(English version)

Question for written answer E-011848/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Results and future actions related to automated number-plate recognition system

In 2012 Lithuania and Estonia developed, with financial support through the Hercule II programme, an automated number-plate recognition system (ANPRS). By capturing information about cars and other vehicles entering and leaving Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, the purpose of the ANPRS is to reinforce the fight against cigarette smuggling and counterfeiting.

1. What amount of smuggled / counterfeit cigarettes seized is attributable to the ANPRS, and what is the ratio of smuggled / counterfeit cigarettes seized before and after the establishment of the ANPRS?

2. Is the Commission aware of other Member States or third countries in high-risk areas willing to introduce an ANPRS following the example of Lithuania and Estonia? If so, which countries?

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

1. On the basis of the information provided by the beneficiary of a Hercule grant, the ANPRS deployed in the Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania has been instrumental in the detection of smuggled goods, including cigarettes and tobacco. At this stage, it is not possible however to provide precise figures on the share of cigarettes and tobacco seized with the help of the ANPRS in the overall amount of seized cigarettes and tobacco. The beneficiaries of Hercule grants now have to report one year after closure of the grant on the main results achieved with the equipment purchased under a Technical Assistance grant awarded under the Hercule programme. This information will be included in the annual report on the implementation of the Hercule programme, as provided for in the Hercule II Decision. The next annual report with an overview of the 2013 results in relation to the Hercule II programme will be published as CSWD ([1]) annexed to the annual Article 325 Report ([2]). This report is expected to be adopted by the College mid-2014.

2. The EU funded ANPRS in several Member States, such as Finland, Poland, Hungary or Slovakia, in order to monitor their cross-border traffic with third countries. Now 54 out of 86 (63%) Customs Border Crossing Points on the Eastern land borders of the EU have an ANPRS system. These crossing points cover around 74% of the traffic.

The Commission has recently been informed of initiatives aimed at extending and interconnecting the ANPRS system developed by the three Baltic Member States to Poland. Moreover, the Commission recently awarded grants under the Hercule II programme to Ireland, Poland and Romania for the purchase and implementation of ANPRS that will be used in the fight against the smuggling of tobacco and cigarettes.

([1]) Commission Staff Working Document.
([2]) Article 325 Report on the protection of the EU's financial interests and fight against fraud.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011849/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Statele membre și nivelurile diferite de depistare și raportare a neregulilor frauduloase în 2012

Raportul anual pe 2012 privind protecția intereselor financiare ale Uniunii Europene, „Combaterea fraudei", menționează faptul că rata fraudelor variază masiv de la un stat membru la altul. De exemplu, Italia, Polonia, România, Danemarca și Germania depistează și raportează în mod eficient neregulile frauduloase, în timp ce alte state membre depistează și raportează foarte puține astfel de cazuri (Belgia, Franța, Cipru, Țările de Jos și Austria) sau niciunul (Grecia, Luxemburg, Malta și Finlanda).

Comisia a explicat că aceste diferențe decurg din doi factori principali:

— existența unor abordări diferite pentru depistarea și raportarea neregulilor frauduloase în cadrul statelor membre și în cadrul diferitelor administrații existente în aceeași țară;

— abordarea statelor membre cu privire la neregulile frauduloase: în timp ce unele state investesc resurse semnificative pentru a contracara fraudele, altele preferă să aplice sancțiuni financiare fără a continua cercetarea unor eventuale activități infracționale.

1. Ce măsuri ia Comisia pentru a asigura un nivel minim de armonizare la nivelul tuturor statelor membre și al administrațiilor lor respective competente?

2. Care sunt statele membre care aplică sancțiuni financiare fără a continua cercetarea unor eventuale infracțiuni existente în cazurile de nereguli frauduloase?

3. Ce politici implementează Comisia pentru a îndemna respectivele state membre să investească mai mult în combaterea fraudelor?

Răspuns dat de dl Šemeta în numele Comisiei
(19 decembrie 2013)

1. Comisia o roagă pe doamna deputat să consulte raportul anual pe 2012 „Protejarea intereselor financiare ale Uniunii Europene — Combaterea fraudei" ([1]), în special recomandările 1, 4, 5, 8 și 9 ([2]).

Atunci când există suspiciuni privind posibile nereguli frauduloase, sarcina de a deschide cercetări penale revine autorităților competente ale statelor membre. Comisia a adoptat în 2012 o inițiativă prin care se vizează o mai bună armonizare a legislațiilor penale în acest domeniu ([3]). Această inițiativă se află în prezent în discuție în cadrul Consiliului și al Parlamentului European.

Atunci când OLAF transmite autorităților naționale informații sau le recomandă acestora să întreprindă măsuri de urmărire judiciară, autoritățile competente din statele membre trebuie să informeze OLAF cu privire la eventualele măsuri întreprinse pe baza informațiilor care le-au fost transmise ([4]).

2. Comisia a emis o recomandare de intensificare a eforturilor depuse de statele membre pentru detectarea fraudelor în domeniul politicii de coeziune ([5]). Această recomandare se adresează în special Greciei, Franței și Spaniei, țări care, în legătură cu finanțările primite, fie nu au detectat și nu au raportat nimic în ultimii ani, fie au detectat și au raportat foarte puține cazuri în care există suspiciuni de fraudă.

([1]) Raportul anual al Comisiei intitulat „Protejarea intereselor financiare ale Uniunii Europene — Combaterea fraudei", COM(2013) 548.
([2]) Recomandarea 1: desemnarea sau stabilirea unui serviciu de coordonare antifraudă (AFCOS);
Recomandarea 4: consolidarea eforturilor de depistare a fraudelor;
Recomandarea 5: autoritățile competente ar trebui să ia în considerare rezultatele analizei în momentul planificării verificărilor și controalelor;
Recomandarea 8: statele membre ar trebui să adopte și să dezvolte verificări și controale, să structureze și să îmbunătățească cooperarea dintre autoritățile de gestionare și organismele antifraudă și să îmbunătățească analizele de risc și instrumentele IT;
Recomandarea 9: adoptarea dispozițiilor CFM privind prevenirea fraudelor.
([3]) Propunere de directivă privind combaterea fraudelor îndreptate împotriva intereselor financiare ale Uniunii prin intermediul dreptului penal, COM(2012) 363.
([4]) Articolul 12 alineatul (3) din Regulamentul 883/2013.
([5]) Raportul anual al Comisiei intitulat „Protejarea intereselor financiare ale Uniunii Europene — Combaterea fraudei", COM(2013) 548, anexa 1 și recomandarea 4.

3. Programul Hercule II ([6]) promovează activități în domeniul protecției intereselor financiare ale UE, în scopul prevenirii și al combaterii fraudelor care aduc atingere intereselor financiare ale Uniunii, inclusiv a contrabandei cu țigări și a contrafacerii acestora. Acest program are scopul de a îmbunătăți cooperarea dintre statele membre, Comisie și OLAF ([7]) prin furnizarea unui sprijin financiar autorităților naționale și regionale din statele membre. Comisia transmite anual Parlamentului European informații cu privire la rezultatele programului ([8]).

Comisia o invită pe doamna deputat să consulte și comunicările Comisiei cu privire la o strategie antifraudă ([9]) și la combaterea corupției în UE ([10]).

([6]) Decizia nr. 878/2007/CE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 23 iulie 2007.
([7]) Decizia Comisiei privind adoptarea unei decizii de finanțare pentru anul 2013 în cadrul programului Hercule II, C(2013)612 din 7 februarie 2013.
([8]) SWD(2012) 445 din 11 decembrie 2012: Annual Overview with Information on the Results of the Hercule II Programme in 2011 și SWD(2013) 287 din 27 iulie 2013: Annual Overview with Information on the Results of the Hercule II Programme in 2012.
([9]) COM(2011) 376 final și SEC(2011) 787.
([10]) COM(2011) 308 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011849/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Member States and the variable level of detection and reporting of fraudulent irregularities in 2012

The 2012 Annual Report on the Protection of the EU's financial interest, 'Fight against fraud', mentions that the rate of fraud still varies widely from one Member State to another. For instance, Italy, Poland, Romania, Denmark and Germany efficiently detect and report fraudulent irregularities, while other Member States detect and report very few (Belgium, France, Cyprus, the Netherlands and Austria) or none at all (Greece, Luxembourg, Malta and Finland).

The Commission explains that these differences derive from two main factors:

— the existence of very diverse approaches for the detection and reporting of fraudulent irregularities among Member States and among the different administrations existing in the same country;

— the Member States' approach towards fraudulent irregularities: while some Member States invest significant resources to counter fraud, others prefer to apply financial corrections without further investigation of the potential criminal activities.

1. What measures is the Commission taking to ensure a minimum level of harmonisation across all Member States and their respective responsible administrations?

2. Which Member States apply financial corrections without further investigation of the potential criminal offence in cases of fraudulent irregularities?

3. What policies is the Commission implementing in order to urge those Member States to invest more in countering fraud?

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

1. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its 2012 annual report on the Protection of the EU financial interests 'Fight against fraud' ([1]), in particular to the recommendations number 1, 4, 5, 8 and 9 ([2]).

Where fraudulent irregularities are suspected, it is in the remit of the competent MS (Member States) authorities to launch criminal investigations. The Commission adopted in 2012 an initiative aimed at a better harmonisation of criminal laws in this area ([3]). This is currently under discussion at the Council and the European Parliament.

When OLAF transmits information to the national authorities or recommend judicial follow up, the competent authorities of MS shall inform OLAF on action taken if any on the basis of the information transmitted to them ([4]).

2. The Commission issued a recommendation to strengthen the efforts to detect fraud by the MS, in particular to Greece, France and Spain in the area of the Cohesion policy ([5]), as they are the countries that, in relation to the funding received, have detected and reported no (or very few) cases of suspected fraud in recent years.

([1]) Commission's annual report on the Protection of the European Union's financial interests — Fight against fraud COM(2013) 548.
([2]) No 1: to designate or establish an AFCOS;
No 4: to strengthen the efforts to detect fraud;
No 5: competent authorities should take the results of the analysis into account where planning their checks and controls;
No 8: all Member States (MS) shall adopt and develop checks and controls, structure and improve cooperation between managing authorities and anti-fraud bodies, and improve risk analysis and IT tools;
No 9: to adopt the MFF provisions on fraud prevention.
([3]) COM(2012) 363: Proposal for a directive on the fight against fraud to the Union's financial interests by means of criminal law.
([4]) Article 12(3) of Regulation 883/2013.
([5]) Commission's annual report on the Protection of the European Union's financial interests — Fight against fraud COM(2013) 548 — Annex 1 and Recommendation 4.

3. The Hercule II programme [6] promotes activities in the field of the protection of the financial interests of the EU in order to prevent and combat fraud affecting the financial interests of the Union, including the fight against cigarette smuggling and counterfeiting. This programme aims to improve the cooperation between the MS, the Commission and OLAF [7] by providing financial support to national and regional authorities in the MS. The Commission provides annual information to the European Parliament on the results of the Programme [8].

The Commission would also invite the Honourable Member to refer to its communications on an anti-fraud strategy [9] and on Fighting Corruption in the EU [10].

---

(6) Decision No 878/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 July 2007.
(7) Commission decision concerning the adoption of a financing decision for 2013 in the framework of the Hercule II Programme C(2013) 612 of 7 February 2013.
(8) SWD(2012) 445 of 11 December 2012 : Annual Overview with Information on the Results of the Hercule II Programme in 2011 and SWD(2013) 287 of 27 July 2013: Annual Overview with Information on the Results of the Hercule II Programme in 2012.
(9) COM(2011) 376 final and SEC(2011) 787.
(10) COM(2011) 308 final.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011850/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Acțiunile judiciare și sumele recuperate ca urmare a recomandărilor OLAF din 2012

În 2012, Oficiul European de Luptă Antifraudă (OLAF) a emis pentru autoritățile naționale 54 de recomandări de acțiuni judiciare și a recomandat, de asemenea, recuperarea unei sume de aproximativ 284 de milioane de euro, din care 165,8 milioane de euro legate de venituri și 118,2 milioane de euro legate de cheltuieli.

1. Din cele 54 de recomandări de acțiuni judiciare, câte au dus la inițierea de către autoritățile naționale competente a unor proceduri judiciare efective? La ce state membre se referă recomandările respective?

2. În urma recomandării OLAF, ce fonduri au fost recuperate în ceea ce privește veniturile și, respectiv, cheltuielile?

Răspuns dat de dl Šemeta în numele Comisiei
(9 ianuarie 2014)

OLAF a primit informații potrivit cărora 37 din cele 54 de recomandări emise în 2012 au condus la inițierea unor proceduri penale, iar alte 10 recomandări au determinat adoptarea unor decizii de concediere. OLAF nu a primit încă informații cu privire la punerea în aplicare a celorlalte 7 recomandări restante.

Următoarele state membre au primit recomandări judiciare din partea OLAF în 2012: Austria, Belgia, Bulgaria, Cipru, Estonia, Finlanda, Franța, Germania, Grecia, Italia, Luxemburg, Malta, Polonia, Portugalia, Regatul Unit, Republica Cehă, România, Slovacia, Spania și Țările de Jos.

Astfel cum se specifică în Raportul anual al OLAF pe 2012 la care se referă distinsul membru, pentru a reflecta mai bine activitatea pe parcursul anului de raportare, OLAF înregistrează sumele recuperate în anul care face obiectul recuperării, indiferent de momentul în care au fost emise efectiv recomandările în materie de recuperare. În conformitate cu această abordare, OLAF va furniza informații cu privire la sumele recuperate în 2013 în Raportul său anual pe 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011850/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Judicial actions and recoveries following recommendations by the OLAF in 2012

In 2012 the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) issued 54 recommendations for judicial action to national authorities and a sum of about EUR 284 million was recommended for recovery, of which EUR 165.8 million related to revenue and EUR 118.2 million to expenditure.

1. Out of the 54 recommendations for judicial action, how many have led to actual judicial proceedings by the competent national authorities? Which Member States are concerned by those recommendations?

2. Following the recommendation by the OLAF, what amount of funding has been recovered in term of revenue and expenditure respectively?

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

OLAF has received information that 37 of the 54 recommendations issued in 2012 have resulted in the initiation of criminal proceedings and a further 10 have resulted in dismissal decisions. As regards the implementation of the remaining 7 recommendations, OLAF has not yet received information.

The following Member States received judicial recommendations issued by OLAF in 2012 — Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain and United Kingdom.

As indicated in the OLAF Annual Report for 2012 to which the Honourable Member refers, in order to better reflect the activity during the reporting year, OLAF records the amounts recovered in the year of the recovery, regardless of when the recommendations for recovery were actually issued. In line with this approach, OLAF will report on the recoveries made in 2013 in the OLAF Annual Report for 2013.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011853/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Proiectul pilot pentru combaterea traficului de ființe umane

Traficul de ființe umane este un veritabil flagel care afectează fiecare stat membru și UE ca întreg. Victimele traficului de ființe umane provin nu numai din țări non-UE precum Nigeria, Vietnam, Ucraina, Rusia și China, ci și din interiorul UE (în principal din Bulgaria, România, Polonia și Ungaria). Statele membre care se află la frontierele estice sunt în mod deosebit vulnerabile la acest fenomen. De exemplu, Lituania este recunoscută nu numai ca o țară sursă a traficului de ființe umane pentru exploatare sexuală și în muncă, ci și ca cea mai importantă țară de tranzit între Europa de Est și Europa Centrală.

Conform „Strategiei UE pentru eradicarea traficului de ființe umane 2012-2016”, UE a finanțat un proiect pilot în 2012 pentru a întări cooperarea regională în combaterea traficului de ființe umane pe rutele dinspre est spre UE, utilizând Instrumentul pentru stabilitate.

1. Cât va dura proiectul, ce buget îi este alocat și cine sunt beneficiarii?

2. Ce politici și/sau acțiuni au fost implementate prin acest proiect pilot?

3. Care sunt rezultatele preliminare ale proiectului pilot?

Răspuns dat de dna Malmström în numele Comisiei
(11 decembrie 2013)

Comisia împărtășește preocupările distinsei deputate în Parlamentul European.

Conform Eurostat, ponderea resortisanților țărilor terțe din numărul total de victime ale traficului de persoane din Uniunea Europeană a crescut în perioada 2008-2010, de la 12 % în 2008 la 37 % în 2010, în cazul victimelor de sex masculin, și de la 18 % la 39 %, în cazul victimelor de sex feminin.

Etapa a II-a a programului care vizează ruta heroinei a fost lansată în 2012, beneficiind de o contribuție de 6 milioane EUR din partea Uniunii Europene. Acest program are ca scop combaterea traficului de persoane și a criminalității organizate către și dinspre Afganistan. Acest program include un proiect privind traficul de persoane, care este finanțat cu până la 1,5 milioane EUR din fondurile Instrumentului de stabilitate ([1]). Promotorul proiectului este Centrul internațional pentru dezvoltarea politicilor de migrație. Proiectul a început în ianuarie 2013 și se va încheia în iulie 2014.

Acest proiect este menit să completeze și să consolideze inițiativele regionale și internaționale care au fost adoptate în scopul combaterii traficului de persoane și a criminalității organizate de-a lungul rutei heroinei, fiind vizate țări cum ar fi Azerbaidjan, fosta Republică iugoslavă a Macedoniei și Republica Moldova. Proiectul se concentrează asupra a trei direcții principale de acțiune: îmbunătățirea colectării datelor; promovarea și acordarea de asistență în ceea ce privește schimbul de informații și coordonarea regională; consolidarea cooperării naționale și transnaționale în domeniul aplicării legii și consolidarea capacității procurorilor, a personalului consular și a personalului organizațiilor neguvernamentale.

Proiectul se află încă în plin proces de punere în aplicare, Comisia urmând să evalueze rezultatele sale la momentul oportun. Toate informațiile referitoare la evoluțiile înregistrate în cadrul proiectului pot fi consultate pe site-ul internet al UE privind combaterea traficului de persoane ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/EU+Projects/IFS_2012_299415
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011853/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Pilot project on fighting human trafficking

Human trafficking is a blight which affects every Member State and the EU as a whole. Victims of human trafficking come not only from non-EU countries such as Nigeria, Vietnam, Ukraine, Russia and China, but also from within the EU (mainly from Bulgaria, Romania, Poland and Hungary). Member States located at the eastern boarders are particularly vulnerable to this phenomenon. For instance, Lithuania is recognised not only as a source country for trafficking in human beings for sexual and labour exploitation, but also as the most important country of transit between eastern and central Europe.

According to the 'EU strategy towards the eradication of trafficking in human beings 2012-2016', the EU funded a pilot project in 2012 to strengthen regional cooperation in the fight against trafficking in human beings along routes from the East to the EU using the Instrument for Stability.

1. How long will the pilot project last, what budget has it been allocated and who are the beneficiaries?

2. What policies and/or actions have been implemented through the pilot project?

3. What are the preliminary results of the pilot project?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

The Commission shares the concerns of the Honourable Member.

According to Eurostat, the proportion of non-EU citizens within the total number of victims of trafficking in human beings in the European Union increased between 2008 and 2010, from 12% in 2008 to 37% in 2010 for male victims, and from 18% to 39% for female victims.

Phase II of the programme Heroin Route was launched in 2012 with a EUR 6 million contribution from the European Union. It aims at fighting trafficking in human beings and organised crime to and from Afghanistan. It includes a project on trafficking in human beings which is funded up to EUR 1.5 million by the Instrument for Stability ([1]). The promoter of the project is the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD). The project started in January 2013 and will be finalised in July 2014.

This project aims at complementing and reinforcing regional and international initiatives taken in order to address trafficking in human beings and organised crime along the Heroin Route, targeting countries such as Azerbaijan, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Moldova. It is organised around three clusters: the improvement of data collection, the promotion and the assistance in information sharing and regional coordination, and the enhancement of national and transnational law enforcement cooperation and of the capacity of prosecutors, consular and non-governmental organisations staff.

The project is still in process of implementation; the Commission will assess the results in due course. All information on project developments can be found on the EU Anti Trafficking website ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/EU+Projects/IFS_2012_299415
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011854/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Anchetarea și urmărirea penală a traficanților de ființe umane în Uniunea Europeană

Traficul intern de ființe umane este în creștere, și multe dintre victimele sale sunt cetățeni ai UE. Fără anchete și o urmărire penală eficace, fenomenul va continua să ia amploare. În prezent, numărul total al urmăririlor penale în UE rămâne scăzut. În plus, datele arată o scădere de 13% a numărului condamnărilor în cazurile de trafic cu ființe umane între 2008 și 2010: 1 534 în 2008, 1 445 în 2009 și 1 144 în 2010.

În 2012, în cadrul Strategiei UE pentru „Eradicarea traficului de ființe umane 2012-2016", Comisia recomandă statelor membre să înființeze unități naționale multidisciplinare de aplicare a legii în domeniul traficului de ființe umane. O astfel de măsură va permite o îmbunătățire a investigațiilor și a urmăririi penale a traficanților, precum și o cooperare transfrontalieră mai strânsă și centralizarea cunoștințelor cu privire la traficul de ființe umane.

1. La un an de la publicarea Strategiei UE pentru „Eradicarea traficului de ființe umane 2012-2016", ce statele membre au urmat recomandarea Comisiei de a înființa unități naționale multidisciplinare de aplicare a legii în domeniul traficului de ființe umane?

2. Ce măsuri a luat Comisia și alte agenții responsabile ale UE pentru a convinge statele membre care nu au înființat încă unități naționale multidisciplinare de aplicare a legii în domeniul traficului de ființe umane să facă acest lucru?

Răspuns dat de dna Malmström în numele Comisiei
(2 decembrie 2013)

Comisia Europeană împărtășește preocupările doamnei deputat legate de acest nou fenomen de trafic de persoane în interiorul UE și de estimările Eurostat privind numărul total de urmăriri penale și scăderea numărului de condamnări din UE între 2008 și 2010.

Subiectul înființării de unități naționale multidisciplinare de aplicare a legii în domeniul traficului de persoane a fost inclus în concluziile Consiliului privind noua Strategie a UE pentru perioada 2012-2016 în vederea eradicării traficului de persoane ([1]). Așa cum se precizează în Prioritatea C prima acțiune din Strategia UE pentru perioada 2012-2016 în vederea eradicării traficului de persoane, sarcina înființării acestor unități le revine statelor membre.

Pentru moment, Comisia nu este în măsură să furnizeze informații specifice cu privire la statele membre care au creat deja astfel de unități. Primul raport privind punerea în aplicare a acestei strategii UE va fi publicat în 2014. În măsura în care acest lucru va fi posibil, raportul va cuprinde informații relevante cu privire la înființarea de unități naționale multidisciplinare de aplicare a legii.

Comisia înțelege că înființarea de noi structuri de acest tip la nivel național ar putea fi dificilă pentru anumite țări, având în vedere constrângerile economice și bugetare actuale. În concluzie, Comisia subliniază necesitatea de a se consolida cooperarea dintre unitățile de aplicare a legii care se ocupă de diversele aspecte ale problemei traficului de persoane și ia măsuri menite să încurajeze o astfel de cooperare și să creeze sinergii pentru a se asigura o abordare multidisciplinară, pentru a se consolida contactele cu părțile interesate implicate și pentru ca lupta împotriva traficului de persoane să fie abordată la toate nivelurile de cooperare.

([1]) Concluziile Consiliului privind noua Strategie a UE pentru perioada 2012-2016 în vederea eradicării traficului de persoane — Cea de a 3195-a reuniune a Consiliului Justiție și Afaceri Interne, Luxemburg, 25 octombrie 2012. Disponibile la adresa: http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/download.action?nodePath=/EU+Policy/Council+conclusions+on+the+new+EU+Strategy+towards+the+Eradication+of+Trafficking+in+Human+Beings+2012+-+2016.pdf&fileName=Council+conclusions+on+the+new+EU+Strategy+towards+the+Eradication+of+Trafficking+in+Human+Beings+2012+-+2016.pdf&fileType=pdf.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011854/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Investigation and prosecution of human traffickers in the European Union

Internal human trafficking is on the rise and many of its victims are EU citizens. Without effective investigation and prosecution, the phenomenon will keep flourishing. At present, the total number of prosecutions in the EU remains low. In addition, data showed a decrease of 13% in the number of convictions on trafficking in human beings between 2008 and 2010: 1 534 in 2008, 1 445 in 2009 and 1 144 in 2010.

In 2012, in the framework of the EU Strategy towards the 'Eradication of trafficking in human beings 2012-2016', the Commission recommended that Member States establish national multidisciplinary law-enforcement units on human trafficking. Such a measure would enable better investigation into, and prosecution of, traffickers, as well as deeper cross-border cooperation and the centralisation of knowledge on trafficking in human beings.

1. A year after the publication of the EU Strategy towards the 'Eradication of trafficking in human beings 2012-2016', which Member States have followed the Commission's recommendation and established national multidisciplinary law-enforcement units on human trafficking?

2. What measures have been put in place by the Commission and other responsible EU Agencies in order to convince Member States that have not yet established national multidisciplinary law-enforcement units on human trafficking to do so in the near future?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(2 December 2013)

The European Commission shares the concerns of the Honourable Member on the new phenomenon of intra-EU trafficking in human beings, and on the Eurostat estimates on the total number of prosecutions and on the decrease of convictions in the EU between 2008 and 2010.

The establishment of national multidisciplinary law enforcement units on trafficking in human beings was part of the Council conclusions on the new EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016 ([1]). As stated in the first action under 'Priority C' of the EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016, the establishment of such units is left to Member States.

For the moment, the Commission is not in the position to provide specific information on which Member States have already established such units. The first implementation report of the EU Strategy will be published in 2014. As far as possible, the relevant information regarding the establishment of those national multidisciplinary law enforcement units will be incorporated.

The Commission understands that the establishment of new structures of this kind at national level might be difficult for some countries given current economic and budgetary constraints. Having said this, the Commission highlights the need to strengthen cooperation between law enforcement units dealing with different aspects of the issue of trafficking in human beings and is taking steps to encourage such cooperation and create synergies to ensure a multidisciplinary approach, and to develop contacts with stakeholders involved, to address trafficking in human beings through every level of cooperation.

([1]) Council conclusions on the new EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016 — 3195th JUSTICE and HOME AFFAIRS Council meeting Luxembourg, 25 October 2012 available at http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/download.action?nodePath=/EU+Policy/Council+conclusions+on+the+new+EU+Strategy+towards+the+Eradication+of+Trafficking+in+Human+Beings+2012+-+2016.pdf&fileName=Council+conclusions+on+the+new+EU+Strategy+towards+the+Eradication+of+Trafficking+in+Human+Beings+2012+-+2016.pdf&fileType=pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011855/13
à Comissão
Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(16 de outubro de 2013)

Assunto: Cooperativas — Acesso ao financiamento e aplicação dos princípios cooperativos da ACI

Em 2004, numa Comunicação relativa à promoção das cooperativas na Europa (COM(2004)0018), a Comissão recomendava que os legisladores nacionais baseassem as suas legislações sobre cooperativas na definição, nos valores e nos princípios expostos na «Declaração sobre a Identidade Cooperativa», aprovada pela Aliança Cooperativa Internacional (ACI) em 1995.

Tendo em conta as enormes dificuldades sentidas pelas sociedades cooperativas no que respeita ao acesso ao financiamento, que subsistem, em parte, devido à não distinção entre estas e as pequenas e médias empresas e à inexistência de instrumentos financeiros próprios, pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual a evolução registada no que respeita à recomendação dirigida aos Estados-Membros sobre o reconhecimento dos princípios da ACI?

2. Se se mantém a intenção de atribuir às cooperativas um enquadramento legislativo mais claro e coerente, que tenha em conta as suas características particulares e as necessidades específicas em termos de financiamento? Concretamente, o que está a ser feito a este respeito?

3. Tenciona a Comissão continuar a tratar as sociedades cooperativas como se fossem pequenas e médias empresas, ou existe a intenção de incluir no orçamento comunitário e, em particular, nos instrumentos do Fundo Europeu de Investimento, referências específicas às cooperativas?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(29 de novembro de 2013)

1. Na sequência da sua comunicação de 2004, e no sentido de contribuir para a sensibilização para o modelo de empresa cooperativa, a Comissão organizou conferências ([1]), financiou um estudo sobre a aplicação do Estatuto da Sociedade Cooperativa Europeia (Regulamento (SCE) n.° 1435/2003) ([2]), encomendou a recolha de dados estatísticos ([3]), procedeu a consultas sobre a necessidade de alterar a legislação existente ([4]) e apresentou um relatório exaustivo sobre esta questão ao Conselho e ao PE ([5]).

2. No seguimento de uma consulta acerca da necessidade de simplificar o Regulamento SCE e da sua relativa baixa popularidade entre os utilizadores, a Comissão concluiu que o reduzido aproveitamento se deve, principalmente, à falta de compreensão dos possíveis benefícios das cooperativas para os seus membros e, por conseguinte, está atualmente a organizar grupos de trabalho com representantes das cooperativas europeias e nacionais, para analisar formas de promover e apoiar o desenvolvimento das cooperativas ao nível europeu.

3. A política da Comissão sobre as cooperativas é a de garantir que as cooperativas, independentemente da sua dimensão, possam continuar a operar no mercado, preservando o seu papel social, estilo específico de funcionamento e ética. Estes aspetos são tidos em conta nas políticas da UE em matéria de auxílios estatais, harmonização do direito das sociedades, contabilidade, desenvolvimento regional, financiamento a partir dos fundos estruturais e liberdade de estabelecimento. O projeto de proposta do programa do quadro financeiro plurianual 2014-2020 não inclui instrumentos específicos para promoção das cooperativas. A Comissão tem, no entanto, recomendado aos Estados-Membros que forneçam apoio específico às empresas sociais através de programas dos fundos estruturais da UE e lhes concedam acesso aos regimes de apoio em pé de igualdade com os restantes tipos de PME.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=5876
para comemorar a Ano Internacional das Cooperativas 2012, proclamado pelas Nações Unidas, em Bruxelas, em abril de 2012, e em Nicósia, em setembro de 2012.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/files/sce_final_study_part_i.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=487
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/public-consultation/past-consultations/index_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/files/smes/1_en_act_part1_v7_en.pdf e
http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=3318

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011855/13
to the Commission
Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Cooperatives — access to funding and application of the ICA's cooperative principles

In 2004, in a communication on the promotion of cooperative societies in Europe (COM(2004)0018), the Commission recommended that national legislators base their laws governing cooperatives on the definition, values and principles set out in the 'Statement on the Cooperative Identity', adopted by the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA) in 1995.

In view of the enormous difficulties facing cooperative societies in terms of access to funding, which are partly down to no distinction being made between cooperative societies and small and medium-sized enterprises, and cooperative societies not having their own financial instruments:

1. What progress has been made in terms of the recommendation made to Member States regarding recognition of the ICA's principles?

2. Is there any intention to give cooperatives a clearer legislative and more consistent legislative framework, which takes account of their specific features and their particular financing needs? Specifically, what is being done in this regard?

3. Will the Commission continue to treat cooperative societies as if they were small and medium-sized enterprises, or does it intend to include specific references to cooperatives in the EU budget and, in particular, in European Investment Fund instruments?

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

1. Following its 2004 Communication and to improve awareness of the cooperative business model, the Commission organised conferences ([1]), funded a study on the implementation of the Statute for a European Cooperative Society (SCE Regulation 1435/2003) ([2]), commissioned the collection of statistical data ([3]), proceeded to consultations on the need to amend the existing legislation ([4]), and made a comprehensive report on this issue to the Council and the EP ([5]).

2. Following a consultation about the need to simplify the SCE Regulation and its relative lack of popularity among users, the Commission concluded that the poor uptake is mostly due to a lack of understanding of the possible benefits of cooperatives for their members; therefore it is currently organising working groups with representatives of European and national cooperatives, to examine ways of promoting and supporting the development of cooperatives at European level.

3. The Commission's policy about cooperatives is to guarantee that cooperatives, independently of their size, can continue to operate in the market by preserving their social role, particular style of functioning and ethics. These aspects are taken into account in EU policies relating to state aids, harmonisation of company law, accounting, regional development, financing from structural funds and freedom of establishment. The draft proposal for a 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework programme does not include specific instruments to promote cooperatives. The Commission has however recommended to the Member States to provide specific support to social business via the EU's structural funding programmes and give them access to its support schemes on an equal footing with all other types of SMEs.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=5876 to celebrate the UN 2012 International Year of Cooperatives in Brussels April 2012 and in Nicosia September 2012.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/files/sce_final_study_part_i.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=487
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/public-consultation/past-consultations/index_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/files/smes/1_en_act_part1_v7_en.pdf and http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=3318

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011856/13
à Comissão
Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL) e Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL)
(16 de outubro de 2013)

Assunto: Violação da legislação europeia pela STCP (Sociedade de Transportes Colectivos do Porto, S.A.)

Muito recentemente, a Sociedade de Transportes Colectivos do Porto, S.A. (STCP) entendeu concessionar a privados várias linhas da sua rede, abstendo-se de consultar a Comissão de Trabalhadores para o efeito, violando a legislação europeia.

Todo este processo parece ter sido conduzido pela STCP com má-fé, através de esquemas que visam diminuir a procura dos seus próprios serviços para assim justificar a inevitabilidade da concessão a privados, em desrespeito do interesse público e de um modo nada transparente. A Comissão de Trabalhadores não foi ouvida, apesar de estarmos perante mudanças substanciais no funcionamento da empresa, que podem pôr em causa postos de trabalho.

Tendo em conta a legislação europeia existente, nomeadamente o Regulamento (CE) n.° 1370/2007 e a Diretiva 2002/14/CE, solicita-se à Comissão que se pronuncie sobre:

— a validade do contrato em causa, e

— a violação flagrante dos direitos dos trabalhadores.

Pergunta-se ainda à Comissão como pretende agir face a esta situação, e se iniciará uma investigação que esclareça o caso, a bem do interesse público e dos trabalhadores da STCP.

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(9 de dezembro de 2013)

A Comissão não tem competência para intervir em decisões específicas das empresas. No entanto, o empregador tem de informar e consultar os seus empregados antes de tomar decisões que lhes dizem respeito, em conformidade com a legislação da UE e, em especial, com as Diretivas 2002/14/CE ([1]), 2001/23/CE ([2]) e 98/59/CE ([3]). Cabe às autoridades nacionais competentes, nomeadamente os tribunais, assegurar que a legislação nacional que transpõe essas diretivas da UE é correta e eficazmente aplicada pelo empregador em causa, tendo em conta as circunstâncias específicas de cada caso.

([1]) Diretiva 2002/14/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 11 de março de 2002, que estabelece um quadro geral relativo à informação e à consulta dos trabalhadores na Comunidade Europeia, JO L 80 de 23.3.2002.

([2]) Diretiva 2001/23/CE do Conselho, de 12 de março de 2001, relativa à aproximação das legislações dos Estados-Membros respeitantes à manutenção dos direitos dos trabalhadores em caso de transferência de empresas ou de estabelecimentos, ou de partes de empresas ou de estabelecimentos, JO L 82 de 22.3.2001.

([3]) Diretiva 98/59/CE do Conselho, de 20 de julho de 1998, relativa à aproximação das legislações dos Estados-Membros respeitantes aos despedimentos coletivos, JO L 225 de 12.8.1998.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011856/13
to the Commission
Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL) and Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL)
(16 October 2013)

Subject: Violation of EC law by Sociedade de Transportes Colectivos do Porto, S.A. (STCP)

STCP very recently planned to hand over several lines of its network to private companies, failing to consult the Workers' Commission on the matter, in breach of EC law.

This whole process seems to have been conducted by STCP in bad faith, through schemes seeking to reduce demand for its services in order to justify them being inevitably handed over to private companies, going against the public interest in a totally opaque manner. The Workers' Commission has not been consulted, despite being faced with major changes to the way the company operates, which could put jobs at risk.

In view of existing EU legislation, particularly Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 and Directive 2002/14/EC:

What does the Commission have to say about the validity of the contract in question and the flagrant breach of the workers' rights?

What action does the Commission plan to take in view of this situation and will it launch an investigation to clarify matters, in the public interest and for the sake of the workers at STCP?

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

The Commission has no power to interfere in specific company decisions. However, the employer has to inform and consult employees before taking decisions affecting them, in accordance with EC law and in particular Directives 2002/14/EC ([1]), 2001/23/EC ([2]) and 98/59/EC ([3]). It is for the competent national authorities, including the courts, to ensure that the national legislation transposing those Directives is correctly and effectively applied by the employer concerned, having regard to the specific circumstances of each case.

([1]) Directive 2002/14/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2002 establishing a general framework for informing and consulting employees in the European Community, OJ L 80, 23.3.2002.
([2]) Council Directive 2001/23/EC of 12 March 2001 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the safeguarding of employees' rights in the event of transfers of undertakings, businesses or parts of undertakings or businesses, OJ L 82, 22.3.2001.
([3]) Council Directive 98/59/EC of 20 July 1998 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to collective redundancies, OJ L 225, 12.8.1998.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-011858/13
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Bastiaan Belder (EFD)
(17 oktober 2013)

Betreft: VP/HR — Verslag van de Europese Rekenkamer over corruptie en misbruik van EU-steun in de Palestijnse gebieden

Heeft de VV/HV kennis genomen van het artikel in *The Sunday Times* van 13 oktober 2013 [1], waarnaar wordt verwezen in een persbericht van het AJC Transatlantic Institute [2], met betrekking tot een ongepubliceerd verslag van de Rekenkamer waarin uitvoerig wordt beschreven hoe EU-steun aan Palestina tussen 2008 en 2012 is „verspild, verkwist of verloren is gegaan door corruptie"?

Hoe verhouden deze bevindingen zich tot de verklaring van de Hoge Vertegenwoordiger van 22 februari 2013 dat „een strikt en uitgebreid audit- en controlemechanisme (ervoor) zorgt (…) dat de EU de precieze bestemming kan nagaan van elke afzonderlijke euro [3]"?

Is de VV/HV voornemens aan te dringen op onverwijlde publicatie van dit verslag? Is zij het ermee eens dat deze zaak, gezien de ernst ervan en de telkens weer gebleken wijdverbreide corruptie binnen de Palestijnse regering (zoals gedocumenteerd in het rapport van AMAN-Transparancy Palestine van april 2013 [4]), onmiddellijke opheldering en actie vereist?

Welke maatregelen denkt de VV/HV te treffen om degenen die voor dit misbruik verantwoordelijk zijn, om rekenschap te vragen? Is zij bereid een grondig onderzoek in te stellen naar corruptie en misbruik van steun en naar gelang de bevindingen doeltreffende waarborgen in te voeren om ervoor te zorgen dat Europese steun volledig ten bate van de Palestijnse bevolking wordt gebruikt?

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

Het auditverslag waarnaar het geacht Parlementslid lijkt te verwijzen, is nog niet door de Rekenkamer gepubliceerd.

De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter zal derhalve geen opmerkingen maken, tot dit verslag is gepubliceerd, naar verwachting tegen het einde van 2013.

---

(1) Bojan Pancevski, „GBP 1.95bn EU aid lost in Palestine", The Sunday Times, 13 October 2013.
http://www.thesundaytimes.co.uk/sto/news/world_news/Middle_East/article1326858.ece.
(2) „TAI calls for investigation into corruption and misuse of Palestinian aid", 14 October 2013.
http://www.transatlanticinstitute.org/2013/10/14/tai-calls-for-investigation-into-corruption-and-misuse-of-palestinian-aid/.
(3) Antwoord van Vice-voorzitter/Hoge vertegenwoordiger Baroness Ashton namens de Commissie, 22 februari 2013.
(4) „Corruption Report — Palestine 2012", AMAN-Transparency Palestine, April 2013.
http://www.aman-palestine.org/data/uploads/62444af9c6958242d3ff8c0e76d9b03e.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011858/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Bastiaan Belder (EFD)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — European Court of Auditors report documenting corruption and misuse of EU aid in the Palestinian Territories

Has the VP/HR taken note of the article in *The Sunday Times* of 13 October 2013 (1), mentioned in a press release by the AJC Transatlantic Institute (2), regarding an unpublished report by the Court of Auditors detailing how EU aid to Palestine has been 'misspent, squandered or lost to corruption' between 2008 and 2012?

How do the findings relate to the statement by the High Representative on 22 February 2013 that 'a strict and extensive mechanism of audit and verification is in place which allows the European Union to verify the precise destination of every single Euro'? (3)

Will the VP/HR consider insisting on the immediate release of the report to the public? Does she agree that, given the severity of the matter and the long-standing evidence of widespread corruption within the Palestinian Government (as documented in the April 2013 report by AMAN-Transparency Palestine (4)), this requires immediate clarification and action?

What measures does the VP/HR envisage to hold those responsible for the abuses accountable? Is she willing to launch a full investigation into corruption and misuse of aid and, depending on the findings, implement effective safeguards to ensure that European aid is being used for the full benefit of the Palestinian people?

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

The Performance Audit which the Honourable Member appears to allude to has not yet been published by the Court.

The HR/VP has therefore no comments to make until such time as it shall have been published, estimated to be by the end of 2013.

---

(1) Bojan Pancevski, 'GBP 1.95bn EU aid lost in Palestine', The Sunday Times, 13 October 2013. http://www.thesundaytimes.co.uk/sto/news/world_news/Middle_East/article1326858.ece
(2) 'TAI calls for investigation into corruption and misuse of Palestinian aid', 14 October 2013. http://www.transatlanticinstitute.org/2013/10/14/tai-calls-for-investigation-into-corruption-and-misuse-of-palestinian-aid/
(3) Answer given by Vice-President/High Representative Baroness Ashton on behalf of the Commission, 22 February 2013.
(4) 'Corruption Report — Palestine 2012', AMAN-Transparency Palestine, April 2013. http://www.aman-palestine.org/data/uploads/62444af9c6958242d3ff8c0e76d9b03e.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011859/13
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(17 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Misure che intende apportare la Commissione per tutelare i lavoratori della «Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena»

La Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena (MPS), nata nel 1472, costituisce, assieme alle altre società consorelle, la terza realtà italiana per numero di filiali. L'operatività del gruppo, oltre all'attività bancaria tradizionale, copre l'asset management, il private banking (fondi comuni di investimento mobiliari, gestioni patrimoniali, fondi pensione e polizze vita) e l'investment banking oltre alla finanza innovativa d'impresa (project finance, merchant banking e consulenza finanziaria).

Al 4 febbraio 2011 risultava essere la quarta banca italiana nella classifica delle prime 15 a maggiore capitalizzazione tra quelle quotate sulla borsa nazionale. MPS chiude il 2011 con una perdita netta di 4,69 miliardi di euro. Nell'assemblea dei soci del 27 aprile 2012, su indicazione della Fondazione MPS, viene nominato presidente del consiglio di amministrazione della banca Alessandro Profumo, mentre amministratore delegato diviene Fabrizio Viola, che da gennaio 2012 è anche direttore generale.

Il 27 giugno 2012 viene approvato il nuovo piano di riassetto del gruppo Monte dei Paschi di Siena, fortemente improntato alla riduzione dei costi e alla razionalizzazione. Il 7 ottobre 2013 il consiglio di amministrazione ha votato per il piano di ristrutturazione di MPS che prevede, entro il 2017, un maxi aumento di capitale pari a 2,5 miliardi di euro. Il piano prevede ingenti tagli sia sul personale che sulle filiali. Infatti sono previsti 8.000 esuberi su di un totale di 30.000 dipendenti e la chiusura di 550 filiali (il 25 % sul totale). Il 30 giugno 2013 ci sono già stati 2700 esuberi e a fine settembre 400 sportelli hanno cessato di esistere. L'obiettivo è di realizzare un risparmio sul costo del personale di circa 500 milioni di euro. La riduzione dei dipendenti, si legge nella nota del CdA, si dovrebbe ottenere attraverso operazioni industriali di cessione delle attività non strategiche e di esternalizzazione.

Intende la Commissione introdurre, in occasione della prossima programmazione e della revisione del FSE, un Fondo di emergenza destinato a sostenere lavoratori come quelli della «Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena»?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(16 dicembre 2013)

Il Fondo sociale europeo (FSE) mira a migliorare le possibilità di occupazione, a promuovere l'istruzione e l'apprendimento permanente nonché a elaborare politiche di inclusione attiva a norma dell'articolo 162 del trattato. Di per sé il FSE non fornisce alcun sostegno di emergenza ai lavoratori, quali i dipendenti della Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena (MPS). I lavoratori interessati possono tuttavia beneficiare delle attività cofinanziate dal FSE e, se sono soddisfatte le condizioni necessarie, dal Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG).

La Commissione ricorda che la mobilitazione del FEG in base al criterio della crisi economica è stata possibile solo fino alla fine del 2011. Sulla scorta dell'esperienza acquisita nel periodo 2007-2013 la Commissione ha adottato una proposta relativa al FEG (2014-2020) che ha ricevuto l'accordo preliminare di Parlamento e Consiglio. Tale proposta contempla la possibilità di utilizzare nuovamente il criterio della crisi economica ai fini della mobilitazione del FEG e, se confermata all'atto dell'adozione formale del progetto di regolamento, consentirà all'Italia di chiedere il sostegno del FEG per i lavoratori interessati a partire da gennaio 2014.

La Commissione invita l'onorevole parlamentare a contattare il referente del FEG per l'Italia ([1]) al fine di ottenere informazioni sulla possibilità di mobilitare il FEG nel caso in questione.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011859/13
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Measures the Commission intends to introduce to protect the employees of the 'Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena'

The Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena (MPS), founded in 1472, represents, together with its sister companies, the third biggest entity in Italy in terms of number of branches. In addition to traditional banking, the group's activities include asset management, private banking (investment funds, asset management, pension funds and life insurance) and investment banking, as well as innovative corporate finance (project finance, merchant banking and financial consultancy).

On 4 February 2011, it was ranked fourth out of the 15 Italian banks with the greatest capitalisation, listed on the national stock exchange. MPS finished 2011 with a net loss of EUR 4.69 billion. During the shareholders' meeting of 27 April 2012, on the recommendation of the MPS Foundation, Alessandro Profumo was appointed Chairman of the Board of Directors at the bank, while Fabrizio Viola, who had been Managing Director since January 2012, was named Chief Executive Officer.

On 27 June 2012, the reorganisation plan for the Monte dei Paschi di Siena group was approved. This plan is marked by a reduction of costs and rationalisation. On 7 October 2013, the board of directors voted in favour of the MPS restructuring plan which stipulates a maximum capital increase of EUR 2.5 billion by 2017. The plan provides for huge cuts in both personnel and the number of branches. Indeed, the plan calls for 8 000 redundancies out of a total of 30 000 employees and the closure of 550 branches (25% of the total). On 30 June 2013, there had already been 2 700 redundancies and 400 branches had been closed by the end of September. The objective is to achieve a reduction in personnel costs of around EUR 500 million. According to the minutes of the meeting of the board of directors, the staff cuts should be achieved through industrial operations to terminate non-strategic activities and externalisation.

When planning and revising the ESF, does the Commission intend to introduce an emergency fund aimed at supporting workers, such as those of the Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena?

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

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

The Commission recalls that mobilisation of the EGF on the basis of the economic crisis criterion was possible only until the end of 2011. Building on the experience during the 2007-2013 period, the Commission adopted a proposal on the EGF (2014-2020) on which Parliament and Council have reached preliminary agreement. The latter includes the possibility to use again the economic crisis criterion to mobilise the EGF. If this is confirmed when the draft regulation is formally adopted, Italy may apply for EGF support for the workers concerned as from January 2014.

The Commission would invite the Honourable Member to contact Italy's EGF Contact Point ([1]) and enquire about the possibility to mobilise the EGF in the case in question.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор P-011860/13
до Комисията
Dimitar Stoyanov (NI)
(17 октомври 2013 г.)

Относно: Бежански поток вследствие на конфликта в Сирия

Всеки ден нови 100 лица, които твърдят, че са бежанци от Сирия, навлизат на територията на Европейския съюз през българо-турската граница. Сирийците, пребиваващи на територията на България, вече са над 7 000 души. Възможностите на страната да приема, настанява и да се грижи за този наплив вече са изчерпани. Постоянно расте социалното напрежение, породено от факта, че издръжката на едно лице струва над 1 000 лв. по данни на държавните власти, докато стотици хиляди български пенсионери мизерстват с по 200 лв. пенсия, а Здравната каса не може да осигури на стотици раково болни жизнено необходимите им лекарства поради „липса на средства". Хигиенните условията в центровете за задържане са на критичния минимум, което води до риск от избухване на епидемии. Капацитетът на българските власти да разграничават истинските бежанци от икономически емигранти също е недостатъчен. Има сериозни опасения, че заедно с прииждащите, които наистина имат нужда от помощ, навлизат и лица, които могат да бъдат потенциални терористи. Последното е особено тревожно, като се вземе предвид, че България е последната държава от ЕС, на чиято територия беше извършен атентат от ислямисти. ЕС набра фонд от 2 млрд. евро за справяне с последствията от сирийската криза. Половината от тези средства са предоставени от държавите членки. Поради изложеното се обръщам към Комисията със следните въпроси:

1. България предоставила ли е средства в рамките на този 1 млрд. евро, набран от държавите членки и ако е предоставила — колко?

2. Колко са изразходваните средства от фонда за сирийската криза към момента?

3. Смята ли Европейската комисия да предостави на България безвъзмездна помощ от фонда за сирийската криза и в какви срокове?

Отговор, даден от г-жа Малмстрьом от името на Комисията
(12 декември 2013 г.)

На първо място следва да бъде пояснено, че ЕС не е създал специален фонд за справяне с последствията от кризата в Сирия. От своя страна, държавите членки (ДЧ) не са предоставяли средства за подобна инициатива.

ЕС и ДЧ съвместно събраха 2 млрд. EUR, от които 943 млн. EUR от група специални фондове на ЕС, под формата на хуманитарна помощ и помощ за развитие с цел подкрепа на дейностите в Сирия и съседните държави ([1]). България е осигурила двустранно 295 874 EUR от тези 2 млрд. EUR.

С хуманитарната помощ на ЕС се подпомагат предимно животоспасяващи дейности при спешни случаи ([2]), за да се помогне на най-уязвимите семейства. В региона се предоставя също така помощ за развитие за посрещане на по-дългосрочните нужди на засегнатото население с цел да се подкрепи стабилността в съседните държави и да се намали напрежението между бежанците и местните общности. ([3])

Комисията, подпомагана от Frontex и Европейската служба за подкрепа в областта на убежището (ЕСПОУ), внимателно следи ситуацията в България. Видът на помощта, която може да бъде предоставена, варира от финансова подкрепа до помощ в натура чрез ЕСПОУ, например чрез разгръщане на място на екипите за подкрепа в областта на убежището, за да се окаже съдействие на органите на ДЧ при изграждането на капацитет и качество. Такава помощ може да бъде оказана, ако бъде поискана от органите на ДЧ.

Комисията е в процес на обсъждане на тези възможности с българските власти. На 17 декември 2013 г. бе подписан оперативен план между ЕСПОУ и България, като бе отделено по-специално внимание на разширяването и подобряването на приемния капацитет на България и на нейния капацитет за обработване на молбите за предоставяне на закрила от българската Държавна агенция за бежанците. Налице е финансова подкрепа (Решение на ЕК C(2013) 8558 final от 28 ноември 2013 г.), която се основава на нуждите на България.

([1]) Ливан, Йордания, Ирак и Турция.
([2]) Това включва животоспасяващи дейности при спешни медицински случаи, осигуряването на основни лекарства, храна и продоволствие, питейна вода, санитарни и хигиенни условия, подслон, предоставяне на нехранителни стоки от първа необходимост и защита.
([3]) Например образование, професионално обучение, подкрепа за поминъка и създаване на работни места, основни услуги и инфраструктура и др.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011860/13
to the Commission
Dimitar Stoyanov (NI)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Inflow of refugees as a result of the conflict in Syria

People claiming to be refugees from Syria are crossing the Turkish-Bulgarian border into the European Union at a rate of 100 a day. Already, more than 7 000 Syrians have arrived in Bulgaria and the country's capacity to receive, accommodate and provide for this influx is stretched to the limit. Social tension is gradually mounting because, according to Government figures, upkeep for the refugees is costing BGN 1 000 per head at a time when hundreds of thousands of Bulgarian pensioners are eking out an existence on pensions of BGN 200 and the health insurance system has 'insufficient resources' to cover the cost of vital medicines for hundreds of cancer patients.

In the refugee reception centres, hygiene conditions are basic in the extreme, creating a risk of outbreaks of disease. Moreover, the Bulgarian authorities do not have the capacity to distinguish genuine refugees from economic migrants, and there is a serious danger that, alongside those actually in need of help, the surge of incomers may include potential terrorists. This is a particular cause for alarm given that the most recent terrorist attack by Islamic extremists in the EU took place on Bulgarian soil. The EU has set up a EUR 2 billion fund for coping with the consequences of the Syrian crisis. Half the money was supplied by the Member States. I therefore have a number of questions for the Commission.

1. Did Bulgaria provide any part of the EUR 1 billion contributed by the Member States and, if so, how much?

2. How much of the Syrian crisis fund has been spent to date?

3. Does the Commission intend to grant Bulgaria assistance from the Syrian crisis fund free of charge and, if so, how soon will it do so?

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

It should first be clarified that the EU has not set up a dedicated fund for coping with the consequences of the Syrian crisis. In turn, Member States (MS) have not supplied funds to such an initiative.

The EU and the MS combined have so far mobilised EUR 2 billion — of which EUR 943 million from a number of dedicated EU financial lines — in humanitarian aid and development assistance to support activities in Syria and the neighbouring countries ([1]). Bulgaria has bilaterally provided EUR 295 874 out of the EUR 2 billion.

The EU humanitarian assistance primarily supports life-saving emergency responses ([2]) to help the most vulnerable families. Development assistance is also provided in the region to address longer term needs ([3]) of the affected population to support the stability of the neighbouring countries and mitigate tensions between refugees and host communities.

The Commission, assisted by Frontex and the European Asylum Support Office (EASO), is closely following the situation in Bulgaria. The kind of assistance that can be provided ranges from financial support to assistance in kind through EASO, for instance through deployment of asylum support teams to assist the authorities of the MS with capacity and quality building. Such assistance can be rendered if it is requested by the authorities of the MS.

The Commission is currently discussing these possibilities with the Bulgarian authorities. On 17 October 2013 an EASO-Bulgaria Operating Plan was signed, with particular attention to the enlargement and improvement of Bulgaria's reception capacity and its capacity to process claims for protection by the Bulgarian State Agency for Refugees. Financial support is made available (EC Decision C(2013) 8558 final, 28 November 2013) based on Bulgaria's needs.

([1]) Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq and Turkey.
([2]) This includes life-saving medical emergency responses, the provision of essential medicines, food and nutritional items, safe water, sanitation and hygiene, shelter, distribution of basic non-food items and protection.
([3]) E.g. Education, vocational training, support to livelihoods and job creation, basic services and infrastructures, etc.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011861/13
alla Commissione
Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Oreste Rossi (PPE), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Mara Bizzotto (EFD) e Clemente Mastella (PPE)
(17 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Gestione affidamento appalti per servizi autostradali nella Repubblica slovacca

La gestione degli appalti per la fornitura dei servizi autostradali in Slovacchia è affidata alla compagnia statale National Motorway Company (NDS). Nel giugno e nell'agosto 2012 la NDS ha indetto gare d'appalto per la costruzione di alcune tratte sulle due arterie autostradali principali, la D1 e D3, un progetto cofinanziato da diversi fondi dell'UE. Ad oggi, ancora nessun lotto è stato assegnato. Intanto sono stati presentati numerosi ricorsi all'Ufficio responsabile per gli appalti (UVO) per ingiusta esclusione. Ad esempio, nel caso della joint venture INC-HANT, esclusa dall'appalto dopo aver presentato l'offerta migliore, la NDS ha ignorato le disposizioni dell'UVO di riammissione del consorzio, perseverando sulle proprie posizioni e causando uno stallo nella fornitura dei servizi pubblici. Già nel 2010 la Commissione europea aveva ammonito con un parere motivato la pratica della NDS di escludere dall'appalto i consorzi vincitori (in quell'occasione, Kapsch TrafficCom, ToSy e Slovakpass) a favore dell'offerta più costosa. In quell'occasione, la CE ha denunciato i rischi di chiusura del mercato e di spreco di risorse pubbliche. Dopo pochi mesi, nel maggio 2011, il ministro dei Trasporti ha deposto il direttore della NDS per la conclusione di contratti dubbi. La Commissione:

1. ritiene opportuno chiedere alla NDS, in quanto società di gestione di interesse economico generale, in virtù dell'articolo 106, paragrafo 2, del TFUE, di fornire le motivazioni del blocco di fatto nell'assegnazione degli appalti e dell'indifferenza ai richiami dell'UVO?

2. Non ritiene che tale comportamento possa configurare delle violazioni agli articoli 101 e 102 del TFUE in materia di concorrenza e una consequenziale chiusura del mercato interno?

Risposta di Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione
(13 dicembre 2013)

L'articolo 106 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea (TFUE) impone alle imprese pubbliche di conformarsi alle regole di concorrenza e può essere applicato unicamente in combinato disposto con altre disposizioni del TFUE, come ad esempio gli articoli 101 e 102 del TFUE in materia di diritto della concorrenza e l'articolo 107 del TFEU riguardante gli aiuti di Stato.

L'articolo 101 del TFEU non può essere applicato al comportamento unilaterale di un'impresa, poiché presuppone un accordo, una decisione o una pratica concordata tra due o più imprese. Le informazioni fornite dagli onorevoli deputati non sembrano indicare un abuso di posizione dominante ai sensi dell'articolo 102 del TFEU.

Il caso precedente citato dagli onorevoli deputati non riguardava un appalto di lavori, bensì un appalto pubblico di servizi per la riscossione elettronica del pedaggio. L'indagine si basava su una possibile violazione della direttiva 2004/18/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 31 marzo 2004, relativa al coordinamento delle procedure di aggiudicazione degli appalti pubblici di lavori, di forniture e di servizi.

I servizi della Commissione sono disposti a esaminare eventuali altri elementi sostanziali sottoposti alla loro attenzione che dimostrino una possibile violazione delle norme antitrust o delle norme europee in materia di appalti pubblici nelle nuove gare d'appalto indette dalla NDS nel 2012.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011861/13
do Komisji
Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Oreste Rossi (PPE), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Mara Bizzotto (EFD) oraz Clemente Mastella (PPE)
(17 października 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Zarządzanie udzielaniem zamówień na usługi autostradowe w Republice Słowackiej

Zarządzanie udzielaniem zamówień na świadczenie usług autostradowych w Słowacji zostało powierzone przedsiębiorstwu państwowemu National Motorway Company (NDS). W czerwcu i w sierpniu 2012 r. NDS ogłosiło przetargi na budowę kilku odcinków dwóch głównych autostrad, D1 i D3, w ramach projektu współfinansowanego z różnych funduszy UE. Do dzisiaj żaden z tych przetargów nie został rozstrzygnięty. W tym czasie do Urzędu Zamówień Publicznych (UVO) zostały złożone liczne skargi w związku z niesłusznym wykluczeniem z przetargu. Przykładowo w przypadku spółki joint venture INC–HANT, wykluczonej z przetargu po przedstawieniu najlepszej oferty, NDS zignorowało wydane przez UVO zarządzenie ponownego dopuszczenia konsorcjum do przetargu, nie zmieniając swojej pozycji i powodując zablokowanie świadczenia usług publicznych. Już w 2010 r. Komisja Europejska w umotywowanej opinii udzieliła NDS upomnienia w związku ze stosowaną przez nią praktyką wykluczania z przetargu zwycięskich konsorcjów (w tym przypadku chodziło o firmy Kapsch TrafficCom, ToSy i Slovakpass) i wybierania droższej oferty. Komisja wskazała wówczas na ryzyko zamknięcia rynku i marnotrawstwa środków publicznych. Po kilku miesiącach, w maju 2011 r., Minister Transportu odwołał ze stanowiska dyrektora NDS za zawarcie umów budzących zastrzeżenia. Czy Komisja:

1. uważa za właściwe zażądać od NDS jako od spółki zarządzającej usługami świadczonymi w ogólnym interesie gospodarczym, zgodnie z art. 106 ust. 2 TFUE, przedstawienia uzasadnienia faktycznego zablokowania udzielania zamówień i braku reakcji na wezwania UVO?

2. nie uważa, że takie postępowanie może stanowić naruszenie art. 101 i 102 TFUE w dziedzinie konkurencji, a w konsekwencji powodować zamknięcie rynku wewnętrznego?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Joaquína Almunię w imieniu Komisji
(13 grudnia 2013 r.)

Zgodnie z art. 106 Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej (TFUE) przedsiębiorstwa publiczne są zobowiązane przestrzegać przepisów prawa konkurencji stosowanych w połączeniu z innymi przepisami TFUE, takimi jak art. 101 i 102 TFUE w dziedzinie prawa konkurencji i art. 107 TFUE w dziedzinie pomocy państwa.

Jednostronne zachowanie przedsiębiorstwa nie podlega art. 101 TFUE, który wymaga porozumienia, decyzji lub praktyki uzgodnionej między co najmniej dwoma przedsiębiorstwami. Informacje przekazane przez szanownych Panów Posłów nie zdają się wskazywać na nadużycie pozycji dominującej w rozumieniu art. 102 TFUE.

Poprzednia sprawa, o której wspominają szanowni Panowie Posłowie, nie dotyczyła zamówień publicznych na roboty budowlane, ale zamówienia publicznego na usługi w zakresie elektronicznego poboru opłat. Postępowanie oparte było na możliwym naruszeniu dyrektywy 2004/18/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 31 marca 2004 r. w sprawie koordynacji procedur udzielania zamówień publicznych na roboty budowlane, dostawy i usługi.

Służby Komisji są gotowe dokonać oceny wszelkich przedłożonych im istotnych informacji wskazujących na możliwość naruszenia zasad ochrony konkurencji albo europejskich przepisów dotyczących udzielania zamówień publicznych w nowych przetargach ogłoszonych przez NDS w 2012 r.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011861/13
adresată Comisiei
Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Oreste Rossi (PPE), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Mara Bizzotto (EFD) şi Clemente Mastella (PPE)
(17 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Gestionarea procedurilor de atribuire a contractelor pentru serviciile pe autostrăzi în Republica Slovacă

Gestionarea contractelor pentru furnizarea de servicii pe autostrăzi în Slovacia este încredințată companiei de stat National Motorway Company (NDS). În iunie și în august 2012, NDS a inițiat invitații de participare la procedura de ofertare pentru construirea unor tronsoane pe cele două artere principale de autostradă, D1 și D3, un proiect cofinanțat din diverse fonduri ale UE. Până în prezent, nu a fost atribuit niciun lot. Totuși, din cauza unei excluderi neîntemeiate, au fost introduse acțiuni la Biroul responsabil cu atribuirea contractelor (UVO). De exemplu, în cazul întreprinderii comune INC-HANT, exclusă de la atribuirea contractului după ce a prezentat cea mai bună ofertă, NDS a ignorat dispozițiile UVO de readmitere a consorțiului, menținându-și poziția și cauzând o situație de blocaj în furnizarea serviciilor publice. În 2010, Comisia Europeană sancționase deja, printr-un aviz motivat, practica NDS de a exclude de la atribuirea de contracte consorțiile câștigătoare (în acel context Kapsch TrafficCom, ToSy și Slovakpass) în favoarea ofertei celei mai costisitoare. Cu acea ocazie, Comisia Europeană a denunțat riscurile de închidere a pieței și de risipire a unor resurse publice. După câteva luni, în mai 2011, ministrul transporturilor l-a delegat pe directorul NDS pentru încheierea unor contracte echivoce. Comisia:

1. consideră oportun să solicite NDS, în calitate de societate de gestionare a interesului economic general, în temeiul articolului 106 alineatul (2) din TFUE, să furnizeze motivații ale stării de fapt privind atribuirea contractelor și ale indiferenței față de reclamațiile UVO?

2. nu consideră că acest comportament poate determina încălcarea articolelor 101 și 102 din TFUE în materie de concurență și închiderea în consecință a pieței interne?

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

Articolul 106 din Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene (TFUE) prevede că întreprinderile publice se supun regulilor de concurență; acest articol poate fi pus în aplicare numai în strânsă legătură cu celelalte dispoziții ale tratatului, precum articolele 101 și 102 din TFUE în materie de concurență și articolul 107 din TFUE privind ajutoarele de stat.

Comportamentul unilateral al unei întreprinderi nu poate intra sub incidența articolului 101 din TFUE, prin care sunt interzise orice acorduri, decizii ale asocierilor de întreprinderi și orice practici concertate între două sau mai multe întreprinderi Informațiile furnizate de distinșii membri nu par să indice folosirea în mod abuziv a unei poziții dominante, în sensul articolului 102 din TFUE.

Cazul anterior menționat de distinșii membri nu se referă la contracte privind executarea de lucrări, ci la un contract privind prestarea de servicii publice pentru sistemele de taxare rutieră electronică. Investigațiile au avut ca obiect o posibilă încălcare a Directivei 2004/18/CE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 31 martie 2004 privind coordonarea procedurilor de atribuire a contractelor de achiziții publice de lucrări, de bunuri și de servicii.

Serviciile Comisiei sunt pregătite să evalueze eventualele elemente importante care le sunt prezentate, care să demonstreze o posibilă încălcare a normelor antitrust sau a normelor europene în materie de achiziții publice în cadrul noilor cereri de oferte lansate de NDS în 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011861/13
to the Commission
Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Oreste Rossi (PPE), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Mara Bizzotto (EFD) and Clemente Mastella (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: The management of the awarding of contracts for motorway services in the Slovak Republic

The management of contracts for the provision of motorway services in Slovakia has been entrusted to a state company, the National Motorway Company (NDS). In June and August 2012, the NDS announced a call for tenders for the construction of certain stretches of the two main arterial motorways, the D1 and D3, a project co-financed by various EU funds. As of today, no lot has yet been awarded. Meanwhile, there have been a number of appeals lodged with the Office in charge of contracts (UVO) on grounds of unfair exclusion. For example, in the case of the INC-HANT joint venture, which was excluded from the contract after having presented the best offer, the NDS ignored the stipulations of the UVO to readmit the consortium, maintaining its position and thus causing deadlock in the provision of public services. Back in 2010, the Commission issued a warning with a reasoned opinion concerning the NDS practice of excluding victorious consortia from contracts (in that case Kapsch TrafficCom, ToSy and Slovakpass) in favour of the most expensive bid. On that occasion, the EU deplored the risks of closing the market and wasting public resources. A few months later, in May 2011, the Minister of Transport dismissed the head of the NDS for having concluded questionable contracts. Can the Commission state:

1. whether it should ask the NDS, a management company of general economic interest, as per Article 106(2) of the TFEU, to provide reasons for its de facto obstruction of the awarding of contracts and its indifference towards the reprimands issued by the UVO?

2. Whether it believes that such behaviour could represent violations of Articles 101 and 102 of the TFEU in terms of competition and the resultant closure of the internal market?

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

Article 106 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) requires public undertakings to comply with the rules on competition and can only be applied in conjunction with other provisions of the TFEU, such as Articles 101 and 102 TFEU in the field of competition law and Articles 107 TFEU in respect of state aid.

The unilateral behaviour of one undertaking cannot be caught by Article 101 TFEU, which requires an agreement, decision or concerted practice between two or more undertakings. The information provided by the Honourable Members does not appear to indicate an abuse of dominant position within the meaning of Article 102 TFEU.

The previous case the Honourable Members mention did not concern works contracts but a public service contract for Electronic Toll Collection. The investigation was based on a possible violation of Directive 2004/18/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004 on the coordination of procedures for the award of public works contracts, public supply contracts and public service contracts.

The services of the Commission are ready to assess any substantial elements submitted to them demonstrating a possible violation of either antitrust rules or European public procurement rules in the new calls for tender launched by NDS in 2012.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-011862/13
til Kommissionen
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(17. oktober 2013)

Om: Hurtig færdiggørelse af de reviderede miljørammebestemmelser om statsstøtte

Med henvisning til den igangværende revision af statsstøttepolitikken opfordrer jeg hermed Kommissionen til snarest muligt at færdiggøre arbejdet med formuleringen af de reviderede miljørammebestemmelser.

Idet jeg henviser til den aktuelle problematik som følge af forsinkelsen af udformningen af miljørammebestemmelserne og dennes udsættende effekt på den danske regerings arbejde med formuleringen af støtteordninger til sikring af energieffektiviseringer hos energitunge virksomheder (jf. Vækstplan DK), der risikerer at have vidtgående konsekvenser for det danske gartnerierhverv, fremsætter jeg hermed følgende spørgsmål til Kommissionen:

1. Hvornår forventer Kommissionen, at den endelige lovgivning foreligger i vedtaget form?

2. Hvorledes vil Kommissionen søge at fremme en hurtig færdiggørelse af arbejdet med de reviderede miljørammebestemmelser?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Joaquín Almunia
(13. december 2013)

De gældende retningslinjer for miljø- og energistøtte udløber den 31. december 2014, og de nye retningslinjer forventes derfor vedtaget i løbet af 2014.

Der er allerede gennemført to offentlige høringer: den første i efteråret 2012 med fokus på de eksisterende retningslinjer og den anden i marts 2013 om et debatoplæg med de vigtigste emner for revisionen.

Kommissionen vil gennemføre endnu en offentlig høring om det reviderede udkast til retningslinjerne. Bidragene fra denne høring vil indgå i udarbejdelsen af det endelige udkast, som derefter vil blive fremsat til vedtagelse af Kommissionen. Kommissionen gennemfører denne proces så hurtigt som muligt.

Kommissionen bemærker desuden, at de gældende retningslinjer for miljøbeskyttelsesstøtte allerede tillader støtte til energieffektiviseringer og støtte i form af lempelser af energiafgifter på visse betingelser. Ligeledes kan energitunge virksomheder i visse sektorer i henhold til ETS-retningslinjerne blive delvist kompenseret for deres indirekte CO_2-omkostninger (som sendes videre fra elforsyningsselskaberne).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011862/13
to the Commission
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Swift completion of the revised environmental aid guidelines

With regard to the review of state aid policy that is currently underway, I would urge the Commission to complete the work of drafting the revised environmental aid guidelines as soon as possible.

With reference to the current problems resulting from the delay in developing the environmental aid guidelines and the suspensive effect of this on the work of the Danish Government to develop aid schemes to ensure an improvement in energy efficiency among energy-intensive undertakings (cf. *Vækstplan DK* [Growth Plan DK]), which runs the risk of having far-reaching consequences for the Danish horticulture industry, I would like to ask the Commission the following questions:

1. When does it expect the definitive legislation to be adopted?

2. How will it seek to promote the swift completion of the work of revising the environmental aid guidelines?

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

The new Guidelines on environmental and energy aid are expected to be adopted in the course of 2014, since the currently applicable Guidelines expire on 31 December 2014.

Two public consultations have already taken place: the first in autumn 2012 with a focus on the existing Guidelines and the second on a discussion paper setting out the main topics for revision in March 2013.

The Commission will conduct a further public consultation on the revised draft of the Guidelines. The comments received during this consultation will be taken into account in preparing the final draft, which will then be tabled for adoption by the Commission. The Commission is conducting this process as swiftly as possible.

The Commission notes that the currently applicable Environmental Aid Guidelines already allow aid for energy-efficiency measures and aid in the form of tax reductions from energy taxes under certain conditions. Similarly, under the ETS Guidelines, energy-intensive undertakings from certain sectors can be partly compensated for their indirect CO_2 costs (which are passed on by electricity suppliers).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011863/13
an die Kommission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(17. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Energie-Subventionen

In der Europäischen Union profitieren die verschiedenen Energieträger von staatlichen Förderungen.

Diese Subventionen wurden bisher allerdings noch nicht von der Kommission offiziell dargelegt.

Um die korrekte und zügige Vollendung des europäischen Energiebinnenmarkts bis zum Jahr 2014, eine verantwortungsbewusste Energiewende weg von fossilen hin zu klimafreundlichen Energien sowie die größtmögliche Wirksamkeit der staatlichen Eingriffe im Energiebereich sicherzustellen, ist der Transparenz höchste Priorität einzuräumen.

1. Inwieweit entsprechen die kürzlich zu Tage gekommen Zahlen — 30 Mrd. EUR für erneuerbare Energien, 35 Mrd. EUR für Atomenergie und 26 Mrd. EUR für fossile Energieträger — der Realität?

2. Sollte es sich dabei um „nicht gesicherte Summen" handeln: Welche staatlichen Subventionen werden gegenwärtig für die einzelnen Energieträger aufgewendet?

3. Sollte noch keine gerechtfertigte Auflistung der staatlichen Subventionen im Energiebereich bestehen: Wann und wie gedenkt die Kommission sie offiziell vorzulegen, um größtmögliche Transparenz und somit eine gerechte Förderung der diversen Energieträger zu gewährleisten?

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

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage P-11809/2013 ([1]) von Herrn J. Leinen.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011863/13
to the Commission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Energy subsidies

In the European Union, the various energy sources benefit from state funding.

However, these subsidies have not as yet been set out officially by the Commission.

In order to ensure the proper and expeditious completion of the European internal energy market by 2014 and a responsible switch from fossil fuels to climate-friendly sources of energy, and to make sure that state interventions in the energy sector are as effective as possible, transparency must be given top priority.

1. To what extent do the figures that have recently been disclosed — EUR 30 billion for renewable energy, EUR 35 billion for nuclear energy and EUR 26 billion for fossil fuels — reflect reality?

2. If these are 'unverified sums', what state subsidies are currently going to the individual energy sources?

3. If no legitimate list of state subsidies in the energy sector exists as yet, when and how does the Commission intend to formally present one in order to ensure the greatest possible degree of transparency and thus the equitable promotion of the various energy sources?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-11809/2013 ([1]) by Mr J. Leinen.

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

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011865/13
a la Comisión
Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D)
(17 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Ayuda europea al Reino de Marruecos

Recientemente, la Comisión Europea (Nota de prensa: IP/13/795) ha anunciado que va a conceder una ayuda de 110 millones de euros para el sector agrícola y la cobertura médica universal del Reino de Marruecos, de los cuales 60 millones irán destinados al sector agrícola, y estos se distribuirán preferentemente a explotaciones pequeñas y familiares.

1. ¿Cuál ha sido el volumen de ayudas concedidas por la Comisión Europea al Reino de Marruecos durante el periodo 2009-2013?

2. ¿Cuál ha sido el volumen de ayudas al sector agroalimentario del Reino de Marruecos en el periodo 2009-2013?

3. ¿Cuál es el desglose por subsectores de las ayudas concedidas al sector agroalimentario del Reino de Marruecos?

4. ¿Ha realizado la Comisión algún estudio de impacto en puestos de trabajo creados o incremento del PIB como efecto de las ayudas concedidas al Reino de Marruecos?

Respuesta del Sr. Füle en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de diciembre de 2013)

1. Entre 2009 y el primer semestre de 2013, la UE ha comprometido 786 millones EUR en el contexto de su cooperación bilateral con Marruecos. Este importe incluye subvenciones a las organizaciones de la sociedad civil, el suministro de asistencia técnica a las autoridades marroquíes, pagos efectuados en el entorno de los programas de apoyo sectorial así como subvenciones para la construcción de infraestructuras al amparo del Mecanismo de Apoyo a la Inversión en los Países Vecinos.

2. y 3. La UE está prestando ayuda tanto al desarrollo rural como al sector agrícola en la agricultura a pequeña escala dentro de un programa que apoya el segundo pilar del Plan Marruecos Verde, es decir, la estrategia de desarrollo agrícola de Marruecos (el primer pilar del Plan Marruecos Verde tiene como finalidad prestar apoyo al sector empresarial agrícola a gran escala, al cual la UE no ha concedido ayuda nunca). La ayuda concedida al desarrollo rural desde 2009 asciende a 48 millones EUR.

En 2013, la UE ha comprometido 70 millones EUR para prestar apoyo a la segunda fase de la estrategia de desarrollo agrícola de Marruecos y al funcionamiento de la Agencia Nacional de Servicios de Asesoría Agrícola.

4. En 2013, la UE inició una evaluación de sus actividades de apoyo presupuestario en Marruecos junto con una serie de agencias de cooperación de los Estados miembros (Francia, Bélgica y España). Si bien que la evaluación no analiza específicamente la contribución de estas actividades al número de puestos de trabajo o al crecimiento del PIB, sí que analizará el impacto de las actividades de la UE sobre las reformas (gobernanza pública, reformas económicas, reformas sociales, etc) y su potencial de mejora de la gobernanza democrática y del crecimiento económico. Se espera que los resultados de esta evaluación se publiquen en abril de 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011865/13
to the Commission
Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: European aid to the Kingdom of Morocco

Recently, in Press release: IP/13/795, the Commission announced that it will grant EUR 110 million of aid to the Kingdom of Morocco for the agricultural sector and universal health coverage. EUR 60 million will go to the agricultural sector, to be distributed with preference to small and family farms.

1. How much aid has the Commission granted to the Kingdom of Morocco in the period 2009-2013?

2. What was the volume of aid to the agri-food sector in the Kingdom of Morocco in the period 2009-2013?

3. What is the breakdown by sub-sector of aid granted to the agri-food sector in the Kingdom of Morocco?

4. Has the Commission conducted any impact study on the number of jobs created or the increase in GDP resulting from the aid granted to the Kingdom of Morocco?

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

1. Between 2009 and the first half of 2013, the EU has committed EUR 786 million in the context of its bilateral cooperation with Morocco. This amount includes grants to civil society organisations, the provision of technical assistance to the Moroccan authorities, payments made in the context of sector support programmes as well as grants for infrastructure construction in the context of the Neighbourhood Investment Facility.

2 and 3. The EU is aiding both rural development and the agricultural sector in small-scale farming in the context of a programme supporting the second pilar of the 'Plan Maroc Vert', i.e. the Moroccan agricultural development strategy (the first pilar of the 'Plan Maroc Vert' aims to support large-scale/agri-business sector in Morocco, which the EU has never supported). Aid granted to rural development since 2009 amounts to EUR 48 million.

In 2013, the EU has committed EUR 70 million to support the second phase of the Moroccan Agricultural Development Strategy and the implementation of the National Agency for Agricultural Advisory Services.

4. In 2013, the EU initiated an evaluation of its budget support operations in Morocco together with a number of Member States' cooperation agencies (France, Belgium, Spain). While the evaluation does not specifically look into the contribution of these operations to the number of jobs or GDP growth, it will look into the impact of EU operations on reforms (public governance, economic reforms, social reforms, etc.) and their potential for enhancing democratic governance and economic growth. The results of this evaluation are expected to be published in April 2014.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011869/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(17 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Dichiarazioni di esponenti politici sull'adesione della Turchia all'UE

A fronte di un sondaggio Tavak circa la possibilità dell'adesione della Turchia all'UE, nel quale il 74 % degli intervistati non crede più che ciò avverrà, anche due personalità vicine al premier islamico Erdogan hanno evocato nelle ultime settimane l'ipotesi di una fine della prospettiva di integrazione europea per Ankara. Per la prima volta un ministro, il titolare degli affari europei, ha detto quello che molti pensano: «non entreremo mai». Il primo consigliere di Erdogan, invece, ha affermato: «dobbiamo sbarazzarci dello scenario Unione europea perché il paese possa assumere invece la leadership del "mondo nuovo" che emerge in Medio Oriente, Asia Centrale, Africa».

Dopo le dichiarazioni di questi importanti esponenti politici e l'opinione sfavorevole dei cittadini turchi, la Commissione europea non ritiene sia il caso di sospendere permanentemente qualsiasi tipo di negoziato di adesione con la Turchia?

Risposta di Stefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(10 dicembre 2013)

La Commissione rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alla risposta fornita alle precedenti interrogazioni scritte E- 010763/2013 e E- 011052/2013 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011869/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Declarations from political figures concerning Turkey's accession to the EU

In response to a Tavak opinion poll about the possibility of Turkey acceding to the EU, in which 74% of those interviewed no longer believe it will occur, two people close to the Islamist Prime Minister Erdogan have, over the last few weeks, evoked the proposition of an end to Ankara's prospects of European integration. For the first time, a minister responsible for European affairs has given voice to what many people are thinking, declaring: 'we will never get in'. Conversely, Erdogan's Minister Counsellor stated: 'we need to get rid of the European scenario because our country can instead become the leader of the "new world" which is emerging in the Middle East, Central Asia and Africa'.

Following the declarations from these important political figures and the unfavourable opinion expressed by Turkish citizens, does the Commission not believe that it would be appropriate to permanently suspend any kind of accession negotiations with Turkey?

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

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to previous written questions E-010763/2013 and E-011052/2013 ([1]).

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011870/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(17 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Allarme per la crescita di flussi migratori irregolari dai Balcani

Nel corso di una conferenza dei capi della polizia dell'area balcanica tenutasi recentemente a Belgrado è stato rilevato che tra le principali rotte dei flussi migratori irregolari, quella balcanica continua a essere largamente utilizzata per raggiungere via terra gli Stati membri dell'UE. Negli ultimi mesi i flussi lungo la rotta balcanica hanno registrato un sensibile aumento.

Anche in vista di un ulteriore ampliamento dello spazio di libera circolazione europeo, che sarà la diretta conseguenza dell'ingresso nell'UE di un sempre maggior numero di paesi dell'area balcanica, non ritiene la Commissione europea si renda necessario intensificare i controlli e rafforzare la collaborazione in materia di immigrazione e nel contrasto alle organizzazioni che gestiscono la tratta di esseri umani?

L'immigrazione clandestina, cui è correlato il fenomeno del traffico di esseri umani, negli ultimi anni ha assunto proporzioni tali da divenire, in virtù dei suoi enormi risvolti economici, uno dei principali business delle holding criminali transnazionali.

Come intende la Commissione europea prevenire e contrastare questo fenomeno?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(11 dicembre 2013)

La Commissione si impegna notevolmente per prevenire e ridurre la migrazione irregolare in molti modi, fra l'altro combattendo il traffico e la tratta di esseri umani, rafforzando la gestione delle frontiere e intensificando la cooperazione con i paesi terzi, compresi quelli dei Balcani occidentali.

Sulla base di un meccanismo di allerta mensile gestito da Frontex, la Commissione utilizza un meccanismo di controllo successivo alla liberalizzazione dei visti per affrontare la migrazione irregolare in provenienza dagli Stati balcanici nei quali è stato liberalizzato il rilascio del visto. I colegislatori hanno recentemente adottato una modifica della direttiva sulle procedure di asilo, allo scopo di impedire che si abusi del diritto di asilo moltiplicando le domande. È altresì prossima l'adozione di modifiche del regolamento sui visti, tra cui un meccanismo di sospensione che permetterà all'Unione europea, in circostanze eccezionali, di sospendere temporaneamente l'esenzione dal visto per i cittadini di paesi terzi.

Se vuol essere equa e credibile, la politica migratoria europea deve innanzitutto contrastare lo sfruttamento dei migranti da parte di criminali. La lotta contro il traffico di migranti è l'obiettivo del cosiddetto «pacchetto favoreggiatori», una parte dell'acquis dell'UE in materia di migrazione la cui eventuale revisione è attualmente in discussione nell'ambito della Task Force Mediterraneo, di recente creazione, insieme ad altri aspetti di un'azione dell'UE di più vasta portata sul traffico, quali la cooperazione rafforzata con le agenzie dell'UE, con i paesi terzi di origine e di transito e con le organizzazioni internazionali, anche per la condivisione dell'intelligence.

Per quanto riguarda la tratta degli esseri umani, i cardini dell'azione dell'UE sono la direttiva 2011/36/UE ([1]) e l'attuazione della strategia dell'UE per l'eradicazione della tratta degli esseri umani ([2]). Nell'ambito di quest'azione sono stati individuati alcuni paesi e regioni prioritari, tra cui paesi candidati e potenziali candidati dei Balcani occidentali ([3]).

([1]) Direttiva 2011/36/UE concernente la prevenzione e la repressione della tratta di esseri umani e la protezione delle vittime, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:101:0001:0011:IT:PDF
([2]) COM(2012) 286 final.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/EU+Policy/Second_report_AOP

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011870/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Concern about the growth in irregular migration flows from the Balkans

During a conference of police chiefs in the Balkan area, held recently in Belgrade, it was revealed that, among the main routes of irregular migration flows, the Balkan route continues to be widely used to reach the territory of the EU Member States. Over the last few months, the flow along the Balkan route has increased markedly.

Moreover, considering the further growth of the European area of free movement, which will be the direct consequence of an ever greater number of Balkan countries joining the EU, does the Commission not deem it necessary to intensify checks and reinforce collaboration in terms of immigration and combating organisations that run human trafficking operations?

Over the last few years, illegal immigration, directly linked to the phenomenon of human trafficking, has assumed such proportions that it has, thanks to its enormous financial returns, become one of the main businesses of transnational criminal holding companies.

How does the Commission intend to prevent and tackle this phenomenon?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

The Commission has made a considerable effort to prevent and reduce irregular migration in several ways, including by combating smuggling and trafficking in human beings, enhancing border management and strengthening cooperation with third countries, including from the western Balkans.

On the basis of a monthly alert operated by Frontex, the Commission operates a post-visa liberalisation monitoring mechanism seeking to address irregular migration from the Western Balkan visa-free states. The co-legislators have recently adopted a revised Asylum Procedures Directive, seeking to prevent asylum abuse through multiple applications. They are also close to adopting amendments to the Visa regulation, including a suspension mechanism, which will allow the EU, under exceptional circumstances, to temporarily suspend the visa waiver for third-country nationals.

Tackling criminals who profit from immigrants is a precondition for a fair and credible EU migration policy. Fighting against human smuggling is the objective of the so-called 'facilitators package', a part of the EU acquis on migration whose possible revision is being discussed by the recently created EU Task Force on the Mediterranean, together with other aspects of a broader EU action on smuggling such as reinforced cooperation with EU agencies, third countries of origin and transit, and international organisations, including in sharing intelligence.

Concerning trafficking in human beings, the directive 2011/36/EU ([1]) and the implementation of the EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings ([2]) are cornerstones of EU action. Priority countries and regions were identified, including candidate and potential candidate countries from the western Balkans ([3]).

([1]) Directive 2011/36/EU on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:101:0001:0011:EN:PDF
([2]) COM(2012) 286 final.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/EU+Policy/Second_report_AOP

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011871/13
au Conseil
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 octobre 2013)

Objet: Assurer un véhicule au sein de l'Union européenne

Les démarches administratives pour faire assurer un véhicule neuf ou d'occasion peuvent être particulièrement contraignantes et sont un frein à la libre circulation des biens et des personnes au sein de l'Union.

Alors que les citoyens européens sont de plus en plus mobiles et que l'Union européenne encourage notamment les travailleurs à se déplacer au sein de l'Union, les conditions et les tarifs pour faire assurer un véhicule varient grandement d'un État membre à l'autre, selon des critères appliqués par les compagnies d'assurance qui sont complexes et peu transparents.

La Conseil pourrait-il initier une réflexion sur une harmonisation des règles en matière de critères d'assurance d'un véhicule au sein de l'Union européenne et une information claire aux consommateurs, notamment sur le coût de l'assurance automobile?

Réponse
(23 décembre 2013)

Il appartient à la Commission — dans le cadre de son droit d'initiative — de présenter les propositions appropriées en vue d'une future législation. Le Conseil examinerait et débattrait toute proposition que la Commission pourrait présenter à cet égard.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011871/13
to the Council
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Insuring a vehicle within the European Union

The administrative requirements to insure a new or second-hand vehicle can be particularly demanding and hinder the free movement of goods and persons within the Union.

Whereas European citizens are increasingly mobile and the European Union is encouraging workers to move within the Union, the conditions and costs of insuring a vehicle vary enormously from one Member State to another and depend on criteria applied by the insurance companies which are complex and lack transparency.

Could the Council initiate discussions about harmonising the rules on the criteria for insuring vehicles within the European Union and providing clear information to consumers, particularly regarding the cost of car insurance?

Reply
(23 December 2013)

It is for the Commission — in the context of its right of initiative — to make the appropriate proposals for future legislation. The Council would examine and discuss all proposals that might be presented by the Commission on this subject.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011872/13
à la Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 octobre 2013)

Objet: Assurer un véhicule au sein de l'Union européenne

Les démarches administratives pour faire assurer un véhicule neuf ou d'occasion peuvent être particulièrement contraignantes et sont un frein à la libre circulation des biens et des personnes au sein de l'Union.

Alors que les citoyens européens sont de plus en plus mobiles et que l'Union européenne encourage notamment les travailleurs à se déplacer au sein de l'Union, les conditions et les tarifs pour faire assurer un véhicule varient grandement d'un État membre à l'autre, selon des critères appliqués par les compagnies d'assurance qui sont complexes et peu transparents.

La Commission européenne pourrait-elle proposer une harmonisation des règles en matière de critères d'assurance d'un véhicule au sein de l'Union européenne et une information claire aux consommateurs, notamment sur le coût de l'assurance automobile?

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(2 décembre 2013)

La troisième directive assurance non vie 92/49/CEE autorise les compagnies d'assurance à fixer librement les critères sur lesquels elles évaluent les risques associés aux assurés et déterminent en conséquence les primes.

Ce n'est toutefois pas principalement en raison des critères appliqués que les primes varient sensiblement entre les États membres. Un autre élément important est l'étendue de la couverture de la police d'assurance. Bien que la directive 2009/103/CE sur l'assurance automobile prévoie une couverture minimale obligatoire de l'assurance de responsabilité civile vis-à-vis des tiers dans l'ensemble de l'UE, les États membres peuvent définir librement le régime de responsabilité civile applicable aux sinistres résultant de la circulation des véhicules afin de déterminer l'étendue précise de cette couverture sur la base de leurs règles nationales en matière de responsabilité civile. Dans ce contexte, les États membres doivent veiller à ce que la responsabilité civile applicable selon leur droit national soit couverte par une assurance conforme à la directive 2009/103/CE et exercer leurs compétences dans ce domaine dans le respect du droit de l'Union, en s'assurant que la directive 2009/103/CE n'est pas privée d'effets.

La Commission a l'intention d'examiner le fonctionnement du système de responsabilité civile automobile au sein de l'UE, et notamment la question de la transparence pour le consommateur. Elle tirera, le cas échéant, des conclusions en ce qui concerne les politiques à mener.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011872/13
to the Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Insuring a vehicle within the European Union

The administrative requirements to insure a new or second-hand vehicle can be particularly demanding and hinder the free movement of goods and persons within the Union.

Whereas European citizens are increasingly mobile and the European Union is encouraging workers to move within the Union, the conditions and costs of insuring a vehicle vary enormously from one Member State to another and depend on criteria applied by the insurance companies which are complex and lack transparency.

Could the European Commission propose a harmonisation of the rules on the criteria for insuring vehicles within the European Union and offer clear information to consumers, particularly regarding the cost of car insurance?

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

The Third non-life insurance Directive 92/49/EEC allows insurance companies to freely set criteria on the basis of which they assess the risks associated with policy holders and thus determine the premiums.

However, the different criteria applied are not the main reason why premiums vary significantly between Member States. Another important aspect is the extent of the cover of the insurance policy in question. Whilst the Motor insurance Directive 2009/103/EC provides for a mandatory minimum cover for third party liability insurance across the EU, Member States are free to determine the rules of civil liability applicable to road accidents to determine the precise scope of this cover on the basis of their national civil liability rules. In this context, Member States are obliged to ensure that the civil liability arising under their domestic law is covered by insurance which complies with Directive 2009/103/EC and must exercise their powers in this field in compliance with European Union law, ensuring that directive 2009/103/EC is not deprived of its effectiveness.

The Commission intends to examine the functioning of the motor insurance liability system within the EU, including the issue of transparency to the consumer, and will draw policy conclusions, as appropriate.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011873/13
à la Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 octobre 2013)

Objet: Réponses aux consultations publiques de la Commission européenne

La Commission pourrait-elle indiquer si elle publie systématiquement sur Internet les réponses reçues aux consultations publiques qu'elle lance, et dans quels délais?

Réponse donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission
(21 novembre 2013)

Conformément aux exigences liées aux normes minimales applicables aux consultations engagées par la Commission ([1]), les réponses reçues aux consultations publiques ouvertes devraient être systématiquement publiées sur les pages web de ces consultations spécifiques, normalement dans les quinze jours ouvrables suivant la date d'achèvement de la consultation. Le réexamen de la politique globale de la Commission en matière de consultation effectué en 2012 ([2]) a montré que dans la pratique, ces exigences sont, pour l'essentiel, remplies. Afin d'améliorer encore la qualité des consultations qu'elle organise, la Commission procède actuellement à une révision de ses lignes directrices en matière de consultation; les lignes directrices révisées feront l'objet d'une consultation publique.

([1]) COM(2002) 704.
([2]) SWD(2012) 422.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011873/13
to the Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Responses to the European Commission's public consultations

Could the Commission indicate whether it systematically publishes on the Internet the responses received during its public consultations and according to what timeframe?

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

In line with the requirements of the Commission minimum standards for consultation ([1]), the responses to open public consultations should be systematically published on individual consultation webpages, usually within 15 working days after the consultation end date. The review of the Commission's overall consultation policy carried out in 2012 ([2]) showed that these requirements are broadly respected in practice. To further improve the quality of consultations, the Commission is currently revising its consultation guidelines which will be put out for public consultation.

([1]) COM(2002) 704.
([2]) SWD(2012) 422.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011875/13
à la Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 octobre 2013)

Objet: Commercialisation de la production d'absinthe européenne dans les pays tiers

Alors que la Suisse entreprend des démarches pour l'enregistrement de la dénomination «Absinthe» comme indication géographique, il est à craindre que les États tiers avec lesquels la Suisse a un accord bilatéral restreignent la commercialisation de l'absinthe à la seule production suisse, selon les dispositions de l'accord.

La Commission peut-elle garantir que les producteurs de l'Union européenne ne verront pas leurs droits à utiliser le terme «absinthe» limités dans des pays tiers suite à une demande de protection de son IG par la Suisse via un accord bilatéral avec ces pays tiers?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(6 décembre 2013)

Les autorités suisses ont décidé le 16 août 2012 d'enregistrer l'absinthe en tant qu'indication géographique protégée («IGP») en Suisse. Plusieurs recours ont été introduits contre cette décision auprès du Tribunal administratif fédéral de Suisse. Il convient de souligner que ces recours ont un effet suspensif. Par conséquent, à l'heure actuelle, le terme «absinthe» n'est pas encore protégé en droit national suisse.

Toutefois, la Commission a eu récemment connaissance des efforts déployés par les autorités suisses pour inclure l'absinthe en tant qu'IGP dans des accords internationaux conclus avec des pays tiers. Dans ces situations, si l'accord concerné prévoit la possibilité pour les parties intéressées de s'opposer à l'enregistrement, les opérateurs de l'Union européenne devraient être en mesure de contester l'inclusion de l'absinthe dans la liste en question, en faisant valoir qu'il s'agit d'un terme générique.

La Commission s'informera sur les intentions et les actions des autorités suisses concernant l'inclusion du terme «absinthe» dans des accords internationaux lors de la prochaine réunion du comité mixte UE-Suisse sur l'agriculture, qui se tiendra à Berne le 28 novembre 2013.

Il y a lieu de souligner également que, l'UE ne donnant pas de définition du terme «*absinthe*», les producteurs européens ne sont pas en mesure, dans l'UE, de mentionner sur l'étiquette le terme «*absinthe*» en tant que dénomination commerciale. La Commission a présenté une proposition visant à ajouter la définition de l'absinthe à l'annexe II du règlement (CE) n° 110/2008 ([1]). Cette proposition a cependant été rejetée par le Parlement européen.

([1]) JO L 39 du 13.2.2008, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011875/13
to the Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Marketing in third countries of absinthe produced in the European Union

Given the measures taken in Switzerland to register the name 'Absinthe' as a geographical indication (GI), there is cause for concern that third countries with which Switzerland has bilateral agreements might restrict absinthe marketing to that produced in Switzerland by virtue of these agreements.

Can the Commission guarantee that producers in the European Union will not have their rights to use the name 'Absinthe' restricted in third countries following an application to protect its geographical indication made by Switzerland through its bilateral agreements with these third countries?

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

The Swiss authorities decided on 16 August 2012 to register Absinthe as a protected geographical indication ('GI') in Switzerland. A number of appeals against this decision have been submitted to the Tribunal administratif fédéral of Switzerland. It should be noted that these appeals have suspensory effect. Therefore, at the moment, the term absinthe is not yet protected in the Swiss internal legal order.

Despite this, the Commission became recently aware of the efforts of the Swiss authorities to include absinthe as a protected GI in international agreements with third countries. Under these circumstances, provided the agreement in question foresees the possibility of interested parties to oppose the registration, EU operators should be able to object to the inclusion of absinthe in the relevant list, arguing that the term is generic.

The Commission will enquire on the intentions and actions of the Swiss authorities as to the inclusion of the term absinthe in international agreements during the upcoming meeting of the EU-Switzerland Joint Committee on agriculture, to be held in Bern in 28 November 2013.

It should also be noted that due to the absence of an EU definition of the term 'absinthe', EU producers are not able in the EU to indicate on the label the term 'absinthe' as a sale denomination. The Commission had submitted a proposal to add the definition of 'absinthe' in Annex II of Regulation (EC) No 110/2008 ([1]). This proposal was however rejected by the European Parliament.

([1]) OJ L 39, 13.2.2008.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011876/13
à la Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 octobre 2013)

Objet: Indication «Absinthe»

1. Concernant les démarches d'enregistrement par la Suisse de la dénomination «Absinthe» comme indication géographique (IG), la Commission peut-elle garantir que le terme sera considéré comme suffisamment générique en Europe pour éviter une demande de protection suisse, soit via l'accord bilatéral, soit via le dispositif autonome de demande de protection?

2. Quelle est l'influence à cet égard de l'absence de définition européenne du terme concerné?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloș au nom de la Commission
(5 décembre 2013)

L'enregistrement du terme «absinthe» en tant qu'indication géographique en Suisse n'aurait aucune incidence sur son utilisation pour des produits commercialisés dans l'Union européenne. Ce terme est déjà utilisé dans l'UE pour désigner des boissons spiritueuses produites dans différents États membres et est donc considéré comme un terme générique.

La question de l'enregistrement du terme «absinthe» en Suisse a été largement débattue dans le cadre des échanges bilatéraux avec la Suisse, en particulier au sein du comité mixte UE-Suisse sur l'agriculture. Dans ce contexte, la Commission a souligné que l'enregistrement du terme «absinthe» ne pourrait être envisagé que s'il est accompagné du nom de la zone géographique où la production a traditionnellement lieu, par exemple «Absinthe du Val-de-Travers».

En raison de l'absence de définition par l'UE du terme «absinthe», les producteurs de cette boisson spiritueuse dans l'UE ne sont pas en mesure d'indiquer sur l'étiquette le terme «absinthe» en tant que dénomination de vente. Il convient d'observer que la Commission a présenté une proposition en vue d'ajouter la définition du terme «absinthe» à l'annexe II du règlement (CE) n° 110/2008 ([1]). La proposition a toutefois été rejetée par le Parlement le 13 mars 2013 dans le cadre de la procédure de réglementation avec contrôle, aux motifs que tous les producteurs devraient être autorisés à continuer d'appliquer leurs propres méthodes et critères de production. Les producteurs de l'UE doivent dès lors commercialiser leur produit dans l'une des catégories (dénominations de vente) inscrites à l'annexe II du règlement (CE) n° 110/2008, s'il satisfait aux conditions requises pour être inclus dans ladite catégorie, ou, dans le cas contraire, sous la dénomination de vente «boisson spiritueuse». L'indication «absinthe» ne peut être utilisée qu'en tant que descriptif facultatif.

([1]) JO L 39 du 13.2.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011876/13
to the Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: 'Absinthe' indication

1. With respect to the procedures undertaken by Switzerland to register 'Absinthe' as a geographical indication (GI), can the Commission guarantee that the term will be considered sufficiently generic in Europe to prevent a Swiss request for protection, either through the bilateral agreement or through the stand-alone measure for protection?

2. What is the impact of the lack of a European definition of the term 'Absinthe'?

Answer given by M.Cioloș on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2013)

The registration of the term 'absinthe' as a geographical indication in Switzerland would have no impact on its use for products marketed in the EU. That term is already used in the EU to describe spirit drinks produced in various Member States and is therefore considered as a generic term.

The issue concerning the registration of the term 'absinthe' in Switzerland has been largely discussed in the framework of bilateral exchanges with Switzerland, in particular within the EU-Switzerland Joint Committee on Agriculture. In that context, the Commission has stressed that the registration of the term 'absinthe' could only be envisaged if accompanied by the name of the geographical area where the production traditionally takes place, for example 'Absinthe du Val-de-Travers'.

Due to the absence of an EU definition of the term 'absinthe', the EU producers of this spirit drink are not able to indicate on the label the term 'absinthe' as a sale denomination. It should be noted that the Commission submitted a proposal to add the definition of 'absinthe' in Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 110/2008 ([1]). However, the proposal was rejected by the negative vote of the Parliament on 13 March 2013 in the framework of the PRAC procedure, on the grounds that all producers should be allowed to continue to use their own production methods and criteria. EU producers must therefore sell their product under one of the categories (sales denominations) listed in Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 110/2008, if the compliance with such category exists, or, on the contrary, under the sales denomination 'spirit drink'. The indication 'absinthe' may only be used as an optional descriptor.

([1]) OJ L 39, 13.2.2008.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011877/13
à la Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 octobre 2013)

Objet: Commercialisation de l'absinthe de production européenne en Suisse

1. Suite aux démarches entreprises en Suisse pour l'enregistrement des dénominations «Absinthe», «Fée Verte» et «La Bleue» comme indications géographiques (IG), que fait la Commission pour régler la possible entrave à la commercialisation en Suisse des «absinthes» produites dans l'Union européenne?

2. Est-ce que cette problématique sera maintenue à l'ordre du jour de la prochaine réunion du Comité mixte EU-Suisse sur l'agriculture?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloș au nom de la Commission
(22 novembre 2013)

Lors de contacts bilatéraux avec la Suisse, la Commission a soulevé à plusieurs reprises la question de l'enregistrement des indications géographiques (IG) «Absinthe», «Fée Verte» et «La Bleue».

Plusieurs recours contre ces enregistrements ont été introduits auprès du Tribunal administratif fédéral de Suisse. Ces recours ont un effet suspensif.

La Commission a demandé des informations sur l'état d'avancement des procédures judiciaires lors de la réunion du groupe de travail sur le vin et les boissons spiritueuses qui s'est tenue à Berne le 29 juillet 2013. À la demande de la Commission, cette question a été inscrite à l'ordre du jour de la prochaine réunion du comité mixte UE-Suisse de l'agriculture, qui aura lieu à Berne le 28 novembre 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011877/13
to the Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Marketing in Switzerland of absinthe produced in the European Union

1. Following the measures taken in Switzerland to register the names 'Absinthe', 'Fée Verte' and 'La Bleue' as geographical indications (GI), what is the Commission doing to address this potential impediment to the marketing in Switzerland of 'absinthe' produced in the European Union?

2. Will this issue be kept on the agenda of the next meeting of the EU-Switzerland Joint Committee on agriculture?

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

During bilateral contacts with Switzerland, the Commission has repeatedly raised the issue of the registration of the geographical indications (GIs) 'Absinthe', 'Fée Verte' and 'La Bleue'.

A number of appeals against the registrations have been submitted to the *Tribunal administratif fédéral* of Switzerland. These appeals have suspensory effect.

The Commission enquired on the state of play of the judicial proceedings, during the working group meeting on wine and spirit drinks, held in Bern in 29 July 2013. At the request of the Commission, the matter has been included on the agenda of the next meeting of the EU-Switzerland Joint Committee on agriculture, to be held in Bern on the 28th of November 2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011878/13
alla Commissione
Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)
(17 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Carta dei diritti dei passeggeri — Enti nazionali

La Carta dei diritti dei passeggeri (regolamento (CE) n. 261/2004) è da tempo in vigore e, in molti casi, è servita ai cittadini europei quale utile strumento per ottenere gli indennizzi dovuti, oltre all'assistenza e quant'altro possa essere connesso ai disservizi causati dalle compagnie aeree.

Viene però sovente rilevata una forte differenza in termini di efficienza e puntualità tra l'attività dei vari enti nazionali incaricati di vigilare sulla questione.

Può la Commissione far sapere quali azioni vengono intraprese per controllare ed eventualmente sanzionare gli enti nazionali per l'Aviazione Civile che non garantiscono un servizio ai consumatori decoroso ed efficiente?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011879/13
alla Commissione
Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)
(17 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Carta dei diritti dei passeggeri

La Carta dei diritti dei passeggeri (regolamento (CE) n. 261/2004) è da tempo in vigore e, in molti casi, è servita ai cittadini europei quale utile strumento per ottenere gli indennizzi dovuti, l'assistenza e quant'altro sia connesso ai disservizi causati dalle compagnie aeree.

Viene però sovente rilevata una forte differenza in termini di efficienza e puntualità tra l'attività dei vari enti nazionali incaricati di vigilare sulla questione.

Può la Commissione far sapere quali azioni vengono intraprese per vigilare affinché i vari enti nazionali diano un servizio ai consumatori decoroso e uniforme in tutti gli Stati dell'Unione?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011880/13
alla Commissione
Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)
(17 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: ENAC e Carta dei diritti dei passeggeri

La Carta dei diritti dei passeggeri (regolamento (CE) n. 261/2004) è da tempo in vigore e, in molti casi, è servita ai cittadini europei quale utile strumento per ottenere gli indennizzi dovuti, l'assistenza e quant'altro sia connesso ai disservizi causati dalle compagnie aeree.

Viene però sovente rilevata una forte differenza in termini di efficienza e puntualità tra l'attività dei vari enti nazionali incaricati di vigilare sulla questione.

Può la Commissione far sapere quali azioni vengono intraprese per vigilare affinché l'Ente Nazionale per l'Aviazione Civile italiano garantisca un servizio ai consumatori decoroso e uguale a quello fornito in altri Stati dell'Unione?

Risposta congiunta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(9 dicembre 2013)

A norma del regolamento (CE) n. 261/2004 ogni Stato membro ha istituito organismi nazionali di applicazione (ONA) responsabili dell'applicazione del regolamento stesso.

Sempre secondo il regolamento, la Commissione è incaricata di sorvegliare e verificarne l'attuazione e l'applicazione da parte di ciascuno Stato membro. Pur tenendo in debito conto le differenze nazionali tra i quadri giuridici, amministrativi e giudiziari, la Commissione si adopra al massimo per garantire che le pratiche nazionali siano allineate il più possibile, in particolare per quanto riguarda le scadenze per il trattamento dei singoli reclami. Su impulso della Commissione, nel 2007 gli organismi nazionali di applicazione hanno concluso un accordo volontario tra loro in base al quale, tra l'altro, detti organismi dispongono di 6 mesi per trattare i singoli reclami ([1]).

La Commissione verifica costantemente che gli ONA adempiano correttamente ai loro obblighi e adotta le misure necessarie in caso di mancata conformità delle compagnie aeree alla legislazione dell'UE. Tutto questo è sbrigato principalmente tramite contatti regolari, riunioni e scambio di informazioni con gli ONA. La Commissione chiede loro regolarmente di fornire informazioni su casi specifici che sono stati sottoposti alla sua attenzione. Grazie a questi contatti regolari, gli ONA cooperano attivamente con la Commissione e tra loro. La Commissione ha proposto di rafforzare ulteriormente tale cooperazione nella proposta di revisione del regolamento.

Se da elementi di informazione risultasse che uno Stato membro non applica correttamente il regolamento, la Commissione avvierebbe indagini e, nel caso, una procedura di infrazione. A titolo informativo, sono state avviate indagini nei confronti del Portogallo e dell'Italia e una lettera di costituzione in mora è stata trasmessa all'Italia il 21 giugno 2013.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/passengers/air/doc/neb/neb_complaint_handling_procedures.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011878/13
to the Commission
Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Charter of Passengers' Rights — National bodies

The Passengers' Rights Charter (Regulation (EC) No 261/2004) has been in force for a while and, in many cases, has been a useful tool for European citizens in obtaining assistance, the compensation they are owed and anything related to disruptions caused by airlines.

However, there have been frequent observations about the considerable differences in terms of efficiency and punctuality between the activities of the various national bodies charged with monitoring this issue.

Can the Commission state which measures are being taken to monitor and, potentially, sanction national civil aviation bodies which fail to guarantee consumers a decent and efficient service?

Question for written answer E-011879/13
to the Commission
Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Charter of Passengers' Rights

The Passengers' Rights Charter (Regulation (EC) No 261/2004) has been in force for some time and, in many cases, has been a useful tool for European citizens in obtaining the compensation they are owed, assistance and anything related to disruptions caused by airlines.

However, there have been frequent observations about the considerable differences between the various national bodies charged with monitoring this issue, in terms of the effectiveness and timeliness of their activities.

Can the Commission state what measures are being taken to monitor the various national bodies and ensure that they guarantee consumers a decent and uniform service in all the EU Member States?

Question for written answer E-011880/13
to the Commission
Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: ENAC and the Charter of Passengers' Rights

The Passengers' Rights Charter (Regulation (EC) No 261/2004) has been in force for some time and, in many cases, has been a useful tool for European citizens in obtaining the compensation they are owed, assistance and anything related to disruptions caused by airlines.

However, there have been frequent observations about the considerable differences between the various national bodies charged with monitoring this issue, in terms of the effectiveness and timeliness of their activities.

Can the Commission state which measures are being taken to monitor the Italian National Civil Aviation Body (ENAC) and ensure that it guarantees consumers a decent service equal to that provided in other EU Member States?

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

Under Regulation (EC) 261/2004, each Member State has designated a National Enforcement Body (NEB) which is responsible for the application of this regulation.

The role of the Commission under the regulation is to oversee and monitor the implementation and application of the regulation by each Member State. Whilst taking due account of national differences between legal, administrative and judicial frameworks, the Commission does its utmost to ensure that national practices are aligned as far as possible, notably regarding the time-limit to deal with individual complaints. Encouraged by the Commission, the NEBs have concluded in 2007 a NEB-NEB voluntary agreement that provides, *inter alia*, that NEBs have up to 6 months in principle to deal with individual complaints ([1]).

The Commission constantly verifies that the NEBs carry out their obligations properly and take the necessary measures in cases of non-compliance by airlines with EU legislation. This is primarily achieved through regular contacts, meetings and exchange of information with the NEBs. The Commission regularly requests NEBs to provide information on specific cases which have been brought to its attention. As a result of such regular contacts, NEBs actively cooperate with the Commission and with each other. The Commission proposed to further strengthen this cooperation in its proposal for a revision of the regulation.

Should elements of information show that a Member State is failing to enforce the regulation, the Commission would launch investigation and, as appropriate, infringement procedures. For information, investigations were started against Portugal and Italy and a letter of formal notice was sent to Italy on 21 June 2013.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/passengers/air/doc/neb/neb_complaint_handling_procedures.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011881/13
au Conseil
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 octobre 2013)

Objet: Éolienne et santé humaine

L'installation d'éoliennes pose de nombreuses questions sur le terrain, de la part des élus locaux, des habitants et des scientifiques. Concernant l'impact de l'installation d'éoliennes, le Conseil s'est-il interrogé sur le possible impact négatif de l'éolienne sur la santé humaine?

Le Conseil n'envisage-t-il pas d'adopter une harmonisation des distances entre une éolienne et une habitation?

Réponse
(9 décembre 2013)

Le Conseil n'a pas débattu de cette question.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011881/13
to the Council
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Wind farms and human health

Building wind farms raises many questions for people locally, including elected representatives, inhabitants and scientists. With respect to the installation of wind farms, has the Council looked into the potentially negative impact of wind turbines on human health?

Is the Council planning to adopt a harmonisation of distances between wind turbines and dwellings?

Reply
(9 December 2013)

The Council has not discussed the issue.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011882/13
à la Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 octobre 2013)

Objet: Éolienne et santé humaine

L'installation d'éoliennes pose de nombreuses questions sur le terrain, de la part des élus locaux, des habitants et des scientifiques. Concernant l'impact de l'installation d'éoliennes, la Commission s'est-elle interrogée sur le possible impact négatif de l'éolienne sur la santé humaine?

La Commission n'envisage-t-elle pas d'adopter une harmonisation des distances entre une éolienne et une habitation?

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

1. La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à consulter la réponse qu'elle a donnée à la question écrite P-012246/2013, posée par M. Childers ([1]).

2. À ce jour, il n'existe pas de projets visant à proposer une harmonisation, au niveau de l'Union, de la distance entre les éoliennes et les habitations. Les distances recommandées peuvent varier selon les États membres de l'Union, mais la majorité d'entre eux ont convenu d'exigences spécifiques en matière d'implantation et de distances minimales entre les éoliennes et les habitations, les routes et d'autres infrastructures (EWEA, 2011) ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=FR
([2]) http://www.ewea.org/wind-energy-basics/faq/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011882/13
to the Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Wind farms and human health

Building wind farms raises many questions for people locally, including elected representatives, inhabitants and scientists. With respect to the installation of wind farms, has the Commission looked into the potentially negative impact of wind turbines on human health?

Is the Commission planning to adopt a harmonisation of distances between wind turbines and dwellings?

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

1. The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question P-012246/2013 by Mr Childers ([1]).

2. There are at present no plans to propose harmonisation at EU level of the distance between wind turbines and dwellings. Recomended distances may vary between Member States, but the majority of EU Member States have agreed on specific siting requirements and minimum distances of wind turbines and dwellings, roads and other infrastructure (EWEA, 2011) ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN
([2]) http://www.ewea.org/wind-energy-basics/faq/

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011886/13
a la Comisión
Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE)
(17 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Comercio con Marruecos

Marruecos, país vecino de España, está emergiendo económicamente con el paso del tiempo, generando una riqueza interior que es interesante aprovechar mediante relaciones bilaterales de comercio.

España, tradicionalmente, siempre ha tenido relaciones comerciales y relaciones bilaterales, generando mucha riqueza con ellas.

El próximo paso que está dando la Unión Europea es comenzar las negociaciones para elaborar un convenio por el cual todos los países de la UE puedan establecer relaciones comerciales beneficiosas con este país vecino, pudiendo abrir mercado en su territorio o dejando que Marruecos pueda abrir mercado en el territorio europeo.

¿Están siendo positivas las negociaciones de libre comercio con Marruecos comenzadas en abril de este año?

¿Piensa la Comisión que es posible el acercamiento legislativo de Marruecos y de la Unión Europea en este aspecto para beneficio mutuo?

Respuesta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de diciembre de 2013)

El Presidente Barroso y el Primer Ministro marroquí Benkirán dieron comienzo a las negociaciones sobre una zona de libre comercio de alcance amplio y profundo (DCFTA) entre la UE y Marruecos el 1 de marzo de 2013 en Rabat. Desde entonces, han tenido lugar dos rondas de negociaciones. La tercera ronda tendrá lugar a finales de 2013 o comienzos de 2014. Hasta ahora, las negociaciones progresan adecuadamente y hay textos de negociación sobre la mesa para casi todos los ámbitos.

La DCFTA formará parte del actual Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Marruecos y tendrá por objetivo general profundizar significativamente en la integración económica entre la UE y Marruecos. Ambas Partes buscan un acuerdo global centrado en cuestiones no arancelarias. El principal instrumento en este contexto será la aproximación de la legislación a la legislación de la UE en ámbitos tales como la normalización industrial o las medidas sanitarias y fitosanitarias sobre la base de las prioridades fijadas de común acuerdo. El acuerdo incluirá asimismo diversos compromisos sobre otros aspectos comerciales, especialmente la facilitación del comercio, la contratación pública, la competencia, los servicios, la protección de las inversiones y el desarrollo sostenible.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011886/13
to the Commission
Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Trade with Morocco

Spain's neighbour Morocco is gradually emerging economically, generating internal wealth that we ought to tap into through bilateral trade relations.

Spain has a long tradition of trade and bilateral relations with Morocco, which have generated considerable wealth.

The next step being taken by the European Union is to begin negotiations to draw up an agreement through which all EU countries can establish beneficial trade relations with this neighbouring country, allowing them to open up markets in Morocco and allowing Morocco to do the same in Europe.

Are the free-trade negotiations with Morocco, which began in April this year, proving to be positive?

Does the Commission believe that Moroccan and European Union legislation can be brought into closer alignment in this regard to our mutual benefit?

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

The Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA) negotiations between the EU and Morocco were launched on 1 March 2013 by President Barroso and Moroccan Prime Minister Benkirane in Rabat. Since then two rounds of negotiations have been taken place. The third round will take place end of 2013 or beginning of 2014. The negotiations are advancing well so far, negotiating texts are on the table for nearly all areas.

The DCFTA will be part of the existing EU-Morocco Association Agreement and will have the overall objective to significantly deepen economic integration between the EU and Morocco. Both sides seek for a comprehensive agreement focusing on non-tariff matters. The main instrument in this context will be the approximation of legislation to EU legislation in areas such as industrial standards or sanitary and phytosanitary measures based on mutually agreed priorities. The agreement will also include commitments on other trade related aspects, notably trade facilitation, public procurement, competition, services, investment protection and sustainable development.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011891/13
alla Commissione
Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)
(17 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Situazione degli interventi in tema di amianto

Con riferimento alle misure volte a contrastare le conseguenze derivanti dall'utilizzo dell'amianto, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

— quali interventi ha sostenuto in passato, economicamente e non, al fine di favorire azioni di smaltimento dell'amianto e prevenzione dei rischi per la popolazione ad esso riconducibili?

— Quali misure ha adottato per la formazione degli operatori del settore edile e delle strutture predisposte alla gestione delle problematiche inerenti l'amianto e, nel caso in cui il tema non sia stato affrontato, come intende procedere al riguardo?

— Qual è lo stato dell'arte della normativa europea in tema di amianto?

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

L'UE offre agli Stati membri sostegno finanziario nell'ambito dei fondi strutturali e dei fondi di coesione che, in funzione delle priorità dei programmi operativi pertinenti, possono cofinanziare programmi e progetti relativi sia alla prevenzione dei rischi sia alla bonifica di siti contaminati e aree dismesse.

In materia di informazione e formazione degli operatori del settore, sul sito web della Commissione sono disponibili due pubblicazioni, la cui redazione è stata affidata a un consorzio indipendente: si tratta di una guida pratica (*Practical guidelines for the information and training of workers involved with asbestos removal or maintenance work*, non disponibile in italiano) e di un opuscolo destinato soprattutto ai negozi del settore «fai da te» e ad altri esercizi commerciali di questo tipo ([1]). La guida contiene una serie di esempi di buone pratiche rilevati in Bulgaria, Francia, Germania, Polonia e Regno Unito.

Un'ulteriore guida pratica, pubblicata dal comitato degli alti responsabili degli ispettorati del lavoro, è reperibile sul sito web della DG EMPL: *Guida pratica sulle migliori prassi per prevenire o minimizzare i rischi dell'amianto in lavori che implicano (o possono implicare) la presenza di amianto: per il datore di lavoro, i lavoratori e l'ispettore del lavoro* ([2]).

La normativa applicabile in tema di amianto consta, in particolare, dei seguenti atti:

a) direttiva 87/217/CEE ([3]) che obbliga gli Stati membri a prescrivere le dovute misure preventive nel piano di lavoro previsto all'articolo 13 della direttiva 2009/148/UE ([4]);

b) direttiva 2008/98/CE relativa ai rifiuti ([5]), che copre i rifiuti di amianto e obbliga gli Stati membri a garantire che la gestione dei rifiuti sia effettuata senza mettere in pericolo la salute umana;

c) direttiva 1999/31/CE relativa alle discariche di rifiuti ([6]) e punto 2.3.3 dell'allegato della decisione 2003/33/CE del Consiglio ([7]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=716&langId=en&intPageId=225.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=148&intPageId=685&langId=en. Cliccare sul link «library entries».
([3]) Concernente la prevenzione e la riduzione dell'inquinamento dell'ambiente causato dall'amianto, GU L 85 del 28.3.1987.
([4]) Sulla protezione dei lavoratori contro i rischi connessi con un'esposizione all'amianto durante il lavoro, GU L 330 del 16.12.2009.
([5]) GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.
([6]) GU L 182 del 16.7.1999.
([7]) Che stabilisce criteri e procedure per l'ammissione dei rifiuti nelle discariche, GU L 11 del 16.1.2003.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011891/13
to the Commission
Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: State of play with regard to action taken on asbestos

With reference to the measures intended to tackle the consequences of asbestos use:

— What measures, both financial and otherwise, has the Commission supported in the past in order to facilitate activities aimed at the disposal of asbestos and the prevention of related risks for the local population?

— What steps has it taken for the training of operators in the construction sector and the structures set up to deal with asbestos-related problems and, should this subject not have been tackled, how does it intend to proceed in this regard?

— What is the latest European legislation concerning asbestos?

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

As regards possible EU financial support, Member States can draw on the assistance provided by structural and cohesion funds. In the framework of the priorities in their relevant Operational Programmes, programmes and projects related to risk prevention as well as the rehabilitation of contaminated sites and brownfield could be co-financed.

'Practical guidelines for the information and training of workers involved with asbestos removal or maintenance work' and a 'flyer' to be displayed, inter alia, in DIY shops and similar ones, have been published in the Commission website ([1]). They have been drafted by an independent consortium under contract with the Commission. The guidelines include a series of 'best practice' examples collected from Bulgaria, France, Germany, Poland and the United Kingdom.

The Senior Labour Inspectors Committee also issued a practical guide on best practice to prevent or minimise asbestos risks in work that involves (or may involve) asbestos. This guide is available on the DG EMPL website. ([2])

The applicable legislation concerning asbestos includes:

(a) Directive 87/217/EEC ([3]) which requires Member States to prescribe the necessary preventive measures in the work plan provided in accordance with Article 13 of Directive 2009/148/EU ([4]);

(b) Directive 2008/98/EC ([5]) on waste, which covers asbestos waste, requires Member States to ensure that waste management is carried out without endangering human health;

(c) Directive 1999/31/EC on the landfill of waste ([6]) and Chapter 2.2.3 of the annex to Council Decision 2003/33/EC ([7]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=716&langId=en&intPageId=225
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=148&langId=en&intPageId=685 Follow 'library entries'.
([3]) On the prevention and reduction of environmental pollution by asbestos, OJ L 85, 28.3.1987.
([4]) On the protection of workers from the risks related to exposure to asbestos at work, OJ L 330, 16.12.2009.
([5]) OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([6]) OJ L 182, 16.7.1999.
([7]) Establishing criteria and procedures for the acceptance of waste at landfills, OJ L 11, 16.1.2003.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011892/13
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE) et Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(17 octobre 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Persécutions d'opposants politiques au régime kazakh ainsi que de leur famille et collègues vivant en Europe

Au cours des derniers mois, nous avons assisté à l'intensification de la vague de répression orchestrée par les autorités kazakhes contre les opposants au régime, mais aussi leur famille et leurs anciens collègues vivant en Europe. De nombreux citoyens kazakhs, russes et ukrainiens sont détenus dans différents pays de l'Union européenne, souvent à la suite de demandes émanant des autorités de l'un des trois pays dont ils sont ressortissants, par l'intermédiaire du système d'Interpol.

La situation est particulièrement médiatisée depuis les derniers rebondissements de l'affaire Moukhtar Abliazov, dont l'épouse a été expulsée d'Italie vers le Kazakhstan à la fin du mois de mai 2013 à la suite d'une procédure accélérée impliquant Interpol et des dizaines d'agents des forces spéciales italiennes. Abliazov a lui-même été arrêté en France le 31 juillet 2013 et est actuellement détenu à Aix-en-Provence. Le 5 décembre 2013, la cour d'appel devrait examiner la demande d'extradition adressée par l'Ukraine. M. Abliazov, qui a déjà été emprisonné une fois au Kazakhstan, est un opposant déclaré au régime actuel. S'il est extradé vers l'Ukraine, il risque d'être remis au Kazakhstan et d'y être victime de torture et de mauvais traitements.

Les vastes poursuites engagées contre Moukhtar Abliazov semblent également concerner les membres de sa famille et ses anciens collègues vivant en Europe. Deux personnes sont actuellement dans l'attente de décisions concernant leur extradition: Tatiana Paraskevich, détenue en République tchèque, dont l'Ukraine et la Russie ont demandé l'extradition; et Alexandr Pavlov, détenu en Espagne et faisant l'objet d'une demande d'extradition adressée par le Kazakhstan. Ils risquent tous deux l'extradition à cause des relations qu'ils entretiennent avec Moukhtar Abliazov.

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a-t-elle connaissance de ces affaires, et le Service européen pour l'action extérieure (SEAE) en surveille-t-il régulièrement l'évolution?

Le SEAE a-t-il pris des mesures pour s'assurer que les États membres et les instances nationales compétentes soient conscients du contexte politique dans lequel s'inscrivent les affaires mentionnées ci-avant?

Quels sont, le cas échéant, les mécanismes et actions prévus par le SEAE pour éviter que les gouvernements autoritaires fassent un usage abusif des accords et organes internationaux, tels qu'Interpol, pour persécuter les opposants politiques et leur famille et amis?

Réponse donnée par M^me Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(5 décembre 2013)

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a connaissance de la problématique soulevée par l'Honorable Parlementaire et suit de près la situation de M. Alexandr Pavlov et de M^me Alma Shalabayeva ainsi que de M. Moukhtar Abliazov. La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à prendre connaissance de sa réponse à la question écrite E-009748/2013 ([1]), qui traite de ce sujet.

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante continuera à suivre cette affaire et d'autres affaires similaires. Des moyens formels et informels sont utilisés pour encourager les autorités kazakhes à respecter leurs obligations internationales, notamment la Convention contre la torture et autres peines ou traitements cruels, inhumains ou dégradants et son protocole facultatif auxquels le Kazakhstan est partie.

L'UE soulève les questions liées à la justice et aux Droits de l'homme dans le cadre de son dialogue politique avec le Kazakhstan, et continuera à le faire, systématiquement et à chaque occasion, et tout particulièrement lors des réunions annuelles dans le cadre du dialogue sur les Droits de l'homme et du comité de la justice et des affaires intérieures, organisées cette année les 27 et 28 novembre à Astana.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-009748&language=EN

Pour ce qui est des questions liées à l’extradition, cette procédure relève de la compétence des États membres et est appliquée dans le respect de la législation nationale et des traités internationaux. Il convient toutefois de rappeler que les décisions finales prises au niveau national en matière d’extradition peuvent faire l’objet d’un recours formé devant la Cour européenne des Droits de l’homme.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011892/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE) e Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(17 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Persecuzione di oppositori politici al regime kazako, nonché dei loro parenti e colleghi che vivono in Europa

Negli scorsi mesi si è assistito a una crescente ondata di repressioni da parte delle autorità kazake nei confronti non solo degli oppositori al regime, ma anche dei loro parenti ed ex colleghi che vivono in Europa. Diversi cittadini kazaki, russi e ucraini sono detenuti in vari paesi dell'Unione europea, spesso a seguito di richieste ricevute tramite il sistema Interpol e provenienti dalle autorità di uno dei tre paesi che rilasciano suddetti passaporti.

La situazione è stata posta sotto i riflettori in particolare a seguito dei recenti sviluppi nel caso di Mukhtar Ablyazov, la cui moglie è stata espulsa dall'Italia verso il Kazakistan, alla fine di maggio 2013, nell'ambito di una procedura accelerata che ha visto il coinvolgimento di Interpol e di decine di agenti delle forze speciali italiane. Ablyazov stesso è stato arrestato in Francia il 31 luglio 2013 ed è attualmente detenuto a Aix-en-Provence. Il 5 dicembre la Corte dovrebbe esaminare la richiesta di estradizione presentata dall'Ucraina. Ablyazov, che è già stato incarcerato una volta in Kazakistan, è un dichiarato oppositore dell'attuale regime. Se venisse estradato in Ucraina, rischia di essere consegnato al Kazakistan, dove potrebbe subire torture e maltrattamenti.

Le massicce persecuzioni di Mukhtar Ablyazov sembrano interessare anche i membri della famiglia e gli ex colleghi che vivono in Europa. Attualmente, sono in attesa di decisioni di estradizione Tatiana Paraskevich, detenuta in Repubblica ceca, con richieste di estradizione da parte di Ucraina e Russia, e Alexandr Pavlov, detenuto in Spagna, con richiesta di estradizione da parte del Kazakistan. Entrambi rischiano l'estradizione a causa delle loro relazioni con Mukhtar Ablyazov.

È il Vicepresidente/Alto commissario a conoscenza di questi casi? Sta il Servizio europeo per l'azione esterna (SEAE) monitorando tali casi su base regolare?

Ha il SEAE adottato delle misure per garantire che gli Stati membri e le agenzie nazionali competenti siano consapevoli del contesto politico in cui si inseriscono suddetti casi?

Quali sono gli eventuali meccanismi/provvedimenti previsti dal SEAE per garantire che i governi autoritari non si avvalgano impropriamente degli accordi e degli organismi internazionali, come Interpol, per perseguire gli oppositori politici e le loro famiglie e amici?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(5 dicembre 2013)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è a conoscenza delle questioni sollevate dall'onorevole parlamentare e sta seguendo con attenzione le situazioni di Aleksandr Pavlov e Alma Shalabayeva, come pure quella di Mukhtar Ablyazov. A questo proposito la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-009748/2013 ([1]).

L'AR/VP continuerà a controllare l'evoluzione di questo caso e di altri casi analoghi. Tanto nelle occasioni formali quanto in quelle informali le autorità kazake sono incoraggiate a rispettare i loro obblighi internazionali, in particolare la Convenzione contro la tortura e altre pene o trattamenti crudeli, inumani o degradanti e il suo protocollo opzionale, di cui il Kazakhstan è firmatario.

L'Unione europea solleva e continuerà costantemente a sollevare, in ogni possibile contesto, i problemi relativi alla giustizia e ai diritti umani nel suo dialogo politico con il Kazakhstan, in particolare nel quadro del dialogo annuale sui diritti umani e della commissione per la giustizia e gli affari interni, che quest'anno si svolgerà il 27-28 novembre ad Astana.

L'estradizione, d'altra parte, è di competenza degli Stati membri, che devono applicarla in conformità del diritto nazionale e dei trattati internazionali. Si rammenta tuttavia che le decisioni definitive prese a livello nazionale in materia di estradizione possono essere oggetto di appello dinanzi alla Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-009748&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011892/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE) and Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Persecution of political opponents to the Kazakhstan regime and of their relatives and colleagues living in Europe

Over the past months we have witnessed a rising wave of repression on the part of the Kazakhstan authorities targeting not only opponents to the regime but also their relatives and former colleagues living in Europe. A number of Kazakhstan, Russian and Ukrainian citizens have been detained in different EU countries, often in response to requests received through the Interpol system from authorities in one of the three passport-issuing countries.

The situation has been made particularly visible through recent developments in the case of Mukhtar Ablyazov, whose wife was deported from Italy to Kazakhstan at the end of May 2013 in a rapidly expedited procedure involving Interpol and dozens of Italian special forces agents. Ablyazov himself was arrested in France on 31 July 2013 and is currently being held in detention in Aix-en-Provence. On 5 December 2013 the court is due to hear an extradition request filed by Ukraine. Mr Ablyazov, who has already been imprisoned once in Kazakhstan, is an outspoken critic of the current regime. If extradited to Ukraine, he risks being handed over to Kazakhstan, where he could face torture and ill treatment.

The wide-ranging pursuit of Mukhtar Ablyazov seems also to include family members and former colleagues living in Europe. Currently awaiting decisions on extradition are the following persons: Tatiana Paraskevich, detained in the Czech Republic and subject to extradition requests from Ukraine and Russia; and Alexandr Pavlov, detained in Spain and subject to an extradition request from Kazakhstan. Both risk extradition because of their relationships with Mukhtar Ablyazov.

Is the VP/HR aware of these cases, and is the European External Action Service (EEAS) monitoring them on a regular basis?

Has the EEAS taken steps to ensure that the Member States and their relevant national agencies are aware of the political context of the abovementioned cases?

What (if any) are the mechanisms/actions foreseen by the EEAS to ensure that international agreements and bodies, such as Interpol, are not abused by authoritarian governments to persecute political opponents and their families and friends?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the issues raised by the Honourable Member and is following closely the situation of Mr Aleksandr Pavlov and Ms. Alma Shalabayeva as well as that of Mr Mukhtar Ablyazov. The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to written question on this issue E-009748/2013 ([1]).

The HR/VP will continue to monitor this and other similar cases. Formal and informal opportunities are used to encourage Kazak authorities to respect their international obligations, notably the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and its Optional Protocol that Kazakhstan is party to.

The EU raises and will continue to raise justice and human rights issues in its political dialogue with Kazakhstan consistently and at every opportunity in particular, in the framework of the annual Human Rights Dialogue and Justice and Home Affairs Committee which will take place this year on 27-28 November in Astana.

Regarding the questions pertaining to extradition, this is under the competence of Member States and is done in accordance with national law and international treaties. It is however recalled that national final decisions on extradition can be subject to appeal before the European Court of Human Rights.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-009748&language=EN

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011893/13
adresată Comisiei (Vicepreşedintelui/Înaltului Reprezentant)
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(17 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: VP/HR— Relația UE cu China și Taiwan având în vedere Tratatul bilateral de investiții UE-China

La 18 octombrie 2013, Consiliul ar trebui să aprobe cererea Comisiei de inițiere a negocierilor cu China privind un Tratat bilateral de investiții (TBI).

Cu toate acestea, politica externă cu privire la relația China-Taiwan este dublă: EU gestionează legături diplomatice prin politica „O Chină unică”, recunoscând în același timp Taiwanul ca entitate economică separată.

1. Cum va gestiona Vicepreședintelui/Înaltului Reprezentant aceste politici diplomatice și economice divergente în negocierile sale privind un TBI cu China?

2. În conformitate cu care dispoziții va mandata Consiliul negocierile privind un TBI cu Taiwanul ca entitate economică separată?

Răspuns dat de Înaltul Reprezentant /doamna vicepreședinte Ashton în numele Comisiei
(5 decembrie 2013)

La 18 octombrie 2013, în cadrul Consiliului Afaceri Externe, Comisia a primit autorizația de a negocia un acord global de investiții cu China. UE s-a angajat să inițieze relații comerciale cu China. Această strategie de promovare a comerțului deschis și a concurenței loiale, coroborată cu o atitudine fermă prin care să se asigure că China respectă normele comerciale și drepturile de proprietate intelectuală și că își îndeplinește obligațiile care îi revin în cadrul OMC, este principiul fundamental al politicii comerciale a UE referitoare la China. Negocierile privind încheierea unui acord de investiții între UE și China au fost lansate în cadrul celei de a 16-a reuniuni la nivel înalt UE — China, care a avut loc la 21 noiembrie, la Beijing.

UE va continua să urmărească politica sa care vizează „O Chină unică” și să sprijine dialogul privind relațiile dintre cele două maluri ale strâmtorii Taiwan și soluționarea pașnică a diferendelor legate de suveranitate. În ultimii ani, apropierea dintre China și Taiwan a continuat într-un ritm rapid. Au fost semnate nouăsprezece acorduri de cooperare între China și Taiwan, printre care s-a numărat și Acordul-cadru de cooperare economică (ECFA).

UE consideră Taiwanul drept o entitate economică și comercială distinctă. „Teritoriul vamal distinct Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen și Matsu (Taipei-ul Chinez)” este membru cu drepturi depline al OMC. Taiwanul se află pe locul 23 în clasamentul partenerilor comerciali ai UE, valoarea bunurilor și serviciilor care fac obiectul schimburilor comerciale fiind de aproximativ 40 de miliarde EUR. Pentru moment, nu sunt planificate negocieri privind încheierea unui acord comercial bilateral și nici a unui acord de investiții cu Taiwan.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011893/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EU relationship with China and Taiwan in view of the EU-China Bilateral Investment Treaty

On 18 October 2013 the Council is expected to approve the Commission's request to initiate negotiations with China on a Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT).

However, at present, EU external policy with regard to the China-Taiwan relationship is two-sided: the EU manages diplomatic ties through the 'One China' policy while recognising Taiwan as a separate economic entity.

1. How will the Vice-President/High Representative manage these divergent diplomatic and economic policies in its negotiations on a BIT with China?

2. Under what provisions will the Council mandate BIT negotiations with Taiwan as a separate economic entity?

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

At the Foreign Affairs Council of 18 October 2013, the Commission was given a mandate to negotiate a compehensive investment agreement with China. The EU is committed to open trading relations with China. This strategy of supporting open trade and fair competition while being firm on ensuring that China trades fairly, respects intellectual property rights and meets its World Trade Organisation (WTO) obligations is the guiding principle of the EU's trade policy with China.The negotiations for the EU-China Investment Agreement were launched at the 16th EU-China Summit on 21 November 2013 in Beijing.

The EU will continue to follow its 'One China' policy, and supports cross-straits dialogue and the peaceful resolution of differences over sovereignty. Over the past years, the rapprochement between China and Taiwan has continued at a fast pace. Nineteen cooperation agreements have been signed between China and Taiwan, including the Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement (ECFA).

The EU treats Taiwan as a separate economic and commercial entity. The 'Separate Customs Territory of Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu (Chinese Taipei)' is a full member of the WTO. With around EUR 40 billion of goods and services exchanged, Taiwan is the 23rd trade partner of the EU. For the time being, negotiations of a Bilateral Trade and Investment Agreement with Taiwan are not planned.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011895/13
à la Commission
Bruno Gollnisch (NI)
(17 octobre 2013)

Objet: Rachat de la division mobile de Nokia par Microsoft

La presse a fait état des circonstances très particulières qui entoureraient la cession annoncée à Microsoft de la division mobile de Nokia. Outre l'aspect désolant de voir le dernier constructeur européen de terminaux mobiles vendu à une entreprise étrangère, il a été allégué que cette cession pourrait présenter un aspect délictueux, sous la forme d'une manipulation des cours de l'action de Nokia.

La Commission a des pouvoirs étendus en matière de surveillance et de contrôle des fusions et acquisitions dans l'Union et prétend, par ailleurs, vouloir développer une stratégie européenne industrielle.

1. La Commission, a-t-elle été saisie de cette affaire?

2. Quels sont ses moyens d'action, juridiques et matériels, pour contrôler la légalité de cette opération?

3. Inclut-elle, dans sa «stratégie» industrielle, la conservation et la protection, au niveau européen, de secteurs stratégiques ou importants, étant entendu, comme on le voit dans le cas de Mittal, que la nationalité du propriétaire d'une entreprise n'est pas sans influence sur la localisation géographique de ses activités?

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

Le rachat, par Microsoft, de la division «téléphonie mobile» de Nokia a été notifié à la Commission le 29 octobre 2013 conformément au règlement sur les concentrations ([1]). La concentration notifiée a été autorisée sans conditions le 4 décembre 2013.

La compétence dont jouit la Commission pour ce qui est de l'examen de cette acquisition au titre du règlement sur les concentrations se limite à apprécier si l'opération envisagée est susceptible d'entraver de manière significative le jeu d'une concurrence effective dans le marché intérieur ([2]). La Commission n'est pas habilitée à enquêter sur de possibles infractions au droit, qu'elles aient trait à une manipulation du prix de vente ou à d'autres aspects éventuels de l'opération.

L'initiative en faveur de la politique industrielle ([3]) vise à renforcer l'industrie européenne. Elle a débouché sur le lancement d'un nouveau partenariat entre l'UE, les États membres et les entreprises. Cette stratégie repose sur quatre piliers: la réalisation d'investissements en faveur de l'innovation, essentiellement dans six domaines prioritaires très prometteurs, l'amélioration des conditions de marché, tant au sein du marché intérieur que sur les marchés internationaux, l'accès au financement et aux capitaux grâce à la mobilisation de fonds publics, dont ceux de la Banque européenne d'investissement, ainsi que la mise en œuvre d'investissements dans le capital humain et les compétences en vue de promouvoir la création d'emplois et de favoriser la compétitivité de l'industrie. Par ailleurs, Nokia est une entreprise privée, et la Commission n'a pas le droit d'intervenir dans sa stratégie. La Commission peut seulement examiner la compatibilité de l'opération envisagée avec le règlement sur les concentrations et s'assurer que l'entreprise concernée respecte les dispositions des articles 101 et 102 du traité.

([1]) Règlement (CE) n° 139/2004 du Conseil.
([2]) Dans le cadre de cette compétence limitée, la Commission peut notamment réclamer aux parties et aux tiers des renseignements et des documents utiles à son enquête.
([3]) COM(2012) 582.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011895/13
to the Commission
Bruno Gollnisch (NI)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Microsoft's buyout of Nokia's mobile division

According to press reports, the circumstances surrounding the sale of Nokia's mobile division to Microsoft are very unusual. Apart from the sorry sight of seeing the last European manufacturer of mobile handsets sold to a foreign company, it has been alleged that this sale could be criminal as Nokia's share price might have been manipulated.

The Commission has broad powers when it comes to the supervision and monitoring of mergers and acquisitions in the EU; it also claims that it intends to develop a European industrial strategy.

1. Has this matter been referred to the Commission?

2. What legal and material means does the Commission have at its disposal to check whether this transaction was legal?

3. Does the Commission include in its industrial 'strategy' the conservation and protection, at European level, of important or strategic sectors given that, as we have seen in the Mittal case, the nationality of a company's owner has an effect on the geographical location of its activities?

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

In accordance with the Merger Regulation ([1]), the acquisition of Nokia's Devices and Services unit by Microsoft was notified to the Commission on 29 October 2013. The notified concentration was unconditionally cleared on 4 December 2013.

The Commission's powers to review this transaction under the Merger Regulation are limited to assessing whether the proposed transaction may lead to a significant impediment to effective competition in the internal market ([2]). The Commission does not have any power to investigate possible criminal violations, whether related to the manipulation of the purchase price or to other elements that may have occurred in the context of this transaction.

The Industrial Policy initiative ([3]) is aimed at strengthening the European industry and has launched a new partnership between the EU, Member States and industry. The European Industrial strategy is based on four pillars, namely: investments in innovation, with a focus on six priority areas with great potential; better market conditions in the internal market as well as in international markets; access to finance and capitals by mobilising public funding including the European Investment Bank; and investment in human capital and skills to promote job creation and industry's competitiveness. Furthermore, Nokia is a private company and the Commission has no power to intervene in its strategy, apart from reviewing the proposed concentration's compatibility with the Merger Regulation and the undertaking's compliance with Articles 101 and 102 of the Treaty.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) 139/2004.
([2]) Within this limited remit, the Commission has, among other things, the power to request information and documents that are relevant to its investigation from the parties and third parties.
([3]) COM(2012) 582.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011898/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(17 octobre 2013)

Objet: Dépistage du VIH

Mardi a eu lieu, à Bruxelles, la présentation officielle du Plan national VIH, 2014-2019, sous l'égide de la ministre Onkelinx. Près de 500 personnes ont apporté leur expertise pour l'élaboration des 58 actions.

Une des idées est de faire pratiquer le dépistage par des personnes formées et non plus obligatoirement par le médecin.

La Commission entend-elle promouvoir cette bonne idée parmi les États membres?

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

La prévention et le traitement du VIH, y compris l'organisation des services de dépistage, relèvent en premier lieu de la responsabilité des autorités nationales des États membres. En complément des politiques nationales, la Commission a mis en place un cadre stratégique relatif au VIH/sida avec la communication intitulée «La lutte contre le VIH/sida dans l'Union européenne et les pays voisins, 2009-2013». Dans ce cadre, la Commission soutient la prévention du VIH, laquelle passe notamment par un meilleur accès au dépistage pour les populations les plus exposées et dans les régions où la prévalence du VIH est élevée.

Le Centre européen de prévention et de contrôle des maladies a, en outre, élaboré des lignes directrices en matière de dépistage du VIH, dans l'objectif d'accroître la diffusion et l'efficacité du dépistage dans l'UE ([1]).

De plus, la Commission soutient l'échange de meilleures pratiques sur la prévention, le dépistage et le traitement du VIH/sida dans le cadre du programme d'action de l'UE dans le domaine de la santé, qui comporte des projets tels que le «HIV-Cobatest», axé sur les pratiques de dépistage communautaire du VIH en Europe, ou le projet «Imp.Ac.T», dont l'objectif est d'améliorer l'accès au dépistage du VIH/de la tuberculose pour les groupes marginalisés.

([1]) Les documents pertinents sont disponibles en ligne à l'adresse: http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/activities/diseaseprogrammes/hash/Pages/index.aspx

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011898/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: HIV testing

On Tuesday in Brussels, the official national HIV plan for 2014-2019 was unveiled under the auspices of Minister Onkelinx. Some 500 people contributed their expertise to the development of the 58 actions.

One of the ideas is to have tests carried out by trained personnel and no longer necessarily by a doctor.

Will the Commission promote this good idea among the Member States?

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

Prevention and treatment of HIV, including the organisation of testing services, is primarily a responsibility of the national authorities in the Member States. To complement the national policies, the Commission established a policy framework on HIV/AIDS through the communication 'Combating HIV/AIDS in the European Union and neighbouring countries, 2009-2013'. Through this framework the Commission supports HIV prevention including improved access to HIV testing to most at risk populations and in areas with high prevalence of HIV infection.

The European Centre for Disease Preventions and Control has further developed guidance on HIV testing, with a view to increasing the uptake and effectiveness of testing in the EU ([1]).

In addition, the Commission supports exchange of best practice on prevention, detection and treatment of HIV/AIDS under the EU Health Programme, which includes projects, such as 'HIV COBATEST' focusing on HIV community-based testing practices in Europe, or 'Impact', which aims at improving Access to HIV/TB Testing for marginalized groups.

([1]) The relevant documents are available online at: http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/activities/diseaseprogrammes/hash/Pages/index.aspx

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011899/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(17 octobre 2013)

Objet: Vache folle

Un Britannique sur 2 000 environ serait porteur de l'agent de la forme humaine de la maladie de la vache folle, selon une étude publiée mardi. Mais il est impossible de prédire combien de porteurs de la protéine prion anormale sont réellement susceptibles de développer un jour cette maladie neurodégénérative incurable et toujours fatale, soulignent les auteurs de l'étude publiée dans le *British Medical Journal* (BMJ). Ce travail représente la plus solide mesure de la fréquence de «l'infection» par l'agent du variant de la maladie de Creutzfeldt-Jakob (vCJD), forme humaine de la maladie bovine qui a émergé en Grande-Bretagne via l'alimentation contaminée par des animaux malades entre la fin des années 1980 et le début des années 1990. Le pays compte 177 cas de VCJD (tous décédés). 51 autres cas ont été recensés ailleurs dans le monde, dont 27 en France.

1. Quelle est la réaction de la Commission?

2. Quelles sont les statistiques européennes?

3. Comment la Commission prévoit-elle la situation à long terme concernant la vache folle?

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

L'épidémie du variant de la maladie de Creutzfeldt-Jakob a atteint son point culminant dans l'Union européenne au cours de la période 1999-2004. Elle a décru de façon régulière après la mise en œuvre de mesures de prévention rigoureuses.

Les conclusions de l'étude récemment publiée dans le *British Medical Journal* (BMJ) sur le nombre estimé de cas d'infections par le variant de la maladie de Creutzfeldt-Jakob (un Britannique sur 2 000 pourrait avoir été exposé à la protéine anormale en ayant consommé de la viande contaminée) ne coïncident pas avec le nombre total de 174 cas de la maladie de Creutzfeldt-Jakob déclarés au Royaume-Uni et imputables à une consommation de viande contaminée (trois cas supplémentaires ont été reliés à des transfusions sanguines).

De même, la répartition géographique des échantillons positifs était relativement homogène, contrairement à une surabondance de cas d'infections par le variant de la maladie de Creutzfeldt-Jakob dans le nord du Royaume-Uni.

Les risques dans d'autres États membres sont susceptibles d'être nettement plus bas qu'au Royaume-Uni en raison du nombre de cas beaucoup plus faible, et dans de nombreux pays de l'Union européenne, la maladie n'a pas du tout été décelée.

Il reste, cependant, des préoccupations, notamment sur les différentes formes de sensibilité génétique, la transmission potentielle par l'intermédiaire des produits dérivés du plasma ou les instruments chirurgicaux, le statut de porteur dans la population et la levée partielle des interdictions relatives à certains aliments pour animaux. Dans cette perspective, il est essentiel de poursuivre la détection et la notification rapide de tous les nouveaux cas d'infections par le variant de la maladie de Creutzfeldt-Jakob dans l'Union européenne et dans le monde.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011899/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: 'Mad cow' disease

According to a study published on Tuesday, 1 in 2 000 Britons could be carrying the human form of 'mad cow' disease. However, the authors of the study published in the *British Medical Journal* (BMJ) stress that it is impossible to predict how many carriers of the abnormal protein (prion) are really likely to develop this incurable, and always fatal, neurodegenerative disease. The study represents the most robust measure of the frequency of 'infection' by the protein causing variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease (vCJD), the human form of the bovine disease that emerged in the United Kingdom through feed contaminated by infected animals in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The country has had 177 cases of vCJD (all with a fatal outcome). In addition, 51 other cases have been identified elsewhere in the world, including 27 in France.

1. What is the Commission's reaction?

2. What are the European statistics?

3. What is the Commission's long-term outlook for variant Creutzfeldt-Jacob or 'mad cow' disease?

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

The variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease epidemic peaked in the EU in the period 1999-2004. It has decreased steadily after the implementation of stringent prevention measures.

The findings of the recent study published in the *British Medical Journal* about the estimated number of variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob diseases infections (allegedly one in 2,000 of the United Kingdom population could have been exposed to the abnormal protein in contaminated meat) do not correlate with the total number of 174 cases of Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease reported in the UK which were acquired by the consumption of contaminated meat (3 cases additional cases were linked to blood transfusion).

Also, the geographical distribution of the positive samples was relatively even in contrast with an excess of cases of variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob diseases infections in the north of the UK.

The risks in other Member States are likely to be significantly lower than the United Kingdom on the grounds that the number of cases is much lower, and in many EU countries the disease has not been identified at all.

There are, however, remaining concerns such as different patterns of genetic susceptibility, the potential for transmission via plasma derived products or surgical instruments, carrier status in the population and the partial lift of feed bans. In this perspective, it is crucial to continue the identification and early notification of all new cases of the variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob diseases in the EU and worldwide.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011900/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(17 octobre 2013)

Objet: Explosion des faux euros

L'année 2013 est bien partie pour battre les derniers records, en matière de faux euros saisis. Sur les six premiers mois de l'année, on en est déjà à 21 580 billets récupérés en Belgique, contre 22 433 sur toute l'année précédente. Qui plus est, rien que pour 2013, cela représente déjà la bagatelle de 1,39 million d'euros retirés de la circulation, contre 1,15 million en 2012.

1. Est-ce un phénomène européen?

2. Quel est le montant de faux euros saisis depuis le début de l'année en Europe, pays par pays?

3. À quoi attribue-t-on cette sensible augmentation?

4. Peut-on en conclure que la sécurisation de nos billets n'est plus assez élevée?

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

1. Le faux monnayage n'est pas seulement un phénomène européen, il a aussi une dimension mondiale. Afin de protéger l'euro, la Commission européenne et la BCE ([1]) travaillent en étroite collaboration avec Europol ([2]), qui a été désigné comme office central de coordination de la protection de l'euro, ainsi qu'avec Interpol ([3]).

2. Le tableau présente les chiffres concernant les fausses pièces détectées en circulation par pays pour la période du 1.7.2012 au 30.6.2013. La Commission établit les statistiques en année glissante. Elle n'est pas en mesure de communiquer les statistiques confidentielles sur les fausses pièces en euros saisies pour chaque État membre.

Des informations plus détaillées sont disponibles dans les rapports de la Commission sur la protection des pièces en euros ([4]).

Valeur unitaire ordinaire	0,50 EUR	1 EUR	2 EUR	Total
Valeur unitaire totale	33 561	33 719	140 162	207 442

La BCE publie deux fois par an sur son site web les statistiques sur la contrefaçon des billets en euros. ([5])

3. Une hausse d'environ 11 % a été enregistrée de 2012 au premier semestre de 2013. Cette augmentation est imputable à la meilleure authentification des pièces en euros dans certains États membres, grâce à la mise en œuvre, depuis le 1er janvier 2012, du règlement (UE) nº 1210/2010 concernant l'authentification des pièces en euros ([6]). Les autorités ont pu repérer davantage de fausses pièces en euros. Ce règlement est devenu un instrument puissant de protection de l'euro contre le faux monnayage.

4. L'émission de billets neufs ne relève pas de la compétence de la Commission, mais de celle de la BCE. Par conséquent, l'Honorable Parlementaire est invité à transmettre sa demande directement à la BCE.

([1]) La Banque centrale européenne.
([2]) L'Office européen de police.
([3]) L'Organisation internationale de police criminelle.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/about-us/reports/euro-reports/index_en.htm
([5]) http://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/pr/date/2013/html/pr130719.fr.html
([6]) Le règlement (UE) nº 1210/2010 définit les règles permettant aux institutions financières de s'assurer que toutes les pièces en euros remises en circulation sont authentiques.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011900/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: The boom in counterfeit euros

The year 2013 is well on the way to beating the previous record for the number of fake euros seized. In the first six months of the year, 21 580 notes have already been recovered in Belgium, compared with 22 433 for the entire previous year. Furthermore, and just for 2013, this amounts to a mere EUR 1.39 million withdrawn from circulation, compared with EUR 1.15 million in 2012.

1. Is this a Europe-wide phenomenon?

2. How many fake euros have been seized since the beginning of the year in Europe, country by country?

3. What is the reason for this significant increase?

4. Should we conclude that the security features of our banknotes are insufficient?

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

1. Counterfeiting is not only a European, but also a worldwide phenomenon. In order to protect the euro, the European Commission and the ECB ([1]) work closely with Europol ([2]) which has been designated as the central ofice for coordinating the protection of the euro, as well as with Interpol ([3]).

2. The table shows figures of counterfeit coins detected in circulation per country for the period 1.7.2012 and 30.6.2013. The Commission prepares statistics on the one year rolling basis. The Commission is not in a position to disclose the confidential statistics on the seized counterfeited euro coins for individual Member States.

More detailed information is available in the Commission reports on the protection of euro coins ([4]).

Regular Denominations	0.5 EUR	1 EUR	2 EUR	Total
Denomination Total:	33 561	33 719	140 162	207 442

The ECB publishes biannually on their website statistics on euro banknote counterfeiting ([5]).

3. The increase from 2012 to the first half of 2013 is around 11%. The reason for this is the improvement in the authentication of euro coins in some Member States which is due to the implementation of Regulation 1210/2010 ([6]) on the authentication of euro coins since 1 January 2012. This has enabled the authorities to detect more false euro coins. This regulation has become a powerful instrument to protect the euro against counterfeiting.

4. The issuance of new banknotes is not a competence of the Commission, but of the ECB. Therefore, the Honourable Member is invited to forward his request directly to the ECB.

([1]) The European Central Bank.
([2]) The European Police Office.
([3]) The International Criminal Police Organisation.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/about-us/reports/euro-reports/index_en.htm
([5]) http://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/pr/date/2013/html/pr130719.en.html
([6]) Regulation 1210/2010 sets out the rules for financial institutions to ensure that all euro coins put back into circulation are genuine.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011902/13
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(17 octobre 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Champs de la mort

Le conflit paysans-propriétaires a déjà fait 55 victimes en quatre ans. Jusqu'en 1998, votre banane venait probablement du Honduras, plus précisément de la vallée de Bajo Aguán, paradis agricole du nord de cette petite république d'Amérique centrale qui a longtemps rapporté à lui seul un tiers des revenus d'exportation du pays. Les revenus étaient bien plus juteux encore pour les multinationales fruitières, politiquement et économiquement aux commandes du pays pendant des décennies, avec le soutien du gouvernement américain, pour conserver une mainmise sur ces terres aussi fertiles que profitables. «United Fruit Company», la plus importante d'entre elles, n'est plus là aujourd'hui. Elle a quitté le pays après la destruction d'une grande partie de ses plantations par l'ouragan Mitch. D'autres multinationales ont pris le relais et partagent désormais le terrain avec de grands propriétaires terriens.

Tout irait donc pour le mieux si 12 000 paysans sans terre n'avaient pas l'outrecuidance de venir réclamer la petite parcelle cultivable qui leur est due pour nourrir leur famille et éviter de mourir de faim. Malheureusement pour eux, leurs dirigeants sont plus proches des grands propriétaires. Les terres promises à de multiples reprises par les autorités n'ont jamais été octroyées, et le «Mouvement des ouvriers» a fini par occuper des plantations privées en 2009 pour tenter de forcer la décision. Résultat de l'opération: 55 morts en quatre ans. Des dizaines de paysans, un journaliste, un défenseur des Droits de l'homme, et quelques membres de milices privées armées jusqu'aux dents par les propriétaires multimillionnaires. En 1991, des dizaines de milliers d'hectares devaient être attribués à des familles paysannes sur un ancien terrain d'entraînement militaire américain, avant d'être vendus à de grands propriétaires, des cultivateurs et des responsables politiques. Le président Zelaya a recréé un certain espoir en 2009 en excluant toute expulsion de paysans tant que la légitimité de leurs titres de propriété n'avait pas été examinée, mais il a immédiatement été renversé par un coup d'État favorable aux mêmes propriétaires.

Depuis lors, Bajo Aguán se militarise. Selon les associations locales et les organisations de défense des Droits de l'homme, forces armées, police et milices privées sont omniprésentes et lancent régulièrement des attaques contre les communautés paysannes.

1. Comment cela est-il justifiable?

2. Quelle est la position officielle des autorités européennes face à ces méfaits?

3. Nous entretenons-nous avec les autorités du Honduras à ce sujet? Que se dit-il lors des rencontres diplomatiques?

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(3 décembre 2013)

L'Union européenne demeure préoccupée par la situation dans le Bajo Aguán.

La promotion de la justice et le plein respect des Droits de l'homme sont au cœur du dialogue politique et de la coopération de l'UE avec le Honduras. L'Union s'entretient avec des organisations de défense des Droits de l'homme, rencontre des défenseurs des Droits de l'homme en danger et publie des déclarations sur des cas spécifiques. Elle a publiquement demandé aux autorités d'enquêter sur les violations des Droits de l'homme et de préserver l'intégrité physique des défenseurs des Droits de l'homme en danger. Elle s'est rendue dans le Bajo Aguán en 2010 et 2012, puis à nouveau en avril 2013. Sa délégation et ses États membres se sont entretenus à ces différentes occasions avec l'ensemble des parties prenantes. Elle a encouragé les autorités nationales à parvenir à un règlement pacifique du conflit social et à s'attaquer au problème de l'impunité qui gangrène cette partie du pays.

L'UE, dans le cadre de son projet de coopération *Programa de Apoyo a los Derechos Humanos*, appuie la mise en œuvre de la politique nationale en faveur des Droits de l'homme. Cette dernière soutient les droits des paysans, l'une de ses principales priorités dans les actions à réaliser en vue de garantir le droit à l'alimentation. Les questions de propriété foncière, la réforme agraire et des enquêtes efficaces dans les cas d'assassinats de paysans figurent parmi les actions prévues. La résolution de conflits constitue un autre volet stratégique de cette politique, qui contribuera à la mise en place de mécanismes visant à favoriser l'établissement d'un consensus entre les différents intervenants.

Par ailleurs, l'UE continue à apporter son soutien à la société civile hondurienne et aux défenseurs des Droits de l'homme de ce pays par l'intermédiaire de l'IEDDH. Cette initiative comprend, entre autres, la possibilité pour les paysans de bénéficier d'une aide juridique et de mesures de protection d'urgence pour les personnes en danger.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011902/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Killing fields

In the last four years, the conflict between peasants and landowners has claimed 55 victims. Until 1998, your bananas probably came from Honduras, or more precisely from the Bajo Aguán valley, a rural paradise in the north of this small Central American republic which for a long time brought in one third of the country's export revenue. The market was even more lucrative for the multinational fruit companies who, with the USA's support, have held the country's political and economic reigns for decades, in order to keep control of this fertile and highly profitable land. Today, the largest of the multinationals, the United Fruit Company, is no longer there, having pulled out of the country after many of the plantations were destroyed by Hurricane Mitch. However, others have taken its place and now share the land with the big landowners.

Everything would be wonderful, therefore, if 12 000 peasants with no land had not had the presumption to claim the tiny plot of land that is their right in order to grow food to feed their families and avoid dying of starvation. Unfortunately for them, their bosses have closer ties with the landowners than with them. The land promised many times over by the authorities was never granted and in the end, the Workers' Movement occupied the plantations in 2009 to try to force a decision. The outcome of the operation: 55 people killed in four years — dozens of peasants, one journalist, one human rights activist and several members of the private militias armed to the teeth by the multimillionaire owners. In 1991, tens of thousands of hectares were supposed to have been allocated to peasant families on a former American military training ground, but instead were sold to big landowners, growers and political leaders. President Zelaya introduced a glimmer of hope in 2009 by ruling that no peasants could be expelled until the legitimacy of their property titles had been examined. He was immediately deposed by a coup d'état which favoured the landowners themselves.

Bajo Aguán has become progressively more militarised ever since. According to local associations and human rights organisations, armed forces, police and private militia are everywhere and regularly launch attacks against the peasant communities.

1. How can this be justified?

2. What is the European authorities' official stance on these crimes?

3. Do we ever bring up this subject with the Honduran authorities? What is said during diplomatic meetings?

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

The EU remains concerned with the situation in Bajo Aguan.

The promotion of justice and full respect of Human Rights are at the core of the EU's political dialogue and cooperation with Honduras. The EU speaks with Human Rights organisations, meets with Human Rights defenders at risk, and issues statements on specific cases. The EU has publicly called on the authorities to investigate violations of Human Rights and to safeguard the physical integrity of Human Rights defenders at risk. The EU visited Bajo Aguan in 2010 and 2012, and again in April 2013, where EU Missions, Delegation and Member States, spoke to all stakeholders involved. The EU has encouraged national authorities towards a peaceful resolution of social conflict and to tackle the problem of impunity predominant in this part of the country.

The EU, through its cooperation Programa de Apoyo a los Derechos Humanos, supports the implementation of the National Human Rights Policy. This policy supports the rights of peasants as one of its main priorities in the actions to be implemented to achieve the Right to Food. Land tenure issues, agrarian reform and effective investigations in the cases of peasants assassinations are amongst the actions foreseen. Conflict resolution is also a strategic action of this policy, which will contribute to establishing mechanisms aimed at promoting consensus between different stakeholders.

In addition, the EU continues to support Honduran civil society and Human Rights defenders through the EIDHR. This initiative includes, amongst other, the possibility for peasants to receive legal support and urgent protection actions for those at risk.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-011903/13
do Komisji
Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE)
(17 października 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Zmiana ustawy o bezpieczeństwie żywności i żywienia – notyfikacja w trybie dyrektywy 98/34/WE nr 2013/0509/PL

Sejm Rzeczpospolitej Polskiej, a dokładnie Klub Parlamentarny Polskiego Stronnictwa Ludowego, pragnie zmodyfikować ustawę z dnia 25 sierpnia 2006 r. o bezpieczeństwie żywności i żywienia (tj. Dz.U. z 2010 r., nr 136, poz. 914 z późniejszymi zmianami). Planowane zmiany mają na celu ochronę zdrowia dzieci w wieku szkolnym poprzez ograniczenie w placówkach edukacyjnych dostępu do różnych kategorii produktów żywnościowych zawierających substancje, których nadmierne i wielokrotne spożycie przyczynia się do nieprawidłowego rozwoju i wielu chorób dietozależnych wśród dzieci i młodzieży.

Nadmierne spożycie tłuszczu, nasyconych kwasów tłuszczowych, izomerów trans nienasyconych kwasów tłuszczowych, sodu i cukrów (mono- i disacharydów) jest łączone z niekorzystnym wpływem na zdrowie, wzrostem ryzyka rozwoju niezakaźnych chorób przewlekłych, tj.: choroby serca, otyłość i cukrzyca. Do osób najbardziej narażonych na skutki nieprawidłowego żywienia należą dzieci i młodzież. Na marginesie należy stwierdzić, iż według danych Światowej Organizacji Zdrowia aż 29 proc. polskich 11-latków ma nadwagę. Jak pokazują badania przeprowadzone zarówno w Polsce, jak i w innych krajach europejskich, wskaźnik nadwagi i otyłości społeczeństwa, szczególnie w grupie dzieci i młodzieży w wieku szkolnym rośnie w zastraszającym tempie.

Projektowana regulacja oparta jest o wskazanie kategorii produktów zawierających wysokie stężenia substancji uznanych za niepożądane do spożycia dla dzieci i młodzieży w wieku szkolnym. Chodzi tu przede wszystkim o wyroby cukiernicze, ciastkarskie, napoje gazowane, słone przekąski, posiłki typu fast-food, napoje energetyzujące czy izotoniczne dostępne niemal w każdym sklepiku, stołówce, automacie czy innym punkcie sprzedaży produktów spożywczych na terenach placówek edukacyjnych.

Z powyższych względów, należy wprowadzić zakaz promocji i sprzedaży wspomnianych produktów na terenach placówek edukacyjnych. Nowe zapisy ustawy wprowadzają również zakaz podawania posiłków zawierających opisywane kategorie produktów w stołówkach i innych punktach gastronomicznych na terenie wymienionych placówek, zarówno przygotowywanych na miejscu, jak również dostarczanych przez firmy zewnętrzne.

Czy KE przygotowała już opinię w tej sprawie? Jak KE odnosi się do problemu zdrowego odżywiania dzieci w szkołach UE? Czy zamierza podjąć działania mające na celu zagwarantowanie zdrowiej, zbilansowanej diety młodym Europejczykom i ograniczenia dostępu do niezdrowych produktów w placówkach oświatowych?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(15 listopada 2013 r.)

Władze polskie zgłosiły Komisji poprawki do polskiej ustawy o bezpieczeństwie żywności i żywienia z dnia 25 sierpnia 2006 r. ([1]) Projekt ten zgłoszono dnia 10 września 2013 r. zgodnie z dyrektywą 98/34/WE ([2]) pod numerem referencyjnym 2013/509/PL. Okres zawieszenia zakończy się w dniu 11 grudnia 2013 r. Procedura ta jest w toku i Komisja nie zakończyła jeszcze oceny zgłoszonego środka.

„Owoce w szkole" ([3]) jest programem UE, którego celem jest wspieranie dobrych nawyków żywieniowych wśród dzieci poprzez oferowanie im owoców i warzyw w szkołach. Jest to ważna inicjatywa, obejmująca całą UE i skierowana do dzieci w wieku od 1 do 18 lat. Jak dotąd z programu skorzystało 8,1 mln dzieci. Ponadto Komisja uruchomiła projekty pilotażowe mające na celu promowanie zdrowego żywienia i zwiększanie spożycia świeżych owoców i warzyw w szczególnie wrażliwych grupach społecznych, w tym wśród dzieci.

W ostatnim czasie Grupa Wysokiego Szczebla ds. Żywienia i Aktywności Fizycznej, będąca jednym z instrumentów realizacji strategii, rozpoczęła prace nad wspólnym planem działania w celu zwalczania otyłości wśród dzieci, który powinien objąć lata 2014-2020.

([1]) Dz.U. 2010 nr 136 poz. 914.
([2]) Dyrektywa 98/34/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 22 czerwca 1998 r. ustanawiająca procedurę udzielania informacji w zakresie norm i przepisów technicznych, Dz.U. L 204 z 21.7.1998, s. 37-48.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_pl.htm

Wspólne Centrum Badawcze opracowuje obecnie analizę standardów w zakresie posiłków w stołówkach szkolnych w państwach członkowskich. Wyniki tej analizy zostaną omówione w Grupie Wysokiego Szczebla ds. Żywienia i Aktywności Fizycznej. Nie wiadomo jednak jeszcze, jakie działania zostaną podjęte w tej sprawie w przyszłości.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011903/13
to the Commission
Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Amendment to the Law on Food Product Safety — notification under Directive 98/34/EC, No 2013/0509/PL

The Polish Parliament, specifically the Parliamentary Club of the Polish People's Party, is seeking to amend the law of 25 August 2006 on food product safety (Official Journal, 2010, No 136, item. 914, as subsequently amended). The planned amendments are intended to protect the health of school-age children by limiting access in educational establishments to various categories of food products containing substances which, when consumed excessively or repeatedly, contribute to abnormal development and a number of diet-related diseases among children and adolescents.

Excessive consumption of fat, saturated fatty acids, trans-fatty acids, sodium and sugars (mono-and disaccharides) is linked to adverse health effects and increased risk of developing non-communicable chronic diseases, such as heart disease, obesity and diabetes. Children and adolescents are among those most vulnerable to the effects of poor nutrition. It should be noted that, according to the World Health Organisation, as many as 29% of Polish 11-year-olds are overweight. Studies carried out in Poland and other European countries show that levels of overweight and obesity in society, particularly among children of school age, are increasing at an alarming rate.

The proposed regulation is based on indicating the categories of products containing high concentrations of substances classified as undesirable as a food for children of school age. This mainly concerns confectionery, cakes, carbonated drinks, salty snacks, meals, fast food, energy and isotonic drinks available in almost every shop, canteen, vending machine or other point of sale for food products on the premises of educational establishments.

For these reasons, the promotion and sale of these products should be prohibited on the premises of educational establishments. The new provisions in the law also introduce a ban on the serving of meals containing the aforementioned product categories in canteens and other catering outlets on the premises of the establishments in question, and cover both meals prepared on site as well as those supplied by outside firms.

Has the Commission already drawn up an opinion on this matter? What is the Commission's stance on the issue of healthy eating among schoolchildren in the EU? Does the Commission intend to take action to ensure that young Europeans enjoy a healthy, balanced diet and that access to unhealthy products in educational establishments is restricted?

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

The Polish Authorities notified to the Commission amendments to the Polish Food and Nourishment Safety Act of 25 August 2006 ([1]). This project was notified on 10 September 2013 in accordance with Directive 98/34/CE ([2]) under the reference 2013/509/PL. The end of standstill period is due on 11 December 2013. The procedure is ongoing and the Commission is still assessing the notified measure.

The School Fruit Scheme ([3]) is an EU programme that aims to encourage good eating habits in children by providing them with fruit and vegetables at school. The scheme is an important EU-wide initiative targeting schoolchildren aged 1 to 18, and thus far 8.1 million children have benefited from the scheme. Additionally, the Commission has launched pilot projects aimed at promoting healthy diets and increasing consumption of fresh fruit and vegetables in vulnerable societal groups, including children.

Recently, the High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity, one of the instruments for the purpose of implementing the strategy, started the development of a common Action Plan to tackle childhood obesity, which should cover the period 2014-2020.

([1]) Polish Journal of Laws of 2010, No 136(914).
([2]) Directive 98/34/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 June 1998 laying down a procedure for the provision of information in the field of technical standards and regulations, OJ L 204, 21.7.1998, p. 37-48.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_en.htm

The Joint Research Centre is currently working on a study that will look into school meal standards in Member States. It is planned to discuss the findings in the High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity. However, it would be premature to predict any actions that may follow in the future at this point in time.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-011904/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE)
(17 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Νέες ρυθμίσεις απορρήτου στο Facebook για εφήβους

Την Τέταρτη 16 Οκτωβρίου 2013 το Facebook ανακοίνωσε ότι άλλαξε τις ρυθμίσεις απορρήτου για εφήβους που γίνονται μέλη του συγκεκριμένου ιστοτόπου. Για τους έφηβους νέους χρήστες του Facebook οι προκαθορισμένες ρυθμίσεις για δημοσιεύσεις θα είναι «Φίλοι» (για τους ενήλικες χρήστες η προκαθορισμένη ρύθμιση θα συνεχίσει να είναι «Όλοι»), αλλά οι χρήστες ηλικίας από 13 έως 17 ετών θα μπορούν, εάν το επιθυμούν, να επιλέξουν να κοινοποιήσουν τις φωτογραφίες τους, την κατάστασή τους και τα σχόλιά τους στο ευρύ κοινό. Οι προηγούμενες προκαθορισμένες ρυθμίσεις για έφηβους χρήστες καθιστούσαν τις δημοσιεύσεις ορατές μόνο σε «Φίλους» και «Φίλους φίλων», ώστε το περιεχόμενό τους να είναι ορατό μέχρι τα άτομα που συνδέονται μαζί τους σε δεύτερο βαθμό.

Οι νέες ρυθμίσεις συνεπάγονται ότι οι επιλεγμένες δημοσιεύσεις θα είναι ορατές σε αγνώστους, καθώς και σε εταιρείες που συλλέγουν δεδομένα για διαφημιστές και εταιρείες μάρκετινγκ. Επιπλέον, άγνωστοι θα μπορούν να «ακολουθούν» εφήβους που δεν γνωρίζουν και να βλέπουν τις δημοσιοποιήσεις τους στην κεντρική σελίδα τους. Το Facebook στοχεύει πλέον πιο δυναμικά στους εφήβους για να συγκεντρώσει δημόσια δεδομένα για αυτούς τα οποία είναι ελκυστικότερα για τους διαφημιστές. Παράλληλα, οι νέες ρυθμίσεις αυξάνουν τον κίνδυνο να αφήσουν οι ανήλικοι ψηφιακά ίχνη τα οποία θα μπορούσαν να οδηγήσουν σε διαδικτυακό εκφοβισμό, ιδιαίτερα λόγω του ότι οι ανήλικοι ενδέχεται να μην κατανοούν τις επιπτώσεις της δημοσιοποίησης πληροφοριών.

Επιπλέον, σύμφωνα με την πολιτική της εταιρείας, οι ανήλικοι χρήστες πρέπει να δηλώσουν ότι οι γονείς τους έχουν δώσει τη συγκατάθεσή τους για να χρησιμοποιούν το Facebook, αλλά ο ιστότοπος δεν απαιτεί περαιτέρω σχετική επιβεβαίωση.

Αξίζει να σημειωθεί ότι το Facebook έχει περισσότερους από 200 εκατομμύρια ενεργούς χρήστες, το 15% των οποίων είναι έφηβοι.

Υπό το πρίσμα των ανωτέρω, η Επιτροπή ερωτάται:

1. Ποια είναι η γνώμη της για τις νέες ρυθμίσεις απορρήτου του Facebook; Θεωρεί ότι αποτελούν απειλή για τους έφηβους στην ΕΕ και ότι θα μπορούσαν να αυξηθούν τα περιστατικά διαδικτυακού εκφοβισμού εξαιτίας αυτών;

2. Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι βασική δέσμευση του Ψηφιακού Θεματολογίου για την Ευρώπη είναι η ασφάλεια των παιδιών στο διαδίκτυο, τι σχεδιάζει να πράξει η Επιτροπή για να αντιμετωπίσει τις ενδεχόμενες βλαβερές επιπτώσεις τέτοιου τύπου ρυθμίσεων απορρήτου για τους ανήλικους;

3. Οι νέες αυτές ρυθμίσεις εκφράζουν τις προτεραιότητες της συμμαχίας CEO, δηλαδή «τη βελτίωση του διαδικτύου προς όφελος των παιδιών» διασφαλίζοντας, για παράδειγμα, ότι οι ρυθμίσεις απορρήτου είναι κατάλληλες για την εκάστοτε ηλικία ή παρέχοντας ευρύτερες δυνατότητες για γονικό έλεγχο;

4. Σε ποιες ενέργειες προβαίνει η Επιτροπή προκειμένου να ευαισθητοποιήσει τα παιδιά και τους εφήβους, αλλά και τους γονείς, σχετικά με τη διαδικτυακή ασφάλεια; Μπορεί να προβεί στην ανταλλαγή βέλτιστων πρακτικών σχετικά με ρυθμίσεις απορρήτου που είναι κατάλληλες για την εκάστοτε ηλικία;

5. Πώς μπορούν οι γονείς να αποκτήσουν εύχρηστα εργαλεία για τη ρύθμιση των γονικών ελέγχων; Διαθέτει ήδη η Επιτροπή στοιχεία σχετικά με την πρακτική εφαρμογή ή την ενδεχόμενη επιτυχία των προτεραιοτήτων της συμμαχίας CEO, όπως είναι η ευρύτερη διαθεσιμότητα και η χρήση γονικών ελέγχων;

Απάντηση της κ. Kroes εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(18 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Η αναζήτηση της κατάλληλης ισορροπίας ανάμεσα στην προστασία και στην ελευθερία έκφρασης για τους νέους είναι σύνθετο έργο, ιδίως σε ένα περιβάλλον όπου οι νέοι ενεργά και αιτιολογημένα διαθέτουν δημόσιο λόγο. Σύμφωνα με πληροφορίες που παρείχε το Facebook, οι νέες ρυθμίσεις απορρήτου έχουν ενσωματωμένες προειδοποιήσεις και υποδείξεις κάθε φορά που ο έφηβος θέλει να αναρτήσει δημόσια κάποια πληροφορία και αυτό ευθυγραμμίζεται με τις συμβουλές του δικτύου INSAFE σχετικά με την ανάγκη συνεχούς εκπαίδευσης των νέων στην υπεύθυνη χρήση του διαδικτύου. Οι εργασίες του Συνασπισμού CEO σχετικά με τις κατάλληλες για την εκάστοτε ηλικία ρυθμίσεις απορρήτου κατέληξαν σε συστάσεις βέλτιστων πρακτικών και, μαζί με άλλα υπογράφοντα μέρη, το Facebook δήλωσε επίσημα τη δέσμευσή του στις πρακτικές αυτές ([1]).

Μέσα από τις εργασίες του δικτύου INSAFE, των κέντρων «Safer Internet» και του επιγραμμικού δικτύου «EU-KIDS», η Επιτροπή συνεχίζει να παρακολουθεί τα στοιχεία για τους αναδυόμενους κινδύνους, περιλαμβανομένης της διαδικτυακής παρενόχλησης, και δεσμεύτηκε να συνεργαστεί με τις πολυμερείς πλατφόρμες κοινωνικής δικτύωσης, όπως ο Συνασπισμός CEO, για την πλέον κατάλληλη διαχείριση των θεμάτων αυτών. Η μείωση των κινδύνων δεν είναι μόνον ζήτημα προστασίας αλλά και παροχής στρατηγικών αντιμετώπισης μέσω της αύξησης της ευαισθητοποίησης και της εκπαίδευσης. Ειδικότερα, η αντιμετώπιση της διαδικτυακής παρενόχλησης, απαιτεί τη συμμετοχή των σχολείων και του εκπαιδευτικού τομέα. Οι αποτελεσματικές στρατηγικές θα εξαρτηθούν από την κοινή προσέγγιση γονέων και εκπαιδευτικών και την καθοδήγηση από ομοτίμους.

Τα μέλη του Συνασπισμού επιβεβαίωσαν τον Ιανουάριο του 2013 τη διαθεσιμότητα εργαλείων γονικού ελέγχου ([2]) και δεσμεύτηκαν για την ανταλλαγή βέλτιστων πρακτικών σχετικά με την προώθηση της αφομοίωσης και χρήσης τους. Η Επιτροπή αναθέτει επίσης τακτικά την εκπόνηση μελετών συγκριτικής ανάλυσης ([3]) σχετικά με τα εργαλεία γονικού ελέγχου και το λογισμικό.

([1]) Η συγκεκριμένη δήλωση του Facebook διατίθεται στην ακόλουθη διεύθυνση: https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/better-internet-kids-ceo-coalition-1-year
([2]) Όλες οι δηλώσεις της εταιρείας διατίθενται στην ακόλουθη διεύθυνση: https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/better-internet-kids-ceo-coalition-1-year
([3]) Τα αποτελέσματα της πλέον πρόσφατης ολοκληρωμένης μελέτης διατίθενται στην ακόλουθη διεύθυνση: http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/benchmarking-study-parental-control-tools-latest-findings

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011904/13
to the Commission
Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Facebook's new privacy settings for teenagers

On Wednesday 16 October 2013, Facebook announced that it was changing its privacy settings for teenagers who join the site. For teenagers new to Facebook, the default privacy setting for posts will be 'Friends' (for adult users, the default setting will continue to be 'Public'), but users aged 13 to17 may, if they so choose, elect to share their photos, updates and comments with the general public. Previously, the default setting for teenage users was for posts to be visible only to friends and friends-of-friends, so nobody beyond second-degree connections could see their content.

The new settings mean that strangers, as well as companies collecting data for advertisers and marketing companies, will be able to see selected posts. Strangers will also be able to 'follow' teenagers who are unknown to them and see their public posts in the main news feed. Facebook is now targeting teenagers more aggressively in order to collect public data on them that are more appealing to advertisers. At the same time, the new settings increase the risk of minors leaving a digital trail that could lead to cyberbullying, especially since minors might not necessarily understand the implications of sharing information publicly.

In addition, under the company's policies, underage users have to state that their parents have given them permission to use Facebook, but the site does not require further confirmation of this.

It is worth noting that Facebook has more than 200 million active users in the EU, of whom 15% are teenagers.

In light of the above, the Commission is asked:

1. What does it think about Facebook's new privacy settings? Does it think they pose a threat to teenagers in the EU and that incidents of cyberbullying could increase as a result?

2. Considering the Digital Agenda for Europe's key commitment of 'keeping children safe online', what is the Commission planning to do in order to deal with the potential harmful effects on minors of these types of privacy settings?

3. Do these new settings reflect the priorities of the CEO Coalition, namely to 'make the Internet a better place for kids' by, for example, ensuring that privacy settings are age-appropriate or by offering wider options for parental control?

4. What is the Commission doing in order to raise awareness of online safety among children and teenagers, and also among parents? Can it share best practice on age-appropriate privacy settings?

5. How can parents be equipped with easy-to-use tools in order to configure parental controls? Does the Commission already have data on how the priorities of the CEO Coalition, such as wider availability and use of parental controls, are working in practice and on whether they have been successful?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(18 November 2013)

Finding the balance between protection and freedom of speech for young people is a complex task, especially in an environment where young people are actively and justifiably seeking a public voice. According to information provided by Facebook, the new privacy settings have in-built warnings and tutoring every time the teenager wants to post publicly and this is in line with the advice from the INSAFE network of the need to keep educating young people in responsible use of the Internet. The CEO Coalition's work on age-appropriate privacy settings resulted in best practice recommendations and along with other signatories, Facebook issued a company statement of its commitment to these ([1]).

([1]) Individual Facebook Statement available from: https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/better-Internet-kids-ceo-coalition-1-year

Through the work of INSAFE, the Safer Internet Centres and the EU-KIDS online network the Commission is continuing to monitor evidence of emerging risks, including cyberbullying, and is committed to working with its multi-stakeholder platforms, such as the CEO Coalition, to manage these appropriately. Mitigating risk is not only an issue of protection but of providing coping strategies through awareness raising and education. Tackling cyberbullying, in particular, requires the involvement of schools and the education sector. Effective strategies will depend on a joined-up approach by parents and teachers and peer-mentoring.

Coalition members confirmed in January 2013 the availability of parental controls ([2]) and are committed to sharing best practices on promoting their take-up and use. The Commission also runs regular benchmarking studies ([3]) on parental control tools and software.

([2]) All company statements available on: https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/better-Internet-kids-ceo-coalition-1-year

([3]) The results of the most recent completed study are available at: http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/benchmarking-study-parental-control-tools-latest-findings

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011906/13
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(17 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Europese bijdrage tot verbetering van de veiligheid in de textielsector in Bangladesh

In haar antwoord op vraag E-006345/2013 verwijst de Commissie naar „werkzaamheden betreffende een Duurzaamheidspact om de arbeidsomstandigheden en gezondheids- en veiligheidsnormen voor werknemers in kledingfabrieken in Bangladesh te verbeteren."

De Commissie stelt dat in het pact „wordt verwelkomd dat meer dan 70 grote ondernemingen die zaken doen met Bangladesh het akkoord inzake brandveiligheid en veiligheid van gebouwen („Accord on Fire and Building Safety") hebben ondertekend" en dat andere ondernemingen worden aangemoedigd om dit voorbeeld te volgen.

Hoe evalueert de Commissie het feit dat enkele grote Europese kledingbedrijven zoals Benetton, C&A, Carrefour, Zara en Mango het pact weliswaar ondertekend hebben en zich ertoe verbonden hebben in te zetten op preventie, maar niet bereid zijn te delen in de kosten voor compensatie aan de slachtoffers?

Daarnaast is er vijf maanden na de ramp nog niet veel veranderd in Bangladesh. Dit doet twijfels rijzen over het engagement van de Bengaalse overheid om de problemen in de textielsector ernstig aan te pakken.

Hoe evalueert de Commissie de situatie in Bangladesh en welke acties verwacht de Commissie van de Bengaalse overheid wil ze haar dreigement om de handelspreferentie op te schorten niet in de praktijk brengen?

Antwoord van de heer De Gucht namens de Commissie
(17 december 2013)

Voor zover de Europese Commissie bekend is, onderhandelen de regering van Bangladesh, bedrijven, vakbonden en andere belanghebbenden nog steeds over de compensatie van de slachtoffers, inclusief over een mogelijk op te zetten fonds voor geldtransacties. De Internationale Arbeidsorganisatie (IAO) coördineert deze onderhandelingen als neutrale voorzitter. Compensatie van de slachtoffers is een complexe kwestie, waarbij rekening moet worden gehouden met de juridische aspecten van de identificatie van slachtoffers en van het vaststellen van wie aanspraak kan maken op compensatie, alsook de mate van verantwoordelijkheid en het delen van de kosten.

De Commissie verwacht dat de regering van Bangladesh verder gaat met de implementatie van het Duurzaamheidspact, waarin de toezegging van de regering om de arbeidsnormen en omstandigheden in Bangladesh te verbeteren wordt geconsolideerd. Resultaten die op de korte termijn kunnen worden verwacht, zijn onder anderen de implementatie van de nieuwe arbeidswet (die in juli is aangenomen), voldoen aan de eisen voor deelname aan het Better Work-programma (in oktober door de IAO opgestart) en de werving van extra inspecteurs (in gang). De start van fabrieksinspecties, het akkoord inzake brandveiligheid en veiligheid van gebouwen en de Alliantie voor arbeidsveiligheid in Bangladesh („Alliance for Bangladesh Worker Safety") worden verwacht in de komende weken. De inspecties zullen worden uitgevoerd volgens de gemeenschappelijke normen die vorige week in Dhaka door de drie partners zijn overeengekomen.

Voor wat betreft handelspreferenties voorziet de EU-wetgeving in de opschorting van „Alles behalve wapens" wanneer serieuze en systematische inbreuk is gepleegd op essentiële internationale verdragen. Volgens de huidige wetgeving moet de beoordeling van dergelijke inbreuken worden gebaseerd op de conclusies met betrekking tot de situatie in het hele land door de controleorganen van de Verenigde Naties (waaronder de IAO) die belast zijn met het toezicht op de naleving van de verschillende verdragen. De Commissie blijft de verslagen van deze monitoringsorganen op de voet volgen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011906/13
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: European contribution to improving safety in Bangladeshi textile industry

In its answer to Question E-006345/2013, the Commission refers to activities relating to 'a Sustainability Compact to improve labour, health and safety conditions for workers in Bangladeshi garment factories'.

The Commission states that 'the Compact welcomes that over 70 major companies sourcing from Bangladesh have signed up to the Accord on Fire and Building Safety', and that other companies are encouraged to follow suit.

How does the Commission view the fact that some large European clothing companies such as Benetton, C&A, Carrefour, Zara and Mango have actually signed the compact and committed to focusing on prevention, but are not prepared to share the costs of compensating the victims?

Furthermore, five months after the disaster, not a great deal has changed yet in Bangladesh. This casts doubts on the commitment of the Bangladeshi Government to tackling the problems in the textile industry seriously.

What is the Commission's view of the situation in Bangladesh? What action is the Commission expecting from the Bangladeshi Government to prevent it from carrying out its threat to suspend trade preferences?

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

The European Commission understands that talks are still underway between the Government of Bangladesh, companies, trade unions and other stakeholders about the issue of compensation, including with regard to the possibility of setting-up a fund for cash transfers. The International Labour Organisation (ILO) is coordinating these talks as neutral chair. The issue of compensation is complex and linked to legal aspects of identifying victims, determining eligibility, as well as the levels of responsibility and cost-sharing.

The Commission expects Bangladesh's Government to continue the implementation of the Sustainability Compact, which consolidates commitments by the Government with regard to improving labour standards and working conditions in Bangladesh. Short-term deliverables include: the implementation of the new labour law (adopted in July), achieving eligibility for the Better Work Programme (launched by the ILO in October) and recruitment of additional inspectors (underway). The launch of inspections of factories together with the 'Accord on Fire and Building Safety and the Alliance for Bangladesh Worker Safety' is foreseen within weeks. Inspections will be following common standards agreed between the three partners last week in Dhaka.

As to trade preferences, EC law provides for the suspension of Everything But Arms where serious and systematic violations of core international conventions have taken place. The current law mandates that the assessment of such violations must be based on the conclusions as to the country-wide situation of the United Nations' monitoring bodies (including the ILO) in charge of the different conventions. The Commission continues to follow closely reports of these monitoring bodies.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011907/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(17 de outubro de 2013)

Assunto: Situação em Fukushima — novas contaminações e fugas de radioatividade

Segundo notícias recentes, o primeiro-ministro do Japão anunciou que o país precisa de ajuda internacional para deter as fugas de água radioativa da central nuclear. O apelo surgiu depois da operadora Tokyo Electric Power (Tepco) ter admitido uma segunda fuga de 4 toneladas, de ter sofrido um revés na implementação de uma técnica de descontaminação e de ter lançado ao mar 1,13 mil toneladas de água contaminada.

No verão, a Tepco já havia confirmado a fuga de 300 toneladas de material radioativo, as quais acrescem às infiltrações permanentes no subsolo provenientes dos reatores danificados, fugas que acabam por contaminar igualmente lençóis freáticos e oceano.

Solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Recebeu algum pedido de ajuda das autoridades japonesas?

2. Que medidas de apoio podem ser postas em marcha pela UE?

3. Que avaliação faz do impacto das novas contaminações e fugas de radioatividade?

4. Vai tomar algumas medidas na sequência dos resultados desta avaliação?

Resposta dada por Günther Oettinger em nome da Comissão
(9 de dezembro de 2013)

No que respeita aos recentes problemas ocorridos na central nuclear de Fukushima, a Comissão gostaria de remeter o Senhor Deputado para a resposta dada às perguntas escritas E-003609/13 e E-007824/13.

1. A Comissão não recebeu nenhum pedido de assistência da parte do Japão.

2. A Comissão ofereceu-se para cooperar com o Japão em várias questões relacionadas com o acidente nuclear de Fukushima, como a monitorização do impacto ambiental do acidente e as operações de valorização em curso. Desde o acidente, são efetuados contactos bilaterais entre especialistas de ambas as partes ([1]). Caso o Japão venha a solicitar assistência específica, a Comissão prestará o correspondente apoio através dos seus instrumentos de assistência.

3. Com base nas informações divulgadas pela Tokyo Electric Power Company (TEPCO), pelas autoridades japonesas e pela Agência Internacional da Energia Atómica, e na sequência de reuniões de trabalho específicas entre peritos japoneses e europeus, a Comissão considera que não deverá haver qualquer impacto para os consumidores europeus, mas que é necessária a monitorização contínua dos produtos importados pela Europa da zona afetada.

No que respeita à radioecologia marinha da zona, estão em curso dois projetos, STAR ([2]) e COMET ([3]), ao abrigo do Sétimo Programa-Quadro da Comunidade Europeia da Energia Atómica (Euratom) de actividades de investigação e formação em matéria nuclear (2007 to 2011). Esses projetos fornecerão mais informações sobre a natureza exata e as quantidades de radionuclídeos descarregados no mar, bem como sobre o seu impacto potencial nos organismos vivos.

4. Tendo em conta a avaliação acima referida, a Comissão não prevê tomar de momento outras medidas.

([1]) O Japão foi convidado a observar em 2011 o exercício de «testes de resistência» da UE destinado a verificar a segurança das instalações nucleares europeias, a fim de partilhar as experiências e as lições adquiridas. O Centro Comum de Investigação da Comissão cooperou também com a Agência da Energia Atómica e a Sociedade Oceanográfica do Japão sobre questões relacionadas com a caracterização do combustível fundido de Fukushima e as medições de radionuclídeos na água do mar.

([2]) *Strategy for Allied Radioecology*, (www.star-radioecology.org). No âmbito deste programa, foi lançado um convite à apresentação de propostas visando orientar a investigação sobre o impacto ambiental do acidente nuclear no Japão para o ambiente oceânico vizinho; o prazo para apresentação de propostas termina em 18 de dezembro de 2013.

([3]) *COordination and iMplementation of a pan-European instrumenT for radioecology*, (www.comet-radioecology.org). No âmbito deste programa, está a ser elaborado um relatório sobre a radioecologia marinha a fim de dar resposta às legítimas preocupações dos cidadãos europeus no que respeita ao impacto das fugas de materiais radioativos para o mar provenientes dos reatores acidentados de Fukushima.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011907/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Situation in Fukushima — fresh contamination and radioactive leaks

According to recent news reports, the Japanese Prime Minister has said that his country needs international support to stop the leaks of radioactive water from the power station. His appeal came after the operator, Tokyo Electric Power (Tepco), admitted a second leak of 4 tonnes and acknowledged that it had suffered a setback in its implementation of a decontamination technique and had released 1 130 tonnes of contaminated water into the sea.

Tepco had already confirmed a leak of 300 tonnes of radioactive material in the summer, on top of the fact that the damaged reactors are constantly leaking into the ground, polluting the groundwater and the ocean.

1. Has the Commission received any request for help from the Japanese authorities?

2. What support measures could the EU put in place?

3. How does the Commission assess the impact of the fresh contamination and radioactiveleaks?

4. Will it take any action in the light of this assessment?

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

With regard to the recent problems at the Fukushima nuclear power plant, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to written questions E-003609/13 and E-007824/13.

1. The Commission has not received any detailed request for assistance from Japan.

2. The Commission has offered to cooperate with Japan on various issues related to the nuclear accident at Fukushima, such as the monitoring of the environmental impact of the accident and the ongoing recovery operations. Bilateral contacts between both sides' specialists have been going on since the accident ([1]). Should Japan request any specific assistance, the Commission will provide appropriate support through its assistance mechanisms.

3. Based on the information released by Tokyo Electric Power Company (TEPCO), the Japanese authorities and the International Atomic Energy Agency, and following specific working meetings between Japanese and European experts, the Commission's assessment is that there should be no impact on European consumers, but there is a continuing need to monitor products imported to Europe from the affected area.

With regard to the marine radioecology of the area, two projects, STAR ([2]) and COMET ([3]), are being run under the Seventh Framework Programme of the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) for nuclear research and training activities (2007 to 2011). These projects will provide more information on the exact nature and amounts of radionuclides being discharged into the sea and their potential impact on living organisms.

4. In light of the assessment referred above the Commission does not foresee to take additional measures at this stage.

([1]) Japan was invited to observe the EU's own 2011 'stress test' exercise looking at the safety of European nuclear power plants to share experiences and lessons learned. The Commission's Joint Research Centre has also cooperated with the Japanese Atomic Energy Agency and the Oceanographic Society of Japan on issues related to the characterisation of the molten fuel from Fukushima and measurements of radionuclides in sea water.

([2]) Strategy for Allied Radioecology (www.star-radioecology.org). Under this programme, a call for proposals has been launched to focus research on the environmental impact of the nuclear accident in Japan on the nearby oceanic environment, with a deadline for submission of 18 December 2013.

([3]) COordination and iMplementation of a pan-European instrumenT for radioecology (www.comet-radioecology.org). Under this programme, a report is currently being drafted on marine radioecology to address the legitimate concerns of European citizens regarding the impact of the leaks of radioactive material into the sea from the damaged reactors in Fukushima.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011913/13
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(17 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Omvang problematiek sociale dumping

De detacheringsrichtlijn (96/71/EG) heeft een ongewenst neveneffect van sociale dumping met zich meegebracht. Sociale dumping kenmerkt zich door uitbuiting van werknemers en absolute wantoestanden. Bovendien vormt het een oneerlijke concurrentie voor bedrijven die wél de spelregels volgen.

Graag had ik van de Europese Commissie vernomen of er concrete info en cijfergegevens beschikbaar zijn over de omvang van het probleem:

1. Hoeveel werknemer worden jaarlijks gedetacheerd naar een andere lidstaat?

2. Hoeveel bedrijven worden jaarlijks gecontroleerd op het correct toepassen van de detacheringsrichtlijn? Wat is het resultaat van deze controles (% bedrijven in regel — % bedrijven met inbreuk)

3. In het geval er een inbreuk tegen de bepalingen van de detacheringsrichtlijn wordt vastgesteld, hoeveel werknemers zijn betrokken?

4. Is hier een dalende / stijgende trend te bemerken? Hoe evolueert dit ten opzichte van vorige jaren? Dit zowel met betrekking tot het aantal controles, de vastgestelde inbreuken en het aantal betrokken werknemers.

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(10 december 2013)

1. De Commissie heeft geen gegevens over het aantal werknemers dat overeenkomstig Richtlijn 96/71/EG ([1]) in de EU wordt gedetacheerd. De effectbeoordeling ([2]) bij het voorstel van de Commissie voor een Richtlijn betreffende de handhaving van Richtlijn 96/71/EG bevat evenwel een aantal gegevens over dit verschijnsel, waaronder het aantal detacheringen, de detacheringsstromen met de belangrijkste uitzendende en ontvangende landen, en een sectorspecifieke analyse. Uit gegevens van de lidstaten ([3]) blijkt dat het aantal meeneembare documenten A1 die op grond van Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004 betreffende de coördinatie van de socialezekerheidsstelsels ([4]) worden afgegeven voor een detachering naar andere lidstaten in het laatste jaar waarvoor gegevens beschikbaar zijn (2011), ongeveer 1,2 miljoen bedroeg. Detachering heeft dus slechts betrekking op een klein deel van de beroepsbevolking (0,5 % van de beroepsbevolking in de EU).

2, 3 en 4. De Commissie wijst erop dat de controle en de handhaving van de arbeidsvoorwaarden van werknemers, met inbegrip van die van gedetacheerde werknemers, een bevoegdheid van de lidstaten is. De Commissie kan bijgevolg niet de statistieken leveren waarom het geachte Parlementslid verzoekt; zij kan die opvragen bij de arbeidsinspecties van de lidstaten.

([1]) Richtlijn 96/71/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 16 december 1996 betreffende de terbeschikkingstelling van werknemers met het oog op het verrichten van diensten (PB L 18 van 21.1.1997).

([2]) Deel I van het werkdocument van de diensten van de Commissie „Impact Assessment, Revision of the legislative framework on the posting of workers in the context of provision of services", (SWD(2012) 63 final, van 21 maart 2012), beschikbaar op: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=471&langId=en.

([3]) Posting of workers in the European Union and EFTA countries: Report on A1 portable documents issued in 2010 and 2011, Europese Commissie, 2012, beschikbaar op: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=9675&langId=en.

([4]) Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 29 april 2004 betreffende de coördinatie van de socialezekerheidsstelsels (PB L 166 van 30.4.2004).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011913/13
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Extent of the problem of social dumping

The directive on posting of workers (96/71/EC) has produced the undesirable side-effect of social dumping. Social dumping is characterised by exploitation of workers and abuses in absolute terms. Moreover, it is a source of unfair competition with businesses which do obey the rules.

Do any specific statistics and information exist concerning the extent of the problem:

1. How many workers per annum are posted to another Member State?

2. How many businesses per annum are inspected to check whether they are applying the directive on the posting of workers correctly? What is the result of these inspections (percentage of businesses that apply the rules and percentage which commit breaches)?

3. Where a breach of the directive on the posting of workers is identified, how many workers are involved?

4. Is there a rising or falling trend in these statistics? How do they compare with previous years? Please indicate this with regard to the number of inspections, the breaches identified and the number of workers involved.

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

1. The Commission has no figure on the number of workers posted in the EU in accordance with Directive 96/71/EC ([1]). However, the Commission's Impact Assessment ([2]) accompanying the proposal for a directive on the Enforcement of Directive 96/71/EC presents some data relating to the phenomenon, including the number of postings, flows of posting as regards the most important sending and receiving countries and a sector-specific breakdown. Member State data ([3]) show that the number of A1 portable documents issued for posting to other Member States under Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 ([4]) on the coordination of social security systems was around 1.2 million per year in the latest year for which data are available (2011). Posting thus concerns only a small percentage of the active population (equivalent to 0.5% of the EU active population).

2, 3 and 4. The Commission would point out that the monitoring and enforcement of the working and employment conditions of workers, including posted workers, fall within the competence of the Member States. As a consequence, the Commission cannot provide the statistics requested by the Honourable Member, who could request them from the labour inspectorates of the Member States.

([1]) Directive 96/71/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 1996 concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services, OJ L 18, 21.1.1997.
([2]) Part I of Commission Staff Working Document 'Impact Assessment, Revision of the legislative framework on the posting of workers in the context of provision of services' (SWD(2012) 63 final of 21 March 2012); available at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=471&langId=en
([3]) Posting of workers in the European Union and EFTA countries: Report on A1 portable documents issued in 2010 and 2011, European Commission, 2012, at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=9675&langId=en
([4]) Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems, OJ L 166, 30.4.2004.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011914/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(17 de outubro de 2013)

Assunto: Consequências das restrições orçamentais para as autoridades regionais e locais no que respeita às despesas dos Fundos Estruturais nos Estados-Membros

Numa resolução aprovada pelo Parlamento Europeu no primeiro período de sessões plenárias de outubro de 2013 sobre as consequências das restrições orçamentais para as autoridades regionais e locais no que respeita às despesas dos Fundos Estruturais da UE nos Estados-Membros (A7-0269/2013), o Parlamento Europeu:

— «Reitera categoricamente a sua oposição à introdução de uma condicionalidade macroeconómica na política de coesão 2014-2020, que penalizaria as regiões e os grupos sociais já debilitados pela crise» (n.° 19);

— «Solicita à Comissão que a despesa pública suportada pelos Estados-Membros no âmbito do cofinanciamento dos programas apoiados pelos Fundos Estruturais não seja incluída nas despesas estruturais, públicas ou equivalentes, consideradas no acordo de parceria para a verificação do respeito do Pacto de Estabilidade e Crescimento» (PEC) (n.° 24);

— Considera «que se demonstrou que o pacto orçamental não é adequado para fazer face aos desafios da crise e que um pacto de crescimento que permita investimentos significativos à escala da UE é considerado a solução mais viável, porquanto existe atualmente um consenso em relação ao facto de a austeridade e os cortes orçamentais sem investimento não relançarem a economia e não criarem as condições favoráveis à criação de emprego e ao crescimento económico» (considerando D).

Em face do exposto, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que iniciativas pensa desenvolver na sequência da tomada de posição do Parlamento Europeu agora conhecida?

2. Considera a possibilidade de propor que a despesa pública suportada pelos Estados-Membros no âmbito do cofinanciamento dos programas apoiados pelos Fundos Estruturais não seja incluída nas despesas estruturais (para efeitos do PEC)?

3. Considera a possibilidade de propor o fim da condicionalidade macroeconómica na política de coesão 2014-2020?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(10 de dezembro de 2013)

1. A Comissão já explicou que tenciona equilibrar os investimentos produtivos com os objetivos de disciplina orçamental, através de uma cláusula de investimento que será incluída na avaliação dos orçamentos nacionais para 2014 e dos resultados orçamentais de 2013.

2. A cláusula de investimento abrange os Estados-Membros incluídos na vertente preventiva do Pacto de Estabilidade e Crescimento, em conformidade com o disposto no Plano pormenorizado para uma União Económica e Monetária efetiva e aprofundada ([1]). No que diz respeito a esses Estados-Membros, a Comissão irá considerar a possibilidade de permitir, em certas condições ([2]), um desvio temporário em relação ao objetivo de médio prazo ou à respetiva trajetória de ajustamento. O desvio permitido está ligado às despesas nacionais em projetos cofinanciados pela UE no âmbito da política estrutural e de coesão (ou seja, o Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional, o Fundo Social Europeu e o Fundo de Coesão), das redes transeuropeias e do Mecanismo Interligar a Europa, com efeitos orçamentais positivos, diretos e verificáveis a longo prazo.

3. A Comissão considera que, para serem plenamente eficazes, as intervenções apoiadas pelos Fundos Estruturais e de Investimento Europeus devem ter lugar num enquadramento macroeconómico sólido, em estreita relação com o Semestre Europeu e com os procedimentos de governação económica, através da condicionalidade macroeconómica.

(1) COM(2012) 777 final/2.
(2) Ver carta de 3 de julho de 2013 do VP Rehn aos Ministros das Finanças.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011914/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(17 October 2013)

Subject: Effects of budgetary constraints for regional and local authorities regarding the EU's structural funds expenditure in the Member States

The European Parliament, in a Resolution on the effects of budgetary constraints for regional and local authorities regarding the EU's Structural Funds expenditure in the Member States (A7-0269/2013), approved at its first October 2013 part-session:

'Strongly reiterates its opposition to the introduction of macroeconomic conditionality in the Cohesion Policy 2014-2020, which would penalise regions and social groups already weakened by the crisis' (point 19);

'Calls on the Commission to ensure that public expenditure incurred by Member States to co-finance programmes supported by the Structural Funds is not included in the public or equivalent structural expenditure taken into account under partnership agreements for the purpose of ascertaining that the Stability and Growth Pact is being complied with' (point 24);

and considers that 'whereas the fiscal compact has been shown to be inappropriate in facing the challenges of the crisis and a growth compact enabling significant investment across the Community is envisaged as the most viable solution, as there is a consensus today that fiscal austerity and budgetary cuts without investments do not revitalise the economy and will not create favourable conditions for job creation and economic growth' (recital D);

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

1. What steps does it plan to take in the light of Parliament's position statement on this matter?

2. Is it considering proposing that public spending by the Member States to co-finance programmes supported by the Structural Funds should not be included in structural expenditure (for the purposes of the SGP)?

3. Is it considering the option of eliminating macroeconomic conditionality from the Cohesion Policy 2014-2020?

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

1. The Commission has already clarified how it will balance productive investments with fiscal discipline objectives via an investment clause to be implemented in the assessment of the national budgets for 2014 and the budgetary outcomes for 2013.

2. The investment clause covers Member States in the preventive arm of the SGP in line with the provision of the blueprint ([1]). For those Member States, the Commission will consider allowing, under certain conditions ([2]), a temporary deviation from the medium-term objective or from the adjustment path towards it. The allowed deviation is linked to national expenditure on projects co-funded by the EU under structural and cohesion policy (i.e. the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund), Trans-European Networks and the Connecting Europe Facility with positive, direct and verifiable long-term budgetary effects.

3. The Commission is of the opinion that in order to be fully effective, interventions supported by the European Structural and Investment Funds must take place in a sound macroeconomic framework, with a close connection to the European semester and to the economic governance procedures through macroeconomic conditionality.

([1]) COM(2012) 777 final/2.
([2]) See letter of VP Rehn to Finance Ministers of 3 July 2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-011916/13
an die Kommission
Joachim Zeller (PPE)
(18. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: 30 Mio. EUR Flüchtlingshilfe für Italien

Bei seinem Besuch auf der Mittelmeerinsel Lampedusa in der vergangenen Woche hat der Präsident der Kommission, Manuel Barroso angekündigt, Italien 30 Mio. EUR zur Bewältigung des Flüchtlingsnotstands zur Verfügung zu stellen. So notwendig den Flüchtlingen geholfen werden muss, so ergeben sich doch auch einige Fragen.

1. Werden diese Finanzmittel in Form von Verpflichtungsermächtigungen (commitments) oder als Direktzahlungen (payments) gewährt?

2. Kann die Kommission detailliert Auskunft darüber geben, aus welchem Haushaltsposten diese Finanzmittel bereitgestellt werden bzw. welche Umschichtungen hierfür genau vorgenommen werden?

3. Legt die Kommission für diese Mittel eine Zweckbindung fest, und wird sie den zweckgemäßen Mitteleinsatz kontrollieren?

Hat die Kommission genaue Kenntnis darüber, ob Italien über eine Infrastruktur für die Flüchtlingsaufnahme verfügt, die mit diesen Mitteln erweitert werden kann, oder dienen diese Mittel dazu, eine derartige Infrastruktur für die Unterbringung und Versorgung von Flüchtlingen erst aufzubauen?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(5. Dezember 2013)

Zur Bewältigung der Krisen in mehreren Mitgliedstaaten, die durch den hohen Migrationsdruck auf Grenzverwaltungs- und Migrationssteuerungssysteme ausgelöst wurden, hat die Kommission als Teil eines koordinierten EU-Unterstützungspakets etwas mehr als 60 Mio. EUR als Notfallhilfe zur Verfügung gestellt (in Form von Mitteln für Verpflichtungen). Bereitgestellt wurden diese Mittel durch interne Umschichtungen (32,4 Mio. EUR) und die Verwendung vorhandener Soforthilfemittel (etwa 28. Mio. EUR). Ein Berichtigungshaushaltsplan war somit nicht erforderlich. Der umgeschichtete Betrag stammt aus den Haushaltsmitteln für den Bereich Inneres für das Jahr 2013 (14,4 Mio. EUR) und aus Einsparungen in anderen Programmen („Lebensmittel- und Futtermittelsicherheit" (Kapitel 17 04), technische Unterstützung der „Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums" (Kapitel 05 04), „Internationale Übereinkommen im Bereich der Landwirtschaft" (Kapitel 05 06) und „LIFE+" (Kapitel 07 03)) in Höhe von 18 Mio. EUR.

Fast die Hälfte der 60 Mio. EUR dient der Aufstockung der Mittel für Sofortmaßnahmen im Rahmen des EFF ([1]), um die erste Aufnahme von Personen, die möglicherweise internationalen Schutz benötigen, zu finanzieren. Der andere Teil der Mittel ist für die Nothilfe im Rahmen des Außengrenzenfonds und des Europäischen Rückkehrfonds sowie die Aufstockung des Frontex-Haushalts für 2013 zur Förderung gemeinsamer Einsätze im Mittelmeer vorgesehen.

Was die speziell für Italien angekündigten 30 Mio. EUR angeht, so würde die vorläufige Mittelzuweisung folgendermaßen aussehen: 8 Mio. EUR für Frontex-Einsätze, 10 Mio. EUR für Sofortmaßnahmen im Rahmen des EFF und 12 Mio. EUR für Soforthilfemaßnahmen, die hauptsächlich aus dem Außengrenzenfonds und (gegebenenfalls) dem Europäischen Rückkehrfonds finanziert werden sollen. Wie bei allen Sofortmitteln, die Mitgliedstaaten zugewiesen werden, wird die Kommission überprüfen, ob die betreffenden Mittel zweckgemäß — in diesem Fall also zur Bewältigung der Krise — eingesetzt werden. Mit Blick auf die Sofortmaßnahmen im Rahmen des EFF hat Italien der Kommission mitgeteilt, dass die Mittel für die Finanzierung der Erweiterung bestehender und den Aufbau neuer Aufnahmeeinrichtungen verwendet werden sollen.

([1]) Europäischer Flüchtlingsfonds.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011916/13
to the Commission
Joachim Zeller (PPE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: EUR 30 million in refugee aid for Italy

During his visit to the Mediterranean island of Lampedusa last week, the President of the Commission, Manuel Barroso, announced that Italy would receive EUR 30 million to help manage the refugee crisis. Of course, we must help the refugees, but this raises some questions.

1. Will this funding be granted in the form of commitments or payments?

2. Can the Commission give details about where in the budget this funding will come from or exactly what funds will be reallocated for this purpose?

3. Will the Commission specifically earmark these resources and will it check that they have been used for that specific purpose?

Does the Commission have any precise information on whether Italy has refugee reception and care facilities that can be expanded with this funding, or whether the resources will be used to establish such facilities?

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

To address the crises in a number of Member States resulting from high migratory pressure on border and migration management systems, the Commission has made available slightly more than EUR 60 million (in commitment appropriations) as an emergency response, as part of a coordinated package of EU support. This has been done via internal redeployments (EUR 32.4 million) and by using existing emergency Funds (approx. EUR 28 million); it did not require an amending budget. The redeployed amount comes from within the 2013 Home Affairs budget (EUR 14.4 million) and from EUR 18 million savings in other programmes: Food and feed safety — Chapter 17.04; technical assistance for Rural Development — Chapter 05.04; international agreements in agriculture — Chapter 05.06; and Life+ — Chapter 07.03.

Almost half of the EUR 60 million will increase funds for emergency measures under the ERF [1], to finance initial reception of persons who may be in need of international protection. The other part is for emergency resources under the External Borders Fund (EBF) and the European Return Fund, and to increasing the 2013 Frontex budget to boost Joint Operations in the Mediterranean.

Regarding the EUR 30 million specifically announced for Italy, the tentative allocation would be EUR 8 million for Frontex operations, EUR 10 million for ERF emergency measures, and EUR 12 million for emergency activities to be funded mainly under the EBF and (as appropriate) the European Return Fund. As with all emergency funding allocated to a Member State, the Commission will check that it is used as intended: to remedy the crisis. Regarding ERF emergency measures, Italy has informed the Commission of its plans to use this funding to expand existing reception facilities and to create new ones.

---

[1] European Refugee Fund.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011917/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 octobre 2013)

Objet: STOP à la spéculation alimentaire

La spéculation alimentaire provoque des conséquences dramatiques dans le monde. Des milliers de personnes meurent de faim, alors que la production mondiale pourrait nourrir toute la planète, tout simplement parce que certains se permettent de spéculer et donc de rendre ces denrées alimentaires inaccessibles.

La spéculation alimentaire rend aussi la viabilité des producteurs du sud comme du nord très précaire voire même impossible. Même en Belgique, les revenus de nos agriculteurs sont affectés par cette spéculation.

En cette journée mondiale de l'alimentation, il faut rappeler que le premier objectif du Millénaire pour le développement visait à réduire de moitié la faim dans le monde d'ici 2015. Pourtant, aujourd'hui, nous sommes encore loin du compte: une personne sur huit souffre de malnutrition.

À l'heure où les Nations unies revoient les objectifs du Millénaire pour le développement, il est nécessaire d'accomplir des actes concrets: lutter contre la spéculation sur les prix des denrées alimentaires, contribuer à la lutte contre la faim dans le monde.

1. Quels sont les engagements pris par la Commission sur le sujet?

2. Quels sont ses projets?

3. La Commission nous rejoint-elle dans la volonté claire de légiférer afin d'encadrer la commercialisation, la diffusion ou la promotion d'instruments financiers dont le rendement dépend de l'évolution d'indices liés au cours de matières premières agricoles?

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

La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à se reporter à sa réponse à la question écrite E-005929/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011917/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: STOP food speculation

Food speculation has dramatic consequences throughout the world. There are thousands dying of hunger while world production could feed the whole planet, all because some people indulge in speculation which puts these foodstuffs out of reach.

Food speculation makes the viability of southern and northern production precarious, if not downright impossible. The incomes of even our Belgian farmers are affected by this speculation.

Today, on World Food Day, we need to remember that the first Millennium Development Goal set out to halve world hunger by 2015. Yet today we are still very wide of the mark: one person in eight suffers from malnutrition.

Just as the United Nations is reviewing the Millennium Development Goals, we have to take concrete action: fight against food price speculation, join in fighting world hunger.

1. What commitments has the Commission made in this respect?

2. What are the Commission's plans?

3. Does the Commission join us in wanting to legislate in favour of limiting the commercialisation, distribution and promotion of financial products whose yield derives from variations in agricultural commodity price indices?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-005929/2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011918/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(18 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Comune di Bracciano — informazioni sulla discarica nella zona di Cupinoro

Nelle scorse settimane, dopo la chiusura della discarica di Malagrotta, il Commissario Sottile ha disposto il conferimento di ulteriori 20.000 tonnellate di rifiuti urbani provenienti da Roma, Fiumicino, Ciampino e Città del Vaticano presso la discarica di Cupinoro (Bracciano) fino al 31.12.2013, oltre ai rifiuti già conferiti in discarica da 27 Comuni limitrofi.

Al tempo stesso, secondo notizie riportate dalla stampa la Regione Lazio, su richiesta della società Bracciano Ambiente controllata dal comune di Bracciano, avrebbe intenzione di aumentare la volumetria della discarica di altri 450mila metri cubi.

Per questi motivi, i comitati di quartiere e la popolazione residente hanno espresso forti preoccupazioni per la viabilità pubblica e la salute, dal momento che a valle della discarica (a circa 1 km) sono presenti i pozzi dell'acquedotto comunale «Spanora Casalone» di proprietà del comune di Cerveteri che risulterebbero in parte già compromessi. Inoltre, su alcuni terreni gravano usi civici e altri sono qualificati come «zone protezione speciale (ZPS)».

Considerato che la Commissione si è più volte espressa a favore del superamento della logica emergenziale e contro la realizzazione di discariche temporanee e provvisorie, può la stessa far sapere:

1. se è stata correttamente esperita la procedura di valutazione d'impatto ambientale preventiva e se esistono o meno le condizioni previste dalla direttiva 2011/92/CE;

2. se sono state chieste le autorizzazioni relative ai codici CER, che definiscono la tipologia di rifiuti che deve essere conferita in discarica;

3. se è effettivamente previsto un ampliamento della discarica di Cupinoro che nonostante la prevista dismissione nel 2011 è tuttora aperta in regime di proroga;

4. se sono state effettuate le procedure obbligatorie di pubblicità e informazione della cittadinanza (VIA e VAS);

5. se sono state prese adeguatamente in considerazione da parte delle autorità italiane le disposizioni contenute nella direttiva 2008/98/CE e nella decisione 2003/33/CE del Consiglio che stabilisce criteri e procedure per l'ammissione dei rifiuti nelle discariche;

6. quali garanzie ha fornito la Regione Lazio nell'ambito del procedimento d'infrazione 2011/4021 volto a garantire che le autorità locali italiane approntino sufficienti capacità per trattare tutti i rifiuti smaltiti nelle discariche della Regione?

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

Spetta agli Stati membri garantire la corretta applicazione nel loro territorio del diritto dell'UE, comprese tutte le direttive ambientali e le decisioni citate dall'onorevole deputato. La Commissione non è coinvolta nelle procedure di autorizzazione per impianti di gestione dei rifiuti effettuate a livello nazionale dalle autorità competenti degli Stati membri. La Commissione può intervenire solo se dispone di elementi a riprova di una possibile violazione delle pertinenti disposizioni dell'Unione europea in materia di gestione dei rifiuti, valutazione ambientale o autorizzazioni in relazione alle autorizzazioni, alla costruzione o alla gestione di un tale impianto.

Sulla base delle informazioni fornite dall'onorevole deputato la Commissione non ravvisa alcuna potenziale violazione delle succitate disposizioni dell'UE in relazione alla decisione delle autorità italiane di trattare una quantità maggiore di rifiuti nella discarica di Cupinoro e di aumentarne la capacità.

Per quanto riguarda invece la gestione dei rifiuti nel Lazio, nel giugno 2013 la Commissione ha adito la Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea nel quadro del procedimento di infrazione 2011/4021. Il procedimento è volto a garantire che il Lazio sia dotato delle necessarie capacità di trattamento meccanico-biologiche per una corretta gestione futura dei rifiuti attualmente smaltiti in tutte le discariche della regione. Il caso è ancora pendente dinanzi alla Corte.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011918/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Municipality of Bracciano — information on the Cupinoro landfill site

Over the last few weeks, after the closure of the Malagrotta landfill site, the Commissioner for waste, Goffredo Sottile, has authorised a further 20 000 tonnes of urban waste from Rome, Fiumicino, Ciampino and the Vatican City to be sent to the Cupinoro landfill site in Bracciano between now and 31 December 2013, on top of the waste that is already sent to the site by 27 other municipalities in the area.

At the same time, according to press reports, the Lazio regional government intends to increase the site's capacity by a further 450 000 cubic metres, at the request of the company Bracciano Ambiente, which is controlled by Bracciano municipal council.

As a result, the area's district committees and local residents have voiced serious concerns about the impact both on the roads in the area and on health, given that the wells which feed the Spanora Casalone water tower belonging to the municipality of Cerveteri are around 1 km downstream from the landfill site and some are reported to have already been contaminated. In addition, there are public rights of use on some parts of the site and others are designated Special Protection Areas (SPAs).

The Commission has spoken out more than once encouraging a move away from the emergency management approach and against the creation of temporary landfill sites.

1. Can the Commission state whether a proper prior environmental impact assessment was performed and whether the conditions laid down in Directive 2011/92/EU have been met?

2. Were the relevant permits applied for in relation to the EWC codes, which define which waste types can be sent to landfill?

3. Is it true that there are plans to extend the Cupinoro landfill site, which is still being allowed to operate under an extension, even though it was supposed to have been decommissioned in 2011?

4. Were the mandatory public notice and information procedures carried out (EIA and SEA)?

5. Did the Italian authorities give due consideration to the provisions of Directive 2008/98/EC and Council Decision 2003/33/EC establishing criteria and procedures for the acceptance of waste at landfills?

6. What guarantees has the Lazio regional government provided in the context of infringement proceeding No 2011/4021 aimed at ensuring that Italian local authorities develop enough capacity to process all of the waste disposed of in the region's landfill sites?

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

It is for the Member States to ensure the correct application in their territories of EC law, including all the environmental Directives and Decisions mentioned by the Honourable Member. The Commission is not involved in the authorisation procedures for waste management installations, which are carried out at national level by the competent authorities of the Member States. The Commission can intervene only if it has evidence that a given waste installation has been authorised, built or operated in potential breach of relevant EU provisions on waste management, environmental assessment or permits.

Based on the information provided by the Honourable Member, the Commission cannot identify a potential breach of relevant EU provisions in relation to the Italian authorities' decision to send more waste to the Cupinoro landfill and to increase the site's capacity.

As concerns the situation of waste management in Lazio, in June 2013 the Commission applied to the Court of Justice of the European Union in the framework of infringement procedure 2011/4021. This case is aimed at ensuring that Lazio is equipped with the necessary mechanic-biological treatment (MBT) capacity, so that the waste currently landfilled in all the Lazio landfills is adequaltely treated in the future. The case is still pending before the Court.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011919/13
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(18 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Vingerafdrukken in paspoorten (follow-up)

Het Hof van Justitie van de Europese Unie heeft vandaag een klacht van een Duitse burger verworpen die zich verzet tegen de opname van zijn vingerafdrukken in zijn paspoort. Bovendien is het Hof van oordeel dat het paspoort de enige plaats zou moeten zijn waar de vingerafdrukken mogen worden opgeslagen.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van deze uitspraak van het Hof van Justitie?

2. Welke invloed zal deze uitspraak hebben op de verdere uitvoering van de desbetreffende verordening van de Raad?

3. Is de Commissie van plan wijzigingen voor te stellen voor het beleid ter verbetering van de veiligheid van door EU-lidstaten uitgereikte paspoorten?

4. Kan de Commissie de concrete gevolgen van deze uitspraak toelichten?

5. Blijft de Commissie bij haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-005669/2012?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malström namens de Commissie
(29 november 2013)

In het kader van zijn prejudiciële beslissing in de zaak „Verwaltungsgericht Gelsenkirchen" (Michael Schwarz tegen de stad Bochum) over de vraag of artikel 1, lid 2, van Verordening nr. 2252/2004 als geldig kan worden beschouwd, bevestigt het Hof dat bij het onderzoek ervan niets is gebleken van feiten of omstandigheden die de geldigheid van de verordening kunnen aantasten.

In het bijzonder heeft het Hof vastgesteld dat het afnemen en bewaren van vingerafdrukken (als bedoeld in artikel 1 lid 2 van de verordening) geschikt zijn om de door die verordening nagestreefde doelstellingen en dus ook die van voorkoming van illegale binnenkomst van personen op het grondgebied van de Unie, te verwezenlijken. De verordening brengt geen verwerking van vingerafdrukken met zich mee die verder gaat dan noodzakelijk is voor de verwezenlijking van de doelstelling van bescherming van paspoorten tegen frauduleus gebruik ervan. Derhalve beperkt zij niet overmatig het recht op eerbiediging van het privéleven en op bescherming van persoonsgegevens.

In dat verband zijn er geen veranderingen van het beleid vereist. Het antwoord van de Commissie op vraag E-005669/2012 is dus in overeenstemming met het arrest en blijft geldig.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011919/13
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Fingerprints in passports (follow-up)

The European Court of Justice today rejected a German citizen's challenge to the inclusion of his fingerprints in his passport. The judgment also states that the passport should be the only place where the fingerprints may be stored.

1. Is the Commission aware of this ECJ ruling?

2. How will this ruling affect the further implementation of the relevant Council regulation?

3. Does the Commission intend to propose any kind of change in the policy of improving the security of passports issued by EU Member States?

4. Can the Commission specify the concrete consequences of this ruling?

5. Is the Commission still keeping to the answer it gave to my Written Question E-005669/2012?

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

In its preliminary judgment in the case 'Verwaltungsgericht Gelsenkirchen' (Michael Schwarz v Stadt Bochum), on the question of whether Article 1(2) of Regulation No 2252/2004 can be considered valid, the Court confirms that the examination has revealed nothing capable of affecting the validity of the regulation.

In particular the Court established that the taking and storing of fingerprints (referred to in Article 1(2) of the regulation) are appropriate for attaining the aims of the regulation and, in particular, the objective of preventing illegal entry to the European Union. The regulation does not imply any processing of fingerprints that would go beyond what is necessary in order to achieve the aim of protecting against the fraudulent use of passports. It thus does not unduly restrict the rights to respect of private life and the protection of personal data.

In this respect no changes in policy are requested or necessary. The answer given by the Commission to Question E-005669/2012 is therefore in line with the judgment and remains valid.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011920/13
a la Comisión
Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D) y Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D)
(18 de octubre de 2013)

Asunto: Inclusión de la Vespa velutina en la nueva legislación de la UE sobre especies invasoras

La llegada a territorio de la Unión de la *Vespa velutina*, o avispa asiática, ha venido provocando desde 2004 graves problemas para los sectores de la agricultura hortofrutícola y la apicultura, así como importantes daños a especies autóctonas, a la biodiversidad en general y a la salud humana (a partir de ocho picaduras es necesaria hospitalización). Aunque el foco más preocupante de concentración de esta especie ha sido avistado en La Garrotxa (Catalunya), ejemplares de la avispa asiática han sido ya detectados en varios puntos del norte de España y todo apunta a que podría desplazarse hacia el sur por Tarragona.

Esta avispa de gran tamaño, que alimenta a sus larvas básicamente con abejas melíferas autóctonas, se nutre a su vez del néctar de la fruta. Dada su gran capacidad de reproducción —12 000 ejemplares por hembra fecundada a razón de 200 madres por nido—, la ausencia de un depredador natural para esta especie y su rápida dispersión —puede alcanzar los 30 km por cada golpe de viento racheado—, la *Vespa velutina* está suponiendo la desaparición de un gran número de colmenas y poniendo en peligro cultivos y frutales. A todo ello, cabe añadir su difícil erradicación que, de momento, se realiza mayoritariamente a través del método de detección visual y destrucción de los nidos.

Dado que, según datos de la Comisión Europea, las especies invasoras cuestan al menos 12 000 millones de euros al año a la Unión Europea, ¿está la Comisión realizando un seguimiento de la evolución y los daños causados por la *Vespa velutina* en territorio de la UE, a nivel socioeconómico y medioambiental?

¿Ha recibido la Comisión, por parte de las autoridades españolas, algún tipo de comunicación o solicitud de ayuda para controlar y combatir dicha plaga?

¿Tiene previsto la Comisión estudiar la inclusión de este tipo de avispas cuando elabore la lista de las 50 especies exóticas invasoras anunciadas en su COM(2013) 620?

¿Qué medidas está dispuesta a emprender la Comisión para evitar la propagación transfronteriza de la *Vespa velutina* que, después de llegar a Francia por vía marítima, ya ha sido detectada en tres países de la UE?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(26 de noviembre de 2013)

La Comisión es consciente de la propagación de la *Vespa velutina* en el territorio de la UE; sin embargo, no existe actualmente ningún seguimiento oficial de la evolución o de los daños ocasionados por esta especie a escala de la UE. No se ha recibido hasta la fecha ninguna información de las autoridades españolas sobre esta especie concreta.

La Comisión ha propuesto recientemente una serie de medidas para hacer frente al problema de las especies exóticas invasoras en la EU ([1]). El Reglamento propuesto prevé un mecanismo de la UE para evaluar cuáles son las especies que requieren una intervención sobre la base de una evaluación de riesgos científica que determine el impacto de dichas especies sobre las especies autóctonas. Sobre esta base, se examinará la posible inclusión en la lista de especies exóticas invasoras preocupantes para la Unión de especies tales como *Vespa velutina*, si cumplen los criterios establecidos en el Reglamento.

El Reglamento propuesto recoge medidas sobre prevención, alerta temprana y respuesta rápida, así como medidas de gestión de las especies exóticas invasoras destinadas a evitar la introducción y posterior propagación de estas especies. El Reglamento establece además disposiciones relativas a la gestión de las vías de introducción y propagación, que podrían contribuir también a evitar la propagación transfronteriza de las especies exóticas invasoras.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/invasivealien/docs/proposal/es.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011920/13
to the Commission
Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D) and Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Inclusion of Vespa velutina in new EU legislation on invasive species

The arrival in the EU of *Vespa velutina*, or the Asian predatory wasp, has been causing serious problems for the agricultural, fruit and vegetable, and beekeeping sectors since 2004, as well as seriously harming native species, biodiversity in general and human health (eight stings require hospitalisation). Although the most worrying invasion of this species has been observed in Garrotxa (Catalonia), specimens of the Asian predatory wasp have been found in several parts of northern Spain and all this suggests that it could move south towards Tarragona.

This large wasp, which feeds its larvae essentially with native honeybees, feeds on fruit nectar. Given its tremendous capacity to reproduce (12 000 specimens per fertilised female at a ratio of 200 queens per nest), the absence of a natural predator for this species and its ability to spread rapidly — it can travel 30 km on each gust of wind –, *Vespa velutina* is causing a large number of beehives to disappear and is threatening crops and fruit. On top of this, the wasp is difficult to get rid of; it is currently exterminated largely through visual detection and destruction of the nests.

Considering that, according to the Commission's figures, invasive species cost the European Union at least EUR 12 billion per year, is the Commission monitoring developments and the damage caused by *Vespa velutina* in the EU, in socioeconomic and environmental terms?

Has the Commission received any communication from the Spanish authorities or any request for help to control and combat this pest?

Does the Commission plan to consider including of this type of wasp when it draws up the list of 50 invasive alien species set out in its proposal for a regulation COM(2013) 620?

What action is the Commission prepared to take to prevent the cross-border spread of *Vespa velutina*, which, since arriving in France by sea, has already been found in three EU countries?

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

The Commission is aware of the spread of *Vespa velutina* in the EU territory; however, there is at present no formal monitoring of developments or of the damage caused by this species at EU level. To date, no information has been received from the Spanish authorities on this particular species.

The Commission recently proposed measures to address the issue of invasive alien species (IAS) in the EU ([1]) in a comprehensive manner. The proposed Regulation provides for an EU mechanism to assess which species will require action on the basis of science-based risk assessments that will establish the impact such species have on native species. On this basis, species such as *Vespa velutina* will be considered for listing as IAS of Union concern if they meet the criteria established by the regulation.

The proposed Regulation includes measures on prevention, early warning and rapid response as well as on the management of IAS, designed to prevent the entry and further spread of such species. Furthermore, the proposed Regulation includes provisions on the management of pathways of introduction and spread, which could also contribute to preventing the cross-border spread of IAS.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/invasivealien/docs/proposal/en.pdf

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-011921/13
til Kommissionen
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(18. oktober 2013)

Om: OIE's henstillinger om dyrevelfærd

Verdensorganisationen for Dyrevelfærd (OIE) har sendt en e-mail til visse udviklingslande om, at den gerne ser sine standarder for dyrevelfærd blive »fast etablerede som det eneste og fremherskende internationale referencepunkt for dyrevelfærd«. I e-mailen fortsætter organisationen, idet den siger, at denne »status vil forenkle Deres handelsmæssige forhandlingsposition betydeligt med hensyn til dyrevelfærd og give Dem et stærkt modargument over for de handelspartnere, som eventuelt søger at påtvinge Dem deres egne bindende krav til dyrevelfærd«. Dette viser, at OIE ønsker at hindre EU og andre i at stille krav om, at import skal opfylde dyrevelfærdsstandarder, der er strengere end OIE's standarder.

Vil Kommissionen gøre det klart, at den ikke accepterer OIE's henstillinger om dyrevelfærd som internationale standarder, der hindrer den i at kræve, at import opfylder Kommissionens egne standarder, forudsat at den ved at gøre det agerer på en måde, der er i overensstemmelse med WTO's regler?

Hvis EU ikke fremsætter en klar erklæring om dette, kan det komme til at opleve, at et WTO-panel i en fremtidig handelstvist afgør, at EU tidligere har accepteret OIE's henstillinger som internationale standarder for dyrevelfærd og ikke senere kan kræve, at import lever op til dets egne standarder, som er strengere end OIE-standarderne.

Vil Kommissionen også gøre det klart, at:

— OIE's rolle burde bestå i at forbedre dyrevelfærd globalt, men ikke i at gøre det vanskeligt at vedtage højere standarder for de lande, som ønsker at gøre dette?

— OIE bør anerkende, at WTO's regler og retspraksis gør det muligt for medlemslande at kræve, at import lever op til standarder, som er højere end internationale standarder, under visse omstændigheder og på visse betingelser?

— at OIE's standarder bør betragtes som minimumstandarder, ikke maksimumstandarder?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg
(23. december 2013)

Kommissionen tilstræber at fremme høje velfærdsstandarder i dyrebesætninger i hele verden. For at gøre dette støtter den de specifikke standarder og henstillinger vedrørende dyrevelfærd fra OIE og fremmer dyrevelfærd i de samarbejdsaftaler, der indgås med tredjelande. Ud over at øge omfanget, i hvilket OIE standarder vedrørende dyrevelfærd gennemføres, fremmer dette også kapacitetsopbygning med hensyn til dyrevelfærdsspørgsmål i forbindelse med nogle af EU's vigtigste handelspartnere.

Endvidere har EU været i stand til at indhente garantier med hensyn til dyrevelfærd på slagterier. De slagterier, der eksporterer kød til EU, skal tilvejebringe den relevante certificering af, at dyrene er blevet behandlet i overensstemmelse med forordning (EF) nr. 1099/2009 om beskyttelse af dyr på aflivningstidspunktet, og have opfyldt krav, der mindst svarer til kravene i forordningen.

Ved OIE's tredje verdenskonference om dyrevelfærd, der blev afholdt i Kuala-Lumpur i 2012, blev spørgsmålet om at indføre strengere foranstaltninger end dem, der nævnes i OIE standarderne, diskuteret, og en konklusion blev draget med hensyn til OIE-medlemslandes ret til at fastsætte niveauet for deres nationale videnskabsbaserede foranstaltninger.

Til dato begrænser ingen af disse aftaler EU's modparters kapacitet til at indføre strengere standarder end OIE's.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011921/13
to the Commission
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: OIE Animal Welfare Recommendations

The World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) has sent an email to certain developing countries saying that it would like the OIE animal welfare standards to be 'firmly established as the single pre-eminent international reference point for animal welfare'. The email continues by saying that the 'status will greatly simplify your trade negotiating position with respect to animal welfare and provide you with a strong counterargument to those trading partners who may seek to impose their prescriptive animal welfare requirements on you'. This shows that the OIE wishes to prevent the EU and others from requiring imports to meet animal welfare standards which are more stringent than those of the OIE.

Will the Commission make clear that it does not accept the OIE Recommendations on animal welfare as international standards which prevent it from requiring imports to meet its own standards, provided that in so doing it acts in a manner that is consistent with WTO rules?

Should the EU fail to make a clear statement to this effect it may find that, in a future trade dispute, a WTO panel will rule that the EU has previously accepted the OIE Recommendations as international standards on animal welfare and cannot later require imports to meet its own standards which are more stringent than OIE standards.

Will the Commission also make clear that:

— the role of the OIE ought to be to improve animal welfare worldwide but not to make it difficult for those countries wishing to adopt higher standards to do so?

— the OIE should recognise that WTO rules and case law allow member countries to require imports to meet standards which are higher than international standards in certain circumstances and subject to certain conditions?

— the OIE standards should be seen as minimum rather than maximum standards?

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

The Commission seeks to promote high welfare standards in animal livestock populations worldwide. To do this, it supports both the specific standards and recommendations on animal welfare of the OIE and promotes animal welfare in the cooperation agreements it signs with third countries. Apart from enhancing the degree of implementation of OIE standards on animal welfare, this also facilitates capacity-building on animal welfare matters in some of the EU's key trading partners.

In addition, the EU has been able to secure guarantees as regards animal welfare in slaughterhouses. Those slaughterhouses exporting meat to the EU must provide the relevant certification attesting to the fact that the animals have been handled in compliance with Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing, and have met requirements at least equivalent to those laid down in the regulation.

At the third OIE Global Conference on animal welfare held in Kuala-Lumpur in 2012, the issue of introducing stricter measures than those mentioned in the OIE standards was discussed and a conclusion was added with respect to the right of OIE Member Countries to determine the level of their national science-based measures.

To date, none of these agreements limits the capacity of the EU's counterparts to adopt more stringent standards than those of the OIE.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011922/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(18 de outubro de 2013)

Assunto: Despedimentos na Alcatel Lucent e na Siemens

De acordo com notícias recentes, a Alcatel Lucent e a Siemens pretendem liquidar 25 mil postos de trabalho no próximo biénio.

O grupo franco-americano anunciou que, até ao final de 2015, planeia despedir 10 mil trabalhadores, sendo 4 100 na Europa, 3 800 no Médio Oriente e em África e 2 100 no continente americano.

A multinacional alemã, por seu lado, informou, no final do mês de setembro, da intenção de prescindir de 15 mil trabalhadores em todo o mundo durante o ano de 2014, um terço dos quais nas unidades industriais, de energia e de infraestruturas situadas na Alemanha.

Em face do exposto, solicitamos à Comissão que nos informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que medidas tomou ou pensa tomar na sequência destes anúncios?

2. Efetuou ou vai efetuar alguma avaliação do impacto destas decisões?

3. Tem conhecimento sobre que fundos da UE foram até hoje atribuídos à Alcatel Lucent e à Siemens?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(9 de dezembro de 2013)

A Comissão está ciente da situação das empresas Alcatel Lucent e Siemens, mas não tem poder para interferir nas suas decisões. Contudo, incentiva efetivamente os empregadores a adotarem boas práticas na gestão da mudança de forma socialmente responsável. É de referir também que, em caso de encerramento de empresas, o empregador tem de respeitar as obrigações relativas à informação e consulta dos trabalhadores, em conformidade com a legislação da UE.

A Comissão não analisa o impacto das decisões de reestruturação adotadas por cada empresa.

Até à data, a Comissão não recebeu ainda qualquer pedido de financiamento ao abrigo do Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização (FEG) relativamente aos despedimentos referidos pelos Senhores Deputados.

As informações sobre as organizações e empresas que beneficiaram de financiamento do orçamento da UE podem ser consultadas utilizando o motor de pesquisa criado no âmbito do Sistema de Transparência Financeira, disponível na página Web da DG BUDG, através do seguinte endereço:
http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/beneficiaries_pt.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011922/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Lay-offs at Alcatel Lucent and at Siemens

It has recently been reported that Alcatel Lucent and Siemens plan to cut 25 000 jobs over the next two years.

The French-US group announced that it intends to lay off 10 000 workers between now and the end of 2015, with 4 100 jobs to go in Europe, 3 800 in the Middle East and Africa and 2 100 on the American continent.

The German multinational also said at the end of September that it will cut its worldwide workforce by 15 000 during the course of 2014. One third of the jobs affected will be at its industrial, energy and infrastructure units in Germany.

1. What steps has the Commission taken or does it intend to take in response to these announcements?

2. Has it assessed the impact of these decisions? Does it intend to do so?

3. Is it aware of any EU funding received to date by Alcatel Lucent and Siemens?

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

The Commission is aware of the situation at Alcatel Lucent and Siemens, but has no powers to interfere in company's decisions. It does, however, encourage employers to follow good practices in socially responsible management of change. It should also be noted that in case of closure of undertakings, the employer must respect obligations relating to information and consultation of workers in accordance with EC law.

The Commission does not analyse the impact of individual company restructuring decisions.

The Commission has not so far received any application for funding from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) related to the redundancies referred to by the Honourable Members.

Information on which organisations and companies have received funding form the EU budget may be found by using the search engine set up within the Financial Transparency System available on BudgWeb at the following address: http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/beneficiaries_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011923/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(18 de outubro de 2013)

Assunto: Trabalhadores portugueses explorados em Inglaterra

Recentemente, recebemos denúncias sobre a exploração a que foram submetidos um conjunto de trabalhadores portugueses contratados através de uma agência de trabalho inglesa, instalada no Estoril (Portugal), para trabalharem em Birmingham (Inglaterra).

Os trabalhadores foram aliciados por salários elevados apesar de terem de trabalhar 12 horas diárias sem período de descanso semanal. Em Inglaterra não lhe deram trabalho e nem lhe pagaram.

Após a presença dos funcionários consulares portugueses, solicitada que foi a sua intervenção, 29 trabalhadores fizeram um acordo com o empregador e vieram para Portugal. Outros, perante a promessa de melhores condições de trabalho, resolveram ficar. Contudo, o acordado não foi, mais uma vez, cumprido.

Este é mais um exemplo de como a profunda crise económica e social, que os programas de intervenção FMI-UE vieram agravar, nomeadamente em Portugal, tem empurrado muitos trabalhadores para fora do país, vulneráveis a todo o tipo de abusos e a situações de brutal exploração.

Em resposta a uma pergunta anterior (E-010509/2011), a Comissão refere que: «tem conhecimento de casos idênticos ocorridos em vários Estados-Membros. Por conseguinte, a Comissão tomará medidas para melhorar e reforçar a transposição, a aplicação e o cumprimento da Diretiva 96/71/CE, nomeadamente para prevenir e sancionar eventuais abusos ou evasão às normas aplicáveis».

Em face do exposto, solicitamos à Comissão que nos informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Tem conhecimento deste caso concreto?

2. Que medidas tomou, desde a resposta à pergunta E-010509/2011, para impedir situações como a descrita?

3. Tendo em conta a persistência destas situações, que medidas vai ainda adotar a Comissão?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(12 de dezembro de 2013)

1. A Comissão não tinha conhecimento da situação específica referida pelos Senhores Deputados.

2. Desde a resposta à pergunta E-10509/2011, a Comissão adotou uma proposta ([1]) de diretiva respeitante à execução da Diretiva 96/71/CE ([2]), destinada a melhorar, na prática, a aplicação, a execução e o cumprimento dessa diretiva pelos Estados-Membros, tendo em vista prevenir e punir a evasão às regras aplicáveis, bem como conferir uma melhor proteção aos trabalhadores destacados na UE. A proposta, que se encontra atualmente em exame pelo Conselho e o Parlamento, irá melhorar os instrumentos à disposição dos Estados-Membros para o acompanhamento e o cumprimento das disposições relativas às condições de emprego, nomeadamente através de regras que permitam a aplicação de coimas e sanções, para além de prever medidas destinadas a proporcionar aos trabalhadores e às empresas uma melhor informação sobre os seus direitos e deveres.

3. Para tornar mais eficaz a legislação da UE no domínio da livre circulação dos trabalhadores e da luta contra a discriminação em razão da nacionalidade, a Comissão adotou, em 26 de abril de 2013, uma proposta ([3]) de diretiva destinada a facilitar o exercício dos direitos dos trabalhadores da UE. A proposta, que também se encontra atualmente em exame pelo Conselho e o Parlamento, implica um maior respeito dos direitos existentes, obrigando os Estados-Membros da União a fornecer aos trabalhadores da UE informação relativa os seus direitos e mais assistência com vista ao exercício dos mesmos.

([1]) COM(2012) 131 — final de 21 de Março de 2012.
([2]) Diretiva 96/71/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 16 de dezembro de 1996, relativa ao destacamento de trabalhadores no âmbito de uma prestação de serviços, JO L 18 de 21.1.1997.
([3]) COM(2013) 236 final, de 26 de abril de 2013.

A Comissão relembra, porém, que o acompanhamento e a fiscalização do cumprimento das disposições nos domínios das condições de trabalho e de emprego, e bem assim da remuneração dos trabalhadores são da competência dos Estados-Membros, que possuem organismos especializados para efetuar controlos e determinar as ações corretivas necessárias, mormente as inspeções do trabalho.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011923/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Portuguese workers exploited in England

We recently received complaints concerning the exploitation of a group of Portuguese workers, who were offered jobs in Birmingham (England) through an English employment agency based in Estoril (Portugal).

The workers were attracted by the high wages, despite being required to work 12 hours a day, seven days a week. Once in England, they were neither given work nor paid.

Following the involvement of Portuguese consular staff, who were asked for assistance, 29 workers reached an agreement with the employer and returned to Portugal. Others decided to stay, having been promised better working conditions. Despite this, the agreement was again not honoured.

This is yet another example of the way in which the economic and social crisis, exacerbated by the EU-IMF intervention programmes, has forced many workers to seek employment outside Portugal, making them vulnerable to all forms of abuse and brutal exploitation.

In response to a previous Written Question (E-010509/2011, the Commission said that it was 'aware of similar cases which have occurred in several Member States. Therefore, the Commission will take measures aimed at improving and reinforcing the transposition, implementation and enforcement in practice of Directive 96/71/EC, which will include measures to prevent and sanction any abuse and circumvention of the applicable rules.'

1. Is the Commission aware of this specific case?

2. What steps has it taken since its reply to Written Question E-010509/2011 to prevent such situations recurring?

3. Given that such incidents continue to take place, what further action does the Commission plan to take?

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

1. The Commission was not aware of the specific case referred to.

2. Since answering Question E-10509/2011, the Commission has adopted a proposal ([1]) for an enforcement directive to improve the way Directive 96/71/EC ([2]) is implemented, applied and enforced in practice by the Member States with a view to preventing, and providing for penalties for, the circumventing of the rules applicable and improving the protection of posted workers in the EU. The proposal, which is currently before the Council and Parliament, would improve the instruments available to the Member States for monitoring, and enforcing provisions on, employment conditions, *inter alia* through rules to allow the cross-border enforcement of administrative fines and penalties, in addition to measures to provide workers and companies with better information on their rights and obligations.

3. To make EC law on free movement of workers more effective and fight against discrimination on the basis of nationality and to free movement of workers, the Commission adopted a proposal ([3]) on 26 April 2013 for a directive to facilitate the exercise of rights of Union workers. The proposal, which is also currently before the Council and Parliament, involves better enforcement of existing rights and would require the Member States to provide Union workers with information on their rights and more assistance in asserting them.

The Commission would point out, however, that the monitoring and enforcement of provisions on working and employment conditions and the remuneration of workers fall within the competence of the Member States, which have specialised bodies, such as labour inspectorates, to carry out checks and determine the corrective measures required.

([1]) COM(2012) 131 final of 21 March 2012.
([2]) Directive 96/71/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 1996 concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services, OJ L 18, 21.1.1997.
([3]) COM(2013) 236 final of 26 April 2013.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011924/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(18 de outubro de 2013)

Assunto: Declarações da OIT sobre emprego precário

Segundo a Organização Internacional do Trabalho, dois terços dos trabalhadores não têm um emprego decente, carecem de direitos e de proteção social. Para além da precariedade em que se encontram dois mil milhões de um total de três mil milhões de trabalhadores, o diretor da OIT em Espanha denunciou ainda que cerca de 50 milhões de jovens engrossam todos os anos os números do desemprego, pelo que, concluiu, são necessários 250 milhões de postos de trabalho nos próximos cinco anos para manter a atual taxa de desocupação.

Em face destes números, solicitamos à Comissão que nos informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Pode garantir que os programas recentemente anunciados para promoção do emprego jovem não serão utilizados para promover formas diversas de trabalho precário?

2. Que medidas de combate ao trabalho precário estão em curso na UE neste momento?

3. Como justifica as pressões desenvolvidas pela Comissão, por via dos programas UE-FMI, para uma ainda maior precarização das relações laborais?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(10 de dezembro de 2013)

A Recomendação do Conselho relativa ao estabelecimento de uma «Garantia para a Juventude» ([1]) salienta que os jovens devem beneficiar de uma «boa oferta» (de emprego, aprendizado, estágio ou formação contínua). A Comissão sublinha a importância de essa oferta de qualidade constituir uma oferta individualizada relevante para a pessoa em causa, ajudando-a a desenvolver os seus pontos fortes, para que possa estabelecer-se adequadamente no mercado de trabalho.

A «Iniciativa para o Emprego dos Jovens» dará apoio financeiro às medidas tomadas pelos Estados-Membros no âmbito da «Garantia para a Juventude», atribuindo a mesma ênfase à qualidade das ofertas de emprego.

As informações relativas às medidas que visam combater o emprego precário nos Estados-Membros da UE podem ser consultadas no âmbito dos programas nacionais de reforma sobre as reformas estruturais e as medidas destinadas a estimular o crescimento e o emprego, que os Estados-Membros apresentam à Comissão no contexto do procedimento anual do Semestre Europeu.

Sobre as medidas tomadas a nível da UE, a Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta à pergunta escrita P-009626/2013 ([2]).

As recomendações procuram, em geral, estimular a criação de emprego e, simultaneamente, reduzir a precariedade também nos países apoiados pelos programas de assistência financeira.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2013:120:0001:0006:PT:PDF
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=P-2013-009626&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011924/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: International Labour Organisation comments on precarious employment

According to the International Labour Organisation (ILO), two thirds of workers do not have decent work and have no rights or social protection. In addition to the precarious situation faced by 2 billion people — out of a total of 3 billion workers —, according to the head of the ILO in Spain, around 50 million young people swell the ranks of the unemployed every year; he has therefore concluded that 250 million jobs are needed in the next five years just to maintain the current level of unemployment.

In view of these figures:

1. Can the Commission guarantee that the recently announced programmes to promote youth employment will not be used to promote various forms of precarious employment?

2. What actions to combat precarious employment are currently under way in the EU?

3. How can the Commission justify pushing for even more insecure labour relations, through EU-IMF programmes?

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

The Council Recommendation on Establishing a Youth Guarantee ([1]) stresses that a 'high-quality offer' (of employment, an apprenticeships, traineeship or continuous education) should be made to young people. The Commission stresses that a 'good-quality offer' should be an individualised offer meaningful for the person in question, helping them develop their strengths with a view to gaining a proper foothold in the labour market.

The Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) will provide financial support to the measures undertaken by Member States under the Youth Guarantee with the same focus on the quality of job offers.

Information on actions taken to combat precarious employment in the EU Member States can be found in the National Reform Programmes on structural reforms and measures to boost growth and jobs that the Member States submit to the Commission in the context of the yearly European Semester procedure.

As regards action at EU level, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-009626/2013 ([2]).

Recommendations are generally geared to stimulate job creation while reducing precariousness also in countries supported by financial assistance programmes.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2013:120:0001:0006:EN:PDF
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=P-2013-009626&language=EN

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011925/13
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(18 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Dimethylformamide

Veel bedrijven in de farmaceutische industrie, de agrochemie en de textielsector maken in hun productieprocessen gebruik van het solvent dimethylformamide. De producenten van dimethylformamide in de EU, vaak kleine en middelgrote ondernemingen, doen dit met inachtneming van strenge veiligheidsnormen. Als solvent in het productieproces zou dimethylformamide ook geen sporen in het eindproduct mogen achterlaten.

Het Europees Agentschap voor Chemische Stoffen werkt momenteel aan een aanbeveling om dimethylformamide op de autorisatielijst bij de REACH-verordening te plaatsen.

— Zal de Commissie dimethylformamide opnemen in de autorisatielijst?

— Heeft de Commissie weet van volwaardige alternatieven voor het gebruik van dimethylformamide?

— Hoe kan de Commissie verhinderen dat de productie en het gebruik van dimethylformamide in bepaalde productieprocessen in de toekomst enkel nog door bedrijven buiten de EU en in vele gevallen onder minder strikte veiligheidsvoorwaarden gebeurt, terwijl eindproducten op basis van een productieproces met dimethylformamide via import toch hun weg naar de Europese consument vinden?

Antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie
(3 januari 2014)

De openbare raadpleging overeenkomstig artikel 58, lid 4, van Reach [1] over de ontwerpaanbeveling van het ECHA [2] om N,N-dimethylformamide (DMF) en vier andere stoffen op te nemen in de lijst van autorisatieplichtige stoffen [3], werd op 23 september 2013 afgesloten. De aanbeveling van het ECHA wordt momenteel afgerond en de Commissie verwacht dat zij deze begin 2014 ontvangt. De Commissie zal de aanbeveling tot wijziging van bijlage XIV dan overwegen. Het uiteindelijke doel van autorisatie is geleidelijke vervanging van zeer zorgwekkende stoffen (SVHC's) zoals DMF, voor zover dat economisch en technisch haalbaar is.

Het ECHA verstrekt een beknopte beoordeling van de mogelijke alternatieven voor DMF in het achtergronddocument bij zijn ontwerpaanbeveling. Volgens de bepalingen van Reach moeten de technische en economische geschiktheid en de beschikbaarheid van alternatieven voor bepaalde vormen van gebruik, alsook informatie over de risico's als gevolg van het specifieke gebruik echter per geval worden beoordeeld in de fase van de procedure die betrekking heeft op de aanvraag voor autorisatie. Dat er momenteel geen geschikte alternatieven beschikbaar zijn, speelt dus geen rol bij de opname van een stof in bijlage XIV.

Autorisatie in het kader van Reach geldt niet voor het gebruik van in de lijst van bijlage XIV opgenomen stoffen in productieprocessen buiten de EU. Als het gebruik van die stoffen in (onder meer ingevoerde) voorwerpen een risico voor de gezondheid of het milieu met zich meebrengt, kan een beperking worden ingevoerd overeenkomstig artikel 69, lid 2, van Reach om de situatie te verhelpen indien die stoffen in het afgewerkte voorwerp aanwezig zijn.

Voorts verwijst de Commissie het geachte Parlementslid naar het antwoord op schriftelijke vraag P-10744/2013 van mevrouw Emma McClarkin.

(1) Verordening (EG) nr. 1907/2006 inzake de registratie en beoordeling van en de autorisatie en beperkingen ten aanzien van chemische stoffen (REACH).
(2) Europees Agentschap voor chemische stoffen (ECHA).
(3) Bijlage XIV bij Reach.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011925/13
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Dimethylformamide

Numerous companies in the pharmaceutical industry, agrochemical and textile sectors use the solvent dimethylformamide in their production processes. The producers of dimethylformamide in the EU, frequently small and medium-sized companies, perform this task in compliance with strict safety regulations. When used as a solvent in the production process, there should be no traces left either of dimethylformamide in the end product.

The European Chemicals Agency is currently working on a recommendation to place dimethylformamide on the REACH Regulation's authorisation list.

— Will the Commission include dimethylformamide in the authorisation list?

— Is the Commission aware of acceptable alternatives to using dimethylformamide?

— How can the Commission prevent dimethylformamide being produced and used in certain production processes in the future only by companies outside the EU and, in many cases, under less stringent safety conditions, with end products based on a production process using dimethylformamide still finding their way to European consumers via imports?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(3 January 2014)

The public consultation in accordance with Article 58(4) of REACH (1) on ECHA (2)'s draft recommendation suggesting to include N, N-Dimethylformamide (DMF) and four other substances in the list of substances subject to authorisation (3) ended on 23 September 2013. The ECHA recommendation is being finalised and the Commission expects to receive it at the beginning of 2014. The Commission will then consider the recommendation with a view to amend Annex XIV. The final objective of authorisation is to progressively substitute Substances of Very High Concern (SVHCs) such as DMF, where economically and technically viable.

ECHA provides a brief assessment of the possible alternatives to DMF in the background document to its draft recommendation. However, in line with REACH provisions, technical and economic suitability and availability of alternatives for particular uses, as well as information on the risks arising from the specific use are to be considered case-by-case at the application for authorisation stage of the process. The fact that there are no suitable alternatives available at present is thus not a relevant consideration for the purposes of including a substance in Annex XIV.

REACH authorisation does not apply to the use of substances listed in Annex XIV in the production processes outside the EU and in cases when these substances in articles (including those from imports) pose a risk to health or the environment, a restriction can be introduced in line with Article 69(2) of REACH in order to remedy the situation, when those substances are present in the final article.

The Commission would also like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to P-10744/2013 by Mrs Emma McClarkin.

(1) Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restrictionof Chemicals (REACH).
(2) European Chemicals Agency (ECHA).
(3) Annex XIV of REACH.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-011926/13
aan de Commissie
Wim van de Camp (PPE)
(18 oktober 2013)

Betreft: Diefstal van koper uit hoogspanningsmasten

Op 15 oktober 2013 verscheen in de Nederlandse krant *Algemeen Dagblad* een artikel over de diefstal van koper uit hoogspanningsmasten ([1]). Deze nieuwe vorm van diefstal, die uiterst gevaarlijk wordt geacht, veroorzaakt stroomonderbrekingen en kan tot levensgevaarlijke situaties leiden. Volgens de elektriciteitsbedrijven slagen de dieven er soms in meerdere kilometers koperkabel te stelen. Koperdiefstal is een aanhoudend probleem, niet alleen in Nederland maar ook in andere Europese landen zoals Duitsland, Engeland, Italië, Frankrijk, Luxemburg en België. Volgens diverse nieuwsbronnen zijn met name criminele organisaties uit Oost-Europa verantwoordelijk voor de diefstal van koper. Waar deze criminele organisaties in het verleden koperkabel stalen van de spoorwegen, koper van kerkdaken en metalen rioleringsdeksels op de openbare weg, richten ze hun inspanningen nu blijkbaar ook op andere doelwitten zoals hoogspanningsmasten. Volgens deskundigen verleggen de meeste Oost-Europese criminelen hun activiteiten zoals koperdiefstal naar landen in West-Europa omdat de kans dat ze gepakt worden gering is. Zelfs als deze criminelen worden gepakt, zijn de straffen die ze krijgen relatief mild ten opzichte van die in Oost-Europa.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van deze problemen met betrekking tot koperdiefstal?

2. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat de grootschalige diefstal van koper een probleem op EU-niveau is, en niet een dat enkel van nationaal belang is voor de betrokken lidstaten? Zo nee, waarom niet?

3. Is Europol op de hoogte van het bestaan van criminele organisaties die verantwoordelijk zijn voor de diefstal van koper? Zo ja, wat is er geweten over deze organisaties?

4. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat de verschillen inzake strafrecht tussen West- en Oost-Europese landen voor koperdieven een grote drijfveer kunnen zijn om hun misdaden bijvoorbeeld in Nederland te plegen?

5. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat koperdieven in hun thuisland moeten worden vervolgd om ervoor te zorgen dat criminele organisaties niet langer kunnen profiteren van de verschillen tussen lidstaten inzake strafrecht? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(11 december 2013)

De Commissie is op de hoogte van het probleem van de metaaldiefstal in de EU en ook van de grensoverschrijdende dimensie ervan. Metaaldiefstal is één van de belangrijkste thema's die vallen onder de prioriteit „door mobiele dadergroepen gepleegde diefstal van onroerend goed" in het kader van de huidige EU-beleidscyclus 2013-2017 inzake georganiseerde en zware criminaliteit.

De EU-beleidscyclus inzake georganiseerde en zware criminaliteit is een eerste waardevolle poging om op Europees niveau gezamenlijk grensoverschrijdende fenomenen aan te pakken volgens het concept van inlichtingengestuurde rechtshandhaving. De lidstaten voeren die beleidscyclus op vrijwillige basis uit met krachtige steun van Europol en de andere JBZ-agentschappen en in nauwe samenwerking met de Commissie. EMPACT (European Multidisciplinary Platform Against Criminal Threats) biedt het operationele platform voor de beleidscyclus, waarvan Europol de uitvoering beheert.

De Commissie kan de straffen voor koperdiefstal in de verschillende Europese lidstaten niet beoordelen. Het is niet aan de Commissie om te bepalen in welke lidstaat koperdieven moeten worden vervolgd.

([1]) http://www.ad.nl/ad/nl/1012/Nederland/article/detail/3527345/2013/10/15/Ex-militairen-ingezet-om-op-koperdieven-te-jagen.dhtml.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011926/13
to the Commission
Wim van de Camp (PPE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Theft of copper from electricity pylons

On 15 October 2013, the Dutch newspaper *Algemeen Dagblad* reported on the theft of copper from electricity pylons ([1]). This new form of theft, considered to be extremely dangerous, causes power cuts and can lead to life-threatening situations. According to electricity companies, offenders manage to steal several kilometres of brass wire in some cases. The theft of copper is an ongoing problem in the Netherlands, as well as in other European countries such as Germany, England, Italy, France, Luxembourg and Belgium. According to several news sources, it is criminal organisations from Eastern Europe that are mainly responsible for the theft of copper. Whereas in the past these criminal organisations stole brass wire from railways, copper roofs from churches and iron storm drains from the streets, they now seem to direct their efforts towards targets such as electricity pylons as well. Experts maintain that most Eastern European criminals shift to activities such as copper theft in Western European countries because of the low risk of being caught. Even if these criminals are caught, the sentences imposed on them are relatively low compared with those in Eastern Europe.

1. Is the Commission aware of these problems relating to the theft of copper?

2. Does the Commission agree that the large-scale theft of copper is an EU-level problem, not just one of national significance to the Member States concerned? If not, why not?

3. Is Europol aware of the existence of the criminal organisations responsible for the theft of copper? If so, what is known about these organisations?

4. Does the Commission agree that the differences between Western and Eastern European countries when it comes to their criminal justice systems might be a major incentive for copper thieves to commit their crimes in the Netherlands, for example?

5. Does the Commission agree that copper thieves should be prosecuted in their home country, so as to ensure that criminal organisations can no longer benefit from the differences in legal systems between Member States? If not, why not?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2013)

The Commission is aware of the problem of metal theft in the EU as well as of its cross-border dimension. Metal theft is one of the most important commodities covered by the priority ‘organised property theft committed by mobile organised criminal groups’ in the framework of the current policy cycle on serious and organised crime 2013-2017. The EU policy cycle on serious and organised crime is a valuable first attempt to base cooperation on cross-border crime phenomena at EU level on the concept of intelligence-led policing. It is conducted by Member States on a voluntary basis with strong support from Europol and the other JHA agencies and in close cooperation with the Commission. EMPACT, standing for European Multidisciplinary Platform Against Criminal Threats, provides the operational platform for policy cycle implementation, managed by Europol.

The Commission is not in a position to assess the relative sanctions against copper theft in different EU Member States. It is not for the Commission to decide on jurisdiction in cases of prosecution of cooper theft in the Member States of the EU.

([1]) http://www.ad.nl/ad/nl/1012/Nederland/article/detail/3527345/2013/10/15/Ex-militairen-ingezet-om-op-koperdieven-te-jagen.dhtml

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-011929/13
upućeno Komisiji
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(18. listopada 2013.)

Predmet: Problem objektivnosti informiranja — Hrvatska radiotelevizija

Osnovna funkcija javnog servisa je objektivno, točno i nepristrano informiranje. U Rezoluciji koju je 1994. godine usvojilo Vijeće Europe naglašava se potreba podupiranja javnih radio-televizija i donosi se poseban zaključak u kojem stoji da javni model najbolje podupire vrijednost političkih, pravnih i društvenih struktura demokratskog društva, a osobito poštovanje ljudskih prava, kulture i političkog pluralizma. Dobro je poznato kolika je snaga televizije (i medija općenito) u kreiranju javnog mnijenja, stoga mi se posebno opasnim čini eventualna kohabitacija Vlade i visokopozicioniranih zaposlenika državne televizije.

Stoga se moram referirati na aktualnu situaciju u vezi s navedenim pitanjem u Republici Hrvatskoj. Saborska većina bira ravnatelja HRT-a, a saborsku većinu ima ista koalicija koja čini Vladu RH. Takvom većinom izabrano je trenutačno vodstvo HRT-a koje se miješa u program i bira kadrove sukladno političkoj orijentaciji. Štoviše, takva situacija omogućena je izmjenama i dopunama Zakona o HRT-u iz 2012. g. koji je Europska komisija ocijenila lošijim od zakona iz 2010. g. na osnovi kojeg je biranje vodećih ljudi televizije obavljano političkim konsenzusom parlamentarnih stranaka. Nažalost, toga više nema. Također evidentan je i trend filtriranja informacija, tj. selektivne distribucije informacija.

Sukladno tome molim Komisiju da odgovori:

1. Što Komisija radi kako bi potakla slobodu medija i pluralizam u Hrvatskoj?

2. Što Komisija planira učiniti na temelju javnih konzultacija o neovisnosti audiovizualnih regulatornih tijela?

Odgovor gospođe Kroes u ime Komisije
(23. prosinca 2013.)

Komisija u okviru svoje nadležnosti nastoji osigurati poštovanje slobode i pluralizma medija kako je utvrđeno u članku 11. Povelje Europske unije o temeljnim pravima te prati razvoj tih načela u državama članicama.

Komisija podržava ulogu javne radiodifuzije kao sastavnog dijela europske demokracije. Ugovorom se jasno određuje da su upravljanje i strateške odluke o javnoj usluzi radiodifuzije u nadležnosti država članica. Iako ne može određivati državama članicama kako da organiziraju svojeg pružatelja javne usluge radiodifuzije, Komisija pridaje veliku važnost ulozi koju dvojni sustav javnih i privatnih pružatelja usluga radiodifuzije ima u očuvanju pluralizma medija i promociji europskih vrijednosti. Slučaj koji je cijenjeni član opisao nije obuhvaćen područjem primjene zakonodavstva Europske unije. U skladu s člankom 51. stavkom 1. Povelja se primjenjuje na države članice samo kada primjenjuju zakonodavstvo Europske unije. Nadalje, u članku 6. stavku 1. Ugovora o Europskoj uniji navodi da se „Odredbama Povelje ni na koji način ne proširuju nadležnosti Unije kako su utvrđene u Ugovorima".

Javno savjetovanje o neovisnosti regulatornih tijela za audiovizualne medijske usluge pokazalo je da postoji potreba za boljom i sustavnijom suradnjom na višoj razini između regulatornih tijela u području audiovizualnih medijskih usluga. Komisija promišlja o mogućim daljnjim koracima i u kontekstu savjetovanja o budućnosti Direktive o audiovizualnim medijskim uslugama koja je uvrštena u raspored Programa prikladnosti i učinkovitosti propisa REFIT. Odgovori na ta savjetovanja uzet će se u obzir prilikom donošenja odluke o mogućim daljnjim mjerama u okviru nadležnosti Europske unije.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011929/13
to the Commission
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Problem of media objectivity — Croatian Radio Television (HRT)

The basic function of a public service broadcaster is to report the facts objectively, accurately, and impartially. In a resolution adopted in 1994 the Council of Europe pointed to the need to support public service (radio and television) broadcasting and explicitly stated that the public service model is best suited to supporting the values underlying the political, legal, and social structures of democratic societies, and in particular respect for human rights, culture, and political pluralism. That television, and the media in general, are powerful opinion-formers is well known, and that is why the possibility of collusion between a government and senior employees of a state television broadcaster is, to my mind, especially dangerous.

That is why I have to speak about the current situation in Croatia regarding this matter. The Director-General of HRT is chosen by the majority in Parliament, held by the coalition now serving in the Croatian Government. The present HRT management, chosen with the support of the above majority, interferes with programming and selects personnel according to their political leanings. Furthermore, this state of affairs has been brought about by the amendments introduced by the 2012 HRT Act, which the Commission has judged to be worse than the 2010 law, whereby television executives were to be selected on the basis of a consensus among the parties represented in Parliament. Sadly, that is no longer happening. There is also a visible tendency to filter information, in other words to disseminate it selectively.

In this connection:

1. What is the Commission doing to promote freedom of the media and pluralism in Croatia?

2. What does it plan to do in response to public consultations on the independence ofaudiovisual regulatory bodies?

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

The Commission seeks to ensure the respect of media freedom and pluralism enshrined in Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union within its competences and follows related developments in Member States.

The Commission supports the role of public broadcasting as an integral part of European democracy. The Treaty makes it clear that the governance and strategic choices on public service broadcasting lie with Member States. So while the Commission cannot prescribe Member States how to organise their public service broadcaster, we attach special importance to the role of the dual system of public and commercial service broadcasters in preserving media pluralism and promoting European values. The case described by the Honourable Member falls outside the scope of European Union law. According to its Article 51(1), the Charter applies to Member States only when they are implementing European Union law. Moreover, Article 6(1) of the Treaty of the European Union states that, ‘the provisions of the Charter shall not extend in any way the competences of the Union as defined in the Treaties.’

The public consultation on the independence of audiovisual regulatory bodies showed that there is a need for stronger, more regular and at higher level cooperation between the regulatory bodies in the field of audiovisual media services. The Commission will reflect on possible follow up steps also in the context of deliberations about the future of the Audiovisual Media Services Directive which has been included in the scheduling of the REFIT exercise. The decision on any possible follow-up actions within the limits of the competences of the European Union will take account of the responses to those consultations.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-011931/13
до Комисията
Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(18 октомври 2013 г.)

Относно: Огнища на болестите шап и шарка по домашните животни в погранични райони на Република България

В граничния с Турция район на Странджапланина в България периодично възникват огнища на болестите шап и шарка, както и на други заразни болести по домашните животни, като последният случай е от преди броени дни. За ограничаване и ликвидиране на болестите всички заразени и контактни домашни животни се избиват, което възпрепятства всякакви опити за развитие на животновъдството в района.

Тежкото положение на животновъдите в този район, както и неблагоприятните тенденции, свързани с обезлюдяване и лошо състояние на инфраструктурата, ограничават възможностите за развитие на икономически дейности и осигуряване на устойчив поминък на населението. В същото време в Република Турция животните не се избиват, а ваксинирането е позволено, което не е от полза за българските животновъди.

В тази връзка може ли ЕК да разясни:

Какви мерки са установени на равнище на ЕС за противодействие в случай на поява на огнища на болестите шап и шарка, както и на други заразни болести по домашните животни, с цел рационално развитие на селскостопанския сектор и защита на здравето на животните в ЕС?

Има ли възможност за изключение от европейската политика на неваксиниране на домашните животни за регионите по външната граница на ЕС, което е единственият изход за излизане от създалата се ситуация в България?

Под каква форма могат да бъдат отпуснати европейски средства за компенсации на стопаните за избитите животни и за изграждане на центрове, в които да бъдат настанявани контактни здрави животни при налагане на карантинни мерки?

Отговор, даден от г-н Борг от името на Комисията
(3 декември 2013 г.)

Всички държави — членки на ЕС, са признати от Световната организация за здравето на животните (OIE) за свободни от болестта шап без извършена ваксинация. Много други основни болести по животните също бяха успешно ликвидирани от територията на ЕС. Високият здравен статус на животните в ЕС улеснява развитието на животновъдството в целия Съюз и е от съществено значение за функционирането на единния пазар на животни и животински продукти.

В законодателството на Съюза за борба с редица основни екзотични болести по животните се предвижда избиване на заразените стада с цел бързо ликвидиране на болестта; в него, обаче, се предвижда и възможността за извършването на спешна ваксинация. По отношение на спешната ваксинация срещу болестта шап ЕС поддържа банка с антигени за изготвяне на ваксини, разрешени за употреба при животни, отглеждани за производство на храни. Що се отнася до шарката по овцете, в Съюза няма разрешена ваксина.

През последните години ЕС инвестира значителни средства в мерките за борба с болестта шап в Турция. През 2010 г. OIE призна европейската част на територията на Турция за зона, свободна от шап с извършена ваксинация. Ваксинацията в райони на ЕС, разположени в близост до Турция, не е необходима, и би могла да влоши здравния статус на животните в съответните държави членки.

В законодателството на Съюза относно разходите във ветеринарната област се предвижда финансова подкрепа за държавите членки за загубите, понесени от животновъдите в резултат на мерки за борба с болестта. Финансова и техническа подкрепа се предоставя и на България, Гърция и Турция за изпълняването на програма за ранно откриване и борба с болестта шап при селскостопанските и дивите животни в Тракийския регион.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011931/13
to the Commission
Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease and sheep and goat pox among domestic animals in border regions of Bulgaria

Bulgaria's Strandzha Mountains region bordering Turkey regularly experiences outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease and sheep and goat pox, as well as other infectious diseases affecting domestic animals, with the most recent incident occurring a few days ago. To contain and eradicate the diseases, all domestic animals which have been infected by or come into contact with them are culled, thereby thwarting any attempts to develop livestock farming in the region.

The difficult situation facing livestock farmers in this region, along with the adverse trends relating to depopulation and the poor state of the infrastructure, is restricting the opportunities for developing economic activities and providing a sustainable livelihood for the population. At the same time, animals are not being culled in Turkey, but vaccination is permitted, which is of no benefit to Bulgarian livestock farmers.

In this context, can the Commission explain the following?

What counter-measures are being implemented at EU level in the event of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease and sheep and goat pox, as well as of other infectious diseases among domestic animals, aimed at the realistic development of the agricultural sector and protecting animal health in the EU?

Is there any chance of exempting from the EU's policy of not vaccinating domestic animals the regions at the EU's external border, which is the only way out of the situation which has developed in Bulgaria?

What form can the European funds take which are awarded in compensation to farmers for the animals which have been culled and for building centres where healthy animals which have been in contact with the diseases will be housed, as part of implementing quarantine measures?

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

All EU Member States are recognised by the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) as free from foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) without vaccination. Many other major animal diseases have also been successfully eradicated from the EU. A high animal health status in the EU facilitates the development of animal husbandry throughout the Union and it is essential for the functioning of the single market in animals and their products.

Union law on the control of several major exotic animal diseases requires stamping out of the infected herds, to achieve rapid eradication; however, it also foresees the possibility to apply emergency vaccination. For emergency vaccination against FMD, the EU maintains an antigen bank for the formulation of vaccines authorised for the use in food producing animals. In the case of sheep pox, there is no authorised vaccine available in the Union.

During the past years, the EU substantially invested in the control of FMD in Turkey. In 2010 the OIE recognised the European part of Turkey as a zone free of FMD, with vaccination. Vaccination in areas of the EU close to Turkey appears unnecessary and would lower the current animal health status of the Member States in question.

Union law on expenditures in the veterinary field foresees financial support to Member States for losses incurred by farmers as a result of disease control measures. Financial and technical support is also provided to Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey to implement a programme for the early detection and control of FMD in livestock and wildlife in the Thrace region.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-011932/13
do Komisji
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(18 października 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Paliwa z alg

Parlament Europejski podejmuje działania do szybkiego przejścia na biopaliwa nowej generacji, które są uzyskiwane z alternatywnych źródeł energii takich jak wodorosty, odpady czy algi. Kraje członkowskie UE są zobowiązane, aby do 2020 r. zapewnić przynajmniej 10 % udział energii odnawialnej w całkowitej energii użytej w transporcie.

Olej z alg to kolejny pomysł na zastąpienie ropy naftowej biopaliwami. Z prowadzonych badań wynika, że olej algowy ma wszystkie właściwości oleju napędowego, dzięki czemu może sprawdzić się jako paliwo. Wielu przedsiębiorców i laboratoria prowadzą obecnie badania na ten temat, a nowe hodowle chcą produkować coraz więcej oleju z alg i uruchamiać produkcję na skalę przemysłową.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się z następującymi zapytaniami do Komisji Europejskiej:

— czy Komisja prowadzi badania w przedmiotowej sprawie lub monitoruje technologie produkcji oleju z alg?

— czy Komisja posiada informacje, ile fotobioreaktorów (do produkcji i hodowli alg na skalę przemysłową) występuje w państwach członkowskich?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Máire Geoghegan-Quinn w imieniu Komisji
(3 grudnia 2013 r.)

Rozwój bezpiecznych, niezawodnych, przystępnych cenowo i ekologicznych technologii energetycznych w Europie do 2020 r. jest dla Unii Europejskiej sprawą priorytetową.

UE wspierała badania naukowe nad zaawansowanymi biopaliwami w ramach 7PR ([1]), w tym badania nad biopaliwami z alg, zgodnie z wymogami w zakresie zrównoważonego rozwoju określonymi w dyrektywie w sprawie odnawialnych źródeł energii ([2]). Wkład UE w ramach tematu „Energia” zawartego w 7PR sięgnął 30 mln EUR, które przeznaczono na siedem projektów ([3]) w tej dziedzinie (z czego trzy to projekty w skali demonstracyjnej). Planuje się realizację dalszych projektów w ramach programu „Horyzont 2020” – kolejnego finansowanego przez UE programu w zakresie badań naukowych i innowacji (2014-2020), w którym przyjęto podejście zorientowane na wyzwania. Zaproszenia do składania wniosków mają zostać opublikowane w dniu 11 grudnia 2013 r. na portalu dla uczestników programu ramowego ([4]).

Ponadto Komisja wspiera rozwój zaawansowanych biopaliw na skalę przemysłową w kontekście europejskiej inicjatywy przemysłowej na rzecz bioenergii w ramach planu EPSTE ([5]). UE wspiera rozwój tych technologii na szeroką skalę również w ramach systemu ETS ([6]) poprzez program NER 300 ([7]), przeznaczając 300 mln przydziałów na projekty demonstracyjne obejmujące biopaliwa z alg, a także poprzez programy realizowane w ramach funduszy strukturalnych i Funduszu Spójności ([8]) oraz poprzez mechanizm finansowania oparty na podziale ryzyka obsługiwany przez Europejski Bank Inwestycyjny. Komisja nadzoruje wszystkie technologie wykorzystywane do produkcji biopaliw za pomocą narzędzia BIOMAP ([9]), a także poprzez wspieranie Europejskiej Platformy Technologicznej „Biopaliwa” ([10]), w ramach której prowadzona jest baza danych obejmująca badania naukowe oraz projekty demonstracyjne i przemysłowe.

Obecnie w Europie nie ma fotobioreaktorów do produkcji biopaliw na skalę przemysłową. Istnieje jednak kilka fotobioreaktorów produkujących algi na skalę handlową w celu pozyskiwania produktów o wartości dodanej (np. kosmetyków). Dokładna liczba tych fotobioreaktorów nie jest znana.

([1]) Siódmy program ramowy w zakresie badań, rozwoju technologicznego i demonstracji (PR7, 2007-2013).
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:140:0016:0062:pl:PDF
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/projects_pl.html
Projekty: AQUAFUELS, BIOWALK4BIOFUELS, DEMA, FUEL4ME, ALL-GAS, BIOFAT, INTESUSAL.
([4]) https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/home
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/technology/initiatives/doc/implementation_plan_2010_2012_eii_bioenergy.pdf
([6]) System handlu emisjami.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/funding/ner300/index_en.htm
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/country/prordn/index_pl.cfm
([9]) http://setis.ec.europa.eu/BIOMAP/#31016
([10]) http://www.biofuelstp.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011932/13
to the Commission
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Fuel produced from algae

The European Parliament is taking measures to accelerate the transition to next-generation biofuels derived from alternative energy sources, such as seaweed, waste and algae. EU Member States are required to ensure that by 2020 renewable energy makes up at least 10% of their total energy used in transport.

Using oil from algae is the latest idea for replacing gas oil with biofuels. Studies show that algae oil has all the properties of gas oil and that it can therefore be used as a fuel. Many companies and laboratories are currently conducting research into this field, and new farms want to step up production of oil from algae to an industrial scale.

Can the Commission please state:

— whether it is carrying out research in this field or monitoring the technologies for producing oil from algae?

— whether it knows how many photobioreactors (for the production and cultivation of algae on an industrial scale) exist in the Member States?

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

Developing safe, reliable, affordable and clean energy technologies for Europe by 2020 is of prime concern to the European Union.

The EU supported research on advanced biofuels under FP7 ([1]), including research on biofuels from algae, in line with the sustainability requirements of the Renewable Energy Directive ([2]). Under the Energy Theme of FP7, the EU contribution reached EUR 30 million for seven projects ([3]) on this subject (three of which at demonstration scale). More projects are expected under Horizon 2020, the next EU funding Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020), which adopts a challenge-based approach. The calls for proposals are expected to open in the participant's portal ([4]) on 11 December 2013.

In addition, the Commission is encouraging, within the context of the SET-Plan ([5]) European Industrial Bioenergy Initiative, the development of advanced biofuels at an industrial scale. The EU also supports these technologies at large scale under the ETS ([6]) through the NER 300 Programme ([7]) with 300 million allowances for demonstration projects including biofuels from algae, as well as under the Structural and Cohesion Funds Programmes ([8]), and through the Risk-Sharing Financing Facility operated by the European Investment Bank. The Commission is monitoring all technologies producing biofuels in BIOMAP ([9]) and also via a support to the European Biofuels Technology Platform ([10]), which is maintaining a database on research, demonstration and industrial projects.

Currently, there are no industrial scale photobioreactors for producing biofuels in Europe. However, there are a few commercial scale photobioreactors producing algae for the purpose of extracting added-value products (e.g. cosmetics). The exact number is not known.

([1]) The Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013).
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:140:0016:0062:en:PDF
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/projects_en.html
Projects AQUAFUELS, BIOWALK4BIOFUELS, DEMA, FUEL4ME, ALL-GAS, BIOFAT, INTESUSAL.
([4]) https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/home
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/technology/initiatives/doc/implementation_plan_2010_2012_eii_bioenergy.pdf
([6]) Emission Trading System.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/funding/ner300/index_en.htm
([8]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/country/prordn/index_en.cfm
([9]) http://setis.ec.europa.eu/BIOMAP/#31016
([10]) http://www.biofuelstp.eu/

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011933/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 octobre 2013)

Objet: Sécurité des consommateurs et des touristes dans les infrastructures hôtelières

En 25 ans, quels progrès ont été réalisés pour garantir une «protection adéquate» des voyageurs, protection à laquelle ils sont en droit de prétendre en vertu de la recommandation du Conseil en la matière?

En effet, ni la Commission, ni l'industrie hôtelière ne peuvent prouver de façon claire que la sécurité en cas d'incendie dans les hôtels de l'Union ait été améliorée depuis 1986. Il conviendrait à l'avenir de corriger cette défaillance.

Les personnes sont les plus vulnérables à la fumée et au feu lorsqu'elles sont endormies, particulièrement si elles se trouvent dans un endroit qui ne leur est pas familier, sans connaissance des issues de secours, ou dans un pays étranger dont elles risquent de ne comprendre ni la signalétique, ni la langue. Compte tenu du vieillissement de la population, et donc du nombre croissant de touristes «senior», les risques sont plus élevés que jamais.

Quelles sont les mesures envisagées par la Commission en matière de sécurité en cas d'incendie pour le secteur du tourisme dans l'Union européenne, un secteur critique pour la prospérité économique de celle-ci et pour son image de destination prisée par les touristes?

Réponse donnée par by M. Mimica au nom de la Commission
(2 décembre 2013)

La révision éventuelle de la recommandation 86/666 CEE concernant la sécurité des hôtels existants contre les risques d'incendie ([1]) fait l'objet d'un débat en cours impliquant les parties intéressées.

L'application et l'efficacité de la recommandation ont fait l'objet de diverses études ([2]) et collectes d'information de la part des États membres.

En juin 2012, les services de la Commission ont organisé un atelier destiné aux parties concernées pour discuter de la possibilité d'une révision de la recommandation du Conseil fondée sur une initiative d'autorégulation dans une partie de l'industrie hôtelière. Cependant, le résultat de cet exercice n'a pas été concluant.

Les services de la Commission réfléchissent actuellement à la possibilité et à la manière d'apporter éventuellement une solution à l'échelle de l'UE au problème de la sécurité des touristes dans les infrastructures hôtelières, notamment en cas d'incendie.

([1]) JO L 384 du 31.12.1986, pp. 60-68.
([2]) Étude sur la sécurité incendie dans les hôtels et les établissements d'hébergement de la Communauté Européenne, par Ceten-Apave, 1996; analyse de la mise en œuvre de la recommandation 86/666 CEE concernant la sécurité des hôtels existants contre les risques d'incendie, par S. Kidd, 2000; sécurité des hôtels européens contre les risques d'incendie, par S.D. Christian, 2002.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011933/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Consumer and tourist accommodation safety

After 25 years, what progress has been made towards guaranteeing travellers the 'adequate protection' to which they should be entitled under the terms of the relevant Council recommendation?

Neither the Commission nor the hotel industry can effectively demonstrate that fire safety in hotels has improved across the EU since 1986. This failure must be corrected for the future.

People are most vulnerable to smoke and fire when asleep and especially when in unfamiliar accommodation, with no knowledge of escape routes, or when abroad where languages and signs may be unfamiliar. With an ageing population resulting in increasing numbers of 'senior' tourists, the risks are more acute than ever.

What plans does the Commission have to address fire safety in the European tourism sector, a sector that is critical for the EU's economic well-being, as well as for the EU's image as a desirable destination?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(2 December 2013)

The possible revision of the Council Recommendation 86/666 EEC on Fire Safety in Existing Hotels ([1]) is the subject of an ongoing debate involving relevant stakeholders.

The implementation and effectiveness of the recommendation was subject to different studies ([2]) and information gathering from Member States.

In June 2012, the Commission services organised a stakeholder workshop to discuss the possibility of a revision of the Council Recommendation based on a self-regulatory initiative developed by part of the hospitality industry. However, the outcome of this exercise was not conclusive.

The Commission services are currently considering options on whether and how the issue of consumer safety in the area of tourism accommodation, including fire safety, could possibly be addressed at EU level.

([1]) OJ L 384, 31.12.1986, p. 60-68.
([2]) Étude sur la sécurité incendie dans les hôtels et les établissements d'hébergement de la Communauté Européenne, by CETEN-APAVE, 1996; Analysis of the implementation of the 1986 EC Recommendation on Fire Safety in Existing Hotels, by S. Kidd, 2000; Fire Safety in European Hotels by S.D. Christian, 2002.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor P-011934/13
upućeno Komisiji
Sandra Petrović Jakovina (S&D)
(18. listopada 2013.)

Predmet: Kriminalizacija beskućništva

U cijeloj Europi postoji tendencija prema represivnim administrativnim režimima na lokalnoj razini čiji su čest rezultat kršenje temeljnih ljudskih prava osoba koje se nalaze u posebno osjetljivom položaju kao što su beskućnici, migranti, siromašni i oni koji izlaze iz zatvora, a koje se sve više kažnjava samo zbog njihova položaja. U nekim su slučajevima te osobe isključene iz samih socijalnih programa ili stambenih projekata koji su oblikovani kako bi se ljudima pomoglo da se integriraju ili reintegriraju u društvo.

Lokalne vlasti koriste se mjerama za kriminalizaciju svakodnevnih aktivnosti beskućnika u njihovoj borbi za preživljavanje. Te mjere mogu poprimiti oblik zakonskih propisa protiv prosjačenja, zabrane spavanja na otvorenom i uzimanja predmeta iz kanti za smeće, ili prisiljavanja ljudi na „pokret". Nakon što su jednom optuženi, beskućnicima je vrlo teško, ako ne i nemoguće, pristupiti pravdi.

Socijalna politika i poticanje socijalnog uključivanja oduvijek su se nalazili visoko na dnevnom redu socijalnih demokratskih vlada.

Kao i druge države članice posljednjih je godina i Hrvatska doživjela porast broja ljudi koji žive u siromaštvu. Oni su ranjivi članovi društva i imaju puno pravo na uživanje svojih temeljnih prava i sloboda na razini EU-a i na razini države članice.

U relevantnim ugovorima između ostalog se naglašava obveza Unije da se bori protiv socijalne isključenosti i diskriminacije, da promiče socijalnu pravdu i zaštitu, te da pridonosi iskorjenjivanju siromaštva i solidarnosti među građanima. Postoji potpuna zabrana podvrgavanja drugog ljudskog bića nečovječnom ili ponižavajućem postupanju ili kažnjavanju, u skladu s člankom 4. Povelje Europske unije o temeljnim pravima.

Nije socijalno pravedno da neke zemlje kriminaliziraju beskućništvo, dok mnoge druge čine sve kako bi svojim građanima omogućile da, primjerice, zadrže svoju imovinu unatoč nezaposlenosti i/ili nemogućnosti ispunjavanja svojih kreditnih obveza, a sve to imajući na umu da je, s obzirom na to da ekonomska kriza traje već pet godina, vrlo vjerojatno da će broj ljudi koji žive u siromaštvu i dalje rasti.

Koje pravne radnje Komisija namjerava poduzeti kako bi osigurala zaštitu vrijednosti i temeljnih prava građana, kako je opisano u Ugovorima, kako bi državama članicama bilo nemoguće usvojiti mjere ili zakonodavstvo u tom području koje bi negativno utjecalo na beskućnike?

Odgovor gđe Reding u ime Komisije
(4. prosinca 2013.)

Komisija upućuje časnog zastupnika na njezin pisani upit E-007293/2013.

Komisija će nastaviti pružati potporu državama članicama, koje imaju glavnu odgovornost boriti se protiv beskućništva, politikom EU-a i korištenjem sredstava EU-a. Sredstva EU-a dostupna su za financiranje aktivnosti za bolju socijalnu integraciju beskućnika, uključujući bolji pristup kvatitetnim uslugama i socijalnom stanovanju. Komisija je predložila, u sklopu sljedećeg višegodišnjeg financijskog okvira, daljnje povećanje sredstava za promicanje socijalne uključenosti i borbe protiv siromaštva.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011934/13
to the Commission
Sandra Petrović Jakovina (S&D)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Criminalisation of homelessness

There is a tendency across Europe to move towards repressive administrative regimes at local level that often result in violations of the fundamental rights of people in vulnerable situations such as the homeless, migrants, the poor and prison leavers, who are increasingly being punished simply because of their situation. In some cases they are excluded from the very social programmes or housing projects that are designed to help people integrate or reintegrate into society.

Local authorities use measures to criminalise the everyday activities of the homeless in their struggle for survival. These may take the form of anti-begging legislation, bans on sleeping rough and removing items from rubbish bins, or forcing people to 'move on'. Once charged, homeless people find it very difficult, if not impossible, to access justice.

Social policy and the promotion of social inclusion have always been high on the agenda of social democratic governments.

Just like the other Member States, Croatia has, in recent years, witnessed an increase in the number of people living in poverty. These are vulnerable members of society and are fully entitled to enjoy their fundamental rights and freedoms at EU and Member State level.

The relevant treaties stress, *inter alia*, the Union's obligation to combat social exclusion and discrimination, to promote social justice and protection, and to contribute to the eradication of poverty and to solidarity among citizens. There is a blanket ban on the subjection of another human being to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, in accordance with Article 4 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

It is not socially just that some countries are criminalising homelessness while many others do their utmost to enable their citizens to, for instance, retain their property despite being unemployed and/or unable to meet their loan obligations, all that bearing in mind that, given that the economic crisis has been ongoing for five years, it is highly likely that the number of people living in poverty will continue to rise.

What legal action does the Commission intend to take in order to ensure that citizens' values and fundamental rights are protected as enshrined in the Treaties, such as to make it impossible for Member States to adopt measures or legislation in this area which would impact negatively on the homeless?

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

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-007293/2013.

The Commission will also continue to provide support to Member States — who have the primary responsibility to combat homelessness — through EU policy work and the use of EU funds. EU funds are available to finance actions for better social integration of homeless people, including improved access to quality services and social housing. The Commission has proposed, under the next multiannual financial framework, to further increase funds to promote social inclusion and combat poverty.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-011935/13
alla Commissione
Giovanni La Via (PPE)
(18 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Finanziamento di opere progettate su incarichi legittimamente conferiti prima della legge 109/1994 «Legge quadro in materia di lavori pubblici»

Al fine di usufruire di risorse comunitarie, numerosi comuni siciliani hanno presentato progetti redatti da tecnici, ai quali l'incarico professionale era stato conferito prima dell'entrata in vigore delle norme che impongono gare di evidenza pubblica per l'affidamento degli incarichi.

Inoltre, prima della riforma dei lavori pubblici, di cui alla legge 109/94, il ricorso all'accordo condizionato era spesso l'unico sistema che consentiva ai committenti di potersi dotare di un parco progetti generale o comunque di progetti di opere pubbliche il cui livello di progettazione esecutiva era vincolante o comunque determinante per l'ottenimento del relativo finanziamento.

La regione siciliana, con l'art. 41, comma 4, della legge regionale 2.8.2001 n. 7, nel testo modificato con la legge regionale 19 maggio 2003 n.7, ha fatto salvi e considerato legittimi i vecchi incarichi, dichiarando un principio pacifico: la disciplina della formazione di un atto è quella vigente nel momento in cui l'atto viene formato.

In qualche bando è evidenziato che gli affidamenti di incarico professionale devono effettuarsi attraverso procedure di evidenza pubblica, pena l'inammissibilità della relativa spesa a valere sulle risorse comunitarie di cui al bando medesimo.

Si consideri che l'avvio di procedure per il conferimento di incarichi relativi ad opere già progettate o in corso di progettazione (per le quali era stato già conferito incarico prima del recepimento delle direttive europee in materia) aprirebbe un probabile contenzioso tra professionisti e enti pubblici con la sicura soccombenza di questi ultimi e con l'inutile spesa per progettazione di servizi di cui non si è realmente fruito.

In considerazione di quanto precede, può la Commissione confermare l'ammissibilità a finanziamento, assieme alle relative competenze tecniche professionali negli stessi previste, dei progetti e domande i cui atti di conferimento degli incarichi per servizi tecnici professionali, sono stati conferiti senza procedure di evidenza pubblica, prima dell'entrata in vigore in Italia della L.109/1994, emanata in armonia alle direttive europee in materia di lavori pubblici, così come recepita in Sicilia dalla legge regionale 2.8.2002, n.7, e successive modifiche ed integrazioni?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(3 dicembre 2013)

In base alla giurisprudenza consolidata, nel determinare la legislazione dell'UE applicabile alla decisione di un'amministrazione aggiudicatrice relativa al tipo di procedura da seguire e alla necessità della preventiva pubblicazione del bando di gara, occorre tener conto, di norma, del momento in cui tale decisione è stata adottata. Sulla base delle informazioni fornite dall'onorevole deputato, la Commissione non è in grado di stabilire quando è stata adottata la decisione relativa al tipo di procedura da seguire per l'aggiudicazione dei contratti di servizio pubblico citati per la progettazione di lavori, e pertanto di determinare se i contratti sono stati aggiudicati in violazione del diritto comunitario/dell'UE allora in vigore.

Per quanto riguarda l'ammissibilità al finanziamento dell'UE dei progetti menzionati dall'onorevole deputato, i finanziamenti dell'UE possono essere concessi solamente a progetti pienamente conformi alla normativa dell'UE applicabile, comprese le norme in materia di appalti pubblici.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-011935/13
to the Commission
Giovanni La Via (PPE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Funding for projects for which contracts were legitimately awarded prior to the entry into force of Italian Framework Law 109/1994 on public works

When applying for EU funding, many municipal councils in Sicily have submitted proposals, drawn up by specialists, for which the works contracts were awarded prior to the entry into force of rules requiring that such contracts be awarded on the basis of public tendering procedures.

Prior to the reform of public works contracts under Law 109/1994, agreements conditional on obtaining public funding were often the only way for commissioning councils to embark on a general set of projects or public works projects. The quality of the executive planning for these projects was thus a key — if not to say decisive — factor in securing financing.

Under Article 41(4) of Regional Law No 7 of 2 August 2002, as amended by Regional Law No 7 of 19 May 2003, the Sicilian Regional Government made an exception for contracts awarded under the old system and declared them legitimate, setting out the clear principle that the rules applicable to the conclusion of contracts should be the ones in force when they were drawn up.

Some invitations to tender state that works contracts need to be awarded on the basis of public tendering procedures in order for the expenditure under those contracts to be eligible for the EU funding referred to in the invitation to tender.

However, initiating such procedures when awarding contracts for projects that have already been planned or are currently being planned (and for which contracts were awarded prior to the adoption of the EU directive in question) would likely result in legal disputes between professionals and public bodies, which the latter would most certainly lose, and mean that the amounts outlaid on planning for services not actually used would be wasted.

In the light of the above, can the Commission state whether specialist services projects and project applications — and the specialist tasks these entail — for which contracts were awarded without a public tendering procedure prior to the entry into force in Italy of Law 109/1994 — adopted in line with EU public works directives and transposed in Sicily by means of Regional Law No 7 of 2 August 2002, as subsequently amended and supplemented — are eligible for EU funding?

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

According to settled case-law, in determining the applicable EU legislation to a decision by a contracting authority concerning the type of procedure to be followed and whether it is necessary that a prior call for competition is published, account must be taken, as a rule, of the point in time at which that decision was adopted. On the basis of the information provided by the Honourable Member, the Commission cannot establish when the decision concerning the type of procedure to be followed for the award of the mentioned public service contracts for the design of works was adopted, and therefore whether the contracts have been awarded in breach of the Community/EC law applicable at the time.

With respect to the eligibility for EU funding of the projects mentioned by the Honourable Member, EU funding can only be granted to projects fully complying with all applicable EC law including on public procurement.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011937/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(18. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Webanwendungsentwicklung für die Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden

Im Arbeitsprogramm der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden (ACER) für das Jahr 2014 ([1]) sieht die Agentur für 2014 ein Ausschreibungsverfahren für „Web application development, software maintenance and remote support to stakeholder services" im Umfang von 360 000 EUR vor.

1. Für welchen Zweck soll eine Webanwendung für die Agentur erstellt beziehungsweise gewartet werden?

2. Warum setzt die Agentur diese Kostenhöhe an?

3. Für welche Akteure ist Fernbetreuung zur Nutzung der Anwendung notwendig?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011938/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(18. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Personal der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden

Im Arbeitsprogramm der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden (ACER) für das Jahr 2014 ([1]) sieht die Agentur für 2014 Personalkosten von 10 117 941 EUR vor. Für das Jahr 2013 waren noch 5 886 199 EUR vorgesehen. Im Jahr 2013 waren 49, für das Jahr 2014 sind 98 Stellen vorgesehen.

Warum bedarf die Agentur einer Verdoppelung des Personals?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011939/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(18. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Immobilien der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden

Im Arbeitsprogramm der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden (ACER) für das Jahr 2014 ([1]) sieht die Agentur für 2014 Kosten von 1 439 960 EUR für Mieten und damit verbundene Kosten vor. Für das Jahr 2013 waren noch 1 120 000 EUR vorgesehen.

1. Welche Immobilien mietet die Agentur an?

2. Welche Quadratmeterzahl und welche Quadratmeterkosten haben diese Immobilien jeweils?

3. Welche Kosten sind mit jeder dieser Immobilien jeweils verbunden?

4. Wie genau erklärt sich die Steigerung um 319 960 EUR in nur einem Jahr?

5. Besitzt die Agentur auch eigene Immobilien oder plant sie, solche zu bauen oder zu erwerben?

([1]) http://www.acer.europa.eu/Official_documents/Acts_of_the_Agency/Publication/ACER%20Work%20Programme%202014.pdf

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011940/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(18. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Webseiten der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden

Im Arbeitsprogramm der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden (ACER) für das Jahr 2014 ([2]) sieht die Agentur für 2014 einen Betrag von 314 600 EUR für „Stakeholder involvement, public relations and website" vor; für das Jahr 2013 waren noch 127 875 EUR vorgesehen. Ebenfalls sieht die Agentur ein Ausschreibungsverfahren für „Technical assistance for the Agency's website set-up and maintenance" im Wert von 60 000 EUR vor.

1. Wie genau berechnet die Agentur die vorgesehenen Kosten für den genannten Haushaltsposten von 314 600 EUR?

2. Welcher spezifischen Dienstleistungen bedarf die Agentur, für die sie das genannte Ausschreibungsverfahren vorsieht? Über wie viele Webpräsenzen verfügt die Agentur?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011941/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(18. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: „Operational Missions" der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden

Im Arbeitsprogramm der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden (ACER) für das Jahr 2014 ([2]) sieht die Agentur für 2014 einen Betrag von 369 200 EUR für „Operational Missions" vor. Im Jahr 2013 waren es 225 000 EUR.

1. Welche „Operational Missions" führte die Agentur in den Jahren 2012 und 2013 jeweils durch?

2. Warum errechnet die Agentur von 2013 bis 2014 einen fast verdoppelten Kostenaufwand für „Operational Missions"?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011942/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(18. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Veranstaltungen der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden

Im Arbeitsprogramm der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden (ACER) für das Jahr 2014 ([2]) sieht die Agentur für 2014 einen Betrag von 12 000 EUR (S. 28) für Empfänge und Veranstaltungen vor, sie sieht jeweils Vertragsvolumen von 60 000 EUR für das Catering von Veranstaltungen der Agentur wie für Konferenzräume der Agentur vor (S. 74). Im selben Arbeitsprogramm werden nur zwei vorgesehene Veranstaltungen ausdrücklich genannt, die Jahreskonferenz, für welche die Agentur mindestens 150 Teilnehmer erwartet (S. 15), sowie ein Workshop zum Arbeitsprogramm der Agentur, für welches die Agentur 5 Teilnehmer erwartet (S. 16). In den Jahren 2012 und 2013 nahmen 1 bzw. 3 Teilnehmer an dem Workshop teil.

1. Plant die Agentur weitere Veranstaltungen? Wenn ja, welche? Wie hoch schätzt die Agentur jeweils die Kosten für die beiden genannten Veranstaltungen sowie jede weitere Veranstaltungen?

2. Für welche der Veranstaltungen sollen Ausschreibungen erfolgen?

3. Warum führt die Agentur einen Workshop erneut durch, der in den vergangenen beiden Jahren jeweils weniger als 5 Teilnehmer hatte?

4. Welche Kosten fielen in den Jahren 2012 und 2013 jeweils für den Workshop an?

([2]) http://www.acer.europa.eu/Official_documents/Acts_of_the_Agency/Publication/ACER%20Work%20Programme%202014.pdf

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011971/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Sitzungsausgaben der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden

Im Arbeitsprogramm der Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden (ACER) für das Jahr 2014 sieht die Agentur für 2014 einen Haushaltsposten von 322 839 EUR für „Meeting Expenses" vor. Im Jahr 2013 waren 367 609 EUR vorgesehen.

1. Welche Sitzungen fanden in den Jahren 2012 und 2013 jeweils statt?

2. Wie viele Personen nahmen an diesen Sitzungen jeweils teil?

3. Welche Kosten fielen für jede dieser Sitzungen an?

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

Die Kommission hat die Agentur für die Zusammenarbeit der Energieregulierungsbehörden (ACER) gebeten, die Fragen des Herrn Abgeordneten zu beantworten.

Die Kommission wird die Antwort der Agentur so schnell wie möglich an den Herrn Abgeordneten weiterleiten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011937/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Web application development for the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators

In the Work Programme of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) for 2014 ([1]) the Agency provides for a tendering procedure for 2014 for 'web application development, software maintenance and remote support to stakeholder services' for an amount of EUR 360 000.

1. For what purpose is a web application to be developed or maintained for the Agency?

2. Why is the Agency setting the costs at this level?

3. For which stakeholders is remote support necessary for the use of the application?

Question for written answer E-011938/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Staff of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators

In the Work Programme of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) for 2014 ([1]) the Agency provides for an appropriation of EUR 10 117 941 for staff expenditure for 2014. For 2013, an amount of EUR 5 886 199 was provided for. The number of posts envisaged was 49 in 2013 and 98 in 2014.

Why does the Agency need to double its complement of staff?

Question for written answer E-011939/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Property belonging to the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators

In the Work Programme of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) for 2014 ([1]) the Agency provides for costs of EUR 1 439 960 for rent and associated costs for 2014. For 2013, an amount of EUR 1 120 000 was provided for.

1. What properties does the Agency rent?

2. What is the size of each of these properties in square metres and what do they cost per square metre?

3. What costs are associated with each of these properties?

4. What exactly is the explanation for the increase of EUR 319 960 in just one year?

5. Does the Agency also have property of its own or does it plan to build or acquire property of its own?

([1]) http://www.acer.europa.eu/Official_documents/Acts_of_the_Agency/Publication/ACER%20Work%20Programme%202014.pdf

Question for written answer E-011940/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Websites of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators

In the Work Programme of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) for 2014 ([2]) the Agency provides for an appropriation for 2014 of EUR 314 600 for 'Stakeholder involvement, public relations and website'. For 2013, another EUR 127 875 was provided for. The Agency also provides for a tendering procedure for 'technical assistance for the Agency's website set-up and maintenance' to the value of EUR 60 000.

1. How exactly does the Agency calculate the envisaged costs of EUR 314 600 for the budget items mentioned?

2. For which specific services required by the Agency is the said tendering procedure envisaged? How many websites does the Agency have?

Question for written answer E-011941/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: 'Operational missions' of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators

In the Work Programme of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) for 2014 ([2]) the Agency provides for an appropriation for 2014 of EUR 369 200 for 'Operational Missions'. In 2013, the amount was EUR 225 000.

1. What 'operational missions' did the Agency carry out in 2012 and 2013, respectively?

2. Why is the cost calculated by the Agency for 'operational missions' in 2014 almost twice that for 2013?

Question for written answer E-011942/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Events organised by the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators

In the Work Programme of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) for 2014 ([2]) the Agency provides for an appropriation for 2014 of EUR 12 000 (p. 28) for receptions and events and EUR 60 000 each for catering for the Agency's events and for conference facilities for the Agency (p. 74). The same Work Programme explicitly mentions only two planned events, the Annual Conference, at which the Agency expects at least 150 participants (p. 15) and a workshop on the Agency's Work Programme, at which the Agency expects five participants (p. 16). In 2012 and 2013 there were one and three participants, respectively, at the workshop.

1. Is the Agency planning further events? If so, what are these events? How much does the Agency estimate that each of the two events mentioned and any further events will cost?

2. For which of the events are calls for tender to be issued?

3. Why is the Agency once again holding a workshop which, in both of the last two years, had fewer than five participants?

4. What costs were incurred for this workshop in 2012 and 2013, respectively?

([2]) http://www.acer.europa.eu/Official_documents/Acts_of_the_Agency/Publication/ACER%20Work%20Programme%202014.pdf

Question for written answer E-011971/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Meeting expenses of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators

In the Work Programme of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) for 2014 the Agency provides for an appropriation for 2014 of EUR 322 839 for 'meeting expenses'. In 2013, the amount provided for was EUR 367 609.

1. What meetings took place in 2012 and 2013, respectively?

2. How many people attended each of these meetings?

3. What costs were incurred for each of these meetings?

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

The Commission has requested the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) to provide the answers to the questions raised by the Honourable member.

The Agency's reply will be transmitted by the Commission to the Honourable member as soon as possible.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011944/13
to the Commission
Catherine Stihler (S&D)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: EU funding streams

Can the Commission update Parliament on specific EU funding streams that are available to support local initiatives such as heritage trails, tourism initiatives and potential partner exchange programmes in regard to these types of initiatives or any other grants that may be available to socially deprived areas?

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

Tourism and cultural heritage initiatives can benefit from EU funding programmes via co-financing of projects or via studies by the Commission through calls for tender related specifically to the tourism sector ([1]).

Tourism initiatives continue to be a potential activity area of future cohesion policy programmes under the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) provided they are connected to the thematic priorities and contribute, in particular, to the jobs and growth objectives of the funds ([2]). This applies to both the Investment for growth and jobs goal as well as the European Territorial Cooperation goal.

In addition, the urban dimension of EU regional policy provides the possibility to target the regeneration of deprived urban areas. For 2014-2020, each Member State must allocate a minimum of 5% of ERDF for integrated urban development, which support investments aimed at the reduction of poverty and social exclusion. Moreover, the ESIF programmes can support community-led local development, based on strategies designed by local partnerships.

The programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and SMEs ([3]) (COSME) also foresees financial resources for EU-added value transnational tourism initiatives. EU tourism enterprises can also benefit from free service-tailored support provided by the Enterprise Europe Network ([4]) which includes a dedicated tourism and cultural heritage sector group ([5]).

Finally, the Commission encourages the recognition of a shared European heritage and, through the future Creative Europe programme, provides support for cooperation in the field of cultural heritage, which is potentially a resource for tourism development.

([1]) For an overview of EU financial instruments for possible use by the tourism sector's public and private stakeholders: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/_getdocument.cfm?doc_id=7652
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/what/future/legi_en.cfm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/initiatives/cosme/index_en.htm
([4]) http://portal.enterprise-europe-network.ec.europa.eu/about/about
([5]) http://portal.enterprise-europe-network.ec.europa.eu/about/sector-groups/tourism-cultural-heritage

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011945/13
an die Kommission
Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)
(18. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Sachstand des Vertragsverletzungsverfahrens gegen Deutschland im Zusammenhang mit der Niederlassungsfreiheit

Am 31. Januar 2013 hat die Kommission eine Mitteilung mit dem Titel „Ein Europäischer Aktionsplan für den Einzelhandel" (KOM(2013)0036) veröffentlicht. Der vorgeschlagene Aktionsplan enthält unter anderem Maßnahmen für den Fall der Nichteinhaltung der Verpflichtungen nach der Dienstleistungsrichtlinie sowie Maßnahmen für die Sicherstellung der Niederlassungsfreiheit.

Die Kommission schreibt derzeit eine Rechtsstudie aus, in deren Rahmen die Beschränkungen der gewerblichen Niederlassung in den Mitgliedstaaten untersucht werden sollen (MARKT/2013/104/E). Darüber hinaus soll das Thema von einer Hochrangigen Gruppe für den Einzelhandel bearbeitet werden.

Am 25. Juni 2009 hat die Kommission wegen einer Rechtsvorschrift, die eine Beschränkung der Niederlassungsfreiheit für den Einzelhandel in Deutschland bewirken kann, ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren gegen Deutschland eröffnet ([1]).

1. Die Kommission wird gebeten, den aktuellen Sachstand in Bezug auf dieses Vertragsverletzungsverfahren — sowie die voraussichtliche Entwicklung in der Zukunft — darzulegen. Wann ist mit einer Entscheidung zu rechnen? Werden in der Beurteilung der Kommission auch die Auswirkungen auf kleine und mittlere Unternehmen, insbesondere in ländlichen Gebieten, berücksichtigt?

2. Sind bei der Kommission Beschwerden über ähnliche Beschränkungen der Handelsniederlassung in anderen Mitgliedstaaten eingegangen? Gibt es weitere anhängige Vertragsverletzungsverfahren im Zusammenhang mit diesem Thema und/oder beabsichtigt die Kommission, in der nahen Zukunft neue Verfahren zu eröffnen? Wenn ja: Welcher Mitgliedstaat bzw. welche Mitgliedstaaten sind betroffen?

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

1. Im Nachgang zu den Maßnahmen des Europäischen Aktionsplans für den Einzelhandel steht die Kommission bezüglich der Niederlassungsfreiheit für den Einzelhandel derzeit im Austausch bewährter Verfahren mit den Mitgliedstaaten. Damit ist gewährleistet, dass die verschiedenen Interessen im Zentrum der Gespräche stehen. Ferner dürfte noch vor Ende 2013 eine Studie eingeleitet werden.

2. Die Kommission hat Beschwerden betreffend mehrere andere Mitgliedstaaten erhalten. Sie hat mit diesen Mitgliedstaaten einen konstruktiven Dialog aufgenommen, in dessen Rahmen es ihr gelingen dürfte, die in den anhängigen Vertragsverletzungsverfahren aufgeworfenen Probleme zu lösen.

([1]) IP/09/1002.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011945/13
to the Commission
Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: State of play of infringement procedure against Germany in relation to freedom of establishment

On 31 January 2013 the Commission published a communication entitled 'Setting up a European Retail Action Plan' (COM(2013)0036). Among other things, the proposed Action Plan includes measures to address non-compliance with the obligations of the Services Directive and to ensure the freedom of establishment.

The Commission is currently tendering out a legal study on the subject which will assess the restrictions on commercial establishment imposed by Member States (MARKT/2013/104/E). It has also taken steps to address the matter by means of a high-level group on retail services.

Back on 25 June 2009 the Commission launched infringement procedure against Germany for introducing legislation potentially restricting the establishment of retail facilities ([1]).

1. Could the Commission clarify the current state of play regarding — and the future roadmap for — this infringement procedure? When can we expect a decision? Will the Commission's assessment also take into account the impact on small and medium-sized enterprises, in particular in rural areas?

2. Has the Commission received any complaints about similar restrictions on commercial establishment in other Member States? Are there any other pending infringement procedures touching on this issue, and/or does the Commission envisage launching any new procedures in the near future? If so, which Member State(s) would be affected?

(Version française)

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

1. Comme relevé par l'honorable membre, dans le prolongement des actions prévues par le Plan d'action européen pour le commerce de détail, la Commission est actuellement engagée dans un échange de bonnes pratiques avec les États membres en ce qui concerne les questions relatives à l'établissement des surfaces commerciales. Les divers intérêts en présence seront ainsi au centre des débats. Une étude devrait également être lancée d'ici fin de l'année 2013.

2. La Commission a reçu des plaintes concernant plusieurs États membres. La Commission a entrepris un dialogue constructif avec les États membres concernés qui devrait lui permettre de résoudre les problèmes soulevés dans le cadre des procédures d'infractions pendantes.

([1]) IP/09/1002.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011946/13
au Conseil
Marine Le Pen (NI)
(18 octobre 2013)

Objet: Avenir de la Navfor

Sous la responsabilité du Conseil, la mission de coopération européenne Navfor (Atalante), dont le mandat a été étendu jusqu'en décembre 2014, recourt aux marines de guerre des pays membres de l'UE afin de participer à la lutte contre la piraterie au large de la Somalie.

Sans entrer dans les détails, le commandant de la Navfor, le contre-amiral Bob Tarrant, a évoqué de futures missions, notamment avec le concours de la marine de guerre chinoise ([1]).

1. De quelles autres missions s'agira-t-il?

2. Ces missions vont-elles s'élargir à d'autres territoires maritimes que ceux prévus par le mandat de la Navfor?

3. Sous quelle justification et dans quel cadre légal la coopération de la Navfor avec la marine de guerre chinoise a-t-elle été autorisée?

4. La Navfor continue-t-elle à s'inscrire dans le respect d'un mandat international limité strictement à la sécurisation d'une zone maritime et côtière allant du Golfe d'Aden à l'Océan Indien?

Réponse
(23 décembre 2013)

L'opération EU Navfor Somalie — Atalanta a été lancée par l'action commune 2008/851/PESC du 10 novembre 2008 et modifiée en dernier lieu par la décision 2012/174/PESC du Conseil du 23 mars 2012, à l'appui des résolutions 1814 (2008), 1816 (2008), 1838 (2008), 1846 (2008), 1851 (2008) et ultérieures du Conseil de sécurité des Nations unies.

L'opération EU Navfor Somalie — Atalanta a pour objet de contribuer à la protection des navires du PAM qui acheminent l'aide alimentaire aux populations déplacées de Somalie, à la protection des navires vulnérables naviguant au large des côtes de Somalie, ainsi qu'à la dissuasion, à la prévention et à la répression des actes de piraterie et des vols à main armée au large des côtes somaliennes.

La zone d'opérations des forces déployées à cet effet comprend le littoral somalien et les eaux intérieures, ainsi que les zones maritimes au large des côtes de la Somalie et des pays voisins dans la région de l'océan Indien.

Dans le cadre de son mandat en cours (article 2, point f)), Atalanta «établit une liaison avec les organisations et entités, ainsi qu'avec les États agissant dans la région pour lutter contre les actes de piraterie et les vols à main armée au large des côtes de la Somalie». Dans ce contexte, EU Navfor coopère avec la marine chinoise dans les limites à la fois de son mandat et de sa zone d'opérations.

([1]) http://www.eeas.europa.eu/csdp/missions-and-operations/eu-navfor-somalia/news/20130627_2_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011946/13
to the Council
Marine Le Pen (NI)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: The future of EU NAVFOR Somalia

Under the responsibility of the Council, the European Union Naval Force (EU NAVFOR Somalia — Operation Atalanta) uses the navies of EU Member States to help counter piracy off the coast of Somalia. Its mandate has been extended to December 2014.

Rear Admiral Bob Tarrant, Operation Commander of EU NAVFOR Somalia, has spoken of future missions, involving in particular the Chinese Navy, without giving more details ([1]).

1. What other missions are these?

2. Are these missions to be extended to sea areas beyond those set out in EU NAVFOR's mandate?

3. What is the justification and legal framework for authorising EU NAVFOR's cooperation with the Chinese Navy?

4. Is EU NAVFOR continuing to comply with an international mandate strictly limited to ensuring the security of an area of sea and coastline stretching from the Gulf of Aden to the Indian Ocean?

Reply
(23 December 2013)

EUNAVFOR — Operation Atalanta was established by Joint Action 2008/851/CFSP of 10 November 2008, and most recently amended by Council Decision 2012/174/CFSP of 23 March 2012, in support of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1814 (2008), 1816 (2008), 1838 (2008), 1846 (2008), 1851 (2008) and successor Resolutions.

The mission of EUNAVFOR Atalanta is to contribute to the protection of WFP vessels delivering food aid to displaced persons in Somalia and the protection of vulnerable vessels cruising off the Somali coast, and the deterrence, prevention and repression of acts of piracy and armed robbery off the Somali coast.

The area of operations of the forces deployed to that end consists of the Somali coastal territory and internal waters, and the maritime areas off the coasts of Somalia and neighbouring countries within the region of the Indian Ocean.

Under its current mandate (Article 2, point f), ATALANTA is to 'liaise with organisations and entities, as well as States, working in the region to combat acts of piracy and armed robbery off the Somali coast'. In this context, EUNAVFOR cooperates with the Chinese Navy within the limits of both its mission and area of operation.

([1]) http://www.eeas.europa.eu/csdp/missions-and-operations/eu-navfor-somalia/news/20130627_2_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011947/13
alla Commissione
Guido Milana (S&D) e Francesca Barracciu (S&D)
(18 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Tonno rosso — condizioni dello stock e conseguenti misure

Nell'ultimo anno numerose associazioni di pescatori hanno lamentato una presenza eccessiva dello stock di tonno nel Mediterraneo, tanto da mettere a repentaglio l'equilibrio di altre specie.

Secondo la relazione del comitato permanente di ricerca e statistica (SCRS) dell'ICCAT, nel 2012 la biomassa dello stock di tonno così come la taglia media sono aumentate.

Questo aspetto può essere valutato come un effetto positivo del regime di quote introdotto negli anni passati.

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

— se anche secondo i dati della recente campagna di pesca la taglia media dello stock é aumentata;

— quali iniziative intende prendere per garantire un equilibrio tra le diverse specie presenti nel Mediterraneo;

— se e quali iniziative e misure concernenti lo stock di tonno intende assumere in sede ICCAT;

— se ritiene, qualora le condizioni dello stock di tonno dovessero risultare migliorate, di doversi impegnare per una revisione delle quote di pesca in sede ICCAT?

Risposta di Maria Damanaki a nome della Commissione
(3 gennaio 2014)

La consulenza dell'SCRS ([1]), basata sui dati delle catture del 2012, ha confermato i segnali positivi di ricostituzione dello stock di tonno rosso. La ricostituzione è probabilmente in corso e la biomassa riproduttiva dello stock è in crescita costante. Come l'anno scorso, lo studio indica che lo stock è ancora sovrasfruttato, ma che attualmente non è in corso una pesca eccessiva. Si osserva un aumento netto della taglia media nell'Atlantico e un aumento modesto nel Mediterraneo. La Commissione non è a conoscenza di nessuno squilibrio tra i vari stock nel Mediterraneo.

L'SCRS afferma che permangono molti elementi di incertezza relativi allo scorso anno, nonostante i recenti miglioramenti nella quantità e nella qualità dei dati. L'SCRS sottolinea che tali elementi d'incertezza non possono essere inglobati nelle matrici di rischio, poiché in tal caso il loro uso diretto risulterebbe difficile.

Sebbene la biomassa sembri aumentare, non si possono definire né la velocità né l'entità di tale tendenza, che rimane assai incerta.

Pertanto l'SCRS non può *«esprimere un parere inconfutabile su cui potrebbe basarsi un cambiamento sostanziale dei TAC»*. L'SCRS osserva tuttavia che *«se le catture si mantengono attorno ai livelli recenti di TAC nell'attuale sistema di gestione, gli stock dovrebbero poter aumentare durante il periodo di riferimento, il che è coerente con l'obiettivo di raggiungere l'FMSY (indice di mortalità per pesca atto a garantire il rendimento massimo sostenibile) e il BMSY (biomassa corrispondente al rendimento massimo sostenibile) da qui al 2022 con almeno il 60 % di probabilità»* (che è l'obiettivo del piano di ricostituzione). L'SCRS aggiunge che *«un periodo di stabilità dei principali regolamenti di gestione del piano di ricostituzione consentirebbe all'SCRS di stimare in modo più esatto l'entità e la velocità delle recenti tendenze dell'FMSY (indice di mortalità) e del BMSY (biomassa) per gli anni futuri»*.

Pertanto, e in base alla posizione concordata con gli Stati membri, all'ICCAT la Commissione ha promosso e ottenuto la permanenza delle misure esistenti fino alla prossima valutazione dello stock che avrà luogo nel 2014.

([1]) Comitato permanente di ricerca e statistica.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011947/13
to the Commission
Guido Milana (S&D) and Francesca Barracciu (S&D)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Status of bluefin tuna stocks and implications for action

Over the last year, many fishing organisations have complained about the excessive numbers of tuna in the Mediterranean, at levels which threaten the balance of other species.

According to the report by ICCAT's Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, both the biomass and the average size of tuna stocks increased in 2012.

This can be seen as a positive outcome of the quota rules introduced in previous years.

— Do the data from the latest fishing season also show an increase in the average size among the stock?

— What initiatives does the Commission intend to adopt to guarantee a balance between the different species present in the Mediterranean?

— What initiatives and measures does the Commission intend to adopt in the forum of ICCAT?

— Does the Commission think that steps should be taken within ICCAT to revise fishing quotas if the status of tuna stocks is found to have improved?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(3 January 2014)

The advice of the SCRS ([1]) based on the 2012 catch data, confirmed the positive signs of recovery of the bluefin tuna stock. The recovery is likely taking place and the stock spawning biomass keeps increasing. As last year, the study suggests that the stock is still overfished but that no overfishing is currently ongoing. We observe a clear increase in average size in the Atlantic and a modest increase in the Mediterranean. The Commission is not aware of any imbalance between different stocks in the Mediterranean.

SCRS makes clear that important uncertainties from last year remain in spite of recent improvements in the data quantity and quality. SCRS stresses that such uncertainties cannot be reflected in the risk matrices, thus making the direct use of such matrices difficult.

Although the biomass seems to be increasing, both the speed and magnitude of this trend cannot be determined and remain highly uncertain.

Therefore, SCRS cannot 'give robust advice that would support a substantial change in the TAC'. SCRS notes however that 'maintaining catches at around recent TACs under the current management scheme will likely allow the stock to increase during that period and is consistent with the goal of achieving F_{MSY} and B_{MSY} through 2022 with at least 60% of probability' (i.e. the objective of the recovery plan). SCRS adds that 'a period of stabilisation in the main management regulations of the rebuilding plan would allow the SCRS to better estimate the magnitude and speed of recent trends in F and SSB in the coming years'.

Accordingly, and based on the position agreed with the Member States, in ICCAT the Commission promoted and obtained stability of the existing measures until the next stock assessment takes place in 2014.

([1]) Standing Committee on Research and Statistics.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-011948/13
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(18 octombrie 2013)

Subiect: Taxă pentru defrișările abuzive

Uniunea Europeană dorește să ocupe un loc important în lupta împotriva schimbărilor climatice și combaterea efectelor acesteia la nivel european.

În cadrul acestor eforturi, o acțiune de bază rămâne refacerea suprafețelor defrișate prin plantarea de noi arbori și arbuști.

Are Comisia în vedere colaborarea cu statele membre pentru instituirea unui fond de refacere a suprafețelor împădurite în care să fie inclusă și o taxă pentru defrișările abuzive, în vederea schimbării destinației suprafețelor respective, tocmai pentru a preîntâmpina procentul de tăieri abuzive a pădurilor din diverse regiuni?

Răspuns dat de dl Potočnik în numele Comisiei
(12 decembrie 2013)

În ceea ce privește fondurile UE disponibile în prezent pentru refacerea suprafețelor împădurite, Comisia îl invită pe distinsul membru să consulte răspunsul la întrebarea scrisă nr. E-11514/2013 ([1]).

În plus, statele membre dețin mecanisme de control strict al transformării pădurilor în terenuri destinate altor întrebuințări și/sau impun măsuri compensatorii (care pot include plata unor sume) în cazul unor astfel de transformări.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011948/13
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Tax on illegal deforestation

The European Union wishes to play an important role in the fight against climate change and in tackling its impact across Europe.

One basic action still available as part of these efforts is to restore the deforested areas by planting new trees and shrubs.

Does the Commission intend to cooperate with Member States in setting up a fund for restoring forested areas, which also includes a tax on illegal deforestation, with a view to changing where the relevant areas are planted, precisely so as to curb the rate of illegal forest logging in various regions?

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

As regards the EU funds currently available for the restoration of forests, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-11514/2013 ([1]).

Furthermore Member States have in place strict controls against the conversion of forest to other land uses, and/or require compensatory measures (which can include payments) for such conversions.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011949/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(18 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Esercizi commerciali di ottica e limiti alla libertà di stabilimento

Gli articoli da 49 a 55 del TFUE vietano le restrizioni alla libertà di stabilimento dei cittadini di uno Stato membro nel territorio di un altro Stato membro.

Alcune disposizioni legislative recentemente varate da istituzioni regionali italiane hanno sollevato problemi di compatibilità con le suddette norme, in particolare le disposizioni volte a limitare l'apertura di nuovi esercizi commerciali di ottica in presenza di altri esercizi simili in prossimità o per fascia di popolazione.

La Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea ha recentemente esaminato la questione con la sentenza del 26 settembre 2013 nella causa C-539/11, constatando come tale normativa ostacola e rende meno attraente l'esercizio, nel territorio italiano, dell'attività degli ottici di altri Stati membri, mediante un centro stabile di attività.

La Corte ha già statuito in passato che, nel perseguimento di un obiettivo siffatto, l'apertura di una farmacia può essere oggetto di pianificazione e di limitazioni, in modo che sia garantita un'assistenza sanitaria adeguata alle necessità della popolazione.

La Corte ha quindi stabilito che siffatti principi appaiono applicabili anche agli esercizi di ottica, allorché gli ottici forniscono servizi consistenti nella valutazione, nel mantenimento e nel ripristino dello stato di salute dei pazienti e rientrano nel settore della tutela della salute, rimandando quindi la competenza agli Stati membri in materia di tutela della salute pubblica.

Considerato che, a detta della stessa Corte di Giustizia UE, la normativa in oggetto rischia di portare a un accesso diseguale allo stabilimento degli esercizi di ottica, può la Commissione far sapere:

— Qual è la posizione della Commissione al riguardo?

— Intende trasmettere chiarimenti per un più effettivo e uniforme riconoscimento di cosa sia considerabile come esercizio commerciale con attività prevalente attinente alla tutela della salute pubblica?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(17 dicembre 2013)

Nella causa C-539/11 Ottica New Line, la Corte di giustizia dell'UE rilevava che le restrizioni territoriali e demografiche relative all'insediamento degli esercizi di ottica era atta a favorire una ripartizione equilibrata di tali esercizi nell'ambito di un dato territorio e contribuiva pertanto alla tutela della sanità pubblica. Tuttavia, la Corte indicava che, per essere compatibili con il diritto dell'UE, tali restrizioni dovrebbero garantire il conseguimento dell'obiettivo attinente alla salute pubblica in modo coerente e sistematico. La Corte indicava altresì che la legislazione italiana rischia di comportare un accesso diseguale allo stabilimento degli esercizi di ottica nelle diverse zone della regione considerata. Poiché la sentenza della Corte è stata pronunciata nel quadro di una domanda di pronuncia pregiudiziale, spetta alla giurisdizione nazionale esaminare se, nella pratica, la legislazione nazionale soddisfi il criterio della coerenza.

Gli Stati membri sono responsabili dell'organizzazione del loro sistema sanitario. Spetta ad essi decidere a quale livello intendono tutelare la salute pubblica e stabilire le misure necessarie a tal fine. Queste ultime possono variare da Stato membro a Stato membro. Tuttavia, nell'organizzare i rispettivi servizi sanitari, gli Stati membri sono tenuti a conformarsi al diritto dell'UE, e in particolare alle disposizioni del trattato riguardanti le libertà fondamentali, le quali vietano agli Stati membri di introdurre o mantenere restrizioni ingiustificate all'esercizio di tali libertà nel campo delle cure sanitarie. Allo stadio attuale, la Commissione non intende formulare orientamenti generali in questo settore, ma continuerà a seguire la situazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011949/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Optician businesses and restricted freedom of establishment

Articles 49 to 55 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union prohibit any restriction on the freedom of establishment of nationals of a Member State in the territory of another Member State.

Certain legislative provisions announced recently by some Italian regional bodies have raised the issue of compatibility with the abovementioned articles, in particular certain provisions designed to restrict people from opening new optician businesses if there are other similar businesses nearby or to limit the number of businesses per number of residents.

The European Court of Justice recently studied the matter in its judgment of 26 September 2013 in Case C 539/11, finding that these provisions presented an obstacle to opticians from other Member States practising in Italy at a fixed place of business and made it less attractive for them to do so.

The Court has previously ruled that opening a pharmacy business in a similar way may be subject to planning rules and restrictions, to ensure that the populations' health needs are adequately catered for.

The Court later established that such principles also applied to opticians' businesses, in that their services involve assessing, maintaining and restoring patients' health and thus fall within the health protection sector. The Court referred the matter back to the Member States, as they have jurisdiction over public health matters.

According to the European Court of Justice itself, the legislative provisions in question could lead to unequal access to setting up business as an optician.

— What is the Commission's position on this matter?

— Does the Commission intend to issue clarifications, to ensure that the definition of what constitutes a business primarily concerned with public health protection is more effectively and uniformly recognised?

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

In Case C-539/11 Ottica New Line, the Court found that territorial and demographic restrictions on the establishment of opticians were likely to facilitate an even distribution of opticians' shops throughout a given territory and thus to contribute to the protection of public health. However, the Court indicated that, to be compatible with EC law, such restrictions should secure the attainment of the public health objective in a consistent and systematic manner. The Court indicated that the Italian legislation risks bringing about unequal access to the establishment of opticians' shops in the various areas of the region concerned. Given that the Court's judgment was issued in the framework of a preliminary ruling, it is for the national jurisdiction to examine whether, in practice, the national legislation satisfies the consistency test.

Member States are responsible for the organisation of their health system. It is for the Member States to decide on the level at which they wish to protect public health and on the way for achieving such protection. Such measures may differ from one Member State to another. However, in exercising the power to organise their health services, Member States must comply with EC law, in particular the provisions of the Treaty on the fundamental freedoms, which prohibit Member States from introducing or maintaining unjustified restrictions on the exercise of those freedoms in the healthcare sector. At this stage, the Commission does not intend to issue general guidance in this field but it will continue to monitor the situation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011950/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(18 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Elevata incidenza tumorale nella provincia di Lecce

La «Repubblica salentina», conosciuta anche come Salento o penisola salentina, costituisce la parte meridionale della Puglia, situata tra il Mare Ionio ed il Mare Adriatico. È un'area geografica nota per le bellezze paesaggistiche e naturalistiche, tuttavia è anche la sede di un fenomeno inquietante: si registra un'elevata presenza di tumori al polmone, in particolare nella provincia di Lecce. Nello specifico, le statistiche rivelano che il 20 % degli individui che si ammalano di cancro lo contraggono al polmone. Si registra la più alta incidenza nei distretti di Maglie e di Galatina. Tale tendenza non è un fenomeno emerso recentemente, ma sono all'incirca 10 anni che alcuni studiosi ed esperti hanno evidenziato tale problematica, senza tuttavia riuscire a individuarne l'origine, a causa di una mancanza di fondi e di un coordinamento delle ricerche. Probabilmente si tratta di una causa ambientale: alcuni studi riferiscono che i venti convogliano le emissioni dei poli industriali di Taranto e Brindisi nella provincia leccese. Un'altra ipotesi è che si tratti del radon, riscontrato in valori oltre la soglia in alcune scuole.

Il 30 ottobre ci sarà una riunione di un importante istituto italiano di sanità che dovrebbe presentare un rapporto inedito sulla questione, ma si tratta solamente di un punto d'inizio.

Ogni anno si riscontrano circa 500 nuovi carcinomi polmonari. Si è consapevoli che si tratta di una tematica di competenza dello Stato membro, tuttavia risulta che le risorse per svolgere questi studi sono difficilmente reperibili.

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

— se è a conoscenza dei dati relativi all'incidenza dei tumori nella provincia di Lecce;

— se esistono dei fondi europei che potrebbero essere destinati alle ricerche finalizzate a individuare le cause di tale diffusione tumorale;

— in caso di risposta affermativa, in che modo intende porre in essere azioni di monitoraggio sulle ricerche effettuate?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(3 dicembre 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'incidenza del cancro al polmone nella provincia italiana di Lecce ([1]) cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato.

Essa sostiene la Rete europea dei registri del cancro (ENCR) ([2]) che ha creato l'Osservatorio europeo del cancro (ECO) ([3]) in collaborazione con l'Agenzia internazionale per la ricerca sul cancro (IARC) ([4]). L'ECO fornisce i tassi di incidenza, mortalità e prevalenza del cancro nei vari paesi relativamente a luoghi specifici fino al 2009. Cifre più recenti (2012) sono reperibili nelle schede informative EUCAN ([5]) dell'ECO, che forniscono stime nazionali sull'incidenza, la mortalità e la prevalenza di 24 importanti tipi di cancro, compreso il cancro al polmone.

I fondi di ricerca dell'Unione europea sono attribuiti sulla base di inviti a presentare proposte concorrenziali pubblicati unitamente ai relativi programmi di lavoro. Le domande di ricerca collaborativa presentate in risposta ai suddetti inviti sono selezionate attraverso una procedura di valutazione *inter pares* indipendente, considerando l'eccellenza scientifica come criterio principale così da finanziare le migliori domande.

Orizzonte 2020, il prossimo programma per la ricerca e l'innovazione finanziato dall'UE (2014-2020), offrirà l'opportunità di realizzare ricerche sui fattori di rischio che causano il cancro al polmone nell'ambito della sfida per la società «Salute, evoluzione demografica e benessere». L'apertura degli inviti è prevista per l'11 dicembre 2013.

([1]) http://www.ij-healthgeographics.com/content/8/1/40
([2]) http://www.encr.eu/
([3]) http://eco.iarc.fr
([4]) http://www.iarc.fr/
([5]) http://eco.iarc.fr/eucan/Default.aspx

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011950/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: High incidence of cancer in the province of Lecce

The 'Salentine Republic', also known as Salento or the Salento Peninsula, forms the southern part of the Apulia region, situated between the Ionian and Adriatic seas. It is an area famous for its beautiful countryside and wildlife; however, it is also home to a worrying problem, as there is a high incidence of lung cancer in the area and in the province of Lecce in particular. Statistics show that 20% of cancer cases developed in the area are lung cancer. The highest incidence is recorded in the districts of Maglie and Galatina. This is not a recent problem: scholars and experts have been highlighting the problem for around 10 years, but have not managed to identify the cause due to a lack of funds and coordinated research. The cause is likely to be environmental: some studies report that the wind channels pollution from the industrial centres of Taranto and Brindisi into the province of Lecce. Another theory has looked at radon gas, which has been found at levels above the safe threshold in some schools.

On 30 October 2013, an important Italian health institute will hold a meeting at which an unprecedented report on the issue will be presented. However, this is only a starting point.

There are 500 new lung cancer cases every year. We are aware that this subject falls under Member State jurisdiction; however, in the present circumstances it is difficult to find the necessary funding to carry out these studies.

— Is the Commission aware of the statistics on the incidence of cancer in the province of Lecce?

— Are there any EU funds which could be set aside for research into the reasons for this high incidence?

— If so, what kind of monitoring would be carried out on the research?

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

The Commission is aware of the lung cancer incidence in the Italian province of Lecce ([1]) referred to by the Honourable Member.

The Commission is supporting the European Network of Cancer Registries (ENCR), ([2]) which developed the European Cancer Observatory (ECO) ([3]) in collaboration with the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) ([4]). ECO provides incidence, mortality and prevalence rates across countries for specific cancer sites until 2009. More recent figures (2012) are provided by ECO's EUCAN ([5]) module, which provides national estimates on incidence, mortality and prevalence for 24 major cancer types, including lung cancer.

EU research funding is granted on the basis of competitive calls for proposals published with the relevant Work Programmes. Collaborative research applications submitted to these calls are selected through an independent peer-review evaluation process with scientific excellence as the overriding criterion and financial support awarded to the best applications.

Horizon 2020, the next EU funding Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020), will offer opportunities to address research on risk factors that cause lung cancer through the 'Health, demographic change and well-being' societal challenge. The calls are expected to be opened on 11 December 2013.

([1]) http://www.ij-healthgeographics.com/content/8/1/40
([2]) http://www.encr.eu/
([3]) http://eco.iarc.fr
([4]) http://www.iarc.fr/
([5]) http://eco.iarc.fr/eucan/Default.aspx

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011951/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(18 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Situazione di povertà della Repubblica dello Zambia e finanziamenti europei

La Repubblica dello Zambia, con un PIL che cresce del 7,3 % l'anno, è oggi tra le prime dieci economie del mondo per tassi di crescita. Uno dei driver di tale crescita è l'«agricoltura blu» (detta anche «agricoltura conservativa») promossa dalla FAO e dall'UE che ha reso l'agricoltura in questo paese più redditizia. L'agricoltura blu si basa su tre principi: la copertura permanente del suolo per proteggerlo dall'erosione, una riduzione della lavorazione del terreno e una rotazione delle colture per migliorarne la fertilità.

Occorre notare che l'UE ha fornito cospicui aiuti allo Zambia: tra il 2008 e il 2013 sono stati erogati 489,7 milioni di euro per finanziare scuole, ospedali e 33 comunità locali. Tra gli altri, sono stati stanziati 16,9 milioni di euro per gli agricoltori negli ultimi tre anni e sono previsti altri 11,1 milioni nei prossimi quattro anni. Tuttavia, nonostante i progressi in corso, oggi lo Zambia resta fra i paesi più poveri al mondo.

Nello Zambia tre persone su quattro vivono sotto la soglia di povertà e lo stipendio medio pro capite annuale si aggira sui 395 USD; la maggioranza della popolazione vive nelle città, ma non ha un impiego; l'HIV/AIDS in questo paese è una piaga che contribuisce a collocare l'aspettativa di vita alla nascita degli zambiani intorno ai 37 anni.

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

— se è a conoscenza dei dati relativi alle condizioni di povertà in cui versa la grande maggioranza degli abitanti dello Zambia;

— se sono stati elaborati programmi specifici per rilanciare l'occupazione in tale paese;

— se sono state poste in essere delle azioni di monitoraggio sui finanziamenti erogati dall'UE?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(6 dicembre 2013)

La Commissione è del tutto consapevole delle condizioni di povertà in cui vive la popolazione dello Zambia. Nel paese, che sulla scala dell'HDI ([1]) è al 163° posto su 187, si riscontra un palese contrasto tra l'andamento positivo della crescita economica e quello dello sviluppo umano. Il 61 % della popolazione (soprattutto giovani e persone che vivono in zone rurali) vive al sotto della soglia di povertà e oltre la metà di questi in condizioni di estrema povertà. Nonostante una tendenza al ribasso, la povertà urbana continua a sfiorare percentuali elevate (80 %). Il settore agricolo rappresenta meno del 20 % del PIL ([2]), ma la maggior parte dei cittadini dello Zambia dipende, per il reddito, il lavoro e i generi alimentari, da un'agricoltura di sussistenza priva di sistemi di irrigazione. La disoccupazione è stimata al 50 % ma la maggior parte del lavoro si svolge nel settore sommerso. Negli ultimi dieci anni, il coefficiente di Gini si è deteriorato dallo 0,47 allo 0,54, ponendo lo Zambia tra i primi venti paesi al mondo con le maggiori disparità di reddito.

Una delle priorità del governo è la creazione di posti di lavoro, come indicato nel programma nazionale a lungo termine 2030 (piena occupazione duratura entro il 2030 e un tasso di disoccupazione inferiore al 10 %) e nella politica nazionale per l'occupazione e il mercato del lavoro del 2006, che fornisce un quadro di riferimento per le strategie a favore dell'occupazione.

L'UE ha sostenuto il lavoro dell'OIL ([3]) nello Zambia, volto a potenziare la capacità degli operatori del mercato del lavoro pubblici e privati a valutare i propri risultati e i progressi compiuti verso un lavoro dignitoso. Il nuovo progetto dell'UE per la gestione delle finanze pubbliche, la responsabilità e le statistiche è inteso a migliorare il funzionamento di tutti i ministeri, compreso il Ministero del lavoro. L'UE sta riflettendo sui futuri interventi da attuare nel quadro dell'11° FES ([4]) al fine di promuovere la creazione di posti di lavoro nelle zone rurali.

([1]) Human Develoment Index (HDI).
([2]) Prodotto interno lordo.
([3]) Organizzazione internazionale del lavoro.
([4]) Fondo europeo di sviluppo.

L'utilizzo di finanziamenti dell'UE è sottoposto a monitoraggio mediante il sistema della relazione sulla gestione dell'assistenza esterna e regolari valutazioni intermedie e finali abbinate a visite di monitoraggio ad hoc orientate ai risultati a livello di progetto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011951/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Situation of poverty in the Republic of Zambia and EU aid

With GDP growing by 7.3% per year, the Republic of Zambia is currently among the world's top 10 fastest growing economies. One of the drivers of this growth is conservation agriculture, promoted by the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the EU, which has improved the productivity of farming in the country. Conservation agriculture is based on three principles: permanent coverage of the soil to protect it from erosion, reduced tillage and crop rotation to improve soil fertility.

It is worth noting that the EU has granted significant amounts of aid to Zambia: between 2008 and 2013 it gave EUR 489.7 million to fund schools, hospitals and 33 local communities. EUR 16.9 million have been earmarked for farmers over the last three years and a further EUR 11.1 million have been set aside for the next four years. However, in spite of the progress that is under way, Zambia is still one of the world's poorest countries.

In Zambia, three out of four people are living below the poverty line and the average annual salary per capita is in the region of USD 395.00. Most of the population live in the cities but do not have work; HIV/AIDS is a scourge in the country and is one of the factors which place life expectancy at birth for Zambians at around 37.

— Is the Commission aware of the statistics on the conditions of poverty in which most of Zambia's population is living?

— Have any special programmes been developed to boost employment in the country?

— Is there a system in place to monitor the use of EU funding?

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

The Commission is fully aware of the poverty conditions in which the Zambian population lives. In Zambia, which ranks 163 out of 187 on the HDI ([1]), there is a clear mismatch between the positive economic growth and human development. 61% of the population (mainly young and rural) live below the poverty line and above half of those in extreme poverty. Urban poverty continues to fall but rural poverty remains persistently high (80%). The agricultural sector accounts for less than 20% of GDP ([2]) but most Zambians depend on rain-fed subsistence farming for income, employment and food. Unemployment is estimated at 50% but most work is in the informal sector. Over the past 10 years, the Gini coefficient has worsened from 0.47 to 0.54, placing Zambia's income inequality among the top 20 in the world.

Employment creation is a high priority for the Government, as reflected in the National Long Term Vision 2030 (sustained full employment by 2030 with an unemployment rate below 10%) and the 2006 National Employment and Labour Market Policy that provides a major focus for pro-employment strategies.

The EU has supported ILO's ([3]) work in Zambia to strengthen the capacity of private and public labour market actors to self-monitor and assess progress towards decent work. The new EU 'PFM, Accountability and Statistics' project aims at improving the performance of all Ministries, including the Ministry of Labour. The EU is presently reflecting on future interventions under the 11th EDF ([4]) to boost the creation of employment in rural areas.

The use of EU funding is being monitored through the External Assistance Management Report system and regular mid-term and final evaluations combined with ad-hoc Results-Oriented Monitoring visits at project level.

([1]) Human Development Index.
([2]) Gross Domestic Product.
([3]) International Labour Organisation's.
([4]) European Development Fund.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011952/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(18 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Proprietà curative della liquirizia

Recenti studi hanno portato alla luce come la pianta di liquirizia abbia ulteriori proprietà curative oltre a quelle già conosciute, come per il riflusso gastrico, l'ulcera e il trattamento di alcune affezioni di bocca e gola come afte, herpes e mal di gola.

Questo arbusto legnoso che cresce fino a raggiungere un metro di altezza, viene coltivato per le sue proprietà medicinali e utilizzato come materia principale nella produzione di bevande. Le radici più sottili sono sottoposte al processo di essiccazione da cui derivano i comuni bastoncini che si masticano.

Dalle altre radici, invece, viene estratto un succo nero dal sapore agrodolce che contiene per il 10-20 % la glicirizzina, un edulcorante naturale con un potere dolcificante fino a cento volte superiore a quello del saccarosio. È soprattutto questa sostanza a garantire le molteplici proprietà curative della liquirizia.

Secondo recenti studi di università statunitensi e cinesi, la liquirizia potrebbe rivelarsi anche un'ottima arma contro alcuni tipi di tumore.

Suddetti studi hanno testato una molecola proveniente dalla liquirizia, la BHP, su tessuti prelevati dal tumore alla prostata e al seno. È stato dimostrato che le proprietà di tale molecola sono in grado di inibire lo sviluppo delle cellule tumorali sopracitate, mentre un altro studio ha rivelato che l'acido glicirrizico contenuto nella liquirizia può venire impiegato come «trasportatore» per portare al bersaglio i farmaci antitumorali. Grazie a questi studi si sono ampliate le speranze per l'attuazione di nuove e più efficaci terapie.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, quale posizione intende assumere la Commissione circa l'utilizzo dei derivati dalla pianta di liquirizia in campo medico? Intende predisporre uno studio aggiornato sulla valutazione dei rischi e benefici derivanti dall'assunzione regolare di tali derivati?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(28 novembre 2013)

La Commissione adotterà una posizione sull'uso dei derivati della liquirizia nei prodotti medicinali soltanto se verrà presentata domanda di autorizzazione alla commercializzazione in relazione a un simile prodotto medicinale, nel qual caso la domanda sarà sottoposta alla valutazione dell'Agenzia europea per i medicinali (EMA). In tale eventualità la Commissione fonderà la propria decisione di concessione dell'autorizzazione alla commercializzazione sulla valutazione scientifica effettuata dall'EMA.

La Commissione non prevede attualmente di organizzare uno studio o prove cliniche per valutare la sicurezza e l'efficacia del consumo regolare di sostanze derivanti dalla liquirizia.

Tuttavia, nell'Unione europea il Comitato dei medicinali vegetali (HMPC) ha redatto una monografia comunitaria sulle piante medicinali relativa alla radice di liquirizia per usi medicinali ([1]) che costituisce il parere scientifico dell'HMPC sui dati relativi alla sicurezza e all'efficacia. Una simile monografia comunitaria sulle piante medicinali può essere usata dai richiedenti quale documento di riferimento per presentare domanda di registrazione fondata sull'impiego tradizionale di un medicinale vegetale presentata a un'autorità nazionale competente in uno Stato membro e da essa valutata.

([1]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/medicines/herbal/medicines/herbal_med_000132.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058001fa1d.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011952/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Curative properties of liquorice

Recent studies have shown that liquorice has further curative properties in addition to its known effects, for example on acid reflux, stomach ulcers and the treatment of some throat and mouth conditions such as mouth ulcers, herpes and sore throat.

This woody shrub, which can reach up to one metre in height, is grown for its medicinal properties and as a raw material for drinks manufacturing. The thinnest roots are dried to produce the well-known sticks for chewing.

The other roots are used to extract a black, bittersweet-flavoured juice which contains 10-20% glycyrrhizin, a natural sweetener up to 100 times sweeter than sucrose. The curative properties of liquorice derive primarily from this substance.

According to recent US and Chinese academic studies, liquorice could also prove to be an excellent weapon against some types of cancer.

These studies tested BHP, a substance derived from liquorice, on tissue samples taken from prostate and breast tumours. The substance was demonstrated to have the ability to inhibit the development of these tumour cells, while another study has shown that the glycyrrhizic acid contained in liquorice can be used as a 'carrier' to deliver anti-cancer drugs to their target. These studies have boosted hopes of introducing new, more effective treatments.

What position does the Commission intend to adopt on the use of derivatives of the liquorice plant in medicine? Does the Commission plan to organise an up-to-date study to assess the risks and benefits of regular consumption of these substances?

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

The Commission will adopt a position on the use of derivatives of the liquorice plant in medicinal products only if an application for a marketing authorisation for such a medicinal product is submitted to and evaluated by the European Medicines Agency (EMA). In such case, the Commission will base its decision on the granting of the marketing authorisation on the scientific evaluation performed by EMA.

The Commission has currently no plans to organise a study or clinical trial to assess the safety and efficacy of regular consumption of substances derived from the liquorice plant.

However, in the European Union the Committee on Herbal Medicinal Products (HMPC) has established a Community herbal monograph on liquorice root for medicinal use ([1]), i.e. the scientific opinion of the HMPC on safety and efficacy data. Such a Community herbal monograph may be used by applicants as a reference document for an application for a traditional use registration of a herbal medicinal product submitted to and evaluated by a National Competent Authority in a Member State.

([1]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/medicines/herbal/medicines/herbal_med_000132.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058001fa1d

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-011953/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(18 ottobre 2013)

Oggetto: Tracciabilità dell'oro e problematiche per le PMI operanti nel comparto

La normativa statunitense denominata Dodd-Frank Act prevede per le società statunitensi quotate in borsa l'obbligo di dimostrare che i prodotti oggetto delle loro attività che contengono oro, stagno, tungsteno e tantalio provengano da zone non interessate da conflitti (per cui si parla di «conflict free»), in particolare che non derivino dalla Repubblica democratica del Congo e dai paesi con essa confinanti, ma da Stati che applichino correttamente la legislazione vigente. Si è a conoscenza del fatto che la Commissione europea ha organizzato una consultazione pubblica a giugno nel contesto di uno studio realizzato allo scopo di implementare una normativa similare anche in territorio europeo.

La presenza di un sistema di produzione «a rete», i processi produttivi non standardizzati, l'acquisizione della materia prima presso molteplici fonti di approvvigionamento, nonché la natura stessa dell'oro (fungibile e indistruttibile) rendono complessa l'operazione di garantire al 100 % la provenienza dell'oro lavorato. Il comparto produttivo italiano è costituito da 9000 aziende con una media di 4,5 dipendenti, mentre in Spagna ci sono 9800 PMI che operano nel settore, per cui risulta che la grande maggioranza delle imprese in questi due paesi non è strutturata per poter implementare sistemi di tracciabilità di una certa complessità. Si sta verificando un blocco delle operazioni commerciali nei confronti del Congo e dei paesi limitrofi, facendo quindi fallire il proposito di tutelare le popolazioni di questi paesi.

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

— se intende valutare attentamente le ripercussioni di un'eventuale iniziativa legislativa dell'UE sulle imprese del comparto, nel caso si volesse applicare una normativa similare anche alle imprese non quotate in borsa;

— se considera opportuna un'azione dell'UE per incentivare il controllo nei paesi di origine dei minerali nonché una regolamentazione relativamente alle fasi di estrazione e affinazione del minerale;

— se ritenga sia ragionevole estendere la normativa anche ad altri paesi oltre al Congo (ad esempio Cina, India e Brasile), allo scopo di evitare di danneggiare le imprese dislocate in particolari aree geografiche?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(2 dicembre 2013)

In seguito alla consultazione pubblica su «Una possibile iniziativa dell'UE sull'approvvigionamento responsabile di minerali provenienti da zone di conflitto e ad alto rischio», che si è conclusa nel giugno 2013, la Commissione sta attualmente valutando in dettaglio l'impatto delle varie opzioni identificate, sulla base del quale preparerà le sue proposte. Tale valutazione esaminerà in modo approfondito le possibili conseguenze di ciascuna opzione identificata sulle imprese e sulle altre parti interessate in termini di impatto economico, sociale e ambientale. La valutazione di impatto prende in considerazione tutti i tipi di imprese UE, comprese le piccole e medie.

La Commissione ritiene inoltre importante incoraggiare i paesi in via di sviluppo che producono minerali ad attuare essi stessi i controlli e a disciplinare in modo adeguato il settore minerario.

Nell'UE, come altrove, attraverso le catene globali di approvvigionamento dei minerali, le società sono potenzialmente e indirettamente esposte al finanziamento di gruppi armati, con impatti negativi nelle regioni in cui vi sono conflitti. La due diligence sull'origine e sull'approvvigionamento dei minerali aiuta a rafforzare le prassi di approvvigionamento responsabile. A tale scopo, le proposte della Commissione intendono aumentare la trasparenza delle catene di approvvigionamento di minerali, controllando nella misura del possibile le entità che si trovano al di fuori della giurisdizione dell'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011953/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Traceability of gold and problems for SMEs operating in the sector

In the United States, the Dodd-Frank Act provides that US companies listed on the stock exchange must demonstrate that any products they deal in which contain gold, tin, tungsten or tantalum come from 'conflict free' areas, and in particular are not sourced from the Democratic Republic of the Congo and its bordering countries, but from countries which properly apply the current legislation. We are aware that in June the Commission organised a public consultation as part of a study currently under way with a view to implementing similar legislation in Europe.

However, the 'network' production system, non-standardised production processes, the purchasing of raw materials from many different sources and the nature of gold itself (fungible and indestructible) all mean that to guarantee the origin of finished gold 100% would be a complicated task. In Italy, the gold production sector consists of 9 000 firms, each with an average of 4.5 employees, while in Spain there are 9 800 SMEs operating in the sector. The vast majority of companies in these two countries therefore do not have a structure that could cope with implementing traceability systems of any complexity. Trade with Congo and its neighbouring countries is being blocked, making the idea of protecting these countries' populations impossible.

— Does the Commission intend to carry out a detailed assessment of the possible repercussions EU legislation might have on businesses in the sector if this type of legislation were to be applied to non-listed companies also?

— Does the Commission think the EU should take action to encourage the countries of origin of the minerals to implement controls themselves and to regulate the mining and refining stages also?

— Does the Commission feel it would be reasonable to extend the regulations to cover other countries as well as Congo (such as China, India and Brazil), to avoid harming businesses with branches in specific geographical regions?

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

Following the public consultation on 'A possible EU initiative on responsible sourcing of minerals originating from conflict-affected and high-risk areas', which closed in June 2013, the Commission is currently assessing in detail the impact of various options identified on the basis of which it will prepare its proposal. The impact assessment will duly assess the possible consequences of each option identified on businesses and other stakeholders in terms of economic, social and environmental impact. The impact assessment looks at all types of EU businesses including small and medium enterprises.

Furthermore, the Commission considers it important to encourage mineral-producing developing countries to implement controls themselves and appropriately regulate the mining sector.

In the EU, like elsewhere, through global mineral supply chains, companies are potentially and indirectly exposed to the financing of armed groups with adverse impacts in conflict regions. Due diligence over the origin and supply of minerals helps to ensure responsible sourcing practices. To this end, any Commission proposal would aim at increasing the transparency of mineral supply chains, covering entities outside the EU jurisdiction to the extent possible.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011954/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(18 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Σύγχρονη δουλεία

Σύμφωνα με την οργάνωση Walk Free, σχεδόν 30 εκατομμύρια άνθρωποι σε όλο τον κόσμο ζουν σε συνθήκες δουλείας. Η Ινδία βρίσκεται στην πρώτη θέση παγκοσμίως, εφόσον στη χώρα ζουν περίπου το ήμισυ του συνόλου των σκλάβων. Συνολικά, τα τρία τέταρτα των θυμάτων ζουν στην Ασία.

Σχεδόν 14 εκατομμύρια άνθρωποι ζουν σε καθεστώς σκλαβιάς στην Ινδία, 2,9 εκατομμύρια στην Κίνα, και πάνω από δύο εκατομμύρια στο Πακιστάν. Ακολουθούν η Νιγηρία, η Αιθιοπία, η Ρωσία, η Ταϊλάνδη, η Λαϊκή Δημοκρατία του Κονγκό (ΛΔΚ), η Βιρμανία και το Μπαγκλαντές. Αυτές οι δέκα χώρες συγκεντρώνουν τα 22 από τα 29,8 εκατομμύρια άτομα που ζουν σε καθεστώς σκλαβιάς σε όλο τον κόσμο.

Ο ορισμός της σύγχρονης δουλείας είναι κάπως διαφορετικός από εκείνο του δέκατου όγδοου αιώνα, την εποχή του δουλεμπορίου.

Ως σύγχρονη δουλεία μπορεί να θεωρηθεί η κατάσταση στην οποία οι άνθρωποι αντιμετωπίζουν τη βία, αναγκάζονται να δεχτούν θέσεις εργασίας ή συνθήκες υποταγής, δεν αμείβονται αλλά απλώς τους δίνεται το ελάχιστο για να επιβιώσουν, με αποτέλεσμα να μην είναι ελεύθεροι να φύγουν από τους δεσμώτες τους.

Δεκατέσσερις χώρες της Αφρικής, μεταξύ των οποίων η Μαυριτανία, το Μπενίν, η Ακτή Ελεφαντοστού, η Γκάμπια, η Γκαμπόν και η Σενεγάλη, είναι μεταξύ των 20 χωρών στην υψηλότερη κατάταξη, όσον αφορά τον αριθμό των σκλάβων σε κατά κεφαλήν βάση. Στο αντίθετο άκρο βρίσκονται χώρες όπως η Ισλανδία, η Ιρλανδία και το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο, όπου ο αριθμός των σκλάβων είναι πολύ χαμηλός.

Υπό το πρίσμα των ανωτέρω, θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να απαντήσει στα ακόλουθα:

α) γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή τα προαναφερθέντα γεγονότα;

β) είναι ενήμερη η Επιτροπή για τις περιπτώσεις της σύγχρονης δουλείας στα κράτη μέλη;

γ) ποια μέτρα μπορεί να λάβει η Επιτροπή για να βοηθήσει να ξεπεραστεί το πρόβλημα της σύγχρονης δουλείας στον κόσμο;

Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου κ. Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

A) Η ΕΕ είναι ενήμερη για την ύπαρξη σύγχρονων μορφών δουλείας ανά τον κόσμο. Η γενικότερη δέσμευση της ΕΕ για την καταπολέμηση της δουλείας αντικατοπτρίζεται στο άρθρο 5 του Χάρτη των Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων, που απαγορεύει τη δουλεία και την αναγκαστική εργασία.

B) Παραπέμπω την αξιότιμο βουλευτή στη νομολογία του Ευρωπαϊκού Δικαστηρίου Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων που τα τελευταία χρόνια έχει ασχοληθεί με διάφορα φαινόμενα τα οποία εμπίπτουν στο πεδίο εφαρμογής του άρθρου 4 της Σύμβασης, συμπεριλαμβανομένων περιπτώσεων που αφορούν κράτη μέλη. Η ενωσιακή οδηγία αντιμετώπισης της εμπορίας ανθρώπων περιλαμβάνει τη δουλεία ή πρακτικές παρόμοιες με τη δουλεία ως ελάχιστες μορφές εκμετάλλευσης. Η 1η Έκθεση Στατιστικών Στοιχείων της ΕΕ δημοσιεύθηκε τον Απρίλιο 2013 ([1]).

Γ) Τοπικές ενωσιακές στρατηγικές για τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα σε επίπεδο χώρας συνέτειναν στο να ριχθεί περισσότερο φως στο πρόβλημα της δουλείας σε ορισμένες χώρες, καθώς και στον σχεδιασμό δράσεων για την αντιμετώπιση του ζητήματος. Η ΕΕ προωθεί ενεργώς την εφαρμογή και επικύρωση των συμβάσεων 29 και 105 της ΔΟΕ για την αναγκαστική εργασία και τη σύμβαση 182 με αντικείμενο τις χειρότερες μορφές παιδικής εργασίας. Το άρθρο 8 της συμφωνίας του Κοτονού περιέχει διατάξεις με βάση τις οποίες η ΕΕ προβληματίζεται τακτικά για ζητήματα όπως η δουλεία και η αναγκαστική εργασία και ζητά από χώρες συγκεκριμένες δεσμεύσεις. Η δουλεία αντιμετωπίζεται επίσης και με άλλα κοινοτικά μέσα. Για παράδειγμα, στη Μαυριτανία, η καταπολέμηση της δουλείας συγκαταλέγεται στις προτεραιότητες μιας προκήρυξης υποβολής προτάσεων έργων που δρομολογήθηκε εφέτος στο πλαίσιο του Ευρωπαϊκού Μέσου για τη Δημοκρατία και τα Δικαιώματα του Ανθρώπου (ΕΜΔΔΑ).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/entity.action?breadCrumbReset=true&path=EU+Policy/Report_DGHome_Eurostat

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011954/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Modern-day slavery

According to the organisation Walk Free, nearly 30 million people live in slavery worldwide. India is the global leader, with roughly half of all slaves living in the country. Overall, three quarters of the victims live in Asia.

Almost 14 million people are living in slavery in India, followed by 2.9 million in China and over two million in Pakistan. These are followed by Nigeria, Ethiopia, Russia, Thailand, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Burma and Bangladesh. These ten countries account for 22 of the 29.8 million people living in slavery worldwide.

The definition of modern slavery is somewhat different to that which prevailed in the eighteenth century, the slave trade era.

Modern slavery can be seen as a situation in which people face violence, are forced to accept jobs or circumstances in which they are subordinated, or are not paid but simply given the minimum with which to survive, with the result of not being free to leave their captors.

Fourteen African countries, including Mauritania, Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Gabon and Senegal, are among the 20 countries ranking highest, if we look at the number of slaves on a per-capita basis. At the bottom of the ranking are countries such as Iceland, Ireland and the United Kingdom, where the number of slaves is very low.

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

a) Is the Commission aware of the abovementioned facts?

b) Is the Commission aware of any cases of modern slavery in Member States?

c) What measures can the Commission take to help overcome the problem of modern slavery worldwide?

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

(a) The EU is aware of the existence of modern slavery worldwide. The EU's overall commitment to combating slavery is reflected in Article 5 of the Charter on Fundamental Rights, which prohibits slavery and forced labour.

(b) I can refer the Honourable Member to the case law of the European Court of Human Rights which in recent years has dealt with various phenomena falling within the scope of Article 4 of the Convention, including cases involving Member States. The EU Anti-Trafficking Directive includes slavery or practices similar to slavery as minimum forms of exploitation. The 1st EU Statistical Data Report was published in April 2013 ([1]).

(c) Local EU human rights country strategies have helped further shed light on the problem of slavery in some countries, as well as to draw up actions to address the issue. The EU actively promotes the implementation and ratification of ILO conventions 29 and 105 on forced labour, and convention 182 on the worst forms of child labour. Article 8 of the Cotonou agreement allows for the EU to regularly address its concern over issues such as slavery and forced labour and to call upon countries for specific commitments. Other EC instruments also address slavery. For example, in Mauritania, a call for project proposals launched this year under the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), has the fight against slavery as one of its priorities.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/entity.action?breadCrumbReset=true&path=EU+Policy/Report_DGHome_Eurostat

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011955/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(18 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: «Διαρροή» από τον Snowden — ισχυρισμός περί συλλογής δεδομένων προσωπικού χαρακτήρα από την Εθνική Υπηρεσία Ασφάλειας των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών

Σύμφωνα με το BBC News, ένα έγγραφο που διέρρευσε από τον Edward Snowden αναφέρει ότι η Εθνική Υπηρεσία Ασφάλειας των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών (NSA) συλλέγει έως 250 εκατομμύρια επιγραμμικά βιβλία διευθύνσεων ετησίως, τόσο από αλλοδαπούς όσο και από αμερικανικούς λογαριασμούς ηλεκτρονικών διευθύνσεων και στιγμιαίων μηνυμάτων. Τα βιβλία διευθύνσεων μπορεί να περιλαμβάνουν ονόματα, ηλεκτρονικές διευθύνσεις, αριθμούς τηλεφώνου, διευθύνσεις κατοικίας, καθώς και πληροφορίες σχετικά με την επιχειρηματική και οικογενειακή κατάσταση.

Οι εμπλεκόμενοι διαδικτυακοί πάροχοι, υποστηρίζουν ότι δεν επέτρεψαν στην NSA να έχει άμεση πρόσβαση στις εν λόγω πληροφορίες. Η συλλογή πληροφοριών υλοποιείται υπερπόντια, όταν οι χρήστες συνδέονται, συντάσσουν ένα μήνυμα ή συγχρονίζουν τις συσκευές τους. Εικάζεται ότι οι πληροφορίες έχουν συλλεχθεί από εταιρίες τηλεπικοινωνιών με έδρα εκτός των ΗΠΑ.

Η NSA δήλωσε ότι η παρακολούθηση αυτού του είδους χρησιμοποιείται για την καταπολέμηση της τρομοκρατίας, της παράνομης διακίνησης ναρκωτικών και της εμπορίας ανθρώπων, μεταξύ άλλων εγκλημάτων. Ακόμη και αν ισχύει κάτι τέτοιο, δεν θα πρέπει να λησμονείται το γεγονός ότι οι εν λόγω δραστηριότητες μπορούν να θεωρηθούν ως παραβιάσεις των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και του ιδιωτικού βίου.

Με βάση τα παραπάνω, η Επιτροπή καλείται να απαντήσει στα ακόλουθα ερωτήματα:

α) Ποια είναι η γνώμη της για αυτούς τους νέους ισχυρισμούς εις βάρος της NSA;

β) Τι είδους δράσεις δύνανται να αναλάβουν, τόσο η ίδια όσο και η ΕΕ, προκειμένου να διαφυλάξουν τα θεμελιώδη ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα των πολιτών της ΕΕ από αυτή την παράνομη συλλογή δεδομένων προσωπικού χαρακτήρα;

γ) Έχει θέσει το ζήτημα ενώπιον των αρχών των ΗΠΑ, και σε περίπτωση καταφατικής απάντησης, ποια ήταν η αντίδρασή τους;

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

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στην απάντησή της στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-011733/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011955/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Snowden leak — allegation that US National Security Agency collects personal data

According to BBC News, a document leaked by Edward Snowden alleges that the US National Security Agency (NSA) collects up to 250 million online address books each year, from both foreign and US email and instant message accounts. The address books may contain names, emails, telephone numbers, home addresses and business and family information.

The web providers involved say that they have not given the NSA direct access to this data. The data collection takes place overseas when users log in, compose a message or synchronise devices. The information has allegedly been collected by telecommunication companies based outside the US.

The NSA has stated that such surveillance is used to combat terrorism, drug smuggling and human trafficking, among other crimes. While this may be the case, it should not be forgotten that such activities can be regarded as violations of human rights and privacy.

In the light of this, the Commission is asked to answer the following:

(a) What is its view of these new allegations against the NSA?

(b) What actions can it and the EU take to safeguard the fundamental human rights of EU citizens against this illegal collection of personal data?

(c) Has it raised the matter with the US authorities and, if so, what was their reaction?

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

The Commision would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-011733/2013.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011956/13
προς το Συμβούλιο
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(18 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ύποπτες χρηματοδοτήσεις στη Γερμανία

Σύμφωνα με πληροφορίες του γερμανικού περιοδικού SPIEGEL και σχετικές αναφορές στην ιστοσελίδα του Γερμανικού Κοινοβουλίου, γερμανική αυτοκινητοβιομηχανία χορήγησε το ποσό των 690 000 ευρώ στο κυβερνών Χριστιανοδημοκρατικό Κόμμα της Γερμανίας, με σκοπό η Γερμανική Κυβέρνηση να μπλοκάρει απόφαση της ΕΕ με την οποία θα περιοριζόταν η εκπομπή καυσαερίων των αυτοκινήτων. Πρόκειται για σοβαρούς ισχυρισμούς που αγγίζουν καίρια θέματα δεοντολογίας και μάλιστα σε μια χώρα με ηγετικό ρόλο στην Ένωση.

Ερωτάται το Συμβούλιο:

— Είναι σε γνώση της οι πιο πάνω πληροφορίες;

— Αληθεύει ο προβαλλόμενος ισχυρισμός ότι οι υπουργοί Περιβάλλοντος της ΕΕ, μετά από Γερμανικές πιέσεις, ενέδωσαν και απέρριψαν τη συμφωνία για περιορισμό των καυσαερίων των αυτοκινήτων;

— Θεωρεί ότι εγείρονται θέματα διαφθοράς, μαύρου χρήματος ή πολιτικής δεοντολογίας στην υπόθεση αυτή;

— Τι προτίθεται να πράξει ώστε να διαλευκανθεί πλήρως η υπόθεση αυτή;

Απάντηση
(23 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

Το Συμβούλιο δεν είναι αρμόδιο να σχολιάζει δημοσιεύματα του τύπου.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011956/13
to the Council
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Suspicious funding in Germany

According to an article in the German magazine *Spiegel* and information on the German Parliament website, a German automotive manufacturer has donated the sum of EUR 690 000 to the ruling Christian Democratic Union in Germany, in a bid to get the German Government to block an EU decision limiting vehicle exhaust emissions. These are serious allegations concerning crucial questions of ethics, especially in a country which plays a leading role in the Union.

In view of the above, will the Council say:

— Has the above information come to its attention?

— Is it true that the EU Environment Ministers gave in and rejected an agreement to limit vehicle exhaust emissions under pressure from Germany?

— Does it consider that questions of corruption, bribery and political ethics have arisen in this case?

— What does it intend to do to fully elucidate this matter?

Reply
(23 December 2013)

It is not for the Council to comment on articles appearing in the press.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011959/13
an die Kommission
Richard Seeber (PPE)
(18. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Fehlende Koordinierung der Lerninhalte an europäischen Hochschulen

Die Verwirklichung des Europäischen Hochschulraums scheint in der Praxis bisweilen an den nicht abgestimmten Curricula der Universitäten innerhalb und zwischen den unterschiedlichen Mitgliedstaaten zu scheitern. Das Fehlen jeglicher Koordinierung der Lerninhalte kann die StudentInnen vor große organisatorische Schwierigkeiten stellen und zu Zeitverlusten im Studium führen.

Auch bereits der Wechsel von Universitäten innerhalb eines Mitgliedstaates kann aufgrund der unterschiedlichen Lerninhalte mit großen administrativen Hürden, wie zum Beispiel der Nichtanerkennung von absolvierten Kursen und dem verbindlichen Nachholen von Kursen, einhergehen.

Welche Maßnahmen plant die Kommission zu ergreifen, um diesen in der Praxis auftretenden Hürden für StudentInnen zu begegnen?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(28. November 2013)

Für die Systeme der allgemeinen und beruflichen Bildung sind die nationalen Regierungen zuständig, und über die Curricula und Lehrinhalte der einzelnen Hochschulen bestimmen diese selbst. Es ist nicht Ziel des Europäischen Hochschulraums, eine Harmonisierung der Lehrinhalte herbeizuführen, sondern für mehr Kohärenz und Möglichkeiten der Interaktion zwischen den Hochschulen zu sorgen, wozu auch die Freizügigkeit der Studierenden gehört, für die sich der Herr Abgeordnete einsetzt.

Das von der Kommission geförderte Instrumentarium auf EU-Ebene ist ein Beitrag zur Verstärkung der Kohärenz unterschiedlicher Systeme. Das in den meisten Ländern des Europäischen Hochschulraums verwendete Europäische System zur Anrechnung von Studienleistungen (European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System, ECTS) ist ein starkes Instrument, das nicht nur die Übertragung von Leistungspunkten ermöglicht, sondern auch die Zusammenrechnung der in Studiengängen unterschiedlicher Hochschulen erworbenen Leistungspunkte; dadurch werden die an verschiedenen Hochschulen erzielten Lernergebnisse transparenter und lassen sich besser miteinander vergleichen. Die derzeit laufende Überarbeitung des ECTS-Leitfadens wird dazu führen, dass das ECTS im Europäischen Hochschulraum häufiger Verwendung als gemeinsame Grundlage von Studienprogrammen findet.

Erasmus+ wird die Kohärenz noch weiter verstärken. An den betreffenden Mobilitätsaktionen können sich nur Einrichtungen beteiligen, die die Erasmus-Hochschulcharta unterzeichnet haben. Die Unterzeichner der Charta verpflichten sich, die im Ausland erworbenen Leistungspunkte als integralen Bestandteil ihrer Studiengänge anzuerkennen. Alle Leistungspunkte, die Studierende aufgrund einer Studienvereinbarung erhalten, die im Rahmen einer Mobilitätsaktion geschlossen wurde, müssen von der Heimathochschule ohne weitere Kurse oder Prüfungen anerkannt werden.

Darüber hinaus werden strategische Partnerschaften im Rahmen von Erasmus+ Hochschulen die Gelegenheit zur Förderung und Entwicklung von Mobilitätsfenstern als integraler Bestandteil der Curricula bieten, wodurch die Anerkennung von Studienzeiten im Ausland noch weiter verbessert wird.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011959/13
to the Commission
Richard Seeber (PPE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Lack of coordination of the material being taught at European universities

Realisation of the European Higher Education Area sometimes seems to fail in practice on account of the lack of coordination of the curricula of the universities within and between different Member States. The lack of any coordination of the material being taught can cause major organisational problems for students and lead to wasted time in their studies.

Even changing universities within a Member State can present major administrative obstacles on account of the differing course content, such as courses taken not being recognised and a student being obliged to take courses to catch up on what has been missed.

What steps does the Commission intend to take to address these obstacles that arise in practice for students?

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

National governments are responsible for their education and training systems, and individual higher education institutions organise their own curricula and course content. It is not an objective of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) to bring about harmonisation of educational content but to create greater coherence and possibilities for interaction between institutions, including the free movement of students as promoted by the honourable member.

European tools supported by the Commission are one lever for greater coherence among different systems. The European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS — used by most countries of the EHEA) is a powerful tool, not only for transferring credits, but also for accumulating them in different institutions' study programmes, by making learning outcomes clearer and more directly comparable across institutions. The current revision of the ECTS Guide will strengthen the use of ECTS as a common basis of study programmes in the EHEA.

Erasmus+ will help bring further coherence. Only institutions that have signed the Erasmus Charter for Higher Education may participate in its mobility actions. Use of the Charter will require that credits gained abroad are recognised as an integral part of the student's degree programmes. All credits that the student earns under the Learning Agreement governing their mobility shall be recognised by the home institution without any further courses or exams.

Furthermore, Strategic Partnerships within Erasmus+ will provide the opportunity for higher education institutions to promote and develop mobility windows as an integral part of curricula, thereby further improving recognition of study abroad periods.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011961/13
an die Kommission
Richard Seeber (PPE)
(18. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Mängel bei der Umsetzung eines einheitlichen Europäischen Hochschulraums

Der Bologna-Prozess zielt auf die Schaffung eines einheitlichen Europäischen Hochschulraums ab. Obwohl bereits viele Fortschritte erzielt wurden, scheint die Verwirklichung des Europäischen Hochschulraums in der Praxis bisweilen an den unterschiedlichen akademischen Kalendern und internen Fristen der europäischen Universitäten zu scheitern.

So informieren etwa die unterschiedlichen Universitäten zukünftige Studenten über ihre Studienzulassung zu stark voneinander abweichenden Zeitpunkten. Dies kann dazu führen, dass Studenten, die sich für Studiengänge an Universitäten in mehreren unterschiedlichen Mitgliedstaaten bewerben, aufgrund des Fristlaufs einen Studienplatz verpflichtend annehmen müssen, bevor sie die Bescheide über Studienzulassungen an anderen europäischen Universitäten überhaupt erhalten haben. Ebenso weichen der Zeitpunkt des Studienbeginns und des Studienendes an den unterschiedlichen Universitäten teils stark voneinander ab.

Welche Maßnahmen plant die Kommission zu treffen, um diesen in der Praxis auftretenden Hürden für Studenten zu begegnen?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(3. Dezember 2013)

Gemäß dem Vertrag über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union tragen die Mitgliedstaaten die Hauptverantwortung für die Hochschulpolitik, was im Jahr 1999 in der Erklärung von Bologna bestätigt wurde. Die Europäische Union unterstützt und ergänzt die Maßnahmen der Mitgliedstaaten durch Förderung der Zusammenarbeit und der Entwicklung politischer Konzepte, durch aktive Mitwirkung in den Entscheidungsgremien des Bologna-Prozesses sowie durch Finanzierung verschiedener Maßnahmen.

In Anbetracht der Tatsache, dass die Vielfalt der Kultur- und Bildungstraditionen in den verschiedenen Mitgliedstaaten eine Stärke ist, die den hohen Grad an Autonomie der Hochschulen in allen Bereichen ihrer Tätigkeit reflektiert, zielt der Bologna-Prozess nicht auf eine Harmonisierung der unterschiedlichen Hochschulsysteme (oder ihrer akademischen Kalender) ab. Der Prozess zielt vielmehr darauf ab, die Systeme kohärenter zu gestalten, und die Kommission unterstützt dies, indem sie zur Entwicklung gemeinsamer europäischer Instrumente zur Förderung der Kohärenz und Konvergenz in der Hochschulbildung beiträgt.

Die Kommission unterstützt außerdem das Netz der nationalen Informationszentren für die akademische Anerkennung in der EU, das angehende Studierende über die Zulassungsbedingungen der Hochschulen in unterschiedlichen Ländern des Europäischen Hochschulraums informieren kann. Diese Informationen erleichtern die individuelle Mobilität von Studierenden.

Da sich die für die Hochschulbildung zuständigen Minister auf der Bukarester Bologna-Konferenz 2012 dazu verpflichtet haben, auf das langfristige Ziel einer automatischen Anerkennung vergleichbarer Hochschulabschlüsse hinzuarbeiten, fördert die Kommission derzeit eine Sondierungsgruppe von Ländern, die untersucht, welche Ansätze eine automatische Anerkennung ermöglichen würden. Die Sondierungsgruppe wird der Bologna-Ministerkonferenz, die 2015 in Eriwan stattfindet, ihren Bericht vorlegen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011961/13
to the Commission
Richard Seeber (PPE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Shortcomings in the implementation of a single European Higher Education Area

The Bologna process aims to establish a single European Higher Education Area. Although a great deal of progress has already been made, the realisation of the European Higher Education Area sometimes appears to fail in practice on account of the different academic calendars and internal timescales of the European universities.

For example, the various universities inform future students of their admission at widely differing times. This can result in students who apply for courses at universities in several different Member States being compelled, on account of the deadline set, to accept a place before they have received the decisions regarding admissions to other European universities. The start and end dates of the courses also differ widely at different universities.

What steps does the Commission intend to take to address these obstacles that arise in practice for students?

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

Member States have the primary responsibility for higher education policies under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and this is confirmed under the Bologna Declaration of 1999. The European Union supports and supplements the actions of Member States by promoting cooperation and policy development, by playing an active role in the decision-making bodies of the Bologna Process, and by financing various actions.

The Bologna Process does not aim to harmonise different higher education systems (nor their academic calendars) — considering that the variety of cultural and educational traditions in the different member countries is a strength which reflects the high degree of autonomy of higher education institutions across all their activities. The Process rather aims to make systems more coherent, and the Commission supports this by contributing to the development of common European tools that foster coherence and convergence in higher education.

The Commission also supports the network of National Recognition Centres (NARICs) in the EU, which can provide information to potential students on conditions for admission to higher education institutions in different countries of the EHEA. This information facilitates individual mobility for the purposes of study.

Following the commitment of higher education ministers at the 2012 Bologna-Bucharest conference to work towards the long-term goal of automatic recognition of comparable academic degrees, the Commission is facilitating a pathfinder group of countries exploring approaches to automatic recognition. The pathfinder group will report to the 2015 Bologna ministerial conference in Yerevan.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011962/13
an die Kommission
Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE) und Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE)
(18. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Vorbereitung der Verhandlungen zur transatlantischen Handels- und Investitionspartnerschaft — Transparenz und Einbeziehung von Interessenträgern

Obwohl die Kommission eine Sitzung des zivilgesellschaftlichen Dialogs über die Gespräche der transatlantischen Handels- und Investitionspartnerschaft (TTIP) durchgeführt hat, bleibt ein starkes Ungleichgewicht. Eine Liste von 135 „Sitzungen mit Interessenträgern", die von der Kommission organisiert wurden, wurde veröffentlicht. Sie zeigt, dass 119 von diesen Sitzungen mit großen Konzernen und deren Lobbyisten stattfanden und nur eine Hand voll mit Gewerkschaften und Verbrauchergruppen. Darüber hinaus wurden in den Sitzungen die EU-Vorbereitungen für die Handelsgespräche behandelt, wohingegen die offizielle Konsultation mit der Zivilgesellschaft kaum mehr als eine Informationsveranstaltung war, die dem Beginn der Gespräche folgte. Ebenso kamen die Beiträge der EU-Online-Konsultation fast ausschließlich von Unternehmen und Industrieverbänden, als ein Ergebnis einer Befragung, die sich auf diese Gruppen konzentrierte.

Welche konkreten Maßnahmen wird die Kommission vornehmen, um dieses starke Ungleichgewicht zu bewältigen?

Beim zivilgesellschaftlichen Dialog im Juli 2013 erklärte die Kommission, dass vielleicht eine Gruppe von Fachberatern einberufen wird. Wird die Kommission diesen Vorschlag zu Ende führen?

Was wird die spezifische Rolle einer solchen Gruppe sein und wer sollte ihr angehören? Werden zusätzlich zu Wirtschaftsdelegationen auch NGOs, die sich mit Umwelt-, Verbraucher- und Gesundheitspolitik befassen, Gewerkschaften und unabhängige Experten einbezogen? Falls nicht: warum nicht?

In der Welthandelsorganisation und den UN-Klimaschutzverhandlungen gaben die einzelnen betroffenen Parteien, einschließlich der EU, ihre Verhandlungspositionen bekannt. Die Kommission hat damit begonnen einige von ihren Positionen zu den Handelsverhandlungen zu veröffentlichen. Warum hat die Kommission die Dokumente, die sie den USA in der ersten Runde der Verhandlungen in Washington vorgelegt hat, noch nicht veröffentlicht?

Wann wird die Kommission alle ihre Verhandlungspositionen und ihr Verhandlungsmandat veröffentlichen? Wird sie die Texte der Verhandlungen veröffentlichen? Falls nicht: warum nicht? Seit nunmehr einigen Jahren veröffentlicht die Regierung des Vereinigten Königreichs eine Liste ihrer Sitzungen mit den Lobbyisten, die vierteljährlich aktualisiert wird. Wann wird die Kommission Listen von ihren Sitzungen mit den Lobbyisten auf ihrer Website veröffentlichen? Falls sie solche Listen nicht veröffentlicht: warum nicht?

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(13. Dezember 2013)

Transparenz und Beteiligung der Interessenträger sind für die Kommission nach wie vor essenziell. Bei Verhandlungen über Handelsfragen bezieht die Kommission aktiv alle relevanten betroffenen Parteien ein, z. B. die Wirtschaft, Gewerkschaften, NRO ([1]) und die breite Öffentlichkeit. An den regelmäßigen Sitzungen im Rahmen des zivilgesellschaftlichen Dialogs der Kommission nehmen oft Vertreter von 60 Organisationen teil, die viele verschiedene Gruppen repräsentieren.

In Anbetracht des hohen öffentlichen Interesses an den Verhandlungen über eine transatlantische Handels- und Investitionspartnerschaft (TTIP) mit den USA hat die Kommission weitere Schritte eingeleitet, damit alle relevanten Interessenträger angehört werden und ihre Standpunkte berücksichtigt werden. Sie hat zusätzliche Kanäle für die Information und die Öffentlichkeitsarbeit eingerichtet, z. B. über ihre Website und ein neu geschaffenes Twitter-Konto. Außerdem hat sie, was bisher beispiellos ist, die ersten Positionspapiere der EU veröffentlicht.

Im Allgemeinen ist die Kommission offen für Treffen mit allen Organisationen, ob aus der Wirtschaft oder aus anderen Bereichen. Darüber hinaus fordert sie die Wirtschaft, zivilgesellschaftliche Organisationen und allgemein die Öffentlichkeit auf, zur Ausarbeitung der EU-Politik beizutragen, z. B. durch Kommentare zu den Unterlagen, die auf der Website der Generaldirektion (GD) Handel eingestellt werden.

([1]) Nichtregierungsorganisationen.

Die Kommission hat kürzlich angekündigt, dass sie die Einsetzung einer beratenden Sachverständigengruppe der GD Handel zu den TTIP-Verhandlungen plant. Diese Gruppe soll vor allem dem Austausch der Standpunkte der Sachverständigen und der Beratung zu den in den Verhandlungen angesprochenen Fragen dienen. Sie wird ausgewogen zusammengesetzt sein; die Sachverständigen werden aus der Wirtschaft, aus Gewerkschaften, Verbraucherorganisationen, Umweltschutz-NRO, akademischen Kreisen und Ideenschmieden stammen. Nähere Informationen dazu werden in Kürze auf der Website der GD Handel veröffentlicht.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011962/13
à la Commission
Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE) et Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE)
(18 octobre 2013)

Objet: Préparation des négociations concernant le partenariat transatlantique de commerce et d'investissement — Transparence et participation des parties prenantes

Si la Commission a organisé une réunion de dialogue avec la société civile sur les négociations relatives au partenariat transatlantique de commerce et d'investissement, il demeure néanmoins un déséquilibre majeur. Une liste de 135 réunions organisées par la Commission avec des parties prenantes a été publiée; elle révèle que 119 réunions se sont tenues avec de grandes entreprises et leurs groupes de pression et que seule une poignée d'entre elles se sont déroulée en présence de syndicats et d'associations de consommateurs. Par ailleurs, les réunions traitaient des préparations de l'Union aux négociations commerciales, alors que la consultation officielle de la société civile ne constituait qu'une séance d'information postérieure au début des négociations. De même, les contributions apportées dans le cadre des consultations en ligne de l'Union provenaient presque exclusivement d'entreprises et d'organisations sectorielles, étant donné que le questionnaire ciblait ces groupes en particulier.

Quelles mesures concrètes la Commission va-t-elle prendre pour remédier à ce déséquilibre majeur?

Lors du dialogue organisé avec la société civile en juillet 2013, la Commission a déclaré qu'un groupe de conseillers experts pouvait être créé. La Commission va-t-elle donner suite à cette proposition?

Que va être le rôle spécifique de ce groupe et qui devrait en faire partie? Outre des délégués commerciaux, le groupe comptera-t-il également des ONG actives en matière d'environnement, de consommation et de santé publique, des syndicats et des experts indépendants? Si non, pourquoi?

Au sein de l'Organisation mondiale du commerce et dans le cadre des négociations sur le climat au sein des Nations unies, les diverses parties concernées, y compris l'Union européenne, annoncent leur position de négociation. La Commission a commencé à publier quelques-unes de ses positions concernant les négociations commerciales. Pourquoi la Commission n'a-t-elle pas encore publié les documents qu'elle a présentés aux États-Unis lors du premier cycle de négociations à Washington, DC?

Quand la Commission va-t-elle publier l'ensemble de ses positions de négociation et son mandat de négociation? Envisage-t-elle de publier le texte des négociations? Si non, pourquoi? Depuis déjà plusieurs années, le gouvernement britannique publie une liste de ses réunions avec les groupes de pression et la met à jour tous les trois mois. Quand la Commission mettra-t-elle en ligne une liste de toutes les réunions qu'elle tient avec les groupes de pression? Si elle ne publie pas ce type de liste, pour quelles raisons?

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

La Commission reste très attachée à la transparence et à la participation des parties prenantes. Lorsqu'elle conduit des négociations commerciales, elle s'efforce d'associer toutes les parties prenantes concernées, telles que les entreprises, les syndicats, les ONG et le grand public. Les réunions régulières organisées par la Commission dans le cadre du dialogue avec la société civile attirent souvent des représentants de 60 organisations venant des horizons les plus divers.

Compte tenu du vif intérêt du public pour les négociations relatives à un partenariat transatlantique pour le commerce et l'investissement (PTCI) avec les États-Unis, la Commission a pris des dispositions supplémentaires pour faire en sorte que les points de vue de toutes les parties prenantes concernées soient entendus et pris en considération. Elle a établi des canaux d'information et de contact supplémentaires, par exemple par l'intermédiaire de son site web et d'un compte nouvellement créé sur Twitter. Elle a également publié les documents présentant la position initiale de l'Union européenne, ce qui constitue une première.

D'une manière générale, la Commission applique une politique d'ouverture et rencontre toutes les organisations (professionnelles ou non professionnelles) qui en font la demande. La Commission encourage également les entreprises, les organisations de la société civile et le public en général à contribuer à l'élaboration de la politique de l'UE, notamment par des observations concernant les documents publiés sur le site web de la direction générale du commerce.

La Commission a récemment annoncé qu'elle avait l'intention de créer un groupe consultatif d'experts sur les négociations PTCI sous l'égide de la DG Commerce. Ce groupe sera principalement chargé d'échanger des avis d'experts et de fournir des conseils sur les éléments en cours de négociation. Il aura une composition équilibrée et rassemblera des experts du secteur des entreprises, des syndicats, des organisations de consommateurs, des ONG de protection de l'environnement ([1]), des universitaires et des groupes de réflexion. Des informations détaillées seront publiées prochainement sur le site internet de la DG Commerce.

([1]) Organisations non gouvernementales.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011962/13
to the Commission
Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE) and Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE)
(18 October 2013)

Subject: Preparation of Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership negotiations — transparency and stakeholder involvement

Although the Commission has conducted a civil society dialogue meeting on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) talks, there remains a massive imbalance. A list has been released of 135 'meetings with stakeholders' organised by the Commission, revealing that 119 of these meetings were with large corporations and their lobby groups, and only a handful with trade unions and consumer groups. Moreover, the meetings dealt with the EU's preparations for the trade talks, whereas the official civil society consultation was merely an information session following the launch of the talks. Similarly, contributions to the EU's online consultations came almost exclusively from companies and industry associations, as a result of a questionnaire focusing on these groups.

What concrete action will the Commission take to tackle this massive imbalance?

At the civil society dialogue held in July 2013, the Commission stated that a group of expert advisors may be set up. Will the Commission follow through with this suggestion?

What will be the specific role of such a group, and who should be part of it? In addition to business delegates, will it also include environmental, consumer and public health NGOs, trade unions and independent experts? If not, why not?

In the World Trade Organisation and at UN climate negotiations, the various parties concerned, including the EU, announce their negotiation positions. The Commission has begun publishing a number of its positions on trade negotiations. Why has the Commission not yet published the documents that it presented to the US in the first round of negotiations in Washington DC?

When will the Commission publish all of its negotiation positions, and its negotiating mandate? Will it publish the texts of the negotiations? If not, why not? For several years now, the UK Government has published a list of its meetings with lobbyists, updated quarterly. When does the Commission post lists on its website of all meetings held with lobbyists? If it does not publish such lists, why not?

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

The Commission remains fully committed to transparency and stakeholder involvement. When conducting trade negotiations, the Commission actively seeks the involvement of all relevant stakeholders, such as business, trade unions, NGOs, the broader public. The regular meetings of the Commission's dialogue with civil society often attract representatives from 60 organisations from many walks of life.

Given the high public interest for the negotiations on a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership Agreement (TTIP) with the United States, the Commission has taken additional steps to ensure that the views of all relevant stakeholders are heard and taken into account. The Commission has created additional channels of information and outreach, for example via its website and a newly created Twitter account. It has also, in an unprecedented step, published the EU's initial position papers.

As a general rule, the Commission has an open door policy and meets all organisations (whether business or non-business) that request it. The Commission also encourages business, civil society organisations and the general public to contribute to the preparation of EU policy, for example by commenting on documents posted on the Directorate-General (DG) for Trade's website.

The Commission recently announced that it has the intention to create a DG Trade Expert Advisory Group on the TTIP negotiations. The Group's focus will be to exchange expert views and provide advice on the issues under negotiation. This Group will have a balanced composition. It will gather experts from the business sector, trade unions, consumer organisations, environmental NGOs ([1]), academics and think tanks. Detailed information will be published shortly on the DG Trade website.

([1]) Non-governmental organisations.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011967/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Kriterien für den Wechsel von EU-Beamten in nationale Behörden

In verschiedenen Medienberichten wird immer wieder auf Wechsel von Kommissionsbeamten in die Privatwirtschaft hingewiesen. Für den Wechsel von der Kommission in die Privatwirtschaft gibt es Kriterien der Kommission. Es gibt jedoch auch Kommissionbeamte, die in nationale Behörden wechseln.

1. Sieht die Kommission beim Wechsel von der Kommission in eine nationale Behörde keine Probleme mit Interessenkonflikten?

2. Wie viele Kommissionsbeamte wechselten nach Kenntnis der Kommission in den Jahren 2010, 2011 und 2012 in eine nationale Behörde?

3. Plant die Kommission, die gleichen Kriterien für Wechsel von der Kommission in nationale Behörden anzuwenden, wie sie bereits für Wechsel in die Privatwirtschaft gelten? Wenn ja, ab welchem Zeitpunkt soll dieses Kriterium gelten?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(9. Januar 2014)

1. Die Mitgliedstaaten und ihre Behörden sind Teil der Europäischen Union. Sie sind über den Rat an der Beschlussfassung beteiligt und wenden täglich Rechtsvorschriften und Strategien der EU an. Wechselt ein EU-Beamter in eine nationale Behörde, so bewertet die Kommission von Fall zu Fall die potenziellen Risiken für die Interessen der Kommission. Beamte bleiben weiterhin verpflichtet, sich jeder nicht genehmigten Verbreitung von Informationen zu enthalten, von denen sie im Rahmen ihrer Aufgaben Kenntnis erhalten, es sei denn, diese Informationen sind bereits veröffentlicht oder der Öffentlichkeit zugänglich.

2. Zur Beantwortung der Anfrage des Herrn Abgeordneten müsste die Kommission langwierige und kostspielige Recherchen anstellen, die sie zum jetzigen Zeitpunkt aufgrund anderer Prioritäten nicht in Erwägung zieht.

3. Die Bestimmungen von Titel II „Rechte und Pflichten des Beamten" des Statuts der Beamten der Europäischen Union und der Beschäftigungsbedingungen für die sonstigen Bediensteten der Europäischen Union gelten gleichermaßen für alle Fälle; sie hängen nicht von der Art der Organisation ab, in die Bedienstete im Rahmen der externen Mobilität entsandt werden oder in der sie eine Tätigkeit ausüben.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011967/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Criteria for EU officials moving into national authorities

Moves by Commission officials into the private sector have been reported in the media on numerous occasions. The Commission has criteria that are to be applied when an official moves from the Commission into the private sector. However, there are also Commission officials who move into national authorities.

1. Does the Commission not see any problems in terms of conflicts of interests when an official moves from the Commission into a national authority?

2. To the Commission's knowledge, how many Commission officials moved into a national authority in 2010, 2011 and 2012?

3. Does the Commission plan to apply the same criteria to a move from the Commission into national authorities as already apply to a move into the private sector? If so, from what date is this to apply?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(9 January 2014)

1. Member States and their national authorities are part of the European Union. They participate in the decision-making through the Council and apply EC law and policies on a daily basis. If an EU official moves to a national administration, an assessment of potential risks for the interests of the Commission is carried out by the Commission on a case by case basis. Officials remain bound by their obligation to refrain from any unauthorised disclosure of information received in the line of duty, unless that information has already been made public or accessible to the public.

2. In order to answer the Honourable Member's question the Commission would have to undertake lengthy and costly research. It cannot consider doing this at the present time because of other priorities.

3. The provisions of title II 'Rights and obligations' of the Staff Regulations of the officials and conditions of employments of other servants of the European Union apply equally to all cases; they do not depend on the type of organisation where staffs are sent on external mobility or where they take up activity.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011968/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Mitgliedschaft im Ethikrat der Kommission

In der Kommission gibt es einen Ethikrat, der das Verhalten von Mitgliedern der EU-Kommission bei ihrem Übertritt in die Privatwirtschaft begutachten soll. Ein Mitglied dieses Rates ist Michel Petite, der 2007 aus dem Juristischen Dienst der Kommission ausschied und seither bei der Anwaltskanzlei Clifford Chance arbeitet. Ein Großkunde von Clifford Chance ist der Tabakkonzern Philip Morris.

1. Wie viele Mitglieder hat der Ethikrat der Kommission derzeit?

2. Wie heißen diese Mitglieder?

3. Sieht die Kommission einen Interessenkonflikt zwischen der Mitgliedschaft von Michel Petite im Ethikrat der Kommission und seiner Tätigkeit als Anwalt für einen Tabakkonzern?

4. Welche Kriterien legt die Kommission für die Mitgliedschaft in ihrem Ethikrat an?

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

1. Gemäß Artikel 4 Absatz 1 des Kommissionsbeschlusses K(2003) 3750 vom 21. Oktober 2003 besteht der Ad hoc-Ethikausschuss aus drei Mitgliedern.

2. Derzeit gehören dem Ad hoc-Ethikausschuss an: Rafael García-Valdecasas, ehemaliger Richter am Gericht erster Instanz der Europäischen Union, Terry Wynn, ehemaliges Mitglied des Europäischen Parlaments, und Michel Petite, ehemaliger Generaldirektor des Juristischen Dienstes der Europäischen Kommission.

3. Die Kommission sieht keinen Interessenskonflikt.

Der Ad hoc-Ethikausschuss hat im Wesentlichen zu beurteilen, ob geplante Tätigkeiten ehemaliger Kommissionsmitglieder nach dem Ausscheiden aus dem Amt mit dem Vertrag und dem Verhaltenskodex für Kommissionsmitglieder vereinbar sind. Für die Arbeit der drei Ausschussmitglieder gilt das Kollegialitätsprinzip. Wenn Herr Petite als Mitglied des Ausschusses tätig wird und zusammen mit den anderen Mitgliedern Stellungnahmen für die Kommission erstellt, handelt er in völliger Unabhängigkeit.

4. Die Kriterien der Kommission für die Mitgliedschaft im Ad hoc-Ethikausschuss sind im eingangs genannten Kommissionsbeschluss K(2003)3750 festgelegt; darin heißt es, die Mitglieder des Ausschusses werden „aufgrund ihrer Kompetenz, Erfahrung und beruflichen Fähigkeiten benannt“ und „Voraussetzung für die Benennung sind Unabhängigkeit, eine untadelige Berufslaufbahn sowie eine gründliche Kenntnis des Rechtsrahmens und der Arbeitsmethoden der Kommission“.

Der Europäische Bürgerbeauftragte gelangte in seinen jüngsten Schlussfolgerungen zu einer Individualbeschwerde zu dem Ergebnis, dass die von der Kommission angewandten Kriterien zur Auswahl der Ausschussmitglieder nicht zu beanstanden und mehr als angemessen sind.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011968/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Membership of the Commission's Ethics Committee

Within the Commission there is an Ethics Committee, the purpose of which is to review the behaviour of members of the Commission who move into the private sector. One member of this committee is Michel Petite, who left the Legal Service of the Commission in 2007 and ever since then has worked at the law firm Clifford Chance. An important client of Clifford Chance is the tobacco corporation Philip Morris.

1. How many members does the Commission's Ethics Committee currently have?

2. What are the names of these members?

3. Does the Commission see a conflict of interest between Michel Petite's membership of the Commission's Ethics Committee and his work as a lawyer for a tobacco corporation?

4. What criteria does the Commission set for membership of its Ethics Committee?

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

1. According to Article 4(1) of Commission Decision C(2003) 3750 of 21 October 2003, the Ad hoc Ethical Committee consists of three members.

2. The current members of the Ad hoc Ethical Committee are Messrs Rafael García-Valdecasas, former Judge at the Court of First Instance of the European Union, Mr Terry Wynn, former Member of the European Parliament, and Michel Petite, former Director-General of the European Commission's Legal Service.

3. The Commission does not see any conflict of interests.

The Ad hoc Ethical Committee's remit is essentially to assess the compatibility with the Treaty and with the Code of Conduct for Commissioners of former Commissioners' envisaged post-office activities. Its three members work in a collegiate fashion. When acting as a member of the Committee and contributing with the other members to opinions to be delivered to the Commission, Mr Petite acts in full independence.

4. The Commission's criteria for membership to the Ad hoc Ethical Committee are set in the above referred provision of Commission Decision C(2003) 3750, which states that the Committee members are 'selected for their competence, experience and professional qualities' and that 'appointment as a member shall require, in particular, independence, an impeccable record of professional behaviour as well as a sound knowledge of the existing legal framework and the working methods of the Commission'.

In his recent conclusions on an individual complaint, the European Ombudsman considered that 'the criteria used by the Commission for selecting the members of the Committee are unobjectionable and more than adequate'.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011969/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Immobilien der Europäischen Agentur für die Sicherheit des Seeverkehrs

Dem Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan der Europäischen Agentur für die Sicherheit des Seeverkehrs (EMSA) für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 zufolge sah die Agentur für 2013 Miet- und Nebenkosten von 3 297 000 EUR vor.

1. Welche Immobilien mietet die Agentur an?

2. Welche Quadratmeterzahl und welche Quadratmeterkosten haben diese Immobilien jeweils?

3. Welche Miet- und Nebenkosten sind mit jeder dieser Immobilien jeweils verbunden?

4. Wie viele Mitarbeiter sind den Immobilien jeweils zugeordnet?

5. Besitzt die Agentur auch eigene Immobilien, oder plant sie, solche zu bauen oder zu erwerben?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011979/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Informatikanschaffungen der Europäischen Agentur für die Sicherheit des Seeverkehrs

Dem Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan der Europäischen Agentur für die Sicherheit des Seeverkehrs (EMSA) für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 zufolge sah die Agentur für 2013 Zahlungsverpflichtungen des Postens „Ausgaben für Informatik“ (in der englischen Version „Information Technology Purchases“) von 424 000 EUR vor. 2012 waren es 487 699 EUR, im Jahr 2011 gab es Zahlungsverpflichtungen von 542 982,30 EUR.

Wie genau gliederten sich die Kosten für den Kauf von Informatikausstattung in den Jahren 2011 und 2012 auf?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011980/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Entwicklung von Datenbanken für die Europäische Agentur für die Sicherheit des Seeverkehrs

Dem Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan der Europäischen Agentur für die Sicherheit des Seeverkehrs (EMSA) für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 zufolge sah die Agentur für 2013 Zahlungsverpflichtungen in Höhe von 4 324 707 EUR für den Posten „Entwicklung von Datenbanken“ vor. Im Jahr 2012 gab es Zahlungsverpflichtungen von 4 932 677 EUR und Zahlungen von 5 788 334 EUR.

Wie genau gliedern sich die Kosten der Entwicklung von Datenbanken in den Jahren 2012 und 2013 auf?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(16. Dezember 2013)

Die Kommission hat die Europäische Agentur für die Sicherheit des Seeverkehrs (EMSA) darum gebeten, die Fragen des Herrn Abgeordneten zu beantworten.

Die Antwort der Agentur hat die Kommission dem Herrn Abgeordneten am 2. Dezember 2013 übermittelt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011969/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Property of the European Maritime Safety Agency

According to the statement of revenue and expenditure of the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) for the financial year 2013, the Agency provided for rental and associated costs of EUR 3 297 000 for 2013.

1. What properties does the Agency rent?

2. What is the size of each of these properties in square metres and what do they cost per square metre?

3. What rental and associated costs are connected with each of these properties?

4. How many members of staff are assigned to each of these properties?

5. Does the Agency also have property of its own, or does it plan to build or acquire property of its own?

Question for written answer E-011979/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: The European Maritime Safety Agency's information technology purchases

According to the statement of revenue and expenditure of the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) for the financial year 2013, the Agency provided for commitments of EUR 424 000 under the item 'information technology purchases' for 2013. In 2012, the amount was EUR 487 699, and in 2011 the commitments came to EUR 542 982.30.

What is the exact breakdown of the costs for the purchase of information technology in 2011 and 2012?

Question for written answer E-011980/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Development of databases for the European Maritime Safety Agency

According to the statement of revenue and expenditure of the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) for the financial year 2013, the Agency provided for commitments of EUR 4 324 707 for the item 'development of databases' for 2013. In 2012, the commitments amounted to EUR 4 932 677 and the payments to EUR 5 788 334.

What is the exact breakdown of the costs for the development of databases in 2012 and 2013?

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(16 December 2013)

The Commission has requested the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) to provide the answer to the questions raised by the Honourable member.

The Agency's reply was transmitted by the Commission to the Honourable Member on 2 December 2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011970/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Immobilien von Eurojust

Im Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan von Eurojust für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 sind für das laufende Haushaltsjahr Mittel für „Mieten und Erbpachtzinsen“ in der Höhe von 5 588 600 EUR vermerkt. Für 2012 waren es 5 449 500 und 2011 wurden Ausgaben von 5 166 987 für Mieten und Erbpachtzinsen getätigt.

1. Über welche Immobilien verfügt Eurojust und wie viele Quadratmeter nutzbare Arbeitsfläche haben diese jeweils? Welche dieser Immobilien werden von Eurojust gemietet und wie hoch sind die Mietkosten für diese?

2. Welche Immobilien sind in vollem Besitz von Eurojust? Für welche Immobilien zahlt Eurojust Erbpacht und wie hoch fällt diese jeweils aus? Wie genau sieht der Vertrag mit dem Grundstückseigentümer aus, wer ist der Grundstückeigentümer und was passiert am Ende des Erbpachtvertrages mit dem Grundstück beziehungsweise dem Gebäude?

3. Warum hat Eurojust jährlich höhere Mittel für Mieten und Erbpachtzinsen veranschlagt? Insbesondere welche Kosten sind gestiegen?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011973/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Kosten für bewegliche Sachen und Nebenkosten von Eurojust

Im Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan von Eurojust für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 sind für das laufende Haushaltsjahr Mittel für „Bewegliche Sachen und Nebenkosten“ in Höhe von 107 000 EUR veranschlagt. Im Vorjahr waren es 137 500 EUR und 2011 wurden Ausgaben von 257 404 EUR getätigt.

1. Wie genau gliedern sich die tatsächlichen beziehungsweise erwarteten Kosten für „Bewegliche Sachen und Nebenkosten“ für die Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils auf?

2. Werden die in den Jahren 2012 und 2013 tatsächlich getätigten Ausgaben die veranschlagten Mittel übersteigen?

3. Wie erreichte Eurojust die Kostensenkung von 2011 bis 2013? Erwartet Eurojust in den nächsten Jahren neue Kostensenkungen oder eher neue Kostensteigerungen?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011974/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Datenverarbeitungskosten von Eurojust

Im Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan von Eurojust für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 sind für das laufende Haushaltsjahr Mittel für „Datenverarbeitung“ in Höhe von 540 800 EUR vermerkt. Im Vorjahr waren es 467 900 EUR, und 2011 wurden Ausgaben von 754 177 EUR getätigt.

1. Wie genau gliedern sich die tatsächlichen beziehungsweise erwarteten Kosten für Datenverarbeitung für die Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils auf?

2. Über wie viele geleaste Geräte verfügt Eurojust? Was für Geräte sind dies jeweils, und wie hoch sind die monatlichen Kosten?

3. Wie viele eigene Geräte wie Drucker, Computer, Laptops, Beamer, Server, etc. hat Eurojust in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils erworben? Wie hoch waren dafür jeweils die Kosten?

4. Warum waren im Jahr 2011 die tatsächlichen Ausgaben höher als die Mittel, die für die Jahre 2012 und 2013 veranschlagt sind? Haben die tatsächlichen Ausgaben im Jahr 2012 die veranschlagten Mittel überstiegen? Erwartet Eurojust, dass die tatsächlichen Kosten im Jahr 2013 die veranschlagten Mittel wesentlich übersteigen werden?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011975/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Kosten für Post-, Fernmeldegebühren und Computerinfrastruktur von Eurojust

Im Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan von Eurojust für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 sind für das laufende Haushaltsjahr Mittel für „Post-, Fernmeldegebühren und Computerinfrastruktur" in Höhe von 963 800 EUR veranschlagt. Im Vorjahr waren es 1 398 800 EUR, und 2011 wurden Ausgaben von 1 406 802 EUR getätigt.

1. Wie genau gliedern sich die tatsächlichen beziehungsweise erwarteten Kosten für „Post-, Fernmeldegebühren und Computerinfrastruktur" für die Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils auf?

2. Inwiefern überlappen sich die Posten „Post-, Fernmeldegebühren und Computerinfrastruktur" und „Datenverarbeitung" des Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplans?

3. Wie erreichte Eurojust die Kostensenkung von 2011 bis 2013? Erwartet Eurojust in den nächsten Jahren neue Kostensenkungen oder neue Kostensteigerungen?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011976/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Sitzungs-, Konferenz- und Repräsentationskosten von Eurojust

Im Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan von Eurojust für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 sind für das laufende Haushaltsjahr Mittel für „Sitzungs-, Konferenz- und Repräsentationskosten" in Höhe von 2 319 669 EUR veranschlagt. Im Vorjahr waren es 2 358 000 EUR, und 2011 wurden Ausgaben von 2 078 532 EUR getätigt.

1. Wie genau gliedern sich die tatsächlichen bzw. die erwarteten Kosten für Sitzungs-, Konferenz- und Repräsentationskosten für die Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils auf?

2. Wie viele Konferenzen organisierte Eurojust in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils? Wie hoch waren die Kosten und die Teilnehmerzahl je Konferenz?

3. Wie viele Sitzungen organisiert Eurojust jährlich, und in welcher Form fallen dafür Kosten an? Wie hoch waren die durchschnittlichen Kosten je Sitzung für 2011, 2012 und 2013?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011977/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Kosten für Daten und Dokumentation von Eurojust

Im Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan von Eurojust für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 sind für das laufende Haushaltsjahr Mittel für „Daten und Dokumentation" in Höhe von 2 543 225 EUR veranschlagt. Im Vorjahr waren es 2 791 125 EUR, und 2011 wurden Ausgaben von 3 067 611 EUR getätigt.

Wie genau gliedern sich die tatsächlichen bzw. die erwarteten Kosten für „Daten und Dokumentation" für die Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils auf?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011978/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: Operative Dienstreisen und Dienstreisen von Sachverständigen von Eurojust

Im Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan von Eurojust sind für das laufende Haushaltsjahr Mittel für „Operative Dienstreisen und Dienstreisen von Sachverständigen" in Höhe von 1 797 000 EUR veranschlagt. Im Vorjahr waren es 1 907 109 EUR und 2011 wurden Ausgaben von 1 463 791 EUR getätigt.

1. Wie genau gliedern sich die tatsächlichen beziehungsweise erwarteten operativen Dienstreisen und Dienstreisen von Sachverständigen für die Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 jeweils auf?

2. Wie viele Dienstreisen wurden in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 von Eurojust-Personal unternommen? Wie hoch waren die Kosten für diese Reisen durchschnittlich? Welche waren die fünf teuersten Dienstreisen?

3. Wie viele Dienstreisen wurden in den Jahren 2011, 2012 und 2013 von Sachverständigen für Eurojust unternommen? Wie hoch waren die Kosten für diese Reisen durchschnittlich? Welche waren die fünf teuersten Dienstreisen?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(17. Dezember 2013)

Die Kommission hat Eurojust um die Beantwortung der Fragen des Herrn Abgeordneten gebeten. Die Kommission wird dem Herrn Abgeordneten so rasch wie möglich die Antworten von Eurojust übermitteln.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011970/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Properties belonging to Eurojust

The statement of revenue and expenditure of Eurojust for the financial year 2013 contains an appropriation for the current financial year of EUR 5 588 600 for 'rent and ground rent'. For 2012, the amount was EUR 5 449 500, and in 2011, the outturn for rent and ground rent was EUR 5 166 987.

1. What properties does Eurojust have at its disposal, and how many square metres of useful working area does each of these have? Which of these properties are rented by Eurojust, and what are the rental costs for these properties?

2. Which properties are fully owned by Eurojust? For which properties does Eurojust pay ground rent, and how much is the ground rent in each case? What is the exact nature of the contract with the landowner, who is the landowner, and what happens with the land or building when the ground rent contract ends?

3. Why have Eurojust's appropriations for rent and ground rent increased year on year? In particular, which costs have increased?

Question for written answer E-011973/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Eurojust's costs for movable property and associated costs

The statement of revenue and expenditure of Eurojust for the financial year 2013 contains an appropriation for the current financial year of EUR 107 000 for 'movable property and associated costs'. Last year, the amount was EUR 137 500, and in 2011, the outturn was EUR 257 404.

1. What is the exact breakdown of the actual or expected costs for 'movable property and associated costs' for 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively?

2. Will the amounts actually spent in 2012 and 2013 exceed the appropriated amounts?

3. How did Eurojust achieve the reduction in costs from 2011 to 2013? Does Eurojust expect further reductions in costs in the next few years, or does it instead expect the costs to rise once again?

Question for written answer E-011974/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Eurojust's data processing costs

The statement of revenue and expenditure of Eurojust for the financial year 2013 contains an appropriation for the current financial year of EUR 540 800 for 'data processing'. Last year, the amount was EUR 467 900, and in 2011, the outturn was EUR 754 177.

1. What is the exact breakdown of the actual or expected costs for 'data processing' for 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively?

2. How many items of leased equipment does Eurojust have? What is each of these items of equipment, and what are the monthly costs?

3. How many items of equipment of its own, such as printers, computers, laptops, projectors, servers, etc., did Eurojust acquire in 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively? How much did each of them cost?

4. Why was the outturn in 2011 higher than the appropriations for 2012 and 2013? Did the actual expenditure in 2012 exceed the appropriated amount? Does Eurojust expect the actual costs in 2013 to significantly exceed the appropriated amount?

Question for written answer E-011975/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Eurojust's costs for postal charges, telecoms and computer infrastructure

The statement of revenue and expenditure of Eurojust for the financial year 2013 contains an appropriation for the current financial year of EUR 963 800 for 'postal charges, telecoms and computer infrastructure'. Last year, the amount was EUR 1 398 800, and in 2011, the outturn was EUR 1 406 802.

1. What is the exact breakdown of the actual or expected costs for 'postal charges, telecoms and computer infrastructure' for 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively?

2. To what extent does the item 'postal charges, telecoms and computer infrastructure' overlap with the item 'data processing' in the statement of revenue and expenditure?

3. How did Eurojust achieve the reduction in costs from 2011 to 2013? Does Eurojust expect further reductions in costs in the next few years, or does it expect the costs to rise once again?

Question for written answer E-011976/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Meetings, seminars and representation expenses of Eurojust

The statement of revenue and expenditure of Eurojust for the financial year 2013 contains an appropriation for the current financial year of EUR 2 319 669 for 'meetings, seminars and representation expenses'. Last year, the amount was EUR 2 358 000, and in 2011, the outturn was EUR 2 078 532.

1. What is the exact breakdown of the actual or expected costs for meetings, seminars and representation expenses for 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively?

2. How many seminars did Eurojust organise in 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively? How much did each seminar cost and what were the participant numbers at each one?

3. How many meetings does Eurojust organise on an annual basis, and what form do the costs for these meetings take? What were the average costs per meeting for 2011, 2012 and 2013?

Question for written answer E-011977/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Eurojust's costs for data and documentation

The statement of revenue and expenditure of Eurojust for the financial year 2013 contains an appropriation for the current financial year of EUR 2 543 225 for 'data and documentation'. Last year, the amount was EUR 2 791 125, and in 2011, the outturn was EUR 3 067 611.

What is the exact breakdown of the actual or expected costs for 'data and documentation' for 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively?

Question for written answer E-011978/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Eurojust's operational and expert missions

The statement of revenue and expenditure of Eurojust for the financial year 2013 contains an appropriation of EUR 1 797 000 for 'operational and expert missions'. Last year, the amount was EUR 1 907 109, and in 2011, the outturn was EUR 1 463 791.

1. What is the exact breakdown of the actual or expected operational and expert missions for 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively?

2. How many missions were undertaken by Eurojust staff in 2011, 2012 and 2013? What were the average costs for these missions? Which were the five most expensive missions?

3. How many missions were undertaken by experts on behalf of Eurojust in 2011, 2012 and 2013? What were the average costs for these missions? Which were the five most expensive missions?

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

The Commission has asked Eurojust to provide a response to the questions raised by the Honourable Member. Eurojust's reply will be sent by the Commission to the Honourable Member as soon as possible.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-011972/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21. Oktober 2013)

Betrifft: ITK-Ausgaben der Europäischen Agentur für Flugsicherheit

Im Einnahmen- und Ausgabenplan der Europäischen Agentur für Flugsicherheit (EASA) für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 veranschlagt die Agentur für 2013 Mittel in Höhe von 5 888 000 EUR für Informations- und Telekommunikationstechnologie (ITK). Im Jahr 2012 waren noch Mittel von 3 430 000 EUR veranschlagt.

1. Wie erklärt die Agentur, dass die ITK-Kosten innerhalb von nur einem Jahr um mehr als 2,4 Millionen EUR stiegen?

2. Insbesondere für welche Geräteklassen erwartet die Agentur für 2013 höhere Ausgaben?

3. Welches sind die fünf teuersten ITK-Geräte im Besitz der Agentur?

4. Welches sind die fünf nach Jahreskosten teuersten ITK-Leasingverträge der Agentur?

5. Welches sind die fünf nach Jahreskosten teuersten ITK-Dienstleistungsverträge der Agentur?

6. Welche Maßnahmen führt die Agentur durch, um die Kosten im ITK-Bereich gering zu halten beziehungsweise zu senken?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(10. Dezember 2013)

Die Kommission hat die Europäische Agentur für Flugsicherheit (EASA) gebeten, die Fragen des Herrn Abgeordneten zu beantworten.

Die Kommission wird die Antwort der Agentur so schnell wie möglich an den Herrn Abgeordneten weiterleiten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011972/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: ICT expenditure of the European Aviation Safety Agency

In the statement of revenue and expenditure of the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) for the financial year 2013, the Agency provides for an appropriation for 2013 of EUR 5 888 000 for information and communication technology (ICT). In 2012, the appropriated amount was EUR 3 430 000.

1. How does the Agency explain the increase in ICT costs by more than EUR 2.4 million in just one year?

2. For which equipment classes in particular does the Agency expect higher expenditure for 2013?

3. What are the five most expensive items of ICT equipment owned by the Agency?

4. In terms of annual costs, what are the Agency's five most expensive ICT leasing contracts?

5. In terms of annual costs, what are the Agency's five most expensive ICT service contracts?

6. What steps is the Agency taking to keep ICT costs low or to reduce them?

(Version française)

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

La Commission a demandé à l'Agence Européenne de la Sécurité Aérienne (AESA) de fournir les éléments de réponse à la question posée par l'Honorable Parlementaire.

La réponse de l'Agence sera transmise par la Commission à l'Honorable Parlementaire dès que possible.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-011982/13
до Комисията
Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(21 октомври 2013 г.)

Относно: Пчеларството в новата ОСП

Тристранните преговори по оформянето на новата Обща селскостопанска политика (ОСП) приключиха. Въпреки че тя залага на по-голяма справедливост за земеделските производители и повече гъвкавост при прилагане на регламентите за държавите членки, секторът на пчеларството няма да бъде подпомогнат нито чрез директни плащания, нито чрез обвързано с производството подпомагане. В същото време пчеларският сектор в Европейския съюз изпитва сериозни трудности и средствата, получени чрез националните пчеларски програми, са недостатъчни за устойчивото развитие на сектора. От друга страна, като земеделски производители пчеларите не притежават и необработват земя, което ги поставя в неравностойно положение спрямо другите сектори и ги изключва от подпомагане в новата ОСП, базирано основно на селскостопанска площ.

В тази връзка според ЕК какви са възможностите за подпомагане на сектора на пчеларството в новата ОСП?

И в частност какви са възможностите за подпомагане на пчеларството чрез новата ОСП в страните, прилагащи схема за единно плащане на площ (СЕПП), които да не се базират на притежаването и обработването на земя?

Какви мерки на национално ниво би могла да предложи Комисията за подпомагане на сектора на пчеларството?

Отговор, даден от г-н Чолош от името на Комисията
(16 декември 2013 г.)

В новата обща селскостопанска политика ([1]) се предвиждат няколко възможности за подпомагане на пчеларството.

Чрез новия Регламент за единна обща организация на пазарите и занапред на държавите членки се предоставя възможността да представят тригодишни национални програми в областта на пчеларството за съфинансиране от Съюза. Чрез реформата предходните шест мерки бяха актуализирани и завършени. По-специално ще бъдат обхванати всички пчелни продукти (а не само пчелният мед) и на разположение ще бъде предоставено финансиране от ЕС за нови мерки, насочени към борба срещу агресорите и болестите в кошера, както и към подобряване на мониторинга на пазара и на качеството на пчелните продукти.

Освен това съгласно новия Регламент за програмата за развитие на селските райони държавите членки ще разполагат с редица мерки за допълнителна подкрепа на пчеларството. Реформата предлага възможност за държавите членки да подкрепят проекти за обучение, инвестиции и сътрудничество, които биха могли да бъдат полезни за пчеларството.

На последно място, някои мерки в реформираната ОСП могат да бъдат косвено в полза на пчеларството. Задължителните мерки за обвързване с околната среда в новия Регламент за преките плащания, по-специално диверсификацията на културите и екологичните приоритетни области, биха могли да допринесат за създаването на по-добра околна среда за пчелите. Земеделските производители, по отношение на които се прилага схемата за единно плащане на площ, ще трябва да отговарят на същите задължения за обвързване с околната среда като земеделските производители, обхванати от схемата за основно плащане. Мерките, свързани с агроекологията и климата, които са предвидени в новия Регламент за програмата за развитие на селските райони, следва също така да имат положителен принос за подобряването на околната среда на пчелите.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011982/13
to the Commission
Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Beekeeping under the new CAP

The trilateral negotiations on the formation of the new common agricultural policy (CAP) have been concluded. Although it focuses on greater fairness for farmers and more flexibility in the application of the regulations for the Member States, the beekeeping sector will not be supported via direct payments or coupled support. Meanwhile the beekeeping sector in the European Union faces serious difficulties and the funds from national beekeeping programmes are inadequate for the sustainable development of the sector. Yet, as beekeepers do not have or cultivate land, they are at a disadvantage relative to other sectors and are excluded from support under the new CAP, which is mainly based on agricultural area.

In light of this, what does the Commission believe are the possibilities for supporting the beekeeping sector under the new CAP?

In particular, what possibilities exist for supporting beekeeping under the new CAP in countries that use the single area payment scheme (SAPS), which are not based on the possession and management of land?

What measures at the national level would the Commission propose to support the beekeeping sector?

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

The new Common Agricultural Policy [1] provides for several possibilities to support the beekeeping sector.

The new single Common Market Organisation Regulation continues to provide to the Member States the possibility to submit tri-annual national apiculture programmes for co-financing by the Union. With the reform, the previous six measures have been updated and completed. In particular, all apiculture products (and not only honey) will be covered and EU funding will be available for new measures aiming to fight beehive invaders and diseases as well as to improve the marketing monitoring and the quality of apiculture products.

In addition, with the new Rural Development Programme Regulation, Member States will have at their disposal a series of measures to further support the apiculture sector. The reform offers the possibility for the Member States to support training, investments and cooperation projects which could be useful for the apiculture sector.

Finally, several measures in the reformed CAP may be indirectly in favour of beekeeping. The compulsory greening measures of the new Direct Payment Regulation, in particular crop diversification and ecological focus areas, could contribute to a better environment for bees. Farmers subject to the single area payment scheme will have to fulfil the same greening obligations as farmers covered by the Basic Payment Scheme. Agri-environment-climate measures in the new Rural Development Programme Regulation should also make a positive contribution to the environment of bees.

---

[1] http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/index_en.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011987/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Έργα Housing First Europe και Work in Stations για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος της έλλειψης στέγης

Η Επιτροπή χρηματοδοτεί έργα κοινωνικού περιεχομένου και συγκεκριμένα για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος της έλλειψης στέγης, σε πιλοτικό ακόμη επίπεδο, όπως τα έργα Housing First Europe και Work in Stations, τα οποία προσφέρουν καινοτόμες και νέες προσεγγίσεις πολιτικής για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Σε ποια κράτη μέλη έχουν μέχρι σήμερα υλοποιηθεί τα παραπάνω έργα και ποια τα συμπεράσματα αναφορικά με τις καινοτόμες προσεγγίσεις πολιτικής για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος της έλλειψης στέγης; Είναι σε θέση να παραθέσει συγκεκριμένες νέες προσεγγίσεις και καλές πρακτικές των παραπάνω προγραμμάτων;

2. Ποιο το ύψος της συμμετοχής των κοινοτικών πόρων στα πιλοτικά αυτά προγράμματα; Προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να επεκτείνει τη δράση τους και σε άλλα κράτη μέλη; Είναι δυνατή η συμπερίληψη κρατών μελών στο πιλοτικό πρόγραμμα κατόπιν αιτήματός τους;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή προωθεί την κοινωνική καινοτομία για να βοηθήσει τα κράτη μέλη να εφαρμόσουν πιο αποτελεσματικές κοινωνικές πολιτικές, περιλαμβανομένων πολιτικών για τους αστέγους. Το πιλοτικό έργο «Hope in Stations» συνέβαλε επιτυχώς στην ενίσχυση της ολοκλήρωσης των κοινωνικών υπηρεσιών που παρέχονται στους αστέγους στους σιδηροδρομικούς σταθμούς και στις πέριξ περιοχές, σε τέσσερα κράτη μέλη ([1]). Το «Housing First Europe» (HFE) ήταν ένα διετές έργο κοινωνικού πειραματισμού, που χρηματοδοτήθηκε από το ταμείο Progress ([2]). Στο έργο συμμετείχαν δέκα ευρωπαϊκές πόλεις ([3]) και εξετάστηκε η αποτελεσματικότητα της προσέγγισης της πολιτικής «Housing first», που βασίζεται στην ιδέα ότι η παροχή άμεσης πρόσβασης σε μόνιμη, ανεξάρτητη στέγαση με υποστήριξη για τους αστέγους με σύνθετες ανάγκες θα μπορούσε να αντιμετωπίσει με πιο βιώσιμο τρόπο το πρόβλημα της έλλειψης στέγης, σε σύγκριση με τα μεταβατικά προγράμματα για τους αστέγους. Το έργο HFE προσδιόρισε τα θετικά αποτελέσματα του προγράμματος «Housing first» και τους τομείς όπου η συγκεκριμένη προσέγγιση θα πρέπει να αναπτυχθεί περαιτέρω ([4]).

Το ταμείο Progress μπορεί να χρηματοδοτήσει έργα πειραματισμού και καινοτομίας κοινωνικής πολιτικής, καθώς και αξιολογήσεις ομοτίμων στους τομείς της κοινωνικής προστασίας και της κοινωνικής ένταξης. Οι πτυχές του ταμείου Progress που σχετίζονται με την καινοτομία προτείνεται να ενισχυθούν μετά το 2014, στο πλαίσιο του νέου προγράμματος για την απασχόληση και την κοινωνική καινοτομία. Ο καθορισμός του έργου και των συμμετεχόντων — όσον αφορά τις προδιαγραφές της πρόσκλησης και τους νόμους που διέπουν τη διαδικασία — εναπόκειται κυρίως στους αναδόχους, οι οποίοι επιλέγονται μέσω δημόσιων συμβάσεων. Η Επιτροπή προωθεί ενεργά τη διάδοση των αποτελεσμάτων του έργου: οι εμπειρίες από το έργο HFE παρουσιάστηκαν στην ετήσια διάσκεψη του 2013 ([5]) και οι προϋποθέσεις μιας ευρωπαϊκής δυνατότητας μεταφοράς συζητήθηκαν σε μια αξιολόγηση ομοτίμων της Επιτροπής Κοινωνικής Προστασίας ([6]). Αυτό δίνει τη δυνατότητα στα κράτη μέλη να ενημερώνονται σχετικά με τις νέες προσεγγίσεις και να τις χρησιμοποιούν στις δικές τους εθνικές πολιτικές.

([1]) Περιλαμβανομένου του Βελγίου, της Γαλλίας, της Γερμανίας και της Ιταλίας. Για περισσότερες πληροφορίες σχετικά με το έργο, μπορείτε να επισκεφθείτε την ιστοσελίδα
http://www.solidarites-actives.com/juin-parution-de-lanalyse-scientifique-du-projet-hope-stations

([2]) Για περισσότερες πληροφορίες σχετικά με το ταμείο Progress, επισκεφθείτε την ιστοσελίδα
http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=987

([3]) Άμστερνταμ, Βουδαπέστη, Κοπεγχάγη, Γλασκόβη και Λισαβόνα (δοκιμαστικές πόλεις για το έργο Housing First Europe), Δουβλίνο, Γάνδη, Γκέτεμποργκ, Ελσίνκι και Βιέννη (ομότιμες πόλεις).

([4]) Περισσότερες πληροφορίες υπάρχουν στον επίσημο δικτυακό τόπο του προγράμματος, στη διεύθυνση
www.socialstyrelsen.dk/housingfirsteurope

([5]) Ετήσια διάσκεψη της Ευρωπαϊκής Πλατφόρμας για την καταπολέμηση της φτώχειας και του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού. Για περισσότερες πληροφορίες, επισκεφθείτε την ιστοσελίδα
http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=961

([6]) Βιώσιμοι τρόποι για την πρόληψη της έλλειψης στέγης (Αξιολόγηση ομοτίμων για την κοινωνική προστασία και την κοινωνική ένταξη), 22 Νοεμβρίου 2013, Κοπεγχάγη, Δανία.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011987/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: The Housing First Europe and Work in Stations projects for addressing homelessness

The Commission finances projects of a social nature, and specifically for addressing the problem of homelessness, at pilot level, such as the Housing First Europe and Work in Stations projects, which offer innovative and new policy approaches to dealing with this problem.

1. In which Member States have the above projects been implemented to date, and what conclusions can be drawn about the innovative policy approaches for dealing with homelessness? Can the Commission provide information about the specific new approaches and good practices of the above programmes?

2. What is the level of involvement of Community funds in these pilot programmes? Does the Commission intend to extend their operation to other Member States as well? Is it possible for Member States to be included in the pilot programme on request?

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

The Commission promotes social innovation to help Member States implement more efficient social policies, including homelessness policies. The 'Hope in Stations' pilot project successfully contributed to strengthening the integration of social services delivered to homeless persons at and around train stations in four Member States ([1]). 'Housing First Europe' (HFE) was a 2-year social experimentation project financed from PROGRESS ([2]). It examined in ten European cities ([3]) efficiency of the 'housing first' policy approach, which is based on idea that providing immediate access to long-term, self-contained housing with support for homeless people with complex needs could be a more sustainable way to confront homelessness than transitional homeless programs. The HFE project has identified the positive effects of housing first and areas where the concept should be further elaborated. ([4])

PROGRESS may finance social policy experimentation and innovation projects as well as peer reviews in the areas of social protection and social inclusion. Innovation-related aspects of PROGRESS are proposed to be reinforced for the post-2014 period, under the new Programme for Employment and Social Innovation. Defining project and participants- with respect of the call specifications and the laws guiding the procedure — is primarily up to contractors who are selected through public procurement. The Commission actively fosters dissemination of project results: experiences of the HFE project were introduced at the 2013 Annual Convention ([5]) and conditions of a European transferability were discussed at a Social Protection Committee peer review ([6]). This enables Member States to learn about new approaches and use them in their own national policies.

([1]) Including Belgium, France, Germany and Italy; for more information on the project, you may visit http://www.solidarites-actives.com/juin-parution-de-lanalyse-scientifique-du-projet-hope-stations
([2]) For more information on the PROGRESS fund, please visit http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=987
([3]) Amsterdam, Budapest, Copenhagen, Glasgow and Lisbon (Housing First Europe test cities); Dublin, Ghent, Gothenburg, Helsinki and Vienna (peer cities).
([4]) More information is available at the official website of the programme at www.socialstyrelsen.dk/housingfirsteurope
([5]) Annual Convention for the European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion. For more information, please visit http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=961
([6]) Peer Review on Social Protection and Social Inclusion on 'Sustainable ways of preventing homelessness', 22 November 2013, Copenhagen, Denmark.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011988/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Εξελίξεις στην πρωτοβουλία «εγγύηση για τους νέους»

Το διήμερο 17-18 Οκτωβρίου πραγματοποιείται στις Βρυξέλλες σεμινάριο υπό την αιγίδα της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, για την διευκόλυνση και βοήθεια των κρατών μελών προκειμένου να υλοποιήσουν το πρόγραμμα «Εγγύηση για τους νέους» κατά τη νέα πολυετή δημοσιονομική περίοδο (2014-2020).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Καθώς η Επιτροπή αναφέρει σε ανακοίνωση της (European Commission — IP/13/969 17.10.2013) ότι θα χρειαστούν διαρθρωτικές μεταρρυθμίσεις σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη προκειμένου να καταρτιστεί και να εκτελεστεί επαρκώς το σχέδιο δράσης του προγράμματος «Εγγύηση για τους νέους», είναι σε θέση να μου παραθέσει συγκεκριμένα εμπόδια τα οποία εντοπίζει;

2. Με ποιο τρόπο τελικώς θα χρηματοδοτηθεί η πρωτοβουλία;

3. Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει για το χρονοδιάγραμμα και τον έλεγχο της διαδικασίας για την υλοποίηση του προγράμματος;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(10 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

1. Η Εγγύηση για τη Νεολαία αποτελεί θεμελιώδη διαρθρωτική μεταρρύθμιση για την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας των νέων και τη βελτίωση των μεταβάσεων από το σχολείο στην εργασία. Θα συμβάλλει στην πιο εύρυθμη λειτουργία και συνεργασία των δημόσιων φορέων, καθώς και στη βελτίωση της λειτουργίας της οικονομίας, αυξάνοντας την αντιστοίχιση δεξιοτήτων και την παραγωγικότητα.

2. Η Πρωτοβουλία για την Απασχόληση των Νέων (ΠΑΝ), το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο και οι εθνικοί προϋπολογισμοί των κρατών μελών είναι οι κύριες πηγές χρηματοδοτικής υποστήριξης των μέτρων που λαμβάνονται από τα κράτη μέλη για την κατάρτιση των δικών τους προγραμμάτων Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία ([1]). Τα μέτρα αυτά στοχεύουν να βοηθήσουν απευθείας τους νέους που βρίσκονται εκτός απασχόλησης, εκπαίδευσης ή κατάρτισης, μέσω π.χ. δημιουργίας θέσεων εργασίας, περιόδων πρακτικής άσκησης και μαθητείας, υποστήριξης για την ίδρυση επιχειρήσεων κ.λπ. Η χρηματοδότηση ΠΑΝ θα συνίσταται σε 3 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ από συγκεκριμένη γραμμή προϋπολογισμού της ΕΕ που προορίζεται για την απασχόληση των νέων και τουλάχιστον άλλα 3 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ από τις εθνικές χορηγήσεις του ΕΚΤ.

3. Τα κράτη μέλη που είναι επιλέξιμα για την ΠΑΝ πρέπει να υποβάλουν σχέδια εφαρμογής της Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία έως τον Δεκέμβριο του 2013. Τα υπόλοιπα κράτη μέλη ενθαρρύνονται να υποβάλουν τα σχέδιά τους μέσα στο 2014 ([2]). Όσον αφορά την εποπτεία της Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία, η Επιτροπή Απασχόλησης (ΕΑ) αποφάσισε να εκπονήσει μια επισκόπηση πολυμερούς εποπτείας στις 2 Δεκεμβρίου 2013 για την εφαρμογή των ειδικών κατά χώρα συστάσεων για τη νεολαία. Τα κράτη μέλη καλούνται να υποβάλουν τα δικά τους σχέδια εφαρμογής της Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία στη συγκεκριμένη επισκόπηση. Επιπλέον, η υποομάδα της ΕΑ για τους δείκτες θα εξετάσει τις απαιτήσεις δεδομένων για την εποπτεία της εφαρμογής και τον αντίκτυπο της Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία.

([1]) Σύσταση του Συμβουλίου για τη θέσπιση εγγυήσεων για τη νεολαία, ΕΕ 2013/C 120/01 της 22.04.2013.
([2]) Η «Πρόσκληση για δράση κατά της ανεργίας των νέων» κάλεσε τα κράτη μέλη με περιφέρειες στις οποίες τα ποσοστά ανεργίας των νέων υπερβαίνουν το 25%, να υποβάλουν σχέδιο εφαρμογής της Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία έως τον Οκτώβριο του 2013 (άνοιξη του 2014 για τα άλλα κράτη μέλη). Στα συμπεράσματα του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου του Ιουνίου αναφέρεται ότι «Τα κράτη μέλη που επωφελούνται από την πρωτοβουλία θα πρέπει να θεσπίσουν σχέδιο για την αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας των νέων, μεταξύ άλλων με την υλοποίηση της "Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία", πριν από το τέλος του έτους. Ενθαρρύνονται και άλλα κράτη μέλη να θεσπίσουν ανάλογα σχέδια το 2014». Ωστόσο, οι διμερείς επαφές με τα κράτη μέλη, ιδίως εκείνα με υψηλά επίπεδα ανεργίας των νέων, καταδεικνύουν ισχυρή δυναμική των κρατών μελών για την ολοκλήρωση των σχεδίων εφαρμογής της Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία, έως το Δεκέμβριο του 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011988/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Developments in the 'Youth Guarantee' initiative

On 17-18 October, a seminar is taking place in Brussels under the auspices of the Commission to facilitate and assist Member States in implementing the 'Youth Guarantee' programme during the new multiannual budgetary period (2014-2020).

1. As the Commission states in its press release (European Commission — IP/13/969 17.10.2013) that there will be a need for structural reforms in certain Member States, with a view to setting up and adequately implementing an action plan for the 'Youth Guarantee' programme, can it specify the barriers it has identified?

2. How will the initiative ultimately be financed?

3. Can it inform me about the timetable for and controls over the procedure for implementing the programme?

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

1. The Youth Guarantee is a fundamental structural reform in order to fight youth unemployment and to improve school to work transitions. It will help making public institutions work better (together) and improve the functioning of the economy, by increasing skill matching and productivity.

2. The Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), the European Social Fund and Member States' national budgets are the main sources of financial support to the measures undertaken by MS to establish their own Youth Guarantee schemes ([1]). These measures aim to directly help young people not in employment, education or training through, for instance, job provision, traineeships and apprenticeships, business start-up support, etc. The YEI funding will comprise EUR 3 billion from a specific EU budget line dedicated to youth employment and another at least EUR 3 billion from the ESF national allocations.

3. MS eligible for the YEI should submit Youth Guarantee Implementation Plans by December 2013; other MS are encouraged to submit their plans in 2014 ([2]). In the area of monitoring the Youth Guarantee, the Employment Committee (EMCO) has decided to undertake a multilateral surveillance review on 2 December 2013 on the implementation of youth Country-Specific Recommendations. MS are invited to submit their Youth Guarantee Implementation Plans to this review. In addition, the EMCO Indicators Sub-group will look at the data requirements for monitoring the implementation and impact of the Youth Guarantee.

([1]) Council recommendation on Establishing a Youth Guarantee, OJ 2013/C 120/01, 22.4.2013.

([2]) The 'Call to Action on Youth Unemployment' called for Member States with regions experiencing youth unemployment rates above 25% to submit a Youth Guarantee Implementation Plan by October 2013 (spring 2014 for other MS). The June European Council Conclusions state that 'Member States benefitting from the YEI should adopt a plan to tackle youth unemployment, including through the implementation of the "Youth Guarantee", before the end of the year. Other Member States are encouraged to adopt similar plans in 2014'. However, bilateral contacts with MS, notably those with high levels of youth unemployment, show a strong MS impetus to complete the YGIP by December 2013.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011989/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Εκκαθαριστής η ΕΕ

Σε πρόσφατη συνέντευξή του στη γερμανική εφημερίδα «Handelsblat», ο Επίτροπος για θέματα Εσωτερικής Αγοράς και υπηρεσιών, Μισέλ Μπαρνιέ, πρότεινε τον ρόλο της νέας Αρχής για την εκκαθάριση και αναδιάρθρωση των ευρωπαϊκών τραπεζών, για περιορισμένη περίοδο, να αναλάβει η Επιτροπή και, στην συνέχεια, να τον μεταβιβάσει στον Ευρωπαϊκό Μηχανισμό Σταθερότητας. Στόχος ενός τέτοιου εγχειρήματος θα είναι η αντιμετώπιση των πιέσεων που υφίστανται οι ευρωπαϊκές τράπεζες ώστε να σπάσει ο δεσμός μεταξύ των χρεωμένων χωρών και των τραπεζών τους. Στη συνέντευξη του, τονίζει επίσης πως «Το ταμείο διάσωσης, ο Ευρωπαϊκός Μηχανισμός Σταθερότητας (ΕΣΜ), θα μπορούσε να αναλάβει την εκκαθάριση των τραπεζών μόλις καταστεί ευρωπαϊκός θεσμός».

Ερωτάται λοιπόν ο κ. Μπαρνιέ:

1. Μήπως ο ίδιος παραδέχεται πως ο ΕΜΣ που εκδίδει σήμερα χρέος, από το Φεβρουάριο 2012, για να χρηματοδοτήσει τη χορήγηση δανείων και άλλων μορφών οικονομικής βοήθειας προς τις χώρες της ευρωζώνης, έχει αποτύχει;

2. Ποιος θα είναι ο ρόλος και οι αρμοδιότητες της νέας Αρχής;

3. Με ποιες εξουσίες θα περιβάλλεται όσον αφορά την εκκαθάριση προβληματικών τραπεζών, μικρών και μεγάλων;

4. Ποια θα είναι η σχέση της νέας Αρχής με τις εθνικές εποπτικές αρχές των τραπεζών;

5. Σε ποιο βαθμό το κούρεμα των καταθέσεων (όπως επιβλήθηκε στην περίπτωση της Κύπρου) θα αποτελεί πάγια πολιτική και για άλλες χώρες της Ευρωζώνης;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(13 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

1. Στις 10 Ιουλίου 2013, η Επιτροπή πρότεινε τη θέσπιση ενιαίου μηχανισμού εξυγίανσης. Βάσει της ισχύουσας Συνθήκης ΕΕ, σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο, μόνον ένα όργανο της ΕΕ μπορεί να λάβει την τελική απόφαση σχετικά με τον χρόνο ενεργοποίησης της εξυγίανσης μιας τράπεζας. Η Επιτροπή, σύμφωνα με την πρότασή της, θα έχει, τελικά, την ευθύνη των αποφάσεων για εξυγίανση των τραπεζών των κρατών μελών που συμμετέχουν στον ενιαίο μηχανισμό εξυγίανσης.

2-3. Η Επιτροπή πρότεινε να καλύπτονται όλες οι τράπεζες, μικρές και μεγάλες, από τον ενιαίο μηχανισμό εξυγίανσης, ο οποίος θα χρησιμοποιεί τα εργαλεία εξυγίανσης που προβλέπονται στην πρόταση οδηγίας για την ανάκαμψη και εξυγίανση των τραπεζών. Τα αναγκαία οικονομικά μέσα θα προέλθουν σε πρώτη φάση από τους μετόχους και τους πιστωτές της τράπεζας και, εφόσον αυτό δεν επαρκεί, από ενιαίο ταμείο εξυγίανσης που θα χρηματοδοτείται εξ ολοκλήρου από εισφορές του τραπεζικού τομέα.

4. Στο πλαίσιο του ενιαίου μηχανισμού εξυγίανσης, η Επιτροπή και το συμβούλιο θα συνεργαστούν στενά με τις εποπτικές αρχές. Η ΕΚΤ, ως εποπτική αρχή, θα επισημαίνει πότε μια τράπεζα στη ζώνη του ευρώ ή τράπεζα εγκατεστημένη σε κράτος μέλος που συμμετέχει στην Τραπεζική Ένωση αντιμετωπίζει σοβαρές χρηματοοικονομικές δυσχέρειες και πρέπει να εξυγιανθεί.

5. Στο πλαίσιο του ενιαίου μηχανισμού εξυγίανσης και σύμφωνα με τα σημερινά δεδομένα, οι καταθέσεις μέχρι ποσού 100 000 ευρώ θα προστατεύονται πάντοτε από εθνικά συστήματα εγγύησης καταθέσεων. Καταθέσεις που υπερβαίνουν αυτό το κατώτατο όριο μπορεί, δυνητικά, να επιβαρυνθούν σε περίπτωση εξυγίανσης των τραπεζών, αλλά σε κάθε περίπτωση, οι μέτοχοι και οι πιστωτές μειωμένης εξασφάλισης θα συμβάλουν κατά προτεραιότητα. Το θέμα αυτό θα ρυθμιστεί στην οδηγία για την ανάκαμψη και εξυγίανση των τραπεζών, προκειμένου να εξασφαλιστεί ασφάλεια δικαίου και σαφήνεια. Η εν λόγω οδηγία βρίσκεται επί του παρόντος υπό διαπραγμάτευση. Οι ίδιοι κανόνες θα ισχύουν και για τον ενιαίο μηχανισμό εξυγίανσης.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011989/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: The EU as liquidator

In a recent interview in the German newspaper *Handelsblatt*, Michel Barnier, Commissioner for the internal market and Services, proposed that the Commission assume the role of the new authority for liquidating and restructuring European banks for a limited period, and, following that, to pass the role on to the European Stability Mechanism (ESM). The aim of this exercise is to address the pressures on European banks, so that the link between the indebted countries and their banks can be broken. In his interview, he also points out that 'The bail-out fund (the ESM) could take over the liquidation of banks as soon as it becomes a European institution'.

Will Mr Barnier therefore say:

1. Does he himself agree that the ESM, which has been issuing debt to finance its lending and other forms of financial assistance to the countries of the euro area since February 2012, has failed?

2. What will be the role and competences of the new authority?

3. What powers will the authority be given in relation to the liquidation of distressed banks, small and large?

4. What will the relationship be between the new authority and the national supervisory authorities for banks?

5. To what extent will the savings haircut (as applied in Cyprus) become a fixed policy for the other euro area countries as well?

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

1. On 10 July 2013, the Commission has proposed a Single Resolution Mechanism (SRM). Under the current EU Treaty, at European level, only an EU body can take the final decision on when to trigger the resolution of a bank. According to its proposal, the Commission would be ultimately responsible to decide on the resolution of banks in Member States participating in the Single Supervisory Mechanism.

2 and 3. The Commission has proposed that the Single Resolution Mechanism will cover all banks, small and large, and will use the resolution tools provided for in the proposed Bank Recovery and Resolution Directive. The necessary financial means would be sourced in the first place from the bank's shareholders and creditors and, if this is insufficient, from a Single Resolution Fund fully financed by contributions from the banking sector.

4. Under the Single Resolution Mechanism, the Commission and the Board will closely cooperate with the supervisors. The ECB, as the supervisor, would signal when a bank in the euro area or established in a Member State participating in the Banking Union is in severe financial difficulties and needs to be resolved.

5. Under the Single Resolution Mechanism and as is the case today, deposits up to EUR 100 000 will always be protected by national Deposit Guarantee Schemes. Deposits above that threshold may potentially be called upon in case of bank resolution but in any event, shareholders and junior creditors would contribute first. This matter will be settled in the Bank Resolution and Recovery Directive, providing legal certainty and clarity. That directive is currently under negotiation. The same rules will apply in the SRM.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011990/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ενδυνάμωση της Aegean — Πονοκέφαλος για τις Κυπριακές Αερογραμμές

Όπως μεταδόθηκε από τις Βρυξέλλες, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή έδωσε το «πράσινο φως» για την εξαγορά της Olympic Air από την Aegean Airlines, προβάλλοντας το επιχείρημα ότι, αν η Olympic Air δεν εξαγοραζόταν από την Aegean, θα αναγκαζόταν στο άμεσο μέλλον να παύσει να λειτουργεί λόγω οικονομικών δυσχερειών.

Αυτή η απόφαση δημιουργεί σοβαρές ανησυχίες για τη βιωσιμότητα των Κυπριακών Αερογραμμών, αφού στον πιο προσοδοφόρο προορισμό τους (Κύπρος-Ελλάδα και αντίστροφα) βλέπουν τον βασικό τους αντίπαλο, την Aegean Airlines, να δυναμώνει ανησυχητικά, αφού εγκρίθηκε πια από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή η εξαγορά της Olympic Air.

Και όλα αυτά τη στιγμή που τα μηνύματα από τις Βρυξέλλες δεν είναι ικανοποιητικά αναφορικά με την έγκριση του σχεδίου αναδιάρθρωσης του εθνικού αερομεταφορέα της Κύπρου.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Προτίθεται να στηρίξει τις Κυπριακές Αερογραμμές ώστε να μην βάλουν λουκέτο;

2. Ποια είναι η άποψή της για την υλοποίηση ενός σχεδίου Β, δηλαδή ίδρυσης μιας νέας αεροπορικής εταιρείας;

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

Η Επιτροπή έλαβε κοινοποίηση για χορήγηση ενίσχυσης αναδιάρθρωσης υπέρ της Cyprus Airways. Η Επιτροπή αξιολογεί τα κοινοποιηθέντα μέτρα για τη συμμόρφωση με τους κανόνες για τις κρατικές ενισχύσεις, σε συνδυασμό με άλλα μέτρα κρατικής στήριξης που αποτελούσαν ήδη αντικείμενο της έρευνας. Η Επιτροπή δεν μπορεί να προβλέψει το αποτέλεσμα της αξιολόγησης αυτής, δεδομένου ότι είναι ακόμη σε εξέλιξη.

Η Κύπρος δεν έχει κοινοποιήσει στην Επιτροπή σχέδιο για τη σύσταση νέας αεροπορικής εταιρείας στην Κύπρο. Ως εκ τούτου, η Επιτροπή δεν μπορεί να σχολιάσει το τελευταίο σημείο.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011990/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: The strengthening of Aegean Airlines — a headache for Cyprus Airlines

It has been reported from Brussels that the Commission has approved the acquisition of Olympic Air by Aegean Airlines, arguing that if Olympic Air was not acquired by Aegean, it would soon have to cease operating, due to financial difficulties.

This decision creates serious concerns for the viability of Cyprus Airlines, as it sees its main rival — Aegean Airlines — strengthened to a worrying extent on its most profitable route (Cyprus — Greece), following approval of the acquisition of Olympic Air by the Commission.

All of this at a time when the signals from Brussels are not favourable as regards approval of the restructuring plan of Cyprus's national carrier.

1. Does the Commission intend to support Cyprus Airways, so that it does not go under?

2. What is its view on the implementation of plan B, involving the establishment of a new airline company?

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

The Commission has received a notification for restructuring aid in favour of Cyprus Airways. The Commission is assessing the notified measures for compliance with state aid rules, in conjunction with other State support measures already under investigation. The Commission cannot anticipate the outcome of this assessment, since it is still ongoing.

Cyprus has not communicated to the Commission any plan to establish a new airline company in Cyprus. Therefore, the Commission cannot comment on the latter.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011991/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Η ανησυχία των πολιτών για την οικονομική κατάσταση του νοικοκυριού τους

Για έναν στους έξι πολίτες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, η άσχημη οικονομική κατάσταση του νοικοκυριού τους περιλαμβάνεται ανάμεσα στα δυο σημαντικότερα ζητήματα που τους απασχολούν αυτήν την περίοδο. Σύμφωνα με τα πορίσματα του πρόσφατου Ευρωβαρόμετρου για τα σημαντικότερα θέματα που απασχολούν τον Ευρωπαίο πολίτη στα 27 κράτη μέλη, στην Κύπρο καταγράφεται ο υψηλότερος βαθμός ανησυχίας των πολιτών για την οικονομική κατάσταση του νοικοκυριού τους, και είναι μάλιστα σχεδόν τριπλάσιος από τον μέσο όρο της ΕΕ. Η οικονομική κατάσταση του νοικοκυριού των Κυπρίων πολιτών αποτελεί το υπ' αριθμόν ένα πρόβλημά τους, αυτήν την περίοδο.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς μπορεί έμπρακτα να ανατρέψει την ολοένα αυξανόμενη δυσπραγία και δυσφορία των Κυπρίων Ευρωπαίων πολιτών για τη δραματική επιδείνωση που σημειώνεται στην οικονομική κατάσταση των νοικοκυριών τους;

2. Τι απαντά για τους λόγους στους οποίους οφείλεται;

3. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει ώστε να τους ενθαρρύνει να μην αποστρέψουν το πρόσωπο, αλλά να ψηφίσουν στις επερχόμενες Ευρωεκλογές;

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

Η Επιτροπή έχει επίγνωση των δυσκολιών που πολλά νοικοκυριά αντιμετωπίζουν σε όλη την ΕΕ, ιδίως στην Κύπρο.

Κατά τη διάρκεια της τελευταίας δεκαετίας, η Κύπρος βίωσε αυξανόμενες εξωτερικές και εσωτερικές μακροοικονομικές ανισορροπίες, όπως διάβρωση της διεθνούς ανταγωνιστικότητας, επιδείνωση των δημόσιων οικονομικών, διογκωμένο τραπεζικό τομέα, αυξανόμενο ιδιωτικό χρέος και αυξανόμενες τιμές ακινήτων.

Για την αντιμετώπιση των οικονομικών προκλήσεων της Κύπρου, οι αρχές της χώρας πρότειναν πολυετές πρόγραμμα μεταρρυθμίσεων. Το πρόγραμμα θα συμβάλει στη σταθεροποίηση του χρηματοπιστωτικού συστήματος, στην επίτευξη δημοσιονομικής διατηρησιμότητας και στη θεμελίωση της οικονομικής ανάπτυξης. Με την ανάκαμψη της κυπριακής οικονομίας, αυτό θα βοηθήσει τα νοικοκυριά που αντιμετωπίζουν δυσκολίες.

Η Επιτροπή στηρίζει την Κύπρο στην αποκατάσταση της χρηματοπιστωτικής σταθερότητας, της δημοσιονομικής διατηρησιμότητας και της ανάπτυξης για τους πολίτες της. Για την περίοδο 2007-2013 χορηγήθηκε στην Κύπρο επιπλέον ενίσχυση της τάξεως του 10% από τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία, με αποτέλεσμα το ποσοστό συγχρηματοδότησης να αυξηθεί σε 95%. Το Συμβούλιο διέθεσε πρόσθετο ποσό ύψους 100 εκατ. ευρώ στην Κύπρο από τον προϋπολογισμό του 2014, το οποίο θα μπορούσε να διατηρηθεί και το 2015.

Η αντιπροσωπεία της Επιτροπής στην Κύπρο εξακολουθεί να αναλαμβάνει δραστηριότητες με σκοπό την ενθάρρυνση της συμμετοχής στις επικείμενες ευρωπαϊκές εκλογές, καθώς και την ενημέρωση των πολιτών σχετικά με όλο το φάσμα των πολιτικών της ΕΕ. Η Επίτροπος κα Βασιλείου θα παραστεί στον διάλογο με τους πολίτες ([1]), ο οποίος θα πραγματοποιηθεί στις 28 Νοεμβρίου 2013 στη Λεμεσό, με σκοπό να ακούσει τις ανησυχίες των πολιτών.

([1]) Η Επιτροπή διοργανώνει σειρά διαλόγων με τους πολίτες σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη, στο πλαίσιο των προσπαθειών της, αφενός, να ενθαρρύνει τους πολίτες να ασκήσουν τα εκλογικά τους δικαιώματα και, αφετέρου, να ενισχύσει τη νομιμότητα της διακυβέρνησης της ΕΕ. (http://ec.europa.eu/debate-future-europe/citizens-dialogues/index_el.htm).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011991/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Citizens’ concerns over household finances

For one in six citizens of the EU, the poor financial situation of their households is one of the two most important issues that currently concern them. According to the findings of the recent Eurobarometer on the most important issues that concern European citizens in the 27 Member States, the greatest worry among Cypriot citizens — at a level almost three times the EU average — is the financial situation of their households. The financial situation of the households of Cypriot citizens is their number one problem at the moment.

1. What can the Commission do, in practical terms, to reverse the ever-increasing hardship and distress of Cypriot European citizens in relation to the dramatic deterioration that can be seen in their household finances?

2. What does it think are the causes of this problem?

3. What does it intend to do to encourage Cypriots to vote in the coming European elections, rather than staying away?

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

The Commission is aware of the difficulties many households are facing across the EU, particularly in Cyprus.

Over the last decade, Cyprus saw growing external and internal macroeconomic imbalances. These included the erosion of international competitiveness, deteriorating public finances, an oversized banking sector, rising private debt and increasing property prices.

The Cypriot authorities have proposed a multiannual reform programme to address Cyprus’s economic challenges. This will help stabilise the financial system, achieve fiscal sustainability and lay the foundations for economic growth. As the Cypriot economy recovers, this will help households in difficulty.

The Commission stands by Cyprus in restoring financial stability, fiscal sustainability and growth for its people. A 10% top up to the Structural Funds for Cyprus has been granted for the period 2007-2013, raising the co-financing rate to 95%. And the Council has allocated an additional EUR 100m to Cyprus in the 2014 budget, with the potential for this to be maintained in 2015.

The Commission Representation in Cyprus continues to undertake activities to promote participation to the upcoming European elections and to inform citizens on the whole spectrum of EU policies. Commissioner Vassiliou will attend the Citizens’ Dialogue ([1]) in Limassol on 28 November 2013 to listen to citizens’ concerns.

([1]) As part of its efforts to encourage citizens to use their voting rights and strengthen the legitimacy of EU governance, the Commission is holding a series of Citizens’ Dialogues in all Member States. (http://ec.europa.eu/debate-future-europe/citizens-dialogues/index_en.htm).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011992/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Κοινοτική συγχρηματοδότηση ζητά η Κύπρος

Ευελιξία από την πλευρά των εταίρων στο κυπριακό αίτημα για αύξηση της κοινοτικής συγχρηματοδότησης προς την Κύπρο, στο πλαίσιο του Πολυετούς Δημοσιονομικού Πλαισίου της περιόδου 2014-2020, αναμένει η Λευκωσία.

Λόγω της οικονομικής κρίσης που διέρχεται η Κύπρος και της έλλειψης εθνικών πόρων για χρηματοδότηση προγραμμάτων, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή, στο νομοθετικό πακέτο της πολιτικής συνοχής για την περίοδο 2014-2020, θα μπορούσαν να χρησιμοποιηθούν περισσότεροι κοινοτικοί πόροι, προς ενίσχυση των προσπαθειών της Κυπριακής Κυβέρνησης για ανάκαμψη της οικονομίας;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(10 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

Προκειμένου να ενισχυθεί η κυπριακή ανάκαμψη, η νομοθετική δέσμη για τα ευρωπαϊκά διαρθρωτικά και επενδυτικά ταμεία για την περίοδο 2014-2020 περιλαμβάνει μια σειρά πρόσθετων μέτρων που απευθύνονται ειδικά προς την Κύπρο.

Εκτός από τις χρηματοδοτήσεις που ορίζονται στο πολυετές δημοσιονομικό πλαίσιο του 2014-2020, η Κύπρος θα επωφεληθεί από την πρόσθετη χρηματοδότηση ύψους 94,2 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ το 2014 και 92,4 εκατομμυρίων το 2015 (εκφρασμένα σε τιμές 2011), η οποία πρέπει θα προστεθεί στη χρηματοδότηση των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων της.

Επιπλέον, για την περίοδο από 1 Ιανουαρίου 2014 έως 30 Ιουνίου 2017, η Κύπρος θα επωφεληθεί από ένα ανώτατο ποσοστό συγχρηματοδότησης ύψους 85% για κάθε προτεραιότητα στα επιχειρησιακά της προγράμματα.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011992/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Cyprus seeks Community co-financing

Nicosia expects flexibility from its partners in relation to the Cypriot request for an increase in Community co-financing for Cyprus, within the multiannual financial framework for 2014-2020.

With regard to the economic crisis that Cyprus is going through and the lack of national resources to fund programmes, can the Commission say whether it would be possible for more Community funds to be utilised in the legislative package of the Cohesion Policy for 2014-2020 to enhance the Cypriot Government's efforts towards economic recovery?

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

In order to assist the Cypriot recovery, the legislative package for the European Structural and Investment Funds for 2014-2020 sets out a number of additional measures specifically addressed to Cyprus.

On top of the allocations set out in the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework, Cyprus will benefit from an additional allocation of EUR 94.2 million in 2014 and 92.4 million in 2015 (expressed in 2011 prices), to be added to its Structural Funds allocation.

Moreover, for the period from 1 January 2014 to 30 June 2017, Cyprus will benefit from a maximum co-financing rate of 85% for each priority in its operational programmes.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011993/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Οι δύο εναλλακτικές, η εξής … μία: στάση πληρωμών

Η προσπάθεια των χωρών του Ευρωπαϊκού Νότου να εφαρμόσουν την πολιτική της εσωτερικής υποτίμησης, με τεράστιο κόστος όσον αφορά τη μείωση του ΑΕΠ και την αύξηση της ανεργίας, δεν συνοδεύεται από αντίστοιχη πολιτική εσωτερική s ανατίμησης στις χώρες του Ευρωπαϊκού Βορρά, γεγονός που σημαίνει ότι ολόκληρο το βάρος της οικονομικής προσαρμογής πέφτει αποκλειστικά στις χώρες του Νότου.

Κάποιοι μάλιστα οικονομικοί αναλυτές παραλληλίζουν την κατάσταση που επικρατεί σήμερα στην Ευρωζώνη, με αυτήν που επικράτησε στη Γερμανία μετά τον Α' Παγκόσμιο Πόλεμο, διότι τα υπερχρεωμένα κράτη του Νότου είναι υποχρεωμένα να πληρώνουν επί δεκαετίες μεγάλα ποσά στις πιστώτριες χώρες.

Ερωτάται λοιπόν η Επιτροπή:

1. Τι προτείνει για να μπορέσει η Ευρωζώνη να αποφύγει την άτακτη χρεοκοπία των χωρών του Νότου;

2. Θα μπορούσε να υιοθετήσει συμμετρική δημοσιονομική πολιτική; Να αντισταθμίσουν δηλαδή εν μέρει οι χώρες του Βορρά την πολιτική λιτότητας στις χώρες του Νότου, υιοθετώντας επεκτατική δημοσιονομική πολιτική, η οποία θα ενισχύσει τη ζήτηση και την ανάκαμψη της Ευρωζώνης και, ταυτόχρονα, θα περιορίσει τις ανισορροπίες του ισοζυγίου τρεχουσών συναλλαγών μεταξύ Βορρά και Νότου;

3. Θα μπορούσε η ΕΚΤ να αγοράσει σημαντικό μέρος του υπάρχοντος δημοσίου χρέους των χωρών του Νότου και να προχωρήσει σε μερική διαγραφή του, τυπώνοντας παράλληλα νέο χρήμα;

4. Θα μπορούσε η Ευρωζώνη να συνδυάσει τη συμμετρική δημοσιονομική πολιτική με μερική διαγραφή χρέους από την ΕΚΤ;

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

1. Τα προγράμματα χωρών της ζώνης του ευρώ απέτρεψαν την άτακτη χρεοκοπία και περιόρισαν τη διάχυση των κινδύνων. Παρά τις αντιξοότητες, η μακροοικονομική και δημοσιονομική κατάσταση σταθεροποιείται και έχουν δρομολογηθεί σημαντικές διαρθρωτικές προσαρμογές.

Η δέσμη εργαλείων πολιτικής προσαρμόστηκε ώστε να ενισχυθεί η ανθεκτικότητα των χωρών της ζώνης του ευρώ σε σοβαρές οικονομικές και χρηματοπιστωτικές κρίσεις. Η θέσπιση του ΕΜΣ (Ευρωπαϊκός Μηχανισμός Σταθερότητας) τον Οκτώβριο του 2012 δημιούργησε ένα μόνιμο μηχανισμό χρηματοδοτικής συνδρομής για τις χώρες της ζώνης του ευρώ με δανειοδοτική ικανότητα ύψους 500 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ.

2. Εδώ και πολύ καιρό, η Επιτροπή έχει υιοθετήσει μια διαφοροποιημένη προσέγγιση για τη δημοσιονομική εξυγίανση, δηλαδή όσα κράτη μέλη αντιμετωπίζουν μεγάλες δημοσιονομικές προκλήσεις, θα πρέπει να επισπεύσουν τη διαδικασία εξυγίανσης, ενώ εκείνα που διαθέτουν δημοσιονομικά περιθώρια, θα πρέπει να ακολουθήσουν μια σταδιακή διαδικασία εξυγίανσης. Σε γενικές γραμμές, τα κράτη μέλη ακολούθησαν τις συμβουλές αυτές. Ορισμένα κράτη μέλη που αντιμετωπίζουν δημοσιονομικές πιέσεις έχουν εφαρμόσει εκτεταμένα προγράμματα εξυγίανσης, ενώ ορισμένες άλλες χώρες με δημοσιονομικά περιθώρια έχουν υιοθετήσει έναν εν πολλοίς ουδέτερο δημοσιονομικό προσανατολισμό. Οι μεσοπρόθεσμοι δημοσιονομικοί στόχοι των χωρών αυτών αντανακλούν επίσης ανησυχίες σχετικά με τη μακροπρόθεσμη βιωσιμότητα των δημόσιων οικονομικών, η οποία εξαρτάται από τα τρέχοντα επίπεδα του χρέους και τις μελλοντικές δαπάνες που συνδέονται με τη δημογραφική γήρανση. Ακόμη και αν κάποια κράτη μέλη έχουν τη δυνατότητα να εφαρμόσουν πιο επεκτατική δημοσιονομική πολιτική χωρίς να θέσουν σε κίνδυνο την βιωσιμότητα των δημοσίων οικονομικών, από την ανάλυση προκύπτει ότι μια τέτοια πολιτική θα έχει περιορισμένες μόνο επιπτώσεις στις εξωτερικές ανισορροπίες των κρατών μελών που αντιμετωπίζουν τις μεγαλύτερες οικονομικές προκλήσεις.

3&4. Οι αποφάσεις για θέματα νομισματικής πολιτικής ([1]) εντός της ζώνης του ευρώ εμπίπτουν στην αποκλειστική αρμοδιότητα της ΕΚΤ και η Επιτροπή τις σέβεται πλήρως. Αναφορικά με την ενδεχόμενη αγορά δημόσιου χρέους από την ΕΚΤ με σκοπό τη μερική διαγραφή του, η Επιτροπή υπενθυμίζει ότι η απαγόρευση της χρηματοδότησης με νομισματικά μέσα κατοχυρώνεται στις συνθήκες της ΕΕ.

([1]) συμπεριλαμβανομένων ενδεχόμενων προγραμμάτων αγοράς ομολόγων από την κεντρική τράπεζα,

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011993/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: The two alternatives are as follows… one: default

The efforts made by the countries of the European south to implement their policies of internal devaluation at enormous cost in terms of reducing GDP and increasing unemployment, are not accompanied by a corresponding internal policy on appreciation in the countries of the European north, which means that the entire burden of economic adjustment falls exclusively on the southern countries.

Some economic analysts even draw parallels between the current situation in the euro area and the situation in Germany after the First World War, as the indebted southern countries will have to pay considerable sums to the creditor countries for decades.

1. What does the Commission propose to enable the euro area to avoid the disorderly bankruptcy of the countries of the south?

2. Will it be able to adopt a symmetrical fiscal policy? In other words, can the countries of the north offset the austerity policy of the countries of the south by adopting an expansionist fiscal policy which will strengthen demand and the recovery of the euro area, and which will, at the same time, limit current account imbalances between north and south?

3. Could the ECB buy a substantial part of the existing public debt of the countries of the south and implement a partial write-off of the debt by printing new money?

4. Could the euro area combine a symmetrical fiscal policy with a partial write-off of debt by the ECB?

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

1. The euro area programmes avoided disorderly default and limited contagion. Despite heavy headwinds, the macroeconomic and financial situation is stabilising and major structural adjustments are underway.

The policy toolkit has been adapted to enhance the resilience of the euro area countries against severe economic and financial crises. The establishment of the ESM (European Stability Mechanism) in October 2012 created a permanent financial assistance mechanism for euro area countries with a lending capacity of EUR 500 billion.

2. The Commission has for a long time now advocated a differentiated approach to consolidation, i.e. MS facing large fiscal challenges should frontload consolidation, while in those with fiscal space consolidation should be gradual. The MS have broadly followed this advice: MS under fiscal pressure have implemented impressive consolidation programmes while the fiscal stance in some of the countries with fiscal space has been broadly neutral. The medium-term budgetary objectives of these countries also reflect concerns about long-term sustainability linked to current debt levels and future age-related expenditure. Even if some of the MS could afford a more expansionary policy without endangering fiscal sustainability, the analysis shows that its impact on the external imbalances of the MS facing the largest economic challenges would be limited.

3 and 4. Monetary policy decisions ([1]) in the euro area are the exclusive competence of the ECB and the Commission fully respects them. With regard to potential purchases of public debt by the ECB with the purpose of partial write-offs, the Commission recalls that the prohibition of monetary financing is enshrined in the EU Treaties.

([1]) Including potential bond-purchase schemes by the central bank.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-011995/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(21 Οκτωβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Υπόδειξη Μπαγίς προς Φούλε

Σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα, ο Υπουργός Ευρωπαϊκών Υποθέσεων της Τουρκίας, Εγκεμέν Μπαγίς, προειδοποίησε τον Επίτροπο Διεύρυνσης, Στέφαν Φούλε, ότι, σε περίπτωση κατά την οποία η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή προέβαινε σε προσωπική κριτική κατά του Ταγίπ Ερντογάν στην έκθεση προόδου της ενταξιακής πορείας της Τουρκίας, οι σχέσεις Άγκυρας-Βρυξελλών θα εισέρχονταν σε νέα φάση κρίσης.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Μήπως είναι αυτός ο λόγος που η ίδια δεν κατέγραψε τις εμπρηστικές τοποθετήσεις Ερντογάν και το κλίμα πόλωσης που προκάλεσε ο Τούρκος πρωθυπουργός στη διάρκεια των διαδηλώσεων;

2. Γιατί δεν περιέλαβε αυτές τις δηλώσεις στο προσχέδιο της έκθεσης προόδου;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(18 Δεκεμβρίου 2013)

Οι εκθέσεις στις οποίες αναφέρεται το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου είναι εντελώς αβάσιμες.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011995/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Note from Mr Bargis to Mr Füle

According to reports, Turkey's Minister for European Affairs, Egemen Bargis, has warned Štefan Füle, European Commissioner for Enlargement and Neighbourhood Policy, that if the Commission were to make a personal attack on Recep Tayyip Erdogan in its progress report on Turkey's accession process, the Ankara-Brussels relationship will be thrown into crisis.

1. Is this the reason for the Commission's failure to report the inflammatory positions taken by Mr Erdogan and the increasing polarisation he caused during the demonstrations?

2. Why did it not include these positions in the draft progress report?

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

The reports referred to by the Honourable Member are completely unfounded.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-011996/13
à la Commission
Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)
(21 octobre 2013)

Objet: Formation professionnelle d'experts nationaux en sûreté nucléaire

Sous l'impulsion de la Commission européenne, l'Union a entrepris, à la suite de l'accident de Fukushima, une évaluation générale du niveau de sûreté de ses installations électronucléaires, sous la forme de «stress tests» menés dans chaque État membre, complétés par des revues croisées et des groupes de travail thématiques. Cette revue va conduire à des mesures de renforcement de la sûreté vis-à-vis notamment des aléas naturels extrêmes.

Cependant, les circonstances de l'accident de Fukushima ont également mis clairement en évidence l'importance que revêt la capacité des autorités nationales de sûreté à disposer de moyens fiables et indépendants d'expertise, tant pour ce qui concerne la gestion des processus d'autorisation de l'exploitation nucléaire que la gestion en temps réel d'une situation accidentelle pouvant mettre en danger les populations et l'environnement. Or le mécanisme des «stress tests» ne permet pas de disposer d'éléments d'analyse suffisants pour apprécier à cet égard, de manière objective, la situation dans les différents États membres. Il n'existe pas non plus de mécanisme de soutien ciblé aux États membres qui rencontreraient des difficultés dans ce domaine.

Pourtant, en ce qui concerne les pays tiers, partenaires de l'Instrument relatif à la coopération en matière de sûreté nucléaire (INSC), l'Union s'est dotée d'une politique visant à analyser et développer si nécessaire la performance de ces États en matière d'expertise. Cette politique permet notamment le financement de la formation d'experts dans le cadre de l'institut européen de formation et de tutorat en matière de sûreté nucléaire et de radioprotection, l'Enstti, créé à l'initiative des TSO européens.

La Commission prévoit-elle donc d'engager des initiatives visant à renforcer les obligations des États membres en ce qui concerne la disponibilité suffisante d'experts de sûreté auprès des autorités de sûreté ou des TSO nationaux? Si nécessaire, va-t-elle soutenir les efforts restant à accomplir pour harmoniser davantage les méthodes d'analyse de sûreté et faciliter la formation des experts dans certains États membres?

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

1. Les directives actuelles relatives la sûreté nucléaire ([1]) et aux déchets nucléaires ([2]) imposent déjà aux États membres de donner aux autorités de sûreté des ressources humaines suffisantes. La directive sur la sûreté nucléaire en particulier fait obligation aux États membres de soumettre au moins tous les dix ans leur cadre national et/ou leurs autorités nationales à un examen international par des pairs. Cet examen est actuellement réalisé en utilisant le programme de l'IRRS ([3]), qui couvre les effectifs et les compétences des autorités de sûreté. La proposition de la Commission modifiant la directive relative à la sûreté nucléaire ([4]) envisage de renforcer ces exigences ([5]). Une proposition de nouvelle directive sur les normes de base relatives à la protection sanitaire ([6]) inclut également des dispositions concernant la formation ([7]).

2. La proposition de modification de la directive sur la sûreté nucléaire introduit de nouveaux objectifs et de nouvelles exigences en termes de sûreté aux différents stades du cycle de vie des installations nucléaires ([8]). Elle instaure également un mécanisme visant à faciliter l'élaboration, à l'échelle de l'Union européenne, de recommandations et de lignes directrices génériques relatives à la sûreté nucléaire, sur la base des résultats des examens thématiques de sûreté des installations nucléaires réalisés par des pairs. Ces initiatives devraient contribuer à harmoniser les méthodes d'analyses de la sûreté au sein de l'Union.

([1]) Directive 2009/71/Euratom du Conseil du 25 juin 2009 établissant un cadre communautaire pour la sûreté nucléaire des installations nucléaires.

([2]) Directive 2011/70/Euratom du Conseil du 19 juillet 2011 établissant un cadre communautaire pour la gestion responsable et sûre du combustible usé et des déchets radioactifs.

([3]) Service d'examen intégré de la réglementation de l'AIEA (IRRS).

([4]) Proposition d'une directive du Conseil modifiant la directive 2009/71/Euratom du Conseil du 25 juin 2009 établissant un cadre communautaire pour la sûreté nucléaire des installations nucléaires (COM(2013)715 final).

([5]) La proposition prévoit l'obligation, pour les autorités réglementaires, d'employer en nombre suffisant du personnel possédant les qualifications, l'expérience et l'expertise adéquates.

([6]) Proposition de directive du Conseil fixant les normes de base relatives à la protection sanitaire contre les dangers résultant de l'exposition aux rayonnements ionisants (COM(2013)242 final).

([7]) La proposition impose aux États membres de mettre en place un cadre législatif et administratif adéquat permettant l'éducation, la formation et l'information appropriées en matière de radioprotection de toutes les personnes dont les missions nécessitent des compétences spécifiques dans ce domaine. Des exigences supplémentaires particulières ont été établies en ce qui concerne la formation des experts chargés de la radioprotection, des travailleurs exposés et des membres des équipes d'intervention.

([8]) Conception, implantation, construction, mise en service, exploitation et déclassement.

Dans le cadre du programme de la Communauté européenne de l'énergie atomique dans le domaine de la recherche et de la formation, la Commission accorde en outre aux organismes de recherche des aides pour la recherche et le développement technologique dans le domaine de la sûreté de la fission nucléaire. Depuis Fukushima, l'accent est mis, entre autres, sur l'harmonisation des méthodes et des normes européennes dans ce domaine. Le volet «fission (Euratom)» du programme-cadre «Horizon 2020» poursuit cet effort en promouvant l'intégration européenne de la recherche dans le domaine de la sûreté, de la radioprotection, de l'éducation et de la formation et en renforçant les capacités régionales dans ces domaines pour les nouveaux États membres.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011996/13
to the Commission
Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Professional training of national nuclear safety experts

Following the Fukushima accident, the European Union, on the initiative of the Commission, has undertaken a general assessment of the safety of its nuclear power plants in the form of 'stress tests', which were conducted in every Member State along with peer reviews and thematic working groups. This review will lead to improved safety measures in terms of extreme natural disasters in particular.

However, the circumstances surrounding the Fukushima accident also clearly emphasised the importance of national safety authorities having the capacity for reliable and independent expertise, both in terms of management of the authorisation process for nuclear operations and the real-time management of an accident with the potential to put people and the environment at risk. The 'stress test' mechanism, however, does not comprise enough analytical components in order to objectively assess the situation in the various Member States in this regard; neither is there a support mechanism targeted at Member States that would struggle in this area.

However, with regard to third countries that are Nuclear Safety Cooperation Instrument (NSCI) partners, the EU has adopted a policy to analyse and develop, if necessary, the performance of these states in terms of their expertise. In particular, the policy allows for funding the training of experts on nuclear safety and radiation protection under the European Nuclear Safety Training and Tutoring Institute (ENSTTI), established on the initiative of the European Technical Safety Organisations (TSOs).

Does the Commission therefore intend to take steps to strengthen Member States' obligations to have sufficient safety experts on hand from safety authorities or national TSOs? If necessary, will it support the efforts still required to further harmonise safety analysis methods and to facilitate the training of experts in certain Member States?

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

1. The current Nuclear Safety Directive (NSD) ([1]) and Nuclear Waste Directive ([2]) already require Member States to provide safety authorities with the necessary human resources. The NSD in particular requires Member States to invite, at least every 10 years, an international peer review of their national framework and/or authorities. This is currently conducted using the IRRS ([3]) scheme, which covers the staffing and competence of safety authorities. The Commission's proposal for an amended NSD ([4]) envisages strengthening these requirements further ([5]). A proposal for a new Basic Safety Standards Directive ([6]) also contains provisions on training ([7]).

2. The proposal for an amended NSD introduces new safety objectives and requirements for the different stages of the lifecycle of nuclear installations ([8]). It also establishes a mechanism to help formulate EU-wide generic safety recommendations and guidelines on the basis of the results of topic-based peer reviews of the safety of nuclear installations. These initiatives should contribute to the harmonisation of safety analysis methods in the European Union.

([1]) Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom of 25 June 2009 establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations.
([2]) Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom of 19 July 2011 establishing a Community framework for the responsible and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste.
([3]) IAEA Integrated Regulatory Review Service (IRRS).
([4]) Proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 2009/71/Euratom establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations (COM(2013) 715 final).
([5]) The proposal requires that regulatory authorities need to employ an appropriate number of staff with the necessary qualifications, experience and expertise.
([6]) Proposal for a Council Directive laying down basic safety standards for protection against the dangers arising from exposure to ionising radiation (COM(2012) 242final).
([7]) The proposal requires Member States to establish an adequate legislative and administrative framework ensuring the provision of appropriate radiation protection education, training and information to all individuals whose tasks require specific competences in radiation protection. Further detailed requirements exist in relation to the education and training of radiation protection experts, occupationally exposed workers and emergency workers.
([8]) Design, siting, construction, commissioning, operation and decommissioning.

Moreover, Commission support is granted to research institutions for research and technological development in the field of nuclear fission safety under the European Atomic Energy Community Research and Training Programmes, After Fukushima, the emphasis was placed on, *inter alia*, the harmonisation of European methods and standards in this field. The Euratom fission part of Horizon 2020 is further pursuing this effort, namely by promoting the European integration of research in nuclear safety, radiation protection, education and training and in strengthening regional capabilities in these fields for new Member States.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-011997/13
upućeno Komisiji
Davor Ivo Stier (PPE)
(21. listopada 2013.)

Predmet: Uredba o jedinstvenom tržištu elektroničkih komunikacija

Europska komisija predložila je Uredbu Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća o utvrđivanju mjera u vezi s europskim jedinstvenim tržištem elektroničkih komunikacija i ostvarenju „Povezanog kontinenta" te o izmjeni direktiva 2002/20/EZ, 2002/21/EZ i 2002/22/EZ i uredbi (EZ) br. 1211/2009 i (EU) br. 531/2012.

U vezi s tim, želim Vam uputiti sljedeća pitanja:

1. Prema procjeni Komisije, kako bi stvaranje jedinstvenog digitalnog tržišta moglo utjecati na otvaranje radnih mjesta u Europskoj uniji?

2. Kako bi donošenje navedene uredbe moglo utjecati na zapošljavanje mladih?

3. Ima li Komisija projekcije o utjecaju predložene uredbe na stvaranje novih radnih mjesta u Hrvatskoj?

Odgovor gđe Kroes u ime Komisije
(28. studenog 2013.)

Postizanjem jedinstvenog tržišta telekomunikacijskih usluga trebao bi se ostvariti godišnji porast od 0,9 % BDP-a (ukupno 110 milijardi EUR godišnje). Njime će se stvoriti nove mogućnosti za djelovanje poduzeća na višoj razini uz manje regulatorno opterećenje i pojačati njihovu sposobnost za inovacije, rast i veću produktivnost te otvoriti radna mjesta osobito za mlađe generacije, povećati odabir za potrošače i poboljšati kvalitetu usluga.

Još važnije, poboljšanom povezanošću diljem Europe stvorile bi se i mogućnosti rasta u svim gospodarskim sektorima uporabom aplikacija kao što su eCommerce, računalstvo u oblaku i organizacijske inovacije, što bi osobito za MSP-ove poticalo rast produktivnosti.

Izgradnja jedinstvenog tržišta elektroničkih komunikacija na taj će način znatno utjecati na zapošljavanje u svim državama članicama — velikim i malim, „starim" i „mladim", uključujući Hrvatsku, pomoću općeg porasta produktivnosti i difuzijskog učinka u digitalnom ekosustavu i cjelokupnom gospodarstvu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011997/13
to the Commission
Davor Ivo Stier (PPE)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Regulation on the single market for electronic communications

The Commission has put forward a proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down measures concerning the European single market for electronic communications and to achieve a Connected Continent, and amending Directives 2002/20/EC, 2002/21/EC and 2002/22/EC and Regulations (EC) No 1211/2009 and (EU) No 531/2012.

1. What impact does the Commission think that completion of the digital single market is likely to have from the point of view of opening up job opportunities in the EU?

2. How might the adoption of the above regulation make itself felt in terms of youth employment?

3. Does the Commission have any projections relating to the effect of the proposed regulation on the creation of new jobs in Croatia?

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

Achieving the Single Telecoms Market should bring an annual increase of up to 0.9% of the GDP (amounting yearly to EUR 110 billion). It will create opportunities for firms to operate on a bigger scale with less regulatory burden, enhancing their capacity to innovate, to grow, become more productive and generate jobs, especially for the younger generations, widen consumer choice and raise the quality of service.

Even more importantly, improved connectivity across Europe would in turn enable growth possibilities across all economic sectors enabling the use of applications such as eCommerce, cloud computing and organisational innovation, driving productivity gains especially for SMEs.

The building of a Single Telecoms Market will thus have a significant impact on employment in all Member States — big and small, ‘old’ and ‘new’, including Croatia, through the general productivity gains and diffusion effects in the digital eco-system and on the economy as a whole.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011998/13
à Comissão
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) e Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(21 de outubro de 2013)

Assunto: Declarações do Representante da Comissão Europeia sobre o Tribunal Constitucional de Portugal

Tivemos hoje conhecimento de um relatório elaborado e assinado pelo Representante da Comissão Europeia em Portugal, no qual estão explanadas várias considerações sobre um órgão de soberania de Portugal, o Tribunal Constitucional.

O autor do documento acusa o Tribunal Constitucional de ser um ativista político, de pôr em risco, com as suas decisões, o Memorando de Entendimento e, consequentemente, de precipitar um segundo resgate.

O Tribunal Constitucional tem como competência específica, de acordo com a Constituição da República Portuguesa, administrar a justiça em matérias de natureza jurídico-constitucional, nomeadamente verificar a inconstitucionalidade das normas que infrinjam o disposto na Constituição, ou os princípios nela consignados. Além disso, a Constituição da República Portuguesa, bem como todas as revisões da mesma, foi votada na Assembleia da República portuguesa pelos deputados eleitos, ao contrário do Memorando de Entendimento.

Fundamentar as conclusões vertidas no relatório em debates de comentadores ou de um dos muitos professores de Direito do país, que, ao contrário dos juízes do Tribunal Constitucional, não estão obrigados a qualquer dever de imparcialidade, é um exercício grosseiro de manipulação e de irresponsabilidade. Usar esse exercício para encontrar justificações para os falhanços do governo português é mais grave e configura, isso sim, uma transformação da Comissão Europeia num ativista do debate político português, em completa violação dos limites do seu mandato.

Coagir a ação de um órgão de soberania independente de um Estado-Membro, através de chantagens e ultimatos, constitui um precedente gravíssimo de desrespeito pela autonomia dos Estados-Membros e pelo princípio da separação dos poderes político e judicial, central em todas as democracias europeias.

Assim, pretendemos saber da Comissão se subscreve o conteúdo do relatório do seu Representante em Portugal.

Se não subscreve, pretende a Comissão enviar algum pedido de desculpas ao Tribunal Constitucional e permitir que o autor do documento continue em funções?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-011999/13
à Comissão
Edite Estrela (S&D) e Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE)
(21 de outubro de 2013)

Assunto: Ingerência da CE nos assuntos nacionais de um Estado-Membro

Considerando as notícias hoje publicadas na imprensa portuguesa, dando conta de um documento enviado para Bruxelas pelo Chefe da Representação Interino da Comissão Europeia em Portugal, que alerta para as consequências de um chumbo do Tribunal Constitucional a algumas medidas propostas no Orçamento de Estado para 2014;

Considerando que as notícias referem que o documento contém considerações políticas e alerta para a eventualidade de um parecer negativo do Tribunal Constitucional acarretar como consequência um segundo resgate;

Considerando o precedente aberto pelo referido funcionário aquando da apresentação da moção de censura ao governo por parte do Partido Socialista, em que se pronunciou politicamente contra a iniciativa, à revelia do Estatuto dos Funcionários das Instituições Europeias;

Manifestamos a nossa perplexidade e preocupação e solicitamos à Comissão que nos esclareça qual o seu enquadramento funcional e se tem condições para continuar no seu posto.

Mais, manifestamos a nossa indignação pelas considerações que, no referido documento, se tecem em relação ao Tribunal Constitucional português, sugerindo que se trata de um «legislador negativo» e responsabilizando-o, em tom de chantagem, por um possível segundo resgate e concomitante colapso do atual governo;

Tendo em conta o artigo 4.° do Tratado da União Europeia, que determina a igualdade dos Estados-Membros perante os tratados e o respeito pelas suas «estruturas políticas e constitucionais», como pode a Comissão, enquanto «guardiã dos Tratados», justificar uma pressão direta sobre o Tribunal Constitucional de um Estado-Membro?

Tendo em conta as disposições constantes no Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia, não considera a Comissão que esta atuação representa uma clara ingerência nos assuntos nacionais de um Estado-Membro?

Resposta conjunta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão

(19 de dezembro de 2013)

O relatório mencionado pelos Senhores Deputados faz parte de um documento interno elaborado pela sua representação em Lisboa, com vista a informar os serviços da Comissão sobre o debate político em curso em Portugal.

Este relatório interno apresenta uma descrição analítica do debate nacional em Portugal relativo às decisões do Tribunal Constitucional. A análise apresentada no relatório baseou-se nas posições dos vários intervenientes políticos e funcionários, além dos meios de comunicação social portugueses e internacionais. Inclui também informações baseadas na doutrina do Tribunal Constitucional, recolhidas a partir de estudos sobre a questão.

A Comissão não exerce qualquer pressão sobre o Tribunal Constitucional de qualquer Estado-Membro. Por conseguinte, a Comissão não põe em causa as competências do Tribunal Constitucional de Portugal no âmbito da constituição e da legislação portuguesas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-011998/13
to the Commission
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) and Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Statements by the Commission's representative on Portugal's Constitutional Court

Today we learned of a report prepared and signed by the Commission's representative in Portugal, which contains several comments on one of Portugal's sovereign bodies, the Constitutional Court.

The author of the document accuses the Constitutional Court of interfering in politics and, with its decisions, putting the memorandum of understanding in jeopardy and precipitating a second bailout as a result.

In accordance with the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic, the Constitutional Court is specifically tasked with administering justice on legal and constitutional matters, including establishing whether rules that infringe the provisions of the Constitution, or the principles enshrined therein, are unconstitutional. Moreover, the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic, as well as all the revisions thereto, was adopted in the Assembly of the Portuguese Republic by elected representatives, unlike the memorandum of understanding.

Basing the conclusions set out in the report on the debates of commentators or of one of the country's many law professors, who, unlike the judges of the Constitutional Court, are not bound by any duty of impartiality, is grossly manipulative and irresponsible. Using this exercise to find justifications for the Portuguese Government's failings is more serious and, in fact, means that the Commission is interfering in Portuguese political debate, totally overstepping the bounds of its mandate.

Putting pressure on the activity of a Member State's independent sovereign body, by means of blackmail and ultimatums, sets a very serious precedent of disrespect for Member States' autonomy and for the principle of separation of political and judicial powers, which is central to all European democracies.

Does the Commission agree with the content of the report by its representative in Portugal?

If not, will the Commission apologise to the Constitutional Court and allow the author of the report to continue in his post?

Question for written answer E-011999/13
to the Commission
Edite Estrela (S&D) and Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE)
(21 October 2013)

Subject: Interference by the Commission in the domestic affairs of a Member State

According to reports published today in the Portuguese press, the acting Head of the Commission Representation in Portugal has sent a document to Brussels warning of the consequences of a ruling by the Constitutional Court on certain measures proposed in the State budget for 2014.

According to the reports, the document contains comments of a political nature and warns that a negative opinion from the Constitutional Court could possibly result in a second bailout.

When the Socialist Party tabled a motion of censure against the government, the aforementioned official set a precedent by expressing his political opposition to the initiative, disregarding the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union.

We are baffled and concerned and call on the Commission to clarify what the framework governing his role is and whether he is in a position to continue in his post.

Moreover, we are offended by the comments concerning the Portuguese Constitutional Court in the aforementioned document, which suggest that it is a 'negative legislator' and hold it responsible, in a blackmailing tone, for a potential second bailout and the attendant collapse of the current government.

Given that Article 4 of the Treaty on European Union establishes the equality of Member States before the Treaties and respect for their 'political and constitutional' structures, how can the Commission, as 'guardian of the Treaties', justify direct pressure being put on the Constitutional Court of a Member State?

In view of the provisions of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, does the Commission not think that this act is a clear case of interference in the domestic affairs of a Member State?

Joint answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(19 December 2013)

The report mentioned by the Honourable Members consists of an internal document drawn up by its Representation in Lisbon to inform the Commission services about the ongoing political debate in Portugal.

This internal report presents an analytical description of the domestic debate in Portugal regarding rulings of the Constitutional Court. The analysis in the report was based on the positions of several political actors, officials, Portuguese and international media. It also includes information collected from studies on the matter of constitutional court doctrine.

The Commission does not exert any pressure on the Constitutional Court of any Member States. Therefore the Commission does not call into question the competences of the Portuguese Constitutional Court under the Portuguese constitution and laws.

ISSN 1977-088X (elektronische Ausgabe)
ISSN 1725-2407 (Papierausgabe)

Amt für Veröffentlichungen der Europäischen Union
2985 Luxemburg
LUXEMBURG

DE