohibits a European bias.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009768/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(30 août 2013)

Objet: Favoriser le WiFi

En 2012, 71 % des consommations Internet sur tablette et smartphone ont transité par le réseau WiFi, selon une étude interne de la Commission européenne. Un taux qui devrait s'élever à 78 % en 2016, toujours selon Bruxelles.

Autrement dit, le WiFi constitue le principal canal de consommation des données en mobilité, loin devant les réseaux mobiles des opérateurs. Un constat qui s'explique notamment par le coût relativement bas du WiFi face aux réseaux mobiles, particulièrement lorsque les utilisateurs sont en déplacement à l'étranger, mais aussi par son usage généralisé en entreprise et à domicile.

Il n'en reste pas moins que l'accès au WiFi peut se révéler contraignant, voire onéreux.

Quelle est la stratégie de la Commission pour changer ce dernier constat?

Réponse donnée par Mme Kroes au nom de la Commission
(30 septembre 2013)

On constate en effet une utilisation accrue des accès Wi-Fi publics, privés et communautaires ainsi qu'un délestage du trafic des données mobiles de la part des opérateurs de réseau mobile en Europe. Les nouvelles applications sans fil comme les nuages, les médias sans fil et l'internet des objets stimulent encore plus la demande en matière de capacité des réseaux sans fil et de haut débit.

Dans ce contexte, la proposition de règlement concernant un marché unique des télécommunications adoptée par la Commission le 11 septembre 2013 [COM(2013 627 final)] prévoit notamment une série de dispositions éliminant les restrictions potentielles au déploiement et à l'utilisation du réseau Wi-Fi afin d'améliorer sa disponibilité dans toute l'Union.

Les dispositions proposées suppriment les obstacles à la fourniture de services Wi-Fi, permettent aux fournisseurs d'ouvrir des réseaux Wi-Fi au public avec l'accord des clients, éliminent les restrictions à la fourniture de Wi-Fi dans les locaux des autorités publiques ou aux alentours et à la fédération de points d'accès Wi-Fi.

De plus, les règles proposées éliminent les lourdeurs administratives lors du déploiement et de l'exploitation des points d'accès sans fil à portée limitée, notamment des points d'accès Wi-Fi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009768/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(30 August 2013)

Subject: Making WiFi more readily available

According to a Commission study, 71% of all wireless internet traffic on tablets and smartphones was over WiFi in 2012. The study predicts that this figure will increase to 78% by 2016.

WiFi is therefore used far more than mobile phone networks for accessing the net when on the move. The reasons for this include the fact that it is cheaper to use WiFi than a mobile telephone connection, particularly when abroad, and the fact that most homes and businesses have a WiFi network.

However, WiFi connections are not always readily available or cheap.

How does the Commission intend to go about changing this?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(30 September 2013)

There is indeed an increased usage of public and private, and community Wi-Fi access as well as offloading of mobile traffic applied by mobile operators in Europe. Emerging wireless applications such as wireless cloud, media, and Internet of Things are driving further demand for wireless network capacity and broadband speed.

Against this background the proposal for a Telecoms Single Market Regulation adopted by the Commission on 11 September 2013 (COM(2013) 627 final) *inter alia* contains a number of provisions removing potential restrictions to Wi-Fi network deployment and usage with a view to improve its availability across the Union.

These proposed provisions remove barriers to offer Wi-Fi services, allow providers to open Wi-Fi networks to the public with their customers' consent, avoid lock-in for consumers, remove restrictions on provision of Wi-Fi on or around the premises of public authorities and remove restrictions on the federation of Wi-Fi access points.

Furthermore the proposed rules remove red tape for the deployment and operation of small-area wireless access points including Wi-Fi access points.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009770/13
aan de Commissie
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)
(30 augustus 2013)

Betreft: eCall-autochip

U stelde in uw antwoord dd 21.8.2013 op mijn vraag E-008690/2013 dat er bij het starten van de auto die is uitgerust met een eCall-chip automatisch een „aanmelding” plaats zal vinden bij het telecommunicatienetwerk met de beste dekking, echter dat er pas een „verbinding” wordt opgezet na het inschakelen van eCall.

1. Welke partijen zijn betrokken bij respectievelijk de „aanmelding” en de „verbinding”?
2. Wordt bij deze „aanmelding” uniek identificeerbare informatie overgedragen aan het telecommunicatienetwerk?
3. Wordt bij het zich verplaatsen van het voertuig opnieuw een aanmelding gedaan als een ander netwerk of een andere zendmast een betere dekking geeft?
4. Welke informatie wordt bij aanmelding bij het telecommunicatienetwerk precies aangeboden? Valt deze informatie onder de Richtlijn Dataretentie? Staat deze informatie ter beschikking aan opsporingsautoriteiten?
5. Als na het opzetten van een „verbinding” locatiegegevens worden overgedragen, wie is op dat moment zender en wie is ontvanger van die gegevens? Hoe en hoe lang worden die gegevens bewaard? Staat deze informatie ter beschikking aan opsporingsautoriteiten?
6. Zijn de gegevens die ten tijde van de „verbinding” worden doorgestuurd ook leesbaar voor eventuele tussenliggende partijen? Is het voor die partijen juridisch en technisch mogelijk om de gegevens in te zien?

Antwoord van mevrouw Kroes namens de Commissie
(10 oktober 2013)

Wanneer het eCall-boordsysteem (In-Vehicle System, IVS) zich in de normale bedrijfsstatus bevindt, is het bij geen enkel telecommunicatienetwerk aangemeld. De aanmelding en de spraak-/dataverbinding vinden alleen plaats als er een ongeval is gebeurd. Tijdens normaal bedrijf mag het IVS enkel het radiospectrum scannen op beschikbare netwerken, maar geen verbinding met exploitanten van mobiele netwerken (Mobile Network Operators, MNO's) tot stand brengen.

Bij de aanmelding wordt de internationale identiteit mobiele abonnee (International Mobile Subscriber Identity, IMSI) verstrekt.

Als er een ongeval plaatsvindt, worden de locatiegegevens verzonden, net als bij alle andere 112-gesprekken. Op deze gegevens zijn alle eisen uit de relevante wetgevingsbesluiten ⁽¹⁾ ⁽²⁾ van toepassing. Daarnaast worden meer nauwkeurige locatiegegevens (de door het satellietnavigatiesysteem bepaalde huidige positie en de twee voorafgaande posities van het voertuig) door middel van de minimumgegevensset ⁽³⁾ (Minimum Set of Data, MSD) verzonden. Deze gegevens worden verzonden naar de alarmcentrale (Public Safety Answering Point, PSAP) en daar opgeslagen overeenkomstig de relevante wetgeving betreffende persoonsgegevens en consumentenbescherming ⁽²⁾.

Geen enkele MNO of andere tussenpersoon heeft toegang tot de MSD die door de IVS naar de PSAP's wordt verzonden.

⁽¹⁾ Richtlijn 2002/22/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 7 maart 2002 inzake de universele dienst en gebruikersrechten met betrekking tot elektronische-communicatienetwerken en -diensten, PB L 108 van 24.4.2002, blz. 51.

⁽²⁾ Richtlijn 2002/58/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 12 juli 2002 betreffende de verwerking van persoonsgegevens en de bescherming van de persoonlijke levenssfeer in de sector elektronische communicatie, PB L 201 van 31.7.2002, blz. 37. Verordening (EG) nr. 2006/2004 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 27 oktober 2004 betreffende samenwerking tussen de nationale instanties die verantwoordelijk zijn voor handhaving van de wetgeving inzake consumentenbescherming, PB L 364 van 9.12.2004, blz. 1. Richtlijn 2009/136/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 25 november 2009 tot wijziging van Richtlijnen 2002/22/EG en 2002/58/EG en Verordening (EG) nr. 2006/2004, PB L 337 van 18.12.2009, blz. 11.

⁽³⁾ CEN EN 15722 „Telematica voor wegvervoer en -verkeer — Esafety — ECall minimumgegevensset”.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009770/13
to the Commission**

Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)

(30 August 2013)

Subject: eCall chip in vehicles

In its reply of 21 August 2013 to my Question E-008690/2013, the Commission stated that when a vehicle which is equipped with eCall technology is started, the in-vehicle system will automatically 'register' in the telecommunication network with the best coverage reachable, but 'communication' will take place only after an eCall has been triggered.

1. Which parties are involved in 'registration' and 'communication' respectively?
2. Does this 'registration' involve transmitting uniquely identifiable information to the telecommunication network?
3. As the vehicle moves, does the system re-register if a different network or mobile base station can provide better coverage?
4. Exactly what information is provided when registering with the telecommunication network? Does this information fall under the Data Retention Directive? Is this information available to investigating authorities?
5. If, after 'communication' has been established, location data are transmitted, who is then transmitting and who is receiving the data? How, and for how long, are the data stored? Is this information available to investigating authorities?
6. Can the data which are transmitted during the 'communication' also be accessed by any intermediate parties? Is it legally and technically possible for those parties to inspect the data?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission

(10 October 2013)

While in its normal operational status the eCall In-Vehicle System (IVS) is not registered to any telecommunications network. Registration and voice/data communications take place only in case of an accident. During its normal operation, the IVS may only scan the radio spectrum for available networks, but without communicating with the Mobile Network Operators (MNOs).

The International Mobile Subscriber Identity (IMSI) is provided during registration.

When an accident occurs, location data are transmitted, as in any other 112 call. All requirements set out in the relevant legislative acts ⁽¹⁾ ⁽²⁾ also apply to these data. Additionally, more accurate location data (the current and the two previous positions of the vehicle as determined by the satellite navigation system) are transmitted through the Minimum Set of Data ⁽³⁾ (MSD). These data are transmitted and stored by the Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) in compliance with the relevant legislation on personal data & consumer protection ².

No intermediate parties (including the MNOs) have access to the MSD that is transmitted from the IVS to the PSAPs.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2002/22/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 March 2002 on universal service and users' rights relating to electronic communications networks and services, OJ L 108, 24.4.2002, p. 51.

⁽²⁾ Directive 2002/58/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 July 2002 concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector, OJ L 201, 31.7.2002, p. 37; Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 October 2004 on cooperation between national authorities responsible for the enforcement of consumer protection laws, OJ L 364, 9.12.2004, p. 1; Directive 2009/136/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2009 amending Directives 2002/22/EC and 2002/58/EC and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004, OJ L 337, 18.12.2009, p. 11.

⁽³⁾ CEN EN 15722 'Road transport and traffic telematics — ESafety — eCall minimum set of data'.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009771/13
aan de Commissie
Philippe De Backer (ALDE)
(30 augustus 2013)

Betreft: Aanbevelingen nationaal hervormingsprogramma 2013 België — breedband

Eerder dit jaar formuleerde de Europese Commissie aanbevelingen over het nationale hervormingsprogramma 2013 van België. In de vierde aanbeveling wordt gesteld dat er voorzien moet worden in een betere verbinding voor mobiele breedband.

1. Welke aanbevelingen stelt de Commissie voor om de markt m.b.t. mobiele breedband verder te openen? Gaat de Commissie hieromtrent concrete maatregelen nemen?
2. Welke economische — of andere — gevolgen verwacht de Commissie van een betere verbinding van mobiele breedband?
3. Kan de Commissie kwantificeren wat een betere mobiel breedband voor de economie in Brussel en in België zou betekenen?
4. Hoe gaat de Commissie om met de strenge stralingsnormen die momenteel van toepassing zijn in Brussel? Zal het extra maatregelen nemen om de mobiele bereikbaarheid te garanderen?

Antwoord van mevrouw Kroes namens de Commissie
(3 oktober 2013)

Snelle draadloze diensten zijn van belang om de ontwikkeling van innovatieve technologieën en diensten die bepalend zijn voor de groei in de EU-economie te stimuleren; ze dragen bij tot andere sectoriële beleidsmaatregelen van de EU en helpen de digitale kloof te overbruggen. Uit studies is gebleken dat overheden voor een snellere economische groei en een hogere productiviteit kunnen zorgen door invoering en gebruik van mobiel breedbandinternet uit te breiden ⁽¹⁾. Geschat wordt dat een toename met 10 % van de 3G-penetratie leidt tot een stijging van het BBP per hoofd van de bevolking met 0,15 procentpunt ⁽²⁾.

Door meer radiospectrum beschikbaar te stellen voor mobiel breedband kan mobiel dataverkeer zonder belemmeringen verder groeien. België is echter nog een van de weinige landen in Europa waar mobiel breedband geen gebruik kan maken van de 800 MHz-band ondanks een met alle lidstaten gemaakte afspraak dit uiterlijk eind 2012 mogelijk te maken. De Commissie heeft er bij de Belgische autoriteiten op aangedrongen de geplande veiling van gebruiksrechten in de 800 MHz-band zo spoedig mogelijk uit te voeren.

De uitrol en beschikbaarheid van 4G in Brussel is van essentieel belang voor de economische en sociale ontwikkeling. In dit verband verheugt de Commissie zich over de politieke overeenkomst die in juni werd bereikt over de ontwikkeling van 4G in Brussel, alsook over de opstelling van een register van openbare ruimtes waar antennes kunnen worden geplaatst. De Commissie volgt nauwlettend of dit politieke akkoord wordt omgezet in bindende wetgeving, en verwacht dat in de nabije toekomst oplossingen op langere termijn worden gevonden.

⁽¹⁾ Analysys Mason Limited (2013), „Study on the socio-economic impact of bandwidth”, studie uitgevoerd in opdracht van de Europese Commissie.

⁽²⁾ Deloitte, GSMA en Cisco (2012), „What is the impact of mobile telephony on economic growth?”.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009771/13
to the Commission**

Philippe De Backer (ALDE)

(30 August 2013)

Subject: Recommendations concerning Belgium's national reform programme 2013 — broadband

Earlier this year, the Commission made recommendations concerning Belgium's national reform programme 2013. In the fourth recommendation, it stated that it was necessary to provide better mobile broadband connections.

1. What recommendations does the Commission propose in order to further open up the market for mobile broadband? Will the Commission take specific measures in this regard?
2. What economic or other consequences does the Commission expect from better mobile broadband connections?
3. Can the Commission quantify what impact better mobile broadband would have on the economy in Brussels and Belgium?
4. What is the Commission's approach to the strict radiation standards which currently apply in Brussels? Will it take extra measures to guarantee mobile access?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission

(3 October 2013)

The availability of fast wireless services is important to stimulate the development of innovative technologies and services that will drive growth in the EU economy, contribute to other EU sectorial policies and help overcome the digital divide. Studies suggest that countries can accelerate economic growth and productivity by increasing mobile broadband Internet adoption and usage ⁽¹⁾. It has been estimated that a 10% rise in 3G penetration increases GDP per capita growth by 0.15 percentage points ⁽²⁾.

Increasing the amount of radio spectrum allocated to mobile broadband allows mobile data traffic to grow without supply constraints. Yet, Belgium is one of the few remaining countries in Europe where the 800 MHz band is still not available for mobile broadband in spite of an agreed commitment by all Member States to do so by the end of 2012. The Commission has urged the Belgian authorities to complete the planned auction of the usage rights in the 800 MHz band as soon as possible.

The roll-out and availability of 4G in Brussels is essential to its economic and social development. In this respect, the Commission welcomes the political agreement reached in June on the development of 4G in Brussels as well as the creation of a register of public spaces available to accommodate antennas. The Commission is closely monitoring the implementation of this political agreement into binding legislation, and expects that longer term solutions will be found in the near future.

⁽¹⁾ Analysys Mason Limited (2013), Study on the socioeconomic impact of bandwidth, study prepared for the European Commission.

⁽²⁾ Deloitte, GSMA and Cisco (2012), What is the impact of mobile telephony on economic growth?

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-009772/13

à la Commission

Gaston Franco (PPE)

(30 août 2013)

Objet: Éducation à l'environnement et au développement durable dans l'Union

À travers le 7^e programme d'action pour l'environnement (PAE), dont je suis le rapporteur au Parlement européen, l'Union européenne s'engage à devenir une économie verte inclusive qui garantisse croissance et développement, préserve la santé et le bien-être de l'homme, fournisse des emplois dignes de ce nom, réduise les inégalités et investisse dans le capital naturel tout en le protégeant. Cette transformation passe par l'intégration totale des questions liées à l'environnement dans d'autres politiques afin de créer une approche cohérente et coordonnée. Parmi ces politiques, l'éducation occupe une place de choix, comme l'a reconnu l'accord politique intervenu en trilogue le 19 juin 2013 sur le 7^e PAE.

1. La Commission a-t-elle produit une analyse des programmes d'éducation à l'environnement dans les écoles primaires et les établissements de l'enseignement secondaire des États membres de l'Union?
2. À la lumière d'initiatives telles que la Décennie des Nations unies sur l'ESD (éducation au service du développement durable) et la Stratégie de l'UNECE sur l'ESD, la Commission envisagerait-elle de lancer une Stratégie européenne sur l'éducation à l'environnement et au développement durable au titre de la mise en œuvre du 7^e PAE?
3. À la suite de la réunion intitulée «Renforcer l'éducation pour les politiques de développement durable en Méditerranée» organisée dans le cadre du programme «Horizon 2020» «Renforcement des capacités/Programme méditerranéen pour l'environnement» les 17 et 18 juin derniers à Zagreb, quelle priorité et quels moyens la Commission compte-t-elle accorder à la future Stratégie méditerranéenne sur l'éducation pour le développement durable à la veille de la conférence ministérielle conjointe des ministres de l'environnement et des ministres de l'éducation, qui se tiendra le 21 octobre 2013 à Monaco?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Vassiliou au nom de la Commission

(27 septembre 2013)

1. Conformément aux dispositions de l'article 165 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne, la responsabilité du contenu et de l'organisation des systèmes d'éducation et de formation incombe entièrement aux États membres. La recommandation sur les compétences clés pour l'éducation et la formation tout au long de la vie ⁽¹⁾ souligne l'importance des connaissances, aptitudes et attitudes environnementales correspondant aux compétences de base en sciences et technologies. Bien que la Commission n'ait pas établi de rapport détaillé sur l'éducation à l'environnement dans les États membres, le rapport élaboré en 2011 pour la Commission par le réseau Eurydice aborde la question dans le contexte plus large de l'enseignement des sciences ⁽²⁾.
2. La Commission ne prévoit pas actuellement de lancer une stratégie européenne particulière pour l'éducation à l'environnement et au développement durable. Les politiques de l'UE visent à soutenir les actions nationales et à contribuer à relever les défis communs. La Commission continuera à fournir des publications et du matériel audiovisuel sur les questions environnementales qui peuvent être utilisés pour soutenir les initiatives pédagogiques dans les États membres. La Commission mène également une campagne environnementale à l'échelle de l'UE intitulée «Generation Awake» dans le contexte de la feuille de route pour une utilisation efficace des ressources ⁽³⁾. Le matériel de lecture est disponible sur la page d'accueil du site de la campagne.
3. La Commission a soutenu l'élaboration d'une stratégie méditerranéenne sur l'éducation pour le développement durable à l'occasion de plusieurs réunions régionales parrainées par le programme «Horizon 2020 — Renforcement des capacités/Programme méditerranéen pour l'environnement», comme celle qui s'est tenue à Zagreb en juin 2013. Une décision sur la poursuite de l'appui de la Commission doit encore être prise et dépendra du résultat de l'évaluation à mi-parcours du programme «Horizon 2020» et de l'adoption officielle de la stratégie sur l'éducation pour le développement durable.

⁽¹⁾ Journal Officiel L 394 du 30 décembre 2006.

⁽²⁾ Agence exécutive «Éducation, audiovisuel et culture» de l'UE, 2011, «L'Enseignement des sciences en Europe: les politiques nationales, les pratiques et la recherche». Disponible à l'adresse: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/133FR.pdf

⁽³⁾ Generation Awake: tes choix feront la différence (<http://www.generationawake.eu/>).

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-009772/13
to the Commission**

Gaston Franco (PPE)

(30 August 2013)

Subject: Environment and sustainable development education in the EU

Under the 7th Environmental Action Programme (EAP), for which I am the European Parliament rapporteur, the European Union undertakes to transform itself into an inclusive green economy that secures growth and development, safeguards human health and well-being, provides decent jobs, reduces inequalities and invests in and preserves natural capital. This is to be achieved through environmental mainstreaming with a view to ensuring a coherent and coordinated approach focusing on education, in accordance with the political agreement reached at the 7th EAP dialogue of 19 June 2013.

1. Has the Commission drawn up a detailed report on environment education programmes at primary and secondary school level in the EU Member States?
2. In view of initiatives such as the UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) and the related UNECE strategy, would the Commission consider launching a European environmental education and sustainable development education strategy under the 7th EAP?
3. Following the meeting of 17 and 18 June 2013 in Zagreb on strengthening sustainable development education policies in the Mediterranean as part of the Horizon 2020 Capacity Building/Mediterranean Environment Programme, what level of priority will the Commission give to the future Mediterranean strategy for sustainable development education and what resources will it earmark for this purpose in the run-up to the joint conference of Environment and Education Ministers scheduled for 21 October 2013 in Monaco?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission

(27 September 2013)

1. 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. The recommendation on Key Competences for Lifelong Learning ⁽¹⁾ highlights the importance of environmental knowledge, skills and attitudes in relation with basic competences in science and technology. While the Commission has not carried out any detailed report on environment education in Member States, a 2011 report compiled for the Commission by the Eurydice network touches upon the issue in the wider context of science education. ⁽²⁾
2. The Commission has currently no plans to launch a specific European environmental education and sustainable development education strategy. EU policies are designed to support national actions and help address common challenges. The Commission will continue to provide printed and audiovisual material on environmental issues which can be used to support educational initiatives in Member States. The Commission also runs an EU-wide environmental campaign called 'Generation Awake' in the context of the Resource Efficiency Roadmap ⁽³⁾. Reading materials are available on the homepage of the campaign.
3. The Commission has supported the preparation of a Mediterranean Strategy on Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), through various regional meetings sponsored by the Horizon 2020 Capacity Building/Mediterranean Environment Programme, including the one in Zagreb in June 2013. A decision on further Commission support needs yet to be taken and will depend on the outcome of the Horizon 2020 mid-term review and the formal adoption of the strategy on Education for Sustainable Development.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 394, 30.12.2006.

⁽²⁾ Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (Eurydice), 2011, Science Education in Europe: National Policies, Practices and Research. Online at http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/133EN.pdf

⁽³⁾ Generation Awake: your choices make a world of difference (<http://www.generationawake.eu/>).

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-009773/13
upućeno Komisiji
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(30. kolovoza 2013.)

Predmet: Kršenje privatnosti građana EU-a

U proteklih nekoliko mjeseci bilo je nebrojeno mnogo medijskih izvješća o čestim kršenjima privatnosti korisnika internetskih usluga iz SAD-a kao što su Google i Facebook, što istovremeno uključuje i značajan broj građana EU-a.

Problem se pojavio zbog različitog tumačenja privatnosti u SAD-u i Europskoj uniji. Dok se u SAD-u postupak nadzora provodi bez obzira na eventualnu uključenost pojedinca u nezakonite aktivnosti, EU dopušta nadgledanje samo, i uz sudski nalog, ako je dotični pojedinac osumnjičen za kršenje zakona ili ugrožavanje sigurnosti države članice EU-a.

Imajući to na umu, može li Komisija pojasniti što namjerava učiniti kako bi zaštitila privatnost građana EU-a koji koriste internetske usluge iz SAD-a?

Odgovor gđe Reding u ime Komisije
(7. studenog 2013.)

Komisija je iznimno zabrinuta zbog medijskih izvješća o programima kao što je PRISM koji, čini se, omogućavaju, u velikim razmjerima, pristup podacima i obradu podataka o Europljanima.

Komisija je od vlade SAD-a zatražila objašnjenje u vezi s programima o kojima se izvještavalo u medijima i mogućim utjecajem na temeljna prava Europljana. Potpredsjednica Komisije zadužena za pravosuđe, temeljna prava i građanstvo potaknula je raspravu o toj temi izravno s glavnim državnim odvjetnikom SAD-a Ericom Holderom na Ministarskoj konferenciji za pravosuđe i unutarnje poslove EU-a i SAD-a u Dublinu 14. lipnja 2013. Nakon sastanka, zatražena su dodatna objašnjenja u pismu vlastima SAD-a, uključujući objašnjenja o količini prikupljenih podataka, opsegu programa i sudskom nadzoru koji su dostupni Europljanima. Osim toga, Komisija je osnovala, zajedno s Predsjedništvom Vijeća EU-a, ad hoc radnu grupu EU-a i SAD-a na visokoj razini o zaštiti podataka kako bi se detaljnije razmotrila ova pitanja. Na temelju prikupljenih informacija, Komisija će povratno o tome izvijestiti Europski parlament i Vijeće.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009773/13
to the Commission
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(30 August 2013)

Subject: Breaches of EU citizens' privacy

In the past couple of months, countless media reports have been made regarding frequent breaches of privacy against users of US Internet services such as Google and Facebook, which automatically includes a significant number of EU citizens.

The problem has arisen as a result of the difference between the US and European understanding of privacy. While in the US monitoring is carried out regardless of whether or not one is suspected of dealing with illegal activities, the EU allows monitoring only where, along with a court order, the individual concerned is suspected of breaking the law or of compromising the security of EU Member States.

Bearing this in mind, will the Commission clarify what it intends to do in order to protect the privacy of EU citizens who use these US online services?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2013)

The Commission is very concerned regarding the media reports about programmes such as PRISM which appear to enable access and processing, on a large scale, of data of Europeans.

The Commission has requested clarifications from the US Government regarding the programmes reported in the media and the potential impact on the fundamental rights of Europeans. The Vice-President of the Commission responsible for Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship raised this issue directly with US Attorney-General Eric Holder at the EU-US Justice and Home Affairs Ministerial in Dublin on 14 June 2013. Following this meeting, further clarifications have been requested writing to the US authorities, including on the volume of the data collected, the scope of the programmes and the judicial oversight available to Europeans. In addition, the Commission has set up, together with the Presidency of the Council of the EU, an ad-hoc high-level EU-US working group on data protection to examine these issues further. Based on the information gathered, the Commission will report back to the European Parliament and the Council.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009774/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(30 August 2013)

Subject: Alleged ban on Iranian state TV channels

I have been contacted by a constituent who believes that Iranian state TV channels have been forced to stop broadcasting in the EU and the US by the US Government and EU Member States. My constituent believes that this alleged action is based on false arguments that Iran is developing nuclear weapons.

Could the Commission confirm:

1. What evidence it has of whether the broadcasting of Iranian state TV channels inside the EU has ceased?
2. What it believes to be the reasons why broadcasting has been stopped?
3. What directives support the freedom to broadcast?
4. Whether any directives have been breached, and if so, what action it intends to take?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2013)

The Commission is aware of a press release by Press TV announcing the termination of its carriage by satellite operator Intelsat ⁽¹⁾. The decision allegedly affecting all channels offered by the Iranian state broadcaster Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting (IRIB) took effect as of 30 June 2013. It is unclear whether this caused any other service providers to terminate transmission services for IRIB channels. Information available from Press TV's website suggests that the service remains available in Europe from a number of satellites, such as Arabsat 8C, Express AM44 and Badr 4.

The Commission is unaware of the exact modalities that may have brought about the cancellation of transmission service contracts for channels of the described nature. The Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMSD) underpins the freedom of providing broadcasts within the Union subject to compliance with the regulatory framework in the country of origin. The provision of electronic communications services carrying broadcast content is regulated under the Electronic Communications Regulatory Framework.

The Commission has not received any complaints or submissions indicating a breach of the AVMSD, or of other provisions of Union law. For this reason, no further actions are planned. To the extent that satellite service providers may have chosen to terminate distribution agreements for reasons unrelated to the content of audiovisual media services, these fall outside the Commission's supervisory function in ensuring that the AVMSD is effectively implemented. In general, it is for Member States to ensure that the provisions transposing the obligations of the directive into domestic law are effectively being complied with.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/06/26/310864/intelsat-to-take-iranian-channels-off-air/>

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009775/13
alla Commissione**

Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)

(30 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: Il problema del cyberbullismo nell'UE

Il 6 agosto 2013 il quotidiano britannico *The Times* ha riportato la notizia del suicidio di una adolescente britannica che aveva ricevuto messaggi offensivi su un sito di relazioni sociali. La ragazza è stata trovata impiccata nella sua abitazione e si presume che sia stata spinta al suicidio da messaggi anonimi inviati online che la incitavano al suicidio. Dopo il decesso della ragazza i famigliari hanno creato una pagina web in sua memoria, anch'essa oggetto di ingiurie.

Il padre della ragazza ha chiesto al primo ministro del Regno Unito David Cameron di adottare misure per proteggere i giovani che utilizzano i media sociali e ha dichiarato che: «I siti web come questo sono oggetto di bullismo perché le persone possono trincerarsi dietro l'anonimato. [...] Chiedo al primo ministro e padre David Cameron di esaminare la questione e di provvedere affinché tali siti siano adeguatamente regolamentati in modo che gli episodi di bullismo come quello ai danni di mia figlia non accadano più. [...] Non voglio che nessun altro genitore passi quello che sto passando io».

Stando al quotidiano il sito di relazioni sociali che avrebbe agevolato le ingiurie è Ask.fm, un sito molto popolare tra gli adolescenti, il quale consente agli utenti di inviare commenti o domande in forma anonima sulle pagine dei profili di altri utenti. Il sito a gestione lettone conta oltre 60 milioni di utenti ed è presumibilmente legato ai decessi di almeno quattro adolescenti soltanto nell'ultimo anno. L'anno scorso Ciara Pugsley, 15 anni, ed Erin Gallagher, 13 anni, entrambi irlandesi, si sono tolti la vita dopo essere stati presumibilmente oggetto di bullismo attraverso il sito.

1. È disposta la Commissione a esaminare il problema dei suicidi collegati al sito di relazioni sociali Ask.fm?
2. È disposta la Commissione a contattare il governo lettone per chiedergli di aprire un'indagine sulle denunce riguardanti l'operato di Ask.com?
3. È disposta la Commissione a valutare la possibilità di definire strategie più ampie a livello UE per contrastare il problema del cyberabuso e del cyberbullismo?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione

(21 ottobre 2013)

La Commissione europea condanna il cyberbullismo, un fenomeno che, come molti altri aspetti dei comportamenti online, è in rapida evoluzione.

Ask.fm ha incaricato uno studio legale ⁽¹⁾ britannico di effettuare un audit sulle caratteristiche di sicurezza del suo sito e il 16 agosto ha annunciato una serie di misure che intende adottare, tra cui: pubblicare un sito web per informare i genitori sulle funzionalità del sito e sulla politica aziendale per contrastare gli abusi, rendere maggiormente visibile sul sito la funzione di segnalazione degli abusi e aggiungere una funzione che dia agli utenti l'opzione di non ricevere messaggi anonimi. In questo momento la Commissione non ritiene pertanto opportuno esaminare ulteriormente la questione.

La strategia europea per creare un'internet migliore per i ragazzi ⁽²⁾, che definisce un approccio globale nei confronti della sicurezza online dei minori, si applica anche al cyberbullismo e la Commissione è sempre pronta ad apportare miglioramenti su questo fronte. Nell'ambito di tale strategia, una coalizione di aziende del settore (*CEO Coalition for a better Internet for Children*) ha concordato l'attuazione di misure concrete per migliorare la facilità e la visibilità delle segnalazioni di abusi e chiarire agli utenti le implicazioni delle diverse impostazioni di privacy ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Studio Legale: Mishcon de Reya (<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/askfm-will-be-safer-from-online-bullying-as-owners-introduce-new-features-8774234.html>).

⁽²⁾ <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/european-strategy-deliver-better-internet-our-children>

⁽³⁾ <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/self-regulation-better-internet-kids>

Con il sostegno della Commissione è stata inoltre creata una rete paneuropea di «centri internet più sicuro» che fornisce assistenza tramite call center nei vari paesi e promuove attività di sensibilizzazione per gestire i rischi ma anche per cogliere le opportunità di internet. Nel maggio 2013 questa rete ha pubblicato un documento che raccoglie consigli e suggerimenti su come utilizzare ask.fm e le sue impostazioni di privacy (*).

(*) http://www.saferinternet.org/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=32d5bf23-59b7-4a1b-88c3-4690c646cc7e&groupId=10137

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009775/13
to the Commission
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
 (30 August 2013)

Subject: EU-wide problem of cyber bullying

On 6 August 2013 *The Times* newspaper (UK) reported that in early August a British teenage girl had committed suicide after receiving abusive messages on a social networking site. Tragically, the girl was found hanged in her home, and it is alleged that she was driven to suicide by anonymous online messages encouraging her to kill herself. After her death, her family created a web page in her memory. It too was the target of abuse.

The father of the girl has appealed to UK Prime Minister David Cameron to take measures to protect young people using social media. In a statement, the father said: 'Websites like this are bullying websites because people can be anonymous. [...] I would appeal to David Cameron as the Prime Minister and a father to look at this and to make sure these sites are properly regulated so bullying of vulnerable people like my daughter cannot take place. [...] I don't want any other parents to go through what I am going through.'

According to the newspaper, the social networking site alleged to have facilitated the abuse is Ask.fm. It is popular with teenagers, and allows users to post anonymous comments or questions on other users' profile pages. The Latvian-run site has over 60 million users and has allegedly been linked to the deaths of at least four teenagers in the past year alone. Ciara Pugsley, 15, and Erin Gallagher, 13, both from Ireland, took their lives in separate incidents last year, reportedly after having been bullied on the site.

1. Is the Commission prepared to look into the problem of suicides linked to the social networking site Ask.fm?
2. Is the Commission prepared to contact the Latvian Government with a request that it conduct an investigation into the complaints regarding the conduct of Ask.com?
3. Is the Commission prepared to look into outlining broader EU-wide strategies to tackle the problem of cyber-abuse and cyber-bullying?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
 (21 October 2013)

The European Commission condemns cyber bullying. This is a phenomenon that is evolving very rapidly, just like many other aspects of our online behaviour.

Ask.fm commissioned a UK law firm ⁽¹⁾ to conduct an audit of its site and its safety features, and announced on 16th August a series of measures to be implemented, including the creation of a website for parents informing about the site's functions and moderation policy, to make the report abuse button more prominent on their site, as well as to add a button for users to opt-out from receiving messages from anonymous users. Therefore, the Commission does not deem it appropriate to foresee a further investigation at this stage.

The European Strategy to create a better Internet for Children ⁽²⁾ is a comprehensive approach to child safety online. It also applies to cyber bullying, but the Commission is always ready to improve. As part of the strategy, the CEO Coalition for a better Internet for Children has agreed to take practical measures improving the ease and visibility of reporting and making clear to users the implications of different privacy settings ⁽³⁾.

The Commission has also set up and supports a pan-European network of Safer Internet Centres, providing support through national networks of helplines and promoting awareness of how to manage risks and get the best out of the opportunities on the Internet. The network has produced in May 2013 a tip sheet about how to use ask.fm and its privacy settings ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Law Firm: Mishcon de Reya (<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/askfm-will-be-safer-from-online-bullying-as-owners-introduce-new-features-8774234.html>).

⁽²⁾ <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/european-strategy-deliver-better-internet-our-children>

⁽³⁾ <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/self-regulation-better-internet-kids>

⁽⁴⁾ http://www.saferinternet.org/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=32d5bf23-59b7-4a1b-88c3-4690c646cc7e&groupId=10137

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009776/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto rappresentante)**

Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)

(30 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: Traffico di stupefacenti in Algeria

Il 25 luglio 2013 il ministro dell'Interno algerino Dahou Ould Kablia ha annunciato che il paese sta per intraprendere una guerra contro i trafficanti di stupefacenti. «È una guerra contro una nuova forma di terrorismo» ha detto. I trafficanti di stupefacenti, sostenuti in passato da gruppi di islamisti del Mali, hanno dovuto adattarsi e sono diventati più aggressivi nel portare avanti il traffico di droga. Stando al ministro «sia in Marocco che in Algeria esistono gruppi estremamente organizzati», aggiungendo che in passato vi era uno «straordinario livello di coordinamento» tra i gruppi.

Secondo il sito web di notizie Maghreb i trafficanti di stupefacenti «hanno perduto i loro più importanti alleati, i terroristi, a causa della guerra in Mali e della situazione relativa alla sicurezza nel Sahel». Stando alle parole del direttore della sicurezza pubblica presso la gendarmeria nazionale, Mohamed Tahar Ben Naemane, «i trafficanti di droga non sono più in grado di pagare i terroristi per ottenere aiuto nel traffico illecito di stupefacenti. [...] Hanno invece scelto di sfidare direttamente i servizi di sicurezza algerini, in alcuni casi con armi pesanti, e questo spiega la grande quantità di sequestri nel paese». In risposta l'Algeria ha mobilitato 1 300 brigate della gendarmeria nazionale, 28 unità di ricerca, 8 brigate di ricerca e diverse unità transfrontaliere, in tutto 25 000 uomini.

Secondo un esperto in materia di sicurezza Kamel Aimeur «non è impossibile che i trafficanti di droga, pur avendo perso un alleato importante nei gruppi terroristici, diventino più aggressivi dopo la guerra nel Mali. [...] Il legame tra i gruppi terroristici e i trafficanti di droga è comprovato e per diversi anni i terroristi hanno protetto i trafficanti di droga, ovviamente hanno pagato un prezzo per tale protezione».

1. Quali misure è disposta ad adottare l'UE per sostenere le autorità algerine nella loro attività di contrasto al traffico di droga?
2. Quali misure sta adottando l'UE per monitorare i presunti legami tra i gruppi terroristici quali AQIM e i trafficanti di droga?
3. Alla luce dell'attacco di In Amenas, avvenuto nel gennaio 2013 in Algeria, quali provvedimenti sono stati adottati per migliorare il controllo sulla prevenzione di futuri attacchi ai danni di impianti petroliferi e di gas che impiegano cittadini dell'Unione europea?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(24 ottobre 2013)

L'AR/VP è al corrente dell'importanza del problema relativo al traffico di droga descritto dal ministro dell'interno algerino (oggi non più in carica). I legami tra terrorismo e criminalità organizzata, in particolare per il traffico di stupefacenti, sono reali. Molti degli strumenti e delle strutture necessari per affrontarli non differiscono da quelli per contrastare il terrorismo. Sia le autorità nazionali che la cooperazione regionale e internazionale dovrebbero sfruttare potenziali sinergie per combattere più efficacemente queste minacce alla sicurezza.

Lo sviluppo istituzionale gioca un ruolo fondamentale in questi sforzi. L'UE promuove un approccio alla lotta contro il terrorismo in Algeria basato sulla giustizia penale, nel pieno rispetto dello Stato di diritto, del diritto internazionale e dei diritti umani. Il programma d'azione annuale 2013 per la regione ENPI meridionale sostiene, nel rispetto dello stato di diritto, indagini e azioni penali nella regione del Maghreb (3 milioni di EUR). L'azione, attuata congiuntamente all'UNODC, è il primo progetto finanziato dall'UE in questa regione. Per il periodo 2013-2016 sono previste o sono in corso d'esame attività regionali e nazionali, assistenza tecnica all'interno dei vari paesi e corsi di formazione. Attraverso il programma SPRING (sostegno al partenariato, alle riforme e alla crescita inclusiva) i finanziamenti dell'UE promuovono la governance in Algeria (10 milioni di EUR), concentrandosi in particolare sullo stato di diritto, incluso l'accesso alla giustizia e la lotta contro la corruzione, sulla partecipazione dei cittadini e sulla sana gestione delle finanze pubbliche.

Dopo l'attacco terroristico del gennaio 2013 all'impianto a gas nei pressi di In Amenas, l'Algeria ha rafforzato la presenza delle sue forze di sicurezza in punti strategici delle regioni di confine. Il paese è un importante partner per la cooperazione internazionale nella lotta contro il terrorismo. Diversi Stati membri dell'UE si sono dichiarati interessati e hanno presentato proposte per collaborare con l'Algeria nella strategia antiterrorismo.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009776/13
to the Commission (Vice-President / High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)**

(30 August 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Drug trafficking in Algeria

On 25 July 2013 Algerian Minister of the Interior Dahou Ould Kablia announced that the country was waging a war against drug traffickers. 'It is a war against a new form of terrorism', he said. Drug traffickers previously supported by Islamist groups in Mali have had to adapt and become more aggressive in order to maintain their drug traffic. According to the Minister, 'there are highly organised gangs in both Morocco and Algeria'. He added that there had previously been an 'extraordinary level of coordination' between these gangs.

According to the news website Maghreb24, drug traffickers 'have lost their biggest helpers, the terrorists, due to the war in Mali and the security situation in the Sahel'. In the words of the Director for Public Security at the National Gendarmerie, Mohamed Tahar Ben Naemane, 'drug traffickers are no longer able to pay terrorists to help them smuggle drugs. [...] Instead, they have opted to take on the Algerian security services directly, sometimes with heavy weapons. This explains the large quantities seized in the country'. In response, Algeria has mobilised 1 300 National Gendarmerie brigades, 28 search divisions, eight search brigades and a number of cross-border units, in all 25 000 men.

According to security expert Kamel Aimeur, 'it is not impossible that drug traffickers, who lost a major ally in the terrorist groups, will become more aggressive after the war in Mali. [...] The link between terrorist groups and drug traffickers is proven. And for several years, these terrorists have protected drug traffickers. They paid a high price for this protection, of course'.

What steps is the EU prepared to take in support of the Algerian authorities working to combat drug trafficking?

What steps is the EU taking to monitor the alleged links between terrorist groups, such as AQIM, and drug traffickers?

In light of the attack in In Amenas, Algeria, in January 2013, what steps have been taken to improve monitoring to prevent future attacks against oil and gas installations employing European Union citizens?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(24 October 2013)

The HR/VP is aware of the importance of the drug problem described by the (then) Minister of the Interior of Algeria. The link between terrorism and organised crime, especially drug trafficking, is real. Many of the structures and instruments needed to tackle these are the same as for counter terrorism. Both national authorities and regional and international cooperation should exploit potential synergies to more effectively address these security threats.

Institution building is fundamental in these efforts. The EU promotes a criminal justice approach to the fight against terrorism in Algeria, based on full respect for the rule of law, international law and human rights. The ENPI Regional South Annual Action Programme 2013 supports rule-of-law-compliant investigations and prosecutions in the Maghreb region (EUR 3 million). This action implemented in joint management with UNODC is the first EU-financed project in the Maghreb region. In 2013-2016 regional and national activities, in-country technical assistance and training courses are foreseen or under consideration. Through its SPRING (Support to Partnership, Reform and Inclusive Growth) programme the EU finances a programme aimed to support governance in Algeria (EUR 10 million), focusing on the rule of law, including access to justice and the fight against corruption, citizens participation and sound management of public finances.

Following the January 2013 terrorist attack at the gas plant near In Amenas, Algeria has reinforced the presence of its security forces at strategic points in border regions. Algeria is an important partner in international cooperation in fight against terrorism. Several EU Member States declared interest and steps to cooperate with Algeria in counter-terrorism.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009777/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)

(30 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Cristiani copti egiziani presi di mira deliberatamente

Il 14 agosto 2013, Jessi Boulus, una ragazza appartenente alla comunità dei cristiani copti egiziani, è stata uccisa da colpi di arma da fuoco mentre stava rientrando a casa dopo una lezione di studi biblici presso la Chiesa evangelica di via Ahmed Esmat dove lo zio svolge la funzione di pastore. Si teme che ciò possa mostrare il collasso dell'autorità centrale e l'ascesa della militanza islamica. La famiglia della ragazza intende incontrare il procuratore generale del Cairo auspicando che il caso della loro figlia riceva una risposta più efficace, dato che finora le autorità hanno taciuto. I cristiani copti e le altre minoranze lamentano spesso il fatto che né la polizia né la magistratura affrontano i loro casi con la dovuta serietà.

Molti egiziani che sostengono il deposto leader della fratellanza musulmana Mohammed Morsi hanno accusato i cristiani di essere i responsabili della sua caduta. L'8 agosto 2013 quasi 10 000 persone di fede islamica hanno percorso in marcia una strada della città di Assiut densamente abitata da cristiani cantando «Islam, Islam, nonostante i cristiani». Alcuni ragazzini hanno scritto con le bombolette spray sui muri «Boicottare i cristiani». Altri hanno scritto «Tawadros è un cane», facendo riferimento al patriarca dei copti, il papa Tawadros II. Su numerose abitazioni, negozi e luoghi di culto di persone di fede cristiana sono state dipinte croci di grandi dimensioni per segnalare la confessione degli occupanti, mentre i copti hanno ricevuto minacce di morte.

1. Quali passi è disposto a intraprendere il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante per chiedere alle autorità egiziane di aprire un'indagine sull'omicidio di Jessi Boulus di 10 anni?
2. Intende il VP/AR affrontare con le competenti autorità egiziane la questione dei diritti delle minoranze e della loro protezione?
3. Come valutano i funzionari UE in servizio nella regione l'inasprimento delle tensioni tra islamisti egiziani e copti cristiani?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(25 ottobre 2013)

L'AR/VP ha condannato in termini di assoluta chiarezza l'estrema violenza, le uccisioni e gli attacchi, compresi quelli rivolti a chiese, che hanno fatto seguito alla dispersione di sit-in appoggiati dai Fratelli Musulmani avvenuta a metà agosto. Il 21 agosto 2013, l'AR/VP ha indetto una riunione straordinaria del Consiglio Affari esteri dedicata all'Egitto, nel corso della quale i ministri degli esteri dell'UE hanno adottato conclusioni che si riferivano in modo specifico anche alla distruzione di numerose chiese e agli assalti indirizzati alla comunità copta.

L'UE è a conoscenza delle coercizioni alle quali sono sottoposte diverse minoranze religiose in Egitto ed esprime profonda preoccupazione al riguardo, condannando ogni forma di intolleranza, discriminazione e violenza per motivi di religione o di credo, ovunque ciò avvenga e indipendentemente dalla religione. L'AR/VP ha ripetutamente esortato le autorità egiziane 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 contribuire ad aumentare il rispetto della libertà di religione e di credo in Egitto, l'AR/VP è pronta a impegnarsi con tutte le parti interessate nel paese e con le organizzazioni regionali e internazionali che condividono i valori e gli obiettivi dell'UE su questo tema.

L'UE ritiene che la cooperazione e il dialogo politico costituiscano i canali più appropriati per incoraggiare e fare pressione sul governo del Cairo in modo che esso intraprenda azioni concrete per proteggere la comunità copta e altre minoranze religiose.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009777/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
 (30 August 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Deliberate targeting of Egyptian Coptic Christians

On 14 August 2013, a ten-year-old Egyptian Coptic Christian girl, Jessi Boulus, was shot as she walked home from a Bible study class at the Ahmed Esmat Street Evangelical Church in Cairo, where her uncle serves as a pastor. There are concerns that this could be illustrative of the collapse of central authority and the rise in Islamist militancy. The family of the girl plan to meet with Cairo's central prosecutor hoping that their daughter's case will receive a better response, as there has been silence from the authorities up to now. Coptic Christians and other minorities often complain that neither the police nor the judiciary take their cases seriously.

Many Egyptians who back the ousted Muslim Brotherhood leader Mohammed Morsi have accused Christians of being responsible for his downfall. On 8 August 2013, up to 10 000 Islamists marched down the heavily Christian street in the town of Assiut and chanted 'Islamic, Islamic, despite the Christians'. A number of kids spray-painted on the walls 'Boycott the Christians'. Others wrote 'Tawadros is a dog' referring to the Patriarch of the Copts, Pope Tawadros II. Many Christians' homes, shops and places of worship have been marked with large painted crosses, to identify the confession of the occupants and Copts have been subject to death threats.

1. What steps is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to take in order to ask that the Egyptian authorities take measures to investigate the killing of 10-year-old Jessi Boulus?
2. Does the VP/HR plan to discuss the issue of minority rights and their protection with the relevant Egyptian authorities?
3. What is the assessment of EU officials in the region with regard to the heightening of tensions between Egyptian Islamists and Coptic Christians?

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

The HR/VP condemned in the clearest possible terms the extreme violence, killings and attacks, including on churches, that followed the dispersal in mid-August of the Muslim Brotherhood supported sit-ins. On 21 August 2013, the HR/VP convened an extra-ordinary Foreign Affairs Council on Egypt where EU Foreign Ministers adopted conclusions which also specifically referred to the destruction of many churches and the targeting of the Coptic community.

The EU is aware and concerned about the constraints that different religious minorities face in Egypt 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. The HR/VP is repeatedly calling 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 HR/VP is keen to engage with the relevant stakeholders in the country as well as with the regional and international organisations sharing the EU's values and objectives in this respect.

The EU considers that cooperation and political dialogue are the most appropriate channels to encourage and put pressure on Cairo's government so that it will undertake concrete actions in order to protect Copts and other religious minorities.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009778/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)

(30 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: Omicidio di un politico laico tunisino

Il 26 luglio 2013 il politico laico tunisino Mohamed Brahmi è stato brutalmente ucciso nella città meridionale di Sidi Bouzid e in risposta il più grande sindacato del paese ha indetto uno sciopero generale. Mohamed Brahmi ha svolto la funzione di coordinatore del movimento popolare di sinistra ed è stato anche un oppositore del governo guidato dagli islamisti. Mentre stava uscendo dalla sua abitazione nella periferia di Tunisi è stato tragicamente ucciso da 11 proiettili sparati a bruciapelo.

Stando al quotidiano britannico *The Times*: «È stato crivellato di colpi davanti a sua moglie e ai suoi bambini». Secondo altre versioni prima dell'attentato avrebbe ricevuto una telefonata che lo avrebbe indotto a uscire di casa. È stato ucciso nel giorno della repubblica celebrato in Tunisia, e tra i tunisini cresce la rabbia sul modo di operare del governo e per come sta gestendo la questione. L'atroce omicidio di Brahmi ha soltanto alimentato il livello di malcontento nel paese. All'inizio di quest'anno è stato ucciso un altro politico laico, Chokri Belaid, presumibilmente per mano di estremisti islamici. Stando a un servizio di un notiziario della BBC numerosi giovani tunisini temono che le loro speranze di democrazia vengano annientate dall'intolleranza delle fazioni jihadiste islamiche armate che operano nel paese.

1. Qual è la posizione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante circa l'omicidio del politico laico Mohamed Brahmi, il secondo omicidio di alto profilo commesso quest'anno in Tunisia?
2. Quale è la valutazione dei funzionari dell'UE in servizio in Tunisia in merito al coinvolgimento e alla provenienza degli elementi islamici estremisti che operano nel paese e che stanno prendendo di mira i leader laici?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(25 ottobre 2013)

Nella dichiarazione rilasciata il 25 luglio 2013 l'AR/VP ha condannato fermamente l'assassinio di M. Brahmi, come aveva fatto nel febbraio 2013 in seguito all'uccisione di C. Belaid. L'UE chiede lo svolgimento tempestivo di indagini efficaci su questi omicidi politici affinché i colpevoli siano assicurati alla giustizia e processati con la massima rapidità. Su un piano politico, l'UE è convinta che il rapido completamento della Costituzione e l'organizzazione delle prossime elezioni politiche costituiscano la miglior risposta collettiva a questi ignobili delitti. Gli esponenti politici e i rappresentanti della società civile devono trovare il necessario compromesso, in uno spirito di consenso, tolleranza e rispetto reciproco, per far progredire il processo di transizione.

L'UE è pienamente consapevole delle minacce terroristiche nella regione, comprese quelle in Tunisia, e segue da vicino gli sviluppi della situazione. Attraverso i suoi strumenti di cooperazione, l'UE sostiene il rafforzamento dello Stato di diritto in tutta la regione e mantiene un dialogo con la Tunisia sulla sicurezza delle frontiere e sulla riforma del settore della sicurezza.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009778/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
 (30 August 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Assassination of Tunisian secular politician

On 26 July 2013 the Tunisian secular politician Mohamed Brahmi was brutally killed in the southern city of Sidi Bouzid. In response, the country's largest trade union called for a general strike. Mr Brahmi was the coordinator of the leftist Popular Movement. He was also a critic of the Islamist-led government. As he was leaving his home in the suburbs of Tunis, he was tragically killed by 11 bullets shot at point-blank range.

According to *The Times* newspaper (UK): 'He was riddled with bullets in front of his wife and children'. Other reports claim that just before the shooting he had received a telephone call at his home prompting him to leave the house. He was killed on Tunisia's Republic Day, and there is growing anger among Tunisians at the way in which the government is functioning and how it is handling this issue. The atrocious killing of Brahmi has only fuelled the level of discontent in the country. Earlier this year, another secular politician, Chokri Belaïd, was killed, allegedly the work of extremist Islamists. According to a BBC News report, many young Tunisians are fearful that their hopes for democracy are being crushed by the intolerance of armed Islamist jihadi factions in the country.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President / High Representative on the murder of the secular politician Mohamed Brahmi, the second such high-profile assassination in Tunisia this year?
2. What is the assessment of EU officials in Tunis of the involvement and provenance of the extremist Islamist elements in the country who are targeting secular leaders?

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

As expressed in the statement of 25 July 2013, the HR/VP firmly condemned the murder of M. Brahmi, as HR/VP also did following the assassination of C. Belaïd (February 2013). The EU calls for prompt and effective investigations on these political assassinations so that perpetrators can be brought to justice and judged without delays. Politically, the EU is convinced that the rapid finalisation of the Constitution and the organisation of the next general elections are the best collective reply to those vile murders. Political actors as well as civil society representatives need to find the necessary compromise in a spirit of consensus, tolerance and mutual respect, so that the transition process can move forward.

The EU is well aware of the terrorist threats in the region, including in Tunisia and is closely following the development of the situation. Through its cooperation instruments, the EU is supporting the strengthening of the rule of law in the country and has a dialogue with Tunisia on border's security and security sector reform.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009779/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

Mario Borghezio (NI)

(30 agosto 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Tutela del patrimonio archeologico razzato in Egitto

Durante la recente fase di «guerra civile» in Egitto è avvenuto, pressoché indisturbatamente, un vero e proprio saccheggio generalizzato di preziosi reperti archeologici.

Da mesi, infatti, approfittando del caos e dell'attenzione dei media concentrata solo sulle piazze del Cairo, la furia iconoclasta islamista si è abbattuta attaccando molti siti archeologici, i musei più lontani dalla capitale sono stati devastati, le piramidi meno famose e meno protette sono state violate e le loro pietre sono state di nuovo usate per costruire muri e case.

Può l'Alto Rappresentante dell'UE far sapere come e con quali modalità intende intervenire a tutela di un così prezioso patrimonio culturale?

Quali iniziative intende attuare affinché sia avviato il recupero dei beni sottratti, che rischiano di arricchire il traffico internazionale di beni archeologici?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(25 ottobre 2013)

L'Unione europea interviene in tutela del patrimonio culturale egiziano tramite discussioni politiche e tecniche con le autorità e le parti interessate, oltre che con l'attuazione di programmi di cooperazione specifici. L'Unione sta seguendo attentamente la situazione del patrimonio culturale con i suoi partner, le autorità egiziane, gli Stati membri e l'UNESCO ⁽¹⁾.

Si tengono regolarmente riunioni ad alto livello con il ministro delle Antichità, oltre che riunioni tecniche, per individuare adeguati programmi di cooperazione. A questo proposito la delegazione dell'UE ha discusso con gli Stati membri e con i rappresentanti del ministero degli Affari esteri e del ministero delle Antichità a proposito del traffico illecito e del saccheggio dei beni culturali egiziani.

Di conseguenza l'UE sta preparando l'attuazione di due seminari, finanziati nel quadro dello strumento TAIEX ⁽²⁾ e incentrati sulle misure da adottare in Egitto per una lotta più efficace al saccheggio dei beni culturali ai fini di tutelare il patrimonio culturale a rischio e sulle modalità di contrasto del traffico illecito. Inoltre l'UE sta preparando programmi di follow up per rafforzare le capacità delle autorità responsabili e per sensibilizzare i cittadini sulla necessità di tutelare il patrimonio culturale a rischio. L'Unione europea si è inoltre impegnata a livello regionale con i programmi Euromed Heritage (fino a gennaio 2013) e Euromed Police (in corso).

L'UE continuerà a collaborare con le autorità egiziane per il recupero e la restituzione dei beni culturali in virtù del quadro di cooperazione UE-Egitto, rispettando la divisione delle competenze con gli Stati membri e gli strumenti internazionali pertinenti per il recupero e la restituzione.

⁽¹⁾ (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, Organizzazione delle Nazioni unite per l'educazione, la scienza e la cultura).

⁽²⁾ Assistenza tecnica e scambio di informazioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009779/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Mario Borghezio (NI)
 (30 August 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Protection of archaeological heritage plundered in Egypt

During the recent period of 'civil war' in Egypt, people have — virtually undisturbed — been looting precious archaeological finds all over the country.

For months now, taking advantage of the chaos and of the media attention that has been focused only on Cairo's squares, Islamist iconoclastic fury has been unleashed, with attacks on numerous archaeological sites. Museums the furthest away from the capital have been destroyed and the less famous, less protected pyramids have been violated and their stones re-used to build walls and houses.

Can the High Representative of the EU say what action she intends to take to protect such a precious cultural heritage?

What steps will she take to initiate the recovery of these stolen assets, which are likely to bolster the international trafficking of archaeological heritage?

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

The European Union is involved in the protection of Egyptian cultural heritage through policy-level and technical discussions with authorities and stakeholders as well as through the implementation of specific cooperation programmes. The European Union is closely monitoring the situation of cultural heritage with its close partners, the Egyptian authorities, Member States and Unesco ⁽¹⁾.

There are continuous high-level meetings with the Minister of State for Antiquities, as well as on the technical level to identify adequate cooperation programmes. In this respect, the EU Delegation discussed with Member States and representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and of the Ministry of State of Antiquities the illicit trafficking and looting of Egyptian cultural property.

As a result, the EU is preparing the implementation of two workshops financed under the TAIEX ⁽²⁾ instrument, concentrating on measures to be implemented in Egypt to better fight looting of cultural heritage for the protection of cultural heritage at risk and on countering illicit trafficking. Moreover, the EU is preparing future follow-up programmes aiming at reinforcing the capacities of responsible authorities and raising awareness of the need for protecting cultural heritage at risk. Furthermore, the European Union has been working at the regional level through the Euromed Heritage (until January 2013) and Euromed Police Programmes (ongoing).

The EU will continue to cooperate with the Egyptian authorities on the recovery and restitution of cultural property within the context of the EU-Egypt cooperation framework, and respecting the division of competences with Member States as well as the relevant international instruments for recovery and restitution.

⁽¹⁾ United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation.

⁽²⁾ Technical Assistance and Information Exchange.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-009780/13

za Komisijo

Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)

(30. avgust 2013)

Zadeva: E-zdravstvene storitve

Tehnološki napredek in uporaba tehnologije sta izjemno pomembna pri približevanju zdravstvenega sistema uporabnikom in povečevanju njegove učinkovitosti. Z ustrezno uporabo e-zdravstvenih storitev in izmenjavo informacij naj bi tudi izboljšali rezultate zdravljenja, z bolj kakovostno zdravstveno oskrbo, odpravljanjem neenakosti v zdravstvu ter večjo dostopnostjo kakovostnih zdravstvenih storitev pa zagotovili cenovno dostopnejšo zdravstveno nego. Med glavna vprašanja, na katera je treba poiskati odgovor, sodijo različna obravnavna zaradi spola in različne možnosti zaradi dostopa do interneta, pa tudi dostop do zdravstvenih informacij.

— Kako namerava Komisija spodbujati e-zdravstvene storitve med starejšimi, ki nimajo znanja o informacijskih tehnologijah?

— Kako Komisija spodbuja uvajanje e-zdravstvenih storitev v državah v razvoju, zlasti med ženskami, ki običajno ne uporabljajo tehnologije, prav tako pa jim manjka osnovno znanje o informacijskih tehnologijah?

Odgovor komisarke Neelie Kroes v imenu Komisije

(21. oktober 2013)

Opolnomočenost pacienta, digitalna pismenost na zdravstvenem področju, h končnemu uporabniku usmerjen pristop in spodbujanje inovativnih rešitev za starejše generacije so bistvenega pomena za uspešno uvedbo e-zdravja v okviru Akcijskega načrta za e-zdravje za obdobje 2012–2020 – Inovativno zdravstveno varstvo za 21. stoletje⁽¹⁾. Komisija tako s programom za konkurenčnost in inovativnost podpira in bo z Obzorjem 2020 še nadalje podpirala ukrepe za povečanje digitalne pismenosti državljanov na zdravstvenem področju. Namen nedavnega pilotnega evropskega partnerstva za inovacije za dejavno in zdravo staranje je povečati obseg uspešnih inovacij, vključno z rešitvami na področju e-zdravja, in izmenjati pomembne prakse, ki se razvijajo in uvajajo s sodelovanjem različnih deležnikov iz celotne Evrope.

Več kot sto organizacij, ki so končne uporabnice storitev, je vključenih v raziskovalne in inovacijske projekte, ki jih financira EU, da se tako pridobijo jasni dokazi o njihovem socialno-ekonomskem vplivu. Tako je na primer projekt CommonWell zajemal vrsto pilotnih storitev in je vključeval več kot 500 starejših državljanov in njihove skrbnike. Rezultati ovrednotenja so dostopni na <http://commonwell.eu/commonwell-home/>.

Eden od ukrepov iz akcijskega načrta za e-zdravje 2012–2020 je tudi spodbujanje razprav o e-zdravju na globalni ravni za razvoj spretnosti na področju informacijske in komunikacijske tehnologije (IKT). Pomembno je poudariti, da v državah v razvoju že obstajajo številni primeri uporabe inovativnih orodij na področju zdravstvenega varstva, na primer Mobile Alliance for Maternal Action (MAMA), ki nosečnicam in novim materam po mobilnih telefonih v Bangladešu postopno zagotavlja najpomembnejše informacije, ali številni ukrepi na področju nadzora tobaka, npr. za preprečevanje in prenehanje kajenja ter sledenje nezakoniti trgovini.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0736:FIN:SL:PDF>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009780/13
to the Commission
Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)
 (30 August 2013)

Subject: E-health services

Advancing and using technology is an essential means of making the healthcare system more accessible and effective for consumers. The appropriate use of e-health and information exchange also aims to improve health outcomes and make healthcare more affordable by improving the quality of medical care, decreasing health disparities, and enhancing access to quality medical services. However, the main issues that need to be addressed include gender and digital gaps, as well as access to health information.

— How will the Commission promote e-health services among elderly people lacking IT skills?

— How is the Commission encouraging the implementation of e-health services in developing countries, especially among women who usually do not have access to technology and who lack basic IT knowledge?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
 (21 October 2013)

Patient empowerment, digital health literacy, end-user centred approach and promotion of innovative solutions towards older generations are essential for successful eHealth deployment as stated in the eHealth Action Plan 2012 — 2020: Innovative healthcare for the 21st century ⁽¹⁾. Therefore, the Commission supports via the Competitiveness and Innovation Programme and will continue supporting under Horizon 2020, activities aiming at increasing citizens' digital health literacy. The recent European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing aims to scale up successful innovation including eHealth solutions and to exchange notable practices which are developed and deployed by cooperation among various stakeholders from across all of Europe.

More than one hundred end user organisations have been involved in EU funded research and innovation projects to ensure clear evidence of socioeconomic impact. For example the CommonWell project consisted of a series of pilot services with involvement of more than five hundred older citizens as well as their carers. The evaluation results can be found at <http://commonwell.eu/commonwell-home/>

One of the actions listed in the eHealth Action plan 2012 — 2020 is the promotion of policy discussions on eHealth at global level to develop ICT (Information and Communication Technology) skills. It is worth mentioning that there is already a number of good examples of using innovative tools in healthcare in developing countries such as the Mobile Alliance for Maternal Action (MAMA) which was created to provide new and expectant moms with vital stage-based information via mobile phones in Bangladesh or a series of tobacco control activities e.g. for smoking prevention, cessation and tracking illicit trade.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0736:FIN:EN:PDF>

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor P-009781/13

upućeno Komisiji

Oleg Valjalo (S&D)

(30. kolovoza 2013.)

Predmet: Spor Komisije s Hrvatskom u vezi s europskim uhidbenim nalogom

Kao i moje biračko tijelo, prilično sam zabrinut oko mogućeg ishoda spora koji je u tijeku između Komisije i Republike Hrvatske u vezi s europskim uhidbenim nalogom.

S obzirom na negativan učinak koji bi sankcije Komisije koje je najavila povjerenica Reding mogle imati na Hrvatsku, a time neizostavno i na moje birače, bio bih zahvalan ako bi Komisija mogla pojasniti koje konkretne mjere namjerava poduzeti ako:

1. spor između Komisije i Republike Hrvatske u vezi s europskim uhidbenim nalogom potraje u predstojećim tjednima/mjesecima;
2. Vlada Republike Hrvatske, u suradnji s hrvatskim Ministarstvom pravosuđa, postigne djelomičan ili uglavnom zadovoljavajući sporazum s Komisijom?

Odgovor gđe Reding u ime Komisije

(10. listopada 2013.)

Na sastanku potpredsjednice Reding i hrvatskog ministra pravosuđa Miljenića 25. rujna 2013., Hrvatska se obvezala da će bez odgode i bezuvjetno napraviti potrebne izmjene zakona o provedbi Okvirne odluke o europskom uhidbenom nalogu kako bi otklonila vremensko ograničenje primjene europskog uhidbenog naloga u Hrvatskoj koja je država članica izvršenja. Izmijenjeni bi zakon stupio na snagu najkasnije 1. siječnja 2014.

Komisija pozdravlja odluke Republike Hrvatske kojima će se osigurati da počinitelji budu privedeni pravdi te napominje kako će se brzim, učinkovitim i bezuvjetnim usklađivanjem zakona o provedbi europskog uhidbenog naloga s pravnom stečevinom Europske unije omogućiti da svi zahtjevi za predaju osumnjičenih ili osuđenih počinitelja budu obrađeni u okviru sustava europskog uhidbenog naloga bez obzira na vrijeme počinjenja kaznenog djela. Komisija će pomno pratiti ovaj postupak te će u trenutku kada hrvatski zakon bude donesen ponovno ocijeniti njegovu usklađenost s Okvirnom odlukom o europskom uhidbenom nalogu.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009781/13
to the Commission
Oleg Valjalo (S&D)
(30 August 2013)

Subject: Commission dispute with Croatia regarding the European Arrest Warrant

Sharing the concern of my constituents, I am somewhat worried about the possible outcomes of the ongoing dispute between the Commission and the Republic of Croatia regarding the European Arrest Warrant (EAW).

Given the negative effect that the Commission's sanctions — announced by Commissioner Reding — might have on Croatia, and therefore inevitably on my constituents, I would be grateful if the Commission could clarify the exact steps it is planning to take if:

1. The dispute between the Commission and the Republic of Croatia regarding the EAW continues in the coming weeks/months;
2. The Croatian Government, in cooperation with the Croatian Ministry of Justice, reaches a partial or largely satisfactory agreement with the Commission?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(10 October 2013)

On 25 September 2013 at a meeting between Vice-President Reding and Croatian Minister of Justice Miljenić, Croatia has given a commitment to swiftly and unconditionally make the required changes in the law implementing the European arrest warrant Framework Decision in order to remove the time-limitation on Croatia's application of the European arrest warrant as an executing state. The modified law would enter into force at the latest on 1 January 2014.

The Commission welcomes the steps taken by the Republic of Croatia to ensure that criminals are brought to justice and notes that the swift, effective and unconditional alignment of the law implementing the European arrest warrant in line with the *acquis communautaire* will allow for all requests for the surrender of suspected and convicted criminals to be dealt within the European arrest warrant system irrespective of the date of commission of the crime. The Commission will closely watch this process and once the Croatian law is enacted then assess whether it is, again, in line with the European arrest warrant Framework Decision.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009782/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(2 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Κακοποίηση παιδιών και σεξουαλική παρενόχληση στην Τουρκία

Σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα της εφημερίδας *Hurriyet Daily News*, τα ποινικά μητρώα καταδεικνύουν ότι οι περιπτώσεις κακοποίησης παιδιών και σεξουαλικής παρενόχλησης έχουν αυξηθεί σημαντικά μεταξύ 2008 και 2012 στην Τουρκία.

Η περιοχή του Μαρμαρά κατέχει την πρώτη θέση όσον αφορά την κακοποίηση παιδιών, με 29,1% των υποθέσεων για τις οποίες κινήθηκε διαδικασία το 2012, ενώ η Κεντρική Ανατολία έρχεται δεύτερη με 16,7%. Η περιοχή του Μαρμαρά ήταν επίσης η περιοχή με τις περισσότερες αγωγές για σεξουαλική παρενόχληση το 2012 (32,1%), ενώ στη δεύτερη θέση βρίσκεται η περιοχή του Αιγαίου (18,3%).

Όσον αφορά τις ανθρωποκτονίες εκ προθέσεως, η περιοχή του Μαρμαρά ήταν και πάλι η πρώτη στη λίστα, αριθμώντας περίπου 3 405 υποθέσεις το 2012, ενώ η Νότια Ανατολία ήρθε δεύτερη με 2 764 υποθέσεις.

Η Επιτροπή παρακαλείται να απαντήσει στις εξής ερωτήσεις:

1. Ποια είναι η άποψή της σχετικά με αυτό το ζήτημα;
2. Ποια μέτρα πρέπει να ληφθούν για να προστατευθούν τα δικαιώματα των ευάλωτων παιδιών στην Τουρκία;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή είναι ενήμερη για το θέμα που θίγει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου. Η βία κατά των παιδιών και οι πρόωροι γάμοι εξακολουθούν να προκαλούν ανησυχία.

Οι τουρκικές αρχές έχουν λάβει και σχεδιάζουν να λάβουν μέτρα για την αντιμετώπιση του ζητήματος. Στις 4 Οκτωβρίου 2012, το πρωθυπουργικό γραφείο εξέδωσε εγκύκλιο που εξετάζει την καθιέρωση κέντρων παρακολούθησης για παιδιά σε νοσοκομεία και ιδρύματα που υπάγονται στο Υπουργείο Υγείας, με απώτερο στόχο την πρόληψη της κακοποίησης παιδιών και την παροχή φροντίδας στα παιδιά που είναι θύματα κακοποίησης. Τα κέντρα αυτά επιτρέπουν την ταυτόχρονη διεξαγωγή όλων των δικαστικών και των ιατρικών διαδικασιών στο πλαίσιο ενός κέντρου, προκειμένου να μην προκληθεί περαιτέρω βλάβη στο παιδί. Έχει οριστεί αναπληρωτής διαμεσολαβητής ειδικά αρμόδιος για τα δικαιώματα των γυναικών και των παιδιών. Ο Υπουργός Οικογένειας και Κοινωνικών Πολιτικών έχει αναλάβει την ολοκλήρωση μιας εθνικής στρατηγικής για τη βία κατά των παιδιών, η οποία θα συμπληρώνει τις προσπάθειες που καταβάλλονται για την αντιμετώπιση της ενδοοικογενειακής βίας και της βίας στα σχολεία, της κακοποίησης, της εκμετάλλευσης και της παραμέλησης.

Η Τουρκία, ως υποψήφια χώρα στην πορεία προς την προσχώρησή της στην ΕΕ, οφείλει να ενισχύσει τις προσπάθειές της προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση και να εξασφαλίσει ότι τα μέτρα που έχουν ληφθεί και όσα πρόκειται να ληφθούν θα έχουν βιώσιμα αποτελέσματα. Η Επιτροπή θα εξακολουθήσει να παρακολουθεί επισταμένως τις εξελίξεις.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009782/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Child abuse and sexual harassment in Turkey

According to the Turkish news site *Hurriyet Daily News*, criminal records show that the incidence of child abuse and sexual harassment increased drastically in Turkey between 2008 and 2012.

The Marmara region is ranked number one as regards child abuse, with 29.1% of cases opened in 2012; and Central Anatolia is second, with 16.7%. Marmara was also the region with the most sexual harassment lawsuits filed in 2012 (32.1%), followed by the Aegean region (18.3%).

With regard to intentional homicide, the Marmara region again topped the list, with some 3 405 cases filed in 2012, while South-Eastern Anatolia came second, with 2 764 cases.

The Commission is asked to answer the following:

1. What is its position on this matter?
2. What measures should be taken in order to protect the rights of vulnerable children in Turkey?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(25 October 2013)

The Commission follows the issue raised by the Honourable Member closely. Violence against children and early marriages remain issues of concern.

Turkish authorities have taken, and are planning to take steps to address the issue. With a view to preventing child abuse and treating children victims of abuse, a Circular was issued on 4 October 2012 by the Prime Ministry envisaging the establishment of child monitoring centres within hospitals and institutions affiliated to the Ministry of Health. They allow all judicial and medical procedures to be concluded within one centre and at once, in order to prevent further harm to the child. A Deputy Ombudsman was made specifically responsible for women's and children's rights. The Minister for Family and Social Policies undertook to finalise a National Strategy on Violence against Children, which would complement ongoing efforts to address domestic violence and violence in schools, abuse, exploitation and neglect.

Turkey, as a candidate country on its EU accession path, needs to strengthen efforts in this direction and achieve sustainable impact of the measures adopted and of those planned to be adopted. The Commission will keep on monitoring developments closely.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009783/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(2 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Η δέσμη μέτρων εκδημοκρατισμού της Τουρκίας

Η τουρκική ημερήσια εφημερίδα Taraf έχει ως πρωτοσέλιδο τη δέσμη μέτρων εκδημοκρατισμού που η κυβέρνηση πρόκειται να δημοσιοποιήσει αυτήν την εβδομάδα.

Η εφημερίδα επικρίνει το γεγονός ότι η αστυνομία θα έχει το δικαίωμα να θέτει υπό κράτηση ύποπτους εγκληματικών πράξεων, χωρίς την έγκριση του εισαγγελέα. Η νέα αυτή ρύθμιση θα ανοίξει ωστόσο τον δρόμο για μαζικές κρατήσεις σε περιπτώσεις δημόσιων ταραχών, όπως οι διαδηλώσεις στο πάρκο Γκεζί. «Η δίκη χωρίς κράτηση θα αποτελέσει την εξαίρεση με τη νέα ρύθμιση», αναφέρει η εφημερίδα. Επιπλέον, η δέσμη μέτρων θα προβλέπει βαρύτερες ποινές για διαδηλωτές.

Η Taraf περιγράφει τη δέσμη ως «ένα ακόμη βήμα στην προσπάθεια μετατροπής της Τουρκίας σε αστυνομοκρατούμενο κράτος» και ως τμήμα του νέου προγράμματος δράσης της τουρκικής κυβέρνησης που αποσκοπεί στην αποτροπή νέου κύματος διαδηλώσεων στο Γκεζί και στην αντιμετώπιση του «συνδρόμου Γκεζί της κυβέρνησης».

Η δέσμη περιλαμβάνει, μεταξύ άλλων, τη σύσταση ανεξάρτητης επιτροπής παρακολούθησης για την αποτροπή των βασανιστηρίων στην αστυνομία και την χωροφυλακή, σε μία προσπάθεια εκπλήρωσης των απαιτήσεων της ΕΕ. Ωστόσο, η Taraf επισημαίνει ότι η αστυνομία δεν θα παρακολουθείται από ανεξάρτητους επιθεωρητές, αλλά από την γραφειοκρατία, και ότι δεν θα υπάρχει εποπτεία των δυνάμεων ασφαλείας.

Υπό το φως των προαναφερθέντων, η Επιτροπή παρακαλείται να απαντήσει στις εξής ερωτήσεις:

1. Πλήρως η νέα αυτή δέσμη μέτρων εκδημοκρατισμού τα πρότυπα που όρισε η ΕΕ για την Τουρκία ως υποψήφια για ένταξη χώρα;
2. Θα προστατεύσει αυτή η δέσμη τα βασικά ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα των Τούρκων πολιτών, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του δικαιώματος στην έκφραση, και θα ενθαρρύνει τη συμμετοχική δημοκρατία, σύμφωνα με τους κανόνες και τις πεποιθήσεις της ΕΕ;
3. Είναι η Επιτροπή αισιόδοξη για τις μεταρρυθμίσεις της Τουρκίας όσον αφορά τη δικαιοσύνη και τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή παρακολούθησε προσεκτικά τη συνέντευξη τύπου του πρωθυπουργού Ερντογάν στις 30 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013, κατά την οποία ανακοινώθηκε η δέσμη μέτρων εκδημοκρατισμού στην οποία αναφέρεται το Αξιότιμο Μέλος, και επικροτεί την αναφορά του πρωθυπουργού στον καθοδηγητικό ρόλο του κεκτημένου της ΕΕ στις τουρκικές μεταρρυθμίσεις.

Τα μέτρα που ανακοινώθηκαν προσφέρουν προοπτικές προόδου σε σειρά σημαντικών θεμάτων, όπως η χρήση γλωσσών πλην της τουρκικής σε ορισμένες περιπτώσεις, καθώς και σχετικά με τα δικαιώματα των μειονοτήτων, όπως είναι η περίπτωση της μονής Mor Gabriel. Επιπλέον, τα μέτρα δεσμεύουν την Τουρκία να πραγματοποιήσει αλλαγές στο τρέχον υψηλό όριο κοινοβουλευτικής εκπροσώπησης και να επεκτείνει την κρατική χρηματοδότηση των πολιτικών κομμάτων, γεγονός το οποίο αναμένεται να αυξήσει την πολυφωνία. Η Επιτροπή ελπίζει επίσης ότι η εξαγγελία νόμου για την προστασία των προσωπικών δεδομένων θα διευκολύνει τη συνεργασία μεταξύ της ΕΕ και της Τουρκίας σε διάφορους τομείς.

Η Επιτροπή αναμένει πρόοδο σε αυτά τα ζητήματα, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της πλήρους δέσμευσης των κομμάτων της αντιπολίτευσης, και θα παρακολουθεί στενά τη μετατροπή των προτάσεων σε συγκεκριμένες δράσεις, καθώς και την υλοποίησή τους.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011262/13

aan de Commissie

Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)

(3 oktober 2013)

Betreft: „Democratization and Human Rights Package” van de Turkse regering

De Turkse regering heeft haar „Democratization and Human Rights Package” gepresenteerd. Daarin staat onder „Right to Assembly and Demonstration” het volgende:

- Rallying places and routes are to be determined by civilian authorities in consultation with political parties, trade unions and related bodies;
 - Time periods for rallies and demonstrations are extended;
 - Government commissioner will no longer be needed to decide on rallies and demonstrations;
 - Board of Assembly Arrangement is strengthened and the authority to decide on terminating rallies and demonstrations is assigned to the Regulatory Authority.
1. Is de Commissie bekend met het „Democratization and Human Rights Package” van de Turkse regering⁽¹⁾? Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie dit? Welke verwachtingen heeft zij ervan?
 2. Hoe interpreteert resp. hoe serieus neemt de Commissie de onder „Right to Assembly and Demonstration” aangekondigde maatregelen, nu in het rapport „Gezi Park Protests — Brutal Denial of the Right to Peaceful Assembly in Turkey”⁽²⁾ van Amnesty International juist wordt geconcludeerd „dat de Turkse autoriteiten zich rond de protesten van deze zomer op grote schaal schuldig hebben gemaakt aan mensenrechtenschendingen”?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie

(4 november 2013)

De Commissie heeft zorgvuldig geluisterd naar de persconferentie van eerste minister Erdoğan op 30 september 2013 waarin hij het democratiseringspakket presenteerde waarnaar het geachte Parlements lid verwijst, en is verheugd over de verwijzing door de eerste minister naar de leidende rol van de EU-acquis bij de Turkse hervormingen.

De aangekondigde maatregelen bieden kans op vooruitgang op een reeks belangrijke thema's, zoals het gebruik van andere talen dan het Turks in een aantal gevallen en de rechten van minderheden, zoals in het geval van het Mor Gabriël-klooster. De maatregelen verplichten Turkije ertoe iets te doen aan de huidige hoge drempelwaarden voor de vertegenwoordiging in het Parlement en aan het opener maken van de nationale overheidsfinanciering voor politieke partijen, wat moet leiden tot meer pluralisme. De Commissie hoopt eveneens dat de aankondiging van een wet inzake gegevensbescherming de samenwerking tussen de EU en Turkije op diverse gebieden zal vergemakkelijken.

De Commissie verheugt zich op de vooruitgang bij deze zaken, met inbegrip van het feit dat de oppositiepartijen hierbij volledig zullen worden betrokken, en zij zal van nabij volgen hoe de voorstellen in concrete maatregelen worden vertaald. Zij zal de uitvoering ervan op de voet volgen.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.akparti.org.tr/english/haberler/democratization-and-human-rights-package/52628>.

⁽²⁾ <http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/EUR44/022/2013/en/0ba8c4cc-b059-4b88-9c52-8fbd652c6766/eur440222013en.pdf>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009783/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
 (2 September 2013)

Subject: Turkey's democratisation package

The Turkish daily newspaper *Taraf* gives front-page coverage to the democratisation package that the government is expected to unveil this week.

The paper criticises that the police will be authorised to detain suspected criminals without the prior approval of the prosecutor. This new arrangement will pave the way for mass detentions in cases of public unrest, such as the Gezi park protests. 'Trial without detention will become exceptional with the new arrangement,' the paper says. In addition, the package will envisage heavier penalties for protesters.

Taraf describes the package as 'another step in the bid for transforming Turkey into a police state', and part of the new agenda of the Turkish government to prevent a new wave of Gezi protests and to deal with the 'government's Gezi syndrome.'

The package includes, among others, the establishment of an independent monitoring commission to prevent torture by the police and the gendarmerie, in an effort to meet EU demands. However, *Taraf* highlights that the police will not be monitored by independent inspectors, but by the bureaucracy, and that there will be no oversight of the security forces.

In this light, could the Commission answer the following:

1. Does this new democratisation package meet the standards set by the EU for Turkey as a candidate country?
2. Will this package protect the basic human rights of Turkish citizens, including freedom of expression, and encourage participative democracy in line with EU rules and beliefs?
3. Does the Commission look favourably upon Turkey's reforms with regard to justice and human rights?

Question for written answer E-011262/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
 (3 October 2013)

Subject: 'Democratization and Human Rights Package' from the Turkish Government

The Turkish Government has presented its 'Democratization and Human Rights Package'. It states the following under the heading 'Right to Assembly and Demonstration':

- Rallying places and routes are to be determined by civilian authorities in consultation with political parties, trade unions and related bodies;
- Time periods for rallies and demonstrations are extended;
- Government commissioner will no longer be needed to decide on rallies and demonstrations;
- Board of Assembly Arrangement is strengthened and the authority to decide on terminating rallies and demonstrations is assigned to the Regulatory Authority.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the Turkish Government's 'Democratization and Human Rights Package'? ⁽¹⁾ What is the Commission's view of it? What expectations does it have of it?

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.akparti.org.tr/english/haberler/democratization-and-human-rights-package/52628>

2. How does the Commission interpret and how seriously does it take the measures announced under 'Right to Assembly and Demonstration', given now the conclusion just made in the report 'Gezi Park Protests — Brutal Denial of the Right to Peaceful Assembly in Turkey' ⁽²⁾ from Amnesty International that Turkish authorities have committed human rights violations on a massive scale this summer against the protests?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(4 November 2013)

The Commission has listened carefully to the press conference of Prime Minister Erdoğan on 30 September 2013 in which he announced the democratisation package referred to by the Honourable Member, and welcomes the reference by the Prime Minister to the guiding role of the EU *acquis* in Turkey's reforms.

The announced measures hold out the prospect of progress on a range of important issues, including use of languages other than Turkish in a number of instances and minority rights such as the case of the Mor Gabriel Monastery. The measures also commit Turkey to address changes to the current high thresholds for representation in Parliament and to open up state financing of political parties, which should increase pluralism. The Commission also hopes that the announcement of a law on data protection will facilitate EU/Turkey cooperation in different areas.

The Commission looks forward to progress on these matters, including the full engagement of the opposition parties and will closely follow the translation of the proposals into concrete actions and follow up its implementation.

⁽²⁾ <http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/EUR44/022/2013/en/0ba8c4cc-b059-4b88-9c52-8fbd652c6766/eur440222013en.pdf>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009784/13
to the Commission
Brian Simpson (S&D)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Accompanying measures for sugar protocol countries

In its response to Written Question E-007698/2013 the Commission stated that assistance for sugar producers in the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP) and those countries considered least developed has been targeted through the accompanying measures of the sugar protocol to improve competitiveness and, in some instances, to diversify operations.

1. Can the Commission confirm what percentage of the EUR 1.02 billion package for transitional assistance has been committed to:
 - support the improvement in competitiveness, efficiency and production in the sugar industry?
 - diversification and withdrawal from sugar production?
2. Moreover, can the Commission provide an assessment of the effectiveness of the use of the assistance package in improving the competitiveness and export capacity of the sugar cane industry for ACP countries?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(28 October 2013)

1. With regards to the objectives of the 18 Multiannual Indicative Programmes and the country allocations, 23% of the funding allocated to the Accompanying Measures of the Sugar Protocol (AMSP) target diversification and adaptation to the social impact of the sugar reform, and 77% finance activities improving the competitiveness and efficiency of sugar production ⁽¹⁾.

2. AMSP actions are evaluated by the EU Delegations according to the Multiannual Indicative Programmes objectives and indicators. Evaluation criteria include relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact.

In Trinidad and Tobago, for instance, where it was decided to phase out sugar production, our support under the AMSP contributed to the following results:

- More than 2500 employees coming from the state-owned sugar company Caroni have been re-trained, and a pension plan for all employees has been established.
- A total of 17 agricultural estates, 30 residential estates and 10 industrial estates have been developed on lands formerly under sugar cultivation.

In Mauritius, which aims at improving sugar production and competitiveness, AMSP support has contributed to the following results:

- Two new refineries have been in operation since 2009. Producers of special sugars have further increased their production capacities, focusing on the supply of high value added sugars.
- The share of white sugar in total sugar export from Mauritius has increased from zero per cent in 2009 to about 70% in 2012.

⁽¹⁾ In a previous response (E-007698/2013), we erroneously indicated that the AMSP is supporting Jamaica with the objective of withdrawing from sugar production. We recognise and support the Jamaica Country Strategy for the Adaptation of the Sugar Cane Industry 2006-2020 which includes the following objectives: to develop and maintain a sustainable private sector led Sugar Cane industry; to strengthen the economic diversification, social resilience and environmental sustainability of sugar dependent areas; and to support progress towards macroeconomic goals national adaptation strategy targeting. We present our apologies for any inconvenience caused.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-009785/13
upućeno Komisiji
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(2. rujna 2013.)

Predmet: Problem ometanja frekvencija na hrvatskoj obali

Štetnim ometanjem signala preko talijanskih televizijskih i radijskih odašiljača, koji se koriste frekvencijama koje nisu dogovorene na međunarodnoj razini i tehničkim parametrima koji na toj razini nisu usklađeni, izravno se krše međunarodni sporazumi i nanosi izravna šteta Hrvatskoj i njezinim građanima.

Tim se ometanjem izravno krše prava na frekvencije dodijeljena Republici Hrvatskoj i stvaraju problemi u prijemu televizijskog i radijskog signala duž hrvatske obale. Najviše su pogođeni Istra, Dubrovnik i jadranski otoci. Ometanjem se onemogućuju i smanjuju zone prijema signala naših odašiljača te nanosi znatna gospodarska šteta i izazivaju veliko nezadovoljstvo i frustracija među našim građanima.

Talijanski odašiljači i dalje emitiraju na svim radijskim i televizijskim frekvencijskim spektrima, ne poštujući pritom sporazume Ženeva 84 (za radio) i Ženeva 06 (za televiziju). Zbog toga je jedino trajno raspoloživo rješenje primjena tehničkih i regulatornih odredbi utvrđenih međunarodnim sporazumima.

Kako Komisija može pomoći Hrvatskoj u rješavanju problema štetnog ometanja signala preko talijanskih odašiljača, čime se nanosi znatna gospodarska šteta i izazivaju veliko nezadovoljstvo i frustracija među našim građanima?

Odgovor gđe Kroes u ime Komisije
(14. listopada 2013.)

Komisija je svjesna prekograničnih smetnji u radijskoj frekvenciji koje stvaraju određene emisije Italije u Hrvatskoj i drugim državama članicama, posebice u slučaju televizijskih odašiljača visoke snage. U ovoj fazi radiofrekvencijski pojas 470 — 790 MHz nije usklađen na razini EU-a te su prekogranične smetnje u prijemu radijske frekvencije DVB-T prvenstveno dvostrano pitanje između Hrvatske i Italije. Jedan način rješavanja tog problema jest da nadležna hrvatska regulatorna tijela to pitanje upute nadležnim talijanskim tijelima na dvostranoj osnovi. Država članica koja se suočava s prekograničnim problemima povezanim s koordinacijom frekvencija ili štetnim interferencijskim problemima može zatražiti intervenciju „dobre usluge” Skupine za politiku radiofrekvencijskog spektra (RSPG), koja je savjetodavna skupina pri Komisiji ⁽¹⁾. I Hrvatska i Italija članice su RSPG-a. Hrvatska agencija za poštu i elektroničke komunikacije (HAKOM) ima predstavnika u RSPG-u i može bilo kada podnijeti zahtjev za pomoć putem postupka „dobre usluge” RSPG-a unutar europodručja, ako to smatra primjerenim.

⁽¹⁾ Dodatne informacije o mogućnosti dobivanja pomoći od RSPG-a možete pronaći u sljedećim dokumentima:
<https://circabc.europa.eu/sd/d/0fb28fab-3007-46b4-bdbf-883b02da318c/RSPG12-409%20on%20EU%20assistance%20as%20Adopted.pdf>
http://rspg-spectrum.eu/_documents/documents/meeting/rspg29/rspg12-420_final-rfr_eu_assistance_bilateral_coordination.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009785/13
to the Commission
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Frequency interference problem on the Croatian coast

Harmful interference of Italian television and radio transmitters, which are operating at frequencies that are not internationally concerted and using technical parameters that are not internationally harmonised, is directly violating international agreements and causing direct damage to Croatia and its citizens.

These interferences are in direct violation of frequency rights that are granted to the Republic of Croatia and cause problems for television and radio reception along the Croatian coast. Istria, Dubrovnik and the Adriatic islands are the areas most affected. The interferences preclude and reduce the reception zone of our transmitters and cause significant economic damage as well as strong dissatisfaction and frustration among our citizens.

Currently, Italian transmitters continue to broadcast on all frequency spectrums for radio and television while not respecting the 'Geneva 84' (radio) and 'Geneva 06' (television) agreements. The only permanent solution available, therefore, is to apply technical and regulatory provisions set out in international agreements.

How can the Commission help Croatia deal with this problem of harmful interferences of Italian transmitters which cause significant economic damage and strong dissatisfaction and frustration among our citizens?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(14 October 2013)

The Commission is aware of cross-border radio frequency interferences generated by certain Italian emissions in Croatia and other Member States, particularly in the case of high-power TV transmitters. At this stage, the UHF-TV frequency band 470 — 790 MHz is not harmonised at EU level, and cross border radio frequency DVB-T interference is therefore primarily a bilateral issue between Croatia and Italy. A possible way to address this issue is for the responsible Croatian national regulatory authority to raise this issue on a bilateral basis with the respective Italian authorities. A Member State which faces cross-border frequency coordination issues or harmful interference problems may also request the 'good offices' intervention from the Radio Spectrum Policy Group (RSPG), an advisory group to the Commission⁽¹⁾. Both Croatia and Italy are members of the RSPG. The 'Hrvatska agencija za poštu i elektroničke komunikacije' (HAKOM) is represented at the RSPG and may file a request for assistance through the (intra-EU) RSPG 'good offices' procedure at any time if it considers it appropriate.

⁽¹⁾ More information about possible assistance of the RSPG can be found in the following documents:
<https://circabc.europa.eu/sd/d/0fb28fab-3007-46b4-bdbf-883b02da318c/RSPG12-409%20on%20EU%20assistance%20as%20Adopted.pdf>
http://rspg-spectrum.eu/_documents/documents/meeting/rspg29/rspg12-420_final-rfr_eu_assistance_bilateral_coordination.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009786/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: South Tyrol transport pass

I have been contacted by a constituent who informs me that a discriminatory regulation is preventing Britons and other non-Italian EU citizens from obtaining cheap travel in South Tyrol, northern Italy.

My constituent tells me that the regional transport system, SII, offers a number of travel passes for use on the bus and train network. He says that, according to the SII website, the pass is available to all citizens of the EU and to anyone working or studying in South Tyrol. However, he says that those who apply for the pass must provide a 'Steuernummer', an Italian state tax number, on their application form.

My constituent tells me that his application was rejected because he does not have an Italian tax number. When he contacted SII, he was told to contact the Italian Finance Ministry to obtain a tax number. However, he believes that he would not be eligible for this as he does not work or pay tax in Italy.

As SII appears to be in breach of the statements on its own website, could the Commission

1. investigate and state if it believes SII to be in breach of any EU legislation on non-discrimination towards EU citizens?
2. take action to ensure that the relevant Italian authorities enable EU citizens to apply for the pass without the need to supply an Italian state tax number?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2013)

The Commission is committed to ensuring the full respect of the principle of non-discrimination on grounds of nationality enshrined in Article 18 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (the Treaty) and the right of every Union citizen to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States, subject to the limitations and conditions laid down in the Treaties and by the measures adopted to give them effect.

Articles 18 and 21(1) of the Treaty as confirmed by the Court of Justice require that Union citizens should be treated outside of their Member State of origin similarly to the nationals of the host Member State when they are in a similar situation unless differential treatment can be justified by objective considerations of public interest that are independent of nationality of the persons concerned and are proportionate to the legitimate aim of the national provisions (see for example Case C-103/08 Gottwald).

The issue raised by the Honourable Member has not been brought to the attention of the Commission so far. The Commission will request further information on that particular aspect of the South Tyrolean bus and train fare scheme so as to assess whether it complies with the Treaty. It will inform the Honourable Member of its findings.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009787/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(2 septembre 2013)

Objet: Bayer et Syngenta s'entêtent à tuer les abeilles

Sensibilisée à la disparition des abeilles, la Commission, avec l'appui du Parlement européen, avait confirmé, à l'époque, sa décision de restreindre pendant deux ans à compter du 1^{er} décembre prochain l'utilisation de trois produits chimiques (la clothianidine, l'imidaclopride et le thiaméthoxame) utilisés dans des pesticides fabriqués par les groupes Bayer et Syngenta et considérés comme responsables de l'hécatombe. Leur utilisation sera proscrite pour le traitement des semences, l'application au sol (en granulés) et le traitement foliaire des végétaux, y compris des céréales (à l'exception des céréales d'hiver), qui attirent les abeilles. Bruxelles avait ensuite décidé, en juillet, d'interdire pour deux ans l'utilisation à l'air libre du fipronil, un insecticide réputé mortel pour les abeilles, fabriqué par le groupe allemand BASF.

Les deux pesticides de Bayer à base de clothianidine et d'imidaclopride sont sur le marché depuis plusieurs années et ont reçu une autorisation de commercialisation, a fait valoir Bayer mardi. Pour Bayer, une plainte a été déposée devant la Cour de Justice de l'Union pour lui permettre d'y voir plus clair dans la réglementation européenne.

«Nous avons besoin de conditions générales fiables pour décider de futurs investissements», a souligné le porte-parole de Bayer CropScience.

«Nous aurions préféré ne pas tenter une action en justice, mais nous n'avons pas le choix étant donné que nous sommes persuadés que la Commission a établi à tort un lien entre le thiaméthoxame et le déclin de la santé des abeilles», a pour sa part expliqué mardi le directeur opérationnel du groupe suisse Syngenta, John Atkin, cité dans un communiqué

Quelles sont les réponses de la Commission à l'argumentation des entreprises citées?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission

(4 octobre 2013)

La Commission a connaissance des actions en justice engagées par les entreprises Bayer et Syngenta. Elle défendra autant qu'il sera nécessaire, devant les tribunaux, les mesures qu'elle a adoptées.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009787/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Are Bayer and Syngenta determined to kill bees?

Against the backdrop of declining bee populations, the Commission, with the support of the European Parliament, confirmed its decision to restrict for a period of two years as from 1 December 2013 the use of three chemical products (clothianidin, imidacloprid and thiamethoxam) used in pesticides manufactured by the Bayer and Syngenta groups and which are thought to be responsible for the deaths of millions of bees. Their use will be banned in the treatment of seeds, and as pesticides spread on the soil (in granule form) or sprayed on the leaves of plants, including cereals (except for winter cereals), which attract bees. Subsequent to that decision, the Commission decided, in July 2013, to prohibit for two years the spraying of fipronil in the open air, an insecticide produced by the German group BASF which is believed to kill bees.

According to a statement issued recently by Bayer, its two clothianidin and imidaclopride-based pesticides have been on the market for several years and were granted marketing authorisation. Bayer has filed a complaint with the European Court of Justice seeking a clarification.

According to its spokesperson, Bayer Cropscience needs a stable legal framework on which to base future investment decisions.

Swiss company Syngenta's chief operating officer, John Atkin, said in a statement issued recently that 'we would prefer not to take legal action but have no other choice given our firm belief that the Commission wrongly linked thiamethoxam to the decline in bee health'.

What is the Commission's response to the arguments put forward by Bayer and Syngenta?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(4 October 2013)

The Commission is aware of the legal actions initiated by Bayer and Syngenta and will defend the measures taken in Court as necessary.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009788/13
à la Commission**

Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)

(2 septembre 2013)

Objet: Crise humanitaire en Syrie

Selon l'Organisation des Nations unies, les réfugiés syriens traversent la pire crise humanitaire depuis le génocide rwandais. Ils sont 6 000 à fuir leur pays chaque jour. Plus d'1,8 million de Syriens ont trouvé refuge dans les pays voisins, dont les deux tiers depuis le début de l'année.

La situation se dégrade de jour en jour et les enfants sont les premières victimes du drame humanitaire qui se joue depuis plus de deux ans en Syrie. Ils sont aujourd'hui un million à devoir fuir dans les pays limitrophes pour se réfugier dans les camps ou dans des abris de fortune, parfois sans leur famille. C'est une génération entière qui est aujourd'hui traumatisée, privée de foyer et de repères, et qui a désespérément besoin de soutien.

En Syrie, près de la moitié des 6,8 millions de Syriens ayant besoin d'une aide d'urgence sont aussi des enfants. Selon le Programme alimentaire mondial, 4 millions de personnes ne sont plus en mesure de se nourrir.

1. Quelles mesures humanitaires urgentes la Commission a-t-elle prises pour soulager la situation de la population syrienne?
2. Avec quelles organisations la Commission collabore-t-elle afin de faire parvenir l'aide humanitaire aux réfugiés?
3. Quels sont les moyens déployés par la Commission vis-à-vis des enfants syriens?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Georgieva au nom de la Commission

(28 octobre 2013)

1. Outre l'aide humanitaire fournie par les États membres, qui s'élève à 1,014 milliard d'euros, l'UE a, depuis fin 2011 et en réponse directe aux crises, mobilisé 943 millions d'euros au total (aide humanitaire: 515 millions d'euros; aide économique, aide au développement et aide à la stabilisation: 428 millions d'euros) pour des activités mises en œuvre en Syrie et ailleurs. L'aide humanitaire de l'UE soutient en priorité des réponses médicales urgentes destinées à sauver des vies, la fourniture de médicaments essentiels, de nourriture et de compléments alimentaires, l'approvisionnement en eau potable, des services d'assainissement et d'hygiène, la fourniture d'abris, la distribution de produits non alimentaires de base et la protection des plus vulnérables dans la région (personnes déplacées à l'intérieur du pays, réfugiés, communautés d'accueil).

2. L'UE fournit son aide humanitaire par l'intermédiaire des Nations unies et d'ONG internationales, en respectant les principes humanitaires.

3. Au titre de son budget humanitaire, la Commission soutient dix partenaires dans la région pour des activités en rapport direct avec la protection des enfants et avec les violences à caractère sexiste. La Commission applique des critères de vulnérabilité stricts lorsqu'elle sélectionne les projets à financer. Or les enfants sont souvent ceux qui ont, comparativement, le plus grand besoin d'aide et qui sont, par conséquent, les bénéficiaires directs d'une aide destinée à sauver des vies, qui comprend de la nourriture, des services de santé, de l'eau, des services d'assainissement et d'hygiène, des abris et des produits non alimentaires. À ce jour, la Commission a également affecté plus de 124 millions d'euros à la fourniture de services éducatifs aux enfants touchés par le conflit en Syrie et dans les pays voisins.

Le 25 septembre, la Commission a organisé, conjointement avec le ministre jordanien des affaires étrangères, M. Judeh, une réunion de haut niveau en marge de l'Assemblée générale des Nations unies. L'accent était mis tout particulièrement sur le sort des enfants syriens et sur les mesures nécessaires pour assurer leur protection.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009788/13
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Humanitarian crisis in Syria

According to the United Nations, Syrian refugees are facing the world's worst humanitarian crisis since the Rwandan genocide. Six thousand Syrians are fleeing their country every day. More than 1.8 million Syrians have sought refuge in neighbouring countries, two thirds of whom have fled this year alone.

The situation is getting worse every day. What is more, it is children who are the primary victims of the humanitarian crisis, which has now been raging in Syria for more than two years. So far a million children have been forced to flee to neighbouring countries, where they live in refugee camps or makeshift shelters, sometimes without their families. An entire generation has been traumatised, left homeless and deprived of all points of reference. They are now desperately in need of help.

In Syria almost half of the 6.8 million Syrians in need of emergency aid are children. According to the World Food Programme, four million people no longer have the means to feed themselves.

1. What urgent humanitarian measures has the Commission taken to improve the situation for the Syrian people?
2. What organisations is it working with to make sure that humanitarian aid reaches the refugees?
3. What has it done to support Syrian children?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(28 October 2013)

1. In addition to EUR 1.014 billion of humanitarian assistance provided by Member States, the EU has, since the end of 2011 and in direct response to the crises, mobilised EUR 943 million (humanitarian aid: EUR 515 million; economic, development and stabilisation assistance: EUR 428 million) of total support for activities inside and outside Syria. The EU humanitarian assistance primarily supports life-saving medical emergency responses, the provision of essential drugs, food and nutritional items, safe water, sanitation and hygiene shelter, distribution of basic non-food items and protection to help the most vulnerable in the region (Internally Displaced People, refugees, host communities).

2. The EU provides its humanitarian assistance through the UN and international NGOs in line with humanitarian principles.

3. The Commission supports ten partners in the region for activities directly related to child protection and gender-based violence under its humanitarian budget. The Commission uses strict vulnerability criteria when selecting projects for funding. Consequently, children often have the relatively greatest need of aid and are therefore the direct recipients of life-saving assistance including food, health, water, sanitation and hygiene, shelter and non-food items. The Commission has also provided to date more than EUR 124 million to provide education services to affected children in Syria and in the neighbouring countries.

On the 25 September, the Commission co-hosted a High-Level meeting together with the Jordanian Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr Judeh in the margins of the UN General Assembly week. The meeting included a special focus on the plight of Syrian children and measures needed to ensure their protection.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009789/13

alla Commissione

Oreste Rossi (PPE)

(2 settembre 2013)

Oggetto: Dolcificanti artificiali: nuovi rischi per la salute dell'uomo rispetto allo zucchero naturale

Da una revisione di recenti studi su bevande e cibi dolcificati artificialmente o zuccherati, emerge che i dolcificanti artificiali, sostitutivi dello zucchero, anche quelli a calorie zero, non sono meno rischiosi per la salute rispetto allo zucchero vero e non costituiscono un'alternativa più salutare allo zucchero raffinato o allo sciroppo di glucosio. Inoltre, vi è un effetto boomerang: se si consumano tanti prodotti dolcificati artificialmente, la risposta dell'organismo sia a livello cerebrale sia a livello metabolico risulta attenuata perché i dolcificanti non sazano la voglia di dolce che è insita nel cervello e anche perché non stimolano l'insulina come sa fare lo zucchero. Ciò significa che affidandosi troppo a cibi e bevande dolcificati artificialmente si rischia di finire per mangiare di più; le prove che si sono accumulate negli ultimi anni suggeriscono che i consumatori assidui di sostituti dello zucchero (saccarina, sucralosio, aspartame ecc.) potrebbero anche essere a maggior rischio di ingrassare e di ammalarsi di sindrome metabolica, di diabete e malattie cardiovascolari. Da dati attuali, il consumo frequente di dolcificanti può avere effetti inaspettati e dare disturbi metabolici. Consumare cibi dolci a basso contenuto calorico interferisce con le risposte dell'organismo che contribuiscono all'equilibrio energetico; quindi, il messaggio è che sia lo zucchero sia i dolcificanti vanno usati con moderazione e cautela. La voglia di dolce risulta insoddisfatta e il cervello non si attiva per inviare gli stimoli necessari alla produzione di insulina. La conseguenza è che non ci si sente sazi, si mangia di più e si continua ad introdurre calorie attraverso l'assunzione di altri cibi, fino ad ottenere l'appagamento sperato, che potrebbe però essere accompagnato dall'accumulo di chili di troppo.

Chi soffre di problemi di obesità o di diabete, o chi sperava di dimagrire grazie ad aspartame, saccarina e altri dolcificanti artificiali, ha probabilmente una sola alternativa dal punto di vista dei dolcificanti: optare per la frutta fresca o essiccata e per soluzioni più naturali, come la stevia, oltre a diminuire in generale il consumo di alimenti dolci, sfuggendo alla dipendenza dagli zuccheri artificiali e raffinati.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, può la Commissione far sapere che posizione intende assumere circa l'aumento del consumo di bevande e cibi dolcificati artificialmente, e se intende predisporre uno studio aggiornato sulla valutazione dei rischi connessi alla salute dei consumatori abituali?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione

(10 ottobre 2013)

Gli edulcoranti destinati ad essere utilizzati nei prodotti alimentari sono disciplinati nell'UE dal regolamento (CE) n. 1333/2008 ⁽¹⁾ relativo agli additivi alimentari. Tale regolamento stabilisce l'elenco di tutti gli edulcoranti autorizzati che possono essere immessi sul mercato in quanto tali e le loro condizioni d'impiego nei prodotti alimentari.

L'articolo 7 di tale regolamento definisce le condizioni d'impiego specifiche per gli edulcoranti, incluso l'impiego per sostituire gli zuccheri nella produzione di alimenti a ridotto contenuto calorico, alimenti non cariogeni o alimenti senza zuccheri aggiunti, per produrre alimenti destinati a un'alimentazione particolare o per sostituire gli zuccheri qualora ciò consenta di prolungare la durata di conservazione degli alimenti.

Onde proteggere la salute umana, la sicurezza degli additivi destinati ad essere utilizzati nei prodotti alimentari per il consumo umano va valutata prima che essi siano immessi sul mercato dell'Unione. La Commissione ha inoltre istituito un programma relativo a una nuova valutazione, da parte dell'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare (EFSA), della sicurezza degli additivi alimentari autorizzati nell'Unione anteriormente al 20 gennaio 2009 ⁽²⁾. Per tale nuova valutazione l'EFSA tiene conto delle informazioni sull'esposizione umana agli additivi alimentari collegata alla catena alimentare (schemi di consumo e utilizzi, livelli attuali e massimi di utilizzo, frequenza di consumo e altri fattori che incidono sull'esposizione).

La Commissione segue da vicino il programma di nuova valutazione e prenderà, ove necessario, opportuni provvedimenti in base ai risultati riportati nei pareri scientifici.

⁽¹⁾ Regolamento (CE) n. 1333/2008 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 16 dicembre 2008, relativo agli additivi alimentari.

⁽²⁾ Regolamento (UE) n. 257/2010 della Commissione, del 25 marzo 2010, che istituisce un programma relativo a una nuova valutazione degli additivi alimentari autorizzati conformemente al regolamento (CE) n. 1333/2008 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativo agli additivi alimentari.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009789/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
 (2 September 2013)

Subject: Artificial sweeteners — new risks to human health compared to natural sugar

A review of recent studies on sweetened or artificially sweetened foods and beverages has shown that artificial sweeteners, or sugar substitutes — even those with zero calories — are no less hazardous to health than real sugar and are not a healthier alternative to refined sugar or glucose syrup. There is also a boomerang effect: if many artificially sweetened products are consumed, the body's response, both in the brain and metabolism, is attenuated because the sweeteners do not fulfil the desire for sweetness that is inherent in the brain and also because they do not trigger an insulin response in the same way as sugar. This means that by relying too heavily on artificially sweetened foods and drinks you are likely to end up eating more. The evidence that has been building up over the years suggests that regular consumers of sugar substitutes (saccharin, sucralose, aspartame, etc.) could also be at greater risk of gaining weight and becoming ill with metabolic syndrome, diabetes and cardiovascular disease.

According to current data, frequent consumption of sweeteners can have unexpected effects and give rise to metabolic disorders. Consumption of low-calorie sweet foods interferes with the body's responses that contribute to energy balance — the message is, therefore, that both sugar and sweeteners should be used sparingly and cautiously. Sweet cravings are not satisfied and the brain does not send out the necessary stimuli for insulin production. The result is that you do not feel full, you eat more and continue to introduce calories by eating other foods until you obtain the desired level of satisfaction, which could, however, be accompanied by weight gain.

People suffering from obesity or diabetes, or those who hope to lose weight thanks to aspartame, saccharin and other artificial sweeteners, probably have only one alternative as far as sweets are concerned — that of opting for fresh or dried fruit, or for more natural solutions, such as stevia, as well as reducing their consumption of sweet foods, thereby escaping from their dependence on artificial and refined sugars.

In the light of the above, can the Commission say what position it intends to adopt with regard to the increased consumption of artificially sweetened foods and beverages and whether it intends to carry out an updated study on the assessment of the health-related risks for regular consumers?

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

Sweeteners for use in foodstuffs are regulated within the EU by Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008 ⁽¹⁾ on food additives. This legislation sets out the list of all permitted sweeteners which may be placed on the market as such and their conditions of use in foods.

Article 7 of that regulation establishes the specific conditions of use for sweeteners, including replacing sugars for the production of energy-reduced food, non-cariogenic food or food with no added sugars, for producing food intended for particular nutritional uses or replacing sugars where this permits an increase in the shelf-life of the food.

In order to protect human health, the safety of additives for use in foodstuffs for human consumption must be assessed before they are placed on the Union market. In addition, the Commission set up a programme for the re-evaluation, by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), of the safety of food additives that were already permitted in the Union before 20 January 2009 ⁽²⁾. For this re-evaluation EFSA takes into account information on the human exposure to the food additives from food (e.g. consumption pattern and uses, actual use levels and maximum use levels, frequency of consumption and other factors influencing exposure, including high level consumers).

The Commission is closely following the re-evaluation programme and if needed, appropriate measures will be taken based on the outcomes indicated in the scientific opinions.

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on food additives.

⁽²⁾ Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 257/2010 of 25 March 2010 setting up a programme for the re-evaluation of approved food additives in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council on food additives.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009790/13

alla Commissione

Oreste Rossi (PPE)

(2 settembre 2013)

Oggetto: Ghiandola tiroidea: benefici da alimenti ricchi di iodio ma svantaggi da inquinamento ambientale

Lo iodio contenuto in pesci, molluschi, crostacei, alghe, frutta e verdura coltivate vicino al mare protegge la ghiandola tiroidea da malattie. Infatti, nelle popolazioni che vivono sul mare e si nutrono del pescato si registra la più bassa incidenza di patologie della tiroide, quali gozzi, noduli e neoplasie.

L'alimentazione è la fonte principale per prevenire tali malattie. Gli esperti indicano tra i cibi ricchi di iodio sia il pesce fresco che i prodotti coltivati su terreni costieri in cui è presente questo elemento; a questi vanno aggiunti i broccoli, gli spinaci, le rape e la salsa di soia, alimenti ricchi di iodio.

Nonostante l'Italia sia circondata dal mare, con quasi 8mila km di coste, è tra i paesi in cui si è più esposti alle patologie della tiroide. Tra le cause la trasmissione genetica ed ereditaria, un'inadeguata assunzione di iodio e problemi ambientali, che potrebbero essere riferibili a centrali elettriche e attività industriali. Si pensi che ogni anno in Italia si assiste a più di 40mila interventi per asportazione della tiroide, nel 20 % dei casi per neoplasie e tumori.

Considerato che:

- il pesce fresco si dimostra uno degli alimenti salva tiroide più salutari e importanti, in una dieta che deve essere il più varia possibile;
- la ghiandola tiroidea è influenzata notevolmente dall'inquinamento ambientale e dalla presenza di polveri sottili ed allergeni nell'aria inquinata;

può la Commissione far sapere:

1. Se intende fornire maggiori informazioni e linee guida su una corretta alimentazione a protezione della ghiandola tiroidea, visti i benefici degli alimenti ricchi di iodio?
2. Che posizione assume rispetto agli studi della ricerca medica che evidenziano una stretta relazione tra infiammazione della ghiandola tiroidea e inquinamento ambientale?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione

(14 ottobre 2013)

1. Il tenore di iodio di un alimento può essere etichettato se almeno una quantità significativa di iodio è presente nell'alimento stesso ⁽¹⁾. È inoltre consentito agli alimenti di recare la seguente indicazione autorizzata sulla salute: «Lo iodio contribuisce alla normale produzione di ormoni della tiroide e alla normale funzione tiroidea» se sono conformi alle specifiche condizioni previste per utilizzare tale indicazione, vale a dire possiedono un contenuto minimo di iodio ⁽²⁾. Rientra inoltre nell'ambito di responsabilità degli Stati membri controllare la situazione nutrizionale della popolazione e decidere se intendono o no intraprendere iniziative per rimediare a un'insufficiente assunzione di elementi nutritivi essenziali, come le campagne d'informazione. Alcuni Stati membri hanno affrontato il problema della carenza di iodio nella popolazione adottando misure volontarie od obbligatorie per un incremento del contenuto di iodio negli alimenti, categorie di misure entrambe consentite dalla normativa dell'UE in materia di prodotti alimentari.

2. La Commissione non è al corrente di studi che colleghino l'infiammazione della tiroide all'inquinamento ambientale. Le strategie di prevenzione basate sui rischi e le politiche di promozione della salute sono elementi dell'iniziativa Horizon 2020, che sarà lanciata tra breve — Programma quadro per la ricerca e l'innovazione (2014-2020) ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Regolamento (UE) n. 1169/2011. G.U.L. 304 del 22/11/2011, pagg. 18-63.

⁽²⁾ Regolamento (UE) n. 432/2012 della Commissione. G.U.L. 136 del 25/5/2012 pagg. 1-40.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009790/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
 (2 September 2013)

Subject: The thyroid gland: benefits of iodine-rich food and effects of environmental pollution

The iodine in fish, shellfish, crustaceans, algae, and fruit and vegetables grown near the sea protects the thyroid gland from disease. In fact, people who live by the sea and eat fish have the lowest recorded incidence of thyroid disorders such as goitre, nodules and neoplasia.

Eating properly is the best way to prevent these disorders. Experts advise that foods rich in iodine include fresh fish and produce grown on coastal soil in which iodine is present. Broccoli, spinach, turnips and soya sauce are also foods with a high iodine content.

Italy is surrounded by the sea, with almost 8 000 km of coastline. Nonetheless it is one of the countries with the highest rates of thyroid disorders. Reasons for this include genetic and hereditary transmission, insufficient iodine intake and environmental problems, which could be related to power stations and the effects of industry. There are said to be more than 40 000 operations to remove part or all of the thyroid every year in Italy, in 20% of cases on account of neoplasia and tumours.

Fresh fish, eaten as part of a diet that is as varied as possible, has been proven to be one of the most important and healthiest foods for protecting the thyroid.

The thyroid gland is particularly affected by environmental pollution and the presence of fine particulates and allergens in polluted air.

1. In light of the benefits of food rich in iodine, does the Commission plan to provide more information and guidelines on what foods help protect the thyroid gland?
2. What is the Commission's view of medical research demonstrating a close link between inflammation of the thyroid gland and environmental pollution?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
 (14 October 2013)

1. The iodine content of a food may be labelled if at least a significant amount of iodine is present in the food ⁽¹⁾. Also, foods are allowed to bear the authorised health claim: 'iodine contributes to the normal production of thyroid hormones and normal thyroid function' if they meet the specific conditions of use for this claim, i.e. a minimum amount of iodine ⁽²⁾. Furthermore, it is the responsibility of Member States to monitor the nutritional situation of the population, and to decide whether or not they wish to take initiatives to address insufficient intake of essential nutrients, such as information campaigns. Some Member States have addressed iodine deficiency in the population by voluntary or mandatory food fortification with iodine, which are both allowed by EU food legislation.

2. The Commission is not aware of studies linking thyroid inflammation to environmental pollution. Risk-based prevention strategies and health promotion policies is one aspect that will be addressed by the soon-to-start Horizon 2020 — The framework Programme For Research And Innovation (2014-2020) ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011. OJL 304, 22/11/2011 P. 0018 — 0063.

⁽²⁾ Commission Regulation (EU) No 432/2012. OJL 136, 25/5/2012 P. 0001 — 0040.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009791/13

alla Commissione

Oreste Rossi (PPE)

(2 settembre 2013)

Oggetto: Recupero dei patrimoni occultati indebitamente dagli ex regimi di Egitto, Libia e Tunisia

In seguito agli avvenimenti e alle rivolte di piazza della cosiddetta «primavera araba» sono stati rovesciati tre regimi dell'Africa settentrionale: il governo di Muammar Gheddafi in Libia, Hosni Mubarak in Egitto e Zine el Abidine Ben Ali in Tunisia. Tra i crimini, accertati o meno, commessi negli ultimi decenni in tali paesi su mandato dei governanti vi è anche l'appropriazione indebita e l'occultamento di beni e disponibilità economiche. I fatti in questione non hanno una rilevanza marginale poiché, seppure non sia possibile redigere delle stime esatte dei patrimoni accumulati nel corso degli anni in conseguenza della natura illegale delle attività, si presume che le fortune sottratte da Gheddafi e Mubarak possano ammontare anche a diverse decine di miliardi di dollari mentre ben più contenuta sembra essere la ricchezza estorta da Ben Ali. In seguito alle elezioni e alla nomina di governi democratici, le autorità dei Paesi protagonisti della primavera araba stanno cercando di istruire indagini e processi nei confronti degli esponenti dei regimi coinvolti nelle attività di espropriazione e occultamento dei beni, ma le difficoltà, soprattutto di carattere burocratico, che devono fronteggiare per il recupero di quanto sottratto sono spesso un ostacolo arduo da superare, anche in conseguenza delle limitate conoscenze delle autorità arabe sugli ordinamenti giuridici internazionali.

Considerato che:

- nei due anni circa che sono passati dalla caduta dei regimi, il valore dei beni resi alla Libia ammonta a 3,6 miliardi di dollari mentre solo 29 milioni di dollari sono tornati in possesso della Tunisia e nessuna restituzione è ancora stata effettuata a favore dell'Egitto;
- il valore dei beni congelati, in attesa di un giudizio sulla loro liceità, è di 25 miliardi di dollari per la Libia, 800 milioni per l'Egitto e 69 milioni per la Tunisia;
- le autorità dei Paesi della primavera araba, subito dopo il rovesciamento dei regimi, hanno avviato una serie di mutual legal assistance (MLA), procedure volte ad acquisire e scambiare informazioni per perseguire reati civili e penali tra due paesi, delle quali una buona parte non sono andate a buon fine per difetti di forma o per motivi «politici».

si chiede alla Commissione:

1. quali azioni e programmi intende predisporre per il recupero dei patrimoni occultati dai passati regimi (potenzialmente anche in alcuni Stati membri)?
2. che posizione assume rispetto alle negoziazioni di mutua assistenza giudiziaria con i paesi in questione?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(29 novembre 2013)

1. Il coinvolgimento dell'Unione europea nel recupero dei beni è conseguenza dell'imposizione di misure restrittive a 48 persone in relazione alla Tunisia, a 19 persone in relazione all'Egitto e a 24 persone e 50 persone giuridiche in relazione alla Libia. Scopo di tale imposizione era contribuire a consolidare i cambiamenti politici avvenuti durante i disordini della «primavera araba» del 2011.

Occorre però sottolineare che le misure restrittive imposte dall'UE riguardano il congelamento dei beni, che è una questione distinta dalla confisca e dal rimpatrio dei beni stessi: la confisca e il rimpatrio dei fondi congelati sono di competenza non dell'Unione ma degli Stati membri e oggetto dei pertinenti procedimenti nazionali. Dato che il recupero dei beni può avvenire esclusivamente mediante meccanismi giudiziari bilaterali, l'UE può svolgere soltanto un ruolo di coordinamento.

Per assistere l'Egitto, la Libia e la Tunisia, l'UE ha comunque mantenuto il congelamento dei beni in occasione di ogni revisione annuale, in modo da dare agli Stati membri e ai paesi richiedenti più tempo per ottenere il ritorno dei beni oggetto di appropriazione indebita dopo l'applicazione delle misure restrittive.

Sono stati inoltre adottati ulteriori atti giuridici per favorire lo scambio di informazioni riguardanti il recupero dei beni e il ritorno dei fondi in attesa dell'esito di procedimenti giudiziari in relazione all'Egitto, alla Libia e alla Tunisia.

Nel suo ruolo di coordinamento, l'AR/VP continua a impegnarsi presso le autorità egiziane, libiche e tunisine riguardo alle questioni delle sanzioni e del recupero dei beni, nonché a promuovere la restituzione dei beni oggetto di appropriazione indebita in contesti quali il Forum arabo del partenariato di Deauville su iniziativa del G8.

2. Le istituzioni dell'UE possono svolgere soltanto un ruolo di facilitazione. Le negoziazioni si svolgono nel contesto della cooperazione bilaterale tra gli Stati membri e i paesi terzi richiedenti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009791/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Recovery of assets illegally hidden away by the former regimes in Egypt, Libya and Tunisia

Three regimes in North Africa were overthrown as a result of the popular uprisings and events of the Arab Spring: the governments of Muammar Gaddafi in Libya, Hosni Mubarak in Egypt and Zine al-Abidine Ben Ali in Tunisia. To the crimes, whether confirmed or not, committed in these countries over the past decades on the orders of government leaders should be added the embezzlement and concealing of commodities and capital assets. This is not a small matter. It is not possible to calculate precisely how much was amassed over the course of the years, as it was done illicitly, but it seems likely that the fortunes stolen by Gaddafi and Mubarak could amount to as much as tens of billions of dollars, while Ben Ali would appear to have siphoned off a lesser amount. Following the elections and the appointment of democratic governments, the authorities in the Arab Spring countries are trying to start investigations and collect evidence against regime leaders implicated in the expropriation and concealment of assets. However the problems they must deal with in their efforts to recover the stolen money, especially problems caused by bureaucracy, are often difficult to overcome, with the Arab authorities' limited knowledge of international legal systems not helping.

It is approximately two years since these regimes fell. During this time Libya has received USD 3.6 billion in returned assets, while only USD 29 million have been returned to Tunisia and Egypt has yet to see any of its assets returned.

The value of assets frozen pending a ruling on their lawfulness stands at USD 25 billion for Libya, USD 800 million for Egypt and USD 69 million for Tunisia.

Authorities in the Arab Spring countries set a series of mutual legal assistance (MLA) requests in motion immediately after the overthrow of the regimes. These are procedures whereby two countries can acquire and exchange information in order to prosecute civil and criminal crimes. However many of these were unsuccessful owing to faulty drafting or because of 'political' motives.

1. What actions and programmes does the Commission plan to establish in regard to recovery of assets hidden away (possibly even in some Member States) by the former regimes?
2. What is its position regarding negotiations on mutual legal assistance with the countries concerned?

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

1. The involvement of the EU in the issue of asset recovery stems from the imposition of restrictive measures on 48 persons in relation to Tunisia, 19 in relation to Egypt and 25 persons and 50 entities in relation to Libya. This was done to help assure the political changes that took place during the 2011 Arab Upheaval.

It is important to note that the EU restrictive measures relate to an asset freeze, which is a separate matter from confiscation/repatriation of assets. The EU has no competence for the confiscation and repatriation of these frozen funds. This is a competence of Member States and subject to relevant national proceedings. Given that asset recovery can only be achieved via bilateral judicial mechanisms, the role that the EU can play must be one of coordination.

However, to assist Egypt, Libya and Tunisia, the EU has maintained its asset freeze in place at each annual review to give Member States and requesting states more time to achieve the return of restrictive misappropriated assets.

Further legal acts have also been adopted to better facilitate information sharing in relation to asset recovery and the return of funds pending to judicial decisions in relation to Egypt, Libya and Tunisia.

In its coordination role, the HR/VP continues to engage with the Egyptian, Libyan and Tunisian authorities regarding sanctions and asset recovery issues and to promote the restitution of misappropriated assets at fora such as the G-8 Deauville Partnership Arab Forum.

2. The EU institutions can only play a facilitation role. Negotiations are a matter for bilateral cooperation between Member States and requesting third states.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009792/13

alla Commissione

Oreste Rossi (PPE)

(2 settembre 2013)

Oggetto: Sostanze tossiche nell'abbigliamento «made in China»: quali rischi e quale tutela normativa

Quarantaquattro capi di abbigliamento esterno per adulti e bambini con etichetta di origine «made in China» sono di recente passati al vaglio di due autorevoli laboratori di analisi tessili. Lo studio, promosso da laboratori di prova dotati di sistema di qualità europeo e accreditati dal rispettivo ente nazionale, fornisce la certezza scientifica che «sui 23 capi selezionati per un'analisi approfondita, ben 21 campioni contengono sostanze tossiche».

I criteri di analisi presi in esame sono stati tre:

- la valutazione delle conformità dei materiali tessili rispetto alle normative sulla sicurezza chimica (sia europee che cinesi);
- la presenza o meno di alchilfenoli etossilati, sostanze tossiche per la fauna acquatica e dannose anche per l'uomo (vietate in Europa, senza restrizioni in Cina);
- la conformità o meno delle etichette di composizione fibrosa all'effettiva realtà dei capi.

Il nome tecnico della sostanze tossiche riscontrate è alchilfenoli etossilati, ossia prodotti chimici usati come detergenti in diversi processi industriali e nella produzione di tessuti naturali e sintetici. Una volta usati e scaricati, si decompongono in un sottoprodotto molto tossico considerato un interferente endocrino.

L'iniziativa prende le mosse dalla constatazione che nella valutazione della sicurezza chimica dei prodotti della filiera della moda esistono, nei diversi mercati internazionali, parametri differenti. In particolare, sono significative le differenze normative tra UE e Cina. I parametri ecotossicologici cinesi sono meno restrittivi di quelli europei, proprio per gli alchilfenoli etossilati. Inoltre, le restrizioni normative della Cina valgono solo per i prodotti commercializzati nel loro mercato interno, non per l'export. La normativa europea riguarda direttamente la produzione, indipendentemente dai percorsi della successiva commercializzazione.

Considerato che:

- vi sono differenze sostanziali tra la normativa europea e quella della Cina;
- i risultati allarmanti dello studio evidenziano la non rispondenza delle normative cinesi per la commercializzazione di capi di abbigliamento destinati al mercato europeo;
- le evidenze scientifiche hanno provato che la presenza degli alchilfenoli etossilati rende tali prodotti altamente tossici sia per la salute dell'uomo che per l'ambiente;

si chiede alla Commissione:

1. quale posizione assume rispetto alle evidenze scientifiche riportate dal suddetto studio?
2. quali azioni intende intraprendere per garantire una maggiore vigilanza sui prodotti che arrivano da paesi terzi?
3. intende valutare se tale situazione di assenza di reciprocità comporti per i cittadini europei un alto fattore di rischio in termini di insalubrità di prodotti di importazione, cui si aggiunge la scarsa affidabilità delle informazioni merceologiche riportate sulle etichette ed una perdita di competitività per le imprese del settore, rispetto al mercato cinese?

Risposta di Neven Mimica a nome della Commissione

(30 ottobre 2013)

La Commissione non dispone di informazioni riguardo allo studio al quale si riferisce l'onorevole parlamentare e gradirebbe pertanto riceverne copia. La Commissione è pienamente consapevole della tossicità degli alchilfenoletossilati. Nell'ambito dell'Unione europea l'impiego del nonilfenolo e degli etossilati di nonilfenolo è già stato circoscritto ad alcune applicazioni specifiche a norma del regolamento REACH.

Tutti i prodotti importati da paesi terzi devono essere conformi alle prescrizioni UE in materia di salute e sicurezza del prodotto. Gli operatori economici hanno l'obbligo di provvedere affinché i prodotti importati e immessi in commercio siano sicuri. La garanzia del rispetto della normativa e la sorveglianza del mercato, compresa l'irrogazione delle sanzioni agli operatori economici, è di competenza degli Stati membri, i quali notificano alla Commissione le misure adottate nei confronti di prodotti non sicuri. In tale quadro, nel 2013 sono state finora ricevute 54 notificazioni di grave rischio chimico per quanto riguarda tessili e abbigliamento.

Le autorità cinesi sono informate settimanalmente dalla Commissione circa i prodotti pericolosi originari della Cina e riferiscono periodicamente in merito alle azioni correttive intraprese, compresi i divieti all'esportazione emanati. Per quanto concerne i controlli eseguiti dalle autorità cinesi, la Commissione desidera tuttavia sottolineare che, in conformità della legge cinese sulle importazioni ed esportazioni ⁽¹⁾, soltanto un numero ristretto di categorie di prodotti non alimentari è sottoposto a controlli prima dell'esportazione. Tali controlli sono eseguiti a norma dei regolamenti cinesi e solo raramente in conformità alle prescrizioni del Paese di destinazione.

Migliorare ulteriormente la sicurezza dei prodotti originari della Cina costituisce una priorità fondamentale per la Commissione. Congiuntamente con le autorità cinesi è stato avviato un progetto per meglio coordinare tra queste e l'UE i controlli di sicurezza dei prodotti lungo tutta la filiera delle forniture.

⁽¹⁾ <http://english.mofcom.gov.cn/article/policyrelease/Businessregulations/201303/20130300045852.shtml>.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009792/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Toxic substances in Chinese-made clothing — what are the risks and what legal protection is available?

44 items of outerwear for adults and children, with Made in China labels, have recently been tested by two authoritative textile testing laboratories. The study, sponsored by laboratories with European quality systems and accredited by the relevant national authority, has provided scientific certainty that 'of the 23 items of clothing selected for in-depth analysis, as many as 21 samples contained toxic substances'.

There were three test criteria:

- an assessment of whether the textiles complied with chemical safety legislation (both European and Chinese);
- the presence (or absence) of alkylphenol ethoxylates, substances which are toxic to aquatic fauna and also harmful to humans (banned in Europe but unrestricted in China);
- whether or not the fibrous labels conformed to the true nature of the items of clothing.

The technical name of the toxic substances found is alkylphenol ethoxylates, i.e. chemicals used as detergents in various industrial processes and in the production of natural and synthetic fabrics. Once used and discharged, they decompose into a highly toxic by-product that is considered to be an endocrine disrupter.

This initiative was based on the observation that, as regards chemical safety assessments for fashion industry products, different international markets have different parameters. In particular, there are significant regulatory differences between the EU and China. Chinese ecotoxicological parameters are less restrictive than those in Europe, precisely because of alkylphenol ethoxylates. Moreover, China's regulatory restrictions apply only to products sold on their domestic market, not those for export. EU legislation directly concerns production, regardless of subsequent marketing pathways.

Given that:

- there are substantive differences between EU and Chinese law;
- the alarming results of the study reveal the non-compliance of Chinese regulations as regards the marketing of garments for the European market;
- scientific evidence has proven that the presence of alkylphenol ethoxylates makes these products highly toxic for both human health and the environment;

can the Commission therefore say:

1. what its position is with regard to the scientific evidence set out in this study;
2. what action it intends to take to ensure greater monitoring of products that come from third countries;
3. whether it will assess whether this lack of reciprocity carries a high risk factor for EU citizens in terms of the unhealthiness of imported products, not to mention the unreliability of the information given on labels and the loss of competitiveness for companies in this sector compared to the Chinese market?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(30 October 2013)

The Commission has no information about the study referred to by the Honourable Member and would appreciate to receive a copy. It is fully aware of the toxicity of alkylphenol ethoxylates. Within the Union, the use of nonylphenol and nonylphenol ethoxylates has already been restricted for a number of specific applications under the REACH Regulation.

All products imported from third countries must comply with EU product safety and health requirements. It is the obligation of economic operators to ensure that products imported and placed on the market are safe. Enforcement and market surveillance, including imposing penalties on economic operators, is the responsibility of the Member States who notify measures taken against unsafe products to the Commission. In this context, 54 serious chemical risk notifications concerning textiles and clothing from China were received so far in 2013.

Chinese authorities are informed weekly by the Commission about dangerous products of Chinese origin and regularly report back on corrective actions taken in China, including on export bans imposed. With regard to checks carried out by Chinese authorities, the Commission would however like to underline that, in accordance with Chinese law on Import and Export ⁽¹⁾, only a small number of non-food product categories are checked before being exported. These checks are carried out according to Chinese regulations and only rarely in accordance with requirements of the country of destination.

Further improving the safety of products from China is a key priority of the Commission. Together with the Chinese authorities, a project has been launched to better coordinate product safety controls between EU and Chinese authorities throughout the whole supply chain.

⁽¹⁾ <http://english.mofcom.gov.cn/article/policyrelease/Businessregulations/201303/20130300045852.shtml>

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009793/13

alla Commissione

Mara Bizzotto (EFD)

(2 settembre 2013)

Oggetto: Tutela dello status giuridico del Porto franco di Trieste

Con le interrogazioni E-000264/2013 ed E-006306/2013, è stato richiesto alla Commissione europea di intervenire per togliere o limitare al Porto internazionale di Trieste i privilegi che ad esso derivano in virtù del Trattato di Pace del 1947, in quanto lesivi della libera concorrenza all'interno dell'UE. In tali interrogazioni viene evidenziato che l'attuazione delle prerogative stabilite dall'allegato VIII del Trattato di pace di Parigi del 1947 per il Porto franco di Trieste danneggerebbe gli altri porti italiani. Lo stesso governo italiano, recependo tali richieste, è già intervenuto imponendo, in violazione del Memorandum di intesa di Londra del 1954, una soprattassa specifica solo per il porto di Trieste «al fine di riequilibrare il rapporto differenziale tra la misura della tassazione applicata nel porto franco di Trieste e quella applicata nella generalità dei porti nazionali». Inoltre il Comitato tecnico dell'UE ha approvato, in data il 24 luglio 2013, l'inserimento di un terminale di rigassificazione nell'Alto Adriatico tra i progetti prioritari in ambito energetico per l'Unione europea, senza peraltro specificare dove tale impianto dovrebbe essere ubicato. I progetti fino ad ora presentati riguardano due impianti, uno nel Porto di Trieste (Gas Natural — sito di Zauale) e l'altro off-shore nel Golfo di Trieste. Entrambi gli impianti vanno ad interferire con il traffico commerciale del Porto franco di Trieste e il progetto della Gas Natural all'interno del Porto franco di Trieste è addirittura proposto in violazione del Trattato di pace del 1947 che stabilisce l'impossibilità per uno Stato di esercitare la propria giurisdizione all'interno del Porto di Trieste (Allegato VIII del Trattato di Pace). Tale obbligo è stato ribadito con il Memorandum d'intesa di Londra con il quale all'art. 5 «Il Governo italiano s'impegna a mantenere il Porto franco a Trieste in ottemperanza delle disposizioni degli articoli da 1 a 20 dell'Allegato VIII del Trattato di pace con l'Italia». Lo status giuridico del porto di Trieste è quindi quello di un territorio internazionale al di fuori della sovranità della Repubblica italiana. Gli interventi dello Stato italiano, con imposizione di soprattasse sulle attività portuali svolte all'interno del porto di Trieste per «riequilibrare la concorrenza con i porti italiani», e le decisioni del Comitato tecnico UE e della Commissione UE per la realizzazione di terminali di rigassificazione nel porto di Trieste e/o nelle sue acque marittime si trovano quindi in contrasto con gli obblighi derivanti dai trattati internazionali in vigore per il territorio di Trieste e il suo porto e al cui rispetto è tenuta la stessa Unione europea.

Può dire la Commissione se è a conoscenza dei fatti sopra descritti? Come intende agire per assicurare il rispetto del trattato di pace del 1947 e del Memorandum di intesa di Londra che tutelano il Porto franco di Trieste?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione

(24 ottobre 2013)

La Commissione non è in grado di esprimere un parere sulla conformità delle misure adottate e/o previste dal governo italiano per il porto di Trieste nell'ambito del Trattato di pace del 1947 e del Memorandum d'intesa di Londra cui si riferisce l'interrogazione dell'onorevole deputato.

Per quanto riguarda il terminale di rigassificazione GNL onshore nell'Alto Adriatico, il 24 luglio gli organi decisionali dei gruppi regionali, costituiti da Stati membri e Commissione, hanno convenuto di inserirlo nell'elenco indicativo dei progetti di interesse comune (PIC). L'esatta ubicazione dell'impianto onshore non è stata ancora stabilita e nell'elenco non figura alcun terminale GNL offshore per questa regione. Gli elenchi regionali sono stati stilati dai gruppi di lavoro regionali in seguito alla valutazione del contributo delle proposte presentate al conseguimento degli obiettivi della politica energetica, conformemente al regolamento TEN-E.

Gli Stati membri hanno il diritto di approvare progetti di interesse comune concernenti il proprio territorio. Dal momento che la città di Trieste e il suo entroterra (zona A) sono territori soggetti alla sovranità dello Stato italiano, l'Italia ha il legittimo diritto di approvare il progetto GNL. L'Italia e la Jugoslavia hanno riconosciuto reciprocamente i confini che separano Trieste dalla vicina Jugoslavia con il Trattato di Osimo del 1975.

Al fine di mantenere lo status di progetti di interesse comune, tutti i progetti inclusi nell'elenco dei PIC devono essere conformi alla normativa dell'UE, compresa quella ambientale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009793/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
 (2 September 2013)

Subject: Protection of legal status of the Free Port of Trieste

In written questions E-000264/2013 and E-006306/2013 the Commission was asked to take action to withdraw or restrict the privileges granted to the international Port of Trieste under the 1947 Peace Treaty, given that they are detrimental to free competition within the EU. These questions pointed out that the implementation of the rights laid down in Annex VIII to the 1947 Paris Peace Treaty, with regard to the Free Port of Trieste, was damaging other Italian ports. The Italian Government itself, in acknowledgment of such requests, has already taken action by imposing — in breach of the 1954 London Memorandum of Understanding — a surtax specific only to the Port of Trieste 'in order to restore the balance in the taxation applied in the Port of Trieste and that applied in most national ports'.

In addition, on 24 July 2013 the EU Technical Committee approved the inclusion of a regasification terminal in the northern Adriatic among the priority projects of the EU energy sector, without specifying where such a facility was to be located. The projects submitted so far concern two plants — one in the Port of Trieste (*Gas Natural* — Zaule site) and the other site offshore in the Gulf of Trieste. Both plants will interfere with the commercial traffic of the Port of Trieste and the *Gas Natural* project in the Port of Trieste is even in breach of the 1947 Peace Treaty, which stipulates that a State may not exercise its jurisdiction in the Port of Trieste (Annex VIII to the Treaty of Peace). This requirement was reiterated in the London Memorandum of Understanding which, under Article 5, stipulates that 'the Italian Government undertakes to maintain the Free Port at Trieste in general accordance with the provisions of Articles 1-20 of Annex VIII of the Italian Peace Treaty'. The legal status of the Port of Trieste is therefore that of an international territory outside the sovereignty of the Italian Republic. The action taken by the Italian Government, in imposing surcharges on port activities carried out within the Port of Trieste to 'restore competition with Italian ports' and the decisions of the EU Technical Committee and the Commission to build regasification terminals in the port of Trieste and/or its waters are thus in breach of the obligations arising from existing international treaties in respect of the territory of Trieste and its port, with which the European Union is required to comply.

Can the Commission say whether it is aware of these issues? What action will it take to ensure compliance with the 1947 Peace Treaty and the London Memorandum of Understanding, which protect the Free Port of Trieste?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
 (24 October 2013)

The Commission is not in a position to comment on the compliance of the measures adopted and/or envisaged by the Italian Government in the Port of Trieste under the 1947 Peace Treaty and the London MoU referred to in the question of the Honourable Member.

Concerning the LNG regasification terminal 'Onshore LNG terminal in the Northern Adriatic', the decision making bodies of the Regional groups, comprised of Member States and Commission, agreed on the 24th of July on its inclusion on the draft list of Projects of Common Interest (PCI). The precise location of the onshore facility is not defined yet and there is no off-shore LNG terminal on this list in this region. The regional lists have been drawn up by the regional working groups following the assessment of the contribution of the submitted proposals to energy policy objectives, in accordance with the TEN-E regulation.

Member States have the right to approve projects of common interest related to their territory. The city of Trieste and its hinterland (Zone A) being under Italian sovereignty, Italy has the legitimate right to approve the LNG project. Borders separating Trieste from neighbouring Yugoslavia were mutually recognised by Italy and Yugoslavia in 1975 in the Treaty of Osimo.

All projects included in the PCI list have to be compliant with the EU legislation, including environmental legislation, in order to retain their PCI status.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009794/13

an die Kommission

Franz Obermayr (NI)

(2. September 2013)

Betrifft: Fehlende Autobahnverbindung zwischen Koper (Slowenien) und der kroatischen Grenze

Die vielbefahrene und beliebte Urlaubsrouten über Marburg, Laibach und Koper (A1/E61/E70) ist für zahlreiche Bürger Anlass zu Ärger darüber, dass es ca. 15 km vom Autobahnende in Koper (A1/E70) bis zum Beginn der neuen Autobahn (A9/E751) etwa 8 km nach der Grenze in Istrien keine Autobahnverbindung gibt. Dies führt von Koper bis zur kroatischen Grenze zur vermehrten Staubildung auf der schlecht ausgebauten Bergstraße.

1. Sind regionale Fördervorhaben geplant, um diesen infrastrukturellen Missstand zu beseitigen, zumal insbesondere Kroatien als neues EU-Mitglied besonderen Nutzen aus dieser Tourismusroute ziehen würde?
2. Wie kann man Slowenien dazu motivieren, auf dessen Seite der Großteil der unzureichenden Infrastruktur liegt, in die fehlende Autobahnverbindung zu investieren?
3. Welche Möglichkeiten gäbe es, auch Kroatien, das schließlich von den Touristen profitiert, als neues EU-Mitgliedsland dazu zu motivieren, ebenso in diese fehlende Autobahnverbindung zu investieren?
4. Wie könnte man Slowenien und Kroatien an einen Tisch bringen, um endlich die jahrelangen Grenzstreitigkeiten an der Dragonja-Mündung zu beseitigen und so auch dieses grenzüberschreitende Infrastrukturprojekt zu fördern?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission

(15. Oktober 2013)

Während die Autobahn- und die Eisenbahnverbindung Ljubljana — Koper Teile des TEN-V-Kernnetzes und der künftigen Korridore Ostsee-Adria und Mittelmeerraum bilden, gehört die Straßenverbindung von Koper zur kroatischen Grenze und darüber hinaus bis zur kroatischen Autobahn A9 nicht zum Transeuropäischen Verkehrsnetz.

Daher liegen der Kommission keine genauen Informationen über diese Verbindung vor. Außerdem gibt es keine Rechtsgrundlage für eine Kofinanzierung dieser Straßenverbindung mit TEN-V-Mitteln oder Mitteln der Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ (CEF); auch eine Förderung aus dem Kohäsionsfonds kommt nicht in Frage. Dagegen wäre eine Förderung mit EFRE-Mitteln möglich, doch gehören Nationalstraßen nicht zu den Kofinanzierungsprioritäten des Programmplanungszeitraums 2013-2020 für Slowenien und Kroatien.

Die Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ legt ihren Schwerpunkt auf die Verwirklichung von Teilen des künftigen Verkehrskernnetzes, insbesondere für den Schienenverkehr und die Binnenschifffahrt, die multimodalen Schnittstellen (Häfen, Terminals usw.) und technologische Innovationen.

Der Ausbau der vorhandenen Straßenverbindung oder der Bau einer neuen Autobahnverbindung müsste bilateral zwischen Slowenien und Kroatien vereinbart werden. Die Kommission weist darauf hin, dass bereits andere Autobahnverbindungen zwischen Slowenien und Kroatien vorhanden oder geplant sind.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009794/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Missing section of motorway between Koper (Slovenia) and the Croatian border

Although busy and popular, the holiday route via Maribor, Ljubljana and Koper (A1/E61/E70) is also a source of aggravation for many motorists, because smooth progress is interrupted by a stretch of normal road approximately 15 km in length between the end of the A1/E70 motorway in Koper and the start of the new motorway (A9/E751) some 8 km beyond the border in Istria. Traffic jams are frequent on the narrow mountain road from Koper to the Croatian border.

1. Are there plans to make regional funding available to do away with this bottleneck, particularly as Croatia in particular, as a new EU Member State, would benefit greatly from improvements to this tourist route?
2. What steps could be taken to persuade Slovenia — on whose side of the border the majority of the inadequate infrastructure is located — to invest in a project to connect the two motorways?
3. Given that it too benefits from tourism, how could Croatia, as a new Member State, also be encouraged to invest in such a project?
4. What steps could be taken to bring Slovenia and Croatia to the negotiating table with a view to ending the lengthy border dispute between them concerning the estuary of the River Dragonja and thus clearing the way for investment in this cross-border infrastructure project?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2013)

While the motorway and the railway line Ljubljana — Koper are parts of the TEN-T core network and, as such, of the future Baltic-Adriatic and Mediterranean Corridors, the road link continuing from Koper to the Croatian border and beyond to the Croatian A9 motorway is not included in the TEN-T.

Accordingly, the Commission does not have specific information on this link. Further, there is no legal base for co-funding this road connection from TEN-T or CEF funds, nor from cohesion fund. On the contrary, ERDF funding could be available yet national roads are not considered as a priority for co-financing in 2013-2020 programming period in Slovenia and Croatia.

The Connecting Europe Facility concentrates on the implementation of elements of the future transport core network in particular of rail and inland waterway, the multimodal interfaces (ports, terminals, etc.) and technological innovation.

Upgrading the existing road connection or constructing a new motorway link in this relation would have to be agreed bilaterally between Slovenia and Croatia. The Commission would like to recall the fact that there are already other existing and planned motorway links between Slovenia and Croatia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009795/13
to the Commission
Fiona Hall (ALDE)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Infringement procedures 2003-2013

Article 258 TFEU gives the Commission the power to hold Member States to account if they do not comply with EC laws.

Since January 2008, how many such infringement procedures have been initiated by the Commission against each EU Member State?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2013)

The Commission is sending directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat a table containing the data requested.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009796/13
to the Commission
Fiona Hall (ALDE)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Addax Bioenergy plantation in Sierra Leone

By 2014, a large proportion of the ethanol produced on the Addax Bioenergy sugar cane plantation in Sierra Leone will be exported to the EU. This biofuels project is funded by the African Development Bank, as well as five European bilateral institutions and two other donors. It has been promoted previously by the Commission as a sustainable biofuels project and has received a sustainability certificate from the Roundtable for Sustainable Biofuels.

However, in a report published this week by the NGO 'ActionAid' entitled 'Broken promises, the impacts of Addax Bioenergy in Sierra Leone on hunger and livelihood', it is suggested that this project has fallen short of the expected standards.

The report provides evidence of negative impacts on food security, land rights and the livelihoods of local communities, and there is said to have been a lack of adequate free, prior and informed consent from communities.

Bearing in mind the Commission's previous interest in this project, the role of European bilateral institutions in its funding, and the important commitment the EU has made to reducing poverty and hunger across the globe:

1. Is the Commission aware of the negative impacts that this project is having on local communities?
2. Will the Commission be undertaking a full investigation as to what has gone wrong with the Addax Bioenergy project and, if so, what form will this investigation take?
3. What does the Commission plan to do in order to ensure that such problems are not repeated, on this project or other biofuels projects exporting to the EU?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(6 November 2013)

The European Commission would first of all like to underline that funds from the European Development Fund have not been used to support the ADDAX plantation in Sierra Leone and as such, the Delegation of the European Union to Sierra Leone has not been involved in the project.

Investments in agriculture on the African continent are strongly needed. However, access to land, land rights, local food security, local access to energy and gender equity are among the issues that needs to be addressed for such investments to be beneficial for the societies as a whole. The Commission through its Delegation is actively following the general discussion around the land policy reform in Sierra Leone. The Government is currently working on a land policy reform in order to create clarity on issues related to land.

The European Union has a substantial quality assurance process which all new projects have to go through in order to ensure that such negative impacts, as described in the ActionAid report, can be addressed.

The Honourable Member will find more details about this quality assurance at:
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/ensure-aid-effectiveness/quality-support-groups_en.htm

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009797/13
do Komisji**

Adam Bielan (ECR)

(2 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: W sprawie norweskich koncesji na wydobycie węglowodorów

Norweski Dyrektoriat ds. Paliw rozpoczyna proces licencyjny w zakresie koncesji na poszukiwanie i wydobycie węglowodorów we wschodniej części Morza Barentsa. Dotychczas na tym obszarze Oslo toczyło spór graniczny z Rosją. Norwegowie szacują, że mogą znajdować się tam złoża w objętości prawie 2 mld baryłek ekwiwalentu ropy naftowej.

W interesie obywateli Wspólnoty zwracam się z pytaniem, czy wobec zaistniałej sytuacji Komisja wyraża zainteresowanie norweskim procesem licencyjnym i czy planuje przedsięwziąć dodatkowe kroki zachęcające europejskich przedsiębiorców branżowych do ubiegania się o ww. koncesje? Proszę również o informacje, czy i w jakim zakresie, unijne firmy obecnie partycypują w norweskiej produkcji węglowodorów?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Günthera Oettingera w imieniu Komisji

(15 października 2013 r.)

Norwegia, będąc stroną Porozumienia o Europejskim Obszarze Gospodarczym, stosuje większość dorobku prawnego UE, w tym przepisy dotyczące zezwoleń na poszukiwanie, badanie i produkcję węglowodorów (dyrektywa 94/22/WE z dnia 30 maja 1994 r. w sprawie warunków udzielania i korzystania z zezwoleń na poszukiwanie, badanie i produkcję węglowodorów). Komisja obserwuje norweski proces licencyjny w ramach dyrektywy 94/22/WE, która zobowiązuje Norwegię do publikacji informacji o procedurze licencyjnej w Dzienniku Urzędowym UE co najmniej 90 dni przed końcowym terminem składania wniosków. Taka informacja powinna określać obszar geograficzny, rodzaj zezwolenia oraz kryteria kwalifikowania wnioskodawców, aby umożliwić składanie wniosków wszystkim zainteresowanym przedsiębiorstwom europejskim. Komisja, oprócz zagwarantowania, że takie informacje zostaną publikowane, nie nadzoruje w sposób czynny procedur licencyjnych w poszczególnych państwach UE lub EOG ani nie uczestniczy w tych procedurach do tego stopnia, aby promować poszczególne rundy licencyjne.

Jeśli chodzi o firmy partycypujące w norweskiej produkcji węglowodorów, Komisja informuje, że uaktualnione informacje znajdują się w sekcji „Fact pages” na stronie internetowej norweskiej Dyrekcji ds. Ropy Naftowej:
<http://factpages.npd.no/factpages/>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009797/13
to the Commission
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Norwegian licences for the extraction of hydrocarbons

The Norwegian Petroleum Directorate is launching a licencing procedure for the prospection and extraction of hydrocarbons in the east of the Barents Sea, an area which has been at the centre of a border dispute between Norway and Russia. The Norwegians think that the area could contain crude oil deposits equivalent to a volume of around two billion barrels.

With the interests of EU citizens in mind, I should like to ask whether the Commission is expressing any interest in the Norwegian licencing process in the light of the current situation. Moreover, is the Commission intending to take any additional action to encourage European businesses in the sector to apply for the above licences? Could the Commission also tell me whether, and to what extent, EU companies are currently active in Norwegian hydrocarbon production?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2013)

As a member of the European Economic Area Agreement, Norway applies most of the EU *acquis* including legislation on hydrocarbons licensing (Directive 94/22/EC of 30 May 1994 on the conditions for granting and using authorisations for the prospection, exploration and production of hydrocarbons). The Commission follows the Norwegian licensing process within the framework of the directive 94/22/EC which binds Norway to publish, in the Official Journal of the EU, a notice on the licensing procedure at least 90 days before the closing date for applications. This notice should specify the geographical area, the type of authorisation and the selection criteria for applicants so that all interested European enterprises can submit applications. Besides ensuring the publication of such notices, the Commission does not actively oversee or get involved in the licensing procedures in individual EU or EEA countries to the extent of promoting individual licensing rounds.

As regards the data on companies active in Norwegian hydrocarbon production, the Commission is aware that updated information can be found under the Fact pages of the Norwegian Petroleum Directorate website:
<http://factpages.npd.no/factpages/>

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009798/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)**

Adam Bielan (ECR)

(2 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – W sprawie zapowiadanych ograniczeń dostaw rosyjskiej ropy do Białorusi

W odpowiedzi na zatrzymanie przez Białoruś dyrektora rosyjskiego koncernu produkującego sole potasowe, Kreml zapowiedział zmniejszenie, z dniem 1 września br., dostaw ropy do tego kraju. Wyrażono również zastrzeżenia wobec białoruskich produktów mlecznych. Obok Ukrainy, Białoruś staje się zatem kolejnym krajem Partnerstwa Wschodniego, szykanowanym przez Moskwę, co w kontekście zbliżającego się wileńskiego szczytu, wzbudza szczególnie niepokój.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się do Wysokiej Przedstawiciel z pytaniem, czy w obliczu prawdopodobnego pogorszenia się relacji rosyjsko-białoruskich, Bruksela rozważa wyrażenie jasnego stanowiska wobec coraz bardziej agresywnej polityki Kremla względem naszych krajów partnerskich? Stanowisko takie mogłoby skutkować wypracowaniem bardziej przychylniej postawy Mińska w odniesieniu do Unii Europejskiej.

Ponadto, proszę o informacje, czy i jakie konsekwencje dla krajów Wspólnoty, mogą zaistnieć w następstwie rosyjskich ograniczeń w dystrybucji surowców energetycznych do Białorusi.

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel i Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji**

(24 października 2013 r.)

Unia Europejska zawsze bardzo wyraźnie podkreślała swoje stanowisko wobec naszych sąsiadów wschodnich, zakładając współpracę na rzecz dobrobytu i stabilnej sytuacji na naszym kontynencie. Zostało to potwierdzone w ramach naszego wspólnego celu przewidującego stowarzyszenie polityczne oraz integrację gospodarczą w oparciu o układy o stowarzyszeniu i odnośne pogłębione i kompleksowe strefy wolnego handlu. Jakikolwiek działania podejmowane przez Rosję w związku z możliwością podpisania takich układów z niektórymi wschodnimi partnerami UE są nie do zaakceptowania. Odnosi się to do wszystkich form nacisku, również w odniesieniu do ewentualnych kwestii bezpieczeństwa energetycznego.

W 2009 r. UE i Rosja ustanowiły mechanizm wczesnego ostrzegania, który ma zagwarantować wczesną ocenę potencjalnych zagrożeń i problemów związanych z dostawami energii. Obejmuje to sytuacje, w przypadku których istnieje ryzyko dostaw rurociągami prowadzonymi przez terytorium Białorusi.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009798/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Adam Bielan (ECR)

(2 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Restrictions announced on supplies of Russian oil to Belarus

In response to the detention in Belarus of an executive from a Russian potash-producing company, the Kremlin announced a reduction in oil supplies to Belarus beginning on 1 September. It also expressed reservations about Belarusian dairy products. After Ukraine, Belarus has become the next Eastern Partnership country to be harassed by Moscow. In the context of the forthcoming summit in Vilnius, this is a matter of particular concern.

In this regard, I would like to ask the High Representative whether, in the face of a likely deterioration in Russian-Belarusian relations, Brussels is considering taking a clear stance against the Kremlin's increasingly aggressive policy towards our partner countries. Such a stance could lead to a more favourable attitude in Minsk towards the European Union.

In addition, what consequences, if any, will there be for EU Member States resulting from Russian restrictions on energy supplies to Belarus?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(24 October 2013)

The European Union has always been very clear about its policy towards our Eastern Neighbours to work together to build a zone of prosperity and stability on our continent. This is confirmed through our joint objective of political association and economic integration underpinned by Association Agreements and their Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas. Any measures by Russia linked to the possible signing of such Agreements with some of European Union's Eastern Partners are unacceptable. This applies to all forms of pressure including as regards possible energy security issues.

The EU and Russia established an Early Warning Mechanism in 2009, in order to guarantee an early evaluation of potential risks and problems related to energy supply. This includes situations in case there is a risk of supply disruptions through pipelines going through Belarus.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009799/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)**

Adam Bielan (ECR)

(2 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – W sprawie masowych prześladowań chrześcijan w Egipcie

W ogarniętym chaosem Egipcie systematycznie powtarzają się ataki bojowników Bractwa Muzułmańskiego na chrześcijan, pomimo że ci ostatni nie są stroną konfliktu. M.in. w Luksorze doszło do zbrojnej napaści na siedzibę biskupa, na szczęście odpartej przez policję. Koptowie pozostają jednakże pod ciągłym zagrożeniem, praktycznie nie mogą opuszczać swoich schronień i domostw. Przy czym również i tam nie mogą czuć się bezpieczni.

Chrześcijańscy duchowni przyznają ponadto, że władze nierzadko nie reagują na ich wezwania o pomoc, choćby w przypadkach ataków na obiekty sakralne. Według relacji, biskup Al-Minii, Anba Makarios, miał bezskutecznie zwracać się do premiera, szefa MSW i przedstawiciela wojska z prośbą o wysłanie sił bezpieczeństwa do ochrony Koptów.

Koptyjska mniejszość stanowi ok. 10 % mieszkańców Egiptu. Jest to więc znacząca grupa obywateli. W trosce o jej los zwracam się do Wysokiej Przedstawiciel z prośbą o odpowiedź:

1. W jaki sposób Unia Europejska realizuje pomoc dla egipskich chrześcijan?
2. Czy możliwe jest dyplomatyczne wsparcie mniejszości koptyjskiej poprzez wywarcie wpływu na obecnie rządzących w Kairze, aby zwracali baczniejszą uwagę na podobne przypadki haniebnego dyskryminacji na tle religijnym?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji

(25 października 2013 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel / Wiceprzewodnicząca wyraźnie potępiła przypadki skrajnej przemocy, zabójstw i ataków, w tym w stosunku do kościołów, które nastąpiły w wyniku licznych demonstracji wspieranych przez Bractwo Muzułmańskie, jakie miały miejsce w połowie sierpnia. W dniu 21 sierpnia Wysoka Przedstawiciel / Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji zwołała nadzwyczajne posiedzenie Rady do Spraw Zagranicznych w sprawie Egiptu, gdzie ministrowie spraw zagranicznych państw UE przyjęli konkluzje, w których odnieśli się w szczególności do licznych przypadków zniszczeń kościołów i ataków na wspólnotę koptyjską.

UE jest zaniepokojona ograniczeniami, jakim podlegają różne mniejszości religijne w Egipcie, i potępia wszelkie formy nietolerancji, dyskryminacji i przemocy przeciwko osobom ze względu na ich religię lub przekonania, niezależnie od miejsca oraz wyznania. Wysoka Przedstawiciel / Wiceprzewodnicząca regularnie wzywa egipskie władze do zapewnienia wolności wyznania i przekonań w tym kraju.

Delegatura UE w Kairze uważnie śledzi przypadki przemocy na tle religijnym i w swoich kontaktach z władzami egipskimi podkreśla znaczenie unikania dyskryminacji z przyczyn religijnych. Aby wesprzeć poprawę wolności wyznania lub przekonań w Egipcie, Wysoka Przedstawiciel / Wiceprzewodnicząca z zaangażowaniem współpracuje z wszelkimi odnośnymi zainteresowanymi stronami w tym kraju, a także z regionalnymi i międzynarodowymi organizacjami podzielającymi wartości i cele UE w tej dziedzinie.

UE stwierdza, że współpraca i dialog polityczny są najbardziej odpowiednimi kanałami wspierania i wywierania presji na rząd w Kairze, aby podjął on konkretne działania w celu ochrony Koptów i innych mniejszości religijnych.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009799/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Adam Bielan (ECR)

(2 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Widespread persecution of Christians in Egypt

In the chaos that is engulfing Egypt, Christians are being systematically and repeatedly attacked by Muslim Brotherhood militants even though Christians are not involved in the conflict. In Luxor, for example, an armed attack on the bishop's office was fortunately repelled by the police. However, the Copts remain under constant threat and are virtually unable to leave their shelters and homes. And even there they cannot feel safe.

Christian clergy have also reported that the authorities often do not respond to their calls for help, even when places of worship come under attack. According to reports, the Bishop-General of Minya, Anba Macarius, has asked the prime minister, the interior minister and an army representative to send security forces to protect the Copts, but his requests have fallen on deaf ears.

The Coptic minority makes up around 10% of Egypt's population, in other words a substantial number of people. Out of concern for their fate I would like to put the following questions to the High Representative:

1. How is the European Union helping Egypt's Christians?
2. Is it possible to provide diplomatic support to the Coptic minority by exerting influence on the current rulers in Cairo in order to draw more attention to such incidents of shameful discrimination on religious grounds?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(25 October 2013)

The HR/VP condemned in the clearest possible terms the extreme violence, killings and attacks, including on churches, that followed the dispersal in mid-August of the Muslim Brotherhood supported sit-ins. On 21 August, the HR/VP convened an extra-ordinary Foreign Affairs Council on Egypt where EU Foreign Ministers adopted conclusions which also specifically referred to the destruction of many churches and the targeting of the Coptic community.

The EU is aware and concerned about the constraints that different religious minorities face in Egypt 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. The HR/VP is repeatedly calling 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 HR/VP is keen to engage with the relevant stakeholders in the country as well as with the regional and international organisations sharing the EU's values and objectives in this respect.

The EU considers that cooperation and political dialogue are the most appropriate channels to encourage and put pressure on Cairo's Government so that it will undertake concrete actions in order to protect Copts and other religious minorities.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009800/13

do Komisji

Adam Bielan (ECR)

(2 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: W obliczu konsekwencji rosyjsko-ukraińskiej „wojny handlowej”

W ostatnim czasie obserwujemy wzrost zaangażowania Kremla względem Ukrainy, pozostającego w wyraźnej kontrze wobec interesów Wspólnoty na Wschodzie. Przedstawiciele władz Rosji wprost przyznają, że niedawne zaostrzenie kontroli ukraińskich towarów miało zniechęcić Kijów do podpisania umowy o stowarzyszeniu z UE. Tymczasem Ukraina zmaga się z ogromną recesją.

W związku z powyższą sytuacją zwracam się do Komisji z prośbą o wyrażenie opinii w następujących kwestiach:

1. Czy w obliczu możliwego zaostrzenia stanowiska Moskwy wobec Kijowa, w następstwie podpisania umowy stowarzyszeniowej z UE, Bruksela rozważa zwiększenie pomocy gospodarczej dla Ukrainy oraz jakie dodatkowe działania zostałyby wówczas uruchomione?
2. Jakie działania ze strony instytucji podległych Komisji są rozważane na wypadek, gdyby w kolejnych sankcjach wobec Ukrainy partycypowały także: Białoruś i Kazachstan (pozostali członkowie Unii Celnej)?
3. Należy również liczyć się z prawdopodobieństwem kolejnego odcięcia przez Rosję dostaw gazu na Ukrainę. Czy i w jaki sposób instytucje europejskie zabezpieczą interesy energetyczne, również zagrożonych wówczas, krajów członkowskich?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Štefana Fülego w imieniu Komisji

(31 października 2013 r.)

1. Presja wywierana na Ukrainę w związku z możliwością podpisania przez nią układu o stowarzyszeniu, obejmującego pogłębioną i kompleksową umowę o wolnym handlu (AA/DCFTA), jest niedopuszczalna. Najskuteczniejszym sposobem zapewnienia wsparcia w tej sytuacji jest przystąpienie do podpisania układu, pod warunkiem spełnienia wymogów unijnych przez Ukrainę, i zapewnienie jego jak najszybszego tymczasowego stosowania. Ukraińska gospodarka skorzystałaby nie tylko z obniżonych stawek celnych, ale również czerpałaby korzyści z dynamizujących efektów wdrożenia pogłębionej i kompleksowej umowy o wolnym handlu poprzez poprawę klimatu gospodarczego.

Ukrainie udostępniono pomoc makrofinansową UE w wysokości do 610 mln EUR w celu uzupełnienia ewentualnego kolejnego programu MFW. Obowiązkiem Ukrainy jest zapewnienie, że spełnione są warunki dokonywania wydatków. Dostępna jest dodatkowa pomoc techniczna mająca na celu ułatwienie wdrażania DCFTA.

2. Układ o stowarzyszeniu/pogłębionej i kompleksowej strefie wolnego handlu nie stanowi przeszkody dla Ukrainy w budowaniu konstruktywnych stosunków z Eurazjatycką Unią Celną, dopóki te opierają się na poszanowaniu zasad WTO i nie pozostają w sprzeczności z DCFTA. Jeśli w wyniku swojej decyzji o ściślejszej współpracy z UE Ukraina znajdzie się pod presją, UE będzie ją wspierać w stosownych przypadkach, także na szczeblach wielostronnych.

3. Komisja regularnie zwołuje spotkania w ramach Grupy Koordynacyjnej ds. Gazu w celu ułatwienia koordynacji środków służących zapewnieniu bezpieczeństwa dostaw, zwiększenia gotowości w odniesieniu do zakłóceń w dostawach oraz wspomagania państw członkowskich w koordynacji środków krajowych w razie kryzysu. W przypadku wystąpienia zakłóceń dostaw z Rosji do UE, Komisja uruchomiłaby również mechanizm wczesnego ostrzegania UE-Rosja, który przewiduje wspólne działania mające na celu szybkie przewidywanie nagłych sytuacji awaryjnych, łagodzenie ich skutków i zapobieganie im w przyszłości.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009800/13
to the Commission
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Consequences of the 'trade war' between Russia and Ukraine

The Kremlin has recently been ratcheting up its involvement in Ukraine, in clear opposition to the EU's interests in the East. Representatives of the Russian Government have openly admitted that the recent tightening of controls on Ukrainian goods was designed to discourage the Ukrainians from signing an association agreement with the EU. Ukraine is also in the grip of a major recession.

With this in mind:

1. Given that Moscow's stance towards Ukraine might well harden following the signing of the association agreement with the EU, is Brussels considering increasing its economic support for Ukraine? What other action would be taken in such circumstances?
2. What steps might the Commission and its institutions take if Belarus and Kazakhstan (the other members of the Customs Union) also take part in further sanctions against Ukraine?
3. Given that Russia might well cut off gas supplies to Ukraine once again, are the European institutions going to protect the energy interests of the Member States that will also be at risk if this happens? If so, how?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(31 October 2013)

1. Pressure on Ukraine linked to the possible signing of the Association Agreement, including its Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (AA/DCFTA), with the EU is unacceptable. The most effective way of providing support is to proceed with the signature of the Agreement, provided that Ukraine fulfils the EU's benchmarks, and to ensure the earliest possible provisional application. Besides tariff reductions, the Ukrainian economy would benefit from the dynamic effects of implementing the DCFTA through improvements of the business climate.

EU Macro-Financial Assistance of up to EUR 610m has been made available to Ukraine to complement a potential successor IMF programme. It is for Ukraine to make sure the disbursement conditions are met. Additional technical assistance is available to facilitate DCFTA implementation.

2. The AA/DCFTA does not prevent Ukraine from developing constructive relations with the Eurasian Customs Union as long as this is based on the respect of WTO rules and does not contradict the DCFTA. In case of pressure resulting from Ukraine's choice of closer association with the EU, the EU will support and stand by Ukraine, including at multilateral levels, if appropriate.

3. The Commission regularly convenes meetings in the Gas Coordination Group to facilitate the coordination of security of supply measures, improve preparedness with regard to supply disruptions, and assist MSs in coordinating national measures in the event of a crisis. Should a disruption of Russian supplies to the EU occur, the Commission would also activate the EU-Russia Early Warning Mechanism, which provides for joint actions to rapidly overcome emergencies, mitigating consequences and preventing such situations in the future.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-009801/13
alla Commissione**

Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)

(2 settembre 2013)

Oggetto: Materiale per missioni elettorali prodotto non localmente e fuori dall'Unione

Secondo la risposta a un'interrogazione, per il materiale relativo alle missioni elettorali la Commissione incoraggia acquisti sul mercato locale nonché la produzione di prodotti locali, ogniqualvolta ciò sia possibile.

Quali motivi non hanno reso possibile l'applicazione del citato principio in Paraguay, dove gli elementi di visibilità dell'UE per i membri della missione non erano prodotti né localmente né nell'Unione?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(25 settembre 2013)

La Commissione incoraggia i fornitori di servizi ad acquistare gli elementi di visibilità nel paese partner in cui si svolge la missione di osservazione elettorale. L'obiettivo è quello di sostenere l'economia locale e i prodotti fabbricati sul posto che spesso sono più adeguati alle condizioni locali.

Tuttavia, conformemente alle condizioni generali degli appalti UE, i fornitori di servizi sono tenuti a proporre l'offerta più ampia possibile e a cercare i prezzi e la qualità migliore per l'acquisto del materiale necessario, a condizione che vengano rispettati i termini stabiliti per la consegna e che si tenga conto dei piani per quanto riguarda l'assegnazione delle sedi ai membri della missione di osservazione elettorale.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-009801/13
to the Commission**

Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)

(2 September 2013)

Subject: Material for election missions not produced locally or in the Union

According to the answer given to a parliamentary question, as regards all material relating to election missions, the Commission, whenever possible, encourages local purchases and the production of local products.

Why was it not possible to apply that principle in Paraguay, where EU promotion material for the members of the mission was produced neither locally nor in the Union?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(25 September 2013)

The Commission encourages the service providers to buy visibility material in the partner country where the electoral observation mission is to take place. The objective is to support the local economy and locally manufactured products are often better adapted to the local conditions.

However, under the general terms of EU contracts service providers are obliged to tender as wide as possible and seek the best prices and quality for the acquisition of the necessary material for as long as they also comply with required delivery deadlines and take into account the deployment plans of the members of the election observation mission.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie P-009802/13

Komisi

Anna Záborská (PPE)

(2. septembra 2013)

Vec: Zlúčenie pracovného, osobného a rodinného života – vymedzenie pojmov „rodinný život“ a „osobný život“

Aké právne vymedzenia pojmov „rodina“ a „rodinný život“ používa Komisia v súvislosti s opatreniami Spoločenstva na „zlúčenie pracovného, osobného a rodinného života“?

Ktoré články v zmluvách stanovujú právny základ pre vymedzenie pojmu „rodina“ na účely a plnenie spoločnej stratégie EÚ?

Aký je rozdiel medzi „rodinným životom“ a „osobným životom“?

Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie

(9. októbra 2013)

Zásady rešpektovania súkromného a rodinného života, ako aj ochrany rodinného a pracovného života sú ukotvené v článkoch 7 a 33 Charty základných práv Európskej únie (ďalej len „charta“).

Tieto ustanovenia neobsahujú právne vymedzenia pojmov „rodina“, „rodinný život“ a „súkromný život“. Pokiaľ ide o pojem „súkromný život“, ktorý je uvedený v článku 7 charty aj v článku 8 Európskeho dohovoru o ľudských právach, tak Európsky súd pre ľudské práva predložil túto definíciu: „Článok 8 ochraňuje právo na identitu a osobný vývoj, ako aj právo na nadviazanie a rozvíjanie vzťahov s ostatnými ľuďmi a vonkajším svetom“⁽¹⁾. Uvedený výklad je záväzný v súvislosti s článkom 7 charty (porov. článok 52 ods. 3 charty). Pokiaľ ide o pojem „rodinný život“, z judikatúry Súdneho dvora a Európskeho súdu pre ľudské práva vyplýva, že tento pojem predovšetkým zahŕňa právo žiť a tráviť čas so svojimi blízkymi príbuznými.

⁽¹⁾ Pozri vec *Pretty/Spojené kráľovstvo*, podnet č. 2346/02, rozsudok Európskeho súdu pre ľudské práva z 29. apríla 2002.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-009802/13
to the Commission
Anna Záborská (PPE)
(2 September 2013)**

Subject: Reconciliation of work, private and family life — definitions of 'family life' and 'private life'

What legal definitions of 'the family' and 'family life' does the Commission apply when dealing with Community policies on 'reconciliation between work, private and family life'?

What articles in the Treaties provide a legal basis for the definition of the concept of 'the family' for the purpose and implementation of a common EU strategy?

What is the difference between 'family life' and 'private life'?

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

The principles of respect for private and family life as well as protection of family and professional life are enshrined in Articles 7 and 33 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union ('the Charter').

There are no legal definitions of the terms 'family', 'family life' and 'private life' provided in these provisions. Regarding the latter term, which is contained in Article 7 of the Charter as well as in Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, the European Court of Human Rights has given the following definition: 'Article 8 protects a right to identity and personal development, and a right to establish and develop relationships with other human beings and the outside world' ⁽¹⁾. This interpretation is binding as regards Article 7 of the Charter (cf. Article 52 (3) of the Charter). Concerning the term 'family life', it follows from the case law of the Court of Justice and of the European Court of Human Rights that this concept notably encompasses the right to live and spend time with one's close relatives.

⁽¹⁾ See Case Pretty v. the United Kingdom, App no 2346/02, European Court of Human Rights judgment of 29 April 2002.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-009803/13

Rade

Anna Záborská (PPE)

(2. septembra 2013)

Vec: Zosúladenie pracovného, súkromného a rodinného života – vymedzenie pojmu „rodinný život“ a „súkromný život“

Aké vymedzenie „rodiny“ a „rodinného života“ používa Rada, pokiaľ ide o politiky Spoločenstva v oblasti rovnováhy medzi pracovným a súkromným životom (zosúladenie pracovného, súkromného a rodinného života)?

Ktoré články v zmluvách poskytujú právny základ pre Radu na vymedzenie konceptu rodiny z právneho hľadiska na účel politik Únie?

V čom spočíva rozdiel medzi „rodinným životom“ a „súkromným životom“ pri vykonávaní týchto politik?

Odpoveď

(5. novembra 2013)

„Rodina“ a „rodinný život“ nie sú v právnych predpisoch EÚ nikde vymedzené a v súčasnosti ani nebol Rade predložený žiadny návrh takejto definície. Taktiež nie je vymedzený rozdiel medzi „rodinným životom“ a „súkromným životom“.

Ak by chcela Komisia navrhnúť definíciu pojmov „rodina“, „rodinný život“ a „súkromný život“, potom by mala tiež navrhnúť právny základ, ktorý by následne preskúmala Rada alebo Rada spolu s Európskym parlamentom.

V Charte základných práv sa článok 7 zaoberá rešpektovaním súkromného a rodinného života: „Každý má právo na rešpektovanie svojho súkromného a rodinného života, obdobia a komunikácie.“ Tu použité pojmy podliehajú výkladu Súdneho dvora a, pokiaľ ide o príslušné ustanovenie Európskeho dohovoru o ľudských právach, Európskeho súdu pre ľudské práva v Štrasburgu.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009803/13
to the Council**

Anna Záborská (PPE)

(2 September 2013)

Subject: Reconciliation of work, private and family life — definitions of 'family life' and 'private life'

What definitions of 'family' and 'family life' does the Council apply when dealing with community policies on the work-life balance (reconciliation between work, private and family life)?

What articles in the Treaties provide a legal basis for the Council to define legally the concept of the family for the purpose of EU policies?

What is the difference between 'family life' and 'private life' when implementing these policies?

Reply

(5 November 2013)

There is no definition of 'family' or 'family life' in EU legislation, nor is there any proposal for such a definition currently before the Council. The difference between 'family life' and 'private life' has not been defined either.

If the Commission were to propose a definition of the concepts of 'family', 'family life' and 'private life', it would be up to the Commission to suggest the legal basis, which would then be examined in the Council, or the Council and the European Parliament.

Article 7 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights deals with the respect for private and family life: 'Everyone has the right to respect for his or her private and family life, home and communications.' The terms used here are the subject of interpretation by the Court of Justice and, as far as the corresponding provision of the European Convention of Human Rights is concerned, by the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009804/13
an die Kommission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(2. September 2013)

Betrifft: Erschwernis der Jugendbegegnungen zwischen Deutschland und Frankreich

Im Rahmen der Jugendbegegnung zwischen Deutschland und Frankreich werden zunehmend hohe formale Anforderungen an die Betreuerinnen und Betreuer gestellt. Diese umfassen mittlerweile die Nennung der Namen und Geburtsnamen der Eltern sowie verschiedene Zertifikate der Unbedenklichkeit sowie der pädagogischen Eignung. Das erschwert die Maßnahmen in erheblichem Maße.

Kann die Kommission daher folgende Fragen beantworten:

Erkennt die Kommission das Problem der zunehmenden Erschwernis von Austauschmaßnahmen?

Gedenkt die Kommission, hier die ehrenamtlichen Veranstalter von Jugendaustauschmaßnahmen zu unterstützen und auch in Zukunft einen Austausch zu ermöglichen?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(15. Oktober 2013)

Der Kommission ist nicht bekannt, dass es zunehmend Schwierigkeiten bei der Organisation von Jugendbegegnungen zwischen Deutschland und Frankreich gibt. Was die von der Kommission im Rahmen des Programms „Jugend in Aktion“ finanzierten Begegnungen betrifft, so hat die Kommission keine der Anforderungen eingeführt, die in der Anfrage der Frau Abgeordneten als Beispiele angeführt werden.

Die Kommission plant, die Unterstützung der derzeit im Rahmen von „Jugend in Aktion“ organisierten Jugendbegegnungen in Zukunft zu verstärken; für den Programmplanungszeitraum 2014-2020 sind im zukünftigen Programm Erasmus+ mehr Mittel insbesondere zur Finanzierung von Jugendbegegnungen, von Projekten des Europäischen Freiwilligendienstes und von Fortbildungs- und Vernetzungsprojekten für sozialpädagogische Betreuer vorgesehen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009804/13
to the Commission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Difficulty of organising youth exchanges between Germany and France

More and more formal requirements are being made of coordinators of youth exchanges between Germany and France. These requirements now include giving their parents' names and birth names as well as various certificates attesting to their conduct and suitability for teaching. This makes it much more difficult to organise exchanges.

Is the Commission aware of the increasing difficulty of organising exchanges?

Does the Commission plan to support youth exchange organising volunteers and enable exchanges to continue in future?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Vassiliou au nom de la Commission
(15 octobre 2013)

La Commission n'est pas informée de difficultés croissantes d'organiser des échanges de jeunes entre l'Allemagne et la France. En ce qui concerne les échanges que finance l'Union européenne à travers le programme Jeunesse en Action, la Commission n'a introduit aucune exigence qui corresponde aux exemples évoqués par l'Honorable Parlementaire.

La Commission prévoit de renforcer à l'avenir le soutien aux échanges de jeunes actuellement assuré par Jeunesse en Action: sur la période 2014-2020, le futur programme Erasmus+ devrait disposer de moyens budgétaires accrus pour notamment financer des échanges de jeunes, des expériences de Service volontaire européen et des activités de formation et de mise en réseau proposées aux animateurs socio-éducatifs.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009805/13
a la Comisión**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE) y
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)**
(2 de septiembre de 2013)

Asunto: Cierre de la cuenta Twitter del activista por la lengua Jaume Flor — posible violación de la libertad de expresión por razones ideológicas y políticas

Mientras que, el 31 de agosto de 2013, los estudiantes valencianos están a punto de comenzar las clases y el nuevo año escolar, el activista en favor de la lengua valenciana/catalana Jaume Flor ha visto su cuenta Twitter cerrada después de organizar un *tweet* colectivo por el derecho a estudiar en catalán en el País Valenciano ⁽¹⁾.

Jaume Flor es un experto en promover *tweets* en Twitter en favor de causas relacionadas con la libertad del país y los derechos lingüísticos de los catalanoparlantes.

Jaume Flor animaba a todos a expresar en Twitter «el rechazo más firme a la conculcación del derecho a estudiar en valenciano a miles de niños valencianos con la etiqueta #vullestudiarenvalencià y la mención @AlbertoFabra».

A la luz de lo anterior,

1. ¿Cree la Comisión que el cierre de la cuenta Twitter del activista representa una violación de la libertad de expresión de un ciudadano europeo?
2. ¿Piensa la Comisión proponer una normativa a favor de la protección de la libertad de expresión en las nuevas tecnologías y las redes sociales?

Respuesta de la Sra. Kroes en nombre de la Comisión
(22 de noviembre de 2013)

El derecho a la información y la libertad de expresión están recogidos en el artículo 11 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea. Sin embargo, según el artículo 51, apartado 1, de la Carta, esta se aplica a los Estados miembros únicamente cuando apliquen el Derecho de la Unión Europea. En otros ámbitos, son aplicables las disposiciones de los Estados miembros sobre el derecho a la información y la libertad de expresión. Basándose en los hechos expuestos en la pregunta, la Comisión considera que no existe una relación con el Derecho de la UE.

Al mismo tiempo, la Comisión trata de garantizar el respeto de la libertad de los medios de comunicación y el pluralismo, dentro de sus competencias, y está reflexionando actualmente sobre un posible seguimiento en el marco de la consulta pública sobre el informe del Grupo independiente de Alto Nivel sobre Libertad y Pluralismo en los Medios de Comunicación.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.vilaweb.cat/noticia/4141346/20130902/tremosa-porta-brusselles-censura-twitter-limpulsor-vullestudiarenvalencia.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009805/13
to the Commission**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE) and
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)**
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Twitter account of language activist Jaume Flor shut down — possible violation of freedom of expression for ideological and political reasons

On 31 August 2013, as Valencian students were preparing to start their first classes of the new school year, activist Jaume Flor, a campaigner for the Valencian/Catalan language, saw his Twitter account shut down after he organised a Twitter campaign calling for people in the Valencian region to have the right to study in Catalan ⁽¹⁾.

Jaume Flor is an expert in organising Twitter campaigns to promote causes relating to Valencian independence and the linguistic rights of Catalan speakers.

He sent out a tweet urging people to express their 'rejection in the strongest possible terms of the violation of thousands of Valencian children's right to study in Valencian using the hashtag #vullestudiarenvalencià and the mention @AlbertoFabra'.

1. Does the Commission think that the shutting down of Jaume Flor's Twitter account is a violation of the right to freedom of expression guaranteed under EC law?
2. Does it intend to propose rules aimed at safeguarding the freedom of expression of users of new technologies and social networks?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(22 November 2013)

The right to information and freedom of expression is enshrined in Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. However, according to its Article 51(1), the Charter applies to Member States only when they are implementing European Union law. In other areas, Member States' provisions on the right to information and freedom of expression apply. Based on the facts as referred to in the question, the Commission considers that there is no link to EC law.

At the same time the Commission seeks to ensure respect for media freedom and pluralism within its competences. It is currently reflecting possible follow up to the public consultation on the report of the independent High Level Group on Media Freedom and Pluralism.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.vilaweb.cat/noticia/4141346/20130902/tremosa-porta-brusselles-censura-twitter-limpulsor-vullestudiarenvalencia.html>

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009806/13

alla Commissione

Lara Comi (PPE)

(2 settembre 2013)

Oggetto: Concorrenza nella vendita di sostanze liquide negli aeroporti

Premesso che:

- la vigente regolamentazione europea prevede ad oggi una serie di restrizioni circa il trasporto dei liquidi nei voli aerei da aeroporti europei;
- tra le varie regole, vi è quella di non poter portare a mano una semplice bottiglia d'acqua, anche della più piccola dimensione standard, che viene requisita al momento del controllo di sicurezza;
- questa limitazione costringe i cittadini ad acquistare bottiglie di acqua o di altri liquidi nella parte interna dell'aeroporto antistante la zona per l'imbarco;
- accade troppo spesso che i punti vendita nella zona interna dell'aeroporto, ovvero quella riservata ai passeggeri che devono imbarcarsi su un volo, applicano prezzi molto elevati sulle bevande, anche sulla semplice acqua minerale, con un costo che supera anche di dieci volte il prezzo medio del prodotto;
- analoga situazione si riscontra anche per altre bevande e per i prezzi che vengono applicati sugli stessi aerei;
- bere è una funzione fisiologica essenziale dell'essere umano;
- nel rispetto delle regole sulla sicurezza, i cittadini passeggeri sono pertanto costretti ad acquistare acqua o altre bevande a costi notevolmente superiori a quelli medi applicabili nel relativo paese di imbarco;
- questi comportamenti sembrano avvantaggiare le imprese che svolgono attività commerciale all'interno degli aeroporti, in maniera del tutto ingiustificata e dannosa per i consumatori europei;

tanto premesso,

senza voler entrare nel merito delle regole vigenti applicabili all'interno dell'UE, si domanda alla Commissione:

1. come giudica questa situazione e se ritiene che si tratti di un comportamento distortivo della concorrenza e di un danno ingiusto e ingiustificato ai consumatori europei;
2. quali rimedi ha posto o intende porre in essere per eliminarla o quali rimedi possono mettere in campo i cittadini stessi per difendersi da questi comportamenti lesivi dei loro diritti.

Risposta di Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione

(2b ottobre 2013)

Le attuali restrizioni sul trasporto di liquidi nel bagaglio a mano sono state introdotte per gravi motivi di sicurezza. Dal 2006 solo quantità limitate di liquidi possono essere portate oltre i varchi per i controlli di sicurezza. La minaccia rappresentata dagli esplosivi liquidi sussiste ancora. Pertanto la Commissione ha stabilito una tabella di marcia per sostituire le restrizioni sui liquidi con metodi di rilevamento di esplosivi basati sulla tecnologia al fine di migliorare la comodità dei passeggeri, mantenendo nel contempo elevati livelli di sicurezza dell'aviazione dell'UE.

Probabilmente, limitando le fonti di approvvigionamento di alcuni beni oltre i varchi per i controlli di sicurezza, le misure di sicurezza hanno inciso sui prezzi, in particolare se il numero dei negozi nella zona interna degli aeroporti riservata alle partenze è limitato.

Tuttavia, non vi sono indicazioni del fatto che tale effetto derivi da una violazione delle norme antitrust dell'UE, che vietano accordi tra concorrenti aventi per oggetto o per effetto la restrizione della concorrenza e proibiscono gli abusi di posizione dominante in una parte considerevole del mercato interno. Entrambi i divieti vanno applicati solo nella misura in cui eventuali abusi possano incidere in maniera sostanziale sugli scambi tra Stati membri.

La politica antitrust dell'UE mira a promuovere prezzi più bassi e beni concorrenziali per i consumatori. Tuttavia, in mancanza di indicazioni di una violazione delle norme antitrust, la Commissione non può intervenire.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009806/13
to the Commission
Lara Comi (PPE)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Competition in the sale of liquids at airports

European regulations have imposed a number of restrictions on the amount of liquids that may be carried on flights from European airports. Under one of those rules, ordinary bottles of water, even of the smallest standard size, may not be carried in passengers' hand baggage: they are confiscated when passengers go through the security checkpoints. Because of this restriction, passengers are forced to buy bottles of water or other liquids airside, in the airport area immediately adjoining the boarding gates. It is too often the case that airside shops, in the area only for passengers about to board, charge very high prices for drinks, including plain mineral water, which can cost as much as ten times the average price. The same applies to other drinks and to inflight prices. Drinking is physiologically essential for the human body. It follows from the above that passengers, in order to comply with the security regulations, have to buy water or other drinks at a cost far above the average going rates in the countries of departure. Pricing practices of this sort appear to be benefiting firms which do business airside, but, apart from being wholly unjustified, they are harming European consumers.

Without going into the merits of the rules applying at EU airports:

1. How does the Commission view this situation? Does it believe that competition is being distorted and unfair damage needlessly caused to European consumers?
2. What steps has it taken or will it take to remedy the situation? Alternatively, what remedies can citizens themselves employ in order to protect themselves from such practices and the resulting infringement of their rights?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(28 October 2013)

The current restrictions on carrying liquids in cabin baggage were put in place for serious security reasons. Since 2006 only limited quantities may be taken beyond security checkpoints. The threat from liquid explosives persists. Therefore the Commission has established a roadmap on how to replace liquid restrictions with technology based explosive detection methods in order to facilitate passenger convenience while keeping high levels of EU aviation security.

Arguably, by limiting the sources of supply of some goods after the security checkpoints, the security measures may have had an impact on prices, notably if the number of shops in the secured area of the airport is limited.

However, there are no indications that such an effect results from an infringement of EU antitrust rules. The rules prevent agreements between competitors which have as their object or effect restriction of competition. They also prohibit abuses of a dominant position in a substantial part of the internal market. Both prohibitions only apply to the extent that the conduct may have a significant effect on trade between Member States.

The EU's antitrust policy aims at promoting lower prices and competitive goods for consumers. However, in the absence of indications of an infringement of antitrust rules, the Commission cannot intervene.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009807/13

an die Kommission

Franz Obermayr (NI)

(2. September 2013)

Betrifft: Verfolgung von Kopten in Ägypten

Während der gegenwärtigen Krise in Ägypten werden Angehörige der christlichen Gemeinschaft der Kopten nach wie vor von Islamisten drangsaliert. Die Kopten stellen mit insgesamt 7,5 Millionen Menschen die größte christliche Minderheit im arabischen Nahen Osten dar. Kopten haben die Absetzung des ägyptischen Präsidenten Mursi unterstützt, und die ersten Angriffe auf sie ereigneten sich kurz nachdem Anhänger des gestürzten Präsidenten gewaltsam auseinandergetrieben worden waren. Mehr als 60 Kirchen wurden in ganz Ägypten teilweise oder völlig zerstört. Kopten wurden zusammengeschlagen oder getötet, ihre Läden in Brand gesetzt und Bibeln verbrannt. In Wandschmierereien an koptischen Kirchen wird Christen „Feuer und Hölle“ angedroht.

Die Kommission wird ersucht, dazu folgende Fragen zu beantworten:

1. Beabsichtigt die Kommission eine Untersuchungskommission zum Schutz von religiösen Minderheiten in Ägypten einzurichten? Falls nicht, weshalb nicht?
2. Könnte die Verfolgung von Kopten die Kommission dazu bewegen, ihre Politik im Hinblick auf Ägypten zu überdenken? Falls ja, in welchem Maße und in welcher Weise?
3. In seiner Entschließung vom 27. Oktober 2011 hat das Parlament gefordert, „dass die EU Maßnahmen verabschieden sollte, die im Fall gravierender Verletzungen der Menschenrechte von Bürgern in Ägypten zur Anwendung gelangen.“ Hat die Kommission die jüngsten Gräueltaten gegen die Gemeinschaft der Kopten bereits entsprechend berücksichtigt?
4. Wie gedenkt die Kommission zu reagieren, um die Achtung der Grundrechte, der Religionsfreiheit und des Rechts auf Freiheit und Sicherheit für die Glaubensgemeinschaft der Kopten zu gewährleisten?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission

(4. November 2013)

Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin hat aufs Deutlichste die brutale Gewalt, die Morde und Angriffe, auch auf Kirchen, verurteilt, die sich Mitte August nach der Auflösung der Sit-Ins der Muslimbruderschaft ereigneten. Am 21. August 2013 berief die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin eine außerordentliche Sitzung des Rates „Auswärtige Angelegenheiten“ zum Thema Ägypten ein, auf der die EU-Außenminister Schlussfolgerungen annahmen, die sich ausdrücklich auch auf die Zerstörung vieler Kirchen und auf gezielte Übergriffe gegen die koptische Gemeinschaft bezogen.

Die EU weiß um die Einschränkungen, denen verschiedene religiöse Minderheiten in Ägypten ausgesetzt sind, und ist besorgt darüber. Sie verurteilt alle Formen von Intoleranz, Diskriminierung und Gewalt gegen Personen aufgrund ihrer Religion oder ihres Glaubens, gleich wo sie stattfinden und unabhängig von der Glaubensrichtung. Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin hat die ägyptischen Behörden mehrfach dazu aufgefordert, die Religions- und Glaubensfreiheit im Land sicherzustellen.

Die EU-Delegation in Kairo verfolgt Fälle religiös motivierter Gewalt aufmerksam und betont bei ihren Kontakten mit den ägyptischen Behörden, dass Diskriminierungen aus religiösen Gründen vermieden werden sollten. Um zu einer besseren Achtung der Religions- und Glaubensfreiheit in Ägypten beizutragen, ist die EU bestrebt, mit den relevanten Akteuren im Land sowie mit regionalen und internationalen Organisationen, die die Werte und Ziele der EU in diesem Bereich teilen, zusammenzuarbeiten.

Die EU ist der Auffassung, dass Zusammenarbeit und politischer Dialog die geeignetsten Wege sind, um die Regierung in Kairo zu ermutigen und darauf zu drängen, konkrete Maßnahmen zum Schutz der Kopten und anderer religiöser Minderheiten zu treffen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009807/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
 (2 September 2013)

Subject: Persecution of the Coptic community in Egypt

In the current Egyptian crisis, the Coptic Christian community has been and is still being harassed by Islamists. With about 7.5 million members, this community is the most important Christian minority in the Arab Middle East. Copts supported the deposing of former President Mursi and the first attacks against them happened shortly after the violent dispersal of supporters of the now deposed president. All over Egypt, more than 60 churches have been partially or totally destroyed. Copts have been killed or beaten up; shops and Bibles have been burned. Threatening graffiti has been written on the walls of Coptic churches promising 'fire and hell' to Christians.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does the Commission plan to set up a committee of inquiry on the protection of religious minorities in Egypt? If not, why not?
2. Could the acts of persecution carried out against the Coptic community bring the Commission to review its policies vis-à-vis Egypt and, if so, to what degree and how?
3. In its resolution of 27 October 2011, Parliament stated that 'measures should be adopted by the EU in the event of serious violations of the human rights of any citizens in Egypt'. Has the Commission already taken these recent atrocities against the Coptic community into account?
4. How does the Commission plan to react in order to ensure respect for fundamental rights, freedom of religion and the right to liberty and security for the Coptic community?

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

The HR/VP condemned, in the clearest possible terms, the extreme violence, killings and attacks including on churches that followed the dispersal in mid-August of the Muslim Brotherhood supported sit-ins. On 21 August 2013, the HR/VP convened an extra-ordinary Foreign Affairs Council on Egypt where EU Foreign Ministers adopted conclusions which also specifically referred to the destruction of many churches and the targeting of the Coptic community.

The EU is aware and concerned about the constraints that different religious minorities face in Egypt 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. The HR/VP repeatedly calls 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 keen to engage 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.

The EU considers that cooperation and political dialogue are the most appropriate channels to encourage and put pressure on Cairo's Government so that it will undertake concrete actions in order to protect Copts and other religious minorities.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009808/13

an die Kommission

Franz Obermayr (NI)

(2. September 2013)

Betrifft: PRISM/Überwachungsprogramme und EU-Rechtsvorschriften

Angesichts der eklatanten Verstöße gegen die Rechte von EU-Bürgern durch US-Überwachungsprogramme (PRISM) sowie angesichts der von den G29 unlängst gegenüber der Kommission vorgebrachten Bedenken wird die Kommission um die Beantwortung der folgenden Fragen gebeten:

1. Laut den EU-Behörden, die die Freiheit im Internet überwachen, müssen Überlegungen über die nationalen Rechtsvorschriften in den Mitgliedstaaten angestellt werden, und Viviane Reding hat klargestellt, dass sie die Rechte von EU-Bürgern angesichts der Sammlung personenbezogener Daten und des damit verbundenen Missbrauchs durch die USA stärken möchte. Welche Kriterien und Bedingungen werden angewandt, um diese beiden Ziele zu verfolgen?
2. Welche von PRISM und damit zusammenhängenden Überwachungsprogrammen gesammelten Informationen werden von EU-Behörden bzw. europäischen Überwachungssystemen mit Ausnahme des Militärs ebenfalls genutzt?
3. In welchem Maße entspricht dies EU-Rechtsvorschriften?
4. Wird die Kommission die Konsequenzen und Erkenntnisse des EU-Überwachungsskandals bei der geplanten neuen Datenschutzregelung angemessen berücksichtigen?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission

(11. November 2013)

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antworten auf die Anfragen zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009773/2013 und E-006932/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009808/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Prism/surveillance programmes and EU legislation

Following the abuse of European citizens' rights by the US Prism surveillance programme and concerns recently expressed to the Commission by the G29, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. According to the European authorities monitoring Internet freedom, further consideration needs to be given to national legislation in the Member States, and Mrs Viviane Reding has made it clear that she wishes to strengthen European citizens' rights in response to the collection and abuse of personal data by the United States. What criteria and conditions will be adopted to pursue these two aims?
2. Which items of information collected via Prism and related surveillance programmes are also used by European authorities or European surveillance mechanisms — excluding in the military domain?
3. To what extent does this process comply with European legislation?
4. Will the Commission properly reflect and incorporate the results and outcomes of the EU surveillance scandal in its planned new regulations on data protection?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(11 November 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-009773/2013 and E-006932/2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009810/13

an die Kommission

Franz Obermayr (NI)

(2. September 2013)

Betrifft: Verarbeitete Tierproteine gefährden die Gesundheit von Menschen und die Lebensmittelsicherheit

Obwohl Tierfutter in der EU sehr streng kontrolliert wird, findet man in Lebensmitteln immer wieder genetisch veränderte Organismen (GMO), Dioxin und Antibiotika. Eine Reihe von Lebensmittelskandalen hat zutage gefördert, dass es in der Tierfutterindustrie viel mehr Schlupflöcher in Bezug auf die Lebensmittelsicherheit gibt als in anderen Branchen. Ungeachtet der strengen EU-Richtlinien gibt es noch einiges zu tun. Trotz Berichten aus einigen Mitgliedstaaten, in denen davon abgeraten wird, hat die Kommission im Februar 2013 beschlossen, dass Aquakulturbetreiber ab dem 1. Juni 2013 verarbeitete Tierproteine wieder verwenden dürfen.

1. Auf der Grundlage welcher Berichte hat die Kommission beschlossen, die Verwendung von verarbeiteten Tierproteinen wieder zuzulassen? Wurden externe Studien — aus der Zivilgesellschaft — in Auftrag gegeben bzw. berücksichtigt?
2. Mit welchen Verfahren wird die Produktion verarbeiteter Tierproteine künftig kontrolliert?
3. Hat die Kommission Pläne für kurz- oder mittelfristige Kontrollen und Studien, um zu gewährleisten, dass die Lebensmittelsicherheit angemessen kontrolliert und sie durch verarbeitete Tierproteine nicht beeinträchtigt wird?
4. Handelt es sich bei der Genehmigung für Aquakulturbetreiber, verarbeitete Tierproteine zu verwenden, um einen heimlichen Versuch oder eine vorbereitende Maßnahme, die Genehmigung später auch auf andere Bereiche der Landwirtschaft auszuweiten?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission

(4. November 2013)

1. Mit der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 56/2013 ⁽¹⁾ der Kommission wird die Verwendung verarbeiteter tierischer Eiweiße (VTE), die aus anderen Nutztieren als Wiederkäuern (d. h. vor allem Schweinen und Geflügel) gewonnen werden, in Futtermitteln für Tiere in Aquakultur erneut zugelassen. Die Verordnung gilt seit dem 1. Juni 2013 und steht im Einklang mit den jüngsten wissenschaftlichen Stellungnahmen ⁽²⁾ der Europäischen Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit (EFSA), denen zufolge die Gefahr der Übertragung boviner spongiformer Enzephalopathie (BSE) zwischen Nichtwiederkäuern vernachlässigbar ist, solange die Rückführung innerhalb einer Spezies (Kannibalismus) verhindert wird. Bei der Vorbereitung der Verordnung berücksichtigte die Kommission auch die Schlussfolgerungen des Rates vom 29. November 2010 ⁽³⁾ und die Entschließung des Europäischen Parlaments vom 6. Juli 2011 ⁽⁴⁾.
2. Die Verordnung der Kommission in Verbindung mit der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1069/2009 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates ⁽⁵⁾ und der dazugehörigen Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 142/2011 ⁽⁶⁾ enthält strenge Anforderungen an die Rückverfolgbarkeit und die analytischen Kontrollen, die in allen Mitgliedstaaten entlang der VTE-Produktionskette durchzuführen sind, um jegliche Kreuzkontamination zu verhindern. Nach Auffassung der Kommission wird das hohe Verbraucherschutzniveau durch die korrekte Anwendung und Durchsetzung dieser Verordnungen aufrechterhalten.
3. Ab 2014 werden die Inspektionsdienste der Kommission beginnen, in den Mitgliedstaaten Audits durchzuführen, um die Einhaltung der Kommissionsverordnung (EU) Nr. 56/2013 zu prüfen.

⁽¹⁾ ABL L 21, 24.1.2013, S. 3.

⁽²⁾ Opinion of the Scientific Panel on Biological Hazards on a request from the European Parliament on the assessment of the health risks of feeding of ruminants with fishmeal in relation to the risk of TSE, The EFSA Journal (2007) 443, 1-26.

Opinion of the Scientific Panel on Biological Hazards on a request from the European Parliament on Certain Aspects related to the Feeding of Animal Proteins to Farm Animals, The EFSA Journal (2007) 576, 1-41.

Opinion of the Scientific Panel on Biological Hazards on a revision of the quantitative risk assessment (QRA) of the BSE risk posed by processed animal proteins (PAPs), EFSA Journal 2011;9(1):1947.

⁽³⁾ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/de/10/st13/st13889-ad01re01.de10.pdf>

⁽⁴⁾ Angenommener Text, P7_TA(2011)0328.

⁽⁵⁾ ABL L 300 vom 14.11.2009, S. 1.

⁽⁶⁾ ABL L 54 vom 26.11.2011, S. 1.

4. Im Einklang mit ihrer Mitteilung vom 16. Juli 2010 ⁽⁷⁾ wird die Kommission eine Änderung der Bestimmungen zum Verfütterungsverbot nur in Betracht ziehen, wenn solide wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse vorliegen und belastbare Kontrollinstrumente verfügbar sind.
-

⁽⁷⁾ Zweiter Fahrplan für die TSE-Bekämpfung — Ein Strategiepapier zum Thema transmissible spongiforme Enzephalopathien (2010-2015), KOM(2010)384.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009810/13
to the Commission**

Franz Obermayr (NI)

(2 September 2013)

Subject: Processed animal proteins and risks to human health and food safety

Despite very tight controls on animal feed in the EU, GMOs, dioxins and antibiotics can be found in various foods. Several different food scandals in the animal feed industry have revealed considerably more loopholes in the area of food safety than in other industries. Although the EU does issue rigid guidelines, some challenges remain in this area. In February 2013, the Commission decided that processed animal proteins could be used again by fish farmers as of 1 June 2013, despite adverse reports from some Member States.

1. On which reports did the Commission base its decision to reauthorise the use of processed animal proteins? Were external studies — from civil society — commissioned or taken into account?
2. Which kind of procedures will be used to control the production of processed animal proteins?
3. Does the Commission have plans for any short or medium-term checks and studies to ensure that food safety is properly controlled and not subject to shortcomings caused by processed animal proteins?
4. Is the authorisation for fish farmers to use processed animal proteins a discreet or preliminary first step towards subsequently expanding this authorisation to other agricultural sectors?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(4 November 2013)

1. Commission Regulation (EU) No 56/2013 ⁽¹⁾ aims to re-authorise the use of processed animal protein (PAP) derived from non-ruminant farmed animals (i.e. mainly from pigs and poultry) in feed for aquaculture animals. It is applicable from 1 June 2013 and is in line with the latest scientific opinions ⁽²⁾ of the European Food safety Authority (EFSA) which indicate that the risk of transmission of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) between non-ruminant animals is negligible provided that intra-species recycling (cannibalism) is prevented. When drafting this text, the Commission took also into account the Council conclusions of 29 November 2010 ⁽³⁾ and the European Parliament resolution of 6 July 2011 ⁽⁴⁾.
2. This Commission Regulation, read together with Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council ⁽⁵⁾ and its Implementing Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 ⁽⁶⁾, provide for very strict traceability requirements and analytical controls to be applied by the Member States all along the PAP production chain in order to prevent any kind of cross-contamination. The Commission believes that with the correct implementation and enforcement of these Regulations, the current high level of consumer protection would be maintained.
3. As from 2014, the Commission inspection services intend to start conducting audits in Member States in order to check on compliance with the requirements provided for in Commission Regulation (EU) No 56/2013.
4. In line with its communication adopted on 16 July 2010 ⁽⁷⁾, the Commission will continue to consider the review of the feed ban rules only if supported by solid scientific basis and robust control tools.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L21, 24.1.2013, p.3.

⁽²⁾ Opinion of the Scientific Panel on Biological Hazards on a request from the European Parliament on the assessment of the health risks of feeding of ruminants with fishmeal in relation to the risk of TSE, The EFSA Journal (2007), 443, 1-26.

Opinion of the Scientific Panel on Biological Hazards on a request from the European Parliament on Certain Aspects related to the Feeding of Animal Proteins to Farm Animals, The EFSA Journal (2007) Journal number 576, 1-41.

Opinion of the Scientific Panel on Biological Hazards on a revision of the quantitative risk assessment (QRA) of the BSE risk posed by processed animal protein (PAPs), EFSA Journal 2011;9(1):1947.

⁽³⁾ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/10/st13/st133889-ad01re01.en10.pdf>

⁽⁴⁾ Text adopted, P7_TA(2011)0328.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ L 300, 14.11.2009, p. 1.

⁽⁶⁾ OJ L 54, 26.11.2011, p. 1.

⁽⁷⁾ TSE Road Map 2 — A strategy paper on Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathies for 2010-2015- COM/2010/0384.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009811/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR- Criminal charges against Andrew Hall in Thailand

On 2 January 2013 the Finnish-based NGO, Finnwatch, published the report, 'Cheap Has a High Price'. The report documented alleged exploitation of migrant workers by the National Fruit Company in Thailand and made other claims of human rights abuses.

The report alleged that workers were being forced to work in cramped, overheated and dangerous working environments; that workers were hit by managers and security guards; that passports and identity papers were confiscated and not returned upon request and that wages were below the legal requirement, with compulsory overtime being enforced. The report also accused the company of using child labour.

Since the publication of the report, its chief author, British citizen Andrew Hall, is being sued for defamation by the company in question. He is being charged under the Thai Criminal Code sections 90, 91, 236, 328 and 332; sections 3 and 4 of the Computer Crimes Act 2007 have also been levelled. If found guilty, Mr Hall could face up to 7 years in prison and fines in excess of USD 10 million.

Campaigners claim that the charges are an attempt by the company to silence its critics and prevent alleged abuses from being scrutinised. It is also claimed that the charges represent an assault on free speech and could act to undermine the work of human rights' groups in Thailand.

Would the High Representative/Vice-President raise the case of this EU citizen with the Thai authorities, especially in the light of its potential to affect similar human rights activism in the country?

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

The EU Delegation in Thailand follows this case very closely, which includes direct contacts with Andrew Hall and trial observation. It does so in close cooperation with the most concerned Member States.

The case is between two private parties and is now before a Thai court. The EU will continue to follow the trial in full respect of the independence of the Thai judicial system.

Overall, support and outreach to human rights defenders is an important part of the EU's work in Thailand, in cooperation with Member States.

Examples of this work include trial observations on Human Rights Defenders' cases on issues ranging from freedom of expression to land rights, detention visit of Human Right Defenders, EU statements on court rulings, meetings across country with Human Rights Defenders, organisation of meetings between visiting Members of the European Parliament and senior European External Action Service (EEAS) officials with Human Rights Defenders and the organisation of seminars on Issues and Challenges Faced by Human Rights Defenders.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009812/13
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)**

Philippe Boulland (PPE)

(2 septembre 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Organisation par l'Union européenne d'une conférence pour la paix

Les récentes attaques chimiques en Syrie ont fait réagir la communauté internationale. L'utilisation d'armes chimiques contre la population avait été considérée comme la « ligne rouge » à ne pas franchir sous peine d'intervention des États tiers.

En effet, l'utilisation d'armes chimiques en temps de guerre est interdite par la Convention sur l'interdiction des armes chimiques de 1992, à laquelle tous les États européens sont parties.

Puisque tous les États européens sont parties à la Convention sur l'interdiction des armes chimiques, la Haute Représentante estime-t-elle que l'Union européenne pourrait organiser une conférence pour la paix afin d'évoquer les perspectives d'après-crise en Syrie et jouer un rôle d'interlocuteur privilégié pour tous les États parties à cette convention?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission

(12 novembre 2013)

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante de la Commission européenne a répété à de nombreuses reprises que la réponse au conflit syrien ne pouvait être que politique. L'initiative internationale visant à détruire le programme nucléaire syrien constitue une occasion de relancer les efforts déployés en vue de l'organisation d'une conférence de paix sur la Syrie.

L'UE procède actuellement à la mise en place d'un soutien spécifique à la mission d'inspection de l'OIAC en Syrie pour instaurer des conditions propices à une solution négociée de la crise.

L'UE a exprimé tout son soutien à la tenue d'une conférence de paix, qui serait convoquée par les Nations unies et s'appuierait sur le communiqué de Genève de juin 2012.

Cette conférence réunirait les deux parties au conflit autour de la table des négociations, en présence, éventuellement, d'acteurs internationaux. Elle est actuellement prévue pour novembre 2013. L'UE entretient des contacts avec les intervenants clés, dont les Nations unies, les États-Unis et la Russie, afin de définir les possibilités d'un soutien concret à la préparation, à l'organisation et au suivi de la conférence.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009812/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Organisation by the European Union of a peace conference

The recent chemical weapons attacks in Syria have provoked an outcry among the international community. Warnings had been given that the use of chemical weapons against the population was the 'red line' that, if crossed, would lead to action by other countries.

The use of chemical weapons in warfare is banned by the 1992 Chemical Weapons Convention, to which all European states are party.

Since all European countries are States Party to the Chemical Weapons Convention, does the High Representative think that the European Union could convene a peace conference to discuss the future of Syria after the crisis, at which the EU could act as a negotiator for all States Party to the Convention?

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

The HR/VP has reiterated on numerous occasions that the Syrian conflict can only be solved through a political process. The international initiative aimed at destroying Syria's nuclear programme provides an opportunity for a revival of efforts toward organising a peace conference on Syria.

The EU is in the process of implementing specific support for the OPCW inspection mission in Syria, with a view to promoting an environment conducive to a negotiated solution of the crisis.

The EU has stated its full support for the convening of a peace conference, which would be convened by the United Nations and build upon the Geneva Communiqué agreed in June 2012.

The conference would bring to the two parties of the conflict to the negotiations table, with international presence as appropriate. It is currently planned to take place in November 2013.

The EU is in contact with relevant key players, including the UN, USA and Russia, to identify possibilities of tangible support related to the preparations for, organisation of, and follow-up to the conference.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009813/13

à la Commission

Philippe Boulland (PPE)

(2 septembre 2013)

Objet: Gaz réfrigérant R1234yf dans les voitures

Depuis le 12 juin 2013, la France a bloqué l'immatriculation des derniers modèles Mercedes vendus sur le territoire français, au motif que la marque ne respectait pas la nouvelle norme européenne imposant l'utilisation d'un nouveau gaz réfrigérant, le R1234yf, jugé moins polluant.

En effet, l'Agence fédérale allemande pour l'automobile a demandé aux constructeurs allemands de ne pas appliquer la réglementation européenne, puisqu'après avoir mené une enquête préliminaire sur des prototypes utilisant le nouveau gaz, elle a constaté que le gaz incriminé présentait des risques potentiels de combustion. L'agence a donc demandé à la Commission de mener de plus amples investigations pour évaluer les risques de ce gaz réfrigérant dans la climatisation de véhicules.

Au moment de l'adoption du règlement européen rendant obligatoire l'utilisation du R1234yf dans les voitures, quel organisme la Commission a-t-elle mandaté pour étudier l'impact des gaz réfrigérants?

Estime-t-elle nécessaire de mener des investigations supplémentaires pour évaluer les risques potentiels soulevés par l'agence allemande? Cela peut-il influencer sur l'application actuelle du règlement, qui rend obligatoire l'utilisation de ce gaz dans les nouvelles voitures à partir du 1^{er} juillet 2013?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission

(17 octobre 2013)

La Commission renvoie l'Honorable Parlementaire aux réponses qu'elle a données aux questions E-008870/2013 et E-008990/2013 sur le même sujet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009813/13
to the Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(2 September 2013)

Subject: Use of R1234yf coolant in motor vehicle air-conditioning systems

Since 12 June 2013, France has been refusing to register new Mercedes vehicles on the grounds that they do not comply with the new EU standard requiring the use in vehicle air-conditioning systems of the new, more environment-friendly, refrigerant gas R1234yf.

Following preliminary tests carried out on prototypes fitted with systems using the new gas, during which it was found that the gas could present a fire risk, Germany's Federal Motor Transport Authority (KBA) asked German manufacturers not to apply the new EU rules. The authority asked the Commission to carry out further investigations into the risks of using this coolant in motor vehicle air-conditioning systems.

What body carried out impact assessments on refrigerant gases for the Commission prior to the adoption of the regulation making it compulsory for R1234yf to be used in new motor vehicles from 1 July 2013?

Would the Commission agree that further investigations should be carried out in order to assess the possible risks highlighted by the KBA? What implications could the findings of such investigations have for the implementation of the above regulation?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the replies to questions E-008870/2013 and E-008990/2013 on the same subject.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009814/13
do Komisji**

Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)

(3 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Rozbudowa rosyjskiej kolei szerokotorowej

W polskiej opinii publicznej coraz częściej poruszany jest temat projektu rozbudowy rosyjskiej kolei szerokotorowej do Wiednia. Projekt ma przewidywać połączenie kolejowe z Rosji przez Kazachstan, Ukrainę i Słowację do Austrii. Główne obawy wzbudza chęć ominięcia Polski przy transzycie ze wschodu.

O takich planach negatywnie wypowiadają się także przedstawiciele Polskich Kolei Państwowych, ponieważ projekt może być zagrożeniem dla linii LHS – towarowego połączenia szerokotorowego do Sławkowa.

W związku z powyższym proszę o odpowiedź:

Czy Komisja uważa, że rozbudowa kolei szerokotorowej nie stanowiłaby zagrożenia dla konkurencyjności Polski i Unii Europejskiej?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Siima Kallasa w imieniu Komisji

(7 października 2013 r.)

Rosyjskie plany przedłużenia linii kolejowej o szerokości toru 1 520 mm z Rosji do Austrii nie wchodzą w zakres sieci TEN-T Unii Europejskiej i dla tego projektu nie zostaną udostępnione żadne fundusze unijne. Jeśli zainteresowane państwa członkowskie będą realizować ten projekt, będą musiały zapewnić przestrzeganie wszystkich wymagań technicznych przewidzianych w prawie UE, w tym mających zastosowanie do systemów kolejowych o szerokości toru 1 520 mm.

Komisja jest zdania, że rozwój konkurencyjnych usług międzynarodowego transportu kolejowego powinien koncentrować się na realizacji korytarzy towarowych ustanowionych na mocy rozporządzenia nr 913/2010⁽¹⁾. Korytarze nr 6, 8 i 9 dochodzą do wschodniej granicy UE, przy czym korytarz nr 8 przechodzi przez Polskę.

⁽¹⁾ Rozporządzenie Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady (UE) nr 913/2010 z dnia 22 września 2010 r. w sprawie europejskiej sieci kolejowej ukierunkowanej na konkurencyjny transport towarowy, Dz.U. L 276 z 20.10.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009814/13
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(2 September 0132)

Subject: Extension of Russian broad-gauge railway

A plan to extend a Russian broad-gauge railway line to Vienna is the subject of increasing concern in Poland. The plan is to build a railway line from Russia through Kazakhstan, Ukraine and Slovakia to Austria. The main cause for concern is that the project seeks to build a transit route from the east which bypasses Poland.

Representatives of Polish National Railways also take a negative view of the plan, as the project could be a threat to the LHS broad-gauge freight line to Sławków.

Does the Commission not consider that the extension of this Russian broad-gauge railway line would be a threat to the competitiveness of Poland and the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(7 October 0132)

Russian plans to extend a 1520 mm gauge railway line from Russia to Austria do not fall within the European Union TEN-T network and no EU funding will be made available for this project. In case where the Member States concerned implement the project, they will need to ensure that all technical requirements provided for in EC law, including those applying to 1520 mm gauge railway systems, are respected.

The Commission considers that the development of competitive international rail freight should focus on the implementation of the Rail Freight Corridors established under Regulation No 913/2010⁽¹⁾. Corridor 6, 8 and 9 reach the Eastern borders of the EU, with Corridor 8 running through Poland.

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EU) No 913/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 September 2010 concerning a European rail network for competitive freight, OJ L 276, 20.10.2010.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009815/13
do Komisji**

Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)

(3 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Przymusowe leczenie psychiatryczne na Białorusi

Jak podaje Amnesty International białoruski psychiatra, Ihara Pastnou, został zatrzymany i poddany przymusowemu leczeniu w szpitalu, w którym pracował, po serii krytycznych wypowiedzi dotyczących systemu opieki zdrowotnej w Witebsku. Z powodu wygłaszanych opinii Ihara Pastnou wszedł w konflikt ze swoimi przełożonymi, a 16 sierpnia 2013 r. komisja psychiatryczna szpitala, w którym pracuje orzekła, że wymaga on przymusowego leczenia ze względu na „psychotyczne zaburzenie osobowości z manią w kierunku prześladowania autorytetów”.

Zgodnie z punktem 16 *Zasad ochrony osób z zaburzeniami psychicznymi* ONZ, przymusowe leczenie psychiatryczne może być stosowane jedynie w przypadkach najcięższych zaburzeń, przez najkrótszy możliwy czas, gdy osoba stanowi bezpośrednie lub nieuchronne zagrożenie dla siebie lub innych.

W wydanej decyzji sąd stwierdza, że wymaga on przymusowego leczenia psychiatrycznego ze względu na „utrzymujące się zaburzenie psychotyczne”, z powodu którego stanowi on zagrożenie dla samego siebie oraz otoczenia. Sąd jednak nie wyjaśnia w jaki sposób Ihara Pastnou zagraża otoczeniu, wspominając jedynie o publikacjach internetowych.

Uznawanie za „chorych psychicznie” i przymusowe leczenia było jednym z popularnych narzędzi represji wobec jednostek, których zachowania nie odpowiadały władzy w czasach ZSRR. Dziś, jak widać na przykładzie Ihara Pastnou, ten rodzaj represji jest wykorzystywany przez władze Białorusi.

W związku z powyższym:

Czy Komisja zamierza zareagować w sprawie przymusowo leczonego białoruskiego psychiatry Ihara Pastnou?

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009831/13
do Komisji**

Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)

(3 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wyrok dla białoruskiego lekarza psychiatry

21 sierpnia sąd obwodu witebskiego skazał białoruskiego lekarza psychiatrę, Ihara Pastnoua na przymusowe leczenie psychiatryczne. Ihara Pastnou krytykował rząd, nieprawidłowości w systemie opieki zdrowotnej w Witebsku i informował na swoim kanale na YouTube o malwersacjach finansowych związanych z władzą.

Nie ma najmniejszych wątpliwości, że proces Ihara Pastnoua i wyrok sądu mają charakter polityczny. Według prawa, były lekarz ma 10 dni, żeby odwołać się od decyzji sądu. Oburzającym jest jednak fakt, że w szpitalu psychiatrycznym nie pozwolono mu skorzystać z długopisu i kartki papieru, by mógł napisać odwołanie. W związku z zaistniałą sytuacją Ihara Pastnou rozpoczął głodówkę.

Sprawa Ihara Pastnoua po raz kolejny dobitnie pokazuje, że na Białorusi łamane są prawa człowieka, a jakakolwiek krytyka reżimu Aleksandra Łukaszenki niesie poważne konsekwencje i jest surowo karana.

W związku z tymi doniesieniami, zwracam się z zapytaniem, czy Komisja ma zamiar podjąć interwencję w sprawie wyroku dla Ihara Pastnoua i wyrazić zdecydowany sprzeciw wobec niesprawiedliwych i motywowanych politycznie procesów na Białorusi?

**Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji
(16 października 2013 r.)**

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca zna tę sytuację. Podobnie jak w innych sprawach związanych z prawami człowieka, również w tym przypadku wykorzystujemy każdą okazję, aby poruszyć z władzami białoruskimi kwestie budzące zaniepokojenie UE. Obejmuje to podnoszenie kwestii dotyczących więźniów politycznych, praw mniejszości oraz innych problemów i spraw związanych z poszanowaniem praw człowieka i demokracji podczas wszelkich kontaktów z białoruską administracją.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009815/13
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
 (3 September 2013)

Subject: Compulsory psychiatric treatment in Belarus

According to Amnesty International, Igor Postnov, a Belarusian psychiatrist, was detained and forced to undergo psychiatric treatment in the hospital where he works following his criticism of the healthcare system in Vitebsk. Igor Postnov had been in conflict with his managers for his outspoken views, and on 16 August a psychiatric commission at the hospital where he works concluded that he required forced psychiatric treatment for a 'psychopathic personality disorder with a mania for persecuting the authorities'.

According to principle 16 of the UN's 'Principles for the protection of persons with mental illness', involuntary psychiatric treatment should only be resorted to in cases of severe mental illness, for the shortest possible time and where there is an immediate or imminent risk that the person will harm themselves or others.

The court order stated that Postnov required psychiatric treatment against his will because of a 'persistent delusional disorder' which meant that he presented a danger to himself and others. The court did not explain, however, how he represents a danger to society, and mentions only his publications on the Internet.

Classifying someone as 'mentally ill' and imposing forced treatment on them was a common means of repression against individuals whose behaviour was disapproved of in the Soviet era. From the case of Igor Postnov it appears that this type of repression is still used today by the Belarusian authorities.

Does the Commission intend to take action in response to the compulsory psychiatric treatment of Igor Postnov?

Question for written answer E-009831/13
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
 (3 September 2013)

Subject: Sentencing of Belarusian psychiatrist

On 21 August a court in Vitebsk sentenced Belarusian psychiatrist Igor Postnov to compulsory psychiatric treatment. Postnov had criticised the government and highlighted irregularities in the healthcare system in Vitebsk, and spoken on his YouTube channel about financial misappropriation connected to the authorities.

There is no doubt whatsoever that Postnov's trial and the sentence handed down were politically motivated. Under the law, he has 10 days to lodge an appeal against the judgment. Quite shockingly, in the psychiatric hospital he was not allowed to use a pen and paper to write an appeal. As a result, Igor Postnov has begun a hunger strike.

The case of Igor Postnov shows clearly once again that human rights are violated in Belarus, and that any criticism of Alexander Lukashenko's regime has serious consequences and is severely punished.

Does the Commission intend to take any action in response to the sentence handed down against Igor Postnov and take a firm stand against unjust and politically motivated trials in Belarus?

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

The HR/VP is aware of this case. In this case, as well as in the other human rights related cases, every opportunity is taken to raise the EU's concerns with the Belarusian authorities. This includes raising the questions related to the political prisoners, rights of minorities as well as other issues and cases related to respect of human rights and democracy in any contacts with the Belarusian administration.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-009816/13
alla Commissione
Erminia Mazzoni (PPE)
 (2 settembre 0132)

Oggetto: Messa al bando dei sacchi biodegradabili

Considerando:

- che la Legge n. 296 del 2006 («Finanziaria 2007») ha previsto il divieto di commercializzazione dei sacchi per asporto di merci non biodegradabili, fissato inizialmente all'1.1.2010, poi posticipato all'1.1.2011;
- che il Decreto Legge n. 2 del 2012 recante «misure straordinarie e urgenti in materia ambientale» (poi convertito nella Legge n. 28/2012) ha introdotto un'ulteriore proroga dell'entrata in vigore del divieto di commercializzazione, limitando ulteriormente la commercializzazione soltanto ai sacchi monouso compostabili o di bioplastica;
- il Decreto Interministeriale n. 452, concernente l'individuazione delle caratteristiche tecniche dei sacchetti per l'asporto merci in attuazione dell'articolo 2, comma 2 del D.l. 25.1.2012 n.2 convertito, con modificazioni, dalla legge 24.3.2012 n. 28.

Visto:

- la direttiva 94/62/CE sugli imballaggi, che indica il compostaggio solo quale una delle possibilità di recupero dei rifiuti da imballaggio;
- l'articolo 18 della medesima direttiva, che prevede che «gli Stati non possono ostacolare l'immissione sul mercato nel loro territorio di imballaggi conformi alle disposizioni della presente direttiva»;
- il principio fondamentale dell'ordinamento comunitario di libera circolazione delle merci e il divieto di restrizione all'importazione ed esportazione delle merci che non sia giustificata dalle particolari ragioni di cui all'articolo 36, espressi nel Titolo II, Parte Terza del TFUE;
- che la normativa italiana ha di fatto e di diritto posto fuori commercio ogni altra tipologia di sacchetto da asporto che non sia corrispondente alle caratteristiche Uni EN 13432/2001, cioè non biodegradabile in condizioni di compostaggio, avvantaggiando di fatto un unico produttore e mettendo in ginocchio un intero comparto (produttori di sacchetti, produttori di macchine, distributori, commercianti, ecc.), senza avere effetti benefici sull'ambiente, tanto meno sulla occupazione;
- la procedura di infrazione 4030/2011 per violazione delle direttive 1994/62/CE e 1998/34/CE.

Può la Commissione comunicare quale sia lo stato della procedura di infrazione in corso e quali siano le ragioni contro dedotte dalla Repubblica italiana.

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
 (33 ottobre 0132)

Come indicato dall'onorevole parlamentare, la Commissione era motivata dal timore che il divieto sui sacchetti di plastica non compostabili proposto dal Governo italiano costituisse una potenziale violazione del principio della libera circolazione delle merci e ha quindi lanciato il procedimento d'infrazione n. 2011/4030. La procedura è in corso ed è nella fase dell'invio della lettera di costituzione in mora ai sensi dell'articolo 258 del TFUE. In particolare, la Commissione sta valutando l'impatto del nuovo decreto interministeriale 542, volto all'individuazione delle ulteriori caratteristiche tecniche che i sacchetti in plastica dovrebbero rispettare per essere commercializzati in Italia.

La principale argomentazione addotta dalle autorità italiane per l'introduzione di un divieto sui sacchetti di plastica non biodegradabili consiste nell'impatto complessivamente negativo dei rifiuti di plastica sull'ambiente. Si tratta di un impatto particolarmente grave soprattutto per l'ambiente marino, un problema recentemente affrontato nel Libro verde della Commissione sulla consultazione pubblica riguardante i rifiuti di plastica. ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ COM(2013)0123 final.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-009816/13
to the Commission**

Erminia Mazzoni (PPE)

(2 September 0132)

Subject: Banning of biodegradable bags

Under the 2006 Italian Law No 296 (the 'Finance Act 2007') the marketing of non-biodegradable carrier bags was to have been prohibited, initially with effect from 1 January 2010, a date subsequently put back to 1 January 2011. The 2012 Decree-Law No 2, laying down urgent special measures concerning the environment (later converted into Law No 28/2012), again postponed the entry into force of the marketing ban and further narrowed the range of bags allowed on the market, which was thus confined to compostable disposable types or bags made from bioplastic material. Interdepartmental Order No 452 has laid down the technical specifications for carrier bags pursuant to Article 2(2) of Decree-Law No 2 of 25 January 2012, which has been converted, with some changes, into Law No 28 of 24 March 2012.

Directive 94/62/EC on packaging treats composting as just one possible way of recovering packaging waste; Article 18, moreover, prohibits Member States from 'imped[ing] the placing on the market of their territory of packaging which satisfies the provisions of this directive'. Free movement of goods is a fundamental principle of EC law and their import and export may not be restricted other than for the special reasons set out in Article 36 of the TFEU (Part Three, Title II). The Italian legislation has, de jure and de facto, ruled out the sale of every type of carrier bag not matching the UNI EN 13432:2001 standard, in other words, bags which are not biodegradable by means of composting. In practice, it is favouring a single producer and bringing an entire sector to its knees (carrier bag manufacturers, makers of machines, distributors, retailers, etc.), without affording any benefits to the environment, to say nothing of employment. Infringement procedure 4030/2011 has been initiated for breach of Directives 1994/62/EC and 1998/34/EC.

What stage has the infringement procedure reached and what counter-arguments has it elicited from Italy by way of a response?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission

(33 October 0132)

As stated by the Honourable Member, the Commission was motivated by concerns that the proposed ban on non-compostable plastic bags by the Italian Government constituted a potential breach of the principle of free movement of goods to launch infringement procedure 2011/4030. This procedure is ongoing and at the stage of Letter of Formal Notice under Article 258. In particular, the Commission is currently assessing the impact of the new inter-ministerial Decree no. 542, aimed at setting further technical characteristics that plastic bags should comply with in order to be marketed in Italy.

The main argument used by the Italian authorities for introducing a ban on non-biodegradable carrying bags is the overall negative impact of plastic waste on the environment. These impacts are particularly negative, notably in the marine environment; an issue recently addressed in the Commission's Green Paper consultation on Plastic Waste. ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ COM(2013) 0123.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009818/13
an die Kommission
Jo Leinen (S&D)
(3. September 2013)

Betrifft: Förderung deutsch-arabischer Kinderliteratur

Die Förderung der Mehrsprachigkeit ist in der Europäischen Union von großer Bedeutung. Neben den Amtssprachen sollten Migrantensprachen wie Arabisch nicht vernachlässigt werden. Arabische Kinderliteratur kann vielseitig in Schulen, Kindergärten und Bibliotheken eingesetzt werden. Zweisprachige Bücher sind für den kulturellen Austausch besonders sinnvoll.

1. Gibt es EU-Fördermittel für die Übersetzung und das Verlegen arabischer Kinderliteratur?
2. Gibt es EU-Fördermittel für arabisch-deutsche Ausgaben von Bilderbüchern, deren Original aus einem arabischen Land stammt?
3. Ist grenzüberschreitende Zusammenarbeit von Verlagen förderungsfähig? Wenn ja: Was sind die Bedingungen?
4. Über welche europaweiten Kanäle könnte man arabisch-deutsche Bücher besser bekannt machen?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(5. November 2013)

Die Förderung der Mehrsprachigkeit in der Europäischen Union ist von zentraler Bedeutung. In den Bereichen Mehrsprachigkeit und Sprachenlernen bietet die Europäische Kommission finanzielle Unterstützung in Form der (Ko)Finanzierung von Projekten, die den Sprachunterricht und die Förderung von Sprachen, auch von Nicht-EU-Sprachen, betreffen.

Aus dem derzeitigen Programm für lebenslanges Lernen wurden seit 2007 mehrere Bildungsprojekte kofinanziert, die die Vermittlung von Nicht-EU-Sprachen, darunter auch Arabisch, fördern. Zu den übergeordneten Prioritäten des neuen Programms Erasmus+, das das Programm für lebenslanges Lernen ab dem Jahr 2014 ablösen wird, zählen das Sprachenlernen und die sprachliche Vielfalt. Dieses Programm wird Finanzierungsmöglichkeiten für strategische Partnerschaften und Maßnahmen für eine breite Palette von Sprachen bieten, auch für Nicht-EU-Sprachen.

Im Rahmen des neuen Programms „Kreatives Europa“, das ebenfalls im Jahr 2014 anlaufen wird, werden kulturelle Projekte auch im Verlagsbereich unterstützt. Die genauen Einzelheiten müssen noch festgelegt werden; grundsätzlich können jedoch Verlage, die bestimmte Kriterien erfüllen, Finanzhilfen für die Übersetzung oder Veröffentlichung arabischer Literatur in deutscher Sprache beantragen.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-009818/13
to the Commission**

Jo Leinen (S&D)

(3 September 2013)

Subject: Promoting German-Arabic children's literature

The promotion of multilingualism is of great importance in the European Union. In addition to the official languages, the languages of immigrants, such as Arabic, should not be neglected. There are many ways in which Arabic children's literature can be used in schools, kindergartens and libraries. Bilingual books are particularly useful for cultural exchanges.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Is any EU funding available for the translation and the publication of Arabic children's literature?
2. Is any EU funding available for Arabic-German editions of picture books originating in an Arab country?
3. Is cross-border cooperation between publishers eligible for aid? If so, what are the conditions?
4. Through which Europe-wide channels could Arabic-German books become better known?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission

(5 November 2013)

The promotion of multilingualism in the European Union is of key importance. In the area of multilingualism and language learning, the Commission provides financial help by way of (co)financing projects aimed at teaching and promoting languages, including non-EU languages.

The current Lifelong Learning Programme has co-funded several educational projects since 2007 which promote the teaching of non-EU languages, including Arabic. The new Erasmus+ programme which will replace the Lifelong Learning Programme in 2014 has language learning and linguistic diversity as an over-arching priority. It will create funding opportunities for strategic partnerships and actions targeting a wide array of languages including non-EU languages.

The new 'Creative Europe' programme, which will also be launched in 2014, will support cultural projects including publishing. Details are yet to be finalised, but in principle, publishing companies that meet certain criteria may be eligible to apply for funding for translating or publishing Arabic literary works in German.
