

Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union

C 206



Ausgabe
in deutscher Sprache

Mitteilungen und Bekanntmachungen

57. Jahrgang

2. Juli 2014

Inhalt

IV Informationen

INFORMATIONEN DER ORGANE, EINRICHTUNGEN UND SONSTIGEN STELLEN DER
EUROPÄISCHEN UNION

Europäisches Parlament

ANFRAGEN ZUR SCHRIFTLICHEN BEANTWORTUNG MIT ANTWORT

2014/C 206/01

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 206/01)

Inhalt	Seite
E-010077/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
Subject: Horizon 2020 funding	
Version française	25
English version	26
E-010078/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
Subject: Framework favourable to research and innovation (R&I)	
Version française	27
English version	28
E-010079/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
Subject: Sustainable urban development project	
Version française	29
English version	30
P-010576/13 by Lara Comi to the Commission	
Subject: Riva case: anomalies and possible solutions	
Versione italiana	31
English version	33
P-010577/13 by Jean-Luc Mélenchon to the Commission	
Subject: VP/HR — US interference	
Version française	34
English version	35
E-010578/13 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission	
Subject: Environmental disaster caused by oil spill in Ammochostos Bay in Cyprus	
Ελληνική έκδοση	36
English version	37

E-010579/13 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission

Subject: The crisis and health cuts

Ελληνική έκδοση	38
English version	39

E-010580/13 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission

Subject: Continuation of water ski facilities project in Lake Pamvotida without environmental authorisation

Ελληνική έκδοση	40
English version	41

E-010581/13 by Gay Mitchell to the Commission

Subject: European Schools

English version	42
-----------------------	----

E-010583/13 by Nicole Sinclair to the Commission

Subject: VP/HR — Women's participation in Pakistan elections

English version	43
-----------------------	----

E-010584/13 by Jean-Luc Mélenchon to the Commission

Subject: Espionage by the United States

Version française	44
English version	45

E-010585/13 by Christine De Veyrac to the Commission

Subject: Use of cyanide in gold mines in Romania

Version française	46
English version	48

E-010596/13 by Jean Louis Cottigny to the Commission

Subject: Roşia Montană and the ban on using cyanide in mines

Version française	46
English version	48

E-010586/13 by Christine De Veyrac to the Commission

Subject: European and global food wastage

Version française	50
English version	52

E-010749/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission

Subject: Economic and environmental impact of food waste

Versione italiana	51
English version	52

E-010587/13 by Christine De Veyrac to the Commission

Subject: The hotel industry and online booking agencies

Version française	54
English version	55

E-010588/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission

Subject: Analysis of the study 'The Portuguese People's Perception of the European Parliament' by the Directorate-General for Communication

Versão portuguesa	56
English version	58

E-010589/13 by Jürgen Creutzmann to the CommissionSubject: Revision of the *de minimis* Directive

Deutsche Fassung	59
English version	60

E-010590/13 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission

Subject: VP/HR — Contravention of human rights by the Egyptian Constitution imposed by Mr Morsi in 2012

Deutsche Fassung	61
English version	62

E-010591/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> UN survey reveals rape crisis in countries of Asia-Pacific	
Ελληνική έκδοση	63
English version	65
E-010592/13 by Julie Girling to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Infringement proceedings — European health insurance card, Spain	
English version	66
E-010593/13 by Julie Girling to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Pigs Directive	
English version	67
E-010594/13 by Julie Girling to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Eggs and the Ukraine — follow-up to Written Question E-004548/2013	
English version	68
E-010595/13 by Lucas Hartong to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Development aid from the EU budget to the den of thieves that is Somalia	
Nederlandse versie	69
English version	70
E-010597/13 by Ruža Tomašić to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Sanctions imposed on Croatia by the Commission for violating the European Arrest Warrant in the 'Lex Perković' case	
Hrvatska verzija	71
English version	72
E-010598/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> International child abduction — application of EU and international law in Slovakia	
Versione italiana	73
English version	74
E-010599/13 by Matteo Salvini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Request for measures to support 1 400 workers facing dismissal at Gruppo Riva's Ilva firm	
Versione italiana	75
English version	76
E-010600/13 by Ivo Belet to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Common approach to tackling drugs trafficking	
Nederlandse versie	77
English version	78
P-010601/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Legal insecurity for Catalan researchers	
Versión española	79
English version	80
E-010602/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VAT exemptions for the protection of children and young people (III)	
Versión española	81
English version	82
E-010604/13 by Birgit Collin-Langen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Disadvantages for European undertakings as a result of German gambling law	
Deutsche Fassung	83
English version	84
E-010606/13 by Jürgen Klute and Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Public service staff reductions by Greece as a consequence of European austerity policy	
Deutsche Fassung	85
Ελληνική έκδοση	86
English version	87

E-010607/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Installation of photovoltaic systems and net metering systems	
Ελληνική έκδοση	88
English version	89
 E-010608/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Digital Single Market Regulation: where is the impact assessment?	
Svensk version	90
English version	91
 E-010609/13 by Catherine Stihler to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Test-Achat Case	
English version	92
 E-010610/13 by Małgorzata Handzlik to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Improper implementation of the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive	
Wersja polska	93
English version	94
 E-010612/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> NSA monitors Belgacom network	
Ελληνική έκδοση	95
English version	96
 E-010613/13 by Alyn Smith to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Turtle doves	
English version	97
 E-010614/13 by Alajos Mészáros to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Public administration practice and judicial interpretation in breach of EC law	
Magyar változat	98
English version	99
 E-010615/13 by Małgorzata Handzlik to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Protective tariffs on fertilisers	
Wersja polska	100
English version	101
 E-010616/13 by Filip Kaczmarek to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Evolution of asylum policy	
Wersja polska	102
English version	103
 P-010617/13 by Michael Cramer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Legislation in Romania concerning stray dogs	
Deutsche Fassung	104
English version	105
 P-010618/13 by Jacek Saryusz-Wolski to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU support for Moldova's energy security	
Wersja polska	106
English version	107
 P-010619/13 by Niccolò Rinaldi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Use of European funds for the conversion of the former sugar factory in Finale Emilia	
Versione italiana	108
English version	109
 E-010620/13 by Anna Maria Corazza Bildt to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Removing economic needs tests and barriers to free establishment	
Svensk version	110
English version	111

E-010621/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Child Labour in Tanzania	
English version	112
E-010622/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Instability in the Central African Republic	
Versione italiana	113
English version	115
E-010623/13 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Killing of foreign trekker in Pakistan	
Versión española	116
English version	117
E-010624/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> European responsibility with regard to Orphacol	
Version française	118
English version	119
E-010625/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Revision of the directive on greater pay equality between men and women	
Version française	120
English version	121
E-010626/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> The future of Catalonia in the European Union	
Version française	122
English version	123
E-010627/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Industrial pig farming and the Nitrates Directive	
Version française	124
English version	125
E-010628/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Domain names '.vin' and '.wine'	
Version française	126
English version	127
E-010630/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Corporal punishment of children	
Version française	128
English version	129
E-010631/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Outcome of the Commission's investigation into Google	
Version française	130
English version	131
E-010632/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Guilty of tax optimisation	
Version française	132
English version	133
E-010633/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Net neutrality at risk	
Version française	134
English version	135
E-010634/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Invasive species in Europe	
Version française	136
English version	137

E-010635/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> UEFA rule on 'locally trained players' in jeopardy	
Version française	138
English version	140
E-010636/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Financial Transaction Tax (FTT) disputed by the Council	
Version française	141
English version	142
E-010637/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Financial Transaction Tax (FTT) disputed by the Council	
Version française	143
English version	144
E-010638/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Advance payment of CAP subsidies	
Version française	145
English version	146
E-010639/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Syrians in Bulgaria	
Version française	147
English version	148
E-010640/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Deep-sea trawling ban	
Version française	149
English version	150
E-010641/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Data protection within the framework of eCall	
Version française	151
English version	152
E-010642/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> UEFA's financial fair play (FFP) in jeopardy	
Version française	153
English version	154
E-010643/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Joint ownership in the field of football	
Version française	155
English version	156
E-010644/13 by Andrea Cozzolino to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Waste issue in Campania — Giugliano waste-to-energy plant	
Versione italiana	157
English version	159
E-010645/13 by Theodoros Skylakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Relocation of registered office of Biochalko from Greece to Belgium	
Ελληνική έκδοση	161
English version	162
E-010646/13 by Theodoros Skylakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> International Monetary Fund forecasts for the Greek banking system in 2014	
Ελληνική έκδοση	163
English version	164
E-010647/13 by Theodoros Skylakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Impact of early retirements in 2010-2012 on the general government deficit	
Ελληνική έκδοση	165
English version	166

E-010648/13 by Theodoros Skylakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Report on actuarial balance in the pension system	
Ελληνική έκδοση	167
English version	168
E-010649/13 by Theodoros Skylakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Provisions in the memorandum for real estate taxes	
Ελληνική έκδοση	169
English version	170
E-010650/13 by Theodoros Skylakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Licences to establish and operate works machinery repair and servicing workshops	
Ελληνική έκδοση	171
English version	172
E-010651/13 by Inês Cristina Zuber and João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Protecting the public interest in the provision of regular air services to the Bragança and Vila Real districts	
Versão portuguesa	173
English version	174
P-010652/13 by Santiago Fisas Aixela to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Use of the media for political purposes	
Versión española	175
English version	176
E-010654/13 by Catherine Stihler to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European order for payment procedure	
English version	177
E-010655/13 by Catherine Stihler to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Civil liability of employers	
English version	178
E-010656/13 by Giles Chichester to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Recognition of professional qualifications — revision of Directive 2005/36/EC	
English version	179
E-010657/13 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Aceh and the Helsinki MOU	
English version	180
E-010658/13 by Catherine Grèze to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Floods in south-west France — combating global warming and the EU Solidarity Fund	
Versión française	181
English version	183
E-010659/13 by Jean Louis Cottigny to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Payment Services Directive (PSD II)	
Versión française	184
English version	185
E-010660/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> End-of-waste criteria for paper	
Versione italiana	186
English version	188
E-010662/13 by Ria Oomen-Ruijten to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Amendments to the Dutch Care Insurance Act contrary to the free movement of patients — follow-up question	
Nederlandse versie	190
English version	191

E-010663/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission

Subject: The EU, Iceland and Norway: pending entry into force of the Agreement on the stepping-up of cross-border cooperation

Versão portuguesa	192
English version	193

E-010664/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission

Subject: Possible expansion of cooperation with Switzerland and Liechtenstein

Versão portuguesa	194
English version	195

E-010665/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission

Subject: Commission's recommendation for the next election of the European Parliament

Versão portuguesa	196
English version	197

E-010666/13 by Elena Băsescu to the Commission

Subject: 'Your first EURES job' programme

Versiunea în limba română	198
English version	199

E-010667/13 by Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă to the Commission

Subject: Unemployment

Versiunea în limba română	200
English version	202

P-010668/13 by Iliana Malinova Iotova to the Commission

Subject: Public contract for the construction of a waste disposal plant in Sophia

българска версия	204
English version	205

E-010669/13 by Philip Claeys to the Commission

Subject: Shooting-down of a Syrian helicopter by the Turkish air force

Nederlandse versie	206
English version	207

E-010670/13 by Philip Claeys to the Commission

Subject: EU support for the European Council on Tolerance and Reconciliation

Nederlandse versie	208
English version	209

E-010671/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission

Subject: VP/HR — The state of Syria's chemical weapons programme

Versione italiana	210
English version	211

E-010672/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission

Subject: VP/HR — Terrorist plot against the Suez Canal

Versione italiana	212
English version	213

E-010673/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission

Subject: De facto use of standard versus standardisation

Svensk version	214
English version	215

E-010674/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission

Subject: VP/HR — Armenia and the Russian customs union

Wersja polska	216
English version	217

E-010675/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission

Subject: VP/HR — Azerbaijan and human rights

Wersja polska	218
English version	219

E-010676/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission	
Subject: VP/HR — Cuba: the Case of Iván Fernández Depestre	
Wersja polska	220
English version	221
E-010677/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission	
Subject: Cyrillic alphabet in Croatia	
Wersja polska	222
English version	223
E-010678/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission	
Subject: The EU-Morocco fisheries agreement	
Wersja polska	224
English version	225
E-010680/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission	
Subject: VP/HR — Kazakhstan: The Case of Zinaida Mukhortova	
Wersja polska	226
English version	227
E-010681/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission	
Subject: VP/HR — Anti-Ukrainian allegations concerning arms supplies to Syria	
Wersja polska	228
English version	229
E-010682/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
Subject: Russian Federation embargo against Moldova	
Versiunea în limba română	230
English version	231
E-010683/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
Subject: Risk of acetaminophen overdose	
Versiunea în limba română	232
English version	233
E-010684/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
Subject: Partnership Agreement with Romania	
Versiunea în limba română	234
English version	235
E-010685/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
Subject: Memorandum on animal health and food safety between Romania and China	
Versiunea în limba română	236
English version	237
E-010686/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
Subject: Statistics on fighting corruption, by political affiliation	
Versiunea în limba română	238
English version	239
E-010687/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
Subject: Impact of Commission's food safety measures	
Versiunea în limba română	240
English version	241
E-010688/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
Subject: Interests and rights of local communities in projects financed by European funds — case of the Arad-Nădlac motorway	
Versiunea în limba română	242
English version	243
E-010689/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
Subject: EU-Ukraine free trade agreement	
Versiunea în limba română	244
English version	245

E-010690/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Anti-competitive agreement among grain traders in Romania	
Versiunea în limba română	246
English version	247
E-010691/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Purchase of honey as part of the European Food Aid Programme (PEAD) 2013 in Romania	
Versiunea în limba română	248
English version	249
E-010692/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Right of access to basic food products in Romania	
Versiunea în limba română	250
English version	251
E-010693/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Late announcement of procedures for selecting partners in Romania	
Versiunea în limba română	252
English version	253
E-010694/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Incitement by Dutch minister to violate the Treaty	
Versiunea în limba română	254
English version	255
E-010695/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Fraud in the European Food Aid Programme for the most deprived (PEAD) in Romania	
Versiunea în limba română	256
English version	257
E-010696/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Funds intended for Romania and Bulgaria redirected to Germany	
Versiunea în limba română	258
English version	259
E-010697/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Restricting the rights of NGOs in Romania	
Versiunea în limba română	260
English version	261
E-010698/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Insolvency of Madrid's R-2 motorway — disproportionate state aid, sustainability of the deficit (follow-up to the answer to Question E-005354/2013)	
Versión española	262
English version	263
E-010700/13 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> The role of central securities depositories in the collection of financial transaction tax revenue	
Versión española	264
English version	265
E-010701/13 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The role of central securities depositories in the collection of taxes on financial transactions	
Versión española	266
English version	267
E-010702/13 by Andrés Perelló Rodríguez to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Breach of the directive 2008/98/EC on waste management in the Community of Valencia	
Versión española	268
English version	269
E-010703/13 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Listing of countries that practise illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing	
Versión española	270
English version	271

E-010704/13 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission*Subject:* Negotiation of fisheries agreements

Versión española	272
English version	273

E-010705/13 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission*Subject:* Fisheries Agreement between the EU and Mauritius

Versión española	274
English version	275

E-010706/13 by Horst Schnellhardt to the Commission*Subject:* Authorisation of genetically modified SmartStax maize as an animal feed in the EU

Deutsche Fassung	276
English version	277

E-010707/13 by Ioannis A. Tsoukalas to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Cybersecurity of EU institutions

Ελληνική έκδοση	278
English version	280

E-010708/13 by Ioannis A. Tsoukalas to the Commission*Subject:* Cybersecurity of EU institutions

Ελληνική έκδοση	279
English version	280

E-010709/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Marine reserve in the Ross Sea

Wersja polska	282
English version	283

E-010710/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Russian threats against Moldova

Wersja polska	284
English version	285

E-010711/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — South Sudan: the case of the Murle population

Wersja polska	286
English version	287

E-010712/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Syrian refugees

Wersja polska	288
English version	289

E-010713/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission*Subject:* Trade war between Macedonia and Kosovo

Wersja polska	290
English version	291

E-010714/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Tunisia and freedom of expression

Wersja polska	292
English version	293

E-010715/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Venezuela and human rights

Wersja polska	294
English version	295

E-010716/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission*Subject:* Using Scotland's award winning 'active and healthy ageing' practices in Europe

English version	296
-----------------------	-----

E-010717/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Reducing the carbon footprint in Europe English version	297
E-010718/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Protected Geographical Indication application success rates English version	298
E-010719/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Plastic bag charge and environmental benefits English version	299
E-010720/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Eliminating the manufacture of 'legal high' substances English version	300
E-010721/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> The Commission's efforts to tackle racial abuse in spectator sports played in Europe English version	301
E-010722/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Afghan Public Protection Force at risk of collapse Versione italiana	302
English version	303
E-010723/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Malians protest Jihadists return to Gao Versione italiana	304
English version	305
E-010724/13 by Marta Andreasen to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Finance and accountancy training for Commission staff English version	306
E-010725/13 by Cornelis de Jong to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Treatment of minority communities in the Pakistan elections Nederlandse versie	307
English version	308
E-010726/13 by Britta Reimers to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> GMO authorisation Deutsche Fassung	309
English version	310
E-010727/13 by Martina Anderson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> EU legislation on working hours for professional drivers English version	311
E-010728/13 by Ruža Tomašić to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> How to draw on money from EU funds Hrvatska verzija	312
English version	313
E-010729/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Update on Co.Ve.Ri landfill in Casale sul Sile in the Province of Treviso Versione italiana	314
English version	316
E-010730/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> New landfill site in the Paese municipality in the Province of Treviso — public health and environmental safety at risk Versione italiana	317
English version	319

E-010731/13 by Janusz Wojciechowski to the Commission*Subject:* EU funding for measures to reduce the stray dog population in Romania

Wersja polska	321
English version	322

E-010732/13 by Inês Cristina Zuber and João Ferreira to the Commission*Subject:* Assassination of Pavlos Fyssas by activists of the Golden Dawn fascist group

Versão portuguesa	323
English version	324

P-010733/13 by Lena Kolarska-Bobińska to the Commission*Subject:* Reverse gas flow deliveries from the EU to Ukraine

Wersja polska	325
English version	326

P-010734/13 by Marianne Thyssen to the Commission*Subject:* Debt mediation activities in connection with a private insolvency procedure

Nederlandse versie	327
English version	328

E-010735/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission*Subject:* Loan refinancing

Versión española	329
English version	330

E-010736/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission*Subject:* European sickness insurance card in Spain

Versión española	331
English version	332

E-010737/13 by Phil Bennion to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Allegations of torture in Jericho Prison in the West Bank

English version	333
-----------------------	-----

E-010738/13 by Iva Zanicchi to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Human trafficking in West African states

Versione italiana	334
English version	335

E-010739/13 by Iva Zanicchi to the Commission*Subject:* Combating organised crime in parts of south-east Asia

Versione italiana	336
English version	338

E-010740/13 by Iva Zanicchi to the Commission*Subject:* Diminishing water resources in Europe

Versione italiana	340
English version	341

E-010742/13 by Ryszard Antoni Legutko to the Commission*Subject:* Problems faced by freight companies operating on routes between the EU and Russia

Wersja polska	342
English version	343

E-010743/13 by Ryszard Antoni Legutko to the Commission*Subject:* Increasing VAT on medical devices in Poland

Wersja polska	344
English version	345

P-010744/13 by Emma McClarkin to the Commission*Subject:* Azodicarbonamide

English version	346
-----------------------	-----

E-010745/13 by María Irigoyen Pérez to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Delays in regional authority payments of Commission funding for local authorities	
Versión española	347
English version	348
E-010746/13 by Dan Jørgensen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Total ban on the rearing of milk-fed calves	
Dansk udgave	349
English version	350
E-010747/13 by Christel Schaldemose to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Maximum amounts of vitamins and minerals in food supplements	
Dansk udgave	351
English version	352
E-010748/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Hunting of pilot whales in the Danish Faeroe Islands	
Versione italiana	353
English version	354
E-010750/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Disseminating telemedicine and remote patient monitoring practices	
Versione italiana	355
English version	357
E-010751/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by plastic waste	
Versione italiana	358
English version	359
E-010752/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU campaign for the standardisation of vaccines and information and promotional activities	
Versione italiana	360
English version	361
E-010753/13 by Esther de Lange to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Fire safety in Europe	
Nederlandse versie	362
English version	363
P-010754/13 by Olle Schmidt to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — The case of Oswaldo Payá	
Svensk version	364
English version	365
E-010756/13 by Julie Girling to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Illegal hunting and trapping of birds in France	
English version	366
E-010757/13 by Julie Girling to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Commission action regarding bus fares in Malta	
English version	367
E-010758/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Technical standards and procurement	
Svensk version	368
English version	369
E-010759/13 by Stephen Hughes to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Commission proposal for new rules to restrict air crews' Flight Time Limitations (FTL) (D028112/02) — safety enhancement clause/Recital 5	
English version	370

E-010760/13 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Arrest of Khalil Almarzooq	
English version	371
E-010761/13 by Catherine Grèze to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Protecting farmers against state repression in Colombia	
Version française	372
English version	373
E-010762/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> AMA Salaria plant in Rome: latest information on the plant's relocation; protection of the environment and public health	
Versione italiana	374
English version	375
E-011052/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Low level of public support for the EU in Turkey	
Versione italiana	376
English version	378
E-010763/13 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Reluctance of the Turks to join the EU	
Nederlandse versie	377
English version	378
P-010764/13 by Gesine Meissner to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Unfair competition in the haulage sector from truckers from outside the EU	
Deutsche Fassung	380
English version	381
P-010765/13 by Gaston Franco to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> List of invasive alien species of concern to the EU	
Version française	382
English version	383
P-010766/13 by Mikael Gustafsson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Unequal requirements for test vehicles and driving tests for A-class licences in the EU	
Svensk version	384
English version	385
E-010767/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Two-pack for Portugal	
Versão portuguesa	386
English version	387
E-010768/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Council <i>Subject:</i> Economic situation in Cyprus and ways of addressing it	
Ελληνική έκδοση	388
English version	390
E-010769/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Economic situation in Cyprus and ways of addressing it	
Ελληνική έκδοση	391
English version	393
E-010770/13 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Commission of investigation into the Spanair flight JK5022 accident	
Versión española	395
English version	396
E-010771/13 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Indemnifications for the Spanair flight JK5022 accident	
Versión española	397
English version	398

E-010772/13 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission*Subject:* Spanair flight JK5022 accident

Versión española	399
English version	401

E-010773/13 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission*Subject:* Extension to the airworthiness certificate for the aircraft used on Spanair flight JK5022

Versión española	399
English version	401

E-010774/13 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission*Subject:* Extension to the airworthiness certificate for the aircraft used on Spanair flight JK5022

Versión española	403
English version	404

E-010775/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission*Subject:* Single European Sky IV

Versión española	405
English version	407

E-010776/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission*Subject:* Single European Sky V

Versión española	405
English version	407

E-010777/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission*Subject:* Feta and Gorgonzola, victims of the trade agreement with Canada

Ελληνική έκδοση	408
English version	409

E-010778/13 by Sylvana Rapti, Marietta Giannakou, Niki Tzavela, Nikos Chrysogelos, Theodoros Skylakakis, Anni Podimata, Spyros Danellis, Dimitrios Droutsas, Georgios Papanikolaou, Maria Eleni Koppa, Konstantinos Poupakis, Chrysoula Paliadeli, Ioannis A. Tsoukalas, Georgios Stavrakakis and Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Council

Subject: Rise of Nazism in Europe — murder of a young man in Greece

Ελληνική έκδοση	410
English version	412

E-010779/13 by Sylvana Rapti, Marietta Giannakou, Niki Tzavela, Nikos Chrysogelos, Theodoros Skylakakis, Anni Podimata, Spyros Danellis, Dimitrios Droutsas, Georgios Papanikolaou, Maria Eleni Koppa, Konstantinos Poupakis, Chrysoula Paliadeli, Ioannis A. Tsoukalas, Georgios Stavrakakis and Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission

Subject: Rise of Nazism in Europe — murder of a young man in Greece

Ελληνική έκδοση	414
English version	416

E-010781/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — President Hollande ready to give weapons to Syrian rebels

Ελληνική έκδοση	418
English version	419

E-010782/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission*Subject:* Digital Single Market Regulation: identified obstacles

Svensk version	420
English version	421

E-010783/13 by Catherine Stihler to the Commission*Subject:* Zero hour contracts

English version	422
-----------------------	-----

E-010784/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission*Subject:* Events to mark 60th anniversary of the European Convention on Human Rights

English version	423
-----------------------	-----

E-010786/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission*Subject:* Commission involvement in Offshore Europe event in Aberdeen

English version 424

E-010787/13 by Claude Moraes, Jan Philipp Albrecht, Dimitrios Droutsas, Sophia in 't Veld and Brian Simpson to the Commission*Subject:* Article 29 Working Party investigation of the International Air Transport Association (IATA) and the new distribution capability

Deutsche Fassung 425

Ελληνική έκδοση 426

Nederlandse versie 427

English version 428

E-010789/13 by Michèle Striffler to the Commission*Subject:* CAP funding for bullfighting

Version française 429

English version 430

E-010791/13 by Jean-Pierre Audy to the Commission*Subject:* Representation of Member States in the European Council

Version française 431

English version 432

E-010793/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission*Subject:* Increase in the incidence of leprosy in India

Versione italiana 433

English version 434

E-010794/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission*Subject:* Pai-Ita Group (Vicenza): 110 workers made redundant

Versione italiana 435

English version 436

E-010795/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission*Subject:* 1 500 employees made redundant by the Riva Group following the precautionary seizure of assets by the courts: protection of workers

Versione italiana 437

English version 438

E-010796/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission*Subject:* Child brides in Bangladesh: a case in the province of Padua

Versione italiana 439

English version 440

E-010797/13 by Patricia van der Kammen to the Commission*Subject:* Subsidiarity at stake!/Maritime spatial planning and integrated coastal management

Nederlandse versie 441

English version 443

E-010798/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission*Subject:* The effects of electromagnetic radiation on health

Versão portuguesa 445

English version 446

P-010799/13 by Ivo Strejček to the Commission*Subject:* INDECT research project

České znění 447

English version 448

P-010800/13 by Bogusław Liberadzki to the Commission*Subject:* EU/Ukrainian transport policy

Wersja polska 449

English version 450

P-010801/13 by Zigmantas Balčytis to the Commission*Subject:* The allocation of national energy projects to projects of common interest

Tekstas lietuvių kalba	451
English version	452

P-010802/13 by Edite Estrela to the Council*Subject:* Revision of Directive 92/85/EEC

Versão portuguesa	453
English version	454

E-010803/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission*Subject:* Implications of Spanish Royal Decree-Law 9/2013 for investment in renewable energy and adherence to EU renewable energy undertakings

Versión española	455
English version	456

E-010804/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission*Subject:* Equal treatment regarding preferential shares

Versión española	457
English version	458

E-010805/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission*Subject:* Equality between European citizens

Versión española	459
English version	460

E-010806/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission*Subject:* VP/HR — Violence and human rights situation in Honduras

Versión española	461
English version	463

E-010807/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission*Subject:* Application of Directive 2007/65/EC in Spain

Versión española	464
English version	466

E-010808/13 by Jens Geier and Petra Kammerevert to the Commission*Subject:* Work of the adviser to Commissioner Kroes

Deutsche Fassung	467
English version	468

E-010809/13 by Burkhard Balz to the Commission*Subject:* Role of the European Investment Bank (EIB) in the European Association of Long-Term Investors (ELTI)

Deutsche Fassung	469
English version	470

E-010810/13 by Georgios Toussas to the Commission*Subject:* Major fire disaster in the historic Amfissa Olive Grove in Greece

Ελληνική έκδοση	471
English version	472

E-010811/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission*Subject:* Empty beds in intensive care units in Greek hospitals

Ελληνική έκδοση	473
English version	474

E-010812/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission*Subject:* Serious problems in the fish-farming sector in Greece

Ελληνική έκδοση	475
English version	476

E-010813/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission*Subject:* Debate on reversing the suspension of auctions in respect of borrowers' homes in Greece

Ελληνική έκδοση	477
English version	478

E-010814/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Mandatory country of origin labelling on dairy products	
Ελληνική έκδοση	479
English version	481
E-010815/13 by Charles Tannock to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Stray animal disposal practices in Romania	
English version	483
E-010816/13 by Charles Tannock and Fiorello Provera to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Murder of Sushmita Banerjee	
Versione italiana	484
English version	485
E-010818/13 by Cecilia Wikström to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Swedish police revealed to have illegal data register of Roma people	
Svensk version	486
English version	487
E-010819/13 by Paweł Zalewski to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Possible exclusion from the Third Energy Package	
Wersja polska	488
English version	489
E-010820/13 by Phil Prendergast to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU funding for international youth initiatives across Member States	
English version	490
E-010821/13 by Phil Prendergast to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Shannon water abstraction scale	
English version	491
E-010822/13 by Phil Prendergast to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Shannon water abstraction and supply leakage	
English version	491
E-010823/13 by Phil Prendergast to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Shannon water abstraction and alternatives	
English version	491
E-010824/13 by Phil Prendergast to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Gelmini reform and discrimination against foreign-language teachers in Italy	
English version	493
E-010825/13 by Julie Girling to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Air pollution in Bath	
English version	494
E-010826/13 by Sajjad Karim to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Portuguese coastal property law	
English version	495
E-010827/13 by Philippe de Villiers to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) — Bosnia and Herzegovina	
Version française	496
English version	497
E-010828/13 by Philippe de Villiers to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Textile production in Bangladesh — Working conditions	
Version française	498
English version	499

E-010830/13 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission

Subject: Biogas plant digestate used neat: request to assess whether the substance should be registered under Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006

Versione italiana	500
English version	501

E-010831/13 by Zigmantas Balčytis to the Commission

Subject: On the period of operation of tax-free shops on the EU's external borders set out in Directive 2008/118/EC concerning the general arrangements for excise duty

Tekstas lietuvių kalba	502
English version	503

E-010832/13 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission

Subject: 'Turkey will never join'

Nederlandse versie	504
English version	505

E-010833/13 by Philippe De Backer to the Commission

Subject: Recommendations — Belgian 2013 National Reform Programme — Pensions

Nederlandse versie	506
English version	507

E-010834/13 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission

Subject: Turkish pianist Fazıl Say's conviction for 'insulting Islam' upheld

Nederlandse versie	508
English version	509

E-010835/13 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission

Subject: Fines for critical TV stations in Turkey (follow-up question II)

Nederlandse versie	510
English version	511

E-010836/13 by Piotr Borys to the Commission

Subject: Functioning of Eurodesk under the Erasmus+ programme

Wersja polska	512
English version	513

E-010837/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission

Subject: VP/HR — Refusal of permission for Nicolás Maduro to fly over US territory

Versión española	514
English version	515

E-010838/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission

Subject: VP/HR — Persecution of individuals in the Ahmadiyya community in Saudi Arabia

Versión española	516
English version	518

E-010839/13 by Ivo Strejček to the Commission

Subject: Support for renewable energy sources

České znění	519
English version	520

E-010841/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission

Subject: State aid to Dublin Bus and Irish Bus

English version	521
-----------------------	-----

E-010843/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission

Subject: Latest information on the opening of a new landfill site in the Falcoghana district of Rome

Versione italiana	522
English version	524

E-011261/13 by Roberta Angelilli and Alfredo Antoniozzi to the Commission

Subject: Falcognana area of Rome: additional information on the opening of a new landfill site and the consequent dumping of new types of waste

Versione italiana	522
English version	524

E-010844/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission

Subject: EU relations with the N11

Versão portuguesa	526
English version	528

E-010857/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission

Subject: EU relations with the N11

Versão portuguesa	526
English version	528

E-010845/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission

Subject: Implementation of the European digital single market

Versão portuguesa	530
English version	531

E-010846/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission

Subject: Discrimination by a credit institution against a Portuguese emigrant

Versão portuguesa	532
English version	533

P-010858/13 by Alfredo Antoniozzi to the Commission

Subject: New landfill site at Falcognana to replace the Malagrotta site

Versione italiana	534
English version	535

P-010859/13 by Carl Schlyter to the Commission

Subject: Storage of personal data and ethnic profiling by the police

Svensk version	536
English version	537

E-010860/13 by Ivo Strejček to the Commission

Subject: Common agricultural policy — a more drastic adjustment of degressive direct payments is detrimental to the Czech Republic

České znění	538
English version	539

E-010861/13 by Ivo Strejček to the Commission

Subject: EMCS electronic monitoring system as a means of fighting fiscal fraud

České znění	540
English version	541

E-010862/13 by Edvard Kožušník to the Commission

Subject: Revision of Regulation (EU) No 913/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning a European rail network for competitive freight

České znění	542
English version	543

E-010863/13 by Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou to the Commission

Subject: Competitiveness, transparency and future prospects in the European fur industry

Ελληνική έκδοση	544
English version	545

E-010864/13 by Claudette Abela Baldacchino to the Commission

Subject: Youth work

Verżjoni Maltija	546
English version	547

E-010865/13 by Claudette Abela Baldacchino to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Unemployment among people over the age of 40	
Verżjoni Maltija	548
English version	549
E-010866/13 by Claudette Abela Baldacchino to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Poverty targets	
Verżjoni Maltija	550
English version	551
E-010867/13 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Israeli reprisals following the publication of EU guidelines concerning Israeli settlements	
Version française	552
English version	554
E-010868/13 by Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Speech by the Dutch Minister of Social Affairs and Employment, 10.9.2013	
Wersja polska	556
English version	557
P-010869/13 by Petra Kammerevert to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Commission's decision not to consult those concerned before adopting its proposal for a regulation COM(2013) 627	
Deutsche Fassung	558
English version	559
P-010870/13 by Claudio Morganti to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Links between Telefónica and Spanish banks	
Versione italiana	560
English version	561
P-010871/13 by Silvia-Adriana Țicău to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Speeding up the procedures for supporting people and areas hit by floods	
Versiunea în limba română	562
English version	563
E-010872/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Support for youth employment from the European Investment Bank	
Ελληνική έκδοση	564
English version	565
E-010873/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> HIV epidemic in Greece	
Ελληνική έκδοση	566
English version	567
E-010874/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Psychotropic substances	
Ελληνική έκδοση	568
English version	569
E-010875/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Reduction of the administrative burden relating to the use of European funds	
Ελληνική έκδοση	570
English version	572
E-010876/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> The economic crisis and safeguarding family homes	
Ελληνική έκδοση	573
English version	575
E-010877/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The economic crisis and safeguarding family homes	
Ελληνική έκδοση	577
English version	579

E-010878/13 by Jacek Saryusz-Wolski to the Commission*Subject:* EU response to Russian pressure on Eastern Partnership countries negotiating Association Agreements

Wersja polska	580
English version	582

E-010881/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Psoriatic arthritis

Version française	584
English version	585

E-010882/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* The EU's forest strategy

Version française	586
English version	588

E-010883/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Protection of minorities and their culture

Version française	590
English version	592

E-010884/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Libor and Euribor

Version française	594
English version	595

E-010885/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Reducing CO₂ footprint with bio-plastics

Version française	596
English version	597

E-010886/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Fisheries: Mauritania/EU

Version française	598
English version	599

E-010887/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Merkel challenging EU banking union

Version française	600
English version	601

E-010888/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Visa/MasterCard: lower interbank fees

Version française	602
English version	604

E-010889/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission*Subject:* Monte Paschi

Version française	605
English version	606

E-010890/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission*Subject:* EU relations with partner countries affected by the Arab Spring

Versão portuguesa	607
English version	608

E-010891/13 by Małgorzata Handzlik to the Commission*Subject:* Charge for removing a SIM lock

Wersja polska	609
English version	610

E-010892/13 by Małgorzata Handzlik to the Commission*Subject:* Internet shops and ensuring customers are properly informed

Wersja polska	611
English version	612

P-010893/13 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Pre-accession funding for Turkey	
English version	613
E-010894/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — CELAC proposal on global nuclear disarmament	
Versión española	614
English version	616
P-010896/13 by Justas Vincas Paleckis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> On reducing the links between oil and natural gas prices	
Tekstas lietuvių kalba	617
English version	618
E-010897/13 by Lorenzo Fontana to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Situation of religious minorities in Pakistan	
Versione italiana	619
English version	620
E-010898/13 by Lorenzo Fontana to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Stray animals and protection of pet animals in Romania	
Versione italiana	621
English version	622
E-010899/13 by Phil Prendergast to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Aviation insurance funding for third parties	
English version	623
E-010900/13 by Phil Prendergast to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> False online reviews	
English version	624
E-010901/13 by Silvia-Adriana Țicău to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Water shortages and floods in Europe demand the development of a strategy for access to drinking water	
Versiunea în limba română	625
English version	626
E-010902/13 by Silvia-Adriana Țicău to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Millennium Development Goals	
Versiunea în limba română	627
English version	628
E-010903/13 by Nicole Sinclair to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Animal health law	
English version	629

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010077/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(11 septembre 2013)

Objet: Financement «Horizon 2020»

Le Parlement européen, lors de sa session de septembre, a demandé à la Commission, compte tenu de l'importance de la recherche et de l'innovation (R&I) pour l'ensemble de l'économie européenne, de reconnaître l'importance de l'initiative «Horizon 2020» et de prévoir, à ce titre, un financement suffisant.

Quelle est la réponse de la Commission?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Geoghegan-Quinn au nom de la Commission

(17 octobre 2013)

Dans un contexte de compétition économique mondiale, la sortie de crise pour l'Europe exige que nous renforçons les investissements publics et privés dans la recherche, le développement et l'innovation.

La Commission a proposé un budget de 80 milliards d'euros (en prix constants de 2011) pour «Horizon 2020» dans le contexte du cadre financier pluriannuel (CFP) pour la période 2014-2020. Cela permettrait à l'Europe de financer des actions présentant une valeur ajoutée européenne et d'envoyer un signal fort de son engagement pour rester un acteur de rang mondial dans ces domaines.

Les négociations interinstitutionnelles sur le CFP ont permis de conclure un accord sur le programme «Horizon 2020» pour une somme de 70,2 milliards d'euros. Cela envoie un signal fort et constitue un catalyseur indispensable de croissance et un vecteur d'emploi. Elle salue la contribution que peut apporter le programme «Horizon 2020» à la stratégie Europe 2020.

La Commission attend avec intérêt la conclusion rapide des négociations interinstitutionnelles sur le paquet «Horizon 2020», dans lesquelles le Parlement européen a joué un rôle clé. L'objectif est de lancer les premiers appels à propositions dans le cadre de «Horizon 2020» avant la fin de 2013.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010077/13
to the Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(11 September 2013)

Subject: Horizon 2020 funding

At its September part-session, Parliament called on the Commission, in view of the importance of research and innovation (R&I) to the whole European economy, to recognise the importance of the Horizon 2020 initiative and to finance it adequately.

What is the Commission's response?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission

(17 October 2013)

In a context of global economic competition, the exit from the crisis for Europe requires that we enhance public and private investment in research, development and innovation.

The Commission proposed an appropriate budget of EUR 80 billion (in constant 2011 prices) for Horizon 2020 in the context of the Multi-Annual Financial Framework for 2014-2020 (MFF). This would enable Europe to finance actions marked by European added value and send a strong signal of its commitment to remaining a world class actor in these fields.

Through the interinstitutional negotiations on the MFF, an agreement was reached on Horizon 2020 for a EUR 70.2 billion budget. This still constitutes an important signal and is an essential catalyst for growth and jobs. It strongly acknowledges the contribution that Horizon 2020 can make to the Europe 2020 strategy.

The Commission is looking forward to the swift conclusion of the interinstitutional negotiations on the Horizon 2020 package, in which the European Parliament has played an essential role. The goal is to launch the first calls for proposals under Horizon 2020 by the end of 2013.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010078/13
à la Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(11 septembre 2013)

Objet: Cadre favorable à la R&I

La Commission compte-t-elle établir, comme le lui conseille le Parlement, un cadre favorable à la R&I, grâce à la création de systèmes de tarification équitables, efficaces et innovants pour tous les modes de mobilité et de transport, en particulier par l'internalisation des coûts externes, en tenant compte des principes du «pollueur-payeur» et de «l'utilisateur-payeur»?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission

(23 octobre 2013)

La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à se référer à trois documents de travail de ses services.

Dans le premier document de travail, qui accompagne le livre blanc sur les transports ⁽¹⁾, la Commission, reconnaît, au chapitre 3.3, l'importance d'incitations financières adéquates et cohérentes, notamment pour le choix des technologies à déployer. Elle y explique, en outre, la nécessité d'éviter les distorsions de prix, ce qui pourrait également ouvrir la voie à l'innovation dans les modes de transport concurrents.

La Commission considère que les mesures énumérées sous l'initiative n° 39 du livre blanc sur les transports constituent un cadre approprié pour l'internalisation des coûts externes et favorisent ainsi le développement d'un système de transport plus efficient incluant le déploiement de nouvelles technologies ainsi que des services innovants.

Ces aspects sont également présentés dans le document de travail des services de la Commission accompagnant la communication intitulée «La recherche et l'innovation au service de la mobilité européenne de demain» ⁽²⁾ comme des domaines de recherche et d'innovation possibles.

Le troisième document de travail pertinent des services de la Commission ⁽³⁾, adopté le 3 juillet 2013, établit une synthèse des mesures prises pour internaliser ou réduire les coûts externes de tous les modes de transport liés à l'environnement, au bruit et à la santé.

Ce document fournit également des informations à jour sur la mise en œuvre de la stratégie d'internalisation de la Commission et fait référence à des initiatives en faveur des technologies moins polluantes. Ces initiatives, qui relèvent le plus souvent des domaines de la recherche et des infrastructures, créent d'importantes synergies avec les mesures d'internalisation, qui ne pourront se traduire par un changement réel de comportement que si les usagers disposent de solutions de rechange satisfaisantes. À l'inverse, une tarification correcte contribue à la viabilité économique des modes et des technologies de transport qui présentent un intérêt particulier pour la société du fait de leur capacité à réduire les externalités négatives.

⁽¹⁾ Feuille de route pour un espace européen unique des transports — Vers un système de transport compétitif et économe en ressources, COM(2011) 144 final, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SEC:2011:0391:FIN:EN:PDF>

⁽²⁾ Preliminary Descriptions of Research and Innovation Areas and Fields, SWD (2012) 0260 final: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SWD:2012:0260:FIN:EN:PDF>

⁽³⁾ Report in accordance with Article 11 (4) of Directive 1999/62/EC, SWD(2013) 269 final: [http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/sustainable/doc/swd\(2013\)269.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/sustainable/doc/swd(2013)269.pdf)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010078/13
to the Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(11 September 2013)

Subject: Framework favourable to research and innovation (R&I)

Does the Commission, as advised by Parliament, plan to create a framework favourable to R&I by creating fair, efficient and innovative pricing systems for all mobility and transport modes, particularly through the internalisation of external costs, taking into account the 'polluter pays' and 'user pays' principles?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission

(23 October 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to three of its Staff Working Documents (SWD).

The first SWD, accompanying the White Paper on transport ⁽¹⁾, recognises in its Chapter 3.3 the importance of correct and consistent monetary incentives, e.g. in terms of decisions taken on the technologies to deploy. Furthermore, it explains the need for avoiding price distortions, which may also lead to innovation in competing modes.

The Commission considers that the measures listed under Initiative 39 of the White Paper on transport provide the appropriate framework for the internalisation of external costs, and thereby promote the development of a more efficient transport system, including the deployment of new technologies, as well as innovative services.

These aspects are also referred to in the SWD accompanying the communication Research and Innovation for Europe's Future Mobility ⁽²⁾ as possible research and innovation areas.

The other relevant SWD ⁽³⁾ adopted on 3 July 2013 is a summary of the measures taken to internalise or reduce the external costs related to environment, noise and health from all transport modes.

This SWD also provides updated information on the implementation of the Commission's internalisation strategy and refers to initiatives taken to promote less polluting technologies. Those initiatives — typically in the field of research and infrastructure — have strong synergies with internalisation measures, which can only translate into actual change of behaviour if users have satisfactory alternatives. Conversely, the existence of correct pricing contributes to the economic viability of modes and technologies that have a particular value to society for their ability to reduce negative externalities.

⁽¹⁾ Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area — Towards a competitive and resource-efficient transport system, COM(2011) 144 final, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SEC:2011:0391:FIN:EN:PDF>

⁽²⁾ Preliminary Descriptions of Research and Innovation Areas and Fields, SWD (2012) 0260 final, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SWD:2012:0260:FIN:EN:PDF>

⁽³⁾ Report in accordance with Article 11 (4) of Directive 1999/62/EC, SWD(2013) 269 final, [http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/sustainable/doc/swd\(2013\)269.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/sustainable/doc/swd(2013)269.pdf)

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010079/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(11 septembre 2013)

Objet: Projet de développement urbain durable

Que compte faire la Commission pour développer des initiatives, telles que les prix RegioStars, ayant pour but d'identifier et de récompenser les projets de développement urbain durable?

Réponse donnée par M. Hahn au nom de la Commission

(4 novembre 2013)

La Commission continuera à identifier et à diffuser de différentes façons les expériences en matière de développement urbain durable.

Dans le cadre du programme proposé de développement urbain en réseau et du futur programme Urbact, des efforts considérables vont être déployés pour identifier et diffuser les expériences acquises par des villes de toute l'Europe en matière de projets de développement urbain durable.

En outre, la Commission a mis en réserve une enveloppe de 330 000 000 d'euros pour la période 2014-2020, qui sera accordée sur concours aux zones urbaines pour des projets innovants dans le domaine du développement urbain durable. La Commission décerne également un prix CityStar à des projets de développement urbain durable dans le cadre des RegioStars.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010079/13
to the Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(11 September 2013)

Subject: Sustainable urban development project

What does the Commission plan to do to develop initiatives to identify and reward sustainable urban development programmes, along the lines of, for example, the RegioStars awards?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(4 November 2013)

The Commission will continue to identify and disseminate experiences related to sustainable urban development in a variety of ways.

In the framework of the proposed Urban Development Network, and the future URBACT programme, considerable efforts will be made to identify and disseminate the experiences of cities with regard to sustainable urban development projects throughout Europe.

In addition, the Commission has set aside EUR 330 million for the 2014-2020 period which will be granted to urban areas on a competitive basis for proposed innovative projects in the field of sustainable urban development. The Commission also gives a CityStar award to projects concerning sustainable urban development as part of the RegioStars awards.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-010576/13

alla Commissione

Lara Comi (PPE)

(17 settembre 2013)

Oggetto: Caso Riva: anomalie e possibili soluzioni

Sui giornali italiani si trovano decine di articoli ogni giorno sul caso dei sette stabilimenti (Caronno Pertusella, Leseugno, Malegno, Sellero, Cervero, Annone Brianza e Verona) chiusi dalla famiglia Riva in seguito al sequestro di 916 milioni di euro effettuato dalla magistratura. Tale azione si pone nella scia dello spegnimento dell'altoforno dello stabilimento ILVA di Taranto. Alla famiglia Riva, proprietaria di 38 stabilimenti in tutto il mondo, nei quali si producono circa 16 milioni di tonnellate di acciaio (quarto gruppo in Europa), è stato sequestrato un totale di 2,2 miliardi di euro in beni mobili e immobili oltre a titoli bancari e azionari. In estrema sintesi, l'accusa principale è quella di disastro ambientale, per il finanziamento della cui bonifica queste somme sono state sequestrate.

Premesso che:

- gli Stati membri sono assoggettati ai vincoli di finanza pubblica previsti dal Trattato di Maastricht e rafforzati dal Fiscal Compact;
- l'Italia in particolare è soggetta a misure di austerità molto stringenti tra le quali la previsione che ciascuna nuova spesa non può essere autorizzata se non è già presente la relativa copertura;
- la normativa sugli aiuti di Stato vieta, anche qualora ci fossero le risorse, di effettuare interventi lesivi della concorrenza;

può la Commissione far sapere se:

1. ritiene che uno Stato membro può agire per tutelare l'occupazione, anche temporaneamente, dati i predetti vincoli, e stante l'obiettivo primario di salvaguardare 1400 posti di lavoro in stabilimenti che producono utili e, essendo fisicamente e funzionalmente scollegati da quello incriminato, non presentano le stesse problematiche ambientali;
2. reputa che si possa riconvertire il capitale umano al momento inutilizzato, ma a carico della fiscalità generale, in modo da ridurre l'impatto di questa decisione su conti pubblici già seriamente compromessi dalla congiuntura economica?

Risposta di Laszlo Andor a nome della Commissione

(23 ottobre 2013)

1. Il quadro comparativo recentemente proposto dalla Commissione consentirà una migliore e più tempestiva identificazione dei principali problemi occupazionali e sociali nel contesto del semestre europeo ⁽¹⁾.

La Commissione non ha il potere per interferire nelle decisioni specifiche adottate dalle imprese, ma le sollecita a seguire le buone pratiche ai fini di una gestione proattiva e socialmente responsabile delle ristrutturazioni. Per quanto riguarda il riferimento alle regole sugli aiuti di Stato, le possibilità di cui dispongono gli Stati membri per concedere aiuti ai fini del mantenimento dell'occupazione sono soggette a condizioni precise e in linea di principio sono unicamente fruibili nel contesto di piani di ristrutturazione che devono essere notificati alla Commissione. Se il governo italiano intende attivare una qualche forma di sostegno al gruppo Riva, esso deve pertanto rispettare le regole sugli aiuti di Stato.

⁽¹⁾ Comunicazione della Commissione «Potenziare la dimensione sociale dell'Unione economica e monetaria», COM(2013)690 def.

2. L'esperienza insegna che gli interventi precoci a sostegno dei lavoratori colpiti dalle ristrutturazioni industriali sono essenziali per aiutarli a trovare un nuovo posto di lavoro. I lavoratori colpiti dalle ristrutturazioni possono fruire del sostegno del Fondo sociale europeo (FSE) e, se sono soddisfatte le pertinenti condizioni, del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione. I programmi operativi (PO) del FSE sono amministrati a livello nazionale o regionale da apposite autorità di gestione. La Commissione suggerisce pertanto all'onorevole deputata di mettersi in contatto con le autorità di gestione competenti per i PO ⁽²⁾ nelle regioni italiane interessate per ottenere maggiori informazioni sugli aiuti eventualmente disponibili per i lavoratori in esubero.

(2) <http://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=386&langId=it>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-010576/13
to the Commission**

Lara Comi (PPE)
(17 September 2013)

Subject: Riva case: anomalies and possible solutions

Dozens of articles appear in the Italian press every day concerning the seven plants (in Caronno Pertusella, Lesegno, Malegno, Sellero, Cervero, Annone Brianza and Verona) which have been closed by the Riva family following the seizure by the courts of family assets worth EUR 916 million, a decision which comes in the wake of the decommissioning of the blast furnace at the ILVA plant in Taranto. Movable and immovable assets, bank securities and shares worth a total of EUR 2.2 billion have been confiscated from the Riva family, which owns 38 steel plants throughout the world with an annual output of some 16 million tonnes (making the family firm the fourth-largest steel producer in Europe). Put extremely simply, the main accusation against the family is that of having caused an environmental disaster, and the assets seized will be used to fund the clean-up operations.

Given that:

- the Member States are bound by the deficit and budget rules laid down by the Maastricht Treaty and tightened up by the Fiscal Compact;
- Italy in particular has had very stringent austerity measures imposed on it, including the stipulation that new spending can be authorised only if the corresponding funding is available in the budget;
- the rules on state aid ban anti-competitive measures, even if such funding is available,

can the Commission say whether:

1. in the light of the rules referred to above, a Member State may take action to safeguard employment, even temporarily, if the primary objective is to save 1 400 jobs in plants which generate profits and which, because they are operationally and functionally separate from the plant which was the subject of the decommissioning order, do not pose the same environmental problems?
2. the workers who are currently unemployed and receiving State benefits can be retrained in such a way as to reduce the impact of the Riva family's decision on Italy's public finances which are already buckling under the severe strain of the current economic crisis?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission

(23 October 2013)

1. The Commission's recently proposed scoreboard will allow for better and earlier identification of major employment and social problems in the framework of the European Semester ⁽¹⁾.

The Commission has no power to interfere in specific decisions taken by companies, but it urges them to follow good practice in the anticipation and socially responsible management of restructuring. As regards the reference to state aid rules, the possibilities for Member States of granting aid for the maintenance of employment are subject to very precise conditions and in principle only accessible in the context of restructuring plans that must be notified to the Commission. If the Italian Government wishes to engage itself in some form of support to Riva companies, all State Aid rules must therefore be followed.

2. Experience shows that early intervention in support of workers affected by industrial restructuring is essential to help them find new jobs. Workers affected by restructuring may qualify for support from the European Social Fund (ESF) and, provided the relevant conditions are met, from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund. ESF operational programmes (OPs) are administered at national or regional level by managing authorities. The Commission therefore suggests that the Honourable Member contact the managing authorities competent for the OPs ⁽²⁾ in the Italian regions concerned in order to obtain more information on possible support for the workers made redundant.

⁽¹⁾ Commission Communication 'Strengthening the social dimension of the Economic and Monetary Union', COM(2013) 690.

⁽²⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=386&langId=en>

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-010577/13
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL)
(17 septembre 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Ingérence des États-Unis

Le secrétaire d'État états-unien John Kerry était invité, ce vendredi 6 septembre, à participer à la réunion informelle des ministres des affaires étrangères des États de l'Union européenne dans le but non dissimulé d'infléchir la diplomatie européenne sur le sujet de la Syrie, et ainsi d'entraîner l'Union européenne dans son projet d'intervention armée.

Cette intrusion des États-Unis dans la diplomatie européenne est humiliante pour l'Union, réduite au rôle de suppléant des USA, auprès desquels elle vient chercher conseil, et marque les tentations d'un positionnement atlantiste au sein même de la Commission.

À noter que, si la plupart des pays membres (hors la France) s'étaient déjà prononcés contre cette intervention ou avaient fait part de leur non-participation à une éventuelle intervention, d'autres (Italie, Belgique, Slovaquie...) attendaient le rapport de l'ONU à ce sujet avant de prendre position. Pourtant, à la sortie de cette réunion, vous déclariez sans attendre qu'une «réponse claire et forte» était nécessaire. Les États-Unis ont donc fait encore preuve ici de leur mépris du droit international en devant l'influence de la seule organisation légitime à décider d'une telle intervention.

Comment la haute représentante de l'Union pour les affaires étrangères et la politique de sécurité entend-elle garantir l'indépendance de l'Union européenne et de ses institutions face à l'ingérence des États-Unis?

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

L'Union européenne mène une coopération approfondie et intensive avec ses partenaires stratégiques, y compris les États-Unis, impliquant un dialogue politique au plus haut niveau. Dans ce contexte, elle entretient un dialogue régulier et soutenu avec le Secrétaire d'État américain sur l'ensemble des questions liées à la coopération UE/États-Unis et conformément à la politique de l'Union européenne. La haute représentante de l'Union pour les affaires étrangères et la politique de sécurité exerce ses fonctions de manière indépendante et conformément aux traités.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-010577/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL)
(17 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — US interference

US Secretary of State John Kerry was invited to take part in the informal meeting of foreign ministers of EU Member States on Friday 6 September with the clear aim of shifting EU diplomacy on the subject of Syria and dragging the European Union into his plans for armed intervention.

This US intrusion into EU diplomacy is a humiliation for the EU, its role reduced to that of a back-up for the United States, to which it turns for advice, and is indicative of attempts, even within the Commission, to position the EU as Atlanticist.

Note that while most Member States (but not France) had already come out against intervention or had said that they would not take part if it went ahead, others (Italy, Belgium, Slovenia, etc.) were waiting for the UN report on the subject before taking a position. Yet when you came out of this meeting you immediately declared that a 'clear and strong' response was needed. Once again the United States has demonstrated its disregard for international law by seeking to over-ride the influence of the only organisation with the legitimacy to authorise such intervention.

How does the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy intend to guarantee the independence of the European Union and its institutions in the face of interference by the United States?

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

The European Union has an extensive and intense agenda of cooperation with its strategic partners, including the United States, which involves political dialogue at the highest levels. In this context, there is regular and sustained dialogue with the US Secretary of State on the full range of issues relevant to EU-US cooperation, and in accordance with EU policy. The High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy carries out her functions independently and in accordance with the Treaties.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-010578/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(17 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Περιβαλλοντική καταστροφή από διαρροή πετρελαιοειδών στον Κόλπο της Αμμοχώστου, στην Κύπρο

Στις 16 Ιουλίου προκλήθηκε σημαντική περιβαλλοντική καταστροφή, από διαρροή περίπου 100 τόνων πετρελαίου στα νότια παράλια της χερσονήσου της Καρπασίας (περιοχή Γαστριών), στον κόλπο της Αμμοχώστου Κύπρου ⁽¹⁾. Τις μέρες που ακολούθησαν παρουσιάστηκαν σε αρκετές παραλίες της ευρύτερης περιοχής κηλίδες πετρελαίου. Η περιοχή των Γαστριών είναι προτεινόμενη για ένταξη στο Δίκτυο Natura 2000, ενώ στην ίδια περιοχή (Επτακώμη) προγραμματίζεται να κατασκευαστεί τερματικός σταθμός καυσίμων. Τα αρμόδια τμήματα της κυπριακής κυβέρνησης, αμέσως μετά την ενημέρωση που έλαβαν από τον ΟΗΕ, βρέθηκαν σε επιχειρησιακή ετοιμότητα, ενώ η κυπριακή κυβέρνηση επικοινωνήσε με την τουρκοκυπριακή πλευρά για να προσφέρει τη βοήθειά της. Η τουρκοκυπριακή πλευρά έδειξε απροθυμία και αρνήθηκε να δεχθεί την βοήθεια, παρόλο, που, απ' ό,τι φάνηκε, δεν ήταν έτοιμη να αντιμετωπίσει τη διαρροή πετρελαίου και δεν αντέδρασε άμεσα για την αποτροπή της εξάπλωσης και τη συλλογή του.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει πληροφόρηση σχετικά με το γεγονός;
2. Συμφωνεί ότι η κατασκευή τερματικού σταθμού καυσίμων στην περιοχή της Επτακώμης ενέχει σοβαρές περιβαλλοντικές επιπτώσεις για την ευρύτερη περιοχή του κόλπου της Αμμοχώστου;
3. Έχει λάβει η τουρκοκυπριακή πλευρά ευρωπαϊκές χρηματοδοτήσεις για τη σύσταση ομάδας αντιμετώπισης έκτακτων περιστατικών; Αν έχει λάβει, πώς τις έχει αξιοποιήσει; Γνωρίζει αν υπάρχει μια τέτοια ομάδα, που να είναι σε θέση να αντιμετωπίσει παρόμοια προβλήματα;
4. Τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει ώστε να προστατεύεται το περιβάλλον της περιοχής;
5. Προτίθεται να ζητήσει τη θέσπιση συγκεκριμένων κανόνων και πρακτικών, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της συνεργασίας με τις υπηρεσίες της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας ή/και του ΟΗΕ, για την αντιμετώπιση φυσικών ή άλλων καταστροφών;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(19 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στην απάντησή της στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-008849/2013 ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Χατζηβασιλής Μ. Οικολογική καταστροφή στα Γαστριά. Εφ. Φιλελεύθερος, 17ης Ιουλίου 2013.

⁽²⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010578/13
to the Commission**

Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: Environmental disaster caused by oil spill in Ammochostos Bay in Cyprus

On 16 July, a major environmental disaster was caused by a leak of around 100 tonnes of oil in Ammochostos Bay on the south coast of the Karpasia peninsula (Gastria region) in Cyprus ⁽¹⁾. Over the following days, oil slicks appeared on many beaches in the wider area. The Gastria region has been put forward for inclusion in the Natura 2000 network, while there is a plan to construct a fuel terminal in the same area (Eptakomi). After having been informed by the UN, the relevant departments of the Cypriot government immediately placed themselves on operational readiness, and the Cypriot government communicated with the Turkish Cypriot side to offer its assistance. The Turkish Cypriot side was reluctant and refused to accept assistance, in spite of the fact that — as later became clear — it was not ready to deal with the oil spill and failed to respond immediately to prevent the oil spreading and to remove it.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Has it been informed about this event?
2. Does it agree that the construction of a fuel terminal in the Eptakomi region has serious environmental consequences for the wider area of Ammochostos Bay?
3. Has the Turkish Cypriot side received European funding to set up a team for dealing with emergencies? If so, how has the funding been used? Does the Commission know whether there is a team in place that can deal with such problems?
4. What measures does it intend to take to protect the environment in this area?
5. Does it intend to request the introduction of specific rules and procedures, including cooperation with the services of the Republic of Cyprus and/or the UN, in order to deal with natural or any other disasters?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission

(19 November 2013)

The Commission would kindly refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-008849/2013 ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ M. Chadzivasillis, Environmental disaster in Gastria, Phileleftheros, 17 July 2013.

⁽²⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html>

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-010579/13

προς την Επιτροπή

Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)

(17 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Κρίση και περικοπές στην υγεία

Η δημοσιονομική πολιτική πλήττει βίαια τις πολιτικές συνοχής και υγείας, αντί να συμβάλει στον εξορθολογισμό τους. Πρόσφατα έκλεισαν 5 νοσοκομεία στην Αττική για να τεθούν σε διαθεσιμότητα-κινητικότητα οι εργαζόμενοι. Ένα από αυτά, το Γεν. Νοσοκομείο Πατησίων, παρείχε υψηλή ποιότητα υπηρεσιών προς 1 000 000 κατοίκους μιας ευρύτερης περιοχής, υπηρεσίες, όπως το ιατρείο πόνου, που δεν παρέχονται αλλού, ενώ είχε υγιή οικονομικά και μηδενικά χρέη. 40 000 υπογραφές πολιτών κι ομόφωνα τα Δημοτικά Συμβούλια Αθηναίων, Αγ. Αναργύρων, Φιλαδέλφειας-Χαλκηδόνας εξέφρασαν την αντίθεσή τους στο κλείσιμο.

Με μείωση εισοδημάτων 30-50% και αύξηση του ποσοστού φτώχειας, μικρομεσαίοι χάνουν την πρόσβαση σε υπηρεσίες υγείας, αδυνατώντας να πληρώνουν ασφαλιστικές εισφορές, όπως και οι περισσότεροι από τους 1 400 000 ανέργους. Με σειρά γραφειοκρατικών «ρυθμίσεων» μένουν ακάλυπτοι ή χάνουν οποιαδήποτε οικονομική στήριξη ασθενείς με σοβαρά προβλήματα υγείας και ανάπηροι, ιδιαίτερα από νησιά και απομακρυσμένες περιοχές. Λόγω έλλειψης υπαλλήλων και αύξησης της γραφειοκρατίας, ο ΕΟΠΥΥ χρωστάει 40 000 000 ευρώ σε ασθενείς. Πολλοί, με καρκίνο και άλλες σοβαρές ασθένειες, αναγκάζονται να προκαταβάλουν από το υστέρημά τους υψηλό κόστος για τις θεραπείες, αλλά περιμένουν πάνω από ένα χρόνο για να πάρουν πίσω τα χρήματα.

Ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

1. Ποια είναι η θέση του εκπροσώπου της στην τρόικα για τη βαρβαρότητα αυτή απέναντι σε ανθρώπους που υποφέρουν; Έχει γνώση των συνεπειών από το κλείσιμο νοσοκομείων με στόχο τη «διαθεσιμότητα» 1 700 ατόμων; Έχει συζητήσει με οργανώσεις ασθενών για τις συνέπειες των πολιτικών αυτών στην υγεία;
2. Πώς θα διασφαλίσει την πρόσβαση όλων των Ελλήνων πολιτών σε ποιοτικές υπηρεσίες υγείας, σύμφωνα με το Πολυετές Πλαίσιο για την Υγεία 2014-2020;
3. Πώς θα διασφαλίσει ότι ο ΕΟΠΥΥ θα αποπληρώνει τάχιστα τα κόστη θεραπειών που έχουν προκαταβάλει ασθενείς, ώστε να μην περιμένουν πάνω από ένα χρόνο;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής

(11 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Οι αποφάσεις στις οποίες αναφέρεται το αξιότιμο μέλος έχουν ληφθεί από τις ελληνικές αρχές ως μέρος ενός ευρύτερου προγράμματος μεταρρυθμίσεων που αποσκοπεί στην αναδιοργάνωση/εξορθολογισμό του νοσοκομειακού δικτύου της Ελλάδας με στόχο τη μείωση των υφιστάμενων προβλημάτων αποτελεσματικότητας και την αξιοποίηση οικονομικών κλίμακας. Η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει αυτό το ευρύτερο πρόγραμμα μεταρρυθμίσεων που εφαρμόζεται από τις ελληνικές αρχές.

Οι αποφάσεις σχετικά με την παροχή της υγειονομικής περίθαλψης εμπίπτουν στην αρμοδιότητα των ελληνικών αρχών δεδομένου ότι, σύμφωνα με τη Συνθήκη, η διαχείριση των υγειονομικών υπηρεσιών και της ιατρικής περίθαλψης, καθώς και η κατανομή των πόρων που διατίθενται για τις υπηρεσίες αυτές είναι ευθύνη των κρατών μελών.

Η Επιτροπή θα συνεχίσει να παρακολουθεί τα θέματα που σχετίζονται με τον τομέα της υγειονομικής περίθαλψης σε μελλοντικές συζητήσεις με τις ελληνικές αρχές κατά τη διάρκεια των τακτικών αποστολών ελέγχου στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010579/13
to the Commission**

Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: The crisis and health cuts

Budgetary policy is having a brutal impact on coherence and health policies, rather than contributing towards their rationalisation. In Attica, five hospitals recently closed down in order to put their employees on a transfer status. One of these, the Patission General Hospital, provided high quality services not provided anywhere else — including a pain clinic — for 1 million inhabitants across a broad area, and had healthy finances and zero debts. Opposition to the closure was expressed in a petition signed by 40 000 people and in unanimous votes in the Athens, Agioi Anargyroi and Filadelfeia-Chalkidona local councils.

With incomes down by 30-50% and increasing poverty, middle and lower class people are losing access to health services as a result of their inability to pay insurance contributions, like most of the 1.4 million unemployed. Under a series of bureaucratic 'regulations', patients with serious health problems and disabilities are left without cover or lose all financial support, particularly in the islands and remote regions. Due to staff shortages and increasing bureaucracy, the National Agency for the Provision of Health Services owes EUR 40 million to patients. Some patients with cancer and other serious illnesses are having to make large advance payments for treatment from their savings, and are then having to wait more than a year for their money to be reimbursed.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What is the view of its representative in the troika with regard to this barbarous treatment of people in distress? Is he aware of the consequences of closing these hospitals in order to put 1 700 people on a transfer status? Has he held discussions with patients' organisations regarding the consequences of these policies for health?
2. How will it safeguard the access of all Greek citizens to high quality health services, in accordance with the 2014-2020 Multiannual Framework for Health?
3. How will it ensure that the National Agency for the Provision of Health Services promptly reimburses the treatment costs prepaid by patients, so that they do not have to wait for more than one year?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(11 November 2013)

The decisions the Honourable Member is referring to have been taken by the Greek authorities as part of a wider reform programme aimed at reorganising/ streamlining Greece's hospital network with a view of reducing existing inefficiencies and utilising economies of scale. The Commission supports this wider reform programme by the Greek authorities.

The decisions regarding the delivery of healthcare fall under the responsibility of the Greek authorities as, according to the Treaty, the management of health services and medical care, and the allocation of the resources assigned to them is the responsibility of the Member States.

The Commission will continue to monitor matters related to healthcare sector in future discussions with Greek authorities during the regular review missions under the Economic Adjustment Programme to Greece.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-010580/13

προς την Επιτροπή

Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)

(17 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Συνέχιση του έργου θαλασσίου σκι στην Παμβώτιδα χωρίς περιβαλλοντική αδειοδότηση

Η Επιτροπή, στην απάντησή της E-001111/2013 σε προηγούμενη ερώτησή μου για τη λίμνη Παμβώτιδα E-001111/2013, αναφέρει ότι «κάθε έργο με ενδεχόμενες πιθανές σοβαρές επιπτώσεις, όπως οι επίμαχες εγκαταστάσεις θαλάσσιου σκι, πρέπει να υποβάλλεται σε κατάλληλη αξιολόγηση και να εγκρίνεται, μόνον εάν δεν επηρεάζεται η ακεραιότητα της περιοχής» καθώς και ότι «η αρμόδια αρχή (η Αποκεντρωμένη Διοίκηση Δυτικής Ηπείρου-Μακεδονίας) έχει πλέον ζητήσει, μετά από καταγγελίες, την παύση των χωματουργικών έργων στη λίμνη και την αποκατάσταση του υδάτινου οικοσυστήματος που υπέστη ζημιές». Όμως, ενώ πράγματι η Αποκεντρωμένη Διοίκηση αρχικά διέταξε την παύση των παράνομων εργασιών, στη συνέχεια χορήγησε στο δήμο άδεια εκτέλεσης έργου κοπής καλαμιών με τον παραπλανητικό τίτλο «Έργο αξιοποίησης υδατικών πόρων προστασίας οικοσυστημάτων», με παρατήρηση ότι για την κοπή θα χρησιμοποιηθεί ο πλωτός εκσκαφέας Water Master.

Ύστερα από καταγγελίες του Συλλόγου Προστασίας Περιβάλλοντος Ιωαννίνων για εκρίζωση του καλαμιώνα και εκβάθυνση σε βάθος 2 μέτρων με χρήση του τεράστιου μηχανήματος drag line που χρησιμοποιείται σε εκσκαφές λιμένων και μάλιστα χωρίς απόφαση έγκρισης περιβαλλοντικών όρων, η διοίκηση διέκοψε εκ νέου τις εργασίες έπειτα από εισαγγελική παρέμβαση ⁽¹⁾. Η Αποκεντρωμένη Διοίκηση, αδιαφορώντας για το μέγεθος της καταστροφής του οικοσυστήματος της περιοχής, επανήλθε προ ημερών με νεότερη απόφασή της ⁽²⁾ και τροποποιώντας την προηγούμενη απόφασή της αναφορικά με τον τρόπο εκτέλεσης των εργασιών, εγκρίνει τη χρήση μηχανήματος drag line. Σε ένδειξη διαμαρτυρίας για τις συνεχιζόμενες περιβαλλοντικές αυθαιρεσίες τόσο του Δήμου όσο και της Αποκεντρωμένης Διοίκησης Δυτικής Ηπείρου-Μακεδονίας στη λίμνη Παμβώτιδα, παραιτήθηκε ολόκληρο το Διοικητικό Συμβούλιο του Συλλόγου Προστασίας του Περιβάλλοντος Ιωαννίνων ⁽³⁾.

Δεδομένης της επιμονής της ελληνικών αρχών να συνεχίσουν, κα μάλιστα χωρίς καμία απόφαση έγκρισης περιβαλλοντικών όρων, ένα έργο στη λίμνη Παμβώτιδα που αντίκειται στις Οδηγίες 92/43/ΕΟΚ για τη διατήρηση των φυσικών οικοτόπων καθώς και της άγριας πανίδας και χλωρίδας και 2009/147/ΕΚ, περί της διατηρήσεως των αγρίων πτηνών, σε τι ενέργειες προτίθεται να προβεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή;

Απάντηση του κ. Ροτοζνίκ εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής

(6 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Βάσει των νέων στοιχείων που παρασχέθηκαν από το Αξιότιμο Μέλος, η Επιτροπή θα επικοινωνήσει με τις ελληνικές αρχές για να διερευνήσει κατά πόσον η βυθοκόρηση που συνδέεται με τις εν λόγω εγκαταστάσεις θαλάσσιου σκι αξιολογήθηκε και εγκρίθηκε σύμφωνα με τις διατάξεις του άρθρου 6 της οδηγίας για τα ενδιαιτήματα 92/43/ΕΟΚ ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ http://news.kathimerini.gr/4dcgi/_w_articles_ell_2_13/07/2013_526609

⁽²⁾ Αριθμός απόφασης 38036/982/03.07.2013.

⁽³⁾ <http://goo.gl/ftDIL>

⁽⁴⁾ Οδηγία 92/43/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου της 21ης Μαΐου 1992 για τη διατήρηση των φυσικών οικοτόπων καθώς και της άγριας πανίδας και χλωρίδας. ΕΕ L 206 της 22/7/1992.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010580/13
to the Commission**

Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(17 September 2013)

Subject: Continuation of water ski facilities project in Lake Pamvotida without environmental authorisation

The Commission, in its Answer E-001111/2013 to my earlier Question E-001111/2013 on Lake Pamvotida, says that 'any project with likely significant effect, such as the water ski facilities in question, needs to undergo an appropriate assessment and can only be authorised if it does not affect the integrity of the area' and also that 'the competent authority (the decentralized administration of Western Epirus-Macedonia) has now ordered, following complaints, the cessation of earthworks in the lake and the restoration of the damaged wetland ecosystem'. However, whilst the decentralised administration did indeed initially order the cessation of the illegal works, it later provided the municipality with an authorisation to cut the reeds under misleading title of 'Water Resource Utilisation and Habitat Protection Project', with an attached note stating that a floating dredger would be used to cut the reeds.

Following complaints from the Environmental Protection Association of Ioannina with regard to the eradication of the reeds and dredging to a depth of two metres with a huge dragline machine used for dredging harbours, and, moreover, without a decision approving the necessary environmental conditions, the administration again halted work following intervention from the public prosecutor ⁽¹⁾. The decentralised administration, being indifferent to the scale of the disaster for the habitat in the area, came back a few days ago with a fresh decision ⁽²⁾ amending its earlier decision in relation to the manner of implementing the project, and approving the use of the dragline machine. The entire governing body of the Environmental Protection Association of Ioannina has resigned in protest at the arbitrary nature of the continuing environmental actions in Lake Pamvotida, carried out not only by the municipality but also by the decentralised administration of Western Epirus-Macedonia ⁽³⁾.

Given the Greek authorities' insistence on continuing with the project in Lake Pamvotida, without any decision setting out environmental conditions — contrary to Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, and Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds — what actions is the European Commission planning to take?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(6 November 2013)

In the light of new information supplied by the Honourable Member the Commission will contact the Greek authorities in order to investigate whether the dredging activities connected with the water ski facility in question have been assessed and authorised in accordance with the provisions laid down in Article 6 of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ http://news.kathimerini.gr/4dcgi/_w_articles_ell_2_13/07/2013_526609

⁽²⁾ Decision number 38036/982/3.7.2013.

⁽³⁾ <http://goo.gl/ftDIL>

⁽⁴⁾ Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora Official Journal L 206, 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010581/13
to the Commission
Gay Mitchell (PPE)
(17 September 2013)

Subject: European Schools

On 2 April 2012, the European Ombudsman made a finding of maladministration against the Commission for failing to respond to requests for an independent external audit of the European Schools. Has the Commission responded to this ruling?

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

The Commission sent its comments on the findings of the European Ombudsman in the case 814/2010/JF on 6 July 2012.

The Commission did not share the view that there was an instance of maladministration as found by the Ombudsman. It recalled that the European Schools were educational establishments governed jointly by the governments of the Member States of the European Union in the Board of Governors. In the Board, the Commission has only one vote, and all the Member States that are signatories to the convention have one vote each, therefore the Commission cannot be held the sole responsible for the decisions concerning the European Schools.

The Commission informed the Ombudsman that numerous initiatives had already been taken in order to improve the management of the European Schools System (ESS), including a proposal for the European Schools to take part in the international OECD PISA study which would present a basis for comparison with the Member States' national education systems and evaluating the ESS according to the same criteria, and at the same time representing a cost efficient way of an external evaluation of the system.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010583/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nicole Sinclair (NI)
(17 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Women's participation in Pakistan elections

The participation of women, as both candidates and voters, in Pakistan's national election of 11 May 2013 was rather low.

Allegedly, one of the reasons for this was threats made by the Tehreek-i-Taliban Pakistan (TTP) group to kidnap or kill women who took part in these democratic elections.

Similar threats were recently made by the TTP to women in parts of the Hangu district, ahead of the local elections there.

What actions are being taken by the VP/HR to pressure the Government of Pakistan to protect women who wish to exercise their democratic right to vote and/or to stand as candidates?

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

Women's rights, including civil and political, are among the EU's priorities in human rights dialogue with Pakistan, and these are raised regularly with the Pakistani authorities. In the run up to the elections, there was an escalation of violent attacks by extremists targeting particularly the secular political parties but also voters.

In spite of intimidation, the electoral process is generally regarded to have been the best so far in Pakistan. The EU Foreign Affairs Council conclusions in June 2013 noted that there had been an increase in the number of women registered as voters and female candidates compared to 2008, on the basis of which it is hoped that women's participation in political life will strengthen. Nevertheless, as underlined in the final report of the EU Election Observation Mission (EOM) to Pakistan, women continue to be underrepresented as voters, candidates, in elected office and in the campaign.

The EU is ready to accompany Pakistan in following up on recommendations from the EOM, including recommendations concerning women's participation. The EU has also given its commitment to assist Pakistan to combat terrorism. The issue is a priority under the EU's Strategic Dialogue with Pakistan. The EU is supporting projects to augment access to education especially for girls, to improve law enforcement with the police and prosecution services, and has encouraged the authorities to reinforce cooperation activities in support of security and counter-terrorism.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010584/13
à la Commission**

Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL)

(17 septembre 2013)

Objet: Espionnage des États-Unis

En juillet dernier, je vous ai interrogé sur l'espionnage pratiqué par les États-Unis contre l'Union européenne qui a été révélé par Edward Snowden.

Votre réponse a sûrement été mûrement réfléchie car elle ne m'est parvenue, malgré l'urgence de la situation, que le 10 septembre. J'y apprendis que «La Commission a demandé au gouvernement américain de lui fournir des clarifications à propos des programmes évoqués par les médias et de leurs conséquences potentielles sur les droits fondamentaux des Européens».

Peut-on connaître la réponse du gouvernement américain à cette demande de clarification?

Il apparaît que cette question a même été évoquée avec le ministre de la justice des États-Unis, Eric Holder, lors de la réunion des ministres de la justice et des affaires intérieures organisée à Dublin, le 14 juin 2013.

Peut-on connaître la position du ministre de la justice des États-Unis sur l'espionnage?

Enfin, on apprend que d'autres précisions ont été demandées par écrit, notamment le volume de données collectées, l'ampleur des programmes et le contrôle judiciaire disponible pour les Européens.

Peut-on avoir accès à ces documents?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Reding au nom de la Commission

(4 décembre 2013)

Comme indiqué dans la question de l'Honorable Parlementaire, la Commission a soulevé la question directement auprès du ministre de la justice, Monsieur Holder, lors de la réunion des ministres de la justice et des affaires intérieures qui s'est tenue à Dublin le 14 juin 2013. M. Holder a fourni des éclaircissements et proposé de fournir des informations complémentaires au niveau des experts.

À la suite de cette réunion, de nouvelles précisions ont été demandées par écrit aux autorités des États-Unis, notamment en ce qui concerne le volume des données collectées, l'ampleur de ces programmes et le contrôle judiciaire dont disposent les citoyens européens. En outre, la Commission a mis en place, conjointement avec la présidence du Conseil de l'UE, un groupe de travail ad hoc entre l'UE et les États-Unis afin d'examiner ces questions de manière plus approfondie. Ce groupe s'est réuni à trois reprises, en juillet, septembre et novembre. Sur la base des informations recueillies, la Commission fera rapport au Parlement européen et au Conseil.

Parallèlement, la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a demandé des éclaircissements à l'administration américaine sur les allégations de surveillance, par les États-Unis, des missions diplomatiques de l'UE, et a fait passer le message selon lequel l'Union européenne entend être traitée comme le partenaire stratégique qu'elle est, et non pas comme une cible.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010584/13
to the Commission**

Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL)
(17 September 2013)

Subject: Espionage by the United States

In July 2013 I asked you about the United States' spying on the European Union, as revealed by Edward Snowden.

You clearly thought carefully about your answer because, in spite of the urgency of the situation, I only received it on 10 September. It states that '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.'

What was the US Government's response to this request for clarification?

It seems that this question was even raised with United States Attorney General, Eric Holder, at the EU-US justice and home affairs ministerial meeting in Dublin on 14 June 2013.

What is the position of the United States Attorney General on the espionage?

Lastly, it appears that further clarifications have been requested in writing, including the volume of data collected, the scope of the programmes and the judicial oversight available to Europeans.

May we have access to these documents?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(4 December 2013)

As mentioned in the Honorable Member's question, the Commission raised this issue directly with Attorney General Holder at the EU-US Justice and Home Affairs Ministerial meeting of 14 June 2013, in Dublin. Attorney General Holder provided clarifications and offered to provide further information at expert level.

Following this meeting, further clarifications have been requested in writing from 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 EU-US working group to examine these issues further. The working group has met three times, in July, September and November. Based on the information gathered, the Commission will report back to the European Parliament and the Council.

In parallel, the HR/VP has sought clarifications from the US Administration on the allegations of US surveillance of EU diplomatic missions, and conveyed the message that the EU expects to be treated as the strategic partner that it is, not as a target.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010585/13
à la Commission**

Christine De Veyrac (PPE)

(17 septembre 2013)

Objet: Utilisation de cyanure dans les mines d'or en Roumanie

Une société prévoit d'extraire 300 tonnes d'or et 1 600 tonnes d'argent dans la plus grande mine à ciel ouvert d'Europe, à Rosia Montana, dans le massif des Carpates en Roumanie. Environ 12 000 tonnes de cyanure par an seront nécessaires pour ce projet minier, qui nécessitera le déplacement de centaines de familles et la destruction partielle de quatre montagnes.

Ce projet est dès lors contesté par la population locale, qui est notamment soucieuse des impacts sur l'environnement que pourrait avoir ce projet.

La société canadienne indique que les normes européennes d'environnement seront respectées et affirme que ce projet sera créateur de centaines d'emplois durant les années d'exploitation.

Le Parlement européen avait toutefois adopté une résolution datant du 5 mai 2010 sur l'interdiction générale de l'utilisation des technologies à base de cyanure dans l'industrie minière de l'Union européenne.

Le cyanure est un élément chimique toxique dont l'utilisation massive engendrera des conséquences néfastes non seulement pour le lac qui recueillera les eaux usées de l'exploitation aurifère, mais aussi pour la biodiversité en général dans cette région.

Aussi, la Commission entend-elle renforcer sa politique environnementale contre les menaces pour l'environnement que représente l'utilisation de cyanure et prendre les mesures nécessaires face aux risques qui pèsent sur cette région?

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010596/13
à la Commission**

Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)

(17 septembre 2013)

Objet: Rosia Montana et l'interdiction de l'utilisation du cyanure dans les mines

En 2007, la Rosia Montana Gold Corporation (RMGC), entreprise à capitaux canadiens et roumains, a acheté le sol de Rosia Montana. Depuis, la ville est rythmée par les manifestations sur la place du village, la venue des délégations européennes inspectant les lieux et l'adoption de lois contradictoires par le gouvernement.

Le 27 août 2013, les dirigeants roumains ont exprimé leur intention de favoriser le projet d'exploitation au cyanure des gisements aurifères de Rosia Montana, projet proposé par la RMGC.

S'il est adopté, le projet permettra l'utilisation des techniques d'extraction de l'or par les cyanures, ce qui implique la création d'un bassin de 600 ha où seront déversées des centaines de millions de tonnes de déchets cyanurés. Une telle installation met en péril la biodiversité de la zone, et est susceptible d'engendrer des catastrophes écologiques majeures en cas de fuite, comme ce fut le cas à Baia Mare en 2000. Au-delà des préoccupations environnementales, les préoccupations sociales sont liées au déracinement de plus de 2 000 habitants et à la démolition d'environ 900 maisons ainsi que d'éléments du patrimoine culturel et archéologique. Ces deux types de préoccupations ont également été exprimés en 2004 par la Commission environnement du Parlement européen.

En 2010, le Parlement européen a demandé à la Commission d'interdire totalement l'utilisation des technologies à base de cyanure dans l'industrie minière.

1. La Commission pourrait-elle nous informer quant à l'évolution de la législation sur l'interdiction de l'utilisation du cyanure dans les mines?
2. Compte tenu de ces éléments, la Commission dispose-t-elle des moyens adéquats pour intervenir afin de s'opposer au démarrage de l'exploitation de la mine d'or et d'argent de Rosia Montana?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Potočník au nom de la Commission*(29 octobre 2013)*

En ce qui concerne la question relative à l'éventuelle introduction de l'interdiction de l'utilisation du cyanure dans les technologies minières dans l'UE, la Commission renvoie les Honorables Parlementaires à la réponse qu'elle a donnée à la question écrite E-6197/2012 ⁽¹⁾, posée par Mme Hassi et M^{me} Pietikäinen.

Les autorités roumaines compétentes doivent veiller à la bonne exécution ainsi qu'à l'application et au respect de la législation de l'UE, la Commission se chargeant d'évaluer la conformité avec les exigences applicables.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2012-006197&language=EN>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010585/13
to the Commission**

Christine De Veyrac (PPE)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: Use of cyanide in gold mines in Romania

A company plans to extract 300 tonnes of gold and 1 600 tonnes of silver in the largest open-cast mine in Europe, at Roşia Montană, in the Carpathian mountains in Romania. This mining project will require about 12 000 tonnes of cyanide per year and involve the relocation of hundreds of families and the partial destruction of four mountains.

Consequently, the project is being challenged by local people, who are particularly concerned about the environmental impact it could have.

The Canadian company says that European environmental standards will be respected and that the project will create hundreds of jobs during the years of operation.

However, on 5 May 2010 the European Parliament adopted a resolution on a general ban on the use of cyanide mining technologies in the European Union.

Cyanide is a toxic chemical whose large-scale use will be harmful not only for the lake into which the wastewater from the gold extraction will flow, but also for the region's biodiversity in general.

Does the Commission therefore intend to strengthen its environmental policy against the environmental threat posed by cyanide use and to take the necessary action to address the risks affecting this area?

**Question for written answer E-010596/13
to the Commission**

Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: Roşia Montană and the ban on using cyanide in mines

In 2007, Roşia Montană Gold Corporation (RMGC), a Canadian and Romanian-owned company, purchased the land of Roşia Montană. Since then, life in the village has been punctuated by demonstrations in the village square, the arrival of European delegations inspecting the site and the adoption of contradictory laws by the government.

On 27 August 2013, Romanian leaders expressed their intention to support the planned exploitation of the gold deposits in Roşia Montană using cyanide, a plan that was proposed by the RMGC.

If it goes ahead, the project will allow the use of cyanide to extract the gold, involving the creation of a 600 ha tailings pond into which hundreds of millions of tonnes of cyanide-laced waste will be dumped. Such a facility is a threat to the area's biodiversity and could cause major environmental disasters were the cyanide to leak, as happened in Baia Mare in 2000. In addition to the environmental concerns, there are social concerns over the displacement of over 2 000 residents and the demolition of some 900 houses and cultural and archaeological heritage assets. The same concerns were also expressed in 2004 by Parliament's Committee on the Environment.

In 2010, Parliament called on the Commission to introduce a total ban on the use of cyanide-based technology in the mining industry.

1. Could the Commission say what progress has been made with regard to legislation banning the use of cyanide in mining?
2. In view of this information, does the Commission have any suitable way of taking action in order to oppose the commencement of gold and silver mining in Roşia Montană?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission*(29 October 2013)*

As regards the question relating to the potential introduction of a ban of the use of cyanide mining technologies in the EU, the Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answer to Written Question E-6197/2012 ⁽¹⁾ by Ms Hassi and Ms Pietikäinen.

The competent Romanian authorities have to ensure proper implementation, enforcement and compliance with the EU legislation, and the Commission will monitor compliance with the relevant requirements.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2012-006197&language=EN>

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010586/13
à la Commission**

Christine De Veyrac (PPE)

(17 septembre 2013)

Objet: Gaspillage alimentaire en Europe et dans le monde

Le gaspillage alimentaire massif dans le monde constitue un danger considérable pour la protection de l'environnement et la sécurité alimentaire. En effet, dans un rapport publié le 11 septembre 2013, la FAO (Organisation des Nations unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture) affirme que plus d'un milliard de tonnes de nourriture sont gaspillées chaque année dans le monde, soit un coût d'environ 750 milliards d'USD.

Au total, plus de 1,3 milliard de tonne de nourriture sont gaspillées chaque année et la production de la nourriture non mangée occupe 30 % des terres cultivables. Les pertes agricoles et alimentaires coûtent chaque année à la planète environ 250 km³ de ressources en eau et la production de ces denrées non consommées représente une empreinte carbone estimée à 3,3 milliards de tonnes de CO₂. Toujours selon la FAO, 54 % des pertes sont enregistrées dans les phases de production, de récolte et de stockage.

Dans l'Union européenne, le gaspillage alimentaire représente plus de 90 millions de tonnes par an.

Soucieux des impacts de ce phénomène sur l'environnement, le Parlement européen avait déjà pris conscience du problème en adoptant, le 19 janvier 2012, une résolution sur le thème «Éviter le gaspillage des denrées alimentaires: stratégies pour une chaîne alimentaire plus efficace dans l'Union européenne». Par ce moyen, les députés européens ont donc invité la Commission à adopter des démarches significatives pour faire face aux menaces soulevées par le gaspillage alimentaire de masse en Europe, en se centrant notamment sur un effort d'éducation pour lutter contre le gaspillage, ainsi que sur un effort pour un étiquetage et un emballage adéquats.

Aussi la Commission voudrait-elle indiquer quelles démarches et quelles mesures législatives elle a entreprises pour répondre aux enjeux spécifiques de ce problème écologique majeur qu'est le gaspillage alimentaire?

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

(19 novembre 2013)

Les pertes et le gaspillage de denrées alimentaires comestibles et nourrissantes ont des conséquences à la fois pour l'économie et pour l'environnement. Dans ce contexte, la Commission étudie actuellement, en étroite coopération avec les parties prenantes, comment réduire le gaspillage, sans pour autant compromettre la sécurité alimentaire, et examine les mesures qui pourraient être adoptées à l'échelon de l'Union européenne en complément des mesures nationales. Les résultats des réunions du groupe de travail constitué à cet effet sont disponibles à l'adresse suivante (en anglais): http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/sustainability/index_en.htm. Ce site comprend également une campagne de sensibilisation (un clip viral sur les déchets alimentaires, «10 conseils pour réduire les déchets alimentaires» dans toutes les langues de l'Union et une clarification des mentions «à consommer de préférence avant» et «à consommer jusqu'à» dans toutes les langues de l'Union).

Cette démarche s'inscrit dans la lignée des travaux sur la viabilité du système alimentaire dans le cadre desquels une consultation publique, lancée avant l'été, a été clôturée au début du mois d'octobre 2013. La Commission étudie actuellement les résultats de cette consultation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-010749/13

alla Commissione

Oreste Rossi (PPE)

(19 settembre 2013)

Oggetto: Conseguenze economiche e ambientali dello spreco di prodotti alimentari

Nel Rapporto sulle conseguenze ambientali dello spreco di prodotti alimentari presentato dalla FAO risulta che ogni anno si spreca una quantità di cibo pari a 565 miliardi di euro, valore questo pari ai Pil di Turchia e Svizzera. Il volume globale dello spreco è di 1,6 miliardi di tonnellate di prodotti primari e di 1,3 miliardi di tonnellate di cibo commestibile. L'Europa si colloca al 3° posto (dopo Asia e Sud Est asiatico) con uno spreco pari al 15 % del cibo prodotto.

Oltre che a livello economico, questo fenomeno ha un impatto estremamente negativo sull'ambiente: ogni anno a causa dello spreco di cibo che si colloca al terzo posto delle cause di emissione di gas serra circa 3,3 miliardi di tonnellate di CO₂ sono immessi nell'atmosfera. Si evidenziano anche le conseguenze del cibo disperso sull'acqua: per coltivare, stoccare e portare sulle tavole le tonnellate di cibo non mangiato si sprecano 250 chilometri cubi all'anno, quantità d'acqua questa corrispondente al lago di Ginevra. Inoltre ogni anno si utilizzano 1,4 milioni di ettari di suolo per produrre cibo che non sarà mangiato (pari all'intero territorio russo). Infine, sono 9,7 milioni gli ettari di bosco distrutti ogni anno per produrre cibo sprecato, compromettendo pesantemente la biodiversità del nostro pianeta.

Considerato che:

- negli anni a venire si registrerà un aumento della popolazione, un conseguente incremento di domanda di cibo e una richiesta di aumento della produzione alimentare pari al 60 % entro il 2050;
- questo sforzo difficilmente sarà sostenibile dall'industria alimentare;
- si spreca un terzo del cibo prodotto, mentre 870 milioni di persone soffrono la fame ogni giorno;

può la Commissione far sapere se:

1. è consapevole dei danni economici e ambientali legati a tale fenomeno;
2. intende elaborare politiche mirate all'ottimizzazione della produzione, nonché al riutilizzo e al riciclo;
3. intende predisporre campagne di educazione e sensibilizzazione dirette ai consumatori?

Risposta congiunta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione

(19 novembre 2013)

Le perdite e gli sprechi di cibo ancora commestibile e nutriente hanno conseguenze economiche ed ambientali. La Commissione sta analizzando, in stretta cooperazione con gli stakeholder, il modo per ridurre gli sprechi di alimenti senza compromettere la sicurezza alimentare e sta discutendo eventuali misure unionali per integrare le misure nazionali. I risultati delle riunioni del gruppo di lavoro sono disponibili all'indirizzo:

http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/sustainability/index_en.htm. Questo sito web contiene anche una campagna di informazione e di sensibilizzazione (come il video virale «10 consigli per ridurre gli sprechi alimentari» in tutte le lingue dell'UE, nonché un chiarimento delle etichette «consumare preferibilmente entro il» e «da consumare entro il»).

Questi lavori confluiranno negli imminenti lavori in tema di «Sostenibilità del sistema alimentare», tematica in merito alla quale è stata avviata prima dell'estate una consultazione pubblica conclusasi all'inizio dell'ottobre 2013. La Commissione sta ora analizzando i risultati della consultazione.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010586/13
to the Commission**

Christine De Veyrac (PPE)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: European and global food wastage

Worldwide food wastage on a massive scale poses a considerable risk to environmental protection and food security. According to a report published on 11 September 2013 by the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) of the United Nations, more than 1 billion tonnes of food go to waste globally every year, at a cost of about USD 750 billion.

In all, more than 1.3 billion tonnes of food go to waste every year and producing the uneaten food takes up 30% of arable land. Losses in agriculture and food cost the planet around 250 km³ annually in water resources and producing these unused foodstuffs equates to an estimated carbon footprint of 3.3 billion tonnes of carbon dioxide. Also according to the FAO, 54% of losses occur during production, harvest and storage.

In the European Union, more than 90 million tonnes of food goes to waste every year.

Conscious of the environmental impact of this wastage, Parliament had already acknowledged there was a problem when it adopted a resolution on 19 January 2012 on how to avoid food wastage: strategies for a more efficient food chain in the EU. In that resolution, the Members of the European Parliament called on the Commission to take meaningful action to address the threats posed by massive food wastage in Europe, focusing on efforts to educate against waste and efforts to ensure appropriate labelling and packaging.

Could the Commission state what steps and legislative measures it has undertaken in response to the specific challenges of this major ecological problem of food wastage?

**Question for written answer E-010749/13
to the Commission**

Oreste Rossi (PPE)

(19 September 2013)

Subject: Economic and environmental impact of food waste

According to the report by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) on the environmental impact of food waste, each year EUR 565 billion worth of food is wasted, a figure equal to the gross domestic products of Turkey or Switzerland combined. The total quantities wasted are 1.6 billion tonnes of raw materials and 1.3 billion tonnes of edible food. Europe is the third biggest waster of food (after Asia and south-east Asia), wasting some 15% of the food it produces.

In addition to its economic consequences, this problem has an extremely negative impact on the environment. Food waste is the third biggest cause of greenhouse gas production, leading to the emission of 3.3 billion tonnes of CO₂ into the atmosphere every year. The report also highlights the impact of food wastage on water: every year, 250 km³ of water are wasted on growing, storing and bringing to the table the many tonnes of uneaten food, a volume equal to the size of Lake Geneva. Furthermore, 1.4 million hectares of land (an area equivalent to the whole of Russia) are used every year to produce food that will not be eaten. Lastly, 9.7 million hectares of forest are destroyed each year for the sake of producing food which ends up wasted, posing a severe threat to the planet's biodiversity.

In the coming years, we will see an increase in the population and consequently an increase in the demand for food, with a 60% increase in demand for food production by 2050. The food industry will have difficulty sustaining this level of output. Every day, a third of the food we produce is wasted, while 870 million people go hungry.

1. Is the Commission aware of the economic and environmental harm caused by this problem?
2. Does it intend to develop policies aimed at both at optimising production and reusing and recycling?
3. Does it intend to organise educational and awareness-raising campaigns aimed at consumers?

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission*(19 November 2013)*

Losses and wastage of edible and nutritious food have economic and environmental consequences. The Commission is analysing, in close cooperation with stakeholders, how to reduce food waste without compromising food safety and is discussing possible EU measures to complement national measures. The results of the working group meetings are available at http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/sustainability/index_en.htm

This website also includes awareness raising information campaign (such as viral clip on food waste, '10 tips to reduce food waste' in all EU languages, and a clarification of 'best before' and 'use by' labels in all EU languages).

This work feeds into the forthcoming work on the 'Sustainability of the Food System' on which a public consultation was launched before summer and closed early October 2013. The Commission is currently analysing the results of this consultation.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010587/13
à la Commission**

Christine De Veyrac (PPE)

(17 septembre 2013)

Objet: Hôtellerie et agences de réservation en ligne

De nos jours, la plupart des voyageurs à la recherche d'un hôtel passent par une agence de réservation en ligne, telle que Booking.com, Expedia.fr ou Hrs.com. Ces agences de réservation sont considérées comme plus pratiques car elles recensent un grand nombre d'hôtels de toutes les catégories pour chaque ville et proposent des chambres qui sont perçues comme moins onéreuses par les clients. Les motifs pécuniaires sont ainsi la principale raison qui pousse nos concitoyens à passer par ces centrales de réservation.

Néanmoins, ces sites sont de plus en plus contestés par les hôteliers et notamment par l'Union des métiers et des industries de l'hôtellerie (UMIH) en France. En effet, le référencement des hôtels sur ces agences n'est pas exhaustif. Seuls apparaissent les établissements dont les gérants acceptent de verser aux centrales des commissions pouvant atteindre 30 % du prix de la chambre. Ces centrales de réservation sur Internet sont accusées par les hôteliers et les restaurateurs d'exercer une forme de pression et de position dominante, à cause notamment du principe dit de parité tarifaire. Ainsi, un hôtelier voulant faire une promotion de dernière minute sur son site doit en informer préalablement les autres sites qui le commercialisent pour que tout le monde puisse afficher les mêmes prix. Ces pratiques, pouvant constituer une entrave aux règles de concurrence, interdites en Allemagne sont toujours autorisées en France par exemple.

L'Union européenne vise à favoriser la libre circulation des personnes sur son territoire. Cette promotion du tourisme implique de permettre à nos concitoyens de se loger facilement durant leurs voyages. Or, les pressions tarifaires exercées par ces agences de réservation en ligne dans certains États membres peuvent s'avérer néfastes pour nos hôteliers, tout comme pour leurs clients.

1. Aussi, la Commission entend-elle entreprendre des démarches pour s'assurer que les règles de concurrence sont bien appliquées dans le domaine de l'hôtellerie au sein de ses États membres?
2. La Commission a-t-elle l'intention d'harmoniser les règles s'appliquant aux agences de réservation en ligne pour l'hôtellerie au sein de l'Union européenne?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission

(26 novembre 2013)

À l'heure actuelle, aucune enquête relative à la concurrence n'est en cours à la Commission en ce qui concerne la réservation d'hôtels en ligne. Toutefois, certaines autorités de concurrence des États membres, compétentes pour appliquer les règles tant européennes que nationales en matière de concurrence, enquêtent actuellement sur des pratiques comme celle mentionnée par l'Honorable Parlementaire. Dans le cadre du réseau des autorités européennes de concurrence, la Commission est tenue informée de ces cas et elle les examine en ce moment avec les autorités nationales de concurrence afin de garantir l'application effective et cohérente des règles de concurrence de l'UE sur ces marchés.

La Commission n'a pas l'intention d'harmoniser les règles qui s'appliqueraient spécifiquement aux agences de réservation d'hôtels en ligne dans l'Union.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010587/13
to the Commission**

Christine De Veyrac (PPE)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: The hotel industry and online booking agencies

Nowadays most travellers looking for a hotel go through an online booking agency such as Booking.com, Expedia.co.uk or Hrs.com. These reservation agencies are considered more convenient because they identify a large number of hotels in every category in each city and offer rooms that the customers see as less expensive. Financial considerations are therefore the main reason why our fellow citizens go through these booking centres.

However, these sites are being increasingly called into question by hoteliers, especially by the French Hotel Trade and Industry Association (UMIH). The hotel listings published by these agencies are not comprehensive. The only establishments which appear are those whose managers agree to pay commissions to the centres, which can be as much as 30% of the room rate. These online booking centres are accused by hotel and restaurant owners of exerting a kind of pressure and market dominance, in particular because of the principle known as rate parity. This means that a hotelier who wants to run a last-minute promotion on his site must first inform the other sites that market his hotel so that they can all display the same prices. As these practices may constitute a barrier to the rules on competition, they are not allowed in Germany, but they are still permitted in France, for example.

The European Union aims to facilitate the free movement of people on its territory. Promoting tourism in this way means that our fellow citizens should be able to find accommodation easily when travelling. However, the pressure put on prices by these online booking agencies in some Member States can prove detrimental to our hoteliers and to their customers.

1. Does the Commission intend to take steps to ensure that the rules on competition are properly applied in the hotel industry in its Member States?
2. Does the Commission intend to harmonise the rules that apply to online hotel booking agencies in the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission

(26 November 2013)

The Commission has currently no pending competition investigation in relation to online booking of hotels. However, some competition authorities of the Member States, which are competent to apply both EU competition rules and national competition rules, are currently investigating practices such as the one referred to by the Honourable Member. Within the network of European Competition authorities, the Commission is informed of these cases and is discussing them with the national competition authorities in order to safeguard the consistent and effective application of EU competition rules in these markets.

The Commission has no intention to harmonise the rules that would apply specifically to online hotel booking agencies in the Union.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-010588/13

à Comissão

Nuno Teixeira (PPE)

(17 de setembro de 2013)

Assunto: Análise do Estudo «Perceção do Parlamento Europeu pelos Portugueses» — DG COMM

Tendo em conta que:

- Pelo segundo ano consecutivo, a Direção-Geral da Comunicação, nomeadamente a Unidade de Acompanhamento da Opinião Pública e a empresa TNS opinion, realizaram um estudo sobre a «Perceção do Parlamento Europeu pelos Portugueses»;
- Foram atualizadas as perguntas realizadas pelo Eurobarómetro sobre temas como «A minha Voz conta na União Europeia» e «No meu País», bem como as dimensões relacionadas com as respostas à crise (medidas isoladas e coordenadas) e a retoma do crescimento;
- Segundo o estudo em causa «O Eurobarómetro é um instrumento que não está concebido para analisar resultados a uma escala regional. Porém, mediante a combinação de dados de vários inquéritos EB/PE, nos quais foram efetuadas perguntas idênticas, é possível obter resultados de âmbito regional.»
- O estudo aborda assim a perceção regional dos Portugueses sobre o Parlamento Europeu, tendo sido realizado um vasto trabalho de campo nas várias regiões portuguesas. No entanto, 28 % das regiões portuguesas foram completamente ignoradas, não tendo sido consideradas no estudo as Regiões Autónomas da Madeira e dos Açores que possuem mais de 510 mil habitantes;
- As Regiões Autónomas são consideradas 2 das 7 regiões portuguesas, devendo ter sido naturalmente incluídas no estudo em causa;
- Segundo o artigo 349.º, em articulação com o artigo 355.º do Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia, estas regiões são consideradas Regiões Ultraperiféricas, recebendo um apoio específico adicional para fazer face às suas condicionalidades económicas, sociais e territoriais.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Como justifica que o estudo «Perceção do Parlamento Europeu pelos Portugueses» tenha ignorado as Regiões Autónomas da Madeira e dos Açores?
2. Qual o critério adotado para que apenas se tenha dado importância à opinião das pessoas residentes em 70 % das regiões portuguesas, extrapolando a análise para o espaço nacional?
3. Tenciona realizar um novo estudo completo à escala regional e que seja integrado numa verdadeira análise à escala nacional?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão

(5 de novembro de 2013)

O título «Perceção do Parlamento Europeu pelos Portugueses» refere-se a um estudo Eurobarómetro realizado pelo próprio Parlamento.

A Comissão Europeia leva a cabo o inquérito Eurobarómetro sobre a opinião pública na União Europeia duas vezes por ano em todos os Estados-Membros. Tal inclui, nomeadamente, perguntas para saber se as pessoas sentem que a sua opinião conta, na União Europeia e no seu país. A Unidade de Acompanhamento da Opinião Pública, da Direção-Geral da Comunicação do Parlamento Europeu, realiza também anualmente um inquérito Eurobarómetro que inclui as mesmas duas questões.

Normalmente, o Eurobarómetro da Comissão tem como objetivo dar uma imagem representativa da opinião pública, em função do Estado-Membro, da região e do grupo sociodemográfico (sexo, idade, atividade profissional, nível de educação, etc.). A Comissão realiza igualmente estudos que analisam os mesmos tipos de questões, de forma mais pormenorizada, ao nível regional.

O Eurobarómetro Flash n.º 356 sobre «Opinião Pública nas Regiões da UE», realizado pela Direção-Geral da Comunicação em agosto-setembro de 2012, incluiu a Madeira e os Açores entre as 170 regiões inquiridas. A Comissão está a planear realizar inquéritos regionais semelhantes no futuro.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010588/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(17 September 2013)

Subject: Analysis of the study 'The Portuguese People's Perception of the European Parliament' by the Directorate-General for Communication

For the second year running, the Directorate-General for Communication's Public Opinion Monitoring Unit and the company TNS Opinion have conducted a study on 'The Portuguese People's Perception of the European Parliament'.

Eurobarometer questions on issues such as 'My voice counts in the European Union' and 'My voice counts in my country', as well as aspects concerning responses to the crisis (one-off and coordinated measures) and reviving growth, were updated.

According to the study in question, Eurobarometer is not an instrument that is designed to analyse results on a regional scale. However, combining data from several Eurobarometer/EP surveys, in which the same questions have been asked, makes it possible to obtain regional results.

The study thus deals with the Portuguese people's regional perception of Parliament, with a huge amount of fieldwork having been done in several regions of Portugal. However, 28% of Portuguese regions were completely ignored, as the autonomous regions of Madeira and the Azores, which have over 510 000 residents, were not taken into account by the study.

The autonomous regions count as two of Portugal's seven regions and should, of course, be included in the study in question.

According to Article 349, in conjunction with Article 355, of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, these regions are considered outermost regions, receiving specific additional support to deal with their economic, social and territorial constraints.

1. How can the Commission justify the study 'The Portuguese People's Perception of the European Parliament' ignoring the autonomous regions of Madeira and the Azores?
2. On what basis was only the opinion of people living in 70% of Portuguese regions considered important, with the results extrapolated nationally?
3. Does the Commission plan to conduct a new, comprehensive regional-level study to be integrated into a genuinely national analysis?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2013)

'The Portuguese People's Perception of the European Parliament' refers to a Eurobarometer carried out by the Parliament itself.

The European Commission conducts the Standard Eurobarometer survey on public opinion in the European Union twice yearly in all Member States. This includes, among others, questions on whether citizens feel their voice counts in the European Union and in their country. The Directorate-General for Communication's Public Opinion Monitoring Unit in the European Parliament also conducts an annual Eurobarometer survey, which includes the same two questions.

The Commission's Standard Eurobarometer aims to give a representative overview of public opinion according to Member State, region and socio-demographic grouping (gender, age, occupation, level of education, etc.). The Commission also conducts studies that look into the same types of questions in more detail at a regional level.

Flash Eurobarometer 356 on 'Public Opinion in the EU Regions', carried out by the Commission's Directorate-General for Communication in August-September 2012, included Madeira and the Azores among the 170 regions surveyed. The Commission is planning to carry out similar regional surveys in the future.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-010589/13
an die Kommission**

Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)

(17. September 2013)

Betrifft: Überarbeitung der „De-minimis“-Richtlinie

Die „De-minimis“-Richtlinie ist ein zentrales Instrument der Mittelstandsförderung und eine der wichtigsten Rechtsgrundlagen im EU-Beihilferecht. Die geplante Überarbeitung der Richtlinie in wesentlichen Punkten birgt die Gefahr, dass es EU-weit zu erheblichen Einschränkungen bei der Unternehmensförderung kommt.

1. Wie begründet die Kommission die in ihrem Entwurf vorgesehene Beibehaltung des aktuellen Schwellenwertes bis 2020? Wäre im Hinblick auf die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung seit 2006 eine Anhebung des Schwellenwertes angebracht?
2. Im Entwurf werden KMU mit einer bilanziellen Eigenkapitalquote von 12 % als „Unternehmen in Schwierigkeiten“ bezeichnet. Berücksichtigt die Kommission in ihrer Überarbeitung ausreichend die Tatsache, dass üblicherweise gerade KMU in Europa ein geringes Kapitalpolster besitzen und Experten zufolge dadurch mindestens die Hälfte ihres KMU-Bestands aus der Förderung herausfallen würde?
3. Wie rechtfertigt die Kommission die Erstellung eines zentralen nationalen „De-minimis“-Registers und den damit einhergehenden erheblichen bürokratischen und finanziellen Aufwand, der insbesondere für föderal strukturierte Mitgliedstaaten entstände?

Antwort von Herrn Almunia im Namen der Kommission

(18. November 2013)

Die Überarbeitung der De-minimis-Verordnung wird auf transparente Weise durchgeführt: Alle Stellungnahmen werden sorgfältig geprüft, und es wurden bisher noch keine endgültigen Entscheidungen getroffen. Ohne jeden Zweifel beabsichtigt die Kommission, dass diese Regelung ein einfaches und flexibles Instrument zur Unterstützung insbesondere von KMU bleibt.

1. Was den Schwellenwert anbelangt, hat die Kommission keine neuen Hinweise erhalten, die eine Anhebung rechtfertigen würden. Die aus den Mitgliedstaaten eingegangenen Angaben zeigen, dass der Durchschnittsbetrag der De-minimis-Beihilfe relativ gering ist und in den allermeisten Fällen der Höchstbetrag nicht ausgeschöpft wird. Bei der letzten Anhebung des Schwellenwerts im Jahr 2006 von 100 000 auf 200 000 EUR wurden bereits sowohl die vorangegangene Inflation als auch die prognostizierten Entwicklungen für 2006-2013 berücksichtigt. Die tatsächliche Inflation war in diesem Zeitraum jedoch niedriger als 2005 erwartet und dürfte in den nächsten Jahren voraussichtlich nicht erheblich steigen.
2. Die vorgeschlagene Definition von „Unternehmen in Schwierigkeiten“ beruht auf den verfügbaren Daten. Seither sind bei meinen Dienststellen aus vielen Mitgliedstaaten und von Interessengruppen Informationen und Daten zu diesem Punkt eingegangen. Alle Stellungnahmen werden sorgfältig geprüft, bevor die Entscheidung darüber fällt, ob und wie der Text geändert wird. Außerdem steht die Kommission kurz davor, eine öffentliche Anhörung zur Überarbeitung der Leitlinien der Gemeinschaft für staatliche Beihilfen zur Rettung und Umstrukturierung von Unternehmen in Schwierigkeiten durchzuführen.
3. Die Kommission hat alle Stellungnahmen zur Einführung eines obligatorischen Registers zur Kenntnis genommen und wird diese berücksichtigen, wenn es darum geht, eine ausgewogene Lösung zu finden, die sicherstellt, dass die De-minimis-Reform den Zielen der Modernisierung der staatlichen Beihilfen dient und keinen unverhältnismäßigen Verwaltungsaufwand schafft.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010589/13
to the Commission**

Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: Revision of the *de minimis* Directive

The *de minimis* Directive is a key instrument for supporting small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and one of the most important legal bases in the EU State aid *acquis*. The planned substantial revision of the directive is liable to result in considerable restrictions on aid to enterprises throughout the EU.

1. How does the Commission justify the retention of the current threshold until 2020, as provided for in its draft? In view of the economic developments since 2006, would it be appropriate to raise the threshold?
2. In the draft, SMEs with an equity ratio on their balance sheet of 12% are defined as 'undertakings in difficulty'. Is the Commission taking sufficient account in its revision of the fact that SMEs in Europe do usually have a low capital buffer, and, according to experts, this would result in at least half of all its SMEs dropping out of the aid scheme?
3. How does the Commission justify the creation of a national central *de minimis* register and the associated considerable financial commitment and amount of red tape that would result, in particular for Member States with a federal structure?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission

(18 November 2013)

The review of the *de minimis* Regulation is being carried out in a transparent way in which all comments are carefully considered and no final decisions have been taken yet. It is certainly the Commission's intention to ensure that the *de minimis* instrument will provide a simple and flexible tool to support in particular SMEs.

1. Concerning the ceiling, the Commission has received no new element showing that a higher ceiling would be justified. The data received from Member States (MS) show that the average amount of *de minimis* aid granted is quite low and in the vast majority of cases the ceiling is not exhausted. The previous increase from EUR 100 000 to 200 000 in 2006 already took into account both past inflation and likely developments for 2006-2013. The real inflation for this period was lower than predicted in 2005 and it is not expected to be very significant in the coming years.
 2. The proposed definition of undertakings in difficulty was based on the available data. My services have since received information and data from many MS and other stakeholders on this point. All comments are being considered with great care before any decision is taken on whether and how to amend the text. The Commission is also on the point of launching a public consultation on the revision of the guidelines for rescue and restructuring aid to firms in difficulty.
 3. Concerning the introduction of a mandatory register, the Commission has listened carefully to all comments and will take these into consideration to find a balanced solution able to ensure that the *de minimis* reform fits with the State Aid Modernisation objectives and does not create a disproportionate administrative burden.
-

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-010590/13
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)**

Franz Obermayr (NI)

(17. September 2013)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Menschenrechtsverletzungen im Rahmen der 2012 von Präsident Mursi durchgesetzten Verfassung

Mit Blick auf die Forderungen der internationalen Völkergemeinschaft und der EU insbesondere nach Verhandlungen mit der Muslimbrüderschaft (der Mohammed Mursi angehört), um den Ägypten-Konflikt beizulegen, müssen noch einige Punkte geklärt werden. Während die internationale Völkergemeinschaft nun in Sorge über die Krise in Ägypten ist, sei angemerkt, dass von einigen eine solche Krise angesichts der von Mohammed Mursi 2012 in Kraft gesetzten Verfassung als unausweichlich vorausgesagt worden war. Die Verfassung war zwar im Rahmen eines Referendums mit 68,3 % angenommen worden — aber es hatten sich lediglich 32,9 % der eingetragenen Wähler beteiligt. Damals befürchtete die Opposition, dass die Verfassung den Weg für eine weitere Islamisierung des Gesetzes ebnen würde (Befürchtungen, die sich bewahrheitet haben), wobei Catherine Ashton Präsident Mursi bereits lange vor Inkrafttreten der Verfassung aufgefordert hatte, das Vertrauen der Menschen in die Demokratie wieder herzustellen.

Die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin wird um folgende Auskünfte ersucht:

1. Angesichts der damals offenkundig sehr laxen Haltung von Catherine Ashton gegenüber dem Mursi-Regime und seinen fundamentalen Menschenrechtsverletzungen wird der Rat um Mitteilung darüber ersucht, ob Catherine Ashton nun ihre Herangehensweise in den Verhandlungen mit einer künftigen ägyptischen Regierung wesentlich ändern wird?
2. Catherine Ashton hat nicht energisch auf die Verletzung grundlegender Menschenrechte durch diese Verfassung reagiert (Schutz von Rechten (Artikel 10, 11, 81); Meinungsfreiheit (Artikel 31, 44, 45); Religionsfreiheit (Artikel 43); Rechte der Frau (Artikel 10, 30); Abhaltung von zivilen und militärischen Prozessen (Artikel 198); völkerrechtliche Verpflichtungen (Artikel 145)). Hat sich Catherine Ashton damals die Verfassung aufmerksam durchgelesen oder war sie der Meinung, sie werde keine kurz- oder mittelfristigen Auswirkungen für Ägypten, die EU und den Rest der demokratischen Welt haben?
3. Kann man sich in Anbetracht des oben Gesagten nicht fragen, welche Rolle die EU-Außenbeauftragte Ashton tatsächlich während der Amtszeit von Präsident Mursi gespielt hat? War ihre Rolle eher symbolischer Natur oder hat sie wesentlich zu Vertretung der Interessen der EU in Ägypten beigetragen?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission

(9. Dezember 2013)

Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin verfolgt die Entwicklungen in Ägypten aufmerksam und mit Besorgnis. Die EU vertritt gegenüber Ägypten weiterhin mit Entschiedenheit ihren wertebasierten Ansatz und dringt in diesem Zusammenhang auf die Achtung der Menschenrechte und der Grundfreiheiten sowie des Rechtsstaatlichkeitsprinzips. Die Hohe Vertreterin hat diesen Standpunkt in verschiedenen Erklärungen deutlich gemacht, insbesondere auch gegenüber Gesprächspartnern im Rahmen ihrer Besuche in der Region. Die zentrale Bedeutung dieser grundlegenden Werte wurde von den 28 Mitgliedstaaten in den Schlussfolgerungen des Rates vom 22. Juli und 21. August nachdrücklich bekräftigt.

Ebenso hat sich die EU-Delegation in Kairo bei ihren Kontakten mit Partnern in der Übergangsregierung für die Achtung dieser Werte eingesetzt. Die EU-Delegation verfolgt und überwacht die Entwicklung der Verfassungsfrage genau und steht dabei in engem Kontakt mit der Venedig-Kommission des Europarats. Die Verfassung dient als Grundlage eines demokratischen Ägyptens und sollte daher die uneingeschränkte Achtung der Gewaltenteilung mit allen notwendigen Kontrollmöglichkeiten gewährleisten.

Die EU ruft Ägypten daher dazu auf, rasch zu einem alle Beteiligten einbeziehenden Prozess des Übergangs zur Demokratie finden. Sie weist außerdem immer wieder darauf hin, dass Konfrontation und Polarisierung keine Lösung bieten und vielmehr Aussöhnung und Dialog vorrangige Bedeutung eingeräumt werden muss. Entsprechende Stellungnahmen wurden bereits der Regierung von Präsident Mursi übermittelt.

Die EU unterstützt weiterhin die demokratischen Bestrebungen des ägyptischen Volkes.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010590/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Franz Obermayr (NI)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Contravention of human rights by the Egyptian Constitution imposed by Mr Morsi in 2012

Given the calls by the international community and the EU in particular for negotiations to be held with the Muslim Brotherhood (of which Mr Morsi is a member) in order to put an end to the Egyptian conflict, certain points need to be clarified. While the international community is now worrying about the Egyptian crisis, it is worth noting that some people had predicted that a crisis of this kind would be inevitable because of the constitution enacted by Mr Morsi in December 2012. Although the constitution was ratified by 68.3% of voters in a referendum, only 32.9% of registered voters turned out to vote. At the time, the opposition was afraid that the constitution would pave the way for greater Islamisation of the law (fears which proved to be well-founded), while Catherine Ashton was calling on President Morsi long before the constitution entered into force to 'restore people's faith in democracy'.

Could the Vice-President/High Representative answer the following questions:

1. Given Ms Ashton's apparently very lax attitude towards Mr Morsi's regime as regards respect for fundamental human rights, will she change her approach substantially in negotiations with any future Egyptian Government?
2. Ms Ashton did not react strongly to the constitution's disregard for fundamental human rights (protection of rights (Articles 10, 11, 81); freedom of expression (Articles 31, 44, 45); freedom of religion (Article 43); women's rights (Articles 10, 30); civilians and military trials (Article 198); obligations under international law (Art. 145)). Did Ms Ashton read through the constitution carefully or did she consider that it would not have any short- or medium-term consequences for Egypt, the EU and the rest of the democratic world?
3. In the light of the above, one is entitled to wonder what role Ms Ashton really played during Mr Morsi's mandate. Was her role a symbolic one or was it crucial in terms of representing the EU in Egypt?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(9 December 2013)

The HR/VP is following the developments in Egypt closely and with concern. The EU continues to stress its value-based approach towards Egypt. In this respect, the EU is calling for the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms as well as the rule of law. The High Representative stressed this approach in various statements and in particular with her interlocutors when travelling to the region. These values have likewise been stressed by the 28 Member States in the Council Conclusions on 22 July and 21 August.

Also the EU Delegation in Cairo is underlining these values in its contacts with counterparts of the interim authorities. Moreover, the EU Delegation is following and monitoring closely the issue of the Constitution in close contact with the Venice Commission of the Council of Europe. The Constitution will be the basis for a democratic Egypt and therefore should reflect the full respect of division of powers with the necessary checks and balances.

The EU continues to call on Egypt to rapidly move to an inclusive transformation process. The EU also continues to stress that confrontation and polarization are not a solution. Reconciliation and dialogue are paramount. These messages had already been passed to the Morsi government.

The EU continues to support the democratic aspirations of the Egyptian people.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-010591/13

προς την Επιτροπή

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)

(17 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Έρευνα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών φέρνει στο φως αλληπάλληλα κρούσματα βιασμών σε χώρες της Ασίας και του Ειρηνικού

Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατα δημοσιευμένη έρευνα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών που πραγματοποιήθηκε σε έξι χώρες της Ασίας και του Ειρηνικού και σε πολύ διαφορετικά μεταξύ τους μέρη, το ένα τέταρτο σχεδόν των ερωτηθέντων ανδρών παραδέχτηκαν ότι έχουν βιάσει γυναίκες που συχνά είναι οι ίδιες οι σύντροφοί τους.

Η έρευνα βασίστηκε σε ανώνυμες συνεντεύξεις με περισσότερους από 10 000 άνδρες, ηλικίας 18 έως 49 ετών, από το Μπανγκλαντές, την Κίνα, την Καμπότζη, την Ινδονησία, τη Σρι Λάνκα, και την Παπούα Νέα Γουινέα.

Με αφετηρία έναν ορισμό σύμφωνα με τον οποίο βιασμός είναι μία μη συναινετική σεξουαλική επαφή με διείσδυση, προκύπτει ότι το 11% όσων απάντησαν στη μελέτη έχουν βιάσει γυναίκα που δεν ήταν η σύντροφός τους και ότι το ποσοστό ανεβαίνει στο 24% σχεδόν όταν συμπεριλαμβάνεται ο βιασμός της συντρόφου.

Το 45% αυτών των ανδρών παραδέχτηκαν ότι έχουν βιάσει περισσότερες από μία γυναίκες. Μία ιδιαίτερα ανησυχητική παράμετρος είναι ότι οι μισοί από τους εν λόγω δηλωμένους βιαστές ήταν έφηβοι όταν διέπραξαν το έγκλημα και ότι το 12% αυτών ήταν νεώτεροι από 12 ετών. Στην πλειοψηφία τους δεν αντιμετώπισαν καμία νομική συνέπεια για τις πράξεις τους.

Η μεγαλύτερη συχνότητα παρατηρείται στην Bougainville της Παπούα Νέας Γουινέας, όπου 62% από τους ερωτηθέντες παραδέχτηκαν ότι έχουν διαπράξει βιασμό. Παρόμοια αποτελέσματα καταγράφηκαν και στην γειτονική επαρχία της Ινδονησίας Papua, όπου το 49% σχεδόν από τους ερωτηθέντες παραδέχτηκαν ότι έχουν διαπράξει βιασμό.

Με βάση τα ανωτέρω, παρακαλείται η Επιτροπή να απαντήσει στα ακόλουθα ερωτήματα:

1. Σε ποιες περαιτέρω ενέργειες προτίθεται να προβεί η Επιτροπή όσον αφορά την πρόληψη και την εξάλειψη τούτου του σοβαρότατου φαινομένου, προκειμένου να αλλάξουν οι επικρατούσες ανδρικές αντιλήψεις και νοοτροπίες και προκειμένου να προσαχθούν στη δικαιοσύνη οι αυτουργοί του εγκλήματος του βιασμού;
2. Με ποιους τρόπους μπορεί η ΕΕ να διαδραματίσει αποτελεσματικότερα και αποδοτικότερα τον ρόλο της στη διεθνή σκηνή προκειμένου να παταχθεί η βία εναντίον των γυναικών σε τρίτες χώρες; Παρακαλείσθε επίσης να περιγράψετε συγκεκριμένα μέτρα που έχουν ήδη ληφθεί.

Απάντηση της Υπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής

(6 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Το σχέδιο δράσης της ΕΕ σχετικά με την ισότητα των φύλων και τη χειραφέτηση των γυναικών στο πλαίσιο της αναπτυξιακής συνεργασίας για την περίοδο 2010-2015 περιλαμβάνει δεσμεύσεις για όλους τους φορείς της ΕΕ όσον αφορά τη στήριξη των προσπάθειών των αναπτυσσόμενων χωρών για τη βελτίωση της θέσης των γυναικών. Η προστασία έναντι μορφών βίας που σχετίζονται με το φύλο αποτελεί μία από τις προτεραιότητες του στρατηγικού πλαισίου και του σχεδίου δράσης της ΕΕ για τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και τη δημοκρατία που εγκρίθηκαν το 2012. Η ΕΕ και τα Ηνωμένα Έθνη συνεργάζονται στενά για την υλοποίηση των συμπερασμάτων της 57ης Επιτροπής του ΟΗΕ σχετικά με τη θέση των γυναικών στην πρόληψη και εξάλειψη της βίας κατά των γυναικών και των κοριτσιών.

Έχουν αναπτυχθεί προγράμματα της ΕΕ με στόχο την πρόληψη της βίας, την προστασία και υποστήριξη των θυμάτων και τη δίωξη των δραστών. Τα προγράμματα ανθρωπιστικής βοήθειας συχνά περιλαμβάνουν παροχή βοήθειας σε επίζώντες μορφών βίας που σχετίζονται με το φύλο. Το ζήτημα της βίας κατά των γυναικών τίθεται στο πλαίσιο του διαλόγου για τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα ή άλλων μορφών πολιτικού διαλόγου που διεξάγει η ΕΕ με τις περισσότερες από τις χώρες που αναφέρονται στην ερώτηση του Αξιότιμου Μέλους. Τα θέματα των γυναικών επίσης ενσωματώνονται σε πολλές δραστηριότητες αναπτυξιακής συνεργασίας της ΕΕ: εκπαίδευση, υγεία, δικαιώματα των διακινούμενων εργαζομένων, χειραφέτηση των γυναικών.

Στο Μπαγκλαντές, την Ατσέ και την Καμπότζη, οι προσπάθειες της ΕΕ επικεντρώνονται επίσης στην πρόσβαση στη δικαιοσύνη ώστε να διασφαλιστεί ότι η βία κατά των γυναικών αποτελεί αξιόποινη πράξη και ότι λαμβάνονται μέτρα για τη διευκόλυνση της πρόσβασης των θυμάτων στη δικαιοσύνη. Στην περίπτωση της Παπουασίας-Νέας Γουινέας, η καταπολέμηση της βίας κατά των γυναικών βρίσκεται στην κορυφή των δράσεων που υποστηρίζει η ΕΕ. Ο πρόσφατος διάλογος για τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα με την Κίνα προσέφερε τη δυνατότητα να συζητηθούν ο αντίκτυπος της πολιτικής του ενός παιδιού, η ενδοοικογενειακή βία και η βία κατά των ιερόδουλων. Στη Σρι Λάνκα, η ΕΕ προωθεί την ενσωμάτωση της ισότητας των φύλων σε όλα τα προγράμματα και παρέχει στήριξη σε συγκεκριμένες δράσεις με στόχο την καταπολέμηση των μορφών βίας που σχετίζονται με το φύλο.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010591/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(17 September 2013)

Subject: UN survey reveals rape crisis in countries of Asia-Pacific

According to a recently published UN report, nearly one quarter of men surveyed — in a wide variety of locations in six Asia-Pacific countries — admitted to raping a woman, often their own partner.

The report was based on anonymous interviews with more than 10 000 men aged between 18 and 49 years in Bangladesh, China, Cambodia, Indonesia, Sri Lanka and Papua New Guinea.

Using a definition of non-consensual, penetrative sex as a benchmark, the study reported that 11% of respondents had raped a woman who was not their partner, with this figure rising to nearly 24% when rape of a partner was included.

45% of these men admitted to having raped more than one woman. Alarming, half of the rapists identified were teenagers at the time of committing the crime, of whom 12% were younger than 15 years of age. The majority had not faced any legal consequences for their actions.

The highest prevalence of rape was observed in Bougainville in Papua New Guinea, where 62% of respondents admitted to having committed rape. Similar findings were recorded in the neighbouring Indonesian province of Papua, where nearly 49% of respondents admitted to having committed rape.

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

1. What further actions does the Commission intend to take in order to prevent and put an end to this alarming issue, so as to change the traditional perceptions and culture prevalent among men and to bring aggressors to trial for committing rape crimes?
2. How can the EU adopt a more effective and efficient role as a world player, so as to combat violence against women in third countries? Please outline specific actions that have already been taken.

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

The EU Plan of Action on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Development 2010-2015 contains commitments for all EU actors in terms of supporting developing countries' efforts to improve the situation of women. Protection against gender-based violence (GBV) is one of the priorities under the EU Strategic Framework and Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy adopted in 2012. The EU and UN work closely on the implementation of the conclusions of the 57th UN Commission on the Status of Women on prevention and ending violence against women and girls.

EU projects have been developed in order to prevent violence; protect and support victims; prosecute perpetrators. Humanitarian aid projects often include assistance to survivors of GBV. Violence against women is raised in the framework of the Human Rights Dialogues or other forms of political dialogues conducted by the EU with most of the countries mentioned in the Honourable Member's question. Women's issues are also mainstreamed into the EU's development cooperation activities: education, health, rights of the migrant workers; empowerment of women.

In Bangladesh, Aceh and Cambodia, EU efforts have been also focused on access to justice so as to ensure that violence against women is punishable by law and that measures are taken to facilitate victims' access to justice. In the case of Papua New Guinea, combatting violence against women is at the top of EU supported actions. The recent Human Rights Dialogue with China offered the opportunity to raise the impact of the one-child policy, domestic violence and violence against sex workers. In Sri Lanka, the EU has been promoting mainstreaming gender across all programmes and offering support to specific actions aimed at combating GBV.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010592/13
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(17 September 2013)

Subject: Infringement proceedings — European health insurance card, Spain

According to newspaper reports, British holidaymakers in need of emergency treatment at Spanish accident and emergency units are being greeted by chip-and-pin machines, as hospitals force them to provide upfront payment details before care is given.

It is understood that the European health insurance card (EHIC) entitles visitors to state-provided, medically-necessary treatment for the duration of their stay. However it has been reported that medical treatment is being refused unless payments are made first.

Can the Commission please clarify exactly what holiday makers are entitled to when travelling within Europe and using the EHIC, and whether payment before treatment (particularly for serious injuries) is considered acceptable?

Can the Commission please clarify whether the position adopted by Spain is legal?

Can the Commission comment on the status of infringement proceedings initiated against Spain?

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

The European Health Insurance Card ('EHIC') proves that the holder is an 'insured person' under the state healthcare scheme of a Member State and entitled to receive medically necessary state healthcare during a stay in another Member State. EHIC holders should receive in the Member State of stay the same treatment (procedures and tariffs) as persons insured in that state. Where an insured person has no EHIC, he or she can obtain a Provisional Replacement Certificate ('PRC') from the state of insurance. The PRC also proves that the holder is an insured person.

Where holidaymakers seeking healthcare in the public system in Spain have no EHIC or PRC to prove they are insured persons, they can be treated in the same way as Spanish nationals who are not affiliated to the Spanish social security system, namely, they can be required to pay. If in fact the holidaymakers are insured persons under their home state's healthcare system (but simply had no proof of this), they can request reimbursement of the cost of their treatment either from the health institution of the place of stay, or from the health institution in the state where they are insured. Such reimbursement is made in accordance with the conditions and tariffs in the state of stay. Since most healthcare in Spain is free, this means that, upon presentation of the invoice, 100% reimbursement of any payment made should be possible.

As regards the infringement procedure against Spain, the Honourable Member is referred to the answer to E-010736/2013 ⁽¹⁾.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010593/13
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(17 September 2013)

Subject: Pigs Directive

With 13 Member States now fully compliant with Directive 2008/120/EC laying down minimum standards for the protection of pigs and many others confronted with infringement proceedings, when does the Commission expect all Member States to comply with this directive?

Does the Commission expect to have to initiate further infringement proceedings before the end of the year?

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

With regard to the requirement for group housing of sows ⁽¹⁾, the Member States are making progress towards full compliance. It is difficult for the Commission to give an exact date for when this will have been achieved across the EU as this will depend on the legislative procedures in each of the Member States and how they handle situations that ensue.

Due to the administrative procedures for infringements any further steps will at the earliest occur in November 2013.

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 2008/120/EC; OJ L 47, 18.2.2009, p. 5.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010594/13
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(17 September 2013)

Subject: Eggs and the Ukraine — follow-up to Written Question E-004548/2013

In its answer to Written Question E-004548/2013, the Commission does not specify the time frame for an 'interim period'. Could the Commission indicate what it considers an 'interim period' of time to be?

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

The draft Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) with Ukraine does not indicate the length of the interim period during which the Ukrainian authorities have to approximate the EU legislation on animal welfare. The length of the interim period has not been fixed. Until the process of approximation of animal welfare legislation has been completed the EU will import products of animal origin, including eggs for the processing industry, from Ukraine under the same conditions as for other third countries.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-010595/13

aan de Commissie

Lucas Hartong (NI)

(17 september 2013)

Betreft: Ontwikkelingshulp vanuit EU begroting aan boevennest Somalië

Vandaag werd bekend ⁽¹⁾ dat de Commissie voornemens is vanuit de EU-begroting de komende drie jaar 650 miljoen euro aan ontwikkelingshulp richting Somalië te sturen. Al tijdens de aankondiging hiervan waren ernstige waarschuwingen aan het adres van de EU te horen: „Terrorist attacks continue to be a stability threat, and human rights, in particular women's rights, remain at risk”. Verder stelde Amnesty International: „Large scale human rights abuses are occurring as people are being forcibly evicted from camps. Sexual violence is widespread and the inability and unwillingness of the Somali authorities to investigate and bring the attackers to justice contributes to a climate of impunity”. Transparency International ⁽²⁾ plaatst het land Somalië qua corruptie en onbetrouwbaar openbaar bestuur op plaats 174. Lager kan niet, want er zijn maar 174 geïndexeerde landen. In dat kader de volgende vraag:

Hoe is het mogelijk dat de Commissie, kennelijk zonder ook maar een greintje verstand, vanuit de EU-begroting zo veel geld van hardwerkende belastingbetalende Nederlanders in dit bestuurlijk totaal onbetrouwbare en corrupte boevennest Somalië stort? Heeft de Commissie volledig haar verstand verloren? Graag een uitgebreide toelichting.

Antwoord van de heer Piebalgs namens de Commissie

(6 november 2013)

De steun van de EU heeft een aanzienlijk verschil in Somalië teweeggebracht, waar wij sinds 2012 voor het eerst getuige waren van een verkozen regering, van een sterk verminderde invloed van Al-Shabaab en van succesvolle aanvallen door piraten die tot een verwaarloosbaar niveau werden teruggebracht. Er zijn duidelijk nog veel uitdagingen en de aanslagen van de afgelopen maanden in Mogadishu en onlangs in Nairobi door Al-Shabaab moeten aantonen hoe belangrijk het is voor de EU om de veiligheidssector te ondersteunen in het kader van het uitgebreide mandaat voor de EU-opleidingsmissie, van de aanzienlijke financiële middelen ter ondersteuning van de krachten van de missie van de Afrikaanse-Unie-in-Somalië (AMISOM-krachten) en de talrijke andere programma's van de Commissie. Veiligheid en ontwikkeling gaan hand in hand en de EU volgt een alomvattende aanpak van Somalië, waarbij zij naast al haar capaciteiten, ook politieke ontwikkelingsmissies en missies ten behoeve van haar gemeenschappelijk veiligheids- en defensiebeleid (GVDB) inzet. De EU zal blijven werken om ervoor te zorgen dat deze steun volledig coherent is met andere internationale donoren en overeenkomstig de Somalische behoeften. In dit verband betekende de conferentie in Brussel over een „New Deal” voor Somalië op 16 september 2013 een belangrijke mijlpaal voor het aanpakken van de meest kritieke politieke, veiligheids- en sociaaleconomische prioriteiten in Somalië. De EU-steun wordt niet rechtstreeks gericht aan de centrale en lokale overheden, maar de activiteiten worden uitgevoerd door organisaties uit het Europees maatschappelijk middenveld, internationale organisaties of uit agentschappen van de lidstaten op basis van duidelijke en transparante procedures en systemen.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.euractiv.com/development-policy/new-deal-somalia-business-usual-news-530491?utm_source=EurActiv%20Newsletter&utm_campaign=d2d986c0fa-newsletter_daily_update&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_bab5f0ea4e-d2d986c0fa-245708337.

⁽²⁾ <http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2012/results/>.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010595/13
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(17 September 2013)

Subject: Development aid from the EU budget to the den of thieves that is Somalia

Today it was announced ⁽¹⁾ that in the next three years the Commission intends to give EUR 650 m in development aid to Somalia. Even at the time of the announcement, the EU was receiving serious warnings: 'Terrorist attacks continue to be a stability threat, and human rights, in particular women's rights, remain at risk'. Amnesty International has also stated: 'Large-scale human rights abuses are occurring as people are being forcibly evicted from camps. Sexual violence is widespread and the inability and unwillingness of the Somali authorities to investigate and bring the attackers to justice contributes to a climate of impunity'. Transparency International ⁽²⁾ ranks Somalia in 174th place on the index of corruption and unreliable governance. A lower ranking would not be possible, as only 174 countries are listed.

How is it possible that the Commission, plainly failing to display an ounce of common sense, can transfer so much money from hardworking Dutch taxpayers to the den of thieves that is Somalia, which is administered in a totally unreliable manner and is extremely corrupt? Has the Commission completely taken leave of its senses? Please account for this in detail.

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(6 November 2013)

EU support has made a substantial difference in Somalia, where since 2012 we have seen a government elected for the first time, Al-Shabaab influence seriously diminished and successful piracy attacks brought back down to negligible levels. There are clearly many challenges remaining, and the attacks in recent months in Mogadishu and recently in Nairobi by Al-Shabaab serve to demonstrate the importance that the EU is placing on supporting the security sector, through the enhanced mandate for the EU Training Mission, the substantial funding in support of the African Union Mission in Somalia (Amisom) forces and the many other Commission programmes. Security and development go hand in hand and the EU takes a Comprehensive Approach to Somalia using all its capabilities, political, developmental and Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) missions. The EU will continue to ensure that this support is fully coherent with other international donors and in line with Somali needs. In this regard the Brussels Conference on a New Deal for Somalia on 16 September 2013 was a major milestone for addressing the most critical political, security, and socioeconomic priorities in Somalia. EU support is not provided directly to the Central and Local authorities but the activities are implemented by European Civil Society Organisations, International Organisations or Member States agencies on the basis of clear and transparent procedures and systems.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.euractiv.com/development-policy/new-deal-somalia-business-usual-news-530491?utm_source=EurActiv%20Newsletter&utm_campaign=d2d986c0fa-newsletter_daily_update&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_bab5f0ea4e-d2d986c0fa-245708337

⁽²⁾ <http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2012/results/>

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-010597/13
upućeno Komisiji (potpredsjednici/Visokoj predstavnici)
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(17. rujna 2013.)

Predmet: VP/HR — Sankcije koje je Komisija pokrenula protiv Republike Hrvatske zbog kršenja europskog uhidbenog naloga u slučaju „Lex Perković”

Poštovana gospođo potpredsjednice,

budući da su hrvatski mediji u ponedjeljak, 16. rujna objavili da je Komisija pokrenula sankcije protiv Republike Hrvatske zbog kršenja europskog uhidbenog naloga u slučaju Perković, željela bih znati točan sadržaj i opseg razmatranih sankcija. Nadam se nedvosmislenom i krajnje konkretnom odgovoru kako bi se izbjegle potencijalne manipulacije ovim pitanjem u domaćoj javnosti.

Dopustite mi da istaknem kako se u vrijeme gospodarske krize, s kojom se slabije razvijene zemlje poput Hrvatske posebno teško nose, financijske restrikcije mogu drastično odraziti na daljnji napredak zemlje članice. Čak i ako razmatrane sankcije obuhvaćaju isključivo sredstva za pripremu na zonu Schengena, Hrvatsku se takvim potezom može dugoročno osuditi na ostanak izvan te zone, čime će biti nanesena velika šteta, ne samo našoj zemlji, već i Europskoj uniji.

Ovim Vas putem pozivam da uzmete u obzir i rastući trend euroskepticizma i nepovjerenja prema europskim institucijama kod građana Unije, u čemu Hrvatska ne predstavlja iznimku. Iznimno mala izlaznost građana Republike Hrvatske na izvanredne izbore za Europski parlament, održane u svibnju ove godine, jasan je pokazatelj nepovjerenja Hrvata prema Europskoj uniji. Imajte na umu da će nerazumne odluke ove vlade na svojoj koži najviše osjetiti hrvatski građani koji kaznu ničim nisu zaslužili, čime će se to nepovjerenje dodatno produbiti.

Dopustite građanima Republike Hrvatske da neodgovornost ove vlade kazne na jedini primjeren način — na demokratskim izborima. Dotad Vas pozivam da zajedno s nama zastupnicima u Europskom parlamentu radite na izgradnji povjerenja građana Republike Hrvatske prema europskim institucijama, što je posebno značajno u ovoj izbornoj godini.

Odgovor gđe Reding u ime Komisije
(11. studenog 2013.)

Nakon sastanka održanog 25. rujna 2013. između potpredsjednice Reding i hrvatskog ministra pravosuđa Miljenića⁽¹⁾, Hrvatski sabor donio je 4. listopada 2013. izmjenu Zakona o pravosudnoj suradnji u kaznenim stvarima. Tom izmjenom Zakon se ponovno usklađuje s Okvirnom odlukom o europskom uhidbenom nalogu u pogledu primjene europskog uhidbenog naloga na sva kaznena djela, bez obzira na datum njihova počinjenja, uklanjajući ograničenje kojim se sprječava njegova primjena na kaznena djela počinjena prije 7. kolovoza 2002. Izmjena stupa na snagu do 1. siječnja 2014. i bit će objavljena u Službenom listu Republike Hrvatske, čime svi postupci usmjereni ka sankcijama postaju nepotrebni.

Potpredsjednica Reding pozdravlja korake koje je Republika Hrvatska poduzela kako bi osigurala 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 datum počinjenja kaznenog djela.

⁽¹⁾ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-824_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010597/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Ruža Tomašić (ECR)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Sanctions imposed on Croatia by the Commission for violating the European Arrest Warrant in the 'Lex Perković' case

Following reports published in the Croatian media on 16 September 2013 which revealed that the Commission had initiated a procedure to sanction Croatia for violating the European Arrest Warrant in the 'Lex Perković' case, I would like to know what the precise details and scope of the sanctions under consideration are. I hope to receive an unambiguous and detailed response that will ensure that this issue cannot be distorted in Croatian public discourse.

During an economic crisis that has hit less-developed countries such as Croatia particularly hard, financial restrictions could have a drastic impact on Croatia's continued progress. Even if the sanctions being considered only affect funds for preparations to join the Schengen zone, imposing such sanctions could condemn Croatia to remain outside the zone for the foreseeable future. This would do a great deal of damage not only to our country, but also to the EU.

I therefore urge you to take the growing euroscepticism and mistrust towards the European institutions felt by EU citizens, including Croatians, into account. The exceptionally low voter turnout for Croatia's special European Parliament elections, which were held in May 2013, is a clear indicator of Croatians' mistrust of the EU. Bear in mind that it is the people of Croatia who will suffer most as a result of the irrational decisions taken by their government. They are entirely innocent, yet it is they who will be punished, and this will only serve to deepen mistrust of the EU.

The Croatian people must be allowed to punish their government's irresponsibility in the only appropriate way — in democratic elections. I urge you to work alongside us, the Members of the European Parliament, to build trust in European institutions among Croatians. This is of particular importance in this election year.

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(11 November 2013)

Subsequent to a meeting on 25 September 2013 between Vice-President Reding and Croatian Minister of Justice Miljenić ⁽¹⁾, the Croatian parliament adopted on 4 October 2013 an amendment to the Act on judicial cooperation in criminal matters. This amendment has the effect of returning the Act to compliance with the framework Decision on the European arrest warrant in respect of the application of the European arrest warrant to all offences, irrespective of the date of commission by removing the time limitation preventing its application to crimes committed before 7 August 2002. The amendment will enter into force by 1 January 2014 and will be published in the Official Journal of Croatia, thereby making any procedures leading to sanctions unnecessary.

Vice-President Reding has welcomed the steps taken by the Republic of Croatia to ensure that criminals are brought to justice and has noted 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.

⁽¹⁾ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-824_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-010598/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(17 settembre 2013)

Oggetto: Sottrazione internazionale di minori — Applicazione della normativa europea ed internazionale in Slovacchia

L'Ufficio del Mediatore del Parlamento europeo per i casi di sottrazione internazionale di minori riceve sempre più spesso richieste da parte di genitori, appartenenti a diverse nazionalità, relative a casi di sottrazione o trattenimento di minori in Slovacchia.

I genitori non slovacchi lamentano numerose difficoltà nell'ottenere, da parte delle autorità slovacche competenti, la corretta applicazione del regolamento (CE) n. 2201/2003 — Brussels II ed il trascorrere di tempi lunghissimi per il riconoscimento e l'esecuzione in Slovacchia di sentenze giudiziarie di altri Stati membri relative a minori di coppie binazionali.

Spesso l'esecuzione in Slovacchia delle sentenze giudiziarie che prevedono il rimpatrio di minori in altri Stati membri, incontrano difficoltà di ordine pratico, che di fatto ne impediscono l'esecuzione rendendo così vano l'intero procedimento espletato ai sensi del regolamento (CE) n. 2201/2003 — Brussels II.

Allo stesso modo alcuni genitori lamentano la non corretta applicazione da parte delle autorità slovacche competenti della convenzione dell'Aia del 25 ottobre 1980 sugli aspetti civili della sottrazione internazionale dei minori, specificatamente in relazione alla richiesta di condizioni «speciali» non previste dalla convenzione stessa per ordinare il rimpatrio del minore nella sua residenza abituale in un altro Stato membro.

Può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. viene svolto a livello dell'UE un monitoraggio relativo alla corretta applicazione del regolamento (CE) n. 2201/2003 — Brussels II da parte della Slovacchia, ivi compresi i tempi impiegati per il ritorno di minori?
2. È in possesso di statistiche recenti in relazione all'applicazione del regolamento (CE) n. 2201/2003 — Brussels II da parte della Slovacchia, riguardante il ritorno di minori?
3. Quali azioni intende, se del caso, intraprendere al fine di richiamare le autorità slovacche ad applicare correttamente la normativa comunitaria in vigore e velocizzare i tempi relativi al ritorno di minori da quel paese?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(5 novembre 2013)

I casi di sottrazione transfrontaliera di minori da parte di uno dei genitori all'interno dell'Unione europea sono disciplinati dal regolamento (CE) n. 2201/2003 (il regolamento «Bruxelles II bis»), che integra la convenzione dell'Aia del 1980 sugli aspetti civili della sottrazione internazionale dei minori. Il regolamento prevede un procedimento rapido e uniforme grazie al quale il genitore leso nei suoi diritti può ottenere il rientro di un minore che è stato trasferito o trattenuto illecitamente. Per quanto riguarda l'esecuzione, il regolamento permette che le decisioni emanate in uno Stato membro siano eseguite in un altro, in linea con le norme e le procedure nazionali.

La Commissione controlla in vari modi l'applicazione del regolamento da parte degli Stati membri. Al fine di esaminare attentamente le denunce presentate dai cittadini, la Commissione si è informata direttamente presso le autorità slovacche in merito all'applicazione del regolamento in casi specifici. Inoltre, la Commissione collabora con le autorità centrali slovacche designate a norma del regolamento ai fini della sua applicazione e discute il corretto funzionamento dello strumento nel quadro della rete giudiziaria europea in materia civile e commerciale. In caso di violazione del diritto dell'UE, la Commissione farà ricorso alle procedure disponibili a norma del trattato.

La Commissione ha inoltre avviato una revisione del regolamento e adotterà una relazione sul modo in cui è stato applicato in pratica.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010598/13
to the Commission**

Roberta Angelilli (PPE)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: International child abduction — application of EU and international law in Slovakia

The European Parliament Mediator for International Parental Child Abductions is increasingly receiving requests from parents, of various nationalities, relating to cases of child abduction or detention in Slovakia.

Non-Slovak parents complain that they have great difficulty getting the competent Slovak authorities to properly implement Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 — Brussels II and that it takes a very long time to have judgments from other Member States, concerning children of binational couples, recognised and enforced in Slovakia.

The enforcement in Slovakia of judgments ordering the return of children to other Member States often runs into practical difficulties, actually hindering enforcement, thus making the whole procedure followed pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 — Brussels II a waste of time.

Likewise, some parents complain that the competent Slovak authorities do not properly implement the Hague Convention of 25 October 1980 on the civil aspects of international child abduction, specifically with regard to the need for 'special' conditions not provided for by the convention to order the return of the child to their habitual residence in another Member State.

1. Is Slovakia's proper implementation of Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 — Brussels II, including the times taken for children to be returned, being monitored at EU level?
2. Does the Commission have any recent statistics on Slovakia's implementation of Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 — Brussels II, as regards children being returned?
3. If necessary, what action will it take to call on the Slovak authorities to properly implement EC law in force and to speed up the times taken to return children from that country?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(5 November 2013)

Cases of intra-EU cross-border parental child abduction are covered by Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 (the Brussels IIa regulation), which supplements the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction. The regulation provides for an expeditious uniform procedure whereby the left-behind parent can obtain the return of a child who has been wrongfully removed or retained. As regards enforcement, it renders judgments issued in one Member State capable of execution in another, in line with national rules and procedures.

The Commission monitors Member States' implementation of the regulation in various ways. In order to carefully assess citizens' complaints the Commission has enquired directly with the Slovak authorities on the application of the regulation in specific cases. Additionally, the Commission works together with the Slovak central authorities designated under the regulation to assist in its application and discusses proper operation of the instrument within the framework of European Judicial Network in Civil and Commercial Matters. Where EC law is breached, the Commission will make use of the procedures available under the Treaty.

Furthermore, the Commission has launched a review of the regulation and will adopt a report on how it has been applied in practice.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-010599/13

alla Commissione

Matteo Salvini (EFD)

(17 settembre 2013)

Oggetto: Richiesta di misure di sostegno nei confronti di 1.400 lavoratori dell'azienda Ilva, «Gruppo Riva», che rischiano di essere licenziati

L'azienda Ilva «Gruppo Riva» è leader nel settore siderurgico; l'attività produttiva del gruppo è principalmente concentrata in acciaio e derivati. Nel 2011 è il primo nel settore in Italia, quarto in Europa e ventitreesimo nel mondo.

Il gruppo Riva, all'indomani del sequestro di beni mobili e immobili e di conti correnti per 916 milioni di euro eseguito dalla Guardia di finanza nell'ambito dell'inchiesta della Procura di Taranto per disastro ambientale, ha deciso di ricorrere alla chiusura immediata di sette stabilimenti e di due società di servizi e trasporti, con la messa in libertà di circa 1.400 addetti. Gli stabilimenti interessati sono quelli di Verona, Caronno Pertusella (Varese), Lesegno (Cuneo), Malegno, Sellero e Cervenò in provincia di Brescia, Annone Brianza (Lecco) e le società sono Riva Energia e Muzzana Trasporti.

Con la sentenza del gip di Taranto vengono sottratti a Riva Acciaio i cespiti aziendali, tra cui gli stabilimenti produttivi, e vengono sequestrati i saldi attivi di conto corrente attuando di conseguenza il blocco delle attività bancarie e impedendo il normale ciclo dei pagamenti aziendali. Questo provvedimento farà perdere il lavoro a millequattrocento operai delle acciaierie.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

- è a conoscenza di finanziamenti comunitari, diretti o indiretti, erogati a favore di questa multinazionale?
- Per quanto concerne il diritto d'informazione dei lavoratori nelle imprese con più di 50 dipendenti, come intende agire per evitare che gli impiegati di tali imprese si trovino, senza alcun preavviso, improvvisamente disoccupati?
- Intende introdurre, in occasione della prossima programmazione e della revisione del FSE, un Fondo di emergenza destinato a sostenere lavoratori come quelli del «Gruppo Riva»?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione

(6 novembre 2013)

Secondo quanto riportato nel sito web «OpenCoesione» ⁽¹⁾ il Gruppo Riva non ha ricevuto alcun finanziamento, erogato attraverso i fondi strutturali europei in Italia.

La Commissione non è in grado di esprimere una valutazione in merito ai fatti riferiti dall'onorevole parlamentare o di stabilire se un'azienda privata abbia ottemperato alle disposizioni nazionali di recepimento delle direttive dell'UE. Spetta alle autorità nazionali competenti, fra cui i tribunali, garantire l'applicazione corretta ed efficace, da parte del datore di lavoro interessato, della normativa nazionale di recepimento delle direttive dell'UE, tenendo conto delle circostanze specifiche di ciascun caso.

Il FSE mira a migliorare le possibilità di occupazione, a promuovere l'istruzione e l'apprendimento permanente nonché ad elaborare politiche di inclusione attiva a norma dell'articolo 162 del trattato. Di per sé il Fondo non fornisce sostegno di emergenza ai lavoratori, quali gli addetti del Gruppo Riva. Questi ultimi possono tuttavia beneficiare delle attività cofinanziate dal FSE e, se sono soddisfatte le condizioni necessarie, dal Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.opencoesione.gov.it/>.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010599/13
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(17 September 2013)

Subject: Request for measures to support 1 400 workers facing dismissal at Gruppo Riva's Ilva firm

Gruppo Riva's Ilva firm is a leader in the steel industry, with the group concentrating its production on steel and steel derivatives. In 2011, it was the leading steel company in Italy, the fourth largest in Europe and the twenty-third largest in the world.

The day after Italy's finance police seized tangible and intangible assets and bank accounts amounting to EUR 916 million as part of the investigation conducted by the Public Prosecutor's Office of Taranto into environmental disaster, Gruppo Riva decided to close with immediate effect 7 plants and 2 services and transport companies, with the dismissal of around 1 400 workers. The plants affected are those in Verona, Caronno Pertusella (Varese), Lesegno (Cuneo), Malegno, Sellero and Cervo in the province of Brescia, Annone Brianza (Lecco), and the companies are Riva Energia and Muzzana Trasporti.

The ruling of Taranto's investigating magistrate has deprived Riva Acciaio of its company assets, including its production plants, and seized its bank account balances, consequently blocking banking activities and preventing the normal cycle of company payments. This measure will cost 1 400 steelworkers their jobs.

— Is the Commission aware of direct or indirect EU funding which has been granted to this multinational?

— With regard to the right to information enjoyed by workers in businesses with more than 50 employees, what action does it intend to take to prevent employees of such businesses suddenly finding themselves unemployed, without being given any notice?

— Does it envisage introducing an emergency fund to support workers such as those employed by Gruppo Riva during the next programming period and ESF review?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(6 November 2013)

According to the 'Open Cohesion' website⁽¹⁾, Gruppo Riva has not received any funding from the European structural funds in Italy.

The Commission is not in a position to assess the facts referred to by the Honourable Member or state whether a private company has complied with national provisions implementing EU directives. It is for the competent national authorities, including the courts, to ensure that the national legislation transposing EU Directives is correctly and effectively applied by the employer concerned, having regard to the specific circumstances of the case.

The aim of the ESF is to improve employment opportunities, promote education and life-long learning, and develop active inclusion policies in accordance with Article 162 of the Treaty. As such, it does not provide emergency support to workers such as those employed by Gruppo Riva. However, the workers concerned may benefit from the activities co-financed by the ESF and, if the necessary conditions are met, from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.opencoesione.gov.it/>

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-010600/13

aan de Commissie

Ivo Belet (PPE)

(17 september 2013)

Betreft: Gemeenschappelijke aanpak drugshandel

In haar antwoord op vraag E-008717/2013 merkt de Commissie op dat het Nederlandse gedoogbeleid ten aanzien van coffeeshops verband houdt met het beginsel van opportuniteit van vervolging, dat buiten het toepassingsgebied van het kaderbesluit valt.

Overweegt de EC het beginsel van opportuniteit van vervolging van verkoop van drugs mee te nemen in de toekomstige discussies over de prioriteiten van de EU-drugsstrategie?

Of meent de EC dat dit element geen deel uitmaakt van een coherent Europees drugsbeleid?

Meent de EC dat de verhuizing van Nederlandse coffeeshops vanuit het centrum van Maastricht naar de grens met België in overeenstemming is met het verminderen van de grensoverschrijdende handel en van het faciliteren van activiteiten die dit op het oog hebben (zoals opgenomen in de prioriteiten in de aanbeveling van de Raad over de EU-drugsstrategie 2013-2020)?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie

(7 november 2013)

De drugsstrategie van de EU (2013-2020) ⁽¹⁾, die in december 2012 door de Raad Justitie en Binnenlandse Zaken is goedgekeurd, omvat het overkoepelend beleidskader en de prioriteiten voor het drugsbeleid van de EU.

In overeenstemming met het algemene kader van de drugsstrategie van de EU maken de lidstaten op nationaal niveau de keuzes die het best bij hun sociale, economische en culturele context passen. De lidstaten mogen dus zelf beslissen hoe zij omgaan met de zogenaamde coffeeshops.

De drugsstrategie van de EU schrijft echter voor dat de lidstaten en de Europese instellingen samenwerken om synergie, communicatie en een doeltreffende uitwisseling van informatie over ontwikkelingen in het drugsbeleid te verzekeren, in overeenstemming met het beginsel van „loyale samenwerking”.

⁽¹⁾ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/nl/12/st17/st17547.nl12.pdf>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010600/13
to the Commission**

Ivo Belet (PPE)
(17 September 2013)

Subject: Common approach to tackling drugs trafficking

In its response to Question E-008717/2013, the Commission notes that the Netherlands' policy of tolerance towards coffee shops relates to the principle of discretionary proceedings, which is outside the scope of application of the framework Decision.

Is the Commission considering including the principle of discretionary proceedings in relation to the sale of drugs in future discussions about the EU Drugs Strategy's priorities?

Or does the Commission believe that this aspect is not part of a coherent European drugs policy?

Does the Commission believe that relocating coffee shops from the centre of Maastricht to close to the Belgian border is consistent with reducing cross-border trafficking and facilitating activities targeting this (as specified in the priorities featuring in the Council's recommendation on the EU Drugs Strategy 2013-2020)?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2013)

The EU Drugs Strategy (2013-2020) ⁽¹⁾, which was adopted by the Justice and Home Affairs Council in December 2012, provides the overarching political framework and sets the main priorities for EU drugs policy.

In line with the general framework provided by the EU Drugs Strategy, Member States make, at national level, the choices that suit best their social, economic and cultural context. It is, therefore, within Member States' discretion to decide on their approach as regards the so-called coffee shops.

However, the EU Drugs Strategy requires the Member States and the EU institutions to cooperate to ensure synergies, communication and an effective exchange of information regarding developments in drugs policy, in line with the principle of 'sincere cooperation'.

⁽¹⁾ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st17/st17547.en12.pdf>

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-010601/13
a la Comisión**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(17 de septiembre de 2013)

Asunto: Inseguridad jurídica para los investigadores catalanes

Un investigador del Institut Català de Recerca de l'Aigua (ICRA ⁽¹⁾), con sede en Cataluña, solicitó en 2011, para el proyecto de cooperación Greentech, 140 000 euros en la convocatoria europea (7FP) ERA-NET New Indigo-DST (Programa Nacional de Internacionalización de la I+D, modalidad de Proyectos de Investigación Multilaterales) junto con otros participantes: Ciemat PSA (España); Universidad de Amberes (Bélgica); Universidad de Jadavpur (India); TERI (India). Tan solo nueve de las veintiuna propuestas presentadas fueron admitidas en la convocatoria. Al ICRA, coordinador del proyecto, le fueron finalmente concedidos 35 000 euros. El código del proyecto es PRI-Pimnin-2011-1460.

La fecha de inicio del proyecto era el 1 de junio de 2012. El 14 de junio de 2012 el Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad español publicó una resolución provisional positiva de aprobación del proyecto.

El 3 de julio de 2013 el referido investigador catalán recibió un email del Vicedirector Adjunto de Proyectos Internacionales del citado Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad comunicándole que el informe del Ministerio de Hacienda español no respaldaba la participación de organismos de investigación catalanes en el proyecto de referencia. La razón aducida es que el territorio de Cataluña no está cumpliendo con las expectativas de déficit económico fijadas por el Ministerio español en 2012.

Esto constituye una grave e inaceptable discriminación de las autoridades españolas contra los investigadores y organismos de investigación de Cataluña en el marco del programa de la Unión Europea ERA-NET (FP7), en el que las autoridades nacionales y regionales identifican programas de investigación que desean coordinar o iniciar mutuamente.

¿Conoce la Comisión estos hechos?

¿No cree la Comisión que esta actitud del gobierno español atenta contra la seguridad jurídica de los ciudadanos catalanes?

¿No cree la Comisión que esta actitud del gobierno español afecta a la competitividad de los investigadores catalanes?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión

(15 de noviembre de 2013)

La cuestión planteada se refiere a la negativa por parte del Ministerio de Economía español de financiar la participación de un investigador catalán en un proyecto de colaboración, Greentech, presentado en el marco de la convocatoria lanzada por el programa *New Indigo Partnership*.

A este respecto, la Comisión observa que el programa *New Indigo Partnership* tiene por objetivo el apoyo a los proyectos de investigación multilateral y de creación de redes desarrollados entre Europa y la India. En particular, las convocatorias llevadas a cabo dentro del apartado Indigo-DST cubren la colaboración con el Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología de la India.

Conviene subrayar que *New Indigo Partnership* recibe ayuda del 7º PM ERA-NET solo para los costes relacionados con la coordinación de las acciones que se estén realizando, mientras que las convocatorias que *New Indigo* decide a su vez poner en marcha están financiadas exclusivamente por las organizaciones nacionales de los países participantes, de acuerdo con sus propias normas.

En este contexto, la Comisión no está en posición de interferir en las normas de subvencionabilidad y financiación establecidas a escala nacional o regional.

(1) <http://www.icra.cat/index.php?lang=3>

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-010601/13
to the Commission**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: Legal insecurity for Catalan researchers

In 2011 a researcher at the Catalan Institute for Water Research (ICRA) ⁽¹⁾, which is located in Catalonia, applied for EUR 140 000 in funding for a collaborative project, Greentech, under the European FP7 call ERA-NET NEW INDIGO-DST (national research and development internationalisation programme, multilateral research projects option) along with other participants, namely: CIEMAT PSA (Centre for Energy, Environmental and Technological Research — Almería Solar Platform) (Spain); the University of Antwerp (Belgium); Jadavpur University (India); and TERI (The Energy and Resources Institute, India). Only nine of the 21 proposals submitted in this call were granted. The ICRA, which was the coordinator of the project, was granted EUR 35 000. The project code is PRI-PIMNIN-2011-1460.

The start date for the project was 1 June 2012. On 14 June 2012, the Spanish Ministry for Economy and Competitiveness published a positive provisional resolution giving the go-ahead for the project.

On 3 July 2013, however, the Catalan researcher in question received an email from the Deputy Assistant Director-General of International Projects at the Spanish Ministry for Economy and Competitiveness stating that the Spanish Ministry of Finance did not support the participation of Catalan research institutions in the abovementioned project, on the grounds that Catalonia had not met the ministry's economic deficit expectations in 2012.

This constitutes serious and unacceptable discrimination by the Spanish ministries against researchers and research institutions in Catalonia in the context of a European Union ERA-NET scheme (FP7), under which national and regional authorities identify research programmes they wish to coordinate or open up to others.

Is the Commission aware of this situation?

Does it not think that the attitude of the Spanish Government is undermining the legal security of Catalan citizens?

Does it not think that the attitude of the Spanish Government is affecting the competitiveness of Catalan researchers?

Answer given by Ms Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(15 November 2013)

The issue concerns the refusal by the Spanish Ministry for Economy to fund the participation of a Catalan researcher in a collaborative project, Greentech, submitted to a call launched by the New INDIGO Partnership Programme.

In this regard, the Commission observes that the New INDIGO Partnership Programme is established to support Indian-European multilateral research and networking projects. In particular, the calls launched under the INDIGO-DST heading, involve collaboration with the Indian Department for Science and Technology.

It should be underlined that New INDIGO Partnership receives support under the FP7 ERA-NET scheme only to cover costs related to the coordination of the actions being carried out, whereas the calls that New INDIGO decides in turn to launch are exclusively funded by national organisations in participating countries, according to their own rules.

In this context, the Commission is not in a position to interfere with eligibility and funding rules established at national or regional level.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.icra.cat/index.php?lang=3>

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-010602/13
a la Comisión**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(17 de septiembre de 2013)

Asunto: La exención del IVA en la protección de la infancia y la juventud (III)

Con referencia a la pregunta E-005758/2013, de 28 de junio de 2013, sobre la exención del IVA a los comedores escolares, el Sr. Semeta contestó en nombre de la Comisión: «La Comisión ya ha preguntado a las autoridades españolas sobre este asunto. Cuando reciba una respuesta, la Comisión la analizará y decidirá el curso que dará a dicho asunto».

Ya han empezado las clases del nuevo curso escolar 2013-2014. ¿Ha tenido la Comisión respuesta de las autoridades españolas? En caso afirmativo, ¿está satisfecha la Comisión con esta respuesta?

Respuesta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión

(21 de octubre de 2013)

La Comisión recibió la respuesta de las autoridades españolas el 23 de septiembre de 2013 y actualmente la está estudiando.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010602/13
to the Commission**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: VAT exemptions for the protection of children and young people (III)

With reference to Question E-005758/2013 of 28 June 2013, regarding a VAT exemption for school canteens, Mr Šemeta replied on behalf of the Commission: 'The Commission has already questioned the Spanish authorities about this issue. Once a response is received, it will be analysed, and the Commission will decide on the way forward regarding this matter'.

Classes in the new academic year, 2013-2014, have now begun. Has the Commission received a response from the Spanish authorities? If so, is the Commission satisfied with this response?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission

(21 October 2013)

On 23 September 2013, the Commission has received the reply from the Spanish authorities which it is presently examining.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-010604/13
an die Kommission
Birgit Collin-Langen (PPE)
(17. September 2013)

Betrifft: Nachteile für europäische Unternehmen durch deutsches Glücksspielrecht

Freies Unternehmertum ist eines der Kernelemente der EU. Es wird durch die unternehmerische Freiheit (Artikel 16 der Grundrechtecharta), das Eigentumsrecht (Artikel 17 der Grundrechtecharta) und die Freiheit des Binnenmarktes, insbesondere die Dienstleistungs- und Niederlassungsfreiheit (Artikel 49, 56 AEUV), begründet. Auch der Gleichbehandlungsgrundsatz (Artikel 20 der Grundrechtecharta) ist wesentlich für das Unternehmertum in der EU.

Der neue deutsche Glücksspielstaatsvertrag widerspricht diesen Grundprinzipien: Private Spielhallen und staatliche Spielbanken werden dort unterschiedlich behandelt. Dies zwingt mehr als die Hälfte der privat geführten Spielhallen zur Geschäftsaufgabe und verletzt somit ihr Eigentumsrecht und ihre unternehmerische Freiheit. Der Glücksspielstaatsvertrag erschwert es auch europäischen Spielhallenbetreibern, sich in Deutschland niederzulassen; dies stellt eine ernsthafte Beschränkung der Unternehmerfreiheit und der Dienstleistungs- und Niederlassungsfreiheit dar.

1. Werden durch diesen regulatorischen Rahmen in Deutschland europäische Unternehmen diskriminiert?
2. Seit 2008 (IP/08/119) hat sich die GD Binnenmarkt und Dienstleistungen mit den Geschehnissen im deutschen Glücksspielrecht beschäftigt, und europäische Unternehmen werden in Deutschland mit einer rechtlichen Unsicherheit konfrontiert. Wie beurteilt die GD Unternehmen und Industrie die Situation? Beabsichtigt sie, gegebenenfalls dagegen vorzugehen?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(13. November 2013)

1. Die Kommission erinnert daran, dass es den Mitgliedstaaten obliegt, die Organisation und Kontrolle ihres Glücksspielmarktes sowie die Durchführung von Glücksspielen im Einklang mit der einschlägigen Rechtsprechung des EuGH zu regeln. Dabei sind die Wett- und Glücksspielkonzessionen erteilenden Behörden verpflichtet, die grundlegenden Bestimmungen der Verträge, die Grundsätze der Gleichbehandlung und der Nichtdiskriminierung aufgrund der Staatsangehörigkeit und das daraus folgende Transparenzgebot einzuhalten.

Der geänderte Staatsvertrag zum Glücksspielwesen in Deutschland trat im Juli 2012 in Kraft. Die neuen Bestimmungen werden von den deutschen Behörden derzeit umgesetzt. Um die Einhaltung des EU-Rechts zu gewährleisten, verfolgt die Kommission diesen Umsetzungsprozess im Austausch mit den deutschen Behörden auch in Bezug auf die Regulierung der herkömmlichen Spielkasinos und Spielhallen. Diese Dienstleistungen sind allerdings nur teilweise im Staatsvertrag und mehrheitlich im Länderrecht geregelt, das sich teilweise ebenfalls im Änderungsverfahren befindet. Die Kommission wird dafür sorgen, dass auch diese Gesetze im Einklang mit den EU-Vorschriften stehen.

2. Die Mitgliedstaaten teilen der Kommission Gesetzesentwürfe mit technischen Vorschriften, einschließlich Vorschriften betreffend Dienste, im Einklang mit der Richtlinie 98/34/EG⁽¹⁾ mit. Im Rahmen dieses Verfahrens, das einen vorbeugenden Kontrollmechanismus darstellt, treten die Kommission und die Behörden der Mitgliedstaaten in einen Dialog, um zu gewährleisten, dass die notifizierten Entwürfe technischer Vorschriften den Anforderungen des Binnenmarktes gemäß den Auslegungen des Gerichtshofs entsprechen. Falls die Bewertung der in Deutschland auf Bundes- oder Landesebene erlassenen spezifischen Rechtsvorschriften ergibt, dass diese den in Artikel 34 AEUV festgeschriebenen freien Warenverkehr nicht gewährleisten, kann die Kommission weitere Maßnahmen in Betracht ziehen.

⁽¹⁾ Richtlinie 98/34/EG über ein Informationsverfahren auf dem Gebiet der Normen und technischen Vorschriften und der Vorschriften für die Dienste der Informationsgesellschaft.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010604/13
to the Commission**

Birgit Collin-Langen (PPE)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: Disadvantages for European undertakings as a result of German gambling law

Free enterprise is one of the core elements of the EU. It is based on the freedom to conduct a business (Article 16 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights), the right to property (Article 17 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights) and the freedom of the internal market, in particular the right of establishment and the freedom to provide services (Articles 49 and 56 TFEU). The principle of equality (Article 20 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights) is also essential for enterprise within the EU.

The new German State Treaty on Gambling contradicts these fundamental principles: private and state-owned casinos are treated differently there. This forces more than half of the privately run casinos out of business, and thus violates their right to property and freedom to conduct a business. The State Treaty on Gambling also makes it more difficult for European casino operators to establish themselves in Germany, which constitutes a serious restriction of the right to conduct a business, the right of establishment and the freedom to provide services.

1. Does this regulatory framework in Germany discriminate against European undertakings?
2. The Directorate General for Internal Market and Services has been dealing with the events in German gambling law since 2008 (IP/08/119), and European undertakings are faced with legal uncertainty in Germany. How does the Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry view this situation? Does it intend to take action to tackle this, where appropriate?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(13 November 2013)

1. The Commission would like to recall that it is for the Member States, in accordance with the relevant case-law of the CJEU, to determine the organisation and control of the gambling offer and how gambling is carried out. However, authorities granting betting and gaming licences have a duty to comply with the fundamental rules of the Treaties, the principles of equal treatment and of non-discrimination on grounds of nationality and the consequent obligation of transparency.

The revised German State Treaty on Gambling entered into force in July 2012 and the German authorities are currently implementing the new provisions. The Commission follows closely the implementation process, in a dialogue with the German authorities, in order to ensure compliance with EU rules. This includes regulation of land-based casinos and gambling halls. However, these services are only partly regulated in the State Treaty and mainly in specific legislation at federal and regional level; partly also under review. The Commission will equally ensure that these laws comply with EU rules.

2. Member States notify to the Commission draft legislation which contains technical regulations, including rules on services, in accordance with Directive 98/34/EC⁽¹⁾. This procedure, a preventive control mechanism, allows the Commission and the authorities of Member States to enter into a dialogue that aims to ensure the compliance of notified draft technical rules with Internal Market law, as construed by the Court of Justice. Moreover, the Commission might consider further action if the assessment of the specific legislation adopted at federal and regional level in Germany lead to the conclusion that it unduly restricts the free movement of goods laid down in Art. 34 TFEU.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 98/34/EC laying down a procedure for the provision of information in the field of technical standards and regulations and of rules on Information Society services.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-010606/13
an die Kommission
Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL) und Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(17. September 2013)

Betrifft: Personaleinsparungen im öffentlichen Dienst Griechenlands als Konsequenz der europäischen Sparpolitik

In den letzten Monaten häuften sich die Beschwerden griechischer Staatsbürger in Deutschland anlässlich des Vorgehens beim griechischen Generalkonsulat in Düsseldorf. Die Beantragung eines Reisepasses dauert derzeit mindestens drei Monate, die Beantragung anderer Unterlagen wie Geburtsurkunden oder Heiratsurkunden mehrere Monate. Die Mitarbeiter des Generalkonsulats sind telefonisch derzeit überhaupt nicht mehr erreichbar. Diese Verzögerungen beeinträchtigen das Alltagsleben der griechischen Migranten in erheblichem Maße.

Mehrere Gespräche mit Vertretern des griechischen Konsulats führten nicht zu Verbesserungen. Die Angestellten führten an, dass sie aufgrund der Sparmaßnahmen der griechischen Regierung kaum in der Lage sind, die aufkommenden Aufgaben zu bewältigen. Es handelt sich hierbei um reale Folgen aus der Troika-Politik.

1. Wie bewertet die Kommission die Personaleinsparungen im öffentlichen Dienst, die die EU von Griechenland eingefordert hat und die eine direkte Auswirkung auf die griechischen Staatsbürger haben, die in anderen EU-Ländern leben?
2. Ist sich die Kommission dieser Art der Folgen der rigiden Sparpolitik in den krisengeschüttelten EU-Mitgliedstaaten bewusst?
3. Wie können nach Ansicht der Kommission die notwendigen Dienstleistungen für die griechischen Bürger trotz der Sparmaßnahmen aufrechterhalten werden?
4. Erwägt die Kommission Maßnahmen einzuleiten, um notwendige Dienstleistungen für EU-Bürger trotz der Sparmaßnahmen aufrechtzuerhalten?

Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission
(26. November 2013)

Die im Rahmen des zweiten Anpassungsprogramms durchgeführte Reform der griechischen öffentlichen Verwaltung zielt auf die Schaffung einer modernen und transparenten öffentlichen Verwaltung ab, die den Bedürfnissen der griechischen Bürger und Unternehmen effizient und wirksam gerecht wird. Vor der Krise war der öffentliche Sektor in Griechenland äußerst ineffizient, belastete die öffentlichen Finanzen und die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und erbrachte keine angemessenen Dienstleistungen. Diese Situation war eindeutig nicht tragbar und erforderte ehrgeizige Reformanstrengungen.

Eine beträchtliche Verschlankung der öffentlichen Verwaltung war zwar unvermeidlich, da das Land sich seinen überdimensionierten öffentlichen Sektor nicht leisten konnte, doch möchte die Kommission hervorheben, dass die Reformbemühungen ehrgeiziger sind und sehr viel mehr umfassen als lediglich einen Personalabbau. Im Rahmen des Programms werden Maßnahmen ergriffen, um den öffentlichen Sektor und dessen Verfahren zu modernisieren, den Verwaltungsaufwand zu verringern und die Qualität der Dienstleistungen zu steigern.

Besonderes Augenmerk wird darauf gelegt, dass geeignete Beamte eingestellt werden, ihre Leistung ordnungsgemäß bewertet wird und sie dort eingesetzt werden, wo man sie wirklich benötigt, damit die Qualität der Dienstleistungen für die griechischen Bürger nicht nur aufrechterhalten, sondern auch verbessert wird.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-010606/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL) και Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(17 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Μειώσεις προσωπικού στον δημόσιο τομέα της Ελλάδας ως συνέπεια της ευρωπαϊκής πολιτικής λιτότητας

Κατά τους τελευταίους μήνες πολλαπλασιάστηκαν οι καταγγελίες ελλήνων πολιτών στην Γερμανία λόγω των διαδικασιών που εφαρμόζει το ελληνικό γενικό προξενείο στο Ντύσελντορφ. Για τη χορήγηση διαβατηρίου απαιτούνται τουλάχιστον τρεις μήνες, ενώ η χορήγηση άλλων πιστοποιητικών, όπως πιστοποιητικό γέννησης ή γάμου διαρκεί περισσότερους μήνες. Επί του παρόντος δεν είναι δυνατόν να έρθει κανείς σε επαφή τηλεφωνικά με τους εργαζόμενους στο γενικό προξενείο. Οι καθυστερήσεις αυτές επηρεάζουν σε σημαντικό βαθμό την καθημερινή ζωή των ελλήνων μεταναστών.

Πολυάριθμες συζητήσεις με εκπροσώπους του ελληνικού προξενείου δεν οδήγησαν σε βελτίωση της κατάστασης. Οι εργαζόμενοι ισχυρίστηκαν ότι, λόγω των μέτρων λιτότητας της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης, δεν είναι πλέον σε θέση να ανταποκριθούν στα τρέχοντα καθήκοντά τους. Πρόκειται στο θέμα αυτό για πραγματικές επιπτώσεις από την πολιτική της τρόικα.

1. Πώς αξιολογεί η Επιτροπή τις μειώσεις προσωπικού στον δημόσιο τομέα που έχει ζητήσει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση από την Ελλάδα και οι οποίες έχουν άμεση επίπτωση στους Έλληνες πολίτες που διαβιούν σε άλλες χώρες της ΕΕ;
2. Γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή τις εν λόγω επιπτώσεις από την άκαμπτη πολιτική λιτότητας στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ που έχουν πληγεί από την κρίση;
3. Πώς είναι δυνατό σύμφωνα με την άποψη της Επιτροπής να συνεχισθούν, παρά τα μέτρα λιτότητας, οι παροχές των απαραίτητων υπηρεσιών προς τους Έλληνες πολίτες;
4. Προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να λάβει μέτρα ώστε να συνεχισθούν, παρά τα υφιστάμενα μέτρα λιτότητας, οι απαραίτητες παροχές υπηρεσιών προς τους πολίτες της ΕΕ;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(26 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Στόχος της μεταρρύθμισης της ελληνικής δημόσιας διοίκησης, η οποία εφαρμόζεται στο πλαίσιο του 2ου προγράμματος προσαρμογής είναι ακριβώς να δημιουργήσει μια σύγχρονη και διαφανή δημόσια διοίκηση, που να εξυπηρετεί αποτελεσματικά και αποδοτικά τους Έλληνες πολίτες και τις επιχειρήσεις. Ο ιδιαίτερα αποτελεσματικός δημόσιος τομέας πριν από την κρίση συνιστούσε βάρος για τα δημόσια οικονομικά της χώρας και την ανταγωνιστικότητα, και δεν μπόρεσε να παράσχει ικανοποιητικές δημόσιες υπηρεσίες. Αυτό συνιστούσε μία σαφώς μη βιώσιμη τάξη πραγμάτων και απαιτούσε φιλόδοξες μεταρρυθμιστικές προσπάθειες.

Ενώ μια σημαντική συρρίκνωση της δημόσιας διοίκησης ήταν αναπόφευκτη, δεδομένου ότι η χώρα δεν μπορούσε να ανθέξει τον υπερτροφικό δημόσιο τομέα, η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε να τονίσει ότι οι μεταρρυθμιστικές προσπάθειες είναι πολύ πιο ολοκληρωμένες και φιλόδοξες από μια απλή μείωση του προσωπικού. Στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος, λαμβάνονται μέτρα για τον εκσυγχρονισμό του δημόσιου τομέα και των διαδικασιών του, τη μείωση του διοικητικού φόρτου και την αναβάθμιση των υπηρεσιών του δημοσίου τομέα.

Ιδιαίτερη προσοχή καταβάλλεται ώστε να εξασφαλιστεί η βελτίωση της ποιότητας των προσλαμβανόμενων δημοσίων υπαλλήλων, η σωστή αξιολόγηση των επιδόσεών τους και η διαθεσιμότητά τους εκεί όπου πραγματικά χρειάζονται, με στόχο όχι μόνο να διατηρηθεί, αλλά να βελτιωθεί η ποιότητα των παρεχόμενων υπηρεσιών στους Έλληνες πολίτες.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010606/13
to the Commission
Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL) and Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(17 September 2013)

Subject: Public service staff reductions by Greece as a consequence of European austerity policy

In recent months, there have been numerous complaints from Greek citizens in Germany in connection with procedures at the Greek Consulate General in Düsseldorf. The process of applying for a passport currently takes at least three months, and requests for other documents, such as birth or marriage certificates, also take several months. It is currently impossible to reach the staff of the Consulate General by telephone. These delays have a considerable detrimental impact on the day-to-day lives of Greek migrants.

Several talks with representatives of the Greek Consulate have failed to result in any improvements. The employees stated that, on account of the austerity measures taken by the Greek Government, they are barely able to cope with the work that comes in. These are the real-life consequences of the Troika policy.

1. What is the Commission's view of the reduction in public service staff that the EU has required Greece to make, and which is having a direct effect on Greek citizens living in other EU countries?
2. Is it aware of these sorts of consequences of the rigid austerity policy in the crisis-stricken EU Member States?
3. In its opinion, how can the essential services for Greek citizens be maintained despite the austerity measures?
4. Is it considering taking measures in order to maintain essential services for EU citizens despite the austerity measures?

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

The objective of the reform of the Greek public administration which is being implemented in the context of the 2nd adjustment programme is precisely to create a modern and transparent public administration, which serves efficiently and effectively the Greek citizens and businesses. The highly inefficient public sector prior to the crisis was a burden for the country's public finances and competitiveness and failed to provide adequate public services. This was clearly unsustainable and required ambitious reform efforts.

While a significant downsizing of the public administration was unavoidable as the country could not afford its oversized public sector, the Commission would like to highlight that reform efforts are much more comprehensive and ambitious than a simple reduction of staff. In the context of the programme, measures are being taken to modernise the public sector and its procedures, reducing administrative burden and increasing the quality of public sector services.

Close attention is being paid in particular to ensuring that better civil servants are hired, that their performance is properly evaluated, and that they are available where they are really needed, with the aim to not only maintain but actually improve the quality of services to Greek citizens.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-010607/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(17 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Εγκατάσταση φωτοβολταϊκών συστημάτων και συστημάτων «Net Metering»

Η αξιοποίηση φωτοβολταϊκών συστημάτων για παραγωγή ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας στην Κύπρο αντιμετωπίζει σημαντικές δυσκολίες για διάφορους, διοικητικούς, αλλά και καθαρά οικονομικούς λόγους. Παρόλο που η υψηλή ηλιοφάνεια της χώρας προσφέρει τις συνθήκες για προώθηση της πράσινης ενέργειας, το σχετικό πρόγραμμα δεν φαίνεται να σημειώνει ικανοποιητική πρόοδο.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Μέσα στα πλαίσια της ενεργειακής πολιτικής της ΕΕ, θεωρεί η Επιτροπή ότι η εγκατάσταση φωτοβολταϊκών συστημάτων σε ευρεία κλίμακα θα είναι θετική και επιθυμητή;
2. Μπορεί η Επιτροπή να παράσχει την αναγκαία τεχνική και οικονομική βοήθεια για εγκατάσταση σε νοικοκυριά και επιχειρήσεις του συστήματος «net metering»;
3. Λόγω και της επικρατούσας κακής οικονομικής κατάστασης στην Κύπρο, μπορεί η Επιτροπή να με πληροφορήσει εάν υπάρχουν ειδικά ευρωπαϊκά προγράμματα και πηγές χρηματοδότησης, από τις οποίες θα μπορούσαν να επωφεληθούν τα κυπριακά νοικοκυριά και οι επιχειρήσεις, με στόχο την εγκατάσταση φωτοβολταϊκών συστημάτων παραγωγής ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας και συστημάτων «net metering»;

Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(8 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

1. Η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει θερμά την ανάπτυξη των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας. Με την οδηγία για τις ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας (οδηγία 2009/28/EK) τέθηκε στόχος της ΕΕ για μερίδιο των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας ύψους 20% για το 2020, ο οποίος επιμερίζεται μεταξύ των κρατών μελών με τη μορφή εθνικών δεσμευτικών στόχων. Η Κύπρος έχει δεσμευθεί για την επίτευξη στόχου 13% ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας επί της τελικής κατανάλωσης ενέργειας έως το 2020. Το 2011, το μερίδιο της κατανάλωσης ενέργειας από ανανεώσιμες πηγές στην Κύπρο ήταν 5,4%, που είναι υψηλότερο από τον ενδιάμεσο στόχο της για την περίοδο 2011/2012 (4,8%). Αυτό δείχνει ότι η Κύπρος βρίσκεται σε τροχιά επίτευξης του στόχου της για το 2020. Ωστόσο, η εφαρμογή της οδηγίας, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της επιλογής των τεχνολογιών ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας και του σχεδιασμού καθεστώτων στήριξης, εμπίπτει στην αρμοδιότητα των κρατών μελών.

2. και 3. Δεδομένου ότι η υλοποίηση της οδηγίας για τις ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας εμπίπτει στην αρμοδιότητα των κρατών μελών, δεν υπάρχουν μηχανισμοί υποστήριξης για την ανάπτυξη τεχνολογιών ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας, όπως τα φωτοβολταϊκά συστήματα ή η καταμέτρηση καθαρής ενέργειας που διατίθενται σε επίπεδο ΕΕ. Εντούτοις, υπάρχει διαθέσιμη οικονομική στήριξη με διάφορα προγράμματα και μέσα της ΕΕ με στόχο την παροχή συνδρομής στα κράτη μέλη για την εφαρμογή της πολιτικής της ΕΕ για τις ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας και την έναρξη συναφών επενδύσεων. Για παράδειγμα, βάσει του επιχειρησιακού προγράμματος της ΕΕ στο πλαίσιο των Διαρθρωτικών Ταμείων για την περίοδο 2007-2013 (με τίτλο «Βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη και ανταγωνιστικότητα»), αποφασίστηκε η συγχρηματοδότηση της εγκατάστασης φωτοβολταϊκών συστημάτων σε δημόσια κτίρια, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του Προεδρικού Μεγάρου, σχολικών κτιρίων, στρατοπέδων και υπουργείων στην Κύπρο. Επιπλέον, μπορεί να υπάρξει πρόσβαση στη διευκόλυνση ELENA για την παροχή επιχορηγήσεων τεχνικής βοήθειας (έως και 90% των επιλέξιμων δαπανών) σε τοπικές και περιφερειακές αρχές για την ανάπτυξη και την έναρξη επενδύσεων για βιώσιμη ενέργεια στο έδαφός τους.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010607/13
to the Commission**

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: Installation of photovoltaic systems and net metering systems

The use of photovoltaic systems for electricity production in Cyprus has come up against considerable difficulties for various administrative and purely financial reasons. Although the long hours of sunshine in Cyprus provide the conditions needed for promoting green energy, this programme does not appear to be making satisfactory progress.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does the Commission think, within the context of EU energy policy, that the installation of photovoltaic systems on a broad scale would be a positive and welcome move?
2. Can the Commission provide the technical and financial assistance needed in order to install net metering systems in households and businesses?
3. Given the prevailing economic situation in Cyprus, can the Commission tell me if there are special European programmes and funds which Cypriot households and businesses could take advantage of in order to install photovoltaic systems for electricity production and net metering systems?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission

(8 November 2013)

1. The Commission strongly supports the development of renewable energy sources. The Renewable Energy Directive (Directive 2009/28/EC) has established an EU 20% renewable energy target for 2020 which is shared between Member States in the form of binding national targets. Cyprus has committed to reach a target of 13% renewable energy in final energy consumption by 2020. In 2011, the share of renewable energy consumption in Cyprus was 5.4%, which is higher than its 2011/2012 interim target (4.8%). This shows that Cyprus is currently on track to meet its 2020 target. The implementation of the directive including the choice of renewable energy technologies and the design of support schemes, however, is the responsibility of the Member States.

2 and 3. As the implementation of the Renewable Energy Directive falls under the responsibility of the Member States, there are no support mechanisms for the deployment of renewable energy technologies like photovoltaic systems or net metering available at the EU level. However, financial support is available through various EU programmes and instruments aimed at assisting Member States in their implementation of the EU renewable energy policy and initiating associated investments. For instance, under the EU Structural Funds Operational Programme for 2007-2013 (titled 'Sustainable development and Competitiveness'), it was decided to co-finance the installation of photovoltaic systems in public buildings, including the Presidential Palace, school buildings, army camps and Ministries in Cyprus. Furthermore, the ELENA Facility could be accessed to provide technical assistance grants (of up to 90% of eligible costs) to local and regional authorities for development and launch of sustainable energy investments over their territories.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-010608/13
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(17 september 2013)

Angående: Förordningen om den digitala inre marknaden: var är konsekvensbedömningen?

Kommissionen lade nyligen fram ett förslag till förordning om åtgärder för att fullborda den europeiska inre marknaden för elektronisk kommunikation och upprätta en uppkopplad kontinent (KOM(2013)0627). Parlamentet har endast fått en sammanfattning av konsekvensbedömningen, inte den fullständiga bedömningen.

Fanns en fullständig konsekvensbedömning någonstans att få den 12 september 2013? Om så var fallet, varför hade den då inte översänts till parlamentet?

Svar från Neelie Kroes på kommissionens vägnar
(31 oktober 2013)

Den 11 september 2013 överlämnades till Europaparlamentet en fullständig konsekvensbedömning i anslutning till förslaget till Europaparlamentets och rådets förordning om åtgärder för att fullborda den europeiska inre marknaden för elektronisk kommunikation och upprätta en uppkopplad kontinent. Den dagen sände Europeiska kommissionens generalsekretariat en skrivelse (referens "SG-Greffe (2013) D/13984") till Francesca Ratti, biträdande generalsekreterare för Europaparlamentet, med förslaget (KOM(2013) 627 final – 2013/0309 (COD)) tillsammans med den fullständiga konsekvensbedömningen (SWD(2013) 331 final) och dess sammanfattning (SWD(2013) 332 final) som åtföljer förslaget.

Den fullständiga konsekvensbedömningen är också tillgänglig på EUR-Lex
(<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SWD:2013:0331:FIN:EN:PDF>),

på IPEX, systemet för informationsutbyte mellan parlamenten
(<http://www.ipex.eu/IPEXL-WEB/dossier/document/SWD20130331.do>),

på Europeiska kommissionens webbplats för konsekvensbedömningar
(http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/cia_2013_en.htm#cnect)

och på webbplatsen för en digital agenda för Europa
(<http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/impact-assessment-connected-continent>).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010608/13
to the Commission**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: Digital Single Market Regulation: where is the impact assessment?

The Commission recently proposed a 'regulation laying down measures concerning the European single market for electronic communications and to achieve a Connected Continent' (COM(2013)0627). Parliament has only been given an executive summary of the impact assessment, but has not been provided with a full impact assessment.

Was a full impact assessment available anywhere on 12 September 2013? If so, why was it not transmitted to Parliament?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission

(31 October 2013)

On 11 September 2013, the full Impact assessment accompanying the Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down measures concerning the European single market for electronic communications and to achieve a Connected Continent was transmitted to the European Parliament. That day, the Secretariat-General of the European Commission sent a letter (reference 'SG-Greffe(2013) D/13984') to Ms Francesca Ratti, Deputy Secretary-General of the European Parliament, transmitting the proposal (COM(2013) 627 final — 2013/0309(COD)) together with the full impact assessment accompanying the proposal (SWD(2013) 331 final) and its summary (SWD(2013) 332 final).

The full impact assessment is also available on Eur-Lex

(<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SWD:2013:0331:FIN:EN:PDF>),

on IPEX, the platform for EU Interparliamentary Exchange

(<http://www.ipex.eu/IPEXL-WEB/dossier/document/SWD20130331.do>),

on the impact assessment website of the European Commission

(http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/cia_2013_en.htm#cnect)

and on the website of the Digital Agenda for Europe

(<http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/impact-assessment-connected-continent>).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010609/13
to the Commission**

Catherine Stihler (S&D)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: Test-Achat Case

Can the Commission provide me with statistics indicating the impact on insurance premiums following the European Court of Justice ruling in the Test-Achat case, as well as details of how the implementation of this ruling has been monitored?

Can the Commission also confirm whether there is evidence of any inadvertent discrimination as a result of the ruling?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(11 November 2013)

In its ruling in Case C-236/09 (Test-Achats), which was delivered on 1 March 2011, the Court of Justice of the European Union declared Article 5(2) of the directive 2004/113/EC ⁽¹⁾ invalid with effect from 21 December 2012. The Court considered that the possibility for Member States to maintain an exemption from the unisex rule laid down in Article 5(1), Article 5(2) without temporal limitation runs counter to achievement of the objective of equal treatment between men and women in relation to the calculation of insurance premiums and benefits, and is therefore incompatible with Articles 21 and 23 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

In December 2011, the Commission published guidelines on the implications of the Test-Achats ruling for the application of Directive 2004/113/EC in the insurance sector ⁽²⁾.

The Commission will report in 2014 on the implementation of the directive 2004/113/EC. This report will include as one of its integral elements an analysis of the implementation of the Test-Achats ruling in national law and in insurance practice. The Commission is currently gathering the necessary information to monitor the implementation of the ruling by the Member States and is at this stage not aware of any inadvertent discrimination as a result of the ruling.

In addition, the European Insurance and Occupational Pension Authority (EIOPA) has foreseen in its work programme for 2013 to conduct a survey on the national incorporation of the Test Achats ruling. This survey could also include an analysis of the impact of the ruling on market practice by insurers.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 373 of 21.12.2004, p. 37.

⁽²⁾ OJ C 011 of 13.1.2012, p. 1.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-010610/13
do Komisji**

Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)

(17 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Niewłaściwe wdrażanie dyrektywy w sprawie nieuczciwych praktyk handlowych

Właściwe i zharmonizowane wdrażanie prawodawstwa UE ma kluczowe znaczenie dla prawidłowego funkcjonowania jednolitego rynku. Szczegółowa ocena wdrażania dyrektywy w sprawie nieuczciwych praktyk handlowych (dyrektywa 2005/29/WE) pokazuje jednak, że transpozycja dyrektywy do prawa krajowego w niektórych dziedzinach jest niewłaściwa.

W marcu 2013 r. Komisja przyjęła pierwsze sprawozdanie na temat stosowania dyrektywy 2005/29/WE, w którym przedstawiono proces wdrażania dyrektywy w optymistycznych barwach. W sprawozdaniu tym nie wskazano poważnych naruszeń prawodawstwa UE, a w szczególności niewłaściwego wdrażania załącznika I pkt 14 dotyczącego systemów promocyjnych typu „piramida” i decyzji kilku państw członkowskich o utrzymaniu krajowych bezpośrednich zakazów i ograniczeń sprzedaży, które nie są zgodne z dyrektywą w sprawie nieuczciwych praktyk handlowych.

W świetle powyższego jakie kroki zamierza podjąć Komisja, aby zapewnić właściwe i zharmonizowane wdrażanie tej dyrektywy w całej UE oraz aby przeciwdziałać wyżej wspomnianym naruszeniom?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Viviane Reding w imieniu Komisji

(7 listopada 2013 r.)

Komisja pragnie odesłać do swojej odpowiedzi na zapytanie nr E-002171/2013 udzielonej dnia 25 kwietnia 2013 r.

Ponadto szanowna Pani poseł powinna wiedzieć, że niedawno wszczęto wobec pewnej liczby państw członkowskich postępowania w sprawie uchybienia zobowiązaniom państwa członkowskiego ze względu na nieprawidłową transpozycję dyrektywy 2005/29/WE w sprawie nieuczciwych praktyk handlowych. Niektóre z tych postępowań dotyczyły w szczególności nieprawidłowej transpozycji przepisów punktu nr 14 załącznika I do tej dyrektywy.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010610/13
to the Commission**

Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: Improper implementation of the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive

Correct, harmonised implementation of EU legislation is key to the proper functioning of the single market. A thorough assessment of the implementation of the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive (UCPD) (Directive 2005/29/EC) shows, however, that it has not been properly transposed into national legislation in some areas.

In March 2013 the Commission adopted its 'First Report on the Application of Directive 2005/29/EC', which provided an optimistic picture of the implementation of that directive. However, the report did not point out serious breaches of EU legislation, particularly when it comes to the incorrect implementation of Annex I(14) on pyramid promotional schemes and the decision of several Member States to maintain national direct selling bans and restrictions that are not in line with the UCPD.

In the light of the above, what steps is the Commission going to take to ensure the proper, harmonised implementation of the directive across the EU and to stop the abovementioned breaches?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(7 November 2013)

The Commission would like to refer to its reply to Question E-002171/2013 given on 25 April 2013.

Furthermore, the Honourable Member should be aware that infringement procedures for inadequate transposition of Directive 2005/29/EC on unfair commercial practices have been recently opened against a number of Member States some of which had, in particular, not adequately transposed No 14 of Annex I to Directive.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-010612/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(17 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Παρακολούθηση του δικτύου της Belgacom από την NSA

Σύμφωνα με αναφορές των βελγικών μέσων ενημέρωσης που βασίζονται σε στοιχεία που ήρθαν στο φως εξαιτίας της υπόθεσης Snowden, η Εθνική Υπηρεσία Ασφαλείας των ΗΠΑ (NSA) φέρεται να έχει προβεί σε ηλεκτρονικές παρακολουθήσεις του δικτύου του βελγικού δημόσιου οργανισμού τηλεπικοινωνιών (Belgacom) το 2011.

Οι υποκλοπές είχαν κυρίως στόχο την BICS (Belgacom International Carrier Services) που είναι θυγατρική εταιρία της Belgacom και έχει ως αντικείμενο την διαχείριση των διεθνών τηλεπικοινωνιών. Οι υποκλοπές αφορούσαν τηλεφωνικές συνδιαλέξεις με χώρες όπως η Υεμένη, η Συρία και άλλες που θεωρούνται «ύποπτες» από τις ΗΠΑ.

Σύμφωνα με τις βελγικές υπηρεσίες ασφαλείας, είναι σαφές ότι υπάρχει ανάμειξη της NSA στην υπόθεση μολονότι δεν έχει αποδειχθεί τυπικά κάτι τέτοιο. Σύμφωνα με τις αναφορές, η Πρέσβης των ΗΠΑ στο Βέλγιο ενδέχεται να κληθεί για να δώσει εξηγήσεις ενώ η Belgacom έχει ήδη υποβάλει τα υπάρχοντα στοιχεία στην βελγική ομοσπονδιακή εισαγγελία.

Ο Βέλγος Πρωθυπουργός Elio Di Rupo έχει δηλώσει ότι, εάν επιβεβαιωθούν οι καταγγελίες, τότε θα πρόκειται για υπόθεση ηλεκτρονικής κατασκοπείας την οποία η κυβέρνησή του καταδικάζει αυστηρά ως παρεμβολή και παραβίαση της λειτουργίας ενός δημόσιου φορέα τηλεπικοινωνιών.

1. Έχει υπόψη της η Επιτροπή τις εν λόγω υποκλοπές τηλεφωνικών συνδιαλέξεων και την παραβίαση της ιδιωτικής ζωής που αυτές συνιστούν;
2. Εάν οι καταγγελίες αποδειχθούν βάσιμες, σε ποιες ενέργειες θα προβεί η ΕΕ έναντι της NSA;

Απάντηση της κ. Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον κ. βουλευτή στην απάντησή της στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-009773/2013.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010612/13
to the Commission**

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: NSA monitors Belgacom network

According to reports in the Belgian media based on the revelations of the 'Snowden' case, the US National Security Agency (NSA) allegedly monitored the network of Belgacom (the Belgian public telecommunications company) in 2011.

The intercepts mainly targeted Belgacom's subsidiary BICS (Belgacom International Carrier Services), which is responsible for the management of international telecommunications. They were made on telephone conversations with countries such as Yemen, Syria and others deemed 'suspicious' by the US.

According to the Belgian security authorities, it is clear that the NSA was involved in the case, although the claim has not been formally proven. The reports state that the US Ambassador to Belgium may be asked to explain; meanwhile, Belgacom has already submitted the information available to the Belgian federal prosecutor's office.

The Belgian Prime Minister, Elio Di Rupo, has said that if the allegations are confirmed, then this would indeed be a case of electronic espionage and the government would strongly condemn such interference in, and violation of, the functioning of a public telecommunications company.

1. Is the Commission aware of this interference in, and breach of the privacy of, telephone conversations?
2. If the allegations are confirmed, what action will the EU take against the NSA?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(7 November 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-009773/2013.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010613/13
to the Commission
Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)
(17 September 2013)**

Subject: Turtle doves

Each spring, thousands of migrant birds, including turtle doves, cross Malta on their way to breeding grounds in Europe.

In Malta, although there are laws in place to govern when shooting can be carried out, a huge number of protected birds are believed to be illegally killed. One of the most common birds targeted by hunters is the turtle dove, a species on the verge of extinction in the UK.

Earlier this year, the UK Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) reported that nationally turtle dove numbers had declined by 93% since 1970.

The opening of a spring hunting season in 2013 again disregards the fact that hunting during spring goes against the Commission's own Hunting Guide. Could the Commission confirm what, if any, action is planned to stop the shooting of turtle doves in Malta during their migration?

Furthermore, is the Commission planning to verify the Maltese Government's ability to enforce, properly control, and limit the spring hunting season in accordance with its derogation under the EU Birds Directive?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2013)**

The judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 2009 ⁽¹⁾ left open the possibility of a limited spring hunting derogation of Turtle Dove and Quail under strictly supervised conditions in view of the specific circumstances prevalent in Malta. Malta has over the past few years strengthened and improved the national regulatory framework relating to the spring hunting derogation. The relevant national regulations introduce a number of controls in relation to a spring hunting season, including bag limits and quotas, restrictions pertaining to time and places and a range of reporting requirements. Nevertheless, the Commission is aware of concerns relating to the enforcement of spring hunting regulations, and therefore it is in regular contact with the Maltese authorities with a view to identifying further steps to improve effectiveness of the enforcement regime.

⁽¹⁾ Case C-76/08 Commission v Malta.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-010614/13

a Bizottság számára

Mészáros Alajos (PPE)

(2013. szeptember 17.)

Tárgy: Uniós jogot sértő közigazgatási gyakorlat és bírói értelmezés

Összeegyeztethető-e az uniós joggal egy olyan tagállami jogszabály, amely nyelvtani értelmezés szerint nem sérti az uniós jogot, de az adott tagállam közigazgatási gyakorlata és bírósági értelmezése – különös tekintettel az adott tagállamban végső fokon eljáró bíróságra – uniós jogot sértő helyzeteket eredményez? Megköveteli-e az uniós jog ilyen esetekben, hogy az adott szabályozást megváltoztassák oly módon, hogy a változtatást követően ne fordulhasson elő uniós jogot sértő értelmezés? ⁽¹⁾

José Manuel Barroso válasza a Bizottság nevében

(2013. november 27.)

Az állandó ítélkezési gyakorlat szerint a tagállami bíróságoknak az uniós jog előírásainak megfelelően kell értelmezniük és alkalmazniuk a tagállami jogot. Amennyiben ilyen értelmezésre vagy alkalmazásra nincs lehetőség, a tagállami bíróságoknak el kell tekinteniük a tagállami jog minden olyan rendelkezésének alkalmazásától, amely az uniós jog előírásaival ellentétes (lásd a C-357/06. sz., Frigerio Luigi ügyben hozott ítélet [EBHT 2007., I-12311. o.] 28. és 29. pontját).

Ezen túlmenően, ha maga a tagállami rendelkezés az uniós jog szempontjából semleges, az említett rendelkezés uniós joggal való összeegyeztethetősége annak fényében értékelhető, hogy a tagállami bíróságok miként alkalmazzák és értelmezik azt.

Az Európai Bíróság megállapította továbbá, hogy amennyiben valamely tagállami szabályozással kapcsolatban olyan eltérő bírói értelmezések merülnek fel, amelyek közül egyes értelmezések az említett szabályozásnak az uniós joggal összeegyeztethető alkalmazására, más értelmezések pedig ezzel ellenkező alkalmazásra vezetnének, meg kell állapítani, hogy e szabályozás nem teljesen egyértelmű ahhoz, hogy biztosítsa a szabályozás uniós joggal összeegyeztethető alkalmazását, ezért azt módosítani kell (lásd a C-129/00. sz., Bizottság kontra Olaszország ügyben hozott ítélet [EBHT 2003., I-14637. o.] 29–33. pontját).

A fenti elvek abban az esetben is alkalmazandók, ha az uniós jogot valamely hatóság gyakorlata sérti azáltal, hogy a tagállami rendelkezéseknek az uniós joggal ellentétes értelmezést ad.

⁽¹⁾ Európai Unió Bírósága, C-129/00.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010614/13
to the Commission**

Alajos Mészáros (PPE)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: Public administration practice and judicial interpretation in breach of EC law

Can a law of a Member State which, according to its grammatical interpretation, does not violate EC law but the public administration practice and judicial interpretation of which, in the Member State concerned — with particular reference to the court adjudicating at last instance — results in a situation whereby EC law is violated, be reconciled with EC law? In such cases, does EC law require the legislation in question to be amended in such a way as to prevent any future interpretation being in violation of EC law ⁽¹⁾?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission

(27 November 2013)

According to established case-law, national courts shall interpret and apply national law in conformity with the requirements of EC law. In so far as such an interpretation or application is not possible, national courts must disapply any provision of domestic law which is contrary to the requirements of EC law (see Case C-357/06 *Frigerio Luigi* [2007] ECR I-12311, paragraphs 28 and 29).

Furthermore, if a national provision is in itself neutral in respect of EC law, the question whether such provision is compatible with EC law can be assessed in the light of the application made and the interpretation given to them by national courts.

Moreover, the European Court of Justice established that where national legislation has been the subject of different relevant judicial constructions, some leading to the application of that legislation in compliance with EC law, others leading to the opposite application, it must be held that such legislation is not sufficiently clear to ensure its application in compliance with EC law and should therefore be amended (see Case C-129/00, *Commission v Italy*, [2003] ECR I-14637, paragraphs 29 to 33).

The abovementioned principles apply also when a public administration is violating EC law in its practice, by giving an interpretation of national provisions which would be contrary to EC law.

⁽¹⁾ Court of Justice of the European Union, C-129/00.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-010615/13
do Komisji**

Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)

(17 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Cła ochronne na nawozy

Unia Europejska powinna wspierać rodzimy przemysł. Kluczowe jest, aby UE działała szybko i skutecznie przeciwko niesprawiedliwym praktykom dumpingowym lub subsydiom na eksport do UE. Należy zauważyć, że europejskie mechanizmy ochrony są już bardzo liberalne, i należy zapobiegać wszelkim działaniom czy zmianom w prawie, które spowodowałyby nierównowagę na niekorzyść europejskich firm.

Wiele sektorów, włączając w to przemysł nawozowy, jest w sytuacji nieuprzywilejowanej, gdyż musi zmagać się z zawyżonymi cenami gazu, węgla, potasu czy innych surowców. Rozbieżności w cenach tych podstawowych – na przykład dla przemysłu nawozowego – surowców pomiędzy rynkiem europejskim a rynkami głównych partnerów handlowych są niezwykle głębokie. Różnice te są regularnie wykorzystywane, jako praktyka dumpingowa w stosunku do produktów z UE.

W związku z powyższym chciałabym zadać Komisji poniższe pytania:

1. Czy Komisja popiera rezygnację z zasady mniejszego cła? Rezygnacja z tej zasady będzie dowodem, że UE nie akceptuje niesprawiedliwego i nierównego poziomu cen surowców, zwłaszcza jeśli efekt będzie szkodliwy dla europejskiego przemysłu. Dlatego zwracam się do Komisji o ustosunkowanie się do tej kwestii, co szczególnie małym i średnim przedsiębiorstwom ułatwi udział w zamówieniach publicznych. Co ważne, najniższa cena nie będzie już głównym kryterium, dzięki temu wykluczone zostaną propozycje, które są tanie, bo zaniżają jakość lub są nienaturalnie niskie.
2. Jakie środki Komisja już stosuje lub planuje wprowadzić i kiedy, aby zapewnić zasady równego traktowania przedsiębiorców i wyeliminować niesprawiedliwe praktyki dumpingowe?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Karela De Guchta w imieniu Komisji

(6 listopada 2013 r.)

W przypadkach zakłócenia międzynarodowego handlu towarami poprzez nieuczciwą konkurencję, w zakresie, w jakim subsydiowanie lub praktyki dumpingowe wyrządzają szkodę przemysłowi unijnemu, istnieje możliwość wprowadzenia celów wyrównawczych lub antydumpingowych po przeprowadzeniu dochodzenia przez Komisję.

Komisja może rozważyć wszczęcie dochodzenia antydumpingowego lub antysubsydyjnego, jeśli posiada wystarczające dowody *prima facie* świadczące o dumpingu lub subsydiowaniu przywożonych towarów, które to praktyki powodują istotną szkodę dla przemysłu unijnego.

Przemysł unijny może wnieść skargę, a jeśli istnieją wystarczające dowody, Komisja jest prawnie zobowiązana do wszczęcia dochodzenia, o ile spełnione są odpowiednie wymogi prawne Światowej Organizacji Handlu (WTO) i UE.

Należy również przypomnieć, że Komisja wystąpiła z inicjatywą modernizacji stosowanych instrumentów ochrony handlu. Inicjatywa ta pozwoliłaby na znaczne zwiększenie skuteczności tych instrumentów w zakresie przeciwdziałania nieuczciwej konkurencji wynikającej z dumpingu i subsydiowania wywozu. W ramach tej modernizacji Komisja zamierza również ułatwić stosowanie instrumentów ochrony handlu małym i średnim przedsiębiorstwom (MŚP), które dzięki temu będą mogły się bronić przeciwko nieuczciwej konkurencji. Wniosek legislacyjny w tej sprawie jest obecnie rozpatrywany przez Parlament i Radę.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010615/13
to the Commission**

Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)

(17 September 2013)

Subject: Protective tariffs on fertilisers

The EU should support its own industry. It is vital that the EU take swift, effective action against the unfair practices of dumping and subsidising of exports to the EU. It should be noted that European protection mechanisms are extremely liberal, and we should prevent any action or change in the law that would cause an imbalance which puts European businesses at a disadvantage.

Many sectors, including the fertiliser industry, are at a disadvantage as they are struggling with rising prices for gas, carbonates, potassium and other raw materials. There are unusually big differences in the prices of these basic raw materials, for example in the fertiliser industry, on the European market as compared with the markets of Europe's major trade partners. These differences are regularly exploited to practise dumping to the detriment of products from the EU.

1. Does the Commission support abandoning the idea of lowering customs duties? By doing so the EU would signal its refusal to accept unfair, unequal prices for raw materials, particularly where they have an adverse impact on European industry. I therefore call on the Commission to address this issue, in particular so that SMEs will be better able to participate in public procurement procedures. Importantly, lowest price must stop being the main criterion, so that tenders which are low-priced because what they cover is of a lower quality or because artificially low prices are being quoted can be eliminated.

2. What action is the Commission taking or does it plan to take — and when — to ensure that the principle of equal treatment of entrepreneurs is adhered to and eliminate unfair dumping practices?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission

(6 November 2013)

In cases where international trade in manufactured goods is distorted by unfair competition, in so far as countervailing and/or dumping practices cause injury to the Union industry, anti-subsidy and/or anti-dumping duties may be imposed after investigation by the Commission.

The Commission can consider opening an anti-subsidy and/or an anti-dumping investigation when it has sufficient prima facie evidence that dumping or subsidisation takes place and the Union industry is suffering material injury, caused by the dumped or subsidised imports.

EU industry can bring a complaint and if there is sufficient evidence, the Commission is under a legal obligation to initiate an investigation if the relevant World Trade Organisation and EU legal requirements are met.

It should also be recalled that the Commission launched an initiative to modernize its trade defence instruments. This initiative would significantly strengthen the effectiveness of the trade defence instruments to address unfair competition as a result of dumping and subsidisation of exports. As part of this modernisation exercise, the Commission also intends to help small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) have recourse to trade defence instruments, and therefore protect themselves against unfair competition. The legislative proposal is currently before Parliament and the Council.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-010616/13

do Komisji

Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)

(17 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Rozwój polityki azylowej

Europejska Rada ds. Uchodźców i Wypędzonych opublikowała raport dotyczący praktyk w zakresie przyjmowania imigrantów i przyznawania im ochrony międzynarodowej w 14 państwach UE. Dokument pokazuje wciąż istniejące rozbieżności między 14 badanymi państwami członkowskimi. Dzieje się tak mimo ulepszania narodowych polityk azylowych i podpisania przez UE w czerwcu 2013 r. pakietu azylowego. Różnice dotyczą przede wszystkim kwestii proceduralnych, gwarancji dla poszukujących ochrony, dostępu do zakwaterowania oraz zatrudnienia i zasad umieszczania w ośrodkach zamkniętych. Priorytetową sprawą jest zapewnienie cudzoziemcom dostępu do bezpłatnej pomocy prawnej i pełnomocników w ramach procedury azylowej. Niestety, dostępność takich praktyk w opisanych krajach ciągle się zmniejsza. Dodatkowo w niektórych państwach UE (np. Polska, Wielka Brytania) przepisy nie przewidują odpowiedniego czasu na przygotowanie skargi na decyzję odmowną przez osobę ubiegającą się o przyznanie pomocy międzynarodowej. Z tego powodu w praktyce prawo to nie jest przestrzegane. Konkludując, w niektórych krajach cudzoziemcy, którym odmówiono przyznania statusu uchodźcy lub innej formy pomocy są pozbawieni możliwości odwołania się od decyzji sądu. Jest to praktyka niedopuszczalna w państwach europejskich, godząca w podstawowe prawa obywatela i gościa Europy.

Zwracam się z poniższym zapytaniem.

1. Czy Komisja przewiduje zharmonizowanie przepisów państw europejskich dotyczących przyznawania ochrony międzynarodowej?
2. Czy Komisja rozważa powołanie instytucji Rzecznika ds. Cudzoziemców?
3. Co Komisja sądzi o powołaniu wspólnej dla wszystkich państw członkowskich instancji odwoławczej od decyzji odmownych w sprawie przyznania azylu?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Cecilję Malmström w imieniu Komisji

(28 października 2013 r.)

Podjęte właśnie zostały dalsze kroki w celu zharmonizowania przepisów państw członkowskich dotyczących przyznawania ochrony międzynarodowej w drodze przyjęcia tzw. „pakietu azylowego” składającego się z trzech dyrektyw⁽¹⁾ i dwóch rozporządzeń⁽²⁾. Wspomniany pakiet musi jeszcze nabrać pełnego skutku prawnego, gdyż państwa członkowskie mają czas do lipca 2015 r. na wdrożenie większości jego przepisów. W związku z tym Komisja nie zamierza obecnie proponować dalszej harmonizacji.

W chwili obecnej Komisja nie zamierza proponować powołania instytucji Rzecznika ds. Cudzoziemców ani rozważać takiego wniosku.

Jeśli chodzi o powołanie wspólnej dla wszystkich państw członkowskich instancji odwoławczej od decyzji odmownych w sprawie przyznania azylu, niedawne badanie⁽³⁾ przeprowadzone na zlecenie Komisji pokazało, że istnieją pewne przeszkody natury prawnej i praktycznej.

⁽¹⁾ Dyrektywy 2011/95/UE, 2013/32/UE, 2013/33/UE.

⁽²⁾ Rozporządzenia (UE) nr 603/2013 i (UE) nr 604/2013.

⁽³⁾ Studium wykonalności oraz skutków prawnych i praktycznych stworzenia mechanizmu wspólnego rozpatrywania wniosków o azyl na terytorium UE,
http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/asylum/common-procedures/docs/jip_final_report_final_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010616/13
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(17 September 2013)

Subject: Evolution of asylum policy

The European Council on Refugees and Exiles has published a report on practices in the areas of receiving immigrants and granting asylum in 14 EU Member States. The document shows that disparities remain between the 14 Member States studied. This is in spite of advances in national asylum policies and the EU's adoption, in June 2013, of the Asylum Package. The differences mainly concern procedural matters, guarantees for asylum-seekers, access to accommodation and employment, and the rules on holding people in closed detention centres. A priority issue is ensuring that migrants have access to free legal assistance and attorneys during the asylum process. Sadly, such services are constantly being reduced in the Member States studied. Moreover, in some Member States (e.g. Poland and the United Kingdom) there are no legal provisions giving asylum-seekers an appropriate time frame in which to prepare an appeal against a negative decision. This right, therefore, is not respected in practice. In some countries, asylum-seekers who have been refused refugee status or another form of assistance are deprived of the possibility of appealing against the court's decision. This practice, which strikes at the heart of the rights of citizens and guests in Europe, cannot be permitted to occur in European countries.

1. Does the Commission see scope for harmonising EU Member States' laws on the granting of international protection?
2. Is the Commission considering establishing an Ombudsman for Non-EU Nationals?
3. What is the Commission's position on establishing a common EU instance for appeals against negative decisions on the granting of asylum?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(28 October 2013)

Further steps have just been taken to harmonise Member States' laws on the granting of international protection through the adoption of the so-called 'asylum package' consisting of three directives ⁽¹⁾ and two regulations ⁽²⁾. This package has yet to take full legal effect, since Member States have until July 2015 to implement the bulk of its provisions. Accordingly, the Commission currently has no plans for proposing further harmonisation.

Currently, the Commission has no plans to propose the establishment of an Ombudsman for non-EU nationals, or to consider making such a proposal.

As concerns establishing a common EU instance for appeals against negative asylum decisions, a recent study ⁽³⁾ conducted for the Commission, pointed to some legal and practical obstacles.

⁽¹⁾ Directives 2011/95/EU, 2013/32/EU, 2013/33/EU.

⁽²⁾ Regulations (EU) No 603/2013 and 604/2013.

⁽³⁾ Study on the Feasibility and legal and practical implications of establishing a mechanism for the joint processing of asylum applications on the territory of the EU,
http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/asylum/common-procedures/docs/jip_final_report_final_en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-010617/13

an die Kommission

Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)

(18. September 2013)

Betrifft: Rechtsvorschriften über streunende Hunde in Rumänien

Am 10. September 2013 hat das rumänische Parlament ein neues Gesetz verabschiedet, das es den Behörden gestattet, Tausende von gesunden streunenden Hunden einzuschläfern, wenn sie nicht innerhalb von 14 Tagen von Bürgern adoptiert werden. Der rumänische Verfassungsgerichtshof hat bereits 2012 ein ähnliches Gesetz aufgehoben, da man zu dem Schluss gelangt war, dass es gegen die rumänische Verfassung verstößt.

Artikel 13 des Vertrags von Lissabon besagt: „Bei der Festlegung und Durchführung der Politik der Union [...] tragen die Union und die Mitgliedstaaten den Erfordernissen des Wohlergehens der Tiere als fühlende Wesen in vollem Umfang Rechnung“. Ich möchte daher an die Kommission in ihrer Eigenschaft als Hüterin der Verträge folgende Fragen richten (bitte um getrennte Beantwortung):

1. Steht das neue rumänische Gesetz im Widerspruch zu Artikel 13 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union? Wenn nicht, warum nicht?
2. Welche Maßnahmen kann die Kommission ergreifen und wirksam umsetzen, um dafür zu sorgen, dass Rumänien den Vertrag über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union einhält?
3. Welche Maßnahmen kann die Kommission ergreifen und wirksam umsetzen, um dafür zu sorgen, dass sich die rumänischen Behörden an die Verfassung ihres Landes halten?
4. Welche der oben genannten Maßnahmen wird die Kommission ergreifen, um dafür zu sorgen, dass Rumänien sich sowohl an den Vertrag über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union als auch an seine eigene Verfassung hält?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission

(17. Oktober 2013)

Der Kommission sind dieser Fall und andere ähnliche Fälle, die Folge der andauernden problematischen Anwesenheit herrenloser Hunde in einigen Gebieten mehrerer Mitgliedstaaten sind, wohl bekannt. Das Vorgehen gegen diese Tiere unterliegt nicht den EU-Rechtsvorschriften, sondern fällt in die alleinige Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten.

Daher ist die Kommission nicht befugt, den rumänischen Behörden Maßnahmen in diesem Bereich vorzuschreiben. Es sei allerdings darauf hingewiesen, dass die Weltorganisation für Tiergesundheit (OIE) internationale Leitlinien zur Populationskontrolle bei herrenlosen Hunden angenommen hat, in denen sie betont, dass die örtlichen Regierungsstellen bei der Durchsetzung der Rechtsvorschriften über die Hundehaltung eine wichtige Rolle spielen, und diejenigen Stellen nennt, die für die Ausarbeitung und Durchführung geeigneter Schulungen für das Einfangen, den Transport und die Haltung von Hunden zuständig sind, sowie Mindestkriterien für Unterbringung und Versorgung vorsieht.

In den Leitlinien wird außerdem betont, dass bei der Populationskontrolle bei herrenlosen Hunden eine abgestimmte Vorgehensweise erforderlich ist, dass die Tötung von Hunden, falls diese unumgänglich ist, nach tiergerechten Methoden erfolgen sollte und dass die Tötung allein keine nachhaltige Strategie darstellt.

Als Mitglied der OIE ist es jedoch an Rumänien zu entscheiden, wie diese internationalen Leitlinien auf nationaler Ebene am besten umgesetzt werden können.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-010617/13
to the Commission**

Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Legislation in Romania concerning stray dogs

On 10 September 2013, the Romanian Parliament adopted a new law allowing the authorities to euthanise thousands of healthy stray dogs if they are not adopted by citizens within a period of 14 days. The Romanian Constitutional Court already withdrew a similar law in 2012, as it was considered to be in conflict with the Romanian Constitution.

Article 13 of the Lisbon Treaty stipulates that 'in formulating and implementing the Union's [...] policies, the Union and the Member States shall, since animals are sentient beings, pay full regard to the welfare requirements of animals.' I therefore wish to ask the Commission, in its capacity as guardian of the Treaties (please answer separately):

1. Does the new Romanian law contradict Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union? If not, why not?
2. What measures can the Commission take and effectively implement in order to ensure that Romania abides by the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union?
3. What measures can the Commission take and implement effectively in order to ensure that the Romanian authorities abide by their country's constitution?
4. Which of the aforementioned measures will the Commission take in order to ensure that Romania abides by the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union as well as its own constitution?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(17 October 2013)

The Commission is fully aware of this and other similar events that are the result of the persistent problematic presence of stray dogs in some areas of several Member States. However, the control of these animals is not governed by EU rules and remains under the sole responsibility of the Member States.

The Commission is thus not entitled to request any action to the Romanian authorities on this issue. It is important, however, to recall that the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) has adopted international standards on stray dog population control, highlighting the important role of the local government agencies for the enforcement of legislation relating to dog ownership and indicating the bodies responsible for developing and implementing appropriate training to regulate dog capture, transport, and holding as well as minimum housing and care criteria.

These standards also insist on the need to use parallel approaches for controlling stray dog population and consider that killing should be carried out in a humane way when necessary, and it is not a sustainable strategy if performed alone.

However, it is up to Romania, as member of the OIE, to consider how it might most appropriately use these international guidelines in its national context.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-010618/13
do Komisji**

Jacek Saryusz-Wolski (PPE)

(18 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Unijne wsparcie bezpieczeństwa energetycznego Mołdawii

W rezolucji z dnia 12 września 2013 r. ⁽¹⁾ Parlament mocno skrytykował Rosję za naciski wywierane na kraje Partnerstwa Wschodniego w przededniu szczytu Partnerstwa Wschodniego w Wilnie i wezwał Komisję do podjęcia działań w obronie partnerów Unii, do wysłania wszystkim krajom Partnerstwa Wschodniego mocnego sygnału wsparcia oraz do przedstawienia konkretnych, skutecznych środków wsparcia tych partnerów.

Mołdawia, która ma duże osiągnięcia jeśli chodzi o politykę proeuropejską i należy do Wspólnoty Energetycznej, jest szczególnie narażona na naciski ze strony Rosji, która jest obecnie jednym dostawcą gazu dla Mołdawii. Wprawdzie należy pochwalić starania Komisji związane z gazociągami Iasi-Ungheni (który w 2014 r. ma połączyć Mołdawię z rumuńskim rynkiem gazowym), lecz jakie inne kroki zamierza poczynić Komisja, aby wesprzeć bezpieczeństwo energetyczne Mołdawii, w szczególności w związku:

- a) ze staraniami, jakich dokonuje ten kraj, aby zróżnicować źródła i drogi dostaw energii m.in. poprzez dalszą integrację z unijną infrastrukturą energetyczną, w tym za pomocą wzajemnych połączeń elektroenergetycznych;
- b) z procesem wdrażania przez Mołdawię dorobku prawnego Wspólnoty Energetycznej (w szczególności trzeciego pakietu dotyczącego rynku energii) oraz restrukturyzacją mołdawskiego sektora gazowego, w tym poprzez prace wspólnej grupy ekspertów powołanej w grudniu 2012?

W świetle kroków, jakie Rosja poczyniła niedawno wobec Mołdawii, oraz obaw, jakie wyrazili mołdawscy ministrowie, co do możliwości przerwania przez Gazprom dostaw energii w trakcie nadchodzącej zimy, czy Komisja przygotowuje tymczasowe plany awaryjne, aby pomóc Mołdawii, gdyby zaistniała taka sytuacja? Jeżeli tak, to jakie są to plany? W jaki sposób UE może przyspieszyć proces uniezależniania się Mołdawii od monopolu Rosji na rynku dostaw gazu?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Günthera Oettingera w imieniu Komisji

(17 października 2013 r.)

Mołdawia ściśle współpracuje z Rumunią w celu określenia wspólnych priorytetów w zakresie projektów dotyczących międzysystemowych połączeń sieci elektrycznej i gazowej, które poprawią bezpieczeństwo dostaw w Mołdawii. Komisja wspiera te projekty zarówno politycznie, jak i finansowo oraz aktywnie uczestniczy w ułatwianiu realizacji priorytetowych projektów przez organizowanie spotkań technicznych z przedstawicielami Mołdawii, Rumunii, EBOR i EBI.

Aby osiągnąć niezależność energetyczną i bezpieczeństwo dostaw, rząd mołdawski koncentruje się na integracji z unijnym rynkiem energii. Komisja i Sekretariat Wspólnoty Energetycznej wspierają Mołdawię we wdrażaniu trzeciego pakietu dotyczącego rynku energii i w restrukturyzacji sektora gazu tego państwa. Wspólna Grupa Ekspertów UE-Mołdawia prowadzi wymianę doświadczeń w zakresie praktycznego wdrażania odpowiednich unijnych przepisów energetycznych.

Przygotowanie UE i państw członkowskich Wspólnoty Energetycznej do kryzysu gazowego jest regularnie oceniane przez unijną grupę koordynującą ds. gazu i przez grupę koordynacyjną ds. bezpieczeństwa dostaw Wspólnoty Energetycznej. Mołdawia, wypełniając swoje zobowiązania w ramach Wspólnoty Energetycznej, jest obecnie na etapie finalizacji oświadczenia o krajowej strategii bezpieczeństwa dostaw w celu lepszego przygotowania się do ewentualnego kryzysu energetycznego. Bezpieczeństwo dostaw zarówno gazu, jak i energii elektrycznej można poprawić także w perspektywie średnio- i długoterminowej przez rozwijanie projektów inwestycyjnych oraz przez umożliwienie odwrócenia kierunku przepływu gazu.

⁽¹⁾ Teksty przyjęte, P7_TA(2013)0383.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-010618/13
to the Commission**

Jacek Saryusz-Wolski (PPE)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: EU support for Moldova's energy security

In its resolution of 12 September 2013 ⁽¹⁾, Parliament strongly criticised Russia for the pressure it has been exerting on the Eastern Partnership countries in the run-up to the Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius and called on the Commission to take action in defence of the Union's partners, to send out strong messages of support for all Eastern Partnership countries and to come forward with concrete effective measures to support those partners.

Moldova, which has a good track record when it comes to pro-European policies and is a member of the Energy Community, is particularly vulnerable to pressure from Russia, which is currently the country's sole supplier of gas. Although the Commission's efforts with regard to the Iasi-Ungheni pipeline (which is to link Moldova to the Romanian gas market by 2014) are to be commended, what other steps does the Commission plan to take to support Moldova's energy security, in particular as regards:

- (a) the country's efforts to diversify sources and routes of energy supply, through, *inter alia*, further integrating Moldova into the EU's energy infrastructure, including by means of electricity interconnections;
- (b) the process for Moldova's implementation of the Energy Community *acquis* (especially the Third Energy Package) and the restructuring of its gas sector, including through the work of the Joint Expert Group set up in December 2012?

In the light of recent steps taken by Russia vis-à-vis Moldova, and the concern expressed by Moldovan ministers at a possible cut-off by Gazprom of energy supplies during the coming winter, is the Commission drawing up provisional contingency plans to aid Moldova should this occur? If so, what are they? How can the EU further speed up the process of making Moldova less dependent on Russia's monopoly of the gas supply market?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission

(17 October 2013)

Moldova is working closely with Romania to define common priorities on gas and electricity interconnection projects which will improve the security of supply in Moldova. The Commission is supporting these projects both politically and financially and is actively involved in facilitating implementation of the prioritised projects by organising technical meetings with Moldova, Romania, EBRD and EIB.

To achieve energy independence and security of supply, the Moldovan government is focusing on integration with the EU energy market. The Commission and the Energy Community Secretariat are supporting Moldova in implementing the third energy market package and restructuring the gas sector of the country. The Joint EU-Moldova Expert Group shares expertise on the practical implementation of the relevant EU energy law.

The gas crisis preparedness in the EU and in the member countries of the Energy Community is regularly assessed both in the EU Gas Coordination Group and in the Energy Community Security of Supply Coordination Group. As part of its obligations in the Energy Community, Moldova is currently finalising a statement for the national strategy on security of supply in order to be better prepared in the event of an energy crisis situation. The security of supply situation for both gas and electricity can also be improved in the mid- and long-term by the development of investment projects and by allowing reverse gas flows.

⁽¹⁾ Texts adopted, P7_TA(2013)0383.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-010619/13
alla Commissione
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(18 settembre 2013)**

Oggetto: Uso dei fondi europei per la riconversione dell'ex zuccherificio di Finale Emilia

In riferimento all'interrogazione E-009018/2013, il Commissario conclude la sua risposta affermando che «Il programma di sviluppo rurale 2007-2013 della Regione Emilia-Romagna esclude specificamente tali interventi dal finanziamento».

Si chiede alla Commissione se:

1. i fondi europei non potevano essere chiesti/erogati;
2. i fondi siano stati erogati in contrapposizione con quanto previsto dal programma di sviluppo rurale della Regione e se in tal caso dovranno essere restituiti;
3. se l'Europa abbia finanziato un progetto che non poteva finanziare.

**Risposta di Dacian Ciolos a nome della Commissione
(7 ottobre 2013)**

I criteri di ammissibilità per la concessione dell'aiuto alla ristrutturazione sono previsti dal regolamento (CE) n. 320/2006 del Consiglio, del 20 febbraio 2006, che istituisce un regime temporaneo per la ristrutturazione dell'industria dello zucchero nella Comunità ⁽¹⁾.

Nel quadro della ristrutturazione del settore dello zucchero gli Stati membri avevano piena responsabilità per la concessione e l'attuazione dei progetti nel loro territorio:

- l'articolo 5, paragrafo 1 del regolamento (CE) n. 320/2006 del Consiglio recita: «*gli Stati membri decidono in merito alla concessione dell'aiuto alla ristrutturazione*»;
- l'articolo 5, paragrafo 4 del regolamento (CE) n. 320/2006 del Consiglio recita: «*gli Stati membri procedono al monitoraggio, al controllo e alla verifica dell'attuazione del piano di ristrutturazione, quale è stato approvato*»;

Il programma di sviluppo rurale (PSR) 2007-2013 della Regione Emilia Romagna escludeva specificamente gli interventi a favore della ristrutturazione di zuccherifici nell'ambito della «Misura 123 — accrescimento del valore aggiunto dei prodotti agricoli e forestali» del PSR. A partire dal 2012 gli interventi a favore di ex produttori di barbabietole da zucchero in Emilia Romagna erano autorizzati per altre misure del PSR, in quanto le risorse per gli aiuti alla ristrutturazione ai sensi del regolamento (CE) n. 320/2006 erano esaurite.

La Commissione verifica la corretta attuazione della normativa europea da parte degli Stati membri, attraverso verifiche periodiche e, se necessario, adotta i provvedimenti opportuni.

⁽¹⁾ GUL 58 del 28.2.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-010619/13
to the Commission
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: Use of European funds for the conversion of the former sugar factory in Finale Emilia

With reference to Question E-009018/2013, the Commission concludes its reply by stating that: 'The 2007-2013 Rural Development Program of the region Emilia Romagna specifically excludes such interventions from funding.'

1. Was it not possible to apply for/grant the European funding?
2. In granting the funds, were the rules governing the Region's rural development programme breached, and if so, will the funding have to be repaid?
3. Did Europe finance a project which it could not finance?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(7 October 2013)

The eligibility criteria for granting the restructuring aid are laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 320/2006 of 20 February 2006 establishes a temporary scheme for the restructuring of the sugar industry in the Community ⁽¹⁾.

Within the framework of this sugar restructuring Member States had full responsibility for the granting and implementation of the projects within their territory:

- Article 5(1) of Council Regulation (EC) N 320/2006 states that 'Member States shall decide on the granting of the restructuring aid';
- Article 5(4) of Council Regulation (EC) N 320/2006 states that 'Member States shall monitor, control and verify the implementation of the restructuring aid as approved by it';

The 2007-2013 Rural Development Program (RDP) of the region Emilia Romagna specifically excluded interventions in favour of the restructuring of sugar refineries under Measure 123 — 'Adding Value to Agricultural and Forestry Products' of the RDP. From 2012 on, interventions in favour of former sugar beet growers in Emilia Romagna were allowed for other RDP measures, since resources for restructuring aid under Regulation (EC) No 320/2006 had been exhausted.

The Commission verifies the correct implementation of European law by Member States through regular audits and will, if necessary, take appropriate actions.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 58, 28.2.2006.

(Svensk version)

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-010620/13
till kommissionen**

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE)

(18 september 2013)

Angående: Avskaffande av prövning av det ekonomiska behovet och hinder för fri etablering

I dessa tider då vi inte kan spendera oss ut ur krisen är ett möjliggörande av fri rörlighet för varor och tjänster ett av de bästa sätten att få till stånd tillväxt och sysselsättning utan att spendera skattebetalarnas pengar. Enligt direktiv 2006/123/EG om tjänster på den inre marknaden (tjänstedirektivet) är medlemsstaterna skyldiga att avskaffa omotiverade begränsningar av marknadstillträdet, och denna skyldighet innebär även ett avskaffande av prövning av det ekonomiska behovet.

I rapporten *Den inre marknadens integration 2013*, som ingick i den årliga tillväxtöversikten 2013, fastslår kommissionen att sådana krav (prövning av det ekonomiska behovet) är förbjudna enligt tjänstedirektivet, men att de ändå finns kvar i Rumänien, Österrike, Grekland, Nederländerna, Ungern och i vissa regioner i Tyskland och Spanien.

Dessutom har man i vissa delar av Europa infört särskilda skatter som diskriminerar mot vissa branscher och företagsmodeller, och därmed skapat hinder för den fria etableringen och snedvrider konkurrensen.

Många hinder beror på att tjänstedirektivet inte har integrerats på rätt sätt i annan EU-lagstiftning och nationell lagstiftning. Samtidigt bör man beakta att överträdelseförfaranden i samband med överträdelser av reglerna om den inre marknaden ofta är långdragna.

EU får inte missa några tillfällen att skapa sysselsättning. Hur avser kommissionen att, i dialog med medlemsstaterna, säkerställa att fullt ansvar tas för att man till fullo och på ett korrekt och konsekvent sätt övervakar att reglerna om den inre marknaden följs? Hur kommer nolltoleranspolitiken att tillämpas i praktiken? Tror kommissionen att påskyndade förfaranden kommer att införas som kan snabba upp behandlingen av överträdelseförfaranden?

Svar från Michel Barnier på kommissionens vägnar

(11 november 2013)

Enligt kommissionens meddelande av den 8 juni 2012 om genomförandet av tjänstedirektivet⁽¹⁾, kommer kommissionen att tillämpa nolltolerans i fall där de otvetydiga skyldigheterna inte uppfylls och kommer när så krävs att tillämpa nolltolerans genom överträdelseförfaranden.

Förbudet mot en prövning av det ekonomiska behovet, som anges i artikel 14.5 i direktiv 2006/123/EG om tjänster på den inre marknaden (tjänstedirektivet), är en av de otvetydiga skyldigheter som medlemsstaterna måste uppfylla.

Efter en genomgripande undersökning om genomförandet av tjänstedirektivet, som täckte alla medlemsstater, har kommissionen på eget initiativ inlett nästan 40 undersökningar i syfte att kartlägga alla eventuella överträdelser av otvetydiga skyldigheter som anges i tjänstedirektivet. Kommissionen håller också på att göra undersökningar till följd av klagomål där en del av dessa gäller prövning av det ekonomiska behovet.

Att bevaka överträdelser av dessa skyldigheter är en prioriterad fråga för kommissionen. På mindre än ett år har alla ärenden på eget initiativ behandlats. Till följd av det har man i 31 fall (13 av dem har lösts) kunnat inleda en strukturerad dialog med den berörda medlemsstaten och inlett två formella överträdelseförfaranden. Kommissionen har för avsikt att hantera dessa överträdelseförfaranden i linje med de åtaganden som gjordes i meddelandet om styrning och tjänster i juni 2012.

⁽¹⁾ Meddelande om genomförandet av tjänstedirektivet: Ett partnerskap för ny tillväxt i tjänstesektorn 2012–2015, KOM(2012) 261.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010620/13
to the Commission**

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Removing economic needs tests and barriers to free establishment

At a time when we cannot spend our way out of the crisis, enabling the free movement of goods and services is one of the best ways to generate growth and jobs without spending taxpayers' money. Under Directive 2006/123/EC on services in the internal market (the services directive), Member States are obliged to remove unjustified restrictions to market access, including eliminating economic needs tests.

However, in the report entitled 'State of the single market integration 2013', as part of the Annual Growth Survey 2013, the Commission states that 'such requirements [economic needs tests] are prohibited under the services directive but are nevertheless still in place in Romania, Austria, Greece, the Netherlands, Hungary and in certain regions of Germany and Spain'.

Furthermore, in some parts of the EU, special taxes have been put in place which discriminate against certain sectors or business models, thereby creating obstacles to free establishment and distorting competition.

Many barriers stem from the poor integration of the services directive with other EU and national legislation. At the same time, infringement cases for breaches of internal market rules often take a long time.

The EU cannot afford to miss any opportunity to create jobs. With this in mind, how does the Commission intend, in dialogue with the Member States, to ensure that full responsibility is taken to enforce in a comprehensive, correct and coherent manner existing internal market rules? How will the zero-tolerance policy be applied in practice? Does the Commission foresee the establishment of fast-track procedures that would speed up the processing of infringement cases?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(11 November 2013)

As stated in the Commission's Communication of 8 June 2012 on the implementation of the Services Directive ⁽¹⁾, 'The Commission will apply a "zero tolerance" policy in cases of non-compliance with the unequivocal obligations' and 'will apply its zero tolerance policy through infringement procedures, where necessary'.

The prohibition of an 'economic needs test', laid down in Article 14(5) of Directive 2006/123/EC on services in the internal market ('the Services Directive'), is one of the unequivocal obligations by which Member States must abide.

Following a horizontal study on the implementation of the Services Directive that covered all of the Member States, the Commission has launched, on its own initiative, nearly 40 investigations in order to identify any possible violations of the unequivocal obligations set out in the Services Directive. Furthermore, the Commission is also conducting investigations triggered by complaints, some of which concern the economic needs test.

The Commission pursues cases infringing these obligations as a matter of priority. In less than one year, all the own-initiative cases have been treated. As a result, 31 cases (13 of which have been solved) have led to the opening of a structured dialogue with the Member State concerned and 2 formal infringement procedures have been initiated. The Commission intends to deal with these infringement cases in line with the commitments made in its Governance and Services Communications of June 2012.

⁽¹⁾ Communication on the implementation of the Services Directive. A partnership for new growth in services 2012-2015, COM 2012(261).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010621/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)**

(18 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Child Labour in Tanzania

On 28 August 2013, a number of news agencies publicised the findings of a Human Rights Watch report concerning child labour in Tanzania. The report alleges that thousands of children, some as young as eight years of age, are working in Tanzanian gold mines, whilst also mentioning the inherently dangerous working conditions. A number of hazards are identified in the report, the most serious of which include the risk of mercury poisoning, unstable working conditions in underground mining pits liable to collapse, and the prevalence of long shifts lasting up to 24 hours.

The levels of poverty existing in Tanzania mean that there is an economic imperative for young children, in particular orphans, to seek work. Whilst these obligations are very real, the long-term consequences for the future of these children can be serious. Girls often face sexual harassment and are at risk of contracting diseases such as HIV. Exposure to mercury, not uncommon as part of the mining process, is also a serious problem, causing life-long disabilities for those exposed.

In January 2013, the Tanzanian Government helped to draw up the Minamata Convention on Mercury, which is supported by 140 countries. Nevertheless, Healthcare Research Worldwide states that Tanzania must do more in order to implement the provisions of the convention by monitoring the issue of child labour.

1. What policies has the EU recently adopted in order to monitor the issue of child labour in the gold mining industry across Africa?
2. Is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to talk with Tanzanian President Jakaya Kikwete about his government's commitment to the Minamata Convention?
3. Are EU officials in Tanzania, and in the wider region, taking steps to prevent children being drawn into the gold mining industry? If so, what steps are being taken?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission

(6 November 2013)

The EU welcomes the signature of the Minamata Convention by Tanzania and will use all upcoming high level discussions to address issues of implementation. The next political dialogue under the Cotonou Agreement between the EU and Tanzania, with the participation of President Kikwete, will be among these. The EU Heads of Mission have also recently made a field trip to mining areas in North Tanzania where the matter was raised with senior authorities and other stakeholders.

Concerning the Commission's action against child labour in Tanzania in particular, the Honourable Members are also referred to the answer to previous Written Question E-010100/2013 ⁽¹⁾.

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

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-010622/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)

(18 settembre 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Instabilità nella Repubblica centrafricana

In seguito alla rimozione dell'ex Presidente Francois Bozize per mano del gruppo di ribelli Seleka, vi è il timore che la Repubblica centrafricana rischi di diventare uno Stato fallito. Il gruppo di ribelli ha preso il controllo della capitale Bangui e molti abitanti del paese denunciano la mancanza di uno Stato di diritto o di sicurezza. Secondo il giornale britannico *The Economist*, molti funzionari statali se ne sono anche andati in quanto non pagati per mesi. Nel frattempo, il gruppo Seleka si sta adoperando per reclutare più persone nelle sue fila e la consistenza del gruppo è lievitata da 2 000 a 20 000 persone nel solo mese di marzo.

Il Presidente Bozize avrebbe dovuto ricevere la protezione della missione di consolidamento della pace nella Repubblica centrafricana, che comprende soldati provenienti da Stati che formano la Comunità economica degli Stati dell'Africa centrale. Tuttavia, stando a quanto affermato dagli osservatori, ciò si è rivelato inefficace. Il paese è attualmente guidato dal leader di Seleka, Michel Djotodia, il quale ha affermato che entro diciotto mesi verranno indette le elezioni. Molti ritengono tuttavia che ciò non sia probabile dal momento che i ribelli hanno distrutto i registri elettorali. M. Djotodia è il primo leader musulmano della Repubblica centrafricana; la maggior parte delle reclute di Seleka proviene dal nord musulmano e sussistono timori secondo cui potrebbero aggravarsi i contrasti etnici e religiosi in tutto il paese. Il Presidente francese, François Hollande, ha affermato che il paese si trova a rischio di «somalizzazione» e ha invitato le Nazioni Unite e l'Unione africana a elaborare un piano di soccorso. Secondo l'articolo pubblicato da *The Economist*, il timore di instabilità nella Repubblica centrafricana potrebbe estendersi agli Stati circostanti e far sì che il paese diventi un rifugio sicuro per i militanti islamici.

1. Qual è la posizione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante in merito al deteriorarsi della situazione nella Repubblica centrafricana? Ritiene che i timori espressi dai leader quali il Presidente François Hollande abbiano fondamento?
2. Quali sono le misure che l'UE sta attualmente adottando al fine di affrontare la crescente crisi umanitaria nel paese?
3. Ritengono i funzionari dell'UE che la Repubblica centrafricana possa diventare un punto nodale della militanza islamica?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(12 novembre 2013)

L'Unione europea è estremamente preoccupata per il deterioramento della situazione nella Repubblica centrafricana. L'intera popolazione è vittima del collasso totale dell'ordine pubblico che sta provocando una crisi umanitaria e causando diffuse violazioni dei diritti umani.

In numerose dichiarazioni l'AR/VP ha condannato la presa di potere incostituzionale da parte dei gruppi ribelli SELEKA e ha ribadito che i responsabili di violazioni dei diritti umani devono essere chiamati a risponderne.

Dato il vuoto di sicurezza causato dal totale collasso delle istituzioni statali, la presenza di combattenti stranieri nonché l'ubicazione geografica della Repubblica centrafricana al centro di numerosi paesi in cui sussistono elevate probabilità di conflitti, esiste un rischio grave di diffusione della crisi in tutta la regione. È di fondamentale importanza che la comunità internazionale agisca rapidamente. L'AR/VP elogia pertanto l'adozione della risoluzione del Consiglio di sicurezza dell'ONU 2121 (10 ottobre) che sottolinea la necessità di ripristinare la sicurezza, fornendo sostegno all'operazione MISCA guidata dall'Unione africana, preparando nel contempo, come eventuale passo successivo, la strada per trasformarla in un'operazione di mantenimento della pace delle Nazioni Unite.

In risposta alla crisi la Commissione ha aumentato a 20 milioni di EUR il suo aiuto umanitario destinato alla Repubblica centrafricana per l'anno in corso, dando la priorità alla protezione, all'accesso all'assistenza sanitaria, all'approvvigionamento alimentare e di acqua potabile, agli impianti igienico-sanitari, alla logistica e al coordinamento umanitario. La Commissaria Georgieva ha visitato il paese due volte nell'arco di tre mesi, l'11-12 luglio e il 13 ottobre — la seconda volta con il Ministro degli Affari esteri francese L. Fabius — ed ha inoltre collaborato all'organizzazione di una riunione ministeriale di alto livello relativa alla Repubblica centrafricana, congiuntamente con il Ministro Fabius e il Sottosegretario per gli affari umanitari delle Nazioni Unite V. Amos durante la settimana dell'assemblea generale dell'ONU.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010622/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Instability in the Central African Republic

Following the ousting of former President Francois Bozize by the rebel group Seleka, there have been fears that the Central African Republic (CAR) is at risk of becoming a failed state. The rebel group has seized control of the capital Bangui, and many of the country's inhabitants say that there is no rule of law or security. According to UK newspaper *The Economist*, many civil servants have also fled as they have not been paid in months. In the meantime, Seleka is working to recruit more into its ranks, and its numbers have swelled from 2 000 to 20 000 since March alone.

President Bozize was supposed to have been protected by the Mission for the Consolidation of Peace in the Central African Republic, which comprises troops from the states making up the Economic Community of Central African States. Observers claim, however, that they have proved ineffective. The country is now being run by Seleka's leader, Michel Djotodia, who has said that elections will be held within 18 months. Many believe that this is unlikely, however, as the rebels have destroyed electoral registration records. Mr Djotodia is the first Muslim leader of the CAR; most of Seleka's recruits come from the Muslim north and there are fears that ethnic and religious divides could deepen throughout the country. French President François Hollande has said that the country is at risk of 'Somalisation' and has asked the United Nations and the African Union to come up with a rescue plan. The article in *The Economist* states that the fear of instability in the CAR could spread to surrounding countries and lead to the country becoming a safe haven for Islamist militants.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding the deteriorating situation inside the CAR? Does she think that there is any substance to the fears voiced by leaders such as President François Hollande?
2. What steps is the EU currently taking to tackle the growing humanitarian crisis in the country?
3. Do EU officials believe that there is potential for the CAR to become a hub of Islamist militancy?

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

The EU remains strongly concerned about the deteriorating situation in the Central African Republic (CAR). The whole population is affected by the complete breakdown of law and order, causing an ongoing humanitarian crisis and leading to widespread human rights violations.

In several statements the HR/VP condemned the unconstitutional seizure of power by SELEKA rebel groups and reiterated that those responsible for human rights violations should be held accountable.

Given the security vacuum caused by the complete collapse of state institutions, the presence of foreign fighters as well as the CAR's geographic location at the crossroads of several conflict-prone countries, there is a serious risk of the crisis spreading across the region. It is essential for the international community to act swiftly. The HR/VP thus commends on the adoption of the UN Security Council Resolution 2121 (10 Oct.), highlighting the need to restore security, providing support for the African Union-led MISCA operation while, as a possible next step, paving the way for stepping it up into an UN peacekeeping operation.

In response to this crisis, the Commission has increased its humanitarian aid for CAR to EUR 20 million this year, focusing on protection, access to healthcare, food and drinking-water, sanitation, logistics and humanitarian coordination.. Commissioner Georgieva has been visiting CAR on 11-12 July and on 13 October — the second time together with the French FM L. Fabius — her second visit in three months. She has also co-organised a high-level ministerial meeting on CAR, jointly with Minister Fabius, and the UN Under-Secretary General for humanitarian affairs V. Amos during the UN General Assembly Week.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-010623/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)**

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)

(18 de septiembre de 2013)

Asunto: VP/HR — Asesinato de senderistas extranjeros en Pakistán

La región pakistaní de Gilgit-Baltistán tiene la novena montaña más alta del mundo y es, por ello, uno de los destinos favoritos de los practicantes del senderismo a escala internacional. El mes pasado, unos talibanes causaron la muerte por disparos a tres agentes de seguridad que estaban investigando la muerte de un senderista extranjero en la región. Los talibanes han reivindicado también la responsabilidad por el asesinato, el 23 de junio de 2013, de otros diez senderistas y de su guía pakistaní en un campamento base de Nanga Parbat.

Aunque el Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior (SEAE) no es competente para publicar alertas de viaje, ¿está informando a los Estados miembros de la tensa situación reinante y del riesgo para los turistas europeos que tengan previsto viajar a esta zona?

¿Está el SEAE ayudando al Gobierno pakistaní a localizar a los autores de estos crímenes y a ponerlos en manos de la Justicia?

Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión

(29 de noviembre de 2013)

La Delegación de la UE en Islamabad apoya la coordinación entre las misiones de los Estados miembros sobre cuestiones relacionadas con el asesoramiento a los ciudadanos de la UE, y se anima a los distintos Estados miembros a difundir los cambios en sus recomendaciones de viaje. No obstante, siguen siendo los ministerios de asuntos exteriores de los Estados miembros los únicos autorizados a emitir alertas de viaje para sus ciudadanos.

Mediante una gestión diplomática, la UE pidió al Gobierno de Pakistán que aclarara las circunstancias del incidente y facilitara información relacionada con las conclusiones de la investigación. La UE también expresó su preocupación sobre la seguridad y la protección de los extranjeros en Pakistán y conversó sobre las medidas que tiene previsto adoptar el Gobierno. Si bien corresponde a las autoridades pakistaníes perseguir a los autores y llevarlos ante la justicia, la Delegación de la UE mantiene contactos con el Gobierno de Pakistán sobre esta cuestión y está dispuesta a colaborar de todas las formas posibles.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010623/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Killing of foreign trekker in Pakistan

The Gilgit-Baltistan region of Pakistan is home to the ninth highest peak in the world and is therefore a favourite among international trekkers. Last month Taliban militants shot dead three security officials who were investigating the recent killing of a foreign trekker in the region. Militants have also claimed responsibility for the killing of 10 foreign trekkers and their Pakistani guide at a base camp of Nanga Parbat on 23 June 2013.

Whilst the European External Action Service (EEAS) does not have the power to issue travel alerts, is it advising Member States of the current tensions and risks to European travellers who are considering travelling to the region?

Is the EEAS helping the Pakistani Government to find the perpetrators and bring them to justice?

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

The EU Delegation in Islamabad supports the coordination among Member States' missions on issues relating to advice to EU citizens and individual Member States are encouraged to share changes to travel advice. Nonetheless it remains the sole authority of the respective Member States' MFA's to issue travel alerts to their citizens.

In a demarche, the EU asked the Pakistani Government to clarify the circumstances of the incident and to provide information related to the findings of the investigation. The EU also conveyed its concerns regarding the safety and security of foreigners in Pakistan and discussed intended measures to be taken by the Government. While it is for the appropriate Pakistani authorities to pursue the perpetrators and bring them to justice, the EU Delegation maintains contact with the Government of Pakistan on this issue and is ready to help in any way possible.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010624/13
à la Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Orphacol: responsabilités européennes

Cette question fait suite à une autre question posée début juillet E-008578/2013 sur le dossier Orphacol.

Pour rappel, la Commission s'était fait désavouer par la justice européenne qui a annulé sa décision refusant de mettre sur le marché un médicament orphelin, l'Orphacol, destiné à traiter une maladie rare et mortelle du foie. La fin d'un cauchemar bureaucratique pour CTRS, le petit laboratoire français qui commercialise ce produit dans l'Hexagone, la Commission s'étant acharnée pendant presque 4 ans, en s'appuyant sur des arguties juridiques balayées par le Tribunal de l'Union européenne, pour avoir la peau de l'Orphacol. Sans doute pour complaire à un laboratoire américain — Asklepion Pharmaceuticals —, qui voulait s'emparer du marché. Une première, la Commission s'étant toujours contentée, faute d'expertise scientifique propre, de valider les avis de l'Agence européenne du médicament (AEM) basée à Londres. Le Tribunal de Luxembourg, saisi par CTRS, appuyé par la France, la Grande-Bretagne, l'Autriche, le Danemark et la République tchèque, réduit en lambeaux tous les arguments de la Commission.

Il n'est pas contesté qu'il n'existe aucun médicament mis sur le marché susceptible de soigner les affections hépatiques en cause, susceptible d'entraîner rapidement le décès de la personne affectée.

Comment lors de la parution de l'article de Libération, Frédéric Vincent, le porte-parole du commissaire chargé de la santé, a-t-il osé arguer de manière totalement fallacieuse qu'il existait bien un traitement alternatif, «la greffe du foie»?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission

(31 octobre 2013)

La Commission accorde un rôle important à l'autorisation des médicaments dans l'Union européenne. Elle ne suit pas aveuglément les avis de l'Agence européenne du médicament (AEM) et, ces trois dernières années, ses services lui ont demandé de préciser certains aspects de ses avis sur les autorisations de mise sur le marché dans plus de 50 cas.

L'utilisation de moyens autres que l'acide cholique (ou la transplantation de foie) pour le traitement des affections hépatiques en cause est mentionnée dans la littérature soumise dans le cadre de l'autorisation de mise sur le marché d'Orphacol, comme l'explique le rapport d'évaluation du comité des médicaments à usage humain de l'Agence européenne du médicament.

À la suite de l'arrêt du Tribunal dans l'affaire T-301/12, la Commission a adopté une décision accordant l'autorisation de mise sur le marché d'Orphacol le 16 septembre 2013.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010624/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 September 2013)**

Subject: European responsibility with regard to Orphacol

This question follows another question submitted at the beginning of July regarding the Orphacol issue (E-008578/2013).

By way of a reminder, the Commission was ordered by the European Court of Justice (ECJ) to reverse its refusal to authorise Orphacol, an orphan drug used to treat a rare fatal liver condition. This marks the end of a bureaucratic nightmare for CTRS, a small French laboratory that markets Orphacol in France and which the Commission has victimised for four years on the basis of flimsy legal arguments that the ECJ has now comprehensively refuted. This campaign was probably carried out at the behest of an American laboratory, Asklepios Pharmaceuticals, that wished to take over the market. This is a first; up until now the Commission, which has no scientific expertise of its own, has always blindly followed the opinion of the European Medicines Agency in London. The ECJ, seized by CTRS with the support of France, the UK, Austria, Denmark and the Czech Republic, has shown that, legally, the Commission did not have a leg to stand on.

The fact that there is no other drug on the market that can treat the potentially rapidly fatal liver conditions in question is not in doubt.

Why then was Frédéric Vincent, the Commission's spokesman for health and consumer affairs, quoted in the *Libération* newspaper making the ludicrous claim that there was indeed an alternative course of treatment, namely a liver transplant?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(31 October 2013)**

The Commission has been given an important role in the authorisation of medicines in the European Union. The Commission does not follow blindly the opinions of the European Medicines Agency and over the past three years the Commission services have requested the Agency to clarify certain aspects of its opinions on marketing authorisations in over 50 cases.

The use of treatments other than cholic acid (or liver transplant) for the treatment of the relevant conditions is referred in the literature data submitted as part of the marketing authorisation for Orphacol, as it is explained in the assessment report of the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use of the European Medicines Agency ('CHMP').

Following the ruling of the General Court in case T-301/12, the Commission adopted a decision granting the marketing authorisation for Orphacol on 16 September 2013.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010625/13
à la Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Révision de la directive sur une plus grande équité salariale entre hommes et femmes

Cette question fait suite à une autre question posée début juillet sur l'inégalité salariale hommes-femmes (E-007129/2013).

Nous vous remercions pour votre réponse mais certains éléments paraissent encore obscurs.

1. La Commission est-elle en faveur de nouvelles mesures pour sanctionner les écarts de rémunération et les réduire de manière efficace?
2. Entend-elle réviser la législation en vigueur à ce sujet, à savoir la directive en objet, comme l'a demandé le Parlement dans sa résolution du 13 mars 2012?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Reding au nom de la Commission

(12 novembre 2013)

La mise en œuvre effective du principe de l'égalité des rémunérations entre les hommes et les femmes est l'une des priorités établies par la Commission dans sa stratégie pour l'égalité entre les femmes et les hommes 2010-2015 ⁽¹⁾.

Le principe de l'égalité des rémunérations est inscrit dans les traités et a été incorporé dans la directive 2006/54/CE ⁽²⁾. Les États membres de l'UE sont déjà tenus d'appliquer des sanctions efficaces, proportionnées et dissuasives dans les cas de violation des dispositions nationales transposant les obligations découlant de la directive 2006/54/CE, y compris celle de respecter le principe d'égalité des rémunérations.

Pour le moment, la Commission ne voit pas la nécessité de réviser la directive 2006/54/CE. Au lieu de cela, la priorité de la Commission dans ce domaine est de contrôler l'application correcte et la mise en œuvre du cadre juridique en vigueur sur l'égalité des rémunérations au niveau national. Il s'agit notamment de déterminer si les États membres appliquent les sanctions appropriées imposées par la directive. Il est prévu d'adopter plus tard cette année le rapport sur l'application de la directive 2006/54/CE, qui évalue la mise en œuvre des dispositions en matière d'égalité des rémunérations.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2010) 491 final.

⁽²⁾ Directive 2006/54/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 5 juillet 2006 relative à la mise en œuvre du principe de l'égalité des chances et de l'égalité de traitement entre hommes et femmes en matière d'emploi et de travail (refonte) (JO L 204 du 26.7.2006, p. 23).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010625/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 September 2013)**

Subject: Revision of the directive on greater pay equality between men and women

This question follows another question submitted at the beginning of July on pay inequality between men and women (E-007129/2013).

While we are grateful for your answer, certain points still seem unclear.

1. Does the Commission support new measures to penalise pay gaps and effectively reduce them?
2. Will it revise the current legislation on this subject, namely the abovementioned Directive, as Parliament called for in its resolution of 13 March 2012?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(12 November 2013)**

The effective implementation of the principle of equal pay for men and women is one of the Commission's priorities in its Strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015 ⁽¹⁾.

The equal pay principle has been enshrined in the Treaties and is also incorporated in Directive 2006/54/EC ⁽²⁾. The EU Member States are already obliged to apply effective, proportionate and dissuasive sanctions in cases of infringements of the national provisions transposing the obligations of Directive 2006/54/EC, including the equal pay principle.

For the time being, the Commission does not see a need to revise Directive 2006/54/EC. Instead, the Commission's priority in this area is to monitor the correct application and enforcement of the existing legal framework on equal pay at the national level. This includes the question whether Member States are applying the appropriate sanctions as required by the directive. The report on the application of Directive 2006/54/EC, assessing the implementation of the equal pay provisions, is envisaged for adoption later this year.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2010) 491 final.

⁽²⁾ Directive 2006/54/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 on the implementation of the principle of equal opportunities and equal treatment of men and women in matters of employment and occupation (recast); OJ L 204, 26.7.2006, p. 23-36.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010626/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Avenir européen de la Catalogne

Depuis un an, le gouvernement catalan, mené par le nationaliste Artur Mas, mène une campagne féroce pour défendre l'indépendance. Ses discours, enflammés, sur la richesse de la Catalogne et les brimades du gouvernement central, ses calculs, sujets à controverse, selon lesquels Madrid s'approprierait 8 % du PIB catalan chaque année, soit 16 milliards d'euros, et ses slogans polémiques, voire populistes, comme celui, utilisé récemment par sa coalition CiU, qui affirme que «l'Espagne subventionnée vit aux crochets de la Catalogne productiviste», ont contribué à la montée du mouvement indépendantiste. Une négociation, c'est ce que propose le président du gouvernement espagnol Mariano Rajoy à Artur Mas dans une lettre rendue publique ce week-end. Le chef de l'exécutif ignore sa demande, formulée en juillet, d'organiser un référendum d'autodétermination en 2014. Mais il s'engage à «dialoguer», à condition que ce soit «dans le cadre de la loyauté institutionnelle» et «le cadre juridique qui protège et unit tout un chacun», afin «d'offrir la meilleure réponse aux besoins réels de tous les citoyens». En fait, le dialogue et les négociations ont déjà commencé, en secret: M. Rajoy et M. Mas se sont rencontrés fin août en privé. Reste à savoir ce que l'un comme l'autre sont disposés à céder. Le parti populaire (PP, conservateur, au pouvoir), qui s'appuie sur la constitution espagnole, n'autorisera pas une consultation populaire sur le thème de l'indépendance en Catalogne, mais la région est sur le point de voter sa propre loi régionale qui lui permette d'esquiver l'interdiction madrilène. Le gouvernement central, qui doit revoir le système de financement des autonomies l'an prochain pourrait offrir une amélioration substantielle du traitement économique réservé à la Catalogne pour éviter qu'elle ne se tienne.

1. Quelles seraient les conséquences pour la Catalogne d'une déclaration d'indépendance au niveau européen?
2. Quelle est la position de la Commission sur la tenue de ce référendum?

Réponse donnée par M. Barroso au nom de la Commission

(18 novembre 2013)

Il n'appartient pas à la Commission de s'exprimer sur des questions d'organisation interne en rapport avec les dispositions constitutionnelles d'un État membre donné.

Un scénario tel que la sécession d'une partie d'un État membre ou la création d'un nouvel État ne serait pas neutre au regard des traités de l'UE. La Commission donnerait son avis sur les conséquences juridiques en vertu du droit de l'Union si un État membre, exposant un scénario précis, le lui demandait.

L'UE repose sur les traités qui ne s'appliquent qu'aux États membres qui les ont adoptés et ratifiés. Les traités ne s'appliqueraient plus à une partie du territoire d'un État membre qui ferait sécession par rapport à cet État à la suite de son indépendance. En d'autres termes, un nouvel État indépendant deviendrait, du fait de son indépendance, un pays tiers vis-à-vis de l'UE et les traités ne seraient plus applicables sur son territoire.

En vertu de l'article 49 du traité sur l'Union européenne, tout État européen qui respecte les valeurs visées à l'article 2 du traité sur l'Union européenne peut demander à devenir membre de l'Union. Si cette demande est acceptée par le Conseil, statuant à l'unanimité, un accord est alors négocié entre l'État candidat et les États membres sur les conditions d'adhésion et les mises en conformité avec les traités que cette adhésion induit. Un accord est soumis à ratification par tous les États membres et l'État candidat.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010626/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 September 2013)**

Subject: The future of Catalonia in the European Union

Over the last year, the Catalan Government, led by nationalist Artur Mas, has been vigorously campaigning to promote independence. Its inflamed rhetoric on Catalonia's wealth and the bullying from central government, its contentious calculations, according to which Madrid allegedly claims 8%, or EUR 16 billion, of Catalonia's GDP per year, and its controversial or even populist slogans, such as the one recently used by the Centre-Right Catalan Nationalist Coalition (CiU), stating that 'subsidised Spain is living off production-driven Catalonia', have contributed to the rise of the independence movement. In a letter made public last weekend, the Spanish Prime Minister, Mariano Rajoy, proposed a negotiation to Artur Mas, ignoring the call made by Mr Mas in July for a self-determination referendum to be held in 2014. However, Mr Rajoy did affirm his commitment to 'dialogue', provided that this take place 'within the framework of institutional loyalty' and 'the legal framework which protects and unites everyone', in order to 'provide the best response to the real needs of all citizens'. In fact, dialogue and negotiations have already commenced in secret, with Mr Rajoy and Mr Mas meeting in private at the end of August. It remains to be seen what each of them is prepared to concede. The ruling conservative People's Party (PP), acting in accordance with the Spanish Constitution, will not allow a public consultation on the topic of independence in Catalonia; however, the region is on the verge of passing its own regional law which will enable it to circumvent the ban by Madrid. Spain's central government, which is due to review its system of funding for autonomous regions next year, could propose a significant improvement in the economic treatment of Catalonia in order to prevent this consultation from taking place.

1. What consequences would there be for Catalonia at EU level if it were to declare independence?
2. What is the Commission's position on the holding of such a referendum?

**Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(18 November 2013)**

It is not the Commission's role to express a position on questions of internal organisation related to the constitutional arrangements of a particular Member State.

Scenarios such as the separation of one part of a Member State or the creation of a new state would not be neutral as regards the EU Treaties. The Commission would express its opinion on the legal consequences under EC law upon request from a Member State detailing a precise scenario.

The EU is founded on the Treaties which apply only to the Member States who have agreed and ratified them. If part of the territory of a Member State would cease to be part of that state because it would become a new independent state, the Treaties would no longer apply to that territory. In other words, a new independent state would, by the fact of its independence, become a third country with respect to the EU and the Treaties would no longer apply on its territory.

Under Article 49 of the Treaty on European Union, any European state which respects the principles set out in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union may apply to become a member of the EU. If the application is accepted by the Council acting unanimously, an agreement is then negotiated between the applicant state and the Member States on the conditions of admission and the adjustments to the Treaties which such admission entails. This agreement is subject to ratification by all Member States and the applicant state.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010627/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Porcherie industrielle et directive «Nitrates»

Le gouvernement français est sur le point d'autoriser un accroissement de capacité des porcheries industrielles de 450 à 2 000 places.

Ayant été en charge de la directive «Nitrates» pour le Parlement européen, je me pose la question suivante:

La Commission estime-t-elle ou non qu'il s'agit là d'un affaiblissement de la mise en œuvre de la directive «Nitrates» et de la lutte contre les algues vertes?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočník au nom de la Commission

(31 octobre 2013)

La directive 91/676/CEE ⁽¹⁾ concernant la protection des eaux contre la pollution par les nitrates à partir de sources agricoles a pour objectif de réduire la pollution des eaux provoquée par les nitrates à partir de sources agricoles et de prévenir toute nouvelle pollution de ce type. Pour atteindre ses objectifs, la directive impose aux États membres d'établir des programmes d'action, qui doivent inclure, entre autres mesures, des dispositions spécifiques relatives à l'entreposage et à la gestion du fumier.

La Commission estime qu'une intensification de la production animale doit tenir pleinement compte des risques que représentent ces activités pour les eaux. Le cas échéant, des mesures renforcées appropriées doivent être prises dans le cadre des programmes d'action afin de continuer à respecter les objectifs de la directive «Nitrates». Ces programmes d'action renforcée revêtent une importance capitale dans les régions dans lesquelles la qualité de l'eau est déjà dégradée du fait, par exemple de l'eutrophication.

En outre, l'élevage intensif de porcs (plus de 2 000 emplacements pour les porcs de production ou plus de 750 emplacements pour les truies) est soumis à la directive 2010/75/UE relatives aux émissions industrielles ⁽²⁾. Ces activités doivent être mises en œuvre conformément aux conditions fixées dans une autorisation, dont la délivrance est subordonnée à l'application des meilleures techniques disponibles (MTD), afin de prévenir ou, lorsque ce n'est pas réalisable, de réduire dans toute la mesure du possible, la pollution et les émissions dans l'environnement.

⁽¹⁾ JO L 375 du 31.12.1991.

⁽²⁾ JO L 334 du 17.12.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010627/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: Industrial pig farming and the Nitrates Directive

The French Government is about to authorise an increase in the capacity of industrial pig farms from 450 to 2 000 places.

Having been responsible for the Nitrates Directive for the European Parliament, I would like to ask the following question:

Does the Commission believe that this will have a negative impact on the implementation of the Nitrates Directive and the fight against green algae?

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

Directive 91/676/EEC ⁽¹⁾ concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources aims to reduce water pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources and to prevent further such pollution. To reach its objectives, the directive requires Member States to establish Action Programs, which should include, among other measures, specific provisions on manure storage and management.

The Commission considers that any intensification on livestock production should take full account of the risks these activities pose to waters. If necessary, appropriate reinforced measures in the Action Programs should be taken to ensure that they remain in line with the Nitrates Directive objectives. Reinforced Action Programs are crucial in areas where water quality is already degraded due, for instance, to eutrophication.

Moreover the intensive rearing of pigs (more than 2,000 places for production pigs or more than 750 places for sows) is subject to Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions ⁽²⁾. These activities have to be operated in accordance with a permit requiring the application of the best available techniques (BAT) to prevent or, where that is not possible, to minimise pollution and emissions to the environment.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 375, 31.12.1991.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 334, 17.12.2010.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010628/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Noms de domaine «.vin» et «.wine»

Aux côtés des traditionnels «.com» ou «.org», de nouvelles extensions comme «.paris», «.archi» ou «.bio» sont en train d'être attribuées par l'Icann, instance mondiale chargée de réglementer les noms de domaine sur internet. Mais certaines font l'objet d'un contentieux, comme «.vin» et «.wine».

Les seuls candidats à ces deux noms de domaine sont des sociétés étrangères n'ayant aucun lien avec le vin, et le secteur viticole français craint que ses précieuses appellations d'origine pâtissent de l'exploitation commerciale de ces extensions par des spéculateurs qui feraient fi de la législation européenne.

1. La Commission rejoint-elle notre avis selon lequel l'Europe ne peut accepter d'avoir sur internet les extensions ".vin" et ".wine" sans que les droits et les intérêts des indications géographiques et ceux des consommateurs ne soient suffisamment protégés?
2. Quel est le réel pouvoir de la Commission sur l'Icann?
3. Que compte faire la Commission pour permettre d'offrir une aire protégée pour les détenteurs d'indications géographiques et les consommateurs?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Kroes au nom de la Commission

(7 novembre 2013)

La Commission est parfaitement au courant du programme gTLD de l'ICANN et elle partage les préoccupations quant aux conséquences potentielles de l'attribution des noms de domaine «.wine» et «.vin» pour la protection des indications géographiques (IG) dans le secteur du vin. La Commission a insisté auprès de l'ICANN sur l'importance économique et politique de cette question pour l'UE.

Au sein du comité consultatif des gouvernements (GAC) de l'ICANN, la Commission défend l'idée selon laquelle des garde-fous doivent être mis en place afin de respecter la législation internationale et celle de l'Union sur les IG. En outre, la Commission a fait part au comité directeur de l'ICANN de son souci, et de la nécessité, de garantir une protection adéquate aux détenteurs de droits sur les IG et aux consommateurs.

La prise de décisions au sein de l'ICANN se faisant sur un mode plurilatéral, la Commission est également en contact étroit avec les organisations de détenteurs de droits de l'UE et leurs instances dirigeantes. La Commission suit attentivement l'évolution des négociations avec les candidats, afin de parvenir à une solution satisfaisante avant que l'ICANN ne puisse décider d'attribuer les deux extensions.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010628/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: Domain names '.vin' and '.wine'

Alongside the traditional '.com' or '.org', the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (Icann), the global body responsible for regulating Internet domain names, is now assigning new extensions such as '.paris', '.archi' and '.bio'. However, some are the subject of a dispute, such as '.vin' and '.wine'.

The only candidates for these two domain names are foreign companies which have no association with wine, and the French winegrowing sector is concerned that its precious designations of origin will be affected by the commercial use of these extensions by speculators flying in the face of European legislation.

1. Does the Commission share our opinion that Europe can only accept the existence of the extensions '.vin' and '.wine' on the Internet if the rights and interests of geographical indications and those of consumers are sufficiently protected?
2. What real power does the Commission have over Icann?
3. What does the Commission intend to do in order to provide protection for holders of geographical indications and consumers?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2013)

The Commission is fully aware of the ICANN gTLD programme and shares the concerns in relation to the potential implications of the two strings .wine and .vin on the protection of geographical indications (GI) in the wine sector. The Commission has stressed to ICANN the economic and political significance for the EU of the matter.

The Commission is defending the view in the GAC of ICANN that safeguards must be introduced in relation to EU and International legislation on GIs. In addition the Commission has shared with the ICANN Board its concerns and the need for sufficient protection for GI right holders and consumers.

The decisions in ICANN are taken through a multi stakeholder model, therefore the Commission is also in close contact with the EU right holders' organisations and governing bodies. The Commission is actively following the evolution of the negotiations with the applicants in order to reach a satisfactory solution, before ICANN can take the decision to delegate the two strings to the applicants.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010630/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Châtiments corporels sur les enfants

Pour satisfaire aux exigences de la Charte sociale européenne et de la Charte sociale européenne révisée, d'après le Comité européen des droits sociaux, il convient pour les États membres d'interdire tous les châtiments corporels et toutes les autres formes de châtiment et de traitement dégradant à l'encontre des enfants.

1. La Commission peut-elle expliquer pourquoi cinq États membres ne satisfont toujours pas à leurs engagements car ils n'ont pas de fait interdit tous les châtiments corporels?
2. Que fait à cet égard la Commission pour changer ce triste constat?
3. Que met en place la Commission pour promouvoir l'interdiction et l'élimination des châtiments corporels à l'égard des enfants dans tous les contextes de vie?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Reding au nom de la Commission

(19 novembre 2013)

1. La Charte sociale européenne et la Charte sociale européenne révisée ne font pas en soi partie du droit de l'Union. Par conséquent, la Commission n'est pas compétente en ce qui concerne le respect des obligations qui incombent aux États membres en vertu de ces instruments.
2. Eu égard au fait que la Commission n'est pas compétente en la matière, il appartient aux États membres concernés de répondre aux questions portant spécifiquement sur une violation de la Charte sociale européenne.
3. Le programme de l'Union européenne en matière de droits de l'enfant ⁽¹⁾ est centré sur une série d'actions dans des domaines dans lesquels l'Union peut apporter une valeur ajoutée, comme la justice adaptée aux enfants, la protection des enfants en situation de vulnérabilité et la lutte contre la violence à l'encontre des enfants, tant à l'intérieur de l'Union européenne qu'à l'extérieur. En outre, dans le cadre des programmes Daphné, la Commission a financé de nombreux projets visant à promouvoir la protection des enfants contre toute forme de violence qui se sont avérés fructueux. Toutefois, la portée de ces programmes se limite au soutien, entre autres, des activités de projets transnationaux et d'ONG portant sur l'étude de la violence, la sensibilisation, la facilitation de la mise en réseau et l'élaboration de programmes d'aide aux victimes. La protection active des enfants dans les États membres ainsi que tout programme de surveillance national se situent en dehors du champ d'application du programme Daphné III et des compétences de la Commission.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011DC0060:fr:NOT>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010630/13
to the Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Corporal punishment of children

According to the European Committee of Social Rights, in order to comply with the European Social Charter and the Revised European Social Charter, Member States must ban all forms of corporal punishment and any other forms of degrading punishment or treatment of children.

1. Can the Commission explain why five Member States still do not meet these requirements as they have not banned all forms of corporal punishment?
2. What is the Commission doing in this respect to change this sad state of affairs?
3. What is the Commission doing to promote the ban and to eliminate corporal punishment of children wherever they live?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(19 November 2013)

1. The European Social Charter and the Revised European Social Charter are as such not part of Union law. Therefore, the Commission has no competence regarding the compliance of Member States with their obligations under these instruments.
2. Considering the absence of competence of the Commission, it is for the Member States concerned to respond to specific questions relating to a violation of the European Social Charter.
3. The 'EU Agenda on the Rights of the Child' ⁽¹⁾ focuses on a number of actions in areas where the EU can bring added value, such as child-friendly justice, protecting children in vulnerable situations and fighting violence against children both inside the European Union and externally. Moreover, with the Daphne Programmes the Commission has funded numerous successful projects aimed at promoting the protection of children from all forms of violence. However, the remit of these programmes is limited to supporting, *inter alia*, transnational projects and NGOs in studying violence, raising awareness, facilitating networking and developing support programmes for victims. The active protection of children in the Member States as well as any national monitoring programmes lie outside the scope of the Daphne III programme and the competences of the Commission.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011DC0060:en:NOT>

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010631/13
à la Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Résultat de l'enquête de la Commission européenne sur Google

La Commission enquête depuis trois ans sur les pratiques de Google, après une plainte de Microsoft, TripAdvisor et d'autres concurrents de la firme de Mountain View.

Pour s'assurer de préserver la concurrence, la Commission va-t-elle enfin choisir entre rendre les engagements proposés par Google légalement contraignants et «une possible décision négative», à savoir une lourde amende infligée au moteur de recherche?

Quelle est la motivation de cette décision?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission

(22 novembre 2013)

Dans une évaluation préliminaire rendue publique en mars 2013, la Commission a fait part à Google de ses préoccupations et, le 3 avril 2013, l'entreprise a présenté des engagements détaillés visant à dissiper les quatre problèmes évoqués. À la suite de la consultation des acteurs du marché lancée le 26 avril 2013, la Commission a informé Google que ses engagements devaient être améliorés afin d'apporter une réponse adéquate aux préoccupations de la Commission. Google a aujourd'hui proposé des améliorations à ses engagements. La Commission demandera prochainement l'avis des plaignants et d'autres acteurs du marché concernés sur cette nouvelle version des engagements. Elle décidera ensuite, à la lumière de leurs réactions, si les engagements proposés par Google apportent une réponse satisfaisante à ses préoccupations en matière de concurrence et, partant, s'ils doivent être rendus obligatoires en vertu de l'article 9 du règlement (CE) n° 1/2003.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010631/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: Outcome of the Commission's investigation into Google

The Commission has been investigating Google's practices for three years, following a complaint lodged by Microsoft, TripAdvisor and other competitors of the Mountain View-based company.

To ensure that competition is preserved, is the Commission finally going to choose between making Google's proposed commitments legally binding and 'a possible negative decision', namely imposing a heavy fine on the search engine?

What are the grounds for this decision?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(22 November 2013)

The Commission outlined its concerns to Google in a Preliminary Assessment in March 2013 and Google proposed a detailed text of commitments to address the four concerns on 3 April 2013. Following a market test of these commitments launched on 26 April 2013, the Commission informed Google that improvements to its commitments were required to adequately address the Commission's concerns. Google has now offered improvements to its commitments. The Commission will soon seek feedback on Google's improved commitments from complainants and other relevant market participants. The Commission will then decide in light of the market feedback if the commitments offered by Google adequately address the Commission's competition concerns and thus whether they should be made binding pursuant to Article 9 of Regulation 1/2003.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010632/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Coupable d'optimisation fiscale

Le *Financial Times* a expliqué que les Pays Bas, l'Irlande et Luxembourg avaient des accords fiscaux qu'ils négocient au cas par cas pour attirer sur leur sol des multinationales. Quelle est la réaction de la Commission?

Va-t-elle dès lors diligenter une enquête formelle, s'il se confirmait que ces régimes constituent un traitement de faveur, voire un soutien public, en violation des règles européennes sur les aides d'État, comme cela a l'air d'être le cas?

Dans ce cadre, faute de législation interdisant de tels régimes, quels instruments peut utiliser la Commission? Contrôle de concurrence?

La démarche vise, entre autres, des sociétés comme Apple, Starbucks et Google (une fois encore), qui parviendraient à réduire comme peau de chagrin leur imposition sur l'Ancien Continent, tout en y réalisant par ailleurs de confortables bénéfices. La Commission compte-t-elle auditionner ces entreprises?

N'est-il pas évident que ces multinationales tentent d'éviter l'impôt partout dans le monde, y compris dans les pays en développement? Quelle est la réaction de la Commission?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission

(18 novembre 2013)

La Commission n'a pas pour habitude de commenter pas les allégations de violation présumée des règles en matière d'aides d'État reprises dans la presse. En cas de violation de ces règles, elle dispose de procédures d'examen. À l'heure actuelle, aucune décision anticipée en matière fiscale (ruling fiscal) ne fait l'objet d'une procédure formelle d'examen.

Les États membres sont libres de déterminer leurs régimes fiscaux et de choisir la politique économique qu'ils jugent la plus adéquate, pour autant qu'ils exercent cette compétence dans le respect de la législation de l'Union ⁽¹⁾. En particulier, les États membres ne doivent ni adopter ni maintenir une législation qui prévoit une aide d'État ou une discrimination contraires aux libertés fondamentales.

Les décisions anticipées prises par les administrations fiscales ne constituent pas en soi une aide d'État, sauf si elles octroient un avantage sélectif à certaines sociétés.

La procédure en matière d'aide d'État est une procédure bilatérale entre la Commission et l'État membre concerné. Bien que l'audition de sociétés ne soit pas prévue dans cette procédure, les parties intéressées sont toutefois invitées à formuler des observations.

Il existe déjà un certain nombre d'initiatives visant à lutter contre les stratégies de planification fiscale mises en œuvre par les multinationales afin de réduire leur charge fiscale globale ⁽²⁾. Par exemple, le code de conduite dans le domaine de la fiscalité des entreprises, adopté par le Conseil en décembre 1997, vise à lutter contre la concurrence fiscale dommageable et éviter ainsi des pertes trop importantes de recettes fiscales ⁽³⁾. En décembre 2012, la Commission a adopté un plan d'action pour renforcer la lutte contre la fraude et l'évasion fiscales ⁽⁴⁾ qui concerne également les pays tiers, dont les pays en développement. En ce qui concerne plus spécifiquement la taxation de l'économie numérique, le président Barroso a annoncé, lors du Conseil européen du 24 octobre 2013, la création d'un groupe d'experts externes qui aidera la Commission à identifier les options envisageables pour faire face à ces questions complexes.

⁽¹⁾ Voir, notamment, l'arrêt du 17 septembre 2009 dans l'affaire C-182/08, Glaxo Wellcome (Recueil 2009, p. I-8591, point 34) et jurisprudence citée.

⁽²⁾ Le plan d'action de l'OCDE sur l'érosion de la base d'imposition et le transfert de bénéfices a, par exemple, été approuvé par les dirigeants du G-20 lors de leur réunion à Saint-Petersbourg le 5 septembre dernier. Il prévoit un certain nombre d'actions visant à empêcher la double non-imposition ainsi que les cas d'impôt nul ou faible résultant de pratiques qui séparent artificiellement le bénéfice imposable des activités qui le génèrent.

⁽³⁾ Conclusions de la réunion du Conseil ECOFIN du 1^{er} décembre 1997 en matière de politique fiscale, (JO C 2 du 6.1.1998 p. 1).

⁽⁴⁾ COM(2012) 722 final. Dans sa recommandation relative à la planification fiscale agressive [C(2012) 8806 final] qui accompagnait le plan d'action, la Commission a notamment recommandé de prendre des mesures de lutte contre la planification fiscale agressive. Ces mesures visent à 1) éviter la double non-imposition par l'inclusion d'une clause appropriée dans les conventions des États membres en matière de double imposition, et 2) invitent les États membres à adopter une règle anti-abus générale, adaptée aux situations nationales et transfrontières.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010632/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: Guilty of tax optimisation

According to the *Financial Times*, the Netherlands, Ireland and Luxembourg have tax agreements which they negotiate on a case-by-case basis to attract multinationals to their shores. What does the Commission have to say about this?

Will the Commission therefore conduct a formal investigation if it is confirmed that these regimes constitute preferential treatment, or even official support, in breach of European rules on state aid, as seems to be the case?

In this context, in the absence of legislation prohibiting such regimes, what instruments can the Commission use? A competition test?

This action is aimed at companies including Apple, Starbucks and Google (once again), which manage to minimise their tax liabilities in Europe, while still making healthy profits. Does the Commission plan to hold hearings with these companies?

Is it not obvious that these multinationals are trying to avoid paying tax throughout the world, including in developing countries? What does the Commission have to say about this?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(18 November 2013)

The Commission generally does not comment on allegations on the infringement of state aid rules in the press. The Commission has procedures to investigate infringement of state aid rules. There is currently no formal investigation into any case of tax rulings.

Member States are free to design their tax systems and decide on the economic policy which they consider most appropriate, provided they exercise this competence consistently with Union law ⁽¹⁾. In particular, Member States must not introduce or maintain legislation which entails state aid or discrimination that is contrary to the fundamental freedoms.

Tax rulings issued by tax administrations do not per se constitute state aid, unless they provide for a selective advantage to certain companies.

The state aid procedure is a bilateral procedure between the Commission and the Member State concerned. No hearings of individual companies are provided for in this procedure; interested parties are however invited to make comments.

A number of initiatives are already in place to fight tax planning strategies employed by multinationals to reduce their overall tax burden ⁽²⁾. For example, the Code of Conduct for business taxation, agreed by the Council in December 1997, aims to fight harmful tax competition thereby preventing excessive losses of tax revenue ⁽³⁾. In December 2012 the Commission adopted an Action Plan to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion ⁽⁴⁾, also in relation to third countries including developing ones. More specifically as regards the taxation of the digital economy, President Barroso at the European Council on 24 October 2013 announced the establishment of a group of external experts that will assist the Commission in identifying options to address these complex issues.

⁽¹⁾ See, *inter alia*, Case C-182/08 Glaxo Wellcome [2009] ECR I-8591, paragraph 34 and the case-law cited.

⁽²⁾ E.g. the OECD's Action Plan on Base Erosion and Profit Shifting was endorsed by G-20 Leaders during their meeting in St-Petersburg on 5 October. It includes a number of actions to prevent double non-taxation, as well as cases of no or low taxation associated with practices that artificially segregate taxable income from the activities that generate it.

⁽³⁾ Conclusions of the Ecofin Council meeting on 1 December 1997 concerning taxation policy (98/C 2/01).

⁽⁴⁾ COM(2012) 722 final. In its Recommendation on Aggressive Tax Planning, C(2012) 8806 final, that accompanied the action plan, the Commission recommended, among other things, to take action against aggressive tax planning which includes (1) prevention of double non-taxation by the inclusion of an appropriate clause in their double taxation conventions; and (2) invite Member States to introduce into their national legislation a general anti-abuse rule, adapted to domestic and cross-border situations.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010633/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Neutralité de l'internet en péril

Soutenu par la commissaire européenne, un projet de règlement concernant les télécommunications a été adopté par la Commission européenne.

1. En prétendant protéger la neutralité d'internet en interdisant le blocage et le ralentissement des communications en ligne, ce texte ne vide-t-il pas ce principe de son sens en autorisant explicitement la discrimination commerciale par le biais de la «priorisation»?
2. La Commissaire comprend-elle que ce règlement va à l'encontre d'un internet vraiment libre?
3. La Commission accepte-t-elle, par respect pour les droits de l'internaute, que cette section du texte soit remplacée par des mesures garantissant l'application réelle et inconditionnelle de la neutralité de l'internet afin de défendre l'intérêt général?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Kroes au nom de la Commission

(31 octobre 2013)

La proposition ⁽¹⁾ de la Commission garantit un internet vraiment libre et ouvert, étant donné qu'il est interdit aux opérateurs de bloquer, ralentir, détériorer ou pénaliser certains contenus, applications et services, ou certaines catégories de ceux-ci, sauf dans un nombre très limité de cas où il est permis d'exercer une gestion raisonnable du trafic, pour autant que ce soit de manière transparente, non discriminatoire et proportionnée.

La proposition n'autorise pas de «priorisation» du trafic internet. Elle autorise toutefois la différenciation des prix de détail pour l'accès à l'internet en fonction du volume de données et de la vitesse, ce qui est compatible avec la neutralité de l'internet car les opérateurs doivent respecter les règles de gestion du trafic prévues à l'article 23. La pratique consistant à lier les prix au volume est fréquente dans la plupart des secteurs et garantit que les consommateurs ayant une faible consommation ne financent pas les gros utilisateurs par des subventions croisées.

Pour stimuler l'innovation, la proposition permet aux fournisseurs de contenus et d'applications de conclure des accords sur des niveaux de qualité supérieurs pour la fourniture de services spécialisés (tels que la télévision par internet, les applications de santé en ligne, l'informatique en nuage essentielle aux entreprises) aux utilisateurs finals. La proposition précise que ces services spécialisés ne peuvent se substituer à l'internet. En outre, étant donné que les services spécialisés ne doivent pas compromettre la qualité générale de l'internet, ils nécessitent généralement des investissements supplémentaires dans les réseaux, qui devraient profiter à l'ensemble de l'écosystème en ligne, y compris l'internet ouvert.

La proposition prévoit que les autorités réglementaires nationales auront des obligations étendues de surveillance et leur confère le pouvoir d'imposer des exigences minimales de qualité de service afin d'éviter l'altération de la qualité générale de l'internet. Elle prévoit que la qualité de l'internet devrait évoluer avec le progrès technologique.

⁽¹⁾ Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil établissant des mesures relatives au marché unique européen des communications électroniques et visant à faire de l'Europe un continent connecté, et modifiant les directives 2002/20/CE, 2002/21/CE et 2002/22/CE ainsi que les règlements (CE) n° 1211/2009 et (UE) n° 531/2012. COM(2013) 627 final.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010633/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 September 2013)**

Subject: Net neutrality at risk

With the Commissioner's support, a draft regulation on telecommunications has been adopted by the Commission.

1. Under the guise of protecting net neutrality by banning the blocking and slowing down of online communications, does this text not render this principle void of all meaning by explicitly authorising commercial discrimination through 'prioritisation'?
2. Does the Commissioner understand that this regulation runs counter to a truly free Internet?
3. Does the Commission accept that, in respect for the rights of Internet users, this section of the text should be replaced by measures ensuring the real and unconditional application of net neutrality in order to defend the general interest?

**Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(31 October 2013)**

The Commission's Proposal ⁽¹⁾ guarantees a truly free and open Internet as operators are prohibited to block, slow down, degrade or discriminate against specific content, applications and services, or specific classes thereof, except in a very limited number of cases when reasonable traffic management can be applied, and this has to be transparent, non-discriminatory and proportionate.

The proposal does not authorise 'prioritisation' of Internet traffic. It does allow differentiation of retail tariffs for Internet access based on data volume and speed, which is compatible with net neutrality because operators have to comply with the traffic management rules set out in Article 23. Volume-linked prices are common in most industries and ensure that consumers with low consumption do not cross-subsidise heavy users.

In order to foster innovation, the proposal allows content and application providers to conclude agreements on enhanced quality which are necessary for the provision of specialised services (such as IPTV, eHealth applications, business-critical cloud computing) to end-users. The proposal makes clear that such specialised services cannot be a substitute for the Internet. In addition, as specialised services must not impair the general quality of the Internet, they typically require additional investments in networks that will be beneficial to the online ecosystem as a whole, including the open Internet.

The proposal requires national regulators to have far-reaching monitoring obligations and confers on them powers to impose minimum quality of service requirements in order to prevent impairment of the general quality of the Internet. The proposal foresees that Internet quality should evolve with technological progress.

⁽¹⁾ Proposal for a regulation of the European parliament and of the Council laying down measures concerning the European single market for electronic communications and to achieve a Connected Continent, and amending Directives 2002/20/EC, 2002/21/EC and 2002/22/EC and Regulations (EC) No 1211/2009 and (EU) No 531/2012; COM(2013) 0627 final.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010634/13
à la Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Espèces européennes envahissantes

Ce lundi 9 septembre, la Commission européenne a présenté une nouvelle proposition de règlement visant à prévenir et à gérer le danger que représentent les quelque 2 000 espèces envahissantes recensées en Europe.

La proposition s'articule autour d'une liste d'espèces exotiques tout aussi envahissantes que préoccupantes pour l'Union, qui sera établie en concertation avec les États membres, sur la base d'évaluations des risques et de preuves scientifiques.

Les espèces désignées seront interdites dans l'Union européenne, ce qui signifie qu'il ne sera pas possible de les importer, de les acheter, de les utiliser, de les libérer dans l'environnement ni de les vendre.

1. Sur quelles bases s'est faite cette liste?
2. Que met en place la Commission en matière de prévention?
3. Quand la Commission saisira-t-elle le Parlement et pour quand compte-t-elle voir ce règlement d'application?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočník au nom de la Commission

(31 octobre 2013)

Dans le cadre de la proposition de la Commission ⁽¹⁾, la liste initiale des espèces exotiques envahissantes (EEE) préoccupantes pour l'Union sera proposée sur la base des évaluations des risques existantes réalisées, entre autres, par des organisations internationales telles que l'Organisation européenne pour la protection des plantes ou d'autres organisations scientifiques, après avoir vérifié le respect des critères définis dans la législation. Les États membres seront également invités à présenter à la Commission des demandes d'inscription d'espèces sur la liste des EEE préoccupantes pour l'Union selon les mêmes critères. La Commission établira et actualisera cette liste au moyen d'actes d'exécution.

La proposition de la Commission prévoit d'assurer la prévention par a) des interdictions accompagnant la liste des EEE préoccupantes pour l'Union et des dispositions visant à faire respecter ces interdictions; b) des mesures visant à remédier aux voies d'introduction non intentionnelle et c) la mise en place d'un système d'alerte précoce et de réponse rapide, soutenu par le Réseau européen d'information sur les espèces exotiques (EASIN — European Alien Species Information Network).

La Commission prévoit de proposer le premier acte d'exécution dans un délai d'un an après l'entrée en vigueur de la législation. Tous les projets d'actes d'exécution seront mis à la disposition du Parlement européen, conformément aux dispositions du règlement (UE) n° 182/2011 ⁽²⁾ concernant l'exercice des compétences d'exécution.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2013) 620.

⁽²⁾ JO L 55 du 28.2.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010634/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: Invasive species in Europe

On Monday 9 September, the Commission presented a new proposal for a regulation aimed at preventing and managing the danger represented by the approximately 2 000 invasive species recorded in Europe.

The proposal centres around a list of invasive alien species of Union concern, which will be drawn up with the Member States using risk assessments and scientific evidence.

Selected species will be banned from the EU, meaning it will not be possible to import, buy, use, release or sell them.

1. On what basis will this list be drawn up?
2. What is the Commission putting in place in terms of prevention?
3. When will the Commission submit this to Parliament and when does it expect to see this implementing regulation?

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

Under the Commission proposal ⁽¹⁾, the initial list of invasive alien species (IAS) of Union concern would be proposed on the basis of existing risk assessments carried out, *inter alia*, by international organisations, such as the European Plant Protection Organisation, or other scientific institutions, after checking compliance with the criteria set out in the legislation. Member States would also be invited to submit to the Commission requests for the inclusion of species on the list of IAS of Union concern, according to the same criteria. The Commission would establish and update the list by means of implementing acts.

The Commission proposal foresees prevention through (a) the bans attached to the list of IAS of Union concern and the provisions to enforce those bans; (b) measures to address the pathways of unintentional introduction; and (c) the establishment of an early warning rapid response system, supported by the European Alien Species Information Network (EASIN).

The Commission plans to propose the first implementing act within a year after the entry into force of the legislation. All draft implementing acts will be made available to the European Parliament in line with the rules of Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 ⁽²⁾ on the exercise of implementing powers.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2013) 620.
⁽²⁾ OJ L 55, 28.2.2011.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010635/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Règle UEFA sur les «joueurs formés localement» en péril

La Commission européenne avait commandité une étude sur l'évaluation de la règle des «joueurs formés localement» adoptée en 2005 par l'UEFA. Cette étude a pour objet de déterminer la compatibilité de cette règle avec le droit communautaire et, en particulier, le principe de la libre circulation des travailleurs.

Les conclusions de l'ouvrage sont assassines avec la règle UEFA. Il y est expliqué, entre autres, que:

- la règle des joueurs formés localement est restrictive de liberté;
- les effets bénéfiques de la règle des joueurs formés localement sont faibles.

En conséquence, il n'est pas démontré l'équilibre (proportionné) entre la nécessité de cette règle et l'atteinte portée à la libre circulation des travailleurs.

1. La Commission confirme-t-elle ces conclusions?
2. Estime-t-elle que l'UEFA ne réalise pas ses objectifs? Pour rappel, l'objectif de l'UEFA est d'encourager la formation locale des jeunes joueurs et d'augmenter l'ouverture et l'impartialité des compétitions européennes. Elle vise également à limiter la tendance à acheter des joueurs à tout-va et à essayer de rétablir l'identité «locale» des clubs.
3. À compter de la saison 2008-2009, les clubs engagés en UEFA Champions League et en UEFA Europa League doivent inscrire au minimum huit joueurs formés localement dans un groupe limité à 25 joueurs. Ces règles ont également été mises en place dans plusieurs championnats nationaux d'Europe. La Commission remet-elle aussi en cause cet aspect-là?
4. Que propose la Commission?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission

(11 novembre 2013)

1. Selon l'étude mentionnée dans la question, l'équilibre de la concurrence entre les clubs de football qui participent à la Champions League et à l'Europa League s'est amélioré depuis la mise en œuvre de la règle de l'UEFA sur les joueurs formés localement («la règle»). L'étude analyse également l'impact sur la formation des jeunes joueurs et conclut que leur nombre a augmenté dans les compétitions de l'UEFA au cours de ces dernières années. Cette règle revient à limiter la libre circulation des travailleurs dans l'Union européenne. Toutefois, cette limitation peut être justifiée par des objectifs légitimes d'intérêt public, conformément à l'article 45 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne et à la jurisprudence de la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne.
2. Selon l'étude, cette règle contribue à atteindre les objectifs poursuivis, mais d'autres facteurs peuvent également y avoir contribué. Si l'augmentation du nombre de jeunes joueurs formés localement qui participent aux compétitions de l'UEFA semble être une conséquence directe de cette règle, d'autres mesures mises en œuvre par l'UEFA, par exemple l'obligation de maintenir un centre de formation dans le cadre des conditions d'octroi des licences des clubs, ainsi que des mesures mises en œuvre à l'échelon national, peuvent également avoir exercé une influence.
3. Non, la Commission n'a pas remis en cause la règle en soi (voir la communication de la Commission du 28 mai 2008 ⁽¹⁾), ni des dispositions nationales similaires, dans la mesure où elles restent proportionnées aux objectifs poursuivis.

⁽¹⁾ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-08-807_fr.htm

4. La Commission suivra de près l'évolution de cette règle et des dispositions nationales similaires.

La Commission invitera le comité européen du dialogue social dans le secteur du football professionnel à discuter des conclusions de cette étude et à réfléchir aux recommandations qui y sont proposées.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010635/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 September 2013)**

Subject: UEFA rule on 'locally trained players' in jeopardy

The Commission commissioned a study evaluating the rule on 'locally trained players' adopted by UEFA in 2005. The aim of this study is to determine whether this rule is compatible with EC law and, in particular, the principle of the free movement of workers.

The conclusions of the study are damning for the UEFA rule. Amongst other items, the study explains that:

- the locally trained players rule is freedom-restricting;
- the beneficial effects of the locally trained players rule are limited.

Consequently, there is no evidence of the (proportionate) balance between the need for this rule and the threat that it poses to the free movement of workers.

1. Can the Commission confirm these findings?
2. Does it believe that UEFA is failing to reach its objectives? By way of reminder, UEFA's objective is to encourage local training of young players and to make European competitions more open and impartial. It also aims to curb the trend of buying players left, right and centre, and is trying to re-establish clubs' 'local' identities.
3. Since the 2008-09 season, UEFA Champions League and UEFA Europa League clubs must sign at least eight locally trained players in a group limited to 25 players. These rules have also been put in place in several European national championships. Is the Commission calling this into question as well?
4. What does the Commission propose?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(11 November 2013)**

1. According to the study the competitive balance among the clubs playing the Champions and Europa League improved since the implementation of the UEFA's home-grown player rule ('the Rule'). The study also analyses the impact on the training of young players and concludes that their number in UEFA competitions increased in the last years. The rule is a limitation to EU free movement of workers. However, it might be justified by legitimate objectives of public interest according to Article 45 TFEU and CJEU case-law.
2. According to the study the Rule helps to reach the pursued objectives, but other factors may have also contributed. While the increase in the number of young home-grown players participating in UEFA competitions seems to be a direct consequence of the Rule, other measures implemented by UEFA, for example the requirement to maintain a training academy as part of the Club Licensing conditions, as well as measures implemented at national level may also have exerted an influence.
3. No. The Commission did not call into question the Rule as such (see the Commission's communication of 28.05.2008 ⁽¹⁾), or similar national rules as far as they remain proportionate to the pursued objectives.
4. The Commission will closely monitor further development of the Rule and similar national rules.

The Commission will invite the EU Social Dialogue Committee in the Professional Football sector to discuss the study's findings and reflect on the study's recommendations.

⁽¹⁾ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-08-807_en.htm

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010636/13
au Conseil**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: TTF contestée par le Conseil

Le Conseil européen veut remettre en cause la taxe sur les transactions financières au sein de l'Union européenne. Le projet est même tout simplement illégal selon un rapport des experts juridiques du Conseil européen, qui représente les exécutifs des États membres de l'Union européenne. Cette taxe, qui doit rapporter 35 milliards d'euros par an serait contraire au traité européen parce qu'elle empiéterait sur les compétences en matière de fiscalité d'États membres qui ne souhaitent pas s'y soumettre.

1. Que pense le Conseil de l'argument des experts disant qu'en plus de provoquer des «distorsions de concurrence», selon les termes employés par les experts, elle serait en effet un «obstacle» à l'un des piliers du traité fondateur: la libre circulation des capitaux?

L'idée est de prélever 0,1 % sur les transactions d'actions et d'obligations et 0,01 % sur les produits dérivés avec quelques exceptions. Une seule condition: que la transaction soit effectuée par une banque ou une institution financière basée dans l'un des États signataires. C'est principalement cette disposition que les experts du Conseil trouvent excessive.

2. Que répond le Conseil au fait que la volonté de garder une activité de marché au sein de la zone euro ne peut justifier à elle seule une position considérée comme trop agressive?

3. Partagez vous le point de vue de ces experts disant que la taxe frapperait en effet des activités «avec une réelle substance économique qui ne sont pas susceptibles de contribuer au risque systémique et qui sont indispensables pour les activités d'entreprises non financières»?

Réponse

(11 novembre 2013)

Le 28 septembre 2011, la Commission a adopté une proposition de directive du Conseil établissant un système commun de taxe sur les transactions financières et modifiant la directive 2008/7/CE ⁽¹⁾. L'unanimité requise au sein du Conseil pour que cette taxe puisse être instaurée n'a pu être réalisée et, le 29 juin 2012, le Conseil européen a conclu que la directive proposée ne serait pas adoptée par le Conseil dans un délai raisonnable ⁽²⁾.

Onze États membres ont toutefois indiqué qu'ils souhaitaient établir entre eux une coopération renforcée pour instituer cette taxe. Le 22 janvier 2013, le Conseil, sur proposition de la Commission et après avoir obtenu l'accord du Parlement européen, a adopté une décision autorisant une coopération renforcée dans le domaine de la taxe sur les transactions financières ⁽³⁾.

Le 14 février 2013, la Commission européenne a donc présenté une proposition de directive du Conseil mettant en œuvre cette coopération renforcée ⁽⁴⁾.

Les discussions sur cette proposition de directive sont en cours et le Conseil n'a pas encore défini de position sur les questions posées par l'Honorable Parlementaire.

⁽¹⁾ 14942/11.

⁽²⁾ EUCO 76/12.

⁽³⁾ JO L 22 du 25.1.2013, p. 11.

⁽⁴⁾ 6442/13.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010636/13
to the Council**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Financial Transaction Tax (FTT) disputed by the Council

The European Council is seeking to challenge the taxing of financial transactions within the European Union. The proposal is quite simply illegal according to a report by legal experts of the European Council, which represents the Heads of State or Government of EU Member States. This tax, which should generate an annual EUR 35 billion, is said to be incompatible with the European Treaty because it would infringe upon the taxing competences of non-participating Member States.

1. What does the Council think of the experts' claim that in addition to causing 'distortions of competition', the tax would in fact, to quote the words of the experts, be an 'obstacle' to one of the cornerstones of the EU Treaty, namely free movement of capital?

The idea is that trading of shares and bonds would be taxed at 0.1% and derivatives at 0.01% with a few exceptions. The only condition would be that the transaction be performed by a bank or financial institution based in one of the Member States having signed up to the FTT. This is the main provision which the Council experts consider to be unreasonable

2. What is the Council's response to the fact that the desire to maintain a trading activity within the euro area cannot by itself justify what has been deemed as an over-aggressive position?

3. Does the Council share the opinion of these experts that the tax would indeed impact activities with a 'genuine economic substance that are not liable to contribute to systemic risk and which are indispensable for the activities of non-financial business entities'?

Reply

(11 November 2013)

On 28 September 2011, the Commission adopted a proposal for a Council Directive on a common system of financial transaction tax and amending Directive 2008/7/EC ⁽¹⁾. The unanimity required in the Council to proceed with this tax was not achieved and the European Council concluded on 29 June 2012 that the proposed Directive would not be adopted by the Council within a reasonable period ⁽²⁾.

However, eleven Member States expressed their willingness to proceed with this tax under enhanced cooperation. On 22 January 2013, the Council adopted a decision authorising enhanced cooperation in the area of financial transaction tax ⁽³⁾, on a proposal from the Commission and after obtaining the consent of the European Parliament.

On 14 February 2013, the European Commission thus tabled a proposal for a Council Directive implementing this enhanced cooperation ⁽⁴⁾.

Deliberations are ongoing on the proposed Directive and a position has not been reached within the Council on the questions raised by the Honourable Member.

⁽¹⁾ 14942/11.

⁽²⁾ EUCO 76/12.

⁽³⁾ OJ L 22 of 25.1.2013, p. 11.

⁽⁴⁾ 6442/13.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010637/13
à la Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: TTF contestée par le Conseil

Le Conseil européen veut remettre en cause la taxe sur les transactions financières au sein de l'Union européenne. Le projet est même tout simplement illégal selon un rapport des experts juridiques du Conseil européen, qui représente les exécutifs des États membres de l'Union européenne. Cette taxe, qui doit rapporter 35 milliards d'euros par an serait contraire au traité européen parce qu'elle empiéterait sur les compétences en matière de fiscalité d'États membres qui ne souhaitent pas s'y soumettre.

1. Que pense la Commission de l'argument du Conseil européen disant qu'en plus de provoquer des «distorsions de concurrence», selon les termes employés par les experts, elle serait en effet un «obstacle» à l'un des piliers du traité fondateur: la libre circulation des capitaux.

L'idée est de prélever 0,1 % sur les transactions d'actions et d'obligations et 0,01 % sur les produits dérivés avec quelques exceptions. Une seule condition: que la transaction soit effectuée par une banque ou une institution financière basée dans l'un des États signataires. C'est principalement cette disposition que les experts du Conseil trouvent excessive.

2. Que répond la Commission au fait que la volonté de garder une activité de marché au sein de la zone euro ne peut justifier à elle seule une position considérée comme trop agressive?

3. Partagez vous le point de vue de ces experts disant que la taxe frapperait en effet des activités «avec une réelle substance économique qui ne sont pas susceptibles de contribuer au risque systémique et qui sont indispensables pour les activités d'entreprises non financières»?

Réponse donnée par M. Šemeta au nom de la Commission

(6 novembre 2013)

1. La Commission ne partage pas ce point de vue ⁽¹⁾.

2. La Commission ne partage pas ce point de vue ⁽²⁾.

3. La Commission a exposé dans ses différentes analyses d'impact et analyses supplémentaires effectuées dans le cadre de ses propositions relatives à la TTF que l'harmonisation de la taxe telle que proposée, tout bien considéré, ne nuira pas à l'économie réelle et ne devrait pas avoir d'incidence négative sur l'efficacité des marchés financiers.

⁽¹⁾ Pour les arguments qui sous-tendent le point de vue, voir l'analyse d'impact (SWD/2013/28) et son résumé (SWD/2012/29).

⁽²⁾ Pour les arguments qui sous-tendent le point de vue, voir l'analyse d'impact (SWD/2013/28) et son résumé (SWD/2012/29).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010637/13
to the Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Financial Transaction Tax (FTT) disputed by the Council

The European Council is seeking to challenge the taxing of financial transactions within the European Union. The proposal is quite simply illegal according to a report by legal experts of the European Council, which represents the Heads of State or Government of EU Member States. This tax, which should generate an annual EUR 35 billion, is said to be incompatible with the European Treaty because it would infringe upon the taxing competences of non-participating Member States.

1. What does the Commission think of the European Council's claim that in addition to causing 'distortions of competition', the tax would in fact, to quote the words of the experts, be an 'obstacle' to one of the cornerstones of the EU Treaty, namely free movement of capital?

The idea is that trading of shares and bonds would be taxed at 0.1% and derivatives at 0.01% with a few exceptions. The only condition would be that the transaction be performed by a bank or financial institution based in one of the Member States having signed up to the FTT. This is the main provision which the Council experts consider to be unreasonable.

2. What is the Commission's response to the fact that the desire to maintain a trading activity within the euro area cannot by itself justify what has been deemed as an over-aggressive position?

3. Does the Commission share the opinion of these experts that the tax would indeed impact activities with a 'genuine economic substance that are not liable to contribute to systemic risk and which are indispensable for the activities of non-financial business entities'?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission

(6 November 2013)

1 and 2. The Commission does not share this view ⁽¹⁾.

3. The Commission showed in its different impact assessments and additional analysis undertaken in the context of its FTT proposals that the harmonisation of the tax as proposed will on balance neither harm the real economy nor is it expected to negatively impact on the efficiency of financial markets.

⁽¹⁾ For the reasoning behind, see the impact assessment (SWD/2013/28) and its summary (SWD/2012/29).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010638/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Versement anticipé des aides de la PAC

Les conditions climatiques très défavorables, notamment liées aux pluies exceptionnelles du printemps, ainsi que le contexte économique difficile, en particulier pour les éleveurs, justifieraient un versement anticipé des aides de la PAC.

Plusieurs demandes ont été faites à la fin du mois d'août pour un versement anticipé des aides de la PAC.

La Commission accède-t-elle à cette demande? Si oui, dans quelle mesure, et à quelles conditions?

Réponse donnée par M. Ciolos au nom de la Commission

(5 novembre 2013)

La Commission est bien consciente des difficultés auxquelles sont confrontés les agriculteurs européens à la suite des conditions climatiques extrêmes qui ont frappé une grande partie du territoire de l'Union européenne et elle suit de près l'évolution de la situation climatique ainsi que ses conséquences sur l'agriculture.

Afin d'aider les agriculteurs à surmonter ces difficultés, la Commission a adopté le 2 octobre le règlement d'exécution (UE) n° 946/2013 de la Commission ⁽¹⁾.

Ce règlement prévoit qu'à compter du 16 octobre 2013 les États membres peuvent verser aux agriculteurs des avances jusqu'à concurrence de 50 % des paiements directs énumérés à l'annexe I du règlement (CE) n° 73/2009 ⁽²⁾ pour les demandes introduites en 2013. Ces montants peuvent être versés sans tenir compte de l'ajustement visé à l'article 11 du règlement (CE) n° 73/2009 pour autant que la vérification des conditions d'admissibilité au bénéfice de l'aide conformément à l'article 20 du règlement (CE) n° 73/2009 ait été effectuée.

En ce qui concerne les paiements pour la viande bovine prévus au titre IV, chapitre 1, section 11 du règlement (CE) n° 73/2009, les États membres sont autorisés à augmenter ce montant jusqu'à concurrence de 80 %.

⁽¹⁾ JO 261 du 3.10.2013.

⁽²⁾ JO L 30 du 31.1.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010638/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: Advance payment of CAP subsidies

The very unfavourable weather conditions, particularly related to exceptionally heavy rain in the spring, in addition to the difficult economic climate, particularly for farmers, would justify an advance payment of CAP subsidies.

Several requests were made at the end of August for an advance payment of CAP subsidies.

Will the Commission agree to these requests? If so, to what extent and on what terms?

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

The Commission is well aware of the difficulties European farmers are facing as a consequence of extreme weather conditions affecting a large part of the European Union territory and monitors closely the evolution of the weather situation and the impact on agriculture.

In order to help farmers to face these difficulties, the Commission adopted on 2 October Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 946/2013 ⁽¹⁾

This regulation foresees that Member States may pay, from 16 October 2013 on, advances to farmers of up to 50% of the direct payments listed in Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 ⁽²⁾ in respect of applications made in 2013. This can be done without taking into account the adjustment referred to in Article 11 of Regulation (EC) No 73/2009, provided that the verification of the eligibility conditions pursuant to Article 20 of Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 has been finalised.

Regarding the beef and veal payments provided for in Section 11 of Chapter 1 of Title IV of Regulation (EC) No 73/2009, Member States are authorised to increase this amount to up to 80%.

⁽¹⁾ OJ 261 of 3.10.2013.
⁽²⁾ OJ L 30, 31.1.2009.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010639/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Syriens en Bulgarie

Confronté à un afflux massif de réfugiés fuyant les combats en Syrie, le gouvernement bulgare a lancé, le 16 septembre, un appel «à la solidarité européenne», demandant aux autres pays de l'Union d'en accueillir une partie.

«Actuellement, 4 010 personnes, dont 1 465 Syriens, sont en procédure de demande d'asile, et près d'un millier, dont 250 Syriens» en attente, a déclaré le ministre de l'intérieur, Tsvetlin Iovchev. Celui-ci a ajouté que, «bientôt», la Bulgarie «aura atteint le seuil de 5 000 réfugiés qu'elle peut accueillir» et a annoncé qu'il allait écrire à la Commission européenne pour solliciter son aide.

Le 16 septembre, la police des frontières a arrêté 57 personnes, dont 30 réfugiés syriens, qui avaient franchi illégalement la frontière turco-bulgare. Les trois centres d'accueil du pays tourneraient à plus de 150 % de leur capacité: la Croix-Rouge nationale a lancé une campagne de récolte de fonds pour faire face à une probable urgence humanitaire.

1. Quelle est la réaction de la Commission?
2. Quelles sont ensuite les actions à entreprendre par elle?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Malmström au nom de la Commission

(19 novembre 2013)

La Commission, avec l'appui de Frontex et du Bureau européen d'appui en matière d'asile (BEAA), suit de près l'évolution de la situation sur le terrain dans tous les États membres affectés par le gonflement des flux migratoires ou susceptibles de l'être, y compris en Bulgarie.

Pour aider un État membre à relever de tels défis, la Commission peut lui apporter un soutien financier ou un appui matériel par le truchement de Frontex ou du BEAA, par exemple avec le déploiement d'équipes d'appui «asile» qui aideront les autorités de l'État membre concerné à renforcer leurs capacités et la qualité. Cette assistance peut être fournie si l'État membre concerné en fait la demande.

La Commission discute actuellement de la possibilité d'accorder un soutien financier aux autorités bulgares, et un plan opérationnel BEAA-Bulgarie a été signé le 17 octobre 2013. Une attention particulière est accordée à la nécessité de renforcer et d'améliorer les structures d'accueil et d'hébergement de la Bulgarie, ainsi que les capacités de traitement des demandes de protection de l'Agence d'État bulgare aux réfugiés.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010639/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: Syrians in Bulgaria

Faced with a massive influx of refugees fleeing the war in Syria, on 16 September the Bulgarian Government appealed for 'European solidarity', and called on other EU Member States to take charge of some of the asylum-seekers.

'As it stands, asylum applications from 4 010 people, including 1 465 Syrians, are being processed, and close to 1 000 others, of which 250 are from Syrians' are in preparation, declared Interior Minister Tsvetlin Iovchev. The Minister added that Bulgaria would 'soon exceed the limit of 5 000 refugees' and announced his intention to write to the Commission to solicit aid from the EU.

On 16 September, border police arrested 57 people, including 30 Syrian refugees, who had illegally crossed the Bulgarian-Turkish border. The country's three refugee centres are currently operating at 150% of their capacity: the national branch of the Red Cross has launched a campaign to collect funds for a probable humanitarian emergency.

1. What is the Commission's reaction?
2. What actions will the Commission then take?

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

The Commission, assisted by Frontex and the European Asylum Support (EASO) office, is closely following the situation on the ground in all Member States that are or could be affected by increased migratory flows, including Bulgaria.

The Commission can assist Member States faced with such challenges with financial support and/or offer assistance in kind through EASO or Frontex, for instance through deployment of asylum support teams to assist the authorities of the Member State with capacity and quality building. Such assistance can be provided if it is requested by the authorities of the Member State.

The Commission is currently discussing the possibility of financial support with the Bulgarian authorities, and an EASO-Bulgaria Operating Plan was signed on 17 October 2013. Particular attention is being paid to the need to enlarge and improve Bulgaria's reception and accommodation capacity, as well as capacity of the Bulgarian State Agency for Refugees to process claims for protection.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010640/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Interdiction du chalutage en eaux profondes

En 2012, la Commission avait proposé d'interdire dans un délai de deux ans le chalutage en eaux profondes, accusé d'avoir un impact négatif sur les fonds des océans. À l'époque, cette demande avait été rejetée par la France et par l'Espagne.

1. N'est-il pas temps, pour la Commission, d'interdire le chalutage en eaux profondes une fois pour toutes?
2. La Commission partage-t-elle notre avis quant à la nocivité de cette pratique pour les fonds des océans?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Damanaki au nom de la Commission

(19 novembre 2013)

Le 19 juillet 2012, la Commission a adopté une proposition ⁽¹⁾ de nouveau régime d'accès pour les pêcheries d'eau profonde prévoyant que les engins identifiés comme nuisibles à l'environnement, à savoir les chaluts de fond et les filets maillants de fond, seraient progressivement supprimés pour des pêcheries ciblées. Cette mesure vise à assurer la protection efficace des écosystèmes marins vulnérables et à réduire les captures accidentelles. Le Comité économique et social européen a rendu son avis le 13 février 2013. La commission de la pêche du Parlement européen s'est prononcée sur le rapport portant modification de la proposition de la Commission le 4 novembre 2013. Le Conseil n'a pas encore commencé l'examen de la proposition de la Commission.

La Commission a fondé sa proposition sur des éléments de preuve démontrant que le chalutage hauturier porte atteinte aux fonds marins et nuit à la structure de l'habitat des fonds marins et de ses communautés associées. Certains habitats, notamment les récifs coralliens d'eau froide et les communautés d'éponges d'eau profonde, sont connus pour être particulièrement sensibles à ces perturbations physiques. Les chaluts de fond et les filets maillants ne seraient donc plus utilisés pour la pêche des stocks de poissons d'eau profonde afin de prévenir ce type de dommages.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 371.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010640/13
to the Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Deep-sea trawling ban

In 2012, both France and Spain rejected a Commission recommendation calling for the introduction within two years of a ban on deep-sea trawling in response to concerns that it was damaging the seabed.

1. Is the time not now ripe for the Commission to ban deep-sea trawling once and for all?
2. Does the Commission agree that this activity is causing damage to the seabed?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission

(19 November 2013)

On 19 July 2012 the Commission adopted a proposal ⁽¹⁾ for a new access regime for deep sea fisheries whereby those gears identified as environmentally harmful, i.e., bottom trawls and gillnets, would be phased out for targeted fisheries. This measure seeks the effective protection of vulnerable marine ecosystems and to reduce unwanted catches. The European Economic and Social Committee gave opinion on 13 February 2013. The Fisheries Committee in the European Parliament has voted on the report amending the Commission proposal on 4 November 2013. The Council has not started yet discussing the Commission proposal.

The Commission has based its proposal on evidence that deep-sea trawling harms the seabed and damages both the structure of the seabed habitat and its associated communities. Some habitats, including cold-water coral reefs and deep-sea sponge communities, are known to be particularly sensitive to such physical disturbance. Bottom trawls and gillnets would therefore no longer be used in fisheries targeting deep sea fish stocks in order to prevent such harm.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 371.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010641/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Protection des données dans le cadre d'eCall

Alerter les secours à l'instant même où l'accident se produit, c'est le boulot d'eCall. Projet de la Commission européenne, ce système permet d'appeler automatiquement ambulance et police en cas de collision entre véhicules ou de sortie de route. C'est le déclenchement de l'airbag ou la détection d'un freinage très appuyé qui pourrait informer le 112, le numéro d'urgence général. Dès 2015, tous les nouveaux véhicules immatriculés dans l'Union européenne devront être équipés d'un tel système. De manière générale, l'efficacité de l'eCall est saluée par tous. Selon la Commission, il permettrait de sauver de nombreuses vies en réduisant le temps de réponse d'au moins 50 %. Des avantages que le TCS relève également. «L'eCall permet une réaction plus rapide et plus ciblée car il transmet les données concernant le véhicule, y compris sa position en cas d'accident», indique Laurent Pignot, porte-parole. Ainsi, les opérations de sauvetage sont accélérées, en particulier dans des régions isolées. En outre, l'eCall permet une communication vocale entre les occupants du véhicule et la centrale appelée. Enfin, le système appelle la centrale même si les occupants sont inconscients. Mais, comme tout système de géolocalisation, il suscite doutes et inquiétudes en termes de protection des données.

1. Quelles sont les dispositions prévues concernant l'enregistrement des données privées et leur type? Qui pourra y avoir accès?
2. En cas de procès après un accident, le système qui vous a sauvé la vie pourrait-il vous la rendre invivable par la suite?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Kroes au nom de la Commission

(29 octobre 2013)

En cas d'accident, des données de localisation sont transmises, comme pour tout autre appel au 112. Toutes les exigences fixées dans les actes législatifs pertinents ⁽¹⁾, ⁽²⁾, ⁽³⁾, s'appliquent également à ces données. En outre, des données de localisation plus précises (la position actuelle et deux positions antérieures du véhicule telles que déterminées par le système de navigation par satellite) sont transmises via l'ensemble minimal de données ⁽⁴⁾ (MSD). Ces données sont transmises au centre de réception des appels d'urgence (PSAP) et enregistrées conformément à la législation applicable⁽²⁾; dans le cas des appels urgents, le consentement de l'utilisateur n'est pas requis pour le traitement des données de localisation par les organismes chargés de traiter les appels d'urgence et reconnus comme tels par les États membres, notamment les forces de l'ordre, les services d'ambulance et les corps de sapeurs-pompiers, aux fins de réagir à ces appels. Aucun intermédiaire n'a accès à l'ensemble minimal de données qui est transmis par le système embarqué (IVS) aux PSAP.

Les champs obligatoires du MSD comprennent le mode de déclenchement (automatique ou manuel), l'identification du véhicule, le type et le mode de propulsion du véhicule, l'horodatage, la direction du véhicule, sa position actuelle et deux positions antérieures, et le nombre de passagers. Aucune autre donnée n'est collectée ou transmise par le système eCall embarqué (IVS); l'IVS n'est actif qu'en cas d'accident ou d'activation manuelle, de sorte qu'il n'y a pas de problème de protection de la vie privée lié à la localisation.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2002/22/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 7 mars 2002 concernant le service universel et les droits des utilisateurs au regard des réseaux et services de communications électroniques (directive «service universel»).

⁽²⁾ Directive 2009/136/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 25 novembre 2009 modifiant la directive 2002/22/CE concernant le service universel et les droits des utilisateurs au regard des réseaux et services de communications électroniques, directive 2002/58/CE concernant le traitement des données à caractère personnel et la protection de la vie privée dans le secteur des communications électroniques et règlement (CE) n° 2006/2004 relatif à la coopération entre les autorités nationales chargées de veiller à l'application de la législation en matière de protection des consommateurs.

⁽³⁾ Directive 95/46/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 24 octobre 1995 relative à la protection des personnes physiques à l'égard du traitement des données à caractère personnel et à la libre circulation de ces données.

⁽⁴⁾ CEN EN 15722 «Télématique de la circulation et du transport routier — ESafety — Ensemble minimal de données (MSD) pour l'eCall».

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010641/13
to the Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Data protection within the framework of eCall

eCall's task is to alert the emergency services at the very second an accident takes place. As one of the Commission's projects, the system makes it possible to make automatic calls to police and ambulance services in the event of a vehicle collision or roadside accident. When the airbag is released or sudden braking is detected, a call can be made to 112, the general emergency number. From 2015, all new vehicles registered in the European Union will have to be fitted with such a system. Generally speaking, eCall's effectiveness is welcomed by all. According to the Commission, it means that many lives will be saved by reducing response times by at least 50%. Touring Club Suisse (TCS) also highlights these advantages. 'eCall enables a faster and more targeted response as it transmits data about the vehicle, including its position in the event of an accident', according to spokesperson Laurent Pignot. Rescue operations are therefore faster, particularly in isolated areas. In addition, eCall enables voice communication between passengers inside the vehicle and the response centre. Finally, the system calls the response centre even if the passengers are unconscious. However, like any GPS system, it raises doubts and concerns with regard to data protection.

1. What provisions are planned with regard to recording private data and the nature of these data? Who will be able to access them?
2. In the event of a trial following an accident, could the system that saved your life subsequently make your life unliveable?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission

(29 October 2013)

When an accident occurs, location data are transmitted, as in any other 112 call. All requirements as set out in the relevant legislative acts ⁽¹⁾ ⁽²⁾ ⁽³⁾ also apply to these data. Additionally, more accurate location data (the current and two previous positions of the vehicle as determined by the satellite navigation system) are transmitted through the Minimum Set of Data ⁽⁴⁾ (MSD). These data are transmitted to the Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) and stored in compliance with the relevant legislation ⁽²⁾; in the case of emergency calls the consent of the user is not needed for the processing of location data by organisations dealing with emergency calls and recognised as such by the Member States, including law enforcement agencies, ambulance services and fire brigades, for the purpose of responding to such calls. No intermediate parties have access to the MSD that is transmitted from the IVS to the PSAPs.

The mandatory fields of the MSD include the triggering mode (automatic or manual), vehicle identification, vehicle type and propulsion, timestamp, vehicle direction, current and two previous positions, and number of passengers. No other data is collected or transmitted by the eCall in-vehicle system (IVS); the IVS is only active when an accident occurs or if it is manually triggered, thus there is no privacy issue related to tracking.

⁽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 (Universal Service Directive).

⁽²⁾ Directive 2009/136/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2009 amending Directive 2002/22/EC on universal service and users' rights relating to electronic communications networks and services, Directive 2002/58/EC concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 on cooperation between national authorities responsible for the enforcement of consumer protection laws.

⁽³⁾ Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data.

⁽⁴⁾ CEN EN 15722 'Road transport and traffic telematics — ESafety — eCall minimum set of data'.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010642/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Fair-play financier de l'UEFA en danger

Depuis 2011, les équipes accusant des arriérés de paiement peuvent être sanctionnées. Le club espagnol de Malaga, quart-de-finaliste de la Ligue des champions en avril, a ainsi été exclu de toute compétition européenne en 2013-2014 à cause de ses dettes. Un palier supplémentaire sera franchi cette saison, avec l'obligation de présenter des comptes équilibrés et un déficit autorisé de 5 millions d'euros — en excluant les dépenses liées aux stades et aux centres de formation — ou de 45 millions d'euros dans le cas où des actionnaires pourraient combler les pertes. Les premières sanctions tomberont dès mai 2014, avec de possibles exclusions des coupes continentales.

Si l'Association des clubs européens a validé à l'unanimité les principes du FPF en 2010, tous n'en respectent toujours pas les règles. Et, comme un paradoxe, alors que l'UEFA clame sa volonté d'assainir le football, les dépenses somptuaires ont encore rythmé le marché estival. Fin août, le Real Madrid a ainsi déboursé 100 millions d'euros pour se payer Gareth Bale, un record. Le PSG, propriété des Qataris, peut s'appuyer sur le contrat de sponsoring signé avec la «Qatar Tourism Authority», pour un montant avoisinant les 200 millions d'euros annuels jusqu'à la saison 2015-2016.

1. D'après la Commission, ne s'agit-il pas d'une manière de contourner la règle? Les clubs de milliardaires sont en train de signer des contrats pour des montants faramineux avec des entreprises ou des fondations très proches des actionnaires, comme c'est aussi le cas avec Manchester City, sponsorisé par Etihad Airways.

2. Au-delà de sa capacité à sévir contre les gros clubs dont elle peut difficilement se passer financièrement, l'UEFA risque de voir son cheval de bataille contesté sur le terrain du droit. Selon la Commission, comment peut-on réussir à mettre en œuvre le fair-play financier alors qu'il porte atteinte juridiquement à la liberté d'entreprendre?

3. Interdire à de riches propriétaires d'investir à pertes dans leur club s'annonce ardu. Des clubs contesteront leurs sanctions et certaines batailles juridiques seront très longues alors que le temps sportif est très court. Des clubs comme le PSG ou Monaco iront en justice pour atteinte à la liberté d'entreprendre et à la libre circulation des capitaux, droits encouragés par l'arrêt Bosman. Quelles sont là encore la réaction et les actions de la Commission?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Vassiliou au nom de la Commission

(15 novembre 2013)

La Commission renvoie l'Honorable Parlementaire à ses réponses aux questions écrites E-4447/10, E-8252/11, E-10573/11 et E-4268/13 concernant les règles du fair-play financier de l'UEFA ⁽¹⁾.

La Commission considère que la mise en œuvre et l'application de ces règles relèvent de la responsabilité de l'UEFA. Elle reste toutefois attentive à ce que ces règles ainsi que leur mise en œuvre et leur application soient conformes au droit de l'UE et en particulier aux principes du marché intérieur.

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010642/13
to the Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: UEFA's financial fair play (FFP) in jeopardy

Since 2011, football teams with outstanding debts have been liable to sanctions. The Spanish club Malaga, which reached the quarter finals of the Champions League in April, has thus been excluded from all European competitions in 2013-2014 because of its debts. This rule will be taken a step further this season, with clubs required to submit balanced accounts and allowed to have a deficit of EUR 5 million — excluding expenditure linked to stadia and training centres — or EUR 45 million where shareholders could cover the losses. The first sanctions will come into effect as of May 2014, with possible exclusions from continental cup competitions.

Although the European Club Association unanimously approved the FFP principles in 2010, not all clubs play by the rules. Moreover, paradoxically, while UEFA claims it wants to clean up football, the summer transfer market has once again been marked by extravagant spending. At the end of August, Real Madrid paid a record EUR 100 million for Gareth Bale. Qatari-owned Paris Saint-Germain can rely on the sponsorship agreement it signed with the Qatar Tourism Authority, worth around EUR 200 million per year until the 2015-2016 season.

1. Is this not a way of getting round the rules, in the Commission's view? Billionaire-owned clubs are in the process of signing contracts for astronomical sums of money with companies or foundations that have very close links with the clubs' shareholders, as is the case with Manchester City, which is sponsored by Etihad Airways.
2. Beyond its capacity to be ruthless with big clubs, which may be difficult to achieve in financial terms, UEFA risks seeing its hobby horse challenged in court. In the Commission's view, how can financial fair play be successfully implemented when it legally damages free enterprise?
3. Banning rich owners from investing in their club at a loss promises to be hard work. Some clubs will dispute their sanctions and some legal battles will be very drawn out whereas things move quickly in sport. Some clubs, like PSG and Monaco, will go to court over the infringement of free enterprise and the free movement of capital, rights encouraged by the Bosman ruling. What is the Commission's reaction and what will it do?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission

(15 November 2013)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-4447/10, E-8252/11, E-10573/11 and E-4268/13 concerning UEFA's Financial Fair Play rules ⁽¹⁾.

The Commission considers that the implementation and enforcement of these rules fall under the responsibility of UEFA. The Commission, however, is monitoring whether these rules, and the way they are implemented and applied, comply with EC law, in particular internal market principles.

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010643/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Actionnariat populaire dans le domaine du football

En France, un projet d'actionnariat populaire a vu le jour là où les principes du collectif (sur et en dehors du terrain) avaient su démontrer, en l'espace d'une quarantaine d'années, toute leur efficacité avant que l'actionnariat unique, en l'espace d'une douzaine d'années, ne vienne démontrer toute sa force destructrice.

Les bénévoles de l'association permettent à plus de 2 000 supporters de tous âges, figures de la société civile, acteurs économiques et responsables politiques, de gauche, de droite et du centre, avec la même ardeur, de se tenir par la main pour promouvoir ensemble des valeurs sportives et extra-sportives. «À la nantaise» effectue actuellement une levée de fonds avec un objectif précis: monter au capital du FC Nantes en tant qu'actionnaire minoritaire pour siéger dans les organes de décision et contribuer à la gestion du club, au nom des principes fondamentaux du sport. Les institutions de l'Union européenne se sont clairement positionnées. Le Parlement européen s'est prononcé à une écrasante majorité pour que «les États membres et les instances dirigeantes du sport [stimulent] activement le rôle social et démocratique des supporters sportifs qui soutiennent les principes du fair-play, en favorisant leur participation dans les structures de gouvernance et de propriété des clubs». En Europe, l'actionnariat populaire est une réalité qui démontre toute sa pertinence à la fois sur le plan de la promotion des valeurs éthiques et sur le plan de l'efficacité économique. La forte rentabilité de la Bundesliga serait ainsi principalement le résultat d'une gestion à long terme basée sur un actionnariat stable. Il s'agit là d'un fonctionnement plus démocratique ainsi que d'une gouvernance raisonnable et durable.

1. Que fait la Commission pour encourager l'actionnariat populaire? Comment appréhende-t-elle en particulier ce concept dans le milieu du sport?
2. Dans quels domaines apporte-t-elle son soutien? De quel type est-il?
3. Que prévoit-elle à moyen et à long termes?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Vassiliou au nom de la Commission

(30 octobre 2013)

La Commission estime que la démocratie et la participation de tous sont deux des principes essentiels qui sous-tendent la bonne gouvernance des organisations sportives. Elle reconnaît que l'ouverture de l'actionnariat des clubs sportifs aux supporters est une des expressions de la démocratie participative dans le domaine du sport. La Commission encourage l'implication des acteurs intéressés du monde sportif, comme les supporters, et leur participation active à la gestion de l'activité sportive par le biais de structures démocratiquement élues.

Afin de contribuer à la promotion de ces principes, la Commission a cofinancé le projet intitulé «Améliorer la gouvernance dans le football grâce à la participation des supporters et à l'adhésion de la population locale», l'un des projets sélectionnés dans le cadre de l'action préparatoire dans le domaine du sport pour l'année 2011. L'association française «À la nantaise», mentionnée par l'Honorable Parlementaire, a été un partenaire de ce projet.

La Commission a l'intention de renforcer le dialogue avec les supporters et d'autres catégories d'acteurs afin de poursuivre la discussion sur les moyens d'améliorer la gouvernance du sport dans l'ensemble de l'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010643/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: Joint ownership in the field of football

In France, a joint ownership scheme has emerged in which the principles of teamwork (on and off the pitch) have proven their effectiveness over the course of some 40 years, before sole ownership proves to be a destructive force in the space of a dozen years.

The association's volunteers make it possible for more than 2 000 supporters of all ages, civil society leaders, economic actors and politicians from left, right and centre, with the same passion, to join together to promote sporting and non-sporting values. The association, 'À la nantaise' is currently collecting funds with a specific goal: to raise capital for Nantes FC as a minority shareholder to sit on the decision making bodies and contribute to the management of the club, in the interest of the fundamental principles of the sport. The EU institutions have made their position clear. Parliament ruled, by an overwhelming majority, that 'Member States and sports governing bodies [should] actively stimulate the social and democratic role of sports fans who support the principles of fair play, by promoting their involvement in the ownership and governance structures at their sports clubs'. In Europe, joint ownership is a reality which is proving its relevance both in terms of promoting ethical values and in terms of economic efficiency. The high profitability of the Bundesliga is also mainly due to long-term management based on stable ownership. It is a question of more democratic functioning and reasonable and sustainable governance.

1. What is the Commission doing to encourage joint ownership? How does it perceive this concept in the field of sport in particular?
2. In which areas does it lend its support? What type of support is it?
3. What plans does it have for the medium and long term?

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

The Commission considers that democracy and inclusiveness are two of the main principles underpinning the good governance of sport organisations. It recognises that joint ownership of sports clubs by supporters is one of the ways in which participatory democracy can express itself in the field of sport. The Commission encourages the empowerment of relevant sports stakeholders, such as supporters, and their active involvement in the governance of the game through democratically elected structures.

To help promote these principles, the Commission co-financed the project called 'Improving Football Governance through Supporter Involvement and Community Ownership' as one of the projects selected under the 2011 Preparatory Action in the field of Sport. The French association A La Nantaise, mentioned by the Honourable Member, was a partner within this project.

The Commission intends to further engage with supporters and other categories of stakeholders in order to continue the discussion on how to improve the governance of sport across the EU.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-010644/13

alla Commissione

Andrea Cozzolino (S&D)

(18 settembre 2013)

Oggetto: Questione rifiuti Campania — termovalorizzatore Giugliano

Considerando quanto segue:

- il Commissario straordinario ai rifiuti della Campania ha bandito una gara d'appalto per la concessione della progettazione, della realizzazione e della gestione del termovalorizzatore per i rifiuti stoccati in balle nella regione Campania;
- in Campania si stimano circa sei milioni di balle, prevalentemente nel sito di «Taverna del Re», che sono state dichiarate «bruciabili» solo con ordinanza dovuta a motivi emergenziali e limitatamente all'impianto di Acerra;
- le direttive europee prevedono che gli Stati membri debbano preventivamente seguire quattro «gradini» nel ciclo di gestione dei rifiuti;
- molti paesi europei stanno abbandonando la strada dell'incenerimento;
- l'Unione europea ha lanciato un invito a recuperare tutti i materiali preziosi contenuti nei nostri scarti, piuttosto che bruciarli nei termovalorizzatori;
- sono in corso due procedure di infrazione nei confronti dell'Italia,

si chiede:

1. se l'Italia e la Regione Campania abbiano rispettato i principi in materia di corretta gestione del ciclo integrato dei rifiuti;
2. se la scelta di inviare ai termovalorizzatori la frazione non riciclabile sia l'unica possibile strada esistente o se, viceversa, esistono alternative percorribili caratterizzate da tecnologie più moderne e meno inquinanti;
3. se l'Italia rischia di incorrere in una nuova procedura di infrazione, come accaduto per l'impianto di Acerra, nel caso in cui la società che gestirà l'impianto dovesse beneficiare degli incentivi CIP/6;
4. se sia possibile inviare le balle al termovalorizzatore senza avere prima effettuato una caratterizzazione scientifica atta a verificare l'assenza al loro interno di sostanze pericolose, come richiesto dalla decisione 2000/532/CE.

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione

(21 novembre 2013)

Nel contesto del procedimento d'infrazione 2007/2195 relativo alla gestione dei rifiuti in Campania, l'Italia si è impegnata a dare esecuzione alla sentenza del Tribunale UE del 4.3.2010 attuando il piano di gestione dei rifiuti in Campania («waste management plan» — WMP) adottato nel 2012. Il WMP prevede un passaggio dalla discarica alla riduzione dei rifiuti, alla raccolta differenziata, al recupero dei rifiuti organici e al recupero dell'energia.

A causa della mancata adozione di misure efficaci per attuare il WMP in tempi ragionevoli, la Commissione ha deciso, nel giugno 2013, di adire per la seconda volta la Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea.

Per quanto riguarda in particolare le circa 6 milioni di tonnellate di rifiuti imballati, ancora immagazzinate in Campania, il WMP prevede che questi vecchi rifiuti siano bruciati in un termovalorizzatore da costruire nella regione. Data la gravità della situazione dei rifiuti in Campania e il loro considerevole quantitativo, la Commissione ritiene che la decisione di incenerirli in un termovalorizzatore sia accettabile.

In base alle informazioni fornite dall'Italia, è in corso un'analisi dei rifiuti imballati in modo da stabilire la tecnologia di incenerimento da utilizzare per gli stessi. Tale analisi dovrebbe includere una valutazione della pericolosità dei rifiuti, a norma della direttiva 2008/98/CE ⁽¹⁾ in combinato disposto con la decisione 2000/532/CE ⁽²⁾.

Nel caso in cui l'impianto di termovalorizzazione previsto soddisfi la normativa dell'Unione in materia di ambiente, la concessione di incentivi nell'ambito del programma CIP 6 potrebbe non comportare l'avvio di un procedimento di infrazione. Tuttavia, tali incentivi dovrebbero essere valutati e approvati dalla Commissione in base alle norme sugli aiuti di Stato applicabili.

⁽¹⁾ Direttiva 2008/98/CE relativa ai rifiuti, GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.

⁽²⁾ Decisione 2000/532/CE che sostituisce la decisione 94/3/CE che istituisce un elenco di rifiuti conformemente all'articolo 1, lettera a), della direttiva 75/442/CEE del Consiglio relativa ai rifiuti e la decisione 94/904/CE del Consiglio che istituisce un elenco di rifiuti pericolosi ai sensi dell'articolo 1, paragrafo 4, della direttiva 91/689/CEE del Consiglio relativa ai rifiuti pericolosi (GU L 226 del 6.9.2000).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010644/13
to the Commission
Andrea Cozzolino (S&D)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: Waste issue in Campania — Giugliano waste-to-energy plant

Taking into account the following facts:

- the special Commissioner for waste in Campania has issued a call for tender to award the project for designing, constructing and managing the waste-to-energy plant for waste stored in bales in the Campania region;
- there are estimated in Campania to be around six million bales, mainly at the 'Taverna del Re' site, which have been declared as being 'burnable' only by ordinance on emergency grounds and restricted to the Acerra plant;
- according to the EU directives, Member States must follow in advance four 'steps' in the waste management cycle;
- many European countries are abandoning the incineration option;
- the European Union has made a call for us to recover all the valuable materials contained in our refuse rather than burn them in waste-to-energy plants;
- they are two ongoing infringement procedures against Italy,

I have the following questions to ask:

1. Have Italy and the Campania region observed the principles for correctly managing the integrated waste cycle?
2. Is the decision to send the non-recyclable fraction to waste-to-energy plants the only possible option available or, conversely, are there viable alternatives deploying more modern and less polluting technologies?
3. Is Italy at risk of facing a new infringement procedure, as happened with the Acerra plant, if the company going to manage the plant were to benefit from the CIP 6 incentives?
4. Can the bales be sent to the waste-to-energy plant without having had a scientific breakdown established first to verify that they do not contain any hazardous substances, as required by Decision 2000/532/EC?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(21 November 2013)

In the context of the infringement procedure 2007/2195 concerning waste management in Campania, Italy engaged to execute the EU Court judgment of 4/3/2010 by implementing the Campania waste management plan (WMP) adopted in 2012. The WMP provides for a shift from landfilling to waste reduction, separate collection, recovery of organic waste and energy recovery.

For lack of effective measures to implement the WMP within reasonable timeframe, the Commission decided in June 2013 to apply to the EU Court for the second time.

As concerns in particular the about 6 million tons of baled waste still stored in Campania, the WMP foresees that this old waste should be burnt in a waste-to-energy plant to be built in Campania. Given the seriousness of the Campania waste situation and the considerable amount, the Commission considers that burning it in a waste-to-energy plant is acceptable.

According to the information provided by Italy, the baled waste is being analysed so as to establish the incineration technology to be used for this kind of waste. This analysis should include an assessment of the hazardousness of the waste, according to Directive 2008/98/EC ⁽¹⁾ in conjunction with Decision 2000/532/EC ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2008/98/EC on waste (OJ L 312, 22.11.2008).

⁽²⁾ Decision 2000/532/EC replacing Decision 94/3/EC establishing a list of wastes pursuant to Article 1(a) of Council Directive 75/442/EEC on waste and Council Decision 94/904/EC establishing a list of hazardous waste pursuant to Article 1(4) of Council Directive 91/689/EEC on hazardous waste (OJ L 226, 6.9.2000).

In case the envisaged waste-to-energy plant meets Union environmental law, the granting of CIP 6 incentives could not lead to an infringement procedure. However, such incentives would have to be assessed and approved by the Commission under the applicable state aid rules.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-010645/13

προς την Επιτροπή

Theodoros Skyllakakis (ALDE)

(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Μεταφορά της έδρας της εταιρείας ΒΙΟΧΑΛΚΟ από την Ελλάδα στο Βέλγιο

Στις 16.9.2013, η ΒΙΟΧΑΛΚΟ, ο μεγαλύτερος ελληνικός μεταλλουργικός όμιλος, ανακοίνωσε την μεταφορά της έδρας της στο Βέλγιο, αποχωρώντας από την ελληνική κεφαλαιαγορά. Είναι η τρίτη μεγάλη ελληνική επιχείρηση, μετά την 3Ε και την ΦΑΓΕ, η οποία τον τελευταίο χρόνο μεταφέρει την έδρα της στο εξωτερικό.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τα παραπάνω, καθώς επίσης και το γεγονός πως οι πολιτικές της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης δεσμεύονται από το μνημόνιο συμφωνίας μεταξύ της Ελλάδας και της τρόικας, μέλος της οποίας είναι η Επιτροπή, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Ποιοι είναι, κατά την άποψη της Επιτροπής, οι λόγοι που εξωθούν τις ελληνικές επιχειρήσεις να φεύγουν από την Ελλάδα, τέσσερα χρόνια μετά την έναρξη του προγράμματος δημοσιονομικής εξυγίανσης;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής

(5 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή έχει πλήρη επίγνωση του ότι η Ελλάδα βρίσκεται σε ύφεση για έκτη συνεχή χρονιά, καθώς και ότι οι οικονομικές συνθήκες και οι όροι χρηματοδότησης είναι δυσχερείς για τον ελληνικό ιδιωτικό τομέα. Η δέσμη πολιτικών που περιλαμβάνεται στο μνημόνιο συμφωνίας στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος προσαρμογής αποσκοπεί στην οικοδόμηση μιας πιο στέρεας βάσης για την ανάπτυξη και τη δημιουργία θέσεων απασχόλησης στην Ελλάδα, που θα στηρίζεται σε βιώσιμα δημόσια οικονομικά, ένα σταθερό χρηματοπιστωτικό σύστημα και μια πιο ανταγωνιστική και δυναμική οικονομία.

Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, το ΜΣ περιέχει μεγάλο αριθμό μέτρων τα οποία στοχεύουν στην ενίσχυση του ιδιωτικού τομέα στην Ελλάδα, που είναι καίριας σημασίας για την εξασφάλιση βιώσιμης ανάπτυξης και δημιουργίας θέσεων απασχόλησης. Εκτός από τις φιλόδοξες μεταρρυθμίσεις της αγοράς εργασίας οι οποίες έχουν ήδη εφαρμοστεί, περιλαμβάνονται μέτρα για τη διευκόλυνση της χρηματοδότησης των ΜΜΕ, όπως είναι η σταθεροποίηση του τραπεζικού συστήματος και ένα νέο μη τραπεζικό χρηματοπιστωτικό ίδρυμα, καθώς και μέτρα για τη βελτίωση του επιχειρηματικού περιβάλλοντος, μεταξύ άλλων μέσω της μείωσης του χρόνου και του κόστους σύστασης νέων επιχειρήσεων, της απλούστευσης των διαδικασιών αδειοδότησης, της διευκόλυνσης των εμπορικών συναλλαγών και της βελτίωσης του δικαστικού συστήματος.

Ως εκ τούτου, η απарέγκλιτη εφαρμογή του προγράμματος είναι ουσιαστικής σημασίας για τη βελτίωση των συνθηκών στον ελληνικό ιδιωτικό τομέα και της ικανότητας της Ελλάδας να προσελκύει άμεσες ξένες επενδύσεις. Ορισμένες ξένες επιχειρήσεις, όπως η COSCO Pacific, η Hewlett-Packard, η Nokia ή η ZTE Corporation, αποφάσισαν πρόσφατα να επενδύσουν στην Ελλάδα, γεγονός που αποδεικνύει ότι η Ελλάδα αποτελεί όλο και πιο ελκυστική επιλογή για επιχειρήσεις.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010645/13
to the Commission**

Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Relocation of registered office of Biochalko from Greece to Belgium

On 16 September 2013, Biochalko, the biggest mining group in Greece, announced that it was relocating its registered office to Belgium and exiting the Greek capital market. This is the third largest Greek company, after 3E and Fage, which has recently relocated its registered office abroad.

In view of the above and the fact that Greek Government policy is bound by the memorandum of understanding between Greece and the Troika, of which the Commission is a member, will the Commission say:

What, in its opinion, is pushing Greek companies to leave Greece four years after the economic readjustment programme started?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(5 November 2013)

The Commission is fully aware that Greece is in its sixth consecutive year of a recession and the current economic and financing conditions are challenging for the Greek private sector. The set of policies included in the memorandum of understanding in the context of the adjustment programme has the objective of building a more solid basis for growth and job creation in Greece, based on sustainable public finances, a stable financial system, and a more competitive and dynamic economy.

In this context, the MoU contains a large number of measures aimed at strengthening the private sector in Greece, which is key to ensure sustainable growth and employment creation. In addition to the ambitious labour market reforms already implemented, this includes measures to facilitate SME financing, such as the stabilisation of the banking system and a new non-bank financial institution, as well as 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.

Steadfast implementation of the programme is therefore essential to improve conditions for the Greek private sector as well as Greece's performance in attracting foreign direct investment. A number of foreign companies, such as Cosco Pacific, Hewlett-Packard, Nokia or ZTE Corporation, have recently decided to invest in Greece showing that the country is an increasingly attractive place for business.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-010646/13

προς την Επιτροπή

Theodoros Skyllakakis (ALDE)

(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Προβλέψεις του Διεθνούς Νομισματικού Ταμείου για το 2014 για το ελληνικό τραπεζικό σύστημα

Σύμφωνα με τις προβλέψεις του Διεθνούς Νομισματικού Ταμείου για το 2014 ⁽¹⁾ ότι μεγέθη όπως private credit growth θα είναι 4,7 και private sector deposit growth θα είναι 5, ενώ, για το 2013, τα ίδια μεγέθη είναι -3,1 και -1,8 αντίστοιχα, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Σύμφωνα με τα επικαιροποιημένα στοιχεία που έχει για την εξέλιξη των πραγμάτων στο ελληνικό τραπεζικό σύστημα η αύξηση αυτή των παραπάνω μεγεθών είναι σύμφωνη με τις προβλέψεις;

και

Αν όχι, τότε τι επιπτώσεις θα έχει αυτή η απόκλιση από τις προβλέψεις στον ρυθμό ανάπτυξης;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής

(5 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή δημοσίευσε προσφάτως ανάλυση των επικαιροποιημένων στατιστικών για το ελληνικό τραπεζικό σύστημα, η οποία είναι διαθέσιμη στην έκδοση συμμόρφωσης του δεύτερου προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα του Ιουλίου 2013. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή δεν αποφαινεται για τις προοπτικές όσον αφορά την εξέλιξη των καταθέσεων ή του δανεισμού.

Κατά τη διάρκεια της συνεχιζόμενης επανεξέτασης προτείνεται επικαιροποιημένη αξιολόγηση των στατιστικών για το ελληνικό τραπεζικό σύστημα και τα πορίσματα θα κοινοποιηθούν στα σχετικά έγγραφα του προγράμματος.

⁽¹⁾ First and Second Reviews Under the Extended Arrangement Under the Extended Fund Facility, Request for Waiver of Applicability, Modification of Performance Criteria, and Rephasing of Access — Staff Report; Staff Supplement; Press Release on the Executive Board Discussion; and Statement by the Executive Director for Greece, IMF Country Report No. 13/20, January 2013, p.52, table 9.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010646/13
to the Commission**

Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: International Monetary Fund forecasts for the Greek banking system in 2014

As, according to forecasts by the International Monetary Fund for 2014, ⁽¹⁾ private credit growth will be 4.7 and private sector deposit growth will be 5, compared with -3.1 and -1.8 for 2013, will the Commission say:

Based on the updated statistics on the Greek banking system in its possession, is this increase in the above figures in keeping with forecasts?

If not, what impact will the difference have on anticipated rates of growth?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(5 November 2013)

The Commission latest published analysis of the updated statistics on the Greek banking system can be found in the July 2013 Compliance Report of the Second Economic Adjustment Programme for Greece. However, the Commission does not report on deposit or credit developments outlook.

An updated assessment of statistics on the Greek banking system is being proposed during the ongoing review and will be communicated in the related programme documents.

⁽¹⁾ First and Second Reviews Under the Extended Arrangement Under the Extended Fund Facility, Request for Waiver of Applicability, Modification of Performance Criteria, and Rephasing of Access-Staff Report; Staff Supplement; Press Release on the Executive Board Discussion; and Statement by the Executive Director for Greece, IMF Country Report No 13/20, January 2013, p. 52, Table 9.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-010647/13

προς την Επιτροπή

Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)

(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Επιπτώσεις πρόωρων συνταξιοδοτήσεων περιόδου 2010-2012 στο έλλειμμα της γενικής κυβέρνησης

Σε συνέχεια της προηγούμενης ερώτησης και αντίστοιχης απάντησης (E-008078/2013) με θέμα τις πρόωρες συνταξιοδοτήσεις και επιπτώσεις στο έλλειμμα της γενικής κυβέρνησης ⁽¹⁾, και, ειδικότερα, σε σχέση με τις δύο υποερωτήσεις για το αν η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει ποια είναι η επίπτωσή των πρόωρων συνταξιοδοτήσεων στο έλλειμμα της γενικής κυβέρνησης και αν θεωρεί ότι οι πρόωρες συνταξιοδοτήσεις συμβάλλουν στην προσπάθεια ανάκαμψης της ελληνικής οικονομίας, η Επιτροπή απαντά ότι λεπτομερή στοιχεία θα πρέπει να ζητηθούν από το κράτος μέλος.

Δεδομένου ότι στην εν λόγω ερώτηση δεν ζητήθηκαν λεπτομερή στοιχεία, αλλά ερωτήθηκε η Επιτροπή κατά πόσο έχει γνώση των σχετικών στοιχείων ή όχι, η ερώτηση επαναλαμβάνεται ως εξής:

Γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή ποια είναι η επίπτωσή των πρόωρων συνταξιοδοτήσεων της περιόδου 2010-2012 στο έλλειμμα της γενικής κυβέρνησης;

Αν η Επιτροπή δεν γνωρίζει, γιατί συμβαίνει αυτό; Αντιμετωπίζει το θέμα ως μικρής σημασίας ή δεν υφίστανται τα σχετικά στοιχεία;

Αν η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει, τότε γιατί δεν απάντησε στην υποβληθείσα ερώτηση;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής

(2 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

Όπως αναφέρθηκε στην απάντηση στην κοινοβουλευτική ερώτηση (E-008078/2013), το Ελληνικό Κοινοβούλιο ενέκρινε την περίοδο 2010-2012, ως μέρος του ελληνικού προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής, σημαντικά μέτρα μεταρρύθμισης του συνταξιοδοτικού συστήματος με στόχο τον περιορισμό της πρόωρης συνταξιοδότησης (π.χ. αύξηση του κατώτατου ορίου ηλικίας συνταξιοδότησης, αύξηση της ελάχιστης περιόδου εισφορών ή αναθεώρηση του καταλόγου επικίνδυνων και ανθυγιεινών επαγγελμάτων). Τα μέτρα αναμένεται να μειώσουν την πρόωρη συνταξιοδότηση και να οδηγήσουν σε σημαντική εξοικονόμηση πόρων σε μεσοπρόθεσμη και μακροπρόθεσμη βάση. Ενόψει της επικείμενης θέσπισης αυστηρότερων κανόνων, τα εν λόγω μεταρρυθμιστικά μέτρα οδήγησαν σε μεγαλύτερο αριθμό ατόμων που υπέβαλαν αίτηση πρόωρης συνταξιοδότησης, γεγονός που αύξησε τις συνταξιοδοτικές δαπάνες βραχυπρόθεσμα. Σύμφωνα με την έκθεση του 2012 για τη δημογραφική γήρανση, οι δημόσιες δαπάνες για συντάξεις στην Ελλάδα προβλέπεται ωστόσο να αυξηθούν την περίοδο 2010-2060 μόνο κατά 1,00 π.μ. του ΑΕΠ, ποσοστό σαφώς χαμηλότερο από τον μέσο όρο της ΕΕ (+1,5 π.μ.) και επίσης 11,5 π.μ. χαμηλότερο από την προβλεπόμενη αύξηση για την Ελλάδα στην έκθεση του 2009 για τη δημογραφική γήρανση.

Λεπτομερείς στατιστικές πληροφορίες για τον αριθμό των συντάξεων στην Ελλάδα και την κατανομή μεταξύ κατηγοριών συντάξεων, καθώς και ηλικιακών ομάδων, παρέχονται στις εκδόσεις για «Στατιστικές πληροφορίες για τις συντάξεις» (ΗΛΙΟΣ), όπως δημοσιεύονται σε μηνιαία βάση από το Ελληνικό Υπουργείο Εργασίας, Κοινωνικής Ασφάλισης & Πρόνοιας ⁽²⁾. Οι εκδόσεις αυτές αναφέρουν επίσης το ποσό της σύνταξης και, ως εκ τούτου, τις δημοσιονομικές επιπτώσεις.

⁽¹⁾ Early retirement and its impact on the general government deficit:

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=%2F%2FEP%2F%2FTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2013-008078%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2F%2FEN&language=EN>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.idika.gr/cespsyntax>. Βλ. π.χ. την έκθεση του Σεπτεμβρίου, σ. 7-8.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010647/13
to the Commission**

Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Impact of early retirements in 2010-2012 on the general government deficit

Further to a previous question and reply (E-008078/2013) on the question of early retirement and its impact on the general government deficit ⁽¹⁾ and, in particular, two sub-questions asking if the Commission knows what impact early retirements are having on the general government deficit and if it considers that early retirements are helping to foster the recovery of the Greek economy, the Commission replied that detailed figures should be requested from the Member State.

In view of the fact that detailed figures were not requested in that question and the Commission was asked if it was aware of those detailed figures, may I repeat the question as follows:

Does the Commission know what impact early retirements in 2010-2012 had on the general government deficit?

If the Commission does not know, why does it not know? Is the issue being treated as an issue of minor importance or do the figures in question not exist?

If the Commission does know, then why did it not reply to the question?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(2 December 2013)

As indicated in the reply to the parliamentary question (E-008078/2013), significant pension reform measures to limit early retirement have been adopted by the Greek parliament between 2010 and 2012 as a part of the Greek economic adjustment programme (e.g. an increased (minimum) retirement age, increased penalties, an increased minimum contributory period or a revision of the list of hazardous and arduous professions). The measures are expected to reduce early retirement and lead to significant savings in the medium- and long-run. In anticipation of forthcoming stricter rules, these reform measures led to a higher number of persons have been seeking early retirement, which has increased pension expenditure in the short-term. According to the 2012 Ageing Report, public pension expenditures in Greece are nevertheless projected to increase between 2010 and 2060 only by 1.0 p.p. of GDP, which is clearly below the EU average (+1.5 p.p.) and even 11.5 p.p. lower than the projected increase for Greece in the 2009 Ageing Report.

Detailed statistical information on the number of pensions in payment in Greece and the division between pension categories as well as age groups can be found in the reports on 'Statistical Information for Pensions' (Helios), as published on a monthly basis by the Hellenic Ministry of Labour, Social Security & Welfare ⁽²⁾. These reports also indicate the pension amount and thus the budgetary impact.

⁽¹⁾ Early retirement and its impact on the general government deficit: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2013-008078%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.idika.gr/eseptions> see e.g. the September report, p.7-8.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-010648/13

προς την Επιτροπή

Theodoros Skyllakakis (ALDE)

(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Μελέτη αναλογιστικής ισορροπίας του ασφαλιστικού συστήματος

Στην σύμβαση δανειακής διευκόλυνσης 2010 και στο πλαίσιο της ασφαλιστικής μεταρρύθμισης, προβλέπεται ότι η «Εθνική Αναλογιστική Αρχή θα εκπονήσει μελέτη προκειμένου να εξασφαλιστεί ότι οι παράμετροι του νέου συστήματος διασφαλίζουν μακροπρόθεσμα αναλογιστική ισορροπία ⁽¹⁾».

Κατόπιν τούτου, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Έχει ολοκληρωθεί η σχετική μελέτη;

Εάν ναι, έχει περιέλθει στην Επιτροπή;

Με στοιχεία ποιου έτους και ποιο μακροοικονομικό σενάριο έχει ολοκληρωθεί η σχετική μελέτη;

Εάν έχει ολοκληρωθεί και έχει περιέλθει στην Επιτροπή, θεωρεί η Επιτροπή αναγκαία την επικαιροποίησή της και τότε;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής

(7 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Η Εθνική Αναλογιστική Αρχή (ΕΑΑ) εκπόνησε τον Ιανουάριο του 2012 ⁽²⁾ αναλογιστική μελέτη αναφορικά με το ελληνικό συνταξιοδοτικό σύστημα. Η Επιτροπή συνεργάστηκε στενά με την ΕΑΑ στην εκπόνηση της μελέτης, η οποία αποτέλεσε αντικείμενο αξιολόγησης από ομοτίμους και εγκρίθηκε από το συμβούλιο οικονομικής πολιτικής. Τα κύρια συμπεράσματα της αναλογιστικής μελέτης παρουσιάζονται στην έκθεση για τη δημογραφική γήρανση του 2012 ⁽³⁾.

Το έτος βάσης για τα μακροοικονομικά σενάρια που χρησιμοποιήθηκαν στην έκθεση για τη δημογραφική γήρανση του 2012 ήταν το 2010. Η κατασκευή των μακροοικονομικών σεναρίων περιγράφεται λεπτομερώς στον πρώτο τόμο της έκθεσης για τη δημογραφική γήρανση του 2012 με τίτλο: Underlying Assumptions and Projection Methodologies (Βασικές παραδοχές και μεθοδολογίες πρόβλεψης) ⁽⁴⁾.

Η Ελλάδα, μαζί με όλα τα άλλα κράτη μέλη, αναμένεται να εκπονήσει νέες προβλέψεις για το συνταξιοδοτικό, ενόψει της προσεχούς έκθεσης για τη δημογραφική γήρανση που θα δημοσιευθεί το 2015. Οι προβλέψεις αυτές θα διενεργηθούν στη βάση νέας δέσμης δημογραφικών προβλέψεων από την EUROSTAT.

⁽¹⁾ ΣΥΜΒΑΣΗ ΔΑΝΕΙΑΚΗΣ ΔΙΕΥΚΟΛΥΝΣΗΣ μεταξύ ΤΩΝ ΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΩΝ ΚΡΑΤΩΝ ΜΕΛΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΟΠΟΙΩΝ ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΤΟ ΕΥΡΩ: ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΟ ΤΟΥ ΒΕΛΓΙΟΥ, ΙΡΛΑΝΔΙΑ, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΟ ΤΗΣ ΙΣΠΑΝΙΑΣ, ΓΑΛΛΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ, ΙΤΑΛΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ, ΚΥΠΡΙΑΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ, ΜΕΓΑΛΟ ΔΟΥΚΑΤΟ ΤΟΥ ΛΟΥΞΕΜΒΟΥΡΓΟΥ, ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΜΑΛΤΑΣ, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΟ ΤΩΝ ΚΑΤΩ ΧΩΡΩΝ, ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΑΥΣΤΡΙΑΣ, ΠΟΡΤΟΓΑΛΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ, ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΣΛΟΒΕΝΙΑΣ, ΣΛΟΒΑΚΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ και ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΦΙΝΛΑΝΔΙΑΣ και του ΚfW, που υπόκειται στις οδηγίες, τελεί υπό την εγγύηση και ενεργεί προς το δημόσιο συμφέρον της Ομοσπονδιακής Δημοκρατίας της Γερμανίας, ως Δανειστών και ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑΣ ως Δανειολήπτη ΤΗΣ ΤΡΑΠΕΖΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΑΔΟΣ ως Αντιπροσώπου του Δανειολήπτη 8 ΜΑΪΟΥ 2010, παράγραφος 13, σελ. 68.

⁽²⁾ Βλ.: <http://www.eaa.gr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=cGnwVw7zUkk%3D&tabid=92&mid=422&language=el-GR>

⁽³⁾ Βλ.: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/2012-ageing-report_en.htm

⁽⁴⁾ Βλ.: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2011/ee4_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010648/13
to the Commission**

Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Report on actuarial balance in the pension system

Provision is made under pension reform in the 2010 loan facility agreement for the National Actuarial Authority to produce a report to verify that the parameters of the new system ensure long-term actuarial balance. ⁽¹⁾

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Has that report been completed?

If so, has the Commission received it?

On which year's figures was the report based and which macroeconomic scenario was used?

If it has been completed and the Commission has received it, does the Commission consider that it should be updated and, if so, when?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(7 November 2013)

An actuarial study on the Greek pension system was conducted by the National Actuarial Authority (NAA) in January 2012 ⁽²⁾. The Commission worked in close cooperation with the NAA in conducting the study. It was subject to a peer review and endorsed by the Economic Policy Committee and the main results of the actuarial study are shown in the 2012 Ageing Report ⁽³⁾.

The base year for the macroeconomic scenarios used in the 2012 Ageing Report was 2010. The construction of macroeconomic scenarios is laid out in detail in the first volume of the 2012 Ageing Report: Underlying Assumptions and Projection Methodologies ⁽⁴⁾.

Greece, together with all other Member States, is expected to produce new pension projections for the next Ageing Report, to be published in 2015. These projections will be carried out on the basis of a new set of population projections by Eurostat.

⁽¹⁾ Loan Facility Agreement between the following Member States whose currency is the Euro: Kingdom of Belgium, Ireland, Kingdom of Spain, French Republic, Italian Republic, Republic of Cyprus, Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, Republic of Malta, Kingdom of the Netherlands, Republic of Austria, Portuguese Republic, Republic of Slovenia, Slovak Republic and Republic of Finland and KfW, acting in the public interest, subject to the instructions of and with the benefit of the guarantee of the Federal Republic of Germany, as Lenders and the Hellenic Republic as Borrower, the Bank of Greece as Agent to the Borrower 8 May 2010, paragraph 13, p. 68.

⁽²⁾ See: <http://www.eaa.gr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=cGnwVw7zUkk%3D&tabid=92&mid=422&language=el-GR>

⁽³⁾ See: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/2012-ageing-report_en.htm

⁽⁴⁾ See: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2011/ee4_en.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-010649/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skyllakakis (ALDE)
(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Προβλέψεις μνημονίου για τους φόρους επί της ακίνητης περιουσίας

Στο Μνημόνιο Συνεννόησης στις Συγκεκριμένες Προϋποθέσεις Οικονομικής Πολιτικής 2012, στο πλαίσιο της φορολογικής μεταρρύθμισης αναφέρεται ότι «μέχρι τον Ιούνιο του 2012 η κυβέρνηση θα αναθεωρήσει τις αντικειμενικές αξίες της ακίνητης περιουσίας για να τις ευθυγραμμίσει σε μεγαλύτερο βαθμό προς τις τιμές της αγοράς ⁽¹⁾».

Κατόπιν τούτου, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Πότε προβλέπεται να εκπληρωθεί ο όρος αυτός του Μνημονίου;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Οι ελληνικές αρχές συνεχίζουν τις εργασίες επί της τυπικής διαδικασίας για την αναθεώρηση της αντικειμενικής αξίας των ακινήτων, ώστε να εναρμονιστούν καλύτερα με τις τιμές της αγοράς. Η τυπική αυτή διαδικασία θα ισχύει για τους σκοπούς της φορολογίας ακινήτων για το οικονομικό έτος 2016 ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Μνημόνιο Συνεννόησης στις Συγκεκριμένες Προϋποθέσεις Οικονομικής Πολιτικής 9 ΦΕΒΡΟΥΑΡΙΟΥ 2012, Φορολογική Μεταρρύθμιση, παράγραφος 2.3, σελ. 5.

⁽²⁾ http://www.tovima.gr/files/1/2012/10/23/MEMORANDUM_1.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010649/13
to the Commission**

Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Provisions in the memorandum for real estate taxes

The Memorandum of Understanding on Specific Economic Policy Conditionality 2012 states, in connection with fiscal reform, that 'by June 2012, the Government will revise the legal values of real estate to better align them with market prices'. ⁽¹⁾

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

When is this term of the memorandum expected to be fulfilled?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(5 November 2013)

The Greek authorities continue to work on a standard procedure for the revision of legal values of real estate in order to better align them with market prices. Such standard procedure will be in place for the purposes of real estate taxation for the fiscal year 2016 ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Memorandum of Understanding on Specific Economic Policy Conditionality of 9 February 2012, Fiscal Reforms, paragraph 2.3, p. 5.

⁽²⁾ http://www.tovima.gr/files/1/2012/10/23/MEMORANDUM_1.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-010650/13

προς την Επιτροπή

Theodoros Skyllakakis (ALDE)

(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Άδειες ίδρυσης και λειτουργίας Συνεργείων Επισκευής και Συντήρησης Μηχανημάτων Έργων (ΣΕΣΜΕ)

Στην Ελλάδα, σύμφωνα με την παράγραφο 4 του άρθρου 6 του νόμου 1575/85, προβλέπεται η υπογραφή του προεδρικού διατάγματος για την άδειες ίδρυσης και λειτουργίας Συνεργείων Επισκευής και Συντήρησης Μηχανημάτων Έργων (ΣΕΣΜΕ). Η υπογραφή του εν λόγω προεδρικού διατάγματος δεν έχει πραγματοποιηθεί μέχρι και σήμερα, με αποτέλεσμα τα μηχανήματα έργων να μην υποβάλλονται σε τακτικό μηχανολογικό έλεγχο, με τις αντίστοιχες συνέπειες που αυτό έχει στο περιβάλλον — ασύστολη ρύπανση του περιβάλλοντος από τις ανεξέλεγκτες διαρροές λιπαντικών — στο διάστημα των ετών από το 1985 μέχρι και σήμερα. Δηλαδή, επί 28 δηλαδή χρόνια.

Δεδομένης της επίπτωσης που έχουν η καθυστέρηση της ίδρυσης και λειτουργίας των ΣΕΣΜΕ, όπως και ο συνεπαγόμενος τακτικός μηχανολογικός έλεγχος των μηχανημάτων έργων στο περιβάλλον, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Είναι ο τακτικός έλεγχος των μηχανημάτων έργων αναγκαίος σύμφωνα με τις γενικές και ειδικές διατάξεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Νομοθεσίας για τον έλεγχο των πηγών ρύπανσης;

Αν ναι, τότε πώς αντιμετωπίζει η Επιτροπή την μακροχρόνια καθυστέρηση υπογραφής του σχετικού προεδρικού διατάγματος και την απουσία τακτικού μηχανολογικού ελέγχου των μηχανημάτων έργων;

Απάντηση του κ. Ροτοčνίκ εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής

(4 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Συναφείς ευρωπαϊκοί κανόνες αφορούν εγκαταστάσεις που ασκούν δραστηριότητες οι οποίες απαριθμούνται στο παράρτημα I της οδηγίας 2010/75/ΕΕ περί βιομηχανικών εκπομπών⁽¹⁾. Σύμφωνα με την εν λόγω οδηγία, οι εγκαταστάσεις αυτές λειτουργούν βάσει της αδείας, που επιβάλλει την εφαρμογή των βέλτιστων διαθέσιμων τεχνικών (ΒΔΤ).

Οι δραστηριότητες για τις «μηχανικές επισκευές» και όσον αφορά τις τακτικές μηχανικές δοκιμές μηχανημάτων έργων δεν προσδιορίζονται στο παράρτημα I της οδηγίας 2010/75/ΕΕ. Ως εκ τούτου, οι δραστηριότητες που αναφέρονται δεν καλύπτονται από την νομοθεσία στον τομέα των βιομηχανικών εκπομπών.

⁽¹⁾ ΕΕ L 334 της 17.12.2010.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010650/13
to the Commission**

Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Licences to establish and operate works machinery repair and servicing workshops

Provision is being made in Greece for a presidential decree to be signed under Article 6(4) of Law 1575/85 on licences to establish and operate works machinery repair and servicing workshops. The presidential decree in question has not yet been signed, meaning that works machinery is not subject to regular mechanical testing. This has been causing an environment impact in the form of flagrant environmental pollution from uncontrolled leaks of lubricants since 1985 i.e. for 28 years.

In view of the impact that the delay in establishing and operating works machinery repair and servicing workshops and hence regular mechanical testing of works machinery is having on the environment, will the Commission say:

Is regular testing of works machinery necessary under the general and specific provisions of European legislation on controlling sources of pollution?

If so, how will the Commission address the delayed signing of the presidential decree in question and the absence of regular mechanical testing of works machinery?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission

(4 November 2013)

Relevant European rules concern installations engaged in activities listed in Annex I to Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions ⁽¹⁾. According to this directive, such installations operate in accordance with a permit requiring the application of the best available techniques (BAT).

The activities for 'machinery repair' and for the regular mechanical testing of works machinery are not specified in Annex I to Directive 2010/75/EU. Therefore, the activities referred to are not covered by the legislation on industrial emissions.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 334, 17.12.2010.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-010651/13
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL) e João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(18 de setembro de 2013)

Assunto: Salvaguarda do interesse público associado à prestação de serviços aéreos regulares aos distritos de Bragança e de Vila Real

No âmbito dos auxílios sociais à mobilidade dos cidadãos residentes nos distritos de Bragança e de Vila Real e outros beneficiários, relativamente ao serviço aéreo entre Bragança-Lisboa, Lisboa-Bragança, Vila Real-Lisboa e Lisboa-Vila Real, o Governo português publicou um decreto-lei, aguardando-se a publicação de uma portaria que definirá o valor, termos e extensão do subsídio social de mobilidade.

Atendendo a que a aprovação da portaria referida depende da decisão da Comissão Europeia, a emitir no âmbito do procedimento de notificação de auxílios de Estado, previsto no Regulamento (CE) n.º 659/1999 do Conselho, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Já tomou qualquer decisão sobre esta matéria? Se sim, qual foi essa decisão e quando será publicada?
2. Se ainda não a tomou, quando prevê que seja tomada, tendo em conta que dela depende o início do seu pagamento em Portugal?

Resposta dada por Joaquín Almunia em nome da Comissão
(6 de novembro de 2013)

A Comissão foi notificada do regime proposto em 26 de março de 2013; no entanto, essa notificação acabou por ser retirada em 30 de setembro de 2013. Nestes termos, não será adotada qualquer decisão no que respeita às referidas ligações aéreas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010651/13
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL) and João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: Protecting the public interest in the provision of regular air services to the Bragança and Vila Real districts

Pending the publication of an ordinance to specify the amount, terms and scope of the subsidy, the Portuguese Government has published a decree-law on providing aid for the mobility of citizens living in the districts of Bragança and Vila Real and other beneficiaries, with regard to the Bragança-Lisbon, Lisbon-Bragança, Vila Real-Lisbon and Lisbon-Vila Real air links.

Approval of this ordinance is dependent on the Commission issuing a decision under the state aid notification procedure laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 659/1999.

1. Has the Commission already taken a decision on this issue? If so, what was the decision and when will it be published?
2. If not, when does it expect this decision to be taken, given that payment of the subsidy in Portugal is dependent upon it?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(6 November 2013)

The Commission was notified of the proposed scheme referred to on 26 March 2013, however this notification was eventually withdrawn on 30 September 2013. Therefore no decision will be taken with regard to the flight links referred to.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-010652/13
a la Comisión**

Santiago Fisas Aixela (PPE)

(18 de septiembre de 2013)

Asunto: Uso de los medios de comunicación con fines políticos

En septiembre de 2013, el canal de televisión público Televisió de Catalunya (Canal 33-TV3), en su programa infantil «Info K», emitió un reportaje en el que se entrevistó a niños de 12 y 14 años de edad que explicaban su experiencia en la cadena humana del pasado 11 de septiembre para reclamar la independencia de Cataluña.

El reportaje no sólo ha enviado mensajes políticos a favor de la independencia en un programa en horario infantil y dirigido a la infancia, sino que ha usado menores de edad para dicha finalidad partidista.

Entre las declaraciones de los niños se recogen expresiones como «España se rendirá y podremos tener la independencia», «vengo a luchar por tener la independencia» o incluso «en 1714 dejamos de ser independientes».

¿Cree la Comisión que un medio de comunicación público debe utilizar a menores de edad con fines políticos?

¿Cree la Comisión que enviar mensajes políticos en programas infantiles es atentar contra la libertad de opinión y la protección de la infancia?

Respuesta de la Sra. Kroes en nombre de la Comisión

(19 de noviembre de 2013)

La Directiva de servicios de comunicación audiovisual ⁽¹⁾ tiene en cuenta que es necesario equilibrar la protección de los menores frente a los servicios de comunicación audiovisual con otros importantes valores de una sociedad democrática, como, por ejemplo, la libertad de expresión. La Comisión observa que, fundamentalmente, es competencia de la autoridad española de reglamentación garantizar la aplicación de la citada Directiva y comprobar el cumplimiento de las medidas nacionales de transposición por parte de los organismos de radiodifusión.

La Comisión no puede afirmar que se aplique a los hechos en cuestión, tal como los describe Su Señoría, el artículo 27 de la Directiva de servicios de comunicación audiovisual, que versa de forma específica sobre los contenidos que pueden perjudicar seriamente el desarrollo de los menores. Independientemente de lo anterior, tampoco considera que el programa en cuestión atente contra la libertad de opinión.

⁽¹⁾ Directiva 2010/13/UE, de 10 de marzo de 2010 (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:095:0001:0024:ES:PDF>).

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-010652/13
to the Commission**

Santiago Fisas Aixela (PPE)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Use of the media for political purposes

In September 2013, the public television station Televisió de Catalunya (Channel 33, TV3) broadcast a report in its children's programme 'Info K' featuring interviews with children aged 12 and 14 talking about their experiences as part of the 'human chain' formed on 11 September in support of demands for an independent Catalonia.

The report not only used a programme broadcast during children's viewing hours and aimed specifically at children to deliver political messages in favour of independence, but it did so using minors for party-political purposes.

The children's statements included declarations such as 'Spain will surrender and we will have independence', 'I will fight for independence' and 'in 1714 we ceased to be independent'.

Does the Commission believe that public media should be allowed to use minors for political purposes?

Does the Commission consider using children's programmes to deliver political messages to be an attack on the freedom of opinion and the protection of children?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission

(19 November 2013)

The Audiovisual Media Services Directive ⁽¹⁾ takes into account that the protection of minors from audiovisual media services must be balanced with other important values of a democratic society, as for instance freedom of expression. The Commission observes that it is primarily the competence of the Spanish regulatory authorities to ensure implementation of the AVMSD, and scrutinise broadcasters' compliance with domestic transposition measures.

The Commission cannot conclude that the facts of the case, as described by the Honourable Member, would bring into play Article 27 of the Audiovisual Media Services Directive which specifically deals with content which might seriously impair minors' development. Neither does it see how, independently of this, the programme at issue could be said to breach freedom of opinion.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2010/13/EU of 10 March 2010 — <http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:095:0001:0024:EN:PDF>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010654/13
to the Commission
Catherine Stihler (S&D)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: European order for payment procedure

Under Article 32 of Regulation (EC) No 1896/2006, the Commission is required to present a detailed report reviewing the operation of the European Order for Payment procedure by 12 December 2013. Member States are required to provide information to the Commission for the purpose of producing the report.

Can the Commission inform us:

1. When the report is expected to be submitted?
2. Whether the UK has made any representations to the Commission regarding the operation of the procedure in Scotland (and in the rest of the UK) and, if not, when it intends to do this?
3. Whether the UK (within Scotland or elsewhere in the UK) is accepting representations from individual parties and practitioners regarding the use of the procedure and, if so, who the representations should be sent to?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(12 November 2013)

The Commission is preparing the report reviewing the operation of the European order for payment procedure in view of submitting it to the European Parliament in December 2013 as foreseen in Article 32 of the regulation (EC) No 1896/2006. To this end, the Commission has launched a detailed questionnaire to Member States on the application of the European order for payment procedure which is in force in their jurisdiction since December 2008.

On the basis of the replies to the questionnaire the report will show how the procedure is used, also in the UK. Furthermore, the Honourable member should be aware that all relevant information concerning the submission of the claim to the courts in England and Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland is already published on the website of the European Judicial Atlas:

http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/judicialatlascivil/html/epo_communicationshtml_uk_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010655/13
to the Commission
Catherine Stihler (S&D)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: Civil liability of employers

The UK, under the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act, has witnessed the removal of the civil liability of employers for breaches of health and safety rules.

Can the Commission outline how Scottish workers' rights will be protected? Does it believe that this act contravenes EU health and safety law?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(6 November 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-005951/2013.

In addition, the Commission has sent a request for information to the UK authorities within the frame of the EU Pilot system, regarding the removal of the civil liability of employers for breaches of health and safety rules in the UK legal order, further to the adoption of the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act.

The Commission will thoroughly analyse the reply of the UK authorities in light of assessing the conformity of the mentioned Act with the EU health and safety at work legislation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010656/13
to the Commission
Giles Chichester (ECR)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: Recognition of professional qualifications — revision of Directive 2005/36/EC

Does the Commission agree that the proposals made by the Council of European Dentists regarding the proposal for a directive amending Directive 2005/36/EC (2011/0435(COD)) undermine the independent practice of dentistry by non-dentist dental professionals and restrict their movement across the EU?

How does the Commission plan to ensure the freedom of movement and recognition of professional qualifications whilst maintaining high standards of practice?

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

Directive 2005/36/EC ⁽¹⁾ constitutes the European framework for the recognition of professional qualifications. For seven professions, including dental practitioners, this directive coordinates the minimum training conditions, which allows for the automatic recognition of these professional qualifications. In December 2011, the Commission presented a proposal for the modernisation of the Professional Qualifications Directive. In June 2013, the European Parliament and the Council reached a political agreement on the modernisation of this directive ⁽²⁾.

Under the modernised Directive, the minimum training requirements of basic and specialist dental trainings will be updated ⁽³⁾. These changes reflect some of the proposals made by the Council of European Dentists on 20 September 2011 in its response to the Commission's Green Paper Modernising the Professional Qualifications Directive.

The Commission believes that the Modernised Professional Qualifications Directive will further facilitate the mobility of dental practitioners whilst ensuring high quality of dental care in the European Union.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2005/36/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 7 September 2005 on the recognition of professional qualifications, OJ L 255, 30.9.2005.

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/barnier/headlines/speeches/2013/06/20130612-2_en.htm

⁽³⁾ The minimum duration of basic dental training would be expressed not only in years (5 years) but also in training hours (5000 hours); and the principle of automatic recognition would apply also to the dental specialties which are common to at least two-fifths of Member States.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010657/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Aceh and the Helsinki MOU

In 2005 the Government of the Republic of Indonesia and the Free Aceh Movement signed the memorandum of understanding (generally known as the Helsinki MOU) which brought an end to the violence on the island of Sumatra.

The Aceh conflict left between 10 000 and 30 000 people dead, and organisations such as Amnesty International and other human rights groups have documented a range of crimes committed by members of the security forces and their auxiliaries against the civilian population, including unlawful killings and torture.

The 2005 Helsinki MOU called, in its paragraph 2.3, for the establishment of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission for Aceh. It also called, in its paragraph 2.2, for the creation of a human rights court. However, neither of these bodies exists, and there are very few examples of those responsible for serious human rights abuses being brought to justice, while attempts to provide reparation to victims have been described as inadequate.

What representations have been made to the Indonesian authorities to ensure the establishment of the aforementioned court and commission?

What support is the EU offering to assist with justice, reparation and reconciliation in Aceh?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(12 November 2013)

A law establishing a national Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) was adopted in 2004 but struck down by the Constitutional Court in 2006. A revised law has been prepared by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights but has yet to be submitted to the House of Representatives.

The EU has supported efforts of civil society in Indonesia in the field of human rights and in promoting the establishment of a TRC, by providing, for instance, funding under EIDHR to the International Centre for Transitional Justice (ICTJ) and the Institute for Policy Research and Advocacy (ELSAM). Moreover, as part of its support to the Aceh peace process, the EU funded the Access to Justice Project and supported the Crisis Management Initiative (CMI), which helped establish a regular dialogue between Aceh representatives and the central government in addressing outstanding issue under the MOU, including the question of a TRC.

In the context of the annual EU-Indonesia Human Rights Dialogue, the EU has also encouraged Indonesia to establish a TRC and will continue to encourage the regional government and Jakarta to address outstanding issues regarding the implementation of the MOU as well as the 2006 Law on the Governing of Aceh.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010658/13

à la Commission

Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Inondations dans le Sud-Ouest: lutte contre le réchauffement climatique et Fonds de Solidarité de l'Union européenne

De sévères inondations ont frappé au mois de juin dernier la France, notamment plusieurs vallées pyrénéennes. Elles ont fait plusieurs centaines de millions d'euros de dégâts publics et privés. De nombreux villages ont été isolés suite à la destruction d'infrastructures, beaucoup d'entreprises ont perdu leurs moyens de production et l'agriculture a subi des pertes considérables.

Ce phénomène n'était pas isolé: l'Allemagne, l'Autriche, la République tchèque, la Slovaquie, la Hongrie ainsi que l'Espagne ont également été touchées. Suite à ces événements, le Parlement européen a adopté le 3 juillet dernier une «résolution sur les inondations en Europe (2013/2683(RSP))» (P7_TA(2013)0316). Ce texte demande à ce que soient revues et simplifiées les règles de fonctionnement du Fonds de Solidarité de l'Union européenne institué par le règlement (CE) n° 2012/2002 du Conseil du 11 novembre 2002 et à ce que la procédure d'attribution d'aides aux régions sinistrées soit accélérée.

Je pense que les dégâts considérables causés par les inondations dans le Sud-Ouest justifient pleinement l'attribution urgente d'aides issues de ce Fonds de solidarité de l'Union européenne.

En dehors de ces aides de gestion de crise, il me semble aussi indispensable d'intervenir en amont pour prévenir ces catastrophes «naturelles». Il est clair que leur fréquence, leur gravité, leur complexité et leur impact se sont accrus ces dernières années. Le groupe d'experts intergouvernemental sur l'évolution du climat (GIEC) prévoit une aggravation significative de ces phénomènes météorologiques extrêmes. Il devient donc urgent que l'Union européenne lutte activement contre le réchauffement climatique. La diminution des émissions de gaz à effet de serre doit devenir notre priorité absolue pour pouvoir maintenir le réchauffement global au-dessous de 2 °C.

1. Comment la Commission compte-t-elle agir pour lutter plus efficacement contre le réchauffement climatique et ainsi prévenir au maximum les événements climatiques extrêmes?
2. Où en est la Commission dans l'instruction des demandes d'aides issues du Fonds de Solidarité de l'Union européenne pour le Sud-Ouest de la France?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Hedegaard au nom de la Commission

(11 novembre 2013)

1. Au titre de la Convention-cadre des Nations unies sur les changements climatiques, la communauté internationale a convenu de maintenir le réchauffement climatique au-dessous de 2 °C. L'Union européenne participe activement aux négociations concernant un nouvel accord international sur les changements climatiques qui devrait entrer en vigueur en 2020 et contribuer au respect de cet objectif. Outre l'application du paquet législatif sur l'énergie et le climat et ses objectifs «20/20/20» pour 2020, la mise en place du cadre d'action de l'UE pour le climat et l'énergie à l'horizon 2030 est également en cours. Il convient que ce cadre soit suffisamment ambitieux pour que l'Union soit en mesure de réduire ses émissions de gaz à effet de serre de 80 % à 95 % par rapport aux niveaux de 1990 d'ici à 2050, dans le cadre des efforts à déployer par les pays développés, et puisse ainsi atteindre son objectif à long terme.

Pour autant, l'Union n'a d'autre choix que de s'adapter aux changements climatiques qui résultent des effets différés des émissions passées et présentes. La stratégie d'adaptation de l'Union européenne ⁽¹⁾ vise à rendre l'Europe plus résiliente aux changements climatiques. Elle préconise notamment l'adoption de stratégies d'adaptation aux niveaux national et régional, et propose des lignes directrices et éventuellement un soutien financier pour leur élaboration.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/adaptation/what/documentation_en.htm

En vertu de la directive «Inondations» ⁽²⁾, les évaluations préliminaires des risques d'inondation, indiquant, le cas échéant, l'incidence des changements climatiques sur les risques d'inondation, devaient être terminées pour la fin de l'année 2011. Les cartes des zones inondables et les cartes des risques d'inondation doivent être établies pour la fin de l'année 2015. Pour cette même date, les États membres doivent également achever et publier leurs plans de gestion des risques d'inondation, qui seront régulièrement revus et, au besoin, actualisés. La définition d'objectifs concrets de réduction des risques d'inondation et le choix des mesures à mettre en œuvre sont laissés à la discrétion des États membres.

2. Le Fonds de solidarité de l'Union européenne ne peut intervenir qu'à la demande des autorités nationales du pays touché dans un délai de 10 semaines à compter de la survenue de la catastrophe. Une telle demande n'a pas été présentée par les autorités françaises.

⁽²⁾ Directive 2007/60/CE (JO L 288 du 6.11.2007, p. 27).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010658/13
to the Commission**

Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Floods in south-west France — combating global warming and the EU Solidarity Fund

In June 2013, severe floods hit France and some valleys in the Pyrenees in particular. Damage amounting to hundreds of millions of euros was done to public and private property. Many villages were cut off, many businesses lost their means of production and farmers suffered considerable losses.

This was not an isolated extreme weather event — Germany, Austria, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary and Spain were also affected. In response to these events, on 3 July 2013 Parliament adopted a resolution on floods in Europe (2013/2683(RSP)) (P7_TA(2013)0316) calling for the rules on the functioning of the EU Solidarity Fund, which was established by Council Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002 of 11 November 2002, to be reviewed and simplified and for the allocation of aid to the affected regions to be speeded up.

The sheer scale of the devastation caused by the floods in south-west France fully justifies the urgent allocation of aid from the EU Solidarity Fund.

This crisis management aid should be accompanied by measures aimed at preventing 'natural' disasters. It is clear that in recent years, these events have become more frequent, serious and complex and their impact even more devastating. What is more, the intergovernmental panel on climate change (IPCC) has warned that these extreme weather events are likely to get significantly worse. The EU should, therefore, take urgent action to combat global warming. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions should become our absolute priority in order to limit the global temperature rise to below 2°C.

1. How does the Commission intend to combat global warming more effectively, thus minimising the risk of extreme weather events?
2. What progress has the Commission made in processing the applications for EUSF aid for south-west France?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission

(11 November 2013)

1. The international community, under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, agreed on limiting global warming below 2°C. The EU is engaging proactively in the negotiations on a new international climate agreement that should take effect in 2020 and would contribute to meeting this objective. Beyond the application of the EU climate and energy package and its 20/20/20 targets by 2020, work is also ongoing on the EU climate and energy policy framework for up to 2030. It should be sufficiently ambitious to ensure the EU is on track to meet its long-term goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 80-95% below 1990 levels by 2050 as part of the effort needed from developed countries.

In parallel, the EU has no choice but to adapt to climate change, due to the delayed impacts of past and current emissions. The EU Adaptation Strategy ⁽¹⁾ aims to contribute to a more climate resilient Europe. It notably calls for the adoption of adaptation strategies at national and subnational levels, and provides guidelines and potential financial support for their development.

Under the Floods Directive ⁽²⁾, preliminary flood risk assessments, considering where applicable the impact of climate change on floods, were required by the end of 2011. Flood hazard and risk maps should be completed by end of 2015. Member States have to complete and publish Flood Risk Management Plans by end of 2015, to be periodically reviewed and if needed updated. Setting concrete risk reduction objectives and selection of measures is left to Member States.

2. The EU Solidarity Fund can only intervene following an application by the national authorities of the affected country within 10 weeks of the occurrence of the disaster. The French authorities submitted no such application.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/adaptation/what/documentation_en.htm

⁽²⁾ Directive 2007/60/EC, OJ L 288, 6.11.2007, p.27.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-010659/13
à la Commission**

Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)

(18 septembre 2013)

Objet: Directive sur les services de paiements (PSD II)

Le 24 juillet 2013, la Commission européenne a adopté un paquet législatif portant sur le domaine du cadre européen des paiements. Ce paquet inclut notamment une révision de la directive sur les services de paiements (PSD II) afin d'uniformiser les règles en matière de cartes de paiement dans l'Union européenne.

Or, certaines études montrent que cette directive n'est pas bénéfique pour l'ensemble des consommateurs des vingt-huit États membres de l'Union européenne. En effet, elle pourrait plus particulièrement desservir les consommateurs français en n'ayant pas les effets de simplification espérés. Les consommateurs français paieraient alors des frais plus élevés sur leurs cartes bancaires.

Cette mesure pourrait avoir pour conséquence de détourner les consommateurs français de ce moyen de paiement, ce qui est contraire à l'objectif du paquet législatif.

Ainsi, à la lumière de ces éléments, la Commission prévoit-elle de revoir cette directive afin de prendre davantage en compte les conséquences sur les consommateurs européens?

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission

(13 novembre 2013)

Le paquet «Paiements» adopté le 24 juillet se compose d'une proposition de directive sur les services de paiement (PSD2) et d'une proposition de règlement relatif aux commissions d'interchange pour les opérations de paiement liées à une carte. L'objectif de ce paquet est de simplifier et de moderniser le cadre juridique des paiements électroniques, en tenant compte des progrès techniques. Le règlement proposé se fonde sur les informations de marché recueillies durant les dix dernières années, y compris l'expérience acquise dans le cadre des enquêtes de concurrence sur les commissions d'interchange, ainsi sur de très larges consultations menées au cours des deux dernières années.

L'Honorable Parlementaire s'inquiète de ce que les propositions pourraient entraîner une hausse des frais pour les cartes «consommateurs»; cette préoccupation a été exprimée par rapport aux plafonds proposés en matière de commissions d'interchange. Nos analyses, de même des études réalisées par différentes organisations et les contacts avec différentes autorités dans les pays où les commissions d'interchange ont été réglementées, confirment toutefois qu'il n'y a pas de lien de causalité direct entre la réglementation des commissions d'interchange et les frais payés par le consommateur. En fait, c'est généralement dans les pays où les commissions d'interchange sont les plus basses que le coût des services de carte de paiement est le plus faible ⁽¹⁾.

Une étude concernant l'Espagne et commandée par MasterCard peut donner une impression différente. Toutefois, une analyse plus approfondie de la situation espagnole, et notamment des résultats d'autres études, permet de mettre évidence plusieurs facteurs ayant contribué à cette augmentation des frais; il s'agit en particulier du contexte économique général, qui a conduit à une augmentation globale des frais pour tous les services bancaires, et du fait que les consommateurs espagnols ont délaissé les cartes de débit, moins chères, pour des cartes crédits, plus onéreuses, en raison d'un marketing agressif de la part des banques espagnoles.

La proposition de règlement prévoit un rapport de la Commission sur l'incidence du règlement quatre ans après son entrée en vigueur.

⁽¹⁾ Par exemple, les Pays-Bas et le Danemark.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010659/13
to the Commission**

Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Payment Services Directive (PSD II)

On 24 July 2013, the Commission adopted a legislative package on the EU payments framework. The package includes a revised version of the Payments Services Directive (PSD II) which aims to harmonise the rules on the use of payment cards in the EU.

However, studies show that the new directive will not necessarily benefit all consumers in the 28 EU Member States: if it does not have the desired effect of simplifying the payments market, French consumers could find themselves paying higher charges on their bank cards.

The new measure could therefore discourage French consumers from using bank cards, a development entirely at odds with the purpose of the legislative package.

In the light of the above, does the Commission intend to review the revised directive in an effort to take greater account of the impact it will have on EU consumers?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(13 November 2013)

The Payments Package adopted on 24 July consists of a proposal for a directive on payment Services (PSD2) and a regulation on interchange fees for card-based payments. The aim of the package is to simplify and modernise the legal framework for electronic payments, taking account of new technical developments. The proposed Regulation is based on market information gathered over the last 10 years, including experience from competition investigations on interchange fees and on very extensive consultations during the last two years.

The Honourable Member is concerned that the proposals could lead to higher charges on consumer cards, which is a concern that has been voiced in relation to the proposed caps on interchange fees. Our analyses, studies by different organisations and contacts with different authorities in countries in which the interchange fees have been regulated, however, confirm that there is no direct causal link between the regulation of interchange fees and the consumer charges. In fact, in countries with the lowest interchange fees the costs for card services also tend to be the lowest ⁽¹⁾.

One study related to Spain and commissioned by MasterCard may create a different perception. However, a more in-depth analysis of the Spanish situation, including results from other studies points to several factors having contributed to these higher fees, notably the general economic context, which has led to generally higher fees for all banking services and the fact that Spanish consumers moved from cheaper debit to more expensive credit cards as a result of aggressive marketing by Spanish banks.

The proposed Regulation foresees a report by the Commission on the impact of the regulation four years after entry into force.

⁽¹⁾ e.g. Netherlands and Denmark.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-010660/13
alla Commissione**

Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)

(18 settembre 2013)

Oggetto: Criteri EOW per la carta

L'industria cartaria è molto preoccupata per la proposta relativa ai criteri End of Waste (EOW) (cessazione di qualifica di rifiuto) per la carta e ritiene che la Commissione abbia ecceduto nel mandato previsto dalla direttiva Rifiuti 2008/98/CE per i seguenti motivi.

a. La proposta è in contrasto con la definizione di riciclaggio che richiede il «reprocessing of waste», cioè il ritrattamento dei materiali di rifiuto (articolo 3, punto 17, della direttiva n. 98 citata) e con la legislazione esistente in materia di Ecolabel, Green Procurement, Ecodesign e Reach, oltre che con la decisione 2011/753/UE.

b. La Commissione non adduce alcuna giustificazione nel considerare riciclaggio una fase diversa da quella dell'uso in cartiera. Viene considerato con ciò negli obiettivi di riciclaggio un materiale con l'1,5 % di impurità, standard incompatibile con quello del prodotto riciclato nella cartiera.

c. La percentuale di impurità citata al punto 2 è in contrasto con la «gerarchia dei rifiuti» (articolo 4 della direttiva n. 98) e con l'obiettivo prioritario del riciclaggio.

d. Concedendo lo status di EOW a questo materiale si renderà impossibile verificare che gli standard ambientali extra UE siano equivalenti a quelli europei, come prevede il regolamento (CE) n. 1013/2006 sui movimenti transfrontalieri dei rifiuti.

e. Incrementare il commercio globale della carta da macero come EOW non sarà senza conseguenze sulle cartiere europee, che si troveranno costrette a utilizzare più fibre vergini o a fermare la produzione.

La Commissione:

1. condivide queste osservazioni?
2. Cosa risponde all'industria cartaria che, con l'introduzione di questi criteri, corre il rischio di fermare la produzione?
3. Può dirci qual è la *ratio* che l'ha spinta a includere la carta nei nuovi criteri EOW?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione

(11 dicembre 2013)

La proposta è il risultato del mandato legale di cui all'articolo 6, paragrafo 2 della direttiva 2008/98/CE ⁽¹⁾ e si basa su studi di valutazione imparziale eseguiti dal Centro comune di ricerca ⁽²⁾ della Commissione (CCR), previa consultazione non solo dei produttori di carta, ma anche dei molteplici operatori del settore privato coinvolti in diverse fasi del ciclo di riciclaggio della carta. La proposta della Commissione mira a garantire condizioni ottimali di riciclaggio della carta, mantenendo nel contempo un equilibrio tra gli interessi economici in gioco.

La proposta EoW è pienamente in linea con la pertinente normativa UE, compresa la gerarchia dei rifiuti e la definizione di riciclaggio. Lo status di EoW può essere ottenuto tramite un'operazione di recupero, incluso il riciclaggio. Tali operazioni di recupero possono aver luogo prima della fase di produzione della polpa in cartiere.

La soglia di impurità proposta (< 1,5 %) e lo standard europeo EN 643 ⁽³⁾ garantirebbero la disponibilità di carta recuperata di alta qualità per ritrattamento in cartiere e impedirebbero eventuali impatti negativi sull'ambiente.

⁽¹⁾ GUL 312 del 22.11.2008.

⁽²⁾ <http://ftp.jrc.es/EURdoc/JRC58206.pdf>

⁽³⁾ Questo standard, ampiamente utilizzato dall'industria cartaria, definisce i livelli di tolleranza dei componenti non cartacei nell'intervallo tra lo 0,25 % e il 2 %.

Le esportazioni di carta EoW rappresenterebbero un rischio inferiore per l'ambiente, giacché in media il tenore di impurità sarebbe inferiore rispetto alla carta da recupero. La relazione del Centro comune di ricerca ⁽⁴⁾, sulla quale si basa la proposta, riconosce che l'eliminazione di taluni scarti cartacei dalla disciplina dei rifiuti comporterebbe ulteriori esportazioni di entità tale che esse potrebbero minacciare la disponibilità di queste materie prime secondarie sui mercati dell'Unione europea.

L'onorevole deputato sarà a conoscenza del fatto che questa proposta è stata discussa dagli Stati membri ed è ora soggetta al voto del Parlamento europeo in seduta plenaria secondo la procedura di regolamentazione con controllo.

⁽⁴⁾ <http://ftp.jrc.es/EURdoc/JRC64346.pdf> (pagina 77).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010660/13
to the Commission**

Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: End-of-waste criteria for paper

The paper industry is extremely concerned by the proposal on end-of-waste (EoW) criteria for paper and believes that the Commission has gone beyond the remit laid down in the Waste Directive (2008/98/EC) for the following reasons:

(a) The proposal is at odds with the definition of recycling which involves the reprocessing of waste (Article 3, paragraph 17 of Directive 98), as well as with legislation on Ecolabels, Green Procurement, Ecodesign and the REACH Directive and Decision 2011/753/EU.

(b) The Commission does not provide any justification for changing the point at which paper ceases to be waste from its current location in the paper making process. Paper with a 1.5% impurity content is considered to have end-of-waste status — a figure that is incompatible with the standard for recycled paper used in the paper industry.

(c) This percentage is at odds with the waste hierarchy (Article 4 of Directive 98/2008/EC) and the priority given to recycling.

(d) If such paper is given EoW status, it will be impossible to check whether environmental standards outside the EU are equivalent to those applied EU-wide, as required under Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 on shipments of waste.

(e) Increasing the global trade of wastepaper with EoW status will have an impact on EU paper makers, who will be forced to use more virgin fibre or to shut down production.

1. Does the Commission agree with the above views?
2. What does it have to say to paper makers, who, if these criteria are introduced, may have to shut down?
3. Can it say why it has included paper in the new EoW criteria?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission

(11 December 2013)

The proposal responds to the legal mandate in Article 6 (2) of Directive 2008/98/EC ⁽¹⁾ and is based on impartial assessment studies carried out by the Commission's own Joint Research Centre ⁽²⁾ (JRC) after consultation not only with paper producers, but also the various private sector operators involved at different stages in the 'loop' of paper recycling. The Commission proposal aims at ensuring optimal conditions for paper recycling whilst maintaining a balance of the economic interests involved in the loop.

The EoW proposal is fully in line with applicable EU legislation, including the waste hierarchy and the definition of recycling. EoW status can be reached through a recovery, including recycling, operation. These recovery operations may take place before the pulping stage at paper mills.

The proposed impurity threshold (<1.5%) and the European standard EN 643 ⁽³⁾ would ensure the availability of high-quality recovered paper for reprocessing in paper mills and would prevent possible detrimental impacts on the environment.

Exports of EoW paper would pose a lesser threat to the environment as on average the impurity content would be lower than waste paper. The Joint Research Centre's report ⁽⁴⁾, on which the proposal is based, acknowledges that it is not to be expected that removing certain waste paper from the waste regime would lead to additional exports at a scale which could threaten the availability of these secondary raw materials on the EU markets.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.

⁽²⁾ <http://ftp.jrc.es/EURdoc/JRC58206.pdf>

⁽³⁾ This standard, widely used by the paper industry, defines tolerance levels of non-paper component in the range between 0.25% and 2%.

⁽⁴⁾ <http://ftp.jrc.es/EURdoc/JRC64346.pdf> (page 77)

The Honourable Member will be aware that this proposal has been discussed by Member States and will now be subject to a vote in the EP plenary under the scrutiny procedure.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-010662/13
aan de Commissie
Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)
(18 september 2013)

Betreft: Wijzigingen in Nederlandse Zorgverzekeringswet in strijd met het vrij verkeer van patiënten — Vervolg vraag

In antwoord op vraag E-004616/2013 stelt de Commissaris dat Zorgverzekeraars de toegang tot grensoverschrijdende gezondheidszorg niet mogen beperken en terugbetaling niet mogen weigeren op grond van het feit dat zij geen contract hebben met een bepaalde zorgaanbieder in een andere lidstaat van de EU. De Nederlandse regering is van mening dat haar voorgestelde wetwijziging niet in strijd is met Europees recht. Voorafgaand aan het kalenderjaar maken verzekerden een keuze voor een verzekeringspolis voor het komende jaar. Daarbij kiezen zij tussen een naturapolis, een restitutiepolis, of een polis met zowel natura- als restitutie-elementen. Bij een naturapolis maakt de verzekerde in beginsel gebruik van de zorgaanbieders die door zijn zorgverzekeraar zijn gecontracteerd. De selectieve inkoop van zorg door de zorgverzekeraar leidt er doorgaans toe dat voor een naturaverzekering een lagere nominale premie verschuldigd is dan voor een restitutieverzekering.

1. Indien een patiënt een keuze heeft gemaakt voor een natura-polis met de bijbehorende lagere premie en de beperking dat bij genoten zorg bij een niet-gecontracteerde zorgaanbieder een lagere of nihil-vergoeding geldt, mag de Nederlandse zorgverzekeraar dan ook een lagere of nihil-vergoeding bepalen voor genoten zorg bij een niet-gecontracteerde zorgaanbieder in een andere Lidstaat?
2. Hoe verhoudt zich een dergelijke bepaling tot het vrij verkeer van patiënten, zeker gezien de logischerwijs beperktere interesse en mogelijkheden van Nederlandse zorgverzekeraars om contracten af te sluiten met zorgaanbieders in andere lidstaten dan België en Duitsland?
3. Richtlijn 2011/24/EU stelt in overweging 4 dat de omzetting van deze richtlijn in nationale wetgeving en de toepassing ervan, er niet toe mag leiden dat patiënten worden aangemoedigd om buiten hun lidstaat van aansluiting een behandeling te ondergaan. Als een patiënt met een naturapolis voor een behandeling bij een nationale niet-gecontracteerde zorgaanbieder een nihil-vergoeding of lagere vergoeding zou ontvangen, en hij uit hoofde van Jurisprudentie van het Europees Hof recht zou hebben op een hogere vergoeding (arrest van Braekel) indien hij gepland gebruik maakt van een niet-gecontracteerde zorgaanbieder in een andere lidstaat, is er dan volgens de Commissie sprake van aanmoediging zoals gedefinieerd in overweging 4 van de Richtlijn?

Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(31 oktober 2013)

Overeenkomstig Richtlijn 2011/24/EU betreffende de toepassing van de rechten van patiënten bij grensoverschrijdende gezondheidszorg ⁽¹⁾ moet een lidstaat erop toezien dat de kosten die zijn gemaakt door een verzekerde die grensoverschrijdende gezondheidszorg ontvangt, worden terugbetaald tot het bedrag dat ten laste zou zijn genomen indien de gezondheidszorg zou zijn verstrekt op het grondgebied van de lidstaat waar die persoon is verzekerd.

Wat de vaststelling van „het bedrag dat ten laste zou zijn genomen” betreft, zij erop gewezen dat de toepassing van terugbetalingstarieven of -bedragen die lager zijn dan die welke worden toegepast voor gezondheidszorg die werd verstrekt door gecontracteerde zorgverleners in Nederland patiënten zou ontmoedigen om gebruik te maken van hun recht op grensoverschrijdende gezondheidszorg. Dat zou bijgevolg een belemmering vormen voor de uitoefening van het vrije verkeer en zou op grond van dwingende redenen van algemeen belang moeten worden gerechtvaardigd. Er zou ook moeten worden aangetoond dat deze belemmering gezien het nagestreefde doel zowel evenredig als noodzakelijk was. Momenteel kan de Commissie zich nog geen definitief oordeel vormen, aangezien haar in dit verband nog geen rechtvaardigingen werden voorgelegd.

Wat uw laatste vraag betreft, zij eraan herinnerd dat de richtlijn de rechten codificeert die het Europees Hof van Justitie duidelijk heeft vastgesteld en die voortvloeien uit de bepalingen van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie inzake vrij verkeer. Wanneer de nodige voorzieningen worden getroffen waardoor patiënten deze rechten kunnen uitoefenen, houdt dat niet in dat grensoverschrijdende gezondheidszorg als doel op zich wordt aangemoedigd. De keuzemogelijkheden van de patiënten worden er wel door uitgebreid.

⁽¹⁾ PB L 88 van 4.4.2011, blz. 45-65.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010662/13
to the Commission**

Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Amendments to the Dutch Care Insurance Act contrary to the free movement of patients — follow-up question

In answer to Question E-004616/2013, the Commissioner stated that care insurers cannot restrict access to cross-border healthcare and reject reimbursement on the grounds that they do not have a contract with a given provider of healthcare in another EU Member State. The Netherlands Government does not consider that its proposed legislative amendment breaches European law. Before the calendar year, policy-holders choose an insurance policy for the year ahead. In so doing, they choose between a 'naturapolis' (designated care providers policy), a 'restitutiepolis' (non-contracted care policy) and a policy combining elements of both. In the case of the 'naturapolis', the insured person is in principle expected to use care providers who have a contract with the care insurer. Thanks to the selective purchase of care by the care insurer, the nominal premium for such a policy is generally lower than for a 'restitutiepolis'.

1. If a patient has opted for a 'naturapolis' at a lower premium, subject to the restriction that if care is received from an uncontracted care provider, the reimbursement will be smaller or zero, is it permissible for the Dutch care insurer to stipulate that the reimbursement will be smaller or zero if care is received from an uncontracted care provider in another Member State?

2. Can such a provision be reconciled with the free movement of patients, particularly as Dutch care insurers, for logical reasons, have less interest in concluding contracts with care providers in Member States other than Belgium and Germany, and less opportunity to do so?

3. Recital 4 of Directive 2011/24/EU provides that the transposition of that directive into national legislation and its application should not result in patients being encouraged to receive treatment outside their Member State of affiliation. If a patient with a 'naturapolis' would receive a reduced or zero reimbursement for treatment by an uncontracted national care provider, while, according to the case-law of the Court of Justice (the van Braekel judgment), he would be entitled to a larger reimbursement if he made use in a planned manner of an uncontracted care provider in another Member State, does this, in the Commission's view, constitute encouragement as referred to in Recital 4 of the directive?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(31 October 2013)

Directive 2011/24/EU on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare ⁽¹⁾ requires Member States to ensure that the costs incurred by an insured person who receives cross-border healthcare are reimbursed up to the level of costs that would have been assumed had the healthcare been provided in the territory in which that person is insured.

On the point of reference for establishing 'the level of costs that would have been assumed', the application of reimbursement tariffs or amounts lower than those used for care received from contracted providers in the Netherlands would amount to a disincentive for patients to use their rights to cross-border healthcare. It would therefore constitute an obstacle to the exercise of free movement, and would need to be justified with reference to overriding reasons of general interest. It would also need to be demonstrated that this obstacle was both proportionate and necessary with regard to the desired objective. At the current time the Commission is not yet able to make a conclusive assessment as it has not yet seen any justification with regard to this issue.

Regarding the final question, the directive codifies the rights which the European Court of Justice has clearly set out, and which derive from the free movement provisions of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. Ensuring these rights are put into place correctly so that patients may make use of them does not encourage cross-border healthcare as an end in itself, although it does increase the choices available to patients.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 88, 4.4.2011, p. 45-65.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-010663/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(18 de setembro de 2013)

Assunto: UE, Islândia e Noruega — pendência da entrada em vigor do Acordo relativo ao aprofundamento da cooperação transfronteiras

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-008435/2013, a senhora Comissária Cecilia Malmström declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «a entrada em vigor do Acordo [entre a União Europeia e a Islândia e a Noruega sobre a aplicação de determinadas disposições da Decisão 2008/615/JAI do Conselho relativa ao aprofundamento da cooperação transfronteiras, em particular no domínio da luta contra o terrorismo e da criminalidade transfronteiras, bem como da Decisão 2008/616/JAI do Conselho referente à execução da Decisão 2008/615/JAI relativa ao aprofundamento da cooperação transfronteiras, em particular no domínio da luta contra o terrorismo e da criminalidade transfronteiras] ainda está pendente por falta das declarações da Islândia e da Noruega, exigidas em conformidade com o seu artigo 8.º».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Face à ausência de informações por parte da Islândia e da Noruega quanto à eventual adoção de medidas tendentes à entrada em vigor do Acordo, pretende contactar as autoridades competentes destes países a este propósito?
2. Quais são, em seu entender, as principais desvantagens da não entrada em vigor do Acordo?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão

(12 de novembro de 2013)

A Comissão congratula-se com a adoção do Acordo entre a União Europeia e a Islândia e a Noruega sobre a aplicação de determinadas disposições da Decisão 2008/615/JAI do Conselho relativa ao aprofundamento da cooperação transfronteiras, em particular no domínio da luta contra o terrorismo e da criminalidade transfronteiras, bem como da Decisão 2008/616/JAI do Conselho referente à execução da Decisão 2008/615/JAI relativa ao aprofundamento da cooperação transfronteiras, em particular no domínio da luta contra o terrorismo e da criminalidade transfronteiras.

Espera-se que este acordo possa facilitar o intercâmbio de informações entre autoridades responsáveis pela prevenção e investigação de infrações penais na Islândia, na Noruega e na UE. Estes benefícios só estarão disponíveis para os Estados-Membros da UE, a Noruega e a Islândia após a entrada em vigor do acordo.

Em conformidade com o artigo 8.º do presente acordo, o Secretário-Geral do Conselho da UE deve verificar, antes do acordo entrar em vigor, que todos os requisitos formais foram cumpridos e deve, na qualidade de depositário, tornar públicas quaisquer notificações efetuadas no âmbito do presente acordo. A Comissão não tem conhecimento de qualquer publicação pelo Secretário-Geral sobre as notificações por parte da Noruega ou da Islândia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010663/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: The EU, Iceland and Norway: pending entry into force of the Agreement on the stepping-up of cross-border cooperation

In the Commission's reply to my previous Written Question E-008435/2013, Commissioner Cecilia Malmström said that 'the entry into force of the Agreement [on the application of certain provisions of Council Decision 2008/615/JAI relating to stepping up cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and cross-border crime, and Council Decision 2008/616/JAI relating to the implementation of Decision 2008/615/JAI relating to stepping up cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and cross-border crime] is still pending failing the declarations by Iceland and Norway required according to Article 8 thereof'.

1. Can the Commission say whether, given the lack of information from Iceland and Norway as to the possible adoption of measures to bring the Agreement into force, it intends to contact the competent authorities in these countries on the subject?
2. What does it see as being the main disadvantages of the Agreement not being applied?

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

The Commission welcomes the adoption of the agreement between the EU and Iceland and Norway on the application of certain provisions of Council Decision 2008/615/JAI relating to stepping up cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and cross-border crime, and Council Decision 2008/616/JAI relating to the implementation of Decision 2008/615/JAI relating to stepping up cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and cross-border crime.

This agreement is expected to facilitate the exchange of information between authorities responsible for the prevention and investigation of criminal offences in Island, Norway and in the EU. These benefits will only be available for the EU Member States and Norway and Iceland once the agreement has entered into force.

According to Article 8 of this agreement, the Secretary-General of the Council of the EU shall establish, before the agreement enters into force, that all formal requirements have been fulfilled and shall, acting as depository, make public information on any notification made concerning this agreement. The Commission is not aware of any such publication by the Secretary-General about notifications on the part of Norway or Iceland.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-010664/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(18 de setembro de 2013)

Assunto: Eventual alargamento da cooperação com a Suíça e o Liechtenstein

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-008436/2013, a senhora Comissária Cecilia Malmström declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «a União Europeia coopera em muitos domínios com a Suíça e o Liechtenstein. Qualquer cooperação que ultrapasse os atuais domínios de ação terá de ser avaliada em função das necessidades, tendo em conta as relações gerais entre a União Europeia e estes dois países».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão se já identificou áreas em que se possa verificar semelhante necessidade e, em caso afirmativo, que áreas são essas.

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão

(30 de outubro de 2013)

Nas suas conclusões de dezembro de 2012 sobre a Suíça, o Conselho considerou que «a conclusão de negociações sobre a participação deste país no Mercado Interno depende, em particular, da resolução dos problemas institucionais». Está atualmente em preparação uma recomendação de decisão do Conselho que autoriza negociações com a Suíça sobre um quadro institucional horizontal para as relações com a UE. Tendo isso em conta, os domínios de ação atuais são unicamente os identificados antes das referidas conclusões e aqueles no âmbito dos quais estão já em curso negociações.

No que diz respeito ao Liechtenstein, a Comissão não identificou quaisquer novos domínios de cooperação.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010664/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: Possible expansion of cooperation with Switzerland and Liechtenstein

In the Commission's reply to my previous Written Question E-008436/2013, Commissioner Cecilia Malmström said that 'the European Union cooperates in many fields with Switzerland and Liechtenstein respectively. Any cooperation going beyond the existing policy fields would need to be assessed on a needs basis taking into account the general relations between the European Union and these two countries'.

Can the Commission say whether it has already identified areas in which such needs exist and if so, which areas these are?

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

In December 2012, Council conclusions on Switzerland stated that 'the conclusion of any negotiation regarding the participation of Switzerland in the internal market is, in particular, dependent on solving the institutional issues'. A recommendation for a Council decision authorising negotiations with Switzerland on a horizontal institutional framework for EU-relations is currently being prepared. In the light of this, only the policy areas identified prior to these Council conclusions or in which negotiations are already ongoing are being pursued.

As concerns Liechtenstein, the Commission has not identified any new areas for further cooperation at present.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-010665/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(18 de setembro de 2013)

Assunto: Recomendação da Comissão para as próximas eleições do Parlamento Europeu

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-008438/2013, a senhora Vice-Presidente Viviane Reding declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «a recomendação da Comissão para as próximas eleições do Parlamento Europeu apoia igualmente o espaço público europeu quando sugere candidatos europeus para o cargo de Presidente da Comissão, destaca o papel das famílias políticas europeias e preconiza a realização das eleições no mesmo dia em todos os Estados-Membros».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Considera que as medidas elencadas terão verdadeiro impacto nas eleições europeias?

Dito de outro modo:

2. Crê que a recomendação de apresentação de candidatos europeus para o cargo de Presidente da Comissão e a realização de eleições no mesmo dia tenderá a influir positivamente na afluência às urnas? Por que motivos?
3. Considera que as famílias políticas europeias dispõem de coesão doutrinária e notoriedade pública suficientes para serem reconhecidas pelo eleitorado? Julga que as suas propostas e programas dispõem de um grau de concretude suficiente ou que ainda permanecem excessivamente distantes do eleitor médio, que não conhece essas medidas nem se revê nos seus programas?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão

(11 de novembro de 2013)

A Recomendação ⁽¹⁾ sobre o reforço da realização democrática e eficaz das eleições para o Parlamento Europeu a que o Senhor Deputado se refere visa aprofundar a dimensão europeia destas eleições, aumentando a transparência e tornando, assim, o sistema mais próximo dos cidadãos da União. Na prática, estas recomendações podem fomentar verdadeiros debates pan-europeus durante a campanha e motivar o interesse dos cidadãos nas eleições europeias.

A aplicação das recomendações requer a participação de todos as partes envolvidas, incluindo os partidos políticos. Foi precisamente por isso que a Comissão se congratulou com o relatório sobre a melhoria da organização das eleições para o Parlamento Europeu em 2014 ⁽²⁾, onde se sublinha a convergência entre as ideias apresentadas no relatório do Parlamento e as suas próprias recomendações, bem como a vontade comum de reforçar a legitimidade do processo de tomada de decisões, aproximando-o dos cidadãos.

⁽¹⁾ JO L79 de 21.3.2013, p. 29.

⁽²⁾ O relatório foi votado na sessão plenária do PE do passado mês de julho (P7_TA-PROV(2013)0323).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010665/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: Commission's recommendation for the next election of the European Parliament

In the Commission's reply to my earlier Written Question E-008438/2013, Commissioner Viviane Reding said that 'the Commission's Recommendation for the next election of the European Parliament also supports a European Public Space by suggesting European candidates for the post of President of the Commission, by highlighting the role of European party families and advocating to vote on a single day in all Member States'.

1. Does the Commission believe that these measures will really have an impact on the European elections?

In other words:

2. Does it consider that the recommendation to put forward European candidates for the post of President of the Commission and to hold the voting on the same day will have a positive effect on voter turnout? If so, why?
3. Does it feel that the ideological cohesion and public profile of the European political families are strong enough that they can be recognised by the electorate? Does it view their proposals and programmes as being of sufficient substance or does it feel they are still too far removed from the average voter, who is likely to be unfamiliar with their proposals and unable to see his or herself reflected in their programmes?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(11 November 2013)

The recommendation ⁽¹⁾ for further enhancing the democratic and efficient conduct of the European elections to which the Honourable Member refers aims at deepening the European dimension of these elections, increasing transparency and thus bringing the system closer to Union citizens. Put to practice, these recommendations can encourage genuine pan-European debates in the campaign and help to stimulate voter interest in the European elections.

The implementation of the recommendations requires the contribution of all involved actors including the political parties. This is precisely why the Commission had welcomed the 'Report on improving the organisation of the elections to the European Parliament in 2014' ⁽²⁾, underlining the convergence between the ideas presented in Parliament's report and its own recommendations, as well as the shared will to reinforce the legitimacy of the EU decision-making process and to bring it closer to the citizens.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L79, 21.3.2013, p. 29.

⁽²⁾ The report was voted in the last July EP plenary session (P7_TA-PROV(2013)0323).

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-010666/13

adresată Comisiei

Elena Băsescu (PPE)

(18 septembrie 2013)

Subiect: Programul „Primul tău loc de muncă EURES”

Diferite studii contractate de către Comisia Europeană arată că, în pofida crizei economice actuale și a ratei ridicate a șomajului, în special în rândul tinerilor, în momentul de față în Uniunea Europeană există aproximativ 2 milioane de locuri de muncă vacante. Această situație se datorează, conform acelorași studii, în special, lipsei de competențe și de persoane calificate în anumite domenii.

Una dintre inițiativele Comisiei Europene lansate în acest sens este „Primul tău loc de muncă EURES”. Lansată ca proiect pilot în 2012, unul dintre principalele sale obiective este acela de a răspunde cerințelor actuale ale pieței muncii, având rolul de intermediar între cerințele și ofertele existente, în special pentru ocuparea celor 2 milioane de locuri de muncă vacante la nivelul Uniunii.

Această inițiativă se adresează mai ales sectoarelor cu un nivel scăzut de ocupare a forței de muncă la nivel național, sectoare unde trebuie încurajată mobilitatea profesională, precum: construcții, catering, vânzări, mecanică, inginerie sau sănătate.

Acest program a avut ca obiectiv inițial facilitarea accesului la locuri de muncă pentru 5000 de persoane. Intenționează Comisia să continue acest program și să îl extindă, prin creșterea numărului de persoane eligibile? De asemenea, care sunt mijloacele prin care Comisia a asigurat și intenționează să asigure pe viitor, vizibilitatea programului?

În același context, ce măsuri intenționează Comisia să ia pentru îmbunătățirea funcționării și creșterea vizibilității portalului EURES, atât în rândul persoanelor în căutarea unui loc de muncă, cât și al angajatorilor?

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei

(6 noiembrie 2013)

Programul „Primul tău loc de muncă EURES” are drept scop să testeze eficacitatea serviciilor de plasament, alături de un sprijin financiar, pentru a-i ajuta pe tineri să-și găsească un loc de muncă în alte state membre. Programul (acțiunea pregătitoare) este gestionat prin cereri anuale de propuneri (2011-2013). Obiectivul este de a plasa 5 000 de tineri pe piața muncii, cu aproximativ 12 milioane de euro.

În total, au fost finanțate nouă proiecte, inițiate de servicii publice și private de ocupare a forței de muncă din mai multe țări din UE. Ultima cerere de propuneri pentru acțiunea pregătitoare a fost publicată în septembrie 2013. Aceasta vizează crearea de locuri de muncă, cursuri de formare și stagii de ucenicie. Implementarea proiectului este prevăzută până la sfârșitul anului 2015. Până în prezent, au fost realizate peste 1 000 de plasamente.

Consiliul European din 27-28 iunie 2013 indică faptul că „se vor depune noi eforturi pentru promovarea mobilității tinerilor aflați în căutarea unui loc de muncă, inclusiv prin consolidarea programului Primul tău loc de muncă EURES”. În perioada 2014-2020, în cadrul Programului UE pentru ocuparea forței de muncă și inovare socială (EaSI), cu un buget anual de 5-9 milioane de euro, vor fi finanțate programe menite să-i sprijine pe tineri în găsirea unui loc de muncă și alte programe speciale de mobilitate a lucrătorilor. De asemenea, prin intermediul unor campanii de recrutare specifice, vor fi elaborate inițiative la scară redusă pentru locurile de muncă vacante care vizează anumite ocupații, sectoare sau state membre. Ocuparea forței de muncă în rândul tinerilor va rămâne o prioritate. Un sprijin financiar pe scară mai largă în favoarea mobilității transnaționale a forței de muncă este disponibil prin intermediul Fondului Social European, în acest caz deciziile de investiții fiind totuși luate de autoritățile naționale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010666/13
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: 'Your first EURES job' programme

Various studies commissioned by the European Commission show that, despite the current economic crisis and high rate of unemployment, particularly amongst young people, there are currently approximately 2 million job vacancies in the European Union. According to the same studies, this situation is due in particular to a lack of competencies and of qualified individuals in certain fields.

One of the European Commission initiatives launched to this end is 'Your first EURES job.' Launched as a pilot project in 2012, one of its main objectives is to meet current labour market requirements by taking on the role of intermediary between these requirements and existing vacancies, particularly with regard to filling the 2 million vacant positions in the European Union.

This initiative particularly addresses sectors with a low rate of employment at the national level, sectors in which professional mobility should be encouraged, such as construction, catering, sales, mechanics, engineering or healthcare.

The initial objective of this programme was to facilitate access to employment for 5 000 people. Does the Commission intend to continue with this programme and to expand it by increasing the amount of eligible candidates? Furthermore, what resources has the Commission used and what resources does it intend to use in the future to ensure the visibility of the programme?

In the same context, what measures does the Commission intend to take to improve the functioning and increase the visibility of the EURES portal, both for those seeking employment and employers?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(6 November 2013)

'Your first EURES job' aims to test the effectiveness of job search services combined with financial support to help young people find a job in other Member States. The scheme (preparatory action) is run through annual calls for proposals (2011-2013). The objective is to place 5.000 young people with around EUR 12 million.

A total of nine projects have been supported, driven by public and private employment services in several EU countries. The last call of the preparatory action was published in September 2013 covering jobs, traineeship and apprenticeship placements. Project implementation is planned until the end of 2015. To date, more than 1000 placements have been made.

The European Council of 27-28 of June 2013 specifies that 'new efforts will be made to promote the mobility of young jobseekers, including by strengthening "Your first EURES job"'. In 2014-2020, schemes to support young people finding a job and other targeted labour mobility schemes will be funded under the EU Programme for Employment and Social Innovation (EaSI), with an annual budget of EUR 5 to 9 million. Small-scale initiatives will be developed to deal with vacancies in certain occupations, sectors or Member States through tailor-made recruitment campaigns. Youth employment will remain a priority. Larger-scale financial support to transnational labour mobility is available from the European Social Fund, where investment decisions are however made by national authorities.

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-010667/13
adresată Comisiei**

Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)

(18 septembrie 2013)

Subiect: Șomaj

Într-o Europă care nu reușește să găsească cele mai eficiente soluții pentru depășirea crizei, cu fabrici care se închid în fiecare lună sau își delocalizează activitatea în afara granițelor Uniunii Europene, alegerea unei meserii devine din ce în ce mai dificilă nu doar pentru tineri, dar și pentru părinții și profesorii care trebuie să îi ghideze în identificarea domeniului care corespunde cel mai bine abilităților lor.

Problema tinerilor șomeri este cu atât mai dificilă cu cât numărul celor care abandonează școala înainte de a obține o calificare sau o diplomă este în creștere.

Mai trebuie adăugată și problema „irosirii inteligentei”, respectiv tineri înalt calificați care lucrează sub potențialul lor, ceea ce are efecte negative asupra lor, din punct de vedere social și psihologic.

Politica de austeritate practică la nivel european nu a condus doar la tăieri bugetare, ci și la concedieri masive, alimentând spectrul unei generații pierdute.

Generații întregi de tineri îngroașă numărul șomerilor existenți, iar mulți dintre ei nu au avut până în prezent niciun loc de muncă, cunoscut fiind faptul că, cu cât trece timpul fără să fii încadrat în câmpul muncii, cu atât unui șomer îi va fi mai greu în găsirea unui loc de muncă.

Potrivit datelor oficiale publicate de Organizația Internațională a Muncii, 75 milioane de tineri din întreaga lume nu au locuri de muncă, adică 6% din totalul persoanelor cu vârsta între 18 și 24 de ani.

Numărul persoanelor fără locuri de muncă în Uniune, în special în rândul tinerilor, a atins un nivel record și a devenit una dintre problemele cele mai urgente în majoritatea, dacă nu în toate statele membre.

Șomajul pe termen lung presupune costuri foarte mari, dar și posibilitatea creării unor generații pierdute. Ce are în vedere Comisia pentru reducerea șomajului pe teritoriul Uniunii și pentru integrarea pe piața muncii a șomerilor care nu au lucrat niciodată?

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei

(7 noiembrie 2013)

În cadrul strategiei Europa 2020, Comisia a propus un set de obiective și inițiative majore. Două dintre acestea vizează promovarea ocupării forței de muncă și reducerea sărăciei ⁽¹⁾. În plus, începând cu 2012, Comisia a adoptat un pachet privind ocuparea forței de muncă, un pachet privind ocuparea forței de muncă în rândul tinerilor, precum și un pachet de măsuri privind investițiile sociale și o comunicare privind „regândirea educației” ⁽²⁾. Acestea fac propuneri concrete, cum ar fi punerea în aplicare a „garanției pentru tineret” ⁽³⁾ și Alianța europeană pentru ucenicii, prin care se promovează crearea de locuri de muncă mai bune, incluziunea activă, o mai bună corelare a competențelor cu nevoile de pe piața forței de muncă și intensificarea programelor de ucenicie pentru a facilita tranziția de la băncile școlii la câmpul muncii. Cel mai important, prin intermediul semestrului european, Consiliul convine, în fiecare an, asupra unor recomandări specifice adresate statelor membre, în special cu privire la aspecte legate de ocuparea forței de muncă ⁽⁴⁾.

În același timp, UE poate susține financiar combaterea șomajului prin intermediul fondurilor structurale și de investiții, și în special al Fondului social european (FSE). Se preconizează că în principal măsurile de susținere a integrării pe piața forței de muncă și a consolidării competențelor și a capacității de inserție profesională a tinerilor vor facilita angajarea acestora. Este vorba, de exemplu, despre programele de mobilitate în domeniul formării profesionale și al muncii, precum și de programele de ucenicii și stagii în țară sau în străinătate, care le permit tinerilor să dobândească experiență practică.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_ro.htm

⁽²⁾ COM(2012) 669 final din 21.11.2012.

⁽³⁾ JO C120/1, 26.4.2013.

⁽⁴⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/index_ro.htm

În plus, inițiativa „Locuri de muncă pentru tineri”, care va fi cofinanțată de FSE și se va desfășura în perioada 2014-2020, se va concentra asupra sprijinirii tinerilor care nu au un loc de muncă și nu urmează studii sau cursuri de formare profesională, în regiunile care înregistrează cele mai ridicate rate ale șomajului în rândul tinerilor. Această inițiativă va furniza regiunilor respective sprijin suplimentar pentru implementarea recomandării Consiliului privind „garanția pentru tineret ⁽⁹⁾”.

(9) A se vedea Comunicarea Comisiei: „Împreună pentru tinerii Europei — Apel la acțiune pentru combaterea șomajului în rândul tinerilor”.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010667/13
to the Commission**

Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Unemployment

In a Europe that is failing to find the most effective solutions to overcome the crisis, and with factories closing every month or relocating their operations outside of the EU, choosing a profession is becoming increasingly difficult, not only for young people but also for the parents and teachers who have to guide them in identifying the fields that best meet their skills.

The issue of youth unemployment is becoming even more difficult with a growing number of pupils dropping out of school before obtaining any qualifications or a diploma.

Added to this is the problem of 'brain drain', specifically relating to highly qualified young people working below their potential, which has a negative effect on them from a social and a psychological perspective.

The austerity policy being implemented at European level has not only led to budget cuts but also to huge waves of redundancies, raising the spectre of a lost generation.

Entire generations of young people are swelling the ranks of those currently unemployed, with many of them having never previously worked and it is a well-known fact that the more time that passes without them finding employment, the harder finding a job will become.

According to official data published by the International Labour Organisation, 75 million young people around the world are unemployed, or 6% of all those aged between 18 and 24.

The number of unemployed in the European Union, particularly amongst young people, has reached record levels and has become one of the most urgent problems in most, if not all Member States.

Long-term unemployment entails huge costs, but also the possibility of creating lost generations. What measures is the Commission intending to take to reduce unemployment in the European Union and to integrate the unemployed who have never worked into the labour market?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission

(7 November 2013)

As part of the Europe 2020 strategy, the Commission has proposed a set of targets and flagship initiatives including two targeted at promoting employment and reducing poverty ⁽¹⁾. Moreover, since 2012, the Commission has adopted an Employment Package, a Youth Employment Package as well as a Social Investment Package and a communication on 'Rethinking Education' ⁽²⁾, which make concrete proposals (such as the implementation of the Youth Guarantee ⁽³⁾ and the European Alliance for Apprenticeships) to foster more and better jobs, promote active inclusion, better match skills with labour market needs and step up apprenticeships to promote the transition from education to the labour market. Most importantly, via the European Semester, the Council agrees every year on Country Specific Recommendations addressed to Member States in particular on issues related to employment ⁽⁴⁾.

With the European Structural and Investment Funds, and more specifically the European Social Fund (ESF), the EU can also financially support the fight against. In particular, measures to support labour market integration and enhance young persons' skills and employability are expected to help their transition to employment. This includes job and training mobility programmes, as well as apprenticeships and traineeships at home and abroad to gain practical experience.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm

⁽²⁾ COM(2012) 669 final of 21.11.2012.

⁽³⁾ OJ C120/1, 26.4.2013.

⁽⁴⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/index_en.htm

In addition, the 2014-2020 Youth Employment Initiative, which will be co-funded by the ESF, will focus on supporting youth not in employment, education or training, in the regions of the Union worst affected by youth unemployment. This initiative will provide additional support for those regions towards the implementation of the Youth Guarantee Council Recommendation ⁽⁹⁾.

⁽⁹⁾ See the Commission's Communication: 'Working together for Europe's young people: A call to action on youth unemployment'.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор P-010668/13

до Комисията

Iliana Malinova Iotova (S&D)

(18 септември 2013 г.)

Относно: Обществена поръчка за строеж на завод за отпадъци в София

Европейската комисия е открила наказателна процедура срещу България заради неизпълнението от страна на държавата на член 5 от Директива 2006/12/ЕО относно отпадъците. В същото време на 20 април 2012 г. 11 кандидати представиха офертите си за строеж на завод за отпадъци в София. На 26 април т. г., след заседание при затворени врати на оценяващата комисия, проектът е присъден на участника, който предлага най-висока цена за построяване на обекта. Тази сума е с около 13,5 милиона лева повече от определеното за допустимо в търга.

Нарушила ли е Столичната община директива 2004/18/ЕО относно координирането на процедурите за възлагане на обществени поръчки за строителство, услуги и доставки? Счита ли ЕК, че избраната фирма отговаря на изискванията и правилата в горепосочената директива?

Какви ще бъдат последствията за страната, в случай че има нарушение на европейското право?

Отговор, даден от г-н Хаан от името на Комисията

(7 ноември 2013 г.)

Проектът за строеж на завод за третиране на отпадъци в София е сред ключовите инвестиции, съфинансирани от ЕС през периода 2007—2013 г. Съгласно принципа на споделеното управление в рамките на политиката на сближаване държавите членки носят основната отговорност за надзора върху правилното провеждане на процедурите за възлагане на обществени поръчки, както и за гарантирането на правилното прилагане на съответните разпоредби от националното законодателство и законодателството на ЕС. Европейската комисия извършва оценка на проекта от гледна точка на неговата техническа осъществимост и съответствието му с целите на политиката.

Подписването на договора за строителство на завод за механично-биологично третиране на отпадъци в София беше отложено, докато Върховният административен съд се произнесе с решение относно редовността на въпросната процедура за възлагане на обществена поръчка. Съгласно последната информация, с която разполага Комисията, Върховният административен съд се е произнесъл с решение по жалбите във връзка с процедурата за възлагане на обществена поръчка и през идните седмици се очаква Столичната община да подпише договора.

Междувременно конкуриращи се участници в търга подадоха и до Комисията две отделни жалби, които съдържат твърдения за нередности в провеждането на процедурата за възлагане на обществена поръчка. Получаването на тези две жалби бе потвърдено на 8 август 2013 г. На 25 октомври 2013 г. е изпратена трета жалба до Комисията. Комисията ще разгледа надлежно получените жалби и същевременно ще вземе предвид резултата от съдебната процедура на национално равнище. Ако след този анализ се докаже наличието на нередности по отношение на декларираните разходи, свързани с този проект, може да бъде взето решение за финансова корекция.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-010668/13
to the Commission**

Iliana Malinova Iotova (S&D)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Public contract for the construction of a waste disposal plant in Sophia

The Commission has initiated infringement proceedings against Bulgaria for non-compliance with Article 5 of Directive 2006/12/EC on waste. Meanwhile, on 20 April 2012, 11 tenders were received for the construction of a waste disposal plant in Sophia and on 26 April 2013, following a meeting of the tender evaluation committee behind closed doors, the contract was awarded to the tenderer quoting the highest price. The figure in question is some BGN 13.5 million higher than the specified ceiling for the project.

Has the Sofia municipal authority breached Directive 2004/18/EC on the coordination of procedures for the award of public works contracts, public supply contracts and public service contracts? Does the Commission consider that the company selected meets the requirements and stipulations of the directive?

What will be the consequences for Bulgaria if EC law has been broken?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(7 November 2013)

The project of the construction of the Sofia waste treatment plant is one of the key EU co-financed investments in the 2007-2013 period. Under the principle of shared management of cohesion policy, the Member States have the primary responsibility for overseeing the correct handling of procurement procedures and ensuring that the relevant national and EU legislation are correctly applied. The Commission assesses the project for its technical feasibility and compliance with policy objectives.

The works contract signature for the Mechanical Biological Treatment Plant in Sofia was suspended awaiting the ruling of the Supreme Administrative Court as concerns the regularity of the procurement procedure in question. According to the latest information available to the Commission, the Supreme Administrative Court has issued its ruling as concerns the appeals with respect to the tender procedure and signature of the contract by the City of Sofia is expected in the coming weeks.

In the meantime two separate complaints containing allegations of irregularities in the handling of the procurement procedure have been submitted also to the Commission by competing bidders in the tender. Receipt of both complaints was acknowledged on 8 August 2013. A third complaint has been sent to the Commission on 25 October 2013. These complaints will be duly examined by the Commission while taking full account of the outcome of the court procedure at national level. If, after this analyse, the existence of an irregularity concerning the declared expenditure linked to this project is proved, a decision of financial correction could be approved.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-010669/13

aan de Commissie

Philip Claeys (NI)

(18 september 2013)

Betreft: Turkse luchtmacht haalt Syrische helikopter neer

Op 16 september schoot een vliegtuig van de Turkse luchtmacht een helikopter van het Syrische leger uit de lucht. Volgens de Turkse regering had de Syrische helikopter het Turkse luchtruim geschonden, maar de helikopter stortte neer op Syrisch grondgebied ⁽¹⁾.

Er bestaat grote onduidelijkheid over de „rules of engagement” die Turkije hanteert. Naar verluidt zouden die toelaten dat Syrische vliegtuigen die tot 5 kilometer van de grens met Turkije komen, onder vuur mogen genomen worden. Klopt deze informatie?

Volgens sommige bronnen werd de helikopterpiloot door Syrische „rebellens” gevangen genomen en onthoofd. Heeft de Commissie daarover bevestiging gevraagd aan de Turkse regering?

Deze vijandelijke daad van Turkije kan leiden tot een escalatie van het conflict aan de grens tussen Turkije en Syrië. De Turkse premier Erdogan steunt voluit de Syrische rebellen, die voor een groot deel uit soennitische jihadisten bestaan. Erdogan maakt er overigens geen geheim van dat hij een militaire oplossing van het conflict in Syrië wil. Welke gevolgen heeft dat voor de onderhandelingen over de toetreding van Turkije tot de Europese Unie?

Nam de Commissie hierover contact op met de Turkse regering? Zo ja, wat waren de conclusies?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie

(8 november 2013)

De kwestie waarnaar wordt verwezen, is een bilaterale kwestie tussen Turkije en Syrië.

De EU blijft in nauw contact met Turkije aangaande de crisis in Syrië. Een voortzetting van de samenwerking en de dialoog over vraagstukken van buitenlands beleid is van belang in het kader van de toetredingsonderhandelingen met Turkije.

⁽¹⁾ Zie bijvoorbeeld http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/17/world/europe/turkey-syria.html?_r=0.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010669/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: Shooting-down of a Syrian helicopter by the Turkish air force

On 16 September, an aircraft belonging to the Turkish air force shot down a Syrian army helicopter. According to the Turkish Government, the Syrian helicopter had violated Turkish airspace, but the helicopter crashed within Syrian territory ⁽¹⁾.

The rules of engagement by which Turkey is operating are very unclear. They are said to allow Turkey to shoot at Syrian aircraft if they approach within 5 km of Turkey's border. Is this true?

According to some sources, the helicopter pilot was captured by Syrian 'rebels' and decapitated. Has the Commission asked the Turkish Government to confirm this?

This hostile act by Turkey could escalate the conflict at the border between Turkey and Syria. Turkey's Prime Minister Erdogan fully supports the Syrian rebels, many of whom are Sunni jihadists. Erdogan also makes no secret of the fact that he would like to see a military solution to the conflict in Syria. What consequences will this have for the negotiations on Turkey's accession to the European Union?

Has the Commission contacted the Turkish Government about this? If so, what were the conclusions?

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

The issue referred to is a bilateral matter between Turkey and Syria.

The EU remains in close contact with Turkey on the crisis in Syria. Continued cooperation and dialogue on foreign policy issues is important in the framework of the accession negotiations with Turkey.

⁽¹⁾ See for example http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/17/world/europe/turkey-syria.html?_r=0

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-010670/13

aan de Commissie

Philip Claeys (NI)

(18 september 2013)

Betreft: EU-steun voor „European Council on Tolerance and Reconciliation”

Ontving de „European Council on Tolerance and Reconciliation” (ECTR) in 2011, 2012 en 2013 subsidies of enige andere steun van de Europese Unie? Zo ja, om welke bedragen gaat het? In welk kader werd/wordt deze steun verleend?

Indien er geen steun wordt verleend, diende deze organisatie ooit aanvragen tot steun in?

Op welke basis werd die geweigerd?

Antwoord van de heer Lewandowski namens de Commissie

(23 oktober 2013)

De Commissie deelt het geachte Parlements lid mee dat haar centraal boekhoudsysteem geen gegevens bevat betreffende een derde partij met de naam „European Council on Tolerance and Reconciliation”. Evenmin heeft zij enige entiteit geregistreerd onder het acroniem ECTR of het nummer 0899854350 (Belgisch registratienummer).

Wat betreft het deel van de vraag of deze organisatie ooit steun heeft aangevraagd en op welke basis die eventueel werd geweigerd, luidt het antwoord van de Commissie dat zij ten behoeve van het beantwoorden van een schriftelijke vraag niet de tijdrovende en kostelijke naspeuringen kan verrichten die vereist zouden zijn om het geachte Parlements lid de gevraagde informatie te kunnen verstrekken.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010670/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: EU support for the European Council on Tolerance and Reconciliation

Has the European Council on Tolerance and Reconciliation (ECTR) received subsidies or any other support from the European Union in 2011, 2012 and 2013? If so, how much funding has it received? In what context is or was this support provided?

If no support is being provided, has this organisation ever applied for support? On what basis was its application rejected?

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

The Commission informs the Honourable Member that it holds no record of any third party in its central accounting system with the name European Council on Tolerance and Reconciliation. It has also not registered any entity with the acronym ECTR or with the number 0899854350 (Belgian registration number) either.

Concerning the part of the question that asks whether the organisation has ever applied for support, and on what basis its potential applications were rejected, 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.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-010671/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)

(18 settembre 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Stato del programma di armi chimiche della Siria

Il 28 agosto 2012 l'agenzia Reuters ha pubblicato una relazione sullo stato del programma di armi chimiche della Siria. Si ritiene che la Siria abbia avviato il suo programma trent'anni fa, con l'obiettivo di contrastare una presunta minaccia da parte di Israele. Il 21 agosto sono stati impiegati razzi contenenti agenti nervini in diversi quartieri di Damasco, causando la morte di almeno 500 persone. La Siria è uno dei sette paesi a non aver aderito alla Convenzione sulle armi chimiche del 1997, con la quale i paesi firmatari si impegnano a distruggere tutte le proprie scorte di armi chimiche. Nel luglio 2012, un portavoce del ministero degli Esteri siriano, Jihad Makdissi, ha dichiarato che l'esercito non avrebbe utilizzato armi chimiche contro i ribelli siriani, ma avrebbe preso in considerazione l'uso di tali armi contro forze straniere.

Il programma di armi chimiche siriano è gestito dal Centro di studi e ricerche scientifiche (SSRC) con sede a Damasco, che è diretto dai servizi di informazione militari siriani ed è considerato «il centro di ricerche dotato delle migliori attrezzature in Siria». Il Centro dispone di strutture per la produzione di agenti vescicanti, quali l'iprite, e agenti nervini, come il sarin e il gas VX. Si ritiene che gran parte della tecnologia per la produzione di armi chimiche e biologiche in Siria provenga da «grandi società di intermediazione di prodotti chimici in tutta Europa». Secondo il generale Mustafa al-Sheikh, il quale ha disertato dall'esercito siriano, le armi chimiche sono ora nelle mani di seguaci del clan alawita del Presidente Assad, addestrati ad usare armi chimiche. Il direttore dei servizi di intelligence statunitensi ha osservato che «il programma globale di armi chimiche della Siria è vasto, complesso ed esteso sul piano geografico, con siti di stoccaggio, produzione e preparazione».

1. Qual è la posizione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante per quanto riguarda il rischio che le armi chimiche possano cadere in mano a gruppi armati quali Jabhat al-Nusra?
2. Quali sforzi diplomatici l'UE sta mettendo in atto per indurre il regime siriano a rivelare il contenuto delle proprie riserve di armi chimiche?

Risposta dell'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(20 novembre 2013)

L'AR/VP è seriamente preoccupata della minaccia che le armi chimiche della Siria rappresentano per la popolazione siriana e per i paesi vicini così come a livello regionale e internazionale.

L'AR/VP ha appoggiato pienamente l'iniziativa internazionale volta alla soppressione del programma di armi chimiche della Siria. Ha accolto favorevolmente la risoluzione n. 2118 del Consiglio di sicurezza dell'ONU come documento rappresentante «un grosso passo verso una risposta internazionale sostenibile e unificata alla crisi siriana» che «dovrebbe preparare la strada per l'eliminazione delle armi chimiche in Siria e stabilire norme per la risposta della comunità internazionale alle minacce poste dalle armi di distruzione di massa» (si veda la dichiarazione dell'Alto Rappresentante del 28 settembre 2013).

Il regime siriano ha fornito informazioni sul suo programma di armi chimiche all'OPCW, l'organizzazione incaricata di verificare il processo di distruzione delle armi chimiche siriane. L'attuazione di tale processo è cominciata in base a tali informazioni. È fondamentale che il regime siriano continui a fornire tutti i dati rilevanti e che continui a cooperare. La risoluzione del Consiglio di sicurezza dell'ONU contiene adeguate disposizioni in tale ambito. Un esito positivo del processo di distruzione significherebbe l'eliminazione dei rischi correlati, come quello che le armi cadano in mano a organizzazioni estremiste.

A livello pratico, l'UE sta fornendo specifico sostegno alla missione di ispezione OPCW/ONU in Siria, come indicato nella sopracitata risoluzione.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010671/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)**

(18 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — The state of Syria's chemical weapons programme

On 28 August 2012, Reuters released a report on the state of Syria's chemical weapons programme. It is believed that Syria began its programme three decades ago, with the aim of countering a perceived threat from Israel. On 21 August, rockets carrying nerve agents were deployed in a number of Damascus suburbs, killing at least 500 people. Syria is one of only seven countries not to have joined the 1997 Chemical Weapons Convention, which commits its signatories to destroy any and all stockpiles of chemical weapons. In July 2012, a Syrian Foreign Ministry Spokesman, Jihad Makdissi, declared that the army would not use chemical weapons against Syrian rebels but that it would consider using them against foreign forces.

The country's chemical weapons programme is directed by the Damascus-based Scientific Studies and Research Centre (SSRC), which is run by Syrian military intelligence. It is believed to be the 'best-equipped research centre in Syria'. SSRC has set up facilities for the production of blister agents, such as mustard gas, and nerve agents, such as sarin and VX gas. It is believed that the bulk of Syria's chemical and biological weapons production technology comes from 'large chemical brokerage houses across Europe'. According to Brigadier-General Muta al-Sheikh, who has defected from the Syrian Army, chemical weapons are now in the hands of chemical weapons-trained loyalists of President Assad's Alawite clan. The US Director of National Intelligence has noted that 'Syria's overall chemical weapons programme is large, complex, and geographically dispersed, with sites for storage, production and preparation'.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President / High Representative regarding the threat of chemical weapons falling into the hands of militant groups such as Jabhat al-Nusra?
2. What diplomatic efforts are currently underway by the EU to pressure the Syrian regime to reveal the contents of its chemical stockpiles?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(20 November 2013)

The HR/VP is gravely concerned at the threat posed by Syria's chemical weapons for the people of Syria, the neighbouring countries, as well as at the regional and international level.

The HR/VP fully supported the international initiative aimed at destruction of the Syrian chemical weapons programme. She has welcomed the Resolution no. 2118 of the UN Security Council as a document that represented 'a major step towards a sustainable and unified international response to the crisis in Syria', which 'should pave the way to the elimination of chemical weapons in Syria, and set a standard for the international community in responding to threats posed by weapons of mass destruction' (cf. statement of the High Representative of 28 September 2013).

The Syrian regime has provided a disclosure of its chemical weapons programme to the OPCW, the organisation mandated to verify the destruction process of Syria's chemical weapons. The implementation of that process has started based on that disclosure. It remains essential that the Syrian regime continues to provide all relevant information and cooperation. The existing UNSC Resolution includes appropriate provisions in that context. A successful conclusion of the destruction process will mean that the associated risks, such as the weapons falling into the hands of extremist organisations, will be eliminated.

At the practical level, the EU is in the process of implementing specific support for the OPCW/UN inspection mission in Syria, as referred to in the aforementioned Resolution.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-010672/13
alla Commissione**

Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)

(18 settembre 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Complotto terroristico contro il Canale di Suez

Il 25 agosto 2013 il giornale britannico *Sunday Times* ha reso noto che alcuni membri della Jihad islamica egiziana cospirano per affondare una nave nei pressi della città di Porto Said. Il gruppo, legato ad al-Qaeda, avrebbe selezionato tale luogo per perturbare la navigazione commerciale internazionale. In risposta a tale informazione, le forze speciali egiziane sarebbero state spostate dal Sinai a Porto Said, secondo quanto noto.

Le entrate annuali del governo egiziano provenienti dall'uso del canale ammontano all'incirca a 5 miliardi di USD. Un attacco del genere, quindi, potrebbe ripercuotersi gravemente sull'economia dell'Egitto. Porto Said è considerato un centro per i militanti salafiti e le truppe egiziane hanno ricevuto l'ordine di proteggere gli impianti portuali della città. Secondo un funzionario egiziano responsabile della sicurezza, un attacco al molo carburanti del porto potrebbe causare una vera e propria catastrofe.

1. Dato il rischio che i militanti sferrino un attacco per colpire il Canale di Suez, quali misure è disposta ad adottare l'UE, congiuntamente ad altri membri della comunità internazionale, per migliorare la sicurezza degli scambi commerciali attraverso il canale?
2. Quali provvedimenti stanno adottando i funzionari dell'UE in Egitto per valutare le minacce agli interessi europei poste dai gruppi militanti quali la Jihad islamica?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(6 novembre 2013)

L'Unione europea è consapevole del rischio di attacchi di militanti nella zona del Canale di Suez. Nelle conclusioni del Consiglio del 21 agosto, i ministri degli Esteri dell'UE hanno condannato fermamente tutti gli atti di terrorismo quali l'assassinio di poliziotti nel Sinai. Ora come ora l'Unione europea non collabora con l'Egitto nel campo della lotta al terrorismo.

L'Unione europea, e in particolare la sua delegazione in Egitto, segue con attenzione gli sviluppi, in stretta collaborazione con gli Stati membri, onde valutare i rischi per gli interessi europei attraverso contatti regolari con le autorità locali, i partner internazionali con posizioni analoghe e altri interlocutori politici e sociali nel paese.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010672/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Terrorist plot against the Suez Canal

On 25 August 2013, the UK's *Sunday Times* reported that members of Egypt's Islamic Jihad were plotting to sink a ship near the town of Port Said. The group, which has links to al-Qaeda, is believed to have targeted the site with a view to disrupting international commercial shipping. In response to this information, it is understood that Egyptian special forces have been transferred from the Sinai to Port Said.

The Egyptian government earns approximately USD 5 billion in revenue each year from the use of the canal. An attack of this kind could therefore have severe consequences for the Egyptian economy. Port Said is believed to be a hub for Salafi militants, and Egyptian commandos have been ordered to protect the town's port facilities. According to an Egyptian security official, 'an attack on the port's fuel docks could lead to an inferno, a catastrophe'.

1. In light of the risk of militant attacks against the Suez Canal, what steps is the EU prepared to adopt, in conjunction with other members of the international community, to improve safety for commercial traffic through the canal?
2. What steps are EU officials adopting in Egypt in order to assess the risks posed to European interests by militant groups such as Islamic Jihad?

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

The European Union is aware of the risk of militant attacks against the Suez Canal. In the Council Conclusions of 21 August, the Foreign Ministers of the EU strongly condemned all acts of terrorism such as the murder of policemen in Sinai. Currently, the European Union is not cooperating with Egypt on counter-terrorism measures.

The European Union, in particular its Delegation on the ground in Egypt in close cooperation with the EU Member States, is following closely developments in this area to assess the risk to European interests in regular contact with local authorities, likeminded international partners and other political and social actors in the country.

(Svensk version)

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-010673/13
till kommissionen**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(18 september 2013)

Angående: Faktisk användning av standard eller standardisering

I sitt svar på den skriftliga frågan E-005195/2013 om standardisering av specifik användning eller affärsmodeller i webbläsare svarar kommissionen att "om [den] får information om att sådana [standardiserade] tekniker används för att förstärka begränsningar i avtal i likhet med dem som parlamentsledamoten hänvisar till [C-408/05, Murphy mot Premier League], kommer kommissionen att vidta lämpliga åtgärder".

Programmeringsgränssnittet DRM API verkar vara utvecklat särskilt med den typen av begränsningar som anges i C-408/05 i åtanke.

Eftersom W3C är den faktiska organisationen för webbstandardisering för alla stora leverantörer av webbläsare kommer alla beslut som fattas i W3C sannolikt att påverka den stora majoriteten av webbläsaranvändarna i Europa och i övriga världen.

Menar kommissionen att endast faktisk användning av den standard som fastställts av W3C kan vara oförenlig med C-408/05?

Svar från Joaquín Almunia på kommissionens vägnar

(18 november 2013)

I sin dom av den 4 oktober 2011 i målen Premier League (C-403/08) och Karen Murphy (C-429/08), som parlamentsledamoten hänvisar till, ansåg domstolen att "avtal som syftar till att avskärma de nationella marknaderna vid de nationella gränserna eller som försvårar integrationen av de nationella marknaderna" i princip måste anses begränsa konkurrensen i den mening som avses i artikel 101.1 i EUF-fördraget.

Viktigt att poängtera är att domstolen inte bestrider mot själva tilldelningen av exklusiva licenser för sändningar eller det faktum att innehållet var krypterat och endast tillgängligt via avkodare. Snarare ifrågasätter domstolen endast de kompletterande skyldigheter som är avsedda att garantera att programföretagen inte lämnar avkodade anordningar till personer som är bosatta i medlemsstater utanför programföretagens exklusiva område.

Kommissionen känner inte till något som tyder på att programgränssnittet HTML5 DRM som utvecklats och godkänts inom W3C skulle syfta eller bidra till att nationella marknader avskärmats vid de nationella gränserna liksom avtalen i de förenade målen C-403/08 och 429/08. Enligt allmänt tillgänglig information om specifikationerna för programgränssnittet HTML 5 DRM verkar det inte finnas någon avsikt från W3C att fastställa en särskild DRM-lösning eller att främja någon form av territoriella begränsningar⁽¹⁾.

Trots detta och såsom angivits i dess svar på den skriftliga frågan E-005195/2013, kommer kommissionen inte att tveka att vidta lämpliga åtgärder om företag använder programgränssnittet HTML DRM för att införa begränsningar av denna typ.

⁽¹⁾ Se <http://www.w3.org/TR/encrypted-media/>: Denna specifikation fastställer inte ett skydd för datainnehåll eller ett förvaltningssystem för digitala rättigheter. Den fastställer snarare ett gemensamt programgränssnitt som kan användas för att finna, välja och interagera med sådana system, samt innehåll i enklare krypteringssystem. Genomförandet av förvaltningen av digitala rättigheter är inte nödvändig för att den här specifikationen ska efterföljas. Det är endast det enkla, tydliga nyckelsystemet som måste genomföras som en gemensam grund. (vår understrykning).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010673/13
to the Commission**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: De facto use of standard versus standardisation

In its response to Written Question E-005195/2013 on standardisation of particular use-cases or business models in the browser the Commission responds that 'Should [it] become aware that such [standardised] technologies are used to enforce contractual restrictions similar to those at stake in the case [C-408/05, *Murphy v Premier League*], it will not hesitate to take an appropriate action.'

The DRM API seems developed particularly with the type of restrictions in mind that are specified in C-408/05.

Since the W3C is the de facto standard setting organisation for all major browser vendors, any decision made in the W3C is likely to affect the vast majority of European browser users and in fact consumers of browsers worldwide.

Does the Commission mean that only de facto usage of the standard made at the W3C can be incompatible with C-408/05?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission

(18 November 2013)

In its judgment of 4 October 2011 in cases *Premier League* (C-403/08) and *Karen Murphy* (C-429/08), to which the Honourable Member refers, the Court held that 'agreements which are aimed at partitioning national markets according to national borders or make the interpenetration of national markets more difficult' must, in principle, be regarded as restricting competition within the meaning of Article 101(1) TFEU.

Importantly, the Court did not take issue with the actual grant of exclusive licences to broadcast or the fact that the content was encrypted and only accessible via decoder. Rather, the Court called into question only the additional obligations designed to ensure that broadcasters do not supply decoding devices to persons resident in Member States outside of the broadcasters' exclusive territory.

The Commission does not have any indication that the HTML5 DRM APIs developed and agreed within W3C would aim at or have an effect of partitioning national markets according to national borders similar to the agreements in Joined Cases C-403/08 and 429/08. According to publicly available information on the specifications for the HTML 5 DRM APIs, there does not seem to be any intention by W3C to define a specific DRM solution, not to mention to foster any kind of territorial restrictions ⁽¹⁾.

That said and as indicated in its response to Written Question E-005195/2013, the Commission will not hesitate to take appropriate action should undertakings use the HTML DRM APIs to impose restrictions of such kind.

⁽¹⁾ See <http://www.w3.org/TR/encrypted-media/>: 'This specification does not define a content protection or Digital Rights Management system. Rather, it defines a common API that may be used to discover, select and interact with such systems as well as with simpler content encryption systems. Implementation of Digital Rights Management is not required for compliance with this specification: only the simple clear key system is required to be implemented as a common baseline.' (emphasis added).

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-010674/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)**

Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)

(18 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Armenia i rosyjska unia celna

Chociaż Armenia obecnie zamierza zawrzeć układ o stowarzyszeniu z UE, to przygotowuje się także do przystąpienia do unii celnej z Rosją. Częścią starań Rosji o zacieśnienie więzów z byłymi republikami radzieckimi jest wciągnięcie Armenii do umowy handlowej obejmującej już Kazachstan i Białoruś. Taki związek gospodarczy z Rosją utrudni jednak Armenii zawarcie umowy o wolnym handlu z UE, ponieważ unia celna jest nie do pogodzenia z pogłębionymi i kompleksowymi umowami o wolnym handlu z UE.

Czy Wysoka Przedstawiciel jest świadoma tego problemu wywołanego przez kolidujące ze sobą umowy handlowe? Jak UE będzie od tej pory prowadzić negocjacje układu stowarzyszeniowego?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Štefana Fülego w imieniu Komisji

(28 października 2013 r.)

W dniu 3 września Armenia ogłosiła, że zamierza przystąpić do Eurazjatyckiej Unii Celnej. Członkostwo w Eurazjatyckiej Unii Celnej nie jest zgodne z układem o stowarzyszeniu z UE oraz pogłębioną i kompleksową strefą wolnego handlu (DCFTA) z UE. W związku z tym, mimo że negocjacje w sprawie układu o stowarzyszeniu i DCFTA zostały zasadniczo ukończone w lipcu, UE i Armenia nie są już w stanie przystąpić do ich parafowania.

UE i Armenia będą musiały wspólnie zastanowić się nad nowymi podstawami ich wzajemnych stosunków, które mogłyby zastąpić obecną umowę o partnerstwie i współpracy.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010674/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Armenia and the Russian customs union

Although Armenia is currently on track to cement an Association Agreement with the EU, it has indicated a commitment to a customs union with Russia. As part of its attempts to strengthen ties with former Soviet republics, Russia has drawn Armenia into a trade agreement that already features Kazakhstan and Belarus. However, this economic tie with Russia will hinder Armenia's free trade deal with the EU, as the customs union is not compatible with the EU's Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreements (DCFTA).

Is the High Representative aware of this issue caused by the conflicting trade agreements? How will the EU proceed with the Association Agreement negotiations from here?

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

On 3 September, Armenia announced that it intended to join the 'Eurasian' Customs Union. Membership in the Eurasian Customs Union is not compatible with an Association Agreement (AA) and Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA) with the EU. Therefore, although the negotiations on the AA/DCFTA were substantively completed in July, the EU and Armenia are no longer in a position to proceed with initialling.

The EU and Armenia will need to reflect jointly about a new basis for their relations to replace the current Partnership and Cooperation Agreement.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-010675/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)**

(18 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Azerbejdżan i prawa człowieka

Organizacja Human Rights Watch wydała ostatnio ostrzeżenie, że azerbejdżańskie władze zaczęły stosować represje wobec osób krytykujących rząd. Większość zatrzymanych za „wolność wypowiedzi” to młodzi ludzie, którym postawiono rozmaite zarzuty począwszy od przestępstw narkotykowych aż po chuligaństwo, co ma na celu utrzymanie nad nimi kontroli. Azerbejdżański rząd podwyższył również wysokość grzywien wymierzanych protestującym, a wszelkie zniesławienie rządu w Internecie uznał za przestępstwo.

Czy Wysoka Przedstawiciel zamierza poruszyć tę kwestię na zbliżającym się szczycie Partnerstwa Wschodniego?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji**

(25 listopada 2013 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca stale monitoruje sytuację praw człowieka i demokracji w Azerbejdżanie i wyraża obawy w ramach kontaktów dwustronnych z władzami Azerbejdżanu, jak miało to przykładowo miejsce podczas ostatniego posiedzenia Komitetu Współpracy w dniach 1-2 października 2013 r. Kwestie związane z wymiarem sprawiedliwości i prawami człowieka omawiane są szczegółowo na zebraniach odpowiedniego podkomitetu.

Ponadto w niedawnym oświadczeniu rzeczników Wysokiej Przedstawiciel i Komisji (z 3 października 2013 r.) wyrażone zostały obawy dotyczące wolności słowa, zgromadzeń i zrzeszania w okresie przedwyborczym.

Wysoka Przedstawiciel śledzi również rozwój sytuacji w zakresie zmiany azerskiej ustawy dotyczącej zniesławienia. Komisja Wenecka Rady Europy przyjęła niedawno opinię na temat projektu tej ustawy. Jej zdaniem w wielu aspektach, projekt ten nie jest zgodny z zasadami europejskiej konwencji praw człowieka; jest on oderwany od innych części prawa krajowego oraz nie wykazuje postępów na drodze do depenalizacji zniesławienia, natomiast zakres zniesławienia został poszerzony, obejmując również publikacje w internecie.

Pełne poszanowanie praw człowieka, podstawowych wolności i praworządności przez Azerbejdżan są kluczowym elementem jego zobowiązań wynikających z członkostwa w Radzie Europy i uczestnictwa w Organizacji Bezpieczeństwa i Współpracy w Europie (OBWE), a także jego zobowiązań podjętych w ramach partnerstwa wschodniego. UE w dalszym ciągu dąży do wspierania Azerbejdżanu w wypełnianiu jego zobowiązań na arenie międzynarodowej dotyczących praw człowieka i demokracji.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010675/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Azerbaijan and human rights

Human Rights Watch has warned recently that the authorities in Azerbaijan have started to crack down on people who criticise the government. The majority of those arrested for 'free expression' are young people, who are now facing charges ranging from drugs offences to 'hooliganism' that are designed to keep them in check. The Azeri Government has also increased fines for those involved in acts of protest and has made any defamation of the government on the Internet a crime.

Does the High Representative intend to raise this issue during the upcoming Eastern Partnership Summit?

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

The HR/VP continuously monitors the situation of human rights and democracy in Azerbaijan and raises concerns in bilateral contacts with the Azerbaijani authorities, such as, for example, the last Cooperation Committee which met on 1-2 October 2013. Justice and human rights (JLS/HR) issues are discussed in detail at JLS/HR subcommittee meetings.

In addition, concerns about freedom of expression, assembly and association in the pre-election period were recently expressed on 3 October 2013 in a statement by the spokespersons of the HR and the Commission.

The HR/VP is also following developments concerning the amendment of Azerbaijani legislation on defamation. The Council of Europe's Venice Commission has recently adopted an opinion on the draft law. In many respects, it found the draft not to be in line with the principles of the European Convention on Human Rights; to be prepared in complete isolation from other parts of domestic law and not showing progress towards decriminalising defamation, with its scope widened to online expressions.

Full respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms and the rule of law by Azerbaijan are at the heart of its obligations stemming from its Council of Europe membership, its participation in the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), as well as commitments taken within the framework of the Eastern Partnership. The EU remains committed to assisting Azerbaijan in fulfilling its international commitments related to human rights and democratisation.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-010676/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)**

(18 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Kuba: sprawa Ivana Fernandez Depestre

Ivan Fernandez Depestre, obywatel Kuby został skazany na trzy lata pozbawienia wolności za „niebezpieczeństwo” określoną jako „szczególną skłonność osoby do popełniania przestępstw”, po tym, jak spotkał się z „antyspołecznymi osobami”. Depestre został zaaresztowany, kiedy brał udział w pokojowej imprezie zorganizowanej, aby upamiętnić kubańskiego bohatera narodowego Franka Paísa, po czym odmówiono mu przedstawiciela prawnego. Na mocy art. 78-84 kubańskiego kodeksu karnego wymiar sprawiedliwości może skazać osoby krytycznie wobec rządu oraz działaczy w zakresie praw człowieka na pobyt w „wyspecjalizowanym ośrodku pracy lub nauki” lub też „kolektywie prac”.

Czy Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel znana jest sprawa Ivana Fernandez Depestre?

Jak UE podchodzi do kwestii praw człowieka w kontaktach z władzami kubańskimi?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu
Komisji**

(8 listopada 2013 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel i Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji wie o przedmiotowej sprawie, gdyż została ona zgłoszona przez Amnesty International, która w dniu 11 września br. uznała Iváną Fernández Depestre za więźnia sumienia. Delegatura Unii na Kubie uważnie śledzi rozwój sytuacji.

UE porusza systematycznie kwestie praw człowieka w ramach dialogu politycznego z Kubą. Rozmowy te odbywają się regularnie na wszystkich szczeblach władz tak w Hawanie, jak i w Brukseli.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010676/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Cuba: the Case of Iván Fernández Depestre

Iván Fernández Depestre, a Cuban national, was sentenced to three years in prison for 'dangerousness', defined as the 'special proclivity of a person to commit crimes,' after he met with 'antisocial persons'. Depestre was charged after peacefully participating at an event to commemorate the Cuban national hero Frank País and was subsequently denied legal representation. Under Articles 78 to 84 of the Cuban Criminal Code, the justice system may sentence those who are critical of the government and human rights activists to 'specialised work or study establishments' or 'work collective[s]'.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the case of Iván Fernández Depestre?

How is the EU addressing the issue of human rights with the Cuban authorities?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the case, which has been signalled by Amnesty International who adopted Iván Fernández Depestre as prisoner of conscience on 11 September. The Delegation in Cuba is monitoring the situation closely.

The EU addresses human rights questions systematically in the EU-Cuba political dialogue. Such dialogue is taking place on a regular basis, at all levels both in Havana and in Brussels.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-010677/13
do Komisji**

Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)

(18 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Cyrylica w Chorwacji

Aby móc przystąpić do UE w 2013 r., Chorwacja podjęła kroki na rzecz poprawy sytuacji w zakresie praw człowieka i ochrony mniejszości. Mniejszości mają prawo posługiwać się własnym językiem, a w niektórych częściach kraju, w tym w mieście Vukovar, zamieszkuje liczna mniejszość serbska. Jako echo napięć z czasów wojny w Jugosławii w latach 90. demonstranci chorwaccy usunęli niedawno znaki z napisami serbską cyrylicą. Napięcia między Chorwatami i Serbami nie słabną, a demonstranci uzyskali poparcie weteranów wojennych i mieszkańców sąsiednich miejscowości.

Jak UE może promować pokojowy dialog między Serbami i Chorwatami mieszkającymi w Chorwacji? Czy Komisja posiada strategię, która pomoże zapewnić przestrzeganie praw serbskich mniejszości etnicznych i stosowanie cyrylicy?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Viviane Reding w imieniu Komisji

(19 listopada 2013 r.)

Zgodnie z art. 2 Traktatu o Unii Europejskiej poszanowanie praw osób należących do mniejszości stanowi jedną z podstawowych wartości Unii Europejskiej. Ponadto art. 21 i 22 Karty praw podstawowych Unii Europejskiej zakazują dyskryminacji opartej na przynależności do mniejszości narodowej i przewidują poszanowanie przez Unię różnorodności kulturowej, religijnej i językowej.

Komisja potępia wszelkie formy przemocy wobec osób należących do mniejszości bądź jakiegokolwiek innej grupy. Jednakże, zgodnie z wyjaśnieniami np. w odpowiedzi na pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi na piśmie E-09947/13, Komisja nie posiada żadnych ogólnych uprawnień w odniesieniu do mniejszości. W szczególności Komisja nie posiada kompetencji w zakresie definicji i uznawania mniejszości narodowych, ich prawa do samostanowienia oraz autonomii lub używania języków regionalnych lub mniejszościowych. Kwestie te wchodzą w zakres obowiązków państw członkowskich.

W zakres mandatu Rady Europy wchodzi też między innymi monitorowanie stosowania Konwencji ramowej Rady Europy o ochronie mniejszości narodowych, a także Europejskiej karty języków regionalnych lub mniejszościowych przez jej państwa członkowskie. Chorwacja ratyfikowała obydwa teksty.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010677/13
to the Commission**

Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: Cyrillic alphabet in Croatia

Croatia took steps to strengthen human rights and protect minorities so that it could join the EU in 2013. Minorities have the right to use their native language, and the Serb minority has a strong presence in some parts of Croatia, including the town of Vukovar. As an echo of the tensions which existed during the Yugoslav war of the 1990s, Croat protesters recently tore down signs written in the Serbian Cyrillic script. Tensions remain high between Croats and Serbs, and protesters have received support from war veterans and neighbouring towns.

What can the EU do to promote peaceful dialogue between Serbs and Croats living in Croatia? Does the Commission have a strategy to help ensure that the rights of Serb ethnic minorities and the use of the Cyrillic alphabet are respected?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(19 November 2013)

According to Article 2 of the Treaty on the European Union, the respect for the rights of persons belonging to minorities constitutes one of the founding values of the European Union. Furthermore, Articles 21 and 22 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union prohibit discrimination based on membership of a national minority and provide for the respect by the Union of cultural, religious and linguistic diversity.

The Commission condemns any form of violence against people belonging to minorities or against any other group. However, as explained e.g. in its reply to Written Question E-09947/13, the Commission has no general powers as regards minorities. In particular, the Commission has no competence over the definition and recognition of national minorities, their self-determination and autonomy or the use of regional or minority languages, which fall under the responsibility of the Member States.

It falls within the mandate of the Council of Europe to monitor, among others, the application of the framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities as well as of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages by its Member States. Croatia has ratified both texts.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-010678/13
do Komisji**

Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)

(18 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Porozumienie w sprawie połowów między UE a Marokiem

UE przygotowała ostatnio projekt porozumienia z Marokiem w sprawie połowów, na mocy którego statki z państw członkowskich UE mogłyby prowadzić połowy na marokańskich wodach. Mieszkańcy Sahary Zachodniej dali wyraz złości w reakcji na to porozumienie handlowe, które w ich mniemaniu „nie szanuje woli politycznej Saharyjczyków”. Mniej więcej połowa wybrzeża, do którego prawa rości sobie Maroko, należy do Sahary Zachodniej, tak więc UE, prowadząc połowy na tych wodach, w gruncie rzeczy „nabywałaby towary kradzione”. Sahara Zachodnia nie została zaproszona do negocjacji w sprawie porozumienia, które niektórzy członkowie organizacji Western Sahara Resource Watch określają jako „nieważne”.

Jakie jest stanowisko Komisji w tej sprawie? Czy planowane jest włączenie Sahary Zachodniej do negocjacji?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Marię Damanaki w imieniu Komisji

(22 listopada 2013 r.)

Nowy protokół został wynegocjowany w oparciu o wytyczne Rady z dnia 14 lutego 2012 r. oraz przy uwzględnieniu rezolucji PE z dnia 14 grudnia 2011 r. Wzięto pod uwagę także kwestię przestrzegania prawa międzynarodowego i praw człowieka. W dniu 6 listopada 2013 r. Komitet Stałych Przedstawicieli podjął decyzję o zatwierdzeniu tego protokołu.

W myśl stanowiska Rady Bezpieczeństwa Narodów Zjednoczonych Sahara Zachodnia jest spornym terytorium niesamodzielnym administrowanym przez Maroko. Zgodnie z prawem międzynarodowym Maroko musi wykazać, że pod względem możliwych korzyści protokół leży w interesie wszystkich grup społecznych, których dotyczy. W tym celu w protokole zawarto szczegółowe postanowienia zobowiązujące Maroko do regularnego składania sprawozdań na temat skutków społecznych i gospodarczych przewidzianego wsparcia sektorowego, w tym na temat jego rozmieszczenia geograficznego.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010678/13
to the Commission**

Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)

(18 September 2013)

Subject: The EU-Morocco fisheries agreement

The EU recently drafted a fisheries agreement with Morocco, which would allow vessels from EU countries to fish in Moroccan waters. The Saharawi people have expressed anger at this business transaction, which they say 'doesn't respect the political will of the Saharawi people.' About half of the coastline that is claimed by Morocco belongs to Western Sahara, so the EU would essentially be 'buying stolen goods' by fishing in these waters. Western Sahara was not invited to the negotiations on the agreement, which some at Western Sahara Resource Watch are now calling 'invalid.'

What is the Commission's position on this issue? Are there new plans to include Western Sahara in the proceedings?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission

(22 November 2013)

The new protocol has been negotiated following the directives adopted by the Council on 14 February 2012 and taking into account the EP resolution of 14 December 2011, including on the issue of the respect of international law and human rights. On 6 November 2013, the Committee of Permanent Representatives decided to approve this protocol.

According to United Nations Security Council, the Western Sahara is a disputed Non-Self- Governing Territory under Moroccan administration. In order to comply with international law, Morocco needs to demonstrate that the Protocol serves the interests (in terms of benefits generated) of all the populations concerned. To that end, the Protocol contains detailed provisions requiring Morocco to regularly report on the economic and social impact of the sectoral support provided for, including its geographical distribution.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-010680/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(18 września 2013 r.)**

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Kazachstan: sprawa Zinaidy Mukhortovej

We wrześniu 2009 prawniczka Zinaida Mukhortova wysłała do prezydenta Kazachstanu list, w którym uskarżała się na ingerencję jednego z członków parlamentu Kazachstanu w sprawę, którą się zajmowała. Została ona wtedy zatrzymana przez władze i umieszczona w szpitalu psychiatrycznym, ponieważ cierpi na „chroniczne zaburzenia urojeniowe”. Od kiedy przebywa w szpitalu jest nieludzko traktowana i odmówiono jej porady prawnej. Kazachstan łamie Międzynarodowy Pakt Praw Obywatelskich i Politycznych, ponieważ rząd stosuje diagnozę i przymusowe leczenie jako formę odwetu.

Czy Wiceprzewodniczącej Komisji/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel znana jest sprawa Zinaidy Mukhortovej? Czy są podejmowane jakiekolwiek działania z myślą o jej uwolnieniu?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji
(12 listopada 2013 r.)**

Sprawa Zinaidy Mukhortovej jest znana Wysokiej Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącej i jest przez nią uważnie obserwowana, zarówno w siedzibie głównej w Brukseli, jak i delegaturze UE w Astanie. Delegatura UE utrzymuje stały kontakt z miejscowymi obrońcami praw człowieka, którzy zajmują się tą sprawą. Ponadto pracownicy delegatury planują odwiedzić panią Mukhortovą w szpitalu, w którym jest przetrzymywana.

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca otrzymała sprawozdania dotyczące przypadków innych osób, które zostały zatrzymane w ośrodkach psychiatrycznych w Kazachstanie w podobnych okolicznościach. Delegatura UE poruszyła tę sprawę z władzami Kazachstanu.

UE konsekwentnie porusza kwestie związane z prawami człowieka z władzami Kazachstanu, również podczas ostatnich posiedzeń Rady Współpracy UE-Kazachstan i Komitetu ds. Współpracy UE-Kazachstan. Następne posiedzenie w ramach dialogu dotyczącego praw człowieka między UE a Kazachstanem jest zaplanowane w listopadzie w Astanie. Podczas tego spotkania będą omawiane indywidualne przypadki dotyczące praw człowieka.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010680/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Kazakhstan: The Case of Zinaida Mukhortova

In Kazakhstan in September 2009, lawyer Zinaida Mukhortova sent a letter to the President of Kazakhstan complaining about interference by a Member of the Kazakh Parliament in a case in which she was involved. She was then detained by the authorities and placed in a psychiatric hospital on the grounds that she was suffering from a 'chronic delusional disorder'. Since being admitted, she has been subjected to inhumane treatment and has been denied legal counsel. Given that the government is using her diagnosis and forced treatment as a form of retaliation, Kazakhstan is violating the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the case of Zinaida Mukhortova? Are any steps being taken with a view to her release?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the case of Ms Mukhortova and it has been followed it closely, both at headquarters in Brussels and at the EU Delegation in Astana. The EU Delegation has maintained regular contact with local human rights defenders who have been working on the case, and the Delegation plans to visit Ms Mukhortova at the hospital where she is detained.

The HR/VP has received reports of other cases in Kazakhstan where individuals have been detained in psychiatric institutions, in similar circumstances, and the EU Delegation has raised this with the Kazakhstan authorities.

The EU has consistently raised concerns with the authorities of Kazakhstan in relation to Human Rights issues, including in the recent meetings of the EU-Kazakhstan Cooperation Council and the EU-Kazakhstan Cooperation Committee. The next meeting of the EU-Kazakhstan Human Rights Dialogue is scheduled to take place in Astana in November, and individual human rights cases will be addressed during that meeting.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-010681/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)**

Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)

(18 września 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Antyukraińskie zarzuty dotyczące dostaw broni do Syrii

„Washington Post” opublikował artykuł, w którym twierdzi, że port Oktiabrsk na Ukrainie był wykorzystywany do wysyłania dostaw broni do reżimu syryjskiego Baszara al-Assada. Ministerstwo spraw zagranicznych Ukrainy zaprzecza tym zarzutom, zdecydowanie twierdząc, że Ukraina w pełni popiera zakończenie syryjskiej wojny domowej. Komentatorzy ukraińscy zauważyli, że możliwe jest, że za fałszywymi zarzutami stoi Rosja, która chciałaby powtórzyć tzw. aferę Kolczuga z 2002 r., która spowodowała izolację Ukrainy od Zachodu na wiele lat. Rosja otwarcie mówi o swojej dezaprobatie w stosunku do zawarcia przez Ukrainę ewentualnego układu o stowarzyszeniu z UE – perspektywa, która wydaje się prawdopodobna – a także wobec podpisania pogłębionej i kompleksowej umowy o wolnym handlu.

Jakie informacje w tej sprawie ma Europejska Służba Działań Zewnętrznych? W jaki sposób Wysoka Przedstawiciel postrzega trudności stwarzane przez Rosję w odpowiedzi na stosunki Ukrainy w UE? Czy jest możliwe, że oskarżenia o handel bronią są częścią kampanii oszczerstw mającej na celu uniemożliwienie Ukrainie integracji z UE?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji**

(27 listopada 2013 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca jest świadoma doniesień prasowych, o których wspomina szanowny Pan Poseł, ale nie są jej znane żadne dowody przemytu broni do Syrii przez ukraiński port Oktiabrsk. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca zwraca uwagę na stwierdzenie ukraińskiego Ministerstwa Spraw Zagranicznych, że Ukraina zaprzestała dostaw broni do Syrii w 2011 r.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-010681/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(18 September 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Anti-Ukrainian allegations concerning arms supplies to Syria

The Washington Post has published an article claiming that Ukraine's Oktyabrsk port was used to send arms supplies to assist Bashar al-Assad's Syrian regime. The Ukrainian Foreign Ministry denies the allegations, firmly stating that Ukraine is in full support of ending the Syrian civil war. Commentators on Ukraine have raised the possibility that Russia is behind the false allegations, with a view to repeating the 'Kolchuga scandal' of 2002, which isolated Ukraine from the West for a number of years. Russia has been open about its disapproval of Ukraine's potential Association Agreement with the EU — a prospect which seems ever more likely — as well as the signing of the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement.

What information does the European External Action Service possess on this matter? How does the High Representative view the difficulties that Russia is posing in response to Ukrainian relations with the EU? Is it possible that the arms sale allegations are part of a smear campaign against Ukraine to prevent it from integrating with the EU?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the press reports referred to by the Honourable Member, but is not aware of any evidence of arms smuggling to Syria through the Ukrainian port of Oktyabrsk. The HR/VP notes the statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine that Ukraine stopped arms deliveries to Syria in 2011.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-010682/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(19 septembrie 2013)

Subiect: Embargo al Federației Ruse împotriva Moldovei

Federația Rusă a anunțat impunerea unui nou embargo asupra livrărilor de vinuri din Republica Moldova, invocând motive de îngrijorare legate de calitatea producției vinicole moldovenești. Cu toate acestea, măsura pare să constituie mai curând o încercare de a compromite parcursul european al Republicii Moldova și de a o menține în sfera sa de influență. O posibilă dovadă în acest sens o constituie faptul că Rusia face o excepție pentru vinurile și alte băuturi provenite din Transnistria, regiune separatistă a Republicii Moldova.

Comisia este rugată să comenteze măsura anunțată de autoritățile ruse și soluțiile pe care le are în vedere cu privire la această măsură, precum și altele similare din ultimul timp.

Răspuns dat de dl De Gucht în numele Comisiei
(21 noiembrie 2013)

La 25 septembrie, Comisia a adoptat o propunere de modificare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 55/2008 al Consiliului ⁽¹⁾ de introducere a unor preferințe comerciale autonome pentru Republica Moldova (Regulamentul APT), pentru a elimina cota anuală cu taxe vamale zero pentru importurile de vin din Republica Moldova și pentru a deschide astfel complet piața Uniunii Europene la aceste importuri. Acest lucru ar ajuta Republica Moldova să-și diversifice mai mult piețele sale de export de vin și, prin urmare, i-ar permite să reducă la minimum dificultățile cu care se confruntă în prezent pe o parte dintre piețele sale tradiționale. Această propunere a fost deja prezentată Consiliului și Parlamentului European, iar Comisia așteaptă cu interes să colaboreze îndeaproape cu ambele instituții pentru ca ea să fie aprobată rapid.

În plus, în baza Regulamentului APT, Republica Moldova beneficiază deja de un acces foarte generos la piața UE pentru toate produsele sale, cu puține excepții. Pentru anumite produse, cum ar fi cele de origine animală, acest acces este limitat din cauza lipsei de conformitate cu standardele sanitare și fitosanitare ale UE. Modificarea Regulamentului APT nu este instrumentul care poate contribui la soluționarea acestei probleme. Mai degrabă, prevederile privind o zonă de liber schimb complex și cuprinzător din viitorul acord de asociere pot rezolva această chestiune. Comisia depune toate eforturile pentru a pregăti acordul de asociere pentru semnare în cel mai scurt timp posibil, pentru a permite intrarea în vigoare rapidă a acestuia prin aplicarea sa cu titlu provizoriu.

În final, la solicitarea Republicii Moldova, Comisia pregătește o evaluare *inter pares* pentru a analiza situația reală a controalelor privind siguranța alimentară în sectorul vitivinicol, precum și în cel al producției de struguri de masă și de mere. De asemenea, Comisia a propus să ofere asistență pentru a accelera tranziția la un sistem de asigurare a calității care să respecte normele UE pentru produsele de origine animală.

⁽¹⁾ JO L 20, 24.1.2008, p. 1.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010682/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(19 September 2013)

Subject: Russian Federation embargo against Moldova

The Russian Federation announced the imposition of a new embargo on Moldovan wines, citing reasons for concern about the quality of Moldovan wine production. However, the measure appears to be more of an attempt to undermine Moldova's course towards the EU and to keep Moldova within its sphere of influence. Possible evidence of this is the fact that Russia is making an exception for wines and other drinks from Transnistria, a separatist region of the Republic of Moldova.

Can the Commission comment on the measure announced by the Russian authorities and the solutions envisaged, as well as other similar measures?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission

(21 November 2013)

On 25 September the Commission adopted a proposal to amend Council Regulation (EC) No 55/2008 ⁽¹⁾ introducing autonomous trade preferences for the Republic of Moldova (ATP Regulation) to eliminate the annual duty-free quota for imports of Moldovan wine and thereby fully open the European Union's market to such imports. This would help the Republic of Moldova further diversify its wine export markets and thereby minimise its current difficulties with some of its traditional markets. This proposal has been already submitted to the Council and the European Parliament, and the Commission looks forward to working closely with both institutions to seek approval of this proposal in a swift manner.

Besides, the Republic of Moldova already benefits under the ATP Regulation from a very generous access to the EU market for all its products, with limited exceptions. For certain products, such as those of animal origin, this access is limited by lack of conformity with EU sanitary and phytosanitary standards. Changing the ATP Regulation is not the instrument to help resolve this issue. Rather, the provisions of the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area contained in the future Association Agreement aim to tackle this matter. The Commission is making all efforts to prepare the Association Agreement for signature as soon as possible, to enable its swift entry into force through its provisional application.

Finally, the Commission is also currently preparing, on Moldova's request, a peer review to assess the real state of play of food safety controls in the wine sector as well as table grapes and apples. It has also proposed assistance to accelerate the transition to a EU-compliant quality assurance system for products of animal origin.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 20, 24.1.2008, p. 1.

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-010683/13
adresată Comisiei**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(19 septembrie 2013)

Subiect: Riscul de supradoză de acetaminofen

O companie din Statele Unite ale Americii, producătoare a unui medicament care conține acetaminofen (substanța activă din paracetamol) a decis ca ambalajele acestui produs să cuprindă un avertisment privind riscul de supradoză. Această măsură se datorează faptului că, în SUA, între 55 000 și 80 000 de persoane sunt spitalizate anual din cauza supradozelor de acetaminofen, iar cel puțin 500 dintre acestea își pierd viața.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă consideră oportună o măsură similară în UE.

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei

(4 noiembrie 2013)

Medicamentele care conțin paracetamol existente în prezent pe piață sunt autorizate numai prin procedura corespunzătoare la nivel național, de către statele membre. Legislația UE ⁽¹⁾ prevede posibilitatea de a include un avertisment special pentru anumite medicamente, dacă este necesar. Atunci când autorizează introducerea pe piață a unui medicament care conține paracetamol, statele membre pot solicita ca pe ambalaj să existe un avertisment, precum cel menționat de distinsul membru al Parlamentului European. Dacă există preocupări privind un anumit produs, statele membre pot cere modificări ale etichetării chiar și după acordarea autorizației de introducere pe piață.

⁽¹⁾ Directiva 2001/83/CE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 6 noiembrie 2001 de instituire a unui cod comunitar cu privire la medicamentele de uz uman (JO L 311, 28.11.2001, p. 67).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010683/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(19 September 2013)

Subject: Risk of acetaminophen overdose

A company in the United States that produces a drug containing acetaminophen (the active substance in paracetamol) has decided to put a warning on the packaging of this product concerning the risk of overdose. This measure is being taken on account of the fact that between 55 000 and 80 000 people are hospitalised annually in the US due to acetaminophen overdose and at least 500 of these people lose their lives.

Can the Commission state whether a similar measure is deemed appropriate in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(4 November 2013)

Paracetamol-containing medicinal products currently on the market are only authorised at national level by the Member States. EU legislation ⁽¹⁾ foresees the possibility of including a special warning for an individual medicine, if needed. When authorising paracetamol-containing medicinal products, Member States may request that a warning, as referred to by the Honourable Member in his question, is provided on the labelling. In case of concerns, Member States may also request modifications to the labelling after a marketing authorisation has been granted.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001 on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, p. 67.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-010684/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(19 septembrie 2013)

Subiect: Acordul de Parteneriat cu România

Comisia este rugată să precizeze care este stadiul exact al Acordului de Parteneriat cu România, document care va reglementa modul de utilizare a fondurilor europene pentru 2014-2020.

Răspuns dat de dl Hahn în numele Comisiei
(14 noiembrie 2013)

Autoritățile române cooperează îndeaproape cu Comisia, în contextul dialogului informal inițiat în vederea pregătirii proiectului de acord de parteneriat. Un proiect revizuit și consolidat, suficient de elaborat pentru a permite evaluarea pe plan intern, a sosit la data de 11 octombrie. Dialogul cu autoritățile române este productiv și constructiv.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010684/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(19 September 2013)

Subject: Partnership Agreement with Romania

Can the Commission state the exact status of the Partnership Agreement with Romania, which is the document that will regulate the use of EU Funds for 2014-2020?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(14 November 2013)

Romanian authorities are closely cooperating with the Commission, in the context of the informal dialogue with a view to preparing the draft partnership agreement. A revised and consolidated draft arrived on 11 October which is mature enough to be internally assessed. The dialogue with Romanian authorities is fruitful and constructive.

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-010685/13
adresată Comisiei**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(19 septembrie 2013)

Subiect: Memorandumul privind sănătatea animală și siguranța alimentelor dintre România și China

Autoritățile române au încheiat în luna august memorandumul de înțelegere privind sănătatea animală și siguranța alimentelor între autoritatea veterinară din România și cea din China. Potrivit autorităților române, actul are „scopul de a întări cooperarea între cele două țări în domeniul comerțului cu animale vii și produse de origine animală” și „prefigurează deschiderea unor noi domenii de cooperare”.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă încheierea unui astfel de act bilateral este compatibilă cu legislația europeană aplicabilă.

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei

(27 noiembrie 2013)

Direcția Generală Sănătate și Consumatori a Comisiei Europene a primit din partea autorităților române „Memorandumul de înțelegere privind sănătatea animală și siguranța alimentelor între autoritățile veterinare din România și China”.

Încheierea acestui memorandum de înțelegere este compatibilă cu legislația UE. Acesta se referă exclusiv la promovarea cooperării între părți în domeniul siguranței alimentelor și cel sanitar. În plus, actul ia în considerare competența Comisiei Europene privind aspectele comerciale și nu conține dispoziții care ar putea împiedica buna funcționare a pieței unice a UE pentru produsele supuse cerințelor sanitare și de siguranță alimentară.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010685/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(19 September 2013)

Subject: Memorandum on animal health and food safety between Romania and China

In August, the Romanian authorities concluded the memorandum of understanding (MoU) on animal health and food safety between the veterinary authorities of Romania and China. According to the Romanian authorities, the act 'aims to strengthen the cooperation between the two countries on the trade of live animals and animal products' and it 'prefigures the opening of new areas of cooperation'.

Can the Commission state whether the concluding of such a bilateral act is compatible with EU legislation?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(27 November 2013)

The Health and Consumers Directorate-General of the European Commission has received from the Romanian authorities the 'Memorandum of Understanding on animal health and food safety between the veterinary authorities of Romania and China'.

The conclusion of this Memorandum of Understanding is compatible with the EU legislation. It exclusively relates to the promotion of cooperation between the parties in the areas of food safety and sanitary issues. In addition, it takes into account the European Commission competence as regards trade matters and does not contain dispositions which may hinder the good functioning of the EU single market for products subject to food safety and sanitary requirements.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-010686/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(19 septembrie 2013)

Subiect: Statistici privind combaterea corupției, în funcție de apartenența politică

Liderul PNL, unul dintre partidele aflate la guvernare în România, a solicitat ministrului justiției să prezinte o statistică oficială privind activitatea Direcției Naționale Anticorupție (componentă a Parchetului), în care să precizeze apartenența politică a celor anchetați. Comisia este rugată să comenteze această solicitare și eventualele implicații ale acestei declarații în ceea ce privește mecanismul de cooperare și verificare.

Răspuns dat de dl Șefcovič în numele Comisiei
(21 octombrie 2013)

Comisia nu are comentarii de formulat cu privire la solicitare, dar îl invită pe distinsul membru să consulte Raportul tehnic de însoțire a Raportului Comisiei către Parlamentul European și Consiliu privind progresele realizate în România în cadrul mecanismului de cooperare și de verificare din iulie 2012 ⁽¹⁾, în care se afirmă că „Din 2007, DNA a continuat să construiască un istoric convingător de anchete imparțiale. Instituția a înaintat cazuri împotriva unor persoane din toate partidele politice.”

⁽¹⁾ SWD(2012) 231 final — România : Raport tehnic de însoțire a documentului Raportul Comisiei către Parlamentul European și Consiliu privind progresele realizate în România în cadrul mecanismului de cooperare și de verificare [COM(2012) 410 final], p.26.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010686/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(19 September 2013)

Subject: Statistics on fighting corruption, by political affiliation

The leader of the PNL, one of the ruling parties in Romania, has asked the Ministry of Justice to submit official statistics on the activities of the National Anticorruption Directorate (a branch of the Prosecutor's Office), stating the political affiliation of those under investigation. Can the Commission comment on this request and the possible implications of this statement on the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (CVM)?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission

(21 October 2013)

The Commission has no comment on the request but would refer the Honourable Member to the Technical Report accompanying the report on Progress under the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism of July 2012 ⁽¹⁾ stating 'Since 2007 DNA [National Anti-Corruption Directorate] has continued to build a convincing track record of impartial investigations. It has taken forward cases against persons from all political parties.'

⁽¹⁾ SWD(2012) 231 final — Romania : Technical Report *accompanying the document* Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on Progress in Romania under the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (COM(2012) 410 final), p.26.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-010687/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(19 septembrie 2013)

Subiect: Impactul măsurilor CE în domeniul siguranței alimentare

La șase luni de la scandalul cărnii de cal din 2012, a avut loc o altă situație similară, implicând carne improprie consumului, care ar viza cai din Olanda, Belgia, Franța și Spania. Această nouă situație a fost semnalată de autoritățile sanitare din Marsilia, Franța. Comisia este rugată să precizeze care a fost valoarea adăugată a măsurilor adoptate de Comisie în acest interval, în condițiile în care o nouă criză majoră, la fel de gravă, are loc în aceste zile.

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(30 octombrie 2013)

Comisia este la curent cu situația care implică un posibil comerț fraudulos cu cai pentru sacrificare între Franța și Belgia, situație despre care s-a relatat în presă în data de 5 septembrie. În acest sens, autoritățile franceze și belgiene nu au semnalat niciun risc grav pentru sănătate. Investigația inițială a început încă din 2011, deci înainte de evenimentele din acest an legate de comercializarea cărnii de cal, iar autoritățile competente au confirmat că în cele două state membre implicate este în curs de desfășurare o procedură judiciară. Comisia își exprimă satisfacția în legătură cu cooperarea transfrontalieră instaurată între anchetatorii din Franța și cei din Belgia, de natură să faciliteze depistarea eventualelor fraude.

În ceea ce privește normele privind identificarea ecvideelor, deși acest lucru nu are o legătură directă cu scandalul cărnii de cal, s-au constatat unele deficiențe în cursul investigațiilor efectuate în urma evenimentelor care au implicat comercializarea cărnii de cal. Comisia se ocupă în prezent de revizuirea normelor privind identificarea ecvideelor cu scopul de a sprijini statele membre în aplicarea acestor norme, precum și pentru a elimina orice deficiențe care ar fi putut facilita abuzul și fraudă.

Elementele-cheie ale acestei evaluări au fost discutate cu statele membre la 10 septembrie 2013, în cadrul grupului de lucru privind identificarea cailor, dar și ulterior, în cursul reuniunilor Comitetului permanent pentru lanțul alimentar și sănătatea animală. Chestiunile rămase vor fi discutate în cadrul întâlnirii unui alt grup de lucru, programată pentru sfârșitul lunii octombrie.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010687/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(19 September 2013)

Subject: Impact of Commission's food safety measures

Six months after the horsemeat scandal of 2012, another similar situation has arisen involving meat not fit for human consumption, affecting horses in the Netherlands, Belgium, France and Spain. This new situation has been highlighted by the health authorities in Marseille, France. Can the Commission clarify what added value has been provided by the measures it has adopted in the interim, at a time when a new and equally serious major crisis has recently arisen?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(30 October 2013)

The Commission is aware of the situation involving a possibly fraudulent trade in horses for slaughter between France and Belgium, which was reported by the press on 5 September. No serious risk for health was reported by the French or Belgian authorities in relation to the facts. The initial investigation started prior to this year's horsemeat events, dating as far back as 2011, and the competent authorities confirmed that a judicial proceeding is ongoing in the two Member States involved. The Commission is satisfied with the cross-border cooperation put in place between investigators in France and Belgium, which is enabling the detection of potential frauds.

As regards the rules for the identification of equidae, although this has no direct link to the horsemeat scandal, certain deficiencies were observed during the follow-up investigations of the horsemeat events. The Commission is currently reviewing the rules on identification of equidae with the aim to further assist Member States in enforcing those rules and to eliminate any flaws that might have offered opportunities for malpractice and fraud.

Key elements of this review have been discussed with Member States during the Working Group on Horse Identification on 10 September 2013, but also subsequently during meetings of the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health and remaining questions shall be discussed in another working group scheduled for end of October.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-010688/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(19 septembrie 2013)

Subiect: Interesele și drepturile comunităților locale în proiectele cu finanțare europeană — cazul autostrăzii Arad-Nădlac

Agricultorii din regiunea de vest a României sunt nemulțumiți de încălcarea dreptului lor la proprietate prin construirea autostrăzii Arad-Nădlac. Această nouă autostradă blochează accesul la unele terenuri agricole, aflate în această zonă, ca urmare a faptului că în proiect nu au fost prevăzute drumuri agricole, căile de acces fiind blocate.

Valoarea totală a acestui proiect este de un miliard de lei, iar pentru suma de 913 milioane lei a fost solicitată finanțarea nerambursabilă a Uniunii Europene.

În calitate de finanțator, Comisia este rugată să explice:

1. care sunt obligațiile beneficiarului — statul român — în ceea ce privește interesele și drepturile comunităților locale și
2. care sunt mijloacele de acțiune aflate în acest caz la dispoziția comunităților locale, împiedicate să își desfășoare activitatea economică.

Răspuns dat de dl Hahn în numele Comisiei
(11 noiembrie 2013)

1. În conformitate cu principiul gestionării partajate, aplicabil politicii de coeziune, pregătirea și organizarea licitațiilor, precum și monitorizarea proiectelor, reprezintă responsabilitatea statelor membre. În plus, fiecare stat membru este responsabil, prin intermediul autorității contractante, pentru proiectarea detaliată a proiectelor de investiții în infrastructură.

În pregătirea oricărui proiect de infrastructură de transport, statul membru ar trebui să ia în considerare toate aspectele relevante pe teren, astfel încât populația locală și întreprinderile din zonă să beneficieze de o accesibilitate sporită.

2. Luând în considerare cele de mai sus, comunitățile locale ar trebui să contacteze autoritățile naționale responsabile cu proiectul, pentru a le prezenta problemele cu care se confruntă.

Comisia este conștientă de problemele întâmpinate de agricultorii din zona Nădlac ca urmare a construirii autostrăzii Nădlac-Arad și a adus subiectul în atenția autorităților române. Acestea au început să caute soluții la problema restricționării accesului fermierilor din zona Nădlac la terenurile agricole, cauzată de dezvoltarea acestui proiect.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010688/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(19 September 2013)

Subject: Interests and rights of local communities in projects financed by European funds — case of the Arad-Nădlac motorway

Farmers in the western region of Romania are unhappy that their right to property has been breached by the construction of the Arad-Nădlac motorway. This new motorway will block access to some of their farmland located in this area, due to the fact that no provision has been made in the project for agricultural roads, with access roads being blocked.

This project has a total value of RON 1 billion, and an application has been submitted for RON 913 million in non-repayable European Union funding.

As the funding provider, can the Commission explain the following:

1. What obligations does the beneficiary — the Romanian State — have with regard to the interests and rights of the local communities?
2. What means of action are available in this case to the local communities which have been prevented from carrying out their business?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(11 November 2013)

1. According to the shared management principle applicable to cohesion policy, the preparation, tendering and monitoring of a project is the responsibility of the Member State. Moreover, the Member State, through the contracting authority of a project, is responsible for the detailed design of an infrastructure investment project.

In the preparation of any transport infrastructure project, the Member State should take into consideration all the relevant aspects on the ground so that the local people and the businesses of the project area benefit from an increased accessibility.

2. Taking the above into account, local communities should contact the national authorities responsible for the project with their concerns.

The Commission is aware of the problems of the farmers from the Nadlac area as a result of the Nadlac-Arad motorway and has raised the matter with the Romanian authorities. They have started to work on solutions for the issue of access to land resulting from this project for the farmers from the Nadlac area.

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-010689/13
adresată Comisiei**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(19 septembrie 2013)

Subiect: Tratatul de liber schimb între Uniunea Europeană și Ucraina

Comisia este rugată să comenteze declarația Președintelui Federației Ruse, care a avertizat Ucraina că va lua „măsuri de protecție” dacă Ucraina va continua demersurile în vederea semnării unui tratat de liber schimb cu Uniunea Europeană.

Răspuns dat de dl De Gucht în numele Comisiei

(5 noiembrie 2013)

Comisia urmărește cu atenție evoluția poziției Rusiei față de Ucraina și ceilalți parteneri estici care doresc să-și confirme, la summitul de la Vilnius, decizia de a semna acordurile de asociere cu UE. Comisia a afirmat faptul că amenințările adresate în mod deschis de către Rusia sunt inacceptabile, la fel ca și măsurile recente care au avut ca țintă statele membre.

În plus, Comisia este de părere că măsurile sunt nejustificate și în mod clar discriminatorii. Comisia va continua să analizeze situația pentru a identifica soluții adecvate, inclusiv la nivel multilateral, dacă este cazul. În același timp, Comisia se așteaptă ca Rusia să ia măsurile necesare pentru a asigura respectarea obligațiilor impuse de Organizația Mondială a Comerțului.

Fără a aduce atingere rezultatului dezbaterilor politice care vor avea loc în cadrul următoarei reuniuni a Consiliului Afaceri Externe privind decizia de a semna și de a aplica cu titlu provizoriu Acordul de asociere cu Ucraina, Comisia este de părere că cea mai eficientă măsură de sprijin este accelerarea procedurilor interne necesare pentru o aplicare anticipată provizorie a unor părți din Acordul de asociere, cu condiția să existe o acțiune hotărâtă din partea Ucrainei și să se înregistreze progrese tangibile în ceea ce privește reperele de politică stabilite în concluziile Consiliului Afaceri Externe din decembrie 2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010689/13
to the Commission
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(19 September 2013)**

Subject: EU-Ukraine free trade agreement

Can the Commission comment on the statement made by the President of the Russian Federation, who warned Ukraine that he will take 'protective measures' if Ukraine continues its efforts towards signing a free trade agreement with the EU?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2013)**

The Commission is carefully following the developments in the position of Russia towards Ukraine and those Eastern Partners who are willing to confirm at the Vilnius Summit their decisions to sign the Association Agreements with the EU. The Commission has made clear that Russia's open threats are unacceptable, as are the recent measures targeted at Member States.

Furthermore, the Commission is of the view that the measures are unjustified and clearly discriminatory. The Commission will continue to analyse the situation with a view to identifying adequate solutions including at multilateral levels if appropriate. At the same time, the Commission expects that Russia will take the necessary steps to ensure full compliance with its World Trade Organisation obligations.

Without prejudice to the outcome of the political debate that will take place at the next meetings of the Foreign Affairs Council on the decision to sign and provisionally apply the Association Agreement with Ukraine, the Commission believes that the most effective supporting measure is the acceleration of the internal procedures necessary for an early provisional application of parts of the Association Agreement, provided that there is determined action and tangible progress by Ukraine on the political benchmarks set out in the conclusions of the Foreign Affairs Council of December 2012.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-010690/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(19 septembrie 2013)

Subiect: Înțelegere anticoncurențială între comercianții de cereale din România

Autoritățile române au declanșat o investigație în rândul societăților comerciale care fac achiziții pe piața cerealelor, suspectând o înțelegere anticoncurențială între comercianți. Investigația a pornit de la faptul că prețurile obținute din vânzarea recoltei sunt cu 40-45% mai mici decât anul trecut, iar comercianții profită de perisabilitatea produselor și lipsa posibilităților de depozitare.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă are cunoștință de această investigație și dacă s-au înregistrat situații similare anul acesta în alte state membre.

Răspuns dat de dl Almunia în numele Comisiei
(13 noiembrie 2013)

Comisia are cunoștință de ancheta inițiată de autoritatea de concurență din România.

În conformitate cu Regulamentul nr. 1/2003, Comisia și autoritățile naționale din domeniul concurenței („ANC”) au competențe paralele de a aplica articolele 101 și 102 din TFUE, în strânsă cooperare. Regulamentul nr. 1/2003 prevede în special mecanisme de consultare și informare aplicabile cazurilor în care ANC au în vedere adoptarea de decizii de asigurare a respectării normelor de concurență.

În ceea ce privește dificultățile cu care se confruntă fermierii cultivatori de cereale în cursul negocierilor cu cumpărătorii acestora, au fost adoptate noi norme în contextul recente reforme a politicii agricole comune, în vederea consolidării puterii acestora de negociere. Atunci când aceste norme vor intra în vigoare, fermierilor care fac parte din organizațiile de producători (OP) recunoscute li se va permite să negocieze în comun clauzele contractuale, inclusiv prețul, pentru furnizarea produselor lor, cu condiția ca, printre altele, aceștia să se angajeze și în alte activități care pot genera creșteri semnificative ale eficienței, astfel încât activitățile globale ale OP să contribuie la îndeplinirea obiectivelor prevăzute la articolul 39 din tratat ⁽¹⁾.

Această condiție specifică are ca scop încurajarea fermierilor de a lua măsuri concrete pentru a spori economiile de scară și de gamă ale acestora, de exemplu, prin punerea în comun, la scară corespunzătoare, a achizițiilor acestora de factori de producție, precum și a investițiilor în spații de depozitare. Acest lucru ar permite reducerea costurilor de producție totale ale fermierilor, consolidând în același timp poziția acestora în negocierea cu cumpărătorii produselor lor, contribuind, în ultimă instanță, la marje mai ridicate pentru fermieri.

⁽¹⁾ Astfel cum este prevăzut la articolul 39 din Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene, politica agricolă comună are următoarele obiective: (i) creșterea productivității agricole; (ii) asigurarea unui nivel de trai echitabil pentru populația agricolă; (iii) stabilizarea piețelor; (iv) garantarea siguranței aprovizionării lor; (v) asigurarea unor prețuri rezonabile de livrare către consumatori.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-010690/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(19 September 2013)

Subject: Anti-competitive agreement among grain traders in Romania

The Romanian authorities have launched an investigation into the commercial companies making purchases on the grain market, suspecting that an anti-competitive agreement has been reached among traders. The investigation is based on the fact that the prices obtained from post-harvest sales were 40-45% lower than last year, with traders exploiting the products' perishability and the lack of storage facilities.

Can the Commission clarify whether it is aware of this investigation and whether similar situations have been noted this year in other Member States?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission

(13 November 2013)

The Commission is aware of the investigation initiated by the Romanian Competition Authority.

According to Regulation 1/2003, the Commission and the National Competition Authorities ('NCAs') have parallel competences to apply Articles 101 and 102 TFEU in close cooperation. Regulation 1/2003 notably provides for information and consultation mechanisms applicable to cases in which NCAs envisage the adoption of enforcement decisions.

Concerning the difficulties faced by cereal farmers in their negotiations with their buyers, new rules have been adopted in the context of the recent Common Agriculture Policy reform in order to strengthen their bargaining power. When these rules enter into force farmers via recognised Producers Organisations (PO) will be allowed to jointly negotiate contract terms, including price, for the supply of their products, provided i.a. that they also engage in other activities which can create significant efficiencies so that the activities of the PO overall contribute to the fulfilment of the objectives of Article 39 of the Treaty ⁽¹⁾.

This specific condition is designed to encourage farmers to take concrete steps to increase their economies of scale and scope by, for instance, pooling together at the appropriate scale their input procurement as well as investments in storage facilities. This would enable them to reduce their overall production costs while enhancing their negotiating position towards buyers of their products, ultimately contributing to higher margins for farmers.

⁽¹⁾ As set out in Article 39 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union the CAP has the following objectives: (i) to increase agricultural productivity; (ii) to ensure a fair standard of living for the agricultural community; (iii) to stabilise markets; (iv) to assure the availability of supplies; (v) to ensure that supplies reach consumers at reasonable prices.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-010691/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(19 septembrie 2013)

Subiect: Achiziționarea de miere în cadrul PEAD 2013 România

Agencia de Plăți și Intervenții pentru Agricultură din România (APIA) a achiziționat la prețuri care pot ridica suspiciuni 750 de tone de miere, prețurile fiind cu mult peste cele practicate pe piață.

APIA a încheiat în 8 august 2013 un contract pentru furnizarea, până la sfârșitul anului, a 750 de tone de miere, ambalată în recipiente de plastic de 0,25 kg. Mierea este achiziționată din mijloacele financiare puse la dispoziție de Comisia Europeană, în cadrul Planului european de ajutorare pentru persoanele cele mai defavorizate din România (PEAD)- 2013.

Achiziția s-a făcut la prețul de aproximativ 13,12 lei/kg, față de prețurile de 10-12 lei/kg practicate pe piață. Acest fapt a fost reclamat de apicultori.

Comisia este rugată să prezinte un punct de vedere cu privire la această situație.

Răspuns dat de dl Ciolos în numele Comisiei
(29 octombrie 2013)

Programul european de ajutorare pentru persoanele cele mai defavorizate este defalcat în programe naționale, care, în conformitate cu principiul subsidiarității, sunt stabilite și puse în aplicare în statele membre. În cadrul acestor programe naționale, autoritățile competente lansează și gestionează licitații în conformitate cu normele naționale privind achizițiile publice. Comisia nu este în măsură să ofere un aviz referitor la situația descrisă de distinsul membru al Parlamentului, deoarece nu este implicată în procedura de achiziții publice și nu are cunoștințe amănunțite despre descrierea ofertei (de exemplu, o posibilă includere a cheltuielilor suplimentare precum ambalarea, etichetarea sau livrarea).

În cazul în care există suspiciuni referitoare la nerespectarea normelor privind achizițiile publice, se pot utiliza căile de atac prevăzute în cadrul procedurii de plângere sau pot fi contactate serviciile de anchetă locale. În plus, orice cetățean al UE are libertatea de a trimite informații către OLAF, dacă acesta consideră, în mod rezonabil, că a fost comisă o neregulă.
