(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011710/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(15 de outubro de 2013)

Assunto: Declarações do presidente da Comissão sobre o Tribunal Constitucional português

O presidente da Comissão deslocou-se há poucos dias a Portugal, tendo participado no II Fórum Empresarial do Algarve, que teve lugar em Vilamoura. Nessa ocasião, entendeu o presidente da Comissão Europeia fazer declarações à comunicação social que incluíram considerações sobre o desempenho de instituições de soberania portuguesas, como o Tribunal Constitucional. Estas considerações, para além de constituírem uma intolerável intromissão em questões internas de um Estado soberano, constituem uma inadmissível forma de pressão sobre um tribunal e, nessa medida, um grave ataque à democracia, ao Estado de direito, à lei fundamental de um Estado soberano.

Em face deste acontecimento, perguntamos à Comissão o seguinte:

1. Como justifica as gravíssimas declarações do seu presidente?

2. Como compatibiliza estas declarações com o disposto nos Tratados, em particular com o artigo 2.° e com o artigo 4.° do Tratado da União Europeia?

3. O presidente da Comissão fez alguma vez declarações de teor idêntico sobre tribunais constitucionais de outros países? Em caso afirmativo, quando, em que ocasiões e com que justificação?

4. Está disposta a apresentar desculpas a Portugal, às suas instituições de soberania, ofendidas com estas insultuosas declarações, e ao povo português?

Resposta dada por José Manuel Durão Barroso em nome da Comissão
(17 de dezembro de 2013)

No seu discurso no «Fórum Empresarial Algarve 2013», em 5 de outubro de 2013 ([1]), o Presidente declarou que, no atual período de programa do ajustamento económico em Portugal, cabe ao Governo e a todos os órgãos de soberania proporcionar segurança e previsibilidade. Para recuperar a credibilidade é essencial uma cultura de diálogo político e social e de compromisso entre todas as instituições em conformidade com os compromissos internacionais aceites.

Essas declarações estão em conformidade com o que foi a posição constante da Comissão Europeia, das outras instituições em causa e dos Estados-Membros da UE em relação aos países em processo de ajustamento.

A recente declaração conjunta da Comissão Europeia, do FMI e do BCE, no âmbito da oitava e da nona missões a Portugal é um exemplo disso, ao sublinhar que «no caso de algumas das medidas serem consideradas inconstitucionais, o Governo terá de reformular a proposta de orçamento a fim de cumprir o objetivo fixado em matéria de défice. Tal implica, contudo, um aumento dos riscos para o crescimento e o emprego e reduz as perspetivas de um regresso mais sustentado aos mercados financeiros.»

Não são inabituais declarações relativas ao quadro constitucional nos Estados-Membros. A título de exemplo, na Frankfurter Europa-Rede em 5 de novembro de 2013 ([2]), o Presidente sublinhou, no âmbito do contexto constitucional em que funcionam o Governo alemão e o Parlamento alemão, a necessidade de proceder à fase seguinte de aprofundamento da União Económica e Monetária, sem alteração do Tratado e sem perder de vista o objetivo a longo prazo da união política.

---

(1) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-13-773_pt.htm
(2) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-13-878_pt.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011710/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Statements by the President of the Commission about the Portuguese Constitutional Court

A few days ago, the President of the Commission visited Portugal to attend the second Algarve Business Forum, which was held in Vilamoura. While he was there, the President of the Commission made statements to the media, including comments on the performance of Portugal's sovereign institutions, including the Constitutional Court. As well as representing unacceptable meddling in the internal affairs of a sovereign state, these comments put unacceptable pressure on a court and, as such, are a serious attack on democracy, the rule of law and the fundamental law of a sovereign state.

1. How can the Commission justify these very serious statements by its President?

2. How can it square these statements with the provisions of the Treaties, particularly Article 2 and Article 4 of the Treaty on European Union?

3. Has the President of the Commission ever made the same kind of comments about the constitutional courts of other countries? If so, when, on which occasions and on what grounds?

4. Is the Commission prepared to apologise to Portugal and its sovereign institutions, which have taken offence at these insulting comments, and to the Portuguese people?

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

In his speech at the 'Forum Empresarial Algarve 2013' on 5 October 2013 (1), the President said that during the current period of economic adjustment in Portugal, it is the task of the government and all sovereign bodies to provide certainty and predictability. A culture of political and social dialogue and compromise between all institutions in line with the accepted international commitments are essential to reconquer credibility.

These declarations are in line with what has been the consistent position of the European Commission, other concerned institutions and EU Member States regarding the countries under an adjustment process.

The recent joint statement from the European Commission, IMF and ECB on the eight and nine review mission to Portugal is such an example by having pointed out that 'in the event that some of the measures were determined to be unconstitutional, the government would need to reformulate the draft Budget in order to meet the agreed deficit target. This, however, would imply increasing risks to growth and employment and would reduce the prospects for a sustained return to financial markets.'

Statements related to the constitutional framework in Member States are not unusual. By way of example, in the Frankfurter Europa-Rede on 5 November 2013 (2), the President highlighted, against the background of the constitutional context in which the German Government and the German parliament are operating, the need to take the next steps towards a deeper Economic and Monetary Union without Treaty change and not to lose sight of the long-term goal of political union.

---

(1) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-13-773_pt.htm

(2) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-13-878_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-011711/13
a la Comisión
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial (S&D)
(15 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Cambio de prioridad de los Gobiernos español y francés respecto al corredor Atlántico

En el otoño de 2011, la Comisión Europea incluyó entre las redes transeuropeas de transporte el denominado corredor Atlántico, gracias, entre otras cosas, como reconoció el coordinador europeo Dottore Sechi, al grado de avance de la «Y Vasca» desde 2009, lo que permitió colocar su conexión transfronteriza entre las actuaciones prioritarias. En concreto, la Comisión señalaba en su propuesta que la «Y Vasca» estaría para 2016 y la conexión con Aquitania para 2020.

A pesar de estos plazos europeos, cuyo cumplimiento condiciona la financiación de importantes fondos europeos (que, en el caso transfronterizo, es todavía mayor), los Gobiernos de España y Francia están obviando el carácter prioritario de este corredor en el mapa europeo, poniendo en peligro la financiación europea y, sobre todo, el interés europeo y de las regiones que integran dicho corredor para concluir esta importante red de transporte.

Concretamente, el Gobierno de España está priorizando otras conexiones en detrimento de la planificación y los plazos de la política europea de transportes.

1. ¿Dispone la Comisión de información oficial sobre este cambio de prioridades en las inversiones ferroviarias en España y Francia?

2. ¿Considera que los nuevos planes del Gobierno español son consecuentes con los compromisos adquiridos durante la negociación y aprobación de los plazos y trazados para que las redes transeuropeas de transporte sean posibles?

3. ¿Qué actuaciones piensa emprender la Comisión para corregir esta situación?

4. ¿Ha avanzado la Comisión en su diálogo con las autoridades españolas y francesas, en el contexto del futuro corredor Atlántico de la red principal, sobre los detalles de los proyectos, con el fin de garantizar unas conexiones de transporte interoperables y eficaces de la red principal, en consonancia con los resultados de las negociaciones sobre el nuevo Reglamento relativo a las orientaciones para el desarrollo de la red transeuropea de transporte?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de noviembre de 2013)

1. La Comisión ha seguido atentamente el informe de la denominada Comisión «Mobilité 21» en Francia y ha mantenido contactos con las autoridades francesas y españolas, incluso durante las recientes reuniones ministeriales mantenidas en Tallin en el marco de las jornadas de la RTE-T de 2013. Hasta ahora no se ha tomado ninguna decisión formal sobre la revisión de los proyectos en curso en el corredor mencionado por Su Señoría, salvo por lo que respecta a la modificación del enlace transfronterizo de la RTE-T entre Francia y España cofinanciado, que se adoptó en 2012 y que permite la plena realización de las acciones previstas en estos proyectos hasta finales de 2015.

2. El nuevo plan de transporte de España (PITVI) se ajusta a la evolución prevista del Corredor Atlántico. En el marco de las negociaciones sobre la política de cohesión, la Comisión ha pedido a España que proporcione información complementaria sobre los planes y prioridades nacionales en materia de transporte.

3.y 4. Durante las recientes jornadas de la RTE-T celebradas en Tallin del 16 al 18 de octubre de 2013, la Comisión y los representantes ministeriales de Francia, España y Portugal firmaron una declaración conjunta sobre el Corredor Atlántico recordando la planificación de la red básica y reafirmando su prioridad.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011711/13
to the Commission
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Change of priorities by the Spanish and French Governments with regard to the Atlantic Corridor

In the autumn of 2011, the European Commission included the 'Atlantic Corridor' in its plans for a trans-European transport network. As European Coordinator Carlo Secchi observed, this was possible thanks partly to the progress made on the 'Basque Y' since 2009, which has enabled the cross-border connection to be made a priority. The Commission stated in its proposal that the 'Basque Y' would be completed by 2016 and its connection with the Aquitaine region by 2020.

These European deadlines must be met in order to receive the necessary European financing (especially important in the case of the cross-border connection), but the governments of France and Spain are disregarding the priority status of this corridor in the European network and European financing may be lost as a result. More importantly, it is crucial for Europe and the regions which make up the corridor that this key transport network is completed.

The Spanish Government in particular is prioritising other connections to the detriment of the plans and deadlines stipulated in European transport policy.

1. Does the Commission have any official information about this change of railway investment priorities in France and Spain?

2. Does the Commission believe that the Spanish Government's new plans are consistent with the commitments established during the negotiation and approval of the deadlines and routes which would make the trans-European transport networks possible?

3. What steps does the Commission plan to take in order to remedy the situation?

4. Has there been any development in the dialogue between the Commission and the Spanish and French authorities with regard to the specific details of the projects that will make up the future Atlantic Corridor as part of the main network, with the aim of guaranteeing interoperable and effective transport connections in accordance with the outcome of the negotiations on the new Regulation on guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network?

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

1. The Commission has followed up carefully the report from the so-called Commission 'Mobilité 21' in France and has kept contacts with both French and Spanish authorities, including during recent ministerial meetings in Tallinn in the framework of the TEN-T days 2013. No formal decision on the revision of ongoing projects along the corridor mentioned by the Honourable Member has been taken so far except for the modification of the TEN-T co-financed cross-border link between France and Spain, which was adopted in 2012, allowing a full completion of the actions under this projects until the end of 2015.

2. Spain's new transport plan (PITVI) is in line with the projected development of the Atlantic Corridor. In the framework of the negotiations on the Cohesion Policy, the Commission has asked Spain to provide additional information about national transport planning and prioritisation.

3-4. During the recent TEN-T Days that took place in Tallinn on October 16th-18th 2013, the Commission and Ministerial representatives of France, Spain and Portugal signed a joint declaration on the Atlantic Corridor recalling the Core Network planning and reaffirming its priority.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-011712/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(15 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Παραβίαση της οδηγίας SEVESO κατά τη μεταφορά και αποθήκευση επικίνδυνων ορυκτών υλών της «ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΣ ΧΡΥΣΟΣ ΑΕΜΒΧ»

Πρόσφατο είναι το περιστατικό διαρροής ποσότητας πιθανά τοξικής ορυκτής ύλης, προϊόν των εξορυκτικών δραστηριοτήτων της «ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΣ ΧΡΥΣΟΣ ΑΕΜΒΧ», σε κατοικημένη περιοχή της Ρεντίνας του Δήμου Βόλβης Θεσσαλονίκης. Επιπλέον, σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα, το Σάββατο 5 Οκτωβρίου ο καπετάνιος πλοίου, στο οποίο γινόταν φόρτωση προϊόντων των εξορυκτικών δραστηριοτήτων της «ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΣ ΧΡΥΣΟΣ ΑΕΜΒΧ» από το έργο «ΑΠΟΜΑΚΡΥΝΣΗ, ΚΑΘΑΡΙΣΜΟΣ & ΑΠΟΚΑΤΑΣΤΑΣΗ ΧΩΡΟΥ ΑΠΟΘΕΣΗΣ ΠΑΛΑΙΩΝ ΤΕΛΜΑΤΩΝ ΟΛΥΜΠΙΑΔΑΣ», αρνήθηκε να φορτώσει κοντέινερ με φορτίο πιθανά τοξικών ορυκτών υλών. Σύμφωνα με δηλώσεις του προέδρου του Οργανισμού Λιμένος Θεσσαλονίκης «ο καπετάνιος ανέφερε πως υπάρχει κοντέινερ στο οποίο παρατηρήθηκε διαρροή (…). Κατά την πάγια τακτική που ακολουθείται, όταν τα φορτία δεν είναι καλά συσκευασμένα, αυτά δεν μένουν στο λιμάνι αλλά απομακρύνονται από αυτό». Σύμφωνα με τον εκπρόσωπο της εταιρείας «ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΣ ΧΡΥΣΟΣ ΑΕΜΒΧ» «το εν λόγω υλικό είναι εμπορεύσιμο συμπύκνωμα χρυσοφόρου πυρίτη, το οποίο παράγεται στο εργοστάσιο εμπλουτισμού της Ολυμπιάδας». Πρόσθεσε, επίσης, ότι «χαρακτηρίζεται ως επικίνδυνο». Η αποθήκευση του συγκεκριμένου υλικού γίνεται σε μονάδα της «BALKAN LOGISTICS ΕΠΕ» που είναι εγκατεστημένη στη Β' Φάση της ΒΙ.ΠΕ. Θεσσαλονίκης στη Σίνδο του δήμου Δέλτα του νομού Θεσσαλονίκης, για την οποία το Υπουργείο Περιβάλλοντος, Ενέργειας και Κλιματικής Αλλαγής έχει εγκρίνει τους περιβαλλοντικούς όρους λειτουργίας της (Απόφαση με Αριθ. πρωτ. 21619/5.3.2013). Ωστόσο, στην «Έγκριση — Τροποποίηση Γενικού Πολεοδομικού Σχεδίου της Δημοτικής Ενότητας Εχεδώρου του Δήμου Δέλτα Ν. Θεσσαλονίκης» (ΦΕΚ 304 ΑΑΠ 7.11.2011, σελ. 2944), γίνεται σαφής και ρητή αναφορά για: «Την απαγόρευση της εγκατάστασης οποιασδήποτε νέας μονάδας "SEVESO" στα διοικητικά όρια της Δημοτικής Ενότητας Εχεδώρου».

Με βάση τα ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Είναι ενήμερη για τη σειρά περιστατικών διαρροής στη Ρεντίνα και στο λιμάνι της Θεσσαλονίκης;

— Έχουν τηρηθεί οι διατάξεις του άρθρου 2 και 5 της οδηγίας 2012/18/ΕΕ (οδηγία SEVESO) που ορίζουν ότι τα κράτη μέλη πρέπει να λαμβάνουν όλα τα απαραίτητα μέτρα για την πρόληψη ατυχημάτων που αφορούν τη μεταφορά επικίνδυνων υλικών, λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι τον τελευταίο μήνα σημειώθηκαν δύο ατυχήματα στην περιοχή της Θεσσαλονίκης;

— Είναι η αδειοδότηση της συγκεκριμένης μονάδας σύμφωνη με το άρθρο 13 σχετικά με το σεβασμό των πολιτικών χρήσεων γης της ίδιας οδηγίας, η οποία εμπίπτει στο πεδίο εφαρμογής της οδηγίας, σε απαγορευμένη περιοχή από το Γενικό Πολεοδομικό Σχέδιο;

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

Η Επιτροπή δεν είναι ενήμερη για τη διαρροή τοξικής ύλης από προϊόντα εξορυκτικών δραστηριοτήτων της εταιρείας «ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΣ ΧΡΥΣΟΣ ΑΕΜΒΧ».

Η οδηγία 96/82/ΕΚ Seveso II (1) δεν εφαρμόζεται στη μεταφορά επικίνδυνων ουσιών και την ενδιάμεση προσωρινή αποθήκευσή τους, και το ίδιο ισχύει για την οδηγία 2012/18/ΕΕ Seveso III (2) η οποία θα την καταργήσει από 1ης Ιουνίου 2015.

Οι εν λόγω οδηγίες θα εφαρμόζονταν εάν τα εν λόγω προϊόντα των εξορυκτικών δραστηριοτήτων χαρακτηρίζονταν ως επικίνδυνες ουσίες σύμφωνα με τις σημειώσεις του παραρτήματος I, εάν η αποθήκευση στην μονάδα της «BALKAN LOGISTICS ΕΠΕ» δεν αποτελούσε ενδιάμεση προσωρινή αποθήκευση άμεσα σχετιζόμενη με τη μεταφορά επικίνδυνων ουσιών, και εάν είχε σημειωθεί υπέρβαση των κατώτατων ορίων, ώστε να έχει εφαρμογή η οδηγία.

---

(1) ΕΕ L 10 της 14.1.1997.
(2) ΕΕ L 197 της 24.7.2012.

Το άρθρο 12 της οδηγίας 96/82/ΕΚ και το άρθρο 13 της οδηγίας 2012/18/ΕΕ υποχρεώνουν τα κράτη μέλη να μεριμνούν ώστε στις πολιτικές χρήσης γης ή και σε άλλες σχετικές πολιτικές και στις διαδικασίες εφαρμογής αυτών να συνεκτιμάται μακροπρόθεσμα η ανάγκη να τηρούνται κατάλληλες αποστάσεις ασφαλείας μεταξύ των μονάδων που καλύπτονται από την οδηγία και των οικιστικών ζωνών, των κτιρίων και των χώρων δημόσιας χρήσης, των χώρων αναψυχής και, στο μέτρο του δυνατού, των κύριων αξόνων του δικτύου μεταφορών. Οι οδηγίες δεν επιβάλλουν συγκεκριμένες ή λεπτομερείς αποστάσεις ασφαλείας και παρέχουν στις αρμόδιες εθνικές αρχές την ευχέρεια να καθορίσουν κατάλληλες αποστάσεις ασφαλείας με βάση τις ειδικές περιστάσεις κάθε υπόθεσης.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011712/13
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Infringement of 'Seveso' Directive by the Hellenic Gold Company involving the transport and storage of dangerous minerals

Recently, the inhabited Rentina district of the municipality of Volvi (Thessaloniki) has been affected by reportedly toxic seepage from rubble following blasting operations conducted by the Hellenic Gold Company. It has also been reported that, on Saturday 5 October, the captain of a vessel commissioned to take away the rubble, as part of the Olympiada tailings pond clearance, cleaning and rehabilitation project, refused to load containers with a suspect cargo of toxic minerals. According to the Head of the Thessaloniki Port Authority, the captain reported leakage from some of the containers, it being standard practice to remove from the port cargo which has not been properly sealed. According to the Hellenic Gold Company spokesman, the material in question was a marketable gold pyrite concentrate produced at the Olympiada enrichment plant and classified as hazardous. The material in question is currently being stored on 'Balkan Logistics' premises situated on the Sindo II industrial estate in the municipality of Delta (Thessaloniki), compliance with environmental operational standards having been verified by the Ministry for the Environment, Energy and Climate Change (Decision 21619 of 5 March 2013). However, the amended general urban plan published in Official Gazette 304 SSO of 7 November 2011, p. 2944, specifically prohibits the establishment of any new 'Seveso' units within the Echedoros district administrative boundaries in the municipality of Delta (Thessaloniki).

In view of this:

— Is the Commission aware of the leakages affecting the district of Rentina and the port of Thessaloniki?

— What is the situation regarding compliance with Articles 2 and 5 of Directive 2012/18/EU (Seveso Directive) to the effect that Member States must take all necessary measures to prevent accidents involving the transport of dangerous substances, bearing in mind that two such accidents have occurred near Thessaloniki over the last month or so?

— Is the authorisation of the plant in question, situated in what is designated as a restricted area under the general urban plan and falling within the scope of this directive, in accordance with the provisions of Article 13 thereof regarding land use?

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

The Commission is not aware of the toxic leakages from rubble following blasting operations by the Hellenic Gold Company.

The Seveso II Directive 96/82/EC (1) does not apply to the transport of dangerous substances and intermediate temporary storage nor will the Seveso III Directive 2012/18/EU (2), which will repeal the former as from 1 June 2015.

The directives would apply if the rubble in question qualifies as a dangerous substance in accordance with the notes to Annex I, if its storage on the 'Balkan Logistics' premises is not intermediate temporary storage directly related to the transport of dangerous substances and if the thresholds for implementing the directive are met.

Article 12 of Directive 96/82/EC and Article 13 of Directive 2012/18/EU oblige Member States to ensure that their land-use or other relevant policies take account of the need, in the long term, to maintain appropriate safety distances between establishments covered by the directive and residential areas, buildings and areas of public use, recreational areas, and, as far as possible, major transport routes. The directives do not prescribe specific or detailed safety distances, leaving it for the relevant national authorities to set appropriate safety distances, taking into account the specific circumstances of each case.

---

(1) OJ L 10, 14.1.1997.

(2) OJ L 197, 24.7.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011713/13
to the Commission
Bill Newton Dunn (ALDE)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: New EU rules for British businesses

Today, a UK newspaper reported that according to a ‘campaign’ group in Britain called Business for Europe, 3 580 new EU rules for businesses have been introduced since May 2010.

How can this possibly be true?

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

The data on numbers of new EU rules allegedly introduced since May 2010 and affecting United Kingdom business cannot be confirmed, as we do not know the basis on which the calculation was made.

The figures for the total number of measures adopted by the European Parliament and the Council, the Council alone and the Commission can be high, as these comprise decisions and regulations, sometimes addressed to one Member State or another entity for very specific purposes. They include the exercise of powers delegated to the Commission to complete EU legislation or measures required to implement EU legislation. Many of these measures therefore do not extend the scope of EU regulation, but ensure the full application of measures already adopted. They are often of an administrative or technical nature, such as imposing anti-dumping or countervailing duties on imports, exempting notification of state aids, laying down responsibilities and tasks for EU reference laboratories for certain diseases, establishing technical specification for interoperability of railways, setting out data requirements for plant protection products or for active substances.

Excluding these Commission measures, a total of 221 new EU regulations and directives, still in force, were adopted by the EU legislator in the relevant period.

The above figure excludes delegated and implementing acts, decisions, and amendments to existing legislation.

Not all acts affect business. A measure-by-measure assessment would be necessary to identify those acts that do impact on business. In addition, an important number of the acts listed concern the management of the common agricultural policy (11) and the common fisheries policy (42) and mainly concern national authorities.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-011714/13
à la Commission
Eric Andrieu (S&D)
(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: Étiquetage de l'origine des viandes

Suite au problème survenu en France sur la viande de cheval, montrant une présence de nombreux intermédiaires tout au long de la chaîne d'approvisionnement alimentaire — dont certains parfois peu scrupuleux —, qui contribue non seulement à complexifier les réseaux de distribution, mais très souvent à augmenter le coût des produits vendus et les risques de fraude, il apparaît plus qu'indispensable d'adapter la règlementation en vigueur afin d'éviter tous les agissements visant à tromper les consommateurs.

Le règlement (UE) n° 1169/2011 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 25 octobre 2011 (1), relatif à l'information des consommateurs sur les denrées alimentaires, dispose que l'indication du pays d'origine ou du lieu de provenance sera obligatoire avant le 13 décembre 2013 pour les viandes porcine, ovine, caprine et de volaille. Il prévoit aussi la présentation de rapports. Le premier, attendu le 13 décembre 2014, concerne l'extension possible de l'indication d'origine ou du lieu de provenance à tous les types de viande, le second, attendu le 13 décembre 2013, envisage cette extension à la viande utilisée en tant qu'ingrédient.

Afin d'éviter une répétition de la crise du type de celle rencontrée avec la viande de cheval, la Commission se doit d'accélérer son calendrier de présentation de ses rapports, mais se doit surtout de proposer des mesures législatives concernant l'identification de l'origine de toutes les viandes et notamment de celles utilisées en tant qu'ingrédient. Début septembre devant le ministre français Benoît Hamon, M. Borg, commissaire chargé de la santé et de la protection des consommateurs, avait donné des signes allant dans cette direction.

— Que pense réellement faire la Commission dans les toutes prochaines semaines à ce sujet?

À l'approche des échéances européennes, de nombreux consommateurs et professionnels de la filière des viandes, qui sont aussi des citoyens, souhaitent précisément le savoir.

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(6 novembre 2013)

La Commission a déclaré à maintes reprises que l'indication obligatoire de l'origine sur l'étiquette des denrées alimentaires n'était pas destinée à prévenir les agissements frauduleux d'opérateurs mal intentionnés. La mention de l'origine sur les denrées concernées n'aurait pas empêché le scandale de la viande de cheval. Les pratiques trompeuses ne peuvent être contrées que par des mesures garantissant de façon adéquate l'application de la législation de l'Union européenne, à savoir principalement des contrôles officiels réguliers, effectués par les autorités compétentes nationales à partir d'analyses des risques appropriées, et des sanctions réellement dissuasives, conformément aux dispositions du règlement (CE) n° 882/2004 relatif aux contrôles officiels (2).

La Commission s'est déjà engagée à publier à la fin du mois d'octobre le rapport sur l'indication obligatoire de l'origine de la viande utilisée comme ingrédient, alors même que le règlement (UE) n° 1169/2011 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 25 octobre 2011 concernant l'information des consommateurs sur les denrées alimentaires (3) lui laisse jusqu'au 13 décembre 2013 pour le rendre public. Une décision sur l'opportunité de présenter une proposition législative et, le cas échéant, sur les paramètres à retenir pour celle-ci, ne sera pas arrêtée tant qu'un débat nourri sur ce rapport n'aura pas eu lieu avec le Conseil et le Parlement européen.

La Commission prépare actuellement l'adoption d'un acte d'exécution définissant les modalités devant régir la mention obligatoire de l'origine pour la viande non transformée de volaille et celle des espèces porcine, ovine et caprine. Comme l'exige le règlement (UE) n° 1169/2011, elle doit en outre, au plus tard le 13 décembre 2014, présenter un rapport au Parlement européen et au Conseil sur la possibilité d'étendre l'obligation d'indiquer l'origine aux viandes non transformées autres que la viande de volaille et la viande des espèces bovine, porcine, ovine et caprine.

---

(1) JO L 304 du 22.11.2011, p. 18.

(2) Règlement (CE) n° 882/2004 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 29 avril 2004 relatif aux contrôles officiels effectués pour s'assurer de la conformité avec la législation sur les aliments pour animaux et les denrées alimentaires et avec les dispositions relatives à la santé animale et au bien-être des animaux, JO L 165 du 30.4.2004, p. 1.

(3) JO L 304 du 22.11.2011, p. 18. Le règlement est applicable à partir du 13 décembre 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011714/13
to the Commission
Eric Andrieu (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Origin labelling of meat

The horsemeat scandal in France revealed the presence of numerous intermediaries throughout the food supply chain, not all of them completely honest. This not only complicates the distribution networks but in many cases increases the cost of products sold and the risk of fraud. In light of this, we urgently need to adapt existing regulations in order to prevent practices aimed at misleading consumers.

Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 (1) on the provision of food information to consumers stipulates that it will become compulsory to indicate the country of origin or place of provenance of swine, sheep, goat and poultry meat by 13 December 2013. It also provides for the submission of reports. The first, due on 13 December 2014, concerns the possibility of modifying legislation to make it compulsory to indicate the origin or provenance of all types of meat. The second, due on 13 December 2013, envisages extending this requirement to meat used in other products.

In order to avoid another similar crisis, the Commission must push forward its schedule for the submission of these reports, but more importantly propose legislative measures regarding the identification of the origin of all meats, notably those used in other products. At the beginning of September and in the presence of French Minister Benoît Hamon, Mr Borg, Commissioner for Health and Consumer Protection, indicated that he was of this opinion.

With the upcoming European elections, many consumers and professionals in the meat industry, who of course are also citizens, wish to know exactly what the Commission actually plans to do about this in the coming weeks.

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

The Commission has repeatedly held that when it comes to food, mandatory origin labelling is not a tool to prevent fraud by malicious operators. The horsemeat scandal could have occurred even if origin labelling had been mandatory for the foods in question. Deceptive practices can only be countered by appropriate enforcement of EU legislation mainly by means of regular official controls by national competent authorities based on appropriate risk analysis and the imposition of effective dissuasive sanctions, in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on official controls. (2)

The Commission has already committed to publish the report on the mandatory origin labelling for meat used as an ingredient by the end of October, even though Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the provision of food information to consumers (3) requires such publication by 13 December 2013. Any decision on whether to proceed with a legislative proposal and if so, along which parameters, will only be taken once an informed discussion on the basis of the report has taken place with the Council and the European Parliament.

The Commission is currently working on the adoption of an implementing act setting out the modalities for the application of mandatory origin labelling for unprocessed meat of swine, sheep, goat and poultry meat, while the Commission shall present a report to the European Parliament and the Council on the possibility to extend mandatory origin labelling to unprocessed meat other than beef, of swine, sheep, goat and poultry meat by 13 December 2014, as required by Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011.

---

(1) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18.

(2) Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules, OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1.

(3) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18. It enters into application on 13 December 2014.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011715/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: Pesticides en bouteille

L'association française a trouvé des résidus de pesticides dans toutes les bouteilles mises au banc d'essai. Dans une vaste enquête sur les vins français disponibles dans les commerces de l'Hexagone, dont certains se retrouvent dans les rayons de la grande distribution et des cavistes belges, l'association de défense des consommateurs a cherché à savoir s'il y avait des traces de pesticides dans les flacons. Ainsi, 92 bouteilles ont été analysées et… les 92 contenaient des traces de pesticides. Signalons cependant que ces traces restaient largement inférieures aux limites autorisées. Il n'empêche, cela pose question.

Sur les 165 molécules recherchées dans le test, 33 ont été détectées. Le bordeaux Mouton Cadet 2010 affiche le bilan le plus mauvais avec 14 pesticides recensés.

Le phtalimide (un fongicide) est présent dans la majorité des vins sélectionnés, mais il n'est pas toxique pour l'homme. Les vins testés ont été sélectionnés dans un échantillon de bouteilles dont les prix oscillent entre 1,60 et 15 euros (prix de vente en France). Premier constat: ce ne sont pas les vins les moins chers qui contiennent le plus de pesticides. Le Mouton Cadet 2010 en est la parfaite illustration puisque la bouteille est affichée à 10,44 euros en France.

Deuxième constat, plus surprenant: la présence de traces ou résidus de pesticides dans les vins issus de l'agriculture biologique. Toutes ne sont pas à mettre dans le même sac, mais 4 bouteilles sur 10 ont été épinglées, contenant des traces non négligeables de phtalimide.

En moyenne, les vins blancs sont les plus chargés, avec une présence de 242 microgrammes (µg) par kilo. Les rouges en contiennent en moyenne 114 µg/kg tandis que les rosés sont les moins chargés avec 95 µg/kg en moyenne.

1. Quelle est la réaction de la Commission?

2. Possède-t-elle des statistiques européennes ou pourrait-elle mener une étude sur le sujet?

3. La Commission garantit-elle bien que ces pesticides n'ont pas d'effets nocifs?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(3 décembre 2013)

La Commission est au fait de la publication de l'association française de consommateurs. Dans l'UE, des teneurs maximales en résidus (TMR) sont fixées pour les raisins destinés à la vinification et pour les raisins de table. Les contrôles du respect des TMR dans les raisins de cuve, pour s'assurer de leur sécurité pour les consommateurs, sont de la compétence des États membres.

Afin d'avoir une vue d'ensemble de l'exposition des consommateurs, y compris de l'exposition cumulée à de multiples résidus, l'Union européenne a coordonné en 2013 une série d'analyses du vin en tant que denrée alimentaire.

En outre, en conformité avec l'article 4 de la directive 2009/128/CE, la France a communiqué un plan d'action national destiné à réduire les risques et les effets de l'utilisation des pesticides sur la santé humaine et l'environnement et d'encourager la lutte intégrée contre les pesticides et le développement de méthodes ou de techniques de substitution en vue de réduire la dépendance à l'égard de l'utilisation des pesticides. La Commission fera rapport au Parlement européen et au Conseil sur les informations communiquées par les États membres au sujet de leurs plans d'action nationaux pour le 26 novembre 2014 au plus tard.

Par ailleurs, la Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à bien vouloir consulter ses réponses aux questions écrites E-10963/2013 et E-11147/2013 (1).

---

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011715/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Pesticides in wine

In a large survey on French wines available in the shops in France, some of which are also found on the shelves of Belgian retailers, including wine shops, a French consumer group sought to see if any pesticides were present in wines and found traces in all of the bottles sent for testing. The study analysed 92 bottles and all 92 bottles were found to contain traces of pesticides. However, it is important to note that these traces were well below legal toxicity limits. Nevertheless, the matter raises questions.

Out of the 165 pesticides that the study tested for, 33 were detected. Bordeaux Mouton Cadet 2010 was the worst culprit with 14 pesticide traces found.

The fungicide phthalimide was found in the majority of wines tested, but it is not toxic to human beings. The wines tested were chosen from a range of bottles varying in price from EUR 1.60 a bottle to EUR 15 (French prices). Interestingly, the cheapest wines did not necessarily contain the highest level of pesticides. The Bordeaux Mouton Cadet 2010 is the perfect example of this since a bottle costs EUR 10.44 in France.

More surprisingly, traces of pesticides were found in organic wines. The wines cannot all be tarred with the same brush, but 4 out of 10 bottles were singled out for containing non-negligible traces of phthalimide.

On average, white wines were found to have higher levels of pesticide traces, containing 242 micograms per kilo. Red wines contained an average of 114 µg/kg while rosé wines were found to contain the least quantity of pesticide traces — 95 µg/kg on average.

1. What is the Commission's reaction?

2. Does it have any EU-wide statistics available on pesticide traces in wine and if not, coulda study be conducted?

3. Can it guarantee that these pesticides are not harmful?

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

The Commission is well aware of the publication by the French consumer organisation. In the EU maximum residue levels (MRLs) are established for grapes intended for wine production as well as for table grapes. Member States are responsible for controls on wine grapes to check compliance with MRLs which makes sure that they are safe for consumers.

In order to get a complete overview on consumer exposure, including cumulative exposure to multiple residues, the EU coordinated programme schedules wine as a food commodity to be analysed in 2013.

Furthermore, in compliance with Article 4 of Directive 2009/128/EC, France has submitted a National Action Plan for the reduction of risks and impacts of pesticide use on human health and environment and to encourage the development of integrated pest management and of alternative approaches or techniques in order to reduce dependency on the use of pesticides. The Commission shall report to the European Parliament and Council on the information communicated by the Member States in relation to the National Action Plans by 26 November 2014.

In addition, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written questions E-10963/2013 and E-11147/2013 (1).

---

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011718/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: La Fédération anglaise de football dans l'illégalité

L'ancien sélectionneur de l'équipe d'Angleterre a rejoint la commission créée par la Fédération anglaise pour se pencher sur le nombre de joueurs étrangers évoluant en Angleterre et son impact sur la compétitivité de l'équipe nationale. La Fédération anglaise voudrait ainsi limiter le nombre de joueurs étrangers dans les équipes du championnat anglais.

1. Que pense la Commission de cette approche?

2. N'est-elle pas diamétralement opposée au principe de libre circulation des travailleurs?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(9 décembre 2013)

Les dispositions du traité sur la libre circulation des travailleurs (article 45 du TFUE) sont applicables aux sportifs professionnels et semi-professionnels. Par conséquent, les règles qui entraînent une discrimination directe dans le sport professionnel (telles que les quotas de joueurs fondés sur la nationalité) ne sont pas compatibles avec la législation de l'UE, à quelques rares exceptions près telles que la composition des équipes nationales.

À la connaissance de la Commission, la ligue anglaise de première division a adopté et appliqué depuis la saison 2010-2011 exactement la même règle (règle des joueurs formés localement) que l'UEFA pour ses compétitions. La Commission n'a connaissance d'aucun projet de la ligue anglaise de première division de modifier cette règle actuellement en vigueur.

Une étude financée par la Commission (1) évaluant l'effet de la règle de l'UEFA relative aux joueurs formés localement sur la libre circulation des footballeurs professionnels dans l'UE conclut qu'aucun élément ne démontre clairement que les effets restrictifs de cette règle sur la libre circulation des travailleurs justifient ses avantages très limités pour l'équilibre de la concurrence et la formation et l'épanouissement des jeunes joueurs. Cette étude avance également que d'autres règles moins restrictives et n'ayant pas d'effets discriminatoires pourraient parvenir aux mêmes résultats que la règle des joueurs formés localement. De plus, elle souligne que l'UEFA, en liaison avec les principales parties prenantes du football, dispose de l'expérience et de l'expertise nécessaires pour examiner ces autres solutions et qu'il faudrait lui laisser un temps raisonnable (trois ans) pour le faire.

La Commission invite également l'Honorable Parlementaire à se reporter à sa réponse à la question écrite E-010635/2013 (2).

---

(1) Study on the Assessment of UEFA's 'Home Grown Player Rule', University of Liverpool and Edge Hill University (30 April 2013); disponible à l'adresse: http://ec.europa.eu/sport/what-we-do/free-movement-of-sportspeople_en.htm
Study on the Assessment of UEFA's 'Home Grown Player Rule', University of Liverpool and Edge Hill University (30 April 2013); disponible à l'adresse: http://ec.europa.eu/sport/what-we-do/free-movement-of-sportspeople_en.htm

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011718/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Illegality in the Football Association

The former England team coach has joined the committee created by the Football Association to look into the growing number of foreign players in England and their impact on the competitiveness of the national team. The Football Association would thus like to limit the number of foreign players in English Premier League teams.

1. What does the Commission think of this approach?

2. Is this not diametrically opposed to the principle of the free movement of workers?

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

The Treaty provisions on free movement of workers (Article 45 TFEU) are applicable to professional and semi-professional sportspeople. As a consequence, rules entailing direct discrimination in professional sport (such as quotas of players based on nationality) are not compatible with EC law, with some very limited exceptions, such as the membership of national teams.

As far as the Commission is aware, the English Premier League has adopted and applied as of the 2010/11 season exactly the same rule (the 'Home-Grown Player' (HGP) rule) as UEFA for its competitions. The Commission is not aware of any English Premier League plans to change the HGP rule currently applicable.

A Commission-funded study (1) assessing the effect of UEFA's HGP rule on free movement of professional footballers in the EU concludes that there is no clear evidence that the HGP rule's restrictive effects on free movement of workers justify its very limited benefits for competitive balance and the training and development of young players. It also argues that alternative rules which are less restrictive and do not have discriminatory effects could achieve the same results as the HGP rule. Furthermore, it notes that UEFA, in conjunction with the key football stakeholders, has the experience and expertise required to look into those alternatives and should be allowed a reasonable time (three years) to do so.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-010635/2013 (2).

---

(1) Study on the Assessment of UEFA's 'Home Grown Player Rule', University of Liverpool and Edge Hill University (30 April 2013); available at http://ec.europa.eu/sport/what-we-do/free-movement-of-sportspeople_en.htm

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011720/13
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Du plomb dans l'aile de Genève 2

Le Conseil national syrien, principale force politique de l'opposition syrienne, a déclaré dimanche qu'il refusait de participer à la Conférence de paix internationale de Genève 2 sur la Syrie, rapportent les agences occidentales.

Le CNS, qui est le plus grand bloc politique au sein de la Coalition, a pris la ferme décision de ne pas aller à Genève, vu les circonstances actuelles (sur le terrain). Cela veut dire qu'il ne restera pas au sein de la Coalition nationale des forces de l'opposition et de la révolution si celle-ci y va. Auparavant, des représentants de l'aile armée de l'opposition avaient fait savoir qu'ils refusaient tous pourparlers avec les représentants du Président syrien Bachar el-Assad. Le refus des insurgés de reconnaître la Coalition nationale des forces de l'opposition et de la révolution est lié à la disposition des dirigeants de cette dernière à négocier avec le régime d'Assad dans le cadre de Genève 2. Initiée par la Russie et les États-Unis, la Conférence Genève 2, censée reprendre les lignes de l'accord international signé à Genève le 30 juin 2012, doit réunir à une même table des responsables du régime syrien et de l'opposition pour essayer de trouver une solution politique négociée entre Damas et la rébellion.

1. Quelle est votre réaction?

2. Comptez-vous entamer des pourparlers avec l'opposition syrienne?

3. De quelle teneur sont/seront-ils?

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

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante est préoccupée par les signes de désunion croissante qui se font jour au sein de l'opposition syrienne.

L'UE continue d'appeler instamment toutes les parties au conflit à répondre positivement à l'appel lancé par le Secrétaire général des Nations unies concernant la tenue d'une conférence de paix à Genève avant fin novembre et à se déclarer publiquement favorables à une transition politique crédible fondée sur la pleine mise en œuvre du communiqué de Genève. Pour ce faire, les parties devront se mettre d'accord, au cours de la conférence, sur des mesures claires et irréversibles ainsi que sur un calendrier serré pour la transition politique. L'UE appelle l'opposition à s'unir et à participer activement à la conférence, et elle encourage la coalition nationale des forces de la révolution et de l'opposition syrienne à jouer un rôle moteur au cours des négociations.

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante est en contact avec différents groupes d'opposition, auxquels elle ne cesse de rappeler la nécessité de présenter un front uni lors de la conférence.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011720/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Geneva II talks encounter problems

According to reports by Western news agencies, the main Syrian political opposition group, the Syrian National Council, announced recently that it would not take part in the Geneva II international peace conference on Syria.

The Syrian National Council, which is the biggest political grouping within the National Coalition of Syrian Revolution and Opposition Forces (or Syrian National Coalition), took a firm decision not to attend the Geneva talks on account of the current conditions on the ground in Syria. This means that it will no longer form part of the Coalition if the latter decides to attend the talks. Representatives of the armed wing of the opposition had stated previously that they would not engage in any talks with representatives of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad. The rebel group is refusing to recognise the Coalition because of its leadership's willingness to negotiate with the Assad regime at the Geneva II talks. The Geneva II conference, which is being organised at the initiative of Russia and the United States and is intended to build on the principles of the international agreement signed in Geneva on 30 June 2012, aims to bring representatives of the Syrian regime and the opposition to the table in order to seek a negotiated political solution agreed by Damascus and the rebels.

1. What is the response of the Vice-President/High Representative to the announcement bythe Syrian National Council?

2. Does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to start talks with the Syrianopposition?

3. What is or what will be the content of those talks?

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

The HR/VP is concerned with the signs of progressing disunity within the Syrian opposition.

The EU continues urging all sides of the conflict to respond positively to the call made by the UNSG for a peace conference in Geneva before the end of November and to adhere publicly to a credible political transition based on the full implementation of the Geneva communiqué. To this end, the parties will have to agree during the Conference on clear and irreversible steps and a short timeframe for the political transition. The EU calls on the opposition to come together and participate actively at the conference and encourages the National Coalition of the Syrian Revolutionary and Opposition Forces (SOC) to take a leading role during negotiations.

The HR/VP has been in contact with a variety of opposition groups. In those contacts, she reiterates the need for unity of the opposition at the conference.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011723/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: Plan de sauvetage UE

L'Irlande a confirmé samedi qu'elle devrait sortir à la mi-décembre du plan de sauvetage de l'UE et du FMI.

Où en sont individuellement les autres pays de l'UE quant à ces aides?

Réponse donnée par M. Rehn au nom de la Commission
(28 novembre 2013)

Les autres États membres de l'UE qui reçoivent une assistance financière extérieure accordée au titre du FESF, du MESF et du MES n'en sont pas tous au même stade dans leurs programmes d'ajustement économique: en Espagne, la fin du programme financé par le MES est prévue pour décembre 2013; au Portugal, la fin du programme financé par le FESF/MESF est prévue pour mai 2014; en Grèce, la fin du programme financé par le FESF est prévue pour décembre 2014; et à Chypre, la fin du programme financé par le MES est prévue pour mars 2016.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011723/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: EU bailout

On Saturday, Ireland confirmed that it should exit the EU-IMF bailout by mid-December.

What stage are the other EU countries at individually with regard to this aid?

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

The other EU countries receiving external financial assistance from EFSF, EFSM and ESM are at different stages of their economic adjustment programmes: the ESM financed programme for Spain is planned to end in December 2013, the EFSF/EFSM financed programme for Portugal in May 2014, the EFSF financed programme for Greece is scheduled to end in December 2014 and the ESM one for Cyprus in March 2016.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011725/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: Allergies en Europe

Les allergies peuvent être mortelles. D'après l'Organisation mondiale de la santé (OMS), l'asthme, une inflammation commune des voies aériennes pouvant être déclenchée par des allergènes, entraîne le décès d'une personne par heure. Le réseau GA^{2}LEN (Global Allergy and Asthma European Network), financé par l'Union et lancé en 2004, est devenu extrêmement influent dans la lutte contre les maladies allergiques. Ce réseau ne cesse de se développer et dispose aujourd'hui de 60 centres dans plus de 20 pays européens.

1. Quelles sont les principales avancées du réseau?

2. La Commission possède-t-elle des statistiques sur le nombre de personnes allergiques et sur la proportion par rapport au type d'allergie?

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

1. GA^{2}LEN (1) était un réseau d'excellence financé par le sixième programme-cadre pour des actions de recherche, de développement technologique et de démonstration (2002-2006), visant à l'intégration des activités de recherche sur l'allergie et l'asthme en Europe et à la création d'une structure européenne durable pour traiter les questions d'allergie et d'asthme de façon globale. Le projet se poursuit sous la forme d'un réseau à but non lucratif, qui est devenu le plus grand réseau international de recherche sur l'allergie et l'asthme. Ce réseau a organisé, entre autres, des cours pour professionnels sur l'allergie et l'asthme et des programmes de formation spécialisés. En outre, il a établi une plate-forme ouverte pour l'organisation d'activités conjointes, comme la création de bases de données communes et de biobanques et la mise en place d'un réseau d'essais cliniques destiné à tester les nouvelles stratégies de gestion dans le domaine des allergies (notamment en matière de diagnostic, de traitement et de prévention).

2. La Commission n'établit pas de statistiques sur la prévalence des allergies dans l'ensemble de la population de l'UE, ni sur les sous-types d'allergies. C'est pourquoi GA^{2}LEN a proposé de créer un réseau de surveillance de l'évolution des maladies allergiques dans l'ensemble de l'UE. Des données ont été collectées, notamment par des projets de recherche financés par l'UE, et peuvent être consultées. (2) Dans le cadre de l'enquête européenne par interview sur la santé (EHIS), la Commission recueille des données pour certains États membres sur les symptômes d'asthme déclarés par les patients (3), qui servent aux indicateurs de santé de l'UE (ECHI) sur l'asthme (prévalence subjective) (4).

---

(1) http://www.ga2len.net; résultats définitifs: http://ec.europa.eu/research/environment/pdf/european_research_on_environment_and_health_fp6.pdf — page 129.
(2) Par exemple, Europrevall: prévalence, coût et origine des allergies alimentaires en Europe — http://www.europrevall.org
(3) http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_ehis_st1&lang=en
(4) http://ec.europa.eu/health/indicators/echi/list/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011725/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(15 October 2013)

Subject: Allergies in Europe

Allergies can be fatal. According to the World Health Organisation (WHO), one person dies every hour from asthma, a common inflammation of the airways, which can be triggered by allergens. The GA2LEN network (Global Allergy and Asthma European Network), financed by the EU and launched in 2004, has become extremely influential in the fight against allergic diseases. This network has developed continuously and today has 60 centres in more than 20 European countries.

1. What are the network's main areas of development?

2. Does the Commission have statistics on the number of people with allergies and on the proportion in relation to the type of allergy?

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

(3 December 2013)

1. GA^{2}LEN (1) was a Network of Excellence funded by the Sixth Framework for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP6, 2002-2006), focusing on the integration of research activities in Europe on allergy and asthma and the establishment of a durable European structure for addressing allergy and asthma issues in a comprehensive fashion. The project is continuing as a non-profit network and is now the largest international network in allergy and asthma research. It has organised, among other things, allergy schools for professionals addressing various aspects of allergy and asthma and specialist training programmes. Furthermore, it has established an open platform for joint activities, including common databases and biobanks, and a clinical trials network to test novel management strategies in the field of allergy (including diagnostic, treatment and preventive strategies).

2. The Commission does not collect statistics on either the prevalence of allergies in the EU populations in general or allergy subtypes. For this reason, GA^{2}LEN has proposed to set up a sentinel network to monitor emerging trends in allergic disease EU wide. Some data are available and have been collected, e.g., through EU funded research projects. (2) In the European Health Interview Survey (EHIS), the Commission collects data on self-reported asthma for some Member States (3) which covers the European Core Health Indicator (ECHI) on asthma (self-reported prevalence) (4).

---

(1) http://www.ga2len.net
Final results: http://ec.europa.eu/research/environment/pdf/european_research_on_environment_and_health_fp6.pdf — page 129.

(2) For example, EUROPREVALL: The prevalence, cost and basis of food allergy across Europe — http://www.europrevall.org

(3) http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_ehis_st1&lang=en

(4) http://ec.europa.eu/health/indicators/echi/list/index_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011728/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: La Commission aux Fidji

Une délégation de la Commission européenne se rend cette semaine en voyage officiel dans la République des Fidji.

1. Quel est le but de cette visite de trois jours?

2. À quelle hauteur se montent nos échanges avec les Fidji?

3. Cette visite s'inscrit-elle dans une tournée ou n'est-ce qu'un aller-et-retour?

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

1. Le Directeur général adjoint «Coordination géographique» de la direction générale du développement et de la coopération, a représenté la Commission européenne à la 13e conférence ministérielle ACP sur le sucre, qui a eu lieu aux Fidji du 14 au 18 octobre 2013. Il a prononcé le discours principal lors de la première journée de cette conférence consacrée à l'évolution des politiques dans le secteur de la canne à sucre dans les pays ACP.

Cette visite a été l'occasion pour le directeur général adjoint de présider la première réunion de programmation du 11e FED avec les Fidji. Cette réunion a été organisée dans le cadre de la décision 2013/476/UE du Conseil relative à l'adoption de mesures appropriées concernant la République des Fidji. Elle a marqué le lancement, en temps voulu, du processus de programmation du 11e FED, destiné à faire en sorte que le dialogue de programmation avec les Fidji puisse être mené à terme lorsque des élections démocratiques auront eu lieu.

Le Directeur général adjoint a également pu visiter plusieurs projets mis en œuvre par la Commission dans le cadre des mesures d'accompagnement du protocole sur le sucre et de l'instrument européen pour la démocratie et les Droits de l'homme.

2. Au cours de la réunion de programmation, des visites de projets et des réunions bilatérales avec des membres du gouvernement des Fidji (et notamment avec le premier ministre Commodore J. V. Bainimarama), le Directeur général adjoint a constamment rappelé que la condition préalable à la levée des mesures appropriées et à la reprise de la coopération bilatérale entre l'Union européenne et les Fidji en matière de développement était la tenue d'élections démocratiques et la restauration de la démocratie et de l'État de droit ou, plus précisément, le respect des engagements prévus par la décision 2013/476/UE du Conseil.

3. La visite du Directeur général adjoint ne faisait pas partie d'une tournée dans la région. Il a fait un aller-retour aux Fidji pour participer à la conférence ministérielle ACP sur le sucre.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011728/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: The Commission in Fiji

This week, a European Commission delegation is making an official visit to the Republic of Fiji.

1. What is the aim of this three-day visit?

2. What is the nature of our exchanges with Fiji?

3. Is this visit part of a tour or simply a round trip?

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

1. The Deputy Director-General, Geographic Coordination, for Development and Cooperation (DDG), represented the European Commission in the 13th ACP Ministerial Conference on Sugar, which was held in Fiji, on 14-18 October 2013. The DDG delivered the keynote speech on the first day of the Conference, whose theme was 'The Evolving Policy Environment for the ACP Cane Industry'.

This visit gave him the opportunity to chair the first 11th EDF programming meeting with Fiji. The meeting was framed by Council Decision 2013/476/EU on appropriate measures concerning the Republic of Fiji. This was a timely start of the 11th EDF programming process which is meant to ensure that the programming dialogue with Fiji may be completed once democratic elections have taken place.

Finally, the DDG had also the opportunity to visit several projects implemented by the Commission in the framework of the Accompanying Measures for the Sugar Protocol and the the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights.

2. In the course of the programming meeting, project visits and bilateral meetings with members of the Fijian Government (including Prime Minister Commodore J. V. Bainimarama), the DDG consistently reminded that the precondition for the appropriate measures to be lifted and for resuming bilateral development cooperation between the European Union and Fiji, was the holding of democratic elections and the re-establishment of democracy and the rule of law, or, more in detail, the fulfilment of the commitments laid down by Council Decision 2013/476/EU.

3. The DDG's visit was a round trip to Fiji for the ACP Ministerial Conference on Sugar and was not part of a tour.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011729/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: Moscou instaure un rideau de lait

«Le président russe, Vladimir Poutine, a ordonné la levée du contrôle renforcé à la frontière russo-lituanienne», a déclaré le service fédéral russe des douanes (FTS) dans un communiqué publié mercredi 9 octobre. Cette mesure devrait aider à résoudre le problème des énormes embouteillages qui se sont formés à la frontière après l'instauration d'un contrôle douanier renforcé en septembre. Cependant, l'embargo sur les produits laitiers lituaniens n'a pas encore été levé.

1. La Commission a-t-elle été informée de ses plaintes contre les produits laitiers en provenance de la Lituanie? Quelle est sa réaction?

2. La Commission pourrait-elle intenter un procès à la Russie à ce sujet?

3. N'est-il pas vrai que la Russie, en raison de ses engagements dans le cadre de l'Organisation mondiale du commerce, ne peut imposer de restrictions aux importations de produits qu'en prouvant que ces produits représentent un danger pour les consommateurs, ce qu'elle n'a pas fait?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(7 janvier 2014)

La Commission suit avec attention l'embargo russe des produits laitiers lituaniens. Elle a soulevé la question à plusieurs reprises dans des discussions bilatérales avec la Russie (y compris les 9 octobre et 6 novembre 2013). La Commission est convaincue de l'innocuité des produits laitiers lituaniens.

Le problème a été évoqué dans le cadre de l'Organisation mondiale du commerce, d'abord le 17 octobre 2013, en marge de la réunion du comité des mesures sanitaires et phytosanitaires, puis le lendemain, au sein du Conseil du commerce des marchandises. À l'heure actuelle, les autorités sanitaires lituaniennes et russes discutent des conditions de la levée de l'embargo. Si la situation ne s'améliore pas d'ici la fin de l'année, la Commission envisagera d'autres actions à l'échelon bilatéral et/ou multilatéral.

La Commission et les États membres concernés demandent systématiquement à la Russie des justifications scientifiques précises quand celle-ci impose des restrictions à l'égard de produits de l'Union européenne. Même lorsqu'un risque ne peut être écarté, la position de la Commission est que les éventuelles mesures de contrôle adoptées doivent rester proportionnées.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011729/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Moscow establishes a milk curtain

According to a press release published by the Russian Federal Customs Service (FCS) on Wednesday 9 October 2013, the Russian President, Vladimir Putin, has ordered the reinforced controls on the Russian-Lithuanian border to be lifted. This measure should help to resolve the problem of the huge bottlenecks which have developed at the border following the establishment of tighter customs checks in September. However, the embargo on Lithuanian dairy products has not yet been lifted.

1. Has the Commission been informed of its complaints against dairy products coming from Lithuania? What is its response?

2. Could the Commission initiate proceedings against Russia in this regard?

3. Is it not the case that, because of its commitments within the framework of the World Trade Organisation (WTO), Russia may impose restrictions on imported products only if it proves that those products represent a danger for consumers, something which it has failed to do?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(7 January 2014)

The Commission is following closely the situation concerning the Russian ban on Lithuanian dairy products. This issue was raised many times bilaterally with Russia (including on 9 October and 6 November 2013). The Commission is confident in the safety of Lithuanian dairy products.

This issue was raised at the World Trade Organisation Council for Trade in Goods on 18 October 2013 and in the margin of the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) Committee on 17 October 2013. At this stage the Lithuanian and the Russian sanitary authorities are discussing the conditions for lifting the ban on dairy products. If no improvement of the situation is to be seen by the end of the year, the Commission will consider further action at bilateral and/or multilateral level.

Systematically, the Commission and the concerned Member States do not abstain from asking Russia about specific scientific justification for restrictions imposed on EU products. Also in cases where a risk can be suspected the Commission maintains that possible control actions must remain proportionate.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011730/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)

(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: Prise en main des banques en faillite

Les Européens ont toujours bien du mal à s'accorder sur la meilleure façon de gérer la faillite d'un établissement financier.

Les États ne semblent pas disposés à donner à la Commission européenne le pouvoir de trancher en dernier ressort du démantèlement ou de la recapitalisation d'une banque aux abois.

1. Quel est l'argumentaire de la Commission à ce sujet?

2. Que répond-elle à l'Allemagne, qui exige une réforme des traités européens avant de procéder à un transfert de souveraineté aussi massif? En attendant, pour les autorités allemandes, ce sont les autorités nationales de résolution qui doivent être en première ligne pour gérer les crises bancaires.

3. Autre question explosive: le financement des opérations de secours et/ou de démantèlement. L'Allemagne privilégie plutôt, à ce stade, le recours aux fonds nationaux de recapitalisation du secteur, pour éviter tout transfert supplémentaire au profit des économies en difficulté. Berlin plaide, contre l'avis de la France, pour limiter le champ d'action du mécanisme européen de résolution des crises bancaires aux grandes enseignes transfrontalières, celles qui représentent les risques systémiques les plus importants pour la zone euro. La Commission partage-t-elle cet avis?

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission

(13 décembre 2013)

Un des objectifs du mécanisme de résolution unique (MRU) est de garantir l'application uniforme des règles en matière de résolution bancaire, afin de venir à bout de la segmentation du marché et de profiter à l'ensemble du marché intérieur. La décision, à l'échelle européenne, de déclencher la résolution d'une banque doit être confiée à une institution existante. C'est ce qu'ont confirmé la BCE, dans l'avis formel qu'elle a rendu sur la proposition de la Commission, et le service juridique du Conseil. Pour ces motifs juridiques, la Commission propose de décider elle-même de certains aspects essentiels de la résolution d'une banque, sur la base d'une proposition du Conseil de résolution unique qui sera mis en place dans le cadre du règlement.

Le processus décisionnel prévu au sein du MRU (1) ne requiert pas de modification du traité. Il garantit un équilibre institutionnel adéquat et complète le mécanisme de surveillance unique (MSU) par un cadre efficace en matière de résolution bancaire, conformément aux conclusions du Conseil européen (2).

La Commission estime que le MRU devrait s'appliquer à tous les établissements de crédit dans les États membres participants, ce qui est cohérent avec l'approche du MSU. La BCE superviserait directement les banques les plus systémiques, mais pourrait aussi superviser directement d'autres banques en cas de problème. La crise récente a montré que même de petites banques peuvent avoir des conséquences systémiques. L'application du même régime de résolution à tous les établissements, quelle que soit leur taille, garantirait des conditions équitables. En outre, il ne serait pas rentable de maintenir toutes les ressources humaines et techniques disponibles à l'échelle de l'Union et dans chaque État membre participant. De la même façon, un fonds européen unique protégera plus efficacement les contribuables que 18 (ou plus) fonds nationaux distincts.

---

(1) Sur la base de l'article 114 du TFUE.

(2) En décembre 2012 et en juin 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011730/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Taking charge of failed banks

Europeans are still struggling to reach an agreement on the best way to handle financial establishments which have gone bankrupt.

The Member States do not seem willing to give the Commission the power to decide to dismantle or recapitalise a failing bank as a last resort.

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

2. What is its response to Germany's call for the European Treaties to be reformed before such a massive transfer of sovereignty takes place? In the meantime, the German authorities believe it is up to the national resolution authorities to take the lead in managing banking crises.

3. Another highly sensitive issue is financing for rescue and/or dismantling operations. At this stage, Germany favours using national recapitalisation funds for the sector in order to avoid any additional transfer to the benefit of struggling economies. Berlin is arguing, in opposition to France, to limit the scope of the European banking crises resolution mechanism to large cross-border retailers, which represent the greatest systemic risks for the euro area. Does the Commission share this view?

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

One of the main objectives of the Single Resolution Mechanism (SRM) is to ensure the uniform implementation of bank resolution rules, to overcome market fragmentation and to benefit of the whole internal market. A decision at European level regarding the triggering of bank resolution must be conferred on an existing Treaty institution. This has been confirmed by the Council's legal service and by the ECB in its formal opinion regarding the Commission's proposal. For these legal reasons, the Commission proposal foresees that the Commission will decide on certain key aspects of resolving a bank, based on a proposal from the Single Resolution Board, which will be established as part of this regulation.

This proposed decision-making process within the SRM (1) does not require Treaty change. It ensures the appropriate institutional balance and complements the Single Supervisory Mechanism (SSM) with an efficient framework for bank resolution, in line with the conclusions of the European Council (2).

The Commission considers that SRM should apply to all credit institutions in the participating Member States (MS). This is consistent with the approach of the SSM. The ECB would directly supervise the most systemic banks but may assume direct supervision of other banks in case of problems. The recent crisis has shown that even small banks may have systemic consequences. The application of the same resolution regime to all institutions, regardless of their size, would ensure a level playing field. Furthermore, it would not be cost efficient to hold the full technical and human resources available at Union level and in each participating MS. Similarly, a single European fund would be more effective in protecting taxpayers than 18 (or more) separate national funds.

---

(1) Based on Article 114 TFEU.

(2) In December 2012 and in June 2013.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011731/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)

(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: Aides d'État aux énergies vertes en Allemagne

Les aides aux énergies vertes vont de nouveau augmenter en Allemagne en 2014. Chaque consommateur devra payer 6,3 centimes d'euro par kilowatt/heure consommé, soit une hausse de 18 % par rapport à 2013, afin de combler l'écart entre le prix du marché de l'électricité et le prix des énergies renouvelables. Un coût total de 24 milliards d'euros pour la collectivité… À l'échelle d'un ménage moyen, la facture va grimper de 70 euros pour atteindre 1 189 euros, en incluant les hausses des taxes et des coûts des réseaux, selon le site spécialisé Verivox.

L'enjeu est tout sauf anecdotique.

Les industriels, gros consommateurs d'électricité, échappent largement au financement des énergies renouvelables.

Comment la Commission réagit-elle face à cette situation? N'y a-t-il pas lieu d'ouvrir une procédure pour aides d'État? Les industriels ne devraient-ils pas rembourser le coût évité?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission

(11 décembre 2013)

Comme l'indiquent les Honorables Parlementaires, en Allemagne, les aides en faveur des sources d'énergie renouvelables sont financées au moyen d'une surtaxe spéciale, instaurée par la loi sur les sources d'énergie renouvelables (EEG), qui est répercutée sur les consommateurs d'électricité. Cette surtaxe s'élevait à 5,3 centimes d'euro par kilowatt/heure en 2013 et devrait passer à 6,2 centimes d'euro par kilowatt/heure en 2014. Toutefois, certaines entreprises manufacturières à forte intensité énergétique paient une surtaxe réduite.

La Commission évalue actuellement la surtaxe réduite appliquée aux industries manufacturières gourmandes en énergie ainsi que l'aide accordée en faveur des sources d'énergie renouvelables par l'intermédiaire du mécanisme de financement mis en place en 2012.

Elle examine si ces mesures constituent une aide d'État au sens du traité et, dans l'affirmative, si elles sont conformes aux règles applicables aux aides d'État ainsi qu'à d'autres dispositions du traité. Si, à la fin de l'examen préliminaire, la Commission parvient à la conclusion que les mesures en question constituent une aide et si elle émet des doutes quant à leur compatibilité avec le marché intérieur, elle devra ouvrir une procédure formelle d'examen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011731/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: State aid for green energy in Germany

Aid for green energy will be increased again in Germany in 2014. Each consumer will have to pay EUR 0.063 per kilowatt/hour consumed, an increase of 18% compared with 2013, in order to bridge the gap between the market price of electricity and the price of renewable energy. That represents a total cost for the community of EUR 24 billion. In terms of the average household, the bill will rise by EUR 70 to reach EUR 1 189, including increases in taxes and network costs, according to the specialist site Verivox.

The issue is hardly anecdotal.

Manufacturers, which are heavy electricity users, will by and large avoid financing renewable energy.

What is the Commission's response to this situation? Is there not a case for opening a procedure for state aid? Should manufacturers not reimburse the avoided cost?

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

As described by the Honourable Members, support for renewable energy is financed in Germany on the basis of a special surcharge, called the EEG-surcharge, that is ultimately passed on to electricity consumers. The EEG-surcharge amounted to 5.3 ct/Kwh in 2013 and is expected to rise up to 6.2 ct/KWh in 2014. Certain energy-intensive manufacturing industries pay, however, a reduced surcharge.

The Commission is currently assessing the reduced EEG-surcharge for energy-intensive manufacturing industries, as well as support for renewables through the financing mechanism introduced in 2012.

The Commission is examining whether these measures constitute state aid in the meaning of the Treaty and if so, whether they would comply with applicable state aid rules and other Treaty provisions. If the Commission concludes at the end of the preliminary investigation that the measures concerned constitute aid and has doubts as to their compatibility with the internal market, it will have to open the formal investigation procedure.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011732/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: Obligation de circuler phares allumés de jour

Dès le 1er janvier 2014, les voitures, les autobus, les camions et les motos auront l'obligation de circuler avec les feux allumés de jour.

Selon un comptage effectué cette année par le Bureau de prévention des accidents (BPA), 68 % des automobilistes circulent déjà feux allumés de jour. Cela ne devrait donc pas trop poser de problème de passer au stade de l'obligation. C'est une mesure de sécurité éprouvée: dans une zone d'ombre, une voiture est quand même bien plus visible lorsqu'elle circule phares allumés. C'est indéniablement une bonne décision.

1. D'après la Commission, quel est le pourcentage d'accidents ainsi évités?

2. Quelle est la consommation supplémentaire engendrée par cette décision? En effet, sur un véhicule, on imagine volontiers que la consommation de carburant est minime pour allumer ses feux en journée, mais qu'en est-il à l'échelle de l'ensemble du parc européen de véhicules?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission

(6 décembre 2013)

Depuis février 2011 (1), les nouveaux types de voitures particulières et de véhicules utilitaires légers sont équipés de feux diurnes (2). Les camions et autobus doivent se conformer à la même obligation depuis août 2012.

Les feux diurnes sont différents des phares normaux et sont conçus pour accroître la visibilité des véhicules pendant la journée. Ils s'allument automatiquement lorsque le moteur démarre et devraient améliorer la sécurité routière. Ils améliorent considérablement la visibilité des véhicules à moteur pour les autres utilisateurs de la route et consomment peu d'énergie. Dans les pays où les feux diurnes sont devenus obligatoires avant l'adoption de la législation correspondante de l'UE, cela a été salué comme une évolution très positive dans le domaine de la sécurité routière (3) (4).

La capacité à sauver des vies des feux diurnes devrait être de l'ordre de 3 à 5 % du total des décès. Selon les estimations, quelque 1 200 à 2 000 accidents mortels par an pourront être évités dans l'UE lorsque la plupart des véhicules en seront équipés. Sur la base du taux de renouvellement du parc automobile de l'UE, ce devrait être le cas vers 2020.

Comme les feux diurnes sont conçus pour être utilisés de jour, ils sont plus efficaces que les autres dispositifs d'éclairage. Leur consommation d'énergie représente approximativement 25 à 30 % de celle des phares traditionnels. De plus, en utilisant des diodes émettrices de lumière pour les feux diurnes, ce pourcentage descend jusqu'à 5 à 10 % seulement. La consommation de carburant supplémentaire des véhicules due aux feux diurnes devrait être minimale. En cas d'utilisation de diodes émettrices de lumière (selon la tendance technologique actuelle), la consommation de carburant supplémentaire a été estimée à quelque 0,5 %.

---

(1) Pour en savoir plus: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/automotive/safety/daytime-running-light/index_en.htm

(2) Directive 2008/89/CE de la Commission du 24 septembre 2008 modifiant, en vue de son adaptation au progrès technique, la directive 76/756/CEE du Conseil concernant l'installation de dispositifs d'éclairage et de signalisation lumineuse des véhicules à moteur et de leurs remorques (JO L 257 du 25.9.2008, p. 14).

(3) Arora, H. Collard, D. Robbins, G. Welbourne, E.R. White, J.G. Effectiveness of Daytime Running Lights in Canada, Report No. TP1298 (E), Transport Canada 1994.
Tofflemire, T. C., Whitehead, P.C. An Evaluation of the Impact of Daytime Running Lights on Traffic Safety in Canada, Journal of Safety Research, volume 28, numéro 4, 1997.

(4) http://www.bast.de/cln_005/nn_42242/DE/Publikationen/Downloads/downloads-node.html?__nnn=true

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011732/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Obligation to drive with lights on during the day

From 1 January 2014, cars, buses, lorries and motorbikes will have to drive with their lights on during the daytime.

According to a score produced by the Bureau for the Prevention of Accidents (BPA), 68% of drivers already drive with their lights on during the day. Therefore, the transition to making it compulsory should not pose too many problems. This is a proven security measure: in dark areas, cars are nevertheless much more visible when they drive with their lights on. This is undeniably a good decision.

1. According to the Commission, what percentage of accidents could be avoided as a result of this?

2. What additional consumption will this decision entail? Indeed, we could easily imagine that the fuel consumption for turning on these lights in the daytime in one car is minimal, but what would it be on the scale of the entire European fleet of vehicles?

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

Since February 2011 (1) new types of passenger and light commercial vehicles are equipped with Daytime Running Lights (DRL) (2). Trucks and buses have to comply with the same obligation since August 2012.

DRLs differ from normal headlamps and are designed to increase visibility of vehicles during daytime. They are automatically switched-on when the engine is started and are expected to increase road safety. They substantially increase the visibility of motor vehicles to other road users and have low energy consumption. In countries where DRLs became obligatory, prior to the adoption of the relevant EU legislation, this has been hailed as a very positive development in the field of road safety (3) (4).

The life-saving potential of DRLs is expected to be in the order of 3-5% of total fatalities. It is estimated that a round 1,200-2,000 road fatalities can be prevented in the EU per year once the majority of vehicles will be equipped with them. Based on the EU vehicle fleet replacement rate this is expected around the year 2020.

As DRLs are designed to be used during daytime, they are more effective and efficient than other lighting devices. The energy consumption is approximately 25-30% of the consumption of standard lights. Besides, when using LEDs for DRLs, this percentage is reduced to only 5-10%. The additional fuel consumption of vehicles due to DRLs is expected to be minimal. In the case of LEDs (as it is the current technological trend) this has been estimated at about 0.5%.

---

(1) For more info: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/automotive/safety/daytime-running-light/index_en.htm

(2) Commission Directive 2008/89/EC, of 24 September 2008 amending, for the purposes of its adaptation to technical progress, Council Directive 76/756/EEC concerning the installation of lighting and light-signalling devices on motor vehicles and their trailers, OJ L-257, 25.9.2008, p. 14.

(3) Arora, H. Collard, D. Robbins, G. Welbourne, E.R. White, J.G. Effectiveness of Daytime Running Lights in Canada, Report No. TP1298 (E), Transport Canada 1994.
Tofflemire, T. C., Whitehead, P.C. An Evaluation of the Impact of Daytime Running Lights on Traffic Safety in Canada, Journal of Safety Research, Volume 28, Number 4, 1997.

(4) http://www.bast.de/cln_005/nn_42242/DE/Publikationen/Downloads/downloads-node.html?__nnn=true

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011733/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: Enquête sur Skype

Au mois de juin, plusieurs documents mettaient en évidence des relations entre l'équipe de Skype et le programme de surveillance PRISM mis en œuvre par la NSA aux États-Unis. La société avait ainsi transféré des données personnelles, et, en ce sens, violé les lois du Luxembourg.

1. La Commission compte-t-elle mener une enquête sur Skype, au vu des nombreux éléments de suspicion qui entourent la marque?

2. Si le système de taxes au Luxembourg s'avère particulièrement intéressant pour les grandes sociétés, les lois en vigueur prévoient la protection de la vie privée pour ses citoyens et l'obligation d'avoir une autorisation juridique pour effectuer des surveillances. Skype a-t-il reçu une assistance légale pour le transfert de ces données?

3. Au mois de janvier, plusieurs militants et associations de protection de la vie privée avaient publié une lettre ouverte à Microsoft en demandant la publication d'un rapport de transparence incluant le nombre de données partagées avec des tiers et la quantité de requêtes reçues de la part des gouvernements. Comment se positionne la Commission vis-à-vis de cette requête?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Reding au nom de la Commission
(17 décembre 2013)

Alors qu'il incombe aux autorités nationales, notamment aux autorités de contrôle de la protection des données ([1]), de veiller à la mise en œuvre et à l'application correctes de la législation de l'UE en matière de protection des données par les organismes publics et privés dans l'UE, la Commission est gardienne des traités et, compte tenu de ce rôle, la Commission est très attentive aux rapports des médias sur des programmes tels que PRISM qui permettraient l'accès et le traitement, à grande échelle, de données personnelles.

La réaction politique de la Commission face à ces récentes révélations a pris la forme d'une communication de la Commission du 27 novembre 2013 intitulée «Rétablir la confiance dans les flux de données UE-US». La Commission y reconnaît que la confiance dans les relations transatlantiques a été mise à mal et y examine les options politiques dont dispose l'Union pour garantir que cette confiance soit rétablie. La Commission souligne l'importance de l'adoption rapide du paquet de mesures pour une réforme de la protection des données, ainsi que de l'achèvement des négociations de l'accord UE-US sur la protection des données dans le secteur répressif (accord-cadre) qui devrait établir un droit à un recours juridictionnel pour les citoyens de l'UE et un renforcement de la «sphère de sécurité» (Safe Harbour scheme).

Le même jour, les conclusions du groupe de travail ad hoc UE-US, qui a examiné les incidences des programmes de surveillance des États-Unis sur le droit fondamental à la protection des données des citoyens de l'UE, ont été publiées. Ces conclusions relatent le fonctionnement des programmes et évaluent la portée des garanties qui protègent les citoyens de l'Union européenne.

([1]) La commission nationale pour la protection des données au Luxembourg a analysé cette question. Elle n'a pas constaté de violation de la législation luxembourgeoise en matière de protection des données de la part de Skype Communications S.A.R.L. ni de Microsoft Luxembourg S.A.R.L.:
http://www.cnpd.public.lu/fr/actualites/national/2013/11/skype-microsoft/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011733/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Skype investigation

In June 2013, several documents revealed links between the Skype team and the PRISM surveillance programme put in place by the National Security Agency (NSA) in the United States. The company had transferred personal data and therefore violated Luxembourg law.

1. Does the Commission intend to launch an investigation into Skype, in view of the various suspicious elements surrounding the brand?

2. While the Luxembourg tax system may prove particularly beneficial for large companies, the laws in force provide for the protection of its citizens' privacy and the requirement to have legal authorisation to carry out surveillance. Has Skype received legal assistance to transfer these data?

3. In January 2013, several activists and privacy groups published an open letter to Microsoft calling for a transparency report to be published including the amount of data shared with third parties and the number of requests received from governments. What is the Commission's position with regard to this request?

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

While it is for national authorities, including data protection supervisory authorities (1), to ensure the correct implementation and enforcement of EU data protection legislation vis-à-vis public and private bodies in the EU, the Commission is guardian of the Treaties, and, in view of this role, the Commission is very concerned regarding the media reports about programmes such as PRISM which appear to enable access and processing, on a large scale, of personal data.

The Commission's policy response to recent surveillance revelations is set out in the Commission's Communication of 27 November 2013 'Rebuilding trust in EU-US data flows'. The communication acknowledges that trust in the transatlantic relationship has been damaged and examines the policy options available to the Union to ensure it is rebuilt. The Commission emphasises the importance of the swift adoption of the data protection reform package, the completion of negotiations on the EU-US Agreement on Data Protection in the Law Enforcement Sector (the Umbrella Agreement) which should provide a right of judicial redress to EU citizens as well as a strengthening of the Safe Harbour scheme.

On the same day, the findings of the ad-hoc EU-US Working Group which examined the impact of US surveillance programmes on the fundamental right to data protection of EU citizens were published. They provide an account of the functioning of the programmes and assess the scope of the safeguards that protect EU citizens.

---

(1) The Luxembourg National Commission for Data protection (Commission nationale pour la protection des données) investigated that issue. It did not find any violation of the provisions of the Luxembourgish data protection legislation by Skype Communications S.A.R.L. or by Mircosoft Luxembourg S.A.R.L. http://www.cnpd.public.lu/fr/actualites/national/2013/11/skype-microsoft/index.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011734/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: Chèques-innovation

La Commission européenne publie un projet visant à aider les micro-entreprises et les petites entreprises des régions d'Europe à se développer à l'aide des technologies numériques. Pour faire en sorte que les fonds alloués aux PME pour améliorer leurs capacités dans le domaine du commerce électronique et des TIC soient rapidement et intégralement utilisés, des chèques-innovation d'un montant maximum de 10 000 euros seront donnés aux PME.

1. Quels sont les objectifs de la Commission?

2. Que propose-t-elle aux régions?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Kroes au nom de la Commission
(9 décembre 2013)

L'objectif du système de chèques-innovation TIC est d'encourager les régions à consacrer une partie des Fonds structurels et d'investissement européens (Fonds ESI) dont elles bénéficient à promouvoir l'adoption de technologies de l'information et des communications (TIC) par des micro-entreprises et des PME. Les chèques-innovation TIC peuvent renforcer la capacité d'innovation de ces entreprises, notamment en les aidant à acquérir des connaissances, à mettre au point et lancer de nouveaux produits, à améliorer leurs processus d'entreprise, à créer de nouveaux services ou à élargir leur clientèle potentielle. Actuellement, nombre d'entreprises n'ont pas les connaissances ou les ressources nécessaires pour intégrer les TIC à leurs activités.

La Commission espère que les régions adopteront le système de chèques TIC comme un instrument facile à utiliser pour soutenir la numérisation de leurs PME conformément à la priorité accordée aux investissements TIC dans les Fonds ESI. Elle met à disposition les informations nécessaires, y compris un plan de mise en œuvre effective, pour aider les États membres et leurs régions. Elle diffusera également les résultats du programme pilote de systèmes de chèques qui est en cours en Espagne, dans la Région de Murcie et en Estrémadure.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011734/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Innovation vouchers

The European Commission is publishing a project aimed at helping micro-companies and small companies in European regions to develop with the help of digital technology. In order to ensure that the funds allocated to SMEs to improve their capabilities in the field of electronic commerce and ICT are quickly and fully utilised, innovation vouchers of up to EUR 10 000 will be given to the SMEs.

1. What are the Commission's objectives?

2. What does it propose for the regions?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 2013)

The objective of the ICT innovation voucher scheme is to encourage regions to devote part of their European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) to promote the uptake of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) by microenterprises and SMEs. ICT innovation vouchers can strengthen their innovation capacity *inter alia* by facilitating access to new knowledge, supporting the development and launch of new products, improving business processes, creating new services or reaching new potential clients. Currently, many companies lack knowledge or resources to introduce ICT into their activities.

The Commission expects regions to embrace the ICT voucher scheme as an easy to use instrument to support the digitisation of their SMEs in keeping with the priority given to ICT investments the ESIF programme. It is making the necessary information available, including a blueprint for its effective implementation, to assist Member States and their regions. It will also share results of the pilot programme for voucher schemes which is underway in the Region of Murcia and Extremadura in Spain.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011735/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: Salaire minimum européen

1. La Commission partage-t-elle notre avis sur le fait qu'il soit véritablement nécessaire d'instaurer un salaire minimum européen? Même s'il ne s'agit pas de déterminer un niveau de salaire minimum uniforme partout en Europe, il convient de fonder l'idée de la nécessité d'un salaire minimum, tout comme il fallait, il y a un siècle, amorcer le débat sur la nécessité d'un impôt progressif. Cela permettra également d'organiser une forme de convergence.

2. Comment la Commission imagine-t-elle ce salaire minimum? Comment le calcule-t-elle? À quelle échéance et via quelle stratégie pourrait-elle le proposer ou l'imposer?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(13 décembre 2013)

L'harmonisation des salaires n'est pas un objectif du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne (TFUE). Conformément à l'article 153 TFUE, l'Union soutient et complète l'action des États membres dans les domaines des conditions de travail, de la sécurité sociale et de la protection sociale des travailleurs, entre autres, mais les dispositions de l'article 153 ne s'appliquent pas aux rémunérations (conformément à l'article 153, paragraphe 5, TFUE).

Toutefois, sur proposition de la Commission, le Conseil peut adopter des recommandations par pays sur les salaires, y compris sur les salaires minimaux, dans le cadre de la gouvernance économique de l'Union basée sur les grandes orientations des politiques économiques (article 121 TFUE) et les lignes directrices pour l'emploi (article 148 TFUE) intégrées.

Dans le «paquet emploi» ([1]), la Commission a souligné l'importance de salaires décents et durables dans les États membres. Des salaires minimaux fixés à des niveaux appropriés peuvent aider à prévenir la pauvreté des travailleurs et un nivellement par le bas en ce qui concerne les coûts de la main-d'œuvre. Ils constituent, par conséquent, un facteur important pour garantir une rémunération décente et la qualité de l'emploi. Dans la fixation des niveaux de salaires minimaux, les États membres doivent trouver un juste équilibre entre l'octroi d'un salaire décent, en adéquation avec les niveaux de productivité, et l'instauration de mesures d'incitation adéquates pour les chômeurs (renforcement de l'attrait financier du travail). Les salaires minimaux peuvent également contribuer à soutenir la demande globale. Cet aspect est particulièrement important dans une conjoncture économique défavorable.

([1]) COM(2012) 0173 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011735/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: European minimum wage

1. Does the Commission share our view that it is truly necessary to establish a European minimum wage? Even if it is not a case of establishing a uniform minimum wage level everywhere in Europe, it would be wise to develop the idea that there is a need for a minimum wage, just as, a century ago, it was necessary to open the debate on the need for a progressive tax. This will also make it possible to organise a form of convergence.

2. How does the Commission envisage this minimum wage? How does it calculate it? What deadline and what strategy could it propose or impose for this?

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

According to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) wage harmonisation is not a Treaty objective. According to Article 153 TFEU, the Union shall support and complement Member States' activities in the field of, *inter alia*, working conditions, social security and social protection of workers, but the provisions of Article 153 do not apply to pay (by virtue of Article 153 para. 5 TFEU).

However, the Council may adopt, on a proposal of the Commission, country-specific recommendations on wages, including on minimum wages, as part of EU economic governance based on the integrated Broad Economic Policy Guidelines (Article 121 TFEU) and Employment Guidelines (Article 148 TFEU)..

In the Employment Package (1) the Commission stressed the importance of decent and sustainable wages within the Member States. Minimum wages set at appropriate levels can help prevent in-work poverty and a race to the bottom in terms of labour costs. Thus they are an important factor in ensuring decent pay and job quality. In setting minimum wage levels, Member States must strike a balance between offering a decent wage, matching productivity levels and providing the right incentives to the unemployed (making work pay). Minimum wages can also contribute to sustaining aggregate demand. This is particularly relevant in depressed economic circumstances.

---

(1) COM(2012) 0173 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-011736/13
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(15 oktober 2013)

Betreft: IMF-voorstel om eenmalig 10 % van spaarrekeningen aan te slaan

In de zogenaamde „Fiscal Monitor" van oktober 2013 van het Internationaal Monetair Fonds (IMF) wordt geopperd dat een „eenmalige kapitaalbelasting" van 10 % een mogelijke optie is om de hoge overheidsschulden in de eurolanden terug te dringen.

Letterlijk schrijft het IMF: „The sharp deterioration of the public finances in many countries has revived interest in a „capital levy" — a one-off tax on private wealth — as an exceptional measure to restore debt sustainability. The appeal is that such a tax, if it is implemented before avoidance is possible and there is a belief that it will never be repeated, does not distort behavior (and may be seen by some as fair). […] The tax rates needed to bring down public debt to precrisis levels, moreover, are sizable: reducing debt ratios to end-2007 levels would require (for a sample of 15 euro area countries) a tax rate of about 10 percent on households with positive net wealth (1)."

Veroordeelt de Commissie dit „theoretische" voorstel van het IMF als schadelijk voor het spaardersvertrouwen?

Overweegt de Commissie zich openlijk en ondubbelzinnig te distantiëren van het voorstel, teneinde duidelijk te maken dat spaargeld nog veilig is?

Antwoord van de heer Rehn namens de Commissie
(12 november 2013)

Directe belastingen zijn overeenkomstig het Verdrag in wezen een bevoegdheid van de lidstaten. In de Fiscal Monitor wordt het debat inzake de „eenmalige belasting op kapitaal" besproken in een kader dat verscheidene typen belasting op eigendom en transfers presenteert. De Commissie becommentarieert over het algemeen geen technische documenten die door haar personeel of andere internationale instellingen zijn gepubliceerd.

---

(1) http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fm/2013/02/pdf/fm1302.pdf, blz. 59.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011736/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: IMF proposal to impose a one-off tax of 10% on savings accounts

In its *Fiscal Monitor* of October 2013, the IMF proposes a 'one-off capital tax' of 10% as a possible option for reducing the high sovereign debts in the eurozone countries.

To quote the IMF: 'The sharp deterioration of the public finances in many countries has revived interest in a "capital levy" — a one-off tax on private wealth — as an exceptional measure to restore debt sustainability. The appeal is that such a tax, if it is implemented before avoidance is possible and there is a belief that it will never be repeated, does not distort behaviour (and may be seen by some as fair). […] The tax rates needed to bring down public debt to pre-crisis levels, moreover, are sizable: reducing debt ratios to end-2007 levels would require (for a sample of 15 euro area countries) a tax rate of about 10 percent on households with positive net wealth.' ([1])

Does the Commission condemn this 'theoretical' proposal by the IMF as damaging to savers' confidence?

Does the Commission intend to distance itself openly and unambiguously from this proposal in order to make it clear that savings are still safe?

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

Direct taxes are essentially a Member State competence, subject to compliance with the Treaty. In the 'Fiscal Monitor', the debate on a 'one-off capital levy' is referred to in a box linked to a section presenting different types of taxes on property and transfers. The Commission does in general not comment on technical documents published by staff of other international bodies.

([1]) http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fm/2013/02/pdf/fm1302.pdf, p. 59

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-011738/13
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE)
(15 oktober 2013)

Betreft: VP/HR — Financiële steun EU aan Palestijnse gebieden

1. Is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger (VP/HR) op de hoogte van het rapport van de Europese Rekenkamer, waarin wordt gesteld dat er ruim een miljard euro aan Europese hulpgelden is verdwenen in de Gazastrook en de Westelijke Jordaanoever ten gevolge van corruptie en mismanagement?

2. Is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger van mening dat deze gang van zaken absoluut onaanvaardbaar is en dat de autoriteiten in de Palestijnse gebieden zich moeten verantwoorden en dat de gelden moeten worden teruggevorderd?

3. Welke stappen heeft de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger ondernomen richting de Palestijnse autoriteiten in de Gazastrook en op de Westelijke Jordaanoever?

4. Vindt de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger ook dat alle Europese financiële steun aan de Palestijnse gebieden per direct geblokkeerd moet worden zolang deze kwestie niet is opgelost en de hulpgelden niet zijn verantwoord?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(14 november 2013)

De Performance Audit die de geachte Parlementsleden lijken te bedoelen, is nog niet door de Rekenkamer gepubliceerd. De Commissie en de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger hebben daarom geen opmerkingen totdat de audit is gepubliceerd.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011738/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE)

(15 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EU financial aid to Palestinian areas

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the report by the European Court of Auditors which states that some EUR 1 billion in EU aid has disappeared in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank as a result of corruption and mismanagement?

2. Does the Vice-President/High Representative consider that this state of affairs is completely unacceptable, that the authorities in the Palestinian areas should be held accountable and that the money must be reimbursed?

3. What action has the Vice-President/High Representative taken towards the Palestinian authorities in the Gaza Strip and West Bank?

4. Does the Vice-President/High Representative agree that all European financial aid to the Palestinian areas should be immediately halted until this issue is resolved and the aid money is accounted for?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission

(14 November 2013)

The Performance Audit which the Honourable Member appears to allude to has not yet been published by the Court. The Commission and the Vice-President/High Representative have therefore no comments to make until such times as it shall have been published.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-011739/13
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(15 de outubro de 2013)

Assunto: Deslocalização da Microsoft Portugal

A Microsoft vai deslocalizar para a Grécia e o Brasil os serviços de apoio ao cliente e de suporte técnico, que eram prestados pela multinacional SITEL a partir do Parque das Nações, em Lisboa, o que levará ao despedimento coletivo de 120 trabalhadores.

Este é mais um despedimento a somar às centenas de milhar de trabalhadores que, nos últimos dois anos, se viram confrontados com a perda do seu posto de trabalho. Estes despedimentos estão intimamente ligados à submissão e cumplicidades do governo português com a política da troica em Portugal, com a ausência de investimento e medidas que salvaguardem os postos de trabalho em causa.

Assim, solicita-se à Comissão que informe do seguinte:

1. A referida empresa recebeu quaisquer apoios comunitários? Com que fins foram concedidos e que compromissos assumiu aquando da concessão dos apoios? Considera que, a existirem compromissos, estes estão a ser postos em causa pela administração da empresa?

2. Que medidas pensa tomar, tendo em conta os graves problemas sociais e económicos existentes em Portugal onde o desemprego não cessa de aumentar?

3. Que tipo de apoios pode esta empresa ou o governo português solicitar para evitar que estes trabalhadores fiquem desempregados?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(13 de novembro de 2013)

De acordo com as informações recebidas das autoridades portuguesas, a empresa Microsoft Portugal recebeu um apoio financeiro no valor de 23 214,40 euros do Fundo Social Europeu (FSE) no período de programação de 2007-2013. As operações selecionadas para financiamento destinaram-se a apoiar um Plano de Igualdade de Géneros. A multinacional SITEL nunca recebeu qualquer contribuição financeira do FSE.

A política de emprego, incluindo as medidas de combate ao desemprego, é essencialmente uma competência do Estado-Membro. Contudo, os fundos estruturais da UE são importantes fontes de investimento que estimulam o crescimento sustentável e o emprego, a todos os níveis. O Pacote de Investimento Social ([1]) dá orientações aos Estados-Membros sobre políticas sociais mais eficientes e eficazes. O Pacote de Emprego ([2]) e o Pacote de Emprego dos Jovens ([3]) incluem um conjunto de medidas destinadas a ajudar os Estados-Membros a combater o desemprego e, nomeadamente, o desemprego dos jovens e a exclusão social. Além disso, um conjunto de políticas ativas do mercado de trabalho destinadas a inverter as tendências negativas e a promover a criação de emprego tem sido aplicado com o apoio financeiro do FSE.

Os trabalhadores suscetíveis de serem afetados pela reestruturação podem candidatar-se ao apoio do FSE e, se reunirem as condições necessárias para tal, do Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização. As autoridades portuguesas responsáveis pela gestão nacional do FSE e do FEG podem fornecer mais informações:

FSE

IGFSE — Instituto de Gestão do Fundo Social Europeu, I.P.
Rua Castilho, n.° 5 — 6°, 7° e 8°
1250-066 Lisboa
Tel.: 21 359 16 00
Fax: 21 359 16 01
geral@igfse.pt
http://www.igfse.pt

---

[1] COM(2013) 83 de 20 de fevereiro de 2013.
[2] COM(2012) 173 de 18 de abril de 2012.
[3] COM(2012) 727-728-729 de 5 de dezembro de 2012.

FEG

IEFP — Instituto de Emprego e Formação Profissional
Rua de Xabregas, n.° 52
1949-003 Lisboa
Tel.: 00351 218 614 100
Fax: 00351 218 614 601
Email: iefp.info@iefp.pt
http:/www.iefp.pt

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011739/13
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Relocation of Microsoft Portugal

Microsoft intends to relocate its customer and technical support services from Lisbon's Parque das Nações, where they were operated by the multinational company SITEL, to Greece and Brazil.

This will lead to the collective dismissal of 120 employees, who will join the hundreds of thousands of workers who have seen their jobs disappear over the last two years.

These lay-offs are closely linked to the Portuguese Government's submission to and complicity with the Troika's policies in Portugal and the lack of investment and measures to protect jobs under threat.

Can the Commission say:

1. Whether the company in question received any form of Community funding? For what purposes was the funding granted and what commitments did the firm make on receiving it? If commitments were made, does the Commission consider that these are now being sidestepped by the management of the firm?

2. What steps it intends to take, given the current serious social and economic problems in Portugal and its rising level of unemployment?

3. What types of support can be requested by this company, or the Portuguese Government, in order to prevent these workers becoming unemployed?

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

According to information received from the Portuguese authorities Microsoft Portugal received financial support amounting to EUR 23.214,40 from the European Social Fund (ESF) in the programming period 2007-2013. The operations selected for funding aimed at supporting a Gender Equality Plan. The multinational SITEL has never received any ESF financial contribution.

Employment policy, including measures to combat unemployment, is primarily a Member State competence. However, the EU structural funds are important sources of investment stimulating sustainable growth and employment, at all levels. The Social Investment Package (1) gives guidance to Member States on more efficient and effective social policies. The Employment Package (2) and Youth employment package (3) include a set of measures aiming at helping Member States to tackle unemployment and particularly youth unemployment and social exclusion. Moreover, a set of Active Labour Market Policies aiming at reversing the negative trends and fostering employment creation has been implemented with the financial support of ESF.

Workers likely to be affected by restructuring may qualify for support from the ESF and, provided that the necessary conditions are met, from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund. The Portuguese Authorities in charge of the ESF and the EGF national management could provide further information:

ESF

IGFSE — Instituto de Gestão do Fundo Social Europeu, I.P.
Rua Castilho, nº 5 — 6º, 7º e 8º
1250-066 Lisboa
Tel: 21 359 16 00
Fax: 21 359 16 01
geral@igfse.pt
http://www.igfse.pt

---

(1) COM(2013) 83 of 20 February 2013.

(2) COM(2012) 173 of 18 April 2012.

(3) COM(2012) 727-728-729 of 5 December 2012.

EGF

IEFP — Instituto de Emprego e Formação Profissional
Rua de Xabregas, nº 52
1949-003 Lisboa
Phone: 00351 218 614 100
Fax: 00351 218 614 601
Email: iefp.info@iefp.pt
http:/www.iefp.pt

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011740/13
à la Commission
Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE)
(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: Suivi du site Natura 2000 de Kaliakra

En réponse à ma question E-003921/2013 concernant la procédure d'infraction ouverte à l'encontre de la Bulgarie pour mauvaise application des directives relatives aux oiseaux et aux habitats naturels dans les zones importantes pour la conservation des oiseaux (ZICO) et les zones de protection spéciale (ZPS) de Kaliakra, la Commission a informé qu'elle déciderait des prochaines étapes sous peu.

Nous sommes à présent en octobre: la traversée de la région de Kaliakra par les espèces migrant en hiver est tout sauf terminée et aucune action n'a été entreprise pour que la région de Kaliakra accède véritablement au statut de ZICO et pour que les habitats endommagés sur le site soient réparés. Dans moins de neuf mois, les citoyens européens vont se rendre aux urnes pour élire leurs représentants au Parlement européen et nombreux sont ceux qui se demandent ce que l'adhésion à l'Union européenne leur apporte réellement. La Commission envisage-t-elle de prendre de nouvelles mesures concernant Kaliakra et démontrer ainsi que l'Union européenne se mobilise pour le droit des citoyens européens à une protection efficace de l'environnement?

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

Le 17 octobre 2013, la Commission a décidé de saisir la Cour de justice d'un recours contre la Bulgarie car elle n'a pas protégé des habitats uniques et des espèces importantes dans la région de Kaliakra (1).

Le 6 novembre 2013, le conseil des ministres bulgare a décidé (2) d'étendre la zone de protection spéciale de «Kaliakra» (BG0002051), instituée en vertu de la directive «Oiseaux» (3), et d'inclure des territoires non désignés dans le réseau Natura 2000. La Commission examine actuellement ces mesures.

---

(1) (http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-966_fr.htm).

(2) http://www.government.bg/cgi-bin/e-cms/vis/vis.pl?s=001&p=0228&n=5320&g.

(3) Directive 2009/147/CE (version codifiée remplaçant la directive 79/409/CEE), JO L 20 du 26.1.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011740/13
to the Commission
Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Follow-up on Kaliakra Natura 2000 site

In its answer to Written Question E-003921/2013 concerning the infringement proceedings brought against Bulgaria for poor application of the birds and habitats directives in relation to the Kaliakra Important Bird Area (IBA) and Special Protection Area (SPA), the Commission stated that it would shortly decide on the next steps.

It is now October and this year's winter migration over Kaliakra has all but finished, with no sign of anything being done to designate properly the Kaliakra IBA and repair the damaged habitats on the site. In less than nine months, EU citizens will be going to the polls to elect their European Parliament representatives, with many wondering what benefits EU membership actually brings them. Does the Commission plan to take further action on the Kaliakra site and demonstrate that the EU stands up for the rights of EU citizens to effective environmental protection?

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

On 17 October 2013, the Commission decided to refer Bulgaria to Court over its failure to protect unique habitats and important species in the Kaliakra region (1).

On 6 November 2013, the Bulgarian Council of Ministers decided (2) to expand the Special Protection Area 'Kaliakra' (BG0002051), designated under the Birds Directive (3) and includes non-designated territories in the Natura 2000 network. The Commission is currently assessing those measures.

---

(1) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-966_en.htm

(2) http://www.government.bg/cgi-bin/e-cms/vis/vis.pl?s=001&p=0228&n=5320&g

(3) Directive 2009/147/EC (codified version replacing Directive 79/409/EEC), OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011742/13
à la Commission
Tokia Saïfi (PPE)
(15 octobre 2013)

Objet: Première évaluation des effets des préférences commerciales autonomes d'urgence pour le Pakistan

Le règlement (UE) n° 1029/2012 du 25 octobre 2012 introduisant des préférences commerciales autonomes d'urgence pour le Pakistan s'applique depuis près d'un an et jusqu'à la fin de l'année 2013.

Lors de son examen au Parlement européen, nous avons demandé à «pouvoir mesurer concrètement les effets des préférences commerciales autonomes sous les aspects de la création d'emplois, de l'éradication de la pauvreté ainsi que du développement durable au sein de la population active et de la population pauvre du Pakistan» (considérant 6 du règlement).

Or, jusqu'à présent, la Commission ne met aucune donnée concrète à disposition, ni n'informe le Parlement de ses opérations de suivi des importations pakistanaises relevant de ce régime en Europe.

La Commission peut-elle:

1. indiquer dans quelles proportions les importations pakistanaises ont bénéficié de ce régime temporaire; et quels secteurs y ont le plus recours?

2. préciser, même sommairement, l'impact économique de ces mesures sur les deux filières européennes principalement concernées, à savoir celles du textile et de l'éthanol?

3. donner des exemples concrets dans lesquels les gains relevant des préférences commerciales ont bien été redistribués en faveur des zones touchées par les inondations?

4. indiquer comment elle pense articuler le passage du régime de ce règlement au régime de SPG +, dont devrait bénéficier le Pakistan?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(27 novembre 2013)

Les préférences commerciales autonomes d'urgence pour le Pakistan ont répondu à l'appel lancé par le Conseil européen le 16 septembre 2010 en vue de soutenir le redressement économique du Pakistan après les inondations de l'été 2010.

À cet égard, les préférences commerciales ne pouvaient pas être affectées aux régions touchées par les inondations, mais visaient à soutenir le rétablissement de l'ensemble du pays, en améliorant ses possibilités commerciales.

On estime que les produits visés par le règlement (UE) n° 1029/2012 représentent environ 100 millions d'euros d'importations supplémentaires par an. Si la Commission surveille ces importations, comme le prévoit le règlement, il est encore trop tôt pour tirer des conclusions sur les effets de ces préférences. Au plus tard le 31 décembre 2015, la Commission fera rapport au Parlement européen et au Conseil sur le fonctionnement et les effets du règlement.

Les préférences commerciales autonomes d'urgence prendront fin le 31 décembre 2013. En ce qui concerne le système de préférences généralisées (SPG +), la Commission a examiné attentivement la demande du Pakistan et a constaté qu'elle satisfaisait aux critères techniques pour bénéficier des préférences du SPG +. La Commission a donc, dans un acte délégué, décidé d'octroyer le SPG + au Pakistan et à neuf autres pays. Cet acte a été transmis le 30 août dernier au Parlement européen pour examen. Si le Parlement ne s'y oppose pas, cet acte entrera en vigueur le jour suivant celui de la fin des préférences commerciales autonomes d'urgence, à savoir le 1er janvier 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011742/13
to the Commission
Tokia Saïfi (PPE)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: First evaluation of the effects of emergency autonomous trade preferences for Pakistan

Regulation (EU) No 1029/2012 of 25 October 2012 introducing emergency autonomous trade preferences for Pakistan has been in force for almost one year and will apply until the end of 2013.

During its examination in Parliament, we asked that 'the effects of the autonomous trade preferences should be able to be measured concretely in terms of job creation, poverty eradication and the sustainable development of Pakistan's working population and poor' (recital 6 of the regulation).

However, so far, the Commission has not made any concrete data available, nor has it informed Parliament of its efforts to monitor Pakistani imports covered by these arrangements in Europe.

Can the Commission:

1. state what proportion of Pakistani imports have benefited from these temporary arrangements and what sectors use them the most;

2. specify, even summarily, the economic impact of these measures on the two main European sectors concerned, namely textiles and ethanol;

3. give concrete examples in which the gains resulting from the trade preferences have actually been distributed in favour of the flood-hit areas;

4. state how it intends to manage the transition from the arrangements under this regulation to the Generalised System of Preferences + (GSP+), from which Pakistan should benefit?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(27 November 2013)

The emergency autonomous trade preferences for Pakistan responded to the call by the European Council of 16 September 2010 to underpin Pakistan economic recovery after the floods of the summer 2010.

In this respect, trade preferences could not be earmarked for the flood affected regions, but were aimed at supporting the recovery of the entire Pakistan, through greater trade opportunities.

It is estimated that the products covered by Regulation (EU) No 1029/2012 would account for around EUR 100 million in additional imports per year. While the Commission monitors those imports, as provided by the regulation, it is considered too early to draw conclusion on the effects of those preferences. The Commission is to report by 31 December 2015 to the European Parliament and the Council on the operation and effects of the regulation.

The emergency autonomous trade preferences will end on 31 December 2013. Concerning the General Preferential Scheme (GSP+), the Commission has carefully examined Pakistan's application and found that it fulfils the relevant technical criteria for receiving GSP+ preferences. The Commission has therefore, in a delegated act, decided to grant GSP+ to Pakistan and nine other countries: this act has been transmitted on 30 August to the European Parliament for its consideration. If not opposed, the act will enter into force on the day following the termination of the emergency autonomous trade preferences i.e. 1 January 2014.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011743/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Snaha o rešpektovanie a dodržiavanie ľudských práv v Kolumbii

Je potešiteľné, že v súčasnej dobe došlo k pozitívnemu posunu a pokroku v otázke mierového procesu v Kolumbii. V uplynulých rokoch však bola proti bývalému prezidentovi Kolumbie Álvarovi Uribemu Vélezovi podaná sťažnosť v mene zástupcov Európskeho parlamentu. Obvinený bol podozrievaný, že sa podieľal na založení militantného zoskupenia. Došlo k závažnému porušovaniu ľudských práv touto štruktúrou. V snahe zmiernenia situácie, resp. navrátenia mieru bolo stanovených 21 bodov, ktoré by umožnili posun vo vyšetrovaní vzniknutej situácie. Dosiaľ však žiaden z nich nebol prijatý. Voči zainteresovaným, na ktorých životy mala nepriaznivá situácia najväčší dopad, boli vznesené hrozby i zastrašovanie. Nedošlo teda k výpovediam, na základe ktorých by bolo možné očakávať posun vo vyšetrovaní.

Akými konkrétnymi opatreniami môže Komisia prispieť k upokojeniu situácie? Ako chce postupovať chrániac životy i ľudské práva všetkých zainteresovaných? A v danej súvislosti možno sa zasadiť za nezávislosť kolumbijskej justície, pokiaľ ide o samotné vyšetrovanie?

Odpoveď vysokej predstaviteľky Únie a podpredsedníčky Komisie Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(4. decembra 2013)

Vysoká predstaviteľka Únie a podpredsedníčka Komisie naďalej pozorne sleduje situáciu v oblasti ľudských práv v Kolumbii, a to s osobitným dôrazom na situáciu obhajcov ľudských práv. Otázky týkajúce sa ľudských práv sú predmetom pokračujúceho dialógu medzi EÚ a Kolumbiou, ktorých posledné stretnutie sa konalo v Bruseli 17. júna 2013. Okrem toho sa delegácia EÚ v Kolumbii a veľvyslanectvá členských štátov pravidelne venujú otázkam týkajúcim sa ľudských práv vrátane situácie jednotlivých obhajcov v rámci svojich kontaktov s kolumbijskými úradmi. Tieto intervencie viedli k viacerým konkrétnym zlepšeniam, ako je napríklad zabezpečenie ochranných opatrení pre obhajcov, ktorí sa stali terčom vyhrážania. Pracovná skupina pre ľudské práva, ktorej predsedá delegácia EÚ, koordinuje činnosti misií EÚ v oblasti ľudských práv. Delegácia EÚ riadi veľký počet projektov, v rámci ktorých sa poskytuje pomoc orgánom verejnej moci a organizáciám občianskej spoločnosti v kritických oblastiach, ako sú systém súdnictva, podpora reintegrácie bývalých členov ozbrojených skupín, násilie páchané na ženách alebo práva pôvodného obyvateľstva. Vážená pani poslankyňa si môže byť istá, že ľudské práva zostávajú jednou z kľúčových priorít politiky EÚ voči Kolumbii a jej spolupráce s touto krajinou.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011743/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Efforts towards respect for and compliance with human rights in Colombia

It is gratifying that there has recently been positive movement and progress in the peace process in Colombia. In recent years, however, complaints have been filed against former Colombian President Álvaro Uribe Vélez on behalf of representatives of the European Parliament. The accused was suspected of helping to set up a militant group. Serious human rights violations were committed by this structure. In an attempt to alleviate the situation, or to be more precise to restore peace, 21 points were established, which would allow progress in investigating the resulting situation. So far, however, none of them have been adopted. Threats and intimidation have been employed against those interested parties whose lives have been most affected by the unfavourable situation. There have thus been no statements on the basis of which progress might be expected in the investigation.

What concrete steps can the Commission take to help calm the situation? How does it intend to proceed in protecting the lives and human rights of all interested parties? Can the independence of the Colombian judiciary be counted on in the given circumstances, as far as the investigation itself is concerned?

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

The HR/VP continues to follow closely the human rights situation in Colombia, with particular emphasis being given to the situation of human rights defenders. Human rights issues are the subject of an ongoing dialogue between the EU and Colombia whose last meeting took place in Brussels on 17 June 2013. In addition, the Delegation of the EU to Colombia and Member States' Embassies regularly raise human rights issues, including the situation of individual defenders, in their contacts with the Colombian authorities. These interventions have led to a number of concrete improvements, for example the provision of protection measures to defenders having received threats. A working group on human rights, chaired by the EU Delegation, is coordinating the work on human rights of EU missions. Lastly, the EU Delegation manages a significant number of projects providing assistance to both public authorities and civil society organisations in critical areas such as the justice system, support to the reintegration of former members of armed groups, violence against women or the rights of indigenous people. The Honourable Member can also rest assured that human rights will remain one of the key priorities of the EU's policy towards Colombia and of its cooperation with the country.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011744/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Sociálny dumping a obmedzenie voľného pohybu osôb v EÚ

Ministri vnútra štyroch členských štátov, a to Veľkej Británie, Nemecka, Rakúska a Holandska nastolili požiadavku na obmedzenie voľného pohybu osôb v členských krajinách Únie. Ministri týchto západoeurópskych krajín žiadajú, aby mali možnosť vypovedať z územia svojho štátu obyvateľov iných členských štátov, a to v prípade, že budú zneužívať svoje právo na voľný pohyb na tzv. sociálny dumping, čo je podľa presnej definície „prax výhodného využitia nízkych pracovných nákladov, ktorá vedie k zníženiu sociálneho zabezpečenia a iných príspevkov, priťahujúca podnikanie z iných krajín a vytvárajúca nekalú súťaž“.

Ministri tvrdia, že príslušníci niektorých etnických skupín dokonca využívajú právo voľného pohybu, aby mohli v iných štátoch požiadať o sociálnu podporu, čo následne vo výraznej miere zaťažuje rozpočtové možnosti.

Bude sa Komisia požiadavkou Veľkej Británie, Nemecka, Rakúska a Holandska zaoberať?

Ak áno, kedy môžeme očakávať oficiálne stanovisko?

Je podľa názoru Komisie fenomén sociálneho dumpingu reálnou hrozbou?

Odpoveď pána Andora v mene Komisie
(9. decembra 2013)

Dňa 23. apríla 2013 ministri vnútra Holandska, Nemecka, Rakúska a Spojeného kráľovstva napísali predsedníctvu Rady pre spravodlivosť a vnútorné veci list, v ktorom vyjadrujú svoje obavy súvisiace s tým, ako občania EÚ využívajú svoje právo na voľný pohyb.

Ministri neodkazujú na fenomén „sociálneho dumpingu“, ale tvrdia, že niektorí občania EÚ predstavujú pre systémy sociálnej pomoci hostiteľských krajín záťaž alebo „zneužívajú“ právo na voľný pohyb a požiadali členské štáty, z ktorých títo občania pochádzajú, aby zlepšili miestne životné podmienky a náležitým spôsobom na to využívali fondy EÚ.

Vo svojej odpovedi Komisia upriamila pozornosť na dôkazy, ktoré ukazujú, že väčšina mobilných občanov EÚ sa sťahuje do iného členského štátu za prácou a že mobilní občania EÚ nevyužívajú sociálnu podporu o nič viac ako štátni príslušníci daných štátov (1). Dňa 25. novembra (2) predložila aj oznámenie, ktoré sa má zaoberať obavami niektorých členských štátov a zameriava sa na objasnenie práv a povinností občanov EÚ, ako aj podmienok a obmedzení vyplývajúcich z právnych predpisov EÚ. Stanovuje sa v ňom päť opatrení, ktorých cieľom je pomôcť členským štátom a ich miestnym orgánom plne uplatňovať a využívať právne predpisy a nástroje EÚ. K nim patrí aj maximálne využívanie štrukturálnych a investičných fondov EÚ.

Jedným aspektom opatrení Komisie je návrh smernice na uľahčenie lepšieho vnútroštátneho presadzovania práv mobilných pracovníkov EÚ (3). Toto opatrenie by okrem iného zabezpečilo lepšie presadzovanie rovnakého zaobchádzania s domácimi a mobilnými pracovníkmi EÚ. Tým by sa členským štátom poskytol ďalší nástroj na boj proti nečestným praktikám, ku ktorým patrí napr. to, že sa mobilným pracovníkom EÚ platí nižšia hodinová sadzba ako domácim pracovníkom.

---

(1) „Vyšetrovacia analýza týkajúca sa vplyvu, ktorý majú nároky neaktívnych migrantov v rámci EÚ na osobitné nepríspevkové peňažné dávky a zdravotnú starostlivosť poskytovanú na základe pobytu, na systémy sociálneho zabezpečenia členských štátov“, ktorú vypracovala spoločnosť ICF GHK spolu s Milieu Ltd., 14. októbra 2013, je k dispozícii na:
http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=89&newsId=1980&furtherNews=yes

(2) *Voľný pohyb občanov EÚ a ich rodín: Päť opatrení, ktoré prinesú zmenu*, COM(2013) 837 final z 25. novembra 2013.

(3) Návrh smernice Európskeho parlamentu a Rady o opatreniach umožňujúcich uplatňovanie práv priznaných pracovníkom v zmysle voľného pohybu pracovníkov, [COM(2013) 236 z 26. apríla 2013].

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011744/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Social dumping and restrictions on the free movement of persons in the EU

The interior ministers of four Member States — the UK, Germany, Austria and the Netherlands — have tabled a request for restrictions on the free movement of persons in the EU Member States. The ministers of these Western European countries are requesting the possibility of removing from their national territory the inhabitants of other Member States who have abused the right to free movement for so-called social dumping, which is specifically defined as 'The practice of taking advantage of lower labour costs in certain countries, which leads to lower social security and other contributions, thus attracting business away from other countries and thereby creating unfair competition'.

The ministers claim that members of some ethnic groups even exploit the right to freedom of movement to apply for social support in other states, which then places a substantial burden on budgets.

Will the Commission respond to the request of the UK, Germany, Austria and the Netherlands?

If so, when can we expect an official opinion?

In the Commission's view, is the phenomenon of social dumping a real threat?

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

On 23 April 2013 the Interior Ministers of Austria, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom wrote to the Presidency of the Justice and Home Affairs Council, setting out concerns regarding EU citizens' use of their right of free movement.

The Ministers did not refer to the phenomenon of 'social dumping' but alleged that certain EU citizens place a burden on host countries' social assistance systems or 'abuse' the right of free movement and asked that Member States of origin improve local living conditions and make proper use of EU funds.

In response, the Commission has underlined evidence showing that the majority of mobile EU citizens move to another Member State to work and that EU mobile citizens are not more intensive users of welfare than nationals (1). It also presented a communication (2) on 25 November which aims to clarify EU citizens' rights and obligations as well as the conditions and limitations under EC law, and aims to address the concerns raised by some Member States. It sets out five actions to help Member States and their local authorities to apply EC laws and tools to their full potential. This includes the full use of EU structural and investment funds.

One aspect of the Commission's actions is the proposal for a directive to facilitate better national enforcement of EU mobile workers' rights (3). This measure would ensure *inter alia* better enforcement of equal treatment for national and EU mobile workers. It would therefore provide the Member States with an additional tool for combating rogue practices, such as paying EU mobile workers less than the rate paid to national workers.

---

(1) 'A fact finding analysis on the impact on the Member States' social security systems of the entitlements of non-active intra-EU migrants to special non-contributory cash benefits and healthcare granted on the basis of residence', ICF-GHK and Milieu Ltd (14 October 2013), available at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=89&newsId=1980&furtherNews=yes.

(2) Free movement of EU citizens and their families: Five actions to make a difference, COM(2013) 837 final of 25 November 2013.

(3) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and the Council on measures facilitating the exercise of rights conferred on workers in the context of freedom of movement of workers (COM(2013) 236 of 26 April 2013).

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011745/13

Komisii

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)

(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Podfinancovaný výskum vo východnej Európe

Verejné financovanie výskumu a vývoja vo východoeurópskych krajinách je nedostatočné. Táto skutočnosť výrazne ohrozuje pokrok smerom k vedomostnej spoločnosti, ktorý je nesmierne dôležitý. Je totiž dôležité, aby krajiny východnej časti Európskej únie neboli známe iba svojou lacnou pracovnou silou, ale najmä svojimi vysoko kvalifikovanými odborníkmi a technologicky vyspelými firmami, ktoré budú v oblasti výskumu a inovácií dosahovať pozitívne výsledky. Štatistiky Európskej únie však reálne vypovedajú o skutočnosti, že východoeurópske krajiny sú v súvislosti s financovaním výskumu stále na chvoste. Štúdia Európskej komisie, ktorá sa zaoberá napríklad medicínskym výskumom, hovorí o tom, že pôvodných 15 členských štátov získalo až 34-krát viac finančných zdrojov ako nové členské krajiny.

Plánuje Komisia zamerať sa na lepšie financovanie výskumu v krajinách východnej Európy? Ak áno, aké konkrétne opatrenia plánuje v tejto súvislosti prijať?

Odpoveď pani Geogheganovej-Quinnovej v mene Komisie

(3. decembra 2013)

Prehľad výsledkov výskumu a inovácií v Únii (1) vo svojom najnovšom vydaní potvrdzuje pretrvávanie významných rozdielov v inováciách medzi 28 členskými štátmi EÚ.

Bolo identifikovaných viacero faktorov, ktorými je možné tieto rozdiely vysvetliť. Je medzi nimi okrem iného aj nízka úroveň národných a regionálnych investícií do výskumu a inovácií a nie celkom efektívne vnútroštátne výskumné a inovačné systémy.

Siedmy rámcový program v oblasti výskumu a technického rozvoja (RP7) (2) už obsahuje cielené aktivity vrátane programu výskumného potenciálu (3), témy s osobitným dôrazom alebo dosahom na menej výkonné členské štáty, štúdie o dôvodoch slabšej výkonnosti a aktivity zamerané na zvyšovanie povedomia a vytváranie kontaktov.

Cieľom nového rámcového programu pre výskum a inovácie (2014 – 2020) Horizont 2020 je dopĺňať investície realizované prostredníctvom Kohézneho fondu, pomáhať uvoľňovať potenciál pre excelentnosť a inovácie v členských štátoch, ktoré v tejto oblasti zaostávajú, a posilňovať konkurencieschopnosť EÚ. Tento cieľ bude realizovať prostredníctvom nových opatrení spomenutých vo svojej časti IIIa (šírenie excelentnosti a rozšírenie účasti), ako napríklad zriaďovanie katedier Európskeho výskumného priestoru (4), program spolupráce a partnerstiev (5), európska spolupráca v oblasti vedy a techniky (COST) (6) a nástroj politickej podpory.

Súbežne s programom Horizont 2020 zvýšia rozsah pre stimuláciu a motiváciu výskumných a inovačných investícií na národnej a regionálnej úrovni v kontexte inteligentnej špecializácie aj programy Kohézneho fondu na obdobie 2014 – 2020.

Týmto spôsobom bude Komisia aj naďalej motivovať členské štáty, aby viac investovali do výskumu a inovácií s cieľom zabezpečiť, aby ich výskumné organizácie dosiahli úroveň excelentnosti, ktorá im umožní zapájať sa aktívnejšie do programu Horizont 2020 a prispievať do širších cieľov stratégie Európa 2020 pre rast a zamestnanosť.

---

(1) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/innovation/facts-figures-analysis/innovation-scoreboard/
(2) Siedmy rámcový program v oblasti výskumu, technického rozvoja a demonštračných činností (RP7, 2007 – 2010).
(3) http://ec.europa.eu/research/regions/index_en.cfm?pg=research_potential&lg=en
(4) http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/era-chairs_en.html
(5) http://www.biginnovationcentre.com/Assets/Docs/Triple%20Helix/Presentations/Workshops/Corpakis.pdf
(6) http://www.cost.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011745/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Underfunding of research in Eastern Europe

There is insufficient public funding of research and development in East European countries. This fact significantly threatens progress towards an information society, which is hugely important. It is important that the countries of Eastern Europe are known not only for their cheap workforce, but mainly for their highly qualified specialists and technologically-advanced firms, achieving positive results in the area of research and innovation. EU statistics clearly show, however, that East European countries consistently lag behind when it comes to research funding. A European Commission study addressing medical research, for example, states that the original 15 Member States obtained as much as 34 times the funding obtained by the new Member States.

Is the Commission planning to focus on better funding for research in East European countries? If so, what specific steps does it plan to take in this context?

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

In its latest edition, the Innovation Union Scoreboard (1) confirms that significant innovation gaps persist between the 28 EU Member States.

A number of factors that help explain these gaps have been identified. These include *inter alia* low levels of national and regional investment in research and innovation and not fully efficient national research and innovation systems.

FP7 (2) already features targeted activities including the Research Potential Programme, (3) topics with a special interest for or impact on less performing Member States, studies on reasons for weaker performance, and awareness raising and networking activities.

Horizon 2020, the next Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020), will strive to complement investments made through Cohesion funding, to help unlock excellence and innovation in less performing RDI Member States, and to reinforce EU competitiveness. It will do so through new measures under its Part IIIa (Spreading Excellence and Widening Participation) such as ERA Chairs, (4) Teaming and Twinning, (5) COST, (6) and the Policy Support Facility.

In parallel with Horizon 2020, Cohesion funding programmes for 2014-2020 will increase the scope for stimulating and incentivising research and innovation investment at national and regional level in a context of smart specialisation.

In this way, the Commission continues to encourage Member States to invest more in research and innovation so as to ensure that their research organisations reach a level of excellence allowing them to participate more actively in Horizon 2020 and to contribute to the broader objectives of the Europe 2020 strategy for growth and jobs.

---

(1) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/innovation/facts-figures-analysis/innovation-scoreboard/
(2) The Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2010).
(3) http://ec.europa.eu/research/regions/index_en.cfm?pg=research_potential&lg=en
(4) http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/era-chairs_en.html
(5) http://www.biginnovationcentre.com/Assets/Docs/Triple%20Helix/Presentations/Workshops/Corpakis.pdf
(6) http://www.cost.eu/

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011746/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Hudobné práva

Jednou z mnohých problematík preberaných v uplynulých dňoch v Bruseli bola snaha poskytnúť internetovým užívateľom väčší prístup k hudbe on-line. Novoprijaté pravidlá zavádzajú čiastočnú reformu v otázke spravovania kolektívnych práv. Toto je v súčasnosti v rukách národných organizácií. Niektoré z nich ale, ako sa ukázalo, fungujú pomerne neefektívne a netransparentne. V dnešných dňoch však už internet nie je vnímaný ako hrozba. Naopak, ako – okrem iného – napríklad zdroj hudby pre užívateľov. Tí potrebujú lepší prístup. Nie prekážky a sankcie. Súčasne však nesmú byť dotknuté práva umelcov.

Ako je možné vhodne zabezpečiť, aby i v prostredí internetu boli dostatočne uspokojované potreby užívateľov, no zároveň dosiahnuť, aby reforma nepoškodzovala záujmy a práva umelcov?

Odpoveď pána Barniera v mene Komisie
(13. decembra 2013)

Európsky parlament a Rada v novembri 2013 dosiahli dohodu trialógu, pokiaľ ide o návrh smernice o kolektívnej správe autorských práv a o poskytovaní multiteritoriálnych licencií na práva na využívanie hudobných diel online, ktorý vypracovala Komisia.

Vďaka smernici sa po jej prijatí zvýši efektívnosť a zlepší transparentnosť organizácií kolektívnej správy a poskytovatelia služieb online budú môcť od autorských organizácií kolektívnej správy ľahšie získať multiteritoriálne licencie na využívanie hudobných diel. Nové pravidlá, ktoré sa začnú uplatňovať dva roky po prijatí smernice, uľahčia zavedenie online hudobných služieb a ďalších online služieb využívajúcich hudobné diela a ďalej rozšíria legálnu ponuku online hudby v prospech spotrebiteľov aj umelcov.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011746/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Music rights

The attempt to provide Internet users with greater access to online music is one of many issues taken up recently in Brussels. Newly-adopted rules bring partial reform to the issue of administering collective rights. This is currently in the hands of national organisations. Some of these organisations, however, appear to operate in a relatively inefficient and non-transparent way. Nowadays, though, the Internet is no longer seen as a threat. On the contrary, it is seen — among other things — as a source of music for users. Users need better access. They do not need obstacles and sanctions. At the same time, however, artists' rights must not be affected.

How can we appropriately ensure that users' needs are sufficiently met in the context of the Internet, while at the same time ensuring that reform does not undermine the interests and rights of artists?

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

In November 2013 the European Parliament and the Council reached a trilogue agreement on the Commission's proposal for a directive on collective rights management and multi-territorial licensing of rights in musical works for online uses.

Once adopted, the directive will improve the efficiency and transparency of collective management organisations and will make it easier for online service providers to obtain multi-territorial licences from authors' collective management organisations for the use of musical works. The new rules, which will become applicable two years after the adoption of the directive, will facilitate the launch of online music services and other online services using musical works. They will further increase the legal offer of online music for the benefit of consumers and artists alike.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011747/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Demokratické reformy v Bielorusku

V ostatných takmer dvoch desaťročiach bolo prijatých viacero uznesení týkajúcich sa porušovania ľudských práv v Bielorusku. Posledné prijaté odporúčanie sa však usiluje o širší pohľad na problematiku vzájomných vzťahov EÚ – Bielorusko a zvažuje implementáciu novej stratégie. V tejto súvislosti je bezpodmienečné a okamžité prepustenie a rehabilitácia všetkých politických väzňov absolútnym predpokladom pre obnovenie dobrých vzťahov. Ak politickí väzni budú prepustení, je možné obnoviť vzájomný dialóg. Žiaľ, porušovanie ľudských práv v Bielorusku pretrváva a je stále závažnou otázkou. Postupná zmena a nastolenie demokratických reforiem v krajine by bolo jednoduchšie, pokiaľ by bolo podporené vedúcimi predstaviteľmi štátu. Zmeny sú však iniciované predovšetkým občianskou spoločnosťou.

Je v možnostiach Komisie primäť bieloruských štátnych predstaviteľov k spolupráci?

Akými opatreniami by mohla Komisia jednak zmierniť napätú situáciu v krajine a na strane druhej prispieť k obnoveniu vzájomného dialógu medzi EÚ a Bieloruskom?

Odpoveď pána Füleho v mene Komisie
(17. decembra 2013)

EÚ je naďalej verná politike kritickej angažovanosti voči Bielorusku. Zahŕňa to spoluprácu na multilaterálnej úrovni v rámci Východného partnerstva, technické dialógy o osobitných témach spoločného záujmu, udržiavanie diplomatických stykov, ako aj podporu občianskej spoločnosti a obyvateľom Bieloruska všeobecne. Európsky dialóg s bieloruskou spoločnosťou o modernizácii predstavuje fórum pre slobodnú výmenu nápadov pre moderné Bielorusko.

EÚ sa v tejto súvislosti vyjadruje veľmi jasne: naďalej sa obáva, že dochádza k porušovaniu ľudských práv, a preto stále platia reštriktívne opatrenia, ktoré zaviedla proti mnohým osobám a subjektom.

EÚ nebude zásadne meniť svoj súčasný postoj a neobnoví politické vzťahy s Bieloruskom, pokiaľ nebudú prepustení politickí väzni a nebudú obnovené ich politické a občianske práva. Širší rozvoj bilaterálnych vzťahov v rámci Východného partnerstva závisí od pokroku, ktorý Bielorusko dosiahne v oblasti dodržiavania zásad demokracie, právneho štátu a ľudských práv.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011747/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Democratic reforms in Belarus

For almost two decades, numerous resolutions have been adopted in relation to human rights violations in Belarus. The last recommendation to be adopted, however, strives for a broader perspective on the issue of EU-Belarus relations, and considers implementation of a new strategy. In this context, the unconditional and immediate release and rehabilitation of all political prisoners is an absolute precondition for the resumption of good relations. If political prisoners are released, dialogue can be resumed. Unfortunately, human rights violations continue in Belarus, and this is still a major issue. Gradual change and the establishment of democratic reforms in the country would be easier if supported by the country's leadership. The changes are mainly initiated, however, by civil society.

Can the Commission get the Belarus leadership to cooperate?

How might the Commission on the one hand alleviate the tense situation in the country and on the other hand be instrumental in the resumption of dialogue between the EU and Belarus?

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

The EU remains committed to a policy of critical engagement towards Belarus. This includes cooperation through the multilateral track of the Eastern Partnership, technical dialogues on specific topics of common interest, maintaining diplomatic contacts, as well as support to civil society and to the Belarusian population at large. The European Dialogue for Modernisation with Belarusian society provides a forum for the free exchange of ideas for a modern Belarus.

The EU continues to be outspoken about its concerns with regards to the human rights situation, and EU restrictive measures against a number of persons and entities remain in place.

The EU will not fundamentally change its current policy and restore political relations with Belarus unless political prisoners are released and their political and civil rights re-instated. The broader development of bilateral relations under the Eastern Partnership is conditional on progress towards respect by Belarus for the principles of democracy, the rule of law and human rights.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011748/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Napätá situácia v Turecku

Nepokoje v Turecku sa začali koncom mája v Istanbule, keď skupinka niekoľkých desiatok environmentalistov protestovala proti plánu vyrúbať stromy v parku Gezi s cieľom vybudovať nákupné centrum. Protestujúci boli napadnutí políciou a nepokoje následne nabrali na rozmere a intenzite. Žiaľ, došlo i k obetiam na životoch, nemálo obyvateľov bolo vážne zranených. Je poľutovaniahodné, že namiesto snáh o zmierenie a namiesto toho, aby sa poprední politickí predstavitelia usilovali chrániť práva občanov a rešpektovali slobodu prejavu, sú podnikané kroky voči demonštrantom. Nezriedka sprevádzané i zjavne neprimerane použitou silou, na čom sa zhodli i mnohí zahraniční pozorovatelia. Dodržiavanie ľudských práv, zachovanie ľudskej dôstojnosti i rešpektovanie slobody prejavu patrí k základným atribútom v modernej demokratickej občianskej spoločnosti.

Akými konkrétnymi postupmi by sa mohla Komisia pričiniť o nastolenie mierového stavu, resp. dohliadať na to, aby ľudské a demokratické princípy v Turecku boli dodržiavané a rešpektované?

Odpoveď pána Füleho v mene Komisie
(3. decembra 2013)

Komisia vo svojej nedávnej správe o pokroku Turecka z roku 2013 (1) obšírne informovala o svojom znepokojení v súvislosti s protestmi v máji a júni 2013, ktoré sa týkali mestského rozvojového projektu v parku Gezi v Istanbule.

Tieto udalosti zvýrazňujú potrebu, aby EÚ zintenzívnila svoje kontakty s Tureckom, ktoré je pre EÚ kľúčovou krajinou, najmä pokiaľ ide o otázky týkajúce sa základných práv a slobôd. Je v záujme Turecka aj EÚ, aby sa odsúhlasili a čo najskôr oznámili Turecku kritériá na otvorenie kapitol 23 – Súdnictvo a základné práva a 24 – Spravodlivosť, sloboda a bezpečnosť s cieľom umožniť začatie rokovaní o týchto dvoch kapitolách. Významne by to prispelo k zabezpečeniu toho, aby EÚ a jej normy zostali smerodajnými kritériami pre reformy v Turecku.

---

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011748/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Tense situation in Turkey

The unrest in Turkey began at the end of May in Istanbul, when a group of several dozen environmentalists protested against a plan to chop down trees in Gezi park in order to build a shopping centre. The protestors were attacked by the police, and the unrest subsequently grew in scale and intensity. Sadly, some people even lost their lives, and a considerable number were badly injured. It is regrettable that, instead of efforts towards reconciliation, and instead of prominent political leaders seeking to protect citizens' rights and respect freedom of expression, steps are being taken against the demonstrators, frequently accompanied by the use of clearly disproportionate force, a fact which many foreign observers have also agreed on. Respect for human rights, the preservation of human dignity and respect for freedom of expression are fundamental attributes of a modern democratic civil society.

What concrete steps can the Commission take to establish peace, or to ensure respect for and compliance with human and democratic principles in Turkey?

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

The Commission has reported extensively in the recent Turkey 2013 Progress Report (1) on its concerns related to the May and June 2013 protests related to an urban development project in Gezi Park in Istanbul.

These events have highlighted the need for the EU to enhance its engagement with Turkey, a key country for the EU, in particular on issues related to fundamental rights and freedoms. It is in the interest of both Turkey and the EU that the opening benchmarks for chapters 23-Judiciary and Fundamental Rights, and 24-Justice, Freedom and Security are agreed upon and communicated to Turkey as soon as possible with a view to enabling the opening of negotiations under these two chapters. This would significantly contribute to ensuring that the EU and its standards remain the benchmark for reforms in Turkey.

---

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

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011749/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Migrácia obyvateľov v EÚ

Sloboda pohybu v rámci členských štátov EÚ je nepochybne jedným z najvýznamnejších plusov Únie ako celku. Napriek všetkým snahám však európski občania uplatňujúci svoje právo na voľný pohyb môžu byť konfrontovaní – podobne ako príslušníci tretích krajín – so situáciami, keď toto právo nie je rešpektované, a to i napriek existencii rôznych právnych rámcov a ochranných systémov. Pre členské štáty Únie zo zákona plynie povinnosť chrániť práva každého jednotlivca na svojom území. Zdá sa však, že členské štáty ponechali prisťahovalectvo príliš dlho bez jasnej koncepcie. Nedostatočný prístup k zamestnaniu, kvalitnému vzdelaniu a mnohým ďalším službám trápi migrantov čoraz viac. Diskriminácia, xenofóbia, rasizmus, administratívne bariéry, chudoba a sociálne vylúčenie brániace migrantom v prístupe na trh práce, k bývaniu, ku vzdelávaniu, zdravotným a ďalším službám – toto všetko sú citlivé a naliehavé témy vyžadujúce si pozornosť európskych predstaviteľov.

Akým spôsobom prispievajú prijaté opatrenia Komisie k integrácii prisťahovaleckých skupín obyvateľstva?

Odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie
(8. januára 2014)

Účinné integračné opatrenia majú zásadný význam z hľadiska posilnenia účasti migrantov na pracovnom trhu, vzdelávaní, ako aj politickom a kultúrnom živote. Za opatrenia zamerané na integráciu štátnych príslušníkov tretích krajín zodpovedajú predovšetkým členské štáty. Ich úsilie však môže EÚ podporiť prostredníctvom svojich nástrojov formou výmeny skúseností, koordinácie politík, monitorovania a financovania (článok 79 ods. 4 ZFEÚ).

V roku 2011 bola predstavená európska agenda v oblasti integrácie, ktorá sa zameriava na rastúcu účasť migrantov na sociálno-ekonomickom, kultúrnom a politickom živote. V spolupráci s členskými štátmi Komisia na základe agendy vypracovala ukazovatele na monitorovanie výsledkov integračných politík a „moduly“ na podporu integračných metód. Komisia a Európsky hospodársky a sociálny výbor dvakrát do roka organizujú Európske fórum pre integráciu s cieľom získať názor občianskej spoločnosti. Nedávno Komisia pozvala miestnych a regionálnych zástupcov, aby sa pripojili k fóru.

Pokiaľ ide o občanov EÚ s bydliskom v inom členskom štáte než v tom, ktorého sú štátnymi príslušníkmi, ktorí pri prístupe k vzdelávacím a zamestnaneckým službám, finančným službám, ako aj k rodinným prídavkom a príspevkom na deti narážajú na prekážky, Komisia naďalej podporuje členské štáty pri zavádzaní integrovaných stratégií aktívneho začleňovania (1).

Komisia okrem toho plánuje pomáhať miestnym orgánom deliť sa o najlepšie postupy a do konca roka 2013 preto vypracuje štúdiu hodnotiacu vplyv voľného pohybu v šiestich veľkých mestách, ktoré vyvinuli stratégie na presadzovanie a uľahčovanie voľného pohybu a sociálneho začleňovania mobilných občanov EÚ. V spolupráci s Výborom regiónov takisto vo februári 2014 usporiada konferenciu so zástupcami regionálnych a miestnych orgánov.

---

(1) Oznámenie Komisie z 3. októbra 2008 o odporúčaní o aktívnom začleňovaní ľudí vylúčených z trhu práce, KOM(2008) 639 v konečnom znení; vyššie citované oznámenie Komisie z 20. februára 2013 K sociálnym investíciám do rastu a súdržnosti – vrátane realizácie Európskeho sociálneho fondu v rokoch 2014 – 2020; oznámenie Komisie z 5. apríla 2011 Rámec EÚ pre vnútroštátne stratégie integrácie Rómov do roku 2020, KOM(2011) 173 v konečnom znení.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011749/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Migration within the EU

Freedom of movement within the EU Member States is undoubtedly one of the major benefits of the Union as a whole. Despite all efforts, however, European citizens exercising their right to free movement may be confronted — just like third-country nationals — with situations where this right is not respected, despite the existence of various legal frameworks and protection systems. It is a legal obligation for EU Member States to defend the rights of all individuals on their territory. It seems, however, that Member States have avoided a clear strategy on immigration for too long. Migrants increasingly suffer from lack of access to employment, high-quality education and many other services. Discrimination, xenophobia, racism, administrative barriers, poverty and social exclusion that prevents migrants from accessing the labour market, housing, education, health and other services — these are all sensitive and urgent topics requiring the attention of European representatives.

How will the measures adopted by the Commission contribute to the integration of immigrant groups?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(8 January 2014)

Effective integration measures are vital for enhancing migrants' participation in the labour market, education, and political and cultural life. Member States are primarily responsible for integration measures targeting third-country nationals but their efforts can be supported by EU instruments, through exchange of experience, policy coordination, monitoring and funding (Article 79.4 TFEU).

A European Agenda for integration was presented in 2011, which focuses on increasing migrants' socioeconomic, cultural and political participation. Following the Agenda, the Commission, in cooperation with the Member States, has developed indicators to monitor results of integration policies and 'modules' to support integration practices. The Commission, together with the European Economic and Social Committee, organises twice a year a European Integration Forum, to consult with civil society. The Commission has recently invited local and regional representatives to join the Forum.

As regards EU citizens residing in another Member State than their own who may face obstacles in accessing education, employment services, financial services, and family and child benefits, the Commission continues to support Member States in the implementation of integrated active inclusion strategies (1).

The Commission further intends to help local authorities to share best practices, by producing, by the end of 2013, a study evaluating the impact of free movement in six major cities that have developed policies to promote and facilitate the free movement and social inclusion of mobile EU citizens, and by organising, in cooperation with the Committee of the Regions, a conference in February 2014 with representatives of regional and local authorities.

---

(1) Commission Communication of 3 October 2008 on a recommendation on the active inclusion of people excluded from the labour market, COM(2008) 639 final; Commission Communication of 20 February 2013 Towards Social Investment for Growth and Cohesion — including implementing the European Social Fund 2014-2020, cited above; Commission Communication of 5 April 2011 An EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020, COM(2011) 173 final.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011750/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Reforma európskej integračnej politiky

Európska únia je založená na rešpektovaní základných ľudských práv, spravodlivosti a sociálnej starostlivosti. Je nevyhnutné zabezpečiť, aby tieto práva boli k dispozícii všetkým, ktorí žijú a pracujú v EÚ, bez ohľadu na to, odkiaľ pochádzajú. V súčasnosti sa predovšetkým nezamestnanosť, nesúlad medzi požadovanými a ponúkanými zručnosťami na trhu práce, práca za nízku mzdu alebo predčasné ukončenie školskej dochádzky týka pomerne početného množstva prisťahovalcov. Javí sa preto ako vhodné, aby sa pri reforme európskej integračnej politiky zároveň venovala pozornosť i riadenému prisťahovalectvu.

Európsky rok občanov 2013 mimoriadne nabáda k riešeniu i tejto problematiky. Aké konkrétne opatrenia plánuje Komisia prijať v najbližšom čase?

Odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie
(18. decembra 2013)

EÚ musí zabezpečiť spravodlivé zaobchádzanie so štátnymi príslušníkmi tretích krajín s pobytom na území jej členských štátov. Ľudské práva sú jednou z kľúčových oblastí záujmu EÚ a zabezpečenie nediskriminačného prístupu k zamestnaniu a iným oblastiam života je pre integráciu migrantov rozhodujúce.

Európsky rok občanov 2013 poskytol príležitosti na dôkladné prediskutovanie otázok mobility. Najmä Aliancia pre Európsky rok občanov, ktorá je koalíciou združujúcou organizácie občianskej spoločnosti v celej EÚ, pracovala na „podpore inkluzívneho občianstva pre osoby s pobytom v EÚ“. V tejto súvislosti sa nedávne 10. zasadnutie Európskeho fóra pre integráciu zaoberalo demokratickou účasťou migrantov a úsilím o inkluzívnejšie európske občianstvo (1).

Bol vytvorený právny rámec EÚ týkajúci sa podmienok vstupu a pobytu a spoločný súbor práv štátnych príslušníkov tretích krajín (prostredníctvom smerníc o zlúčení rodiny, osobách s dlhodobým pobytom, študentoch, výskumných pracovníkoch, vysokokvalifikovaných migrantoch a o jednotnom povolení na pobyt a prácu v EÚ). Komisia zintenzívňuje svoje úsilie, aby zabezpečila správne vykonávanie týchto nástrojov.

Migrácia je úzko spätá s rôznymi oblasťami politiky. Synergie medzi migračnou politikou na jednej strane a politikou zamestnanosti, sociálnou a integračnou politikou na druhej strane by sa mali zintenzívniť. Európska agenda v oblasti integrácie z roku 2011 (2) sa sústreďuje na zvýšenie účasti migrantov na zamestnanosti, vzdelávaní a spoločnosti ako celku. Komisia bude s týmto cieľom aj naďalej podporovať opatrenia členských štátov v oblasti integrácie prostredníctvom výmeny znalostí, monitorovania a koordinácie, okrem iného aj prostredníctvom európskych fondov (Európskeho fondu pre integráciu až do roku 2013 a v budúcnosti Fondu pre azyl a migráciu).

---

(1) http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/en/policy/legal.cfm#

(2) KOM(2011) 455 v konečnom znení.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011750/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)

(15 October 2013)

Subject: Reform of European integration policy

The European Union is based on respect for fundamental human rights, justice and welfare. It is essential to ensure that these rights are available to everyone living and working in the EU, regardless of where they come from. At present, unemployment, the imbalance between the skills demanded and the skills offered on the labour market, low-pay work and early school leaving affect a relatively large number of immigrants in particular. It therefore seems appropriate, when reforming European integration policy, also to pay attention to managed migration.

The European Year of Citizens 2013 especially encourages a solution to this problem. What concrete measures does the Commission plan to adopt in the immediate future?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission

(18 December 2013)

The EU must ensure fair treatment of third-country nationals who reside on the territory of its Member States. Human rights lie at the heart of the EU and access for migrants to employment and other areas of life in a non-discriminatory way is essential to their integration.

The European Year of Citizens 2013 has provided opportunities to discuss mobility issues in depth. In particular, the European Year of Citizens Alliance, an EU-wide coalition of civil society organisations has worked on ‘promoting an inclusive citizenship for EU residents’. In this context, the recent 10th meeting of the European Integration Forum addressed the democratic participation of migrants and efforts towards a more inclusive citizenship (1).

An EU legal framework has been developed regarding the conditions of entry and stay and a common set of rights of third-country nationals (through the directives on family reunification, long-term residents, students, researchers highly qualified migrants and a single permit for residence and work in the EU). The Commission is stepping up its efforts to ensure correct implementation of these instruments.

Migration is closely linked to different policy areas. Synergies between migration policies, on the one hand, and employment, social and integration policies, on the other hand, should be increased. The European Agenda for Integration of 2011 (2) puts focus on enhancing migrants’ participation in employment, education and society at large. To this aim, the Commission continues supporting Member States’ integration measures through exchange of knowledge, monitoring and coordination, including through the use of European funds (the European Integration Fund up until 2013 and the Asylum and Migration Fund in the future).

---

(1) http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/en/policy/legal.cfm#

(2) COM(2011) 455 final.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011751/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Boj proti podvodom v EÚ

Prostredníctvom pozície Európskeho prokurátora bude možné účinnejšie i cezhranične bojovať proti podvodom. Európsky úrad pre boj proti podvodom (OLAF) dosiaľ totiž nesmie viesť trestné vyšetrovanie. Súčasne, odporúčania úradu OLAF až príliš často nie sú rešpektované príslušnými orgánmi členských štátov. I toto je jeden z dôvodov, prečo môže byť Európsky verejný prokurátor s jasne vymedzenými kompetenciami pozitívnym prínosom v boji proti nekalým praktikám a nezrovnalostiam vzťahujúcim sa na európske financie a rozpočet.

Pokiaľ ide o spomenuté nedostatočné rešpektovanie odporúčaní úradu OLAF členskými štátmi, zvažuje Komisia vyvinúť iniciatívu smerujúcu k posilneniu spolupráce medzi justičnými orgánmi jednotlivých členských krajín?

Odpoveď pána Šemetu v mene Komisie
(10. januára 2014)

Otázka nadväzujúcich opatrení k odporúčaniam Európskeho úradu pre boj proti podvodom (OLAF) bola predmetom nového nariadenia OLAF, ktoré nadobudlo platnosť 1. októbra 2013. Išlo najmä o článok 11 ods. 6 nariadenia č. 883/2013, v ktorom sa ustanovuje, že „na žiadosť úradu mu príslušné orgány dotknutého členského štátu včas zašlú informácie o prípadných opatreniach prijatých po tom, ako generálny riaditeľ zaslal svoje odporúčania v súlade s odsekom 3 a úrad zaslal akékoľvek informácie v súlade s odsekom 5“.

Toto ustanovenie neukladá členským štátom povinnosť prijať opatrenia po doručení správy úradu OLAF, vzniká tým však povinnosť odpovedať na jeho požiadavky, čo vytvára pre OLAF účinnejší nástroj spätnej väzby na výsledok jeho vyšetrovaní postúpených justičným orgánom. Keďže nariadenie iba nedávno nadobudlo platnosť, je príliš skoro na vyvodenie jednoznačných záverov ohľadom fungovania tohto nového mechanizmu.

Spolupráca justičných orgánov jednotlivých členských štátov nespadá do právomocí Komisie.

Vytvorením Európskej prokuratúry (1) sa umožní posilnenie nadväzujúcich súdnych krokov k vyšetrovaniam vedeným úradom OLAF a spolupráca medzi členskými štátmi. Komisia zároveň odkazuje váženú pani poslankyňu na svoju odpoveď na písomnú otázku E-006315/13 (2).

---

(1) Návrh zriadenia Európskej prokuratúry bol prijatý 17. júla 2013 – COM(2013) 534.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011751/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: The fight against fraud in the EU

The European Public Prosecutor's Office will make it possible to combat fraud more effectively and on a cross-border basis. The European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) has hitherto been unable to mount criminal investigations. At the same time, OLAF recommendations are too often ignored by the relevant Member State authorities. This is one of the reasons why a European Public Prosecutor's Office with clearly defined competences may be a positive contribution in the fight against fraudulent practices and discrepancies in relation to European finances and budgets.

As regards the failure of Member States to sufficiently respect OLAF recommendations, is the Commission considering an initiative directed towards strengthening cooperation between the judicial authorities of individual Member States?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(10 January 2014)

The issue of follow-up to OLAF recommendations has been already tackled in the new OLAF Regulation which entered into force on 1 October 2013; in particular Article 11 para 6 of the regulation 883/2013 provides that 'at the request of the Office, the competent authorities of the Member States concerned shall, in due time, send to the Office information on action taken, if any, following the transmission by the Director-General of his recommendations in accordance with paragraph 3, and following the transmission by the Office of any information in accordance with paragraph 5'.

This provision does not create an obligation for the Member States to take actions following the transmission of the OLAF report, but at least it creates an obligation to reply to OLAF requests introducing a stronger instrument for OLAF to have a feedback on the outcome of its own investigations transmitted to the judicial authorities. As the regulation has just entered into force, it is still too early to draw clear conclusions on the functioning of such a new mechanism.

The cooperation between the judicial authorities of the individual Member States is not the area of competences of the Commission.

By establishing the European Public Prosecutor's Office (1) it will be possible to reinforce judicial follow up of OLAF's investigations and cooperation between the Member States. The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-006315/13 (2).

---

(1) The proposal for the establishment of the European Public Prosecutor's Office has been adopted on 17 July 2013 — COM(2013) 534.

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

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011752/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Tajné prijatie homofóbneho zákona o zákaze propagandy v Moldavsku

V uplynulých dňoch bol v Moldavsku (bez informovania verejnosti) prijatý zákon o zákaze propagandy. Podobný ako ten, ktorý bol nedávno prijatý v Rusku a v Litve. Na Ukrajine sú na danú tému vedené diskusie. Táto forma zákonov je podľa odborníkov akousi novou formou kriminalizácie homosexuality. Súčasne je tak porušovaný Európsky dohovor o ľudských právach, ktorý je však právne záväzný i pre Moldavsko. Podľa dostupných informácií je zrejmé, že zákon nesie prvky homofóbie a nie je v súlade so štandardmi ľudských práv. Ak Moldavsko nevyvinie úsilie v zmysle legislatívnej nápravy, hrozí navyše i skomplikovanie snáh o liberalizáciu vízového režimu s EÚ, keďže jednou z podmienok je práve prijatie zákona o nediskriminácii sexuálnych menšín.

Je tiež záujmom Komisie prispieť k uspokojivému riešeniu situácie v dohľadnej dobe?

Čo môže Komisia urobiť, aby sexuálna orientácia moldavských občanov za žiadnych okolností nemohla byť predmetom diskriminácie?

Odpoveď vysokej predstaviteľky Únie a podpredsedníčky Komisie Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(19. decembra 2013)

Zákon, o ktorom sa zmieňuje vážená pani poslankyňa, bol prijatý moldavským parlamentom 23. mája 2013 a nadobudol účinnosť 12. júla 2013. Účelom tohto zákona bolo podľa všetkého zosúladenie moldavských právnych predpisov s dohovorom z Lanzarote prostredníctvom implementácie moldavského zákona zo 7. marca 2013 „o ochrane detí pred negatívnymi dôsledkami informácií".

Zákonom z 23. mája 2013 sa pozmenilo znenie článku 90 ods. 1 moldavského priestupkového kódexu, pričom sa v ňom stanovili sankcie vo forme pokút za „verejné šírenie informácií s negatívnymi dôsledkami na neplnoleté osoby a/alebo za propagáciu prostitúcie, pedofílie, pornografických materiálov a iných vzťahov nesúvisiacich s manželstvom a rodinou". Posledná časť vety vytvorením právnej neistoty otvorila cestu pre možnú diskrimináciu informačných činností organizácií lesbičiek, homosexuálov, bisexuálov a transrodových osôb (LGBT). V júli 2013 sa táto otázka nastolila v rámci bilaterálnych kontaktov týkajúcich sa ľudských práv a dialógu o vízach s moldavskými orgánmi. Uskutočnili sa aj kontakty s organizáciami občianskej spoločnosti.

Orgány reagovali pozitívne: 30. júla 2013 ombudsman predložil parlamentu správu o nedodržiavaní požiadaviek; Protidiskriminačná rada, ktorá bola nedávno zriadená podľa zákona z 25. mája 2012 o „zabezpečení rovnosti", zaslala parlamentu písomnú žiadosť s výzvou na revíziu zákona a ministerstvo vnútra postúpilo orgánom presadzovania práva pokyn „k správnemu a jednotnému uplatňovaniu článku 90 ods. 1" s cieľom zabrániť diskriminačnému výkladu tohto článku.

Moldavský parlament 11. októbra zrušil odkaz na „iné vzťahy nesúvisiace s manželstvom a rodinou".

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011752/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Secret adoption of homophobic law prohibiting propaganda in Moldova

In recent days, a law prohibiting propaganda has been passed in Moldova (without the public being informed). It is similar to the laws recently passed in Russia and Lithuania. The topic is also under discussion in Ukraine. This form of law is, according to experts, a new way of criminalising homosexuality. At the same time, it violates the European Convention on Human Rights, which is legally binding for Moldova. According to the available information, it is clear that the law has homophobic elements and does not comply with human rights standards. If Moldova does not amend the legislation, it risks complicating efforts to liberalise the visa regime with the EU, since one of the conditions for this is the passing of a law on non-discrimination in respect of sexual minorities.

Does the Commission intend to contribute towards a satisfactory resolution to the situation in the foreseeable future?

What can the Commission do so that the sexual orientation of Moldovan citizens does not become, under any circumstances, a matter for discrimination?

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

The law referred to by the Honourable Member was passed by the Moldovan Parliament on 23 May 2013 and entered into force on 12 July 2013. It seems that the law was intended to harmonise Moldovan legislation with the Lanzarote Convention, in implementation of Moldova's Law of 7 March 2013 'on child protection against the negative impact of information'.

The law of 23 May 2013 amended Article 90.1 of the Moldovan Contravention Code by setting sanctions in the form of fines for the 'dissemination of public information with a negative impact on minors and/or spread of prostitution, paedophilia, pornographic materials and other relations that those related to marriage and family'. The latter phrase, by creating legal uncertainty, paved the way for possible discrimination against information activities of LGBTI organisations. In July 2013, the issue was raised with the Moldovan authorities, in the framework of the bilateral contacts on human rights and the visa dialogue. There have also been contacts with civil society organisations.

The authorities reacted positively: on 30 July 2013, the Ombudsman submitted to the Parliament a non-compliance report; the Anti-discrimination Council, just established under the law 'on ensuring equality' of 25 May 2012, sent a written request to the Parliament urging the revision of the law; and the Ministry of Interior circulated to the law enforcement bodies an instruction 'on the correct and uniform application of Article 90.1' meant to prevent its discriminatory interpretation.

On 11 October, the Moldovan Parliament repealed the reference to 'other relations that those related to marriage and family'.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011753/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Väznenie Bielorusa Alesa Bialiatskeho

Štvrtého augusta toho roku uplynuli dva roky, odkedy bol vo svojej rodnej krajine uväznený Ales Bialiatski. Ocitol sa za mrežami pre ochranu ľudských práv v Bielorusku. Pán Bialiatski odvážne bojuje za ochranu ľudských práv v krajine a prináša obrovské životné obete. Organizácia, v ktorej pôsobil a pomocou ktorej zmieňovaný boj za ľudské práva vykonával, podporovala zákaz trestu smrti, zákaz mučenia a iného krúteho a neľudského zaobchádzania. Rovnako tak podporovala politických väzňov. Nezávislá organizácia Amnesty International upozorňuje na skutočnosť, že trestný proces, ktorý vyústil do odsúdenia Bialiatskeho na trest odňatia slobody v trvaní štyri a pol roka, porušil jeho právo na spravodlivý proces a jeho odsúdenie bolo politicky motivované s cieľom prekaziť jeho činnosť.

Aký je postoj Komisie k prípadu väzneného Alesa Bialiatskeho?

Pokiaľ skutočne dochádza k tak závažnému porušovaniu ľudských práv v Bielorusku, akými konkrétnymi krokmi sa Komisia pričinila o nápravu v poslednej dobe?

Odpoveď pána Füleho v mene Komisie
(3. decembra 2013)

Okamžité a bezpodmienečné prepustenie a rehabilitácia všetkých politických väzňov vrátane pána Bialiatskeho je pre EÚ politickou prioritou. Dokazujú to vyjadrenia k otázke politických väzňov vrátane podmienok ich uväznenia a ich zdravotného stavu, vyslovené v rámci všetkých príslušných krokov, v záveroch Rady, stanoviskách a diplomatických posolstvách EÚ. Delegácia EÚ v Minsku neustále upozorňuje bieloruské orgány na problém politických väzňov a opakovane predkladá žiadosti o povolenie navštíviť ich vo väzení. EÚ neustále podporuje a aj v budúcnosti bude podporovať politických väzňov a všeobecne obete represií.

Komisár zodpovedný za rozšírenie a európsku susedskú politiky sa pravidelne stretáva s príbuznými politických väzňov a predstaviteľmi strediska ľudských práv Viasna a všetci sú priebežne informovaní o situácii.

EÚ neustále dáva najavo svoje znepokojenie týkajúce sa situácie v Bielorusku a reštriktívne opatrenia EÚ voči viacerým osobám a subjektom zostávajú naďalej v platnosti. EÚ nebude podstatne meniť svoju súčasnú politiku voči Bielorusku, kým nebudú prepustení všetci politickí väzni a obnovené ich politické a občianske práva.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011753/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)

(15 October 2013)

Subject: Imprisonment of Ales Bialiatski in Belarus

On 4 August this year, it was two years to the day since Ales Bialiatski was imprisoned in the country of his birth. He was put behind bars for defending human rights in Belarus. Mr Bialiatski fights courageously to defend human rights in the country, at huge personal sacrifice. The organisation he worked for, and through which the fight for human rights has been conducted, supported a ban on capital punishment and a ban on torture and other cruel and inhumane treatment. It also supported political prisoners. The independent organisation Amnesty International points out that the criminal trial which resulted in Bialiatski being sentenced to four and a half years in prison violated his right to a fair trial, and that his conviction was politically motivated with the aim of thwarting his activities.

What is the Commission’s position on Ales Bialiatski?

If such a serious breach of human rights has indeed occurred in Belarus, what specific corrective measures has the Commission recently taken?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission

(3 December 2013)

The immediate and unconditional release and rehabilitation of all political prisoners, including Mr Bialiatski, is a political priority for the EU. This is evidenced by the reference to the political prisoners, including the conditions under which they are imprisoned and their state of health, in all relevant actions, Council Conclusions, statements and diplomatic messages of the EU. The EU Delegation in Minsk keeps engaging the Belarusian authorities on the issue of political prisoners and has repeatedly submitted requests to visit them in prison. Political prisoners, and in general victims of repression, have been and continue to be supported by the EU.

The Commissioner responsible for Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy meets regularly with the relatives of the political prisoners and representatives of Viasna, and they are continuously informed about their situation.

The EU continues to publicly voice its concerns about the situation in Belarus and EU restrictive measures against a number of persons and entities remain in place. The EU will not substantially revise its current policy towards Belarus unless all political prisoners are released and their political and civil rights re-instated.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011754/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Štvrtý železničný balíček

Autonómne odbory rušňovodičov zdieľajú názor Komisie ohľadom existujúcich ťažkostí v súvislosti so schvaľovaním dráhových vozidiel a s vystavovaním bezpečnostných osvedčení. Prameniace problémy a nezrovnalosti sú vo veľkej miere spôsobené príliš odlišnými predpismi v jednotlivých členských štátoch. Nesporne, vhodné nápravné opatrenia v rámci danej problematiky sú žiaduce. Mali by však viesť predovšetkým ku skutočnému vylepšeniu interoperability medzi jednotlivými členskými štátmi.

Je v možnostiach Komisie dohliadnuť na skutočnosť, aby ustanovizne na posudzovanie a kontrolu bezpečnostných predpisov, ktoré musia byť v železničnej doprave dodržiavané v jednotlivých členských štátoch, boli jasne a zrozumiteľne definované? Iba tak totiž môžu byť skutočným prínosom pre železničnú dopravu ako celok.

Odpoveď pána Kallasa v mene Komisie
(27. novembra 2013)

V rámci štvrtého železničného balíka Komisia navrhla, aby Európska železničná agentúra (ERA) ako jediný oprávnený orgán vydávala bezpečnostné osvedčenia železničným podnikom, čím sa zabezpečí väčšia transparentnosť a harmonizácia v posudzovaní ich schopnosti riadenia bezpečnosti. Podľa návrhu Komisie dohľad zostane v kompetencii vnútroštátnych orgánov bezpečnosti, zatiaľ čo ERA bude zabezpečovať jeho koordináciu a harmonizáciu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011754/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: The Fourth Railway Package

The independent train drivers' unions share the Commission's opinion on the difficulty of approving rolling stock and issuing safety certificates. The problems and discrepancies that arise are to a large extent due to the fact that regulations differ too much between individual Member States. Appropriate corrective measures are surely needed in this matter. They should, however, lead first and foremost to a real improvement in interoperability between individual Member States.

Can the Commission secure a clear and comprehensible definition of the institutions for evaluating and checking the safety regulations which must be complied with in rail transport in the individual Member States? Only thus, can they be of real benefit for rail transport as a whole.

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(27 November 2013)

In the framework of the 4th Railway Package the Commission has proposed that the European Railway Agency (ERA) would be the sole body to issue safety certificates to railway undertakings, ensuring a more transparent and harmonised assessment of their capability to manage safety. In the Commission's proposal, supervision will remain a task of the national safety authorities (NSAs), while ERA would ensure coordination and harmonisation of this activity.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011755/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Problematika kvality potravinárskych výrobkov

V uplynulých dňoch sa na mňa obrátila Únia hydinárov Slovenska. Podľa jej vlastných vyjadrení už viac ako dva roky upozorňuje na nekvalitné potravinárske výrobky pochádzajúce z Poľska. Závažnými skutočnosťami vznesenými Úniou hydinárov Slovenska je najmä podávanie antibiotík hydine či nedostatočné veterinárne a potravinové kontroly. Takéto nedostatky a prečiny môžu mať závažný vplyv na kvalitu potravín, ako aj zdravie európskeho obyvateľstva.

Akým spôsobom sa Komisia v poslednej dobe pričinila o to, aby boli na úrovni Európskej únie prijaté účinné opatrenia chrániace celoeurópsky trh a predovšetkým zdravie spotrebiteľa pred nekvalitnými potravinárskymi výrobkami?

Aké ďalšie konkrétne ochranné opatrenia je možné v rámci danej problematiky vykonať?

Odpoveď pána Borga v mene Komisie
(29. novembra 2013)

EÚ vytvorila komplexný súbor právnych predpisov určených na ochranu agropotravinového reťazca a na riadenie rizík v oblasti zdravia zvierat a rastlín. Presadzovanie týchto pravidiel sa uskutočňuje prostredníctvom úradných kontrol vykonávaných príslušnými orgánmi v členských štátoch EÚ v súlade s pravidlami stanovenými v nariadení (ES) č. 882/2004 (1). Podľa rovnakých pravidiel sa vykonávajú kontroly v členských štátoch aj expertmi Komisie (Potravinový a veterinárny úrad Európskej komisie (2)), ktorých úlohou je vykonávať audit uplatňovania pravidiel agropotravinového reťazca v členských štátoch.

Nariadenie (ES) č. 882/2004 zároveň stanovuje spoločný rámec pre cezhraničnú pomoc a spoluprácu medzi členskými štátmi. Podľa týchto pravidiel sa od oboch členských štátov, ktoré spomína vážená pani poslankyňa, očakáva, že sa v rámci najvyššej úrovne vzájomnej spolupráce budú spolupodieľať na úspešnom zabezpečení presadzovania právnych predpisov určených na ochranu agropotravinového reťazca na ich území.

Právne predpisy agropotravinového reťazca vrátane predpisov pre úradné kontroly sa v súčasnosti revidujú s cieľom posilniť presadzovanie zdravotných a bezpečnostných noriem pre celý reťazec a zabezpečiť hladké fungovanie vnútorného trhu.

Hlavné prvky tohto balíka opatrení sú opísané na tomto mieste:
http://wcmcom-ec-europa-eu-wip.wcm3vue.cec.eu.int:8080/dgs/health_consumer/pressroom/animal-plant-health_en.htm.

---

(1) Ú. v. EÚ L 165, 30.4.2004, s. 1.
(2) http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/index_en.cfm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011755/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: A food product quality issue

I have recently been approached by the Slovak Poultry Farmers' Union. According to the Union's statement, it has been issuing warnings for almost two years now about low quality food products coming from Poland. The serious issues raised by the Slovak Poultry Farmers' Union concern, in particular, the dosing of poultry with antibiotics and a lack of veterinary and food controls. Shortcomings and malpractices of this kind can have a serious impact on food quality, and on the health of the European population.

How has the Commission been working recently towards the adoption of effective measures at EU level for protecting the pan-European market and consumer health, in particular, from low quality food products?

What further specific protective measures can be taken with regard to this issue?

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

The EU has established a comprehensive body of law designed to protect the agri-food chain and to manage risks to animal and plant health. These rules are enforced through official controls carried out by the competent authorities in the EU Member States in accordance with the rules laid down in Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 ([1]). Under the same rules, controls are also carried out in the Member States by Commission experts (the Commission's Food and Veterinary Office ([2])) tasked with auditing the implementation of agri-food chain rules in the Member States.

Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 also establishes a common framework for cross-border assistance and cooperation between and among Member States. Under these rules, the two Member States referred to by the Honourable Member are expected to share the highest level of mutual cooperation in order to successfully ensure the enforcement of agri-food chain law on their territory.

Agri-food chain legislation, including for official controls, is currently being revised in order to strengthen the enforcement of health and safety standards for the whole chain, and to guarantee the smooth functioning of the internal market.

The main elements of this package of measures are described at:
http://wcmcom-ec-europa-eu-wip.wcm3vue.cec.eu.int:8080/dgs/health_consumer/pressroom/animal-plant-health_en.htm

---

([1]) OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/index_en.cfm

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011756/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Sloboda médií v Rumunsku

V uplynulom období boli zaznamenané nebezpečné útoky na slobodu médií v Rumunsku. V júli toho roku rumunské Národné protikorupčné riaditeľstvo začalo vyšetrovanie rumunskej televíznej stanice a jej zamestnancov. Televízne stanice nielen v Rumunsku, ale i v ďalších členských štátoch Európskej únie sa musia snažiť o maximálnu nestrannosť vysielania (majúc na zreteli slobodu médií). Ak redaktori narazia na možné páchanie zločinu či korupciu, informujú verejnosť. V uplynulom roku však boli rumunské slobodné médiá v tejto súvislosti identifikované ako hrozba pre národnú bezpečnosť.

Je v možnostiach Komisie dohliadnuť na aktuálny stav a snažiť sa urovnať nepokojnú situáciu v Rumunsku?

Akým postupom sa možno pričiniť o to, aby sloboda médií bola rešpektovaná i v tejto krajine?

Odpoveď pani Kroesovej v mene Komisie
(5. decembra 2013)

Právo na informácie a sloboda prejavu sú zakotvené v článku 11 Charty základných práv Európskej únie. Podľa jej článku 51 ods. 1 sa však charta vzťahuje na členské štáty výlučne vtedy, ak vykonávajú právo Európskej únie. V iných oblastiach sa uplatňujú ustanovenia členských štátov týkajúce sa práva na informácie a slobody prejavu.

Komisia sa usiluje zabezpečiť rešpektovanie slobody a plurality médií v rámci svojich právomocí. V súčasnosti sa zamýšľa nad možnými krokmi v nadväznosti na verejnú konzultáciu o správe nezávislej skupiny na vysokej úrovni pre slobodu a pluralitu médií.

Komisia pozorne sleduje situáciu v Rumunsku, najmä prostredníctvom osobitného mechanizmu spolupráce a overovania (CVM). Dvanásta správa CVM o pokroku bola uverejnená 30. januára 2013. V správe sa pripomína potreba preskúmať existujúce štandardy ochraňujúce slobodné a pluralitné médiá pri súčasnom zabezpečení účinnej nápravy v prípadoch porušenia základných práv jednotlivcov a nenáležitého nátlaku na súdnictvo a inštitúcie boja proti korupcii alebo ich zastrašovania zo strany médií. Takisto sa v nej požaduje, aby Národnej rade pre audiovíziu bolo poskytnuté ubezpečenie o jej skutočnej nezávislosti a aby v tejto súvislosti v plnej miere zohrávala svoju úlohu pri stanovení a vynucovaní kódexu správania.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011756/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Media freedom in Romania

Dangerous attacks on media freedom have recently been recorded in Romania. In July of this year, Romania's National Anti-Corruption Directorate began investigating a Romanian television station and its employees. Television stations, not only in Romania but also in other EU Member States, must strive for maximum impartiality in broadcasting (having regard to media freedom). If editors encounter possible cases of crime or corruption, they inform the public. Over the past year, however, Romania's free media have been identified in this context as a threat to national security.

Can the Commission monitor the current situation and try to resolve the difficult situation in Romania?

How can it also encourage respect for media freedom in this country?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2013)

The right to information and freedom of expression is enshrined in Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. However, according to its Article 51(1), the Charter applies to Member States only when they are implementing European Union law. In other areas, Member States' provisions on the right to information and freedom of expression apply.

The Commission seeks to ensure respect for media freedom and pluralism within its competences. It is currently reflecting possible follow up to the public consultation on the report of the independent High Level Group on Media Freedom and Pluralism.

The Commission is closely following the situation in Romania, particularly through a special Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (CVM). The twelfth CVM Progress Report was published on 30 January 2013. The report recalls the need for a review existing standards to safeguard a free and pluralist media while ensuring effective redress against violation of individuals' fundamental rights and against undue pressure or intimidation from the media against the judiciary and anti-corruption institutions. It also pleads that the National Audiovisual Council should be assured of its effective independence and plays fully its role by establishing and enforcing a Code of Conduct in this regard.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011757/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Ruský nátlak na Ukrajinu

V snahe odradiť Ukrajinu od podpísania dohody o pridružení s Európskou úniou Ruská federácia nedávno zablokovala ukrajinský import do Ruska. K podpisu zmieňovanej dohody by malo dôjsť koncom novembra toho roku v Litve. Usudzujúc z konania ruskej strany, tá chce zabrániť tomu, aby podpísanie dokumentu prispelo k posilneniu vzájomných vzťahov medzi Úniou a Ukrajinou. Akýkoľvek nátlak zo strany Ruska je však neprijateľný. Ukrajina ako suverénny štát by mala mať plnú nezávislosť v rozhodovaní nielen v otázkach zahraničnej politiky či posilnenia vzájomnej spolupráce s Európskou úniou. Nátlak alebo zastrašovanie zo strany ďalších štátov tu nemajú miesto.

Akými konkrétnymi opatreniami môže Komisia prispieť a podporiť snahy Ukrajiny učiniť v tejto veci nezávislé rozhodnutie?

Odpoveď vysokej predstaviteľky/podpredsedníčky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(3. januára 2014)

EÚ sa stotožňuje s názorom, že nátlak na nezávislé štáty s cieľom ovplyvniť ich zvrchovanú vôľu je neprípustný. Zároveň zdôraznila, že pripravované dohody o pridružení s krajinami Východného partnerstva nie sú na úkor žiadnej tretej krajiny, práve naopak, úžitok z nich budú mať všetky strany. V tejto súvislosti prijala so sklamaním rozhodnutie ukrajinskej vlády zo dňa 21. novembra 2013 pozastaviť prípravy na podpísanie dohody o pridružení s EÚ. Naďalej však verí, že budúcnosť Ukrajiny spočíva v úzkom vzťahu s Úniou a pevne si stojí za svojim záväzkom voči ľudu Ukrajiny, ktorý by mal z dohody najväčší prínos prostredníctvom posilnenia slobody a prosperity, ktoré by so sebou priniesla.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011757/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Russian pressure on Ukraine

The Russian Federation recently blocked Ukrainian imports into Russia, in an effort to discourage Ukraine from signing an association agreement the European Union. The agreement in question is due to be signed at the end of November in Lithuania. Judging from its behaviour, Russia wants to prevent the document contributing to a strengthening of relations between the EU and Ukraine. However, any pressure whatsoever from the Russian side is unacceptable. Ukraine, as a sovereign state, should have full independence in its decision-making, and not just over questions of foreign policy or strengthening cooperation with the EU. Pressure or intimidation by other states has no place here.

What specific steps can the Commission take to contribute towards and support Ukraine's efforts to reach an independent decision in this matter?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Asthon on behalf of the Commission
(3 January 2014)

The EU shares the view that pressure on independent states to influence their sovereign choices is unacceptable. At the same time, it has also been made clear that the Association Agreements with the Eastern Partnership countries in preparation are not aimed at any third country's expense, on the contrary, they will be beneficial to all. In this context, the EU took note with disappointment of the decision of the Ukrainian Government on 21 November 2013 to suspend preparations for the signature of the Association Agreement with the EU. The EU continues to believe that the future for Ukraine lies in a strong relationship with the EU and it stands firm in its commitment to the people of Ukraine who would be the main beneficiaries of the Agreement through the enhanced freedom and prosperity the Agreement would have brought about.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011759/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Vybudovanie uhoľnej elektrárne v Poľsku

Poľsko má v úmysle budovať novú tepelnú elektráreň na juhozápade krajiny. Suma vyčíslená v súvislosti s realizáciou tohto zámeru siaha do výšky približne 2,7 miliardy EUR. Zdá sa však, že výstavba dvoch blokov elektrárne je v rozpore s európskou legislatívou, pokiaľ ide o zachytávanie a ukladanie oxidu uhličitého.

Aké opatrenia môže Komisia realizovať v snahe predísť hroziacim environmentálnym problémom? Zároveň, ako možno účinne od Poľska požadovať, aby vykonávalo predmetnú legislatívu a neznečisťovalo životné prostredie?

Odpoveď pána Potočnika v mene Komisie
(4. decembra 2013)

Nové tepelné elektrárne s tepelným výkonom 300 megawattov a viac sa podľa smernice EIA ([1]) musia podrobiť posúdeniu vplyvov na životné prostredie. V rámci tohto postupu sa posúdia vplyvy daného projektu na životné prostredie, ktoré sa potom v rozhodovacom procese súvisiacom s projektom musia zohľadniť.

Podľa článku 9a smernice o veľkých spaľovacích zariadeniach ([2]), členské štáty musia zabezpečiť, aby prevádzkovatelia spaľovacích zariadení s nominálnym elektrickým výkonom 300 megawattov alebo viac posúdili technické a ekonomické podmienky potrebné na dodatočnú montáž vybavenia na zachytávanie CO_2. V prípade, že posudok je kladný, treba na mieste inštalácie zariadenia vyčleniť vhodný priestor na umiestnenie vybavenia potrebného na zachytávanie a stláčanie CO_2.

Na súčasné spaľovacie zariadenia sa vzťahuje smernica o priemyselných emisiách ([3]), ktorá od 1. januára 2016 nahradí smernicu o veľkých spaľovacích zariadeniach.

Komisia prijala sťažnosť týkajúcu sa plánovaných dvoch nových blokov elektrárne Opole v Poľsku a v súčasnosti zhromažďuje informácie s cieľom určiť fakty, ktoré sa tohto prípadu týkajú, a právne predpisy, ktoré sa naň vzťahujú.

([1]) Smernica 2011/92/EÚ o posudzovaní vplyvov určitých verejných a súkromných projektov na životné prostredie (Ú. v. EÚ L 26, 28.1.2012).

([2]) Smernica Európskeho parlamentu a Rady 2001/80/ES o obmedzení emisií určitých znečisťujúcich látok do ovzdušia z veľkých spaľovacích zariadení (Ú. v. ES L 309, 27.11.2001).

([3]) Smernica Európskeho parlamentu a Rady 2010/75/EÚ o priemyselných emisiách sa od 7. januára 2013 vzťahuje na nové spaľovacie zariadenia (Ú. v. EÚ L 334, 17.12.2010).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011759/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)

(15 October 2013)

Subject: Construction of a coal-fired power plant in Poland

Poland plans to construct a new thermal power plant in the south-west of the country. The cost of implementing this plan has been calculated at almost EUR 2.7 billion. It seems, however, that the construction of two of the blocks of the power plant is contrary to European legislation, as far as carbon dioxide capture and storage is concerned.

What steps can the Commission take in order to avert the impending environmental problems? At the same time, how can it ask Poland effectively to implement the relevant legislation and not pollute the environment?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission

(4 December 2013)

New thermal power plants with a heat output capacity of 300 MW and more have to undergo an environmental impact assessment (EIA) according to the EIA Directive (1). During the EIA procedure, the environmental effects of the project are assessed and they need to be taken into consideration in the decision-making process on the project.

According to Article 9a of the LCP Directive (2), Member States need to ensure that operators of combustion plants with a rated electrical output of 300 MW or more have assessed the technical and economic conditions necessary to retrofit the plant for CO_2 capture. Where the assessment is positive, suitable space on the installation site for the equipment necessary to capture and compress CO_2 has to be set aside.

The IED Directive (3) has applied for existing combustion plants, replacing the LCP Directive as of 1 January 2016.

The Commission has received a complaint on the planned two new units at the Opole power plant in Poland and is currently gathering information to determine facts and law concerning the case.

---

(1) Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.

(2) 2001/80/EC on the limitation of emissions of certain pollutants into the air from large combustion plants, OJ L 309, 27.11.2001.

(3) Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions applies for new combustion plants since 7 January 2013, OJ L334, 17.12.2010.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011760/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: EÚ a mierové rokovania na Blízkom východe

Posledné mierové rokovania na Blízkom východe sa uskutočnili ešte v roku 2010. Poprední predstavitelia Európskej únie i vyjednávači požadujú od Izraelu a Palestíny, aby mali snahu vyhnúť sa takým aktivitám, ktoré by nastávajúce kolo mierových rokovaní mohli ohroziť. Pozitívnym signálom je v danej súvislosti napr. skutočnosť, že v uplynulých dňoch – po rokoch stagnácie – Izrael prepustil približne stovku palestínskych väzňov.

Je v možnostiach Komisie prispieť k tomu, aby krehká dôvera medzi týmito krajinami nebola narušená? Ako možno prispieť k pretrvaniu relatívne pokojnej situácie i mimo obdobia mierových rokovaní?

Odpoveď podpredsedníčky Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(29. novembra 2013)

EÚ neustále prispievala k obnoveniu súčasných mierových rokovaní, sprostredkovaných Spojenými štátmi, medzi izraelskou a palestínskou stranou a toto úsilie bude naďalej podporovať všetkými prostriedkami, ktoré má k dispozícii. Mier a stabilita na Blízkom východe patria k základným záujmom EÚ a kľúčovým prioritám zahraničnej politiky.

Vysoká predstaviteľka a podpredsedníčka privítala záväzok oboch strán k riešeniu v podobe existencie dvoch štátov, nabádala ich, aby presvedčili vnútornú politickú opozíciu o vhodnosti tohto riešenia a vyzdvihla opatrenia na budovanie dôvery, na ktorých sa už strany dohodli. EÚ zároveň sleduje udalosti v tejto oblasti, ktoré by mohli ohroziť mierové rozhovory, napr. násilné činy, podnecovanie terorizmu, izraelské rozširovanie osád a súvisiace porušovanie medzinárodného práva. EÚ opakovane vyzvala všetky strany, aby sa zdržali akýchkoľvek aktov, ktoré by mohli narušiť dôveru a vyhliadky na mier.

V súlade so závermi Rady pre zahraničné veci z 22. júla a s vyhlásením Kvarteta pre Blízky východ z 27. septembra 2013 bude EÚ naďalej plne spolupracovať s oboma stranami a spolu s ďalšími medzinárodnými partnermi prispievať k tomu, aby sa na základe rokovaní dospelo k riešeniu všetkých otázok týkajúcich sa konečného stavu s cieľom dosiahnuť trvalú dohodu v dohodnutej lehote deviatich mesiacov.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011760/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: The EU and the Middle East peace talks

The last Middle East peace talks took place in 2010. EU leaders and the negotiators are asking the Israelis and the Palestinians to try and avoid activities that might put at risk the forthcoming round of peace talks. In the given circumstances, it is a positive sign, for example, that the Israelis have released almost 100 Palestinian prisoners in recent days — after years of stagnation.

Is the Commission able to help avert a breakdown of the fragile trust between these two countries? How can we contribute to a continuation of the relatively peaceful situation, even beyond the period of the peace talks?

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

The EU has consistently contributed to the resumption of the present — US brokered — peace negotiations between the Israeli and Palestinian sides and shall continue to support these efforts by all means at its disposal. Peace and stability in the Middle East belong to the EU's fundamental interests and key foreign policy priorities.

The HR/VP has welcomed both parties' commitment to the two-state solution, encouraged them to overcome their internal political opposition to this and commended confidence-building measures already agreed between them. At the same time, the EU remains vigilant of developments on the ground which may jeopardise the peace talks, for instance acts of violence, incitement to terrorism, Israeli settlements expansion and related violations of the international law. The EU has repeatedly urged all parties to refrain from actions which could undermine trust and the prospects of peace.

In line with the Foreign Affairs Council conclusions of 22 July and the Middle East Quartet statement of 27 September 2013; the EU will remain fully engaged with both parties and continue to contribute together with other international partners to a negotiated solution on all final status issues in order to reach a permanent agreement within the agreed goal of nine months.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011761/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Problematika pašovaného tovaru

Podľa dostupných údajov hodnota pašovaného tovaru, ktorý bol v uplynulom roku zadržaný colníkmi, predstavovala takmer miliardu EUR. Najvyšší podiel zo zadržaného tovaru tvorili cigarety. Ďalšou početnou kategóriou bol zmiešaný tovar. K pašovaniu významným spôsobom prispel predovšetkým rozvoj a rozmach internetového predaja. I týmto spôsobom je nelegálne distribuované veľké množstvo tovaru. Vymáhanie práv duševného vlastníctva a boj proti falšovanému tovaru má však nezastupiteľný význam nielen v kontexte snahy o posilnenie konkurencieschopnosti, výskumu a inovácií, ale aj v zmysle ochrany zdravia a bezpečnosti.

Akými možnosťami disponuje Komisia v snahe účinne čeliť nekalým praktikám, prostredníctvom ktorých je falošný tovar ilegálne distribuovaný v rámci EÚ?

Odpoveď pána Šemetu v mene Komisie
(16. decembra 2013)

Z colného hľadiska predstavuje riešenie problému predaja tovaru porušujúceho práva duševného vlastníctva cez internet kľúčovú výzvu. Má to široké dôsledky na zdroje z hľadiska colnej správy, ktorá v rokoch 2011 a 2012 zaistila viac než 90 000 prípadov (1).

Nový akčný plán EÚ v colnej oblasti zameraný na boj proti porušovaniu práv duševného vlastníctva pre roky 2013 – 2017 (2) preto navrhuje poskytnúť colným orgánom nevyhnutné nástroje na to, aby mohli úspešne čeliť novým trendom v medzinárodnom obchode s tovarom porušujúcim práva duševného vlastníctva.

Komisia spolu s členskými štátmi následne spustila aktivity zamerané na podporu a uľahčovanie práce colných správ pri vymáhaní práv duševného vlastníctva pri malých balíkoch posielaných poštou alebo kuriérom.

V máji 2011 sprostredkovala Komisia dohodu, v rámci ktorej veľké množstvo internetových platforiem, vlastníkov obchodnej značky a obchodných združení podpísalo memorandum o porozumení týkajúce sa predaja falšovaného tovaru cez internet (ďalej len „memorandum“) (3). Týmto memorandom sa ustanovil kódex postupov pre boj proti predaju falšovaného tovaru cez internet a rozšírila sa spolupráca jeho signatárov.

Komisia prijala 18. apríla 2013 správu o fungovaní memoranda o porozumení týkajúce sa predaja falšovaného tovaru cez internet (4), ktorá ukázala, že memorandum bolo efektívne, a že táto metóda dobrovoľnej spolupráce významne prispela k zníženiu online falšovania. V správe Komisie bolo takisto ohlásené spustenie nových iniciatív s ďalšími kľúčovými hráčmi v boji proti falšovaniu.

Komisia sa medzinárodnou dimenziou tejto problematiky zaoberá prostredníctvom obchodných dialógov zameraných na práva duševného vlastníctva a rokovaní o dohodách o voľnom obchode s kľúčovými tretími krajinami, najmä s Čínou, ktorá je hlavným zdrojom tovaru porušujúceho práva duševného vlastníctva, predávaného cez internet.

---

(1) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/customs/customs_controls/counterfeit_piracy/statistics/index_en.htm
(2) Uznesenie Rady (2013/C 80/01) – Ú. v. EÚ C 80/1 z 19.3.2013.
(3) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/iprenforcement/docs/memorandum_04052011_en.pdf
(4) COM(2013) 209 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011761/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: The problem of smuggled goods

Almost EUR 1 billion of smuggled goods were seized by customs over the past year, according to the available data. Cigarettes accounted for the largest share of the seized goods. Mixed goods made up another large category. The development and expansion of Internet shopping in particular has given a major boost to smuggling. A huge quantity of goods are illegally distributed in this way. The enforcement of intellectual property rights and the fight against counterfeit goods, however, are vitally important, not only in the context of the effort to boost competitiveness, research and innovation, but also in the area of health protection and safety.

What options are available to the Commission in the effort to effectively tackle the dishonest practices by means of which counterfeit goods are illegally distributed in the EU?

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

From a customs perspective, tackling the sale of IPR infringing goods over the Internet is a key challenge. This has vast resource implications for customs that have detained more than 90.000 cases in 2011 and 2012 (1).

The latest EU Customs Action Plan to combat IPR infringements for the years 2013 to 2017 (2), therefore, calls for providing customs authorities with the necessary tools to successfully address new trends in the international trade of goods infringing intellectual property rights.

This has led the Commission, together with the Member States, to launch activities to foster and facilitate the work of customs authorities concerning IPR enforcement on small parcels shipped by postal or courier traffic.

In an agreement brokered by the Commission, in May 2011, a substantial number of Internet platforms, brand owners and trade associations signed a memorandum of understanding on the sale of counterfeit goods via the Internet (MoU) (3). This MoU established a code of practice in the fight against the sale of counterfeit goods over the Internet and enhanced collaboration between its signatories.

On 18 April 2013 the Commission adopted a 'Report on the functioning of the MoU on the sale of counterfeit goods via the Internet' (4), which showed that the MoU has been effective and that this voluntary cooperation approach has significantly contributed to curb online counterfeiting. This Commission Report also announced the launch of new initiatives with other intermediaries who are key in the fight against counterfeiting.

The international dimension is also tackled by the Commission through its Trade IPR Dialogues and FTAs negotiations with key third countries in particular China, the main source of infringing goods sold over the Internet.

---

(1) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/customs/customs_controls/counterfeit_piracy/statistics/index_en.htm

(2) Council Resolution (2013/C 80/01) — OJEU C80/1 of 19.03.2013.

(3) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/iprenforcement/docs/memorandum_04052011_en.pdf

(4) COM(2013) 209 final.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-011762/13
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15. októbra 2013)

Vec: Vyhrocovanie násilností v Egypte

V uplynulých dňoch došlo k vyhroteniu násilností v Egypte. Politický konflikt má za následok rozsiahle krviprelievanie, straty na ľudských životoch i materiálne škody. Zo strany Európskej únie došlo k pozastaveniu dodávok zbraní, aby tieto nemohli byť represívne použité voči oponentom. Zároveň však je nevyhnutné naďalej poskytovať pomoc zraneným i chrániť civilné obyvateľstvo.

Ako sa môže Komisia pričiniť o obnovu politického dialógu? Zvažuje podniknúť konkrétne kroky, ktoré by prispeli k upokojeniu situácie a možnosti rokovať?

Odpoveď vysokej predstaviteľky a podpredsedníčky Komisie Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(12. decembra 2013)

Európsku komisiu znepokojuje prehlbujúca sa politická polarizácia a pokračovanie násilia v Egypte. Rada pre zahraničné veci vo svojich záveroch z 21. augusta „jednoznačne odsudzuje všetky násilné činy“ a žiada o „začatie nezávislého vyšetrovania všetkých vrážd“. Delegácia priamo na mieste pozorne sleduje vývoj.

EÚ aj naďalej požaduje inkluzívny proces, z ktorého nie je vylúčená žiadna politická skupina, ktorá rešpektuje demokratické zásady a zriekne sa násilia. Cieľom EÚ v tomto úsilí je dosiahnuť hlboko zakorenenú a udržateľnú demokraciu ako jediné riešenie súčasnej situácie. Vysoká predstaviteľka navštívila Egypt pri viacerých príležitostiach a EÚ aj naďalej ponúka svoju pomoc a služby a je pripravená na rozhovory so všetkými stranami, ak ju o to požiadajú, bez toho, aby na seba prevzala úlohu sprostredkovateľa.

Zároveň sa aj vzhľadom na závery Rady pre zahraničné veci z 21. augusta spolupráca zameriava na podporu spoločensko-ekonomického vývoja a občianskej spoločnosti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011762/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(15 October 2013)

Subject: Escalating violence in Egypt

Egypt has seen an escalation of violence in recent days. The political conflict is resulting in extensive bloodshed, loss of human life and material damage. The EU has halted supplies of weapons, so that they cannot be used repressively against opponents. At the same time, however, it is essential to continue providing assistance to the injured, and to defend civil society.

How can the Commission work towards a resumption of political dialogue? Is it considering taking concrete steps to help defuse the situation and facilitate negotiation?

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

The European Union is concerned about the continued political polarization and violence in Egypt. In its conclusions of 21 August, the Foreign Affairs Council condemned ‘in the clearest possible terms all acts of violence’ and asked ‘to launch an independent investigation into all the killings’. The Delegation on the ground is following the developments closely.

The EU continues to call for an inclusive process not excluding any political group respecting democratic principles and renouncing the use of violence in order to lead to deep and sustainable democracy as the only solution to the current situation. The High Representative has been travelling to Egypt several times and the EU also continues to offer its good offices and is ready to talk to all sides if invited to do so without taking a mediation role.

At the same time, also following the conclusions of the Foreign Affairs Council of 21 August, cooperation is focused on the support to socioeconomic development and civil society.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011765/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Mayer (PPE)
(16. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Beschwerdekammer der Europäischen Schulen

Die Europäischen Schulen wurden gemeinsam von den Regierungen der Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union sowie den Europäischen Gemeinschaften gegründet. Zu den gesetzlichen Grundlagen gehören Abkommen mit der EU, die u. a. sicherstellen, dass ein Vertreter der Kommission die EU im Obersten Rat und im Verwaltungsrat der Schulen vertritt. Dort getroffene Entscheidungen müssen laut Satzung so weit wie möglich einstimmig erfolgen. Des Weiteren trägt die EU knapp 60 % zum Haushalt der Europaschulen bei (2012 konkret 59,7 % des Gesamtbudgets).

Die Gemeinsame Gerichtsbarkeit aller Europäischen Schulen liegt bei der Beschwerdekammer der Europäischen Schulen. Gemäß Artikel 27 der Vereinbarung über die Satzung der Europäischen Schulen besitzt die Beschwerdekammer, nach Ausschöpfung des Verwaltungsweges, erst- und letztinstanzlich ausschließliche Zuständigkeit. Satzung und Verfahrensordnung der Beschwerdekammer selbst werden vom Obersten Rat einstimmig angenommen. Darüber hinaus sind die Beschwerdekammer sowie ihre Geschäftsstelle mit ihren hauptamtlichen Mitarbeitern, postalisch c/o Europäische Kommission in Brüssel zu kontaktieren.

1. Warum gibt es für Streitigkeiten bei Zulassungsverfahren an Brüsseler Schulen keine Ausschöpfung des Verwaltungsweges, sondern ausschließlich einen kostenpflichtigen Klageweg?

2. Auf welcher Rechtsgrundlage beruht dieser Widerspruch zu Artikel 27?

3. Womit wird gerechtfertigt, dass es sich hierbei zusätzlich um eine erst- und zugleich letztinstanzliche Entscheidung handelt?

4. Gibt es aus den letzten Jahren Statistiken über den Ausgang von Widersprüchen (168 im Jahr 2012) und Verwaltungsklagen (81 in 2012, davon 32 wegen Zulassungen an Brüsseler Schulen)? Hält die Kommission diese Ergebnisse für ausgewogen?

5. Ist sich die Kommission der Mängel der Zulassungsstrategien bewusst, die (Zitat aus der Rechtssache 13/25) „in der Umsetzung und in der Verwaltungsanwendung bei den betroffenen Eltern zu Recht auf viel Kritik und erhebliches Unverständnis gestoßen ist“? Ist sich die Kommission bewusst, dass das Verfahren (Zitat) „zu Recht als wenig flexibel und bürgernah zu qualifizieren ist“ und daher von der Beschwerdekammer (Zitat) als „zukünftig zu überarbeiten (Leitlinien und Zulassungsstrategie)“ angesehen wird? Wie sieht das die Kommission?

6. Was beabsichtigt die Kommission in ihrer Funktion im Obersten Rat und im Verwaltungsrat sowie als Adressat und als Finanzier an dieser Situation zu ändern?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(17. Dezember 2013)

1. In Artikel 50a Absatz 3 der allgemeinen Schulordnung der Europäischen Schulen (ES) ist Folgendes festgelegt: „Wenn der Beschluss über einen Zulassungsantrag von der Zentralen Zulassungsstelle für die Europäischen Schulen in Brüssel gefasst wird, kann die Beschwerdekammer gemäß Artikel 67 mit einer direkten Klage befasst werden“. Daher gibt es in solchen Fällen keinen anderen administrativen Weg mehr, der vorher zu beschreiten wäre. Eltern haben nur dann eine Gebühr zu entrichten, wenn der Rechtsbehelf als Verfahrensmissbrauch angesehen wird.

2. Somit besteht kein Widerspruch zu Artikel 27 der Vereinbarung über die Satzung der Europäischen Schulen, in dessen Absatz 2 es heißt: „Die Voraussetzungen für ein Verfahren der Beschwerdekammer und die entsprechenden Durchführungsbestimmungen sind in den Beschäftigungsbedingungen für das Lehrpersonal bzw. der Regelung für die Lehrbeauftragten oder der allgemeinen Schulordnung festgelegt“.

3. Es besteht keine rechtliche Verpflichtung für die Europäischen Schulen, eine weitere Beschwerdeinstanz zu schaffen. Die Europäische Menschenrechtskonvention sieht in Artikel 2 des Zusatzprotokolls Nr. 7 die Schaffung einer Berufungsinstanz nur für Strafsachen, nicht aber für andere, wie die hier behandelten Angelegenheiten vor.

4. 2012 gab es insgesamt 168 Verwaltungsbeschwerden und 81 formelle Beschwerden, von denen 32 Entscheidungen der Zentralen Zulassungsstelle betrafen. In 24 dieser 32 Fälle wies die Beschwerdekammer die Beschwerde zurück, in 6 Fällen beschloss sie, die Entscheidung der Zentralen Zulassungsstelle aufzuheben, und in zwei Fällen wurden die Beschwerden zurückgezogen.

5. Die Zulassungspolitik ist vor allem wegen der Überbelegung und der infrastrukturellen Beschränkungen ein komplexes Thema. Wie aus den neuen Leitlinien für 2014-2015 deutlich wird, strebt die Zulassungsstelle aber jedes Jahr nach mehr Flexibilität und Transparenz.

6. Auf Ersuchen der Kommission wurde eine Arbeitsgruppe eingesetzt, um den Rechtsschutz innerhalb des Systems der Europäischen Schulen zu analysieren und gegebenenfalls zu überarbeiten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011765/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Mayer (PPE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: European Schools Complaints Board

The European Schools were founded jointly by the governments of the Member States of the European Union and the European Communities. The legal bases include agreements with the EU, which ensure, *inter alia*, that a representative of the Commission represents the EU on the Board of Governors and on the Administrative Board of the schools. Decisions taken there must, as far as possible, be unanimous according to the Statute. Furthermore, the EU contributes just under 60% to the budget of the European Schools (exactly 59.7% of the total budget in 2012).

The judicial body common to all the European Schools is the Complaints Board of the European Schools. In accordance with Article 27 of the Convention defining the Statute of the European Schools, the Complaints Board shall have sole jurisdiction in the first and final instance, once all administrative channels have been exhausted. The Statute and rules of procedure of the Complaints Board itself are adopted by the Board of Governors, acting unanimously. The Complaints Board and the office at which its full-time employees work are also to be contacted by post c/o the Commission in Brussels.

1. Why is there no exhaustion of all administrative channels for disputes in connection with the admission procedures for schools in Brussels, but merely a means of appeal for which a mandatory fee is to be paid?

2. What is the legal basis for this contradiction of Article 27?

3. What is the justification for the fact that this is at the same time both a first- and a final-instance decision?

4. Are there any statistics from the last few years on the outcome of objections (168 in 2012) and administrative proceedings (81 in 2012, 32 of which related to admissions to schools in Brussels)? Does the Commission consider these results to be balanced?

5. Is the Commission aware of the shortcomings of the admissions strategies, which (quote from Case 13/25) 'in their implementation and administrative application have rightly met with a great deal of criticism and considerable confusion among the parents concerned'? Is the Commission aware that the procedure (quote) 'should rightly be classed as not very flexible and remote from citizens' and is therefore regarded by the Complaints Board as 'requiring revision in the future (guidelines and admissions strategy)'? What is the Commission's view of this?

6. What does it intend to do, in its role on the Board of Governors and on the Administrative Board and as addressee and provider of funding, to change this situation?

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

1. Art. 50a.3 of the General Rules of the European Schools (ES) states that 'When the decision on an application for enrolment is taken by the Central Enrolment Authority (CEA) for the Brussels ES, a contentious appeal may be lodged direct with the Complaints Board, in accordance with Article 67.' Therefore, there are no other administrative channels to be exhausted in such cases. A fee has to be paid by the parents only if the appeal is held to be an abuse of process.

2. There is therefore no contradiction with Art. 27 of the Convention of the ES, whose point 2 states that 'The conditions and the detailed rules relative to these proceedings shall be laid down, as appropriate, by the Service Regulations for the teaching staff or by the conditions of employment for part-time teachers, or by the General Rules of the Schools.'

3. There is no legal obligation for the ES to create a two-tier jurisdiction. The European Convention on Human Rights provides in Art.2 of Additional Protocol No 7 only for an obligation to create an appeal instance for criminal matters but not for other matters such as those at issue here.

4. In 2012, there were a total of 168 administrative appeals and 81 contentious appeals, 32 of which related to the decisions of the CEA. Out of these 32, in 24 cases the Complaint Board rejected the appeal, in 6 cases decided to annul the CEA decision and in 2 cases the appeals were withdrawn.

5. The Enrolments Policy is a complex issue due mainly to the overpopulation issue and infrastructure constraints. However, each year the CEA is striving for more flexibility and transparency, as is shown in the new guidelines for 2014-2015.

6. At the Commission's request, a working group has been convened to analyse and possibly revise the legal protection system within the ES System.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011767/13
to the Commission
Giles Chichester (ECR)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Gibraltar-Spain border

Following the visit of EU inspectors to the Gibraltar-Spain border, several incidents in which innocent Gibraltarians have been harassed by the Spanish authorities have again occurred.

Will the Commission continue to monitor the situation at the border between Gibraltar and Spain? Does the Commission intend to take any action against the Spanish authorities who are hindering the free movement of EU citizens in and out of Gibraltar?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2013)

On the basis of the observations during the technical visit of 25 September 2013 at the crossing point of La Línea de la Concepción and of the information provided by both authorities on that occasion, the Commission has not found evidence to conclude that the checks on persons and goods as operated by Spain at the border with Gibraltar have infringed the relevant provisions of Union law.

The management of this crossing point is nevertheless challenging, in view of the heavy traffic volumes in a relatively confined space and the increase in cigarette smuggling into Spain. The Commission believes that the authorities on both sides could take further measures to better address these challenges. Hence, it addressed recommendations to both authorities with a view to develop the mutual exchange of information on tobacco smuggling, to optimise the risk-based profiling at the border and the physical space on the Spanish side of the crossing point.

The Commission will continue to monitor the situation at this crossing point and asked to receive information from both authorities within six months on how the recommendations have been taken into consideration. The Commission reserves the right to reconsider its position should the situation change or evolve and also to pay another visit to this crossing point if appropriate in the future.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-011768/13
till kommissionen
Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE)
(16 oktober 2013)

Angående: European Animal Welfare Platform

Vad var kommissionens sammanlagda utgifter för finansieringen av European Animal Welfare Platform?

European Animal Welfare Platform gav upphov till strategiska dokument för nötkreatur av kött- och mjölkras, svin, värphöns, slaktkycklingar och odlad lax. De strategiska dokumenten innefattar både en förteckning över centrala djurskyddsfrågor och färdplaner för hur de ska hanteras. Vilka åtgärder vidtar kommissionen för att främja användandet av dessa strategiska dokument? Hur används de i dagsläget?

Vad är kommissionens bedömning av de vinster för djurskyddet som finansieringen av European Animal Welfare Platform resulterat i?

Svar från Máire Geoghegan-Quinn på kommissionens vägnar
(3 december 2013)

European Animal Welfare Platform (EAWP) (1) var ett EU-finansierat projekt inom ramen för sjunde ramprogrammet (2) som samlade producenter, återförsäljare och det civila samhällets aktörer för att diskutera djurskyddsfrågor i livsmedelskedjan. Projektet varade i tre år (2008–2011) och fick EU-anslag på totalt omkring 1 miljon euro.

EAWP underlättade utbyte av kunskap mellan intressenter och visade sig vara effektiv när det gäller att identifiera centrala djurskyddsfrågor, föreslå mål för förbättrat djurskydd, sprida god praxis angående djurskyddskrav och fastställa prioriteringar för forskningen.

Kunskaperna från EAWP utnyttjades för utarbetandet av rapporten *"Evaluation of the EU policy on Animal Welfare and Possible Options for the Future"* (3), som utmynnade i EU:s strategi för djurskydd och djurs välbefinnande 2012–2015 (4). Vissa av de problem som ringats in av EAWP undersöks i andra forskningsprojekt, exempelvis benfel i det nyligen utvalda projektet ProHealth. (5) Kommissionen stödjer vidare spridning genom att uppmuntra återanvändning av projektresultaten för att utveckla nya projekt (6) och uppmuntra samarbete med berörda parter.

På begäran av Europaparlamentet har kommissionen dessutom inlett ett pilotprojekt om ett europeiskt samordnat djurskyddsnätverk (*European coordinated animal welfare network*, EUWelNet), som startades i januari 2013 (7), och som bygger vidare på kunskaperna från EAWP och det nätverk av berörda parter som byggdes upp inom EAWP.

---

(1) http://www.animalwelfareplatform.eu

(2) Sjunde ramprogram för verksamhet inom området forskning, teknisk utveckling och demonstration (2007–2013).

(3) http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/3 %20Final%20Report%20-%20EUPAW%20Evaluation.pdf

(4) KOM(2012) 6 final, 15.2.2012.

(5) http://www.accelopment.com/en/infopool/news/ec-grant-agreement-signed-fp7-project-prohealth

(6) Andra projekt för bedömning av djurskyddet: AWIN: http://www.animal-welfare-indicators.net .
och AWARE: http://www.aware-welfare.eu.

(7) http://www.euwelnet.eu

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011768/13
to the Commission
Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: European Animal Welfare Platform

What has been the Commission's overall expenditure to date in funding the European Animal Welfare Platform?

The platform has produced strategic approach documents for beef and dairy cattle, pigs, laying hens, broiler chickens and farmed salmon, which include both an inventory of key welfare issues and roadmaps for addressing these issues. What steps is the Commission taking to encourage the use of these strategic approach documents? How are they being used?

What is the Commission's assessment of the welfare gains achieved as a result of the expenditure in funding the European Animal Welfare Platform?

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

The European Animal Welfare Platform (EAWP) (1) is a European project funded under FP7 (2), which brings together producers, retailers and civil society actors to address animal welfare issues in the food chain. This three-year project (2008- 2011) received a total EU contribution of circa EUR 1 million.

The platform facilitated the exchange of knowledge between stakeholders and proved successful in identifying key welfare issues, proposing goals for welfare improvement, disseminating best practices on animal welfare standards, and identifying research priorities.

The knowledge gained during the EAWP has been used for the 2010 'Evaluation of the EU policy on Animal Welfare and Possible Options for the Future' (3), which led to the EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 (4). Some of the problems identified by EAWP are examined by other research projects, such as leg disorders in the recently selected ProHealth project (5). The Commission supports wider dissemination by promoting the reuse of the project's results for the development of new projects (6) and encouraging stakeholder collaboration.

Furthermore, at the request of the European Parliament, the Commission launched a pilot project on a European coordinated animal welfare network (EUWelNet), which started in January 2013 (7), building upon the knowledge and stakeholder network generated by the EAWP.

---

(1) http://www.animalwelfareplatform.eu

(2) The Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013).

(3) http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/3%20Final%20Report%20-%20EUPAW%20Evaluation.pdf

(4) COM(2012) 6 final, 15.2.2012.

(5) http://www.accelopment.com/en/infopool/news/ec-grant-agreement-signed-fp7-project-prohealth

(6) Other animal welfare assessment projects : AWIN: http://www.animal-welfare-indicators.net andAWARE: http://www.aware-welfare.eu

(7) http://www.euwelnet.eu

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011769/13
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(16 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Gestión descentralizada en los Estados del programa Europa Creativa

La Comisión sustituirá en 2014 los programas Media, Cultura y Media Mundus por la iniciativa «Europa Creativa». La nueva iniciativa, además de apostar por la competitividad mediante un apoyo efectivo a los agentes culturales, cita expresamente la promoción de la diversidad cultural como un objetivo específico.

Desde una perspectiva administrativa, las actuales oficinas (PCC) y Media serán sustituidas en todos los Estados miembros por las oficinas «Europa Creativa». El programa plantea la creación de un organismo de coordinación en cada Estado y atribuye a cada país la facultad de organizar la relación entre este organismo y la oficina u oficinas «Europa Creativa». De acuerdo con las informaciones disponibles, la Comisión va a ofrecer un único acuerdo contractual con cada organismo estatal de coordinación.

Ambas decisiones pueden propiciar una recentralización de las relaciones entre los sectores de producción y creación cultural y las autoridades de los Estados miembros. Esta posibilidad es inconveniente, pues en muchos países las competencias culturales están descentralizadas. En otros hay industrias culturales que producen en lenguas minorizadas. Ambas razones aconsejan que la relación entre creadores y Comisión a través de estas oficinas incorpore a las autoridades locales y regionales. Además, en Estados con lenguas oficiales distintas al idioma común, son las autoridades regionales quienes asumen, prácticamente en exclusiva, la promoción de la producción cultural en estas lenguas.

A la vista de estos hechos:

1. ¿Cree la Comisión que una centralización de estas oficinas es coherente con la promoción de la diversidad?
2. ¿Piensa la Comisión ofrecer acuerdos multibeneficiarios para los Estados miembros en estas circunstancias?
3. ¿Aconsejará la Comisión la descentralización en países con varios idiomas oficiales?

Respuesta de la Sra. Vassiliou en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de noviembre de 2013)

La estructura de las futuras oficinas «Europa Creativa» se ha diseñado, en colaboración con los Estados miembros, a fin de proporcionar la mejor información posible a los agentes de los sectores culturales y creativos. A tal fin, cada país organizará dichas oficinas de acuerdo con su situación específica, incluidas sus particularidades institucionales y lingüísticas. Al mismo tiempo, con el fin de simplificar y reforzar la gestión de las mismas, las autoridades nacionales designarán en cada país un organismo de coordinación responsable ante la Comisión en lo que se refiere a los derechos y obligaciones contractuales entre la Comisión y las oficinas en cuestión. Por lo tanto, las relaciones entre los sectores culturales y creativos y las autoridades de los Estados miembros no estarán centralizadas.

Las disposiciones contractuales también tendrán en cuenta la situación específica de cada país y se ha considerado la posibilidad de ofrecer, en su caso, acuerdos a beneficiarios múltiples.

Las oficinas «Europa Creativa» pueden organizarse, por tanto, de manera más descentralizada, en particular en aquellos países en los que existan varias lenguas oficiales o competencias culturales y audiovisuales transferidas. Sin embargo, incumbe a las autoridades nacionales tomar una decisión al respecto, en el marco contractual y financiero previsto por la Comisión.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011769/13
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Decentralised management of the Creative Europe programme in Member States

In 2014, the Commission will replace the MEDIA, Culture and MEDIA Mundus programmes with the 'Creative Europe' initiative. In addition to backing competitiveness by means of effective support for cultural operators, the new initiative expressly cites the promotion of cultural diversity as a specific objective.

From an administrative perspective, the current offices (PCC and Media) will be replaced in all Member States by 'Creative Europe' offices. The programme is proposing to establish a coordinating body in each Member State and confer upon each country the authority to organise the relationship between this body and the 'Creative Europe' office or offices. According to the information available, the Commission is going to offer a single contractual agreement with each State coordinating body.

Both decisions may give rise to a re-centralisation of relationships between the cultural production and creativity sectors and the authorities of the Member States. This possibility is inappropriate, since in many countries the cultural decision-making authorities are decentralised. In other countries, there are cultural industries that work in minority languages. For both of these reasons, it is recommended that the relationship between creators and the Commission, by means of these offices, incorporates local and regional authorities. Furthermore, in States with official languages that are not the common language, it is the regional authorities that almost exclusively undertake the promotion of culture in these languages.

In view of the above:

1 Does the Commission believe that the centralisation of these offices is consistent with promoting diversity?

2 Is the Commission considering offering multi-beneficiary agreements for the Member States in these circumstances?

3 Will the Commission advise decentralisation in countries with several official languages?

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

The structure of the future Creative Europe Desks has been designed, in cooperation with the Member States, with a view to providing the best possible information to operators from the cultural and creative sectors. To this end, individual countries shall organise these offices so as to better take into account their specific situations, including institutional and/or linguistic specificities. At the same time, with a view to simplifying and strengthening the management of such offices, the national authorities shall appoint in each country a coordinating body that will be responsible vis-à-vis the Commission as regards the contractual rights and obligations between the Commission and these offices. Relationships between the cultural and creative sectors and the authorities of the Member States will therefore not be centralised.

The contractual arrangements will also take into account the specific situation of each country and the possibility of offering multi-beneficiary agreements, where appropriate, has indeed been considered.

The Creative Europe desks can indeed be organised on a more decentralised basis, in particular in countries that have several official languages or devolved cultural and audiovisual competences. However, it is up to national authorities to take such decisions, within the contractual and financial framework offered by the Commission.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011771/13
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(16 octobre 2013)

Objet: Mise sur le marché du Pradaxa

L'anticoagulant de nouvelle génération Pradaxa est accusé par plusieurs familles françaises d'être à l'origine du décès de quatre personnes au début de l'année 2013. Les familles des défunts ont alors décidé de porter plainte contre le laboratoire allemand Boehringer Ingelheim, qui commercialise ce produit.

Il est notamment reproché à l'Agence nationale de sécurité du médicament en France (ANSM) d'avoir méconnu les principes de précaution et de prévention. Les plaignants considèrent également que le laboratoire n'a pas assez étudié la molécule et ses risques, notamment chez les patients les plus fragiles et plus particulièrement les seniors, qui sont les plus exposés à ce médicament.

De plus, les plaignants considèrent regrettable le fait que le laboratoire n'ait pas commercialisé concomitamment le Pradaxa et son antidote qui aurait, selon eux, permis d'éviter de nombreux décès.

Ces plaintes sont apparues quelques semaines après la mise en garde de l'ANSM sur cette nouvelle génération de médicaments. En 2011, le laboratoire commercialisant le produit avait notamment enregistré 260 décès suspects par hémorragie chez des patients traités avec cet anticoagulant.

Aussi, la Commission a-t-elle l'intention d'entreprendre des démarches pour analyser les risques de ce médicament et étudier son éventuel retrait du marché?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(22 novembre 2013)

Un médicament ne peut être commercialisé que si une autorisation de mise sur le marché lui a été accordée conformément à la législation de l'UE (1), lorsque sa qualité, sa sécurité et son efficacité ont été évaluées et qu'un rapport bénéfice/risque positif quant à son utilisation a été établi. La sécurité d'un médicament fait l'objet d'un suivi continu après sa mise sur le marché.

Les rapports d'effets indésirables chez les patients à la suite de l'utilisation d'un médicament sont recueillis et contrôlés par l'Agence européenne des médicaments (AEM) et les notifications de nouveaux effets indésirables sont examinées. La sécurité des différents médicaments est régulièrement revue dans le cadre des rapports périodiques actualisés relatifs à leur sécurité.

Les risques identifiés liés à l'utilisation du Pradaxa (2) font l'objet d'un suivi attentif. Les données relatives aux réactions négatives notifiées sont examinées par l'AEM sur une base semestrielle. Le rapport bénéfice/risque continue d'être considéré comme positif (3).

Si un nouveau problème de sécurité est détecté par des activités de pharmacovigilance, les autorités évaluent les nouvelles données et déterminent si des mesures doivent être prises. Dans ce cas, la Commission demande l'avis de l'AEM. Le comité pour l'évaluation des risques en matière de pharmacovigilance est responsable de la détection, de l'évaluation et de la réduction des risques d'effets indésirables des médicaments, et de la communication sur ces risques. Ce comité fait, le cas échéant, des recommandations d'action visant à réduire les risques identifiés, et la Commission prend les mesures appropriées.

---

(1) Règlement (CE) n° 726/2004 du Parlement européen et du Conseil établissant des procédures communautaires pour l'autorisation et la surveillance en ce qui concerne les médicaments à usage humain et à usage vétérinaire, et instituant une Agence européenne des médicaments (JO L 136 du 30.4.2004) et directive 2001/83/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil instituant un code communautaire relatif aux médicaments à usage humain (JO L 311 du 28.11.2001).

(2) La description détaillée des autorisations de mise sur le marché pour les médicaments autorisés centralement est disponible sur le registre communautaire des médicaments à usage humain, voir: http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/alfregister.htm

(3) Le dernier rapport périodique actualisé relatif à la sécurité concernant Pradaxa a été évalué par l'AEM en octobre 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011771/13
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Marketing of Pradaxa

The new generation anticoagulant Pradaxa has been blamed by some French families for the deaths of four people in the early part of 2013. The families of the deceased have therefore decided to sue the German pharmaceutical company which sells the product, Boehringer Ingelheim.

The French medicines regulatory agency (ANSM) has also been accused of failing to follow the principles of precaution and prevention. The plaintiffs also claim that the pharmaceutical company did not perform sufficient studies on the drug and its risks, for example in the most vulnerable patients and in particular the elderly, who are more likely to be given the drug.

According to the plaintiffs, it is also regrettable that the company did not place an antidote to Pradaxa on the market at the same time as the drug itself, as this would have avoided many deaths.

These lawsuits were brought several weeks after ANSM issued a warning about this new generation drug class. In 2011, the company which sells the product recorded 260 deaths caused by bleeding in patients who had been taking this anticoagulant.

Does the Commission therefore intend to take steps to analyse the risks associated with this drug and the possibility of withdrawing it from the market?

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

A medicine can be placed on the market only after a marketing authorisation has been granted in accordance with the EU legislation (1), when its quality, safety and efficacy have been evaluated and a positive benefit-risk balance related to its use has been concluded. Once placed on the market, the safety of a medicine is continuously monitored.

Reports of adverse reactions in patients following the use of a medicine are collected and monitored by the European Medicines Agency (EMA) and signals of new adverse events are investigated. The safety of individual medicines is regularly reviewed through their periodic safety update reports.

The identified risks associated with use of Pradaxa (2) are closely monitored. Data on the reported adverse events are reviewed by EMA on a 6 monthly basis. The benefit-risk balance continues to be considered positive (3).

If a new safety issue is identified through pharmacovigilance activities, the authorities will assess the new data and determine whether any action is needed. In such cases the Commission seeks the advice of the EMA. EMA's Pharmacovigilance Risk Assessment Committee is responsible for the detection, assessment, minimisation and communication relating to the risk of adverse reactions of medicines. The Committee makes recommendations for action when it is necessary to minimise the identified risk, and the Commission takes action as appropriate.

---

(1) Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 laying down Community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency (OJ L 136, 30.4.2004) and Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use (OJ L 311, 28.11.2001).

(2) Details of the marketing authorisations for centrally authorised medicinal products are available on the Community Register of medicinal products for human use see: http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/alfregister.htm

(3) The most recent periodic safety update report for Pradaxa was assessed by EMA in October 2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011772/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(16 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Progetto per la creazione della 14ª discarica nel comune di Paese in provincia di Treviso, presentato dalla società Dal Zilio S.r.l.

La società Dal Zilio S.r.l. ha recentemente presentato un progetto di trasformazione in discarica per rifiuti speciali non pericolosi dell'ex cava di ghiaia denominata «Cava Castagnole» ubicata a Paese (TV) tra le località di Porcellengo e Castagnole. L'impianto progettato ha capacità di deposito pari a quasi 430 000 m3 di rifiuti, corrispondenti a circa 560 000 tonnellate, che verranno conferiti nell'arco temporale di 8 anni con traffico medio previsto di 8-9 mezzi pesanti giornalieri in entrata, per un conferimento medio annuo di 70 000 tonnellate. Il sito è ubicato nell'alta pianura trevigiana in piena zona di ricarica degli acquiferi, caratterizzata da una preoccupante presenza di nitrati e si trova in prossimità delle abitazioni e di una scuola dell'infanzia.

Lo scrivente deputato è autore di varie interrogazioni in merito all'anomala quantità di discariche e cave spesso irregolari e ai problemi di inquinamento delle falde acquifere riscontrati a Paese e nei comuni circostanti; solo nel comune di Paese, infatti, sono presenti ben 29 cave e 13 discariche. La presenza di una simile concentrazione di impianti e le conseguenti ripercussioni ambientali che il territorio ha subìto nel corso del tempo sembrano essere in contrasto con il principio di precauzione di cui all'articolo 191, paragrafo 2 TFUE.

Nelle risposte alle interrogazioni P-010621/2012 ed E-004885-13, presentate rispettivamente in relazione alle discariche di Paese «T.ER.R.A. S.r.l.» ed «Ex SEV», la Commissione si impegnava a contattare le autorità italiane per ottenere alcuni chiarimenti. Nella risposta all'interrogazione E-006642/13 sull'ampliamento di un'altra discarica nel vicino comune di Trevignano (TV), la Commissione precisava inoltre che le decisioni relative all'autorizzazione delle discariche sono adottate dalle autorità competenti degli Stati membri.

Tutto ciò premesso, la Commissione:

1. è a conoscenza del sopra esposto nuovo progetto di creazione di un'ulteriore a discarica a Paese (TV)?

2. Può far sapere l'esito dei contatti intercorsi con le autorità italiane in merito alla discariche «T.ER.R.A. S.r.l.» ed «ex SEV» e se intende contattare le autorità anche in merito al sopra esposto nuovo progetto?

3. Non ritiene opportuno un futuro aggiornamento della normativa comunitaria di settore, al fine di imporre agli Stati membri regole atte ad evitare il riproporsi di anomale concentrazioni di impianti come quella presente a Paese (TV)?

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

1. La Commissione non dispone di informazioni riguardo al progetto di trasformazione dell'ex cava di ghiaia denominata «Cava Castagnole» in discarica per rifiuti speciali non pericolosi.

2. A seguito delle interrogazioni scritte E-004885/2013 ed E-004886/2013 ([1]), la Commissione ha chiesto alle autorità italiane di fornire chiarimenti sulla discarica dismessa in Via Veccelli, nel comune di Padernello di Paese (provincia di Treviso), e sulla discarica «Ex Nuova ESA», situata tra i comuni di Marcon (provincia di Venezia) e Mogliano Veneto (provincia di Treviso). La Commissione valuterà la risposta data dalle autorità italiane e deciderà se occorre adottare eventuali misure.

Inoltre, qualora dovesse risultare che il progetto presentato dalla società Dal Zilio S.r.l. possa dar luogo a una violazione della normativa ambientale dell'UE, la Commissione contatterà le autorità italiane.

3. Non occorrono norme specifiche per impedire la concentrazione di discariche, poiché queste ultime sono disciplinate dalla direttiva VIA ([2]), che impone di tener conto dell'impatto cumulativo con altri impianti.

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

([2]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale di determinati progetti pubblici e privati — GU L 26 del 28.1.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011772/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Project for the creation of the 14th landfill in Paese (province of Treviso), presented by Dal Zilio S.r.l.

The company Dal Zilio S.r.l. recently presented a project to convert the former gravel quarry, Cava Castagnole, located in Paese (province of Treviso) between Porcellengo and Castagnole, into a landfill site for special non-hazardous waste. The planned facility has a waste storage capacity of almost 430 000 m^3, equal to approximately 560 000 tonnes, which will be landfilled over 8 years with a forecast average of 8-9 incoming heavy vehicles per day, giving an average annual landfilled amount of 70 000 tonnes. The site lies in Treviso's high plains in the middle of a groundwater replenishment area. There is a worrying presence of nitrates, and homes and an infant school are located nearby.

I have submitted several questions on the abnormal number of landfills and quarries, which are often illegal, and on the groundwater pollution problems in Paese and surrounding municipalities; there are, in fact, as many as 29 quarries and 13 landfills in the municipality of Paese alone. Such a high concentration of facilities and the consequent environmental effects on the area over time appear to run counter to the precautionary principle laid down in Article 191(2) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

In its answers to questions P-010621/2012 and E-004885-13, submitted respectively on the 'T.ER.R.A. S.r.l.' and 'Former SEV' landfills in Paese, the Commission undertook to contact the Italian authorities for clarification of certain issues. In its answer to Question E-006642/13 on the expansion of another landfill in the nearby municipality of Trevignano (province of Treviso), the Commission also stated that decisions about the authorisation of landfills are taken by the competent authorities of the Member States.

1. Is the Commission aware of the above new project to create another landfill in Paese?

2. Can it refer the outcome of its contacts with the Italian authorities regarding the T.ER.R.A. S.r.l. and former SEV landfills, and does it also plan to contact the authorities about the above new project?

3. Does it not believe that EU legislation in this area should be updated in the future, in order to impose on the Member States rules to prevent a repetition of abnormal concentrations of facilities such as that found in Paese?

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

1. The Commission has no information on the project to convert the former gravel quarry, Cava Castagnole, into a landfill site for special non-hazardous waste.

2. Following written questions E-004885/2013 and E-004886/2013 (1), the Commission asked the Italian authorities to provide clarifications on the disused landfill in Via Veccelli in the municipality of Padernello di Paese (province of Treviso) as well as on the 'Ex Nuova ESA' landfill between the municipality of Marcon (province of Venice) and the municipality of Mogliano Veneto (province of Treviso). The Commission will assess the reply of the Italian authorities and decide if any steps are necessary.

Also, in case of any evidence that the project presented by Dal Zilio S.r.l. may breach EU environmental legislation, the Commission will contact the competent Italian authorities.

3. Specific legislation to prevent concentration of landfills is not necessary, as landfill are subject to the the EIA Directive (2) where cumulative impacts with other facilities have to be taken into account.

---

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

(2) Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment — OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011773/13
alla Commissione
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(16 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Criminalità organizzata nella filiera agroalimentare

In un periodo di forte crisi internazionale e in un paese come l'Italia, dove oltre l'86 % dei trasporti commerciali avviene su gomma, i consumatori vedono aumentare i prezzi dei prodotti alimentari del 200 % del loro prezzo a causa delle infiltrazioni della criminalità organizzata nel mercato ortofrutticolo.

Come riportato nell'articolo de «Il Sole 24ore» del 7 ottobre, le imprese agricole e i consumatori subiscono un impatto devastante dovuto alle infiltrazioni mafiose che danneggiano tutta l'economia locale. Il costo grava interamente sulla vendita del prodotto ed è scaricato completamente sul consumatore finale, raddoppiando o addirittura triplicando il prezzo delle derrate alimentari.

La criminalità organizzata in agricoltura opera attraverso furti di attrezzature e mezzi agricoli, racket, estorsioni, pizzo e truffe nei confronti dell'Unione europea, senza dimenticare le intromissioni nel sistema di distribuzione e trasporto che mettono a rischio non solo la sicurezza alimentare, ma determinano anche un danno economico.

Pertanto si chiede alla Commissione:

1. quali siano gli organismi (OLAF, Eurojust, Europol e altri) a livello europeo competenti per contrastare il problema di cui sopra;

2. se ci siano provvedimenti o programmi in atto da parte degli organi di controllo per contrastare le infiltrazioni della criminalità organizzata nella filiera agroalimentare.

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(3 dicembre 2013)

La Commissione attribuisce un'elevata priorità alla lotta contro la criminalità organizzata. Tuttavia, alla Commissione non sono ancora pervenute prove di un'infiltrazione significativa della criminalità organizzata nel mercato agroalimentare transfrontaliero, come descritto dall'onorevole deputato.

L'attività di Europol comprende l'impegno contro il coinvolgimento della criminalità organizzata nel traffico di merci contraffatte e scadenti, che violano le norme sanitarie, di sicurezza e alimentari. Le misure operative di Europol per il 2014 nel quadro di questa priorità sono attualmente in fase di discussione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011773/13
to the Commission
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Organised crime in the agri-food industry

At this time of deep international crisis, consumers in Italy, where over 86% of commercial transport takes place by road, are seeing food prices increase by 200% owing to the involvement of organised crime in the fruit and vegetable market.

As reported in *Il Sole 24 Ore* on 7 October, mafia involvement is having a devastating effect on agricultural holdings and consumers, and harming the entire local economy. The cost is reflected entirely in the marketing of the goods and is passed on in full to the end consumer, thereby doubling or even tripling the price of foodstuffs.

Organised crime in the agricultural sector operates through theft of agricultural equipment and vehicles, rackets, extortion, demands for protection money and by defrauding the EU, not to mention its interference in the distribution and transport system which not only jeopardises food security but also results in economic damage.

1. Which EU bodies (OLAF, Eurojust, Europol and so on) are responsible for tackling the above problem?

2. Have the supervisory bodies implemented any measures or programmes to counter the involvement of organised crime in the agri-food industry?

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

The Commission places a high priority on the fight against organised crime. However, the Commission has not so far been made aware of evidence of significant involvement of organised crime in the cross-border agri-food market as described by the Honourable Member.

Europol's work includes efforts against the involvement of organised crime in counterfeit goods that violate health, safety and food regulations, and substandard goods. Its operational measures for 2014 within this priority are currently under discussion.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011774/13
aan de Commissie
Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)
(16 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Nederlandse kentekenplaten (betreft antwoord op vraag E-007556/2013)

Is het antwoord op de vraag nummer E-007556/2013 wel juist, gezien het feit dat de Commissie in een soortgelijk geval in Spanje een andere zienswijze blijkt te hebben? (SG(2008) D/50925; Directiva 98/34/CE; 2008/0189/E; MSG: 200800925. ES)

Kan de Commissie een reactie geven op de volgende opmerkingen:

1. Het feit dat een overheid zegt dat iets een document is, betekent niet dat dat ook zo is, slechts de feiten kunnen dit aantonen.

2. De Commissie beweert dat een kentekenplaat gebruikt kan worden om vast te stellen om welk voertuig het gaat, doch dat is niet correct. Indien een auto van eigenaar verandert wordt alleen het kentekenbewijs (registratiepapieren) gebruikt; indien door bevoegde instanties de identiteit van een voertuig moet worden vastgesteld dan mag dat juridisch gezien slechts met het unieke VIN-nummer (Vehicle Identification Number). Kentekenplaten worden in deze juridische handelingen niet geaccepteerd als zijnde een officieel document. Een kentekenplaat is slechts een visualisatie van het kentekenbewijs.

3. Het kenmerk van een officieel document, zoals het kentekenbewijs, is dat het uitgegeven wordt door een officiële instantie. De overheid geeft in dit geval dan wel de gegevens af, doch de kentekenplaat wordt in Nederland niet uitgegeven door de overheid.

4. De Commissie gaat tevens voorbij aan het feit dat de Nederlandse overheid in 2008, 2009 en 2010 duidelijk heeft gecommuniceerd dat deze kentekenplaten verkocht mochten gaan worden. De genoemde bezwaren golden dus blijkbaar niet en sindsdien is er niets veranderd.

Antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie
(3 december 2013)

In document SG(2008) D/50925 met betrekking tot kennisgevingsprocedure 2008/189/E in het kader van richtlijn 98/34 heeft de Commissie geen standpunt ingenomen dat in strijd is met het antwoord op vraag E-007556/2013.

Kentekenplaten zijn niet geharmoniseerd op EU-niveau. Bijgevolg zijn de lidstaten bevoegd om daarvoor regels vast te stellen en de desbetreffende technische specificaties te bepalen. Hoewel in sommige lidstaten vlakke kentekenplaten zijn toegestaan, vereisen andere lidstaten kentekenplaten met reliëf. In Nederland verlangt de bestaande wetgeving dat kentekenplaten van aluminium en folie zijn gemaakt, geperst zijn en reliëf bevatten, waardoor gedrukte onderscheidingstekens uitgesloten zijn.

Zoals in het antwoord op vraag E-007556/2013 is vermeld, kunnen alleen waren die op geld waardeerbaar zijn en het voorwerp van handelstransacties kunnen vormen, onder de artikelen 34-36 VWEU inzake het vrije verkeer van goederen vallen.

Hoewel materiaal dat voor de productie van kentekenplaten wordt gebruikt (zoals metaal of kunststof) het voorwerp van een handelstransactie kan vormen, is de Commissie van mening dat afgewerkte kentekenplaten in Nederland niet kunnen worden beschouwd als verhandelbare goederen in de zin van de artikelen 34-36 VWEU. De reden daarvoor is dat deze afgewerkte kentekenplaten in Nederland als officiële documenten worden beschouwd — in die zin dat zij een specifieke auto aanduiden — die nadat een voertuig is ingeschreven en op basis van een geldig inschrijvingsbewijs worden afgegeven door entiteiten die door de overheid zijn goedgekeurd. Wanneer de inschrijving eindigt, worden zij aan de bevoegde instantie teruggegeven.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011774/13
to the Commission
Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Netherlands vehicle registration plates (concerning answer to Question E-007556/2013)

Is the answer to Question E-007556/2013 actually correct, given that the Commission seems to have a different view involving a similar case in Spain? (SG(2008) D/50925; Directive 98/34/EC; 2008/0189/E; MSG: 200800925.ES)

Can the Commission give a response to the following comments?

1. The fact that a government says that something is a document does not mean that this is also the case; only the facts can prove this.

2. The Commission claims that a registration plate can be used to identify a specific vehicle, but this is not correct. If a car changes owner, only the registration certificate (documents) is used. If the identity of a vehicle needs to be established by competent authorities, this can only be done legally using the unique VIN number (Vehicle Identification Number). Registration plates are not accepted in these legal proceedings as an official document. A registration plate is merely a representation of the registration certificate.

3. The feature of an official document, such as a registration certificate, is that it is issued by an official body. In this instance, the government actually provides the data, but the registration plate is not issued in the Netherlands by the government.

4. The Commission is also ignoring the fact that the Netherlands Government clearly announced in 2008, 2009 and 2010 that these registration plates were going to be allowed to be sold. Therefore, the abovementioned concerns did not seem to apply and nothing has changed since then.

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

In document SG(2008) D/50925 relating to notification procedure 2008/189/E under Directive 98/34, the Commission did not take a position that would contradict the answer given to Question E-007556/2013.

Car registration plates are not harmonised at EU level. Consequently, it is of the competence of the Member States to regulate these and to set the related technical specifications. While some Member States allow for flat car registration plates, other Member States require embossed registration plates. In the Netherlands the existing legislation requires registration plates to be made of aluminium and foil and to be embossed and contain relief, which excludes printed insignia.

As stated in the answer to Question E-007556/2013, only products that can be valued in money and are capable of forming the object of commercial transactions can fall within the scope of Articles 34-36 TFEU on the free movement of goods.

While the materials used for the production of registration plates (e.g. metal or plastic) could form the subject of a commercial transaction, the Commission holds the view that, in the Netherlands, finished registration plates cannot be considered as tradable goods within the meaning of Articles 34-36 TFEU. The reason for this is that these finished registration plates are considered in the Netherlands to be official documents, in the sense that they identify a specific car, being delivered by entities approved by the government as a consequence of vehicle registration and based on a valid registration document. They are then handed back to the authorised authority when the registration comes to an end.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011775/13
do Komisji
Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(16 października 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Przepisy prawa unijnego a oznakowanie produktów mięsnych

Czy przepisy prawa unijnego zezwalają na informowanie konsumentów, że określony produkt mięsny nie pochodzi od zwierząt poddawanych ubojowi metodą uboju rytualnego, o którym mowa w artykule 4 ustęp 4 rozporządzenia Rady (WE) nr 1099/2009 z dnia 24 września 2009 r. w sprawie ochrony zwierząt podczas ich uśmiercania?

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

W obowiązującym prawodawstwie UE nie ma przepisu regulującego tę kwestię. Została ona jednak poruszona przez Parlament Europejski w trakcie negocjacji, które zakończyły się przyjęciem rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady (UE) nr 1169/2011 w sprawie przekazywania konsumentom informacji na temat żywności ([1]). W rezultacie w motywie 50 tego rozporządzenia stwierdza się, że: „Konsumenci w Unii wykazują rosnące zainteresowanie wdrażaniem przepisów Unii dotyczących dobrostanu zwierząt w czasie uboju, w tym kwestią ogłuszania zwierząt przed ubojem. W związku z tym w kontekście przyszłej strategii Unii na rzecz ochrony i dobrostanu zwierząt należy rozważyć przeprowadzenie badania na temat możliwości dostarczania konsumentom stosownych informacji na temat ogłuszania zwierząt.”

Komisja zleciła już takie badanie, a jego wyniki powinny ukazać się w kwietniu 2014 r.

([1]) Dz.U. L 304 z 22.11.2011, s. 18.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011775/13
to the Commission
Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: EU legislation and the labelling of meat products

Is there any provision under EU legislation for consumers to be informed whether a meat product is derived from ritually slaughtered animals as referred to in Article 4(4) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 of 24 September 2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing?

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

There is no such provision under existing EU legislation. This issue was, however, raised by the European Parliament during the negotiations that led to the adoption of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the provision of food information to consumers (1). Consequently, recital (50) of this regulation states that: ‘Union consumers show an increasing interest in the implementation of the Union animal welfare rules at the time of slaughter, including whether the animal was stunned before slaughter. In this respect, a study on the opportunity to provide consumers with the relevant information on the stunning of animals should be considered in the context of a future Union strategy for the protection and welfare of animals.’

The Commission has now mandated this study and results are expected by April 2014.

---

(1) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-011777/13
an die Kommission
Kerstin Westphal (S&D)
(16. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Subventionen für die Firma Schaeffler

Die Firma Schaeffler plant eine Erweiterung ihres Werkes in Kysucké (Slowakei). Dafür hat die Firma laut Medienberichten beim slowakischen Wirtschaftsministerium Investitionsbeihilfen in Höhe von 3,36 Mio. EUR beantragt. Gleichzeitig plant Schaeffler einen Stellenabbau bei der Radlagerproduktion in Schweinfurt (Deutschland). Über 800 Jobs sollen nach Kysucké verlagert werden.

1. Enthalten die beantragten 3,36 Mio. EUR europäische Investitionsbeihilfen?

2. Wird die Erweiterung des Werkes in Kysucké auf andere Art mit Gemeinschaftsmitteln, zum Beispiel aus Strukturfonds, gefördert? Wenn ja: in welcher Höhe?

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

Nach Angaben des slowakischen Wirtschaftsministeriums hat das deutsche Unternehmen Industriewerk Schaeffler Investitionsbeihilfen bei ihm beantragt. Der Antrag bezieht sich auf ein Investitionsprogramm des Unternehmens in der Slowakischen Republik, wo das Unternehmen vorhat, seine Radlagerproduktion für die Automobilindustrie und andere Industriezweige auszuweiten. Diese Ausweitung soll in Kysucke Nove Mesto (Region Zilina) in der Slowakischen Republik erfolgen. Es wurden staatliche Beihilfen in Höhe von 3,36 Mio. EUR beantragt. Der Antrag auf staatliche Beihilfen liegt in der Slowakischen Republik bereits zur Genehmigung vor.

Es wurde bestätigt, dass in diesem Fall keine EU-Finanzierung vorliegt. Es handelt sich einzig und allein um staatliche Beihilfen der Slowakischen Republik.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011777/13
to the Commission
Kerstin Westphal (S&D)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Subsidies for Schaeffler

The company Schaeffler is planning an expansion of its factory in Kysucké, Slovakia. In order to do this, the company has applied for EUR 3.36 million of investment aid from the Slovak Ministry of Economic Affairs, according to media reports. Schaeffler is also planning to reduce its wheel bearing production workforce in Schweinfurt, Germany. Reportedly 800 jobs will be moved to Kysucké.

1. Does the requested EUR 3.36 million include EU investment aid?

2. Is the expansion of the factory in Kysucké being supported in any other way through EU funding, such as via the Structural Funds? If so, how much is being provided?

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

According to the Slovak Ministry of Economy, an application has been made on behalf of the German company Industriewerk Schaeffler for investment aid from the Slovak Ministry of Economy. The application relates to an investment plan of the company in Slovakia, where the company plans to extend its production of ball bearings for automotive and other industries. This extension would take place in Kysucke Nove Mesto (Zilina region) in Slovakia. State aid of EUR 3.36 million has been requested. The state aid application is currently under approval in Slovakia.

It has been confirmed that no EU financing is involved in this case. It is a matter of national state aid only.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-011778/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(16 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Retraso del proyecto del tren de alta velocidad (TAV) Barcelona — París

Los trenes de alta velocidad (TAV) directos que debían conectar París con Barcelona antes del verano no funcionarán al menos hasta «después de agosto», señaló en el mes de mayo la compañía ferroviaria francesa SNCF, que lo atribuyó a «razones técnicas» (1).

«Son razones técnicas» las que explican el retraso, subrayó el portavoz de la Sociedad Nacional de Ferrocarriles de Francia (SNCF), que negó los rumores sobre desencuentros con su homóloga española Renfe (2).

El portavoz insistió en refutar problemas en la cooperación entre la SNCF y Renfe por la liberalización del tráfico en España y las supuestas ambiciones de la compañía francesa para entrar a competir en ese mercado.

La empresa francesa señaló que las diferencias técnicas entre las dos redes ferroviarias requieren estudios en profundidad para garantizar la compatibilidad. Precisó que se están llevando a cabo pruebas en particular sobre la señalización, la alimentación de electricidad, así como la verificación de los materiales de cada una de las empresas en las redes del otro país.

Hoy se habla de proyecto retrasado hasta «antes de final de año».

A la luz de lo anterior,

1. ¿Puede la Comisión informarnos sobre la situación actual del proyecto y la fecha de puesta en marcha efectiva de esta infraestructura?

2. ¿Cree la Comisión que esos aparentes nuevos retrasos son causados por motivos «técnicos» o que son bloqueados por el Gobierno español por motivos «políticos»?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(15 de noviembre de 2013)

1. La línea de alta velocidad entre Barcelona y la frontera francesa está finalizada y es interoperable, y el sistema europeo de señalización y control ha sido implantado. El tramo transfronterizo ya ha entrado en funcionamiento y se utiliza actualmente para el tráfico tanto de mercancías como de pasajeros.

2. Según los datos de que dispone la Comisión, los retrasos a los que se refiere Su Señoría se deben a problemas en los tramos donde el sistema de señalización todavía no es interoperable, así como a la autorización mutua de material rodante que las respectivas autoridades nacionales deben expedir en este momento.

---

(1) http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20131009/54388681137/alta-velocidad-conectara-barcelona-paris-antes-final-ano.html

(2) http://www.lavanguardia.com/local/barcelona/20130527/54374437090/tav-directo-paris-barcelona-retrasa-despues-agosto.html

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011778/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Barcelona-Paris high-speed train project delayed

The French railway company SNCF said in May that the high-speed trains (TAV) which were to provide a direct connection between Paris and Barcelona before the summer would not be in operation until 'after August', allegedly because of 'technical problems' (1).

'Technical problems' have caused this delay, insisted the spokesperson for French National Railways (SNCF), who denied rumours hinting at disagreements with their Spanish counterpart Renfe (2).

It has been suggested that conflict has arisen between the two companies as a result of the liberalisation of the Spanish rail network and the alleged aspirations of the French company to compete in this market, but the SNCF spokesperson categorically refuted these claims.

SNCF has explained that an in-depth study of the technical differences between the two railway networks is required in order to ensure that they are operationally compatible. Tests are being conducted on signalling systems and electricity supplies in particular, as well as on the materials used by each company in the network of the other country.

Now they are saying that the project may not be completed until the end of the year.

In light of the above:

1. Can the Commission provide details of the project's development thus far and the date of the effective launch of this infrastructure?

2. Does the Commission believe that these new delays have been caused by 'technical problems' or rather that the Spanish Government is blocking further advancement for 'political' reasons?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(15 November 2013)

1. The high-speed line from Barcelona to the french border is completed and interoperable, with European Signalling and Control System deployed. The cross-border section has already become operational and is currently used for both freight and passenger traffic.

2. To the knowledge of the Commission, the delays referred to by the Honourable Member are caused by problems in sections where the signalling system is still not interoperable, as well as by the mutual authorisation of rolling stock to be currently issued by the respective National Authorities.

---

(1) http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20131009/54388681137/alta-velocidad-conectara-barcelona-paris-antes-final-ano.html

(2) http://www.lavanguardia.com/local/barcelona/20130527/54374437090/tav-directo-paris-barcelona-retrasa-despues-agosto.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011781/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(16 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Richiesta di assistenza di sicurezza da parte della Libia

Il 23 settembre 2013 il sito web *Maghrebia* ha riferito che il primo ministro libico Ali Zidan ha suggerito di inviare 3 000 soldati libici in Turchia, Italia, Regno Unito e USA a fini di formazione militare. L'obiettivo è ottenere l'assistenza internazionale per affrontare l'incerta situazione della Libia in materia di sicurezza. Molti cittadini libici lamentano che i blocchi stradali, le rapine, i rapimenti e gli omicidi stanno diventando normale parte della vita quotidiana e che mancano una forza di polizia e un esercito nazionale efficaci nonché forze di sicurezza in campo.

Il primo ministro Zidan ha inoltre affermato che, oltre alla formazione all'estero, almeno 200 comandanti che hanno partecipato alla rimozione di Gheddafi stanno per essere ricompensati con un avanzamento di grado. Il governo libico ammette che sta attivamente cercando aiuto dai partner internazionali. Parlando ad un gruppo di investitori durante una conferenza svoltasi il 17 settembre a Londra, il primo ministro Zidan ha affermato che terroristi «di altri paesi» stanno cercando di costruire una «roccaforte» in Libia, rilevando che la situazione non è destinata a migliorare senza l'effettiva ed efficace partecipazione della comunità internazionale: «Dico sinceramente che, se la comunità internazionale non ci aiuterà a raccogliere armi e munizioni, il ritorno alla sicurezza richiederà un lungo periodo di tempo».

1. Quali passi stanno adottando l'UE e gli Stati membri per fornire assistenza alla Libia al fine di aiutarla a costruire una forza di polizia e un esercito nazionali?

2. L'UE sta lavorando con il governo libico per individuare le vulnerabilità fondamentali del paese in materia di sicurezza e valutare in che modo gli aiuti possano essere utilizzati nel modo più efficiente?

3. Qual è la posizione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante in materia di impegno del governo libico ad affrontare i problemi di sicurezza del paese?

Risposta dell'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(27 novembre 2013)

1. Il settore della sicurezza è uno degli ambiti principali del sostegno dell'Unione europea alla Libia. La sola UE fornisce un finanziamento di più di 20 milioni di euro, inclusi 10 milioni per un programma di riforma riguardante la polizia e la giustizia, il rafforzamento delle capacità in materia di indagini penali attraverso Interpol, la bonifica delle mine e degli ordigni inesplosi, la prevenzione e la riduzione della violenza armata, la sicurezza fisica e la gestione delle scorte.

2. L'UE e gli Stati membri intrattengono con le autorità libiche un dialogo regolare di riflessione sulla situazione della sicurezza e sul modo di affrontare i problemi principali con il sostegno internazionale. Il Ministero libico degli Interni organizza, sotto gli auspici delle Nazioni Unite, incontri periodici di coordinamento con tutti i principali interlocutori.

3. L'AR/VP non mette in dubbio l'impegno del governo libico nell'affrontare i problemi in materia di sicurezza.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011781/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Libya asks for security assistance

On 23 September 2013 the news website *Maghrebia* reported that Libyan Prime Minister Ali Zidan had suggested the idea of sending 3 000 Libyan troops to Turkey, Italy, the UK and the US for military training. The aim is to obtain international assistance in tackling Libya's faltering security situation. Many Libyan citizens complain that road blocks, robberies, kidnappings and assassinations are becoming a common part of daily life, and that there is an absence of an effective police force and national army, and of security forces on the ground.

Prime Minister Zidan has also said that, in addition to foreign training, at least 200 commanders who took part in the removal of Gaddafi are to be awarded with military ranks. The Libyan Government admits that it is actively seeking help from its international partners. Speaking to a group of investors at a conference in London on 17 September, Prime Minister Zidan said that terrorists 'from other countries' are trying to build a 'stronghold' in Libya, noting that the situation is not going to improve without the true and effective participation of the international community: 'I say frankly that if the international community does not help us collect arms and ammunition, then the return of security is going to take a long time'.

1. What steps are the EU and the Member States taking to provide assistance to Libya in order to help construct a national police force and military service?

2. Is the EU working with the Libyan Government to identify the country's key security vulnerabilities and assess how aid can be used most effectively?

3. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding the commitment of the Libyan Government to tackle the country's security problems?

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

1. The security sector is among the key sectors for EU support to Libya. The EU alone provides over EUR 20 million, including a EUR 10 million programme on police and justice reform, capacity building for criminal investigation through Interpol, clearance of mines and unexploded ordnances, the prevention and reduction of armed violence and physical security and stockpile management.

2. The EU and Member States are in regular dialogue with the Libyan authorities to reflect on the security situation and how international support can address key concerns. Regular coordination meetings with all key actors are organised by the Libyan Ministry of Interior under the auspices of the UN.

3. The HR/VP does not question the commitment of the Libyan Government to address the security problems.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011782/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(16 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Tortura nelle carceri libiche

Il 1° ottobre 2013, varie agenzie di stampa hanno riferito le conclusioni di una nuova relazione dell'ONU secondo la quale tortura e brutalità sono normale amministrazione in Libia. La relazione precisa che circa 8000 prigionieri sono detenuti nelle carceri governative in quanto sospettati di aver combattuto per Muammar al-Gheddafi. Molti altri prigionieri sono però detenuti dalle milizie libere, in luoghi nascosti e in condizioni disumane. Le organizzazioni ONU per i diritti dell'uomo come l'UNHCHR riferiscono che «torture e maltrattamenti in Libia sono un problema costante e diffuso in molti centri di detenzione».

L'ONU ha registrato 27 casi di morte in prigione, quasi certamente causati da tortura, e si teme che, in mancanza di interventi, «vi sia il rischio che la tortura diventi istituzionalizzata all'interno della nuova Libia». Molti arresti sono stati effettuati per ragioni arbitrarie e motivati da vendette personali o tribali. La relazione dell'ONU ha illustrato nel dettaglio casi di uomini che sono stati prelevati a forza e senza spiegazione dalle milizie sulla via del lavoro o dalle proprie case. Il personale ONU ha avuto scarso accesso alle carceri gestite dalle milizie per elaborare questa relazione.

1. Quali passi sta adottando l'UE per verificare in modo indipendente l'entità dei casi in cui si applica la tortura nelle carceri libiche?

2. In che modo sta operando con le altre agenzie internazionali per negoziare il diritto delle organizzazioni esterne di ispezionare le carceri gestite dai miliziani?

3. Come giudicano i funzionari UE presenti nella regione gli sforzi compiuti dalle autorità libiche per attuare il loro impegno a porre termine alla tortura?

Risposta dell'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(5 dicembre 2013)

L'Unione europea è consapevole delle condizioni inaccettabili che regnano nei centri di detenzione in Libia, in particolare in quelli sotto il controllo delle milizie.

L'UE ha invitato le autorità a porre sotto il loro controllo tutti i luoghi di detenzione e a indagare sulle presunte violazioni dei diritti dei detenuti. Il governo libico ha successivamente dichiarato di stare trasferendo le strutture di detenzione sotto il controllo delle autorità, sottraendole a quello delle milizie.

L'Unione europea si è avvalsa di progetti finanziati dallo Strumento europeo per la democrazia e i diritti umani per fornire servizi di sostegno alle vittime di tortura, e ha intrapreso attività di promozione di un quadro politico nazionale che affronti la tortura e le altre forme di maltrattamento. L'UE sta inoltre finanziando progetti attuati dall'OIM, dall'ACNUR, da Mercy Corps e dal Danish Refugee Council che vertono sulla protezione dei migranti vulnerabili, dei profughi, dei richiedenti asilo e degli sfollati.

Attraverso il dialogo politico con le autorità l'UE continuerà a perorare la necessità che la Libia rispetti gli obblighi nazionali e internazionali assunti in materia di diritti fondamentali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011782/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Torture in Libyan prisons

On 1 October 2013, various news agencies reported the findings of a new UN report which stated that torture and brutality are commonplace in Libya. The report suggested that approximately 8 000 prisoners are being held in government jails on suspicion of having fought for Muammar al-Gaddafi. However, countless other prisoners are being detained by freelance militias, out of sight and in inhumane conditions. UN human rights organisations such as the UNHCHR reported that, 'Torture and ill-treatment in Libya is an ongoing and widespread concern in many detention centres.'

The UN has recorded 27 cases of death in detention, almost certainly caused by torture, and there are concerns that, unless steps are taken, 'there is a danger that torture will become institutionalised within the new Libya'. Many of the arrests have been for arbitrary reasons and motivated by personal or tribal score-settling. The UN report detailed cases of men hauled off the street on the way to work or from their homes by militia without explanation. The UN staff had very little access to militia-run jails when compiling their report.

1. What steps is the EU taking to verify independently the extent to which torture occurs in Libya's jails?

2. How is the EU working with other international agencies to negotiate the right for external organisations to inspect jails run by militia groups?

3. What is the assessment of EU officials in the region regarding efforts made by the Libyan authorities to act on its commitment to end torture?

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

The EU is aware of the unacceptable conditions prevailing in detention centres in Libya, notably in those under the control of militias.

The EU has been calling on the authorities to bring all places of detention under their control and to investigate allegations of violations of detainees' rights. The Libyan government has subsequently declared that it is in the process of transferring the control of detention facilities to the authorities and away from the militias.

Through projects financed by the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights the EU has provided support services to victims of torture and has undertaken advocacy activities for a national policy framework that addresses torture and other forms of ill-treatment. The EU is also funding projects implemented by IOM, UNHCR, Mercy Corps and Danish Refugee Council focusing on the protection of vulnerable migrants, refugees, asylum-seekers and Internally Displaced People.

Through its political dialogue with the authorities the EU will continue to advocate for the need for Libya to comply with its national and international obligations regarding respect for fundamental right.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011783/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)

(16 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Attivista per i diritti umani cinese tenuta segregata

Secondo la ONG Human Rights Watch, il 14 settembre 2013 all'attivista per i diritti umani Cao Shunli, residente a Pechino, che avrebbe dovuto partecipare a una sessione di formazione in vista dell'esame della situazione in Cina da parte del Consiglio dei diritti umani delle Nazioni Unite, è stato impedito di imbarcarsi su un volo per Ginevra. Da allora ella non è più apparsa in pubblico.

Cao e vari altri attivisti chiedono che il governo cinese, nell'elaborare la sua relazione per il Consiglio dei diritti umani, consulti degli attivisti indipendenti. Human Rights Watch afferma che la Cina opera per impedire agli attivisti di partecipare al processo e sta erodendo l'integrità del processo di esame della situazione dei diritti umani al massimo livello delle Nazioni Unite. A giugno di quest'anno i difensori dei diritti umani hanno dimostrato davanti al Ministero degli affari esteri cinese per protestare contro questa mancata consultazione, con l'unico risultato di essere allontanati con la forza in almeno tre occasioni. Un gruppo di attivisti ha cercato di intentare contro il Ministero un'azione legale amministrativa che renderebbe necessaria la divulgazione di informazioni riguardanti la Revisione Periodica Universale (UPR, Universal Periodic Review). A settembre un tribunale di Pechino ha tuttavia rigettato l'azione con la motivazione che lo svolgimento della UPR attiene esclusivamente alla sfera degli «affari esteri».

Dal febbraio di quest'anno il governo cinese ha privato arbitrariamente della libertà personale almeno 56 attivisti e ha arrestato oppositori e blogger d'opinione. Tutto ciò viene ad aggiungersi all'inasprimento dei controlli sui social media, sull'espressione on-line e sull'azione pubblica degli attivisti.

1. Intende la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante chiedere al governo cinese informazioni su dove si trovi attualmente Cao Shunli e sulle eventuali imputazioni formulate a suo carico?

2. È preoccupata la VP/AR per i tentativi del governo cinese di escludere dal processo dell'UPR gli attivisti per i diritti umani indipendenti e per le conseguenze che ciò potrà avere per il dialogo sui diritti umani dell'Unione europea con la Cina?

3. Che ruolo svolgono attualmente gli attivisti cinesi indipendenti nel contribuire al dialogo sui diritti umani UE-Cina?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(20 dicembre 2013)

Il 20 ottobre l'AR/VP ha rilasciato una dichiarazione in esprimeva profonda preoccupazione per l'improvvisa scomparsa di Cao Shunli il 14 settembre, cioè il giorno in cui si sarebbe dovuta recare a Ginevra per partecipare ad attività di promozione dei diritti umani. Come ha ricordato l'AR/VP, Cao Shunli chiede da anni che il governo cinese associ le organizzazioni della società civile al processo di preparazione della Revisione periodica universale (UPR) del Consiglio per i diritti umani delle Nazioni Unite e il 22 ottobre parteciperà al dialogo interattivo con la Cina sull'UPR.

Nella dichiarazione dell'AR/VP si chiedeva di precisare dove si trovi attualmente Cao Shunli e si esortava la Cina a garantire la piena partecipazione della società civile al processo UPR, compresa la sessione del 22 ottobre, conformemente alle norme pertinenti.

L'UE promuove sistematicamente un ruolo attivo della società civile in Cina e ha sollevato la questione sia nell'ambito del dialogo UE-Cina sui diritti umani che durante la recente visita nel paese del rappresentante speciale dell'UE per i diritti umani Stavros Lambrinidis, che ha potuto incontrare un gran numero di esponenti della società civile tra cui accademici, avvocati, giornalisti, artisti, blogger e difensori dei diritti umani.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011783/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Chinese human rights activist held incommunicado

According to the NGO Human Rights Watch, on 14 September 2013 the Beijing-based human rights activist Cao Shunli was prevented from boarding a flight to Geneva and hasn't made any public appearances since. She was due to attend a training session ahead of the UN Human Rights Council Review of China.

Cao and a number of other activists have been calling for the Chinese Government to consult with independent human rights activists in drafting the report for the Human Rights Council. Human Rights Watch says that China is working to prevent activists from taking part in the process and that it is 'eroding the integrity of the UN's top human rights review process'. In June of this year, human rights defenders demonstrated outside the Chinese Foreign Affairs Ministry to protest this lack of consultation, only to be forcibly removed on at least three occasions. A group of activists attempted to file an administrative lawsuit against the Ministry, which would require disclosure of information related to the Universal Periodic Review (UPR). In September, however, a Beijing court rejected the case on the grounds that the UPR process belonged solely to the realm of 'foreign affairs'.

Since February this year, the Chinese Government has arbitrarily detained at least 56 activists, and has taken into custody critics and online opinion bloggers. This comes on top of increased controls on social media, online expression, and public activism.

1. Will the Vice-President/High Representative make enquires to the Chinese Government as to the whereabouts of Cao Shunli and any charges that have been made against her?

2. Is the VP/HR concerned by the Chinese Government's efforts to exclude independent human rights activists from the UPR process, and the possible affect it may have on the EU's human rights dialogue with China?

3. At present, what role do independent Chinese activists play in contributing to the EU-China human rights dialogue?

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

On 20 October, HR/VP released a statement in which she expressed her deep concern over the sudden disappearance of Ms Cao Shunli on 14 September, the day she was due to travel to Geneva to participate in human rights promotion activities. The HR/VP recalled that, for years, Ms Cao Shunli has been advocating that the Chinese government includes independent civil society organisations in the preparation process of the United Nations Human Rights Council Universal Periodic Review (UPR) and had also planned to attend China's UPR Interactive Dialogue on 22 October.

The EU asked for clarification on Ms Cao's whereabouts in the statement and also urged China to ensure the full participation of civil society in the UPR process, including in the 22 October session, as stipulated by UPR regulations.

The EU has systematically promoted an active role for civil society in China and raised the issue during the EU-China Human Rights Dialogue and during the recent visit of the EU Special Representative for Human Rights, Stavros Lambrinidis, to China, when he was also able to meet with a broad cross-section of civil society, including academics, lawyers, journalists, artists, bloggers and human right defenders.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011784/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(16 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Attentato suicida a Peshawar, in Pakistan

Il 22 settembre 2013 due attentatori suicidi hanno fatto esplodere cariche esplosive nella chiesta di Tutti i Santi situata nella città pakistana di Peshawar. Al momento dell'attentato erano presenti nell'edificio almeno 350 persone. Secondo il quotidiano britannico *Telegraph*, il capo della locale unità artificieri ha dichiarato che la maggior parte delle vittime erano donne e bambini. La chiesa si trova all'interno di un'area mercato frequentata da donne per fare acquisti per la casa. Nell'attentato sono stati utilizzati 12 kg di esplosivo, che hanno danneggiato non solo la chiesa, ma anche edifici vicini. Il direttore sanitario di un ospedale della città ha dichiarato lo stato di emergenza medica perché molti dei feriti versano in condizioni critiche.

Molti cristiani si erano lamentati con la polizia pakistana per le scarse precauzioni prese a protezione della chiesa. Membri della comunità cristiana e di quella indù del Pakistan hanno reagito all'attacco chiudendo i loro negozi e bruciando pneumatici, esprimendo così la propria rabbia verso il governo per non averli protetti. L'episodio si aggiunge a un numero crescente di gravi attentati perpetrati contro i cristiani pakistani. Nel 2011 il Ministro pakistano per le minoranze, che era cristiano, è stato ucciso, e i cristiani sono colpiti dalle leggi pakistane contro la blasfemia in misura molto maggiore rispetto al resto della popolazione.

1. In considerazione dell'aumento degli attentati ispirati all'intolleranza religiosa che si è registrato in Pakistan negli ultimi anni, in che modo la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante si è adoperata per ottenere assicurazioni che le autorità pakistane stiano operando per tutelare gli interessi delle minoranze religiose?

2. È pronta l'UE ad offrire assistenza medica alle vittime dell'attentato del 22 settembre?

3. È pronta l'UE a rivolgersi ai membri delle varie minoranze presenti in Pakistan per conoscere le loro preoccupazioni e per chiedere loro di quale sostegno esterno abbiano bisogno?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(10 dicembre 2013)

Gli sforzi profusi dall'AR/VP per esprimere le proprie preoccupazioni e ottenere garanzie riguardo alle minoranze religiose in Pakistan sono illustrati nelle risposte alle interrogazioni E-011378/2013, E-010897/2013 e E- 02947/2013 ([1]).

Il Regno Unito e la Germania sostengono il settore sanitario in Pakistan nell'ambito del coordinamento dei donatori. La cooperazione allo sviluppo dell'UE in Pakistan è incentrata su istruzione, sviluppo rurale, governance e commercio. Gli stanziamenti del bilancio dell'Unione destinati agli aiuti umanitari servono a sostenere l'assistenza medica e gli interventi chirurgici di emergenza.

La delegazione dell'UE in Pakistan è regolarmente in contatto con i membri delle minoranze religiose e dà loro la possibilità di esprimere le proprie preoccupazioni. L'UE si prepara a sostenere un progetto pluridimensionale che sarà attuato insieme a vari partner e, con una dotazione di 835 000 euro, affronterà il problema delle discriminazioni religiose in Pakistan. Il progetto mira a migliorare gli atteggiamenti personali attraverso i media, l'istruzione, la cultura, gli enti pubblici e le registrazioni, cercando inoltre il modo di affrontare il problema degli attacchi e delle discriminazioni a sfondo religioso attraverso il riesame della legislazione, l'assistenza giuridica e la creazione di meccanismi specifici. L'UE sostiene inoltre il governo e gli organismi che si occupano di diritti umani (commissione nazionale per lo status delle donne, commissione nazionale per i diritti umani), il cui compito consiste anche nel migliorare la capacità dello Stato di tutelare tali diritti, in particolare quelli delle donne, dei minori e delle minoranze religiose.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011784/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Suicide bombing in Peshawar, Pakistan

On 22 September 2013, two suicide bombers detonated explosives at the All Saints Church in the Pakistani city of Peshawar. At least 350 people were in the building at the time of the attack. According to Britain's *Telegraph* newspaper, the head of the local bomb disposal unit indicated that most of the victims were women and children. The church is located inside a market complex where women come to purchase household goods. The militants used 12 kilos of explosives in the attack, which caused damage not only to the church but also to nearby buildings. The medical superintendent from a local hospital declared a medical emergency as many of the injured were in a critical condition (and remain so).

Many Christians had complained to the Pakistani police about the limited precautions that had been taken to protect the church. Members of Pakistan's Christian and Hindu communities have responded to the attack by closing their shops and by burning tyres to voice their anger at the government's failure to protect them. This particular incident can be added to a growing number of high-profile attacks against Pakistani Christians. In 2011 the country's Minister for Minorities, a Christian, was killed, and Christians have been targeted disproportionately by Pakistan's blasphemy laws.

1. In light of the rise in sectarian attacks in Pakistan over the past few years, what efforts has the Vice-President/High Representative made to gain assurances that the Pakistani authorities are working to protect the interests of religious minorities?

2. Is the EU prepared to offer medical assistance to the victims of the 22 September attack?

3. Is the EU prepared to reach out to members of Pakistan's various minority groups to ask about their concerns and the external support they require?

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

Efforts made by the HR/VP to raise concerns and obtain assurances concerning religious minorities in Pakistan are described in E-011378/2013, E-010897/2013, and E-02947/2013 (1).

In the context of donor coordination, the UK and Germany provide support for the health sector in Pakistan. The EU's development cooperation in Pakistan focuses on education, rural development, governance and trade. The EU humanitarian aid budget provides support for emergency medical services and surgical care.

The EU Delegation in Pakistan reaches out to members of religious minorities on a regular basis and is available to listen to their concerns. The EU is preparing to support a multi-pronged/multi-partner project worth EUR 835,000 addressing discrimination on the basis of faith in Pakistan. It will work towards improving attitudes through media, education, culture and public offices, as well as recording, and seeking ways to address, attacks and discrimination on the basis of faith, including through legislative review, legal aid, and setting up specific mechanisms to deal with attacks. Moreover the EU supports the Government and Human Rights bodies (National Commission on Status of Women, National Human Rights Commission), who have a duty to improve the state's capacity to protect human rights, in particular those of women, children and religious minorities.

---

(1) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011786/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(16 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Cuarta ayuda pública del Estado italiano a Alitalia desde 2001. Compatibilidad con las normas sobre ayudas estatales — Aplicación coherente de las ayudas estatales a líneas aéreas nacionales y de bajo coste

Alitalia, la deficitaria compañía aérea nacional de Italia, ha evitado la segunda quiebra en cuatro años al acordarse una inyección de capital de 300 millones de euros, que convertirá a Poste Italiane (el servicio postal público) en su nuevo accionista (1). El Estado invertirá 75 millones de euros en esta última ayuda pública a la empresa a través de Poste Italiane, que es en su totalidad de propiedad pública (2).

Esta es la cuarta ayuda pública que se le concede a la aerolínea nacional desde 2001, ya que recibió dinero en 2001, 2004, 2008 y 2013 (3). En 2009, Alitalia (antiguamente pública) fue rescatada de la bancarrota por un variado grupo de inversores italianos y por Air France-KLM, que se convirtió en su mayor accionista al adquirir el 25 % de la compañía.

En 2013, tras acumular una deuda de cerca mil millones de euros y pérdidas de 294 millones de euros durante el primer semestre, la aerolínea se volvió a encontrar a punto de quedarse en tierra si sus accionistas no acordaban un aumento de capital.

A la vista de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta las estrictas normas de la Comisión en materia de ayudas estatales:

1. ¿Ha notificado el Gobierno italiano esta decisión a la Comisión? En caso afirmativo, ¿lo hizo de forma detallada? ¿Podría proporcionar la Comisión esa información detallada?

2. ¿Abrirá la Comisión una investigación pormenorizada sobre la decisión del Gobierno italiano en favor de Alitalia?

3. Dado que se trata de la cuarta vez que Alitalia es rescatada por el Gobierno, ¿Puede garantizar la Comisión que se aplican coherentemente y de manera uniforme las normas relativas a las ayudas estatales con respecto a las líneas aéreas de bajo coste y las compañías aéreas nacionales tradicionales?

4. ¿Puede proporcionar la Comisión las cifras correspondientes a las pérdidas diarias de Alitalia a lo largo del pasado año?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(22 de noviembre de 2013)

Las autoridades italianas no han notificado las medidas en favor de Alitalia mencionadas en la pregunta de Su Señoría. Sin embargo, sobre la base de la información disponible en la prensa, así como los datos presentados por varios ciudadanos de la UE, la Comisión decidió abrir una investigación preliminar sobre estas medidas, registrada con el número SA.37491 (2013/CP). La Comisión solicitó información a las autoridades italianas mediante carta de 15 de octubre de 2013, que fue respondida en los días 23 y 25 de octubre de 2013. La Comisión está evaluando actualmente la información proporcionada y todavía no puede facilitar ninguna información.

La Comisión no puede afirmar en esta fase si será necesario un procedimiento de investigación formal con arreglo al artículo 108, apartado 2, del TFUE. Esto dependerá de los hechos relacionados con el caso y de la información que faciliten las autoridades italianas en el curso de la investigación preliminar.

En caso de que se confirme dicha ayuda estatal en el sentido del artículo 107, apartado 1, del TFUE en las medidas en favor de Alitalia, la Comisión, como en cualquier otro caso de ayuda estatal, aplicará las normas sobre ayudas estatales de la UE de forma coherente y consecuente.

---

(1) http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/931e3432-3299-11e3-b3a7-00144feab7de.html#axzz2hmtUHhs1

(2) http://www.corriere.it/economia/13_ottobre_14/giornata-cruciale-alitalia-lufthansa-noi-non-siamo-interessati-d33fd7ca-34ae-11e3-b0aa-c50e06d40e68.shtml
http://www.lastampa.it/2013/10/14/economia/attesa-per-lassemblea-di-alitalia-sul-salvataggio-lincognita-air-france-S4krIo8gWqAuqSK6L2C1aO/pagina.html

(3) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-08-385_en.htm

La Comisión no dispone de ninguna información sobre las pérdidas diarias de Alitalia a lo largo del año pasado. Sobre la base de la información públicamente disponible, parece que el resultado neto de Alitalia en el primer trimestre de 2013 fue de –157 millones de euros (4), mientras que el resultado neto para el ejercicio financiero de 2012 fue de –280 millones de euros (5).

---

(4) http://corporate.alitalia.com/en/media/press-releases/27-05-2013.html

(5) http://corporate.alitalia.com/static/upload/8ac/8ac4a511869d65751ae3e4e7e345f605.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011786/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Fourth public aid transfer to Alitalia by the Italian state since 2001 — compatibility with state aid rules — coherent application of state aid rules with regard to low-cost and national carriers

Alitalia, Italy's lossmaking national carrier, has averted a second bankruptcy in four years by agreeing to a EUR 300 million capital injection that will bring in Poste Italiane, the state-owned postal services group, as a new shareholder (1). In this latest public aid transfer to the company, the government will contribute a further EUR 75 million through Poste Italiane, which is 100% state-owned (2).

This is the fourth public aid transfer to the national carrier since 2001. Alitalia received public funds in 2001, 2004, 2008 and 2013 (3). In 2009 the formerly state-owned company was rescued from bankruptcy by a diverse group of Italian investors and by Air France-KLM, which became its largest shareholder with a 25% stake.

In 2013 — after racking up a debt of about EUR 1 billion and first-half losses of EUR 294 million — the airline again found itself at risk of being grounded unless its shareholders agreed on a capital increase.

In the light of the above, and considering the Commission's strict rules on state aid;

1. Has the Italian Government notified this decision to the Commission and, if so, did it do so in a detailed way? Could the Commission provide the details?

2. Will the Commission launch an in-depth investigation into the Italian government's decision in favour of Alitalia?

3. Given the fact that this is the fourth time that the national carrier has been saved by the government, can the Commission guarantee that state aid rules are applied coherently and in a uniform way with regard to low-cost airlines and historic national carriers?

4. Can the Commission provide figures on how much money Alitalia lost each day in the course of the last year?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(22 November 2013)

The Italian authorities have not notified the measures in support of Alitalia referred to in the question of the Honourable Member. However, on the basis of information available in the press as well as information submitted by several EU citizens, the Commission decided to start a preliminary investigation on these measures, registered with number SA.37491 (2013/CP). The Commission requested information from the Italian authorities by letter of 15 October 2013, replied to on 23 and 25 October 2013. The Commission is currently assessing the information provided and cannot yet provide details.

The Commission cannot say at this stage whether a formal investigation procedure in the sense of Article 108(2) TFEU will be necessary. This will depend on the facts of the case and on the information the Italian authorities submitted in the course of the preliminary investigation.

If it is confirmed that state aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) of the TFEU is present in the measures in favour of Alitalia, the Commission — as in any other state aid case — will apply the EU State aid rules in a coherent and consistent way.

---

(1) http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/931e3432-3299-11e3-b3a7-00144feab7de.html#axzz2hmtUHhs1

(2) http://www.corriere.it/economia/13_ottobre_14/giornata-cruciale-alitalia-lufthansa-noi-non-siamo-interessati-d33fd7ca-34ae-11e3-b0aa-c50e06d40e68.shtml
http://www.lastampa.it/2013/10/14/economia/attesa-per-lassemblea-di-alitalia-sul-salvataggio-lincognita-air-france-S4krIo8gWqAuqSK6L2C1aO/pagina.html

(3) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-08-385_en.htm

The Commission does not have at its disposal the information regarding the daily losses of Alitalia in the course of the last year. On the basis of information publicly available, it appears that the net result of Alitalia in 1Q2013 was EUR -157 million (4) while the net result for financial year 2012 was EUR -280 million (5).

---

(4) http://corporate.alitalia.com/en/media/press-releases/27-05-2013.html

(5) http://corporate.alitalia.com/static/upload/8ac/8ac4a511869d65751ae3e4e7e345f605.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-011788/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(16 octobre 2013)

Objet: Traçabilité de la viande

Nous apprenons que la Commission européenne donnerait une nouvelle fois cette semaine aux Européens des raisons de lui accorder une confiance moindre. Pouvez-vous nous confirmer que, contrairement à l'engagement que vous avez pris, vous seriez sur le point d'enterrer la possibilité de mentionner l'origine des viandes dans les plats préparés?

L'Union européenne s'honore d'offrir à nos concitoyens un niveau élevé de qualité et de protection sanitaire capable de la distinguer dans le monde entier: par une mesure allant à l'encontre de ce principe, quel message voudriez-vous adresser aux Européens, aux observateurs internationaux?

Car il s'agit bien sûr aussi de l'image de la qualité de nos produits et donc de l'équilibre de nos filières agro-alimentaires, dont on connaît la fragilité. Si de telles inquiétudes sur la qualité de nos produits survenaient, ce sont bien nos producteurs et nos agriculteurs qui seraient directement pénalisés. Par notre travail, nous respectons au quotidien le rôle de la Commission européenne, dans le cadre d'une coproduction législative constructive et concertée, avec comme seul cap la protection de l'intérêt des Européens.

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(18 novembre 2013)

Alors que le règlement (UE) n° 1169/2011 du Parlement européen et du Conseil concernant l'information des consommateurs sur les denrées alimentaires ([1]) n'exige la publication du rapport auquel fait allusion l'Honorable Parlementaire que pour le 13 décembre 2013, la Commission s'est engagée à présenter ce rapport plus tôt. À la suite de sa publication, un débat informé sur les conclusions qui y figurent pourra avoir lieu au Parlement et au Conseil.

Sur la base des discussions avec les États membres de l'Union européenne et le Parlement européen, la Commission examinera les éventuelles suites à donner. Le cas échéant, celles-ci pourraient comprendre la présentation d'une proposition législative visant à réglementer l'origine de la viande utilisée comme ingrédient dans des denrées alimentaires.

La Commission a constamment défendu l'idée que, dans le domaine des denrées alimentaires, l'obligation d'indication de l'origine n'est pas un outil pour garantir la sécurité alimentaire (toutes les denrées alimentaires mises sur le marché européen doivent être sûres), ni pour dissuader les exploitants du secteur alimentaire de frauder.

([1]) JO L 304 du 22.11.2011, p. 18. Il sera applicable à partir du 13 décembre 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011788/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Traceability of meat

This week it seems that the Commission will be giving Europeans one more reason to distrust it. Can the Commission confirm that, contrary to the commitments it has made, it is about to abandon the idea of origin labelling of meat in ready meals?

The European Union prides itself on offering its citizens high-quality and safe food products, for which it is known the world over. If it goes against this principle, what message does the Commission think it will be sending to people both inside and outside the EU?

Because what is at stake here is the reputation of our food products and, thereby, the stability of our agri-food industries, which is notoriously fragile. If the quality of our products is called into question, our producers and our farmers will be the ones who suffer. As MEPs, we fully respect the Commission's role as a partner in a constructive, shared law-making process whose overriding aim is to protect the interests of all Europeans. With this in mind, does the Commission intend to think again?

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

While Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the provision of food information to consumers (1) requires publication of the report referred to by the Honourable Member only by 13 December 2013, the Commission has committed to come forward with this report earlier. Following its publication, an informed discussion of the findings presented in the report can take place in Parliament and Council.

On the basis of the discussions with EU Member States and the European Parliament, the Commission will consider what, if any, appropriate next steps should be taken. This may include, if appropriate, tabling a legislative proposal to regulate the origin of meat used as an ingredient in foods.

The Commission has repeatedly held that in the area of food, mandatory origin labelling is not a tool to ensure food safety (all foods placed on the EU market must be safe) nor to deter fraudulent food operators.

---

(1) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18. It enters into application on 13 December 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011791/13
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (NI)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Worn tyres policy

Since the advent of recession in 2008, we have seen a proliferation of businesses offering part-worn tyres at discount prices being set up all over Ireland. These tyres, which arrive in Ireland as bulk scrap (usually from England or Germany), are not individually identified and so do not leave the same VAT trail that new tyres do. Not only do legitimate retailers lose business, but the government loses a VAT dividend. Naturally, there are also safety concerns associated with the trustworthiness of such tyres.

Has the Commission discussed or assessed the environmental factors of transporting scrap between borders?

Is there any legislation to protect consumers from being charged 'environmental disposal fees' at the point of transaction for tyres that are resold to other markets?

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

The Waste Framework Directive (Directive 2008/98/EC (1)) requires Member States to establish an integrated and adequate network of waste disposal installations which should allow waste to be disposed of in one of the nearest appropriate installations in order to ensure a high level of protection for the environment and public health. The transboundary shipment of waste tyres is subject to the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1013/2013 on shipments of waste (2) which include an obligation for those involved in the shipment to ensure that the waste is managed in an environmentally sound manner throughout the period of shipment and during its recovery or disposal. The Commission recently proposed amendments to the Waste Shipment Regulation with the aim of enhancing the effectiveness of inspections and controls by national authorities and these are currently being considered by the European Parliament (3).

Environmental disposal fees for tyres are not required under EU legislation. Where there are such fees, they are established in national legislation which may also include specific provisions on exemptions.

---

(1) OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
(2) OJ L 190, 12.7.2006.
(3) COM 2013 516 final of 11 July 2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011793/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(16 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Archeomafia in Albania

Da fonti di stampa si apprende che oltre mille oggetti antichi di culto fra icone, dipinti ed persino opere murali sono stati rubati, principalmente in monasteri e chiese ortodosse, in Albania e Macedonia e successivamente sequestrati dalla polizia albanese. Gli autori del furto, due cittadini albanesi, sono stati poi arrestati.

La polizia sospetta di aver rintracciato una rete di traffico di opere d'arte destinate ai paesi dell'Unione europea.

Che provvedimenti intende intraprendere la Commissione europea per impedire o contrastare eventuali altri casi di archeomafia provenienti da Paesi in procinto di aderire all'UE?

È a conoscenza di quali Stati membri dell'UE sono coinvolti in questo traffico di opere d'arte?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(18 dicembre 2013)

Nell'ambito dello strumento di assistenza preadesione, la Commissione fornisce assistenza tecnica per il consolidamento delle capacità di contrasto in Albania attraverso il progetto PAMECA IV. Il progetto sostiene in particolare l'ulteriore sviluppo di attività di contrasto della criminalità basate sull'intelligence presso la polizia di Stato albanese, in partenariato con la Procura generale, e l'ulteriore potenziamento delle capacità di controllo e gestione delle frontiere per contrastare i traffici illeciti, compreso il traffico di opere d'arte rubate.

Stando alle informazioni fornite dalla polizia di Stato albanese, le opere d'arte recuperate erano state rubate da chiese situate nel sud del paese e nell'ex Repubblica jugoslava di Macedonia. La Commissione è al corrente che la polizia sta indagando, ma non dispone di informazioni specifiche su attività di questo gruppo della criminalità organizzata che interessino gli Stati membri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011793/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Art trafficking in Albania

Media reports say that over 1 000 religious antiquities, including icons, paintings and even murals, have been stolen, mainly from monasteries and orthodox churches in Albania and Macedonia, and subsequently seized by Albanian police. The thieves, two Albanians, have been arrested.

The police believes that it has uncovered a network trafficking works of art destined for EU countries.

What measures does the Commission intend to take to prevent or fight any other cases of art trafficking from countries about to join the EU?

Does it know which EU Member States are involved in this art trafficking?

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

The Commission is providing technical assistance for the consolidation of the law enforcement capacities in Albania under the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance through the ongoing PAMECA IV project. Project activities include support notably to the further development of intelligence-led policing in the Albanian State Police in partnership with the General Prosecution Office, as well as support to further capacity building for border control and management in order to counter illegal trafficking activities, including trafficking in stolen works of art.

According to information provided by the Albanian State Police, the recovered works of art were stolen from churches in the south of the country and in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The Commission understands that police investigations are ongoing, but does not have any specific information about any activities of the specific organised crime group involving Member States.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011794/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(16 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Proibizione dell'uso della parola «Allah» ai Cristiani malesi

Secondo una recente notizia pubblicata da fonti giornalistiche, un tribunale malese avrebbe stabilito che la parola «Allah» sarebbe di uso esclusivo dei musulmani: i cristiani non possono riferirsi a Dio usando questa parola.

Secondo quanto avrebbero dichiarato alcuni giudici della Corte d'appello di Kuala Lumpur, la parola, se usata anche dai non musulmani, provocherebbe confusione all'interno della comunità.

La Malesia (Malaysia) è un paese a maggioranza musulmana (60 %), e i cristiani sono la terza confessione religiosa, dopo i buddisti.

Considerando che i Cristiani da sempre usano il nome «Allah» per definire anche il proprio Dio cristiano, e lo fanno da decenni, e che anche in altri paesi come l'Indonesia e nel Medio Oriente la parola è usata sia da cristiani che da musulmani;

considerando che molte autorità locali si dicono contrarie a questa sentenza, incoraggiando e autorizzando i cristiani a continuare ad usare questa parola,

l'Alto Rappresentante (VP/HR) è al corrente del recente avvenimento?

Intende prendere una posizione e supportare le autorità locali per tutelare maggiormente i diritti religiosi?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(9 dicembre 2013)

L'AR/VP è al corrente del fatto che la Corte d'appello malese ha cassato una decisione dell'Alta Corte di giustizia di Kuala Lumpur che sosteneva che la decisione del governo di vietare l'utilizzo del termine Allah per riferirsi al Dio cristiano era illegittima. In base alla sentenza della Corte d'Appello, pertanto, il divieto emanato dal Ministero degli Interni viene confermato ed il settimanale cattolico malese The Herald non potrà più utilizzare il termine «Allah» per riferirsi al Dio cristiano.

L'AR/VP è convinta che questa decisione della Corte d'Appello malese possa limitare l'interpretazione della libertà religiosa, prevista dalla costituzione malese. L'UE si è impegnata a monitorare la questione della libertà religiosa in Malaysia, così come in altre parti del mondo. Le iniziative dell'UE in tale ambito vanno dalla sensibilizzazione, nel quadro del dialogo politico con i paesi in cui esistono problemi di questa natura, al rispetto delle libertà di religione e di credo, al sostegno ai progetti locali in materia di diritti umani, alla promozione della tolleranza religiosa e delle libertà di religione e di credo presso i vari consessi dell'ONU.

L'AR/VP segue da vicino la situazione dei diritti dell'uomo in Malaysia ed è pronta a sollevare la questione presso le autorità.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011794/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Malay Christians banned from using the word 'Allah'

According to a recent news report, a Malaysian court has ruled that the word 'Allah' may be used exclusively by Muslims: Christians may not refer to God with this word.

Judges at the Court of Appeal of Kuala Lumpur reportedly said that if the word were also used by non-Muslims, it would cause confusion in the community.

Malaysia is a predominantly Muslim country (60%), with Christians constituting the third largest religious group, after Buddhists.

Christians have been using the name 'Allah' to refer to their own Christian God for decades, and also in other countries such as Indonesia and in the Middle East the word is used by Christians and Muslims alike.

Many local authorities do not agree with this ruling and are encouraging and allowing Christians to continue using this word.

Is the High Representative (VP/HR) aware of this recent situation?

Does she intend to take a position and support the local authorities to enhance protection of religious rights?

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

The HR/VP is well aware that the Malaysia Court of Appeal overruled a 2009 decision by the Kuala Lumpur High Court which had held that the government's decision to disallow the use of the term 'Allah' in order to refer to God was unlawful. The Court of Appeal's ruling, therefore, means that the Home Ministry's prohibition stands and that the Herald, a Malaysian Catholic weekly publication, can no longer use the term 'Allah' to refer to God.

The HR/VP believes that this decision by Malaysia's Court of Appeal could limit the interpretation of religious freedom, as enshrined in Malaysia's Constitution. The EU is committed to monitoring the issue of religious freedom in Malaysia and elsewhere in the world. EU action in this field includes raising actively respect of freedom of religion or belief in the political dialogue with countries where such problems exist, support to local human rights projects and promotion of religious tolerance and freedom of religion or belief at the UN forums.

The HR/VP is closely following the human rights situation in Malaysia and is prepared to raise the issue with the authorities.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011796/13
au Conseil
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(16 octobre 2013)

Objet: Adhésion de la Turquie

Alors que les négociations d'adhésion piétinent depuis des années, la récente crise politique a compliqué davantage encore les relations entre la Turquie et les Vingt-Huit. Ces derniers, très choqués par son comportement répressif à l'égard des manifestants, ont multiplié les critiques à l'égard du gouvernement de Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Notre devoir à tous, États membres de l'Union européenne comme pays candidats, est d'aspirer aux plus hauts standards et pratiques démocratiques. Le recours excessif à la force n'est pas acceptable en démocratie.

Le gouvernement turc a aussitôt exigé «des explications». Il s'est ensuite offusqué d'une résolution très critique du Parlement européen, qui mettait M. Erdogan personnellement en cause dans l'usage excessif de la force par les autorités turques. «Vous vous prenez pour qui?», a-t-il demandé.

Depuis lors, le gouvernement turc a tout fait pour canaliser — à défaut de l'étouffer — le mouvement de protestation. Les manifestations sont devenues plus sporadiques. Le 30 septembre, M. Erdogan a présenté un «paquet démocratique» plutôt salué par les Européens.

1. Qu'entendez-vous quand vous annoncez par la voix d'un de vos hauts responsables: «Le climat doit changer, il est temps de faire un geste constructif, il nous faut maintenir un levier pour encourager les réformes en Turquie.» De quel levier est-il question?

2. À ce jour, toutes les discussions sont entravées par le quasi-gel des négociations d'adhésion. Pourtant plusieurs médias relèvent que l'Europe voudrait relancer les négociations avec pour véritable but de permettre principalement d'avancer dans des dossiers comme la Syrie ou l'OTAN, ainsi que sur leur rôle dans la Méditerranée, sur la politique de l'énergie ou sur la politique de l'immigration. Qu'en est-il vraiment?

3. Quel est votre réaction aux propos du premier ministre turc qui a même suggéré que son pays pourrait privilégier, faute de progrès avec les Européens, un rapprochement avec l'Organisation de coopération de Shanghai, emmenée par la Chine et la Russie?

Réponse
(23 décembre 2013)

Il n'appartient pas au Conseil de commenter les déclarations publiques faites par des personnalités politiques.

Dans ses conclusions du 11 décembre 2012, le Conseil a exposé les différents éléments de la stratégie globale d'élargissement de l'UE, réaffirmant entre autres l'importance d'une mise en œuvre cohérente du consensus renouvelé sur l'élargissement, qui repose sur la consolidation des engagements, une conditionnalité équitable et rigoureuse, une meilleure communication, auxquelles s'ajoute la capacité de l'UE, dans toutes ses dimensions, à intégrer de nouveaux membres, chaque pays candidat étant évalué selon ses mérites propres.

En ce qui concerne les négociations d'adhésion avec la Turquie, le Conseil a notamment réaffirmé, dans ces mêmes conclusions, que des efforts supplémentaires et soutenus étaient nécessaires en vue de satisfaire pleinement aux critères de Copenhague. Dans ses conclusions du 11 décembre 2012, le Conseil a évoqué ces aspects, ainsi que d'autres domaines importants dans lesquels des efforts supplémentaires sont attendus de la part de la Turquie.

Le rythme des négociations continue notamment de dépendre des progrès réalisés par la Turquie pour satisfaire aux critères de référence liminaires et finaux ainsi qu'aux exigences prévues dans l'accord d'association et le cadre de négociation, y compris la mise en œuvre du partenariat pour l'adhésion. Il convient de noter que, lors de la conférence intergouvernementale avec la Turquie qui a eu lieu le 5 novembre, l'UE et la Turquie ont décidé d'ouvrir un nouveau chapitre de négociation, à savoir le chapitre 22 (Politique régionale et coordination des instruments structurels). Cela porte le nombre de chapitres ouverts depuis le début des négociations d'adhésion à quatorze et prouve que les deux parties demeurent attachées au processus de négociation.

Les progrès accomplis par la Turquie sur le terrain continueront de faire l'objet d'une évaluation et d'un suivi étroits, conformément au cadre de négociation et au partenariat pour l'adhésion. Ces progrès orienteront les avancées réalisées dans le cadre du processus de négociation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011796/13
to the Council
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Accession of Turkey

Accession talks with Turkey have made little headway for years and the country's recent political crisis has further complicated its relations with the EU-28. The Member States were deeply shocked at Turkey's repressive response to demonstrators and heaped criticism upon Recep Tayyip Erdogan's government. Both EU Member States and candidate countries have a duty to aspire to the highest democratic standards and practices. Excessive use of force is unacceptable in a democracy.

The Turkish Government demanded 'explanations' in response to these criticisms. It also took offence at a highly critical European Parliament resolution blaming Mr Erdogan personally for the excessive use of force by the Turkish authorities, with Mr Erdogan asking 'Who do you think you are?'.

Since then, the Turkish Government has done everything it can to channel the protest movement, short of stamping it out completely. The demonstrations have become more sporadic. On 30 September, Mr Erdogan announced a 'democratic package' which was largely welcomed by Europe.

1. What exactly does this statement by a senior EU official mean: 'The climate must change; it is time to take constructive action and we must keep up the pressure to encourage reform in Turkey'. What kind of pressure does this imply?

2. At the moment, all discussions are hampered by the near-standstill of the accession talks. According to some media reports, however, Europe is keen to revive the talks, primarily with a view to making real progress on subjects like Syria and NATO, the country's role in the Mediterranean, energy policy and immigration. What is the reality of the situation?

3. What is your response to the Turkish Prime Minister's suggestion that if no progress is made with Europe, his country might even favour closer ties with the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, led by China and Russia?

Reply
(23 December 2013)

It is not for the Council to comment on public statements made by political figures.

In its conclusions of 11 December 2012, the Council outlined the various elements of the EU's overall enlargement strategy, reaffirming *inter alia* the importance of coherent implementation of the renewed consensus on enlargement which is based on consolidation of commitments, fair and rigorous conditionality, better communication combined with the EU's capacity, in all its dimensions, to integrate new members, with each candidate country being assessed on its own merits.

With regard to accession negotiations with Turkey, the Council reaffirmed *inter alia* in its conclusions that further and sustained efforts towards fully meeting the Copenhagen criteria were required. These, and other important areas where further efforts are expected by Turkey, were set out in the Council conclusions of 11 December 2012.

The pace of negotiations continues to depend notably on Turkey's progress in addressing opening and closing benchmarks, as well as the requirements of the Association Agreement and the Negotiating Framework, including the implementation of the Accession Partnership. It should be noted that, at an Inter-Governmental Conference held with Turkey on 5 November, the EU and Turkey agreed to open yet another negotiating chapter, namely Chapter 22 — Regional policy and coordination of structural instruments. This brings the number of chapters opened since the start of the accession negotiations to 14, and demonstrates that both parties remain committed to the negotiation process.

Close monitoring and evaluation of Turkey's progress on the ground will continue, in accordance with the Negotiating Framework and the Accession Partnership. This progress will guide the advances made in the negotiating process.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011797/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(16 octobre 2013)

Objet: Adhésion de la Turquie

Alors que les négociations d'adhésion piétinent depuis des années, la récente crise politique a compliqué davantage encore les relations entre la Turquie et les Vingt-Huit. Ces derniers, très choqués par son comportement répressif à l'égard des manifestants, ont multiplié les critiques à l'égard du gouvernement de Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Notre devoir à tous, États membres de l'Union européenne comme pays candidats, est d'aspirer aux plus hauts standards et pratiques démocratiques. Le recours excessif à la force n'est pas acceptable en démocratie.

Le gouvernement turc a aussitôt exigé «des explications». Il s'est ensuite offusqué d'une résolution très critique du Parlement européen, qui mettait M. Erdogan personnellement en cause dans l'usage excessif de la force par les autorités turques. «Vous vous prenez pour qui?», a-t-il demandé.

Depuis lors, le gouvernement turc a tout fait pour canaliser — à défaut de l'étouffer — le mouvement de protestation. Les manifestations sont devenues plus sporadiques. Le 30 septembre, M. Erdogan a présenté un «paquet démocratique» plutôt salué par les Européens.

1. Qu'entendez-vous quand vous annoncez par la voix d'un de vos hauts responsables: «Le climat doit changer, il est temps de faire un geste constructif, il nous faut maintenir un levier pour encourager les réformes en Turquie.» De quel levier est-il question?

2. À ce jour, toutes les discussions sont entravées par le quasi-gel des négociations d'adhésion. Pourtant plusieurs médias relèvent que l'Europe voudrait relancer les négociations avec pour véritable but de permettre principalement d'avancer dans des dossiers comme la Syrie ou l'OTAN, ainsi que sur leur rôle dans la Méditerranée, sur la politique de l'énergie ou sur la politique de l'immigration. Qu'en est-il vraiment?

3. Quel est votre réaction aux propos du premier ministre turc qui a même suggéré que son pays pourrait privilégier, faute de progrès avec les Européens, un rapprochement avec l'Organisation de coopération de Shanghai, emmenée par la Chine et la Russie?

Réponse donnée par M. Füle au nom de la Commission
(6 décembre 2013)

Les points mis en évidence par l'Honorable Parlementaire soulignent combien il est important que l'UE renforce ses relations avec la Turquie. L'avancement des négociations d'adhésion et l'avancement de la réforme politique en Turquie sont les deux facettes d'une même problématique. Ces avancées contribueraient de manière significative à faire en sorte que l'UE et ses normes demeurent le point de référence pour l'instauration de réformes en Turquie. Le potentiel de la relation UE-Turquie ne saurait être pleinement exploité que dans le cadre d'un processus d'adhésion actif et crédible.

La Turquie, avec son économie importante et dynamique, est un partenaire commercial incontournable pour l'UE et contribue à la compétitivité de cette dernière dans le contexte de l'union douanière. Elle occupe une position stratégique, notamment dans le domaine de la sécurité énergétique, et joue un rôle essentiel sur le plan régional. La Commission a mis en exergue l'importance de la coopération et du dialogue en cours sur les questions de politique étrangère.

La Commission mène ses travaux sur la base du cadre de négociation UE-Turquie. Ce dernier indique que l'objectif commun des négociations est l'adhésion (point 2). Dans ce contexte, les États membres ont décidé à l'unanimité d'ouvrir le chapitre 22 (politique régionale), dès que la Turquie satisferait aux critères de référence requis. Ce chapitre a été ouvert lors de la conférence d'adhésion du 5 novembre 2013, ce qui a donné un nouvel élan aux négociations d'adhésion et aux relations entre l'Union et la Turquie.

Enfin, les autorités turques ne cessent de réitérer leur volonté d'aboutir à l'adhésion. Le groupe ministériel de suivi des réformes, qui pilote ce processus, continue à se réunir.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011797/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Accession of Turkey

Accession talks with Turkey have made little headway for years and the country's recent political crisis has further complicated its relations with the EU-28. The Member States were deeply shocked at Turkey's repressive response to demonstrators and heaped criticism upon Recep Tayyip Erdogan's government. Both EU Member States and candidate countries have a duty to aspire to the highest democratic standards and practices. Excessive use of force is unacceptable in a democracy.

The Turkish Government demanded 'explanations' in response to these criticisms. It also took offence at a highly critical European Parliament resolution blaming Mr Erdogan personally for the excessive use of force by the Turkish authorities, with Mr Erdogan asking 'Who do you think you are?'.

Since then, the Turkish Government has done everything it can to channel the protest movement, short of stamping it out completely. The demonstrations have become more sporadic. On 30 September, Mr Erdogan announced a 'democratic package' which was largely welcomed by Europe.

1. What exactly does this statement by a senior EU official mean: 'The climate must change; it is time to take constructive action and we must keep up the pressure to encourage reform in Turkey'. What kind of pressure does this imply?

2. At the moment, all discussions are hampered by the near-standstill of the accession talks. According to some media reports, however, Europe is keen to revive the talks, primarily with a view to making real progress on subjects like Syria and NATO, the country's role in the Mediterranean, energy policy and immigration. What is the reality of the situation?

3. What is your response to the Turkish Prime Minister's suggestion that if no progress is made with Europe, his country might even favour closer ties with the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, led by China and Russia?

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

The issues highlighted by the Honourable Member underline the importance for the EU to enhance its engagement with Turkey. Progress in the accession negotiations and progress on political reform in Turkey are two sides of the same coin. Such progress would significantly contribute to ensuring that the EU and its standards remain the benchmark for reforms in Turkey. The full potential of the EU-Turkey relationship is best fulfilled within the framework of an active and credible accession process.

Turkey, with its large, dynamic economy, is an important trading partner for the EU and contributes to EU competitiveness through the Customs Union. Turkey has a strategic location, including on energy security, and plays an important regional role. The Commission has underlined the importance of ongoing cooperation and dialogue on foreign policy issues.

The Commission conducts its work on the basis of the EU-Turkey Negotiating Framework. The latter states that the shared objective of these negotiations is accession (point 2). In this context, the Member States decided unanimously to open Chapter 22 — Regional policy upon fulfilment of the required benchmarks. The chapter was opened at the accession conference of 5 November 2013, providing new momentum to accession negotiations and EU-Turkey relations.

Finally, Turkish authorities continue to reiterate their commitment to EU accession. The ministerial reform Monitoring Group steering this process continues to meet.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011798/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 octobre 2013)

Objet: Projets d'infrastructures énergétiques

Günther Oettinger, commissaire européen chargée de l'énergie, a présenté, le lundi 14 octobre 2013, une liste de 250 projets d'infrastructures énergétiques éligibles pour des cofinancements européens à hauteur de 5,85 milliards d'euros. Ce budget est alloué aux infrastructures transeuropéennes pour la période 2014-2020, au titre du mécanisme pour l'interconnexion en Europe.

La liste comprend jusqu'à 140 projets dans le domaine du transport et du stockage de l'électricité, environ 100 projets dans le domaine du transport et du stockage du gaz ainsi que du GNL et plusieurs projets liés au pétrole et aux réseaux intelligents, a précisé la Commission dans un communiqué. Pour qu'un projet soit inscrit sur cette liste, il fallait qu'il présente «des avantages considérables» pour au moins deux États membres, qu'il contribue à l'intégration du marché et à l'intensification de la concurrence, qu'il «améliore» la sécurité de l'approvisionnement et qu'il «réduise les émissions de CO_2».

Nous saluons ces initiatives.

1. Comment la Commission va-t-elle s'assurer que les fonds limités dont la Commissiondispose soient utilisés à bon escient et que les fonds de l'Union soient alloués de manière àgénérer le plus d'avantages pour les consommateurs européens?

2. Avec cette liste de projets d'infrastructures dans le secteur de l'énergie et les avantages quien découlent, combien d'investisseurs et de capitaux la Commission compte-t-elle attirer?

3. Ces projets «d'intérêt commun» (PIC) pourraient-ils bénéficier de procédures accéléréespour l'octroi des licences et de meilleures conditions de régulation?

4. À quelle fréquence la liste des PIC sera-t-elle mise à jour?

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

1. La Commission allouera l'aide financière du mécanisme pour l'interconnexion en Europe (MIE) à des projets d'intérêt commun au moyen de subventions et d'instruments financiers. L'aide financière portera essentiellement sur des projets commercialement non viables qui présentent une valeur socio-économique élevée. Le MIE permet de financer des travaux au moyen de subventions, mais privilégie l'utilisation d'instruments financiers innovants afin d'améliorer l'effet de levier des dépenses à la charge du budget de l'Union.

2. La liste de PIC établie par l'Union vise à accélérer la mise en œuvre des projets d'infrastructures dans le domaine de l'énergie. L'aide financière du MIE encouragera la participation du secteur privé au financement des projets de ce type. La plupart des PIC sont exécutés par des gestionnaires de réseau de transport (GRT) qui prendront les décisions en ce qui concerne les investisseurs et les besoins en capitaux pour les projets. Pour l'instant, la Commission ne peut pas prévoir le nombre de (nouveaux) investisseurs et il ne serait pas crédible de communiquer un montant précis en euros étant donné que seule une partie des projets sont suffisamment aboutis pour qu'une estimation des coûts fiable puisse être établie.

3. Les PIC bénéficieront d'une procédure accélérée d'octroi des autorisations et d'un traitement réglementaire amélioré. Pour ce qui est de l'octroi des autorisations, les États membres doivent mettre en place une autorité compétente unique pour l'octroi des autorisations, ce qui assure un traitement plus efficace. Les PIC bénéficieront également de procédures d'octroi des autorisations d'une durée maximale de 3,5 ans. En ce qui concerne le traitement réglementaire, les autorités réglementaires nationales (ARN) veilleront à ce que les PIC bénéficient du traitement le plus préférentiel afin de garantir leur mise en œuvre.

4. La liste de projets d'intérêt commun établie par l'Union sera mise à jour tous les deux ans.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011798/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Energy infrastructure projects

On Monday 14 October 2013, the Commissioner for Energy Günther Oettinger presented a list of 250 energy infrastructure projects which qualify for part funding from the EU worth EUR 5.85 billion. This budget has been set aside for trans-European infrastructure projects for the period 2014-2020 under the Connecting Europe Facility.

In its press release, the Commission explained that of the projects on the list, up to 140 are for electricity transportation and storage, approximately 100 for gas and liquid natural gas transportation and storage and a handful for oil and smart networks. For a project to be included in the list, it had to have 'significant benefits' for at least two Member States, contribute to market integration and further competition, 'enhance' security of supply and 'reduce CO2 emissions'.

We welcome these initiatives.

1. What does the Commission intend to do to ensure that the limited funds at its disposal are used wisely and that EU funds are allocated in a way that generates the most benefits for Europe's consumers?

2. How many investors and how much capital does the Commission hope to attract with this list of infrastructure projects in the energy sector and the advantages attached to them?

3. Is it possible that these 'projects of common interest' (PCI) may benefit from faster permit granting procedures and improved regulatory treatment?

4. How often will the list of PCI be updated?

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

1. The Commission will allocate the financial support from the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) for projects of common interest using grants and financial instruments. The financial support will focus on commercially non-viable projects with high socioeconomic value. The CEF allows funding by grants for works, but prioritises the use of innovative financial instruments to improve the leverage effect of the Union's budget spending.

2. The Union-list of PCIs aims at speeding up implementation of infrastructure projects in the field of energy. The financial support from the CEF will encourage private sector participation in the financing of such projects. Most of the PCIs are carried out by transmission system operators (TSOs) who will decide on investors and capital needs for the projects. For the time being the Commission cannot foresee the number of (new) investors and it would not be credible to communicate a specific amount in Euro as only a part of the projects are mature enough to show reliable cost estimates.

3. PCIs will benefit from a faster permit granting and improved regulatory treatment. Regarding permit granting, Member States need to set up one competent authority for permit granting which ensures more efficient handling. PCIs will also benefit from permit granting procedures within 3.5 years. Regarding the regulatory treatment, national regulatory authorities (NRAs) will ensure that PCIs receive the most preferential treatment to ensure their implementation.

4. The Union-list of projects of common interest will be updated every two years.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011799/13
au Conseil
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 octobre 2013)

Objet: Présidence de la Commission

La nomination de candidats à la présidence de la Commission lors de la campagne électorale européenne n'est pas la meilleure solution pour rétablir la crédibilité de l'Union européenne, selon le président du Conseil européen.

Alors que les partis européens sont à la recherche de figures de proue pour leur campagne, Herman Van Rompuy estime que cette procédure ne suffira pas à résoudre le déficit démocratique dont souffre l'Europe.

«Vous ne devez pas chercher de solutions quand il n'y a pas de problème. Rechercher des "visages" pour guider l'UE n'est pas une solution», a indiqué le président du Conseil lors d'un débat sur l'avenir de l'Union européenne le 10 octobre 2013 à Bruxelles.

1. Quelle est la position officielle du Conseil? Rejoint-il la position d'Herman Van Rompuy,qui est antagoniste à celle du Parlement?

Réponse
(16 décembre 2013)

Il n'appartient pas au Conseil de commenter les déclarations attribuées aux présidents d'autres institutions (en l'occurrence, le Conseil européen).

Le Conseil n'a pas pris position à ce sujet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011799/13
to the Council
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Commission Presidency

The President of the Council has stated that nominating candidates for election to the Commission Presidency during the European parliamentary election campaign is not the best solution to restoring the European Union's credibility.

While the European political parties are looking for figureheads for their campaigns, Herman Van Rompuy feels that this procedure will not be enough to resolve Europe's democratic deficit.

During a debate on the future of the European Union in Brussels on 10 October 2013, the Council President stated that 'You do not have to look for solutions to things that are not problems. To go and look for "faces" to guide the EU: that is not a solution'.

1. What is the Council's official position? Is it the same as that of Mr Van Rompuy, which is the opposite of Parliament's position?

Reply
(16 December 2013)

The Council does not comment on statements attributed to the Presidents of other institutions (in this case the European Council).

The Council has not taken a position on this subject.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011800/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(16 octobre 2013)

Objet: Système d'identification électronique

Les entreprises, les citoyens et les autorités publiques qui veulent conclure des accords transfrontaliers devraient avoir accès à des outils faciles et fiables pour signer et certifier les documents.

1. La Commission européenne est-elle pour un système d'identification électronique?

2. Partage-t-elle l'avis selon lequel, avec un bon équilibre, une législation encouragerait l'économie numérique et contribuerait à créer des emplois tout en renforçant la fiabilité et la sécurité du commerce transfrontalier?

3. Est-elle en faveur d'une contrainte envers les États membres pour reconnaître mutuellement leurs systèmes nationaux d'identification électronique, à condition que ces systèmes aient été notifiés?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Kroes au nom de la Commission
(16 décembre 2013)

La Commission attire depuis bien longtemps l'attention sur le manque d'interopérabilité entre les systèmes nationaux d'identification électronique, qui pour elle, constitue un obstacle majeur au marché unique numérique. L'action clé 16 de la stratégie numérique pour l'Europe (1) préconisait l'adoption d'une proposition législative visant à garantir la reconnaissance mutuelle des systèmes d'identification et d'authentification électroniques. Le 4 juin 2012, la Commission a adopté une proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil sur l'identification électronique et les services de confiance pour les transactions électroniques au sein du marché intérieur (2).

La Commission est favorable à une adoption rapide de ce règlement, car il permettra d'éliminer tous les obstacles juridiques existants à l'utilisation transnationale de moyens d'identification électronique dans le secteur public.

En outre, la Commission, s'appuyant sur les solutions existantes financées par le programme PIC TIC, a l'intention de créer une plateforme centrale de services d'identification électronique financée par le Mécanisme pour l'interconnexion en Europe, qui sera un élément des services transnationaux en ligne au sein du marché unique numérique. En démontrant les avantages concrets de l'identification électronique transnationale, elle encouragera également le secteur privé à l'adopter, garantissant ainsi la viabilité économique à long terme des solutions mises au point.

---

(1) Voir COM(2010) 245 final/2.

(2) COM(2012) 238 + 2012/0146 (COD).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011800/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Electronic identification system

Any businesses, members of the public and public authorities who wish to sign cross-border agreements should have access to simple, reliable tools for signing and certifying documents.

1. Is the Commission in favour of an electronic identification system?

2. Does it share the opinion that, provided it strikes the right balance, a piece of legislation would encourage the digital economy and contribute to job creation, while improving the reliability and security of cross-border trade?

3. Is the Commission in favour of obliging Member States to mutually recognise their national electronic identification systems, provided that these systems have been duly reported on?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

The Commission has long before identified the lack of interoperability of national electronic identification schemes as a major obstacle to the digital single market. Key action 16 of the Digital Agenda for Europe (1) called for a legislative proposal to ensure mutual recognition of e-identification and e-authentication. On 4 June 2012 the Commission adopted a Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on electronic identification and trust services for electronic transactions in the internal market (2).

The Commission supports a swift adoption of this regulation, as it will abolish all existing legal barriers regarding the use of notified electronic identification means across borders in the public sector.

Further to this, based on already existing solutions funded by the CIP ICT Programme, the Commission intends to set up an eID core service platform funded by the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF), which will be a building block for online cross-border services in the Digital Single Market. By demonstrating the tangible benefits of cross-border eID it will also motivate take-up by the private sector, thereby ensuring the financial sustainability of the developed solutions in the long run.

---

(1) See the COM(2010) 245 final/2.

(2) COM(2012) 238 + 2012/0146 (COD).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011801/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(16 octobre 2013)

Objet: Problème législatif autour de la protection des données

Au printemps, un texte législatif est passé dans nos mains en commission du marché intérieur du Parlement européen, qui avait pour objectif de rénover le droit sur la protection des données.

1. La proposition ne tient pas suffisamment compte des exigences spécifiques à la conservation et à l'échange des données en matière de santé publique. De manière générale, la proposition ne réalise pas un équilibre entre la protection de la vie privée et l'utilisation des données à des fins d'intérêt public, telles que la protection de la santé publique, la surveillance des maladies et l'organisation des soins de santé. Quelle est la réponse de la Commission à cet égard?

2. Pourquoi la Commission ne passe-t-elle pas par une directive plutôt que par un règlement? La question est en effet déjà régie par des réglementations nationales qui doivent pouvoir être adaptées avec souplesse.

3. En lien direct avec la deuxième question: sauf erreur de notre part, pourquoi la Commission n'envisage-t-elle pas d'appliquer à ses propres services le règlement proposé?

4. Si la transformation de la proposition en proposition de directive n'est pas possible, une option pourrait être d'exclure du champ d'application du règlement les données utilisées dans un but d'intérêt public (et donc la santé et la sécurité sociale). Ce compromis paraît-il envisageable pour la Commission? Dans la négative, pourquoi?

5. Pourquoi la Commission ne distinguerait-elle pas de manière claire et non équivoque le secteur public du secteur privé dans son texte?

Réponse donnée par $\mathrm{M^{me}}$ Reding au nom de la Commission
(13 décembre 2013)

La proposition de règlement général sur la protection des données (1) harmonisera davantage les conditions de traitement des données dans le domaine de la santé, tout en garantissant un niveau uniforme et élevé de protection des personnes. La forme juridique de la proposition (un règlement au lieu d'une directive devant être transposée par les États membres) contribuera de manière essentielle à cette harmonisation, ce qui favorisera la prestation transfrontière de services de santé.

Le droit fondamental à la protection des données à caractère personnel (article 8 de la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'UE) doit être garanti tant dans le secteur public que dans le secteur privé. Par conséquent, le règlement général sur la protection des données, tout comme la directive 95/46/CE actuelle, ne différencie pas les droits à la protection des données selon que le responsable du traitement ou le sous-traitant est public ou privé.

Les dispositions du règlement général sur la protection des données portant spécifiquement sur le traitement des données relatives à la santé (article 81, paragraphe 1) autorisent les services de soin de santé à traiter les données à caractère personnel à des fins de santé publique et de protection sociale, pour autant que les intérêts ou les droits et libertés fondamentaux des personnes concernées soient respectés. De plus, la proposition fixe des règles spécifiques sur le traitement des données à des fins de recherche historique, statistique et scientifique, notamment des registres de patients (article 81, paragraphe 2).

La Commission a l'intention de présenter les propositions nécessaires pour aligner le règlement (CE) n° 45/2001 (2), qui s'applique au traitement des données à caractère personnel par les institutions et organes de l'UE, sur les principes et dispositions du règlement général sur la protection des données, comme convenu par les co-législateurs, en temps utile pour permettre l'entrée en vigueur simultanée du règlement (CE) n° 45/2001 modifié et du règlement général sur la protection des données.

---

(1) COM(2012) 11 final, proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil relatif à la protection des personnes physiques à l'égard du traitement des données à caractère personnel et à la libre circulation de ces données (règlement général sur la protection des données).

(2) Règlement (CE) n° 45/2001 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 18 décembre 2000 relatif à la protection des personnes physiques à l'égard du traitement des données à caractère personnel par les institutions et organes communautaires et à la libre circulation de ces données (JO L 8 du 12.1.2001, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011801/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Problem regarding data protection legislation

Last spring, the Committee on the internal market and Consumer Affairs had the task of reporting on a proposal aimed at updating the data protection legislation.

1. The proposed legislation does not make enough provision for the special requirements associated with the storage and exchange of public health-related data. As a whole, it does not strike the right balance between protecting privacy and using data in the public interest, for example for the protection of public health, disease surveillance and healthcare provision. How does the Commission view this matter?

2. Why does the Commission not opt for a directive instead of a regulation, since the issue is already covered by national regulations and flexibility is required in adapting these?

3. This relates directly to my second question: if I am not mistaken, why is the Commission not intending to apply the proposed legislation to its own departments?

4. If this draft regulation cannot be converted into a draft directive, one option could be to exclude the use of data in the public interest (and hence healthcare and social security data) from the scope of the regulation. Would the Commission consider this compromise and if not, could it explain why?

5. Could the Commission not distinguish clearly and unequivocally between the public and private sector in the proposed legislation?

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

The proposal for a General Data Protection Regulation (1) (GDPR) will further harmonise the conditions for data processing in the area of health, while ensuring a consistent and high level of protection of individuals. The GDPR's legal nature (a regulation, instead of a directive to be transposed by Member States) will be an essential factor for aforesaid harmonisation, thus fostering the provision of cross-border healthcare services.

The fundamental right to the protection of personal data (Article 8 EU Charter of Fundamental Rights) needs to be ensured both in the public and the private sector. Therefore, the GDPR, like the current Directive 95/46/EC, does not differentiate data protection rights on the basis of the public or private nature of the controller or processor.

The GDPR's specific provisions on processing of health data (Article 81(1)) authorise the processing by healthcare services, for the protection of public health and social protection with safeguards for the interests or fundamental rights and freedoms of the data subjects. In addition, the GDPR lays down specific rules on data processing for historical, statistical and scientific purposes, including patient registries (Article 81(2)).

The Commission intends to present the necessary proposals to align Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 (2), which applies to the processing of personal data by EU institutions and bodies, with the principles and rules of the GDPR as agreed by the co-legislators in a timely manner in order to ensure that the amended Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 can enter into application at the same time as the GDPR.

---

(1) COM(2012) 11 final, Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data (General Data Protection Regulation).

(2) Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2000 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data, OJ L8, 12.01.2001, p. 1-22.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011802/13
an die Kommission
Othmar Karas (PPE), Edit Herczog (S&D), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE) und Derk Jan Eppink (ECR)
(16. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Umsetzung der Richtlinie über Zahlungsverzug

Zahlungsverzug ist innerhalb der EU ein weit verbreitetes Problem, welches viel zu häufig zu Konkurs und dem Verlust von Arbeitsplätzen und insbesondere zur Gefährdung von KMUs führt. Die Richtlinie über Zahlungsverzug, die im Jahr 2011 angenommen wurde, ist ein wichtiges Instrument, um diese Herausforderung zu bewältigen und das große Hindernis zu beseitigen, mit dem die Unternehmen, insbesondere KMU, konfrontiert sind, wenn sie vollen Nutzen aus dem Binnenmarkt ziehen wollen.

Die Interfraktionelle Arbeitsgruppe „Kleine und mittlere Unternehmen“ im Europäischen Parlament hat sich immer mit Nachdruck für die Richtlinie eingesetzt und wacht sorgfältig über ihre Umsetzung. Laut den Informationen der Fragesteller haben nur neun Mitgliedstaaten die überarbeitete Richtlinie über Zahlungsverzug bis zum festgelegten Termin (16. März 2013) umgesetzt. Im September 2013 haben zwei Mitgliedstaaten die Richtlinie noch immer nicht umgesetzt.

1. Welche Maßnahmen hat die Kommission im Hinblick auf die Mitgliedstaaten ergriffen, die die Richtlinie noch nicht umgesetzt haben? Welche weiteren Maßnahmen wird die Kommission ergreifen, um die Umsetzung in diesen Mitgliedstaaten zu beschleunigen?

2. Verfügt die Kommission bereits über Informationen über die Auswirkungen der überarbeiteten Richtlinie über Zahlungsverzug in den Mitgliedstaaten, die die Richtlinie fristgerecht umgesetzt haben?

3. Wie will die Kommission sicherstellen, dass die Richtlinie innerhalb der EU einheitlich ausgelegt wird, und wie will sie die Umsetzung der Richtlinie bewerten?

4. Wie wird die Kommission zusätzlich zu ihrer Informationskampagne die ordnungsgemäße Umsetzung der neuen Vorschriften in den Mitgliedstaaten fördern?

5. Welche Maßnahmen schlägt die Kommission abgesehen von der Richtlinie über Zahlungsverzug vor, um eine Kultur der termingerechten Zahlung im gesamten Binnenmarkt zu erreichen, und zwar sowohl bei Geschäften zwischen Unternehmen (B2B — business to business) als auch zwischen Privatkunden und Unternehmen (P2B — people to business), und um KMU vor Missbrauch durch dominante Marktakteure zu schützen?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(17. Dezember 2013)

1. Im Mai 2013 sendete die Kommission Aufforderungsschreiben an die Mitgliedstaaten ([1]), die bis dahin noch keine Maßnahmen zur Umsetzung mitgeteilt hatten. Belgien und Deutschland haben bis heute noch nicht mitgeteilt, mit welchen Rechtsvorschriften sie die Richtlinie umgesetzt haben. Daher ergingen am 20. November 2013 begründete Stellungnahmen an diese Länder. Der nächste Verfahrensschritt wäre es — wenn sich die Notwendigkeit ergibt — die Angelegenheiten an den Europäischen Gerichtshof zu verweisen.

2. Die betroffenen Kreise melden ein gestiegenes Interesse an der Richtlinie und ein zunehmendes Bewusstsein für sie. Es sei jedoch noch zu früh dafür, deutliche Verbesserungen in der Praxis beim Zahlungsfluss und beim Zeitpunkt der Zahlungen zu erkennen.

3. Die Kommission prüft zurzeit die von 26 Mitgliedstaaten mitgeteilten nationalen Umsetzungsmaßnahmen. Einige Mitgliedstaaten wurden bereits um weitere Angaben und/oder Klarstellungen ersucht; weitere könnten in Kürze folgen. Außerdem hält die Kommission regelmäßig Sitzungen mit der Gruppe nationaler Sachverständiger ab, deren Aufgabe es ist, die Umsetzung der Richtlinie zu erörtern und ihre durchgängige Auslegung sicherzustellen.

([1]) Belgien, die Tschechische Republik, Deutschland und Lettland.

4. Neben der Informationskampagne hat die Kommission die Website „Bekämpfung von Zahlungsverzug" (2) eingerichtet, auf der betroffene Parteien wichtige Informationen zur Zahlungsverzugsrichtlinie und zur Informationskampagne sowie weitere nützliche Hinweise finden können.

5. Innerhalb des Europäischen Semesters zur wirtschaftspolitischen Steuerung hat die Kommission darauf hingewiesen, dass die Modernisierung der öffentlichen Verwaltung in vielen Mitgliedstaaten zu den wichtigsten Prioritäten für die Steigerung der Wettbewerbsfähigkeit gehört. Zu einer effizienten öffentlichen Verwaltung gehört die unverzügliche Zahlung aufgrund vertraglicher Verpflichtungen. Die Kommission wird im Rahmen des Europäischen Semesters die weitere Entwicklung beobachten.

---

(2) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/single-market-goods/fighting-late-payments/index_de.htm

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-011802/13
a Bizottság számára
Othmar Karas (PPE), Herczog Edit (S&D), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE) és Derk Jan Eppink (ECR)
(2013. október 16.)

Tárgy: A késedelmes fizetésekről szóló irányelv végrehajtása

A késedelmes fizetés széles körű probléma az EU-ban, túl gyakran vezet csődhöz és munkahelyek elvesztéséhez, és különösen a kkv-kat veszélyezteti. A késedelmes fizetésekről szóló, 2011-ben elfogadott irányelv egy fontos eszköz e kihívás kezeléséhez és a vállalatoknak – különösen a kkv-knak – az egységes piac előnyeinek teljes kihasználását gátló főbb akadályok felszámolásához.

Az Európai Parlament kkv-kkal foglalkozó frakcióközi csoportja mindig szilárd támogatója volt az irányelvnek és figyelemmel kíséri annak végrehajtását. Információink szerint a 2013. március 16-i határidőig csak kilenc tagállam ültette át a késedelmes fizetésekről szóló felülvizsgált irányelvet. 2013. szeptemberben még két tagállam nem tette ezt meg.

1. Milyen intézkedéseket tett a Bizottság azon tagállamok tekintetében, amelyek még nem ültették át az irányelvet? Milyen további intézkedéseket tesz a Bizottság az átültetés felgyorsítására e tagállamokban?

2. Van-e már a Bizottságnak információja a felülvizsgált irányelv hatásáról azon tagállamokban, amelyek a határidő előtt átültették azt?

3. Hogyan szándékozik a Bizottság biztosítani az irányelv koherens értelmezését az EU-ban és értékelni annak végrehajtását?

4. A tájékoztató kampány mellett hogyan fogja a Bizottság előmozdítani az új szabályok helyes végrehajtását a tagállamokban?

5. Az irányelven kívül milyen intézkedéseket javasol a Bizottság az időben történő fizetés kultúrájának megteremtése érdekében az egységes piacon – mind a vállalkozások közötti, mind a vállalkozások és magánszemélyek közötti ügyletekben – és a kkv-k védelmében az erőfölénnyel rendelkező piaci szereplők visszaélése ellen?

Antonio Tajani válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. december 17.)

1. A Bizottság 2013 májusában hivatalosan értesítette azokat a tagállamokat (1), amelyek elmulasztották átültetési intézkedéseiket bejelenteni. Belgium és Németország a mai napig nem jelentették be az irányelvet nemzeti jogukba átültető intézkedéseket. Ennek következtében a Bizottság e két országnak 2013. november 20-án indokolással ellátott véleményt küldött. Az eljárás következő lépésében az érintett ügyeket szükség esetén az Európai Bíróság tárgyalja meg.

2. Az érdekelt felek azt állítják, hogy fokozott tudatosságot és érdeklődést tapasztaltak az irányelv meglétével kapcsolatban, ugyanakkor érvelésük szerint még nem telt el elegendő idő ahhoz, hogy a pénzforgalom vagy a kifizetések időtartama tekintetében a gyakorlatban egyértelmű javulást lehetne megfigyelni.

3. A Bizottság jelenleg vizsgálja a 26 tagállam által már bejelentett nemzeti átültető intézkedéseket. Egyes tagállamokat már felkértünk arra, hogy szolgáljanak további információkkal és pontosítással, míg másokkal a közeljövőben vesszük fel a kapcsolatot. A Bizottság emellett rendszeresen találkozik az irányelv végrehajtásának megvitatásával és egységes értelmezésének biztosításával megbízott tagállami szakértői csoporttal.

4. A tájékoztató kampány mellett a Bizottság létrehozta a késedelmes kifizetések elleni küzdelemben felhasználható „Fighting Late Payment” (2) honlapot, ahol az érdekeltek hasznos információkat találnak a késedelmes fizetésről szóló irányelvről és a tájékoztató kampányról; a honlapon emellett a témába vágó más dokumentumok is megtalálhatók.

---

(1) Belgium, Cseh Köztársaság, Németország, Lettország.

(2) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/single-market-goods/fighting-late-payments/index_en.htm

5. A Bizottság a kormányzás európai szemeszterének keretében jelezte, hogy a közigazgatás modernizációja számos tagállamban a versenyképesség javulásának egyik kulcsfontosságú prioritása. A szerződéses kötelezettségek szerinti gyors kifizetés a hatékony közigazgatás része. A Bizottság az európai szemeszter keretében továbbra is figyelemmel kíséri az előrehaladást.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011802/13
aan de Commissie
Othmar Karas (PPE), Edit Herczog (S&D), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE) en Derk Jan Eppink (ECR)
(16 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Tenuitvoerlegging van de richtlijn betalingsachterstand

Betalingsachterstand is een veel voorkomend probleem in de EU, maar al te vaak leidend tot faillissementen en het verlies van banen, met name in het MKB. De richtlijn betalingsachterstand, goedgekeurd in 2011, is een belangrijk instrument voor de aanpak van dit probleem en voor het uit de weg ruimen van deze ernstige belemmering voor ondernemingen, en met name het MKB, om ten volle te profiteren van de interne markt.

De Interfractiewerkgroep MKB in het Europees Parlement is altijd groot voorstander geweest van deze richtlijn en houdt de tenuitvoerlegging ervan nauwlettend in het oog. Uit de door ons ontvangen informatie blijkt dat slechts negen lidstaten de herziene richtlijn betalingsachterstand hadden omgezet op de uiterste termijn van 16 maart 2013. In september 2013 hadden twee lidstaten dit nog altijd niet gedaan.

1. Welke maatregelen heeft de Commissie genomen met betrekking tot de lidstaten die de richtlijn nog niet hebben omgezet? Welke maatregelen gaat de Commissie verder nemen om de omzetting van de richtlijn in die lidstaten te versnellen?

2. Beschikt de Commissie reeds over informatie over het effect van de herziene richtlijn in de lidstaten die de richtlijn vóór de uiterste termijn hadden omgezet?

3. Hoe wil de Commissie een coherente uitlegging van de richtlijn in de hele EU waarborgen en hoe gaat zij de tenuitvoerlegging evalueren?

4. Hoe gaat de Commissie, naast de voorlichtingscampagne die zij hierover voert, een juiste tenuitvoerlegging van de nieuwe regels in de lidstaten bevorderen?

5. Welke maatregelen, naast de richtlijn, stelt de Commissie voor om een cultuur van tijdige betalingen in de hele interne markt te bewerkstelligen, zowel bij B2B- als bij P2B-transacties, en om het MKB te beschermen tegen misbruik door dominante marktdeelnemers?

Antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie
(17 december 2013)

1. In mei 2013 heeft de Commissie schriftelijke aanmaningen toegezonden aan de lidstaten (1) die hun omzettingsmaatregelen niet hebben meegedeeld. Tot dusver hebben België en Duitsland hun wetgeving tot omzetting van de richtlijn niet meegedeeld. Daarom zijn op 20 november 2013 met redenen omklede adviezen aan deze landen toegezonden. De volgende procedurele stap is dat de zaken zo nodig aanhangig worden gemaakt bij het Hof van Justitie.

2. De belanghebbenden voeren aan dat zij een verhoogde belangstelling voor en kennis van het bestaan van de richtlijn hebben opgemerkt, maar stellen dat het nog te vroeg is om een duidelijke verbetering in de praktijk te zien wat de kasstroom of de promptheid van de betalingen betreft.

3. De Commissie beoordeelt momenteel de nationale omzettingsmaatregelen die door 26 lidstaten zijn meegedeeld. Met sommige lidstaten is reeds contact opgenomen om meer informatie en/of verduidelijking te ontvangen; met andere wordt waarschijnlijk binnenkort contact opgenomen. Voorts organiseert de Commissie regelmatig bijeenkomsten met de groep van nationale deskundigen, die als taak heeft de tenuitvoerlegging van de richtlijn te bespreken en voor een coherente interpretatie te zorgen.

4. Naast de voorlichtingscampagne is de Commissie gestart met de website „Fighting Late Payment" (2), waar de belanghebbenden belangrijke informatie kunnen vinden over de Richtlijn betalingsachterstand, de voorlichtingscampagne en andere nuttige documentatie.

---

(1) België, Duitsland, Letland en Tsjechië.

(2) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/single-market-goods/fighting-late-payments/index_en.htm

5. In het kader van het Europees semester voor economisch bestuur heeft de Commissie aangegeven dat de modernisering van het openbaar bestuur een prioriteit is voor een beter concurrentievermogen in veel lidstaten. Prompte betaling van contractuele verplichtingen is een wezenlijk onderdeel van een efficiënt openbaar bestuur. De Commissie zal blijven toezien op de vooruitgang in het kader van het Europees semester.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011802/13
to the Commission
Othmar Karas (PPE), Edit Herczog (S&D), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE) and Derk Jan Eppink (ECR)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Implementation of the Late Payment Directive

Late payment is a widespread problem in the EU, leading all too often to bankruptcy and lost jobs and especially endangering SMEs. The Late Payment Directive, adopted in 2011, is an important tool for tackling this challenge and removing what constitutes a major obstacle to enterprises, in particular SMEs, taking full advantage of the single market.

The SME Intergroup in the European Parliament has always been a strong supporter of the directive and is keeping a close eye on its implementation. According to our information, only nine Member States had transposed the revised Late Payment Directive by the deadline of 16 March 2013. By September 2013, two Member States had still failed to do so.

1. What measures has the Commission taken with regard to those Member States that have not yet transposed the directive? What further measures will the Commission take to accelerate transposition in those Member States?

2. Does the Commission already have any information on the impact of the revised directive in those Member States that transposed it before the deadline?

3. How does the Commission intend to ensure coherent interpretation of the directive across the EU and assess its implementation?

4. In addition to its information campaign, how will the Commission promote the correct implementation of the new rules in the Member States?

5. Apart from the directive, what measures does the Commission propose in order to achieve a culture of timely payment throughout the single market, both in B2B and P2B transactions, and to protect SMEs against abuse by dominant market players?

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

1. In May 2013 the Commission sent letters of formal notice to the Member States (1) who had failed to notify their transposing measures. To date Belgium and Germany have not notified their legislation transposing the directive. Hence, reasoned opinions were sent to these countries on 20 November 2013. The following procedural step is referring the cases to the European Court of Justice, if need be.

2. The stakeholders claim to have noticed an increased interest in and awareness of the directive's existence, but argue that it is too early yet to observe any clear improvement in practice as regards the cash flow or the duration of payments.

3. The Commission is currently assessing the national transposition measures notified by 26 Member States. Some Member States have already been contacted to receive further information and/or clarification, others may be contacted soon. The Commission also holds regular meetings with the national experts group, whose role is to discuss the implementation of the directive and to ensure its coherent interpretation.

4. Apart from the information campaign, the Commission has launched the website 'Fighting Late Payment' (2), where the stakeholders may find important information regarding the Late Payment Directive, the information campaign and other useful documentation.

---

(1) Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany and Latvia.

(2) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/single-market-goods/fighting-late-payments/index_en.htm

5. thin the framework of the European semester for economic governance, the Commission has indicated that modernising public administration is a key priority for improved competitiveness in many Member States. Prompt payment of contractual obligations is part of an efficient public administration. The Commission will continue to monitor progress within the framework of the European semester.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011803/13
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: EU protocols on restriction of air travel in the event of a global pandemic

SARS, bird flu and, more recently, the coronavirus that affected Saudi Arabia and other parts of the Arabian Gulf are seen as harbingers of far more widespread and serious pathological outbreaks in the future. For most epidemiologists, the question is not so much whether the world will experience a global pandemic in the coming years, but when.

It will be incumbent on governments and supranational organisations such as the EU to exercise constant vigilance, to liaise with the World Health Organisation (WHO) and to have in place protocols that will allow restrictions on travel.

1. Can the Commission indicate whether the regulations pertaining to the 'Single European Sky' give the Commission any competences in terms of banning air travel to and from particular locations in the event of a pandemic, or does this remain the exclusive prerogative of individual Member States?

2. What restrictions on travel, if any, were put in place by the EU as a consequence of the recent Corona outbreak?

3. Has the Commission supported any recent research into the likely impact of the transmission of viruses (including SARS and bird flu) and other pathogens during flight? Is it the Commission's understanding that air-filtering systems can be modified on modern aircraft if deemed necessary by the appropriate authorities to remove certain pathogens?

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

1. According to Commission Regulation (EU) No 677/2011 (1), the air traffic management (ATM) Network Manager for the Single European Sky is responsible for managing the response to any network crisis in close cooperation with the Member States. In its task, the Network Manager is supported by the newly established European Aviation Crisis Coordination Cell, to which the Commission is a permanent member.

Although banning air travel to and from particular locations in the event of a pandemic (or any other crisis that would affect aviation) remains the exclusive prerogative of individual Member States, effective coordination process at EU level is now organised as a consequence of the eruption of the Eyjafjallajökull volcano in April 2010.

2. No travel restrictions have been taken as a consequence of the current ongoing outbreak of the Middle-East Respiratory Syndrome caused by the new coronavirus (MERS CoV). Health advice to travellers to affected countries was shared among the members of the Health Security Committee to assure consistency of the information in the Member States.

3. Two initiatives have been funded respectively by the Health Program (2) and by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (3) to provide information to prevent and respond to communicable diseases potentially transmissible during air flights.

Most aircrafts built after the late 1980s are equipped with an environmental control system monitoring and controlling the pressure, humidity, temperature and ventilation in the cabin. High efficiency particulate air filters capture 99.97% of particles between 0.1 and 0.3 µm and 100% of other particles.

---

(1) Commission Regulation (EU) No 677/2011 of 7 July 2011 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of air traffic management (ATM) network functions and amending Regulation (EU) No 691/2010, Chapter IV, OJCE L185 of 15.7.2011.

(2) AIRSAN project: 'Coordinated action in the aviation sector to control public health threats'.

(3) RAGIDA project: 'Risk assessment guidance for diseases transmitted on aircraft'.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011804/13
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Air traffic control services in the EU

In a recent edition of the UK newspaper, '*Private Eye*', it was reported that the UK's national air traffic control service (NATS) is 'using instructions from the European Commission to reduce the amount it charges airlines to use air traffic services in the UK as an excuse to shed around 500 jobs'.

The Commission, which is now responsible for regulation across all EU airspace, has advocated that savings could be made if airspace was controlled in blocks based on operational efficiency rather than national borders, as has been the case in the past. The report suggests that the Commission has imposed set cost reductions of between 3% and 7%.

1. Can the Commission indicate whether it has sought specific levels of price reductions to airlines or whether these are simply estimates of the reductions likely to accrue as a result of implementation?

2. If these are predicted savings, are the Commission's estimates predicated on the basis of reductions in staff numbers, such as those alleged in the aforementioned article?

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

The Honourable member refers to the implementation of the Single European Sky (SES) legislation, in particular the SES Performance Scheme that include the establishement of Union-wide performance targets in the key performance areas of safety, environment, capacity and cost-efficiency. Member States then adopt national or functional airspace block (FAB) performance plans and targets that need to be consitent and foresee adequate contribution to the Union-wide targets.

For the so-called first reference period from 2012-2014 targets were adopted in 2010. Member States and the Commission are now in the process of agreeing and adopting targets for the second reference period starting in 2015 until 2019. For the first reference period in respect to cost-efficiency an annual reduction of unit cost of minus 3.2% was agreed.

Key principle of the SES Performance Scheme is that Member States and air navigation service providers should decide on the measures for achieving the targets. Thus, there is by no means any role for the Commission in determining measures such as specific reductions of costs or staff.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011805/13
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: UK limited liability partnerships and 'shell companies' operating within the EU

The UK satirical newspaper *Private Eye* recently published a special report which examines the roles of limited liability partnerships (LLPs) as vehicles for global tax evasion, money-laundering and the breaking of arms embargoes.

In 2005 there were approximately 5 000 LLPs in the UK. By 2012 this number had reached 52 348.

Private Eye's investigation looked into the role of 'shell companies' in the EADS scandal, the Hermitage Capital tax frauds and the scandal involving the London branch of the Wachovia financial services company. It also looked at 'shell companies' that were implicated in sanction-busting arms deals.

1. Following the UK Prime Minister's initiatives on corporate transparency at the Fermanagh G8 Summit, does the Commission believe that the time has come to act internationally to better regulate and inspect 'shell companies'?

2. Does Europol have any powers to investigate allegations of companies based in EU Member States busting EU or UN sanctions?

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

1. The Commission welcomes the increased prominence given to the issue of beneficial ownership under the UK's G8 presidency. The Commission's own proposal for a Fourth Anti-Money Laundering Directive has increased the onus on companies themselves to know who their beneficial owner is and to make this information available to competent authorities and obliged entities. This obligation applies to shell companies which could provide potential opportunities to obscure the identity of the persons operating behind them. Those features make such structures possible conduits for tax evasion schemes which often involve several jurisdictions, including one or more offshore centres. From a tax perspective, reliable information on the beneficial ownership of those structures is important for the investigation of tax evasion schemes.

2. Europol does not have any power to investigate allegations of companies based in EU Member States busting EU or UN sanctions. According to Council Decision 2009/371/JHA (Europol Council Decision) Europol may not autonomously investigate; it may only aid investigations of the Member States.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011806/13
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(16 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: El tratamiento de la industria conservera en el Acuerdo de comercio con Tailandia

El 27 de mayo comenzaron las negociaciones formales del Acuerdo entre la Unión Europea y Tailandia. El referido acuerdo tendrá una gran incidencia en las empresas transformadoras y comercializadoras de pesca del mar, que habitualmente están ubicadas en lugares altamente dependientes de ellas. Tailandia, por otra parte, es un país muy competitivo con los productos transformados, fundamentalmente del atún. Pero, sin embargo, sus estándares sociales, económicos y medioambientales no se ajustan a los parámetros europeos. Esta competencia desleal puede acarrear duras consecuencias para el sector transformador europeo.

1. ¿Tiene previsto la Comisión excluir las conservas preparadas de atún del proceso de liberalización arancelaria?

2. En el acuerdo, ¿exigirá a los productos tailandeses las mismas condiciones que a los productos europeos y, por lo tanto, incluirá algún capítulo referido al cumplimiento de los convenios internacionales en materia social, laboral, de gobernanza y medioambiental?

3. ¿Tiene previsto incluir la exigencia de medidas sanitarias y fitosanitarias europeas a los productos tailandeses?

4. ¿Tiene previsto incrementar los controles sanitarios y fitosanitarios a las conservas de atún procedentes del país de referencia?

Respuesta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de diciembre de 2013)

La Comisión Europea es perfectamente consciente de la importancia de la industria conservera de pescados y mariscos de la UE, especialmente en el marco del comercio bilateral con un gran operador en el sector del atún en conserva como es Tailandia. Un acuerdo de libre comercio entre la Unión Europea y Tailandia ambicioso y equilibrado, que tenga en cuenta un sector tan sensible como el de la industria conservera de pescados y mariscos, entre otros, aportará importantes beneficios a la economía de la UE en su conjunto.

Sobre la liberalización arancelaria, si bien es demasiado pronto para prejuzgar el resultado de las negociaciones, el acuerdo deberá tener en cuenta las sensibilidades de la UE y los intereses de Tailandia en cuanto al acceso al mercado de las conservas de atún. La Comisión Europea dispone de información que le permitirá establecer prioridades y tomar decisiones durante el proceso de negociación gracias a un cuestionario específico que envió al sector pesquero de la UE. La Comisión ha tomado buena nota de las indicaciones y comentarios de esta industria.

El acuerdo recogerá un capítulo específico sobre la aplicación de medidas sanitarias y fitosanitarias que reforzará la cooperación. Tailandia debe seguir cumpliendo las rigurosas normas que establece actualmente la legislación de la UE. El acuerdo de libre comercio no rebajará las exigencias de esas normas.

La Comisión también procurará el establecimiento de disposiciones sólidas en materia de comercio y desarrollo sostenible que incluyan compromisos de Tailandia respecto a las normas laborales fundamentales y los convenios de la Organización Internacional del Trabajo, así como los acuerdos multilaterales de carácter medioambiental.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011806/13
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Treatment of the canning industry in the Trade Agreement with Thailand

On 27 May, formal negotiations began on the Agreement between the European Union and Thailand. This agreement will have a major impact on sea fish processing and marketing companies, which are usually located in areas that are highly dependent on them. Thailand, for its part, is a highly competitive country with regard to processed products, particularly tuna. However, its social, economic and environmental standards do not meet European requirements. This unfair competition may have serious consequences for the European food processing sector.

1. Does the Commission intend to exclude canned tuna from the tariff liberalisation process?

2. In the agreement, will the Commission require the same conditions of Thai products as of European products and, therefore, include a chapter on compliance with international agreements on social, labour, governance and environmental issues?

3. Does the Commission intend to include a requirement for the application of European sanitary and phytosanitary measures to Thai products?

4. Does it plan to increase sanitary and phytosanitary controls on canned tuna from the abovementioned country?

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

The European Commission is well aware of the importance of the EU seafood canning industry, in particular in the context of bilateral trade with a large player in the canned tuna sector such as Thailand. An ambitious and balanced free trade agreement (FTA) between the EU and Thailand, which takes into account the sensitive nature of the seafood canning industry (among others), will bring substantial benefits for the EU economy as a whole.

On tariff liberalisation, while it is too early to prejudge the outcome of the negotiations, the FTA will have to take into account the EU's sensitivities and Thailand's interest in market access for canned tuna. The EU fisheries sector has been given the opportunity, by means of a specific questionnaire, to provide the European Commission with information to enable it to establish priorities and take decisions throughout the negotiating process. The European Commission has taken good note of the industry input.

The FTA will include a separate chapter on the application of sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) matters, which will strengthen cooperation. Thailand has to continue to meeting the current high standards as set in EU legislation. The FTA will not lower these standards.

The Commission will also pursue robust provisions on trade and sustainable development, including commitments by Thailand to the International Labour Organisation core labour standards and conventions as well as multilateral environmental agreements.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011808/13
al Consiglio
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE)
(16 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Reti di trasporti TEN-T, esclusione del porto di Brindisi

Entro la fine del 2013, il Parlamento europeo sarà chiamato a esprimersi sul regolamento sugli orientamenti dell'Unione per lo sviluppo della rete transeuropea dei trasporti.

Da quanto risulta dai documenti disponibili sul sito e da quelli sinora pubblicati dalla regione Puglia, il testo del regolamento prevede finanziamenti per i porti di Bari e Taranto. Si evince invece che il porto di Brindisi ne sarà escluso.

Alla luce di ciò, può il Consiglio:

1. confermare che tale approdo è effettivamente escluso dal regolamento? In caso affermativo, può precisare le ragioni di tale esclusione e se esiste uno studio di settore che la giustifichi, visto che il porto di Brindisi è il secondo in Puglia per numero di passeggeri movimentati (oltre 530 000 l'anno)?

2. Far sapere se, stante l'esclusione del porto di Brindisi dall'allegato I, vol. 18, è possibile che la posizione assunta nel trilogo dello scorso 29 maggio 2013 sia riconsiderata, al fine di includere questo approdo pugliese nel progetto europeo TEN-T?

Risposta
(16 dicembre 2013)

Il Parlamento europeo e il Consiglio hanno raggiunto un accordo politico sulla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sugli orientamenti dell'Unione per lo sviluppo della rete transeuropea dei trasporti durante il trilogo conclusivo tenutosi il 29 maggio 2013.

Conformemente a tale accordo politico, il porto di Brindisi non è escluso dal succitato regolamento. Brindisi fa in effetti parte della rete globale e può pertanto beneficiare dei progetti di interesse comune nel quadro dei trasporti «autostrade del mare» con un porto centrale. Inoltre, sono disponibili strumenti finanziari anche per tutti i porti che si trovano nella rete globale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011808/13
to the Council
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: TEN-T transport networks: port of Brindisi excluded

Parliament will be called upon to state its position on the regulation on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network by the end of 2013.

According to documents available on the site and those published to date by the Regional Government of Apulia, the regulation provides for funding for the ports of Bari and Taranto. It appears, however, that the port of Brindisi will be excluded.

1. Can the Council confirm that the latter port has indeed been excluded from the regulation? If so, can it state why it has been excluded and whether there is a sectoral study justifying this, given that the port of Brindisi is the second largest in Apulia in terms of passenger numbers (over 530 000 per year)?

2. Given that the port of Brindisi was excluded from Annex I Vol. 18, is it possible for the position taken in the trilogue on 29 May 2013 to be reconsidered so that this port in Apulia may be included in the EU TEN-T project?

Reply
(16 December 2013)

The European Parliament and the Council reached a political agreement on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Union guidelines for the development of the Trans-European Transport Network at a final trilogue which took place on 29 May 2013.

According to this political agreement, Brindisi is not excluded from the above Regulation. Indeed, Brindisi is part of the comprehensive network and is therefore eligible for projects of common interest under ‘Motorways of the Sea’ with a core port. Moreover, financial instruments are also available for all ports located on the comprehensive network.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-011809/13
an die Kommission
Jo Leinen (S&D)
(16. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Angekündigte Mitteilung über die Vollendung des Energiebinnenmarkts und die Rolle der Regierungen („Delivering the internal electricity market: making the best of public intervention“)

In dieser Woche berichtete die deutsche Presse, die Kommission habe vor kurzem beschlossen, Schlüsseldaten zu Fördermitteln für fossile Energieträger und Atomenergie aus ihrer angekündigten Mitteilung zum Energiebinnenmarkt („Delivering the internal electricity market: making the best of public intervention“) zu streichen.

Das Dokument soll den Mitgliedstaaten als Leitfaden für eine Energiepolitik dienen, die möglichst wenige Marktverzerrungen verursacht. Die ursprünglich enthaltenen Grafiken zu fossilen Energieträgern sowie zu Atomenergie und erneuerbaren Energien wurden als transparente und kohärente Informationen gewürdigt. Die Zuschüsse für die verschiedenen Energiequellen müssen mit dem übergeordneten Ziel einer Reduzierung der Emissionen von Treibhausgasen um 80-95 % bis 2050 im Vergleich zu 1990 vereinbar sein. Daher sind Zuschüsse für erneuerbare Energien vor dem Hintergrund der Verpflichtung der EU, den Energiebinnenmarkt zu vollenden und den Anteil erneuerbarer Energien bis 2020 auf 20 % und als „No-regrets-Option“ darüber hinaus zu steigern, äußerst wichtig.

Die Kommission wird gebeten, die Beweggründe für die Streichung der oben genannten Angaben in der Endfassung des Dokuments zu erläutern.

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

Die Kommission hat die feste Absicht, die Zahlen über die finanzielle Förderung von Energie für alle Technologien zu ermitteln und zu veröffentlichen. Eine solche umfassende Analyse ist derzeit nicht verfügbar. Die Bewertung der Förderkosten für die verschiedenen Stromerzeugungsarten ist komplex. Sie muss die Investitionen und die Betriebskosten, einschließlich der Netz- und der Regelenergiemarktkosten, und alle damit verbundenen externen Kosten wie Emissionen und Abfallentsorgung umfassen. Um die Kosten dieser verschiedenen Technologien zu reduzieren, verwenden die Mitgliedstaaten verschiedene staatliche Förderinstrumente wie Steuervergünstigungen, Gebühren und Abgaben, die vom Verbraucher zu tragen sind, sowie direkte Subventionen. Einige Formen dieser Förderung stellen staatliche Beihilfen im Sinne des EU-Rechts dar, andere nicht. Die OECD (1) und die IEA (2) haben Methoden entwickelt, um die Höhe der Subventionen für fossile Brennstoffe und erneuerbare Energien zu berechnen. Diese Studien sind jedoch nicht miteinander vergleichbar und nicht uneingeschränkt auf die Situation der Stromerzeugung in der EU anwendbar. Zu beachten ist zudem, dass sie nicht alle EU-Mitgliedstaaten und auch nicht alle einschlägigen subventionierten Technologien umfassen. Sie stellen daher alleine keine ausreichende Basis für die Formulierung der künftigen EU-Energiepolitik dar. Eine solche Grundlage benötigen wir jedoch. Die Kommission beabsichtigt daher, ihre eigene Analyse der Vergleichskosten für alle Technologien weiter voranzutreiben. In diesem Zusammenhang wird die Kommission ihre eigene vorläufige Analyse, die auf den derzeit vorliegenden Informationen beruht, in den bevorstehenden Bericht über die Energiepreistreiber aufnehmen. Eine eingehende Studie zu den vollständigen Kosten und Subventionen der verschiedenen Technologien im Stromsektor soll bis Juni nächsten Jahres vorliegen.

---

(1) Siehe: http://www.oecd.org/site/tadffss/
Die Analyse umfasst direkte Transferleistungen aus dem öffentlichen Haushalt und Steuervergünstigungen, die der Gewinnung oder dem Verbrauch fossiler Brennstoffe zugutekommen oder diese bevorzugen. Darüber hinaus werden die Gesundheitssysteme in der EU durch externe Effekte konventioneller Brennstoffe (soziale Kosten und Gesundheitskosten) jährlich mit schätzungsweise 40 Mrd. EUR belastet.

(2) International Energy Agency, 2012 World Energy Outlook
http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org/

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011809/13
to the Commission
Jo Leinen (S&D)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Upcoming communication: ‘Delivering the internal electricity market: making the most of government intervention’

It was reported in the German press this week that the Commission had recently decided to remove key data on support measures for fossil fuels and nuclear energy from its upcoming communication, ‘Delivering the internal electricity market: making the best of public intervention’.

This document aims to provide guidance to Member States on designing energy policies which keep market distortions to a minimum. The initial inclusion of the relevant figures for fossil fuels, nuclear, and renewable energy alike was appreciated as being transparent and coherent information. The subsidies for the different energy sources must be in line with the overall objective of achieving a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions of 80-95% by 2050 as compared to 1990. Thus, support for renewable energy is crucial, given the EU’s commitment to realising the internal energy market and increasing the share of renewable energy to 20% by 2020, and also beyond as a ‘no regrets’ option.

Can the Commission please explain the rationale for the decision not to include the above figures in the final document?

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

The Commission has the firm intention to establish the figures on financial support to energy across all technologies and to make them public. Such a comprehensive analysis is currently not available. The assessment of the costs of support for the various types electricity generation is complex. It must reflect investments and operating costs, including network and balancing costs and all related external costs such as emissions and waste disposal. To subsidise these costs, Member States use a number of different tools and instruments, including tax breaks, fees and levies added to consumer bills and direct subsidies. Some of these forms of support fall under the EC law definition of state aid whereas others do not. The OECD (1) and IEA (2) have developed methodologies to calculate the amount of subsidy for fossil fuels and renewables. However, these studies are not comparable and not fully applicable to the situation of electricity production in the EU. Importantly, they do not cover all EU Member States and they do not cover subsidies to all relevant technologies. As a result they do not in themselves provide a sufficient basis for the formulation of future EU energy policy. We do however need such a basis. The Commission therefore intends to deepen its own analysis of comparative costs across all technologies. In this context the Commission will integrate its own preliminary analysis based on currently available information in the upcoming report on drivers for energy prices. An in-depth study on full costs and subsidies of the various technologies in the electricity sector should be available by June 2014.

---

(1) See http://www.oecd.org/site/tadffss/; the analysis covers direct budgetary transfers and tax expenditures that provide a benefit or preference for fossil-fuel production or consumption. Beyond this, externalities of conventional fuels in terms of their social and health costs have been estimated at an annual EUR40bn for the EU health systems.

(2) International Energy Agency, 2012 World Energy Outlook http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org/

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-011810/13
an die Kommission
Matthias Groote (S&D)
(16. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Europäischer Mobilitätsausweis/Europäische Strategie zugunsten von Menschen mit Behinderungen 2010-2020

In der EU leben 83 Millionen Bürger mit einer Behinderung. Genauso wie nicht behinderte EU-Bürger haben sie gemäß Artikel 26 der Charta der Grundrechte der Europäischen Union das Recht auf Freizügigkeit. Zwar gibt es in ihren Heimatländern eine Reihe von Leistungen für Menschen mit Behinderungen wie z. B. Fahrpreisermäßigungen, die ihre Mobilität und Inklusion in alle Bereiche des gesellschaftlichen, wirtschaftlichen und kulturellen Lebens erleichtern. Jedoch haben sie keinen Anspruch auf diese Leistungen bei Aufenthalten in einem anderen EU-Mitgliedstaat zum Zwecke der Arbeit, des Studiums usw. Dies stellt ein großes Hindernis für die uneingeschränkte Ausübung ihres Rechts auf Freizügigkeit dar.

Die gegenseitige Anerkennung von Behindertenausweisen und der damit verbundenen Ansprüche oder die Einführung eines mit bestimmten Rechten einhergehenden Europäischen Behindertenausweises wären geeignete Maßnahmen, um Abhilfe zu schaffen.

Der ursprüngliche Plan der Kommission zur Umsetzung der Europäischen Strategie zugunsten von Menschen mit Behinderungen 2010-2020 (KOM(2010)0636) enthielt den Aktionspunkt „Untersuchung der Auswirkungen einer gegenseitigen Anerkennung von Behindertenausweisen und damit verbundener Leistungsansprüche“ als Maßnahme zur Beseitigung der Hindernisse, denen Menschen mit Behinderungen bei der Wahrnehmung ihrer Rechte als Individuen, Studierende und Berufstätige begegnen.

Kann die Kommission vor dem Hintergrund dieser Ausführungen die beiden folgenden Fragen beantworten:

1. Was hat die Kommission unternommen, um den oben genannten Aktionspunkt (d. h. die Auswirkungen gegenseitig anerkannter Behindertenausweise zu untersuchen) in die Tat umzusetzen, und welche Ergebnisse sind dabei erzielt worden?

2. Wird die Kommission tätig werden, indem sie einen Vorschlag zur Einführung eines Europäischen Behindertenausweises vorlegt, und was wäre der Zeitrahmen für dessen Verwirklichung?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(15. November 2013)

Im Rahmen der Maßnahmen 2010-2015 (1) der Europäischen Strategie zugunsten von Menschen mit Behinderungen 2010-2020 (2) hat die Kommission das Akademische Netz europäischer Experten für Behindertenfragen (ANED) mit der Durchführung einer Studie über Leistungen und Vergünstigungen für Menschen mit Behinderungen in Europa beauftragt (3).

Anhand der Ergebnisse dieser Studie sowie einer weiteren Studie des Europäischen Behindertenforums (EDF) hat die Kommission gemeinsam mit den Vertretern der Mitgliedstaaten in der hochrangigen Gruppe für Behindertenfragen geprüft, wie ein allgemein anerkannter EU-Behindertenausweis eingeführt werden könnte. Die Kommission hat dieses Thema als eine der durchzuführenden Maßnahmen in ihrem Bericht über die Unionsbürgerschaft 2013 (4) verankert.

Dank des wachsenden Interesses der EU-Mitgliedstaaten konnte die Kommission eine Projektarbeitsgruppe ins Leben rufen, in der sich Vertreter interessierter Mitgliedstaaten und der Zivilgesellschaft mit den praktischen Fragen der Ausstellung und Verwaltung eines europäischen Musters für einen Behindertenausweis befassen. Diese Gruppe hat ihre Arbeit zwar erst aufgenommen, jedoch ist zu erwarten, dass ein solcher Ausweis Behinderten Vergünstigungen in den Bereichen Kultur, Freizeit, Sport, Verkehr und Tourismus bieten wird.

---

(1) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT
(2) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT
(3) http://www.disability-europe.net/content/aned/media/ANED%202010%20Task%207%20-%20Disability%20Benefits%20and%20Entitlements%20-%20Report%20-%20FINAL%20 %282 %29.pdf
(4) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/2013eucitizenshipreport_de.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011810/13
to the Commission
Matthias Groote (S&D)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: European Mobility Card/ European Disability Strategy 2010-2020

There are 83 million EU citizens with some kind of disability. They are entitled to enjoy the right to freedom of movement, as recognised by Article 26 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, as much as non-disabled EU citizens. While in their home countries there are a number of benefits in place for people with disabilities, such as concessionary fares, which facilitate their mobility and inclusion in all areas of social, economic and cultural life. However, these benefits cannot be transferred when travelling to another EU Member State, in order to work or go to university or for other purposes. This is a serious obstacle to the full enjoyment of the right of freedom of movement.

The mutual recognition of disability cards and related entitlements, or the introduction of a European Disability Card with certain rights linked to it, would be appropriate measures to remedy this.

The Commission, in its initial plan to implement the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (COM(2010) 0636), included the action point ‘Study the implications of a mutual recognition of disability cards and related entitlements’ as a measure for removing the obstacles that people with disabilities face in exercising their rights as individuals, students and professionals.

In the light of these deliberations, I should like to ask two questions:

1. What has been done by the Commission to deliver on the action point mentioned above (i.e. to study the implications of mutually recognised disability cards), and what results have been achieved?

2. Will the Commission take action by introducing a proposal to create a European Disability Card, and what would be the timeframe for its realisation?

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

As part of the actions for 2010-2015 ([1]) of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([2]) the European Academic Network of Experts in Disability (ANED) was tasked by the Commission to do a study on ‘Disability Benefits and Entitlements in European Countries’ ([3]).

The findings of this study and of a further study by the European Disability Forum (EDF) have enabled the Commission to examine together with the representatives from the Member States in the High Level Group on Disability how a mutually recognised EU disability card could be introduced. As a result this has become one of the actions included by the Commission in its EU Citizenship report 2013 ([4]).

The growing interest of EU Member States has enabled the Commission to initiate a project working group where representatives of interested Member States and civil society are dealing with practical details of issuing and managing a European model disability card. This group is still in the early stages of its work but the expectation is that the card to be developed is likely to grant benefits in the areas of culture, leisure, sport, transport and tourism.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT
([3]) http://www.disability-europe.net/content/aned/media/ANED%202010%20Task%207%20-%20Disability%20Benefits%20and%20Entitlements%20-%20Report%20-%20FINAL%20%282%29.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/2013eucitizenshipreport_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011811/13
to the Commission
Rebecca Taylor (ALDE)

(16 October 2013)

Subject: Implementation of the Habitats Directive by the UK

In response to my Question E-009556/12 concerning implementation of the Birds Directive and Habitats Directive in the United Kingdom, and the severe degradation of protected blanket bog habitats on Walshaw Moor in the South Pennines, the Commission advised that it had not yet had an opportunity to assess the complaint made.

Can the Commission now confirm whether it has assessed the complaint and state whether or not the competent authorities in the UK are fulfilling their obligations to avoid the deterioration of natural habitats and habitats of protected species under Article 6(2) of the Habitats Directive?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission

(13 November 2013)

The Commission has received two complaints — one in October 2012 and another in January 2013 — regarding the management of Walshaw Moor and in particular the issue of the burning of blanket bog habitats. The Commission has in consequence started an EU Pilot investigation and has contacted the UK-authorities on their views of the problems outlined. An answer has been received and the Commission has informed the complainants about the main elements of the answer of the UK in order for them to provide additional comments. So far such comments have been received only from one of the two complainants. Once all the necessary information is collected, the Commission will finalise its assessment and take appropriate action should its investigation lead to an assessment that UK is in breach of EU legislation.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011813/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)

(16. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Neue Verschlüsselungsstandards nach NSA-Enthüllungen

Neue Enthüllungen des Whistleblowers Edward Snowden machen deutlich, dass die U.S.-amerikanische National Security Agency (NSA) sowie der britische Geheimdienst Government Communication Headquarters (GCHQ) seit mindestens zehn Jahren gezielt Internet-Verschlüsselungsstandards untergraben. Dieses nach Informationen der britischen Tageszeitung „The Guardian" allein im Jahr 2013 mit 254,9 Millionen US-Dollar geförderte Programm soll den Geheimdiensten die Möglichkeit geben, den gesamten Internetverkehr nahezu in Echtzeit zu verfolgen. Gleichzeitig unterminiert dieses Programm aber die grundlegenden Sicherheitsstrukturen des Internet — vermeintlich verschlüsselte Daten von Privatleuten, Unternehmen, Militär und Regierungseinrichtungen sind gleichermaßen angreifbar und sollten als unsicher angesehen werden, wenn britische oder U.S.-amerikanische Unternehmen oder Regierungseinrichtungen an der Definition der bei der Übertragung und Speicherung verwendeten Verschlüsselungsstandards beteiligt waren.

1. Ist die Kommission derzeit an der Definition von wesentlichen Internet-Verschlüsselungsstandards beteiligt?

2. Wird die Kommission Initiativen vorschlagen, um neue sichere Verschlüsselungsstandards zu definieren, die zum Beispiel bestehende Systeme wie das „Secure Hypertext Transfer Protocol", Sicherheitselemente bestehender „Voice over IP"-Standards und des „Secure Sockets Layer" ersetzen können?

3. Welche Initiativen wird die Kommission ergreifen, um von den britischen und amerikanischen Geheimdiensten unterminierte Sicherheitsstandards zu ändern oder zu ersetzen?

4. Wenn die Kommission solche Initiativen vorschlägt oder an solchen Initiativen bereits beteiligt ist: Wie wird sichergestellt, dass insbesondere die U.S.-Geheimdienste nicht erneut Einfluss darauf gewinnen?

5. Über wie viele fest angestellte Experten für Sicherheits- und Verschlüsselungsstandards verfügt die Kommission?

Antwort von Frau Kroes im Namen der Kommission

(9. Dezember 2013)

Die Kommission ist derzeit nicht an der Festlegung von Internet-Verschlüsselungsstandards beteiligt und beabsichtigt auch in Zukunft nicht, Verschlüsselungsstandards zu definieren, zu ändern oder zu ersetzen. Die Festlegung von Standards ist in erster Linie ein marktgesteuerter Vorgang. Spezifische von der Kommission definierte oder unterstützte Verschlüsselungsstandards würden vielleicht nicht verabschiedet, und bei verbindlich vorgeschriebenen Standards bestünde die Gefahr, dass sie angesichts des raschen technologischen Wandels bald überholt wären.

Damit eine durchgängige Sicherheit — auch in Bezug auf den Schutz der Daten — gegeben ist, müssen die Endnutzer selbst ein angemessene Risikomanagement betreiben und auf sichere IKT-Lösungen zurückgreifen. Die Kommission bemüht sich mit einer Kombination von rechtlichen Maßnahmen, operativen Empfehlungen und Forschungs- und Innovationsförderung um eine höhere Cybersicherheit in Europa. Sie hat insbesondere einen Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie (1) vorgelegt, mit der öffentliche Verwaltungen und wichtige Marktakteure verpflichtet würden, Risikomanagementverfahren anzuwenden. Die Durchführung dieser Richtlinie soll durch eine öffentlich-private Plattform (2) unterstützt werden, die empfehlenswerte Verfahren im Bereich der Sicherheit von Datennetzen ermittelt, deren Übernahme erleichtert und den künftigen Forschungs- und Technologiebedarf für sichere IKT bestimmt. Die Kommission hat mit dem 7. Rahmenprogramm die europäische Verschlüsselungsforschung großzügig gefördert und wird auch im Rahmen von „Horizont 2020" Mittel dafür bereitstellen. Die Projekte müssen sich mit den wichtigsten Herausforderungen für die fortlaufende Sicherheit der Anwendungen auseinandersetzen, die auf Verschlüsselung zurückgreifen, und mit der Leistungssteigerung bei den IKT Schritt halten.

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-009773/2013 (3).

---

(1) KOM(2013)48.
(2) https://resilience.enisa.europa.eu/nis-platform
(3) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011813/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: New encryption standards following the NSA revelations

New revelations by the whistle-blower Edward Snowden make it clear that the US National Security Agency (NSA) and the United Kingdom intelligence agency, the Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ), have been directly undermining Internet encryption standards for at least 10 years. This programme, which, according to the UK daily newspaper *The Guardian*, was funded by USD 254.9 million in 2013 alone, is intended to enable the intelligence agencies to monitor traffic on the entire Internet virtually in real time. At the same time, however, this programme undermines the basic security structures of the Internet — deliberately encrypted data belonging to individuals, companies, the military and governmental institutions are equally vulnerable and should be regarded as unsecure if UK or US companies or governmental institutions were involved in defining the encryption standards used for transmission and storage.

1. Is the Commission currently involved in defining essential Internet encryption standards?

2. Will it propose initiatives to define new secure encryption standards that, for example, will be able to replace existing systems such as Secure Hypertext Transfer Protocol, security elements of existing Voice over IP standards and the Secure Sockets Layer?

3. What initiatives will the Commission take in order to change or replace the security standards undermined by the UK and US intelligence agencies?

4. If it proposes such initiatives or is already involved in such initiatives, how will it be ensured that the US intelligence agencies in particular do not gain influence over these once again?

5. How many experts in security and encryption standards are permanently employed by the Commission?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(9 December 2013)

The Commission is currently not involved in defining Internet encryption standards and does not plan to define, change, or replace encryption standards in the future. Standardisation is primarily a market-driven process. Specific encryption standards defined or supported by the Commission may not be adopted, while mandated standards would run the risk of becoming obsolete in view of rapid technological change.

To ensure end-to-end security, including data confidentiality, end-users need to implement proper risk management and adopt secure ICT solutions. The Commission has adopted a combination of legal action, operational recommendations and research and innovation funding to increase the level of cybersecurity in Europe. In particular, the Commission has made a proposal for a directive (1), which would require public administrations and key market operators to adopt risk management practices. This directive is underpinned by a public-private platform (2), which aims to identify and facilitate the up-take of good cybersecurity practices and identify future research and technological needs in the field of secure ICT. The Commission has extensively funded European encryption research in the 7th Framework Programme and will continue to fund it in Horizon 2020. Projects will have to address the key challenges to guarantee permanent security of the applications supported by encryption and keep pace with the performance increase of ICT technology.

The Commission further refers the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-009773/2013 (3).

---

(1) COM(2013) 48.
(2) https://resilience.enisa.europa.eu/nis-platform.
(3) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011868/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(17 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Ayuda europea en Palestina

Según el Tribunal de Cuentas Europeo, millones de euros de la UE destinados a ayuda en Palestina fueron derrochados o perdidos por la corrupción
(http://www.thesundaytimes.co.uk/sto/news/world_news/Middle_East/article1326858.ece).
Los investigadores europeos, que visitaron campamentos en Jerusalén y Gaza, notaron una escasez significativa de recursos. Los auditores se quejaron de las pocas medidas de control de los recursos europeos, dado el elevado riesgo de corrupción en la zona.

¿Está al corriente la Comisión de estos hechos?

¿Qué medidas piensa tomar la Comisión para que hechos parecidos no se repitan en el futuro y para asegurar que los recursos económicos europeos destinados a ayuda humanitaria se utilicen para este fin?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Füle en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de diciembre de 2013)

El Tribunal todavía no ha hecho pública la auditoría de la gestión a que parece aludir Su Señoría.

Por lo tanto, la Comisión no hará ningún comentario al respecto hasta su publicación, prevista para finales de 2013.

Se remite a Su Señoría a las respuestas de la Comisión a las preguntas escritas P-11738/2013 y P-11858/2013 (1).

---

(1) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html;jsessionid=987EC3257DF4C7A682B41123ABBD3EED.node1

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011818/13
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI) en Lucas Hartong (NI)

(16 oktober 2013)

Betreft: EUR 2,3 miljard van EU aan Palestijnen zoek

In het Britse blad The Sunday Times, van 13 oktober jl., wordt melding gemaakt van een ongepubliceerd rapport van de Europese Rekenkamer. In het rapport wordt ingegaan op het gebrek aan toezicht op de besteding van Europese hulpfondsen aan de „Palestijnse autoriteiten". Daardoor is het zicht op de besteding van EUR 2 300 000 000 aan hulpfondsen, die de EU tussen 2008 en 2012 aan de zogenaamde „bezette gebieden" heeft overgemaakt, verdwenen.

Op 20 september 2012 heeft de heer Zijlstra, MEP, vragen gesteld aan de Commissie over de besteding van gelden die door de EU aan de Palestijnse Autoriteit worden overgemaakt (E-008299/2012). Hij uitte daarbij zijn zorg dat deze gelden werden aangewend om terroristen die in Israëlische gevangenissen zijn opgesloten duizenden dollars per maand te betalen. De Commissie heeft in zijn antwoord aan de heer Zijlstra medegedeeld dat, van de door de Europese burgers aan de Palestijnse autoriteit betaalde belastingmiddelen, niets bij de veroordeelde terroristen terechtkomt.

1. Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat de Europese Rekenkamer een rapport heeft uitgegeven waarin kritiek wordt geleverd op de controle van de EU, of liever gezegd het gebrek hiervan, over de wijze waarop Europees belastinggeld is besteed dat aan de „Palestijnse autoriteit" is overgemaakt?

2. Zo ja, komt dan het antwoord dat de Commissie heeft gegeven aan MEP Zijlstra, in een ander licht te staan?

3. Blijft de Commissie er in het licht van de bevindingen van de Europese Rekenkamer nog steeds aan vasthouden dat er geen cent aan EU-belastinggeld terechtkomt bij Palestijnse terroristen?

4. Zo ja, waar baseert de Commissie dit standpunt op? Graag een gedetailleerde toelichting met ondersteunend bewijsmateriaal.

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011826/13
aan de Commissie
Peter van Dalen (ECR)

(16 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Besteding Europese hulpfondsen in Palestijnse gebieden

De Sunday Times berichtte op 13 oktober dat de Europese Rekenkamer in een nieuw onderzoeksrapport concludeert dat de EU hulpgelden aan de Palestijnse Autoriteiten mogelijk niet correct zijn besteed. Tussen 2008 en 2012 heeft de EU voor 1,95 miljard euro steun gegeven aan de Palestijnse Autoriteiten. EU onderzoekers zouden bij de controle op de besteding van dit geld significante tekortkomingen hebben geconstateerd. Er is onvoldoende controle geweest of het geld niet verkeerd is uitgegeven, verspild en/of verduisterd.

1. Heeft de Europese Commissie kennis genomen van het artikel in de Sunday Times van 13 oktober over de controle op EU-helpgelden aan de Palestijnse Autoriteiten?

2. Deelt de Commissie de conclusie van de Europese Rekenkamer dat de hulpgelden aan de Palestijnse Autoriteiten niet correct verantwoord kunnen worden? Zo nee, waarom niet?

3. Hoe groot is het bedrag aan EU-hulpgelden precies dat tussen 2008 en 2012 door de EU is uitgekeerd aan de Palestijnse Autoriteiten en niet voldoende verantwoord kan worden?

4. Zal de Europese Commissie dit geld terugvorderen van de Palestijnse Autoriteiten? Zo nee, waarom niet?

5. Hoe gaat de Europese Commissie de controle op de besteding van EU gelden in de Palestijnse gebieden in de toekomst verbeteren?

6. Kan de Europese Commissie mij er nogmaals van verzekeren dat EU hulpgelden niet terecht komen bij (leden van) organisaties die op de Europese lijst van terroristische organisaties staan.

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie

(5 december 2013)

De prestatie-audit waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid lijkt te verwijzen, is nog niet door de Rekenkamer gepubliceerd.

De Commissie kan derhalve geen opmerkingen maken, tot dit verslag naar verwachting tegen het einde van 2013 is gepubliceerd.

Verder verwijst de Commissie het geachte Parlementslid naar haar antwoorden op de schriftelijke vragen P-11738/2013 en P-11858/2013 (1).

---

(1) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/nl/parliamentary-questions.html;jsessionid=987EC3257DF4C7A682B41123ABBD3EED.node1

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011818/13
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI) and Lucas Hartong (NI)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: EUR 2.3 billion of EU aid to Palestinians missing

The edition of the UK newspaper *The Sunday Times* published on 13 October last mentions an unpublished report from the Court of Auditors. The report describes the lack of supervision with regard to the spending of the European aid funds given to the 'Palestinian Authority'. This has resulted in failure to keep an eye on the spending of EUR 2.3 billion in aid which the EU paid to the so-called 'occupied territories' between 2008 and 2012.

On 20 September 2012 the MEP Mr Zijlstra submitted questions to the Commission about the spending of the funds paid by the EU to the Palestinian Authority (E-008299/2012). He expressed his concern that this money was being used to pay thousands of dollars a month to terrorists locked up in Israeli prisons. The Commission stated in its answer to Mr Zijlstra that none of the funds paid by European taxpayers to the Palestinian Authority go to the convicted terrorists.

1. Can the Commission confirm that the Court of Auditors has published a report containing criticism about the EU's management, or rather lack of it, in terms of the way in which European taxpayers' money paid to the 'Palestinian Authority' is spent?

2. If so, does this cast in a different light the answer which the Commission gave to Mr Zijlstra?

3. In light of the Court of Auditors' findings, does the Commission still stand by its statement that not a penny of EU taxpayers' money goes to Palestinian terrorists?

4. If so, on what does the Commission base this view? Would it please provide a detailed explanation with supporting evidence?

Question for written answer E-011826/13
to the Commission
Peter van Dalen (ECR)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Spending of European aid funds in the Palestinian territories

The Sunday Times reported on 13 October that the Court of Auditors concluded in a recent investigation report that the EU aid funds given to the Palestinian Authority may not be being spent properly. The Palestinian Authority has been given EUR 1.95 billion in support from the EU between 2008 and 2012. EU investigators were reported to have identified significant shortcomings in the management of how this money was spent. There has been inadequate monitoring to see whether the money has been misspent, wasted and/or misappropriated.

1. Is the Commission aware of the article which appeared in *The Sunday Times* on 13 October about the management of the EU aid funds given to the Palestinian Authority?

2. Does the Commission agree with the conclusion of the Court of Auditors that the aid funds given to the Palestinian Authority may not be properly accounted for? If not, why not?

3. What is the exact amount of EU aid funds which have been paid to the Palestinian Authority by the EU between 2008 and 2012 and may not have been sufficiently accounted for?

4. Will the Commission recover this money from the Palestinian Authority? If not, why not?

5. How will the Commission improve, in future, its management of how EU funds are spent in the Palestinian territories?

6. Can the Commission give me the reassurance that EU aid funds are not going to (members of) organisations featuring on the European list of terrorist organisations?

Question for written answer E-011868/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: European aid to Palestine

According to the European Court of Auditors, millions of euros of EU aid to Palestine have been squandered or lost through corruption (http://www.thesundaytimes.co.uk/sto/news/world_news/Middle_East/article1326858.ece). EU investigators who visited sites in Jerusalem and Gaza noted a significant shortage of resources. The auditors complained of the lack of measures to control European resources, given the high risk of corruption in the area.

Is the Commission aware of these facts?

What steps will the Commission take to ensure that similar events do not recur in future and that European economic resources intended for humanitarian aid are used for this purpose?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2013)

The Performance Audit which the Honourable Member appears to allude to has not yet been published by the Court.

The Commission has therefore no comments to make until such time as it has been published, estimated to be by the end of 2013.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions P-11738/2013 and P-11858/2013 (1).

---

(1) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html;jsessionid=987EC3257DF4C7A682B41123ABBD3EED.node1

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011819/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(16 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Possibile violazione della direttiva «Habitat» 92/43/CEE in relazione alla realizzazione del «Passante Nord» (Traforo delle Torricelle) nel Comune di Verona

Nel territorio del Comune di Verona verrà realizzata un'opera denominata «Passante Nord», collegamento autostradale di circa 13 km, volto a completare l'anello circonvallatorio a nord della città e a collegare il casello di Verona Est con quello di Verona Nord, ubicati rispettivamente lungo le autostrade A4 e A22; il progetto prevede, in particolare, la realizzazione di due gallerie (una per senso di marcia) al fine di consentire l'attraversamento dell'area collinare detta «Le Torricelle» . L'infrastruttura verrà realizzata in regime di project financing da un'ATI (Associazione Temporanea di Imprese) che collaborerà, tra le altre, con Impresa Costruzioni Mantovani S.p.A., recentemente coinvolta in due procedimenti penali paralleli, uno dei quali in merito all'operato del Consorzio Venezia Nuova (concessionario per la realizzazione del progetto MOSE per la salvaguardia di Venezia e della sua laguna dalle acque alte) del quale tale società fa parte. La realizzazione del complesso infrastrutturale è strenuamente avversata da buona parte della cittadinanza costituitasi in un comitato, la quale ritiene l'opera costosa, inutile al fine di risolvere il problema del traffico urbano e approvata in violazione di quanto previsto dalla direttiva «Habitat» 92/43/CEE. Il progetto, infatti, prevede la costruzione di due ponti sul fiume Adige all'interno dell'area SIC (Sito di Interesse Comunitario) IT3210043 «Fiume Adige tra Belluno Veronese e Verona Ovest»; parte del tracciato tanto a cielo aperto quanto in galleria, inoltre, si snoderà poco lontano dal SIC IT3210012 «Val Galina e Progno Borago». In ragione di ciò, si è resa necessaria la stesura di una VINCA (Valutazione di incidenza ambientale) ai sensi dell'articolo 6 della direttiva «Habitat», conclusasi con l'assenza di conseguenze negative per l'area. I membri del succitato comitato, tuttavia, contestano il mancato ricorso a un gruppo interdisciplinare di professionisti e la mancanza di comprovata e documentata competenza da parte dell'unico autore dell'elaborato e ritengono inoltre il documento superficiale, errato e lacunoso in molti suoi punti, laddove, a esempio, omette di indicare molte delle specie di uccelli anche prioritarie presenti, con conseguente mancata rappresentazione della peculiare varietà ornitica della zona fluviale in questione.

Tutto ciò premesso, la Commissione:

1. è a conoscenza di detto progetto?

2. non ritiene opportuno contattare le autorità locali al fine di verificare il rispetto della direttiva «Habitat»?

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

La Commissione non era a conoscenza del progetto cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato.

Se esiste la possibilità che il progetto determini effetti negativi sui siti Natura 2000, deve essere sottoposto ad una valutazione adeguata a norma dell'articolo 6 della direttiva habitat (1). La qualità di tale valutazione costituisce in primo luogo una responsabilità dei promotori ma anche delle autorità nazionali competenti.

È di competenza dell'Italia garantire la corretta applicazione sul proprio territorio della normativa UE in materia di ambiente. Se la Commissione dovesse ricevere prove in merito ad una possibile violazione del diritto UE, contatterà le autorità italiane per chiarire la conformità alla normativa pertinente.

Per quanto riguarda gli eventuali reati imputabili alle società responsabili dei lavori, sono di competenza esclusiva delle autorità nazionali.

---

(1) Direttiva 92/43/CEE del Consiglio, del 21 maggio 1992, relativa alla conservazione degli habitat naturali e seminaturali e della flora e della fauna selvatiche. GU L 206 del 22.7.1992, pag. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011819/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Possible infringement of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) in relation to construction of the north link road ('Traforo delle Torricelle') in the municipality of Verona

A 'north link road' is to be built in the municipality of Verona. This motorway link, around 13 km long, will complete the ring road to the north of the city and connect the Verona Est and Verona Nord toll stations, located respectively on the A4 and A22 motorways. In particular, the project envisages the construction of two tunnels (one for each direction) to provide a means of crossing the hilly area known as 'Le Torricelle'. The infrastructure will be built under a project-financing system by a temporary joint venture which will collaborate with Impresa Costruzioni Mantovani S.p.A, among others. The latter company was recently involved in two parallel criminal prosecutions, one of which concerned the actions of Consorzio Venezia Nuova (licensee for the execution of the MOSE project to protect Venice and its lagoon from high tides), of which it is a member. Construction of the infrastructure complex is strenuously opposed by many local inhabitants who have formed a committee which judges the project costly, ineffective in resolving the problem of urban traffic, and approved in breach of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC). The project envisages the construction of two bridges over the Adige river within SCI (site of Community interest) IT3210043 ('Adige river between Belluno Veronese and Verona Ovest'). Furthermore, part of the route (both open-air and in a tunnel) will run near SCI IT3210012 ('Val Galina and Progno Borago'). It was therefore necessary to carry out an environmental impact assessment (EIA) pursuant to Article 6 of the Habitats Directive, which found no negative consequences for the area. The members of the above committee, however, are challenging the failure to use an interdisciplinary panel of professionals and the lack of proven and documented expertise on the part of the sole author of the report. They also find the document to be superficial, incorrect and sketchy on many points. It omits, for example, to mention many of the species of birds present, including priority species, and consequently fails to describe the characteristic variety of birds in the river area in question.

1. Is the Commission aware of this project?

2. Should the Commission not contact the local authorities to verify compliance with the Habitats Directive?

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

The Commission was not aware of the project mentioned by the Honourable Member.

If the project is likely to have adverse effects on Natura 2000 sites, it must be subject to an appropriate assessment according to Art. 6 of the Habitats Directive ([1]). The quality of such an assessment is primarily a responsibility of the developers but also of the national competent authorities.

It is for Italy to ensure correct application of EU environmental legislation on its territory. If the Commission receives evidence of a possible breach of EC law, it will contact the Italian authorities to clarify compliance with the relevant legislation.

As regards the criminal allegations concerning the companies in charge of the works, these fall under the exclusive competence of national authorities.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011821/13
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Reciprocal enforcement of maintenance orders (REMO) — Council Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 (Maintenance Regulation 4/2009)

What is the Commission doing to ensure that Council Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 (Maintenance Regulation) is being properly and effectively enforced in all Member States?

Are there plans to review how the reciprocal enforcement of maintenance orders (REMO) is working across the EU, given the findings of the Heidelberg Conference in March 2013 which reported problems in practice and jurisprudence and a need for further education and training?

What is the average time for applications for alimony made under REMO rules to be finalised? Would the Commission consider it to be unacceptable that a claim, of which I am aware, has already taken two years and seven months and has not yet been finalised?

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

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that it ensures that Council Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 (1) is being properly and effectively enforced in all Member States, in various ways. First, the Commission can take action under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. Furthermore, it monitors Member States' implementation of the regulation in the European Judicial Network in Civil and Commercial Matters and regularly meets the Central Authorities of the Member States under the regulation. In addition, the Commission co-finances projects aimed at raising awareness of how to apply the regulation properly, such as the Heidelberg Conference of March 2013.

According to the information of the Commission, the Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders (REMO) designates a specific two-way arrangement by which United-Kingdom maintenance orders can be enforced in other countries and foreign maintenance orders likewise can be enforced in the United Kingdom. The regulation specifically requires the Commission to include an evaluation of the functioning of the procedure for recognition, declaration of enforceability and enforcement applicable under the regulation in other Member States to decisions given in the UK, in its report on the application of the regulation.

As the REMO rules form part of a UK-specific scheme, the Commission does not have the information requested by the Honourable Member. However, the report on the application of the regulation will include all relevant statistics that will be requested in due time by the Commission for its delivery due by mid-June 2016. The Commission makes every endeavour to prevent a situation such as that described in the question from arising.

---

(1) Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 on jurisdiction, applicable law, recognition and enforcement of decisions and cooperation in matters relating to maintenance obligations, the mechanisms for the recovery of maintenance in another Member State, OJ L 7, 10.1.2009, p. 1.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011822/13
do Komisji
Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)
(16 października 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Sytuacja Cyganów w Szwecji

Narastające w Europie nastroje antyimigranckie i nacjonalistyczne budzą coraz większy niepokój. Z praktykami przejawiającymi taki charakter spotkać można się na poziomie ustawodawstwa krajowego, administracji państwowej czy różnorodnych działań prowadzonych przez służby publiczne w państwach członkowskich Unii Europejskiej. Przykładem mogą być ujawnione w Szwecji, a prowadzone przez policję rejestry kryminalistów, do których wpisano wszystkich Cyganów mieszkających na terenie południowej Szwecji, niezależnie od ich statusu prawnego. W rejestrze tym prócz danych osobowych Cyganów były również informacje o powiązaniach rodzinnych, dochodach, pracy, sytuacji mieszkaniowej, znajomych itp. Argumentowano, że rejestr powstał ze względów bezpieczeństwa. Istnieje jednak podejrzenie, że jego prowadzenie mogło mieć podłoże ksenofobiczne i rasistowskie.

Czy Komisja Europejska otrzymała sygnały o tych praktykach, a jeżeli tak to czy bada tą sprawę i rozważa podjęcie kroków prawnych mających na celu ochronę praw i wolności zagwarantowanych Traktatem?

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

Niektóre informacje podane w prasie wskazują, że rejestr Romów, w tym wielu nieletnich, został stworzony przez szwedzką policję w celach, które nie były tylko związane z działalnością przestępczą.

Zgodnie z dostępnymi informacjami, rejestr wiąże się z przetwarzaniem danych osobowych. Przetwarzanie danych osobowych przez właściwe organy państwowe w obszarze prawa karnego nie wchodzi w zakres dyrektywy o ochronie danych (1). Jest jednak ono objęte zakresem dyrektywy zaproponowanej przez Komisję w styczniu 2012 r. jako część pakietu reformy ochrony danych (2).

W odniesieniu do przetwarzania danych osobowych do celów innych niż te, które dotyczą prawa karnego, bez uszczerbku dla kompetencji Komisji jako strażnika traktatów, nadzór i egzekwowanie przepisów o ochronie danych leży w kompetencji władz nadzorujących ochronę danych i sądów. W tym względzie Komisja podkreśla, że na mocy art. 8 dyrektywy o ochronie danych przetwarzanie danych osobowych ujawniających rasę lub pochodzenie etniczne jest zasadniczo zabronione. Ograniczoną liczbę wyjątków od tego zakazu przewidziano w dyrektywie.

Komisja będzie w dalszym ciągu monitorować sytuację w szczególności w odniesieniu do działań, które mogą zostać podjęte przez właściwe władze szwedzkie w celu zapewnienia zgodności z przepisami o ochronie danych.

---

(1) Dyrektywa 95/46/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 24 października 1995 r. w sprawie ochrony osób fizycznych w zakresie przetwarzania danych osobowych i swobodnego przepływu tych danych, Dz.U. L 281 z 23.11.1995, s. 31-50.

(2) Wniosek dotyczący dyrektywy Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie ochrony osób fizycznych w związku z przetwarzaniem danych osobowych przez właściwe organy do celów zapobiegania przestępstwom, prowadzenia dochodzeń w ich sprawie, wykrywania ich i ścigania albo wykonywania kar kryminalnych oraz swobodnego przepływu takich danych (COM(2012)0010).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011822/13
to the Commission
Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Situation of the Roma in Sweden

The rising tide of anti-immigrant and nationalist feeling in Europe is becoming an increasing concern, with practices influenced by such attitudes enshrined in national legislation, state administrative structures and various measures implemented by the public authorities in the EU Member States. The recently uncovered criminal register kept by the Swedish police, which contains information on all Roma living in southern Sweden regardless of their legal status, is a good example of this phenomenon. It is not only personal data about Roma which is kept on this register, but also information about family ties, income, employment, living situation, friends etc. It has been argued that this register arose on the basis of security concerns, but there are grounds for suspecting that the motives behind its creation may have been rooted in xenophobia and racism.

Has the Commission been informed about this and similar practices? If so, has it examined the issue, and it is considering taking any legal steps aimed at protecting the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty?

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

Some information reported by the press suggests that registers of Roma people, including many minors, have been set up by the Swedish police for purposes that were not only related to criminal activities.

According to the available information, the register involves the processing of personal data. Processing of personal data by competent State authorities in areas of criminal law does not fall within the scope of the Data Protection Directive (1). It is however covered by the scope of the directive proposed by the Commission in January 2012 as a part of the data protection reform package (2).

With regard to the processing of personal data for purposes other than those which concern criminal law, without prejudice to the competence of the Commission as guardian of the Treaties, the supervision and enforcement of data protection legislation falls within the competence of the data protection supervisory authorities and courts. In this respect, the Commission underlines that under Article 8 of the Data Protection Directive the processing of personal data revealing racial or ethnic origin is generally prohibited. A limited number of exemptions from this prohibition have been foreseen in the directive.

The Commission will continue to monitor the situation in particular with regard to any steps that might be taken by the competent Swedish authorities to ensure compliance with the data protection rules.

---

(1) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995, p. 31-50.

(2) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by competent authorities for the purposes of prevention, investigation, detection or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties, and the free movement of such data (COM(2012) 0010).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011823/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(16 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Επιβάρυνση κρατικού προϋπολογισμού από το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ

Το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ έπληξε τους δημοκρατικούς κανόνες και το δικαίωμα της πληροφόρησης. Το κύριο επιχείρημα της κυβέρνησης ήταν η μείωση του κόστους λειτουργίας και η εξυγίανση των οικονομικών της. Φαίνεται όμως, ότι με το κλείσιμο, εκτός από τα σοβαρά νομικά και κοινωνικά προβλήματα που δημιουργούνται, προκαλείται και μεγάλη επιβάρυνση του κρατικού προϋπολογισμού. Μέχρι το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ, το κόστος λειτουργίας της καλύπτονταν από τις συνεισφορές των πολιτών, μέσω του λογαριασμού του ηλεκτρικού. Μάλιστα, τα τελευταία χρόνια η ΕΡΤ συνεισέφερε ποσό 80 000 000 ευρώ στον κρατικό προϋπολογισμό. Όμως, από το κλείσιμο μέχρι σήμερα, σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα, ο κρατικός προϋπολογισμός έχει επιβαρυνθεί με πάνω από 25 000 000 ευρώ, ενώ υπολογίζεται ότι το κόστος θα ανέλθει στα 100-125 000 000 ευρώ μέχρι την έναρξη λειτουργίας της ΝΕΡΙΤ. Να σημειωθεί επίσης ότι η νέα «Δ.Τ» δεν έχει ακόμα νομικό πρόσωπο, Αριθμό Φορολογικού Μητρώου, κανονισμό λειτουργίας, καθώς και εγκεκριμένο από το Εθνικό Συμβούλιο Ραδιοτηλεόρασης τηλεοπτικό και ραδιοφωνικό πρόγραμμα.

Ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

— ο εκπρόσωπός της στην τρόικα έχει στοιχεία για το ύψος της συνολικής επιβάρυνσης του κρατικού προϋπολογισμού από το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ και την δημιουργία της νέας «Δ.Τ»; Σε μια εποχή βίαιων περικοπών σε εισοδήματα, συντάξεις, δημόσια υγεία και κοινωνικές πολιτικές είναι αποδεκτή η επιβάρυνση του κρατικού προϋπολογισμού κατά 100-125 000 000, λόγω άστοχων ενεργειών της κυβέρνησης;

— ενόψει της ελληνικής προεδρίας της ΕΕ αλλά και των ευρωεκλογών 2014, είναι αποδεκτό να μην λειτουργεί δημόσια τηλεόραση και ραδιοφωνία; Τι μέτρα σκοπεύει να πάρει για να μην συμβεί αυτό αλλά και να τηρήσει η ελληνική κυβέρνηση τις υποχρεώσεις της (1) (2) που προκύπτουν από την Ευρωπαϊκή Χάρτα για την Ελευθερία στα ΜΜΕ (3) και το Πρωτόκολλο του Άμστερνταμ (4);

— πώς αντιμετωπίζει το γεγονός ότι μήνες μετά το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ, δεν έχει γίνει σοβαρή συζήτηση με τους εργαζόμενους, τα πολιτικά κόμματα και την κοινωνία των πολιτών για να διαμορφωθεί δημόσια ραδιοτηλεόραση με πλουραλιστική κι αξιόπιστη λειτουργία;

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

Η ΕΡΤ ήταν ζημιογόνος το 2012 και η νέα εταιρεία αναμένεται να αποβεί επικερδής κατά 100 εκατ. ευρώ ήδη το 2014. Η δημιουργία κερδών στον νέα εταιρεία θα προκύπτει κατά κύριο λόγο από τη μείωση των δαπανών προσωπικού. Συνεπώς το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ δεν συνιστά κατά κανένα τρόπο επιβάρυνση για το ελληνικό κράτος.

Η Επιτροπή έχει ήδη εκφράσει τις απόψεις της σχετικά με το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ από την άποψη της ελευθερίας της έκφρασης και της πληροφόρησης. Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το αξιότιμο μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στη δήλωσή της της 12ης Ιουνίου (MEMO/13/545), στις απαντήσεις της στις κοινοβουλευτικές ερωτήσεις O-69/13, E-6815/2013· E-6912/2013· E-6826/2013· E-6920/2013· E-6924/2013· E-6955/2013· E-6986/2013· E-7171/2013· E-7241/2013 (5), και στη συζήτησή της 3ης Ιουλίου 2013 στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο.

---

(1) http://www3.ebu.ch/files/live/sites/ebu/files/Knowledge/Initiatives%20-%20Policy/Topical%20Issues/Funding/27%2010%202009%20Communication%20from%20the%20Commission%20on%20the%20application%20of%20State%20aid%20rules%20to%20public%20service%20broadcasting.pdf

(2) http://www3.ebu.ch/files/live/sites/ebu/files/Knowledge/Initiatives%20-%20Policy/Topical%20Issues/Media%20Freedom%20and%20Media%20Pluralism/EC%20Consultation_MFMP%20Regulatory%20Bodies_EBU%20response.pdf

(3) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=REPORT&reference=A7-2013-0117&language=EN

(4) http://www.pressfreedom.eu/en/index.php

(5) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/el/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011823/13
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Burdens on the state budget resulting from the ERT closure

ERT's closure was a blow to democratic principles and the right to information. The Government's main argument was the need to reduce operating costs and bring finances under control. However, apart from creating serious legal and social problems, it is clear that the closure has placed a major burden on the state budget. Prior to the closure, ERT's operating costs were covered by citizens' contributions through electricity bills. Additionally, ERT has contributed EUR 80 million to the state budget over recent years. However, since the closure, the state budget has faced a burden of more than EUR 25 million to date, according to publications, while it is estimated that the cost will rise to EUR 100-125 million up to the operational launch of NERIT. It should also be noted that the new public service broadcaster still has no legal personality, tax number, operating rules, or a television and radio schedule approved by the National Council for Radio and Television.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

— Does its Troika representative have information on the total burden for the national budget from the ERT closure and the creation of a new public service broadcaster. In a time of drastic cuts to incomes, pensions, public health and social policies, is it acceptable for the state budget to be burdened to the tune of EUR 100-125 million as a result of inappropriate Government action?

— With regard to the Greek Presidency of the EU, and also the EU elections of 2014, is it acceptable to have no public television and radio broadcaster in operation? What steps does it intend to take so that this will not happen, and so that the Greek Government will fulfil its obligations (1) (2) arising from the European Charter on Freedom of the Press (3) and the Amsterdam Protocol (4)?

— How does it respond to the fact that, months after the closure of ERT, no serious discussion has taken place yet with the employees, political parties or civil society in order to develop pluralistic and dependable public service radio and television broadcasting?

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

ERT was loss-making in 2012 and the new company is expected to generate profitability of EUR 100 million already in 2014. The generation of profits in the new company will be derived primarily from a reduction of personnel costs. The closure of ERT is therefore in no way a burden for the Greek state.

The Commission has already expressed its views on the closure of ERT from the point of view of freedom of expression and information. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its statement of 12 June (MEMO/13/545), to the replies to parliamentary questions O-69/13, E-6815/2013; E-6912/2013; E-6826/2013; E-6920/2013; E-6924/2013; E-6955/2013; E-6986/2013; E-7171/2013; E-7241/2013 (5), and to the European Parliament debate of 3 July 2013 .

---

(1) http://www3.ebu.ch/files/live/sites/ebu/files/Knowledge/Initiatives%20-%20Policy/Topical%20Issues/Funding/27%2010%202009%20Communication%20from%20the%20Commission%20on%20the%20application%20of%20State%20aid%20rules%20to%20public%20service%20broadcasting.pdf

(2) http://www3.ebu.ch/files/live/sites/ebu/files/Knowledge/Initiatives%20-%20Policy/Topical%20Issues/Media%20Freedom%20and%20Media%20Pluralism/EC%20Consultation_MFMP%20Regulatory%20Bodies_EBU%20response.pdf

(3) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=REPORT&reference=A7-2013-0117&language=EN

(4) http://www.pressfreedom.eu/en/index.php

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

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011825/13
do Komisji
Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D)
(16 października 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Dyskryminacja Romów w Szwecji

We wrześniu w Szwecji wybuchł skandal medialny dotyczący prowadzenia przez szwedzką policję z prowincji Skanii rejestrów Romów mieszkających na terenie południowej Szwecji. Rejestr, pod pretekstem środków bezpieczeństwa, zawierał oprócz danych osobowych Romów informacje o powiązaniach rodzinnych, dochodach, pracy, sytuacji mieszkaniowej, znajomych itp. Ponadto rejestr obejmował dzieci, osoby w podeszłym wieku oraz już nieżyjące. Tworzenie podobnych rejestrów jest w Szwecji prawnie zakazane, a względy bezpieczeństwa nie wyjaśniają objęcia spisem np. dzieci. Istnieje, zatem podejrzenie, iż prowadzenie rejestru ma podłoże ksenofobiczne i rasistowskie.

Zgłaszam się więc z pytaniem do Komisji o legalność podobnych praktyk w Unii oraz o podanie, jakie środki stosowane są we Wspólnocie, aby zapobiegać podobnym praktykom.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Viviane Reding w imieniu Komisji
(5 grudnia 2013 r.)

Z niektórych informacji prasowych wynika, że rejestr Romów – obejmujący również nieletnich – był prowadzony przez szwedzką policję w celach wykraczających poza działania związane z monitorowaniem działalności przestępczej.

Według dostępnych informacji prowadzenie rejestru wiąże się z przetwarzaniem danych osobowych. Przetwarzanie danych osobowych przez właściwe organy państwowe w obszarze prawa karnego nie wchodzi w zakres dyrektywy o ochronie danych (1). Wchodzi ono jednak w zakres wniosku dotyczącego dyrektywy przygotowanego przez Komisję w styczniu 2012 r. w ramach pakietu dotyczącego reformy przepisów dotyczących ochrony danych (2).

Bez uszczerbku dla uprawnień Komisji jako strażniczki Traktatów, w przypadku przetwarzania danych osobowych do celów innych niż te, które dotyczą prawa karnego, nadzór nad przepisami w sprawie ochrony danych i ich egzekwowanie należą do kompetencji organów nadzorczych ds. ochrony danych oraz do sądów. W związku z powyższym Komisja podkreśla, że na mocy art. 8 dyrektywy o ochronie danych przetwarzanie danych osobowych ujawniających rasę lub pochodzenie etniczne jest co do zasady zabronione. W dyrektywie przewidziano ograniczoną liczbę wyjątków od tego zakazu.

Komisja będzie w dalszym ciągu monitorować sytuację, w szczególności w odniesieniu do działań, które mogą zostać podjęte przez właściwe władze szwedzkie w celu zapewnienia zgodności z przepisami o ochronie danych.

---

(1) Dyrektywa 95/46/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 24 października 1995 r. w sprawie ochrony osób fizycznych w zakresie przetwarzania danych osobowych i swobodnego przepływu tych danych, Dz.U. L 281 z 23.11.1995, s. 31-50.

(2) Wniosek dotyczący dyrektywy Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie ochrony osób fizycznych w związku z przetwarzaniem danych osobowych przez właściwe organy na potrzeby zapobiegania przestępstwom, prowadzenia dochodzeń w ich sprawie, wykrywania ich i ścigania albo wykonywania kar kryminalnych oraz swobodnego przepływu takich danych (COM(2012) 0010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011825/13
to the Commission
Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Discrimination against the Roma in Sweden

A media storm erupted in Sweden in September in connection with the discovery that Swedish police in the province of Scania had compiled a register of Roma living in southern Sweden. Under the guise of a security measure, the register contained not only personal data about the Roma but also information on family ties, income, employment, living situation, friends etc. Children, elderly people and deceased persons are also included on this register. It is illegal to compile registers of this kind in Sweden, and certain decisions such as the inclusion of children cannot be explained by security concerns. There are therefore grounds for suspecting that the motives behind keeping the register are rooted in xenophobia and racism.

I would therefore like to ask the Commission whether such practices are legal in the EU, and what methods are used in the EU to prevent them.

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

Some information reported by the press suggests that registers of Roma people, including many minors, have been set up by the Swedish police for purposes that were not only related to criminal activities.

According to the available information, the register involves the processing of personal data. Processing of personal data by competent State authorities in areas of criminal law does not fall within the scope of the Data Protection Directive (1). It is however covered by the scope of the directive proposed by the Commission in January 2012 as a part of the data protection reform package (2).

With regard to the processing of personal data for purposes other than those which concern criminal law, without prejudice to the competence of the Commission as guardian of the Treaties, the supervision and enforcement of data protection legislation falls within the competence of the data protection supervisory authorities and courts. In this respect, the Commission underlines that under Article 8 of the Data Protection Directive the processing of personal data revealing racial or ethnic origin is generally prohibited. A limited number of exemptions from this prohibition have been foreseen in the directive.

The Commission will continue to monitor the situation in particular with regard to any steps that might be taken by the competent Swedish authorities to ensure compliance with the data protection rules.

---

(1) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995, p. 31-50.

(2) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by competent authorities for the purposes of prevention, investigation, detection or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties, and the free movement of such data (COM(2012)0010).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011827/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(16 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: VP/HR — Declaraciones de las Naciones Unidas sobre la situación del conflicto mapuche en Chile

El pasado 31 de agosto, el Relator Especial de las Naciones Unidas sobre la promoción y la protección de los derechos humanos y las libertades fundamentales en la lucha contra el terrorismo, Ben Emmerson, formulaba unas declaraciones tras su visita a Chile en las que expresaba su preocupación por la aplicación por parte del Estado chileno de la Ley antiterrorista contra miembros del pueblo mapuche.

El Relator Especial señalaba en sus declaraciones que, en el marco del conflicto mapuche, existe un riesgo real de escalada y resulta imperativo que Chile tome medidas para abordar la situación. Ben Emmerson afirmó que el Estado chileno está abandonando su deber de promover una solución pacífica y justa a la cuestión mapuche. Ante dichas afirmaciones del más alto nivel, Chile ha continuado su política represiva y de bloqueo del diálogo pacífico, con la aplicación de normas como la Ley 2568, adoptada durante la dictadura de Pinochet, o la Ley antiterrorista 18314. Más allá de la aplicación de un marco jurídico represivo, las comunidades mapuches han denunciado numerosos casos de detenciones arbitrarias, ejecuciones extrajudiciales, allanamientos masivos, etc.

Ante la situación denunciada por el Relator Especial, así como las gravísimas acusaciones realizadas por diferentes representantes de comunidades mapuches, el Estado chileno no ha cambiado su aproximación al conflicto y continúa rechazando la apertura de un proceso pacífico de diálogo político entre el Gobierno de Chile y las comunidades mapuches sobre el estatus político de la región de la Araucanía.

¿Conoce la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante las declaraciones de Ben Emmerson sobre el conflicto mapuche? ¿Cómo las valora?

¿Instará la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante al Gobierno chileno a que tome en cuenta las citadas declaraciones del Relator Especial e inicie un diálogo político con las comunidades mapuches para buscar una salida política al conflicto?

¿Instará la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante al Gobierno chileno a que aplique la Convección 169 de la OIT, ratificada por Chile en 2008, en lo relativo a los derechos históricos y políticos del pueblo mapuche?

¿Se plantea la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante la congelación del Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Chile hasta que Chile respete los derechos humanos y los acuerdos internacionales violados en el marco del conflicto mapuche?

¿Solicitará la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante al Gobierno chileno que detenga la aplicación de la Ley antiterrorista y que esclarezca las gravísimas acusaciones de violaciones de los derechos humanos?

Respuesta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(19 de diciembre de 2013)

La UE y Chile tienen unas buenas relaciones bilaterales basadas en el respeto de los principios democráticos y de los derechos humanos, de conformidad con el Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Chile de 2002.

Desde 2010, la UE y Chile mantienen un diálogo periódico sobre los derechos humanos, en el que ambas partes cambian impresiones sobre las prioridades de sus respectivos programas de derechos humanos. En este contexto, la UE plantea sistemáticamente la cuestión de los derechos de los pueblos indígenas. La UE sigue la situación en Chile, inclusive en lo referido a la aplicación de la Ley Antiterrorista y el desarrollo de mecanismos de consulta en línea con el Convenio 169 de la OIT, y plantea estos asuntos en sus contactos con las autoridades chilenas.

Durante el último diálogo sobre derechos humanos entre la UE y Chile del pasado 7 de noviembre, el jefe de la Delegación de la UE y los embajadores de los Estados miembros de la UE volvieron a abordar el respeto de los derechos de los pueblos indígenas, también a la vista de las declaraciones formuladas por Ben Emmerson, relator especial de las Naciones Unidas. La UE está a la espera de sus recomendaciones finales, que promoverá en los foros bilaterales e internacionales pertinentes, sobre todo con ocasión del próximo examen periódico universal de Chile en 2014.

En virtud del Instrumento Europeo para la Democracia y los Derechos Humanos, la UE ha financiado proyectos concretos dirigidos a fomentar lo siguiente: i) el acceso de los indígenas a la justicia, ii) el reconocimiento de los derechos de los indígenas en las decisiones en materia de medio ambiente y territorio y iii) la defensa de los derechos de los niños en el marco de la aplicación de la Ley Antiterrorista. La ayuda actual se ofrece para mejorar las condiciones políticas y judiciales, de forma que los ciudadanos y los indígenas puedan ejercer su derecho a la participación política, y asistir a los defensores de los derechos humanos en seis regiones del país.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011827/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — United Nations declarations on the situation of the Mapuche conflict in Chile

On 31 August, the UN Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the fight against terrorism, Ben Emmerson, made some statements, after his visit to Chile, expressing his concern about the Chilean State's use of the Anti-Terrorism Act against members of the Mapuche community.

The Special Rapporteur noted in his statements that there is a real risk of escalation of the Mapuche conflict and that it is imperative for Chile to take steps to address the situation. Ben Emmerson stated that the Chilean State is abandoning its duty to promote a peaceful and just solution to the Mapuche question. Despite these statements made at the highest level, Chile has continued its repressive policy and to block peaceful dialogue, using legislation such as Act 2568, passed during the Pinochet dictatorship, and the Anti-Terrorism Act 18314. In addition to the application of a repressive legal framework, the Mapuche communities have reported numerous cases of arbitrary arrests, extrajudicial executions, mass detentions, etc.

Despite the situation reported by the Special Rapporteur and the extremely serious accusations made by various representatives of the Mapuche communities, the Chilean State has not changed its approach to the conflict and continues to reject opening a peaceful process of political dialogue between the Government of Chile and the Mapuche communities about the political status of the region of Araucanía.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of Ben Emerson's declarations on the Mapuche conflict? What is its assessment of them?

Will the Vice-President/High Representative urge the Chilean Government to take account of the Special Rapporteur's declarations and start a political dialogue with the Mapuche communities to seek a political solution to the conflict?

Will the Vice-President/High Representative urge the Chilean Government to implement ILO Convention 169, ratified by Chile in 2008, with respect to the Mapuche people's historical and political rights?

Is the Vice-President/High Representative considering putting a freeze on the EU-Chile Association Agreement until Chile respects human rights and international agreements breached in the context of the Mapuche conflict?

Will the Vice-President/High Representative ask the Chilean Government to stop using the Anti-Terrorism Act and to answer the extremely serious allegations of human rights violations?

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

The EU and Chile enjoy good bilateral relations underpinned by the respect for democratic principles and human rights, in accordance with the EU-Chile Association Agreement of 2002.

Since 2010, the EU and Chile have had a regular dialogue on human rights, during which both parties exchange views on priorities of their respective human rights agenda. In this context, the EU raises systematically the rights of indigenous people. The EU monitors the situation in Chile, including with regards to the application of the Anti-Terrorism Law and the development of consultation mechanisms in line with ILO Convention 169, and brings it up in its contacts with the Chilean authorities.

During the last EU-Chile Human Rights Dialogue on 7 November the respect for the rights of indigenous people was raised again by the EU Head of Delegation and EU Member States' Ambassadors, including in the light of the statements made by UN Special Rapporteur Ben Emmerson. The EU awaits his final recommendations and will promote these in relevant bilateral and international fora, notably in the context of the upcoming Universal Periodic Review for Chile in 2014.

Under the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, the EU has financed specific projects aimed to promote the: (i) access of indigenous people to justice, (ii) recognition of indigenous rights in environmental and territorial decisions, and (iii) defence of children rights in the framework of the application of the Anti-terrorism Law. The current support provides for enhancing political and judicial conditions so as to allow for citizens and indigenous people to exercise their right to political participation, and assisting human rights defenders in six regions of the country.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-011829/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Stadiul acordului între Comisie, statele membre și producătorii de țigarete

În 2012, s-a ajuns la un acord cu Philip Morris International, conform căruia producătorul va efectua plăți suplimentare (confiscări) la semnarea unui acord modificat în acest sector între toate statele membre, UE și această companie. În iulie 2013, nu toate statele membre au semnat acordul modificat.

1. A fost între timp semnat acordul modificat cu Philip Morris International de către toate statele membre? Dacă nu, ce state membre trebuie încă să semneze și ce motive au prezentat acestea pentru întârziere?

2. Conform acordului modificat, care va fi noul pachet financiar, atât în termeni de sume, cât și de termene de implementare și cum va fi el divizat între UE și statele membre?

Răspuns dat de dl Šemeta în numele Comisiei
(26 noiembrie 2013)

1. Acordul de modificare a fost semnat, între timp, de toate statele membre, în afară de Croația ([1]). Al 28-lea stat membru a semnat acordul de modificare la sfârșitul lunii septembrie a anului 2013. Întârzierea la semnare s-a datorat procedurii interne a statului membru respectiv.

2. Pachetul financiar nu este prestabilit, deoarece eventualele sume depind de cantitatea de țigarete confiscate. Din plata suplimentară, partea corespunzătoare impozitelor și taxelor care ar fi fost datorate dacă țigaretele ar fi fost importate în mod legal va fi reținută de UE, iar restul va fi distribuit statului membru care a confiscat țigaretele Philip Morris autentice. Acordul de modificare va intra în vigoare de îndată ce va fi semnat de către companiile PMI în cauză și de către reprezentanții Comisiei Europene în numele UE.

În perioada 2006-2013, partea medie care revine Uniunii Europene a fost de 4.7 % din plățile suplimentare în caz de confiscare. Partea care revine UE depinde de mai multe variabile, cum ar fi marca țigărilor confiscate.

([1]) Croația, ca urmare a aderării sale la UE, are în vedere în prezent să adere la acordul de cooperare. Plățile suplimentare în caz de confiscare vor fi posibile în Croația de la data aderării acestei țări la acordul de cooperare, modificat prin acordul de modificare.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011829/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: State of play on the agreement between the Commission, the Member States and cigarette manufacturers

In 2012 an agreement was reached with Philip Morris International, according to which the manufacturer would make supplementary (seizure) payments upon signature of a modified agreement on the matter by all Member States, the EU and the company. In July 2013, not all Member States signed the modified agreement.

1. Has the modified agreement with Philip Morris International now been signed by all Member States? If not, which Member States have still to sign it and what reasons have they given for the delay in doing so?

2. Under the modified agreement, what will the new financial envelope be, both in terms of the amount and the time frame for implementation, and how will it be divided between the EU and the Member States?

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

1. The Modification Agreement has now been signed by all Member States, apart from Croatia (1). The 27th Member State signed the Modification Agreement at the end of September 2013. The delay in signing was due to the Member State's internal procedure.

2. The financial envelope is not pre-determined because the amounts potentially involved depend on the quantity of cigarettes seized. A share of the supplementary payment, which corresponds to the taxes and duties that would have been due had the cigarettes been imported legally, will be retained by the EU, and the remainder will be distributed to the Member State that seized the authentic Philip Morris cigarettes. The Modification Agreement will enter into effect as soon as it is signed by the PMI companies concerned and representatives of the European Commission on behalf of the EU.

In the period 2006-2013 the average share of the European Union was 4.7% of the seizure payments. The EU share depends on several variables, e.g. the brand of the seized cigarettes.

---

(1) Croatia, following its accession to the EU, is currently considering acceding to the cooperation agreement. Croatia will qualify for seizure payments from the day that it will have acceded to the cooperation agreement, as amended by the Modification Agreement.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011830/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Cutting unwarranted red tape

A taskforce report on some of the UK's leading businesses, such as Kingfisher and Diageo, suggests that a plethora of burdensome EU rules and regulations are impeding the competitiveness of British firms, both large and small. For the first time, a report has quantified the true impact of 'red tape' on British industry, rather than discussing it in the abstract. The report's recommendations include simplifying 'costly and complex' chemicals legislation and the requirement for all SMEs to keep written health and safety assessments, as just some of the areas where the EU has over-regulated.

Given the findings of the taskforce's report, and the fact that Commission President, José Manuel Barroso, is due to present proposals for cutting unwarranted regulation at the Council next week, what measures will the Commission take to ensure that Member States have more flexibility to remove burdensome regulations and allow local businesses, large and small, to flourish in the single market?

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

The Commission welcomes the report of a UK business task force published on 15 October 2013 as a useful contribution to better regulation efforts and to reducing regulatory burden to business which is a joint objective for European institutions and Member States alike.

In order to correct inefficiencies and burdens in EU legislation, the Commission initiated a Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme (REFIT) at the end of 2012. The results of this programme, published on 2 October 2013, included initiatives to simplify legislation and reduce regulatory burden, the repeal of laws and withdrawal of proposals that are no longer required and evaluations and Fitness Checks in other areas to determine the focus and extent of future simplification and burden reduction actions.

The conclusions of the European Council of 24 and 25 October 2013 welcomed the Commission's Communication on REFIT and stressed the need for rapid implementation.

REFIT will be implemented as an annual rolling programme to identify and correct weaknesses and burdens in EU legislation. It includes a scoreboard to monitor the progress of Commission proposals to simplify and reduce regulatory burden in the EU legislative procedure-and implementation by Member States.

Studies show that approximately 1/3 of regulatory burden is added through implementation by Member States It is therefore important that action to reduce burdens for business is taken at national, regional and the local levels of government more broadly than just on the implementation of EC law.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011834/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(16 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Λειτουργία περιφερειακών αεροδρομίων της Ελλάδας

Σύμφωνα με δημοσιογραφικές πληροφορίες, η εταιρία Lufthansa Consulting, σύμβουλος του ΤΑΙΠΕΔ για τη διαχείριση των ελληνικών αεροδρομίων, εισηγήθηκε το κλείσιμο πολλών περιφερειακών αεροδρομίων της χώρας. Η είδηση αυτή διαψεύστηκε ωστόσο από το ΤΑΙΠΕΔ, το οποίο επισημαίνει ότι διενεργεί διεθνή ανοιχτό διαγωνισμό για την παραχώρηση της εκμετάλλευσης των περιφερειακών αεροδρομίων σε ιδιώτες επενδυτές.

Ανεξάρτητα από την άποψη που μπορεί να έχει κάποιος για τον τρόπο λειτουργίας και εκμετάλλευσης των δημόσιων υποδομών, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

α. Πόσα και ποια περιφερειακά αεροδρόμια περιλαμβάνονται στις λίστες του ΤΑΙΠΕΔ; Τι προβλέπεται να γίνει με όσα περιφερειακά αεροδρόμια δεν περιλαμβάνονται στις λίστες αυτές; Στο πλαίσιο των συζητήσεων της τρόικα με την ελληνική κυβέρνηση, έχουν εκφρασθεί απόψεις υπέρ του κλεισίματος περιφερειακών αεροδρομίων; Εάν ναι, ποια είναι τα επιχειρήματα που προβάλλονται;

β. Υπάρχει πρόβλεψη οι ιδιώτες επενδυτές που θα αναλάβουν τη λειτουργία των αεροδρομίων να μη μπορούν να εγείρουν στο μέλλον απαίτηση «κρατικής ενίσχυσης» των πιο «άγονων» αεροδρομίων;

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

Η κατάρτιση του σχεδίου ιδιωτικοποίησης βάσει του 2ου προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα, και η απόφαση όσον αφορά τα περιουσιακά στοιχεία του Δημοσίου ή τις δημόσιες επιχειρήσεις που θα ιδιωτικοποιηθούν, τον βαθμό και τη σειρά με την οποία θα διεξαχθούν οι εν λόγω ιδιωτικοποιήσεις, εναπόκεινται αποκλειστικά στις ελληνικές αρχές.

Δεν έχει γίνει απολύτως καμία συζήτηση σχετικά με το κλείσιμο περιφερειακών αεροδρομίων στο πλαίσιο του σχεδίου ιδιωτικοποίησης. Ο επιδιωκόμενος στόχος είναι να βελτιωθεί η οικονομική ρύθμιση και η διαχείριση της εναέριας κυκλοφορίας στην Ελληνική Υπηρεσία Πολιτικής Αεροπορίας, και να βελτιωθεί ο συντονισμός των χρονοθυρίδων.

Στο ταμείο ιδιωτικοποιήσεων ξεκίνησε η διαδικασία εκδήλωσης ενδιαφέροντος για σύναψη συμφωνίας για τη χορήγηση σύμβασης παραχώρησης υπηρεσιών για τη συντήρηση και τη λειτουργία δύο συστάδων που αποτελούνται έκαστη από 7 βασικά αεροδρόμια με τη δυνατότητα να περιληφθούν τρία πρόσθετα αεροδρόμια σε κάθε συστάδα. Ειδικότερες πληροφορίες όσον αφορά τα αεροδρόμια που περιλαμβάνονται στις δύο συστάδες δημοσιεύονται στον ακόλουθο δικτυακό τόπο: http://www.hradf.com/en/infrastructure/regional-airports. Τα υπόλοιπα μη ιδιωτικοποιημένα αεροδρόμια θα συμπεριληφθούν σε χωριστή εταιρεία η οποία θα χρηματοδοτείται με επιδοτήσεις δημόσιας υπηρεσίας.

Η Επιτροπή επανεξετάζει επί του παρόντος τις προϋποθέσεις βάσει των οποίων τα περιφερειακά αεροδρόμια μπορούν να λαμβάνουν κρατικές ενισχύσεις. Η Επιτροπή δρομολόγησε δημόσια διαβούλευση το 2013 και προτίθεται να εκδώσει νέες κατευθυντήριες γραμμές στις αρχές του 2014. Στο τρέχον υπό διαβούλευση κείμενο τα περιφερειακά αεροδρόμια ενδέχεται να λαμβάνουν κυρίως επενδυτικές ενισχύσεις, ανάλογα με τον αριθμό επιβατών κάθε αεροδρομίου, λειτουργικές ενισχύσεις για μεταβατική περίοδο 10 ετών κατ' ανώτατο όριο, καθώς και ενισχύσεις για αντιστάθμιση παροχής δημόσιας υπηρεσίας (1).

---

(1) http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2013_aviation_guidelines/index_en.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011834/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Regional Greek airports

According to media reports, the company Lufthansa Consulting, which is advising the Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund on the management of Greek airports, has advised that numerous regional Greek airports should be closed. However, these reports have been denied by the HRADF, which has pointed out that it is holding an international open procedure to grant operating franchises to regional airports to private investors.

Irrespective of what one may think about how public infrastructures should be operated and used, will the Commission say:

a) How many and which regional airports are included in the HRADF list? What does it expect will happen to the regional airports which are not included on that list? Have views in favour of closing regional airports been expressed during discussions between the Troika and the Greek government? If so, what arguments were expounded?

b) Is there a provision whereby private investors which undertake to operate airports cannot file a claim in the future for 'State aid' for the most 'stranded' airports?

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

The design of the privatisation plan under the 2nd economic adjustment programme for Greece and the choice of what, how far and in which sequence public assets or companies should be privatised is the exclusive result of the Greek authorities' decision.

There have been no discussions whatsoever about closing regional airports in the context of the privatisation plan. The aim is to improve economic regulation and air traffic management in the Hellenic Civil Aviation Authority and improve the slot coordination aspects.

The Privatisation Fund launched the process for expressions of interest to enter into an agreement for the granting of a services concession for the maintenance and operation of two clusters consisting each of 7 core airports with the option of including three additional airports in each of the clusters. The specific information regarding the airports included in the two clusters can be found in the following link: http://www.hradf.com/en/infrastructure/regional-airports. The remaining non-privatised airports would be included in a separate company to be financed with public service subsidies.

The Commission is currently reviewing the conditions under which regional airports can benefit from state aid. The Commission launched a public consultation in 2013 and should adopt new guidelines at the beginning of 2014. In the current text under consultation regional airports might notably benefit from investment aid, depending on the number of passengers at each airport, operating aid for a transitional period of maximum 10 years as well as aid for public service compensation (1).

---

(1) http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2013_aviation_guidelines/index_en.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011835/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(16 octobre 2013)

Objet: Super fruits ou super marketing

Marketing. Goji, acerola, cranberry, noni, maqui, açaï et quelques autres sont les derniers nommés d'une lignée de «super fruits» dont la célébrité «santé» s'établit depuis les années 2000 dans la foulée des grenades, goyaves et autres papayes.

Les super fruits, souvent des baies, seraient bien plus riches que d'autres en vitamines, flavonoïdes, anthocyanines, polyphénols et autres caroténoïdes. Ils feraient la santé d'Indiens d'Amazonie ou de Tibétains: miracles minceur, antioxydant, anti-âge, anti-radicaux libres, anti-cancer. Sans preuve clinique de leur efficacité et en l'absence d'une définition officielle des «super fruits», le marketing s'est emparé de cette manne, s'appuyant sur l'intérêt croissant du consommateur pour la santé «au naturel».

Si le goji se consomme séché, on avalera généralement les «super fruits» sous forme de gélules et comprimés ou de produits transformés (jus, yaourt, bonbons, biscuits, etc.) aux concentrations variables et apports nutritionnels contestables. Venues de très loin, ces baies ont aussi un lourd sac à dos écologique et leur cueillette outrancière compromet les ressources des populations locales.

Un habile marketing vert voudrait nous faire croire qu'il suffit d'avaler quotidiennement des doses de «super fruits» pour être en super santé. Ne s'agit-il pas de publicité mensongère?

Comment se positionne la Commission sur ces «super fruits», leur publicité et les vertus qui leur sont prêtées?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(28 novembre 2013)

La directive 2000/13/CE prévoit que l'étiquetage et les méthodes employées ne doivent pas induire l'acheteur en erreur, en particulier sur les caractéristiques de la denrée alimentaire, et également sur sa nature, son identité, ses propriétés, sa composition, ou en lui attribuant des effets ou propriétés qu'elle ne possède pas.

Dans l'Union européenne, les allégations nutritionnelles et de santé ne peuvent être employées dans l'étiquetage, la présentation et la publicité des denrées alimentaires que si elles sont conformes au règlement (CE) n° 1924/2006 concernant les allégations nutritionnelles et de santé portant sur les denrées alimentaires.

Dans le registre des allégations nutritionnelles et de santé de l'Union européenne sont énumérées toutes les allégations de santé autorisées, non autorisées et en suspens, ainsi que toutes les allégations nutritionnelles autorisées. Ce registre apporte de la clarté, renforce la position des autorités de contrôle nationales et, en fin de compte, garantit une meilleure protection des consommateurs face à des allégations trompeuses.

Par conséquent, toute information fournie aux consommateurs quant aux qualités nutritionnelles ou aux effets bénéfiques pour la santé d'une denrée alimentaire, y compris celles en cause, doit être donnée en conformité avec les dispositions du règlement (CE) n° 1924/2006 et doit également respecter les dispositions de la directive 2000/13/CE.

Toutefois, la Commission tient à préciser que, conformément au règlement (CE) n° 178/2002, les États membres sont responsables de l'application de la législation alimentaire et qu'ils doivent aussi contrôler et vérifier le respect par les exploitants du secteur alimentaire des prescriptions applicables de la législation alimentaire.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011835/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Superfruits or super marketing

Marketing. Goji berry, acerola cherry, cranberry, noni berry, maqui berry, açaí berry, to mention a few, are the latest in a long line of 'superfruits' with famed 'health' properties, which have become popular since the 2000s, following in the footsteps of pomegranates, guavas and papayas.

These superfruits, for the most part berries, are supposedly richer than others in vitamins, flavonoids, anthocyanins, polyphenols and carotenoids. They are apparently the key to the Amazonian Indians' and Tibetans' good health. They are claimed to work miracles for slimming and to have antioxidant, anti-ageing, anti-free radical and anti-cancer properties. However, with no clinical evidence of their effectiveness and with no official definition of 'superfruit', the marketing people have jumped on the berry bandwagon, driven by growing consumer interest in 'natural' health.

Goji berries are eaten dried, but the other 'superfruits' are mostly taken as capsules, tablets or in processed products (fruit juices, yoghurts, sweets, biscuits, etc.) in varying concentrations and with questionable nutritional value. These berries clock up the food miles and therefore carry a heavy ecological burden. Furthermore, the appalling way in which they are harvested threatens the resources of local populations.

Crafty 'green' marketing, however, would have us believe that all we need to do to stay super healthy is to take our daily dose of these 'superfruits'. Is this not misleading advertising?

What is the Commission's position on these 'superfruits', the way in which they are advertised and the virtues ascribed to them?

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

Directive 2000/13/EC provides that the labelling and methods used must not be misleading to the purchaser to a material degree. In particular, for the characteristics of the foodstuff and also to its nature, identity, properties, composition or by attributing to the foodstuff effects or properties which it does not possess.

In the European Union, nutrition and health claims made on foods may be used in the labelling, presentation or advertising of foods only if they comply with Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods.

In the EU Register of nutrition and health claims are listed all authorised, non-authorised and on 'hold' health claims as well as all permitted nutrition claims. This brings clarity, strengthens the position of national controlling authorities and ultimately ensures better protection of consumers from misleading claims.

Therefore, any information provided to consumers about the nutrition or health benefits of any food including those in question, should be given in compliance with the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 and should also respect the provisions of Directive 2000/13/EC.

However, the Commission would like to clarify that according to Regulation (EC) No 178/2002, Member States are responsible for the enforcement of food law and shall also monitor and verify that the relevant requirements of food law are fulfilled by food business operators.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011837/13
adresată Consiliului
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Colectarea datelor referitoare la traficul de ființe umane

Combaterea eficientă a traficului de ființe umane necesită date comparabile, actualizate și reale, la nivel național și european, pentru a putea înțelege optim dimensiunile reale ale fenomenului. Astfel de date statistice sunt greu de colectat, mai ales datorită diferențelor dintre codurile penale ale statelor membre, dintre sistemele lor de raportare și monitorizare și gradul de raportare a cazurilor la poliție, la ONG-uri sau la alte structuri.

În iunie 2011, Consiliul Justiție și Afaceri Interne a adoptat Concluziile Consiliului privind „Combaterea formelor emergente de trafic de persoane în statele membre ale UE” prin care statele membre sunt încurajate să creeze mecanisme de colectare de date multisectoriale, pentru a stimula colectarea de date referitoare la așa numitele forme emergente de trafic de ființe umane și pentru a îmbunătăți calitatea datelor colectate.

1. La doi ani de la adoptarea concluziilor Consiliului, care dintre statele membre au dat curs concluziilor cu privire la colectarea datelor referitoare la traficul de ființe umane?

2. Pentru acele state membre care nu au dat încă curs concluziilor, cum și-au justificat fiecare întârzierea?

Răspuns
(23 decembrie 2013)

În urma Concluziilor Consiliului din 4 iunie 2009 privind crearea unei rețele UE informale de raportori naționali sau mecanisme echivalente privind traficul de persoane, a fost creată o astfel de rețea. Obiectivul rețelei este de a îmbunătăți înțelegerea fenomenului traficului de persoane și de a furniza Uniunii și statelor membre ale acesteia informații obiective, fiabile, comparabile și actualizate de ordin strategic în domeniul traficului de persoane. Articolul 19 din Directiva 2011/36/UE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 5 aprilie 2011 privind prevenirea şi combaterea traficului de persoane şi protejarea victimelor acestuia (transpusă până la 6 aprilie 2013) include și obligația de a institui raportori naționali sau mecanisme echivalente. Astfel de mecanisme ar trebui să includă realizarea unor evaluări ale tendințelor în materie de trafic de persoane, măsurarea rezultatelor acțiunilor de combatere a traficului, inclusiv colectarea de date statistice în strânsă cooperare cu organizațiile relevante ale societății civile din acest domeniu și prezentarea de rapoarte.

Toate statele membre participă la rețea, reunindu-se cel puțin de două ori pe an.

Comisia (Biroul de coordonare pentru combaterea traficului de persoane) sprijină rețeaua și raportează cu privire la progresele înregistrate de aceasta. Acest lucru se realizează în colaborare cu președinția Consiliului.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011837/13
to the Council
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Data collection on human trafficking

Tackling human trafficking effectively requires comparable, up-to-date and reliable data at both national and European level in order to grasp the full extent of the phenomenon. Such statistical data are difficult to collect, mainly due to the differences between the Member States' criminal codes, reporting and monitoring systems and rates of reporting cases to the police, NGOs and other bodies.

In June 2011, the Justice and Home Affairs Council adopted Council conclusions 'Targeting developing forms of trafficking in human beings in the EU Member States' in which Member States are encouraged to establish multi-sector data collection mechanisms, to further develop data collection on so-called developing forms of trafficking in human beings and to improve the quality of the data collected.

1. Two years after the adoption of the Council conclusions, which Member States have complied with the conclusions on data collection on human trafficking?

2. For those Member States which have not yet followed the conclusions, what individual justifications have been given to explain the delay?

Reply
(23 December 2013)

Following the Council Conclusions of 4 June 2009 on establishing an informal EU Network of National Rapporteurs or Equivalent Mechanisms on Trafficking in Human Beings, such a network was established. The aim of the network is to improve the understanding of the phenomenon of trafficking in human beings and to provide the Union and its Member States with objective, reliable, comparable and up-to-date strategic information in the field of trafficking in human beings. Article 9 of Directive 2011/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims (to be transposed by 6 April 2013) also includes an obligation to establish national rapporteurs or equivalent mechanisms. Such mechanisms should include the carrying out of assessments on trends in trafficking in human beings, the measuring of results from anti-trafficking measures, including the gathering of statistics in close cooperation with relevant civil society organisations active in this field, and reporting.

All Member States participate in the network, which meets at least twice a year.

The Commission (the Anti-Trafficking Coordinator's office) supports the network and reports on its progress. This is done in collaboration with the Council Presidency.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011838/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: European Schools system

As the Commission is aware, there has been a lot of talk regarding the reform of the European Schools system but still no action.

It has already been established that this is a matter of urgency and that the crisis regarding the state of the European Schools should finally be resolved.

It is known that the EU Ombudsman, Parliament, the Court of Justice and the Council have expressed their concern regarding the extent of the crisis and the lawlessness of the European Schools system (EURSC), in that the EURSC falls outside the jurisdiction of all EC law and is thereby outside of EU control and utterly unaccountable.

In 2011 it was suggested that the legal nature of the European Schools system is in serious need of reform. Since then, nothing has changed, and this is why the issue was tabled by the Irish Presidency in May 2013.

I am aware that the Commission has called for a meeting of all national education ministers to discuss the matter. To my knowledge, this meeting has not yet been arranged.

I know that I am not alone when I say that this issue has been pending long enough and we can no longer ignore the importance of reforming the European Schools system.

Can the Commission state what it will now do to finally oblige the European Schools to comply with European and national law? Does the Commission plan to arrange the aforementioned meeting of the national education ministers?

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

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its replies to the written questions E-10390/2013 and E-11375/2013.

The European Schools System (ESS) is governed jointly by governments of the EU Members States (MS) within the Board of Governors (BoG) and is subject to international law and its own corpus juris defined in the Convention on the Functioning of the European Schools. Thus, the Commission does not agree that the ESS is unaccountable or that it is outside the EU control. Moreover, the Commission is not in a position to change the legal system of the ES on its own.

The legal protection system of the ESS is currently being analysed by a Working Group convened to deal with that matter. The group will present the outcomes of its reflections to the BoG, accompanied where necessary by proposals for improvements, in the course of 2014. The Commission is represented in this group and may inform about the results of the analysis, should the Honourable Member wish so.

The critical point in the ESS is the cost-sharing issue. A structural proposal to solve it was discussed in September by the BoG and widely accepted by the majority of the MS, so that a discussion of the ESS at the Ministers' level in the framework of the November Education Council was not any more necessary.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011839/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: New rules on flight time limitations

On Wednesday, 9 October 2013 Parliament voted against a motion for a resolution calling on the Commission to withdraw new rules on maximum flight times for pilots and cabin crews. I voted for the motion, in light of the concerns that many of my constituents, including several airline pilots, have raised about the impact on flight safety.

Moving forward into negotiations with the Council, what steps will the Commission take to ensure that flight safety is the absolute priority of any rule changes, and further, what assurances can the Commission give that it will take on board the views and need for flexibility of individual Member States?

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

There are no further negotiations with the Council. No objections were raised by the Parliament or Council during the scrutiny period and the next step is for the Commission to formally adopt the Commission Regulation on flight time limitations. The European Parliament will be involved in the future when an adaptation to the legislative framework is necessary in accordance with the regulatory procedure with scrutiny.

Other relevant information has been provided by the Commission in its answers to written questions E-010759/2013 and E-011452/2013 (1).

---

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011842/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Protection for animal researchers

The Northern Ireland life sciences sector comprises approximately 60 businesses employing 4 100 people. There are clearly beneficial aspects of animal research in terms of healthcare breakthroughs, in my own constituency and across the EU. Nevertheless, the majority of research is undertaken by universities and medical schools operating under a different regulatory environment than industry. This has made universities and medical schools more vulnerable to those who oppose the use of animals in scientific research.

In light of the scientifically important nature of this aspect of the research industry, what plans does the Commission have to harmonise the regulatory environment between businesses and research schools, thereby providing better protection for this important research sector?

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

Directive 2010/63/EU ([1]) on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes took effect on 1 January 2013. It covers all use of animals for scientific purpose irrespective of who, industry or research institute is using the animals, and whether the operator is part of a public or private institute. It follows that the regulatory environment perscribed by the directive applies in the same manner to the former and to the latter.

([1]) OJ L 276, 20.10.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011844/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Glorification of terrorism

The EU Strategy for Combating Radicalisation and Recruitment to Terrorism includes the aim 'to disrupt the activities of individuals and networks that draw people into terrorism'. On 11 August 2013, a parade took place in the town of Castlederg, in my own constituency of Northern Ireland , to commemorate two Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA) members who died in 1973 when their bomb, due to be planted in Castlederg, went off prematurely. On 20 October 2013, a commemoration is due to take place for Thomas Begley, who died when the PIRA bomb he was planting on the Shankill Road exploded prematurely, killing nine people and injuring more than 50. These commemorations are not only grossly insensitive to the victims of such heinous acts, they also serve to glorify acts of terrorism.

What measures can the Commission take to prevent acts that glorify terrorism, and, further, what support will the Commission provide for victims who have been re-traumatised as a result of the glorification of terrorist activities that affected them directly?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

The Commission strongly condemns all use of terrorist violence to advance political causes, whatever their origin.

The Commission is very much involved in the commemoration and support of victims of terrorism. Every year since 2005, on 11 March, the Commission takes an active role in the European Day on Remembrance of Victims of Terrorism.

In addition to funding of projects, the Commission is in the process of establishing a new European Network of Associations of Victims of Terrorism aimed at enhancing the representation of victims' interests at European Union level, and raising awareness among European citizens, in order to strengthen European solidarity with victims of terrorism.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011845/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Model standard pentru tratatele bilaterale de investiții

Într-una din notele de informare privind relațiile externe, emisă de Consiliu, a fost menționată lipsa unui model pentru tratatele bilaterale de investiții. Un astfel de model ar îmbunătăți coerența în politica de investiții a UE și ar contribui la consolidarea normelor la nivel internațional. Având în vedere dimensiunile și capacitatea pieței UE, o standardizare a acestor tratate cu piețe externe și de dimensiuni importante ar putea conduce la instituirea unor standarde pentru protecția investițiilor.

1. Ce măsuri a luat Comisia în direcția unei politici standardizate a UE în domeniul acestor tratate?

2. În ce fel consideră Comisia că poate îmbunătăți transparența și legitimitatea pe piața investițiilor străine?

Răspuns dat de dl De Gucht în numele Comisiei
(26 noiembrie 2013)

Comisia consideră că ar fi important să se adapteze conținutul viitoarelor acorduri în funcție de caracteristicile partenerilor UE. Pentru aceasta, ar fi necesar ca acordurile de investiții să nu se bazeze pe un model unic. Această intenție a fost deja exprimată în Comunicarea Comisiei din 2010 privind politica de investiții a UE ([1]), pentru a se putea ține cont de contextul specific al fiecărei negocieri și pentru a respecta nivelul de dezvoltare al fiecărui partener.

UE este un mediu de investiții foarte deschis și transparent. Competența exclusivă a UE în domeniul investițiilor, introdusă de Tratatul de la Lisabona, are drept scop menținerea și îmbunătățirea calității cadrului juridic în materie de investiții.

Acordurile UE privind investițiile, pe lângă faptul că asigură cel mai ridicat nivel posibil de protecție a investitorilor, vor crea, de asemenea, condiții de concurență echitabile pentru toți investitorii din UE, precum și pentru investitorii străini prezenți pe piața Uniunii. Aceste acorduri conțin dispoziții moderne și inovatoare, inclusiv cu privire la transparență.

([1]) COM(2010) 343 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011845/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Standard model for Bilateral Investment Treaties (BIT)

In a policy briefing on foreign relations released by the Council, the EU's lack of a standard for Bilateral Investment Treaties was mentioned. A template BIT would increase coherence in EU investment policy and would strengthen international norms. With the size and capacity of the EU market, a standardisation of BIT in partnership with large, external markets could lead to an international standard for investment protection.

1. What steps has the Commission taken towards a standardised EU BIT policy?

2. In what ways does the Commission feel it can improve transparency and legitimacy in the foreign investment market?

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

The Commission believes that it would be important to adjust the content of future agreements to the characteristics of the EU's partners. This would be better served by not adopting a one-size-fits-all model for investment agreements. This intention has already been expressed in the Commission's Communication of 2010 on the EU investment policy ([1]) for the precise purpose of being able to take into account each specific negotiating context and of respecting the level of development of each partner.

The EU is a very open and transparent investment environment. The EU's exclusive competence on investment, introduced by the Treaty of Lisbon, aims at preserving and improving the quality of the investment legal framework.

The EU agreements on investment, in addition to ensuring the highest possible level of protection for investors, will also create a level-playing field for all EU investors, as well as for foreign investors into the EU. These agreements contain modern and innovative provisions, including on issues such as transparency.

([1]) COM(2010) 343 final.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011846/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Statutul de membru plin în instituțiile financiare internaționale

În ciuda faptului că piața UE constituie atât cel mai mare investitor internațional cât și cea mai mare piață beneficiară de investiții străine directe, Comisia este obligată să funcționeze numai în calitate de observator în cadrul Băncii Mondiale și a Fondului Monetar Internațional (FMI). Acest statut reduce în mod semnificativ protecția și capacitatea UE pe piața mondială.

1. Ce măsuri sunt luate în vederea realizării statutului de membru plin, de către UE, în Banca Mondială și în FMI?

2. Care este calendarul previzibil pentru realizarea statutului de membru plin, de către UE, în Banca Mondială și în Fondul Monetar Internațional?

Răspuns dat de dl Rehn în numele Comisiei
(25 noiembrie 2013)

La 28 noiembrie 2012, Comisia a adoptat planul de acțiune intitulat „Proiect pentru o Uniune economică și monetară profundă și veritabilă”, în care stabilește o serie de acțiuni prioritare pentru întărirea și consolidarea reprezentării economice externe a zonei euro în cadrul FMI.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011846/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Full member status in international financial institutions

Despite the EU market being both the largest international investor and the largest recipient market of foreign direct investment, the Commission is forced to operate only as an observer in the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). This status significantly reduces the protection and capacity of the EU in the global market place.

1. What steps are being taken towards achieving full membership status for the EU in the World Bank and the IMF?

2. What is the foreseeable timetable for full EU membership in the World Bank and the IMF?

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

The Commission's Blueprint for a Deep and Genuine Economic and Monetary Union on 28 November 2012 sets out a number of priority actions for the strengthening and consolidation of the external economic representation of the euro area in the IMF.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011847/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Acordarea de licență vaccinului contra malariei de către Agenția Europeană pentru Medicamente

Potrivit unui raport al BBC News de miercuri, 9 octombrie 2013, compania farmaceutică GlaxoSmithKline (GSK) are intenția de a prezenta în 2014 Agenției Europene pentru Medicamente (EMA) o cerere de licență pentru un vaccin împotriva malariei. GSK a raportat o cantitate mare de date promițătoare, iar vaccinul este considerat de către unii oameni de știință ca fiind probabil următorul pas în direcția eradicării malariei. De la acțiuni îndreptate spre atingerea Obiectivelor de Dezvoltare ale Mileniului în materie de sănătate până la finanțarea inițiativelor de cercetare pentru combaterea malariei, UE a fost foarte activă în cadrul apelului global privind eradicarea acestei boli. În ciuda acestor eforturi, milioane de persoane sunt încă afectate de malarie în fiecare an.

În perspectiva acestui pas care ar putea avea o importanță esențială în eradicarea malariei, Comisiei i se adresează următoarele întrebări:

1. Care este protocolul EMA pentru evaluarea produselor cu date care indică potențiala eradicare a unei boli globale?

2. Dat fiind faptul că o boală ca malaria este diagnosticată mai ales în afara Europei și că, în comparație, un număr restrâns de cazuri apar în statele membre, care este probabilitatea ca un medicament ca cel descris mai sus să primească din partea EMA statutul de „medicament orfan" (destinat combaterii bolilor rare)?

3. Dacă vaccinul împotriva malariei ar urma să primească „statutul de medicament orfan", prevede Comisia apariția unor conflicte provenind din exclusivitatea comercială pe zece ani de care ar beneficia medicamentul în UE?

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(10 decembrie 2013)

1. Agenția Europeană pentru Medicamente (EMA) dispune de procedurile adecvate pentru a evalua eficacitatea unui potențial vaccin pentru prevenirea malariei. Dacă vaccinul se dovedește a fi de înaltă calitate, eficient și sigur, EMA poate emite un aviz științific, în contextul colaborării cu Organizația Mondială a Sănătății, care poate fi utilizat ulterior de autoritățile naționale de reglementare din statele care nu sunt membre ale UE ca bază pentru o autorizație de introducere pe piață într-o țară din afara UE (așa-numita procedură prevăzută la articolul 58) ([1]). Un ghid pentru solicitanți este disponibil pe site-ul internet al EMA ([2]).

2. Avizul EMA în contextul procedurii prevăzute la articolul 58 este independent de statutul de medicament orfan. În acest context, desemnarea de produs orfan ([3]) ar putea fi acordată în cazul în care solicitantul demonstrează că produsul medicamentos respectiv are ca scop prevenirea unei boli potențial mortale sau a unei boli care provoacă o invaliditate cronică ce afectează mai puțin de cinci din zece mii de persoane din Uniunea Europeană și că nicio altă metodă satisfăcătoare de diagnosticare, prevenire sau tratare a bolii nu mai este autorizată în Uniune. Dacă există o astfel de metodă, compania trebuie să demonstreze că medicamentul va prezenta avantaje semnificative față de tratamentele existente. De exemplu, Comisia a acordat deja în 2012 desemnarea de produs medicamentos orfan unui produs menit să trateze malaria ([4]).

3. În cazul în care vaccinul este autorizat drept produs medicamentos orfan, solicitantul va beneficia de exclusivitate pe piața din Uniunea Europeană timp de zece ani. În acest stadiu, Comisia nu a identificat conflicte cu Obiectivele de dezvoltare ale mileniului pentru a eradica această boală.

([1]) Articolul 58 din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 726/2004 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 31 martie 2004 de stabilire a procedurilor comunitare privind autorizarea și supravegherea medicamentelor de uz uman și veterinar și de instituire a unei Agenții Europene pentru Medicamente.

([2]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document_listing/document_listing_000157.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac05800240d1

([3]) Regulamentul (CE) nr. 141/2000 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 16 decembrie 1999 privind produsele medicamentoase orfane.

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/o1079.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011847/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Licensing of a malaria vaccine by the European Medicines Agency

As reported by BBC News on Wednesday 9 October 2013, British pharmaceutical company GlaxoSmithKline (GSK) intends to submit a licensing application for a malaria vaccine to the European Medicines Agency (EMA) in 2014. GSK has reported a large quantity of promising data, and the vaccine is being considered by some scientists as possibly the next step towards eradicating malaria. From working towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals for health to funding malaria research initiatives, the EU has been very active in the global call to eradicate this disease. Despite these efforts, millions of people are still affected by malaria each year.

In the light of this potentially pivotal step towards ending malaria, the Commission is asked the following:

1. What is the EMA protocol for evaluating products with data pointing to the potential eradication of a global disease?

2. Given that a disease such as malaria is most prominently found outside of Europe, and that comparatively few cases arise in Member States, what is the likelihood of a drug such as the one described above receiving 'orphan drug status' from the EMA?

3. If a malaria vaccine were to receive 'orphan drug status', does the Commission foresee any conflicts arising from the ten-year marketing exclusivity the drug would receive within the EU?

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

1. The European Medicines Agency (EMA) has the appropriate procedures to assess the efficacy of a potential vaccine aiming to prevent malaria. If the vaccine proves to be of high quality, efficacious and safe, EMA can adopt a scientific opinion, in the context of the cooperation with the World Health Organisation, which can then be used by Non-EU National Regulatory Authorities as a basis for a Marketing Authorisation in a Non-EU country (so called Article 58-procedure) (1). Guidance to applicants is available on the EMA website (2).

2. The EMA opinion in the context of the article 58-procedure is independent of the orphan status. In this context, an orphan designation (3) could be granted if the applicant establishes that the product intends to prevent a life threatening or chronically debilitating disease affecting less than five in ten-thousand persons in the European Union, and that no other satisfactory method of diagnosis, prevention or treatment of the disease is authorised in the Union. If such method exists, the company has to establish that the medicine will be of significant benefit over existing treatments. For example, the Commission has already granted an orphan designation to a product aiming to treat malaria in 2012 (4).

3. If the vaccine is authorised as an orphan medicinal product, the applicant will benefit from 10 years of market exclusivity in the European Union. At this stage the Commission has not identified conflicts with the Millennium Development Goals to eradicate this disease.

---

(1) Article 58 of Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004.
Laying down Community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency.

(2) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document_listing/document_listing_000157.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac05800240d1

(3) Regulation (EC) No 141/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 1999 on orphan medicinal products.

(4) http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/o1079.htm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011848/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Rezultate și acțiuni viitoare legate de sistemul automat de recunoaștere a plăcuțelor de înmatriculare

În 2012, Lituania și Estonia au dezvoltat, cu sprijin financiar prin programul Hercule II, un sistem automat de recunoaștere a plăcuțelor de înmatriculare (ANPRS). Colectând informații despre autoturismele și alte autovehicule care intră și ies din Estonia, Letonia și Lituania, scopul ANPRS este de a consolida lupta împotriva contrabandei cu țigări și a contrafacerii acestora.

1. Ce cantitate de țigări de contrabandă/contrafăcute capturate poate fi atribuită ANPRS și care este raportul dintre țigările de contrabandă/contrafăcute capturate înainte de introducerea ANPRS și cele capturate ulterior?

2. Are Comisia informații în legătură cu alte state membre sau țări terțe din zone cu grad ridicat de risc care doresc să introducă ANPRS urmând exemplul Lituaniei și al Estoniei? Dacă da, care sunt aceste țări?

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

1. Pe baza informațiilor furnizate de către beneficiarul unui grant Hercule, sistemul automat de recunoaștere a plăcuțelor de înmatriculare (ANPRS) implementat în Estonia, Letonia și Lituania a fost de o importanță crucială în detectarea mărfurilor de contrabandă, inclusiv a țigărilor și tutunului. În acest stadiu însă nu este posibilă furnizarea unor date exacte cu privire la procentul pe care îl reprezintă țigările și tutunul confiscate cu ajutorul ANPRS din cantitatea totală de țigări și tutun confiscate. În prezent, beneficiarii granturilor Hercule trebuie să raporteze la un an de la încetarea acordării grantului cu privire la principalele rezultate obținute cu echipamentele achiziționate în cadrul unui grant de asistență tehnică acordat prin programul Hercule. Aceste informații vor fi incluse în raportul anual privind punerea în aplicare a programului Hercule, astfel cum se prevede în Decizia privind programul Hercule II. Următorul raport anual care va oferi o imagine de ansamblu asupra rezultatelor din 2013 aferente programului Hercule II va fi publicat sub formă de DLSC (1) anexat la raportul anual elaborat în temeiul articolului 325 (2). Se preconizează că acest raport va fi adoptat de Colegiu la jumătatea anului 2014.

2. UE a finanțat sisteme automate de recunoaștere a plăcuțelor de înmatriculare în mai multe state membre, cum ar fi Finlanda, Polonia, Ungaria și Slovacia, în vederea monitorizării traficului transfrontalier al acestora cu țările terțe. În prezent, 54 din cele 86 (63 %) de puncte vamale de trecere a frontierei situate la frontierele terestre estice ale UE sunt dotate cu ANPRS. Aceste puncte de trecere a frontierei acoperă aproximativ 74 % din trafic.

Recent, Comisia a fost informată cu privire la inițiative care vizează extinderea la Polonia și interconectarea ANPRS-ului dezvoltat de cele trei state membre baltice. În plus, Comisia a acordat recent subvenții în temeiul programului Hercule II Irlandei, Poloniei și României pentru a achiziționa și implementa ANPRS-uri care vor fi utilizate în vederea combaterii contrabandei cu tutun și țigări.

---

(1) Document de lucru al serviciilor Comisiei.

(2) Raport privind protecția intereselor financiare ale UE și combaterea fraudei, elaborat în temeiul articolului 325.