Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union

C 239

Ausgabe in deutscher Sprache

Mitteilungen und Bekanntmachungen

57. Jahrgang

23. Juli 2014

Inhalt

DE

Hinweis für den Leser

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

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

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

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

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

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

ABKÜRZUNGEN DER FRAKTIONEN

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialisten und Demokraten im Europäischen Parlament
ALDE	Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa
Verts/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz
ECR	Europäische Konservative und Reformisten
GUE/NGL	Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke
EFD	Fraktion „Europa der Freiheit und der Demokratie"
NI	Fraktionslos

IV

(Informationen)

INFORMATIONEN DER ORGANE, EINRICHTUNGEN UND SONSTIGEN STELLEN DER EUROPÄISCHEN UNION

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

ANFRAGEN ZUR SCHRIFTLICHEN BEANTWORTUNG MIT ANTWORT

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

(2014/C 239/01)

Inhalt Seite

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013312/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

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

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

En referencia a la pregunta E-010602/2013, el pasado 21 de octubre, el Sr. Šemeta contestó en nombre de la Comisión: «La Comisión recibió la respuesta de las autoridades españolas el 23 de septiembre de 2013 y actualmente la está estudiando».

A la vista de lo anterior:

¿Ya ha analizado la Comisión la respuesta de las autoridades españolas?

¿Qué tipo de IVA tendrá que aplicar el Gobierno español a los comedores escolares?

Respuesta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión
(30 de enero de 2014)

La Comisión se ha puesto en contacto con las autoridades españolas y ha examinado la legislación nacional sobre este asunto. La normativa española había limitado la exención del IVA en lo que se refiere a la custodia y el cuidado de los niños de hasta seis años de edad, restricción que no se encuentra contemplada en la Directiva del IVA ([1]). La Ley de Presupuestos Generales del Estado para 2014 elimina esta restricción ([2]).

Por lo que se refiere al régimen del IVA aplicable a los comedores escolares, a la vista de lo dispuesto en el artículo 132, apartado 1, letra i), de la Directiva del IVA, tales suministros están exentos del IVA, en la medida en que:

i) respondan a la definición de «estrechamente relacionados con la educación» (términos que deben interpretarse de manera estricta) y resulten «esenciales para la realización de las operaciones exentas»;

ii) sean provistos por entidades de Derecho público que tengan tal objeto o por otras organizaciones reconocidas por España con finalidades semejantes.

España ha hecho uso de la opción, prevista en la Directiva del IVA, de excluir de esta exención los servicios prestados por entidades lucrativas.

Los suministros que no cumplan estas condiciones están sujetos al tipo normal del IVA, siempre que no reúnan los requisitos para ser considerados «servicios de restauración» y el Estado miembro no haya hecho uso de la opción, prevista en el artículo 98, apartado 2, en conexión con la categoría 12a del anexo III de la Directiva del IVA, de aplicar un tipo reducido a estos servicios.

([1]) Directiva 2006/112/CE del Consejo, de 28 de noviembre de 2006, relativa al sistema común del impuesto sobre el valor añadido (DO L 347 de 11.12.2006).
([2]) Ley 22/2013 de 23 de diciembre de 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013312/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

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

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

In reference to Question E-010602/2013, of 21 October 2013, Mr Šemeta replied on behalf of the Commission: 'On 23 September 2013, the Commission has received the reply from the Spanish authorities which it is presently examining'.

Has the Commission now examined the reply from the Spanish authorities?

What type of VAT will the Spanish Government have to apply to school canteens?

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

The Commission has contacted the Spanish authorities and has examined the national legislation on this issue. The Spanish rules had limited the VAT exemption as regards the custody and care of children to children up to six years old, a restriction not contained in the VAT Directive ([1]). The Spanish Budget Law ([2]) for 2014 removes this restriction.

As regards the VAT regime applicable to school canteens, in view of Article 132(1) (i) of the VAT Directive such supplies are exempt from VAT in so far as:

(i) they qualify as 'closely related to education' (terms which must be interpreted strictly) and are 'essential to the transactions exempted';

(ii) they are supplied by bodies governed by public law having such as their aim or by other organisations recognised by Spain as having similar objects.

Spain has exercised the option, allowed by the VAT Directive, of excluding from this exemption the services supplied by profit-making bodies.

Supplies not fulfilling these conditions are subject to the standard VAT rate, unless they meet the conditions to be considered as 'catering services' and the Member State has exercised the option, allowed by Article 98(2), in connection with Category (12a) in Annex III to the VAT Directive, of applying a reduced rate to these services.

([1]) Directive 2006/112/EC, of 28 November 2006 on the common system of value added tax (OJ L 347, 11.12.2006).
([2]) Law 22/2013 of 23 December 2013.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013313/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Monedas de uno y dos céntimos de euro

El pasado mes de mayo, la Comisión Europea juntamente con el Consejo y el Parlamento aprobaron que la Comisión desarrolle un estudio sobre la viabilidad de mantener las monedas de uno y dos céntimos.

Actualmente el total de este tipo de monedas en circulación vale alrededor de 714 millones de euros, pero fabricarlas, según los cálculos de la Comisión, ha costado 1 400 millones más que esa suma ([1]).

La Comisión se comprometía a evaluar cuatro opciones distintas y promover una nueva legislación en ese sentido.

A la luz de lo anterior,

¿en qué estado se encuentra tal estudio? ¿Evaluará la Comisión la viabilidad de las monedas de uno y dos céntimos mediante un análisis de coste-beneficio?

¿Piensa la Comisión promover una nueva legislación sobre las monedas de uno y dos céntimos antes del final del mandato?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(23 de enero de 2014)

La Comisión informó sobre el resultado del análisis de los costes y beneficios en su Comunicación de 14 de mayo de 2013 (COM(2013) 281 final) sobre aspectos relacionados con el mantenimiento de la emisión de monedas de uno y dos céntimos de euro. En la Comunicación se presentaban cuatro posibles opciones: dos de ellas prevén una continuación de la emisión y las otras dos la retirada o desaparición gradual de estas denominaciones. Durante el proceso de debate con los Estados miembros y las partes interesadas que siguió a la adopción de la Comunicación se puso de relieve la preferencia por el mantenimiento de las monedas de uno y dos céntimos.

([1]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2013/05/14/actualidad/1368529190_054349.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013313/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: One and two euro cent coins

In May 2013, the Commission, in conjunction with the Council and Parliament, approved the development of a study by the Commission on the viability of keeping the one and two euro cent coins.

These types of coin in circulation currently amount to around EUR 714 million; producing them, however, cost 1.4 billion more than this amount, according to the Commission's calculations ([1]).

The Commission undertook to evaluate four different options and to promote new legislation in this regard.

What is the current status of this study? Will the Commission assess the viability of one and two euro cent coins by means of a cost-benefit analysis?

Does the Commission intend to promote new legislation on one and two euro cent coins before the end of the current term?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(23 January 2014)

The Commission informed about the outcome of the cost-benefit analysis through its communication of 14 May 2013 (COM(2013) 281 final) on issues related to the continued issuance of the 1 and 2 euro cent coins. The communication presented four possible options, out of which two provide for continued issuance and two for withdrawal or fading out of these denominations. During the discussion process with Member States and stakeholders that followed the adoption of the communication, a preference emerged in favour of maintaining the 1 and 2 cent coins.

([1]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2013/05/14/actualidad/1368529190_054349.html

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013314/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Circulación de billetes de 500 y 200 euros

En España hay una economía sumergida en una cantidad cercana a los 250 000 millones de euros, lo que supone algo más del 23 % del PIB. Este dinero escapa al control de Hacienda y la Seguridad Social y cada año se pierde cerca de 90 000 millones en impuestos, aproximadamente un 9 % del PIB.

Por otro lado, en julio de 2013 había en circulación en España 60 759,6 millones de euros en billetes, de los que 42 754,9 correspondían a billetes de 500 euros ([1]). Teniendo en cuenta su nulo uso social, muchos han apuntado que los billetes de 500 son utilizados por evasores fiscales e individuos que desarrollan actividades de carácter criminal. En concreto, en el Reino Unido se calculó que ese era el destino del 90 % de ese tipo de billetes y se prohibió su uso en las casas de cambio. El número de billetes de 200 euros también parece desproporcionado a su uso ([2]).

¿No cree la Comisión que la desmonetización de los billetes de 500 y 200 euros permitiría eliminar uno de los medios de pago más habituales en las actividades criminales y de evasión de impuestos?

¿No cree la Comisión que la recaudación fiscal del Estado español y del resto de los países de la zona del euro aumentaría notablemente gracias a la obligación de retirar de la circulación esos billetes de 500 euros?

¿Piensa la Comisión considerar tal propuesta en el marco de su plan de acción contra la evasión de impuestos?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de enero de 2014)

Las cuestiones relacionadas con los billetes de euro, incluida la determinación de sus denominaciones, son competencia exclusiva del Banco Central Europeo.

Por tanto, la Comisión no está en condiciones de decidir sobre el asunto planteado por Su Señoría.

([1]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2013/08/28/agencias/1377684384_619099.html
([2]) http://www.dw.de/tough-times-for-the-500-euro-note/a-16865110

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013314/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Circulation of 500 and 200 euro banknotes

There is an informal economy in Spain worth close to EUR 250 billion, which represents just over 23% of GDP. This money is beyond the control of the tax authorities and social security and every year almost EUR 90 billion are lost in taxes, approximately 9% of GDP.

Moreover, in July 2013 there were EUR 60.7596 billion in circulation in banknotes in Spain, of which 42.7549 billion were 500 euro banknotes ([1]). Considering that they serve no social purpose, many have suggested that 500 euro banknotes are used by tax evaders and individuals involved in criminal activity. In particular, it was estimated in the United Kingdom that 90% of 500 euro banknotes were used for that purpose and they were banned in bureaux de change. The number of 200 euro banknotes also seems disproportionate to their use ([2]).

Does the Commission not think that the demonetisation of 500 and 200 euro banknotes would eliminate one of the most common means of payment in criminal activities and tax evasion?

Does the Commission not think that the tax revenues of the Spanish State and the rest of the euro area countries would increase dramatically as a result of the compulsory withdrawal of these 500 euro banknotes from circulation?

Does the Commission intend to consider such a proposal within the framework of its action plan against tax evasion?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(24 January 2014)

Issues related to euro banknotes, including the determination of their denominations, are the exclusive competence of the European Central Bank.

Therefore, the Commission is not in position to decide on the matter raised by the Honourable Member.

([1]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2013/08/28/agencias/1377684384_619099.html
([2]) http://www.dw.de/tough-times-for-the-500-euro-note/a-16865110.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-013316/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25. November 2013)

Betrifft: Bekämpfung der Jugendarbeitslosigkeit

Die Arbeitslosigkeit unter Jugendlichen betrug 2012 in der Europäischen Union durchschnittlich 23,40 %. Sie ist damit mehr als doppelt so hoch wie die Arbeitslosenquote der Gesamtbevölkerung im erwerbsfähigen Alter (10,70 Prozent). Das stellt nicht nur ein volkswirtschaftliches Problem dar (die arbeitslosen Jugendlichen in Europa kosten den europäischen Steuerzahler 153 Mrd. EUR im Jahr), sondern auch ein sozialpolitisches: Junge Menschen, die über längere Zeit beschäftigungslos bleiben, werden desillusioniert und verlieren das Vertrauen in die Zukunft ihrer Staaten und in die des gemeinsamen Europas. Untätigkeit birgt die Gefahr der „sozialen Verwahrlosung", des Abrutschens ins kriminelle Milieu und führt letzten Endes zu schweren politischen Unruhen.

In einer Empfehlung hat die Europäische Kommission die Mitgliedstaaten dazu aufgefordert, allen EU-Bürgern unter 25 Jahren innerhalb von vier Monaten nach ihrem Abschluss irgendeine Form der Beschäftigung zu garantieren. Reformiert werden zudem die Jugend-Förderprogramme, um künftig unter dem Titel „Erasmus+" alle EU-Programme für Bildung, Jugend und Sport unter einem Dach zusammenzufassen.

1. Ist eine Reform der Ressortverteilung geplant, um einen neuen Kommissar eigens für den Bereich Bildung und Jugend zu ernennen?

2. Werden auf EU-Ebene Konzepte dafür erarbeitet, wie das Potenzial von 7,5 Millionen arbeitslosen Jugendlichen genutzt werden kann, um dem viel kritisierten Mangel an Schlüsselarbeitskräften in Europa Herr zu werden?

Antwort von László Andor im Namen der Kommission
(29. Januar 2014)

1. Kommissarin Vassiliou, zuständig für Bildung, Kultur, Vielsprachigkeit und Jugend, und Kommissar Andor, zuständig für Beschäftigung, Soziales und Integration, arbeiten in den Bereichen Bildung und Jugend eng zusammen, wenn es um die Jugendarbeitslosigkeit geht. Gemäß Artikel 17 Absatz 6 des Vertrags über die Europäische Union nimmt der Präsident der nächsten Kommission die Ressortverteilung vor.

2. In der Empfehlung des Rates vom 22. April 2013 zur Einführung einer Jugendgarantie ([1]) werden die Mitgliedstaaten aufgerufen, dafür zu sorgen, dass allen jungen Menschen unter 25 Jahren „binnen vier Monaten nach Verlust einer Arbeit oder dem Verlassen der Schule eine hochwertige Arbeitsstelle bzw. weiterführende Ausbildung oder ein hochwertiger Praktikums- bzw. Ausbildungsplatz angeboten wird". Die Mitgliedstaaten werden ermutigt, ihre Pläne zur Umsetzung ihrer nationalen Jugendgarantieprogramme am Qualifikationsbedarf ihrer jeweiligen Volkswirtschaft auszurichten.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2013:120:0001:0006:DE:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013316/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Tackling youth unemployment

The average rate of youth unemployment in the European Union in 2012 was 23.40%. It is therefore more than double the unemployment rate for the population of working age as a whole (10.70%). This is not just an economic problem (unemployed young people in Europe cost the European taxpayer EUR 153 billion per year), but a socio-political one, too: young people who remain unemployed for any length of time become disillusioned and lose confidence in the future of their States and in that of a united Europe. Inactivity carries the risk of 'social abandonment' and of slipping into a life of crime, and ultimately leads to serious political unrest.

In a recommendation, the Commission called on the Member States to guarantee all EU citizens under the age of 25 some form of employment within four months of leaving formal education. The youth support programmes are also being reformed in order, in future, to bring all EU programmes for education, youth and sport together under a single structure with the title 'Erasmus+'.

1. Are there plans for a reform of the distribution of responsibilities in order to appoint a new Commissioner specifically for the area of education and youth?

2. Are strategies being developed at EU level for ways to utilise the potential of 7.5 million unemployed young people in order to tackle the much criticised shortage of key workers in Europe?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

1. Commissioner Vassililou, responsible for Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth and Commissioner Andor, responsible Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, are cooperating closely areas of education and youth when it comes to youth employment. The portfolios of the next Commission will be allocated by the President, in accordance with Article 17(6) of TEU.

2. The Council Recommendation of 22 April 2013 on establishing a Youth Guarantee ([1]) calls on the Member States to ensure that all young people under 25 receive 'a good-quality offer of employment, continued education, an apprenticeship or a traineeship within a period of four months of becoming unemployed or leaving formal education.' The Member States are encouraged to bring their plans for implementing their national Youth Guarantee schemes into line with the skills their economies need.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2013:120:0001:0006:EN:PDF

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-013317/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25. November 2013)

Betrifft: Beschäftigungsgarantie für Jugendliche

Wenn junge Menschen sich nach Abschluss ihrer Ausbildung in Ermangelung eines passenden Arbeitsplatzes gezwungen sehen, in eine andere Branche oder gar in den Niedriglohnsektor zu wechseln, haben sie oft keine Chance mehr, zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt zurück zu wechseln. Bereits im Herbst des Vorjahres hat die Europäische Kommission eine Reihe konkreter Maßnahmen angeregt, mit denen die hohe Jugendarbeitslosigkeit bekämpft werden soll. Mittlerweile wurden seitens der EU extra Fördermittel zur Verfügung gestellt. Ab 2014 sollen besonders junge Menschen vordringlich in jenen Regionen unterstützt werden, in denen die Jugendarbeitslosigkeit über 25 % liegt.

1. Wie viel Fördermittel wurden aus welchen Fonds zur Bekämpfung der Jugendarbeitslosigkeit bereitgestellt?

2. Welche Beträge wurden bis dato bereits ausgezahlt bzw. beantragt?

3. Mit welchen (Kontroll-)Maßnahmen soll verhindert werden, dass (junge) Menschen in Qualifizierungs- und Ausbildungsmaßnahmen gesteckt werden, damit sie aus der Arbeitsmarktstatistik verschwinden?

4. Womit soll verhindert werden, dass diese Förderungen lediglich dazu genutzt werden, kostengünstig Praktikanten einzustellen (also eine EU-subventionierte „Generation von Praktikanten") oder zu einem weiteren Wildwuchs atypischer Beschäftigungsverhältnisse führen würde?

Antwort von László Andor im Namen der Kommission
(29. Januar 2014)

Wenngleich nicht beziffert werden kann, wie viel für den Bereich Jugend ausgegeben wurde, fließen die ESF-Mittel ([1]) im Zeitraum 2007-2014 doch zu 68 % in Projekte, die auch jungen Menschen zugutekommen können. 2012 haben viele Mitgliedstaaten ESF-Zuschüsse in Anspruch genommen, um die Jugendarbeitslosigkeit gemeinsam mit Aktionsteams zu bekämpfen. Bis Ende Oktober 2013 sind 4,2 Mrd. EUR aus ESF-Mitteln erneut für Maßnahmen bereitgestellt worden, die zugunsten von einer Million junger Menschen durchgeführt werden, und 1,4 Mrd. EUR dieser Summe waren zu diesem Zeitpunkt bereits in Projekten gebunden. Durch die Neuzuweisung oder die beschleunigte Auszahlung der EFRE-Mittel ([2]), die diesen Mitgliedstaaten zur Verfügung stehen, konnten 55 000 KMU bei ihren Bemühungen unterstützt werden, ganz generell Arbeitsplätze zu schaffen oder zu erhalten.

Im Zeitraum 2014-2012 wird das Thema Jugend stärker in den Mittelpunkt rücken. Im Rahmen der Jugendbeschäftigungsinitiative ([3]) erhalten die am meisten von Jugendarbeitslosigkeit betroffenen Regionen mindestens 6 Mrd. EUR ([4]) (3 Mrd. EUR aus einem Sonderfonds und mindestens 3 Mrd. EUR aus dem ESF) für die nachhaltige Integration junger Menschen in den Arbeitsmarkt, sofern sie keine Arbeitsstelle haben und auch keine weiterführende oder berufliche Ausbildung absolvieren. Aus dem ESF werden weiterhin auch andere Maßnahmen bezuschusst, die ebenfalls für junge Menschen von Vorteil sein können.

Hierbei muss die Qualität im Mittelpunkt stehen. Die Kommission appelliert in ihrem Vorschlag für eine Empfehlung des Rates zum Qualitätsrahmen für Praktika an die Mitgliedstaaten, dafür zu sorgen, dass die Praktikanten nicht als billige oder kostenlose Arbeitskräfte gebraucht werden und die Qualität der Praktikantenstellen in der Union verbessert wird.

In der Ausbildung befindliche Personen sind unabhängig vom Alter in den Statistiken über Beschäftigte bzw. Arbeitslose weder erfasst noch davon ausgenommen. Dies entspricht den statistischen Definitionen der Internationalen Arbeitsorganisation. So gelten beispielsweise Personen mit einem Ausbildungsplatz oder einer bezahlten Praktikantenstelle als beschäftigt; in Ausbildung befindliche Menschen gelten als arbeitslos, wenn sie keine Arbeitsleistung erbringen, eine Arbeitsstelle suchen oder als vermittelbar betrachtet werden.

([1]) Europäischer Sozialfonds.
([2]) Europäischer Fonds für regionale Entwicklung.
([3]) Beschäftigungsinitiative für junge Menschen.
([4]) In Preisen von 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013317/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Youth employment guarantee

When young people, after completing their training, are forced, in the absence of a suitable job, to switch to a different sector or even to move to the low-wage sector, they often have no opportunity to switch back again later. Back in the autumn of last year, the Commission proposed a number of specific measures intended to tackle the high youth unemployment rate. In the meantime, the EU made additional funding available. From 2014 onwards, priority will be given to supporting young people, in particular in regions where youth unemployment is above 25%.

1. How much in the way of funding from which funds will be made available to tackle youth unemployment?

2. What amounts have been paid out or applied for to date?

3. What (control) measures will prevent (young) people being hidden away in qualification and training measures so that they disappear from the labour market statistics?

4. What means will be employed to prevent this funding simply being used to employ cheap trainees (in other words an EU subsidised 'generation of trainees') or leading to a proliferation of atypical employment relationships?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

Although it's not possible to determine how much has been spent on youth, 68% of ESF ([1]) budget for 2007-13 goes to projects that can benefit young people too. In 2012 many Member States mobilised ESF allocations to combat youth unemployment in connection with youth action teams. By the end of October 2013, EUR 4.2 billion ESF resources had been reallocated to measures benefitting a million young people and EUR 1.4 billion of that amount had already been committed to projects. Likewise, reallocation or acceleration of ERDF ([2]) resources available for these member states enabled to support 55000 SMEs in its effort to create or safeguard jobs in general.

The 2014-20 period will focus more on youth. The YEI ([3]) will provide the regions most affected by youth unemployment with at least EUR 6 billion ([4]) (3 billion from a specific allocation and at least another 3 billion from the ESF) to support the sustainable integration into the labour market of young people not in employment, education or training. The ESF will keep supporting other measures that can benefit young people.

This support should focus on quality. The Commission's proposal for a Council Recommendation on a Quality Framework for Traineeships asks Member States to ensure trainees are not used as cheap or free labour and to improve the quality of traineeships in the Union.

People (young or not) are neither included in nor excluded from employment or unemployment statistics by the mere fact of being in training. This is in line with the statistical definitions of the International Labour Organisation. For instance, persons in apprenticeships or paid traineeships are considered employed; persons in training are considered unemployed if they do not perform any work, are looking for work and are available to work.

([1]) European Social Fund.
([2]) European Regional Development Fund.
([3]) Youth Employment Initiative.
([4]) In 2011 prices.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-013319/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25. November 2013)

Betrifft: Abbruch der Verhandlungen mit der Ukraine — IPA-Gelder

Die Ukraine hat ihre Annäherung an die Europäische Union abgebrochen und orientiert sich nun wieder stärker in Richtung Russland. Dies liegt einerseits an den strikten Vorgaben im Zuge der Verhandlungen über das Assoziierungsabkommen, andererseits an den Forderungen hinsichtlich der inhaftierten früheren Ministerpräsidentin Julia Timoschenko und anderer Oppositionspolitiker.

Diesbezüglich heißt es, man müsse auch über die weitere Verwendung der EU-Gelder aus dem Instrument für Heranführungshilfe (IPA) entscheiden, mit der die EU Reformen in den beitrittswilligen Ländern durch finanzielle und technische Hilfe unterstützt.

Welche Auswirkungen hat dieser Abbruch der Verhandlungen auf die für die Ukraine im Rahmen des Instruments für Heranführungshilfe (IPA) vorgesehenen finanziellen Mittel?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(18. Februar 2014)

Die Ukraine ist kein Beitrittskandidat und profitiert daher nicht vom Instrument für Heranführungshilfe (IPA), sondern vielmehr vom Europäischen Nachbarschaftsinstrument.

Mitte November 2013 beschloss die Regierung der Ukraine, die Vorbereitungen für die Unterzeichnung des Assoziierungsabkommens EU-Ukraine, das auch die Errichtung einer vertieften und umfassenden Freihandelszone vorsieht, vorübergehend auszusetzen. Die EU engagiert sich weiterhin für eine engere politische Assoziierung und wirtschaftliche Integration der Ukraine, zu der auch die Unterzeichnung des Abkommens gehört, sobald die Ukraine dazu bereit ist.

Die EU unterstützt weiterhin die notwendigen sektoralen Reformen. Infolge der Fortschritte im Bereich der Verwaltung der öffentlichen Finanzen genehmigte die EU im November 2013 das Jahresaktionsprogramm 2013 für die Ukraine in Höhe von 186 Mio. EUR. Das Programm unterstützt langfristige Reformen in der Ukraine auf dem Weg der Integration in Richtung EU, die trotz der vorübergehend aufgeschobenen Unterzeichnung des Abkommens Teil der ukrainischen Politik bleiben.

Die Diskussion zwischen Parlament, Rat und Kommission über die Einzelheiten für die Programmierung ab 2014 ist noch nicht abgeschlossen. Die bisherigen Verhandlungen bestätigen, dass der Grundsatz „mehr für mehr“ künftige Entscheidungen über die Mittelzuweisungen für unsere Nachbarländer stark beeinflussen wird. In diesem Zusammenhang wird die Intensität der Beziehungen sicherlich auch bei der Festlegung der Höhe der Finanzierung mit berücksichtigt werden. Die Ukraine könnte somit mit einer Aufstockung der finanziellen Mittel rechnen, wenn der Weg zu Reformen, insbesondere in Richtung der Unterzeichnung des Abkommens, wieder eingeschlagen wird und Fortschritte bei der Vertiefung der Demokratie und der Stärkung der Menschenrechte gemacht werden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013319/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Abandonment of the negotiations with Ukraine — IPA funds

Ukraine has abandoned its plans to move closer to the European Union and is now once again aligning itself more closely with Russia. This is partly due to the strict requirements in connection with the negotiations on the association agreement and partly to the requirements relating to the imprisoned former Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko and other opposition politicians.

In this regard, a decision also has to be made concerning the further use of EU funds from the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA), which supports the EU reforms in the candidate countries by providing financial and technical assistance.

What impact will this abandonment of the negotiations have with regard to the financial resources intended to be provided to Ukraine within the framework of the IPA?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2014)

Ukraine is not a candidate country and as such it does not benefit from the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance, but rather from the European Neighbourhood Instrument.

In mid-November 2013, the Government of Ukraine decided to temporarily suspend the process of preparation for signature of the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement, including its Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (AA/DCFTA). The EU remains committed to a path of closer political association and economic integration with Ukraine, including the signing of the Agreement, as soon as Ukraine is ready.

The EU also remains committed to supporting necessary sector reforms. The EU approved an Annual Action Programme 2013 for Ukraine (worth EUR 186 million) in November 2013, following progress in the area of Public Finance Management. The Programme supports long-term reforms of Ukraine in its path of integration towards EU, which remain part of Ukrainian policy despite the temporary suspension of signature of the Agreement.

The details for the programming 2014-onwards are still under discussion between Parliament, Council and Commission. The negotiations so far confirm that the 'more for more principle' will strongly influence future decisions on country allocations for our neighbours. In this context, the level ambition of the relationship will certainly be factored in the level of funding. Ukraine could thus expect a higher level of funding if it resumes its path towards reforms, in particular towards signature of the Agreement, and progresses further in deep democracy and human rights.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013321/13
to the Commission
Vicky Ford (ECR)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: High-quality securitisations

Calls for the return of a properly functioning high-quality securitisation market have increased following the European Council's agreement to proceed with the Commission's and the European Investment Bank's initiative to boost SME lending through reliance on private-sector and capital market investments in SME securitisations.

Even prior to the Council's agreement, in May this year the President of the European Central Bank, Mario Draghi, called for a revival of high-quality 'good securitisations' to support the funding necessary to underpin economic recovery.

How does the Commission propose to define the principles determining high-quality securitisations in law and to ensure that they are differentiated from other forms of securitisation?

Can the Commission confirm that high-quality securitisations should receive a horizontally consistent treatment differentiating them from other forms of securitisation under prudential regulation, including capital, solvency and liquidity requirements?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(30 January 2014)

In the current context of funding constraints in Europe, securitisation constitutes an important instrument bridging banks and capital markets. Stakeholders and public authorities have actively supported the need to foster the recovery of safe and sustainable securitisation markets in Europe. The Commission is following this development with interest, as indicated in its Green Paper on long-term financing, published in March 2013.

In response to a request from the Commission, an approach differentiating 'high quality' securitisations has been advocated in the insurance sector by EIOPA's technical report on standard formula, design and calibration for certain long-term investments, adopted in December 2013. A detailed list of criteria has been proposed related to (i) structural features, (ii) underlying assets and related collateral characteristics, (iii) listing and transparency features and (iv) underwriting processes.

This approach appears promising and the Commission will explore the possibility of incorporating such an approach in the Solvency 2 Delegated Acts setting out the calculation of insurers' capital requirements. The Commission will also reflect on whether a similar approach should be adopted for other financial sectors to ensure a consistent approach for securitisation products taken into account the specificities of each sector.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-013322/13
à la Commission
Agnès Le Brun (PPE)
(25 novembre 2013)

Objet: Politique commerciale de l'Union européenne et Droits de l'homme

Depuis plusieurs années, des organisations non gouvernementales dénoncent les agissements de la compagnie brésilienne Yaguarete Pora, qui importe du bœuf vers l'Union européenne. Cette entreprise a été sanctionnée par le gouvernement paraguayen pour avoir détruit, en grande partie, la forêt qui abrite des Indiens de la tribu Ayoreo-Totobiegosode au Paraguay.

L'Union européenne conditionne l'exportation de produits en provenance de pays tiers vers l'Union à un certain nombre de normes. Je m'interroge donc sur l'existence de normes en matière de respect des Droits de l'homme dans le cadre de la politique commerciale de l'Union.

1. Dans le cadre de la politique commerciale de l'Union, la Commission peut-elle exiger le respect des Droits de l'homme par des entreprises de pays tiers exportant des produits vers l'Union?

2. Si la Commission est compétente en la matière, quels sont les moyens à sa disposition pour garantir le respect de ces exigences?

3. La Commission envisage-t-elle de prendre des mesures concernant les accusations à l'encontre de l'entreprise Yaguarete Pora?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(4 février 2014)

L'Union européenne attache une grande importance à la défense des Droits de l'homme à divers niveaux, dans des forums tant bilatéraux que multilatéraux, grâce aux divers moyens d'action dont elle dispose. Sa politique commerciale vise principalement à promouvoir un commerce libre et équitable sur les marchés mondiaux. Conjuguée à d'autres instruments, elle peut contribuer à faire progresser les Droits de l'homme et la protection de l'environnement.

La Commission est informée des allégations relatives aux pratiques de la compagnie brésilienne Yaguarete Pora dans la forêt qui abrite les indiens Ayoreo et suit de près cette affaire par l'intermédiaire de la délégation de l'Union à Asunción.

Bien qu'elle ne soit pas habilitée à exiger d'entreprises de pays tiers qu'elles respectent les Droits de l'homme, la Commission promeut les aspects internationaux de la responsabilité sociale des entreprises (RSE), tels qu'ils sont définis dans sa stratégie en la matière ([1]), laquelle s'appuie notamment sur des principes et lignes directrices internationalement reconnus, tels que les principes directeurs de l'OCDE à l'intention des entreprises multinationales et les principes directeurs des Nations unies relatifs aux entreprises et aux Droits de l'homme. Ainsi, l'OCDE prévoit le recours à un mécanisme de réclamation d'accompagnement par lequel les allégations de non-respect de ses principes peuvent être portées à l'attention d'un point de contact national établi par les gouvernements qui ont souscrit à ces derniers, l'objectif étant d'examiner ces allégations et de tenter d'instaurer une médiation entre l'entreprise et les autres parties concernées. Le Brésil adhère aux principes directeurs de l'OCDE et son point de contact national peut contribuer à la résolution des problèmes liés au non-respect de ceux-ci.

([1]) COM(2011) 681 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013322/13
to the Commission
Agnès Le Brun (PPE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: European Union's commercial policy and human rights

Non-governmental organisations have been criticising the practices of the Brazilian company Yaguarete Pora, which imports beef into the European Union, for several years now. The company has been fined by the Paraguayan Government for destroying large swathes of a forest in Paraguay which is home to the Ayoreo-Totobiegosode tribe.

The European Union demands that exports of goods from third countries to the EU meet a number of standards. I would therefore like to ask which human rights standards are incorporated into the EU's commercial policy.

1. Can the Commission ensure that the EU's commercial policy includes a requirement for third-country companies exporting goods to the EU to respect human rights?

2. If the Commission is competent in this area, what means are at its disposal to ensure that this requirement is met?

3. Does the Commission intend to take any action in connection with the allegations made against Yaguarete Pora?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(4 February 2014)

The EU attaches great importance to promoting human rights at various levels in both bilateral and multilateral fora, through its different policy tools. EU trade policy's main aim is to promote free and fair trade in global markets. In combination with other instruments, trade policy can contribute to promoting human rights and environmental protection.

The Commission is aware of the allegations regarding the practices of the Brazilian company in the Ayoreo forest and is following this issue closely through the EU Delegation in Asuncion.

Although the Commission has no authority to impose human rights requirements on third-country companies, it promotes international aspects of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as outlined in its strategy on CSR ([1]), including the internationally recognised principles and guidelines, such as the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (MNEs) and the UN Guiding Principles on business and human rights. The OECD Guidelines provide for an accompanying grievance mechanism whereby allegations of non-respect of the Guidelines can be brought to the attention of a National Contact Point (NCP) established by adhering governments to investigate the allegations and seek to mediate between the enterprise and other concerned parties. Brazil adheres to the OECD Guidelines and its NCP can assist in resolving matters related to non-respect of the Guidelines.

([1]) COM(2011) 681 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-013323/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(25 de novembro de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Colaboração entre a Agência Nacional de Segurança e a CIA em ataques ilegais com aviões não-tripulados (drones)

Pelo menos 22 pessoas morreram nos últimos dias em consequência de cinco bombardeamentos efetuados no Afeganistão por aviões não-tripulados norte-americanos.

Estes atentados ocorreram dias depois de o relator especial da ONU sobre a luta antiterrorista ter divulgado uma versão preliminar do seu relatório, no qual afirma que o total de vítimas civis dos bombardeamentos com aquelas aeronaves supera em muito o número admitido por Washington.

Antecedendo o encontro na Casa Branca entre o primeiro-ministro paquistanês, Nawaz Sharif, e o presidente dos EUA, Barack Obama, a Amnistia Internacional caucionou os dados apurados pelo Gabinete de Jornalismo Investigativo, segundo o qual, desde 2004, os cerca de 400 bombardeamentos com drones levados a cabo nos distritos do Paquistão que fazem fronteira com o Afeganistão causaram entre 2 500 e 3 600 mortes.

Segundo notícias recentemente divulgadas, a Agência Nacional de Segurança e a CIA colaboram estreitamente no lançamento destes ataques ilegais com aviões não-tripulados (drones), nomeadamente usando os também ilegais programas de espionagem das comunicações globais para precisarem os alvos.

Assim, pergunto à Alta-Representante:

Pretende levar a cabo diligências tendo em vista a celebração de um acordo internacional para pôr fim a este tipo de armamento (drones)?

Tendo em conta que estamos perante uma clara e sistemática violação de direitos humanos por parte dos EUA, incluindo o mais fundamental direito à vida, que implicação daqui retira no plano das relações UE-EUA?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(30 de janeiro de 2014)

A Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente, tem o prazer de remeter os Senhores Deputados para a sua resposta à pergunta escrita E-013224/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013323/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Collaboration between the National Security Agency and the CIA in illegal drone attacks

At least 22 people have been killed in recent days as a result of five US drone strikes in Afghanistan.

These attacks come just days after the UN Special Rapporteur on counter-terrorism released his interim report, according to which the total number of civilians killed by drone strikes is much higher than claimed by Washington.

Ahead of the meeting at the White House between the Pakistani Prime Minister, Nawaz Sharif, and the President of the United States, Barack Obama, Amnesty International corroborated the Bureau of Investigative Journalism's figures, according to which around 400 drone strikes carried out in the border regions between Pakistan and Afghanistan have killed between 2 500 and 3 600 people since 2004.

According to recent reports, the National Security Agency and the CIA work in close collaboration to launch such illegal drone attacks, particularly by illegally spying on global communications to establish targets.

Does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to take steps to conclude an international agreement to put an end to this kind of weapon (drones)?

Given that we are dealing with a clear and systematic violation of human rights by the US, including the most fundamental right to life, what implications does this have for EU-US relations?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President would like to refer the Honourable Members to her answer to Written Question E-013224/2013.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-013324/13
komissiolle
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(25. marraskuuta 2013)

Aihe: Komission tiedot Romanian koiratarhojen tilanteesta

Romania on viime aikoina ollut kyseenalaisessa julkisuudessa liittyen sen epäinhimilliseen tapaan hallita kulkukoirakantojaan. Euroopan unionilla ei ole lainsäädännöllistä toimivaltaa puuttua kulkueläinten huonoon kohteluun jäsenvaltioissa, mutta sillä on valtaa puuttua EU-rahoituksen käyttöön.

Onko komissio selvittänyt tai aikeissa selvittää, käytetäänkö EU-varoja Romaniassa suoraan tai välillisesti koiratarhojen ylläpitoon tai koirapopulaatioiden hallintaan?

Onko komissio tietoinen tiedotuskampanjasta, jossa Romanian viranomaiset teiden varsilla harhaanjohtavasti mainostavat kulkukoirien adoptio-ohjelmaa tarkoituksenaan kuitenkin löytää ja tappaa tällä keinolla lisää koiria?

Craiovan pormestari on ilmoittanut kaupungin koiratarhojen noudattavan EU-normeja. Onko Euroopan unionilla lainsäädäntöä, joka määrittelisi kulkueläinten suojia ja hoitoa koskevat vähimmäisvaatimukset?

Onko komissio tietoinen, millä summalla EU rahoittaa Romanian 10-vuotista rabieksen torjuntaohjelmaa?

Torjuntaohjelmien vähimmäisvaatimuksissa todetaan, että ohjelman on oltava tehokas ollakseen oikeutettu EU-tukeen. Rabiestapaukset Romanian kotieläinpopulaatiossa ovat viime vuosina lisääntyneet, eivät vähentyneet. Pitääkö komissio Romanian rabiestorjuntaohjelmaa EU-säännelyn tarkoittamassa mielessä tehokkaana?

Tonio Borgin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(24. tammikuuta 2014)

Arvoisaa parlamentin jäsentä pyydetään tutustumaan kirjallisiin kysymyksiin E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011, E-002062/2013 ja E-005276/2013 ([1]) annettuihin vastauksiin, joissa käsitellään kulkukoiriin ja koirakantojen hallintaan liittyviä asioita.

Komissio on saanut useita valituksia, jotka koskevat kulkukoirien hyvinvointia ja hallintaa Romaniassa. Näin ollen vastaus on julkaistu Euroopan unionin virallisessa lehdessä. ([2])

Raivotaudin hallintaan Romaniassa liittyen unioni osallistuu luonnonvaraisille ketuille – jotka ovat taudin luonnollisia kantajia ja joista tauti leviää muihin lajeihin, myös koiriin – suun kautta annettavan rokotuksen levittämiskampanjoiden rahoitukseen. Suun kautta tapahtuva rokottaminen käynnistettiin vasta vuonna 2013, joten tässä vaiheessa on ennenaikaista odottaa ilmeisiä vaikutuksia taudin esiintyvyyteen.

EU:lla ei ole asiassa toimivaltaa, joten komissio ei voi rahoittaa kulkukoirien hallintaohjelmia.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) EUVL C 343, 23.11.2013, s. 23.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013324/13
to the Commission
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Commission's information on the situation with regard to Romania's dog kennels

Recently, Romania has been the subject of dubious publicity regarding its inhumane way of controlling its stray dog populations. The European Union does not have the legislative competence to do anything about the poor treatment of stray animals in Member States, but it does have the power to look into the use of EU funding.

Has the Commission investigated, or does it intend to investigate, whether or not EU funds are being used in Romania directly or indirectly to maintain kennels or control dog populations?

Is the Commission aware of the publicity campaign in which the Romanian authorities misleadingly advertise a stray dog adoption programme on roadside hoardings, with the intention, however, of finding and killing more dogs in this way?

The Mayor of Craiova has said that his city's dog kennels comply with EU standards. Does the European Union have any legislation that would prescribe minimum requirements for the care of, and shelters for, stray animals?

Is the Commission aware of the sum involved in the EU's financing of Romania's ten-year rabies protection programme?

The minimum requirements for such programmes state that the programme must be effective enough to be eligible for EU aid. The number of rabies cases among the Romanian stray animal population has increased, and not decreased, in recent times. Does the Commission consider the rabies protection programme to be effective in the sense referred to in EU regulations?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(24 January 2014)

The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the answers to written questions E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011, E-002062/2012 and E-005276/2013 ([1]) which address the issues of stray dogs and of dog population management.

The Commission has received a series of complaints about the welfare and management of stray dogs in Romania. In consequence a response has been published in the Official Journal ([2]).

For the control of rabies in Romania, the Union is co-funding the implementation of oral vaccination campaigns for wild foxes, the reservoir of the disease for all other species, including dogs. Country-wide oral vaccination only commenced in 2013, it is therefore premature to expect obvious effects on the disease prevalence at this stage.

EU competences do not allow the Commission to fund stray dogs control programs.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) OJ C 343, 23.11.2013, p. 23.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013325/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Aeropuertos regionales

El Prat fue el aeropuerto español con más pasajeros en agosto gracias al sector del turismo ([1]) y, por lo tanto, este es uno de los sectores clave para reactivar la economía catalana.

El pasado 18 de noviembre, Aena negó a las instituciones catalanas su participación en la gestión de El Prat ([2]). Ni la Generalitat, ni el Ayuntamiento de Barcelona, ni la Cámara de Comercio tendrán voz o voto en la gestión del aeropuerto, decisión que limita considerablemente la estrategia turística en Cataluña porque, aunque la Generalitat tiene competencia exclusiva en materia de turismo, esta acción estratégica se ve muy limitada al no poder gestionar el aeropuerto de Barcelona ([3]).

A la vista de lo anterior,

¿Está esta situación en línea con la Comunicación de la Comisión sobre «Política aeroportuaria de la UE» (COM(2011)0823)?

¿Cree la Comisión que la decisión del Gobierno español cumple las directrices del informe 2011/2196(INI) del Parlamento Europeo sobre el futuro de los aeropuertos regionales y los servicios aéreos en la EU?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de enero de 2014)

Las disposiciones relativas a la gestión de los aeropuertos de los Estados miembros no quedan contempladas en la Comunicación sobre política aeroportuaria de la UE a la que hace referencia en su pregunta. Dicha Comunicación plantea una serie de cuestiones que la Comisión considera de importancia para hacer frente a los retos de capacidad y calidad en los aeropuertos europeos, pero no extrae conclusiones sobre el modelo de propiedad o las estructuras de gestión de los aeropuertos a nivel individual.

La Comisión no se pronuncia en cuanto a si las actuales estructuras de gestión del aeropuerto de Barcelona El Prat son conformes a las directrices expuestas en el informe del Parlamento Europeo sobre los aeropuertos regionales al que se refiere en su pregunta.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20130910/54382259049/prat-aeropuerto-espanol-mas-pasajeros-agosto.html
([2]) http://ccaa.elpais.com/ccaa/2013/11/18/catalunya/1384795154_705579.html
([3]) http://www.gencat.cat/generalitat/cat/estatut1979/titol_primer.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013325/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Regional airports

El Prat was the Spanish airport which had the most passengers in August 2013 thanks to the tourist industry ([1]), and consequently this is one of the key sectors involved in getting Catalonia's economy moving again.

On 18 November 2013, Aena refused to allow Catalan institutions to participate in the management of El Prat ([2]). Neither the Autonomous Government, nor the City of Barcelona, nor the Chamber of Commerce will be entitled to speak or vote on the management of the airport, a decision that places considerable limitations on Catalonia's tourist strategy because, although the Autonomous Government has exclusive competence in the field of tourism, this strategic action is extremely limited, as it is unable to manage Barcelona airport ([3]).

In view of the above:

Does this situation tally with the Commission communication on airport policy in the European Union (COM(2011)0823)?

Does the Commission believe that the Spanish Government's decision is in line with the guidelines set out in European Parliament report 2011/2196(INI) on the future of regional airports and air services in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

Arrangements for the management of airports in the Member States are not covered by the communication on airport policy referred to in the question. That communication set out a number of issues which the Commission considers to be important for meeting capacity and quality challenges at European airports, but it does not draw conclusions on the ownership model or management structures of individual airports.

The Commission has no opinion as to whether the management structures in operation at Barcelona El Prat are in line with guidelines set out in the European Parliament's report on regional airports referred to in the question.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20130910/54382259049/prat-aeropuerto-espanol-mas-pasajeros-agosto.html
([2]) http://ccaa.elpais.com/ccaa/2013/11/18/catalunya/1384795154_705579.html
([3]) http://www.gencat.cat/generalitat/cat/estatut1979/titol_primer.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013326/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: PPC: Modelo de gestión para el Mediterráneo

Según muchos expertos del sector pesquero, la reforma aprobada recientemente en el pleno celebrado en Estrasburgo del 23 de octubre de 2013 parece que intentaría importar al Mediterráneo el modelo de gestión del Atlántico, por ejemplo, la gestión de las ITQ.

A la luz de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta lo aprobado en la sesión parlamentaria del 23 de octubre de 2013,

1. ¿Cómo va a posibilitar la Comisión que se transfieran las ITQ en un mar como el Mediterráneo en el que la flota de bajura no gestiona TACS o CUOTAS y que practica pesquerías de modalidades multiespecíficas?

2. ¿Cree la Comisión que existen unos riesgos al mercantilizar el acceso a los recursos?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de enero de 2014)

De conformidad con el artículo 21 del Reglamento del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, sobre la política pesquera común ([1]), los Estados miembros pueden establecer un sistema de concesiones de pesca transferibles, también denominadas en ocasiones cuotas individuales transferibles (ITQ, en sus siglas en inglés). Dichas concesiones se aplican en los casos en que se han fijado posibilidades de pesca cuantificables, ya sea en términos de limitaciones de las capturas o del esfuerzo pesquero (días de mar).

La nueva política pesquera común no obliga a los Estados miembros a introducir sistemas de este tipo.

El propósito de los Estados miembros que aplican sistemas de concesiones de pesca transferibles es aportar flexibilidad y racionalización a las flotas en lo que respecta a su adaptación a las posibilidades de pesca. Corresponde a los Estados miembros gestionar las concesiones de pesca transferibles de tal modo que se evite cualquier efecto indeseado derivado de las mismas.

([1]) Reglamento (UE) n° 1380/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013326/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: CFP: Management model for the Mediterranean

According to many experts in the fishing sector, the reform recently approved during the plenary session held in Strasbourg on 23 October 2013 seems to be an attempt to import the Atlantic management model to the Mediterranean, for example the management of ITQs.

In view of the above, and considering what was approved in the parliamentary session of 23 October 2013,

1. How will the Commission make it possible to transfer ITQs to a sea such as the Mediterranean, where the inshore fleet does not manage TACs or QUOTAS and practises multispecific fishing?

2. Does the Commission think there are any risks in commercialising access to resources?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

According to Article 21 of the regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the common fisheries policy ([1]), Member States may establish a system of transferrable fishing concessions (TFCs), which are sometimes referred to as Individual Transferable Quotas (ITQs). Such concessions are applied where quantifiable fishing opportunities, either in terms of catch limitations or in terms of effort limits (days at sea), have been established.

The new Common Fisheries Policy does not oblige Member States to introduce such systems.

Member States who apply TFC systems do so to introduce flexibility and rationalization in the fleets as regards adjustment to the fishing opportunities. It is for the Member States to manage TFC in a way to avoid any unwanted effects thereof.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013327/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: PPC: Aspectos sociales

En las diferentes reformas de la Política Pesquera Común desde el año 2000 hasta hoy, siempre se ha mantenido un criterio expansionista, que ha permitido, cuando no alentado, un crecimiento exponencial de la flota comunitaria en tamaño y en capacidad pesquera. Los pescadores, casi todos gente emprendedora, abrazaron mayoritariamente estas reformas con el consiguiente endeudamiento, de tal forma que si esta propuesta se adopta ahora definitivamente así, la depreciación de los bienes y los equipos será absoluta.

A la luz de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta lo aprobado en la sesión parlamentaria del día 23 de octubre de 2013,

1. ¿Está la Comisión estudiando alternativas para atemperar estas consecuencias?

2. ¿Habrá un Plan de Reconversión del Sector Pesquero del Mediterráneo con énfasis especial en los trabajadores del sector?

3. ¿Cree la Comisión que, debido al cambio normativo, vamos a ver cómo el sector pierde progresivamente empleo y se cierran empresas?

4. ¿Cuál es la opinión de los sindicatos?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de febrero de 2014)

Su Señoría hace referencia a la votación sobre el Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de la Pesca (FEMP) en el Pleno de 23 de octubre de 2013. Los debates sobre el FEMP entre los colegisladores siguen su curso.

A lo largo de la última década, uno de los principales objetivos de la Política Pesquera Común de la UE ha sido adaptar la capacidad de pesca a los recursos pesqueros. En consonancia con los esfuerzos realizados al efecto, las ayudas públicas de la UE a la construcción naval se eliminaron gradualmente hasta darse por terminadas a finales de 2004.

El resultado de estos esfuerzos ha sido la reducción progresiva del tamaño de la flota pesquera de la UE. Así por ejemplo, hasta la fecha se han desguazado más de 4 000 buques con el apoyo del Fondo Europeo de la Pesca.

La flota pesquera de la UE tiene todavía bolsas de sobrecapacidad. La propuesta de la Comisión para el FEMP contiene disposiciones de apoyo a la transición hacia prácticas pesqueras más sostenibles con vistas a fomentar el crecimiento y el empleo. Además, la nueva Política Pesquera Común contiene diversas medidas, como la pesca a los niveles de rendimiento máximo sostenible, que ayudarán a aumentar el número de poblaciones explotadas a niveles sostenibles. Hasta la fecha se ha triplicado el número de poblaciones sostenibles de 9 en 2010 a 27 en 2014, con un aumento adicional previsto hasta 30 en 2015. De esta forma aumentarán los ingresos en el sector pesquero y se creará empleo.

Las propuestas de reforma de la Política Pesquera Común y del FEMP presentadas por la Comisión se sometieron a amplias consultas públicas y tanto las partes interesadas del sector como la sociedad civil tuvieron ocasión de expresar sus opiniones en el momento de la evaluación de impacto que apoyó la reforma de la PPC ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/impact_assessments_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013327/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Social aspects of the common fisheries policy

In the various reforms of the common fisheries policy since 2000 up to now, there has always been an expansionist approach that has enabled, if not encouraged, the Community fleet to grow exponentially in size and fishing capacity. Fishermen, almost all enterprising people, have largely supported these reforms, with the debt burden they bring, such that if this proposal is definitively adopted now, the value of goods and equipment will utterly collapse.

In view of what was adopted in the plenary session of 23 October 2013:

1. Is the Commission looking into alternatives to mitigate these consequences?

2. Will there be a conversion plan for the Mediterranean fishing sector, with a particular focus on workers in the sector?

3. Does the Commission think that, due to the regulatory change, we will gradually see job losses and business closures in the sector?

4. What is its view of unions?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(12 February 2014)

The Honourable MEP refers to the plenary vote on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) on 23 October 2013. Discussions on the EMFF between the co-legislators are still ongoing.

Over the last decade, one of the main objectives of the EU's Common Fisheries Policy has been to adapt fishing capacity to fishing resources. As part of these efforts, EU public support for vessel construction was phased out by end 2004.

The result of these efforts has been a progressive reduction of the size of the EU fishing fleet. By way of example, to date more than 4 000 vessels have been scrapped with support from the European Fisheries Fund.

The EU fishing fleet still has pockets of overcapacity. The Commission's proposal for the EMFF includes provisions to support a transition to more sustainable fishing practices with a view to fostering more growth and jobs. Furthermore the new Common Fisheries Policy includes various measures, such as fishing at Maximum Sustainable Yield levels, that will help to increase the number of stocks fished at sustainable level. To date we have tripled the number of sustainable stocks from 9 in 2010 to 27 in 2014 with a further expected increase to 30 in 2015. This will increase the incomes in the fishing industry and help create new jobs.

The Commission's proposals for the reform of the common fisheries policy and the EMFF were subject to extensive public consultations where stakeholders across the sector as well as civil society were able to voice their views at the time of the impact assessment supporting the CFP reform ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/impact_assessments_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013328/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Small-scale coastal fishing

Ante la restrictiva definición de flota costera adoptada o la *small-scale coastal fishing*, donde se limita la inclusión de las embarcaciones de menos de doce metros de eslora y se excluyen las modalidades de arrastre según la definición del cuadro 3 del Anexo I del Reglamento (CE) n° 26/2004, y teniendo en cuenta lo aprobado en sesión parlamentaria el 23 de octubre de 2013:

¿Considera esta definición adaptada a la realidad de la flota de bajura del Mediterráneo, en particular, a la de la Península Ibérica?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013329/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Artes menores artesanales y pesca costera artesanal (small-scale coastal fishing)

La definición de flota costera adoptada o la de pesca costera artesanal (*small-scale coastal fishing*) excluye a las modalidades de cerco de pequeños pelágicos, arrastre de fondo, dragas y sonseras, con independencia de la eslora y a las embarcaciones de artes menores y palangre de más de 12 metros de eslora.

A la luz de lo anterior, y teniendo en cuenta lo aprobado en sesión parlamentaria el 23 de octubre de 2013, ¿es la Comisión conocedora de que muchas de estas modalidades son consideradas en el ordenamiento jurídico interno como artes menores artesanales?

Respuesta conjunta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de febrero de 2014)

Su Señoría hace referencia a la votación sobre el Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de la Pesca (FEMP) en el Pleno del Parlamento Europeo de 23 de octubre de 2013.

La definición de pesca costera artesanal que figura en la propuesta relativa al FEMP sigue siendo la misma que la utilizada hasta ahora en la Política Pesquera Común. Ni el Consejo ni el Parlamento Europeo han modificado la definición de pesca costera artesanal durante los debates sobre el FEMP. La Comisión no ha propuesto cambiar la definición porque la actual es bien conocida, comprendida y utilizada por las autoridades de ordenación y las partes interesadas. Además, esta definición abarca aproximadamente el 80 % de todos los buques pesqueros de la UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013328/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Small-scale coastal fishing

In view of the strict definition of small-scale coastal fishing, which, according to the definition in table 3 in Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 26/2004, only includes vessels less than 12 metres in length not using towed gear, and in view of what was adopted in the plenary session of 23 October 2013:

Does the Commission think that the definition reflects the reality of the Mediterranean coastal fleet, particularly that of the Iberian Peninsula?

Question for written answer E-013329/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Small-scale gears and small-scale coastal fishing

The definition of small-scale coastal fishing does not include seine fishing for small pelagic species, bottom trawls, dredges and 'sonseras', irrespective of the length of the vessel, or vessels over 12 metres in length with small-scale gear and longlines.

In view of what was adopted in the plenary session of 23 October 2013, is the Commission aware that many of these fishing gears are considered small-scale gears in Spanish law?

Joint answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(12 February 2014)

The Honourable Member refers to the plenary vote on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) at the European Parliament on 23 October 2013.

The definition of small-scale coastal fishing contained in the EMFF proposal remains as used until now in the common fisheries policy. Neither the Council nor the European Parliament has made any changes to the definition of small-scale coastal fishing during the EMFF discussions. The Commission did not propose to change the definition, because the current definition is well known, understood and widely used by managing authorities and stakeholders. Furthermore this definition covers approximately 80% of all fishing vessels in the EU.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013330/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Comité Consultivo del Mediterráneo

El 27 de marzo de 2012, el RAC MED (Comité Consultivo del Mediterráneo) aprobó un dictamen sobre la propuesta de Reglamento FEAMP ([1]).

A la luz de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta lo aprobado en sesión parlamentaria el 23 de octubre de 2013:

¿Cree la Comisión que son las entidades quienes deben colaborar con las administraciones comunitarias para trasladar el parecer de los diferentes sectores que actúan como interlocutores pesqueros según la propia normativa comunitaria de creación de las mismas?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de febrero de 2014)

De conformidad con el nuevo Reglamento básico sobre la Política Pesquera Común (UE n° 1380/2013), se han creado Consejos Consultivos para contribuir a la implementación de la Política Pesquera Común (PPC) y al fomento de sus objetivos. En estos consejos deben estar representadas de forma equilibrada todas las partes interesadas con un 60 % de representantes de los Pescadores, los operadores de la acuicultura, y representantes de los sectores de la transformación y la comercialización, y un 40 % de representantes de otros grupos interesados, tales como agrupaciones ecologistas o de consumidores. La PPC abarca, por una parte, la conservación de los recursos biológicos marinos y la gestión de las pesquerías y de las flotas que explotan esos recursos y, por otra parte, las medidas de mercado y financieras de apoyo a la aplicación de las medidas de conservación y gestión anteriormente mencionadas.

La participación de los Consejos Consultivos en la implementación de la PCC está limitada por las zonas geográficas o ámbitos de competencia correspondientes establecidos en el anexo III y por la definición de sus cometidos en el artículo 44 del Reglamento (UE) n° 1380/2013.

([1]) P7_TA-PROV(2013)0441.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013330/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Advisory Council for the Mediterranean

On 27 March 2012, the Regional Advisory Council for the Mediterranean (RAC MED) adopted a report on the proposal for a regulation on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) ([1]).

In view of what was adopted in the plenary session of 23 October 2013:

Does the Commission think that those bodies that represent the fishing industry, in accordance with the EC law that establishes them, should work with the Community authorities to express the opinion of the various sectors?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(12 February 2014)

In line with the new basic regulation on the common fisheries policy (EU No 1380/2013), the Advisory Councils are established to contribute to the implementation of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) and to the promotion of its objectives. Their composition must ensure a balanced representation of all stakeholders in a ratio of 60% representatives of fishermen, aquaculture operators and representatives of the processing and marketing sector and 40% of representatives of other interest groups, for example environmental or consumer groups. The CFP covers, on the one hand, the conservation of marine biological resources and the management of fisheries and fleets exploiting such resources and, on the other hand, measures on markets and financial measures in support of the implementation of the abovementioned conservation and management measures.

The involvement of the Advisory Councils in the implementation of the CFP is constrained by their geographical areas or fields of competence set out in Annex III and by the definition of their tasks in Article 44 of the regulation No 1380/2013.

([1]) P7_TA-PROV(2013)0441.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013331/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: PPC: cadena trófica y red Natura 2000

El tratamiento de los descartes en la nueva Política Pesquera Común (PPC) genera bastantes incertidumbres. La pérdida de alimento para la cadena trófica puede tener efectos perversos ya no sólo para las aves acuáticas que perderían una parte importante de su alimento, sino también en zonas especialmente protegidas como, por ejemplo, la red Natura 2000.

A la luz de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta lo aprobado en sesión parlamentaria el 23 de octubre de 2013, ¿cuáles son los elementos que ha considerado la Comisión para evitar dicha pérdida de alimento para la cadena trófica y proteger la red Natura 2000?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de enero de 2014)

La captura y el descarte de peces no deseados, además de suponer un despilfarro de los recursos pesqueros explotados, conlleva efectos adversos para el medio ambiente y repercusiones negativas para nuestros ecosistemas. La eliminación de los descartes como tal contribuirá a que las cadenas tróficas recuperen un estado más natural. En particular, los hábitos alimentarios de las aves marinas volverán a basarse en una dieta y unos comportamientos más naturales, lo que contribuirá a la mejora del estado medioambiental de los mares europeos, tanto dentro como fuera de los espacios de la red Natura 2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013331/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: CFP: the food chain and the Natura 2000 network

The treatment of discards in the new common fisheries policy (CFP) is generating a fair amount of uncertainty. A loss of food to the food chain can have negative effects not only for waterfowl, which would lose a significant portion of their food, but also in specially protected areas such as the Natura 2000 network.

In view of the above and taking into account what was approved in the plenary sitting of 23 October 2013, what aspects has the Commission considered to prevent the abovementioned loss of food to the food chain and to protect the Natura 2000 network?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

The capture and discarding of unwanted fish, apart from being a waste of yield from exploited fish stocks, represents an undesirable impact on the environment and a negative effect on our ecosystems. As such the elimination of discarding will help return food chains towards a more natural state. In particular, the food and feeding habits of seabirds will revert towards a natural diet and more natural behaviour. This will constitute a contribution to improving the environmental status of European Seas, both inside and outside Natura 2000 areas.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013332/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: PPC: descartes

El tratamiento de los descartes en la nueva PPC puede generar bastantes incertidumbres. De hecho, en el sector pesquero catalán, se han hecho ingentes esfuerzos para evitar la reintroducción en el mercado de los inmaduros, práctica de la que, en la actualidad, podemos decir que está generalmente erradicada de nuestros puertos.

A la luz de lo anterior, y teniendo en cuenta lo aprobado en la sesión plenaria del 23 de octubre de 2013, ¿cree la Comisión que puede existir un temor a que, con la obligación de desembarcar los descartes, se produzca una reintroducción en el mercado de los inmaduros? ¿Cuáles cree la Comisión que serán sus efectos con la nueva política?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de enero de 2014)

El objetivo que se persigue con la obligación de desembarcar introducida por la nueva política pesquera común (PPC) ([1]) es animar a los pescadores a mejorar la selectividad a fin de evitar y reducir en la medida de lo posible las capturas de peces que se encuentren por debajo de las tallas mínimas de referencia para la conservación, establecidas para garantizar la protección de los inmaduros. Sin embargo, puede resultar inevitable que se produzcan algunas capturas de peces por debajo de estas tallas mínimas de referencia. Con el fin de eliminar cualquier incentivo para la captura de inmaduros, la utilización de dichos peces se limita estrictamente a usos distintos del consumo humano. La intención es que los pescadores no obtengan beneficios por la venta de estas capturas, a pesar de que los correspondientes costes de manipulación y transporte pueden quedar cubiertos.

El 27 de enero, la Comisión va a poner en marcha una campaña de comunicación a nivel de la UE para aumentar la sensibilización sobre las ventajas de la nueva política. Como parte de la campaña, se va a organizar un evento en el que se invitará a las partes interesadas (pescadores, científicos, el sector del comercio, colegios, jefes de cocina y la sociedad civil) a intercambiar ideas sobre la manera de influir en los comportamientos, a través de una mejor información sobre lo catastrófico que puede resultar el hábito de consumir inmaduros como exquisitez culinaria, especialmente en los países de la cuenca mediterránea.

En el marco de la evaluación de impacto en la que se basó la reforma de la PPC, se evaluaron exhaustivamente los efectos de las medidas de reducción de los descartes ([2]). Este análisis puso de manifiesto que, aunque la introducción de una política para combatir los descartes daría lugar a pérdidas económicas a corto plazo, aportaría beneficios adicionales a medio y largo plazo, principalmente en términos medioambientales y económicos.

La Comisión llevará a cabo un seguimiento del impacto durante el período de introducción progresiva de la política y solicitará asesoramiento a los organismos científicos pertinentes si fuera necesario. Asimismo, se proporcionará financiación a los proyectos de investigación para evaluar las repercusiones de la obligación de desembarcar en el marco de Horizonte 2020.

([1]) Reglamento (UE) n° 1380/2013 (DO L 354 de 28.12.2013).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/discards/index_en.htmf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013332/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: CFP: discards

The treatment of discards in the new common fisheries policy (CFP) is likely to generate a fair amount of uncertainty. In fact, in the Catalan fishing sector, an enormous effort has been made to prevent the reintroduction of immature fish onto the market, a practice which we can currently say has virtually been eradicated from our ports.

In view of the above and taking into account what was approved in the plenary sitting of 23 October 2013, does the Commission think there may be a fear, with the obligation to land the discards, of immature fish being reintroduced onto the market? What does the Commission think will be the effects of the new policy?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(27 January 2014)

Under the landing obligation introduced under the new Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) ([1]), the objective is to encourage fishermen to improve selectivity to avoid and reduce as far as possible catches of fish below minimum conservation reference sizes established to ensure the protection of juvenile fish. However, some catches of fish below minimum conservation references sizes may be inevitable. In order to remove any incentive to target juvenile fish, the use of such fish is strictly limited to uses other than for human consumption. The intention is that fishermen should not make profit from selling such catches, though their costs for handling and transportation can be covered.

On 27th January, the Commission is launching an EU-wide communication campaign to raise awareness on the benefits of the new policy. Part of the campaign is an event which invites stakeholders (fishermen, scientists, the commerce sector, schools, chefs and the civil society) to exchange ideas on how to influence behaviour, through better information on the catastrophic habit of consuming juveniles as a food delicacy, especially in the Mediterranean countries.

As part of the impact assessment to support the CFP reform, the impact of discard reducing policies was comprehensively assessed ([2]). This analysis showed that the introduction of an anti-discard policy would result in short-term economic losses but medium to long-term additional gains, primarily in environmental and economic terms.

The Commission will monitor the impacts during the phasing-in period and seek advice from the relevant scientific bodies as and when required. Funding for research projects to evaluate the effects of the landing obligation will also be available under Horizon 2020.

([1]) Regulation EU (No) 1380/2013, OJ L354, 28.12.2013.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/discards/index_en.htmf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013333/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Política Pesquera Común — Marco jurídico estable

En las diferentes reformas de la Política Pesquera Común desde el año 2000 hasta la presente, siempre se mantenido un criterio expansionista que ha permitido, cuando no alentado, el desarrollo de la flota comunitaria hacia un crecimiento exponencial en tamaño y en capacidad pesquera. Los pescadores, abrumadoramente gente emprendedora, abrazaron mayoritariamente estas reformas, con el consiguiente endeudamiento. Ahora, incluso si esta propuesta se adopta definitivamente así, la depreciación de los bienes y equipos será absoluta.

A la luz de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta lo aprobado en sesión parlamentaria el 23 de octubre de 2013,

1. ¿Cree la Comisión que la responsabilidad de la Administración Comunitaria con esta disparidad de criterios entre reformas y contrarreformas de la PPC es la mejor para el sector?

2. ¿Cree la Comisión que unos marcos jurídicos estables en el tiempo y una claridad de las normas son elementos clave para nuevas inversiones?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de enero de 2014)

A través de la política pesquera común (PPC), la Unión ha creado un marco jurídico estable, lo que se ha traducido en unas condiciones de igualdad para todos los pescadores y unas normas que se les aplican de manera equitativa. La Comisión considera que este marco jurídico aporta seguridad e igualdad al sector.

La nueva política pesquera común [Reglamento (UE) n° 1380/2013] reconoce que los tipos de pesca pueden diferir de unas zonas a otras y ha introducido el concepto de «regionalización». Así, las normas pueden adaptarse mejor a las características específicas de cada pesquería y podemos ir abandonando la microgestión a nivel de la Unión. La puesta en práctica de la regionalización exigirá desarrollar y reforzar mecanismos de cooperación entre los Estados miembros.

Los cambios que se han ido produciendo a lo largo de los años y las reformas consecutivas de la PPC han dotado al marco de una mayor estabilidad. Además, están orientados hacia una seguridad a largo plazo para el sector, por ejemplo, mediante el establecimiento de planes plurianuales de gestión de las pesquerías a largo plazo. La introducción progresiva de determinadas medidas en virtud de la nueva PPC, tales como la aplicación del rendimiento máximo sostenible y la obligación de desembarque, también permite al sector preparar, planificar y adaptar estrategias de inversión a las nuevas normas de manera oportuna.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013333/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Common fisheries policy — stable legal framework

In the various reforms of the common fisheries policy since 2000 up to now, there has always been an expansionist approach that has enabled, if not encouraged, the Community fleet to grow exponentially in size and fishing capacity. Fishermen, overwhelmingly enterprising people, have largely supported these reforms, with the debt burden they bring. Now, if this proposal is definitively adopted, the value of goods and equipment will utterly collapse.

In view of what was adopted in the plenary session of 23 October 2013:

1. Does the Commission think that the Community authorities being in charge, with this difference in approach between common fisheries policy reforms and counter-reforms, is best for the sector?

2. Does the Commission believe that legal frameworks that are stable over time and clear rules are crucial for new investment?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

With the common fisheries policy (CFP) the Union has created a stable legal framework, and this has allowed for a level playing field for all fishermen, and rules that are equally applicable to all fishermen. The Commission considers that this stable legal framework creates certainty and equality for the industry.

The new Common Fisheries Policy (Regulation 1380/2013) recognises that fisheries can differ from area to area, and has introduced the concept or 'regionalisation'. Rules can be better adapted to the specificities of each fishery and we can move away from micromanagement at Union level. Implementation of regionalization will require developing and strengthening cooperation mechanisms between the Member States.

Changes over the years and consecutive reforms of the CFP have further improved the stability of the framework, and are geared to long-term security for the industry, for instance the introduction of multiannual plans to manage fisheries in the long term. The gradual introduction of certain measures under the new CFP, such as applying Maximum Sustainable Yield and the landing obligation, also allow the industry to prepare, plan and adapt investment strategies timely to the new standards.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013334/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: PPC. Embarcaciones de madera

Según lo acordado en la nueva política pesquera común aprobada el 23 de octubre de 2013, se decidió la retirada definitiva de las embarcaciones de madera.

A la luz de lo anterior, ¿cree la Comisión que es esta prohibición contraria al espíritu conservacionista reconocido por diversos convenios internacionales, como por ejemplo el conocido como Convenio de Barcelona en el que se adoptó el Plan de Acción para la protección y el desarrollo de la cuenca del Mediterráneo (PAM), primer acuerdo regional bajo los auspicios del Programa de Naciones Unidas para el Medioambiente (PNUMA)?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(18 de febrero de 2014)

Su Señoría se refiere a la votación a la que sometió el Parlamento Europeo en su sesión plenaria del 23 de octubre de 2013 el Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de Pesca (FEMP).

La propuesta presentada por la Comisión para el FEMP no prevé ningún tipo de apoyo a la paralización definitiva de buques pesqueros, ni incluye referencia alguna a las embarcaciones de madera tradicionales.

Los objetivos explicitados de dicha propuesta son los siguientes: contribuir a promover una pesca y una acuicultura sostenibles y competitivas, impulsar la aplicación y el desarrollo de la política marítima integrada de la Unión de forma complementaria a la política de cohesión y a la política pesquera común, fomentar en las zonas dependientes de la pesca un desarrollo territorial equilibrado e integrador y reforzar la aplicación de la política pesquera común. Estos objetivos se corresponden con los consagrados en el artículo 39 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea y con el espíritu de desarrollo sostenible reconocido en acuerdos internacionales como el Convenio de Barcelona.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013334/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: CFP: wooden vessels

The definitive withdrawal of wooden vessels was agreed upon as part of the new common fisheries policy approved on 23 October 2013.

In view of the above, does the Commission consider this ban to be contrary to the spirit of conservation recognised by various international conventions, such as the Barcelona Convention, for example, in which the action plan for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Sustainable Development of the Coastal Areas of the Mediterranean (MAP) was adopted, the first regional agreement under the auspices of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2014)

The Honourable Member refers to the European Parliament plenary vote on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) held on 23 October 2013.

The Commission's proposal for the EMFF did not foresee support for the permanent cessation of fishing vessels; neither did it include any reference to traditional wooden vessels.

The stated objectives of the EMFF proposal are to contribute to promoting sustainable and competitive fisheries and aquaculture, fostering the development and implementation of the Union's Integrated Maritime Policy in a complementary manner to cohesion policy and to the common fisheries policy, as well as promoting a balanced and inclusive territorial development of fisheries areas and fostering the implementation of the Common Fisheries Policy. Those objectives are in line with the policy objectives enshrined in Article 39 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and with the spirit of sustainable development recognised by international conventions, such as the Barcelona Convention.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013335/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Small-scale coastal fishing — Dársenas pesqueras de los puertos

En los fondos estructurales en períodos anteriores, las inversiones en dársenas pesqueras de los puertos estaban subvencionadas, lo cual permitió al sector ofrecer a la sociedad en general unas instalaciones modernas y adaptadas a los requisitos y estándares europeos.

A la luz de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta lo aprobado en sesión parlamentaria el 23 de octubre de 2013, ¿qué opinan las organizaciones de consumidores de este extremo?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de febrero de 2014)

Su Señoría hace referencia a la votación sobre el Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de Pesca (FEMP) en la sesión plenaria del Parlamento Europeo del día 23 de octubre de 2013. El FEMP sigue siendo objeto de debate por parte de los colegisladores y, a falta de un acuerdo final, la presente respuesta se basa en la propuesta original de la Comisión adoptada en diciembre de 2011.

La propuesta de la Comisión relativa al FEMP prevé el apoyo a inversiones destinadas a mejorar las infraestructuras portuarias de pesca o lugares de desembarque, incluidas las inversiones en instalaciones de residuos y recogida de basura marina. Esta ayuda tiene por objeto aumentar la calidad de los productos desembarcados, aumentar la eficiencia energética, contribuir a la protección del medio ambiente o mejorar la seguridad y las condiciones de trabajo.

La Comisión no ha recibido ninguna opinión de las organizaciones de consumidores sobre las modificaciones a la propuesta aprobadas por el Parlamento Europeo el 23 de octubre de 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013335/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Small scale coastal fishing — fishing docks in ports

With regard to structural funds in prior periods, investments in fishing docks in ports were subsidised, which enabled the sector to provide wider society with modern facilities that were adapted to requirements and to European standards.

In view of the above and taking into account what was approved in the plenary sitting of 23 October 2013, what is the opinion of consumer organisations in this regard?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(4 February 2014)

The Honourable Member refers to the plenary vote on the European Maritime Fisheries Fund (EMFF) at the European Parliament on 23 October 2013. The EMFF is still being discussed by the co-legislators and in the absence of a final agreement, the reply herewith is based on the Commission's original proposal adopted in December 2011.

The Commission's proposal for the EMFF foresees support to investments improving fishing port infrastructure or landing sites, including investments in facilities for waste and marine litter collection. This support aims at increasing the quality of the product landed, increasing energy efficiency, contributing to environmental protection or improving safety and working conditions.

The Commission has not received any position of the consumer organisations on the amendments to the proposal as adopted by the European Parliament on 23 October 2013.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013337/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Pesca costera artisanal — Vedas temporales

Desde los primeros planes experimentales de mediados del siglo anterior hasta la actualidad, Cataluña, como otras zonas mediterráneas del Reino de España, ha realizado vedas temporales que han ayudado a mantener el recurso pesquero y a regular la capacidad pesquera.

La propuesta del Parlamento no incorpora explícitamente las vedas realizadas en el marco de los planes de gestión adoptados según el Reglamento (CE) n° 1967/2006, conocido como Reglamento de Pesca del Mediterráneo, a diferencia de los planes plurianuales de las pesquerías atlánticas, en los que sí están reconocidas.

A la luz de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta lo aprobado en sesión parlamentaria el 23 de octubre de 2013:

¿Tiene la Comisión conocimiento de dicha realidad que ha ayudado a mantener el recurso pesquero y a regular la capacidad pesquera?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de febrero de 2014)

La Comisión tiene conocimiento de las temporadas de veda aplicadas por España y por otros Estados miembros mediterráneos. Estos períodos también se incluyen a menudo entre las medidas técnicas de los planes de gestión adoptados por los Estados miembros de conformidad con el artículo 19 del Reglamento (CE) n° 1967/2006 del Consejo.

La Comisión considera que las temporadas de veda son un instrumento útil para la protección de los recursos pesqueros (por ejemplo, la concentración temporal de peces en desove), así como para la gestión del esfuerzo pesquero.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013337/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Small-scale coastal fishing — temporary close seasons

Since the first experimental plans of the middle of last century up to the present day, Catalonia, like other Mediterranean areas of Spain, has implemented temporary close seasons that have helped maintain fishery resources and regulate fishing capacity.

Parliament's proposal does not explicitly incorporate the close seasons implemented in the framework of the management plans adopted in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1967/2006, known as the Mediterranean Fisheries Regulation, unlike the multiannual plans for Atlantic fisheries, which do recognise them.

In view of what was adopted in the plenary session of 23 October 2013:

Is the Commission aware of the abovementioned close seasons, which have helped maintain fishery resources and regulate fishing capacity?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(4 February 2014)

The Commission is aware of the closed seasons implemented by Spain and by other Mediterranean Member States. Such closed seasons are also often included among the technical measures of management plans adopted by Member States in accordance with Article 19 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1967/2006.

The Commission considers that closed fishing seasons are a useful tool to protect fishery resources (e.g. temporary aggregation of spawning fish) and to manage fishing effort.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013338/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Pesa costera artesanal — Consecuencias

Según muchos expertos, la definición de pesca costera artesanal adoptada tendrá repercusiones graves: se reducirán los fondos europeos y, además, se restringirá el acceso de las embarcaciones catalanas a las ayudas a la diversificación y a la sustitución de motores, se dificultará el acceso de los jóvenes a la actividad pesquera, etc. El sector y la administración en Catalunya aportaron criterios a la definición de flota costera artesanal que contemplan otros factores como el modelo de marea diaria con menos de 12 horas de pesca, la utilización de caladeros cercanos y la venta diaria de capturas en fresco.

A la luz de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta lo aprobado en sesión parlamentaria el 23 de octubre de 2013,

1. ¿Por qué no se han tenido en cuenta estos elementos en la confección de la definición aprobada?

2. ¿Es que estos valores no son importantes ni deben ser protegidos por la UE?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de febrero de 2014)

Su Señoría hace referencia a la votación sobre el Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de la Pesca (FEMP) en el Pleno del Parlamento Europeo de 23 de octubre de 2013.

La definición de pesca costera artesanal que figura en la propuesta relativa al FEMP sigue siendo la misma que la utilizada hasta ahora en la Política Pesquera Común. Ni el Consejo ni el Parlamento Europeo han modificado la definición de pesca costera artesanal durante los debates sobre el FEMP. La Comisión no ha propuesto cambiar la definición porque la actual es bien conocida, comprendida y utilizada por las autoridades de ordenación y las partes interesadas. Además, esta definición abarca aproximadamente el 80 % de todos los buques pesqueros de la UE.

Si bien las ayudas financieras a la sustitución de motores no figuraban en la propuesta original sobre el FEMP presentada por la Comisión, sí han sido introducidas tanto por el Consejo en su orientación general como por el Parlamento Europeo en las enmiendas adoptadas en el Pleno de octubre de 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013338/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Small-scale coastal fishing — consequences

According to numerous experts, the adopted definition of small-scale coastal fishing will have serious repercussions: EU funds will be reduced, the access of Catalan vessels to aid for diversification and the replacement of engines will be restricted and it will become more difficult for young people to access the fishing business, among other things. The fishing sector and the Catalan Government contributed criteria for the definition of small-scale coastal fishing that consider other factors such as the model of daily fishing trips with less than 12 hours fishing, the use of nearby fisheries and the daily sale of fresh catches.

In view of what was adopted in the plenary session of 23 October 2013:

1. Why have these elements not been taken into account in the preparation of the adopted definition?

2. Is it because these values are not important and do not deserve to be protected by the EU?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(12 February 2014)

The Honourable Member refers to the plenary vote on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) at the European Parliament on 23 October 2013.

The definition of small-scale coastal fishing contained in the EMFF proposal remains the same as has been used until now in the common fisheries policy. The Commission did not change the definition, because the current definition is well known, understood and widely used by managing authorities and stakeholders. Furthermore approximately 80% of all fishing vessels in the EU fall into this category.

Although financial support for engine replacement was not included in the original Commission proposal for the EMFF, it has been introduced by both Council in its July 2013 general approach and the European Parliament in its amendments adopted in the October 2013 plenary.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013339/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Flota costera artesanal: aspectos socioeconómicos

La definición de «flota costera artesanal» (en inglés, *small-scale coastal fishing*), que se limita a las embarcaciones de menos de 12 m de eslora y excluye a las modalidades de arrastre en virtud de la definición que figura en del cuadro III del anexo I del Reglamento (CE) n° 26/2004, tiene consecuencias graves en la flota costera catalana, que se caracteriza por ser una flota de pesca litoral, de mareas diarias, gestionada por empresas familiares y directamente aferrada al territorio.

A la luz de lo anterior, y teniendo en cuenta lo aprobado en el Pleno el 23 de octubre de 2013:

1. ¿No cree la Comisión que esta definición es incoherente con la gestión de las zonas especialmente dependientes de la costa?

2. ¿Cómo se tendrán en cuenta los factores socioeconómicos?

3. ¿Es consciente la Comisión de la destrucción previsible de puestos de trabajo, hasta ahora estables?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de enero de 2014)

Su Señoría hace referencia a la votación sobre el Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de Pesca (FEMP) en la sesión plenaria del Parlamento Europeo del día 23 de octubre de 2013. El FEMP sigue siendo objeto de debate por parte de los colegisladores y, a falta de un acuerdo final, la presente respuesta se basa en la propuesta original de la Comisión adoptada en diciembre de 2011.

La definición de «flota costera artesanal» que figura en la propuesta del FEMP sigue siendo la misma que se ha venido utilizando hasta el momento. La Comisión no tiene constancia de incompatibilidad alguna entre esta definición y las zonas especialmente dependientes de la costa. Además, la Comisión no dispone de pruebas que permitan suponer que la definición de «flota costera artesanal», en sus términos actuales, tenga un impacto socioeconómico perjudicial para las comunidades costeras.

Las flotas artesanales son importantes para el empleo y para el tejido social de las comunidades que dependen de la pesca. En este sentido, la propuesta del FEMP apoya y refuerza las acciones para la cohesión social y la creación de empleo.

Esta propuesta prevé un acceso privilegiado de las pequeñas embarcaciones a todas las medidas dispuestas en el capítulo sobre pesca sostenible, mediante mayores porcentajes de intensidad de la ayuda. Las medidas específicas incluyen también el apoyo a la asesoría empresarial profesional, inclusive en lo relativo a la reconversión en empresas no pesqueras. El apoyo a la innovación es también importante, debido al limitado acceso a financiación de este tipo para la mayoría de las flotas artesanales.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013339/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Small-scale coastal fishing: socioeconomic aspects

The definition of small-scale coastal fishing, which is restricted to vessels less than 12 metres in length and not using towed gear, pursuant to the definition laid down in table III in Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 26/2004, has serious consequences for the Catalan coastal fleet, which is a coastal fishing fleet that makes daily fishing trips, run by family businesses with direct ties to the territory.

In view of what was adopted in the plenary session of 23 October 2013:

1. Does the Commission not think that this definition stands at odds with the management of areas that are particularly dependent on the coast?

2. How will the socioeconomic factors be taken into account?

3. Is the Commission aware of the foreseeable damage to jobs which have been stable until now?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

The Honourable Member refers to the plenary vote on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) at the European Parliament on 23 October 2013. The EMFF is still being discussed by the co-legislators, and in the absence of a final agreement, the reply herewith is based on the Commission's original proposal adopted in December 2011.

The definition of small-scale coastal fishing contained in the EMFF proposal, remains the same as has been used until now. The Commission is not aware of any incompatibility between the definition and areas that are particularly dependent on the coast. In addition, the Commission is not aware of any evidence to suggest that the definition of small-scale coastal fishing, as it stands now, has a detrimental socioeconomic impact on coastal communities.

Small-scale fleets are important for employment and for the social fabric of fisheries-dependent communities. The EMFF proposal supports and reinforces actions for social cohesion and job creation.

The proposal foresees privileged access for small vessels to all measures in the sustainable fisheries chapter through higher aid intensity rates. Specific measures include support to professional business advice, including conversion to a non-fishing business. Support for innovation is also important due to limited access to such funding for the majority of small-scale fleets.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013340/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Small-scale coastal fishing — aspectos económicos

La definición de pesca costera o *small-scale coastal fishing* acordada por el Parlamento Europeo deja fuera del principal Fondo Estructural pesquero al 63,80 % de la flota catalana, que representa el 96,47 % de las capturas en peso y el 92,71 % del importe por la primera venta en las lonjas de pescado y marisco catalanas.

A la luz de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta lo aprobado en el Pleno el 23 de octubre de 2013, ¿podría responder la Comisión a las siguientes preguntas?

1. ¿Cómo se van a mantener las infraestructuras portuarias planificadas para este volumen de ventas?

2. ¿Quién responderá por las tasas portuarias que dejarán de percibirse?

3. ¿Cómo se compensará al concesionario del lucro cesante generado por la disminución de las ventas?

4. ¿Cuál es el destino previsto para estas infraestructuras abandonadas?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de febrero de 2014)

Su Señoría hace referencia a la votación sobre el Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de Pesca (FEMP) en la sesión plenaria del Parlamento Europeo del día 23 de octubre de 2013. El FEMP sigue siendo objeto de debate por parte de los colegisladores y, a falta de un acuerdo final, la presente respuesta se basa en la propuesta original de la Comisión adoptada en diciembre de 2011.

La definición de pesca costera artesanal que figura en la propuesta del FEMP sigue siendo la misma que la utilizada hasta ahora en la política pesquera común. La propuesta del FEMP contiene una serie de disposiciones específicas concebidas para beneficiar a los buques dedicados a la pesca costera artesanal; no obstante, los grandes buques podrán seguir acogiéndose a la ayuda en el marco del FEMP.

La Comisión no prevé ningún efecto negativo sobre las infraestructuras portuarias o las tasas como resultado de las ayudas del FEMP. Por el contrario, la reforma de la política pesquera común, si se aplica con éxito, generará prácticas pesqueras más sostenibles que supondrán desembarques más rentables, con efectos positivos inducidos para los puertos y sus empleados.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013340/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Small-scale coastal fishing — economic aspects

The definition of small-scale coastal fishing agreed by Parliament excludes from the main Structural Fund for fishing 63.80% of the Catalan fleet, which accounts for 96.47% of catches in terms of weight and 92.71% of first sale takings in Catalan fish and seafood auctions.

In view of what was adopted in the plenary session of 23 October 2013:

1. How will the port infrastructure planned for this volume of sales be maintained?

2. Who will answer for the port charges that will no longer be collected?

3. How will the operator be compensated for the loss in profit caused by reduced sales?

4. What fate is anticipated for this abandoned infrastructure?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(4 February 2014)

The Honourable Member refers to the plenary vote on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) at the European Parliament on 23 October 2013. The EMFF is still being discussed by the co-legislators, and in the absence of a final agreement, the reply herewith is based on the Commission's original proposal adopted in December 2011.

The definition of small-scale coastal fishing contained in the EMFF proposal remains the same as has been used until now in the common fisheries policy. The EMFF proposal contains a number of specific provisions designed to benefit small-scale fishing vessels; nevertheless, larger vessels will continue to be able to benefit from support under the EMFF.

The Commission does not envisage any negative effects on port infrastructures or charges as a result of EMFF support. On the contrary, the reform of the common fisheries policy, if successfully applied, would lead to more sustainable fishing practices resulting in more profitable landings, with positive knock-on effects for the ports and their employees.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013341/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Small-scale coastal fishing — aspectos socioeconómicos II

La definición de pesca costera artesanal o *small-scale coastal fishing* adoptada, en la que se incluyen las embarcaciones de menos de 12 m de eslora y se excluyen las modalidades de arrastre según la definición de la propuesta de Reglamento relativo al Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de Pesca, afecta gravemente a la flota costera catalana.

Esta flota excluida representa el 70,68 % de los puestos de trabajo directos del sector pesquero catalán.

A la luz de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta lo aprobado en el Pleno el 23 de octubre de 2013, ¿qué medidas compensatorias se adoptarán para paliar estas graves consecuencias?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de febrero de 2014)

Su Señoría hace referencia a la votación sobre el Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de Pesca (FEMP) en la sesión plenaria del Parlamento Europeo del día 23 de octubre de 2013. El FEMP sigue siendo objeto de debate por parte de los colegisladores y, a falta de un acuerdo final, la presente respuesta se basa en la propuesta original de la Comisión adoptada en diciembre de 2011.

La definición de pesca costera artesanal que figura en la propuesta relativa al FEMP sigue siendo la misma que la utilizada hasta ahora. La Comisión no tiene constancia de que de esta definición puedan derivarse efectos importantes sobre la flota costera catalana. Las flotas artesanales son importantes para el empleo y el tejido social de las comunidades dependientes de la pesca. La propuesta relativa al FEMP apoya y refuerza las acciones para la cohesión social y la creación de empleo.

La propuesta relativa al FEMP actualmente en curso de negociación prevé un acceso privilegiado de los pequeños buques a todas las medidas en el capítulo de la pesca sostenible, a través de mayores porcentajes de ayuda. Entre las medidas específicas se incluyen el apoyo a la asesoría empresarial profesional, incluida la conversión a una empresa no pesquera. El apoyo a la innovación también es importante debido al acceso limitado a dicha financiación para la mayoría de las flotas artesanales.

Los buques o flotas mayores que la flota artesanal no están excluidos en absoluto del FEMP. Por lo tanto, la Comisión no está estudiando la posibilidad de adoptar medidas compensatorias específicas para estos buques o flotas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013341/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Small-scale coastal fishing — socioeconomic aspects II

The adopted definition of small-scale coastal fishing, which, according to the proposal for a regulation on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund, pertains to vessels less than 12 metres in length and not using towed gear, is seriously affecting the Catalan coastal fleet.

This excluded fleet accounts for 70.68% of direct jobs in the Catalan fishing sector.

In view of what was adopted in the plenary session of 23 October 2013, what compensatory measures will be adopted to mitigate these serious consequences?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(4 February 2014)

The Honourable Member refers to the plenary vote on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) at the European Parliament on 23 October 2013. The EMFF is still being discussed by the co-legislators, and in the absence of a final agreement, the reply herewith is based on the Commission's original proposal adopted in December 2011.

The definition of small-scale coastal fishing contained in the EMFF proposal remains the same as has been used until now. The Commission is not aware of any serious effect on the Catalan coastal fleet that could result from the definition. Small-scale fleets are important for employment and for the social fabric of fisheries-dependent communities. The proposal for the EMFF supports and reinforces actions for social cohesion and job creation.

The EMFF proposal currently under negotiation foresees privileged access for small vessels to all measures in the sustainable fisheries chapter through higher aid intensity rates. Specific measures include support to professional business advice, including conversion to a non-fishing business. Support for innovation is also important due to limited access to such funding for the majority of small-scale fleets.

Vessels or fleets bigger than small scale are by no means excluded from the EMFF. Hence, the Commission is not contemplating any specific compensatory measures for these vessels or fleets.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013342/13
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Mejorar las ayudas para las escuelas

La Unión Europea mantiene un gran protagonismo en la educación de los niños. Diversas son las actuaciones que se dirigen a mejorar las instalaciones y medios en las escuelas, como lo muestran sus informes sobre la educación en Europa, así como la feliz idea del programa de alimentación y salud infantil, cuya cuantía muy recientemente se ha incrementado.

Sin embargo, algunas de estas ayudas no consiguen su buen fin, como lo muestran las denuncias ante la Oficina Europea de Lucha contra el Fraude por la inejecución de las obras para sustituir barracones que se utilizaban como escuelas provisionales. Además, la crisis económica tan acentuada en muchos Estados miembros está originando graves recortes en las prestaciones públicas y, ya no es que no se faciliten ordenadores a los niños, sino que no se les ayuda económicamente para adquirir gafas, o disminuye la alimentación escolar. El informe que ha publicado la Cruz Roja la pasada semana, al conmemorar el Día Universal de los Derechos de la Infancia, resulta muy preocupante, porque se ha incrementado la cifra de familias en torno al umbral de pobreza y es difícil garantizar una alimentación saludable de un número muy significativo de escolares.

1. ¿Ha considerado la Comisión establecer nuevos controles para que las inversiones que sustituyan los barracones donde se imparte docencia se realicen en el menor plazo posible?

2. ¿Ha pensado la Comisión en incrementar las ayudas a los escolares para que la alimentación sea mínimamente saludable?

3. ¿Ha evaluado la Comisión alguna línea de ayuda para facilitar el acceso a las necesidades más básicas de los estudiantes, como son las gafas u otros materiales indispensables?

Respuesta de la Sra. Vassiliou en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de febrero de 2014)

Como sabe Su Señoría, de conformidad con el artículo 65 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea, la responsabilidad en cuanto a los contenidos de la enseñanza y la organización del sistema educativo (incluidas las inversiones en infraestructuras educativas, como los edificios escolares) incumbe a los Estados miembros. La Comisión Europea apoya la cooperación y los intercambios de las mejores prácticas entre los Estados miembros sobre problemas comunes.

Con respecto a la ayuda a los escolares que padecen una mala alimentación, los Estados miembros pueden recurrir a los fondos de la Unión en el marco del programa de consumo de leche en las escuelas y el programa de consumo de fruta en las escuelas, a fin de reforzar las iniciativas para dar a los niños en la escuela productos saludables. La reciente reforma de la Política Agrícola Común 2014-2020 ha incrementado los fondos disponibles para el el programa de consumo de fruta en las escuelas a 150 millones EUR anuales y las tasas de cofinanciación de la UE al 75 %, con una tasa superior del 90 % para las regiones menos desarrolladas y las regiones ultraperiféricas. La Comisión está realizando dos proyectos pilotos que tienen por objeto la alimentación infantil. El Grupo de Alto Nivel sobre Alimentación y Actividad Física ([1]) está elaborando un Plan de Acción para luchar contra la obesidad infantil.

En su reciente Recomendación «Invertir en la infancia: romper el ciclo de las desventajas» ([2]), la Comisión insta a los Estados miembros a intensificar la lucha contra la pobreza infantil y la exclusión de los niños, utilizando fondos nacionales y de la UE, como los Fondos Estructurales y de Inversión (Fondos ESI). Sin embargo, los Fondos ESI no contemplan ayudas directas para artículos personales, como gafas graduadas. No obstante, a partir de 2014 los Estados miembros pueden recurrir al nuevo Fondo de Ayuda Europea para los Más Necesitados para facilitar ayuda material (alimentos, ropa y otros productos esenciales) a los más necesitados.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=en

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013342/13
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Improve assistance for schools

The European Union plays an important role in educating children. It undertakes a whole variety of actions to improve facilities and resources in schools, as its reports on education in Europe show, in addition to the welcome idea of the child food and health programme, the allowance for which increased very recently.

Nevertheless, some of these aids fail to accomplish their objectives, as can be seen in the complaints to the European Anti-Fraud Office for the failure to complete works to replace the barracks which were being used as temporary schools. Furthermore, the economic crisis which is so acute in many Member States is causing serious cutbacks in public provision and, it is not just a question of computers not being provided to children, but they are not being given financial assistance to purchase reading glasses and school meals are being cut back. The report published by the Red Cross last week, to celebrate Universal Children's Rights Day, is particularly worrying, because the number of families who are around the poverty threshold has increased and it is difficult to guarantee a healthy diet for a very considerable number of schoolchildren.

1. Has the Commission considered implementing new controls to ensure that the investments in replacing the barracks where teaching is being delivered are made as soon as possible?

2. Has the Commission thought about increasing aid to schoolchildren to ensure that they have a minimally healthy diet?

3. Has the Commission considered any assistance to facilitate access to pupils' most basic needs, such as reading glasses and other essential materials?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(4 February 2014)

The Honourable Member will be aware that, in accordance with Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the responsibility for the content and organisation of education and training systems (including investment in educational infrastructures such as school buildings) rests with Member States. The European Commission supports collaborative work and exchanges of best practices between Member States on common challenges.

Concerning aid to school children suffering from poor diet, Member States may use Union funds available under the European School Milk Scheme and School Fruit Scheme (SFS) to strengthen initiatives to provide children with healthy products at school. The recent Common Agricultural Policy 2014-2020 reform has increased the funds available for the SFS to EUR 150 million annually and raised EU co-financing rates to 75%, with a higher rate of 90% for less developed and outermost regions. The Commission is running two pilot projects that target children's nutrition. The High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity ([1]) is developing an Action Plan to tackle childhood obesity.

In its recent Recommendation 'Investing in Children: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage', ([2]) the Commission urges Member States to step up the fight against child poverty and exclusion, using national and EU funding such as the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF). However, direct financial assistance to cover personal items, such as reading glasses, does not fall within the remit of ESIF. Nevertheless, as of 2014 Member States can use the new European Fund for Aid to the Most Deprived to provide material support-food, clothing and other essential goods-to the most needy.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=en

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013343/13
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Violencia de género y crisis

En lo que va de año, 44 mujeres han muerto a manos de sus parejas o exparejas en España, la cifra más baja desde que se empezó a contabilizarlas en 2004, a raíz de la Ley Integral contra la Violencia de Género. Las estadísticas también muestran un descenso de las denuncias de un 9,6 % en los últimos cinco años, que han ido en disminución continua desde 2008. En consecuencia, han disminuido las medidas cautelares impuestas por los Juzgados de Violencia de Género. Por ejemplo, las 7 750 órdenes de protección acordadas en el primer trimestre de 2012 se han quedado en 4 583 en el mismo periodo de este año, lo que supone un descenso de casi el 40 %. Pero estos datos no reflejan la realidad, porque es ahora, con la crisis, cuando estas situaciones de violencia se acrecientan y disminuyen los recursos de las víctimas para hacer frente a ellas. Así, los datos en España muestran un falso progreso, aumentando la bolsa oculta de maltrato. El número de víctimas mortales que había denunciado a sus agresores ha descendido del 30 % en 2010 hasta el 18,2 % en lo que llevamos de 2013. En la UE, pese a la falta de datos estadísticos comparables, se calcula que entre un 20 y un 25 % de mujeres ha sufrido maltratos físicos al menos una vez a lo largo de su vida adulta, y que más de una de cada diez ha sufrido violencia sexual con uso de la fuerza. Las investigaciones también muestran que el 26 % de niños y niñas han sufrido violencia física

El Parlamento Europeo ya alertó de las duras consecuencias que están teniendo para las mujeres los efectos de la crisis (informes 2009/2204(INI) y 2012/2301(INI)), que ha dado lugar a un aumento de la violencia económica y la feminización de la pobreza, y limitado las posibilidades de escapar de las violencias sufridas mientras estas se recrudecen. Urge dar una respuesta adecuada a tales tragedias con tal de evitarlas y eliminar la violencia de las vidas de las personas y, por ello, es necesario contar con datos recogidos sistemáticamente y comparables entre Estados miembros.

¿Piensa la Comisión reaccionar ante esta grave falta de información? ¿Se muestra favorable a nuevas regulaciones con tal de solucionar esta ausencia de datos? ¿Se plantea la Comisión alguna iniciativa concreta para 2014? ¿Cree que se deberían destinar fondos de la UE para luchar contra la violencia contra las mujeres? ¿Considera que una directiva ayudaría a dar unas garantías por lo que respecta a los derechos básicos, fijando unos mínimos de prevención y reparación en todos los Estados miembros?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de febrero de 2014)

La lucha contra la violencia contra las mujeres es una de las prioridades de la Comisión, como han puesto de manifiesto el plan de acción por el que se aplica el Programa de Estocolmo, la Carta de la Mujer y la estrategia para la igualdad entre mujeres y hombres (2010-2015).

En lo que se refiere a un mejor conocimiento del fenómeno en Europa, la Comisión colabora con el Instituto Europeo de la Igualdad de Género para suministrar datos precisos y comparables sobre la violencia contra las mujeres a escala de la UE. Además, los resultados de la encuesta de la Agencia de los Derechos Fundamentales (ADF) sobre las experiencias violentas de las mujeres se darán a conocer el 5 de marzo de 2014 ([1]).

Mediante los programas Progress y Daphne III, la Comisión apoya a los gobiernos y las organizaciones de la sociedad civil en la lucha contra la violencia contra las mujeres y el intercambio de mejores prácticas en materia de prevención, y así seguirá haciéndolo, sobre todo al amparo del programa de Derechos, Igualdad y Ciudadanía.

([1]) Puede encontrarse información sobre la encuesta en curso de la ADF en: http://fra.europa.eu/en/project/2012/fra-survey-womens-well-being-and-safety-europe

Las Directiva sobre las víctimas ([2]) velará por que las mujeres víctimas de actos violentos se acojan a unas normas mínimas comunes en materia de derechos procesales en los procesos penales mediante toda una serie de medidas, tales como formación de los profesionales del Derecho y servicios de apoyo. El Reglamento (UE) n° 606/2013 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 12 de junio de 2013, relativo al reconocimiento mutuo de medidas de protección en materia civil ([3]), complementa la Directiva sobre la orden europea de protección ([4]) a fin de velar por que las víctimas de la violencia, sobre todo de la doméstica, puedan seguir confiando en las órdenes de alejamiento o protección dictadas en su país si viajan o se mudan a otro Estado miembro. En la actualidad, la Comisión está apoyado activamente a todos los Estados miembros en la puesta en práctica de estas medidas jurídicas de manera efectiva.

([2]) Directiva 2012/29/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 25 de octubre de 2012, por la que se establecen normas mínimas sobre los derechos, el apoyo y la protección de las víctimas de delitos, y por la que se sustituye la Decisión marco 2001/220/JAI del Consejo (la «Directiva sobre las víctimas»). La fecha límite de transposición es el 16 de noviembre de 2015. http://eurex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:315:0057:0073:ES:PDF

([3]) http://new.eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/ES/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32013R0606

([4]) Directiva 2011/99/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 13 de diciembre de 2011, sobre la orden europea de protección, que se aplica en asuntos penales. http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:338:0002:0018:ES:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013343/13
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Gender-based violence and crisis

So far this year, 44 women have died at the hands of their partners or ex-partners in Spain, the lowest number since this was first counted in 2004, following the Spanish Gender-based Violence Act. Statistics also show a fall of 9.6% in complaints over the last five years, and these have steadily fallen since 2008. Consequently, the protective measures imposed by the Gender-based Violence Courts have decreased. For example, the 7 750 protection orders issued in the first quarter of 2012 are down to 4 583 for the same period of this year, a fall of almost 40%. However, these statistics do not reflect reality, because it is now, with the crisis, that these situations of violence are increasing and the victims' resources to deal with them are declining. As such, these statistics in Spain show false progress, and increase hidden abuse. The number of fatalities where the victims had reported their attackers has fallen from 30% in 2010 to 18.2% so far in 2013. In the EU, despite a lack of comparable statistical data, between 20 and 25% of women are estimated to have suffered physical abuse at least once in their adult lives, and more than one in 10 has suffered sexual violence with the use of force. Research also shows that 26% of children have suffered physical violence.

Parliament has already warned about the harsh consequences that the effects of the crisis are having on women (reports 2009/2204(INI) and 2012/2301(INI)). It has given rise to an increase in economic violence and the feminisation of poverty, and limited any opportunities to escape from the violence they suffer at the same time as it is intensifying. There is an urgent need to provide an adequate response to tragedies of this kind in order to avoid them and remove violence from people's lives and, consequently, we need systematically collected, comparable data for the Member States.

Does the Commission intend to react to this serious lack of information? Is it in favour of new regulations to tackle this lack of data? Does it plan to take any practical initiatives for 2014? Does it believe that it should earmark EU funds to combat violence against women? Does it believe that a directive would help to provide safeguards as regards basic rights, laying down minimum criteria for prevention and restorative justice in all Member States?

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

Combating violence against women is one of the Commission's priorities, as evidenced in the action plan implementing the Stockholm Programme, the Women's Charter and the strategy for Equality between Women and Men (2010-2015).

With regards to improving knowledge of the phenomenon in Europe, the Commission is working with the European Institute for Gender Equality on providing accurate and comparable data on violence against women at the EU level. Moreover, the results of the Fundamental Rights' Agency's survey on women's experiences of violence will be released on 5 March 2014 ([1]).

Through the PROGRESS and DAPHNE III programmes, the Commission supports governments and civil society organisations fighting violence against women and exchanging best practices on prevention, and will continue to do so, in particular, under the Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme.

The Victims Directive ([2]) will ensure that women victims of violence benefit from common minimum standards of procedural rights during criminal proceedings, through a whole range of measures, including training to practitioners and support services. The regulation no. 606/2013 on the mutual recognition of civil law protection measures ([3]) complements the directive on the European protection order ([4]) to ensure that victims of (in particular domestic) violence can still rely on restraint or protection orders in their home country if they travel or move to another Member State. The Commission is now actively assisting all Member States in implementing these legal measures effectively.

([1]) Information on the on-going FRA survey can be found at: http://fra.europa.eu/en/project/2012/fra-survey-womens-well-being-and-safety-europe

([2]) Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA ('the Victims' Directive'). The transposition deadline is 16 November 2015. http://eurex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:315:0057:0073:EN:PDF

([3]) http://new.eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32013R0606

([4]) Directive 2011/99/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the European protection order, which is applicable in criminal matters http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:338:0002:0018:EN:PDF

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013344/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Informe del Parlamento Europeo 2011/2196(INI)

El Parlamento Europeo aprobó el informe 2011/2196(INI) sobre el futuro de los aeropuertos regionales y los servicios aéreos en la EU ([1]).

En el apartado de «transparencia» de dicho informe, más concretamente en los a apartados 43, 44 y 45, se insta a la Comisión a pactar con el sector unas directrices comunes en referencia al tamaño y peso del equipaje de mano. Y se va más allá en el apartado 13, donde el Parlamento manifiesta «la preocupación por la práctica comercial agresiva de algunas líneas de bajo coste que operan desde aeropuertos regionales y se aprovechan de su posición dominante, en vista de que las actividades comerciales son una importante fuente de ingresos para los aeropuertos regionales; considera que estas prácticas suponen una violación del Derecho de competencia y cree que estas restricciones pueden constituir un abuso de posición dominante por parte de las líneas aéreas; pide, por consiguiente, a los Estados miembros que impongan a las líneas aéreas unos límites superiores comunes en lo relativo a estas restricciones y considera que los controles aplicables por las restricciones del peso y las dimensiones del equipaje deben efectuarse antes de la llegada a la puerta de embarque».

A la vista de lo anterior,

¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre este tema?

¿Ha empezado la Comisión algún diálogo con las líneas aéreas que operan en la EU sobre este tema, tal como sugiere el informe?

En caso afirmativo, ¿a qué conclusión ha llegado la Comisión?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(3 de febrero de 2014)

El artículo 22 del Reglamento (CE) n° 1008/2008 (Reglamento de los servicios aéreos) dispone que las compañías aéreas fijen libremente las tarifas y fletes de los servicios aéreos dentro de la Unión. Por su parte, el artículo 2, punto 18), de dicho Reglamento define las «tarifas aéreas» como «los precios expresados en euros o en moneda local que se deben pagar a las compañías aéreas (…) por el transporte de pasajeros en los servicios aéreos y las condiciones de aplicación de dichos precios (…)». Así pues, en el marco de ese Reglamento, las compañías aéreas gozan, en principio, de libertad para fijar el precio de los billetes y las condiciones en las que se aplique ese precio.

Además, el artículo 23 del mismo Reglamento dispone que las tarifas y fletes aéreos disponibles para el público en general que se ofrezcan o se publiquen bajo cualquier forma incluyan siempre las condiciones aplicables y que el precio final que deba pagarse se indique en todo momento.

Atendiendo a la información de la que dispone la Comisión, las condiciones aplicables al equipaje que establecen las compañías aéreas para los clientes finales no parecen infringir las normas de competencia de la UE.

Tras una atenta evaluación, la Comisión considera que los derechos y restricciones aplicables al equipaje constituyen ante todo una cuestión que atañe a la transparencia de las normas en la materia. Es por ello por lo que la propuesta presentada por la Comisión para la revisión de los derechos de los pasajeros aéreos ([2]) refuerza la transparencia en la regulación del equipaje y exige expresamente que las compañías aéreas indiquen con claridad en el momento de la reserva y en el propio aeropuerto las condiciones aplicables al equipaje de mano y al facturado.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+REPORT+A7-2012-0094+0+DOC+XML+V0//ES
([2]) COM(2013) 130 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013344/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: European Parliament Report 2011/2196(INI)

The European Parliament adopted report 2011/2196 (INI) on the future of regional airports and air services in the EU ([1]).

In the paragraph on transparency of the aforementioned report, specifically in paragraphs 43, 44 and 45, the Commission is urged to agree with the sector common guidelines on size and weight of hand baggage. Further on in paragraph 13, where Parliament expresses 'concern for the aggressive business practice of some low-cost airlines operating from regional airports to take advantage of their dominant position, and given that commercial activities are a major source of income from regional airports, takes the view that these practices represent a breach of competition law, and believes that these restrictions may constitute an abuse of a carrier's position; calls, therefore, on Member States to set common upper limits to be imposed on airlines with regard to such restrictions and considers that any checks relating to the luggage weight restrictions on size should be made before arrival at the departure gate'.

In view of the above:

What is the Commission's view on this matter?

Has the Commission started any dialogue with the airlines operating in the EU on this matter, as suggested by the report?

If so, what conclusion has the Commission reached?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(3 February 2014)

Art. 22 of the Air Services Regulation (EC) 1008/2008 provides for the pricing freedom of air carriers as regards air fares and air rates for the provision of air services within the Union. Art. 2(18) of the same Regulation defines 'air fares' as the prices expressed in euro or in local currency to be paid to air carriers for the carriage of passengers on air services and any conditions under which those prices apply. Under the Air Services Regulation air carriers are therefore in principle free to set the ticket prices and the conditions under which those prices apply.

In addition, Art. 23 of the said Regulation requires that air fares and air rates available to the general public include the applicable conditions when offered or published in any form and that the final price to be paid is indicated at all times.

The conditions on baggage allowances set by air carriers for end customers do not seem, on the basis of the information available to the Commission, to infringe EU competition law.

After careful assessment, the Commission considers that restrictions and allowances related to baggage are primarily a matter of transparency on baggage rules. Therefore, the Commission's proposal for the revision of air passenger rights ([2]) further enhances the transparency with regard to baggage allowances. It explicitly requires air carriers to clearly indicate the cabin and hold baggage allowances, at booking and at the airport.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+REPORT+A7-2012-0094+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN
([2]) COM(2013) 130 final.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013345/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Informe del Parlamento Europeo — 2011/2196(INI)

El Parlamento Europeo aprobó el informe correspondiente al procedimiento 2011/2196(INI) sobre el futuro de los aeropuertos regionales y los servicios aéreos en la EU ([1]).

En la sección «Transparencia» de dicho informe, más concretamente en el apartado 42, se propone que «las compañías ofrezcan a todos los residentes de todos los Estados miembros una opción de pago con tarjeta de crédito o de débito sin cargo alguno, y recomienda además que esta tarjeta no suponga ninguna tasa mensual ni de gestión, aunque la ofrezca una empresa independiente de la compañía aérea, y que en los casos en los que las compañías aéreas hagan que la gran mayoría de sus pasajeros abone una tasa adicional en relación con el pago, se prohíba dicha tasa y se considere un coste ineludible, por lo que debe formar parte del precio total».

¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre este asunto?

¿Ha empezado la Comisión algún diálogo con las líneas aéreas que operan en la EU para tratar este tema?

En caso afirmativo, ¿a qué conclusión ha llegado la Comisión?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de febrero de 2014)

La Comisión coincide con la opinión expresada en el informe del Parlamento Europeo.

Las propuestas de una nueva Directiva sobre servicios de pago ([2]) y de Reglamento sobre las tasas de intercambio para operaciones de pago basadas en una tarjeta ([3]), adoptadas por la Comisión el 24 de julio de 2013, prohíben la aplicación de recargos en todos los pagos realizados con tarjetas cuyas tasas de intercambio estén reguladas. Las tarjetas sujetas al Reglamento sobre las tasas de intercambio representan más del 95 % de todo el mercado de tarjetas e incluyen prácticamente todas las tarjetas personales. Por consiguiente, los recargos sobre casi todas las operaciones con tarjeta, con escasas excepciones (esto es, con tarjetas American Express), quedarían prohibidos.

Esto supone una mejora importante para los consumidores, dado que, en la actualidad, sobre la base del texto de la Directiva sobre servicios de pago en vigor ([4]), quince Estados miembros permiten los recargos en los pagos con tarjeta.

Asimismo, cabe señalar que, según lo dispuesto en el artículo 19 de la Directiva sobre derechos de los consumidores (2011/83/UE) ([5]), los Estados miembros que no hayan prohibido los recargos deben, no obstante, prohibir a los comerciantes cargar a los consumidores tasas que superen el coste asumido por el comerciante por el uso de la tarjeta. Las disposiciones de dicho artículo deben ser aplicadas por los Estados miembros a más tardar el 13 de junio de 2014.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+REPORT+A7-2012-0094+0+DOC+XML+V0//ES
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0547:FIN:ES:PDF
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0550:FIN:ES:HTML
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:319:0001:0036:ES:PDF
([5]) Directiva 2011/83/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 25 de octubre de 2011, sobre los derechos de los consumidores, por la que se modifican la Directiva 93/13/CEE del Consejo y la Directiva 1999/44/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo y se derogan la Directiva 85/577/CEE del Consejo y la Directiva 97/7/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo (DO L 304 de 22.11.2011).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013345/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: European Parliament Report — 2011/2196(INI)

Parliament approved the report relating to procedure 2011/2196 (INI) on the future of regional airports and air services in the EU ([1]).

In the 'Transparency' section of this report, specifically in paragraph 42, it is suggested that 'companies must offer, to all residents of all EU states, a credit or debit card payment option which would be free of charge, and further recommends that such a charge should have no monthly or administration charges associated with it, even if offered by companies separate to the airline, and that, where airlines had a large majority of their passengers paying an extra charge related to payment, this charge should be outlawed and considered an unavoidable charge, and therefore included as part of the headline price'.

What is the Commission's view on this matter?

Has it started any dialogue with the airlines operating in the EU to deal with this matter?

If so, what conclusion has it reached?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(6 February 2014)

The Commission shares the views expressed in the report of the European Parliament.

The proposals for a new Payments Services Directive ([2]) and for a regulation on interchange fees for card-based transactions ([3]), adopted by the Commission on 24 July 2013, prohibit surcharging on all payments with cards for which interchange fees are to be regulated. The cards subject to the interchange fee Regulation represent more than 95% of the entire card market and include virtually all consumer cards. Consequently surcharging on all but very few card transactions made by consumers (i.e. with American Express cards) would become prohibited.

This means a major improvement for consumers, as currently, on the basis of the text of the Payment Services Directive in force ([4]), 15 Member States allow for surcharging on card payments.

It is also to be noted that on the basis of Article 19 of the Consumer Rights Directive (2011/83/EU) ([5]) Member States which have not banned surcharging shall nevertheless prohibit traders from charging consumers fees that exceed the cost borne by the trader for the use of a card. This Article shall be applied by Member States from 13 June 2014 at the latest.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+REPORT+A7-2012-0094+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0547:FIN:EN:PDF
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0550:FIN:EN:HTML
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:319:0001:0036:EN:PDF
([5]) Directive 2011/83/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 on consumer rights, amending Council Directive 93/13/EEC and Directive 1999/44/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Council Directive 85/577/EEC and Directive 97/7/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, OJ L 304, 22.11.2011.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013346/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Energías renovables

La Comisión Europea expedientó el pasado 26 de septiembre a España y a Italia por no haber comunicado las medidas que tienen previsto adoptar para cumplir el objetivo de cuota de energías renovables en 2020 (el 20 %), pese a que el plazo para hacerlo vencía el 5 de diciembre de 2010. «"Italia y España no han informado a la Comisión de todas las necesarias medidas de transposición para incorporar plenamente la Directiva de renovables a sus legislaciones nacionales", señaló el Ejecutivo comunitario. Por ello, Bruselas envió a los dos países sendos dictámenes motivados, segunda fase del procedimiento de infracción. Si en el plazo de dos meses Madrid y Roma no han corregido la situación, el Ejecutivo comunitario podría llevar el caso ante el Tribunal de Justicia de la UE [1]».

A la vista de que ya han transcurrido dos meses desde el envío de la carta,

¿Ha recibido la Comisión respuesta de estos Estados miembros?

En caso afirmativo, ¿está satisfecha la Comisión con la respuesta?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de enero de 2014)

Tanto Italia como España han respondido a la carta de la Comisión comunicando medidas legislativas adicionales por las que se incorpora a sus respectivos ordenamientos nacionales la Directiva 2009/28/CE, relativa al fomento del uso de energía procedente de fuentes renovables.

La Comisión está evaluando las respuestas de ambos Estados miembros y la legislación notificada.

---

[1] http://www.europapress.es/economia/energia-00341/noticia-economia-energia-bruselas-expedienta-espana-no-comunicar-medidas-cumplir-cuota-renovables-20130926123215.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013346/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Renewable energy

On 26 September the Commission reprimanded Spain and Italy for not having communicated the measures that they plan to adopt to fulfil the target share of renewable energy in 2020 (20%), despite the fact that the deadline to do so expired on 5 September 2010. '"Italy and Spain have not informed the Commission of all the necessary transposition measures for fully transposing the directive on renewables into their national legislation", the Commission noted. Consequently, Brussels sent the two countries reasoned opinions, the second phase of the infringement procedure. If, within two months, Madrid and Rome have not remedied the situation, the Commission may bring the case to the EU Court of Justice ([1])'.

Given that two months have already elapsed since the letter was sent:

Has the Commission received any answer from these Member States?

If so, is the Commission satisfied with the reply?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(24 January 2014)

Both Italy and Spain have replied to the Commission's letters by notifying additional legal measures transposing Directive 2009/28/EC on the promotion of renewable energy sources into national legislation.

The Commission is currently assessing the Member States' replies and the notified legislation.

([1]) http://www.europapress.es/economia/energia-00341/noticia-economia-energia-bruselas-expedienta-espana-no-comunicar-medidas-cumplir-cuota-renovables-20130926123215.html

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-013347/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(25 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Κοινωνική Προστασία στις χώρες της ΕΕ

Σύμφωνα με τα τελευταία στοιχεία της Eurostat (174/2013, 21 Νοεμβρίου 2013), οι δαπάνες για κοινωνική προστασία, ως ποσοστό του ΑΕΠ, παρουσιάζουν πολύ μεγάλες αποκλίσεις μεταξύ των κρατών μελών, κυμαινόμενες μεταξύ 34,3% στη Δανία και 15,1% στη Λεττονία. Ο μέσος όρος των 28 βρίσκεται στο 29,1%.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πως ερμηνεύει τις τεράστιες αποκλίσεις μεταξύ των κρατών μελών;

2. Θεωρεί ότι οι αποκλίσεις αυτές θα πρέπει να μειωθούν;

3. Τι πράττει προς την κατεύθυνση της μείωσης των αποκλίσεων και της ενίσχυσης του κοινωνικού κράτους στα κράτη μέλη, ώστε να υπάρχει παντού μια κατά το δυνατόν ομοιόμορφη κατάσταση;

4. Γιατί στην Κύπρο, ενώ το ποσοστό των δαπανών κοινωνικής προστασίας (22,8%) είναι κατά πολύ χαμηλότερο του μέσου όρου της ΕΕ, η Επιτροπή ως μέλος της Τρόικας επιμένει σε πρόσθετες περικοπές οι οποίες οδηγούν σε αύξηση των αποκλίσεων από την υπόλοιπη Ευρώπη;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(29 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

Οι συνολικές δαπάνες κοινωνικής προστασίας στην ΕΕ κυμαίνονται από λιγότερο από 20% του ΑΕΠ σε πολλά κράτη μέλη της Ανατολικής Ευρώπης (Βουλγαρία, Εσθονία, Λετονία, Λιθουανία, Μάλτα, Ρουμανία, Πολωνία και Σλοβακία) έως πάνω από 30% του ΑΕΠ στα κράτη μέλη της Δυτικής και Βόρειας Ευρώπης (Βέλγιο, Δανία, Γαλλία, Φινλανδία και Κάτω Χώρες). Κατά κανόνα, τα κράτη μέλη με υψηλότερο κατά κεφαλήν ΑΕΠ, τείνουν να αφιερώσουν υψηλότερο ποσοστό του ΑΕΠ για την κοινωνική προστασία, το οποίο αντικατοπτρίζει ειδικότερα μια μετατόπιση από την οικογένεια σε συλλογικές κοινωνικές παροχές. Καθώς τα λιγότερο ανεπτυγμένα κράτη μέλη προσπαθούν να κερδίσουν το χαμένο έδαφος, θα αναμενόταν μείωση της διαφοράς των δαπανών τους για την κοινωνική προστασία.

Τα κράτη μέλη είναι υπεύθυνα για το σχεδιασμό των συστημάτων κοινωνικής προστασίας τους και για την οικονομική τους ισορροπία, και δεν μπορούν να γίνουν μεταβιβάσεις από τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ ώστε να επιτρέψουν στα κράτη μέλη να αυξήσουν τις δαπάνες τους για την κοινωνική προστασία. Επομένως, η ΕΕ μπορεί να υποστηρίξει μείωση της ανισότητας μόνο με έμμεσο τρόπο, με την παροχή υποστήριξης για οικονομική ανάπτυξη και αμοιβαία μάθηση, με τον καθορισμό κοινών στόχων καθώς και με την παρακολούθηση των εν λόγω στόχων. Η επίβλεψη και η καθοδήγηση έχουν ενισχυθεί από πρόσφατες πρωτοβουλίες της ΕΕ. Αυτές περιλαμβάνουν ιδίως (i) την άνοδο του δείκτη επιδόσεων κοινωνικής προστασίας ([1]) ως πλαισίου για την επίβλεψη και τον συντονισμό των κοινωνικών πολιτικών, (ii) την ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής να ενισχύσει την κοινωνική διάσταση της ΟΝΕ ([2]), η οποία εισήγαγε ένα πίνακα αποτελεσμάτων για να προσδιορίσει τις κοινωνικές ανισότητες, και (iii) την δέσμη μέτρων για κοινωνικές επενδύσεις ([3]), η οποία εστιάζει στις κοινωνικές πολιτικές που ενισχύουν την απόκτηση δεξιοτήτων και ικανοτήτων, με ταυτόχρονη βελτίωση της αποτελεσματικότητας και της αποδοτικότητας των δαπανών για την κοινωνική προστασία.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=9235&langId=en
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/archives/2013/10/pdf/20131002_1-emu_en.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=en&newsId=1807&moreDocuments=yes&tableName=news

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013347/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Social protection in the countries of the EU

According to the latest Eurostat data (174/2013, 21 November 2013), social protection expenditure as a percentage of GDP shows very big disparities among the Member States, ranging from 34.3% in Denmark to 15.1% in Latvia. The average for the EU 28 is 29.1%.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. How does it interpret the huge disparities between Member States?

2. Does it believe that these disparities should be reduced?

3. What is it doing towards reducing the disparities and strengthening the social state in the Member States, so that the situation is as uniform as possible everywhere?

4. When the percentage of social protection expenditure in Cyprus (22.8%) is far lower than the EU average, why is the Commission, as a member of the Troika, insisting on additional cuts, which will lead to even greater disparities with the rest of Europe?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

Total expenditure on social protection across the EU ranges from less than 20% of GDP in many Member States in eastern Europe (Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Romania, Poland and Slovakia) to more than 30% of GDP in Member States in western and northern Europe (Belgium, Denmark, France, Finland and the Netherlands). Typically, Member States with higher GDP per capita tend to devote a higher percentage of GDP to social protection, which reflects in particular a shift from family to collective welfare provision. As less-developed Member States catch up, the disparity in their social protection spending could be expected to fall.

The Member States are responsible for the design of their social protection systems and their financial balance, and transfers cannot be made from the EU budget to enable Member States to increase their social protection spending. The EU can therefore only support a reduction in disparity indirectly, by providing support for economic development and mutual learning, by setting common objectives, and by monitoring such objectives. Monitoring and guidance has been stepped up by recent EU initiatives. These include in particular (i) the development of the Social Protection Performance Monitor ([1]) as a framework for monitoring and coordinating social policies; (ii) the Commission communication on strengthening the social dimension of EMU, ([2]) which introduced a scoreboard to identify social imbalances; and (iii) the Social Investment Package, ([3]) which puts the focus on social policies that strengthen people's skills and capacities while improving the effectiveness and efficiency of social protection spending.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=9235&langId=en
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/archives/2013/10/pdf/20131002_1-emu_en.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=en&newsId=1807&moreDocuments=yes&tableName=news

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-013348/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(25 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Οι τιμές του ηλεκτρικού ρεύματος στην Κύπρο

Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατα στοιχεία της Eurostat, το κόστος της παραγωγής ηλεκτρικού ρεύματος στην Κύπρο είναι μακράν το υψηλότερο στην ΕΕ. Το συνολικό κόστος ανά κιλοβατώρα (kWh) στην Κύπρο είναι 23 λεπτά, ενώ τα επόμενα πιο ακριβά κράτη μέλη είναι η Ιταλία (με 19 λεπτά ανά kWh) και το Βέλγιο (με 17 λεπτά). Δεδομένων των οικονομικών προβλημάτων που αντιμετωπίζει η Κύπρος, της χαμηλής ανταγωνιστικότητας των κυπριακών ΜΜΕ και των δοκιμασιών που υφίσταται ο λαός της Κύπρου λόγω της οικονομικής κρίσης:

1. Ποια τυχόν μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει η Επιτροπή, προκειμένου να μετριασθούν οι αρνητικές συνέπειες που έχει το ακριβό ηλεκτρικό ρεύμα στα κυπριακά νοικοκυριά και τις μικρές επιχειρήσεις;

2. Υπάρχουν προγράμματα της ΕΕ, από τα οποία μπορεί να επωφεληθεί η Κύπρος, τα οποία έχουν σχεδιασθεί για να μειωθεί το κόστος του ηλεκτρικού ρεύματος;

3. Μπορεί η Επιτροπή να παράσχει τεχνική ή/και οικονομική βοήθεια σχετικά με αυτό το θέμα;

Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(11 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Η νομοθεσία της ΕΕ, με την τρίτη δέσμη νομοθετικών μέτρων για την ενέργεια και την οδηγία σχετικά με την ενεργειακή απόδοση, δημιουργεί ένα κανονιστικό πλαίσιο το οποίο, όταν εφαρμοσθεί πλήρως στα κράτη μέλη, θα εξασφαλίζει την παροχή, σε πολίτες και επιχειρήσεις, ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας υπό ασφαλείς και ανταγωνιστικούς όρους. Στην ανακοίνωση και τα έγγραφα εργασίας της Επιτροπής που δημοσιεύτηκαν πρόσφατα σχετικά με τις τιμές και το κόστος της ενέργειας στην Ευρώπη ([1]) εξετάζονται περαιτέρω τα ζητήματα αυτά σε επίπεδο κράτους μέλους και σε επίπεδο ΕΕ.

Στο τελευταίο εθνικό σχέδιο δράσης για την ενεργειακή απόδοση, η Κύπρος έθεσε τον φιλόδοξο στόχο εξοικονόμησης 463 000 ΤΙΠ πρωτογενούς ενέργειας έως το 2020. Ο στόχος αυτός πρέπει να επιτευχθεί, αφενός, με τη χρήση φυσικού αερίου στο σύστημα παραγωγής ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας και, αφετέρου, με μέτρα ενεργειακής απόδοσης στον τριτογενή τομέα και στους τομείς της κατοικίας, της βιομηχανίας και των μεταφορών. Η Κύπρος έχει επίσης δυνατότητες για μεγαλύτερη διείσδυση των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας (ηλιακή) που μπορούν να μειώσουν περαιτέρω τις τιμές της ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας.

Το πολυετές δημοσιονομικό πλαίσιο 2014-2020 παρέχει σημαντικούς πόρους για τη βελτίωση της ενεργειακής απόδοσης και τη μείωση του κόστους μέσω: α) των Ευρωπαϊκών Διαρθρωτικών και Επενδυτικών Ταμείων τα οποία διαθέτουν πάνω από 23 δισ. ευρώ για τη «μετάβαση σε οικονομία χαμηλών ανθρακούχων εκπομπών»· β) του προγράμματος «Ορίζοντας 2020» που προσφέρει 5,6 δισ. ευρώ για τεχνολογίες χαμηλών ανθρακούχων εκπομπών συμπεριλαμβανομένης της τεχνολογίας ενεργειακής απόδοσης και γ) του προγράμματος LIFE+, στο πλαίσιο του οποίου συζητείται με την Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων νέος μηχανισμός εγγύησης της ΕΕ για την ενεργειακή απόδοση. Τα εν λόγω προγράμματα προσφέρουν επίσης τεχνική βοήθεια για την ανάπτυξη χρηματοδοτικής στήριξης, μέσων ή έργων ειδικά για κάθε χώρα. Όσον αφορά τις υποδομές, η Κύπρος συμμετέχει επίσης σε δύο έργα κοινού ενδιαφέροντος για την ηλεκτρική ενέργεια και σε ένα έργο κοινού ενδιαφέροντος για το φυσικό αέριο. Τα έργα αυτά θα συνδέσουν το κυπριακό ενεργειακό σύστημα με τα ευρωπαϊκά δίκτυα εξασφαλίζοντας έτσι ασφάλεια εφοδιασμού και ανταγωνισμό.

([1]) COM(2014) 21, SWD(2014) 19 και SWD(2014) 20.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013348/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Electricity prices in Cyprus

According to recent Eurostat data, the cost of electricity production in Cyprus is by far the highest in the EU. The total cost per kilowatt-hour (kWh) in Cyprus is 23 cents, while the next most expensive Member States are Italy (at 19 cents per kWh) and Belgium (at 17 cents). Given the economic problems in Cyprus, the low competitiveness of Cypriot SMEs and the hardship suffered by the people of Cyprus on account of the economic crisis:

1. What measures, if any, does the Commission intend to take in order to mitigate the negative effects of expensive electricity on Cypriot households and small businesses?

2. Are there any EU programmes, from which Cyprus can benefit, which are designed to bring down the cost of electricity?

3. Can the Commission provide any technical and/or financial assistance on this subject?

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

EU legislation, under the Third Energy Package and the Energy Efficiency Directive, creates a regulatory framework that, when fully implemented in Member States, would bring electricity supplies to citizens and businesses on secure and competitive terms. The Commission's recent Communication and Staff Working Documents on energy prices and costs in Europe ([1]) further explore these issues in each Member State and in the EU at large.

Cyprus has set an ambitious primary energy saving target of 463 000 toe by 2020 in their latest National Energy Efficiency Action Plan. This target is to be met by natural gas usage in the electricity generation system and energy efficiency measures in the residential, tertiary, industrial and transport sectors. Cyprus has also a potential for greater penetration of (solar) renewable energy which can further reduce electricity prices.

EU's multi-annual financial framework 2014 — 2020 provides significant funds to improve energy efficiency and reduce costs through: (a) European Structural and Investment Funds allocating more than EUR 23 billion for a 'shift to low-carbon economy'; (b) Horizon 2020 offering EUR 5,6 billion for low-carbon technologies including energy efficiency and (c) LIFE+ Programme under which a new EU guarantee mechanism for energy efficiency is being discussed with the European Investment Bank. These programmes also offer technical assistance for developing country-specific financing supports, instruments or projects. With regards to infrastructure, Cyprus is also part of two projects of common interest for electricity and one project of common interest for natural gas. These projects will connect the Cypriot energy system to the European grids bringing security of supply and competition.

([1]) COM(2014) 21, SWD(2014) 19 and SWD(2014) 20.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013349/13
to the Commission
Giles Chichester (ECR)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Negative Emissions Technologies

Is the Commission aware of the UK Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology's assessment of NETs (Negative Emissions Technologies)?

If so, what is the Commission's assessment of this alternative approach to climate policy?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(4 February 2014)

The Commission thanks the honourable member for bringing this note ([1]) to its attention. Although it is too early to make a definitive assessment, work is being carried out by the Commission's Joint Research Centre (JRC) and through the research programmes to better understand the potential of these technologies. Negative Emission Technologies (NETs) are currently being assessed together with other climate engineering options by the project EuTRACE ([2]). One result clearly emerging from this project is that while some NETs may supplement ambitious emission reduction goals, they cannot replace them.

The 'Representative Concentration Pathways' (RCPs) used in the assessment reports of the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) refer to some NETs as part of the technology portfolio to meet ambitious long-term (2050-2100) greenhouse gas emission reductions (RCP 2.6 and RCP 4.5).

Some NETs have been included in the assessments of energy systems undertaken by the JRC over the last 10 years. In particular 'BECCS' (a combination of two technologies: 'bioenergy' and 'carbon capture and storage' (CCS)), as well as forestation and soil carbon management, have been explicitly considered in economic energy / land use models.

These studies assess the potential of these technologies in the long-term as climate change mitigation options (it appears that BECCS may play a significant role), as well as the uncertainties in their uptake: competition on land use with food production and conservation for the bioenergy; cost, storage potential and social acceptance e.g. for Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS).

([1]) http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/research/briefing-papers/POST-PN-447/negative-emissions-technologies
([2]) ww.eutrace.org, A support action funded under the FP7 environment programme.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013350/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(25 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Mancato riconoscimento della fibromialgia come malattia invalidante

La fibromialgia o sindrome fibromialgica o sindrome di Atlante è una sindrome caratterizzata da dolore muscolare cronico diffuso associato a rigidità. Insorge prevalentemente nelle persone di sesso femminile in età adulta (dalla seconda alla quinta decade, con picchi verso i 25-35 e 45-55 anni), anche se non sono rari casi di fibromialgia in età pediatrica o durante l'adolescenza. Spesso la diagnosi arriva tardivamente e dopo molti controlli medici, in quanto essendo un insieme di sintomi spesso viene male interpretata. La sensibilità al dolore, il senso di debolezza e fragilità portano la persona affetta da questa patologia a un isolamento nella vita lavorativa, di gruppo e affettiva, in quanto la malattia viene erroneamente valutata come «ipocondria» o esagerazione nel focalizzare i sintomi.

Considerato che:

— l'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità il 24 gennaio 2007 ha definitivamente classificato la fibromialgia con il codice M-79.7 nell'International Classification of Diseases al capitolo XII «Malattie del sistema muscolare e connettivo»;

— la fibromialgia è riconosciuta come patologia invalidante negli USA e l'FDA ha approvato i farmaci per il trattamento di tale patologia;

— il Parlamento europeo ha firmato una dichiarazione per il riconoscimento della fibromialgia come malattia invalidante con diritto all'esenzione;

— in Italia tale sindrome non è ancora riconosciuta come malattia invalidante da parte del ministero della Sanità e chi ne soffre è fortemente penalizzato sul piano lavorativo con un alto rischio di licenziamento;

si chiede alla Commissione se intende:

1. valutare di inserire la fibromialgia nel registro ufficiale delle malattie dell'Unione europea, consentendo quindi ai pazienti una diagnosi formale;

2. aprire una consultazione con la comunità scientifica internazionale al riguardo, al fine di prendere in esame tutte le informazioni disponibili circa la diffusione della malattia e l'individuazione di precisi criteri diagnostici;

3. promuovere uno studio che esegua una corretta valutazione dell'impatto economico ed organizzativo di un eventuale riconoscimento della fibromialgia tra le patologie oggetto di tutela.

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(29 gennaio 2014)

La Commissione è al corrente della sindrome da fibromialgia e delle sue conseguenze per le persone che ne sono colpite poiché la fibromialgia causa invalidità, dolore, assenze dal lavoro e si traduce in costi elevati per la società.

La gestione dei sistemi di assistenza sanitaria e la responsabilità di attuare l'«International Classification of Diseases» dell'OMS rientrano nelle responsabilità degli Stati membri. Non esiste un registro unionale delle malattie in cui possa essere inclusa la fibromialgia.

Il Settimo programma quadro di ricerca (FP7, 2007-2013) non sostiene sinora nessun progetto specifico di ricerca incentrato sulla patofisiologia e sulla terapia della fibromialgia. Tuttavia, migliori conoscenze sulla sua origine, sul suo sviluppo e eventuali criteri diagnostici possono essere generati da progetti di ricerca che affrontano aspetti importanti di questa malattia come lo sviluppo e il controllo del dolore, i meccanismi infiammatori o la ricerca sulle funzioni neuromuscolari.

Orizzonte 2020, il programma quadro unionale per la ricerca e l'innovazione (2014-2020) ([1]), nell'ambito della sfida societale «Salute, cambiamento demografico e benessere» può fornire ulteriori opportunità di sostegno alla ricerca sulla fibromialgia.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/home.html

Per quanto concerne la promozione di studi nel campo delle malattie muscoloscheletriche, tra cui la fibromialgia, la Commissione sostiene progetti per il tramite del programma Salute dell'UE. Tra questi si annovera il progetto «European Musculoskeletal Conditions Surveillance and Information Network» ([2]) che intende accrescere e armonizzare la qualità delle cure e assicurare la parità nel trattamento delle malattie reumatiche e di altre patologie muscoloscheletriche, tra cui la sindrome fibromialgica, in tutti gli Stati membri.

Il nuovo programma Salute dell'UE fornisce ulteriori possibilità di finanziamento per portare avanti tali iniziative.

([2]) www.eumusc.net

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013350/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Failure to recognise fibromyalgia as a disease which causes disability

Fibromyalgia, or fibromyalgia syndrome, is a syndrome characterised by chronic widespread muscular pain, together with stiffness. It occurs most commonly among adult females between 20 and 60 years of age (with an increased incidence in the 25-35 and 45-55 age groups), although cases of fibromyalgia among young children and adolescents are not infrequent. It is often diagnosed late and after a number of medical examinations, since the combination of symptoms means that is often misinterpreted. Sensitivity to pain and a feeling of weakness and fragility lead sufferers to become isolated in their work, group and emotional lives, since they are wrongly assumed to be 'hypochondriacs' or to be exaggerating their symptoms.

— On 24 January 2007, the World Health Organisation definitively classified fibromyalgia with the code M-79.7 in the International Classification of Diseases (Chapter XIII 'Diseases of the musculoskeletal system and connective tissue').

— In the United States, fibromyalgia is recognised as a disease which causes disability, and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has approved drugs to treat the disease.

— The European Parliament has signed a declaration calling for the recognition of fibromyalgia as a disease which causes disability with a right to claim exemption.

— In Italy this syndrome is still not recognised as a disease which causes disability by the Ministry of Health, and sufferers are seriously penalised in professional terms, with a high risk of dismissal.

Does the Commission intend:

1. to assess whether fibromyalgia should be included on the EU official diseases registry, thereby enabling patients to receive a formal diagnosis;

2. to open a dialogue on the subject with the international scientific community, in order to examine all the information available on the spread of the disease and the identification of precise diagnostic criteria;

3. to promote a study containing a proper assessment of the economic and organisational impact of recognising fibromyalgia among the diseases in respect of which protection is required?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

The Commission is aware of fibromyalgia syndrome and its impact on people affected, as fibromyalgia can cause impairment, pain, absence from work, and results in high costs for society.

The management of healthcare systems and the responsibility for implementing the 'International Classification of Diseases' of WHO is the responsibility of the Member States. There is no EU disease registry in which fibromyalgia could be included.

The 7th Framework Programme for Research (FP7, 2007 — 2013) does not support to date any specific research project focusing on the pathophysiology and therapy of fibromyalgia. Nevertheless, further insights into its origin, development and potential diagnostic criteria may be generated by research projects tackling important features of this disease such as pain development and control, inflammation mechanisms or research on neuromuscular function.

Horizon 2020 — the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([1]), through its 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' societal challenge may provide further opportunities to support research on fibromyalgia.

With regards to promoting studies in the field of musculoskeletal diseases including fibromyalgia, the Commission is supporting projects through the EU health programme. Among these is the 'European Musculoskeletal Conditions Surveillance and Information Network' ([2]), which intends to raise and harmonise the quality of care and enable equity of care of rheumatic diseases, and other musculoskeletal conditions including fibromyalgia syndrome, across the EU Member States.

The new EU Health Programme provides further funding possibilities for continuing such initiatives.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/home.html
([2]) www.eumusc.net

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013351/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(25 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Rischio di appropriazione dei terreni e di speculazioni economiche in Mozambico con il progetto ProSavana — Ruolo dell'UE (uno dei principali donatori nel paese)

Il progetto ProSavana, avviato nel 2011, è un programma per lo sviluppo dell'agricoltura nelle savane tropicali del Mozambico e prevede un accordo di cooperazione industriale tra il Brasile, il Giappone e il governo di Maputo per la realizzazione di un piano di sviluppo agricolo nel corridoio di Nacala, un'area definita «sottoutilizzata», estesa circa 14 milioni di ettari, da impegnare per coltivare soia per l'esportazione.

La partnership tra Brasile e Giappone, infatti, vuole trasformare il territorio del paese in uno dei maggiori produttori al mondo di semi di soia. L'obiettivo è riqualificare con le tecnologie brasiliane le aree del nord lasciando la commercializzazione dei prodotti, soprattutto nei mercati asiatici, alle compagnie giapponesi.

La durata prevista per la fase iniziale del progetto è di 5 anni. Il programma complessivo prevede, invece, un ciclo di vita di almeno 20 anni e sono già stati costituiti due fondi per aiutare le imprese a investire. Sembrano però altrettanto evidenti i rischi di un fallimento di questo modello di cooperazione in un paese già aperto a forti speculazioni nel settore minerario ed edile:

— basso costo delle terre espropriate alla popolazione;

— incentivi offerti dal Brasile; facile accesso ai mercati asiatici;

— mancanza di normative ambientali rigorose in Mozambico.

In una recente campagna nazionale intrapresa contro la privatizzazione della terra si denuncia la mancanza di chiarezza, la disinformazione sui progetti e sulle motivazioni per le quali il terreno è stato dato in concessione e l'assenza di un dibattito pubblico ampio, trasparente e democratico come pure di uno studio sull'impatto ambientale.

Considerato che:

— l'UE rientra tra i primi 10 paesi donatori in Mozambico;

— la Commissione europea, a valere sul decimo FES, dotato di 746 milioni di euro per il periodo 2008-2013, opera principalmente sul settore infrastrutturale (in particolare lo sviluppo della rete stradale), sull'agricoltura, sullo sviluppo rurale e sullo sviluppo economico regionale;

— a queste aree di intervento prioritario, la Commissione ha aggiunto interventi nel settore della governance, mentre ha annunciato il ritiro dal Fondo comune della sanità;

— nel dicembre 2012 il Mozambico è stato incluso nella lista dei paesi in cui dare avvio all'esercizio di programmazione congiunta a livello europeo (Joint Programming);

può la Commissione riferire perché l'UE non abbia compiuto una valutazione sull'impatto e sui rischi di un simile progetto, rivestendo un ruolo centrale nel coordinamento tra i vari donatori?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(29 gennaio 2014)

Il progetto PROSAVANA, attuato congiuntamente da Brasile, Giappone e Mozambico, mira a utilizzare la tecnologia per migliorare la produttività lungo il corridoio di Nacala, uno dei sei corridoi di sviluppo prioritari identificati dal piano nazionale di investimenti agricoli. In Mozambico la terra è di proprietà dello Stato. Il settore privato può acquisire i diritti d'uso purché valorizzi i terreni.

In quanto donatore principale nel settore agricolo, l'UE è a conoscenza del progetto PROSAVANA e mantiene contatti regolari con i partner responsabili della sua attuazione, che forniscono informazioni sui negoziati in corso, ma non partecipa ai negoziati né finanzia il progetto.

L'UE segue con interesse lo sforzo collettivo volto a sostenere il processo CAADP ([1]) e la strategia settoriale nazionale per l'agricoltura, insistendo perché si tenga conto delle questioni di governance. Per contribuire al vivace dibattito sul progetto PROSAVANA, nel cui ambito la società civile esprime preoccupazione in merito ai possibili reinsediamenti, l'UE monitora l'impegno di PROSAVANA a operare conformemente agli «Orientamenti volontari sulla gestione responsabile della terra» adottati dal Comitato per la sicurezza alimentare mondiale, secondo i quali i reinsediamenti sono ammessi solo previo consenso libero e informato e dietro adeguata compensazione. L'obiettivo è ridurre al minimo i reinsediamenti, a cui per il momento non si è fatto ricorso.

I negoziati sulla programmazione congiunta dell'UE in Mozambico sono in fase iniziale. Il Brasile e il Giappone non vi partecipano.

([1]) Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (programma globale di sviluppo agricolo dell'Africa).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013351/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Risk of land grabbing and economic speculation in Mozambique through the ProSavana Project — Role of the EU (one of the main donors in the country)

The ProSavana Project, launched in 2011, is a programme for the development of agriculture in the tropical savannahs of Mozambique and comprises an industrial cooperation agreement between Brazil, Japan and the government in Maputo aimed at the implementation of an agricultural development plan in the Nacala Corridor, an 'underused' area covering some 14 million hectares, to be used for the cultivation of soya for export.

The partnership between Brazil and Japan is aimed at transforming the country into one of the world's largest soya bean producers. The goal is to use Brazilian technology to redevelop areas in the north of the country, while leaving the marketing of the products, especially in Asia, to Japanese companies.

The initial phase of the project is expected to last for five years. The global programme, however, has an expected life cycle of at least 20 years, and two funds have already been established to help companies to invest. Yet there are equally obvious risks that such a cooperation model could fail in a country already subject to major speculation in the mining and construction sectors due to the low cost of the land taken from the local people; the incentives offered by Brazil and the easy access to Asian markets; and the lack of strict environmental legislation in Mozambique.

A recent national campaign against land privatisation criticised the lack of clarity, the misinformation concerning the projects and the reasons for issuing land concession agreements, and the lack of both a broad, transparent and democratic public debate and an environmental impact study.

The EU is one of the 10 biggest donors in Mozambique.

The Commission, with EUR 746 million for the 2008-2013 period from the tenth EDF, operates mainly in the infrastructure (especially the development of the road network), agriculture, rural development and regional economic development sectors.

The Commission has added action in the governance sector to these priority action areas and also announced its withdrawal from the Health Common Fund.

In December 2012, Mozambique was included on the list of countries considered for the launch of the EU Joint Programming exercise.

Can the Commission state why the EU has failed to assess the impact and risks of such a project, playing a central role in the coordination of the various donors?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

PROSAVANA is a project between Brazil, Japan and Mozambique that seeks to improve productivity through the use of technology in Nacala, one of six priority development corridors identified by the national agricultural investment plan. In Mozambique land is state-owned. The private sector can acquire users' rights on condition that it develops the land.

As the current lead donor in the agriculture sector, the EU is aware of PROSAVANA and maintains regular contact with the project partners, who provide information on the ongoing negotiations. Nevertheless, it does not participate in the negotiations or finance the project.

The EU follows the collective effort to support the CAADP ([1]) process and the national sector strategy for agriculture, encouraging the taking into account of governance issues. Backing up the lively debate around PROSAVANA, with civil society expressing concerns on possible resettlements, the EU monitors the commitment of PROSAVANA to operate within the indications of the 'Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of the Tenure of Land', as adopted by the Committee on World Food Security, which foresee that free, prior, informed consent and appropriate compensation will be sought when resettlements are implied. The aim is to keep resettlements to a minimum and, to date, no resettlement has taken place.

Negotiations on EU joint programming in Mozambique are at an early stage. Brazil and Japan are not taking part in the exercise.

([1]) Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Program.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013352/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(25 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Pakistan e assenza di regolamentazione sull'uso dell'acqua potabile, market failure come possibile minaccia al diritto di acqua potabile

Uno studio di recente pubblicazione esamina la situazione relativa all'accesso all'acqua sicura ed accessibile in Pakistan e riporta dati preoccupanti: in particolare, le stime rivelano che il 44 % della popolazione non ha ancora accesso ad acqua potabile e sicura ed inoltre mostrano come questa percentuale sia ancora maggiore nelle aree rurali (più del 76,5 % della popolazione) e nelle aree urbane ad elevato tasso demografico, dove si arriva al 70 %. Inoltre, si rileva che ogni anno in Pakistan 200 000 bambini muoiono a causa di diarrea. Il diritto all'acqua è, di fatto, strettamente legato al diritto al cibo, come elemento essenziale della dieta quotidiana e, perciò, deve essere tutelato da norme igieniche e sanitarie adeguate.

In Pakistan una delle poche possibilità per avere un accesso sicuro all'acqua è usare le falde sotterranee. L'analisi condotta si concentra sulle cause della carenza d'acqua ed evidenzia come l'estrazione dalle falde acquifere avvenga in assenza di regolamentazione e di politiche strategiche nazionali adeguate. Il risultato è il fallimento di un mercato aperto ai differenti utenti (pubblici e privati) che competono nell'utilizzo di tale scarsa risorsa e la creazione di situazioni distorsive che spesso arrivano a trasformare la vendita e la distribuzione dell'acqua in bottiglia in situazioni di monopolio. A favorire l'instabilità di tale situazione si aggiunge il dibattito politico sull'accesso all'acqua in Pakistan, ancora oggi dominato da dispute per l'irrigazione dei campi, progetti per dighe e canali e cambiamenti climatici. Il focus rimane sull'acqua necessaria all'agricoltura piuttosto che sulla tutela della salute delle persone e all'accesso all'acqua come ad un diritto primario e obiettivo del millennio.

Considerato che:

— secondo la «EU-Pakistan Country Cooperation Strategy (2007-2013)» la Commissione ha stanziato 213 milioni di euro;

— in Pakistan le attuali linee guida nazionali mancano ancora di concretezza rispetto all'obiettivo di ottenere un accesso sicuro e sufficiente all'acqua per metà della popolazione;

si chiede alla Commissione:

1. di riferire sul suo ruolo nell'ambito di questa priorità, ossia della gestione delle risorse idriche;

2. di indicare quale approccio abbia adottato per promuovere una riforma della *governance* nella distribuzione dell'acqua ed evitare distorsioni del mercato in Pakistan;

3. se per la programmazione (2014-2020) affronterà la questione dell'accesso all'acqua potabile ai servizi igienico-sanitari in Pakistan come settore prioritario.

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(28 gennaio 2014)

1) Sin dal periodo 2007-2013 i settori prioritari in Pakistan sono *istruzione e sviluppo delle risorse umane* e *sviluppo rurale e gestione delle risorse naturali*. L'UE ha fornito sostegno sia per la costruzione e il ripristino di impianti idrici nelle zone inondate che nell'ambito di programmi di sviluppo rurale (irrigazione, stoccaggio dell'acqua, energia idroelettrica). L'UE sostiene inoltre il miglioramento dell'accesso all'acqua potabile nelle scuole nell'ambito dei suoi programmi a favore dell'istruzione nelle province di Sindh e Khyber Pakhtunkhwa e di quelli a favore di profughi e sfollati.

2) Poiché il settore idrico non è prioritario per i suoi interventi in Pakistan, l'UE non ha partecipato direttamente alla riforma della gestione dell'approvvigionamento idrico.

3) Le discussioni sulla programmazione hanno confermato che il governo è favorevole al proseguimento, a partire dal 2014-2020, del partenariato per la cooperazione allo sviluppo con l'UE in materia di i) sviluppo rurale, ii) istruzione e iii) buon governo. Questo permetterà di avvalersi dell'esperienza acquisita e di consolidare i risultati ottenuti. Il miglioramento dell'accesso all'acqua potabile e ai servizi igienico-sanitari può essere integrato anche nei programmi di sviluppo rurale. Gli investimenti in programmi per l'acqua potabile possono inoltre essere finanziati attraverso il Fondo investimenti per l'Asia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013352/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Pakistan and the lack of regulations on the use of drinking water, with market failure a possible threat to the right to drinking water

A recently published study analysing the situation regarding access to safe and accessible water in Pakistan contains some worrying data: in particular, the survey reveals that 44% of the population still do not have access to safe drinking water and, furthermore, that this percentage is even higher in rural areas (over 76.5% of the population) and in urban areas with a high demographic rate, where the figure is 70%. Moreover, the study reveals that 200 000 children die every year in Pakistan from diarrhoea. The right to water is, de facto, closely linked to the right to food, as an essential part of our daily diet, and must therefore be safeguarded by adequate health and hygiene rules.

One of the few ways of accessing water safely in Pakistan is to use groundwater. The analysis conducted focuses on the causes of the water shortage and highlights how groundwater is extracted without suitable regulations or strategic national policies. The upshot of this is the failure of a market open to various users (public and private), who compete for the use of this scarce resource, and the creation of distortions which often turn the sale and distribution of bottled water into a monopoly. Another cause of this instability is the political debate on access to water in Pakistan, which is still dominated by disputes about field irrigation, dyke and canal projects, and climate change. The focus is still on water required for agriculture rather than the protection of human health and access to water as a fundamental right and a Millennium Development Goal.

According to the EU-Pakistan Country Cooperation Strategy (2007-2013), the Commission has set aside EUR 213 million of funding.

In Pakistan, the current national guidelines are still not concrete enough as regards the goal of achieving safe and sufficient water for half of the population.

Can the Commission:

1. explain its role as regards this priority, i.e. the management of water resources;

2. explain the approach it has adopted in order to promote water distribution governance reform and to prevent distortion in the Pakistani market;

3. say whether it will address the issue of access to drinking water and sanitation in Pakistan as a priority area under the 2014-2020 programming period?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(28 January 2014)

1. From 2007-2013 the focal sectors in Pakistan were education and human resource development and rural development and natural resources management. The EU has supported the construction and rehabilitation of water schemes in flood-affected areas as well as in the context of rural development programmes (irrigation, water storage, hydro power). In addition, the EU is supporting improved access to safe water in schools in the context of its education sector programmes in Sindh and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province as well as for refugees and displaced persons.

2. Since the water sector as such is not a focal sector for the EU in Pakistan, the EU has not been involved directly with water distribution governance reform.

3. Programming discussions have confirmed that the Government is in favour of continuing its development cooperation partnership from 2014-20 with the EU in (i) rural development, (ii) education and (iii) good governance. This will make it possible to build on experience and consolidate results. Improvements in the access to drinking water and sanitation may then also be integrated in rural development programmes. Furthermore, investments in improving drinking water schemes may also be supported under the Asian Investment Facility.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013353/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(25 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Studio sugli investimenti delle mafie italiane nell'economia europea e nuove prospettive anti-riciclaggio

Un recente studio avviato da Transcrime e finanziato dall'Unione europea ha offerto un'idea precisa dei settori e dei paesi in cui le mafie investono in Europa.

Ne emerge una presenza omogenea delle mafie italiane nella parte occidentale dell'Europa, mentre a oriente viene rilevata la presenza della criminalità organizzata italiana in Romania. Sul fronte occidentale si registra il monopolio assoluto a Tenerife da parte della 'ndrangheta, che controlla le attività immobiliari, la ristorazione e gli alberghi. In Spagna e Portogallo è stata individuata la presenza delle tre principali organizzazioni criminali italiane: alla mafia siciliana fanno capo le attività immobiliari, dell'agricoltura e della pesca e alberghiere; alla camorra agricoltura e pesca, ristorazione, trasporti, commercio al dettaglio e all'ingrosso; alla 'drangheta ristorazione, alberghi e immobiliare. In particolare la camorra è presente a Vigo (agricoltura e commercio di alimentari), a Madrid (ristorazione e commercio di alimentari) e in Andalusia (trasporti), dove è presente anche la 'ndrangheta nel settore agricolo. In Francia c'è la mafia siciliana che gestisce i giochi illegali e d'azzardo, per esempio a Nizza, e gli alberghi (in Corsica), mentre la 'ndrangheta è presente sia nel settore alberghiero che in quello dei lavori pubblici (a Mentone). In Germania sono presenti sia la 'ndrangheta che la camorra: la prima (a Geldern, Oberhausen e ovviamente Duisburg) è insediata nei settori del commercio all'ingrosso e al dettaglio, nella ristorazione e nel settore alberghiero; la seconda nel commercio all'ingrosso e al dettaglio e nel tessile. In Gran Bretagna sono presenti tutte e tre le organizzazioni criminali italiane: la camorra ha in Aberdeen, il terzo centro più popoloso della Scozia, una roccaforte con il controllo della ristorazione, dei lavori pubblici, del commercio all'ingrosso e al dettaglio di cibo e dell'immobiliare; la mafia siciliana a Londra gestisce il gioco illegale e d'azzardo; la 'ndrangheta sempre a Londra opera nell'immobiliare mentre la camorra è presente nel commercio all'ingrosso e al dettaglio.

Considerato l'alto dettaglio delle informazioni ricavate e il grado di penetrazione delle attività di riciclaggio all'estero, può la Commissione far sapere:

se intende acquisire e valutare i risultati di tale studio per mettere a punto nuovi strumenti di difesa commerciale e anticriminale per le attività di riciclaggio?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(10 febbraio 2014)

Lo studio cui l'onorevole deputato fa riferimento è il progetto *Organised Crime Portfolio*, avviato da Transcrime e cofinanziato dalla Commissione.

Il progetto analizza il modo in cui i principali gruppi di criminalità organizzata investono i proventi di reato in determinati paesi europei. Esso dovrebbe fornire indicazioni utili sulla portata dei proventi della criminalità organizzata e sulle sue modalità di infiltrazione nell'economia dell'UE (in particolare i settori di attività più colpiti). L'analisi, tuttora in corso, si concluderà a fine 2014.

La Commissione intende tener conto dei risultati dello studio per valutare ulteriori misure per prevenire l'infiltrazione della criminalità organizzata nell'economia legale dell'Unione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013353/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (PPE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Study on investments made by the Italian mafias in the European economy and new anti-money laundering prospects

A recent study carried out by Transcrime and financed by the European Union has given an accurate picture of the sectors and countries in which mafias invest in Europe.

The study reveals a homogeneous presence of the Italian mafias in western Europe, while in the east Italian organised crime has a foothold in Romania. In the west, the 'Ndrangheta has a total stranglehold in Tenerife, controlling the property, catering and hotel sectors. In Spain and Portugal, the presence of the three main Italian organised crime organisations has been detected: the Sicilian mafia have a grip on the property, farming, fishing and hotel sectors; the Camorra exercise control over the farming, fishing, catering, transport, retail and wholesale sectors; and the 'Ndrangheta calls the shots in the catering, hotel and property sectors. The Camorra, in particular, are active in Vigo (farming and the grocery trade), Madrid (catering and the grocery trade) and Andalusia (transport), where the 'Ndrangheta also has a presence in the farming sector. In France, the Sicilian mafia runs illegal gambling dens, for example in Nice, and hotels (in Corsica), while the 'Ndrangheta has a presence in the hotel and public works sectors (in Menton). In Germany, both the 'Ndrangheta and the Camorra have a presence: the former (in Geldern, Oberhausen and obviously Duisburg) has a foothold in the retail and wholesale, catering and hotel sectors; the latter in the retail and wholesale and textile sectors. In the United Kingdom, all three Italian organised crime organisations run operations: the Camorra stronghold is Aberdeen, the third most populous city in Scotland, where it controls the catering, public works, food retail and wholesale and property sectors; the Sicilian mafia runs illegal gambling dens in London, where the 'Ndrangheta also has a presence, in this case in the property sector; and the Camorra exercises an influence in the wholesale and retail sectors.

In view of the highly detailed information obtained and the level of penetration of money laundering activities abroad, can the Commission say:

whether it intends to obtain and assess the results of this study in order to develop new trade protection and crime prevention tools to combat money laundering?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(10 February 2014)

The study to which the Honourable Member refers is the project Organised Crime Portfolio, carried out by Transcrime, which the Commission is co-financing.

The project analyses how the main organised criminal groups invest the proceeds of their crimes in selected European countries. It is expected to provide useful insights on the extent of the proceeds of organised crime and on the modalities of organised crime infiltration into the EU economy (in particular which business sectors are most affected). The analysis is still under way and will be finalised at the end of 2014.

The Commission intends to take into account the results of this study in order to consider further measures aimed at preventing the infiltration of organised crime into the legal economy of the Union.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013354/13
alla Commissione
Carlo Fidanza (PPE)
(25 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Concorrenza sleale nei confronti degli autotrasportatori italiani

In Italia, in questi giorni, tutte le organizzazioni dell'autotrasporto si stanno preparando a un fermo straordinario dei mezzi che inizierà il 9 dicembre e che potrebbe protrarsi addirittura fino al 16 dello stesso mese.

Nel settore dell'autotrasporto italiano nel 2008 si immatricolavano in un anno oltre 22 mila veicoli pesanti, mentre oggi si arriva a soli 9 500. Tre quarti delle 98 mila imprese ha meno di 4 camion e un'azienda italiana di autotrasporto deve fare i conti con la benzina più cara e tassata d'Europa nonché far fronte al cabotaggio abusivo praticato da vettori dell'Est europeo, che hanno costi del carburante e del lavoro più bassi del 30 e del 40 %.

Se, da un lato, il tema del costo del carburante attiene alle responsabilità dei singoli Stati membri, un maggiore equilibrio nel mercato del lavoro dovrebbe essere un obiettivo del mercato unico.

Si interroga quindi la Commissione per sapere:

come ha intenzione di muoversi di fronte a questa drammatica e inaccettabile situazione di concorrenza sleale?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(24 gennaio 2014)

Il settore dell'autotrasporto si trova in una situazione estremamente difficile a causa della crisi economica. Dal 2012 il volume delle merci trasportate è a livelli inferiori del 12 % rispetto a quelli del 2007, ovvero prima dello scoppio della crisi, alla quale può essere ricondotto il calo delle immatricolazioni dei veicoli.

Non vi sono invece prove certe che il cabotaggio, o le prassi illegali ad esso eventualmente riconducibili, abbiano un impatto significativo sull'andamento del mercato. Il cabotaggio è responsabile di una quota marginale (2 %) di tutti i volumi trasportati e in ogni caso l'applicazione della pertinente legislazione UE ([1]) in questo ambito è di competenza degli Stati membri. Negli Stati membri in cui sono stati effettuati controlli sistematici, le violazioni della normativa sul cabotaggio si sono rivelate estremamente limitate. Da un'analisi delle informazioni disponibili per l'Italia nel periodo gennaio-ottobre 2012 risulta che le sanzioni comminate per violazione della normativa internazionale sui trasporti (tra cui le violazioni relative al cabotaggio) sono state inferiori allo 0,1 % del totale delle ispezioni (205 violazioni su 220 965 controlli stradali) ([2]).

Benché i costi varino da Stato membro a Stato membro, le differenze si stanno riducendo. La legislazione UE in vigore contribuisce ad allineare le condizioni di lavoro dei conducenti che effettuano servizi di trasporto interno al di fuori dei loro Stati membri di immatricolazione a quelle delle loro controparti locali ([3]). Inoltre, i trasportatori che effettuano trasporti internazionali generalmente acquistano il carburante nello Stato membro in cui operano. In questa sede va tuttavia sottolineato che né le griglie salariali né la determinazione del prezzo alla pompa dei carburanti sono di competenza dell'Unione europea.

Come previsto dal regolamento (CE) n. 1072/2009, a breve la Commissione pubblicherà una relazione sulla situazione del mercato UE del trasporto di merci su strada che affronterà, tra l'altro, gli aspetti delle strutture dei costi nel settore.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1072/2009 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 21 ottobre 2009, che fissa norme comuni per l'accesso al mercato internazionale del trasporto di merci su strada, GU L 300 del 14.11.2009.

([2]) Sviluppo e attuazione del cabotaggio stradale nell'UE, Parlamento europeo, 2013.

([3]) Direttiva 96/71/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 16 dicembre 1996, relativa al distacco dei lavoratori nell'ambito di una prestazione di servizi, GU L 18 del 21.1.1997; regolamento (CE) n. 593/2008 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 17 giugno 2008, sulla legge applicabile alle obbligazioni contrattuali (Roma I), GU L177 del 4.7.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013354/13
to the Commission
Carlo Fidanza (PPE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Unfair competition against Italian road hauliers

Over the last few days, all of the road haulage organisations in Italy have been preparing for an extraordinary suspension of their transport services, which will begin on 9 December and could last until 16 December.

In 2008, more than 22 000 heavy goods vehicles were registered in the Italian road haulage sector over the course of one year, whereas today the figure is only 9 500. Three quarters of the 98 000 companies have fewer than four lorries, and Italian road haulage companies face the most expensive and highest taxed petrol in Europe. Added to this, they have to deal with the illegal cabotage practised by hauliers from Eastern Europe, where fuel and labour costs are between 30 and 40% lower.

Although, on the one hand, the issue of fuel costs is the responsibility of the individual Member States, a more even labour market should be an objective of the single market.

What action will the Commission take with regard to this serious and unacceptable instance of unfair competition?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(24 January 2014)

The road haulage sector faces a severe economic downturn as a result of the economic crisis. As of 2012, transport volumes remain 12% below pre-crisis levels of 2007. A drop in the number of vehicle registrations can be attributed to this development.

There is no clear evidence that cabotage, or alleged illegal practices connected to it, has a significant impact on market developments. Cabotage remains limited to a marginal share (2%) of all transport volumes and enforcement of the relevant EU legislation ([1]) is under the responsibility of Member States. In the Member States where thorough checks have been carried out, infringements to cabotage rules are very limited. An analysis of available information for Italy shows that between January and October 2012, infringements levied for violation of international road transport rules (which includes cabotage infringements) were less than 0.1% of total inspections (205 infringements issued following 220,965 roadside checks) ([2]).

Although costs vary between Member States, this gap has been narrowing. EU legislation exists that contributes to aligning the working conditions of drivers carrying out domestic transport outside of their Member State of registration with those of their local counterparts ([3]). In addition, hauliers carrying out international transport usually purchase petrol in the Member State of operation. However, it should be noted that neither salary-setting nor determination of fuel forecourt prices are a competence of the European Union.

In line with Regulation (EC) No 1072/2009, the Commission will issue a report on the situation of the EU road haulage market shortly. This report will address amongst others the issue of cost structures in the sector.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1072/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 on common rules for access to the international road haulage market OJ L 300, 14.11.2009.

([2]) Development and Implementation of EU Road Cabotage, European Parliament, 2013.

([3]) 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; Regulation (EC) No 593/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008 on the law applicable to contractual obligations (Rome I), OJ L 177, 4.7.2008.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013355/13
alla Commissione
Carlo Fidanza (PPE) e Marco Scurria (PPE)
(25 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Surplus tedesco nell'export

Nei giorni scorsi la BCE ha abbassato il costo del denaro dello 0,25 per far fronte alla prospettiva di deflazione che colpirebbe i paesi al momento più deboli della zona euro.

Ciò avviene proprio mentre sia il ministero del Tesoro americano sia l'FMI hanno pubblicamente criticato la crescita trainata dell'economia tedesca, basata su una contrazione della domanda interna e un forte export.

Infatti anche quest'anno il rapporto tra le partite correnti e il PIL è del 6,8 %, con una media negli ultimi 3 anni del 6,6 %.

Considerando che:

— come previsto dai trattati europei, il surplus delle partite correnti di un Paese europeo non può superare il 6 % del prodotto interno lordo sulla media degli ultimi tre anni, mentre il deficit delle partite stesse non può scendere sotto la soglia del 4 %;

— i trattati europei non prevedono sanzioni quali le procedure di infrazione per siffatte violazioni;

— questa situazione ha un impatto negativo diretto su tutti gli altri paesi della zona euro, tenuto conto soprattutto di questo momento di crisi molto acuta, in particolare per alcuni di essi;

— il surplus commerciale tedesco ha un impatto ancora più forte sulla zona euro, già di per sé disomogenea;

si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

1. quali misure intende intraprendere per contrastare realmente tale situazione;

2. se intende introdurre un qualunque meccanismo sanzionatorio, così come previsto per i casi di deficit.

Risposta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione
(23 gennaio 2014)

Il 15 novembre 2013 la Commissione ha adottato la relazione sul meccanismo di allerta nella quale è esposta, fra l'altro, una lettura in chiave economica degli indicatori del quadro di valutazione, comprese le partite correnti. Si rimandano gli onorevoli deputati alle considerazioni esposte dalla Commissione in tale relazione (http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/2014/amr2014_it.pdf) e al memo pubblicato al riguardo (http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-970_en.htm), che riporta, nel contesto, il punto di vista della Commissione sulla situazione della Germania.

La Commissione procederà ora ad un esame approfondito per appurare se esistano squilibri. L'esito dell'esame sarà pubblicato in primavera.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013355/13
to the Commission
Carlo Fidanza (PPE) and Marco Scurria (PPE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: German export surplus

Over the last few days, the ECB has cut interest rates to 0.25% in order to tackle the prospect of deflation, which would affect the weakest countries in the euro area today.

This has coincided with the US Department of the Treasury and the IMF publicly criticising growth driven by the German economy, which is based on a contraction in internal demand and strong exports.

Indeed, Germany's current account balance as a percentage of GDP is 6.8% again this year, while the average over the last three years is 6.6%.

— Under the European Treaties, a European country's current account surplus may not exceed 6% of its gross national product averaged over the preceding three years, while its current account deficit may not fall below the 4% threshold.

— The European Treaties make no provision for sanctions, such as infringement procedures, for such violations.

— This situation has a direct negative impact on all the other countries in the euro area, especially given the current very serious crisis, which is affecting some of these countries in particular.

— Germany's trade surplus has an even greater impact on the already uneven euro area.

1. What steps will the Commission take to genuinely tackle this situation?

2. Does it intend to introduce a sanctions mechanism, such as the one that exists for deficit situations?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(23 January 2014)

The Commission adopted on 15 November 2013 its Alert Mechanism Report (AMR), which included an economic reading of a scoreboard of indicators, among them the current account. The Honourable Member is invited to consult the Commission's findings in the AMR (http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/2014/amr2014_en.pdf) as well as the Memo issued in this context (http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-970_en.htm), which provides information regarding the Commission's view on Germany in this respect.

The Commission will now conduct an in-depth analysis to establish whether imbalances exist. This will be published in spring.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013356/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(25 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Prosecuzione in Lombardia e Veneto di catture di uccelli con mezzi non selettivi (reti) e senza i controlli previsti per le deroghe dall'articolo 9, lettera c), della direttiva 2009/147/CE

L'articolo 9, lettera c), della direttiva 2009/147/CE prevede che le deroghe, quando esercitabili, debbano essere effettuate «in condizioni rigidamente controllate».

La Commissione ha chiarito questo punto, in tema di controlli, nella risposta all'interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E- 000035/2013.

La Regione Lombardia ha comunicato che entro il 2017 cesserà l'attività di cattura in natura di uccelli da utilizzare come richiami; nel frattempo prosegue a utilizzare in modo massiccio le reti.

Lombardia e Veneto, anche per l'anno 2013, hanno autorizzato l'apertura di decine di impianti di cattura di uccelli con l'uso di reti (vietate in via generale dalla predetta direttiva) pericolosi per l'avifauna migratoria in generale:

a. individuando in via preventiva (solo in Lombardia) un ridottissimo numero di controlli sugli impianti;

b. senza che l'autorità italiana abilitata (Istituto superiore per la protezione e la ricerca ambientale ISPRA) dichiari, sin dall'anno 2007 ormai, che le condizioni stabilite nella direttiva siano realizzate (articolo 9, paragrafo 2, della suddetta direttiva), per assoluta carenza di dati;

c. in presenza di recentissime decisioni dell'autorità giudiziaria italiana (ordinanza TAR Lombardia, Sezione I, Milano n. 1277 del 21.11.2013) che avallano l'operato della pubblica amministrazione;

d. senza che la Repubblica italiana abbia bloccato l'esecuzione delle delibere regionali della Lombardia e del Veneto, in forza del diritto interno;

e. individuando tra le specie oggetto di cattura (ed invero anche di caccia), l'allodola, in declino.

Visto il perdurante e grave quadro, non ritiene la Commissione che si debba formalizzare, urgentemente, procedura di infrazione a carico della Repubblica italiana, per la continua violazione della direttiva in materia di conservazione di uccelli selvatici?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(23 gennaio 2014)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-011412/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013356/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Capture of birds using non-selective methods (nets) and without the controls laid down by the derogations provided for in Article 9(c) of Directive 2009/147/EC continues in Lombardy and Veneto

Under Article 9(c) of Directive 2009/147/EC, derogations, where permitted, must be applied 'under strictly supervised conditions'.

The Commission clarified this point, in the context of controls, in its answer to Written Question E-000035/2013.

The Lombardy Region has stated that, by 2017, it will put a stop to the activity of capturing wild birds for use as decoys; in the meantime it will continue to allow the widespread use of nets.

Lombardy and Veneto have authorised the opening of dozens of installations for capturing birds with nets (generally forbidden by the aforementioned Directive) for 2013 also. These installations pose a threat to migratory birds in general. The regions have taken this step:

(a) by introducing, as a precautionary measure, a very small number of controls on these installations (in Lombardy only);

(b) without the competent Italian authority, the *Istituto superiore per la protezione e la ricerca ambientale* (Higher Institute for Environmental Protection and Research (ISPRA)), having declared, since 2007, that the conditions laid down by the directive have been fulfilled (Article 9(2) of the aforementioned Directive), due to a complete lack of data;

(c) in the light of the very recent decisions of the Italian judicial authority (Order of the Regional Administrative Court of Lombardy, I Division, Milan No 1277 of 21 November 2013) endorsing the actions of the public administration;

(d) without the Italian Republic having blocked the implementation of the Lombardy and Veneto regional resolutions, in accordance with Italian law;

(e) by identifying the skylark, whose numbers are in decline, as one of the species to be captured (and, in fact, hunted).

In view of this ongoing and serious situation, does the Commission not believe that it should initiate, as a matter of urgency, a formal infringement procedure against the Italian Republic on the grounds of its continued violation of the directive on the conservation of wild birds?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(23 January 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-011412/2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013358/13
alla Commissione
Lara Comi (PPE)
(25 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Questioni fiscali per i lavoratori transfrontalieri

Ogni giorno, circa 80 000 cittadini italiani si recano a lavorare nei paesi confinanti, che si tratti di Stati membri dell'Unione europea (Francia, Austria, Slovenia), o di paesi extra-UE (Svizzera, Principato di Monaco, San Marino, Città del Vaticano).

Lo stesso accade a cittadini belgi, tedeschi e francesi che si recano a Lussemburgo, nonché in tutte le zone di confine dei 28 Stati membri.

Tale gesto quotidiano ha delle implicazioni fiscali, assicurative e previdenziali non da poco per le persone coinvolte: si tratta di cittadini i cui redditi sono tassati in un paese a fronte di servizi erogati principalmente in un altro paese. Poiché le legislazioni dei diversi Stati membri hanno logiche, storie e dinamiche differenti, può capitare che in alcuni casi i lavoratori siano soggetti a più trattamenti fiscali e previdenziali contemporaneamente, con risultati, in alcuni casi, fortemente penalizzanti, benché a volte provvisori.

1. Ritiene la Commissione opportuno favorire un maggiore coordinamento delle politiche fiscali, assicurative e previdenziali almeno per quanto riguarda la categoria dei lavoratori frontalieri?

2. Ritiene la Commissione di dover intervenire laddove tali divergenze politiche risultino essere penalizzanti per i lavoratori transfrontalieri e quindi lesive della mobilità dei lavoratori stessi, nonché distorsive della concorrenza tra locali e transfrontalieri?

3. Pensa la Commissione che sia opportuno richiedere agli Stati membri di provvedere a fornire misure atte a porre tutti i contribuenti sullo stesso piano, nel rispetto del principio «ne bis in idem»?

Risposta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(22 gennaio 2014)

La legislazione dell'UE non prevede l'armonizzazione dei regimi nazionali di previdenza sociale né di imposizione diretta. Nell'ambito della previdenza sociale, le norme dell'UE si limitano a coordinare i regimi nazionali in modo che i cittadini dell'UE che si spostano da uno Stato membro all'altro, quali i lavoratori transfrontalieri, non perdano il loro regime previdenziale. Per quanto riguarda le imposte dirette, la Commissione può presentare proposte legislative volte a migliorare il funzionamento del mercato interno, ma queste diventeranno legge solo se gli Stati membri dell'UE le approvano all'unanimità. In mancanza di normativa unionale, gli Stati membri possono organizzare a loro discrezione i rispettivi regimi di imposizione diretta e concludere accordi bilaterali per eliminare la doppia imposizione, purché le norme che adottano non siano contrarie ai trattati. A causa di tale limite di competenza a livello dell'UE, per i lavoratori transfrontalieri lo Stato membro competente in materia di previdenza sociale può essere diverso da quello competente a fini tributari. In proposito:

— la Commissione si adopera per eliminare gli ostacoli fiscali transfrontalieri cui devono far fronte i cittadini dell'UE ([1]) ([2]).

— le disposizioni nazionali discriminanti nei confronti dei lavoratori transfrontalieri che si trovano in situazioni analoghe a quelle dei contribuenti residenti sono contrarie al diritto dell'Unione. In tali casi, la Commissione può avviare procedure di infrazione a norma dell'articolo 258 TFUE al fine di assicurare il rispetto del diritto dell'Unione europea. La Commissione sta attualmente esaminando le disposizioni fiscali nazionali per garantire che i lavoratori transfrontalieri non siano discriminati (IP/12/340).

([1]) Cfr. la comunicazione del 2010 «Rimuovere gli ostacoli fiscali transfrontalieri per i cittadini dell'UE» (COM(2010) 769) e la relazione 2013 sulla cittadinanza, COM(2013) 269 final.
([2]) Cfr. E-012285/13 e E-009921/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013358/13
to the Commission
Lara Comi (PPE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Tax issues for cross-border workers

Every day, some 80 000 Italian citizens go to work in neighbouring countries, both EU Member States (France, Austria, Slovenia) and third countries (Switzerland, the Principality of Monaco, San Marino, Vatican City).

The same thing happens with Belgian, German and French citizens who work in Luxembourg, as well as all the border areas of the 28 Member States.

This daily event has considerable fiscal, insurance and social security implications for the persons involved: these citizens have their incomes taxed in one country for services mainly provided in another. Since the logic, history and dynamics of the legislation in the various Member States is different, some of these workers are subject to more than one tax and social security regime at the same time, and, in some cases, are heavily penalised, albeit sometimes only temporarily.

1. Does the Commission believe it necessary to promote better coordination of fiscal, insurance and social security policies, at least as regards the category of cross-border workers?

2. Does the Commission believe it should intervene in cases where such policy differences penalise cross-border workers and are therefore prejudicial to the mobility of said workers, as well as being a distortion of the competition between them and local workers?

3. Does the Commission believe it should ask the Member States to implement measures that put all taxpayers on the same footing, in accordance with the ne bis in idem principle?

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

EC law does not provide for harmonisation of national systems of social security or direct taxation. In the field of social security, EU rules only coordinate national systems so that EU citizens moving between Member States, such as cross-border workers, do not lose their social security protection. As regards direct taxation the Commission can make proposals for legislation to improve the functioning of the internal market but the proposals will only become law if EU Member States unanimously agree to them. In the absence of EU legislation, Member States can design their direct tax systems, and conclude treaties with each other to eliminate double taxation, as they choose as long as their rules are not contrary to the Treaties. Due to this limited competence at EU level, the competent Member State for cross-border workers may be different for taxes and social security purposes. Within that framework:

— The Commission is working to tackle cross-border tax obstacles facing EU citizens ([1]) ([2]).

— National provisions that discriminate against cross-border workers who are in comparable situations to those of resident taxpayers are contrary to EC law. In such cases, the Commission can launch infringement procedures under Article 258 TFEU in order to secure compliance with EC law. The Commission is currently scrutinising national tax provisions to ensure that cross-border workers are not discriminated against (IP/12/340).

([1]) See the 2010 Communication on 'Removing cross-border tax obstacles for EU citizens' — COM(2010) 769 — and the 2013 Citizenship Report, COM(2013) 269.
([2]) See E-012285/13 and E-009921/13.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-013359/13
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(25 novembre 2013)

Objet: Cogénération dans le secteur nucléaire

À l'heure où l'Union européenne réfléchit au cadre adéquat pour les politiques européennes en matière de climat et d'énergie à l'horizon 2030, le potentiel de la cogénération reste encore sous-utilisé en Europe, alors que cette technique de production simultanée de chaleur et d'électricité permet d'économiser de l'énergie et de lutter contre le changement climatique. Ceci avait d'ailleurs justifié la publication, le 13 novembre 2008, d'une communication de la Commission européenne sur la mauvaise transposition de la directive 2004/8/CE du 11 février 2004 concernant la promotion de la cogénération sur la base de la demande de chaleur utile dans le marché intérieur de l'énergie, puis l'adoption, le 25 octobre 2012, de la directive 2012/27/UE relative à l'efficacité énergétique, abrogeant la directive 2004/8/CE.

Aujourd'hui, la cogénération dans l'industrie permet d'économiser 15 millions de TEP en importations d'énergie en Europe chaque année, mais le potentiel reste sous-exploité dans de nombreux secteurs, par exemple le nucléaire. En effet, dans un article du journal *Le Monde* du 29 octobre 2013, un membre de la direction scientifique du Commissariat à l'énergie atomique et aux énergies alternatives (CEA) en France déclarait que «le gisement de chaleur produite dans les centrales nucléaires est énorme. Au lieu d'en rejeter la plus grande partie en pure perte, on pourrait l'exploiter en cogénération pour le chauffage urbain ou l'industrie». Sur les 432 réacteurs en service dans le monde, 74 fonctionnent déjà selon ce principe, que ce soit pour le chauffage dans les villes ou pour alimenter des usines de dessalement d'eau de mer.

Alors que le nucléaire garde toute son utilité pour atteindre les objectifs de l'Union européenne en matière de réduction des gaz à effet de serre, la Commission compte-elle inciter les États membres à exploiter la cogénération dans les centrales existantes et les futures centrales à des fins d'efficacité énergétique?

Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission
(4 février 2014)

La directive 2012/27/UE sur l'efficacité énergétique ([1]) prévoit des dispositions spécifiques pour promouvoir l'utilisation de la cogénération dans l'industrie et dans les réseaux chaleur et de froid. Une mise en œuvre efficace de cette directive devrait également fournir un cadre propice au développement de la cogénération nucléaire. Les États membres restent toutefois libres de décider de promouvoir cette dernière.

Le programme de recherche de la Communauté européenne de l'énergie atomique a récemment financé trois projets: Europairs (la mise en réseau et l'élaboration de feuilles de route dans le domaine de la cogénération nucléaire), Archer (le développement des technologies nécessaires avant la démonstration de la cogénération nucléaire) et le projet «European Nuclear Cogeneration Initiative», qui démontre la cogénération nucléaire dans le contexte de l'industrie européenne et internationale.

([1]) JO L 315 du 14.11.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013359/13
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Cogeneration in the nuclear sector

At a time when the European Union is turning its thoughts to European climate and energy policies through to 2030, the technology of cogeneration, which makes it possible to save energy and fight climate change by producing heat and electricity at the same time, still holds untapped potential for Europe. This fact led to the publication on 13 November 2008 of a Commission communication on problems with the transposition of Directive 2004/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2004 on the promotion of cogeneration based on a useful heat demand in the internal energy market, and then to the adoption on 25 October 2012 of Directive 2012/27/EU on energy efficiency and repealing Directive 2004/8/EC.

Cogeneration is currently used by industry to save 15 million toe of fuel imports into Europe each year, but its potential remains untapped in many areas, for example the nuclear sector. In an article published in the newspaper *Le Monde* on 29 October 2013, a member of the French Atomic Energy and Alternative Energies Commission (CEA) stated that, 'the potential for producing heat in nuclear power stations is enormous. Instead of writing most of it off as a loss, we could use it to supply district or industrial heating through cogeneration'. Of the 432 nuclear reactor in operation around the world, 74 are already producing heat through cogeneration, whether to heat homes or to supply seawater desalination plants.

Nuclear power remains a very useful way of achieving the EU's objectives in terms of reducing greenhouse gas emissions; that being the case, does the Commission intend to encourage the Member States to use cogeneration in existing and future power stations for energy saving purposes?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(4 February 2014)

Directive 2012/27/EU on energy efficiency ([1]) lays down specific provisions to promote the use of cogeneration in industry and in district heating and cooling systems. An effective implementation of this directive should also provide favourable framework conditions for the development of nuclear cogeneration. Member States remain free, however, to decide whether to promote this.

The European Atomic Energy Community research programme recently funded three projects, EuropaIRS (a networking and road-mapping action on nuclear cogeneration), ARCHER (development of technology required prior to demonstration of nuclear cogeneration) and the European Nuclear Cogeneration Industrial Initiative project, demonstrating nuclear cogeneration in European and international industry context.

([1]) OJ L 315 of 14.11.2012.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-013360/13
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(25 novembre 2013)

Objet: Autoroutes de la mer: une priorité de l'Union pour la Méditerranée tombée à l'eau

Le 14 novembre 2013, les ministres des pays de l'Union pour la Méditerranée (UpM), s'entretenaient sur la direction à donner à l'UpM en matière de transports. Les autoroutes de la mer ne figurent plus parmi les projets à l'ordre du jour. Pourtant, elles constituaient l'un des six axes prioritaires assignés à l'UpM lors de sa création en 2008 au Sommet de Paris. Cet axe a été remplacé par un projet plus ciblé sur le développement d'un réseau de plates-formes logistiques.

Le projet «Logismed-Training Activities», est en effet plus spécifique: son domaine d'intervention est limité au développement de plates-formes logistiques dans le transport maritime et la nature des activités financées semblent se limiter à des actions de formation.

1. D'autres activités dans le domaine de la logistique pourront-elles être financées? Lesquelles?

Le projet MEDA-MoS II qui s'est achevé en octobre 2013 était plus large. Il avait vocation à favoriser non seulement l'efficacité des plateformes logistiques mais aussi celle des ports et des connexions de transport maritime ainsi que l'interopérabilité entre les ports et l'arrière-pays.

2. Un bilan des projets menés dans le cadre de MEDA-MoS a-t-il déjà été réalisé? Est-ce cela qui a justifié que le projet d'autoroutes de la mer ait été abandonné au sein de l'UpM alors qu'elles figurent dans le règlement RTE-T voté le 19 novembre 2013?

3. La Commission prévoit-elle des programmes supplémentaires pour continuer à développer les infrastructures portuaires en Méditerranée, qui ne font plus partie du nouveau programme?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(27 janvier 2014)

La Commission renvoie l'Honorable Parlementaire à la «déclaration ministérielle de la Conférence ministérielle sur le transport de l'Union pour la Méditerranée» et aux orientations prioritaires du plan d'action régional de transport pour la région méditerranéenne pour la période 2014-2020. Ces deux documents ont été adoptés le 14 novembre 2013 à Bruxelles ([1]).

Il convient en outre de noter que les ministres présents lors de cette Conférence ministérielle se sont déclarés convaincus que le développement des autoroutes de la mer, la logistique, les aéroports et les connexions terrestres devaient continuer de figurer parmi les actions prioritaires menées en vue de l'articulation globale entre le réseau transméditerranéen de transport (RTM-T) et le réseau transeuropéen de transport (RTE-T).

Lors de la Conférence ministérielle, la Commission a souligné que son assistance technique aura un impact positif sur plusieurs activités prévues dans le cadre de la coopération euro-méditerranéenne pour la période 2014-2020, dans la perspective de la connexion du réseau transméditerranéen de transport (RTM-T) au réseau transeuropéen de transport (RTE-T)

([1]) Documents disponibles à l'adresse suivante: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/international/euromed_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013360/13
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Motorways of the Sea: a UfM priority which has fallen by the wayside

On 14 November 2013, ministers from the countries of the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) met to discuss the UfM's future transport priorities. Motorways of the Sea no longer featured on the agenda, even though they were one of the six priority projects assigned to the UfM when it was set up in 2008 at the Paris Summit. They have been replaced by a project which focuses more on the development of a network of logistical platforms.

The 'LOGISMED-Training Activities' project is much more specific; its scope is limited to the development of logistical platforms for maritime transport, and it would appear that only training measures will be eligible for funding.

1. Will it be possible to obtain funding for other activities in the field of logistics, and if so which?

The MEDA-MoS II project which came to an end in October 2013 was conceived on a larger scale, since it was designed to promote the efficiency not only of logistical platforms but also of ports and maritime transport connections, as well as port/hinterland interoperability.

2. Has a review already been carried out of the projects implemented under MEDA-MoS, and is this the reason why the Motorways of the Sea project has been abandoned by the UfM despite its inclusion in the TEN-T Guidelines adopted on 19 November 2013?

3. Is the Commission planning additional measures outwith the new programme for the continued development of port infrastructure in the Mediterranean?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(27 January 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the 'Ministerial Declaration of the Union for the Mediterranean Ministerial Conference on Transport' and to the Priority guidelines of the regional transport Action Plan for the Mediterranean Region (2014-2020), both documents adopted on 14 November 2013, in Brussels. ([1])

In addition, it should be noted that Ministers expressed during this Ministerial Conference their belief that the development of Motorways of the Sea, logistics, airports and land links should stay amongst priority actions in view of the connection between the Trans-Mediterranean Transport Network (TMN-T) and the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T).

The Commission stressed at the Ministerial Conference that its technical assistance will reflect on a number of activities foreseen within the Euro-Mediterranean cooperation for the period 2014-2020 in view of the connection between the Trans-Mediterranean Transport Network (TMN-T) and the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T).

([1]) Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/international/euromed_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-013361/13
à la Commission
Dominique Riquet (PPE)
(25 novembre 2013)

Objet: Mise en œuvre du plan directeur européen de gestion du trafic aérien et rôle de l'AESA

La Commission a mis l'accent sur l'importance du secteur des transports dans sa communication intitulée «Une meilleure gouvernance pour le marché unique», adoptée le 8 juin 2012. Pour améliorer les infrastructures collectives de navigation aérienne, la Commission a mis en place «la définition de projets communs et l'établissement d'un mécanisme de gouvernance et de mesures incitatives destinés à soutenir la mise en œuvre du plan directeur européen de gestion du trafic aérien», ci-après dénommé le «plan directeur ATM» (règlement d'exécution (UE) nº 409/2013 de la Commission du 3 mai 2013).

En première analyse, le modèle de développement du réseau européen de l'aérien comprend tous les éléments de base du modèle ferroviaire, avec un niveau d'intégration plus abouti. En effet, au lieu de reposer sur une «bonne coordination entre le gestionnaire de l'infrastructure et les utilisateurs du réseau qui sont concernés par ses décisions», comme c'est le cas dans le domaine ferroviaire (proposition de directive du Parlement européen et du Conseil modifiant la directive 2012/34/UE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 21 novembre 2012 établissant un espace ferroviaire unique européen, en ce qui concerne l'ouverture du marché des services nationaux de transport de voyageurs par chemin de fer et la gouvernance de l'infrastructure ferroviaire), le déploiement du plan directeur ATM est confié à une entité unique.

1. Dans le cadre du rail, la responsabilité de la coordination des aspects liés à la sécurité et de ceux liés à l'interopérabilité du réseau a été confiée à l'Agence ferroviaire européenne (AFE). En revanche, le déploiement de l'infrastructure aérienne limite le rôle d'assistance de l'Agence européenne de la sécurité aérienne (AESA) aux «aspects relatifs à la sécurité». Pourquoi l'approche est-elle différente?

2. La Commission veut mettre en avant la responsabilité industrielle pour le déploiement du plan directeur ATM (le terme «industrielle» renvoyant ici à toutes les entités participant à la fourniture du service, des fournisseurs des services de contrôle aérien aux fabricants des systèmes techniques). Cependant, l'entité gestionnaire du déploiement sera, dans les faits, à la fois partie prenante pour la fourniture du service et chargée de la coordination globale. Comment régler ce conflit d'intérêt potentiel? Comment s'assurer que les décisions dites d'ordre technique garantissent un accès équitable à l'infrastructure? La Commission envisage-t-elle de confier à l'AESA un rôle d'expert technique indépendant pour le contrôle des activités de l'entité gestionnaire du déploiement, comme c'est le cas pour l'AFE?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(29 janvier 2014)

1. Conformément à la récente extension de ses compétences dans le domaine de la gestion du trafic aérien (GTA/ATM) et des services de navigation aérienne (SNA) (voir notamment les articles 8 *bis* et 22 *bis* du règlement (CE) n° 216/2008), l'AESA est chargée d'assister la Commission dans la préparation des mesures d'exécution correspondantes, tout en poursuivant ses propres tâches en matière de surveillance et de certification de la GTA/SNA pour les aspects relatifs à la sécurité et à l'interopérabilité. Ces deux aspects sont tellement imbriqués que les dispositions les concernant devraient être élaborées et adoptées en même temps. Dans le cadre de sa récente initiative «Ciel unique européen II +», la Commission a proposé de changer le nom de l'AESA en «Agence de l'Union européenne pour l'aviation» ([1]).

2. En adoptant récemment le règlement d'exécution (UE) n° 409/2013 ([2]), la Commission a mis en place un mécanisme de gouvernance pour mettre en œuvre le plan directeur ATM et accélérer le déploiement de SESAR. Selon ce règlement, une entité gestionnaire est établie afin de mettre en œuvre toutes les activités liées à la modernisation du système européen de gestion du trafic aérien identifiées dans le plan directeur ATM (voir en particulier l'article 9 du règlement). La Commission agira au niveau politique afin de garantir que la participation du secteur au processus de déploiement des technologies ATM par l'intermédiaire du gestionnaire du déploiement respecte certains principes de base, notamment la transparence, l'ouverture à toutes les parties concernées et l'absence de conflit d'intérêts.

([1]) Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil modifiant le règlement (CE) n° 216/2008 dans le domaine des aérodromes, de la gestion du trafic aérien et des services de navigation aérienne, COM(2013) 409 final.

([2]) Règlement d'exécution (UE) n° 409/2013 de la Commission du 3 mai 2013 concernant la définition de projets communs et l'établissement d'un mécanisme de gouvernance et de mesures incitatives destinés à soutenir la mise en œuvre du plan directeur européen de gestion du trafic aérien.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013361/13
to the Commission
Dominique Riquet (PPE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Implementation of the European Air Traffic Management Master Plan and the role of EASA

In its communication 'Better governance for the single market' adopted on 8 June 2012, the Commission highlighted the importance of the transport sector. In order to improve collective air navigation infrastructure, the Commission adopted a text on 'the definition of common projects, the establishment of governance and the identification of incentives supporting the implementation of the European Air Traffic Management Master Plan', hereinafter the 'ATM Master Plan' (Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 409/2013 of 3 May 2013).

Upon first analysis, the development model for the European air network incorporates all the basic features of the rail model and an even greater level of integration. In contrast with the 'good coordination between the infrastructure manager and the users of the network which are affected by his decisions' proposed for the railway sector (proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 2012/34/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 November 2012 establishing a single European railway area, as regards the opening of the market for domestic passenger transport services by rail and the governance of the railway infrastructure), a single entity is charged with rolling out the ATM Master Plan.

1. The European Railway Agency (ERA) is responsible for coordinating matters relating to the safety and interoperability of the railway network. Yet the role of the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) as regards the deployment of air infrastructure is limited to 'safety aspects'. What is the reason for this difference of approach?

2. The Commission has emphasised that the industry should share some of the responsibility for rolling out the ATM Master Plan (the term 'industry' in this context refers to all entities providing services, from air control service providers through to manufacturers of technical systems). Yet the entity managing this roll-out will effectively be both involved in providing services and responsible for overall coordination. How can this potential conflict of interest be managed? How can it be ensured that 'technical' decisions guarantee fair access to infrastructure? Is the Commission planning to place EASA in the role of an independent technical expert monitoring the activities of the entity managing the roll-out, as is the case for ERA?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

1. Following the recent extension of its competence to issues regarding Air Traffic Management (ATM)/Air Navigation Services (ANS) (cf. in particular Articles 8a and 22a of Regulation (EC) No 216/2008), EASA is in charge of assisting the Commission in the preparation of corresponding implementing measures and has own tasks in the areas of oversight and certification of ATM/ANS, for matters relating to safety and interoperability. Safety and interoperability are in fact so intertwined that the corresponding requirements should be simultaneously developed and adopted. In the context of its recent 'SES II+' initiative, the Commission has proposed to change the name of EASA to 'European Union Agency for Aviation'. ([1])

2. By adopting Commission Implementation Regulation (EU) No 409/2013 ([2]), the Commission recently set up the governance for the rolling out of the ATM Master Plan, namely the deployment of SESAR. According to this regulation, a deployement manager shall be established to implement all activities relating to the modernisation of the European ATM system identified in the ATM Master Plan (cf. in particular Article 9 of Commission implementation Regulation (EU) No 409/2013). The Commission will act, at the policy level, to ensure that participation of industry in the process of deploying ATM technologies through the deployment manager respects some basic principles, including transparency, openness to all stakeholders and absence of conflict of interest.

([1]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 in the field of aerodromes, air traffic management and air navigation services, COM(2013) 409 final.

([2]) Commission implementing regulation (EU) n° 409/2013 of 3th May 2013 on the definition of common projects, the establishment of governance and the identification of incentives supporting the implementation of the European ATM Master Plan.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-013362/13
à Comissão
Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)
(25 de novembro de 2013)

Assunto: Proibição de captura de três espécies de raias (Regulamentos (UE) n.° 1262/2012, n.° 39/2013 e n.° 40/2013)

Os regulamentos (UE) n.° 1262/2012, n.° 39/2013 e n.° 40/2013 proíbem a captura de diversas espécies de profundidade, inclusive três espécies de raias — a raia-curva (*Raja undulata*), a raia-tairoga (*Rostroraja alba*) e a raia-oirega (*Dipturus batis*) — que existem ao longo da costa continental portuguesa.

Esta proibição decorre do facto de estas raias se encontrarem ameaçadas a nível europeu. Contudo, tendo em atenção a vasta área de distribuição destas espécies, esta situação de ameaça não se verifica em todas as águas europeias. Com efeito, observações dos operadores do setor referem que estas raias são abundantes na costa continental portuguesa e constituem um recurso disponível para a pesca que pode ser explorado de forma sustentável pelo setor. Por exemplo, a raia-curva (*Raja undulata*), que é uma espécie com uma distribuição mais costeira, é frequentemente observada em estuários e lagunas costeiras. Este facto justifica a realização de um estudo-piloto destinado a avaliar cientificamente a abundância de raias e, eventualmente, ajustar a regulamentação europeia à realidade deste recurso na costa continental portuguesa.

As orientações do ICES para 2013-2014 relativamente às raias nas subáreas VIII e IX referem que este grupo de espécies apresenta diferentes níveis de vulnerabilidade à exploração, propõem a adoção de medidas de gestão específicas em função da espécie e da pescaria e consideram fundamental a proteção da fase reprodutiva das espécies. Neste contexto, é fundamental salientar que Portugal dispõe de regulamentação em vigor com medidas de gestão destinadas precisamente a este efeito, nomeadamente a Portaria n.° 315/201 que interdita a captura de raias por todos os tipos de artes de pesca durante o mês de maio, reduzindo o esforço de pesca durante o período reprodutivo das espécies e potenciando a autorrenovação das populações de raias na costa continental portuguesa.

Perante o exposto, e tendo em atenção que Portugal já dispõe de regulamentação destinada especificamente à proteção das raias, pergunto:

1. Pondera a Comissão a possibilidade de apoiar a realização de estudos-piloto visando avaliar a abundância destas espécies?

2. Se os dados científicos confirmarem a viabilidade da exploração sustentável das três referidas espécies na costa continental portuguesa, a Comissão considerará autorizar a sua pesca?

Resposta dada pela Comissária Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão
(27 de janeiro de 2014)

As raias presente ao largo da costa portuguesa são capturadas em pescarias mistas dirigidas ou não a estas espécies. A gestão da pesca das raias é feita atualmente no âmbito de uma quota comum (total admissível de capturas — TAC), vigorando proibições para algumas espécies. Uma vez que este grupo inclui espécies que se caracterizam por diferentes níveis de vulnerabilidade à exploração e dado que as raias podem ser capturadas em pescarias mistas e devolvidas, mesmo após o esgotamento do TAC, este último não é suficiente, por si só, para gerir de forma adequada estas unidades populacionais. Podem ser necessárias medidas de gestão, tais como áreas/períodos de defeso e outras medidas para a exploração sustentável dos elasmobrânquios demersais.

Os fundos disponíveis ao abrigo do enquadramento de recolha de dados já permitem prestar apoio financeiro aos estudos-piloto nos Estados-Membros. Portugal está atualmente a realizar um estudo desse teor sobre as raias. Desde o início da proibição de desembarque da raia curva, foram empreendidos vários estudos de campo a fim de compreender melhor a dinâmica desta espécie, estando nomeadamente a decorrer projetos de parceria entre os domínios científico e industrial no golfo normando-bretão e no golfo da Biscaia.

Se os dados científicos confirmarem que a pesca das raias numa determinada zona é sustentável com medidas de gestão adequadas, a Comissão poderá ponderar a forma de incorporar essas medidas no direito da UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013362/13
to the Commission
Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Ban on the capture of three species of rays (Regulations (EU) No 1262/2012, No 39/2013 and No 40/2013)

Regulations (EC) No 1262/2012, No 39/2013 and No 40/2013 prohibit the capture of a number deep-sea species, including three species of ray — the undulate ray (*Raja undulata*), the bottlenose skate (*Rostroraja alba*) and the common skate (*Dipturus batis*) — which live along the coast of mainland Portugal.

This ban is in place because these rays are endangered in Europe. However, given that the distribution of these species covers a very wide area, they are not endangered in all European waters. According to observations by operators in the sector, there are abundant stocks of these rays off the coast of mainland Portugal and they are an available fishing resource that could be exploited sustainably. For example, the undulate ray (*Raja undulata*), a species with more coastal distribution, is often observed in estuaries and coastal lagoons. This fact means that it is warranted to conduct a pilot study to provide a scientific assessment of how abundant ray stocks are and possibly amend EU legislation in line with the real situation of these stocks off the coast of mainland Portugal.

According to the ICES guidelines for 2013-2014 on rays in subareas VIII and IX, species in this group are endangered to varying degrees; they also propose adopting management measures tailored to each species and fishery, and consider protection of the species' reproductive phase to be vital. In this regard, it should be pointed out that Portugal has legislation in force with management measures specifically for this purpose, namely Order No 315/2001, which prohibits the capture of rays using any kind of fishing gear during May, reducing fishing effort during the species' reproductive period and promoting self-regeneration of ray populations off the coast of mainland Portugal.

Considering that Portugal already has legislation in place specifically to protect rays:

1. Is the Commission considering the possibility of supporting pilot studies to assess how abundant these species are?

2. If scientific data confirm that the three aforementioned species can be fished sustainably off the coast of mainland Portugal, will the Commission consider authorising fishing for them?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(27 January 2014)

Skates and rays present off the Portuguese coast are caught in mixed target and non-target fisheries. Skates and rays fisheries are currently managed under a common quota (TAC) and with prohibitions for some species. As this group comprises species that have different vulnerabilities to exploitation and catches may be taken in mixed fisheries and discarded, even after the TAC is exhausted, TACs alone may not adequately manage these stocks. Management measures such as closed areas/seasons and other measures may be needed for sustainable exploitation of demersal elasmobranchs.

Funds available under the data collection framework already provide for financial support for pilot studies in Members States. Portugal is now conducting such a study on rays. Since the outset of the prohibition on landing undulate ray several field studies have been concluded to better understand better the dynamics of this species, including ongoing science-industry partnership projects in the Normandy-Breton Gulf and Bay of Biscay.

If scientific data confirm that rays can be fished sustainably in a given area under appropriate management measures, the Commission would consider how such management measures could be implemented in EC law.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013363/13
to the Commission
Anthea McIntyre (ECR)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Review of EU waste policy and burden on SMEs

As part of its review of EU waste policy and legislation, what assessment has the Commission made as to how it may help to alleviate burdens on SMEs?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(24 January 2014)

As announced in the Regulatory Fitness and Performance (REFIT) Communication ([1]), a specific seminar on waste-related issues was organised by DG ENV with SME's representatives on 16 December 2013 in Brussels, allowing for a fruitful dialogue.

The suggestions made by SMEs representatives will be taken into account, where relevant, in the review of waste policy and legislation.

The EU's waste management and recycling sector offers vast potential for expansion. In 2008, its EUR 145 billion turnover represented around 1% of the EU's GDP and 2 million jobs. Compliance with EU policy would save EUR 72 billion a year, helping create a sector with 2,4 million jobs, primarily in SME's, and a total turnover of EUR 187 billion. ([2])

EU waste policy is driving improved waste management in Member States, which results in valuable resources being pumped back into productive use rather than landfilled. This in turn reduces Europe's dependency on increasingly scarce and expensive primary raw materials and enhances economic competitiveness.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/archives/2013/10/pdf/20131002-refit_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/index.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013364/13
a la Comisión
Michael Cashman (S&D), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Kinga Göncz (S&D), Zita Gurmai (S&D), Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D) y Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Actuaciones de la Comisión con respecto a leyes nacionales no acordes con la legislación de la UE sobre igualdad de trato

El 14 de febrero de 2012 y el 19 de marzo de 2013, una serie de diputados atrajeron la atención de la Comisión sobre la probabilidad de que la Ley húngara CCVI de 2011 sobre el derecho a la libertad de conciencia y religión y sobre el estatuto jurídico de las iglesias, las confesiones y las comunidades religiosas de Hungría no sea acorde con el Derecho de la UE, en particular, con la Directiva 2000/78/CE (Preguntas escritas E-001428/2012 y E-003104/2013).

El 2 de abril de 2012, en respuesta a la primera de estas preguntas, la Comisión anunció que «se pondrá en contacto con las autoridades húngaras para solicitar más información y examinar si la legislación húngara se ajusta a la Directiva 2000/78/CE».

En respuesta a la segunda pregunta, la Comisión comunicó el 17 de mayo de 2013 que estaba esperando la respuesta de las autoridades húngaras, que contaba recibir antes de finales de mayo de 2013.

¿Cuál es la respuesta que le ha sido dada? ¿Le parecen satisfactorios los cambios que entraron en vigor el 1 de agosto de 2013? ¿Qué acciones piensa promover la Comisión, aparte de verificar, como ha anunciado, la conformidad de la referida Ley con la legislación de la UE, y en particular, con la Directiva 2000/78/CE?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de febrero de 2014)

Tras enviar una carta a las autoridades húngaras relativa a la Ley CCVI de 2011 sobre el derecho a la libertad de conciencia y religión, la Comisión recibió una respuesta el 24 de mayo de 2013 y una respuesta complementaria el 24 de octubre de 2013. En su respuesta complementaria, Hungría informa a la Comisión de que el Parlamento húngaro ha adoptado la modificación legislativa de la Ley CCVI de 2011 y de que la disposición modificada entró en vigor el 1 de agosto de 2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-013364/13
an die Kommission
Michael Cashman (S&D), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Kinga Göncz (S&D), Zita Gurmai (S&D), Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D) und Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)
(25. November 2013)

Betrifft: Nachbereitung durch die Kommission im Zusammenhang mit der Unvereinbarkeit von nationalstaatlichen Rechtsvorschriften mit Rechtsvorschriften der EU über die Gleichbehandlung

Am 14. Februar 2012 und am 19. März 2013 machten Mitglieder des Europäischen Parlaments die Kommission darauf aufmerksam, dass das ungarische Gesetz CCVI aus dem Jahre 2011 zum Recht auf Gewissens- und Religionsfreiheit und zur Rechtsstellung von Kirchen, Religionsbekenntnissen und religiösen Gemeinschaften in Ungarn vermeintlich gegen EU-Recht und insbesondere gegen die Richtlinie 2000/78/EG verstößt (Schriftliche Anfragen E-001428/2012 und E-003104/2013).

In ihrer Antwort auf die erste Anfrage antwortete die Kommission am 2. April 2012, sie werde die ungarischen Behörden um nähere Auskünfte ersuchen und prüfen, ob das ungarische Gesetz mit der Richtlinie 2000/78/EG vereinbar sei.

In ihrer Antwort auf letztere Anfrage teilte die Kommission am 17. Mai 2013 mit, sie erwarte die Antwort der ungarischen Behörden Ende Mai 2013.

Welche Antwort hat die Kommission inzwischen erhalten? Ist die Kommission mit den seit 1. August 2013 eingeführten Änderungen zufrieden? Welche Maßnahmen will die Kommission ergreifen, um ihrer Zusage nachzukommen, die Vereinbarkeit dieses Gesetzes mit EU-Recht, insbesondere mit der Richtlinie 2007/78/EG, zu prüfen?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(10. Februar 2014)

Im Anschluss an ihr Schreiben an die ungarischen Behörden in Bezug auf das ungarische Gesetz CCVI von 2011 über das Recht auf Gewissens- und Religionsfreiheit erhielt die Kommission am 24. Mai 2013 eine Antwort und am 24. Oktober 2013 ein ergänzendes Antwortschreiben. In seinem ergänzenden Antwortschreiben teilte Ungarn der Kommission mit, dass die Änderung des Gesetzes CCVI von 2011 vom ungarischen Parlament angenommen wurde und die geänderte Bestimmung am 1. August 2013 in Kraft getreten ist.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-013364/13
a Bizottság számára
Michael Cashman (S&D), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Göncz Kinga (S&D), Gurmai Zita (S&D), Tabajdi Csaba Sándor (S&D) és Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)
(2013. november 25.)

Tárgy: Az EU egyenlő bánásmódra vonatkozó jogszabályaival összeegyeztethetetlen nemzeti jogszabályok Bizottság általi nyomon követése

2012. február14-én és 2013. március 19-én európai parlamenti képviselők felhívták a Bizottság figyelmét arra, hogy a lelkiismereti és vallásszabadság jogáról, valamint a magyarországi egyházak, vallásfelekezetek és vallási közösségek jogállásáról szóló 2011. évi CCVI. magyar törvény valószínűleg összeegyeztethetetlen az uniós joggal, különösen a 2000/78/EK irányelvvel (E-001428/2012. és E-003104/2013. sz. írásbeli választ igénylő kérdések).

Az első kérdésre válaszolva a Bizottság 2012. április 2-án közölte, hogy kapcsolatba lép a magyar hatóságokkal, hogy további tájékoztatást kérjen tőlük, és megvizsgálja, hogy a szóban forgó magyar törvény összhangban áll-e a 2000/78/EK irányelvvel.

A Bizottság 2013. május 17-én azt válaszolta a második kérdésre, hogy várja a magyar hatóságok válaszát, amely előreláthatólag 2013 májusában fog megérkezni.

Milyen választ kapott a Bizottság, valamint elégedett-e a 2013. augusztus 1-jén hatályba lépett módosításokkal? Milyen intézkedéseket tervez a Bizottság azon ígéretével kapcsolatosan, hogy megvizsgálja az említett törvény uniós joggal, és konkrétan a 2000/78/EK irányelvvel való összeegyeztethetőségét?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2014. február 10.)

A lelkiismereti és vallásszabadság jogáról szóló 2011. évi CCVI. törvény kapcsán a magyar hatóságokhoz intézett levelére a Bizottság 2013. május 24-én kapott választ, majd 2013. október 24-én kiegészítő választ. A kiegészítő válaszban Magyarország tájékoztatja a Bizottságot, hogy a 2011. évi CCVI. törvény módosítását az Országgyűlés elfogadta, és a módosított rendelkezés 2013. augusztus 1-jén hatályba lépett.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-013364/13
aan de Commissie
Michael Cashman (S&D), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Kinga Göncz (S&D), Zita Gurmai (S&D), Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D) en Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)
(25 november 2013)

Betreft: Follow-up door de Commissie van nationale wetten die onverenigbaar zijn met de EU-wetgeving inzake gelijke behandeling

Op 14 februari 2012 en 19 maart 2013 wezen een aantal leden de Commissie erop dat de Hongaarse Wet CCVI van 2011 betreffende het recht op gewetens- en godsdienstvrijheid en betreffende de wettelijke status van kerken, religieuze denominaties en religieuze gemeenschappen in Hongarije waarschijnlijk niet verenigbaar is met het recht van de Unie en met name met Richtlijn 2000/78/EG (Schriftelijke vragen E-001428/2012 en E-003104/2013).

In haar antwoord op de eerste vraag gaf de Commissie op 2 april 2012 aan dat zij „de Hongaarse autoriteiten om aanvullende informatie [zou] verzoeken en [zou] onderzoeken of de Hongaarse wetgeving in overeenstemming is met Richtlijn 2000/78/EG."

In haar antwoord op de tweede vraag gaf de Commissie op 17 mei 2013 aan dat zij het antwoord van de Hongaarse autoriteiten, verwacht voor eind mei, wilde afwachten.

Welk antwoord heeft de Commissie ontvangen? Is de Commissie tevreden over de sinds 1 augustus 2013 doorgevoerde veranderingen? Welke maatregelen zal de Commissie verder treffen om recht te doen aan haar toezegging dat zij zal onderzoeken of de wet verenigbaar is met het recht van de Unie, en met name met Richtlijn 2000/78/EG?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(10 februari 2014)

Na de brief van de Commissie aan de Hongaarse autoriteiten over wet CCVI van 2011 inzake de vrijheid van geweten en godsdienst, heeft de Commissie op 24 mei 2013 een antwoord ontvangen en op 24 oktober 2013 een aanvullend antwoord. In het aanvullend antwoord laat Hongarije de Commissie weten dat het Hongaarse parlement de wetswijziging van wet CCVI van 2011 heeft goedgekeurd en dat de gewijzigde bepaling op 1 augustus 2013 in werking is getreden.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-013364/13
komissiolle
Michael Cashman (S&D), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Kinga Göncz (S&D), Zita Gurmai (S&D), Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D) ja Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)
(25. marraskuuta 2013)

Aihe: Komission seurantatoimet yhtäläistä kohtelua koskevan unionin lainsäädännön kanssa ristiriidassa olevien kansallisten lakien suhteen

Parlamentin jäsenet kiinnittivät 14. helmikuuta 2012 ja 19. maaliskuuta 2013 komission huomion siihen seikkaan, että Unkarin laki CCVI vuodelta 2011 oikeudesta uskonnonvapauteen ja omantunnonvapauteen sekä kirkkojen, uskontokuntien ja uskonnollisten yhteisöjen oikeudellisesta asemasta Unkarissa on mahdollisesti unionin lainsäädännön ja erityisesti direktiivin 2000/78/EY vastainen (kirjalliset kysymykset E-001428/2012 ja E-003104/2013).

Vastauksessaan ensimmäiseen kysymykseen 2. huhtikuuta 2012 komissio totesi, että se "ottaa yhteyttä Unkarin viranomaisiin saadakseen lisätietoja ja tutkiakseen, onko Unkarin lainsäädäntö direktiivin 2000/78/EY mukainen".

Vastauksessaan toiseen kysymykseen 17. toukokuuta 2013 komissio totesi odottavansa Unkarin viranomaisten vastausta, joka oli määrä toimittaa toukokuun 2013 loppuun mennessä.

Minkälaisen vastauksen komissio sai ja pitääkö komissio 1. elokuuta 2013 tehtyjä muutoksia riittävinä? Mihin toimiin komissio aikoo jatkossa ryhtyä tarkastellakseen lupauksensa mukaisesti lain yhdenmukaisuutta unionin lainsäädännön ja erityisesti direktiivin 2000/78/EY kanssa.

Viviane Redingin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(10. helmikuuta 2014)

Komissio lähetti Unkarin viranomaisille kirjeen, joka koski omantunnon- ja uskonnonvapaudesta vuonna 2011 annettua lakia CCVI. Komissio sai kirjeeseen vastauksen 24. toukokuuta 2013 ja täydentävän vastauksen 24. lokakuuta 2013. Täydentävässä vastauksessaan Unkari ilmoitti komissiolle, että Unkarin parlamentti on hyväksynyt muutoksen vuoden 2011 lakiin ja että muutettu säännös tuli voimaan 1. elokuuta 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013364/13
to the Commission
Michael Cashman (S&D), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Kinga Göncz (S&D), Zita Gurmai (S&D), Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D) and Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Commission follow-up to national laws incompatible with EU equal treatment legislation

On 14 February 2012 and 19 March 2013, honourable Members brought to the attention of the Commission the probability that the Hungarian Act CCVI of 2011 on the Right to Freedom of Conscience and Religion and the Legal Status of Churches, Religious Denominations and Religious Communities in Hungary is incompatible with EC law, and in particular with Directive 2000/78/EC (Written Questions E-001428/2012 and E-003104/2013).

In its answer to the former question, the Commission responded on 2 April 2012 that it would 'contact the Hungarian authorities for further information and to examine whether Hungarian law is in conformity with Directive 2000/78/EC.'

In its answer given to the latter question, the Commission responded on 17 May 2013 that it was waiting for the Hungarian authorities' response, which was due by the end of May 2013.

What response did the Commission receive, and is the Commission satisfied with the changes put in place as of 1 August 2013? What action does the Commission plan to take further to its promise to examine the compatibility of the act with EC law, and in particular with Directive 2000/78/EC?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(10 February 2014)

Following its letter to the Hungarian authorities concerning Act CCVI of 2011 on the Right to Freedom of Conscience and Religion, the Commission received a reply on 24 May 2013 and a complementary reply 24 October 2013. In its complementary reply, Hungary informs the Commission that the legislative amendment of the Act CCVI of 2011 has been adopted by the Hungarian Parliament and that the modified provision entered into force on 1 August 2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013366/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(25 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Ispezioni subacquee della società norvegese Spectrum alla ricerca di idrocarburi lungo le coste croate del mar Adriatico e possibile perturbazione dell'ecosistema marino

Dall'inizio di settembre del 2013 la società norvegese Spectrum sta effettuando la scansione dei fondali del mar Adriatico lungo le coste croate alla ricerca di giacimenti di idrocarburi (greggio e metano) intrappolati nelle rocce; per l'esattezza, le ricerche interessano un'area di 12.000 chilometri quadrati ([1]). L'attività verrebbe effettuata gratuitamente e spontaneamente da parte della società stessa, senza pertanto che sia stata in precedenza indetta alcuna gara pubblica. La metodologia operativa utilizzata, tuttavia, è fonte di inquinamento acustico subacqueo e desta non poche perplessità in ordine ai suoi possibili effetti negativi sull'ecosistema marino. Secondo Sigrid Lüber, presidente dell'Organizzazione internazionale per la difesa del mare «Ocean Care», la tecnica adoperata dallo speciale sottomarino utilizzato nell'attività ispettiva si chiamerebbe «2D» e prevedrebbe l'emissione ogni dieci secondi di un muro di onde sonore di 240-260 decibel, molto più forte, pertanto, di quello originato dai motori di un jet in fase di decollo, che non superano i 140 decibel ([2]). «Ocean Care», infatti, si è attivata per chiedere l'interruzione di tali attività almeno sino all'adozione di misure di contenimento del rumore e denuncia, in particolare, l'assenza di confronto pubblico con le autorità, nonostante vi siano enormi rischi per il patrimonio ittico croato e per lo sviluppo turistico del paese ([3]). Secondo Draško Holcer, presidente dell'ONG croata Blue World Institute of Marine Research and Conservation (BWI), le specie ittiche più a rischio sarebbero i delfini e le balene che possono percepire le onde sonore anche a chilometri di distanza; onde di tale intensità, in particolare, danneggerebbero il loro sistema uditivo provocando lesioni ed emorragie e, a lungo andare, la loro fuga dall'habitat ([4]). Si segnala, infine, che lungo alcune coste italiane sempre dell'Alto Adriatico si sta verificando una concomitante ecatombe di tartarughe marine comuni (*Caretta caretta*), con 165 esemplari morti in meno di due mesi; gli esperti, tuttavia, ritengono che essa sia probabilmente dovuta ad altre cause ([5]).

Tutto ciò premesso, la Commissione:

1. è a conoscenza dello svolgimento di tale attività di ricerca subacquea di idrocarburi nel mar Adriatico mediante l'utilizzo della controversa tecnica poc'anzi illustrata?

2. Può chiarire se ritiene la stessa rispettosa della normativa UE di settore e, in caso negativo, se intende contattare le autorità croate in proposito?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(30 gennaio 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza delle attività di ricerca subacquea menzionate dall'onorevole deputato.

Gli operatori devono rispettare le disposizioni delle direttive Uccelli selvatici ([6]) e Habitat ([7]), sotto la responsabilità dell'autorità competente croata. In particolare, gli Stati membri devono adottare provvedimenti che vietino di perturbare deliberatamente le specie marine rigorosamente tutelate come i cetacei e le tartarughe marine, in conformità all'articolo 12, paragrafo 1, lettera b), della direttiva Habitat. Tra gli elementi da tenere in considerazione ai fini del rilascio dei permessi vanno annoverati anche gli effetti prodotti sugli ecosistemi marini e sugli habitat vulnerabili, e ciò nel rispetto del protocollo offshore della Convenzione di Barcellona per la protezione dell'ambiente marino e del litorale del Mediterraneo, alla quale l'UE ha aderito nel 2012. La Commissione è attualmente impegnata a verificare se tutti gli obblighi sono stati rispettati ed è in attesa che le autorità croate competenti le forniscano chiarimenti sul progetto in questione.

([1]) Cfr. articolo del quotidiano «La Voce del Popolo»: http://goo.gl/yPwGKs
([2]) Cfr. articolo del quotidiano «Il Piccolo» di Trieste: http://goo.gl/0jmkX6
([3]) Cfr. pagina dedicata alla questione nel sito web dell'organizzazione: https://www.oceancare.org/en/alarm_campaign_croatia/
([4]) La società in questione ha già svolto simili «sondaggi» nel Mediterraneo orientale, nel Mare del Nord, nel Golfo del Messico e lungo le coste di Brasile, Uruguay, Indonesia e Sud Africa. I vertici della stessa precisano di rispettare i parametri internazionali e che le operazioni vengono svolte previa verifica dell'assenza di cetacei nel raggio di un chilometro. La società ricorda altresì che la propagazione del suono nell'acqua è inferiore rispetto a quanto non accada nell'aria.
([5]) Cfr. articolo del quotidiano «Corriere della Sera»: http://goo.gl/iaXQaC
([6]) Direttiva 2009/147/CE.
([7]) Direttiva 92/43/CEE del Consiglio.

Inoltre, la direttiva quadro sulla strategia per l'ambiente marino ([8]) fa obbligo agli Stati membri di elaborare strategie per l'ambiente marino finalizzate al conseguimento di un buono stato ecologico delle rispettive acque entro il 2020. L'inquinamento acustico subacqueo costituisce uno dei principali problemi da affrontare. I Direttori delle Acque degli Stati membri hanno approvato recentemente un documento, di prossima pubblicazione, contenente delle linee guida per il monitoraggio dell'inquinamento acustico subacqueo.

([8]) Direttiva 2008/56/CE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013366/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Underwater surveys by the Norwegian company Spectrum to search for hydrocarbons along the Adriatic coast of Croatia and possible damage to the marine ecosystem

Since early September 2013, the Norwegian company Spectrum has been scanning the Adriatic seabed along the coast of Croatia in its search for hydrocarbon deposits (crude oil and methane) trapped in the rocks; specifically the surveys cover an area of 12 000 square kilometres ([1]). The company is carrying out the activities free of charge and of its own accord, which means that no public call for tenders was launched beforehand. However, the operating method used causes underwater noise pollution and has raised serious doubts as to its possible negative effects on the marine ecosystem. According to Sigrid Lüber, president of the international sea defence organisation Ocean Care, the technique employed by the special submarine used in the surveys is called '2D' and involves the emission, every 10 seconds, of a sound wave measuring 240-260 decibels, i.e. much stronger than the sound wave produced by a jet engine on take-off, which does not exceed 140 decibels ([2]). Ocean Care has taken steps to request the suspension of these activities, at least until the adoption of measures to contain the noise, and condemns, in particular, the lack of a public debate with the authorities, despite the huge risks to Croatian fish species and to the development of tourism in the country ([3]). According to Draško Holcer, president of the Croatian NGO Blue World Institute of Marine Research and Conservation (BWI), the fish species most at risk are dolphins and whales, who can hear the sound waves from kilometres away; waves of this intensity, in particular, damage their hearing, causing lesions and haemorrhages and, in the long term, cause them to abandon their habitat ([4]). Finally, it should be pointed out that large numbers of loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) are dying off parts of Italy's coastline, again in the upper Adriatic. One hundred and sixty-five turtles have died in less than two months; however, experts believe that this is probably due to other factors ([5]).

1. Is the Commission aware that these underwater hydrocarbon surveys are being carried out in the Adriatic Sea using the controversial technique outlined above?

2. Can it clarify whether it believes that the technique is in line with EU legislation in the sector and, if not, whether it intends to contact the Croatian authorities in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(30 January 2014)

The Commission is aware of the underwater surveying activities to which the Honourable Member refers.

Operators must ensure compliance with the provisions of the Birds ([6]) and Habitats ([7]) Directives, for which the competent authority in Croatia is responsible. In particular, measures must be taken in order to prohibit the deliberate disturbance of strictly protected marine species such as cetaceans and sea turtles in accordance with Article 12(1) b of the Habitats Directive. Effects on marine ecosystems and critical habitats are also among the factors to be considered for the issue of permits, in compliance with the Offshore Protocol of the Barcelona Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean, to which the EU acceded in 2012. The Commission is currently examining whether all obligations have been met and is seeking clarifications on the project from the relevant authorities in Croatia.

In addition, under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive ([8]) Member States are obliged to develop marine strategies with the aim of reaching Good Environmental Status in their marine waters in 2020. Underwater noise is one of the key issues to be addressed. Guidance for monitoring underwater noise has recently been approved by the Marine Directors of the Member States and will soon be published.

([1]) See article in the daily newspaper *La Voce del Popolo*: http://goo.gl/yPwGKs
([2]) See article in the Trieste daily newspaper *Il Piccolo*: http://goo.gl/0jmkX6
([3]) See the page dedicated to the issue on the organisation's website: https://www.oceancare.org/en/alarm_campaign_croatia/
([4]) The company in question has already carried out similar 'surveys' in the western Mediterranean, the North Sea, the Gulf of Mexico and off the coasts of Brazil, Uruguay, Indonesia and South Africa. The company's directors have stated that they adhere to international guidelines and that the operations are carried out subject to confirmation that there are no cetaceans within a one-kilometre radius. The company also stresses that propagation of sound in water is less than that which occurs in air.
([5]) See article in the daily newspaper *Corriere della Sera*: http://goo.gl/iaXQaC
([6]) Directive 2009/147/EC.
([7]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC.
([8]) Directive 2008/56/EC.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-013367/13
do Komisji
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)
(25 listopada 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Regulacje dotyczące tzw. tłuszczów trans

Od 2004 r. w Europejskim Urzędzie do Spraw Bezpieczeństwa Żywności trwają prace nad przygotowaniem regulacji dotyczących szkodliwości tzw. tłuszczów trans, znajdujących się w artykułach spożywczych codziennego użytku (margaryny, mieszanki margaryn i masła, frytki, fast food, zupy i sosy instant, popcorn, ciastka, batoniki, inne produkty czekoladowe etc.)

Do tej pory Unia Europejska nie wypracowała żadnych konkretnych regulacji dotyczących produktów zawierających tłuszcze trans. Przykładem powinna być Dania, gdzie od 2003r. istnieje zakaz sprzedaży przetworzonych produktów spożywczych ze zwiększonym w stosunku do naturalnego stężeniem trans tłuszczów. W Kanadzie wprowadzono w 2004 r. obowiązek umieszczania informacji o ilości tłuszczów trans we wszelkich produktach spożywczych, a w 2005 r. wprowadzono zakaz sprzedaży produktów, w których ilość tłuszczów trans w stosunku do innych tłuszczów przekracza 5 %.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się do Komisji z zapytaniem:

1. Na jakim etapie są prowadzone prace w UE?

2. Dlaczego Unia Europejska nie wypracowała dotychczas regulacji dotyczących informacji na opakowaniach o zawartości tłuszczy trans, na opakowaniach artykułów spożywczych lub zakazów produkowania artykułów spożywczych przekraczających dopuszczalną normę tłuszczów trans?

3. Czy Komisja zamierza przeprowadzić kampanię informacyjną, mającą na celu uświadomienie mieszkańcom państw członkowskich UE zagrożeń, jakie niesie ze sobą spożywanie artykułów spożywczych zawierających tłuszcze trans?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(31 stycznia 2014 r.)

Komisja uprzejmie prosi szanownego Pana Posła o zapoznanie się z odpowiedzią udzieloną na pytanie pisemne nr E-012709/2013 ([1]).

Odnosząc się do kwestii kształcenia obywateli Unii Europejskiej należy wskazać, że edukacja zdrowotna leży w gestii państw członkowskich.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-012709&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013367/13
to the Commission
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Regulation of trans fats

Work has been underway at the European Food Safety Authority since 2004 to prepare regulations on the harmful 'trans fats' found in everyday foodstuffs (margarines, margarine/butter mixtures, chips, fast foods, packets soups and sauces, popcorn, cookies, chocolate bars, other chocolate-based products etc.).

The European Union has not yet drafted any specific regulations on trans fat products. We should follow the lead of Denmark, where the sale of processed foodstuffs with a higher than normal concentration of trans fats has been banned since 2003. In Canada it has been obligatory to include the trans fat content on all foodstuff labels since 2004, and a ban on the sale of products containing more than 5% trans fats in relation to other fats was introduced in 2005.

I should therefore like to ask the Commission the following questions:

1. what progress has been made with work on this issue in the EU?

2. why has the European Union not yet drafted any regulations on the inclusion of trans fat content on packaged foodstuffs, or introduced a ban on the production of foodstuffs which exceed the permissible level of trans fats?

3. does the Commission intend to launch an information campaign aimed at raising awareness among EU citizens of the risks associated with the consumption of foodstuffs containing trans fats?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(31 January 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Questions E-012709/2013 ([1]).

Regarding educating European citizens, health education is within the competence of Member States.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2013-012709&language=EN

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013368/13
a la Comisión
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Formación dual y discapacidad

La formación profesional dual es el conjunto de las acciones e iniciativas formativas mixtas de empleo y formación que tienen por objeto la cualificación profesional de los trabajadores en un régimen de alternancia de actividad laboral en una empresa con la actividad formativa recibida en el marco del sistema de formación profesional para el empleo o del sistema educativo.

En la actualidad, a la vista del buen resultado que este sistema ha conseguido, una mayoría de países europeos empiezan a adoptar este sistema dual para la formación de los trabajadores más jóvenes y conseguir reducir las altas cifras de paro juvenil.

El empleo es un elemento esencial para conseguir la inserción en la sociedad de las personas con discapacidad, y una de las formas más importantes de promover su independencia y dignidad. La integración laboral de las personas con discapacidad es absolutamente necesaria para lograr una verdadera integración social. No obstante, de media, sólo el 46 % de personas con una discapacidad moderada y el 24 % con discapacidad severa tiene trabajo en la EU, siendo por tanto tasas muy superiores a las de personas sin discapacidad.

Habida cuenta de los objetivos de empleo marcados por la Estrategia Europa 2020 y del artículo 27 de la Convención de Naciones Unidas de las personas con discapacidad,

1. ¿Qué medidas ha adoptado la Comisión para coordinar las acciones emprendidas por los Estados miembros de cara a la elaboración de planes sobre la formación profesional dual?

2. ¿Qué medidas piensa adoptar la Comisión para asegurar que los centros en los que se imparte la formación dual para personas con discapacidad dispongan de condiciones que posibiliten el acceso, la circulación y la comunicación de las personas con discapacidad, de acuerdo con lo dispuesto en la legislación aplicable en materia de inclusión, igualdad de oportunidades, no discriminación y accesibilidad universal, de manera que se garantice la plena igualdad en el trabajo?

Respuesta de la Sra. Vassiliou en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de febrero de 2014)

A fin de desarrollar y coordinar aún más las acciones sobre los aprendizajes de gran calidad y la formación en el trabajo, el 2 de julio de 2013 la Comisión puso en marcha la Alianza Europea para la Formación de Aprendices, que reúne a los Estados miembros de la UE, los interlocutores sociales, las empresas y otros actores pertinentes.

En este contexto, se han realizado, o está previsto que se realicen, diversas acciones ([1]), como la Declaración sobre la Alianza Europea para la Formación de Aprendices ([2]) aprobada por el Consejo el 15 de octubre de 2013. Uno de los elementos esenciales de la misma es la declaración por parte de los Estados miembros de que, cuando proceda, emprenderán las reformas del sistema de EFP, en cooperación con los interlocutores sociales y otras partes interesadas pertinentes, introduciendo un itinerario de aprendizaje o mejorando los sistemas existentes a fin de aumentar el número, la calidad y el atractivo de los aprendizajes.

A fin de apoyar la Alianza, la Comisión publicará en breve una convocatoria especial de propuestas dirigida a los ministerios nacionales responsables de los aprendizajes. Además, en el marco del Método Abierto de Coordinación, un grupo de trabajo sobre educación y formación profesional de la estrategia «Educación y Formación 2020» comenzará próximamente intercambios políticos, con una atención inicial a la formación en el trabajo y los aprendizajes.

La Directiva 2000/78/CE del Consejo ([3]) prohíbe la discriminación en el empleo y la formación profesional, entre otras cosas, por razones de discapacidad, y establece la obligación de que el empleador realice ajustes razonables para las personas con discapacidad. En tanto que guardiana de los Tratados, la Comisión supervisa la oportuna transposición y correcta aplicación de dicha Directiva. Cualquier persona que considere que se han violado sus derechos contemplados en la Directiva puede presentar su caso a los tribunales nacionales al amparo de las leyes nacionales de transposición de la Directiva.

([1]) Véase http://ec.europa.eu/apprenticeships-alliance
([2]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/lsa/139011.pdf
([3]) DO L 180 de 19.7.2000, pp. 22-26.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013368/13
to the Commission
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Dual training and disability

Dual vocational training combines theoretical and practical training to develop the professional skills of workers by alternating between work in a company and training in the vocational training or education system.

In view of the good results achieved by this approach, most European countries are beginning to adopt this dual system to train younger employees and reduce the high rates of youth unemployment.

Employment is essential for integrating people with disabilities into society, and one of the most important ways of promoting their independence and dignity. Integrating people with disabilities into the world of work is vital for true social integration. On average, however, only 46% of people with a moderate disability and 24% of those with a severe disability are currently in employment in the EU. Employment levels are much higher among people without a disability.

Bearing in mind the employment targets set by the Europe 2020 strategy, as well as Article 27 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities,

1. What measures has the Commission adopted to coordinate the actions taken by the Member States to develop dual vocational training plans?

2. What measures does the Commission intend to take to ensure that centres that provide dual training to people with disabilities allow them free access, movement and communication, in compliance with the applicable legislation on inclusion, equal opportunities, non-discrimination and universal access, so that full equality in the workplace is guaranteed?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(11 February 2014)

To further develop and coordinate work on high-quality apprenticeships and work-based learning, the Commission launched the European Alliance for Apprenticeships on 2 July 2013, bringing together EU Member States, social partners, businesses, and other relevant actors.

In this context, several actions have taken place or are in the pipeline. ([1]) For example, on 15 October 2013, the Council adopted the Declaration on the European Alliance for Apprenticeships. ([2]) As one of the key elements, Member States declare that — where appropriate — they will 'undertake VET system reforms, in cooperation with social partners and other relevant stakeholders, by introducing an apprenticeship pathway or improving existing schemes… in order to increase the number, quality and attractiveness of apprenticeships.'

The Commission will shortly publish a special call for proposals in support of the Alliance, addressed to national ministries responsible for apprenticeships. Moreover, an Education and Training 2020 working group on vocational education and training with an initial focus on work-based learning and apprenticeships will also shortly begin policy exchanges within the Open Method of Coordination.

Council Directive 2000/78/EC ([3]) prohibits discrimination in employment and vocational training *inter alia* on the grounds of disability and contains a duty for the employer to provide reasonable accommodation to persons with disabilities. As guardian of the Treaty, the Commission is monitoring the timely transposition and correct implementation of this directive. A person who considers that his rights under the directive have been violated can bring a case before national courts on the basis of the national laws transposing the directive.

([1]) See http://ec.europa.eu/apprenticeships-alliance
([2]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/lsa/139011.pdf
([3]) OJ L 180, 19.7.2000, p. 22-26.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013369/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Competencia entre pymes

Existe en el Estado español una desigualdad creciente entre empresas en la facilidad de crédito: no hay en toda la zona del euro un país en el que la brecha del coste de los créditos entre las grandes empresas y las pymes, que suponen el grueso del tejido productivo, sea mayor. Los préstamos de hasta un millón de euros, los que suelen pedir las pymes, son 2,69 puntos porcentuales más caros que los préstamos superiores a ese millón (de un 4,98 % a un 2,29 %), según los últimos datos del BCE, de septiembre.

El país siguiente a España en esta desigualdad es Eslovaquia, pero a distancia, con 2,06 puntos porcentuales de diferencial, mientras que la media de la eurozona es de 1,61 puntos y en Alemania son solo 1,17 % puntos ([1]).

A la luz de lo anterior,

¿Cree la Comisión que existe un problema de competencia entre las pymes del Estado español y las del resto de la zona del euro?

¿Piensa la Comisión tratar esta desigualdad entre lo que pagan por los préstamos las grandes empresas y las pymes en el marco del memorando de entendimiento y el programa de reformas del sector bancario?

¿Puede la Comisión dar datos del diferencial de lo que pagan las pymes y las grandes empresas por los préstamos de los bancos que han recibido ayudas de Estado?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(30 de enero de 2014)

A la Comisión le parece que la situación en España se debe, más que a la falta de competitividad de las PYME españolas, a la coyuntura económica en los últimos años y al proceso consiguiente de ajustes temporales de los precios a causa del alto número de préstamos bancarios improductivos en un entorno de bajo crecimiento del PIB.

Dicho esto, está claro que el acceso a la financiación de los bancos en favor de las PYME varía según los distintos Estados miembros. La Comisión, en su Estudio Prospectivo Anual sobre el Crecimiento ([2]), reconoce que «la fragmentación de los mercados financieros ha conllevado una gran divergencia de los tipos de interés de los créditos a las empresas y los hogares en la EU […] y los volúmenes de los créditos y las posibilidades de financiación varían ampliamente entre los prestatarios potenciales en función de su ubicación».

La Comisión reconoce que «tales diferencias en el acceso al crédito no se deben solo a diferencias de condiciones económicas predominantes». Recuperar la concesión de préstamos a la economía sigue siendo, por lo tanto, una prioridad en 2014.

La finalización de la unión bancaria es el elemento clave de la respuesta de la UE a esta situación. Además, se prevén medidas específicas: los Fondos Estructurales y de Inversión europeos deben duplicar, respecto al período anterior, los fondos disponibles a través de instrumentos financieros basados en el apalancamiento para las PYME en el período de 2014-2020, lo que ayudará concretamente a los países en los que las condiciones de financiación siguen siendo severas. El Programa COSME 2014-2020 también apoyará el acceso de las PYME a la financiación a través de la concesión de garantías y capital riesgo.

La Comisión no está en condiciones de proporcionar una cifra representativa de la diferencia entre los intereses pagados por las PYME en comparación con las grandes empresas.

([1]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2013/11/22/actualidad/1385153245_380505.html
([2]) COM(2013) 800 http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/2014/ags2014_es.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013369/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 November 2013)

Subject: Competition between SMEs

There is growing inequality between businesses in Spain regarding access to credit: nowhere in the euro area is there a greater gap in the cost of credit between large companies and SMEs, which account for the bulk of the nation's productive fabric. According to the latest ECB figures for September, loans of up to EUR 1 million, which are the ones that SMEs tend to apply for, are 2.69% more expensive than larger loans (between 4.98% and 2.29%). .

The next country after Spain in terms of this inequality is Slovakia, although it is some way behind with a differential of 2.06%. The average for the euro area is 1.61%, while the figure in Germany is only 1.17% ([1]).

In view of the above,

Does the Commission believe there is a competition problem between Spanish SMEs and those of the rest of the euro area?

Does the Commission intend to tackle this inequality in the context of the memorandum of understanding and the programme of banking sector reforms?

Can the Commission give any figures for the difference between the rates paid by SMEs and those paid by large companies for loans from banks that have received State support?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(30 January 2014)

It would appear to the Commission that the situation in Spain is due to the economic situation in recent years and the subsequent process of 'temporary price adjustments' caused by a high amount of bank non-performing loans under a small GDP growth scenario, rather than a lack of competitiveness of Spanish SMEs.

That said, it is clear that access to bank finance for SMEs varies between different Member States. The Commission, in its Annual Growth Survey ([2]) recognises that 'financial market fragmentation has led to very divergent interest rates for loans to businesses and households across the EU (…), and loan volumes and financing possibilities differ widely among potential borrowers depending on their location'.

The Commission agrees that 'such differences in access to credit cannot be explained only by differences in prevailing economic conditions' Restoring lending to the economy thus remains a priority in 2014.

The completion of Banking Union is the core element of the EU's response to this situation. In addition specific measures are also foreseen: the European Structural and Investment Funds should double the funding available through leverage-based financial instruments for SMEs for the period 2014-2020 compared to the previous period, helping in particular countries where financial conditions remain tight. The COSME programme 2014-2020 will also support the access of SMEs to financing through the provision of guarantees and venture capital.

The Commission is not in the position to provide a representative figure representing the difference between the rates paid by SMEs compared to those paid by large firms.

([1]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2013/11/22/actualidad/1385153245_380505.html
([2]) COM(2013) 800 http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/2014/ags2014_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-013370/13
to the Commission
Andrew Henry William Brons (NI)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Ukraine-EU trade deal

I refer to the Ukrainian cancellation of the long-planned EU trade deal with Ukraine.

1. What encouragement or assistance did the EU institutions or agencies or the Member States provide to assist the demonstrations in Kiev and elsewhere against the Ukrainian Government's move to freeze the trade deal between the EU and Ukraine?

2. What financial or other assistance has the EU and/or Mr Füle offered Ukraine and what assistance has been discussed in this context by the EU?

3. What input in terms of representations has the USA made during the course of these trade deal negotiations and talks over the past six years?

Question for written answer E-013371/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Andrew Henry William Brons (NI)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Ukraine-EU trade deal

I refer to the Ukrainian cancellation of the long planned EU trade deal with Ukraine.

1. What encouragement or assistance did the EU institutions or agencies or the Member States provide to assist the demonstrations in Kiev and elsewhere against the Ukrainian Government's move to freeze the trade deal between the EU and Ukraine?

2. What financial or other assistance has the EU and/or Mr Füle offered Ukraine and what assistance has been discussed in this context by the EU?

3. What input in terms of representations has the USA made during the course of these trade deal negotiations and talks over the past six years?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(20 January 2014)

1. The EU closely monitors the situation in Ukraine following the Government's decision to suspend signature of the EU-Ukraine Agreement. The EU has urged all stakeholders to work promptly towards reducing tensions. All civil rights and liberties need to be respected and a peaceful political solution is needed. It is for the Ukrainian parties to overcome the stalemate in a political process and the EU actively helps facilitate contacts.

2. The EU has repeatedly confirmed its commitment to support Ukraine if faced with undue external pressure and hardship. In 2013, the EU and Ukraine signed a MoU on EUR 610m in Macro-Financial Assistance, with possible follow-up programmes, if there is an IMF arrangement. EU financial assistance would have increased to support Ukraine's implementation of the Agreement. Since Ukraine's independence in 1991, the EU has been Ukraine's largest donor of technical and financial assistance with over EUR 3,3b disbursed to support reforms. The EU has helped improve Ukraine's energy security, by facilitating the gas flows from the EU to Ukraine. We are confident that the scenario of closer political association and economic integration represented by the Agreement offers the best possible support to Ukraine.

3. The Agreement is a bilateral agreement between the EU and Ukraine. The US expressed full support for Ukraine's closer association with the EU and there is a high degree of convergence and close consultation between the EU and the US on Ukraine.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013377/13
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(26 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Incineradora de residuos urbanos de Valdemingómez (Madrid)

El 8 de agosto de 2008, la Consejería de Medio Ambiente de la Comunidad de Madrid tramitó la Autorización Ambiental Integrada (AAI) que permitía a la empresa Tirmadrid S.A. la instalación de una incineradora de tratamiento de residuos sólidos urbanos en el Parque Tecnológico de Valdemingómez.

Resulta preocupante que, si bien la AAI recogía que se quemarían los materiales que no puedan ser reciclados o reutilizados, los informes de Tirmadrid señalen que un 20 % de la composición de los materiales que se incineran en la planta sean plásticos, es decir, unas 61 000 toneladas anuales de plásticos que sí son reciclables y que generan un serio riesgo de emisión de dioxinas y furanos al aire, al tiempo que contraviene la jerarquía europea en la gestión de residuos. Por otro lado, la AAI debería haber incluido una Evaluación de Impacto Ambiental (EIA) de acuerdo con la Ley estatal de prevención y control integrado de la contaminación, la Ley de evaluación de impacto ambiental de la Comunidad de Madrid y la Directiva 97/11/CE del Consejo, de 3 de marzo de 1997, por la que se modifica la Directiva 85/337/CEE relativa a la evaluación de las repercusiones de determinados proyectos públicos y privados sobre el medio ambiente.

Teniendo en cuenta lo anterior y que un reciente informe del Instituto de Salud Carlos III ([1]) concluye que existe un incremento significativo del riesgo de muerte por cáncer en municipios próximos a incineradoras, me permito preguntar a la Comisión:

1. ¿Considera que se cumple con los criterios de reciclaje recogidos en la Directiva 2008/98/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo de 19 de noviembre de 2008 sobre los residuos?

2. ¿Qué acciones piensa emprender ante el posible incumplimiento de la Directiva 85/337/CEE relativa a la evaluación de las repercusiones de determinados proyectos públicos y privados sobre el medio ambiente?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de enero de 2014)

1. El tratamiento de residuos debe respetar la jerarquía de residuos que dispone el artículo 4 de la Directiva 2008/98/CE ([2]), según la cual el reciclado debe prevalecer sobre la valorización energética. Por tanto, como principio general, el reciclado de residuos plásticos es una opción más adecuada que la valorización energética. Sobre la base de la información proporcionada por Su Señoría, la Comisión no puede detectar incumplimiento alguno de la legislación de residuos de la UE, ya que no todos los residuos plásticos pueden resultar aptos para el reciclado, lo que convierte a la valorización energética en la siguiente mejor opción de tratamiento.

2. A partir de la información facilitada por Su Señoría, la Comisión no puede determinar la existencia de un posible incumplimiento de la legislación ambiental pertinente. En cuanto a la cuestión de si se ha realizado o no una correcta evaluación de impacto ambiental, el artículo 16 de la Directiva 2008/1/CE ([3]) prevé que las partes interesadas puedan impugnar la legalidad, en cuanto al fondo o en cuanto al procedimiento, de decisiones, acciones u omisiones sujetas a las disposiciones relativas a la participación del público de esta Directiva, mediante procedimientos de recurso tanto administrativos como judiciales.

La incineradora de residuos de Valdemingómez está obligada a respetar los valores límite de calidad del aire establecidos en las Directivas 2000/76/CE ([4]) (Directiva sobre la incineración de residuos) y 2010/75/CE ([5]) (Directiva sobre emisiones industriales). Esto debería evitar los efectos perjudiciales que la incineración de residuos puede provocar en el medio ambiente y la salud humana.

([1]) «La mortalidad por cáncer en ciudades situadas en las proximidades de incineradoras y de instalaciones para la recuperación o eliminación de residuos peligrosos.»
([2]) DO L 312 de 22.11.2008.
([3]) DO L 24 de 29.1.2008.
([4]) DO L 76 de 28.12.2000.
([5]) DO L 334 de 17.12.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013377/13
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Municipal waste incinerator in Valdemingómez (Madrid)

On 8 August 2008, the Regional Ministry of the Environment of the Autonomous Community of Madrid processed the Integrated Environmental Authorisation (AAI) that permitted the Tirmadrid S.A. company to install a municipal solid waste treatment incinerator at the technology park in Valdemingómez.

It is worrying that, according to TIRMADRID's reports, 20% of the materials incinerated at the plant are plastics, even though the Integrated Environmental Authorisation indicated that the plant would burn materials that could not be recycled or reused. In other words, some 61 000 tonnes of plastics that are in fact recyclable are being incinerated every year, creating a serious risk that dioxins and furans could be emitted into the air, and also violating the EU waste management hierarchy. Furthermore, the Integrated Environmental Authorisation should have included an Environmental Impact Assessment, in accordance with the state-level law on prevention and comprehensive control of pollution, the Environmental Impact Assessment Law of the Autonomous Community of Madrid and Council Directive 97/11/EC of 3 March 1997 amending Directive 85/337/EEC on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment.

In view of the above, as well as a recent report from the Instituto de Salud Carlos III ([1]), which concludes that there is a significant increase in the risk of death from cancer in communities near incinerators, I respectfully ask the Commission:

1. Does it take the view that this state of affairs respects the criteria on recycling set forth in Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste?

2. What actions does it plan to take in response to the possible non-compliance with Directive 85/337/EEC of 27 June 1985 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(24 January 2014)

1. The treatment of waste should observe the waste hierarchy in Article 4 of Directive 2008/98/EC ([2]) whereby recycling of waste should prevail over energy recovery. Thus, as a matter of principle, recycling of plastic waste is a better option than energy recovery. On the basis of the information provided by the Honourable Member, the Commission cannot detect any violation of EU waste legislation, as not all plastic waste may be suitable for recycling, making energy recovery the next best treatment option.

2. On the basis of the information provided by the Honourable Member, the Commission is unable to establish possible non-compliance with relevant environment legislation. As regards the issue of whether an Environmental Impact Assessment has been properly carried out or not, Article 16 of Directive 2008/1/EC ([3]) makes provision for interested parties to challenge the substantive or procedural legality of decisions, acts or omissions subject to the public participation provisions of this directive through administrative and judicial review procedures.

The waste incinerator in Valdemingómez is required to comply with the air quality limit values set out in Directive 2000/76/EC ([4]) (Waste Incineration Directive) and 2010/75/EC ([5]) (Industrial Emission Directive). This should prevent detrimental impacts on the environment and human health caused by the incineration of waste.

([1]) 'Cancer mortality in cities in the vicinity of incinerators and facilities to recover or eliminate hazardous waste'.
([2]) OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([3]) OJ L 24, 29.1.2008.
([4]) OJ 76, 28.12.2000.
([5]) OJ L 334, 17.12.2010.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013379/13
alla Commissione
Phil Prendergast (S&D), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) e Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(26 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Controversie in materia di consumo, sospensione dei pagamenti e rating del credito

Qualora nel corso di una controversia con un commerciante e/o un produttore, avente per oggetto la qualità della merce o la sua idoneità all'impiego, un consumatore decidesse di sospendere il pagamento delle rate per la merce acquistata a credito, informandone la controparte, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

La sospensione dei pagamenti avrà ripercussioni sul rating del credito del consumatore?

In caso di risposta affermativa, quali sono i mezzi a disposizione del consumatore per porre rimedio a tale penalizzazione?

Risposta di Neven Mimica a nome della Commissione
(12 febbraio 2014)

Nel caso in cui la merce acquistata a credito non sia conforme al contratto, il consumatore deve in primo luogo rivolgersi al venditore affinché vi ponga rimedio conformemente alla direttiva 1999/44/CE su taluni aspetti della vendita e delle garanzie dei beni di consumo ([1]). Se il venditore non rimedia al difetto, il consumatore può invece rivolgersi al creditore.

L'articolo 15, paragrafo 2, della direttiva 2008/48/CE relativa ai contratti di credito ai consumatori (direttiva sul credito al consumo) ([2]) prevede che «[q]ualora le merci o i servizi oggetto di un contratto di credito collegato non siano forniti o siano forniti soltanto in parte o non siano conformi al contratto per la fornitura degli stessi, il consumatore ha il diritto di agire nei confronti del creditore se ha agito nei confronti del fornitore o prestatore, senza ottenere la soddisfazione che gli spetta ai sensi della legge o in virtù del contratto per la fornitura di merci o la prestazione di servizi.» È tuttavia responsabilità di ciascuno Stato membro stabilire in quale misura e a quali condizioni il consumatore possa agire nei confronti del creditore e quali siano le eventuali conseguenze sul rating del credito del consumatore stesso. In ogni caso, tali condizioni non possono rendere praticamente impossibile o eccessivamente difficile l'esercizio di questo diritto. L'articolo 24, paragrafo 1 della direttiva sul credito al consumo obbliga gli Stati membri a garantire che siano predisposte procedure adeguate ed efficaci per la risoluzione stragiudiziale delle controversie in materia di consumo relative ai contratti di credito. In situazioni puramente nazionali i consumatori potrebbero richiedere la consulenza di un'organizzazione di consumatori in merito alle azioni previste dalla normativa nazionale, mentre nelle situazioni transfrontaliere, i centri europei dei consumatori possono fornire consulenza e assistenza per risolvere le controversie.

([1]) GU L 171 del 7.7.1999.
([2]) GU L 133 del 22.5.2008.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-013379/13
komissiolle
Phil Prendergast (S&D), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) ja Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(26. marraskuuta 2013)

Aihe: Kuluttajariidat, maksujen lykkääminen ja luottoluokitus

Olettakaamme, että kuluttaja lykkää luotolla tekemänsä tavaraostoksen maksuerien suorittamista, koska hänellä on jälleenmyyjän ja/tai valmistajan kanssa vireillä riita tuotteen laadusta tai käyttötarkoitukseen soveltuvuudesta, ja kuluttaja on ilmoittanut vastapuolelle asiasta. Voiko komissio kertoa, vaikuttaako tällainen maksujen lykkääminen kuluttajan luottoluokitukseen?

Voiko komissio siinä tapauksessa ilmoittaa, millä tavoin kuluttaja voi hakea oikaisua tällaiseen seuraamukseen?

Neven Mimican komission puolesta antama vastaus
(12. helmikuuta 2014)

Jos luotolla ostettu tavara ei ole sopimuksen mukainen, kuluttajan on ensisijaisesti haettava tilanteeseen korjausta myyjältä kulutustavaroiden kauppaa ja niihin liittyviä takuita koskevan direktiivin 1999/44/EY ([1]) mukaisesti. Jos myyjä ei kuitenkaan korjaa virhettä, kuluttaja voi kääntyä luotonantajan puoleen.

Kulutusluottosopimuksista annetun direktiivin 2008/48/EY ([2]) (kulutusluottodirektiivi) 15 artiklan 2 kohdassa säädetään seuraavaa: ”Jos liitännäisen luottosopimuksen tarkoittamia tavaroita tai palveluita ei toimiteta tai suoriteta taikka jos ne toimitetaan tai suoritetaan vain osittain tai ne eivät ole niitä koskevan sopimuksen mukaisia, kuluttajalla on oikeus vaatia oikeuksiensa täyttämistä luotonantajalta, mikäli kuluttaja on vaatinut oikeuksiensa täyttämistä tavaroiden toimittajalta tai palvelun suorittajalta mutta ei ole saanut hänelle lain taikka tavaroiden toimitusta tai palvelujen suorittamista koskevan sopimuksen mukaisesti kuuluvaa suoritusta tavaroiden toimittajalta tai palveluiden suorittajalta”. On kuitenkin kunkin jäsenvaltion vastuulla määritellä, missä laajuudessa ja millä edellytyksillä kuluttajat voivat käyttää tällaisia luotonantajaan kohdistuvia oikeuskeinoja ja mitä vaikutuksia niillä mahdollisesti on kuluttajan luottoluokitukseen. Kyseiset edellytykset eivät missään tapauksessa saa tehdä mainitun oikeuden käytöstä käytännössä mahdotonta tai kohtuuttoman vaikeaa. Kulutusluottodirektiivin 24 artiklan 1 kohdassa asetetaan jäsenvaltioille velvollisuus varmistaa, että luottosopimuksia koskevien kuluttajariitojen ratkaisemista varten otetaan käyttöön riittävät ja tehokkaat tuomioistuinten ulkopuoliset riidanratkaisumenettelyt. Pelkästään kotimaata koskevissa tapauksissa kuluttajat voivat pyytää kuluttajajärjestöltä neuvoja siitä, mitä oikeuskeinoja voidaan käyttää kansallisen lainsäädännön nojalla, ja rajatylittävissä tapauksissa Euroopan kuluttajakeskukset voivat antaa neuvoja ja apua riitojen ratkaisemiseksi.

([1]) EYVL L 171, 7.7.1999.
([2]) EUVL L 133, 22.5.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013379/13
to the Commission
Phil Prendergast (S&D), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) and Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Consumer disputes, payment suspension and credit rating

Should a consumer have suspended payment in instalments for a good bought on credit in the course of a dispute with a dealer and/or manufacturer over that good's quality or fitness for purpose, and have notified the counter-party thereof, can the Commission indicate whether such a suspension of payment would affect the consumer's credit rating?

If so, can the Commission further indicate the means available to the consumer to rectify such a penalty?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(12 February 2014)

In the case where a good purchased on credit is not in conformity with the contract, the consumer must in the first place seek remedies from the seller in accordance with Directive 1999/44/EC on consumer sale of goods and guarantees ([1]). If, however, the seller does not remedy the defect, the consumer may instead turn to the creditor.

Article 15(2) of Directive 2008/48/EC on credit agreements for consumers ([2]) (Consumer Credit Directive) provides that 'where the goods or services covered by linked credit agreement are not supplied or supplied only in part, or are not in conformity with the contract for the supply thereof, the consumer shall have the right to pursue remedies against the creditor if the consumer has pursued his remedies against the supplier but has failed to obtain the satisfaction to which he is entitled according to the law or the contract for the supply of goods or services'. However, it is the responsibility of each Member State to determine to what extent and under what conditions those remedies against the creditor shall be exercised by the consumer and what consequences, if any, they could have for the consumer's credit rating. In any event, those conditions may not make it virtually impossible or excessively difficult to exercise this right. Art. 24(1) of the Consumer Credit Directive obliges Member States to ensure that adequate and effective out- of- court dispute resolution procedures for the settlement of consumer disputes concerning credit agreements are put in place. In purely domestic situations consumers could seek the advice of a consumer organisation regarding which remedies are available under national law, while in cross-border situations, the European Consumer Centres can provide advice and assistance in solving disputes.

([1]) OJ L 171 of 7.7.1999.
([2]) OJ L133 of 22.5.2008.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013381/13
alla Commissione
Phil Prendergast (S&D), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) e Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(26 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Perizie di esperti sulla meccanica difettosa di veicoli

Qualora insorga una disputa fra il proprietario di un'automobile e il suo rivenditore e/o fabbricante quanto all'esistenza e all'entità di un difetto nella meccanica del veicolo, potrebbe la Commissione chiarire in quali circostanze un consumatore, titolare di un veicolo acquistato nuovo, possa richiedere una perizia indipendente a un esperto competente?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(18 febbraio 2014)

Ai sensi della direttiva 1999/44/CE un consumatore che ha acquistato un prodotto difettoso, come un'automobile, ha diritto al ripristino o alla sostituzione senza spese entro due anni dalla data di consegna.

L'espressione «senza spese», utilizzata nella direttiva, fa riferimento ai costi sostenuti per rendere conformi le merci a quanto stipulato nel contratto, in particolare le spese postali, i costi della manodopera e del materiale. Finalità della disposizione in questione è garantire che il consumatore non debba sostenere costi per far valere i propri diritti ai sensi della direttiva.

Se il difetto si manifesta entro sei mesi dalla consegna delle merci, di norma se ne presume l'esistenza al momento della consegna. In tal caso il venditore è responsabile del difetto, a meno che non sia in grado di confutare la presunzione e dimostrare che il difetto si è manifestato successivamente.

Se d'altro canto il difetto si manifesta entro due anni ma sei mesi dopo la data di consegna, spetta al consumatore dimostrare che il difetto esisteva al momento della consegna. In tali circostanze il consumatore può in effetti avvalersi del ricorso a una perizia indipendente per corroborare quanto sostiene.

Se tale perizia conferma la mancata conformità e se è palese che il reclamo del consumatore è fondato, il venditore è tenuto a rimborsare al consumatore tutti i costi della perizia al fine di garantire che il ricorso nell'ambito della garanzia giuridica sia gratuito per il consumatore stesso. Se invece la perizia non riesce a dimostrare la mancata conformità spetta al consumatore sostenerne il costo.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-013381/13
komissiolle
Phil Prendergast (S&D), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) ja Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(26. marraskuuta 2013)

Aihe: Autojen mekaanisia vikoja koskevat asiantuntijalausunnot

Voiko komissio selventää, millä edellytyksin uuden auton ostanut kuluttaja voi pyytää pätevää asiantuntijaa laatimaan riippumattoman lausunnon tilanteessa, jossa auton omistajan ja auton myyneen liikkeen ja/tai auton valmistajan välille on syntynyt riita siitä, onko autossa mekaaninen vika vai ei, tai siitä, kuinka vakavasta viasta on kyse?

Viviane Redingin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(18. helmikuuta 2014)

Direktiivin 1999/44/EY mukaan viallisen tuotteen, kuten auton, ostaneella kuluttajalla on oikeus saada tuote korjattua tai vaihdettua vastikkeetta kahden vuoden kuluessa luovutushetkestä.

Direktiivissä käytetyllä ilmauksella ”vastikkeetta” viitataan kuluihin, jotka aiheutuvat tavaran saattamisesta sopimuksen mukaiseksi, erityisesti lähetyskuluihin sekä työ- ja materiaalikustannuksiin. Tämän säännöksen tarkoituksena on huolehtia siitä, ettei kuluttajalle aiheudu kustannuksia direktiivin mukaisiin oikeuksiin vetoamisesta.

Virheen oletetaan olleen olemassa luovutushetkellä, jos se ilmenee kuuden kuukauden kuluessa tavaran luovutushetkestä. Tällaisissa tapauksissa myyjä on vastuussa virheestä, ellei tämä pysty kumoamaan oletusta ja osoittamaan, että virhe on syntynyt myöhemmin.

Jos virhe ilmenee sen sijaan myöhemmin kuin kuuden kuukauden kuluttua mutta kuitenkin kahden vuoden kuluessa luovutushetkestä, on kuluttajan vastuulla todistaa, että virhe oli olemassa luovutushetkellä. Tällaisissa olosuhteissa kuluttaja voi pyytää riippumattomalta asiantuntijalta neuvoja asiansa todistamiseksi.

Jos tällaisen asiantuntijan selvityksessä todetaan, että tavara ei ole sopimuksen mukainen, ja on ilmeistä, että kuluttajan vaatimus oli perusteltu, myyjän on korvattava kuluttajalle kaikki asiantuntijan käytöstä aiheutuneet kustannukset, jotta voidaan varmistua siitä, että lakisääteiseen takuuseen kuuluva oikeussuojakeino on kuluttajalle maksuton. Jos asiantuntijan selvityksen perusteella ei kuitenkaan pystytä todistamaan, että tavara ei ole ollut sopimuksen mukainen, kuluttajan on vastattava asiantuntijan käytöstä aiheutuneista kuluista.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013381/13
to the Commission
Phil Prendergast (S&D), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) and Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Expert reports on faulty car mechanics

Should a dispute arise between an automobile owner and his dealer and/or manufacturer as to the existence and extent of faulty car mechanics, could the Commission clarify the circumstances under which a consumer who owns a vehicle bought new may request an independent report by a competent expert?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2014)

Under Directive 1999/44/EC a consumer who has bought a faulty product, such as a car, has the right to have it repaired or replaced free of charge within two years from the time of delivery.

The term 'free of charge' used in the directive refers to the costs incurred to bring the goods into conformity with the contract, particularly the cost of postage, labour and materials. The purpose of this provision is to ensure that the consumer does not bear any cost when invoking his rights under the directive.

If the defect becomes apparent within six months of the delivery of the goods, it is normally presumed to have existed at the time of delivery. In such cases, the seller is liable for the defect unless he can rebut the presumption and show that the defect arose later.

If, on the other hand, the defect becomes apparent within two years, but later than six months from the time of delivery, it is for the consumer to prove that the defect existed at the time of delivery. Under those circumstances, the consumer may indeed call upon the advice of an independent expert to prove his case.

If, following such an expertise, the lack of conformity is confirmed, and it is apparent that the consumer's claim was substantiated, the seller is obliged to reimburse to the consumer all the costs of the expertise, in order to ensure that the remedy under the legal guarantee is free of any charge to the consumer. If, on the other hand, the expert report fails to provide proof of a lack of conformity, then the consumer will have to bear the cost of the expertise.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013382/13
alla Commissione
Phil Prendergast (S&D), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) e Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(26 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Responsabilità dei fabbricanti e dei rivenditori di automobili

Un cittadino dell'UE, dopo aver tentato inutilmente per oltre cinque anni di ottenere dal rivenditore dal quale aveva acquistato un'automobile (stabilito nel suo paese) e dal relativo fabbricante (stabilito in un altro paese dell'UE) l'ammissione dell'esistenza di un difetto nella meccanica del veicolo in questione — che egli aveva acquistato nuovo — e la relativa riparazione, ha dovuto ricorrere a un'azione giudiziaria per chiedere un risarcimento.

In tale contesto, potrebbe la Commissione chiarire le responsabilità dei rivenditori e dei fabbricanti di automobili in relazione a eventuali problemi meccanici e/o pezzi difettosi — in particolare se suscettibili di mettere in pericolo la salute e la sicurezza del guidatore e dei passeggeri del veicolo — che non siano derivanti dall'usura o dall'uso improprio da parte dei consumatori?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(18 febbraio 2014)

La direttiva 1999/44/CE offre ai consumatori una garanzia giuridica di almeno due anni. Un consumatore che ha acquistato un prodotto difettoso ha diritto alla riparazione o sostituzione gratuita entro due anni dalla data della consegna. Questo diritto è fatto valere nei confronti del venditore.

Nel settore automobilistico la maggior parte dei produttori offre a titolo volontario anche garanzie commerciali sulle automobili come bonus. Tali garanzie sono vincolanti per l'offerente alle condizioni stabilite nella dichiarazione di garanzia e nella relativa pubblicità. Le garanzie commerciali sono disciplinate dal diritto dell'UE solo in misura limitata. Per esempio, il venditore deve sempre informare il consumatore in merito ai suoi diritti di base in virtù della direttiva.

Inoltre, la direttiva 85/374/CE stabilisce che il fabbricante è responsabile del danno causato da un difetto del suo prodotto. Per «danno» s'intende il danno causato dalla morte o da lesioni personali e quello arrecato a un bene diverso dal prodotto difettoso con una franchigia di 500 EUR purché il bene sia destinato ed utilizzato a uso privato.

Se il prodotto difettoso ha causato un danno, il consumatore può avviare un procedimento per il risarcimento entro un termine di tre anni a decorrere dalla data in cui il ricorrente ha avuto conoscenza del danno, del difetto e dell'identità del produttore. Il danneggiato deve provare il danno, il difetto e la connessione causale tra difetto e danno.

A norma della direttiva 2007/46, se i prodotti immessi sul mercato presentano un rischio grave per la sicurezza stradale, la salute pubblica o l'ambiente, il costruttore è tenuto a procedere ad un richiamo dei veicoli e a informare immediatamente l'autorità che ne ha rilasciato l'omologazione.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-013382/13
komissiolle
Phil Prendergast (S&D), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) ja Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(26. marraskuuta 2013)

Aihe: Autonvalmistajien ja autoliikkeiden velvollisuudet

Eräs EU:n kansalainen on yli viiden vuoden ajan turhaan yrittänyt saada kotimaassaan toimivan autoliikkeen ja toisessa EU:n jäsenvaltiossa toimivan asianomaisen auton valmistajan tunnustamaan ja korjaamaan uutena ostetun auton mekaanisen vian, ja hän on joutunut turvautumaan oikeuslaitokseen korvauksen saadakseen.

Voiko komissio tässä yhteydessä selventää, mitkä ovat autoliikkeiden ja autonvalmistajien velvollisuudet, kun havaitaan mekaanisia vikoja ja/tai viallisia komponentteja, etenkin sellaisia, jotka voivat vaarantaa kuljettajan ja matkustajien terveyden ja turvallisuuden ja joissa ei ole kyse normaalista kulumisesta tai kuluttajan käyttövirheestä?

Viviane Redingin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(18. helmikuuta 2014)

Direktiivissä 1999/44/EY säädetään kuluttajalle annettavasta vähintään kahden vuoden takuusta. Jos kuluttaja on ostanut viallisen tuotteen, hänellä on oikeus saada tuote korjatuksi tai vaihdetuksi vastikkeetta kahden vuoden kuluessa tuotteen luovutuksesta. Tämä oikeus kohdistuu tuotteen myyjään.

Autoalalla useimmat valmistajat tarjoavat autoille lisäksi vapaaehtoisena lisäetuutena kaupallisen takuun. Tällainen takuu on takuun antajaa sitova takuutodistuksessa ja takuuseen liittyvässä mainonnassa ilmaistuin edellytyksin. Kaupallisia takuita säännellään EU:n lainsäädännössä vain rajoitetussa määrin. Myyjän on esimerkiksi aina tiedotettava kuluttajalle tälle direktiivin mukaan kuuluvista perusoikeuksista.

Lisäksi direktiivissä 85/374/EY säädetään, että valmistaja vastaa vahingosta, joka aiheutuu sen valmistaman tuotteen puutteellisesta turvallisuudesta. Vahingolla tarkoitetaan kuolemaa ja muuta henkilövahinkoa tai muun esineen kuin turvallisuudeltaan puutteellisen tuotteen itsensä vahingoittumista tai tuhoutumista, vähennettynä kuitenkin 500 euron omavastuumäärällä ja edellyttäen, että esine oli tarkoitettu yksityiseen käyttöön.

Jos turvallisuudeltaan puutteellinen tuote on aiheuttanut tällaista vahinkoa, kuluttaja voi esittää korvausvaatimuksen kolmen vuoden kuluessa siitä päivästä, jona hän sai tiedon vahingosta, tuotteen puutteellisesta turvallisuudesta ja valmistajasta. Vahinkoa kärsineen on näytettävä toteen vahinko, tuotteen puutteellinen turvallisuus sekä puutteellisen turvallisuuden ja vahingon välinen syy-yhteys.

Direktiivissä 2007/46/EY säädetään, että jos markkinoille saatettu tuote aiheuttaa vakavan vaaran liikenneturvallisuudelle, kansanterveydelle tai ympäristönsuojelulle, valmistajan on vedettävä kyseinen ajoneuvo pois markkinoilta ja ilmoitettava asiasta välittömästi ajoneuvon tyyppihyväksynnän myöntäneelle viranomaiselle.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013382/13
to the Commission
Phil Prendergast (S&D), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) and Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Responsibilities of car manufacturers and dealers

Further to an EU citizen's failure, over a period of more than five years, to have his automobile dealer in his home country and the respective manufacturer in another EU country acknowledge the faulty mechanics of his vehicle, which was bought new, and repair it, the citizen has been forced to resort to court action to seek redress.

In this context, could the Commission clarify the responsibilities of dealers and manufacturers in relation to any mechanical problems and/or faulty components, particularly those liable to endanger the driver and passengers' health and safety, other than those arising out of wear and tear or improper consumer use?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2014)

Directive 1999/44/EC provides consumers with a minimum two-year legal guarantee. A consumer who has bought a faulty good has the right to have it repaired or replaced free of charge within two years from the time of delivery. This right exists towards the seller.

In the car sector most manufacturers also offer voluntarily commercial guarantees for cars as an additional benefit. Such guarantees are binding on the offerer under the conditions laid down in the guarantee statement and the associated advertising. Commercial guarantees are regulated by EC law only to a limited extent. For example, the seller must always inform the consumer about their basic rights under the directive.

Furthermore, Directive 85/374/EC provides that the manufacturer shall be liable for damage caused by a defect in his/her product. 'Damage' means any damage caused by death or by personal injury or any damage to any item of property other than the defective product itself with a lower threshold of EUR 500 provided that the item of property was intended and used for private use.

In case that the defective product has caused such a damage, the consumer can initiate a proceedings for the recovery of damages during a period of three years from the day that he/she became aware of the damage, the defect and the identity of the producer. The injured person shall prove the damage, the defect and the causal relationship between them.

According to Directive 2007/46 when products placed on the market present a serious risk to road safety, public health or environmental protection, the manufacturer is obliged to recall the vehicle and to immediately inform the relevant type approval authority.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013384/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Tackling youth unemployment

An unacceptably high 23.5% of Europeans aged between 15 and 24 are currently out of work. The EU has pledged EUR 6 billion over 2014 and 2015 under the Youth Employment Initiative to finance jobs and training programmes for young people under 24. The Commission has also urged Member States to implement, by January 2014, the 'Youth Guarantee', which aims to ensure that young people receive a concrete offer within four months of leaving formal education or becoming unemployed.

In light of the high rates of youth unemployment, can the Commission provide a detailed progress update with regard to the implementation of the 'Youth Guarantee'? Can it also explain how the EUR 6 billion will be invested in employment schemes over the period 2014 to 2015?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

The Youth Guarantee is a key Commission priority. The EUR 6 billion (2011 prices) in the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) will support action to promote young people's sustainable integration into the labour market, including some aspects of the Youth Guarantee. To target the action, the YEI will support direct actions for individuals, such as high-quality traineeships and apprenticeships, first job experience and start-up support for young entrepreneurs. Member States should also use European Social Fund resources to support other investments that fall outside the YEI, such as improving the capacity of public employment services and the relevance of training and education systems.

Member States eligible under the YEI were urged to send the Commission their Youth Guarantee implementation plans by the end of 2013, while other Member States are to do so in early 2014. Such plans must outline the structural reforms and other initiatives needed for implementation, the role of the stakeholders, the way the plans will be financed (including the use to be made of EU funds), the methodology used to monitor/evaluate progress, and the timetable. They are to be based on the outline circulated by the Commission in September 2013, together with a non-exclusive list of activities eligible for programming under the ESF/YEI.

The Commission held a working seminar in October 2013 to assist the Member States in drawing up their plans, and has circulated answers to the frequently asked questions raised at the seminar. The Member States can access a hotline and Youth Guarantee website for information and guidance. The Commission also holds regular bilateral meetings with Member States and will arrange twinning on request.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013385/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Levels of obesity

On 12 November 2013, the European Centre for International Political Economy released a report that outlines the multitude of savings that could be made to European healthcare budgets if there were increased investment in lifestyle weight management solutions. It is estimated that as many as 50% of Europeans can be classified as overweight or obese.

Given that the current European obesity strategy is in the process of being evaluated, can the Commission state what steps it will take to ensure that levels of obesity across the European Union are reduced? Can it further state what support is being given to lifestyle weight management solutions?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(28 January 2014)

Nutrition directly affects the expectancy and quality of life of millions of citizens, as well as the efficiency and sustainability of health systems. The EU Strategy for Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health issues ([1]) has been pivotal in the coordination of action in this area.

The strategy underwent an independent evaluation and its results were published in 2013 ([2]). The added value of joint work at EU level, the efficacy of the strategy and the case for its continuation were made clear by the evaluators. The strategy has been reasserted and it will strengthen its focus on promotion of physical activity and fight against health inequalities.

Both the High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity ([3]) and the Platform for action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health provide fora to exchange solutions for weight-related problems. In addition, the 2014-2020 Health Programme ([4]) includes support for further research to enlarge the evidence-base for action in the areas of obesity and nutrition. Likewise, the Commission's Horizon 2020 Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([5]) will offer opportunities for research on obesity, nutrition and physical activity.

([1]) A Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity related health issues, COM(2007) 279.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/pheiac_nutrition_strategy_evaluation_en.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/key_documents/index_en.htm#anchor2
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm
([4]) COM(2011) 709 final, 9.11.2011.
([5]) COM(2011) 809 final, 30.11.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013386/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Animal health and delegated acts

Parliament's Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development is currently scrutinising the Commission's proposals relating to animal health law as part of the overall legislative package on animal and plant health. While the report is due to be presented in committee this week, concern exists regarding whether the list of diseases and species to be covered in the Commission's proposals should be set out in the annexes rather than in delegated acts.

Given the controversy over the Commission's proposed use of delegated acts for CAP reform, what assurances can it give that delegated acts will only be used where absolutely necessary as part of the legislative package on animal and plant health, and that such acts will not substantially demur from the package that is agreed?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

The package of proposals on animal and plant health and official controls is fully in line with the Commission's commitments to simplify the EU regulatory framework.

The Commission intends to respect the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality when it adopts the delegated and implementing acts that should follow the adoption of the legislative package by the legislator and it will continue its efforts to make legislation simpler and more workable.

However, the Commission wishes to underline that experience in the last decades has demonstrated that there is clear EU added value in formulating and implementing harmonised rules in these fields. This approach is essential to ensure animal and plant health and food safety in the EU as well as the proper functioning of the internal market of agricultural products and food and relevant international trade.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013387/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Match-fixing in sport

In March 2013, Parliament adopted a resolution on match-fixing and corruption in sport which called on the Commission to develop a coordinated approach in order to fight match-fixing and organised crime by coordinating the efforts of main stakeholders, including sports organisations, national police and gambling operators. In addition, at the European Lotteries Sustainable Gambling Conference held on 12 November 2013 speakers noted that a poorly regulated environment creates a higher risk of match-fixing and establishes fertile grounds for fraud and money laundering.

In light of Parliament's resolution and this month's conference, can the Commission outline what strategies it has in place to combat match-fixing in sport and restore the confidence of people across Europe in sports that are particularly affected by the curse of match-fixing?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(30 January 2014)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-010132/2012, E-000964/2013 and E-001039/2013 ([1]) for an overview of planned measures to combat match-fixing in sport at EU level.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013388/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Awareness of EU quality agricultural produce

The Commission has recently announced plans to enhance promotion of the EU's agricultural produce to third-country markets. Nevertheless, it seems that a lot more work could be done in promoting agricultural products within the EU. According to a recent study, only 14% of domestic consumers are able to recognise labels that flag up EU quality schemes for agricultural products.

Given the findings of the study and the Commission's plans to raise awareness, what aspects of this new strategy will be devoted to raising awareness amongst Europeans of quality agricultural produce?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(30 January 2014)

The legislative proposal of the Commission ([1]) on information provision and promotion measures for agricultural products on the internal market and in third countries comprises a series of elements towards the improvement of consumer awareness of EU quality schemes ([2]). Furthermore these measures in the internal market can enhance the authenticity of Union products by increasing consumer's awareness on the qualities of genuine products compared to imitations.

In particular in the internal market, information measures on EU quality schemes are eligible as themes of programs for financial support. The proposal foresees financial support for programs that provide information for the quality schemes, the organic production and the logo for quality products specific to outermost regions of the Union. These programs are eligible to receive financial support up to a maximum of 60% in case of multi programmes. The programmes should disseminate messages highlighting the specific elements of the CAP, including its sustainable production methods and quality schemes.

In addition, the proposal states that the Commission may carry out information and promotion measures such as the participation in trade fairs and exhibitions of international importance by means of stands or operations aimed at enhancing the image of Union products.

Hence, these aspects of the proposal aim to address the low awareness of the European logos for quality schemes while providing information on the EU quality schemes and contributing to the domestic consumers' awareness.

([1]) COM(2013) 812.
([2]) OJ L 343, 14.12.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013389/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Border between Gibraltar and Spain

The Commission recently announced that Spain had not infringed the rules on border controls after it sent observers to investigate the lengthy border queues between Gibraltar and Spain. However, the Commission admitted that the additional checks introduced at the border are 'nevertheless challenging' and pose 'technical problems'.

Although the Commission plans to review the situation in six months, can it state already what measures it will take to ensure that the single market is not compromised by unnecessary restrictions on the free movement of people, goods, services and capital between Member States?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(17 February 2014)

The Commission assessed the compatibility with Union law of the measures taken by Spain at the border with Gibraltar. Its findings can be found via the following link: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2013:357:0005:0007:EN:PDF.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013390/13
alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(26 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Caratteristiche rurali di Fossalto (provincia di Campobasso)

Lo sviluppo rurale dell'Unione europea è una delle priorità chiave delle politiche comunitari e le zone rurali sono un elemento essenziale della geografia e dell'identità dell'UE. Oltre la metà della popolazione dell'Unione europea a 25 vive in zone rurali, che rappresentano il 90 % del territorio dell'UE: lo sviluppo rurale costituisce pertanto un settore di vitale importanza.

La regione Molise è un territorio ad alto tasso di ruralità e, già in passato, le caratteristiche rurali molisane, e in particolare del territorio di Fossalto, comune di antiche tradizioni agricole della provincia di Campobasso, sono state riconosciute e apprezzate in ambito internazionale, come testimoniato dal premio conseguito nell'ambito del concorso «*Images of Rural Europe — An ENRD Photo Competition promoted by Local Action Groups*» indetto dalla Commissione europea.

Nell'ambito della kermesse concorsuale di cui sopra, il territorio fossaltese è stato premiato per una foto denominata «Fienagione» scattata a Fossalto, in cui è rappresentata la raccolta del fieno e la composizione dello stiglio, tipico modo di conservare il fieno ammucchiandolo e pressandolo attorno ad un palo. Si tratta di una tradizione rurale particolare e di un tipo di metodologia difficile da preservare in un mercato sempre più «automatizzato», che punta sulla competitività economica a scapito delle tradizioni rurali europee, che tendono sempre più a scomparire.

L'attuale momento di profonda crisi economica rende impossibile per i paesi membri e le regioni investire risorse economiche tese a tutelare attività secolari che rientrano nello straordinario patrimonio rurale comunitario, ma che attualmente sono ritenute non sufficientemente remunerative.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, potrebbe la Commissione istruirci su eventuali programmi e strumenti finanziari che potrebbero essere utilizzati a tutela delle tradizioni rurali descritte?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione
(20 gennaio 2014)

Per il periodo di programmazione 2007-2013, il programma di sviluppo rurale (PSR) della regione Molise, cofinanziato dal Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale, prevede diverse misure a sostegno di iniziative tese a preservare le tradizioni e il patrimonio culturale delle zone rurali.

È possibile ad esempio sostenere la certificazione e la promozione di determinati prodotti agricoli tradizionali, le pratiche agricole tradizionali aventi effetti benefici sull'ambiente, la diversificazione delle aziende agricole verso attività non agricole (incluso l'artigianato tradizionale), lo sviluppo e il rinnovamento dei villaggi e la tutela e la riqualificazione del patrimonio rurale.

Inoltre, almeno il 5 % di tutti i programmi di sviluppo rurale focalizza l'attenzione sull'approccio dal basso verso l'alto dell'iniziativa LEADER, con gruppi di azione locale responsabili della definizione e dell'attuazione di strategie di sviluppo, che possono includere il sostegno alle attività tradizionali locali in linea con le priorità generali dei PSR.

Per quanto concerne la selezione e il finanziamento dei singoli progetti, l'esecuzione delle azioni nell'ambito del FEASR è decentrata. I finanziamenti sono concessi a seguito di inviti a presentare progetti, pubblicati periodicamente dall'autorità di gestione del PSR del Molise, incaricata anche della selezione dei progetti. È dunque a questo livello che si possono trovare informazioni più dettagliate sui criteri di ammissibilità o di selezione, nonché sul calendario degli inviti a presentare progetti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013390/13
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Rural features of Fossalto (Province of Campobasso)

Rural development in the European Union is one of the EU's key policy priorities, and rural areas are an essential part of the EU's geography and identity. Over half of the EU 25 population live in rural areas, which cover 90% of EU territory: rural development is therefore a sector of vital importance.

Molise is a region with a large farming community and, in the past, the rural features of Molise, and particularly Fossalto, a municipality with ancient farming traditions in the Province of Campobasso, have been recognised and appreciated internationally, as demonstrated by the prize awarded as part of the 'Images of Rural Europe — An ENRD Photo Competition promoted by Local Action Groups', launched by the Commission.

During the competition ceremony, Fossalto received an award for the photo 'Fienagione' taken in Fossalto, which depicts the gathering of hay and the creation of a *stiglio*, a traditional way of storing hay by stacking it and pressing it around a pole. This is a unique rural tradition and a method that is difficult to preserve in an increasingly 'automated' market, which focuses on economic competitiveness to the detriment of European rural traditions, more and more of which are disappearing.

The current deep economic crisis is making it impossible for Member States and regions to invest economic resources in the safeguarding of centuries-old activities which form part of the EU's extraordinary rural heritage, but which are not considered to be sufficiently profitable today.

In view of the above, could the Commission provide details of any programmes and financial instruments which could be used to protect the rural traditions described?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(20 January 2014)

During the programming period 2007-2013, the Rural Development Programme (RDP) of the Molise Region, co-financed from the European Agricultural Fund for Rural development, contains several measures that could support initiatives related to the perpetuation of rural traditions and cultural heritage.

Support can be provided, for example, for the certification and promotion of certain traditional agricultural products, for traditional agricultural practices beneficial to the environment, for de diversification of farms into non-agricultural activities (including traditional crafts), for village renewal and development, as well as for the conservation and upgrading of the rural heritage.

Moreover, a minimum of 5% of all rural development programmes is allocated to the bottom-up approach of Leader, where local action groups draft and implement development strategies, which can include support for local traditional activities in line with the general priorities of the RDPs.

With regard to the selection and funding of individual projects, the implementation of actions under the EAFRD is decentralised. Funding is granted following calls for projects published periodically by the Managing Authority of the Molise RDP, which is also in charge of the selection of projects. It is, therefore, at this level that more detailed information on eligibility or selection criteria, as well as on the timing of calls for projects, can be found.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013391/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(26 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Sfruttamento delle lavoratrici indonesiane

Nelle case di Hong Kong sono impiegate oltre 300 000 migranti, di cui la metà provenienti dall'Indonesia. Un rapporto di Amnesty International denuncia a tale proposito le responsabilità delle autorità indonesiane e di Hong Kong in una questione che coinvolge le agenzie di collocamento di entrambi i paesi. Due terzi delle lavoratrici migranti indonesiane che lavorano come collaboratrici domestiche a Hong Kong vivono in condizioni di sfruttamento o vera e propria schiavitù, sottoposte a orari massacranti, sottopagate, vittime di violenza sessuale e impossibilitate a uscire dall'abitazione in cui prestano servizio.

Dalle interviste individuali realizzate da Amnesty International e da un sondaggio effettuato dal sindacato delle lavoratrici e dei lavoratori migranti dell'Indonesia, è emerso che un terzo delle collaboratrici domestiche non può mai uscire dalla casa del datore di lavoro, che esse lavorano in media 17 ore al giorno senza ricevere nemmeno la paga minima prevista per legge e che non possono praticare la loro fede.

La Commissione:

1. è a conoscenza di queste circostanze?

2. quali disposizioni o misure possono essere adottate al fine di elaborare iniziative efficaci e coerenti per combattere questo fenomeno?

3. intende creare reti e prendere contatti con le autorità nazionali di questi paesi per garantire progressi in tale ambito?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(30 gennaio 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza delle circostanze relative a situazioni di abuso e sfruttamento delle collaboratrici domestiche migranti nel sud-est asiatico.

In linea con l'approccio globale del 2011 in materia di migrazione e mobilità e con la comunicazione del 2013 «Massimizzare l'incidenza della migrazione sullo sviluppo», la Commissione raccomanda una strategia generale di accompagnamento e protezione dei migranti lungo tutto il percorso migratorio, anche per quanto riguarda la tutela dei loro diritti umani e il miglioramento dell'integrazione nei paesi di destinazione. La Commissione è inoltre impegnata a prevenire e debellare situazioni di sfruttamento, in linea con la strategia dell'UE per l'eradicazione della tratta di esseri umani (2012-2016). Forme più concrete di partenariato per la cooperazione nel settore sono in corso di definizione in paesi o regioni prioritari, secondo quanto stabilito dal Consiglio nel 2012, e interessano anche la regione dell'Asia sudorientale.

Nell'ambito dello strumento di cooperazione allo sviluppo sono stati sostenuti diversi progetti per la protezione dei lavoratori migranti vulnerabili; il programma d'azione globale per le lavoratrici e i lavoratori domestici migranti e le loro famiglie (4,4 milioni di EUR, attuato dall'OIL), ad esempio, mira a promuovere i diritti umani e condizioni di lavoro dignitose per queste persone, attraverso l'ampliamento delle conoscenze, la promozione della consapevolezza e il sostegno ai responsabili decisionali, e interessa, tra gli altri, il corridoio di migrazione Indonesia-Malaysia. Peraltro, nel 2014 sarà avviata un'azione della società civile coordinata a livello mondiale per promuovere i diritti dei migranti, in una prospettiva globale e con un'attenzione specifica alle lavoratrici e ai lavoratori domestici migranti.

Inoltre, la Commissione promuove condizioni di lavoro dignitose per le collaboratrici domestiche nel contesto dell'entrata in vigore della Convenzione OIL n. 189 sul lavoro dignitoso per le lavoratrici e i lavoratori domestici anche nei suoi dialoghi politici a livello bilaterale e regionale con i paesi partner.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013391/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Exploitation of female workers in Indonesia

Over 300 000 migrants are employed in houses in Hong Kong, half of whom come from Indonesia. An Amnesty International report highlights the responsibilities of the Indonesian and Hong Kong authorities in this matter, which concerns employment agencies in both countries. Two thirds of Indonesian female migrants employed as domestic workers in Hong Kong live in exploitative or genuinely slave-like conditions, have to work excruciatingly long hours, are underpaid, endure sexual violence and are unable to leave the house where they work.

Individual interviews carried out by Amnesty International and a survey carried out by the Indonesian migrant workers trade union show that a third of domestic workers cannot ever leave the house of their employer, work for an average of 17 hours a day without even receiving the minimum pay stipulated by law and cannot practise their faith.

1. Is the Commission aware of these circumstances?

2. What provisions or measures could be adopted in order to establish effective and consistent initiatives to combat this problem?

3. Does the Commission intend to establish networks and make contact with the national authorities in these countries to ensure progress in this matter?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(30 January 2014)

The Commission is aware of the circumstances relating to situations of abuse and exploitation of migrant domestic workers in South East Asia.

In line with the 2011 Global Approach to Migration and Mobility and the 2013 Communication on Maximising the Development Impact of Migration, the Commission advocates a comprehensive approach to accompany and protect migrants along their migratory route, including protecting their human rights and improving integration in destination countries. The Commission is also engaged in preventing and eradicating exploitative situations, in line with the EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016. More concrete partnerships for cooperation in this area are now being developed in priority countries and regions, as established by the Council in 2012. The South East Asian region is included.

Under the Development Cooperation Instrument, several projects for protecting vulnerable migrant workers have been supported, e.g. the Global Action Programme on Migrant Domestic Workers and their Families (EUR 4.4 million; implemented by ILO) seeks to promote human rights and decent work for migrant domestic workers by expanding the knowledge base, promoting awareness and supporting decision-makers, and targets the Indonesia-Malaysia migration corridor, amongst others. Moreover, a globally coordinated civil society action to promote migrants' rights, with a global scope and a specific focus on migrant domestic workers, will be launched in 2014.

In addition, the Commission also promotes decent work for domestic workers in the context of the entry into force of the ILO Domestic Workers Convention (No 189) in its bilateral and regional policy dialogues with partner countries.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013392/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(26 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Inquinamento dell'aria e minaccia per la salute dei cittadini europei

Ogni giorno i cittadini europei respirano 15 000 litri di aria inquinata. Un'associazione ambientalista francese ha realizzato un esperimento, semplice ma di forte impatto, posizionando sul tetto di un'abitazione parigina un cubo di tela bianco dove, dopo soli 4 giorni, è apparso un messaggio reso visibile dall'effetto dell'inquinamento atmosferico.

1. Come valuta la situazione dell'inquinamento dell'aria in ciascuno Stato membro?

2. Quale strategia intende perseguire per salvaguardare la salute dei cittadini europei?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(30 gennaio 2014)

Gli attuali livelli di inquinamento atmosferico nell'UE sono all'origine di circa 400 000 decessi prematuri e incidono negativamente anche sul benessere dei cittadini, sull'economia e sull'ambiente. I valori limite di qualità dell'aria ([1]) nell'UE per il particolato ($PM_{2,5}$) e il biossido di azoto (NO_2) sono ampiamente superati in molti Stati membri, così come gli standard di qualità fissati per l'ozono troposferico e altri inquinanti. L'Agenzia europea dell'ambiente predispone una relazione annuale che sintetizza queste stime per ciascuno degli Stati membri ([2]).

La Commissione ha presentato una nuova strategia per ridurre l'inquinamento atmosferico il 18 dicembre 2013. Tale strategia contiene proposte legislative per la riduzione dei massimali nazionali di emissione e per nuove norme sulle emissioni per i principali inquinanti come il particolato. Questa strategia è intesa a ridurre l'inquinamento atmosferico e garantire benefici per la salute dei cittadini.

([1]) Direttive 2008/50/CE e 2004/107/CE.
([2]) Ad esempio relazione AEA n. 9/2013, consultabile nel sito: http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/air-quality-in-europe-2013

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013392/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Air pollution and risk to the health of European citizens

Every day, European citizens breathe in 15 000 litres of polluted air. A French environmental association has conducted a simple but powerful experiment that involved placing a white canvas square on the roof of a building in Paris. After just four days, a message appeared, made visible by the effects of air pollution.

1. What is the Commission's assessment of the air pollution situation in each Member State?

2. What strategy does it intend to pursue in order to safeguard the health of European citizens?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(30 January 2014)

The current levels of air pollution in the EU cause some 400 000 premature deaths and also affect citizens' well-being, the economy and the environment. The EU air quality limit ([1]) values for particulate matter (PM2.5) and nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) are widely exceeded in many Member States. The quality standards set for ground-level ozone and other pollutants are also exceeded. The European Environment Agency provides an annual report summarising these estimates for each Member States ([2]).

The Commission put forward a new Strategy to reduce air pollution on 18 December 2013. This strategy sets forth legislative proposals for reduced national emission ceilings and for new emission standards for key pollutants like particulate matter. The strategy is designed to cut air pollution and secure benefits for the health of citizens.

([1]) EU Directive 2008/50/EC and 2004/107/EC.
([2]) e.g. EEA report no. 9/2013 available at http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/air-quality-in-europe-2013

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013393/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(26 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Maltrattamenti dei conigli d'angora in Cina

Si stima che in Cina vengano allevati più di 50 milioni di conigli d'angora per una produzione complessiva di circa 4 000 tonnellate di pelliccia all'anno. Sebbene il processo di tosatura di un coniglio d'angora richieda normalmente un'ora di tempo, i filmati prodotti da un'associazione animalista dimostrano che negli allevamenti cinesi tale operazione avviene nel giro di pochi minuti. La tosatura viene ripetuta circa ogni 3 mesi per tutta la durata della vita dell'animale, che mediamente vive in allevamento 2 o 3 anni, molto meno di quanto potrebbe in condizioni normali (fino a 10 anni). Le immagini, riprese in località segreta, in dieci diversi allevamenti, mostrano conigli d'angora feriti, con tutte le zampe legate a una corda, che cercano di liberarsi mentre operai con le forbici provano a tosarli. In Cina ha luogo il 90 % della produzione mondiale di lana d'angora, mentre il restante 10 % viene prodotto da Argentina, Cile, Repubblica Ceca e Ungheria.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza di questi fatti?

2. Può fornire informazioni relative alle azioni attualmente intraprese dall'UE in materia di benessere animale?

3. Concorda sul fatto che sarebbe opportuno affrontare l'argomento nel corso dei negoziati commerciali con la Cina?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(24 gennaio 2014)

La Commissione è a conoscenza degli articoli pubblicati di recente sui media e basati su filmati preparati dal gruppo per i diritti degli animali PETA (People for the ethical treatment of animals).

Ai conigli allevati nell'UE per la produzione di pellicce e carne si applicano le norme di cui alla direttiva 98/58 del Consiglio, ([1]) intese a garantire che agli animali non vengano provocati dolori, sofferenze o lesioni inutili.

Le norme sul benessere degli animali contenute nella legislazione dell'UE non possono essere applicate direttamente nei paesi terzi. Esistono attualmente poche eccezioni, come le norme relative al benessere nei macelli, che si basano sugli orientamenti internazionali adottati dall'Organizzazione mondiale per la salute animale (OIE). Dal 2013 le carni importate nell'UE devono provenire da animali abbattuti conformemente alle prescrizioni del regolamento (CE) n. 1099/2009 ([2]). Fintantoché le condizioni d'importazione per un determinato prodotto di origine animale sono certificate, tale prodotto può essere importato nell'UE.

([1]) Direttiva 98/58/CE del Consiglio, del 20 luglio 1998, riguardante la protezione degli animali negli allevamenti; GU L 221 dell'8.8.1998, pag. 23.
([2]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1099/2009 del Consiglio, del 24 settembre 2009, relativo alla protezione degli animali durante l'abbattimento; GU L 303 dell'18.11.2009, pag. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013393/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Mistreatment of Angora rabbits in China

It is estimated that over 50 million Angora rabbits are bred in China, with an overall production of some 4 000 tonnes of fur annually. Although the process of shearing an Angora rabbit normally takes an hour, films recorded by an animal welfare association show that Chinese breeding farms only take a few minutes to shear their animals. The shearing is repeated every three months throughout an animal's lifetime, which is two or three years on average in a breeding farm — much less than it would be in normal conditions (up to 10 years). The images, recorded in secret locations in 10 different breeding farms, show injured Angora rabbits, with all their paws tied to a string, struggling to get free while workers with scissors attempt to shear them. China is responsible for 90% of the world's Angora wool production, while the other 10% is produced in Argentina, Chile, the Czech Republic and Hungary.

1. Is the Commission aware of these facts?

2. Can it provide information on the animal welfare measures currently taken by the EU?

3. Does it agree that this topic should be brought up during trade negotiations with China?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(24 January 2014)

The Commission is aware of the media articles which have been published recently on the basis of footage prepared by the animal rights group PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals).

For rabbits farmed within the EU for the production of fur and meat, the rules laid down in Council Directive 98/58 ([1]) apply thus ensuring that the animals are not caused any unnecessary pain, suffering or injury.

Animal welfare standards required by EU legislation cannot be directly applied in third countries. A few exceptions exist at present such as the welfare standards at abattoirs that are based on the international guidelines adopted by the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE). Since 2013 the meat imported into the EU must derive from animals killed in accordance with the requirements in Regulation (EC) 1099/2009 ([2]). As long as the import conditions for a specific product of animal origin are certified such products may be imported into the EU.

([1]) Council Directive 98/58/EC of 20 July 1998 concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes; OJ L 221, 8.8.1998, p. 23.
([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 of 24 September 2009 on the protection of animals at time of killing; OJ L 303, 18.11.2009, p. 1.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-013394/13
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI) en Lucas Hartong (NI)
(26 november 2013)

Betreft: Financiering van vrijgelaten terroristen

Bij verschillende gelegenheden heb ik mijn zorg geuit over de financiering van projecten van de Palestijnse Autoriteit (PA) door de EU. De besteding van deze gelden wordt onvoldoende gecontroleerd waardoor Europees belastinggeld terechtkomt op plaatsen waarvoor dat niet is bestemd (E-008299/2012, E-011818/2013).

In een artikel in „The Times of Israël" wordt melding gemaakt van het schenken door de PA van een premie van ten minste 50 000 dollar aan elke door de Israëlische autoriteiten vrijgelaten gevangene ([1]). Zesentwintig Palestijnse gevangenen die zijn veroordeeld voor moorden op Israëliërs en onlangs door Israël zijn vrijgelaten als een teken van goede wil, om daarmee de vredesbesprekingen vlot te trekken, kregen het genoemde minimale bedrag, verhoogd met een maandelijkse bijdrage van de PA. De hoogte van de maandelijkse bijdrage aan de vrijgelatenen is afhankelijk van de duur van hun gevangenschap.

Degenen die langer dan 25 jaar gevangen hebben gezeten krijgen daarnaast een (overheids)functie toebedeeld met een maandvergoeding van 4 000 dollar. Dit houdt in dat niet alleen Palestijnse gevangenen worden betaald door de PA (zie mijn eerdere vragen aan de Commissie), maar dat ook vrijgelaten gevangenen geldelijke bonussen ontvangen en (imaginaire) functies worden toebedeeld.

1. Kan de Commissie mij garanderen dat er geen Europees belastinggeld wordt gebruikt voor het betalen van vrijgelaten Palestijnse terroristen en/of hun families alleen omdat zij gevangen hebben gezeten vanwege terroristische acties tegen Israëliërs?

2. Kan de Commissie mij garanderen dat er geen EU-gelden worden besteed aan het bezoldigen van vrijgelaten Palestijnse terroristen die (overheids)functies vervullen die zijn geschapen met het doel om de betrokken terroristen te „belonen" voor hun terroristische acties?

3. Zo neen, welke stappen zal de EU nemen om te voorkomen dat Europees belastinggeld wordt gebruikt om vrijgelaten Palestijnse terroristen of hun families direct of indirect te financieren?

4. Vindt de Commissie overigens dat 4 000 dollar (5x het modale Palestijns ambtenarensalaris) een passende beloning is, gezien de sociaaleconomische context van Palestina, dat door de EU als een ontwikkelingsgebied wordt gezien?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(24 januari 2014)

De Commissie verwijst de geachte Parlementsleden naar haar antwoord op de vorige vraag 08299/2012 ([2]), waarin de procedures met betrekking tot de betalingen in het kader van het PEGASE-mechanisme worden geschetst. Er zijn geen EU-middelen gebruikt om vrijgelaten Palestijnse gevangenen te betalen. De Commissie meent dat deze procedures robuust zijn en dit is erkend door de Rekenkamer in haar recente prestatie-audit van het mechanisme.

Aangezien er geen EU-middelen worden gebruikt voor toewijzingen aan voormalige gevangenen, heeft de Commissie geen standpunt ingenomen over deze kwestie.

([1]) http://www.timesofisrael.com/palestinian-authority-gives-freed-prisoners-50000-each/.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/nl/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013394/13
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI) and Lucas Hartong (NI)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Funding of released terrorists

On various occasions, I have expressed my concerns about the EU funding projects for the Palestinian Authority (PA). There is inadequate monitoring of how these funds are spent, as a result of which European taxpayers' money ends up being used for things for which it was not intended (E-008299/2012, E-011818/2013).

An article in *The Times of Israel* reports that the PA awarded each prisoner released by the Israeli authorities a payment of at least USD 50 000 ([1]). Twenty-six Palestinian prisoners who had been convicted of murdering Israelis and recently released by Israel as a goodwill gesture in order to smooth the path of peace talks have received at least the amount listed above, plus a monthly sum from the PA. The amount of the monthly sum for the former prisoners depends on the length of their incarceration.

Those who were held for over 25 years are also receiving a (Government) job with a monthly salary of USD 4 000. This means not only that the PA is paying former Palestinian prisoners (see my previous questions to the Commission), but also that released prisoners are receiving monetary bonuses and (imaginary) jobs.

1. Can the Commission guarantee me that no European taxpayers' money is being used to pay released Palestinian terrorists and/or their families simply for having been imprisoned as a result of carrying out terrorist activities against Israelis?

2. Can the Commission guarantee me that no EU funding is being paid out to fund the salary of released Palestinian terrorists in (Government) jobs that were created in order to 'reward' the terrorists in question for their terrorist activities?

3. If not, what steps is the EU going to take to prevent European taxpayers' money from being used to fund released Palestinian terrorists and their families, either directly or indirectly?

4. Does the Commission believe, in any case, that USD 4 000 (five times the modal average salary for a Palestinian official) is an appropriate salary, given the socioeconomic context of Palestine, which the EU deems a development area?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(24 January 2014)

The Commission refers the Honourable Members to its reply to their previous question 08299/2012 ([2]), where the procedures relating to payments under the PEGASE Mechanism are outlined. No EU funds have been used to pay released Palestinian prisoners. The Commission believes these procedures to be robust and this has been acknowledged by the Court of Auditors in their recent performance audit of the mechanism.

As no EU funds are used for allocations to former prisoners, the Commission has not adopted a position on this issue.

([1]) http://www.timesofisrael.com/palestinian-authority-gives-freed-prisoners-50000-each/
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-013398/13
προς το Συμβούλιο
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(26 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Επιστροφές κερδών ελληνικών ομολόγων από τα κράτη μέλη της Ευρωζώνης

Με τις αποφάσεις του Eurogroup της 21ης Φεβρουαρίου 2012, της 27ης Νοεμβρίου 2012 και της 13ης Δεκεμβρίου 2012, τα κράτη μέλη της Ευρωζώνης, δεσμεύονται να μεταφέρουν στον ειδικό λογαριασμό για την εξυπηρέτηση του ελληνικού δημόσιου χρέους τα κέρδη που δημιουργούν τα ελληνικά κρατικά ομόλογα που κατέχουν οι εθνικές κεντρικές τράπεζες, καθώς και τα κέρδη που αποκόμισε η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα (ΕΚΤ) και έχει διανείμει στους μετόχους της (SMPs και ANFAs). Επίσης, στην Πρώτη Αξιολόγηση του Δεύτερου Προγράμματος Οικονομικής Προσαρμογής, αναφέρεται ότι ένα από τα μέτρα για την ελάφρυνση του ελληνικού χρέους, κατά το Eurogroup, είναι η ανανέωση (rollover) των ομολόγων που κατέχουν οι εθνικές κεντρικές τράπεζες. Τα κράτη μέλη της Ευρωζώνης, όμως, δεν έχουν προχωρήσει σε όλες τις απαραίτητες ενέργειες για την ελάφρυνση του ελληνικού χρέους και λόγω του γεγονότος ότι οι εθνικές κεντρικές τράπεζες επικαλούνται νομικά εμπόδια, όπως παραβίαση του άρθρου 123 της ΣΛΕΕ.

Με δεδομένο ότι η υπαναχώρηση των κρατών μελών από τις συμφωνίες του Eurogroup, για την οποία δεν υπάρχει καμία πληροφόρηση, δημιουργεί πολύ μεγάλο χρηματοδοτικό κενό στο ελληνικό πρόγραμμα, ερωτάται το Συμβούλιο:

1. Πώς σχολιάζει τα επιχειρήματα που επικαλούνται οι εθνικές κεντρικές τράπεζες σχετικά με την παραβίαση του άρθρου 123 της ΣΛΕΕ; Όσοι επικαλούνται «παραβίαση» των Συνθηκών, την αγνοούσαν όταν υιοθετούσαν τέτοια μέτρα στο πλαίσιο των συνόδων του Eurogroup;

2. Με ποιο τρόπο τα κράτη μέλη θα καλύψουν το χρηματοδοτικό κενό που δημιουργείται, με δεδομένο ότι την ευθύνη για τη μη τήρηση των συμφωνηθέντων την έχουν το Eurogroup και τα θεσμικά όργανα της ΕΕ και όχι η Ελλάδα;

Απάντηση
(10 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Το Συμβούλιο δεν συζήτησε το θέμα αυτό.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013398/13
to the Council
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Return of profits made from Greek bonds by euro area Member States

By the Eurogroup's decisions of 21 February 2012, 27 November 2012 and 13 December 2012, the euro area Member States undertook to transfer, onto a special account created for servicing Greece's public debt, the profits generated by Greek Government bonds held by national central banks and the profits made by the European Central Bank (ECB) which it has distributed to its shareholders (SMPs and ANFAs). Furthermore, the first evaluation of the Second Economic Adjustment Programme states that one of the measures to ease the Greek debt, according to the Eurogroup, is the rollover of bonds held by national central banks. The euro area Member States, however, have not taken all the necessary actions to ease the Greek debt, *inter alia* because the national central banks have invoked legal obstacles, such as a breach of Article 123 TFEU.

Given that Member States' failure to honour the agreements reached by the Eurogroup, without any information being provided in this connection, is creating a very large financial shortfall in the Greek programme, will the Council say:

1. How does it view the arguments invoked by the national central banks regarding a breach of Article 123 TFEU? Are those who invoke a 'breach' of the Treaties unaware that they had adopted these measures within the framework of the Eurogroup meetings?

2. How will Member States meet the financial shortfall thereby being created, given that the responsibility for the failure to honour the agreements lies with the Eurogroup and the EU institutions and not with Greece?

Reply
(10 February 2014)

The Council has not discussed the issue.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013399/13
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(26 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Garantizar fondos europeos para organizaciones que apoyan y protegen derechos

Dentro de las prioridades de la Estrategia Europa 2020, la UE fija la lucha contra la pobreza y la exclusión social. Sin embargo, existe un sector de la sociedad europea que, sin importar que exista o no crisis económica, siempre necesita apoyo y recursos para poder reincorporarse paulatinamente a ella. Nos referimos principalmente a las víctimas de crímenes pero también a la situación de los presidiarios.

En Europa existen numerosas organizaciones ([1]) que realizan actividades orientadas a ayudar a estas personas y cuya labor es muy importante. Estos profesionales, expertos en la materia, proporcionan a la Comisión valoraciones e informes que contribuyen a proteger y mejorar la situación de las víctimas y también facilitan, mediante programas, la rehabilitación, la inserción social de presos tras el cumplimiento de las penas para evitar su estigmatización y garantizar que puedan volver de nuevo a la sociedad sin reincidir.

1. ¿Qué opinión le merece a la Comisión la actividad de estas organizaciones?

2. Teniendo en cuenta que muchas de ellas dependen prácticamente de fondos europeos para desempeñar su actividad, ¿ha valorado la Comisión las posibles repercusiones que conllevaría dejar de proporcionarles estos fondos, puesto que ello impediría una mayor inclusión social?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de enero de 2014)

Durante el período comprendido entre 2007 y 2013, la Comisión ha apoyado constantemente diversos proyectos y organizaciones a escala europea que intervienen en la aplicación del Derecho europeo en materia de ayuda a las víctimas de delitos y, en especial, los que facilitan la aplicación de la Directiva por la que se establecen normas mínimas sobre los derechos, el apoyo y la protección de las víctimas de delitos (Directiva 2012/29/UE), la Directiva sobre la orden europea de protección (Directiva 2011/99/UE) y el Reglamento relativo al reconocimiento mutuo de medidas de protección en materia civil [Reglamento (UE) n° 606/2013]. En materia de detención, la Comisión ha financiado proyectos relacionados con el seguimiento efectivo del Libro Verde de la Comisión sobre la detención en la Unión Europea y la aplicación de las Decisiones marco 2008/909/JAI sobre el traslado de prisioneros, 2008/947/JAI sobre las medidas de libertad vigilada y las penas sustitutivas y 2009/829/JAI sobre la orden europea de vigilancia. Se ha facilitado financiación en esos ámbitos mediante convocatorias de propuestas.

Esta práctica proseguirá en el marco del nuevo Programa de Justicia [Reglamento (UE) n° 1382/2013 del Consejo, de 17 de diciembre de 2013, por el que se establece el programa «Justicia» para el período de 2014 a 2020], y se concederán becas a los interesados y a las organizaciones pertinentes al amparo del nuevo programa.

Las asociaciones *Confederation of European Probation* (Confederación de la Libertad Vigilada Europea), *Victims Support Europe* (Apoyo a las Víctimas Europa), *European Organisation of Prison and Correctional Services* (Organización Europea de Centros Penitenciarios y de Servicios de Reinserción) y el Foro Europeo de Justicia Reparadora han aportado una valiosa contribución a los proyectos mencionados y se les ha invitado a seguir haciéndolo en el marco del nuevo Programa de Justicia 2014-2020.

([1]) Confederation of European Probation, Victims Support Europe, European Organisation of Prison and Correctional Services, European Forum for Restorative Justice.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013399/13
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Guaranteeing EU funds for organisations which support and protect rights

As one of the priorities of the Europe 2020 strategy, the EU is taking up the fight against poverty and social exclusion. However, there is a sector of European society that, regardless of whether there is an economic crisis, always requires support and resources in order to be able to gradually reintegrate. We are primarily referring to the victims of crime but also to the situation of prisoners.

There are numerous organisations in Europe ([1]) that undertake activities aimed at assisting such individuals and whose work is very important. These professionals, experts in the field, provide the Commission with assessments and reports that help protect victims and improve their situation. They also facilitate, by means of programmes, the rehabilitation and social integration of prisoners after they have served their sentences to prevent them becoming stigmatised and to ensure they can re-enter society without reoffending.

1. What is the Commission's opinion regarding the activity of these organisations?

2. Considering that many of these organisations depend, practically speaking, on EU funds to conduct their activities, has the Commission assessed the potential repercussions of no longer providing these funds, since it would prevent greater social inclusion?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

During the period 2007-2013 the Commission has consistently supported a variety of projects and organisations at a European level that are involved in the implementation of European legislation in the area of support to victims of crime, particularly those facilitating the implementation of the directive establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime (Directive 2012/29/EU), the directive on the European Protection Order (Directive 2011/99/EU) and the regulation on the mutual recognition of protection measures (Regulation (EU) 606/2013). In the area of detention the Commission has funded projects related to the effective follow-up of the Commission's Green Paper on detention in the European Union and to the implementation on the framework decisions 2008/909/JHA on Transfer of Prisoners, 2008/947/JHA on Probation and Alternative Sanctions and 2009/829/JHA on the European Supervision Order. Funding in these areas has been made available via calls for proposals.

This practice will be continued within the new Justice programme (Regulation (EU) No 1382/2013 of 17 December 2013 establishing a Justice Programme for the period 2014 to 2020), and funding will be available for interested and pertinent organisations under the new programme.

The Confederation of European Probation, Victims Support Europe, European Organisation of Prison and Correctional Services, European Forum for Restorative Justice have contributed in a valuable way to the abovementioned projects and are invited to continue doing so under the new Justice programme 2014-2020.

([1]) Confederation of European Probation, Victims Support Europe, European Organisation of Prison and Correctional Services, European Forum for Restorative Justice.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013401/13
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(26 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Repregunta. El mercado BitCoin

Recientemente distintos medios de comunicación han recogido la fuerte volatilidad en el tipo de cambio de la moneda virtual Bitcoin. En el último año la cotización de la moneda ha aumentado en más de un 6 000 %.

No solo estas fluctuaciones y sus posibles consecuencias preocupan a este diputado. Un informe publicado por el BCE en octubre de 2012 ([1]) señala que el sistema muestra un claro caso de información asimétrica, «es complejo y por lo tanto no es fácil de entender para todos los posibles usuarios. Sin embargo, al mismo tiempo, los usuarios pueden descargarse la aplicación fácilmente y, comenzar a utilizarlo incluso si desconocen el funcionamiento y los riesgos que conlleva».

Además, como conocerá la Comisión, la moneda permite realizar transacciones de manera anónima. Esto podría facilitar enormemente las transacciones a organizaciones criminales o el acceso a mercados fraudulentos ([2]).

Sin duda, y como ha expresado el presidente de la FED, Ben Bernanke, la moneda virtual puede ser prometedora en determinadas áreas a largo plazo. Sin embargo, ante todos los interrogantes que se presentan,

1. ¿No considera oportuno la Comisión poner en marcha un estudio detallado sobre las consecuencias del aumento del uso de esta moneda virtual?

A pesar de que la moneda ha atraído más inversores que consumidores, diferentes noticias ([3]) en los medios indican un posible cambio de rumbo

2. ¿Planea la Comisión adoptar alguna medida en materia de protección al consumidor?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de enero de 2014)

1. Aunque sigue siendo marginal en relación con el tamaño de la economía real, la utilización de una moneda virtual y, más concretamente, la Bitcoin, como medio de pago, es un fenómeno de reciente aparición y de rápido crecimiento que plantea serias preocupaciones. Como se indica en la respuesta a la pregunta E-004459/2013, el año pasado, el Banco Central Europeo (BCE) publicó un informe ([4]) en el que se afirmaba que, por el momento, las monedas virtuales no plantean riesgos para los precios o la estabilidad financiera, pero que la Comisión seguirá supervisando la situación en este mercado. En diciembre de 2013, la Autoridad Bancaria Europea (ABE) puso en marcha un ejercicio de evaluación sobre monedas virtuales para determinar si dichas monedas pueden y deben ser reguladas. La Comisión, en estrecha cooperación con el BCE y la ABE, procederá a un seguimiento activo de la evolución de este asunto y podrá tomar medidas, según proceda.

2. La Comisión es consciente de los riesgos asociados a la utilización de las monedas virtuales por usuarios no profesionales y comparte preocupaciones similares a las que han sido recientemente expresadas por la ABE ([5]), así como por algunos bancos centrales nacionales. La Comisión apoya plenamente la iniciativa de la ABE de emitir una advertencia formal destinada a incrementar la sensibilización de los consumidores acerca del carácter especulativo de, en particular, la moneda Bitcoin.

([1]) http://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/other/virtualcurrencyschemes201210en.pdf
([2]) http://gawker.com/the-underground-website-where-you-can-buy-any-drug-imag-30818160
([3]) http://business.financialpost.com/2013/10/28/bitcoin-atm-canada-this-week/?__lsa=b717-56a8
([4]) http://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/other/virtualcurrencyschemes201210en.pdf
([5]) http://www.eba.europa.eu/-/eba-warns-consumers-on-virtual-currencies

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013401/13
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Follow-up question: the Bitcoin market

Various media sources have recently picked up on the high volatility in the exchange rate of the virtual currency Bitcoin. Over the last year, the value of the currency has soared by more than 6 000%.

It is not only these fluctuations and their potential consequences that are of concern to me. According to a report published by the European Central Bank in October 2012 ([1]), the system demonstrates a clear case of information asymmetry as '[i]t is complex and therefore not easy for all potential users to understand. At the same time, however, users can easily download the application and start using it even if they do not actually know how the system works and which risks they are actually taking'.

Furthermore, as the Commission will be aware, the currency enables transactions to be carried out anonymously. This could greatly help criminal organisations conduct transactions or facilitate access to fraudulent markets ([2]).

Undoubtedly, and as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Ben Bernanke, has claimed, virtual currency may hold long-term promise in certain areas. However, in view of all the questions raised:

1. Does the Commission not think it should launch a detailed study into the consequences of the increased use of this virtual currency?

Despite the fact that the currency has attracted more investors than consumers, various reports ([3]) in the media indicate a possible change in direction.

2. Does the Commission intend to take any action to protect the consumer?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(27 January 2014)

1. Although still marginal in relation to the size of the real economy, the use of virtual currencies and notably Bitcoin as means of payment is a newly emerging and fast growing phenomenon that raises serious issues of concern. As indicated in the reply to E-004459/2013, last year the European Central Bank (ECB) issued a report ([4]) stating that for the time being virtual currencies do not appear to pose risk for price or financial stability, but that it will continue to monitor the situation on this market. In December 2013, the European Banking Authority (EBA) launched a stock-taking exercise about virtual currencies, to assess whether these currencies can and ought to be regulated. The Commission, in close cooperation with the ECB and the EBA, will continue to actively follow the development of this matter and may take action, as appropriate.

2. The Commission is aware of the risks associated to the use of virtual currencies by non-professional users and shares concerns similar to those which have recently been expressed by the EBA ([5]), as well as by some national Central Banks. The Commission fully supports the EBA initiative to issue a formal warning aiming to raise consumers' awareness with regard to the speculative nature of Bitcoin in particular.

([1]) http://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/other/virtualcurrencyschemes201210en.pdf
([2]) http://gawker.com/the-underground-website-where-you-can-buy-any-drug-imag-30818160
([3]) http://business.financialpost.com/2013/10/28/bitcoin-atm-canada-this-week/?__lsa=b717-56a8
([4]) http://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/other/virtualcurrencyschemes201210en.pdf
([5]) http://www.eba.europa.eu/-/eba-warns-consumers-on-virtual-currencies

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013402/13
a la Comisión
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial (S&D)
(26 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Inversiones en el País Vasco de los fondos comunitarios durante el Marco Financiero 2007-2013

¿Podría facilitar la Comisión las cifras de los compromisos contraídos durante el actual Marco Financiero 2007-2013 en el País Vasco, así como los pagos efectuados a fecha 31 de octubre de 2013 sobre esos compromisos, de los siguientes fondos o instrumentos:

— Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional (FEDER)

— Fondo Social Europeo (FSE)

— Fondo de Cohesión

— LIFE

— Programa Marco de Investigación

— Desarrollo rural

— Fondo Europeo de Pesca?

Respuesta del Sr. Lewandowski en nombre de la Comisión
(30 de enero de 2014)

Su Señoría podrá encontrar la información solicitada en el anexo adjunto a la presente respuesta.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013402/13
to the Commission
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial (S&D)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: EU funds invested in the Basque Country during the 2007-2013 financial framework

Could the Commission provide figures for commitments entered into from the following funds or instruments in the Basque Country during the current financial framework (2007-2013), and for the corresponding payments as at 31 October 2013:

— European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)

— European Social Fund (ESF)

— Cohesion Fund

— LIFE

— Research Framework Programme

— Rural Development

— European Fisheries Fund.

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(30 January 2014)

The Honourable Member may find the requested information in Annex to this reply.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013403/13
to the Commission
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Discrimination against Sikhs regarding the wearing of the Dastar (turban)

Members of the Sikh community in a number of EU Member States are experiencing discrimination over the wearing of the Dastar (turban). In France and Belgium, children are being asked to remove their turbans or face exclusion from school, thus forcing them to forfeit their education. Sikhs are also being asked to remove the Dastar when submitting photographs for identification cards and driving licences.

Does the Commission agree that it is wrong for Member States to deny children their right to an education because they wear a turban in the classroom?

Moreover, what does the Commission intend to do to ensure that EU Member States fully observe and respect the rights of Sikhs to wear the Dastar?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(17 February 2014)

The wearing of the Dastar (turban), like that of religious symbols, raises a number of complex issues and relates to situations which differ widely depending on the particular circumstances, the context, and the relevant legal framework in each Member State. Member States have different approaches about this issue. If the issue falls within the scope of EC law, the EU has a competence to examine those approaches.

It is for each Member State to determine the rules governing this matter, subject to the supervision of national courts. It is to be recalled that in a consistent case-law the ECHR has ruled that the obligation to wear off their turban to be photographed is not contrary to Article 14 ECHR (*Phull* decision on inadmissibility). However, in general, EC law does not govern national education systems with the exception of vocational training.

The European Union is based on the value of respect for human rights, including the freedom of religion, and it shall respect cultural and religious diversity, enshrined in Article 10 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. However, this right is not absolute and can be limited according to Article 52 of the Charter.

According to Article 51 of the Charter, its provisions are addressed to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law which is e.g. the case when determining the conditions of how photographs are being taken in order to obtain a Schengen visa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013404/13
to the Commission
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Discrimination against Sikhs at airports

In February 2013, legislation relating to appropriate Dastar (turban) search techniques at EU Member State airports was implemented. More than six months later, many Sikhs are continuing to experience discrimination at various airports, including Madrid, Paris and Rome.

What is the Commission doing to ensure that this legislation is being fully implemented in Member States?

Further, will the Commission introduce new measures to improve the training material for airport security staff so that the proper legislative guidelines are observed?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(27 January 2014)

As the Honourable Member states EU legislation was amended to permit the use of hand-held metal detectors in combination with explosive trace detection equipment for screening religious headwear and other items where a hand search may not be desirable.

This new screening method does not completely eliminate the need for a hand search. Hand searches will still be needed to resolve alarms, for example when caused by metal items. Airports may also choose to use hand search. Since not all airports are equipped with the necessary technology, the Commission expects that airports which do not apply this new method will continue doing their utmost to respect ethnic/religious/cultural differences while fully respecting EU screening requirements.

The Commission carries out regular inspection of Appropriate Authorities and EU airports to ensure that the regulations relating to aviation security (including training) are properly implemented.

As training is already included in the existing legislation, the Commission does not plan to introduce new measures in relation thereto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013405/13
to the Commission
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Issue of the labelling of meat from animals slaughtered without stunning (in line with religious slaughtering practices)

The issue of the labelling of meat from animals that have not been stunned prior to their slaughter (in line with religious slaughtering practices) is currently the subject of a study which is being carried out by an external consultant on behalf of the Commission. The conclusions of the study are expected by April 2014.

In anticipation of the results, could the Commission provide the following information:

1. Will the study include percentages or statistics disclosing the number of instances of mis-stuns, including second and third re-stuns, by slaughter men operating captive-bolt pistols in UK and European abattoirs?

2. Will the study include all forms of so-called humane killing of animals, such as electronarcosis (which involves the positioning of electrodes), suffocation by gas and, in the case of birds, suspension by their feet for the purposes of electrocution in a water bath?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(23 January 2014)

The issues raised by the Member of the European Parliament are not part of the scope of the study.

Concerning the objective of the study, the Commission would like to refer to its previous replies to Questions E-11775/2013, E-12197/2013 and E-12582/2013([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013406/13
to the Commission
Emer Costello (S&D)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: EU support for construction of a 'passive' school building

Could the Commission indicate what current and planned EU initiatives would be of relevance to the construction of the first 'passive' school building in Ireland, and indicate when the next calls for proposals under these initiatives will be made?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(3 February 2014)

The Energy Performance of Buildings Directive 2010/31/EU is the EU's main legislative instrument tackling energy efficiency in buildings, together with the Energy Efficiency Directive 2012/27/EU. Under the energy performance directive, Member States must apply minimum energy performance requirements for new and existing buildings. By 2021 all new buildings must be 'nearly zero-energy buildings'.

The Societal Challenge on secure, clean and efficient energy of the Horizon 2020 supports the increase in number of new and renovated nearly zero-energy buildings, mainly through topics EE20 ([1]) on project development assistance and EE2 on building design for new highly energy performing buildings. The call is open until June 5, 2014.

The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) could also support the construction and renovation of schools. For the next programming period between 12%-20% of the ERDF budget has been allocated to promote the uptake of energy efficiency and renewable energy solutions. At the Member State level, the ERDF funds are allocated through the relevant Operational programme, which as well lays down the details regarding budgetary allocation, timing, beneficiaries and conditions of the support.

Finally, the EU's Intelligent Energy Europe Programme has created tools, guidelines and case studies on passive buildings, available at http://ec.europa.eu/energy/intelligent/

([1]) The Energy Efficiency call for proposals under the H2020 work programme 2014-2015 includes topics referred to as EE 1, EE2.
The title of topic EE20 is: 'Project Development Assistance for innovative bankable and aggregated sustainable energy investment schemes and projects'.
The title of topic EE2 is: 'Building design for new highly energy performing buildings'.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-013410/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(26 listopada 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Masakra Chrześcijan w syryjskim mieście Sadad

Pod koniec października syryjskie wojsko odbiło z rąk oddziałów rebeliantów miasteczko Sadad. Położone około 60 km od strategicznego miasta Homs. Do marca 2011 r. było zamieszkiwane przez prawosławnych chrześcijan. We wrześniu 2013 r. zostało zdobyte przez odziały Wolnej Armii Syryjskiej współpracujące z islamistami z al-Nusra Front.

Po tygodniu walk armia syryjska odbiła miasto, znajdując w nim masowe mogiły. Według różnych źródeł pogrzebano w nich ponad 35 osób rozstrzelanych w zbiorowych egzekucjach. 10 kolejnych osób zostało zamordowanych, a ich ciała wrzucono do miejskich studni, aby zatruć wodę. Jak informują mieszkańcy Sadad wszystkie zbrodnie zostały dokonane przez islamskich rebeliantów tuż po zdobyciu miasta. Jak donoszą mieszkańcy rebelianci zdemolowali również wszystkie kościoły i kapliczki w mieście, niszcząc ich wyposażenie.

Syryjskoprawosławny metropolita, Selwanos Boutros Alnemeh, stwierdził, że to największa masakra chrześcijan w ciągu 2,5 roku wojny domowej w Syrii.

1. Czy Wysoka Przedstawiciel wie o masakrze w Sadad?

2. Jakie działania podjęto w tej sprawie? Czy Wysoka Przedstawiciel otrzymała już wyjaśnienie za strony dowódców Wolnej Armii Syryjskiej?

3. Czy Wysoka Przedstawiciel planuje dalsze działania w celu wyjaśnienia, jaka grupa rebeliantów odpowiada za masakrę chrześcijan w Sadad?

4. Jakie Wysoka Przedstawiciel rekomenduje kroki, aby powstrzymać dalsze ataki rebeliantów na chrześcijan oraz miejsca kultu (przypomnę, że w przeciągu ostatnich dwóch miesięcy jest to kolejny atak na chrześcijan w Syrii po Maalouli)?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(30 stycznia 2014 r.)

UE stale wyraża głębokie zaniepokojenie pogarszającą się sytuacją w Syrii i wielokrotnie potępiała ciągłe powszechne i regularne naruszanie praw człowieka w Syrii, w tym nasilające się ataki na wspólnoty religijne i etniczne. UE jest także poważnie zaniepokojona coraz większym udziałem ekstremistów i zagranicznych podmiotów niepublicznych w walkach w Syrii i zaapelowała do wszystkich zainteresowanych stron, by zaprzestały wspierania tych grup.

UE również powtórzyła, że wszelkie zbrodnie przeciwko ludzkości i naruszenia praw człowieka muszą zostać zbadane, a wykonawców i zlecających należy pociągnąć do odpowiedzialności. UE ponownie stwierdza, że sprawcy takich pogwałceń nie mogą pozostać bezkarni, i przypomina, że Rada Bezpieczeństwa ONZ może w każdej chwili przekazać sprawę Syrii do Międzynarodowego Trybunału Karnego – jak zaapelowano w szwajcarskim piśmie do Rady Bezpieczeństwa z dnia 14 stycznia 2013 r.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-013410/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Massacre of Christians in Sadad, Syria

In late October 2013 the Syrian army recaptured the town of Sadad, a Syriac Orthodox Christian settlement lying some 60 kilometres away from the strategic city of Homs. The Free Syrian Army had moved into the town, together with members of the Islamist al-Nusra Front, in September 2013.

After a week's fighting, the Syrian army recaptured the town, where it discovered mass graves. According to various sources, the graves contained the bodies of more than 35 people shot during mass executions. A further 10 people had been killed and their bodies thrown into the town's wells in order to contaminate the water. According to people in the town, all of the murders were carried out by Islamist rebels right after the town was occupied. They also said that the rebels had vandalised all of the town's churches and chapels, smashing everything inside.

The Syriac Orthodox Metropolitan of Homs and Mama, Archbishop Selwanos Boutros Alnemeh, said this was the worst massacre in two and a half years of civil war in Syria.

1. Is the High Representative aware of the massacre that took place in Sadad?

2. If she is, what action has she taken to date? Has she sought and received clarifications from the commanders of the Free Syrian Army?

3. Does she plan to take further steps to establish which rebel group was responsible for the massacre?

4. What does she recommend be done to put an end to rebel attacks on Christians and their places of worship (this is the second such attack on Christians in the last two months, the first having taken place in Maaloula)?

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

The EU continues to be extremely concerned by the deteriorating situation in Syria and has repeatedly condemned the continuing widespread and systematic violations of human rights in Syria, including increasing attacks on religious and ethnic communities. It is also seriously concerned with the growing involvement of extremist and foreign non-state actors in the fighting in Syria and has called on all relevant parties to halt the support to these groups.

The EU has also reiterated that all crimes against humanity and human rights violations must be investigated and perpetrators and those ordering these crimes must be held accountable. The EU reaffirms that there should be no impunity for any such violations and recalls that the UNSC can refer the situation in Syria to the ICC — as requested in the Swiss letter to the SC of 14 January 2013- at any time.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-013411/13
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD) oraz Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(26 listopada 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wprowadzenie w Niemczech opłat za autostrady

Niemiecki rząd rozważa wprowadzenie opłat za jazdę po autostradach znajdujących się na terenie Niemiec. Kierowcy będą zmuszeni do wykupienia winiet. Kierowcy niemieccy będą jednak mogli odliczyć sobie koszt winiety od od tzw podatku samochodowego (Kraftfahrzeugsteuer). Niemieckie media podały, że w opinii Komisji Europejskiej pomysł ten jest dopuszczalny.

1. Czy rząd Niemiec konsultował Komisję o zamiarze wprowadzenia opłat za przejazd autostradą?

2. Czy Komisja pomysł ten uznała za dopuszczalny?

3. Czy konstrukcja prawna polegająca na wprowadzeniu opłat, a następnie ulgi podatkowej, która ma charakter zwolnienia z tej opłaty określonej kategorii osób (w tym przypadku osób płacących podatek samochodowy na terenie RFN) jest dopuszczalna?

4. Czy można podejrzewać, że konstrukcja opisana w pytaniu 3 narusza zasadę niedyskryminacji i zasadę konkurencji?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Siima Kallasa w imieniu Komisji
(20 stycznia 2014 r.)

Komisja pragnie odesłać Panów Posłów do odpowiedzi udzielonej na podobne pytania: E-012734/2013 i P-013592/2013 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013411/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD) and Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Introduction of motorway fees in Germany

The German Government is weighing up the introduction of charges for driving on German motorways. This would require drivers to purchase vignettes. German drivers, however, will be able to deduct the cost of the vignette from their 'car tax' (Kraftfahrzeugsteuer). German media have reported that this plan is acceptable in the Commission's opinion.

1. Has the German Government consulted the Commission on its plans to introduce fees for motorway use?

2. Did the Commission deem these plans acceptable?

3. Is this legal construction consisting of introducing charges and then providing tax relief which has the character of an exemption from the charges for a defined category of people — in this case payers of 'car tax' in Germany — permissible?

4. Could one conclude that the legal construction described in the third question is in violation of the principles of non-discrimination and competition?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(20 January 2014)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Members to the reply already provided to the similar questions E-012734/2013 and P-013592/2013 ([1]).

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

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-013412/13
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD) oraz Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(26 listopada 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Zmiany w zapisach paktu stabilizacyjnego

Szef Eurogrupy Jeroen Dijsselboem domaga się zmiany w zapisach paktu stabilizacyjnego. Uważa, że państwa, które w trakcie procedury budżetowej będą chciały otrzymać więcej czasu na korektę swojego deficytu, będą musiały zgodzić się na przeprowadzenie „określonych reform w określonym czasie". Ma to być mechanizm analogiczny do tego, jakiemu zostały poddane w ostatnich latach Grecja, Irlandia, Portugalia i Cypr.

Jaki jest stosunek Komisji do tego rodzaju propozycji?

Czy Komisja jest zwolennikiem silniejszego uwarunkowania procedur budżetowych koniecznością wprowadzenia reform wewnętrznych, mających na celu obniżenie deficytu?

Czy tego rodzaju mechanizm będzie dotyczył tylko państw-członków Eurogrupy?

Czy też znajdzie on również zastosowanie do państw-stron paktu stabilizacyjnego, znajdujących się poza Eurogrupą?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Olliego Rehna w imieniu Komisji
(17 stycznia 2014 r.)

W chwili obecnej Komisja nie planuje zmiany paktu stabilności i wzrostu. Zgodnie z postanowieniami paktu zmienionego w 2011 r. Komisja przedstawi sprawozdanie z jego stosowania do końca 2014 r.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013412/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD) and Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Modifications to the provisions of the Stability Pact

The President of the Eurogroup, Jeroen Dijsselboem, is calling for modifications to be made to the provisions of the Stability Pact. He feels that countries undergoing budgetary procedures which want more time to correct their deficit will have to agree to carry out specific reforms within a specific period. This would resemble the mechanisms to which Greece, Ireland, Portugal and Cyprus have been subjected in recent years.

What is the Commission's view on this sort of proposal?

Does the Commission support attaching more rigorous conditions to budgetary procedures by requiring countries to institute internal reforms aimed at reducing deficits?

Will this mechanism apply only to Eurogroup Member States?

Will the mechanism also apply to states that are party to the Stability Pact beyond the Eurogroup?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(17 January 2014)

The Commission does not currently envisage any reform of the Stability and Growth Pact. As per the provisions in the reform adopted in 2011 the Commission will report on the experience with its application by the end of 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013413/13
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Commission Regulation (EU) No 536/2013 and fructose health claims

Commission Regulation (EU) No 536/2013 of 11 June 2013 has allowed products that replace at least 30% of glucose and/or sucrose with fructose to contain the claim that 'consumption of foods containing fructose leads to a lower blood glucose rise compared to foods containing sucrose or glucose'. This claim has been assessed by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), and its findings have been published in its Journal (2011; 9(6):2223).

This is a very narrow claim, as glycaemic index (GI) levels are largely irrelevant when assessing fructose: that measure assesses how much a given type of food increases blood glucose levels, and fructose scores well under it simply because it is not glucose. In addition, the report considered only a tiny fraction of the literature on fructose metabolism (with 11 references). A wealth of peer-reviewed literature links fructose to other public health issues, including obesity, and the risk is that the health claim authorised at EU level, whilst narrow, could be both presented to and interpreted by consumers as offering a 'healthy' and less fattening alternative to products containing sucrose or glucose.

The EFSA appears to have dismissed the evidence cited in its assessment that fructose 'induce[s] dyslipidaemia, insulin resistance and increased visceral adiposity in healthy and in hyperinsulinaemic insulin-resistant subjects', by pointing to a single paper on GI, from 2006.

1. In light of Recital 22 of Regulation 1924/2006, which makes it clear that 'health claims should only be authorised for use in the Community after a scientific assessment of the highest possible standard', is the Commission satisfied that this is the case with its assessment of fructose?

2. Has the Commission considered that the claim authorised and contained in Regulation 536/2013 on fructose:

a) may not be based on the firmest scientific basis;

b) even if stated on a sound scientific basis, is so narrow that it is generally irrelevant to most consumers;

c) has the potential to mislead the public as to the wider health effects?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(28 January 2014)

The claim on fructose was authorised on the basis of a favourable assessment carried out by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA); the Commission is satisfied with that assessment.

The authorised claim on fructose may only be made on foods where glucose and /or sucrose have been replaced by fructose in sugar-sweetened foods or drinks; it targets people who are already consumers of sugar, sweetened foods or drinks and are concerned about their blood glucose levels.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013414/13
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: CSB support and Millennium Development Goals

Fortified blended foods, especially corn soya blend (CSB), are used as food aid to combat child malnutrition. CSB is a porridge powder consisting of maize and soya flour fortified with vitamins and minerals.

Providing nutrition to youngsters via a school feeding programme helps resolve five of the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs):

— MDG 1 — Eradicating Extreme Poverty and Hunger;

— MDG 2 — Achieving Universal Primary Education;

— MDG 4 — Reducing Child Mortality Rates;

— MDG 5 — Improving Maternal Health;

— MDG 6 — Combating HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Other Diseases.

In the light of this, to what extent has the Commission considered supporting school feeding programmes throughout the developing world that use CSB to help meet the MDGs?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(4 February 2014)

The Commission uses a broad range of approaches to address the Millennium Development Goals through the EU's development policy. School feeding may be an efficient way to address food security under certain circumstances but not necessarily undernutriton. The recent EU policy framework on nutrition, the communication 'Enhancing Maternal and Child Nutrition in develop assistance' ([1]), clearly stresses that our development interventions to address undernutrition will give priority to creating the right conditions for optimal growth during the 'crucial window of opportunity' of the first '1 000 days' between conception and two years of age. As children do not attend school normally before that age, school feeding is not necessarily an efficient way to address undernutrition for children under 5 years.

Impact on education is highly dependent on the design of the School Feeding programme and the implementing context. The capacity of the education system to integrate an increasing number of children, especially girls, from the most vulnerable households whilst maintaining quality education are crucial factors to enhance the impact of school feeding on education outcomes.

The Commission would like to underscore that there are specific guidelines on school feeding in humanitarian assistance. These guidelines stipulate that school feeding is not considered an appropriate means of delivering food and nutritional support to vulnerable children in emergencies for the reasons mentioned above.

In any event, in the case of projects that may use fortified blended foods for food assistance, the procurement is done through a competitive process and adapted to the context specific needs.

([1]) COM(2013) 141 final.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-013416/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(26 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Νομική βάση δραστηριοποίησης της Τρόικας

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Με ποια νομική βάση δραστηριοποιείται η Τρόικα και παρεμβαίνει στα κράτη μέλη;

— Ποια είναι η μεθοδολογία της και σε ποιο πλαίσιο έχει εγκριθεί;

— Είναι σωστό να εφαρμόζει την ίδια συνταγή λιτότητας σε όλες τις χώρες αδιακρίτως;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Το Συμβούλιο των Διοικητών του ΕΜΣ αναθέτει στην Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή — σε συνεργασία με την ΕΚΤ και, εφόσον είναι εφικτό, από κοινού με το ΔΝΤ — να διαπραγματευθεί με το ενδιαφερόμενο μέλος του ΕΜΣ μνημόνιο συνεννόησης («ΜΣ») όπου θα περιγράφονται αναλυτικά οι όροι που συνδέονται με τη διευκόλυνση χρηματοδοτικής συνδρομής. Ομοίως, το Συμβούλιο (Ecofin) είναι το αρμόδιο όργανο για τη χρηματοδοτική συνδρομή από την Ένωση (ΕΜΧΣ) και η Ευρωομάδα/ομάδα εργασίας της Ευρωομάδας από κοινού με τα κράτη μέλη εγγυητές είναι το αρμόδιο όργανο για τη χρηματοδοτική συνδρομή από το ΕΤΧΣ.

Οι διαδικασίες έγκρισης για χρηματοδοτική συνδρομή από το ΕΤΧΣ ή τον ΕΜΣ είναι παρόμοιες. Όταν υποβάλλεται αίτημα χρηματοδοτικής συνδρομής, ο Πρόεδρος της Ευρωομάδας στην περίπτωση του ΕΤΧΣ ή ο Πρόεδρος του Συμβουλίου των Διοικητών του ΕΜΣ αναθέτει στην Επιτροπή (σε συνεργασία με την ΕΚΤ) να αξιολογήσει τις ανάγκες προσαρμογής του αντίστοιχου κράτους μέλους. Βάσει της εν λόγω αξιολόγησης, η Ευρωομάδα ή το Συμβούλιο των Διοικητών του ΕΜΣ αναθέτει στην Επιτροπή να διαπραγματευθεί ΜΣ, σε συνεργασία με την ΕΚΤ (και το ΔΝΤ). Από τα μέσα του 2013, το ΕΤΧΣ δε συμμετέχει σε νέα προγράμματα, αλλά συνεχίζει να διαχειρίζεται και να καλύπτει τυχόν ανεξόφλητες οφειλές.

Παρά τις ομοιότητες που ενδέχεται να παρουσιάζουν τα προγράμματα, κάθε πρόγραμμα προσαρμόζεται στις ανάγκες της οικείας χώρας. Αυτό ισχύει τόσο για τους επιμέρους τομείς όσο και για το σύνολο της δημοσιονομικής εξυγίανσης. Τα προγράμματα είναι αποδεδειγμένα ευέλικτα, ώστε να αντιμετωπίζονται απρόσμενες προκλήσεις, και έχουν πράγματι προσαρμοστεί όπου ήταν απαραίτητο. Για παράδειγμα, στην περίπτωση της Ελλάδας και της Πορτογαλίας η πορεία της δημοσιονομικής προσαρμογής τροποποιήθηκε προκειμένου να αντιμετωπιστούν απροσδόκητες μεταβολές της μακροοικονομικής κατάστασης.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013416/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Legal basis for action by the Troika

What is the legal basis for action by the Troika in the Member States?

What procedures does it follow and in what context were they approved?

Is it appropriate to apply the same austerity measures to all countries without distinction?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(6 February 2014)

The Board of Governors of the ESM shall entrust the European Commission — in liaison with the ECB and, wherever possible, together with the IMF — with the task of negotiating, with the ESM Member concerned, a memorandum of understanding (an 'MoU') detailing the conditionality attached to the financial assistance facility. In the same vein, the Council (Ecofin) is the responsible body for Union (EFSM) financial assistance, the Eurogroup/Eurogroup Working Group together with the guarantor Member States is the responsible body for EFSF financial assistance.

The approval process for EFSF or ESM financial assistance is very similar. After having received a request for financial assistance, the president of the Eurogroup in the case of the EFSF or the chair of the ESM Board of Governors entrusts the Commission (in liaison with the ECB) to assess the respective Member State's adjustment needs. Based on this assessment, EG or the ESM Board of Governors entrusts the Commission to negotiate an MoU, in liaison with the ECB (and IMF). Since mid-2013, EFSF does not enter into any new programmes but continues the management and repayment of any outstanding debts.

While each programme may have its similarities, each is tailored to the needs of the Country in question. This applies both to the areas and the overall extent of fiscal consolidation. Programmes have proven flexible enough to cope with unexpected challenges and have been adjusted where necessary. For example, the fiscal adjustment path has been modified in Greece and Portugal to take into account unexpected changes in the macroeconomic situation.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-013417/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(26 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Παρακολούθηση της δράσης της Τρόικας

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Ποιο ευρωπαϊκό όργανο παρακολουθεί τις προβλέψεις, τη δράση, τις επιτυχίες ή τις αποτυχίες της Τρόικας και αξιολογεί τα οικονομικά μεγέθη όπως διαμορφώνονται μετά τις παρεμβάσεις της σε διάφορες χώρες;

— Μπορεί να δώσει συγκεκριμένα στοιχεία βάσει οικονομικών δεικτών για το διάστημα πριν και μετά την παρέμβαση της Τρόικας και για τη σημερινή κατάσταση;

— Πώς διαφοροποιούνται τα βασικά οικονομικά μεγέθη και ποιος ο αναμενόμενος χρόνος εξόδου από την κρίση για χώρες όπως η Ισπανία, η Ελλάδα και η Κύπρος;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(3 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Από νομική άποψη, το Συμβούλιο (Ecofin) είναι το αρμόδιο όργανο για τη χρηματοδοτική συνδρομή από την Ένωση (ΕΜΧΣ), η Ευρωομάδα/ομάδα εργασίας της Ευρωομάδας (EWG) από κοινού με τα κράτη μέλη εγγυητές είναι το αρμόδιο όργανο για τη χρηματοδοτική συνδρομή από το ΕΤΧΣ και το Συμβούλιο Διοικητών του ΕΜΣ είναι το αρμόδιο όργανο για τη χρηματοδοτική συνδρομή από το ΕΜΣ.

Η αξιολόγηση της οικονομικής και δημοσιονομικής κατάστασης των κρατών μελών αποτελεί αρμοδιότητα της Επιτροπής βάσει της Συνθήκης, όπως εξηγείται λεπτομερώς στη διεύθυνση:
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/economic_governance/index_en.htm

Όσον αφορά τα κράτη μέλη που υπόκεινται σε προγράμματα χρηματοδοτικής συνδρομής, οι οικονομικές επιδόσεις, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της ανάπτυξης εσωτερικών και εξωτερικών ανισορροπιών, τεκμηριώνονται πλήρως και αναλύονται σε εκθέσεις συμμόρφωσης οι οποίες δημοσιεύονται στον δικτυακό τόπο της Γενικής Διεύθυνσης Οικονομικών και Χρηματοδοτικών Υποθέσεων (ΓΔ ECFIN):
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/assistance_eu_ms/index_en.htm

Η Ισπανία έχει εφαρμόσει με επιτυχία το πρόγραμμα για τον χρηματοπιστωτικό τομέα και θα το ολοκληρώσει τον Ιανουάριο του 2014, καθώς η ισπανική οικονομία προβλέπεται ότι θα επανέλθει σε θετική ετήσια ανάπτυξη το 2014. Η Ελλάδα έχει λάβει σημαντικά μέτρα δημοσιονομικής προσαρμογής και ανακτά ανταγωνιστικότητα, ενώ ο ρυθμός οικονομικής συρρίκνωσης επιβραδύνεται και το πραγματικό ΑΕΠ αναμένεται να αυξηθεί το 2014. Στην Κύπρο το πρόγραμμα προσαρμογής εξελίσσεται ικανοποιητικά.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013417/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Monitoring the Troika

Which European bodies are responsible for monitoring the forecasts, actions, successes and failures of the Troika and assessing the economic impact of measures taken by it in the various countries concerned?

Can the Commission provide comparative data based on economic indicators for the respective periods before and after the implementation of Troika policies and outline the current situation?

What fundamental economic differences emerge from this analysis and when can countries such as Spain, Greece and Cyprus be expected to emerge from the crisis?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(3 February 2014)

In legal terms the Council (Ecofin) is the responsible body for Union (EFSM) financial assistance, the Eurogroup/Eurogroup Working Group (EWG) together with guarantor Member States is the responsible body for EFSF financial assistance, and the ESM Board of Governors is the responsible body for ESM financial assistance.

It is the Commission's mandate under the Treaty to assess the economic and fiscal situation of Member States as explained in detail under http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/economic_governance/index_en.htm

Regarding Member States with financial assistance programmes the economic performance including the built-up of internal and external imbalances is thoroughly documented and analysed in compliance reports published on DG ECFIN's website at http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/assistance_eu_ms/index_en.htm

Spain has successfully implemented its financial sector programme, is exiting the programme in January 2014 and the Spanish economy is projected to return to positive annual growth in 2014. Greece has completed a remarkable fiscal adjustment, is regaining competitiveness, while the pace of economic contraction is slowing and real GDP is expected to expand in 2014. In Cyprus the adjustment programme is on track.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-013418/13
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(26 ta' Novembru 2013)

Suġġett: Il-Karta tad-Drittijiet Fundamentali tal-Unjoni Ewropea

Huwa prinċipju bażiku tal-liberaliżmu li l-individwi għandhom id-dritt jagħmlu li jridu, dment li ma jiksrux id-drittijiet ta' ħaddieħor. Dan jinkludi l-libertà li jipperikolaw lilhom infushom, jekk jagħżlu li jagħmlu hekk.

Madankollu, l-aktar approċċi regolatorji reċenti tal-UE u ta' xi Stati Membri tagħha aktar jidhru li mexjin lejn forma ta' paternaliżmu, billi jirregolaw iżżejjed ħajjet in-nies u jillimitaw il-libertajiet tagħhom. Il-lista m'hemmx tmiemha, u dan l-aħħar ħaddnet il-logħob tal-azzard, ix-xorb, il-ħelu jew — bħala l-aħħar novità — l-użu tal-boroż tal-plastik.

Il-Karta tad-Drittijiet Fundamentali tal-Unjoni Ewropea, li l-UE qablet li kellha tkun il-bażi ċentrali tal-azzjoni governattiva tagħha, tinkludi wħud mill-prinċipji li ġejjin: (Artikolu 1) li ċ-ċittadini jitħallew jgħixu fil-libertà, u ma jiġux soġġettati għal regolazzjoni żejda u għal paternaliżmu statali; (Artikolu 15) li ċ-ċittadini jitħallew jagħżlu xogħolhom liberament; (Artikolu 17) li ċ-ċittadini jitħallew jużaw liberament proprjetà li jkunu kisbu skont il-liġi; u (Artikolu 20) li ma jitħalliex iseħħ li sitwazzjonijiet ugwali jiġu ttrattati b'mod diżugwali.

Il-Kummissjoni tirreaġixxi bil-ħeffa meta biss ikun hemm possibbiltà li sseħħ vjolazzjoni ta' proporzjonijiet gravi, imqar jekk tkun ta' darba, anki meta dawn il-vjolazzjonijiet jolqtu oqsma aktar astratti bħalma huwa l-istat tad-dritt, bħal fil-każ tal-Ungerija u tar-Rumanija. Vjolazzjonijiet tal-Karta taħt il-bandiera tal-paternaliżmu ilhom ħafna iktar żmien jaffettwaw naqra naqra d-drittijiet fundamentali taċ-ċittadini, imma l-Kummissjoni tibqa' siekta. Din it-tendenza li "jeħtieġ li nipproteġu lin-nies minnhom infushom" spiss tiġi ġġustifikata bil-possibbiltà li, jekk ma jsirx hekk, in-nies jisfaw piż fuq is-sistemi soċjali.

Fil-fehma tal-Kummissjoni, spejjeż soċjali potenzjali huma raġuni suffiċjenti biex dak li jkun jirrestrinġi l-libertajiet fundamentali? Jekk le, il-Kummissjoni x'passi bihsiebha tieħu biex tevita paternaliżmu eċċessiv min-naħa tal-Istati Membri?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Reding f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(18 ta' Frar 2014)

Il-Karta tad-Drittijiet Fundamentali tal-Unjoni Ewropea hija vinkolanti fuq l-istituzzjonijiet tal-UE u huwa r-rwol tal-Kummissjoni li tiżgura li din tiġi rispettata f'kull azzjoni tal-UE.

Fil-prattika, dan ifisser illi l-proposti leġiżlattivi kollha tal-UE jiġu miflija bir-reqqa mal-Karta, inklużi mal-Artikoli 1, 15, 17 u 20 tagħha. B'mod aktar partikolari, il-Valutazzjoni tal-Impatt li takkumpanja kull proposta leġiżlattiva se jkollha tinkludi analiżi bir-reqqa tad-drittijiet fundamentali. F'dan ir-rigward, ta' min ifakkar li l-Artikolu 52(1) jipprovdi li kwalunkwe limitazzjoni tad-drittijiet tal-Karta trid tkun prevista bil-liġi u li soġġetti għall-prinċipju ta' proporzjonalità, jistgħu jsiru limitazzjonijiet biss fejn ikun meħtieġ u jekk dawn ġenwinament jilħqu l-għanijiet ta' interess ġenerali rikonoxxuti mill-Unjoni jew il-ħtieġa li jiġu protetti d-drittijiet u l-libertajiet ta' oħrajn.

Skont l-Artikolu 51(1), il-Karta tapplika għall-Istati Membri meta jkunu qed jimplimentaw id-dritt tal-Unjoni Ewropea. Il-Kummissjoni tista' tieħu l-qorti Stat Membru li jikser id-drittijiet fundamentali meta jkun qed jimplimenta il-liġi tal-UE. F'każijiet barra mill-iskop tal-liġi tal-UE, huwa madankollu għall-Istati Membri, inklużi l-awtoritajiet ġudizzjarji tagħhom, biex jiżguraw li d-drittijiet fundamentali jiġu rispettati u mħarsa b'mod effettiv.

Isegwi għalhekk li kull azzjoni tal-UE trid tkun konformi mal-oġħla standard fir-rigward tal-konformità mad-Drittijiet Fundamentali fi żmien li ssir il-proposta kif ukoll waqt l-implimentazzjoni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013418/13
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union

It is a basic principle of liberalism that individuals have the right to do whatever they want as long as it does not interfere with the rights of others. This includes the liberty to put themselves in danger if they choose to do so.

However, the latest regulatory approaches of the EU and some of its Member States are rather moving towards a form of paternalism, by over-regulating people's lives and limiting their freedoms. The list is endless and in recent times has included gambling, drinking, eating sweets or — as the latest novelty — the use of plastic bags.

The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, which the EU agreed to be its central base of governing action, includes some of the following principles: (Article 1) allowing citizens to live freely and not subjecting them to over-regulation and state paternalism; (Article 15) allowing citizens to pursue a freely chosen occupation; (Article 17) allowing citizens to use their lawfully acquired property; and (Article 20) avoiding any unequal treatment of equal situations.

The Commission is quick to respond to the mere possibility of one-time breaches of grave proportions, even when they pertain to more abstract areas such as the rule of law, as was the case in Hungary and Romania. Violations of the Charter perpetrated under the banner of paternalism have been affecting the fundamental rights of citizens in small doses for much longer periods of time, but the Commission remains silent. This tendency to 'protect people from themselves' is often justified by the possibility that they will otherwise become a social liability.

In the Commission's view, are potential social costs a sufficient reason to restrict fundamental freedoms? If not, what steps does the Commission plan to take in order to avoid excessive paternalism at the hands of Member States?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2014)

The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union is binding on the EU institutions and it is the role of the Commission to ensure that it is respected in every EU action.

In practice, this means all EU legislative proposals are carefully scrutinised against the Charter, including its Articles 1, 15, 17 and 20. More in particular, the impact assessment accompanying any legislative proposal would have to contain a careful fundamental rights analysis. In this respect it is recalled that Article 52(1) provides that any limitation of the Charter rights must be provided for by law and that subject to the principle of proportionality, limitations may be made only if they are necessary and genuinely meet objectives of general interest recognised by the Union or the need to protect rights and freedoms of others.

According to its Article 51(1), the Charter applies to Member States when they are implementing European Union law. The Commission can take a Member State to court for violating fundamental rights when implementing EC law. In cases outside the scope of EC law, it is however for Member States, including their judicial authorities, to ensure that fundamental rights are effectively respected and protected.

It follows that any EU action would have to comply with the very highest standard as concerns compliance with Fundamental Rights at proposal as well as implementation level.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013419/13
to the Commission
Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Reforms of Europol and the use of Interpol

The Commission's proposed Europol Regulation (COM(2013)0173 final) provides for 'reinforced' subject access rights in order 'to increase transparency'. Under the proposed Article 39, upon application by the data subject, Europol would be required to grant access — that is, confirm the existence of information, categorise the information, and communicate in intelligible form the information itself — unless one of four grounds for refusal applied. To determine whether these apply, Europol would 'consult' the Member State concerned. If it were to refuse access, it would have to issue a reasoned decision explaining why. This decision would then be challengeable before the European Data Protection Supervisor.

EU Member States all have access to the Interpol system. Under Article 18 of Interpol's Rules on the Processing of Data, data subjects can also apply to access information concerning them by making an application to the Commission for the Control of Interpol's Files (CCF). However, the CCF can disclose the information only with the permission of the National Central Bureau (NCB) which recorded the information on Interpol's files. This policy may be derogated from only where the persons concerned can provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that they know there is information on file. Otherwise, the NCB can insist on non-disclosure. Applications have been known to take between one and two years to determine. CCF decisions cannot be challenged in any forum.

1. Is the Commission concerned that Member States may be able to circumvent the subject access rights envisaged under the proposed Europol Regulation by instead exchanging information through Interpol, where disclosure requirements are more limited?

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

In relation to the processing of data at Interpol, the Commission refers to its reply to Question E-013039/13 ([1]).

The Commission considers that the rules for data subject access rights contained in Article 39 of the proposed Regulation are reasonable and that they are not likely in themselves to lead Member States to exchange information through Interpol instead of Europol. Article 7 of the proposed Regulation requires, in any event, Member States to supply Europol with information necessary for it to fulfil its objectives, and there are practical advantages to using the Europol channel for bilateral exchange of information between Member States as the Commission recommended in its communication on the European Information Exchange Model (EIXM) of 7 December 2012 ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) COM(2012) 735 final.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-013420/13
komissiolle
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(26. marraskuuta 2013)

Aihe: Huoli lasten ja nuorten kunnon heikkenemisestä

Lapset ja nuoret liikkuvat nyt vähemmän kuin aikaisemmin, samalla kun yhä useampi heistä kärsii ainakin jonkinasteisesta ylipaino-ongelmasta. Koska heikko fyysinen kunto ja vakava ylipaino ovat nuorison keskuudessa koko ajan lisääntymässä, niiden voidaan odottaa aiheuttavan ajanoloon heille merkittäviä terveyshaittoja. Ne puolestaan johtavat työkyvyn alentumiseen ja yleisen sairastavuuden lisääntymiseen. On todennäköistä, että tästä aiheutuu merkittäviä kustannuksia yhteiskunnalle työtehon ja tuottavuuden laskiessa ja sairastamisesta aiheutuvien kulujen kasvaessa. Lisäksi aiheutuu inhimillistä kärsimystä, joka ei ole rahalla mitattavissa. Kuitenkin lasten ja nuorten liikuntakasvatukseen ja syömätottumusten ohjaukseen panostamalla voitaisiin lisätä heidän hyvinvointiaan ja parantaa heidän edellytyksiään elää terveempää elämää.

Kuinka komissio aikoo vastata haasteeseen saada nykyistä kattavammin kaikki lapset ja nuoret jäsenvaltioissa harrastamaan enemmän liikuntaa? Onko komissio jo laatinut ehdotuksia jäsenmaille lasten ja nuorten elintapojen ohjaamiseksi niin, että ne tukisivat paremmin heidän terveyttään ja fyysistä kuntoaan?

Aikooko komissio jakaa hyviä käytäntöjä tällä saralla?

Androulla Vassilioun komission puolesta antama vastaus
(13. helmikuuta 2014)

Komissio on tietoinen lasten ja nuorten liikunnan ja urheilun harrastamisen vähenemisestä. Tämä suuntaus havaittiin komission rahoittamassa tutkimuksessa ([1]) kymmenen vuotta sitten. Jatkotoimiin kuuluivat EU:n liikuntaa koskevat suuntaviivat vuodelle 2008, EU:n urheilualan työsuunnitelma vuosille 2011–2014 sekä urheilua, terveyttä ja osallistumista käsittelevä EU:n asiantuntijaryhmä. Neuvosto antoi 26. marraskuuta 2013 komission ehdotuksen ([2]) pohjalta suosituksen terveyttä edistävän liikunnan lisäämisestä. Terveyttä edistävään liikuntaan liittyviä kansainvälisiä hankkeita on tuettu urheilualan valmistelevilla toimilla vuosina 2009 (yhdeksän hanketta) ja 2012 (neljä hanketta). Uusi Erasmus+-ohjelma tarjoaa uusia rahoitusmahdollisuuksia terveyttä edistävän liikunnan lisäämiseksi.

Vuonna 2007 laaditussa ravitsemukseen, ylipainoon ja lihavuuteen liittyviä terveyskysymyksiä koskevassa eurooppalaisessa strategiassa ([3]) esitetään ensisijaisesti lapsiin kohdistuvaa toimea jäsenvaltioiden kumppanuuksien (ravitsemusta ja liikuntaa käsittelevä asiantuntijaryhmä ([4])) ja kansalaisyhteiskunnan kumppanuuksien (ruokavaliota, liikuntaa ja terveyttä käsittelevä Euroopan toimintafoorumi ([5])) kautta.

Asiantuntijaryhmä valmistelee parhaillaan lasten ylipainoisuuden torjumista koskevaa toimintasuunnitelmaa (2014–2020), jossa käsitellään muun muassa lasten säännöllistä liikuntaa.

Komissio osallistuu lisäksi kohdennettuihin valistuskampanjoihin, joilla edistetään lasten terveellisiä ruokailutottumuksia EU:n kouluhedelmäjärjestelmän ([6]) ja useiden pilottihankkeiden ([7]) avulla.

([1]) Young People's Lifestyle and Sedentariness, Paderbornin yliopisto ja Essenin yliopisto ym., 2004.
([2]) COM(2013)0603 lopullinen.
([3]) KOM(2007)0279.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_en.htm
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_en.htm
([7]) EP2011-SANCO/2011/C4/01 (pilottihanke, jossa testataan erilaisia tapoja lisätä tuoreiden hedelmien ja vihanneksien kulutusta erityisesti EU:n NUTS 2 -alueiden paikallisyhteisöissä, joissa kotitalouksien ensisijaiset tulot ovat alle 50 prosenttia EU27-maiden keskiarvosta) ja EP2012-SANCO/2012/C4/02 (pilottihanke, joka liittyy terveellisen ruokavalion edistämiseen varhaislapsuudessa ja ikääntyvän väestön parissa).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013420/13
to the Commission
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: Concern about the worsening physical fitness of children and young people

Children and young people are now taking less exercise than in the past, while at the same time more and more of them suffer from at least some degree of overweight. Because poor physical fitness and severe overweight are increasing all the time among young people, these factors may be expected to cause significant health problems for them over time, which in turn will lead to reduced ability to work and increased general incidence of disease. It is likely that this will incur significant costs to society as fitness for work and productivity fall while expenditure caused by illness rises. In addition it causes human suffering which cannot be measured in monetary terms. However, investment in physical education and guidance for eating habits could enhance their well-being and improve their chances of living a healthier life.

How does the Commission propose to respond to the challenge of ensuring, more comprehensively than at present, that all children and young people in the Member States take more exercise? Has the Commission already prepared proposals for the Member States for guiding children's and young people's eating habits so as to promote their health and physical fitness more effectively?

Does the Commission propose to share good practices in this area?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(13 February 2014)

The Commission is aware of the decrease in children's and young people's physical activity and sport practice: the trend was identified in a Commission-funded study a decade ago ([1]). Follow-up included the 2008 EU Physical Activity Guidelines, the EU Work Plan for Sport 2011-14 and the EU Expert Group on Sport, Health and Participation. On 26 November 2013, the Council adopted a recommendation on promoting health-enhancing physical activity (HEPA), based on a Commission proposal ([2]). Transnational HEPA-related projects have been supported through the Preparatory Actions in the field of Sport in 2009 (9 projects) and 2012 (4 projects). The new Erasmus+ programme will provide further funding opportunities to support HEPA.

The 2007 EU Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health Issues ([3]) foresees action that targets children as a priority through its partnerships with Member States (High Level Group for Nutrition and Physical Activity ([4])) and civil society (EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health ([5])).

The High Level Group is drafting an Action Plan to tackle childhood obesity (2014-2020) addressing, among others, the regular participation of children in physical activity.

Finally, through the EU School Fruit Scheme ([6]) and several pilot projects ([7]), the Commission contributes to targeted educational campaigns that establish healthier eating habits among children.

([1]) Young People's Lifestyle and Sedentariness, Universities of Paderborn and Essen, et al., 2004.
([2]) COM(2013) 603 final.
([3]) COM(2007) 279.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_en.htm
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_en.htm
([7]) EP2011-SANCO/2011/C4/01 (Pilot project to test different approaches aimed at increasing the consumption of fresh F&V in particular in local communities in EU NUTS2 regions with primary household income below 50% of the EU-27 average) and EP2012-SANCO/2012/C4/02 (Pilot project related to the promotion of healthy diets: early years and ageing population).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013423/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(26 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Finanziamenti UE per le «primavere arabe»

Durante l'ultimo forum «MEdays», svoltosi a Tangeri dal 13 al 16.11.2013, Bernardino Leon Gross, rappresentante speciale dell'Unione europea, ha dichiarato che l'Europa si sforza di sostenere politicamente e finanziariamente le riforme democratiche nei paesi della «primavera araba».

Può l'Alto Rappresentante dell'UE specificare la dichiarazione del rappresentante speciale dell'Unione europea:

1. a quanto ammonterebbero questi finanziamenti e a chi andrebbero destinati? A qualipaesi in particolare?

2. A quali riforme democratiche ci si riferisce?

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

L'UE sostiene le riforme democratiche nella regione, principalmente attraverso lo strumento europeo di vicinato e partenariato (ENPI). Gli impegni a favore del vicinato meridionale nell'ambito dell'ENPI per il periodo 2011-2013 ammontano complessivamente a 4 357,4 milioni di EUR. È stato fornito sostegno sia ai governi che alla società civile, con particolare attenzione alle riforme politiche ed economiche. Nel 2011-2013 l'iniziativa SPRING (sostegno al partenariato, alle riforme e alla crescita inclusiva) ha erogato 540 milioni di EUR per sostenere programmi specifici di riforme in Algeria (10 milioni di EUR), Egitto (90 milioni di EUR), Giordania (101 milioni di EUR), Libano (51 milioni di EUR), Libia (5 milioni di EUR), Marocco (EUR 128 milioni di EUR) e Tunisia (155 milioni di EUR).

Le riforme democratiche possono essere valutate in base all'evoluzione di parametri importanti quali lo svolgimento di elezioni libere e regolari, i processi costituzionali, la libertà di associazione, di espressione e di riunione o la libertà dei media. Purtroppo, i processi di transizione democratica e di riforma nei paesi del vicinato meridionale sono complessi, turbolenti e impegnativi. Per valutare qualsiasi riforma democratica occorrono quindi analisi specifiche e approfondite dei singoli paesi. In Egitto è stato organizzato il secondo referendum costituzionale nell'arco di un anno e le elezioni dovrebbero svolgersi entro tempi brevi. In Tunisia, l'Assemblea costituente nazionale ha recentemente approvato la versione definitiva della nuova costituzione. La Libia risente di un problema istituzionale e di governance che ha pesanti ripercussioni in termini politici, economici e di sicurezza. L'UE continua a monitorare e sostenere la transizione democratica nella regione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013423/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Mario Borghezio (NI)
(26 November 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EU financing for the 'Arab Spring'

During the latest 'MEDays' forum, held in Tangier from 13 to 16 November 2013, Bernardino León Gross, the EU Special Representative for the Southern Mediterranean region, declared that Europe is striving to provide political and financial support for the democratic reforms in the 'Arab Spring' countries.

Can the EU High Representative clarify Mr León's declaration:

1. what are the amounts of financing involved and who are the recipients? Which countries?

2. What are the democratic reforms referred to?

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

The EU has been supporting democratic reforms in the region, mainly through the European Neighbourhood Partnership Instruments (ENPI). Total commitments for the Southern Neighbourhood under the ENPI for the period 2011-2013: EUR 4 357.4 million Support has been provided to both governments and the civil society, focusing on political and economic reforms. The SPRING (Support for Political Reform and Inclusive Growth) Initiative in 2011-13 provided funds (EUR 540 million) to support specific reform agendas in Algeria (EUR 10 million), Egypt (EUR 90 million), Jordan (EUR 101 million), Lebanon (EUR 51 million), Libya (EUR 5 million), Morocco (EUR 128 million), and Tunisia (EUR 155 million).

Democratic reforms can be measured looking at the development of important processes such as free and fair elections, constitutional processes, freedom of association, expression, assembly and media, etc. Unfortunately, the democratic transition and reform processes in the countries of the Southern Neighbourhood are complex, turbulent and challenging. Therefore in-depth and country specific assessments are needed for an evaluation of any democratic reform. In Egypt, the second Constitutional referendum took place in one year, and elections again to come within the near future. In Tunisia, the National Constituent Assembly has recently approved the final version of the country's new constitution. Libya is beset with a governance and institutional problem which has negative repercussions in the political, economic and security situation. The EU continues to monitor and support the democratic transition in the region.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013424/13
a la Comisión
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(27 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Contaminación del Lago de Sanabria y posible uso inapropiado de los Fondos Europeos de Desarrollo Regional

Según varios informes científicos publicados recientemente, los vertidos reiterados de aguas fecales procedentes de los pueblos de alrededor y las deficiencias en las infraestructuras de depuración instaladas en la zona están contaminado gravemente el Lago de Sanabria, en Zamora. Esta contaminación podría acabar con el mayor lago de origen glaciar de la península, que forma parte de la Red Natura 2000 y cuenta con la distinción de Zona de Especial Protección para las Aves y Hábitat de interés comunitario.

En una reciente investigación liderada por la Estación Biológica Internacional Duero-Douro —a la que se han sumado más de 20 científicos y expertos de España, Portugal, Francia y Suiza— se advierte del proceso de eutrofización que están sufriendo las aguas del lago y de sus graves consecuencias para el equilibrio del ecosistema. Sin embargo, la Junta de Castilla y León pone en duda la veracidad de las conclusiones de los científicos y no asume su responsabilidad en la construcción de depuradoras fallidas y en la adopción de convenios de mantenimiento incumplidos.

Puesto que la Unión Europea tiene entre sus objetivos y compromisos la protección de la naturaleza y de las especies amenazadas y los hábitats europeos más valiosos, ¿qué medidas piensa tomar la Comisión para comprobar y asegurar que se está respetando el cumplimiento de la normativa europea de los denominados lugares «Natura 2000» (Directiva de Aves (79/409/CEE) y Directiva de Hábitats (92/43/CEE)) en Castilla y León?

Si se comprueba, tal y como observan los científicos, que los vertidos son los causantes de la contaminación y del ataque a la biodiversidad, ¿se plantea la Comisión multar a España por el posible uso inapropiado de los Fondos Europeos de Desarrollo Regional al financiar la construcción de la depuradora que está causando el destrozo ecológico?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(28 de enero de 2014)

La Comisión observa que el espacio «Lago de Sanabria y alrededores» ha sido designado lugar de importancia comunitaria (LIC ES4190105) y Zona de Especial Protección para las Aves (ZEPA ES4190009) en virtud de las Directivas sobre hábitats ([1]) y sobre aves ([2]).

La Comisión es consciente de las actuales controversias en cuanto al estado del Lago de Sanabria, como bien ha señalado Su Señoría. Según la información disponible, parece que, en este momento, el Defensor del Pueblo regional está llevando a cabo una investigación en relación con este caso concreto, centrándose en el contenido de los informes científicos a los que se refiere Su Señoría y en otros datos pertinentes sobre la calidad del agua del lago. A la luz de las actuales investigaciones, la Comisión no considera conveniente intervenir en este momento en relación con el caso.

En cuanto a las preguntas relativas a la utilización del Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional para la financiación de la construcción de la depuradora, la Comisión se remite a su respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-012511/2013. En lo que respecta al posible uso indebido de los fondos, la Comisión no está en disposición de emprender ninguna acción antes de que haya concluido la actual investigación.

([1]) Directiva 92/43/CEE del Consejo, de 21 de mayo de 1992, relativa a la conservación de los hábitats naturales y de la fauna y flora silvestres (DO L 206 de 22.7.1992).
([2]) Directiva 2009/147/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 30 de noviembre de 2009, relativa a la conservación de las aves silvestres (DO L 20 de 26.1.2010), que codifica la Directiva 79/409/CEE del Consejo, de 2 de abril de 1979, relativa a la conservación de las aves silvestres.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013424/13
to the Commission
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Pollution of Lake Sanabria and possible misuse of European regional development funds

According to various recently-published scientific reports, Lake Sanabria (Zamora) is being seriously polluted by the recurring inflow of sewage from neighbouring towns and the poor condition of water treatment infrastructure in the area. This pollution could lead to the destruction of the Iberian Peninsula's largest lake of glacier origin, which forms part of the Natura 2000 network and is listed as a Special Protection Area (SPA) for birds and a habitat of Community interest.

A recent study carried out by the Duero-Douro International Biological Station, with the collaboration of over 20 scientists and experts from Spain, Portugal, France and Switzerland, warned that the lake's waters are undergoing a process of eutrophication which is seriously unbalancing its ecosystem. Nevertheless, the Castile and Leon regional government has questioned the accuracy of these scientific findings and refused to accept its share of responsibility for the construction of defective water treatment plants and the adoption of maintenance agreements which have not been implemented.

Since the protection of nature, endangered species and the most important European habitats is one of the EU's aims and commitments, what steps does the Commission intend to take to monitor and ensure compliance with European law in these Natura 2000 sites protected under the Birds Directive (79/409/EEC) and the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) in Castile and Leon?

If it is proven that sewage dumping is causing the lake's pollution and loss of biodiversity, as observed by the scientists, will the Commission fine Spain for its possible misuse of European regional development funds to finance the construction of the water treatment plant responsible for this environmental destruction?

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

The Commission notes that the site 'Lago de Sanabria y alrededores' has been designated as a site of Community Importance (SCI ES4190105) and a Special Protection Area (SPA ES4190009) under the Habitats ([1]) and the Birds ([2]) Directives.

The Commission is aware of the existing controversies concerning the state of the lake of Sanabria, as highlighted by the Honourable Member. According to the available information, it appears that an investigation is currently being carried out by the regional Ombudsman concerning this particular case, focusing on the content of the scientific reports referred to by the Honourable Member and other existing relevant information on the quality of the water of the lake. In light of the current investigations, the Commission does not deem it appropriate to act, at this stage, in this case.

As for the questions regarding the use of the European regional development funds to finance the construction of the water treatment plant, the Commission would like to refer to its reply to Written Question E-012511/2013. Concerning the possible misuse of the funds, the Commission is not in a position to take any action before the current investigation is concluded.

([1]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC, of 21 May 1992, on the protection of natural habitats and wild fauna and flora (OJ L 206 of 22.7.1992).
([2]) Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds (OJ L 20/7, 26.1.2010) that codifies the Council Directive 79/409/EEC of 2 April 1979 on the conservation of wild birds.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-013427/13
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(27 november 2013)

Betreft: VP/HR — EUBAM in Libië

EUBAM (EU Border Assistance Mission) opereert in Libië. Het betreft hier formeel een civiele missie. In feite houdt EUBAM zich met name bezig met het trainen van 5 000 tot 8 000 Libische paramilitairen ([1]).

1. Hoe verklaart de Vicevoorzitter/Hoge Vertegenwoordiger het dat de civiele missie in Libië zich in feite bezighoudt met het trainen van 5 000 tot 8 000 Libische paramilitairen? Om wat voor paramilitairen gaat het hier en voor welke concrete doelen worden zij getraind?

2. Hoe verantwoordt de Vicevoorzitter/Hoge Vertegenwoordiger het dat Antti Hartikainen, hoofd van de missie een exorbitant salaris van maar liefst EUR 320 000 geniet?

3. Hoe verantwoordt de Vicevoorzitter/Hoge Vertegenwoordiger het dat het EUBAM-personeel jaarlijks maar liefst 92 vakantiedagen heeft?

4. Hoe verantwoordt de Vicevoorzitter/Hoge Vertegenwoordiger de aanwezigheid van EUBAM in Libië, wetende dat minder dan de helft van de Libische bevolking weet wat de EU überhaupt is? Hoe verhoudt dit zich tot het feit dat EUBAM mede in het belang van de Libische bevolking opereert?

5. Hoe verantwoordt de Vicevoorzitter/Hoge Vertegenwoordiger het dat het EUBAM-personeel zich in Libië aan de aldaar geldende islamitische gebruiken moet aanpassen, inhoudende een verbod op alcohol, tabak, etc.?

6. Hoe verantwoordt de Vicevoorzitter/Hoge Vertegenwoordiger het dat het EUBAM-personeel geen enkele persoonlijke relatie met inlanders mag onderhouden?

7. Hoe verantwoordt de Vicevoorzitter/Hoge Vertegenwoordiger het dat, indien een EUBAM-medewerker zich aan een misdrijf zoals verkrachting of mensenhandel schuldig maakt, deze persoon níet voor het Libische gerecht dient te verschijnen, maar naar zijn thuisland zal worden teruggestuurd? Zal deze persoon in zijn thuisland alsnog voor zijn daden worden gestraft?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(4 februari 2014)

1. EUBAM ondersteunt, adviseert en traint uistluitend personeel dat door de Libische regering is aangewezen om dienst te doen als grenswachters of grenspolitie, in samenwerking met het douanepersoneel de kustwacht.

2. Met het hoofd van de missie werd een contract als bijzonder adviseur van de Commissie gesloten. De toepasselijke salaristabel is vastgelegd in de Mededeling van de Commissie van 2009. Daarnaast ontvangt hij vergoedingen overeenkomstig bijlage X bij het personeelsstatuut van de EU. Het uiteindelijke brutosalaris hangt af van de toegekende rang, waarbij rekening wordt gehouden met eerdere relevante ervaring (in dit geval AD 14).

3. Het totale aantal vakantiedagen bedraagt 82. Internationale personeelsleden van EUBAM Libië hebben recht op 2,5 vakantiedagen per volbrachte dienstmaand. Zij hebben ook recht op 2,5 dagen compensatieverlof. Omdat EUBAM in een gevaarlijke risico-omgeving werkt, hebben personeelsleden recht op een extra verlofdag. Ze krijgen net zoals alle anderen die aan GVDB-missies deelnemen, 10 feestdagen.

4. Het is de taak van EUBAM om de land- en zeegrenzen van Libië veiliger te maken. Het algemene doel is de Libische autoriteiten de mogelijkheid te geven om de problemen met grensbeveiliging aan te pakken. Dit is zeker in het belang van de burgers van Libië en zal de veiligheid van de EU versterken.

5. EUBAM-personeel moet zich houden aan de Gedragscode van de missie die gebaseerd is op een document met als titel „Algemene gedragsnormen voor EVDB-missies". Dit is een EU-document dat iedereen vrij kan raadplegen. EUBAM-personeel wordt dan ook verzocht de plaatselijke gebruiken te respecteren.

([1]) http://euobserver.com/foreign/122134.

6. Het is niet het geval.

7. EUBAM-personeel staat op de diplomatieke lijst in Libië. Als een dergelijk geval zich zou voordoen, gaan wij ervan uit dat de normale diplomatieke procedures gelden, overeenkomstig het Verdrag van Wenen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013427/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EU Border Assistance Mission (EUBAM) in Libya

There is a EUBAM operating in Libya. Technically, this is a civilian mission. EUBAM is in fact training between 5 000 and 8 000 Libyan paramilitaries ([1]).

1. How does the Vice-President/High Representative account for that fact that a civilian mission in Libya is in fact training between 5 000 and 8 000 Libyan paramilitaries? What type of paramilitaries are they, and for what specific objectives are they being trained?

2. How does the Vice-President/High Representative justify the exorbitant salary of no less than EUR 320 000 which is being paid to the Head of Mission, Antti Hartikainen?

3. How does the Vice-President/High Representative justify annual leave of no less than 92 days for EUBAM staff?

4. How does the Vice-President/High Representative justify EUBAM's presence in Libya when less than half the country's population has any idea what the EU is? How is this to be reconciled with the fact that EUBAM is operating in the interests of the Libyan population too?

5. How does the Vice-President/High Representative justify the fact that EUBAM staff in Libya must comply with Islamic customs there, e.g. a ban on alcohol and tobacco?

6. How does the Vice-President/High Representative justify the fact that EUBAM staff are not allowed to have personal contacts with local inhabitants?

7. How does the Vice-President/High Representative justify the fact that any EUBAM staff members committing an offence such as rape or human trafficking would not have to appear before the Libyan courts, but, rather, would be sent back to their home countries? In such circumstances, would the individuals concerned then be punished in their home countries for their actions?

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

1. EUBAM supports and advises — and also trains — excusively personnel appointed by the Libyan government to serve as border guards or border police, with customs personnel, and with naval coastguards.

2. The Head of Mission is contracted as a Special Adviser to the Commission. The applicable salary grid is established in the Commission Communication 2009; on top of this, he receives the allowances as per Annex X to the EU Staff Regulation. The final gross salary is fixed depending on the grade which is attributed taking into consideration the previous relevant experience (in this case AD14).

3. Total leave days are 82. EUBAM Libya international staff members are entitled to earn 2.5 days of Annual Leave per completed month of service. They are also entitled to 2.5 days for Compensatory Time Off. As EUBAM works in a critical risk environment, staff members are entitled for one additional Rest Leave Day. As for all CSDP Missions, EUBAM is granted for 10 Mission Public Holidays.

4. EUBAM's mandate is to enhance the security of the Libyan land and sea borders. The overall intention is to permit the Libyan authorities to tackle border security related challenges. This is surely to the benefit of the people of Libya and will enhance the security of the EU.

5. EUBAM staff must comply with the Mission's Code of Conduct which is based upon a document entitled Generic Standards of Behaviour for ESDP missions. This is an EU document which is in the public domain. EUBAM staff are therefore called upon to respect local customs.

6. Not the case.

([1]) http://euobserver.com/foreign/122134

7. EUBAM staff appear on the diplomatic list in Libya. Were such a case as described to arise, we would expect normal diplomatic procedures to apply, as per the Vienna Convention.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-013433/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(27 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Χρήση του συμβόλου του Ήλιου της Βεργίνας

Νομοσχέδιο με το οποίο απαγορεύεται η χρήση του συμβόλου του Ήλιου της Βεργίνας για κρατικούς και για άλλους σκοπούς, κατέθεσε πρόσφατα στη Βουλή της ΠΓΔΜ ο αρχηγός και βουλευτής του αντιπολιτευόμενου «Φιλελεύθερου Κόμματος» (LP), Ίβον Βελίτσκοβσκι.

Σύμφωνα με τον κ. Βελίτσκοβσκι: «Η απαγόρευση της χρήσης του Ήλιου της Βεργίνας ρυθμίζεται μέσω της Ενδιάμεσης Συμφωνίας που υπεγράφη το 1995 μεταξύ της Ελλάδας και της ΠΓΔΜ, ωστόσο μέχρι τώρα δεν εφαρμόζεται αναλόγως, καθώς ο Ήλιος χρησιμοποιείται από κρατικούς θεσμούς, σε αθλητικούς αγώνες, σε αθλητικές αίθουσες που κατασκευάστηκαν κατά τα προηγούμενα έτη, ενώ η σημαία με αυτό το σύμβολο συχνά κυματίζει στις εορταστικές εκδηλώσεις κατά τις κρατικές εορτές, καθώς και στις συγκεντρώσεις κάποιων πολιτικών κομμάτων».

Υπενθυμίζεται ότι, στο άρθρο 7 παράγραφος 2 της Ενδιάμεσης Συμφωνίας αναφέρεται ότι η ΠΓΔΜ, με την έναρξη ισχύος της Συμφωνίας, θα παύσει να χρησιμοποιεί καθ' οιονδήποτε τρόπο το σύμβολο με τον Ήλιο της Βεργίνας σε όλες του τις μορφές.

Η ΕΕ έχει επανειλημμένα και ομόφωνα αποφασίσει ότι η αμοιβαία διευθέτηση της διαφοράς για το όνομα και την χρήση συμβόλων είναι απαραίτητη προϋπόθεση για την έναρξη ενταξιακών διαπραγματεύσεων με την ΠΓΔΜ.

Ερωτάται λοιπόν η Επιτροπή:

— Πώς επηρεάζει τις σχέσεις της ΕΕ με την ΠΓΔΜ η συνεχιζόμενη χρήση-κατάχρηση του συμβόλου του Ήλιου της Βεργίνας, από την ΠΓΔΜ, κατά παράβαση της Ενδιάμεσης Συμφωνίας του 1995;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(3 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Η διαμεσολάβηση όσον αφορά τη διένεξη για το όνομα μεταξύ της Ελλάδας και της Πρώην Γιουγκοσλαβικής Δημοκρατίας της Μακεδονίας πραγματοποιείται υπό την αιγίδα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή δεν συμμετέχει σε αυτή τη διαδικασία, αλλά την υποστηρίζει πλήρως.

Η ενδιάμεση συμφωνία του 1995 αποτελεί διμερή συμφωνία μεταξύ της Ελλάδας και της Πρώην Γιουγκοσλαβικής Δημοκρατίας της Μακεδονίας στο πλαίσιο των Ηνωμένων Εθνών.

Η ενδιάμεση συμφωνία περιλαμβάνει ρήτρα σχετικά με τον χειρισμό πιθανών διαφορών μεταξύ των δύο μερών ως προς την ερμηνεία των διατάξεών της.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013433/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Use of the symbol of the Vergina Sun

A bill prohibiting the use of the symbol of the Vergina Sun by State authorities or others was recently tabled in the Parliament of FYROM by the leader of the Opposition Liberal Party, Ivon Velickovski, MP.

According to Mr Velickovski: 'A ban on the use of the Vergina Sun is regulated by the Interim Agreement signed in 1995 between Greece and FYROM; however, it has not so far been implemented accordingly, as the Vergina Sun is used by state institutions, at sports events and in sports halls built during last few years. Moreover, a flag bearing this symbol is often used at the state festivities during government holidays, and at the meetings of some political parties'

It will be recalled that Article 7, paragraph 2, of the Interim Agreement provides that FYROM, with the entry into force of the Agreement, will cease to use in any way the symbol of the Vergina Sun in any shape or form.

The EU has repeatedly and unanimously decided that mutual settlement of the dispute regarding the name and the use of symbols is an essential prerequisite for the opening of accession negotiations with FYROM.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

— How does the continuing use and misuse of the symbol of the Vergina Sun by FYROM, in breach of the Interim Accord of 1995, affect relations between the EU and FYROM?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(3 February 2014)

The name dispute between Greece and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia is mediated under the auspices of the United Nations. The European Commission does not take part in this but fully supports the process.

The 1995 Interim Agreement is a bilateral agreement between Greece and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in the context of the United Nations.

The Interim Agreement contains a clause about the handling of possible disputes between the two Parties over the interpretation of its provisions.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013435/13
to the Commission
Phil Bennion (ALDE)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Rural apprenticeships and rural economic development

I represent several large rural counties in the UK (Shropshire, Worcestershire, Staffordshire, Warwickshire and Herefordshire). It has been brought to my attention in this capacity that there is a severe problem with 'underemployment' and unemployment in these areas. This is especially true for young people, many of whom move to cities only for employment purposes and do not return. According to Eurostat, only 6% of European farmers are aged under 35, while a third are over 65. Last year, during the renegotiation of the EU's common agricultural policy (CAP), I lobbied hard for the inclusion of a specific reference to rural apprenticeships with a view to providing training for young people for careers in farming, land management and rural crafts. This did not succeed, largely owing to disagreements surrounding the technical definition of an apprenticeship. However, Parliament's position was to include a rural development funding stream for the purpose of developing a skilled rural workforce, which ALDE believed encompassed the idea. However, for the benefit of all my constituents in the above-mentioned rural areas, I want to make another attempt at getting this issue back onto the Commission's agenda.

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

— Is there any provision in the Commission's post-2013 Rural Development Policy to develop a skilled, young rural workforce? If so, will this take the shape of financial support?

— Does the Commission have any plans to work in conjunction with the Member States to help improve infrastructure, be it roads, broadband services or the setting-up of rural business centres (for example)?

— Following on from the above questions, would the Commission be able to provide me with any information which I can then communicate to my constituents?

— Many inner-city children are growing up without any knowledge of rural issues or food provenance. To remedy this and to attract young people to areas such as Herefordshire and Shropshire, rural estates are offering inner-city children school trip experiences on farms. What European funding opportunities are available to the organisations concerned, and has any provision been made for them to share best practices? These activities could start the process of regenerating rural areas and reversing the negative trend of movement to our cities.

— Lastly, is there any EU strategy to help develop rural tourism? Places in my constituency such as Ironbridge in Shropshire, Alton Towers in Staffordshire and the Malvern Hills in Worcestershire could benefit enormously from EU support. Could the Commission therefore enlighten me as to whether there are any initiatives in this area?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

1. Yes, the new EU rural development policy will support training of farmers, forestry holders and rural SMEs and it will provide further support for advisory services to SMEs (Articles 14 and 15 of the new EAFRD regulation 2014-2020).

2. Yes, the EAFRD will provide financial support for rural services and infrastructure and where possible guidance documents will be provided to Member States and stakeholders (e.g. such as in the case of broadband). The Commission will also work with Member States in the context of the preparation of their programmes for 2014-2020.

3. The EAFRD regulation 2014-2020 was published in the Official Journal on 20/12/2013 ([1]).

4. Support for developing educational farms or other types of farms where children can undertake certain activities is provided under the EAFRD. It is up to Member States (MS) and regions to foresee support for these investments in their rural development programmes.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005, OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.

5. Rural tourism is a responsibility of MS and regions. The EAFRD will widely support this field in 2014-2020 ([2]) and it is up to the MS/regions to introduce such support possibilities in their rural development programmes. For the Commission, the major document showing the way forward is the communication on tourism from 2010 ([3]).

([2]) Support provided by the EAFRD could cover in rural areas business setting-up and development, agri-tourism and farm diversification, leisure and recreational infrastructure, service development, marketing of tourism and cooperation among small operators, tourist information and small scale tourism infrastructure, cultural and natural heritage, etc.

([3]) COM(2010) 352 final of 30.6.2010.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013436/13
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(27 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Fondi europei per la tutela del territorio

Negli scorsi giorni la Sardegna è stata colpita da massicce inondazioni che hanno causato danni gravissimi: una parte della responsabilità di questa tragedia si può sicuramente attribuire a una cattiva gestione del suolo e del territorio negli anni.

La scorsa settimana il Ministro italiano per la coesione territoriale, Carlo Triglia, ha affermato in un'audizione presso la Camera dei Deputati che gran parte dei finanziamenti europei destinati alla messa in sicurezza del territorio sia in realtà rimasta inutilizzata.

Tali finanziamenti avevano come obiettivo la tutela e difesa del suolo, la prevenzione dei rischi naturali e una migliore gestione paesaggistica.

Può la Commissione indicare quale sia l'entità dei finanziamenti dell'UE destinati all'Italia per tale settore nel periodo di programmazione 2007-2013 e quale sia stata l'effettiva utilizzazione?

Può inoltre indicare quale sia la dotazione prevista nel prossimo quadro finanziario pluriennale 2014-2020 per il predetto obiettivo specifico così importante per l'Italia, il cui territorio presenta molte aree soggette al rischio di dissesto idrogeologico?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(3 febbraio 2014)

Nel periodo 2007-2013 l'Italia ha stanziato un importo complessivo di 682 milioni di euro a valere sul Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale a favore di misure contro le catastrofi nazionali e per la prevenzione dei rischi. Conformemente ai dati più recenti disponibili, sinora è stato stanziato un importo complessivo di 575 milioni di euro per progetti selezionati, il che corrisponde all'84 % delle risorse complessive.

Per quanto concerne il periodo 2014-2020, l'Italia comunicherà le proprie cifre ufficiali relative allo stanziamento complessivo per l'obiettivo tematico 5 «adattamento al cambiamento climatico e prevenzione del rischio» nel suo accordo di partenariato, nell'ambito del quale definirà anche la propria strategia nel merito per il periodo in questione. Tale documento sarà perfezionato nei mesi a venire.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013436/13
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: European funds for territorial protection

Over the last few days, Sardinia has been struck by huge floods which have caused terrible damage: part of the responsibility for this tragedy can be attributed to poor soil and land management over several years.

Last week, the Italian Minister for Territorial Cohesion, Carlo Triglia, asserted, during a hearing at the Chamber of Deputies, that a large part of EU financing intended to ensure the safety of the territory has actually been left unused.

The objective of such financing is the protection and defence of the soil, the prevention of natural risks and better landscape management.

Can the Commission indicate the amount of EU financing intended for Italy in this sector during the 2007-2013 programming period and how much was actually used?

Can it also state the allocation provided for in the next 2014-2020 multi-year financial framework for the aforementioned specific directive, which is so important for Italy, whose territory has many areas at risk of hydrogeological instability?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(3 February 2014)

During the 2007-2013 period, Italy allocated an overall amount of EUR 682 million under the European Regional Development Fund in favour of natural disaster and risk prevention measures. According to the most recently available data, an overall amount of EUR 575 million has so far been allocated to selected projects, namely 84% of the overall resources.

As to the 2014-2020 period, Italy will communicate its official figures on the overall allocation for thematic objective 5 relating to 'adaptation to climate change and risk prevention' in its partnership agreement, where it will also lay down its strategy in this field for the period. This document will be finalised in the coming months.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-013437/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(27 novembre 2013)

Objet: Ukraine otage

Ioulia Timochenko reste en prison, l'Ukraine ne signe pas d'accord d'association avec l'Union européenne, et le gouvernement va travailler à intensifier les liens avec les pays de la Communauté des États indépendants, héritiers de l'Union soviétique. Pour le média indépendant Ukrainska Pravda, c'était hier un véritable «jeudi noir».

Le président Viktor Ianoukovitch affirme que ce n'est qu'un retard temporaire, nécessaire à la sécurisation de l'économie ukrainienne contre d'éventuelles pressions russes. Il ne semble d'ailleurs toujours pas prêt à rejoindre l'Union douanière menée par la Russie.

1. Quelle est la réaction de la Commission suite à cet échec?

2. Pour quelles raisons cette négociation a-t-elle capoté, selon la Commission?

3. Faut-il voir dans la décision de Kiev le résultat de la pression très brutale de Moscou, conduisant pratiquement à l'arrêt des exportations ukrainiennes vers la Russie, alors que les caisses de l'État ukrainien sont déficitaires?

Réponse donnée par M. Füle au nom de la Commission
(7 février 2014)

1. Dans ses conclusions du 20 décembre 2013, le Conseil européen a déclaré ce qui suit: «L'Union européenne reste disposée à signer l'accord d'association avec l'Ukraine, y compris la partie relative à la zone de libre-échange approfondi et complet, dès que l'Ukraine sera prête. Le Conseil européen appelle à la retenue et au respect des Droits de l'homme et des libertés fondamentales et plaide en faveur d'un règlement démocratique de la crise politique en Ukraine, qui répondrait aux aspirations de la population ukrainienne» .

2. C'est le gouvernement ukrainien qui a décidé de suspendre les préparatifs en vue de la signature d'un accord d'association, invoquant officiellement des préoccupations en matière de sécurité nationale et la nécessité de regagner les volumes d'échanges commerciaux avec la Russie qui auraient diminué.

3. La Commission considère que cet accord serait bénéfique à l'ensemble des parties mais aussi aux parties tierces, notamment à la Russie, et elle estime que les mesures commerciales restrictives appliquées contre l'Ukraine au cours des derniers mois ne sont pas fondées.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013437/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Ukraine held hostage

Yulia Tymoshenko is still in prison, Ukraine is not signing an association agreement with the European Union, and the government will try to step up links with the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States, the successors to the Soviet Union. For the independent media site *Ukrainska Pravda,* yesterday was a Black Thursday indeed.

President Viktor Yanukovych claims this is just a temporary hold-up, which is needed to secure the Ukrainian economy against possible Russian pressure. However, he does not seem willing to join the Customs Union headed by Russia.

1. What is the Commission's response to this setback?

2. Why, in the Commission's opinion, were these negotiations scuppered?

3. Is Kiev's decision the result of very forceful pressure from Moscow, tantamount to a halt on Ukrainian exports to Russia, while Ukraine's national finances are in the red?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(7 February 2014)

1. As stated by the European Council in its conclusions of 20th December 2013, 'The European Union remains ready to sign the Association Agreement, including Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area, with Ukraine, as soon as Ukraine is ready. The European Council calls for restraint, respect for human and fundamental rights and a democratic solution to the political crisis in Ukraine that would meet the aspirations of the Ukrainian people.'

2. It was the decision of the Government of Ukraine to suspend preparations for the signature of the Association Agreement, quoting officially the following reasons: national security concerns and the need to restore the allegedly lost volumes of trade with Russia.

3. The Commission believes that the Agreement would benefit all sides, as well as third parties including Russia, and finds that restrictive trade measures applied against Ukraine in the last few months were unsubstantiated.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-013438/13
au Conseil
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(27 novembre 2013)

Objet: UE-Ukraine

Ioulia Timochenko reste en prison, l'Ukraine ne signe pas d'accord d'association avec l'Union européenne, et le gouvernement va s'efforcer d'intensifier les liens avec les pays de la communauté des États indépendants, héritiers de l'Union soviétique. Pour le média indépendant *Ukrainska Pravda*, c'était hier un véritable «jeudi noir».

Le président Viktor Ianoukovitch affirme que ce n'est qu'un retard temporaire, nécessaire à la sécurisation de l'économie ukrainienne contre d'éventuelles pressions russes. Il ne semble d'ailleurs toujours pas prêt à rejoindre l'Union douanière menée par la Russie.

1. Quelle est la réaction du Conseil face à cet échec?

2. Selon le Conseil, pour quelles raisons ces négociations ont-elles échoué?

3. Y a-t-il dans la décision de Kiev le résultat de la pression très brutale de Moscou, qui conduit pratiquement à l'arrêt des exportations ukrainiennes vers la Russie, alors que les caisses de l'État ukrainien sont dans le rouge?

Réponse
(10 février 2014)

Le 16 décembre 2013, le Conseil des affaires étrangères a tenu un débat au sujet de la situation en Ukraine. À l'issue de la session, la Haute Représentante a fait la déclaration suivante: «Les ministres ont confirmé une nouvelle fois que l'Union européenne est disposée à signer l'accord d'association, qui comprend un volet relatif à la création d'une zone de libre-échange approfondi et complet, dès que l'Ukraine sera prête et que les conditions nécessaires auront été remplies. (…) Les ministres se sont réjouis du soutien de l'opinion publique en faveur de l'association politique et de l'intégration économique avec l'Union européenne, qui a été exprimé dans toute l'Ukraine par un grand nombre de personnes lors de manifestations qui se sont déroulées le week-end dernier encore».

C'est le gouvernement ukrainien qui a décidé de suspendre les préparatifs menés en vue de la signature de l'accord d'association, en invoquant officiellement des préoccupations liées à la sécurité nationale et la nécessité de rétablir les volumes d'échanges commerciaux qui auraient prétendument été perdus avec la Russie.

En marge de la session du Conseil du 16 décembre, les ministres ont rencontré le ministre des affaires étrangères de la Fédération de Russie, Sergueï Lavrov. En réponse aux objections formulées par la Russie à l'égard de l'accord d'association entre l'UE et l'Ukraine, la Haute Représentante a fait valoir auprès de M. Lavrov que la Russie tirerait également profit de la stabilité et de la prospérité accrues qui découleraient de ce partenariat. Les ministres des affaires étrangères de l'UE ont réaffirmé que les accords d'association et de libre-échange étaient totalement compatibles avec les accords commerciaux déjà en vigueur et respectaient les liens traditionnels qui unissent la Russie et ses voisins.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013438/13
to the Council
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: EU-Ukraine relations

Yulia Tymoshenko is still in prison, Ukraine is not signing an association agreement with the European Union, and the government will try to step up links with the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States, the successor to the Soviet Union. For the independent media site *Ukrainska Pravda,* yesterday was a Black Thursday indeed.

President Viktor Yanukovych claims this is just a temporary hold-up, which is needed to secure the Ukrainian economy against possible Russian pressure. However, he does not seem willing to join the Customs Union headed by Russia.

1. What is the Council's response to this setback?

2. Why, in the Council's opinion, did these negotiations fail?

3. Is Kiev's decision the result of very forceful pressure from Moscow, tantamount to a halt on Ukrainian exports to Russia, while Ukraine's national finances are in the red?

Reply
(10 February 2014)

The Foreign Affairs Council debated the situation in Ukraine on 16 December. As the High Representative remarked after the meeting, 'Ministers confirmed again the European Union's readiness to sign the Association Agreement with its Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area part as soon as Ukraine is ready and the relevant conditions are met. (…) Ministers welcomed the public support for the political association and economic integration with the European Union by so many across Ukraine, who demonstrated yet again this weekend.'

It was the decision of the Government of Ukraine to suspend preparations for the signature of the Association Agreement, quoting officially as reasons national security concerns and the need to restore the volumes of trade with Russia that had allegedly been lost.

In the margins of the Council meeting of 16 December, Ministers met with the Russian Federation's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr Lavrov. In response to Russian objections to the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement, the High Representative stressed to Mr Lavrov that Russia too would benefit from the increased stability and prosperity which such a partnership would bring. EU Foreign Ministers reiterated that the association and free trade agreements were fully compatible with existing trade agreements and respected the traditional links between Russia and its neighbours.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-013439/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 novembre 2013)

Objet: Protection des données

La surveillance de masse des communications privées des citoyens, des entreprises, mais aussi des députés européens est inacceptable. Il est clair que, dans le cadre de ces programmes de surveillance, les citoyens européens ne bénéficient pas des mêmes droits et procédures que les Américains aux États-Unis.

1. Il faut «renforcer» la convention «Safe Harbor», qui permet aux entreprises américaines et européennes de transférer vers les États-Unis les données personnelles de citoyens européens. Ces informations peuvent être utilisées par les autorités américaines d'une manière incompatible avec les motifs pour lesquels les données ont été collectées en Europe et transférées aux États-Unis. Dans sa forme actuelle, ce dispositif constitue un handicap de concurrence pour les entreprises européennes et a une incidence négative sur le droit fondamental à la protection des données. La Commission partage-t-elle cet avis et que propose-t-elle?

2. Ne faudrait-il pas enfin déterminer avec les autorités américaines les «remèdes» qui permettraient de renforcer le contrôle des certificats délivrés aux entreprises américaines, comme Google, Facebook ou IBM, dans le cadre de ces transferts?

3. La Commission se range-t-elle aux côtés du Parlement européen pour un durcissement du ton envers les États-Unis?

4. Une remise en question du PNR et de Swift est-elle évoquée en cas de mauvaise volonté outre-Atlantique?

5. Enfin, il y a, d'une part, la crise diplomatique et de confiance suscitée par les pratiques de la NSA et, d'autre part, les négociations de libre-échange, encore embryonnaires. Faute de progrès sur la protection des données, la Commission a-t-elle conscience que les tractations pourraient s'enrayer, avec la possibilité que le Parlement européen doive alors un jour refuser la ratification d'un compromis final éventuel?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission
(14 février 2014)

La Commission a adopté, le 27 novembre 2013, une communication au Parlement européen et au Conseil relative au fonctionnement de la sphère de sécurité du point de vue des citoyens de l'Union et des entreprises établies sur son territoire [COM(2013) 847]. Cette communication recense une série de problèmes que les États-Unis doivent résoudre pour améliorer le régime de protection des données mis en place en 2000 afin de permettre la libre circulation de données à caractère personnel entre l'UE et les entreprises des États-Unis qui adhèrent aux principes de la sphère de sécurité («Safe Harbour»). La Commission y a notamment formulé treize recommandations aux États-Unis pour renforcer ce régime. La communication «Rétablir la confiance dans les flux de données entre l'Union européenne et les États-Unis d'Amérique» [COM(2013) 846], adoptée le même jour, appelle les États-Unis à définir les mesures à prendre pour combler les lacunes d'ici à l'été 2014 et à les mettre en œuvre le plus rapidement possible.

En ce qui concerne l'accord sur le programme de surveillance du financement du terrorisme (TFTP), ni les consultations entre la Commission et les États-Unis, ni le dialogue avec le fournisseur désigné n'ont révélé d'élément indiquant un non-respect de l'accord par ce pays. Le récent réexamen conjoint de l'accord sur les données concernant les passagers aériens (PNR) n'a pas non plus mis en évidence de violations de cet accord.

En ce qui concerne les négociations relatives au partenariat transatlantique sur le commerce et les investissements (TTIP), les normes de protection des données ne seront pas négociées dans ce cadre, qui respectera pleinement les règles en matière de protection des données. Comme l'imposent les traités, la Commission européenne fait régulièrement rapport sur l'état d'avancement de ces négociations aux États membres et au Parlement européen. La Commission est pleinement consciente que c'est à ces derniers que reviendra la décision sur la conclusion de l'accord, une fois celui-ci négocié.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013439/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Data protection

Mass surveillance of the private communications of citizens, businesses and MEPs is unacceptable. It is also clear that European citizens, if they feel that their privacy has been breached as a result of these surveillance practices, do not have the same rights and recourse to legal action as US citizens.

1. The Safe Harbour agreement, under which US and European businesses can transfer to the United States the personal data of European citizens, needs to be made more robust. The data could be used by the US authorities in a manner inconsistent with the reasons for which the data was collected in Europe and transferred to the United States. In its current form, the agreement puts European undertakings at a competitive disadvantage and has a negative impact on people's fundamental right to data protection. Does the Commission share this opinion and what does it propose to do?

2. Is it not now time to come to an agreement with the US authorities on 'remedies' for stepping up checks on the way American firms such as Google, Facebook and IBM are transferring data on the basis of the authorisations issued to them?

3. Does the Commission agree with Parliament that the EU needs to adopt a tougher tone towards the United States?

4. Will the PNR and Swift arrangements be reviewed if the United States proves unwilling to cooperate?

5. Lastly, the diplomatic crisis and loss of trust caused by the actions of the US NationalSecurity Agency, and the free trade negotiations, which are still very much in theirinfancy, are issues which need to be addressed. If no progress is made on data protection,is the Commission aware that the negotiations could become blocked, and that Parliamentmay one day feel it has no choice but to refuse to ratify a final agreement?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(14 February 2014)

The Commission adopted on 27 November 2013 a communication COM(2013) 847 to the European Parliament and the Council on the Functioning of the Safe Harbour from the Perspective of EU Citizens and Companies Established in the EU. The communication identifies a range of issues that need to be addressed by the US to improve the data privacy scheme which was put in place in 2000 to allow free flow of personal data between the EU and companies in the U.S. adhering to Safe Harbour. The Commission made notably thirteen recommendations to the US to reinforce the scheme. The communication COM(2013) 846 on Rebuilding Trust in EU-U.S. Data Flows, adopted also on 27 November 2013, calls on the US to identify remedies by summer 2014 and implement them as soon as possible.

Concerning the TFTP Agreement, the Commission consultations with the U.S. and also a dialogue with the Designated Provider have not revealed any elements indicating a breach of the Agreement by the U.S. side. Recent joint review of the PNR Agreement did not show a finding of violations of the Agreement neither.

As far as the TTIP negotiations are concerned, data protection standards will not be negotiated within TTIP which will fully respect data protection rules. As required by the Treaties, the European Commission is regularly reporting to Member States and the European Parliament on the progress of the negotiations. The Commission is fully aware that, at the end of the negotiations, it is these two institutions that will decide upon the conclusion of the agreement.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-013440/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(27 novembre 2013)

Objet: Propositions Google

Depuis 2010, Google est accusé de léser des entreprises concurrentes en mettant en avant ses propres services dans les résultats de recherche de son moteur, qui compte pour plus de neuf recherches sur dix effectuées en Europe. Les principaux plaignants sont des comparateurs de prix et des voyagistes. Sous l'impulsion de certaines de ces entreprises, la Commission européenne travaille avec Google sur des solutions pour présenter équitablement tous les services. Google a mis sur la table plusieurs versions d'un moteur modifié, sans convaincre la Commission ni les services concurrents jusqu'ici.

Plus largement, le moteur de recherche est accusé de trop mettre en avant les annonces payantes — le cœur de son modèle économique — au détriment des résultats «naturels», qui apparaissent selon leur pertinence. Une entreprise qui souhaite être visible sur le moteur serait de plus en plus encouragée, voire forcée, à passer par des liens payants, selon les concurrents de Google.

Fin octobre, Google a présenté de nouvelles solutions pour mieux présenter les services concurrents aux siens sur son moteur de recherche. Après un mois d'essai par des services concurrents, les dernières propositions de Google posent pour le moins question.

L'entreprise estime que ce Google nouvelle version est de nature à «enraciner, étendre et aggraver ses pratiques abusives».

Les services de Google seraient toujours aussi proéminents, au-dessus d'une liste réduite de services concurrents, que l'internaute pourrait cacher. Les liens mis en avant seraient soumis à un système d'enchères entre les services désirant y figurer, comme c'est le cas aujourd'hui pour les publicités classiques sur le moteur.

1. Les propositions révisées de Google restent fondamentalement inchangées et souffrent de tous les défauts fatals qui ont rendu les propositions précédentes plus dangereuses qu'utiles. Quelles sont les différences marquantes d'après la Commission?

2. Le système de liens payants serait-il un nouvel exemple de la tentative de Google de passer son moteur d'un modèle gratuit (les liens étant classés par pertinence) à un modèle payant, où le plus offrant gagne?

3. Avec ces nouvelles propositions, le moteur de recherche ne serait-il pas en train de de vouloir ralentir le processus de conciliation et d'éviter une confrontation directe avec le commissaire européen à la concurrence, qui pourrait lui coûter très cher?

4. Quand est prévue la conclusion définitive de ce dossier?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(31 janvier 2014)

À la suite d'une première consultation des acteurs du marché menée en avril 2013 ([1]) et portant sur les propositions de Google destinées à dissiper les quatre préoccupations de la Commission en matière de concurrence, Google a proposé un ensemble d'engagements remaniés.

En octobre 2013, la Commission a adressé des demandes formelles de renseignements à toutes parties intéressées qui avaient participé à la première consultation afin qu'elles donnent leur avis sur ces nouveaux engagements. À la lumière de cette nouvelle consultation, la Commission a conclu que les engagements remaniés n'apportaient toujours pas de réponse adéquate aux préoccupations exprimées dans son évaluation préliminaire et elle en a informé Google.

La Commission a également fait savoir à Google que si l'entreprise souhaitait présenter un nouvel ensemble d'engagements remaniés pour répondre de manière adéquate aux préoccupations de la Commission, elle ne disposait pour ce faire que d'un très court laps de temps. À défaut, la Commission reviendra à la procédure prévue à l'article 7 du règlement (CE) n° 1/2003.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-383_en.htm (en anglais seulement).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013440/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Proposals by Google

Since 2010, Google, whose search engine is used in over 90% of Internet searches in Europe, has faced accusations that it is undermining its competitors by making its own services more visible than others in search results. The complaints have come mainly from price-comparison sites and tour operators. In response to a number of these complaints, the Commission has been working with Google to find a fair way of presenting all the services identified in a search result. Google has submitted several versions of an overhauled search engine, but so far the Commission and the competitor companies remain unconvinced.

A more general accusation is that paid advertisements — crucial to Google's economic model — receive too much prominence at the expense of 'natural' results, which are listed by relevance. Competitors claim that companies seeking visibility on Google are increasingly being encouraged, or indeed obliged, to pay for links.

In late October, Google submitted fresh proposals on ways in which its search engine could make competitor services more visible. The proposed solutions were tested for a month by some of the competitors and are considered dubious at best.

The lead complainant company believes that, in its updated version, Google would 'entrench, extend and escalate its abusive practices'. Google's own services would be as predominant as ever, displayed above a shortened list of competitor services, which users could opt to hide. Services which wanted their links to appear on the list would have to engage in a bidding process similar to that which already exists for normal advertising on Google.

1. Google's revised proposals are in essence unchanged; all the fatal flaws that made the last set of proposals more dangerous than useful are still there. What, in the Commission's view, is significantly different?

2. Surely the system of paid links is another illustration of Google's efforts to shift from a model based on free listing (with links arranged by relevance) to one based on charging, in which the highest bidder comes out on top?

3. Might the new proposals amount to an attempt on Google's part to delay the conciliation process and avoid a potentially very costly head-on clash with the Commissioner for competition?

4. When is the Commission investigation of this case due to be concluded definitively?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(31 January 2014)

Following a first market test of Google's proposals to address the Commission's four competition concerns in April 2013 ([1]), Google offered a revised set of commitments.

In October 2013, the Commission sought feedback on Google's revised commitments via formal requests for information to all interested parties that commented on the formal market test. Following this market test, the Commission has come to the conclusion that the revised commitments still fall short of adequately addressing the competition concerns the Commission expressed in its Preliminary Assessment and has informed Google of this conclusion.

The Commission has also informed Google that if it wishes to submit a further revised set of commitments that adequately addresses the Commission's concerns, it has only a very limited amount of time to do so; failing this the Commission will revert to the procedure under Article 7 of Regulation 1/2003.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-383_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-013444/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(27 novembre 2013)

Objet: Biotechnologies marines

La Commission européenne a ouvert une consultation publique sur les biotechnologies marines. Se présentant sous forme d'un questionnaire sur internet, elle est ouverte jusqu'au 10 février 2014 aux États membres, aux autorités régionales et locales, aux instituts de recherche, aux universités, aux organisations publiques, aux entreprises, à la société civile et aux citoyens.

Les biotechnologies marines ont le potentiel pour aider à répondre à certains des enjeux actuels les plus importants, entre autres en matière de santé, d'approvisionnement alimentaire, de durabilité environnementale et de sécurité énergétique.

La Commission est-elle d'avis qu'il est nécessaire de mettre en place de nouvelles actions à l'échelle européenne pour développer le secteur?

Dans l'affirmative, quelles seraient-elles?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Damanaki au nom de la Commission
(27 janvier 2014)

Les biotechnologies marines peuvent nous aider à relever certains des plus grands défis auxquels nous sommes confrontés aujourd'hui dans des domaines tels que la croissance verte, les industries durables et la santé publique, contribuant tous positivement à la croissance et à l'emploi. Pour exploiter ce potentiel, l'UE a financé, au titre du 7^e^ programme-cadre, 23 projets de recherche dans le domaine des biotechnologies marines pour un montant total de 130 millions d'euros. Les activités de recherche bénéficieront d'un soutien supplémentaire dans le cadre de Horizon 2020.

La Commission partage l'avis des Honorables Parlementaires: des efforts supplémentaires doivent être déployés au niveau de l'UE pour développer ces technologies. C'est pourquoi cette industrie naissante a été définie comme l'un des cinq domaines prioritaires dans la communication de la Commission sur la croissance bleue adoptée en 2012 ([1]).

Dans les mois à venir, la Commission s'efforcera d'approfondir sa connaissance du secteur et de son évolution future. À cette fin, elle a lancé une consultation publique sur les biotechnologies marines. Elle souhaite recueillir des informations sur l'ensemble du secteur et ses différentes parties prenantes et bien comprendre ses forces et ses faiblesses ainsi que les risques et les possibilités qui pourraient aller de pair avec le développement du secteur.

Les résultats de cette consultation publique seront disponibles en avril 2014 et serviront de base à une future initiative pour soutenir le secteur. La Commission effectue une étude de l'analyse des incidences, qui examinera en détail le potentiel des biotechnologies marines, explorera les solutions envisageables pour faciliter le développement du secteur et évaluera leurs incidences sociales, environnementales et économiques.

([1]) Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions intitulée «La croissance bleue: des possibilités de croissance durable dans les secteurs marin et maritime» [COM(2012) 494 final du 13.9.2012].

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013444/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Marine biotechnologies

The Commission has launched a public consultation procedure on marine biotechnologies, and has drawn up an online questionnaire to be completed between now and 10 February 2014. Member States, local and regional authorities, research institutes, universities, public bodies, businesses and individuals will all have the opportunity to take part.

Marine biotechnologies have the potential to help us address some of today's greatest challenges, including in the areas of health, food supply, environmental sustainability and energy security.

Does the Commission agree that more needs to be done at EU level to develop these technologies?

If so, what would this involve?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(27 January 2014)

Marine biotechnologies have the potential to help us address some of today's greatest challenges in areas such as green growth, sustainable industries and population health, all positively contributing to growth and jobs. To unlock this potential the EU has funded, under Framework Programme 7, 23 research projects in marine biotechnology for a total of EUR 130 million. Further support to research activities will be provided through Horizon 2020.

The Commission agrees with the Honourable Members that more needs to be done at EU level to develop these technologies. This is why this nascent industry has been highlighted as one of the five focus areas in the 2012 Commission Communication on 'Blue Growth' ([1]).

In the coming months, the Commission will seek to develop an in-depth understanding of the sector and future trends. For this purpose the Commission has launched a public consultation on marine biotechnologies. Its aim is to gather information about the sector as a whole, as well as individual stakeholders, and establish a robust understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and of the risks and opportunities that further development of the sector could involve.

The results of this public consultation will be available in April 2014 and serve as a basis for a future initiative in support of the sector. The Commission is developing an impact assessment study, which will explore the potential of marine biotechnology in detail, consider possible options to facilitate the development of the sector and analyse their corresponding social, environmental and economic impacts.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions 'Blue Growth opportunities for marine and maritime sustainable growth' COM(2012) 494 final of 13.9.2012.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-013446/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(27 novembre 2013)

Objet: Excédents allemands

La Commission a ouvert une enquête approfondie sur les excédents des comptes courants engrangés par l'Allemagne depuis 2007.

L'enquête devait évaluer l'impact de la politique exportatrice de Berlin sur les déséquilibres économiques de la zone euro. Les excédents commerciaux allemands se situent, en 2013 comme en 2012, à 7 % du produit intérieur brut (PIB), c'est-à-dire au-dessus du seuil de 6 % déterminé comme maximal, lors de la mise en place en 2011 de la surveillance des équilibres des balances commerciales.

1. Si ces chiffres sont exacts, quelles pourraient être les conséquences pour l'Allemagne?

2. Quel est l'agenda prévu pour l'enquête? À quel stade en êtes-vous?

Réponse donnée par M. Rehn au nom de la Commission
(6 février 2014)

L'Honorable Parlementaire est invité à se référer aux dernières prévisions macroéconomiques des services de la Commission, en particulier au tableau 50 de l'annexe statistique (European Economic Forecast — Automne 2013).

Conformément à la procédure concernant les déséquilibres macroéconomiques, l'analyse approfondie consistera à étudier les aspects du développement économique allemand et l'existence éventuelle de déséquilibres. L'analyse est actuellement en cours. Elle est effectuée en tenant dûment compte des conditions et de la situation économiques du pays ainsi qu'à l'aide d'un ensemble plus large d'outils, d'indicateurs et d'informations qualitatives de caractère national. Sa publication est prévue pour le printemps 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013446/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Germany's current account surplus

The Commission has launched an in-depth inquiry into the current account surpluses run by Germany since 2007.

The purpose of the investigation is to assess the impact of Germany's export-driven economy on economic imbalances in the eurozone. In 2013, as in 2012, Germany's trade surpluses amounted to 7% of GDP, above the 6% limit established when the trade balance monitoring system came into effect in 2011.

1. Are these figures correct? If so, what are the implications for Germany?

2. What is the timetable for the inquiry and what progress has been made so far?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(6 February 2014)

The Honorable Member is kindly referred to the Commission services' latest macroeconomic forecast, in particular annex Table 50 (European Economic Forecast — Autumn 2013).

In line with the Macroeconomic Imbalances Procedure, the in-depth review will examine aspects of Germany's economic development and the possible existence of imbalances. The analysis is currently being undertaken, taking due account of country-specific economic conditions and circumstances and of a wider set of analytical tools, indicators and qualitative information of country-specific nature. The publication of the in-depth is expected for Spring 2014.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-013450/13
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(27 novembre 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Exécutions en Indonésie

Selon des informations provenant des médias, Muhammad Abdul Hafeez, âgé de 44 ans, a été passé par les armes dimanche à l'aube. Cette exécution est la cinquième en Indonésie depuis que le pays a repris les exécutions en mars 2013, après quatre années d'interruption. Cinq autres condamnés seraient sur le point d'être exécutés.

Cette dernière exécution confirme une tendance rétrograde à procéder aux exécutions en secret. L'absence complète de transparence est non seulement dévastatrice pour les condamnés et leurs proches, mais elle empêche aussi les appels de dernière minute en faveur d'un sursis.

Ces agissements vont à l'encontre des engagements du gouvernement indonésien en faveur du respect des droits humains, et nous demandons instamment aux autorités de ne procéder à aucune nouvelle exécution.

Toute nouvelle exécution porte préjudice aux efforts menés par le gouvernement pour protéger la vie des ressortissants indonésiens condamnés à mort à l'étranger.

Ces exécutions clandestines donnent le sentiment que le gouvernement veut empêcher la tenue d'un débat public et informé sur l'utilisation de la peine capitale en Indonésie.

1. Quelle est la position de l'Europe face à ces faits accablants?

2. Le sujet est-il abordé avec les autorités du pays?

3. Quelles sont clairement les intentions européennes? Vont-elles demander officiellement aux autorités de ne plus procéder à de nouvelles exécutions?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(6 février 2014)

L'Union européenne est opposée à la peine de mort dans tous les cas et sans exception, et elle n'a cessé de réclamer son abolition universelle.

Dans sa déclaration du 24 novembre 2013, la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante, Catherine Ashton a déploré l'exécution du ressortissant pakistanais condamné à mort, Muhammad Abdul Hafeez, en Indonésie le 17 novembre 2013. Elle a souligné qu'il s'agissait de la cinquième exécution depuis que l'Indonésie avait repris les exécutions en 2013 et que cela constituait un recul allant à l'encontre de la tendance à l'abolition observée dans le monde.

L'UE a exhorté l'Indonésie à revenir au moratoire sur la peine de mort et à envisager de rejoindre l'importante communauté des États qui ont aboli totalement la peine capitale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013450/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Executions in Indonesia

According to media reports, Muhammad Abdul Hafeez, aged 44, was executed by firing squad at dawn on Sunday, this being the fifth execution in Indonesia since this form of punishment was reintroduced in March 2013, having been halted for a period of four years. Five more executions are reportedly due to take place.

This marks a return to the policy of executions carried out in secrecy, resulting in a total lack of transparency, which not only is devastating for those sentenced and their families, but also eliminates the possibility of any last-minute appeal.

In addition, it runs counter to the Indonesian Government's commitment to respect for human rights and we call on the Indonesian authorities to call an immediate halt to any further executions which will, if carried out, undermine official endeavours to protect the lives of Indonesians facing the death sentence in other countries.

Furthermore, the clandestine nature of the executions carried out creates the impression that the Government is seeking to prevent any informed public debate on capital punishment in Indonesia.

1. What is the position of Europe regarding this deplorable situation?

2. Has the matter been raised with the Indonesian authorities?

3. What are Europe's specific intentions? Will it call officially on the Indonesian authorities to call a halt to any further executions?

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

The European Union is opposed to capital punishment in all cases and without exception, and has consistently called for its universal abolition.

The HR/VP Catherine Ashton, issued a statement on the 24th of November 2013 deeply regretting the execution of the Pakistani death row inmate, Muhammad Abdul Hafeez, in Indonesia on 17 November 2013. The HR/VP underlined that this was the fifth execution since Indonesia resumed executions this year and that this was a step backwards which goes against the global abolitionist trend.

The EU calls on Indonesia to return to its previous moratorium policy, and to consider joining the wide community of states that have abolished the death penalty entirely.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-013452/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(27 novembre 2013)

Objet: Réfugiés en Bulgarie

Tout récemment, un jeune Malien a été agressé près d'une mosquée de Sofia et un Bulgare d'origine turque a dû être hospitalisé, dans le coma, après avoir été passé à tabac par des skinheads.

En Bulgarie, nombre d'associations expliquent que migrants et réfugiés vivent dans un climat de peur, et il faut d'urgence ouvrir des enquêtes approfondies sur toutes les attaques menées contre ces groupes vulnérables.

Le nombre de réfugiés, demandeurs d'asile et migrants arrivant en Bulgarie, essentiellement en provenance de Syrie, a augmenté de façon drastique cette année, ce qui a déclenché plusieurs mouvements de protestation anti-immigrants de la part de groupes d'extrême droite.

La xénophobie a en outre pénétré dans le discours politique ordinaire.

1. Les autorités européennes pourraient-elles demander à la Bulgarie des enquêtes approfondies?

2. Que suggère l'Europe pour aider la Bulgarie face à ce flux de migrants?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Malmström au nom de la Commission
(10 février 2014)

La Commission condamne fermement toutes les formes de racisme et de xénophobie, y compris la violence à l'encontre des migrants. Ces phénomènes sont contraires aux valeurs de l'UE. Les autorités publiques doivent condamner et lutter activement contre les crimes racistes et xénophobes, notamment en garantissant la conduite d'une enquête dans les plus brefs délais pour toute infraction alléguée et, le cas échéant, la poursuite en justice et l'adoption de sanctions à l'encontre de ses auteurs.

La décision-cadre 2008/913/JAI du Conseil ([1]) contraint les États membres à sanctionner l'incitation publique à la violence ou à la haine fondée sur la race, la couleur, la religion, l'ascendance, l'origine nationale ou ethnique, et à faire en sorte que, pour toutes les autres infractions, la motivation raciste ou xénophobe soit considérée comme une circonstance aggravante ou puisse être prise en considération pour la détermination des sanctions.

La Commission a noué des contacts étroits avec les autorités bulgares afin d'examiner les mesures et les aides que pourrait apporter l'UE. La Commission et les autorités bulgares ont toutes deux reconnu comme des priorités l'élargissement, l'amélioration des capacités d'accueil, ainsi que la capacité des autorités bulgares à traiter les demandes de protection en temps utile et de façon appropriée.

La Commission a débloqué une aide d'urgence d'environ 8 millions d'euros en faveur de la Bulgarie pour aider le pays à gérer l'afflux croissant de demandeurs d'asile et à améliorer la situation sur le terrain. Ces fonds serviront notamment à accroître et à améliorer la capacité d'accueil et d'hébergement prévue pour les demandeurs d'asile. En outre, le Bureau européen d'appui en matière d'asile a signé avec la Bulgarie un plan opérationnel qui permet le déploiement d'experts détachés par d'autres États membres afin d'aider les autorités bulgares sur le terrain. Les équipes d'experts sont d'ores et déjà opérationnelles.

([1]) Décision-cadre 2008/913/JAI du Conseil du 28 novembre 2008 sur la lutte contre certaines formes et manifestations de racisme et de xénophobie au moyen du droit pénal (JO L 328 du 6.12.2008, p. 55).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013452/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Refugees in Bulgaria

In two incidents in Sofia in the past few weeks, a young Malian was assaulted and a Bulgarian citizen of Turkish origin rushed to hospital, where he was in a coma, after a beating by a group of skinheads.

According to a number of organisations in Bulgaria, migrants and refugees there are living in fear, and there is an urgent need for all attacks on members of these vulnerable groups to be thoroughly investigated.

There has been a dramatic increase this year in the numbers of refugees, asylum-seekers and migrants arriving in Bulgaria — mainly from Syria — and this has triggered anti-immigrant protests by right-wing extremist groups.

Xenophobia has also slipped into the language of everyday political debate.

1. Could the EU authorities call on Bulgaria to conduct thorough investigations?

2. How does Europe propose to help Bulgaria cope with the influx of migrants?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(10 February 2014)

The Commission strongly condemns all forms of racism and xenophobia, including anti-immigrant violence. These phenomena are incompatible with the values of the EU. Public authorities must condemn and actively fight against racist and xenophobic crime, including by ensuring that any alleged offences are promptly investigated and, when necessary, their perpetrators are prosecuted and punished.

Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA ([1]) obliges Member States to penalise the intentional public incitement to violence or hatred based on race, colour, religion, descent or ethnic or national origin, and to ensure that a racist or xenophobic motivation of any other offence is considered as an aggravating circumstance or may be taken into account in the determination of the penalties.

The Commission is in close contact with the Bulgarian authorities to discuss possible measures and support from the EU. Enlargement and improvement of reception capacities, as well as the capacity of the Bulgarian authorities to process requests for protection in a timely and adequate manner, have been identified, together with the Bulgarian authorities, as priorities.

The Commission is providing some EUR 8 million in emergency funding to Bulgaria to support the country in managing the increased influx of asylum-seekers and to improve the situation on the ground. The funding will notably be used to increase and improve reception and accommodation capacity for asylum-seekers. In addition, the European Asylum Support Office has signed an Operational Plan with Bulgaria, allowing for the deployment of experts seconded by other Member States to support the Bulgarian authorities on the ground. The teams of experts are already operational.

([1]) Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law, OJ L 328, 6.12.2008.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-013454/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 novembre 2013)

Objet: Thon OK. Requin danger

Les quotas de pêche au thon rouge pour 2014 ont été maintenus lundi au même niveau que cette année, à l'issue de la réunion annuelle de la Commission internationale pour la conservation des thonidés de l'Atlantique (CICTA). C'est une satisfaction. Il faut saluer le *leadership* manifesté par l'Union européenne — le principal titulaire des quotas — sur le respect de l'approche de précaution.

Un comité scientifique avait recommandé le maintien des quotas, laissant toutefois une petite marge de négociation. Plusieurs gouvernements avaient exercé de fortes pressions pour les augmenter. L'Espagne, le Portugal, l'Italie, la Grèce et Malte souhaitaient rouvrir les discussions, mais l'idée n'était pas soutenue au niveau de l'Union européenne.

Par contre, il faut déplorer le manque d'avancée pour les requins. La CICTA a aussi maintenu le statu quo, échouant ainsi à adopter toute mesure de gestion pour ces stocks menacés.

1. Comment réagissent les autorités européennes à cela?

2. Que suggèrent les autorités européennes?

3. Est-il prévu une rencontre avec les autorités japonaises qui aborderait le sujet, sachant que le Japon est le principal responsable de l'extermination des requins et dauphins?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Damanaki au nom de la Commission
(27 janvier 2014)

La Commission accueille favorablement les résultats de la réunion annuelle de la CICTA en 2013 et se félicite que toutes les mesures de gestion adoptées soient conformes aux avis scientifiques, notamment pour le thon rouge de l'Atlantique Est. Elle regrette que les progrès concernant les requins soient encore limités et que les propositions de l'UE en faveur d'une interdiction de rétention pour les requis-taupes communs et de limites de captures pour les requins-maquereaux n'aient pas fait l'objet d'un consensus. Il en a été de même pour la proposition relative au débarquement des requins avec les nageoires attachées au corps coparrainée par l'UE. La Commission note avec satisfaction que le nombre de parties contractantes soutenant une politique interdisant l'enlèvement des nageoires a considérablement augmenté depuis l'année dernière.

Afin de renforcer à l'avenir la protection des requins au sein de la CICTA, la Commission continuera à plaider en faveur d'une modification de la convention de la CICTA pour que tant les requins ciblés par la pêche que les captures accessoires de requins relèvent de son champ d'application. En outre, la Commission poursuivra son action de sensibilisation à l'égard des parties qui étaient réticentes à soutenir les propositions de l'UE.

Elle engagera notamment des discussions bilatérales avec les autorités japonaises ainsi qu'avec d'autres parties contractantes concernées.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013454/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Tuna and sharks: cause for satisfaction and a continuing danger

On Monday, 25 November, at the end of the annual meeting of the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), it was decided that the 2014 fishing quotas for bluefin tuna would remain at this year's levels. This is welcome news, and the EU — the largest quota holder — should be applauded for taking the lead as regards compliance with the precautionary approach.

A scientific committee had recommended that the quotas should continue unchanged, but did leave a little room for negotiation. Several governments had been pressing hard for an increase. Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece, and Malta were in favour of reopening the discussions, but that idea was not supported within the EU as a whole.

What is disappointing, however, is the lack of progress regarding sharks. Here again the ICCAT has maintained the status quo, without adopting any management measures for endangered stocks.

1. How do the European authorities view the above state of affairs?

2. What suggestions do they have to make?

3. Will any meeting on this subject be held with the Japanese authorities, bearing in mindthat Japan is the main culprit in the extermination of sharks and dolphins?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(27 January 2014)

The Commission welcomes the outcome of the ICCAT Annual Meeting 2013 and is pleased that all the management measures adopted were in line with scientific advice, including for the Eastern bluefin tuna. It regrets that progress on sharks was again limited and that the EU proposals for a retention ban for porbeagle and for catch limits for shortfin mako did not obtain consensus. This was also the case for the fins attached proposal co-sponsored by the EU. The Commission appreciates that the number of Contracting Parties supporting a fins attached policy has substantially increased since last year.

To enhance shark protection in ICCAT in the future, the Commission will continue to push for a change to the ICCAT Convention to ensure that both targeted sharks and sharks as by-catch fall under its purview. In addition, the Commission will continue its outreach to those parties that had difficulties to support the EUs proposals.

This outreach will include bilateral discussions with the Japanese authorities as well as with other Contracting Parties concerned.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-013455/13
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 novembre 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Shell au Nigeria

Avec ses affirmations profondément suspectes et souvent fausses sur la pollution aux hydrocarbures dans le delta du Niger, Shell a manipulé les enquêtes sur les déversements de pétrole au Nigeria. Un nouveau rapport, publié le jeudi 7 novembre 2013, donne des exemples précis de mensonges de Shell sur la cause des déversements, leur volume ou l'étendue et l'efficacité des mesures de dépollution. Shell fait preuve de mauvaise foi à propos de la dévastation provoquée par ses activités dans le delta du Niger. Ces nouvelles preuves montrent que ses affirmations sur les déversements de pétrole ne sont pas crédibles. De nouvelles analyses, réalisées par un expert indépendant, ont montré que les rapports d'enquête dits «officiels» sur les causes des marées noires dans le delta du Niger pouvaient être «très subjectifs, fallacieux, voire purement et simplement faux». Le rapport révèle des faiblesses intrinsèques dans la manière dont les causes et le volume des déversements sont déterminés, avec des erreurs importantes dans les volumes enregistrés. Pour les populations concernées, les conséquences sont désastreuses et peuvent se traduire par une absence totale ou quasi-totale d'indemnisation. Personne n'oblige les compagnies pétrolières à fournir des preuves exhaustives et indépendantes de ce qu'elles affirment. Les éléments de preuve existants restent entièrement sous leur contrôle. L'expert a identifié des cas dans lesquels le déversement avait été faussement attribué à des actes de sabotage. Dans beaucoup d'autres cas, la version du sabotage a été retenue mais n'est étayée que par très peu de données concrètes, voire aucune. Dans l'ensemble, Accufacts a conclu que de nombreux rapports d'enquête officiels étaient «techniquement incomplets» et que d'autres semblaient «servir d'autres intérêts, s'appuyant davantage sur des considérations politiques […] que sur l'examen scientifique des installations pétrolières». Les services nigérians, dotés de moyens très insuffisants, peuvent difficilement superviser ou contrôler la situation et sont obligés de s'en remettre aux enquêtes des compagnies pétrolières. Le rapport estime que les entreprises devraient être pénalement responsables du fait de n'avoir pas pris des mesures efficaces pour protéger leurs installations, notamment face aux actes de sabotage.

1. Quelle est la position de la Commission sur ledit rapport?

2. Les autorités européennes pourraient-elles rencontrer le gouvernement nigérian afin de l'inviter à renforcer, de façon substantielle, les capacités des autorités de contrôle, notamment en leur accordant un budget de fonctionnement plus élevé? Les autorités européennes pourraient-elles l'y aider, le cas échéant?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-013456/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 novembre 2013)

Objet: Shell au Nigeria

Avec ses affirmations profondément suspectes et souvent fausses sur la pollution aux hydrocarbures dans le delta du Niger, Shell a manipulé les enquêtes sur les déversements de pétrole au Nigeria. Un nouveau rapport, publié jeudi 7 novembre 2013, donne des exemples précis de mensonges de Shell sur la cause des déversements, leur volume ou l'étendue et l'efficacité des mesures de dépollution. Shell fait preuve de mauvaise foi à propos de la dévastation provoquée par ses activités dans le delta du Niger. Ces nouvelles preuves montrent que ses affirmations sur les déversements de pétrole ne sont pas crédibles. De nouvelles analyses réalisées par un expert indépendant ont montré que les rapports d'enquête dits «officiels» sur les causes des marées noires dans le delta du Niger pouvaient être «très subjectifs, fallacieux, voire purement et simplement faux». Le rapport révèle des faiblesses intrinsèques dans la manière dont les causes et le volume des déversements sont déterminés — avec des erreurs importantes dans les volumes enregistrés. Pour les populations concernées, les conséquences sont désastreuses et peuvent se traduire par une absence totale ou quasi-totale d'indemnisation. Personne n'oblige les compagnies pétrolières à fournir des preuves exhaustives et indépendantes de ce qu'elles affirment. Les éléments de preuve existants restent entièrement sous leur contrôle. L'expert a trouvé des cas dans lesquels le déversement avait été faussement attribué à des actes de sabotage. Dans beaucoup d'autres cas, la version du sabotage a été retenue mais n'est étayée que par très peu de données concrètes, voire aucune. Dans l'ensemble, Accufacts a conclu que de nombreux rapports d'enquête officiels étaient «techniquement incomplets» et que d'autres semblaient «servir d'autres intérêts, s'appuyant davantage sur des considérations politiques […] que sur l'examen scientifique des installations pétrolières». Les services nigérians, dotés de moyens très insuffisants, peuvent difficilement superviser ou contrôler la situation et sont obligés de s'en remettre aux enquêtes des compagnies pétrolières. Le rapport estime que les entreprises devraient être pénalement responsables du fait de n'avoir pas pris des mesures efficaces pour protéger leurs installations, notamment face aux actes de sabotage.

1. La Commission partage-t-elle l'avis que les compagnies pétrolières devraient publier tous leurs rapports d'enquête, ainsi que les photos et les vidéos qui les accompagnent, et qu'elles doivent fournir des preuves vérifiables de la cause de tout déversement et des dégâts provoqués dans la zone concernée?

2. Quelle est la position de la Commission sur ledit rapport?

3. La Commission compte-t-elle rencontrer les compagnies pétrolières afin de mettre les choses au point?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission
(4 février 2014)

La Commission a fait part de ses préoccupations à propos des dommages environnementaux causés par les fuites de pétrole dans la région du delta du Niger et discute régulièrement de ces questions avec les ONG, les compagnies pétrolières internationales (IOC) et les autorités nigérianes. L'Union européenne encourage les autorités nigérianes à adopter rapidement le projet de loi modificative Nosdra (National Oil Spill Detection and Response Agency) — Agence nationale de détection et de réaction face aux fuites pétrolières — qui prévoit des mesures afin de remédier aux situations de déversement de pétrole. Celles-ci incluent des interventions d'urgence, des sanctions et et des mesures d'exécution, des dédommagements, un plan de gestion de la pollution et le renforcement de la capacité d'intervention de Nosdra.

L'UE n'est pas partie à des dispositions contractuelles entre les IOC et les autorités nigérianes, mais elle encourage vivement les deux parties à suivre les bonnes pratiques à tous les stades de production.

La directive relative à la sécurité des opérations pétrolières et gazières en mer récemment adoptée garantit que les IOC s'engagent à assumer la responsabilité de la maîtrise des risques créés par leurs activités dans l'Union et à l'extérieur de l'Union. En vertu de cette directive, les États membres exigent des entreprises immatriculées sur leur territoire et menant des opérations pétrolières et gazières en mer hors de l'Union qu'elles fassent rapport, si elles y sont invitées, sur les circonstances de tout accident majeur dans lequel elles ont été impliquées. La directive est en cours de transposition dans les États membres de l'UE.

Par l'intermédiaire du Fonds européen de développement (FED), l'UE soutient les réformes du gouvernement nigérian visant à favoriser la transparence et la responsabilisation, notamment dans l'industrie pétrolière. Le FED finance également des projets créant des moyens de subsistance durables pour les communautés locales dans le delta du Niger touchées par des dommages environnementaux.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013455/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Shell in Nigeria

Shell has manipulated oil spill investigations in Nigeria, submitting extremely dubious and often false statements on oil pollution in the Niger Delta. A new report published on Thursday, 7 November 2013 gives specific examples of Shell lying about the cause of spills, the volume of oil spilled, and the extent and effectiveness of clean-up measures. Shell is being disingenuous about the devastation caused by its Niger Delta operations, and this new evidence shows that its claims about the oil spills are not credible. New analysis from an independent expert has shown that the 'official' investigation reports into the causes of oil spills in the Niger Delta can be 'very subjective, misleading and downright false'. The report reveals inherent weaknesses in the way the causes and volumes of spills are determined, with significant errors in the volumes recorded. The implications for the communities affected are disastrous, up to and including the non-payment of all or most of the compensation due to them. Oil companies are under no obligation to provide full and independently verified evidence to support their claims. Any evidence that does exist remains entirely under their control. The expert found cases where spills had been wrongly attributed to sabotage. In many other cases, sabotage was listed as the cause when there was little or no concrete data to support the claim. Overall, Accufacts concluded that many official investigation reports were 'technically incomplete' and that others appear 'to be serving another agenda, more driven by politics […] than pipeline forensic science'. Nigeria's under-resourced regulatory agencies have difficulty monitoring the situation and are forced to accept the findings of the oil companies' investigations. The report argues that companies should be held legally liable for any failure to take effective measures to protect their installations, in particular against sabotage.

1. What view does the Commission take of this report?

2. Could the European authorities meet with the Nigerian Government in order to urge it to substantially increase the resources of the supervisory authorities, in particular by giving them a higher operating budget? If so, could the European authorities then help?

Question for written answer E-013456/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Shell in Nigeria

Shell has manipulated oil spill investigations in Nigeria, submitting extremely dubious and often false statements on oil pollution in the Niger Delta. A new report published on Thursday, 7 November 2013 gives specific examples of Shell lying about the cause of spills, the volume of oil spilled, and the extent and effectiveness of clean-up measures. Shell is being disingenuous about the devastation caused by its Niger Delta operations, and this new evidence shows that its claims concerning oil spills are not credible. New analysis from an independent expert has shown that the 'official' investigation reports into the causes of oil spills in the Niger Delta can be 'very subjective, misleading and downright false'. The report reveals inherent weaknesses in the way the causes and volumes of spills are determined, with significant errors in the volumes recorded. The implications for the communities affected are disastrous, up to and including the non-payment of all or most of the compensation due to them. Oil companies are under no obligation to provide full and independent evidence to support their claims. Any evidence that does exist remains entirely under their control. The expert found cases where spills had been wrongly attributed to sabotage. In many other cases, sabotage was listed as the cause when there was little or no concrete data to support the claim. Overall, Accufacts concluded that many official investigation reports were 'technically incomplete' and that others appear 'to be serving another agenda, more driven by politics […] than pipeline forensic science'. Nigeria's under-resourced regulatory agencies have difficulty monitoring the situation and are forced to accept the findings of the oil companies' investigations. The report argues that companies should be held legally liable for any failure to take effective measures to protect their installations, in particular against sabotage.

1. Does the Commission agree that oil companies should publish their investigation reports, along with accompanying photographs and videos, and that they should provide verifiable evidence of the cause of spills and of all damage in the area affected?

2. What view does the Commission take of this report?

3. Does the Commission intend to meet with the oil companies in order to clarify matters?

Joint answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(4 February 2014)

The Commission has raised its concerns about the environmental damages caused by oil spills in the Niger Delta and regularly discusses these issues with NGOs, International Oil Companies (IOC) and the Nigerian authorities. The EU is encouraging the Nigerian authorities to quickly adopt the NOSDRA (National Oil Spill Detection and Response Agency) amendment bill which would provide for remediation measures to oil spills, including emergency reaction, penalties and enforcement, compensation, a pollution management plan and reinforcement of NOSDRA's capacity to intervene in such matters.

While the EU is not party to contractual arrangements between the IOCs and the Nigerian Authorities, it does encourage both parties to follow best practices at all stages of the production chain.

The recently adopted Offshore Safety Directive ensures that IOCs take responsibility for controlling the risks they create by their operations in the Union and outside of the Union. Under this directive, Member States shall require companies registered within their territory and conducting offshore oil and gas operations outside the Union to report to them, on request, the circumstances of any major accident in which they have been involved. The directive is currently being transposed in the EU Member States.

Through the European Development Fund (EDF), the EU supports the Nigerian Government's reforms aiming at fostering transparency and accountability, including in the oil industry. The EDF also finances projects generating sustainable livelihood for local communities in the Niger Delta affected by environmental damage.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-013458/13
do Komisji
Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)
(27 listopada 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: : Utrudnienia w korzystaniu ze swobody przepływu kapitału

Jedną z czterech podstawowych swobód europejskiego wspólnego rynku jest swoboda przepływu kapitału między państwami członkowskimi UE, która przejawia się m.in. w swobodnym przepływie pieniądza. Wspomnianą zasadę można odnieść także do wszystkich płatności elektronicznych w euro w tym przelewów między rachunkami bankowymi w różnych krajach Unii Europejskiej.

Otrzymuję jednak sygnały, że pojawiają się praktyki łamiące tę swobodę. Jako przykład przytoczę następującą sytuację: organizacja znajdująca się na terenie jednego z państw Unii Europejskiej odmawia dokonania zapłaty za wykonaną pracę w formie przelewu, na konto walutowe, prowadzone w walucie euro, które zostało założone w drugim kraju członkowskimi i żąda posiadania konta bankowego w kraju, w którym organizacja ta ma siedzibę i w którym praca została wykonana.

Czy według Komisji w tej sytuacji zostało naruszone prawo unijne? Jakie kroki Komisja zamierza podjąć, aby ułatwić korzystanie ze swobód rynku wewnętrznego, takich właśnie jak swoboda przepływu kapitału?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Michela Barniera w imieniu Komisji
(10 lutego 2014 r.)

Szanowna Pani Poseł jest zaniepokojona praktyką konkretnej instytucji w państwie członkowskim, która odmawia dokonywania przelewu środków pieniężnych z tego państwa członkowskiego na konto walutowe denominowane w euro w innym państwie członkowskim.

Swobodny przepływ kapitału jest istotnie jedną z czterech podstawowych swobód przysługujących na rynku wewnętrznym. Kwestie płatności są również regulowane przez prawo wtórne, na przykład przez rozporządzenie w sprawie SEPA z 2012 r. i dyrektywę w sprawie usług płatniczych z 2007 r.

Komisja zachęca Szanowną Panią Poseł do przekazania dodatkowych informacji na temat wspomnianej sytuacji w celu umożliwienia Komisji dokonania pełnej oceny sytuacji, a w szczególności kwestii potencjalnego naruszenia prawa UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013458/13
to the Commission
Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Barriers to the free movement of capital

Freedom of movement for capital within the EU is one of the four internal market freedoms, and includes the freedom to transfer money. It extends to all electronic payments made in euros, including transfers between bank accounts held in different Member States.

A number of practices that restrict that freedom have come to my notice. They include a financial institution in one of the Member States refusing to transfer money payable for work performed in that Member State to a foreign currency account denominated in euros opened in another Member State, and only being willing to transfer the money to an account in the Member State in which that institution is based and the work was carried out.

Is this in breach of EC law? How does Commission intend to facilitate the enjoyment of the internal market freedoms, in particular freedom of movement for capital?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(10 February 2014)

The Honourable Member is concerned by the practice of a particular institution in a Member State refusing to transfer money from that Member State to a foreign currency account denominated in euro in another Member State.

The free movement of capital is indeed one of the four fundamental internal market freedoms. Payment issues are also dealt with in secondary legislation, as for example in the SEPA-Regulation from 2012 and the Payment Services Directive from 2007.

The Commission invites the Honourable Member to provide additional information about the situation referred to in order to allow the Commission to fully assess the situation and notably the question of any potential breach of EC law.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-013460/13
till kommissionen
Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE)
(27 november 2013)

Angående: Regler för produktion och märkning av vin

Enligt nya undersökningar i Sverige innehåller vissa av de populäraste EU-vinerna bekämpningsmedel och tillsatser som kan orsaka allergiska reaktioner och hälsoproblem. Även om alla tillsatser i fråga finns upptagna i kommissionens förordning (EG) nr 606/2009, finns det enligt undersökningarna för närvarande inga regler för hur stora mängder av de tillåtna bekämpningsmedlen och tillsatserna som får finnas i vin. Dessutom finns det inga möjligheter för konsumenterna att få reda på vilka tillsatser och bekämpningsmedel som används i ett visst vin, eftersom ingrediensförteckningar inte är obligatoriska. Mot bakgrund av detta vill jag ställa följande frågor till kommissionen:

1. Vilken är situationen ur vetenskaplig synvinkel och vad anser Europeiska myndigheten för livsmedelssäkerhet om förteckningen över tillåtna bekämpningsmedel och tillsatser och deras inverkan på hälsan?

2. Är detta en fråga om volym eller kvantitet? Kan vinproducenterna ha hur många tillsatser och bekämpningsmedel som de vill i vinet, eller finns det några gränsvärden?

3. Vad görs för närvarande i fråga om konsumentinformation om tillsatser, färgämnen och bekämpningsmedel i vin? Hur långt har man kommit med det planerade förslaget om märkning av alkohol?

4. Vad kan göras för att konsumenter ska få mer information? Vilka möjligheter har återförsäljare att informera sina kunder?

Svar från Tonio Borg på kommissionens vägnar
(10 januari 2014)

När det gäller bekämpningsmedelsrester i EU fastställs gränsvärden för jordbruksråvaror på grundval av god jordbrukspraxis samt lägsta möjliga konsumentexponering för att skydda känsliga konsumenter ([1]). Det krävs dessutom ett vetenskapligt yttrande från Europeiska myndigheten för livsmedelssäkerhet (Efsa). Detta gäller även gränsvärden för druvor avsedda för vinframställning och bordsdruvor. Medlemsländerna ska kontrollera druvor för vinframställning för att se till att gränsvärdena respekteras och garantera att druvorna är säkra för konsumenterna och att bekämpningsmedel används i enlighet med godkännandet. Det krävs ingen märkning av bekämpningsmedelsrester i vin, eftersom det inte finns något sådant krav för andra livsmedel.

En lista över godkända oenologiska metoder finns i bilaga I A till kommissionens förordning (EG) nr 606/2009. Där står de tillsatser, processhjälpmedel och fysikaliska processer som kan användas för att tillverka vin. För de flesta av dem finns det ett övre gränsvärde och dessa produkter anses vara säkra.

EU-lagstiftningen kräver ingen innehållsförteckning (t.ex. tillsatser) på vinetiketter.

([1]) Europaparlamentets och rådets förordning (EG) nr 396/2005 av den 23 februari 2005 om gränsvärden för bekämpningsmedelsrester i eller på livsmedel och foder av vegetabiliskt och animaliskt ursprung och om ändring av rådets direktiv 91/414/EEG.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013460/13
to the Commission
Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Rules on the production and labelling of wine

Recent studies in Sweden have shown that some of the most popular wines produced in the EU contain pesticides and additives that can cause allergic reactions and health problems. Although all the additives in question are listed in Commission Regulation (EC) No 606/2009, according to the studies there are currently no rules restricting the amount of authorised pesticides and additives in wine. Furthermore, consumers have no way of knowing which additives and pesticides are used in a specific wine, because it is not mandatory for a list of ingredients to be provided. I would therefore like to ask the following questions:

1. What is the situation from a scientific point of view and what is the view of the European Food Safety Authority on the list of authorised pesticides and additives and their impact on health?

2. Is this a matter of volume or quantity? Can the wine producers include as many additives and pesticides as they want or are there any thresholds?

3. What work is currently being undertaken regarding consumer information on additives, dyes and pesticides in wine? What is the status of the upcoming proposal on the labelling of alcohol?

4. What can be done to encourage the provision of consumer information? What possibilities do retailers have to inform their customers?

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

As regards pesticides residues in the EU maximum residue levels (MRLs) for raw agricultural products are established based on good agricultural practice (GAP) and the lowest consumer exposure necessary to protect vulnerable consumers ([1])and following a scientific opinion of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). This includes the setting of MRLs for grapes intended for wine production as well as for table grapes. Member States are responsible for controls on wine grapes to check compliance with MRLs. This makes sure that grapes are safe for consumers and that pesticides are used according to their authorisation. Labelling of pesticides residues in wine is not required as it is also not required to label pesticides residues in other foods.

The list of oenological practices is provided in the Commission Regulation (EC) No 606/2009, in the Annex IA. This list includes additives, processing aids and physical processes which may be used to produce wine. For most of them there is a maximum use level and those products have been recognised as safe.

The list of ingredients, including additives, is not required on wine labels according to EU legislation.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 February 2005 on maximum residue levels of pesticides in or on food and feed of plant and animal origin and amending Council Directive 91/414/EC.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013461/13
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(27 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Erasmus de Galicia

¿Podría precisar la Comisión cuántos estudiantes han sido beneficiarios del programa de intercambio académico Erasmus con origen y destino en las universidades de Galicia? ¿Podría desglosar este dato por años académicos, universidades de origen y destino y especialidades académicas desde la entrada de España en la EU en 1986?

Respuesta de la Sra. Vassiliou en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de enero de 2014)

Solo se dispone de estadísticas sobre movilidad Erasmus con el nivel de detalle que solicita Su Señoría desde el inicio del Programa de Aprendizaje Permanente en 2007. Desde el curso 2007/2008 hasta el 2011/2012, último para el que actualmente se dispone de cifras, 8 017 estudiantes procedentes de centros de enseñanza superior gallegos han participado en el programa y 6 036 estudiantes de fuera de España han realizado un intercambio en Galicia.

Se adjunta el desglose completo de los datos por año académico, universidades de origen y destino y especialidad académica solicitado por Su Señoría. La Comisión desea señalar que los datos por disciplina disponibles para el año académico 2007/2008 constituyen una aproximación realizada a partir de la información proporcionada por los códigos de área de estudio Erasmus, que fueron sustituidos por los sectores CINE 97 en el año 2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013461/13
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Erasmus in Galicia

Could the Commission say exactly how many students have benefited from the Erasmus academic exchange programme with Galician universities as their point of origin or arrival? Could it provide a breakdown of these figures by academic year, universities of origin and destination, and academic field, since Spain's entry into the EU in 1986?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(17 January 2014)

Statistics for Erasmus mobility broken down at the level of detail requested by the Honourable Member are available only since the beginning of the Lifelong Learning Programme in 2007. Since the academic year 2007/2008 until the academic year 2011/2012, the last year for which data are currently available, 8.017 students have been mobile from higher education institutions situated in Galicia, while 6036 students from outside Spain have spent a period in Galicia.

The full breakdown of the data by academic year, institutions of origin and destination and academic field, as requested by the Honourable Member, is attached. The Commission draws attention to the fact that the subject area data presented for the academic year 2007/2008 are an approximation resulting from a translation of data collected from the Erasmus subject codes, which were replaced by the ISCED 97 fields in 2008.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013462/13
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(27 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Inversiones en los proyectos prioritarios 3 y 19

En la sesión de trabajo que ha celebrado hoy la Comisión de Transportes, el coordinador de los proyectos 3 y 19 ha afirmado que la Comisión impulsará medidas para mejorar la coordinación entre los Estados miembros y la eficiencia de los fondos europeos. El objetivo es conseguir que las prioridades señaladas en el documento sobre redes transeuropeas de transporte se asuman por los Estados miembros y tengan reflejo en sus presupuestos. Igualmente —y a la vista de los retrasos que la crisis financiera está provocando en el corredor atlántico—, se ha informado de que los Estados de Portugal, España y Francia, que intervienen en la construcción de este proyecto, firmaron un memorando en Tallin ratificando su compromiso con estas infraestructuras.

A la vista de las importantes informaciones y novedades conocidas en esta sesión, nos gustaría saber:

1. ¿Qué medidas baraja la Comisión para mejorar esta coordinación y alinear las inversiones estatales con las previstas en los RTE-T?

2. ¿Dispone la Comisión del memorando firmado en Tallin por representantes de Portugal, Francia y España? ¿Podría facilitarlo? ¿Si no es así, figuran en dicho memorando los plazos ya establecidos en las orientaciones aprobadas por el pleno del Parlamento Europeo el pasado 19 de noviembre?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de enero de 2014)

Se nombrará un coordinador europeo para todos los corredores de la red principal, como es el caso del corredor atlántico, según lo previsto en el artículo 45 del Reglamento (UE) n° 1315/2013 ([1]).

Entre otras cosas, el coordinador europeo presidirá un «Foro del Corredor» en el que participarán los Estados miembros y las partes interesadas pertinentes. Se elaborará un plan de trabajo del corredor, a más tardar para diciembre de 2014, que incluirá la lista de proyectos necesarios y las fuentes de fondos y financiación previstas para el corredor.

Se remitirá a Su Señoría el memorando firmado en Tallin por los representantes de los Estados miembros participantes en el corredor atlántico.

([1]) Reglamento (UE) n° 1315/2013 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 11 de diciembre de 2013, sobre las orientaciones de la Unión para el desarrollo de la red transeuropea de transporte y por el que se deroga la Decisión 661/2010/UE (DO L 348 de 20.12.2013).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013462/13
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Investment in Priority Projects 3 and 19

At a meeting of the Committee on Transport and Tourism today, the coordinator of Priority Projects 3 and 19 stated that the Commission would promote measures to improve coordination between Member States and make EU funds more effective. The aim is to get Member States to shoulder responsibility for the priorities in the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T) document, and include them in their budgets. Furthermore — and in view of the delays to the Atlantic corridor caused by the financial crisis — the committee was informed that the Member States involved in this corridor's construction, namely Portugal, Spain and France, had signed a memorandum in Tallinn confirming their commitment to this transport infrastructure.

In light of this important information and news made known during the meeting:

1. What measures is the Commission considering to improve said coordination and align government investment with planned TEN-T investment?

2. Does the Commission have the memorandum signed in Tallinn by representatives of the governments of Portugal, Spain and France? Could it provide a copy? If not, does the memorandum include the deadlines set already in the guidelines approved by Parliament in plenary on 19 November 2013?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

For all Core Network Corridors like the Atlantic Corridor, a European Coordinator will be nominated as foreseen by Art 45 of Regulation 1315/2013 ([1]).

The European Coordinator will *inter alia* chair a Corridor Forum involving Member States and the relevant stakeholders. A corridor work plan will be drafted by December 2014, including the list of projects needed and the sources envisaged for funding and financing the corridor.

The Declaration signed in Tallinn by the Representatives of the Member States involved on the Atlantic Corridor will be sent to the Honourable Member.

([1]) Règlement (UE) n° 1315/2013 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 11 décembre 2013 sur les orientations de l'Union pour le développement du réseau transeuropéen de transport et abrogeant la décision n° 661/2010/UE, OJ L 348, 20.12.2013.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013463/13
a la Comisión
Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D)
(27 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Incidencia en el programa de movilidad Erfurt

En la ciudad alemana de Erfurt se encuentran 180 jóvenes españoles a la espera de iniciar el «Programa de movilidad Erfurt», que consistía en una formación dual práctica y teórica con una duración de tres años. Dicho programa, además, les prometía alojamiento y un contrato de prácticas con un sueldo de 400 euros por parte de las empresas, complementado por el Gobierno alemán hasta alcanzar los 818 euros.

Sin embargo, tras realizar un curso de alemán en España durante seis semanas, cuando llegaron a Erfurt las empresas desconocían la llegada de dichos jóvenes y las residencias se encontraban sin espacio. Durante su estancia, los jóvenes no han recibido ninguna subvención, teniendo que pagarse su manutención de sus propios bolsillos, con el inconveniente de que sin contrato no pueden acceder a las ayudas que les habían prometido desde España, por lo que sobreviven de manera muy precaria.

El sentimiento general por parte de estos jóvenes es de fraude y engaño. Poco a poco se han ido solucionando los problemas de alojamiento y algunos contratos, pero la voluntad de resolver la situación llegó con retraso, viéndose obligados muchos de estos jóvenes a volver a España.

Es intolerable que, ante la situación de desempleo juvenil con la que cuenta España, se prometa una serie de contratos y esperanza para su futuro, sin ninguna garantía.

Tratándose de un Programa suscrito a la red Eures:

— ¿No cree la Comisión que casos como este ponen en evidencia las deficiencias actuales del programa Eures?

— ¿No considera la Comisión que la movilidad laboral de los jóvenes europeos debería realizarse con programas y controles europeos para garantizar la seguridad y evitar fraudes y abusos?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de enero de 2014)

Las colocaciones en cuestión no se efectuaron a través de EURES, la Red europea de empleo para la movilidad de los trabajadores dentro de la UE, y no participaron en las mismas los servicios públicos de empleo alemanes que acogen a la red EURES. Además, las empresas en cuestión no están inscritas en el portal EURES.

Los Estados miembros disponen de los mecanismos y las disposiciones que se necesitan para prevenir, detectar y frenar los abusos, que son también aplicables a las contrataciones a través de la red EURES, uno de cuyos principios es promover la movilidad justa entendida como movilidad ejercida voluntariamente, respetando plenamente la legislación y las normas laborales.

En este caso particular, se prometieron servicios de intermediación que en realidad no se prestaron. Las autoridades competentes en Alemania han adoptado las medidas necesarias con respecto a las empresas en cuestión.

En cuanto a la ayuda a los jóvenes españoles, las autoridades competentes de Turingia han trabajado con la Embajada española a fin de hallar soluciones, en estrecha colaboración con la sociedad civil y los empleadores locales, con respecto al alojamiento y las colocaciones en puestos de trabajo o de aprendiz. A este respecto, los servicios públicos de empleo alemanes han proporcionado información sobre las posibilidades de financiación en el marco del programa «El trabajo de mi vida» ([1]). Gestionado por el Gobierno alemán, dicho programa facilita ayuda financiera a jóvenes trabajadores o aprendices que se desplazan a Alemania desde otros Estados miembros.

El Programa de movilidad Erfurt no está cofinanciado por el Fondo Social Europeo.

([1]) http://www.thejobofmylife.de/en/home.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013463/13
to the Commission
Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Problems with the Erfurt Mobility Programme

There are 180 young Spaniards in the Germany city of Erfurt waiting to start the 'Erfurt Mobility Programme', a three-year dual course combining practical and theoretical training. They were also promised accommodation under this programme and traineeship contracts with firms paying them a salary of EUR 400 which would then be topped up to EUR 818 by the German Government.

However when they arrived in Erfurt after a six-week German course in Spain, the firms knew nothing about the arrival of these young people and all accommodation was full. These young Spaniards have not received any grants during their stay and have had to pay for their keep out of their own pockets. Furthermore, not having a contract they cannot apply for the financial support promised when they were in Spain, so they are surviving hand to mouth.

Generally these young people feel that they have been deceived and tricked. Little by little, solutions to the accommodation problem have been found as well as some contracts, but it was some time before anyone was prepared to resolve the situation, forcing many of these young people to return to Spain.

It is intolerable that anyone can look at youth unemployment in Spain and, without any guarantees, promise a series of contracts and hope for the future.

— As this is a programme registered with the Eures network, would the Commission agree that cases like this one show up the current shortcomings of the Eures programme?

— Would the Commission agree that there should be EU programmes and checks in place to ensure that young Europeans moving around in search of work can do so in security and safety and to prevent fraud and abuse?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

The placements concerned were not made by or via EURES, the European Jobs Network which facilitates intra-EU mobility of workers, and the German public employment services, which host EURES in Germany, were not involved. Furthermore, the companies involved are not registered on the EURES portal.

The Member States have the necessary mechanisms and arrangements in place to prevent, detect and deter abuse. These are also applicable in the case of placements through the EURES network, an operating principle of which is to promote fair mobility, which is understood as mobility that takes place on a voluntary basis and which fully respects labour law and labour standards.

In this particular case, intermediation services were promised, but not actually provided. The competent authorities in Germany have taken the necessary measures *vis-à-vis* the companies concerned.

As for helping the young Spaniards concerned, the competent authorities in Thuringia have worked with the Spanish Embassy to find solutions, in close cooperation with civil society and local employers, as regards accommodation and actual placements in work or apprenticeships. In this connection, the German public employment services have provided information on funding opportunities under the *Job of my life* programme ([1]), which is run by the German Government and provides financial contributions for young workers or apprentices coming to Germany from other Member States.

The Erfurt Mobility Programme is not co-financed by the European Social Fund.

([1]) http://www.thejobofmylife.de/en/home.html

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-013464/13
upućeno Komisiji
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(27. studenog 2013.)

Predmet: Nestale osobe iz Domovinskog rata u Hrvatskoj

Nestale osobe jedna su od najbolnijih i najdugotrajnijih posljedica rata na području Republike Hrvatske. Ratna zbivanja rezultirala su tisućama nestalih. Naporima nadležnih tijela RH do danas je razjašnjena sudbina više od 80 % evidentiranih nestalih osoba, no još je uvijek nepoznata sudbina 1 702 osoba.

U dosadašnjem rješavanju sudbine nestalih, ključnu su ulogu imale informacije prikupljene iz svih raspoloživih izvora — od samih građana i udruga, nadležnih tijela RH pa nadalje. Nažalost, vremenom broj i pouzdanost informacija se smanjuje.

Budući da je Hrvatska članica EU-a, a osobe za kojima se traga su nestali građani EU-a, može li Komisija poduzeti određene mjere kojima bi se pojačale aktivnosti da se pronađu 1 702 nestale osobe iz Domovinskog rata u Hrvatskoj, neovisno o njihovu podrijetlu, narodnosti, vjeroispovijesti ili bilo kojoj drugoj pripadnosti, a sve u duhu dobrosusjedskih odnosa i nastavka bilateralne suradnje između dviju država?

Odgovor gđe Reding u ime Komisije
(18. veljače 2014.)

Sukladno ugovorima koji su temelj Europske unije, Europska komisija nema općih ovlasti za izravno djelovanje. Ona to može učiniti samo u slučajevima povezanima s pravom Europske unije.

U skladu s člankom 51. stavkom 1., države članice moraju poštovati prava i slobode ugrađene u Povelju o temeljnim pravima samo pri provedbi prava Unije.

Iz podataka koje je dostavio časni zastupnik, ne čini se da se predmet o kojem se radi odnosi na provedbu prava Europske unije. U takvim situacijama, Komisija podsjeća na to da države članice i njihova pravosudna tijela moraju osigurati stvarno poštovanje i zaštitu temeljnih prava u skladu s nacionalnim zakonodavstvom i međunarodnim obvezama u području ljudskih prava. U tom pogledu Komisija napominje da je Hrvatska potpisala (ali još nije ratificirala) Međunarodnu konvenciju za zaštitu svih osoba od prisilnog nestanka. ([1])

([1]) Vidjeti: http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/EnforcedDisappearance.aspx.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013464/13
to the Commission
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Missing persons in the Croatian War of Independence

Missing persons are one of the most painfully lingering consequences of the war fought on Croatian soil, in which thousands disappeared. The efforts of the proper Croatian authorities have so far served to shed light on the fate of over 80% of those posted missing, but there are 1 702 still unaccounted for.

In those cases to date in which missing persons have been traced, one key contributory factor was the information gathered from every available source — individuals and organisations, Croatian authorities, and so on. Unfortunately, as time passes, information becomes rarer and less reliable.

Given that Croatia is an EU Member State and those being searched for are missing EU citizens, can the Commission take specific steps with a view to intensifying the efforts to find the 1 702 people who went missing during the Croatian War of Independence, which should be pursued without regard to their origin, nationality, religious beliefs, or any other affiliations and according to a spirit of good neighbourly relations and ongoing bilateral cooperation between two states?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2014)

Under the Treaties on which the European Union is based, the Commission has no general powers to intervene. It can do so only if an issue of European Union law is involved.

According to its Article 51(1), the rights and freedoms enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights must be respected by Member States only when they are implementing Union law.

From the information provided by the Honourable Member, the matter referred to does not appear to be related to the implementation of European Union law. In such situations, the Commission recalls that Member States, including their judicial authorities, have to ensure that fundamental rights are effectively respected and protected in accordance with their national legislation and international human rights obligations. In this respect the Commission notes that Croatia has signed (but not yet ratified) the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance ([1]).

([1]) See: http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/EnforcedDisappearance.aspx

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013465/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Sovraesposizione agli schermi di portatili e smartphone e pericolo di miopia

La sovraesposizione dei cittadini europei agli schermi dei tablet, delle tv e degli smartphone sarà causa tra 30 anni di una vera e propria epidemia di miopia. I dati disponibili stabiliscono che in media in Italia si passano più di quattro ore al chiuso, davanti agli schermi tv, a quelli del pc o degli smartphone per la lettura di pagine scritte con caratteri piccoli. Mentre tre decenni fa, la miopia colpiva un europeo su cinque, oggi ne colpisce più di uno su tre. Un ricercatore britannico ha scoperto che in Gran Bretagna, dopo il lancio degli smartphone nel 1997, c'è stato un aumento del 35 % di casi di miopia avanzata e il peggioramento della miopia nei giovani adulti potrebbe essere del 50 % entro i prossimi 10 anni. Di questo passo il 40-50 % dei trentenni potrebbe soffrire di miopia entro il 2033. In uno studio condotto recentemente a Taiwan su 11mila studenti, circa l'80 per cento è risultato miope.

La Commissione:

1. è a conoscenza di questi studi?

2. intende intervenire celermente con campagne di sensibilizzazione che avvisino i giovani europei del grave pericolo che la sovraesposizione agli schermi può rappresentare per la loro vista?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(31 gennaio 2014)

La Commissione non era a conoscenza degli studi menzionati dall'onorevole deputata. La Commissione non intende organizzare o avviare campagne di sensibilizzazione sugli effetti che la sovraesposizione agli schermi potrebbe comportare per la vista.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013465/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Overexposure to laptop and smartphone screens and risk of myopia

Overexposure to tablet, TV and smartphone screens among European citizens will be the cause of a genuine myopia epidemic in 30 years. The available data show that, on average, Italians spend more than four hours indoors, in front of TV, PC or smartphone screens, reading pages written in small characters. Whereas three decades ago, only one in five Europeans suffered from myopia, the figure is now one in three. A British researcher has found that, in Great Britain, after the launch of the smartphone in 1997, there was a 35% increase in cases of severe myopia and that myopia among young adults could worsen by 50% within the next 10 years. At this rate, 40-50% of adults in their thirties may suffer from myopia by 2033. In a study recently conducted on 11 000 students in Taiwan, around 80% were myopic.

Can the Commission state:

1. If it is aware of these studies?

2. If it intends to take swift action with awareness raising campaigns to warn young Europeans of the serious danger that overexposure to screens can represent for their vision?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(31 January 2014)

The Commission was not aware of the studies the Honourable Member is referring to. The Commission does not intend to organise or launch awareness raising campaigns on the effects that overexposure to screens could potentially represent for people's vision.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013466/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Statistiche sugli abusi contro le donne in Grecia

Da un recente studio risulta che in Grecia il 68 % delle donne che hanno subito violenze sono sposate e 7 su 10 appartengono al ceto medio o alla ricca borghesia; mentre per quanto riguarda gli uomini che commettono abusi più del 50 % ha ottenuto un'istruzione superiore e solamente 1 su 10 risulta disoccupato.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza dei fatti sopra esposti?

2. Intende promuovere iniziative reali mirate per la Grecia?

3. Quali sono le statistiche in merito alle dimensioni del problema in Europa?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(22 gennaio 2014)

Il piano d'azione per l'attuazione del programma di Stoccolma, la Carta per le donne e la strategia per la parità tra donne e uomini 2010-2015 ([1]) testimoniano l'impegno della Commissione a combattere la violenza nei confronti delle donne.

La Commissione è consapevole del fatto che la violenza nei confronti delle donne colpisce tutte le società e classi sociali ed è presente anche nelle relazioni più strette, come quelle tra due partner.

Nel quadro dei programmi Daphne e Progress, la Commissione ha fornito finanziamenti ai governi e alle organizzazioni della società civile al fine di sostenere le iniziative per contrastare la violenza nei confronti delle donne. Analogamente al programma Daphne, anche il programma «Diritti, uguaglianza e cittadinanza» finanzierà le attività volte a combattere la violenza nei confronti dei bambini, degli adolescenti e delle donne così come la violenza nei confronti di altri gruppi a rischio, in particolare nelle relazioni più strette.

Per quanto concerne le statistiche, non sono disponibili dati ufficiali e comparabili a livello dell'UE sulla violenza nei confronti delle donne. Per migliorare la conoscenza relativa alla preponderanza di questo fenomeno, la Commissione sta studiando come sfruttare le attuali indagini Eurostat e sta partecipando attivamente ai lavori dell'Istituto europeo per l'uguaglianza di genere. Inoltre i risultati del sondaggio sulle esperienze di violenza delle donne dell'Agenzia per i diritti fondamentali, che verrà pubblicato il 5 marzo 2014 ([2]), permetteranno di conoscere la portata del problema.

([1]) COM(2010) 491 final, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0491:FIN:EN:PDF

([2]) Le informazioni sull'indagine in corso dell'Agenzia per i diritti fondamentali sono disponibili al seguente indirizzo: http://fra.europa.eu/en/project/2012/fra-survey-womens-well-being-and-safety-europe.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013466/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Statistics on the abuse of women in Greece

A recent study reveals that 68% of women in Greece who have suffered violence are married and that 7 out of 10 belong to the middle and upper classes; while, as regards men who commit abuse, over 50% has had higher education and only 1 in 10 is unemployed.

1. Is the Commission aware of the above facts?

2. Does it intend to promote real, targeted initiatives for Greece?

3. What statistics are there concerning the size of the problem in Europe?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(22 January 2014)

The action plan implementing the Stockholm Programme, the Women's Charter and the strategy for Equality between Women and Men 2010-2015 ([1]) show the Commission's commitment to combating violence against women.

The Commission is aware that violence against women affects all societies and classes and that it is also perpetrated in close relationships, such as between intimate partners.

The Commission has provided funding to governments and civil society organisations to support initiatives to tackle violence against women, under the Daphne and Progress programmes. The Rights, Equality and Citizenship programme will now provide funding as Daphne did for activities that aim to fight violence against children, young people and women, as well as violence against other groups at risk, in particular groups at risk of violence in close relationships.

With regards to statistics, there are no official and comparable data available at EU level on violence against women. To improve knowledge of the prevalence of this phenomenon, the Commission is exploring ways to use current Eurostat surveys and is actively participating in the work of the European Institute for Gender Equality. In addition, insight into the extent of the problem will be provided by the results of the Fundamental Rights' Agency's survey on women's experiences of violence, which will be published on 5 March 2014 ([2]).

([1]) COM(2010) 491 final, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0491:FIN:EN:PDF
([2]) Information on the on-going FRA survey can be found at : http://fra.europa.eu/en/project/2012/fra-survey-womens-well-being-and-safety-europe

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013467/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG) e l'Irlanda

Con riferimento alla mia interrogazione E-007272/2010 la Commissione può fornire aggiornamenti e indicare:

1. quante volte il Fondo è stato attivato a favore dell'Irlanda dal 2007 ad oggi?
2. quali sono i settori interessati?
3. quanti sono i lavoratori complessivamente coinvolti?
4. qual è la tipologia dei progetti sostenuti?
5. qual è l'ammontare complessivo delle risorse erogate?
6. qual è il tasso di reinserimento dei lavoratori che hanno beneficiato delle misure del FEG nel mercato del lavoro irlandese?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013468/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG) e l'Italia

Con riferimento alla mia interrogazione, può la Commissione fornire aggiornamenti e indicare:

1. quante volte il Fondo è stato attivato a favore dell'Italia dal 2007 ad oggi?
2. quali i settori interessati?
3. quanti i lavoratori complessivamente coinvolti?
4. quale la tipologia dei progetti sostenuti?
5. quale l'ammontare complessivo delle risorse erogate?
6. quale il tasso di reinserimento dei lavoratori che hanno beneficiato delle misure del FEGnel mercato del lavoro italiano?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013469/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG) e la Grecia

Con riferimento alla mia interrogazione E-007271/201, la Commissione può fornire aggiornamenti e indicare:

1. quante volte il Fondo è stato attivato a favore della Grecia dal 2007 ad oggi?
2. quali sono i settori interessati?
3. quanti sono i lavoratori complessivamente coinvolti?
4. qual è la tipologia dei progetti sostenuti?

5. qual è l'ammontare complessivo delle risorse erogate?

6. qual è il tasso di reinserimento dei lavoratori che hanno beneficiato delle misure del FEG nel mercato del lavoro greco?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013470/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG) e la Spagna

Con riferimento alla mia interrogazione E-007286/2010, la Commissione può fornire aggiornamenti e indicare:

1. quante volte il Fondo è stato attivato a favore della Spagna dal 2007 ad oggi?

2. quali sono i settori interessati?

3. quanti sono i lavoratori complessivamente coinvolti?

4. qual è la tipologia dei progetti sostenuti?

5. qual è l'ammontare complessivo delle risorse erogate?

6. qual è il tasso di reinserimento dei lavoratori che hanno beneficiato delle misure del FEG nel mercato del lavoro spagnolo?

Risposta congiunta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(29 gennaio 2014)

Per particolari sulle misure che hanno concesso un sostegno del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG) negli ultimi anni si rinvia l'onorevole deputata alla relazione annuale della Commissione sulle attività del FEG nel 2012 e alle relazioni relative agli anni dal 2007 al 2011, che possono essere tutte scaricate dal sito web del FEG ([1]).

Lo «Statistical Portrait» del FEG, che è anche disponibile sul citato sito web, copre il periodo dal gennaio 2007 al giugno 2011 e fornisce dati e cifre in merito a tutti i casi trattati dal FEG sinora.

Le misure che ricevono il sostegno del FEG devono soddisfare i criteri di cui all'articolo 3 del regolamento (CE) n. 1927/2006 ([2]). Per quanto concerne il tasso di reinserimento sul mercato del lavoro dei beneficiari del FEG, sono stati chiusi soltanto 44 casi (i risultati sono sintetizzati nelle relazioni annuali menzionate sopra), mentre gli altri sono ancora in corso di valutazione o di implementazione.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=326&langId=en&moreLinks=yes
([2]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1927/2006 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 20 dicembre 2006, che istituisce un Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione, GU L 406 del 30.12.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013467/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Update on the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) and Ireland

Withe reference to my Written Question E-007272/2010, could the Commission provide an update as follows:

1. How many times has the Fund been mobilised on behalf of Ireland from 2007 to date?
2. What are the sectors concerned?
3. What is the total number of workers involved?
4. What types of projects have received support?
5. How much funding has been disbursed in total?
6. What is the rate of reintegration into the Irish employment market of workers who have benefited from EGF measures?

Question for written answer E-013468/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Update on the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) and Italy

Withe reference to my previous written question, could the Commission provide an update as follows:

1. How many times has the Fund been mobilised on behalf of Italy from 2007 to date?
2. What are the sectors concerned?
3. What is the total number of workers involved?
4. What types of projects have received support?
5. How much funding has been disbursed in total?
6. What is the rate of reintegration into the Italian employment market of workers who have benefited from EGF measures?

Question for written answer E-013469/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Update on the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) and Greece

Withe reference to my Written Question E-007271/2010, could the Commission provide an update as follows:

1. How many times has the Fund been mobilised on behalf of Greece from 2007 to date?
2. What are the sectors concerned?
3. What is the total number of workers involved?
4. What types of projects have received support?

5. How much funding has been disbursed in total?

6. What is the rate of reintegration into the Greek employment market of workers who have benefited from EGF measures?

Question for written answer E-013470/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Update on the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) and Spain

Withe reference to my Written Question E-007286/2010, could the Commission provide an update as follows:

1. How many times has the Fund been mobilised on behalf of Spain from 2007 to date?

2. What are the sectors concerned?

3. What is the total number of workers involved?

4. What types of projects have received support?

5. How much funding has been disbursed in total?

6. What is the rate of reintegration into the Spanish employment market of workers who have benefited from EGF measures?

Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

For details of measures granting support from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) over the past few years, the Honourable Member is advised to consult the Commission's annual report on the activities of the EGF in 2012 and the annual reports for 2007 to 2011, all of which may be downloaded from the EGF website ([1]).

The Statistical Portrait of the EGF, which is also available from that website, covers the period January 2007 to June 2011 and gives facts and figures relating to all EGF cases to date.

Measures supported by the EGF must meet the criteria in Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 1927/2006 ([2]). As regards the rate of EGF beneficiaries' reintegration into the labour market, only 44 cases have been closed (the outcome is summarised in the annual reports referred to), while the others are still either being assessed or implemented.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=326&langId=en&moreLinks=yes
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 1927/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on establishing the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund, OJ L 406, 30.12.2006.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013471/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Crisi del settore degli elettrodomestici in Veneto: Lametal di Valstagna

L'azienda Lametal Like Spa di Valstagna, attiva nel settore degli elettrodomestici, è stata colpita dalla crisi che ha investito il settore. La dirigenza, pur avendo già fatto ricorso agli ammortizzatori sociali, da mesi non è più in grado di corrispondere puntualmente gli stipendi dovuti e ora sta valutando la chiusura dello stabilimento.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se è a conoscenza dei fatti sopra descritti;

2. se ritiene che i lavoratori licenziati potranno usufruire del sostegno del Fondo europeo diadeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG)?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(29 gennaio 2014)

1. La Commissione è al corrente dei fatti menzionati dall'onorevole deputata.

2. Il Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione a certe condizioni fornisce sostegno ai lavoratori in esubero. La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputata al regolamento del FEG (2014-2020) ([1]) per ulteriori dettagli sulle nuove regole che disciplinano questo fondo a decorrere dal 2014.

Compete agli Stati membri decidere se chiedere o meno un sostegno del fondo o se contemplare il ricorso ad altri finanziamenti unionali o alle risorse proprie. L'onorevole deputata può rivolgersi alla persona di contatto del FEG in Italia qualora desideri sapere se è prevista una domanda di aiuto a sostegno dei lavoratori messi in esubero da Lametal Like SpA. I nominativi delle persone da contattare figurano sul sito web del FEG ([2]).

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1309/2013, GU L 347 del 20.12.2013.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013471/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Crisis in the electrical appliance sector in the Veneto Region: Lametal in Valstagna

The Valstagna-based electrical appliance company Lametal Like SpA has become a victim of the crisis which has hit the entire sector. Although the management has already made use of social safety nets, it has been unable to pay its workers' wages on time for months, and is now considering closing the plant.

1. Is the Commission aware of the facts described above?

2. Does it believe that the workers made redundant will receive any support from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF)?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

1. The Commission is aware of the facts referred to by the Honourable Member.

2. The European Globalisation Adjustment Fund could, under certain conditions, provide support for the workers made redundant. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the EGF Regulation (2014-2020) ([1]) for more details on the new rules of this Fund as from 2014.

It is for the Member State to decide whether or not to apply for support from the Fund or to consider using other EU funding or its own resources. The Honourable Member may wish to communicate with the EGF Contact Person in Italy, should she wish to know whether an application is being planned in support of workers made redundant by Lametal Like SpA. The relevant contact details can be found on the EGF website ([2]).

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1309/2013, OJ L 347 of 20.12.2013.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013472/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Finanziamenti comunitari all'Egitto: effettiva efficacia

L'UE ha deciso di investire 47 milioni di euro nell'ambito della cooperazione con l'Egitto, destinandone una parte anche a un programma mirato al miglioramento della rete di gestione dei rifiuti del paese.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. la cifra complessiva che finora ha destinato ai programmi a sostegno dell'Egitto?

2. dei 47 milioni di euro sopra citati, quale cifra è stata destinata a progetti di gestione rifiuti?

3. considerata la situazione politica che sta attualmente vivendo l'Egitto, con continui scontri interni fra sostenitori dell'ex presidente Morsi e le forze di sicurezza del governo in carica, come valuta l'effettiva efficacia di finanziamenti come quello sopra esposto?

Risposta di Stefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(29 gennaio 2014)

1. L'UE ha stanziato 578 milioni di euro a favore dell'Egitto nell'ambito del programma indicativo nazionale (PIN) per il periodo 2007-2010 e 299 milioni di euro nell'ambito del PIN 2011-2013. I 47 milioni di euro assegnati nel quadro del programma d'azione annuale (PAA) per il 2013 fanno parte di tale stanziamento globale e riguardano l'ultimo anno del PIN 2011-2013.

2. La dotazione di 47 milioni di euro comprende due programmi: i) un programma di sviluppo rurale (nell'ambito dell'iniziativa ENPARD), per un importo di 27 milioni di euro, e ii) un programma nazionale di gestione dei rifiuti solidi (NSWMP) per un importo di 20 milioni di euro. Il programma intende contribuire alla tutela sostenibile dell'ambiente al fine di proteggere le risorse naturali e ridurre i rischi per la salute, nonché promuovere la gestione sostenibile dei rifiuti a favore degli egiziani che vivono in regioni svantaggiate.

3. Per quanto riguarda l'attuale situazione politica, tenendo presenti le esigenze dei cittadini egiziani, nell'agosto 2013 il Consiglio «Affari esteri» ha espresso preoccupazione per la situazione economica del paese e per le ripercussioni negative sui gruppi più vulnerabili della società egiziana, concludendo che l'assistenza nel settore socioeconomico e alla società civile proseguirà e che l'UE sorveglierà attentamente la situazione in Egitto e adatterà la sua cooperazione di conseguenza.

Verranno seguiti da vicino anche i cambiamenti istituzionali che potrebbero incidere sui programmi finanziati dall'UE in corso e/o in fase di preparazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013472/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: European funding for Egypt: effectiveness in practice

The European Union has decided to invest EUR 47 million in the field of cooperation with Egypt, and has allocated some of the money to a programme for improving the country's waste management network.

1. Can the Commission state the total amount of funding that it has allocated so far to programmes in support of Egypt?

2. What proportion of the abovementioned EUR 47 million has been allocated to waste management projects?

3. Given the current political situation in Egypt, with continued fighting inside the country between supporters of the former President, Mohamed Morsi, and the security forces of the ruling government, how effective does the Commission consider this kind of funding to be in practice?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

1. The EU has allocated EUR 578 million to Egypt under the National Indicative Programme (NIP) for 2007-2010 and EUR 299 million under the NIP 2011-2013. The EUR 47 million allocated as part of the Annual Action Programme (AAP) for 2013 is part of this global allocation i.e. the last year of the NIP 2011-2013.

2. The EUR 47 million comprises two programmes: (i) a Rural Development Programme (under the ENPARD initiative) for an amount of EUR 27 million, and (ii) a National Solid Waste Management Programme (NSWMP) for an amount of EUR 20 million. This programme aims at contributing to sustainable protection of the environment to protect natural resources and reduce health risks and promote sustainable waste management for Egyptians living in disadvantaged regions.

3. Regarding the current political situation and mindful of the needs of the Egyptian people, the Foreign Affairs Council in August 2013 expressed its concern at the economic situation in the country and the negative impact on the most vulnerable groups of Egyptian society, concluding that assistance in the socioeconomic sector and to civil society will continue and that the EU will monitor the situation in Egypt closely and readjust its cooperation accordingly.

This also includes close following the institutional changes that may have an impact on EU-funded programmes that are on-going and/or in the pipeline.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013473/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Finanziamenti europei a programmi congiunti per la prevenzione dei fenomeni di radicalizzazione islamica nelle carceri

In riferimento alla risposta alla mia interrogazione E-005271/2011 «Proselitismo islamico radicale negli istituti penitenziari europei» nella quale la Commissione afferma di aver finanziato tramite il programma ISEC (Prevenzione e lotta contro la criminalità) un progetto trilaterale realizzato da Austria, Germania e Francia, e un altro attuato da Regno Unito e partner olandesi, tedeschi e spagnoli;

può la Commissione riferire:

1. l'ammontare delle sovvenzioni stanziate per tali progetti?

2. le valutazioni sui risultati ottenuti da essi?

3. se ha sovvenzionato altri progetti simili in altri paesi membri, se sì in quali e l'ammontare dei finanziamenti erogati?

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

L'Onorevole Deputato si riferisce al progetto intitolato «Radicalizzazione e violenza intenzionale — Riconoscimento e trattamento di questi fenomeni da parte delle categorie professionali interessate (Fattori e influenze, esperienze, analisi e controstrategie)», guidato da Austria, Francia e Germania. Il progetto, che ha ricevuto un finanziamento di 119 439 euro, ha permesso di raccogliere e raffrontare le esperienze e le migliori prassi del lavoro compiuto dagli Stati membri sul personale carcerario in prima linea ai fini della sensibilizzazione e formazione alla prevenzione, al riconoscimento e al trattamento dei processi di radicalizzazione dei detenuti.

Il secondo progetto menzionato dall'Onorevole Deputato — «Ridurre le influenze che portano alla radicalizzazione dei detenuti» ha ricevuto un finanziamento di 118 721 euro. Grazie a tale progetto è stato possibile elaborare un programma di formazione per il personale penitenziario e di sorveglianza della libertà condizionale, per il riconoscimento e la riduzione dei rischi e dei fattori che possono portare alla radicalizzazione dei detenuti e delle persone in libertà vigilata.

Un altro progetto analogo — «Deradicalizzazione — Di nuovo sulla buona strada», sostenuto dalla Commissione con 279 709 euro e realizzato dal Ministero danese per i rifugiati, l'immigrazione e l'integrazione, è tuttora in corso.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013473/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: European funding for joint programmes to prevent Islamic radicalisation in prisons

With reference to the answer to my Written Question E-005271/2011 'Islamic radicalisation in EU prisons', in which the Commission confirmed that it had funded, through the ISECProgramme (Prevention of and Fight against Crime), a trilateral project led by Austria, Germany and France, and another project carried out by the United Kingdom together with partners from the Netherlands, Germany and Spain, can the Commission say:

1. how much funding has been granted to these projects;

2. what results have been obtained by these projects;

3. whether it has funded similar projects in other Member States, and if so, in which ones and in what amount?

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

The Honourable Member refers to the project entitled: 'Radicalisation and Willingness to use Violence — Recognition and Handling of these Phenomena by affected Occupational Groups (Factors and Influences, Experiences, Analyses and Counterstrategies)' led by Austria, France and Germany. The project received a grant of EUR 119 439. The project compared and compiled Member States' experiences and best practices in sensitising front-line prison staff and training them to prevent, recognise and tackle radicalisation processes of prison inmates.

The second project mentioned by Honourable Member — 'Reducing Influences that Radicalise Prisoners', received the amount of EUR 118 721. The project resulted in devising a training programme for the staff in prison and probation services with the aim of recognising and reducing risks and factors likely to radicalise prisoners and ex-offenders on parole.

Another similar project — 'Deradicalisation — Back on Track', supported by the Commission with EUR 279 709 is still ongoing. It is led by the Danish Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013474/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Manipolazione del settore bancario islamico da parte dei Fratelli Musulmani: approfondimento

In riferimento alla mia interrogazione E-007699/2011 «Manipolazione del settore bancario islamico da parte dei Fratelli Musulmani», la Commissione è venuta a conoscenza di nuovi elementi per rispondere alla questione posta? In caso contrario intende aprire un'indagine in merito?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(23 gennaio 2014)

La Commissione non ha acquisito nuove informazioni in materia.

Ai sensi dell'articolo 161, paragrafo 8, su mandato della Commissione, l'ABE valuta se i soggetti del settore finanziario che dichiarano di svolgere le proprie attività in conformità dei principi del sistema bancario islamico sono adeguatamente coperti dalla presente direttiva e dal regolamento (UE) n. 575/2013.

La Commissione non ha ancora conferito tale mandato, visto l'ingente carico di lavoro attuale dell'ABE, ma continuerà a monitorare la questione e adottare nuove misure, a seconda dei casi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013474/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Manipulation of the Islamic banking sector by the Muslim Brotherhood: further information

With reference to my Written Question E-007699/2011 'Manipulation of the Islamic banking sector by the Muslim Brotherhood', has the Commission received any new information that would enable it to answer that question? If not, does it intend to open an enquiry into the matter?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(23 January 2014)

The Commission has not acquired any new information on the subject.

According to Article 161(8) of Directive 2013/36/EU, the European Banking Authority shall explore upon receiving a mandate from the Commission whether financial sector entities which declare that they carry out their activities in accordance with Islamic banking principles are adequately covered by that directive and by Regulation (EU) No 575/2013.

The Commission has not yet given such a mandate, in the current very high work-load of EBA, but will continue to monitor the matter and take action, as appropriate.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013476/13
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(27 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Acoso a buque oceanográfico español en el LIC de Gibraltar

El pasado verano, el gobierno de Gibraltar ordenaba de forma unilateral el lanzamiento de unos setenta bloques de hormigón en aguas jurisdiccionales españolas que cuentan con una doble protección comunitaria (LIC ES6120032 Estrecho Oriental y UKGIB0002 Southern Waters of Gibraltar) dentro de la red Natura 2000. La Fiscalía de Medio Ambiente solicitó al Instituto Oceanográfico Español información sobre el impacto medioambiental del lanzamiento de los bloques de hormigón dentro de las Zonas de Especial Conservación.

El pasado 18 de noviembre de 2013, hasta siete embarcaciones de la policía de Gibraltar, con la participación de dos barcos armados de la Royal Navy, acosaron a la embarcación científica para tratar de impedir la labor científica que realizaba cumpliendo una orden de la Fiscalía de Medio Ambiente (misión Viatar), hasta el punto de que tuvo que intervenir de urgencia la Guardia Civil para proteger la integridad de los científicos españoles.

Vistas las preguntas que he dirigido sobre este asunto a la Comisión en reiteradas ocasiones y teniendo presente lo anterior, pregunto a la Comisión:

1. ¿Qué actuaciones piensa adoptar la Comisión para que la Fiscalía de Medio Ambiente pueda asegurar la investigación de un posible delito contra la legislación comunitaria sin que los presuntos infractores hostiguen a los peritos?

2. ¿Qué actuaciones piensa adoptar la Comisión ante las reiteradas infracciones medioambientales por parte de las autoridades de Gibraltar así como por la creciente agresividad ante la investigación judicial de las mismas?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de febrero de 2014)

La Comisión está investigando los hechos descritos por Su Señoría (véase también la respuesta a las preguntas escritas E-13685/2013, E-013686/2013, E-013687/2013 y E-013688/2013). En lo que respecta a las investigaciones independientes a nivel nacional llevadas a cabo por el Instituto Español de Oceanografía, no es este un asunto que competa a la Comisión, sino a las autoridades nacionales.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013476/13
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Harassment of a Spanish oceanographic vessel in the Gibraltar special conservation area

In summer 2013, the Government of Gibraltar unilaterally ordered some 70 concrete blocks to be deposited in waters which are under Spanish jurisdiction and covered by two separate Community listings in the Natura 2000 network (SCI ES6120032 Estrecho Oriental and SCI UKGIB0002 Southern Waters of Gibraltar). The Environment Ombudsman asked the Spanish Oceanographic Institute (IEO) for information on the environmental impact of dumping the concrete blocks within these Special Areas of Conservation (SAC).

On 18 November 2013, the scientific vessel was harassed by as many as six boats belonging to the Royal Gibraltar Police, accompanied by two armed Royal Navy boats, which tried to obstruct the scientific work it was carrying out on orders from the Environment Ombudsman (VIATAR 11/13 scientific research mission), to such an extent that the Spanish Civil Guard was forced to urgently intervene to protect the Spanish scientists.

Bearing in mind the questions which I have repeatedly addressed to the Commission on this subject, and in light of all of the above:

1. What action does the Commission intend to take to enable the Environment Ombudsman's office to investigate a possible infraction of Community law without the presumed culprits harassing the investigators?

2. What action does the Commission intend to take in response to the Gibraltarian authorities' repeated infringements of environmental law and their increasingly aggressive response to the judicial investigation of such infringements?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(10 February 2014)

The Commission is investigating the facts described by the Honourable Member (see also the answers to Written Question E-13685/2013, E-013686/2013, E-013687/2013 and E-013688/2013). With regard to the separate national investigations carried out by the Spanish IEO, this is not a matter for the Commission but for national authorities.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013477/13
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(27 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Paralizada la firma del Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Ucrania y nueva huelga de hambre de Yulia Timoshenko

Los días 28 y 29 de noviembre tendrá lugar en Vilna —Lituania— la Cumbre de la Asociación Oriental de la UE, en la que se darán cita todos los líderes de la UE y los de Ucrania, Moldavia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaiyán y Bielorrusia.

La firma del Acuerdo de Asociación entre la UE y Ucrania era uno de los principales atractivos de este encuentro hasta la pasada semana, momento en el que el Gobierno de Ucrania decidió abandonar su firma y los defensores del acercamiento a la UE tomaron la calle. Esta decisión ha coincidido en el tiempo con la negativa del Parlamento ucraniano a permitir el traslado de Yulia Timoshenko al extranjero para recibir un tratamiento médico que detendría la enfermedad que la mantiene postrada y cada vez más débil en su encierro. Las informaciones que están siendo facilitadas ponen de manifiesto que el Presidente ucraniano ha cedido ante las presiones ejercidas por Rusia, en parte para terminar con sus continuos bloqueos comerciales y también para asegurar el apoyo económico de Vladimir Putin en su carrera hacia la reelección presidencial en 2015.

Desde mediados de 2012 he presentado dos preguntas parlamentarias (P-004512/2012 y E-007804/2012) relativas al trato que la Sra. Timoshenko está recibiendo de las autoridades ucranianas, mostrando mi preocupación ante las pautas que el Gobierno del Sr. Yanukovich está dando sobre este asunto. La Comisión Europea ha insistido al responder en su compromiso con la firma del Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Ucrania como «vía para una Ucrania moderna y democrática» y con el objetivo de «remediar los efectos de la justicia selectiva, incluidos los casos de Yulia Timoshenko y otros», pero la realidad es que ayer mismo la ex primera ministra de Ucrania inició una nueva huelga de hambre ante la gravedad de su propia situación y la de su país.

Vista la situación actual, por una parte, la paralización de las negociaciones con relación a la firma del Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Ucrania por decisión del Presidente ucraniano, y, por otra, la negativa de aprobar una ley que permita mejorar la salud de Yulia Timoshenko, pregunto a la Comisión:

¿Va a producirse algún tipo de cambio de estrategia al plantear las relaciones entre la UE y Ucrania? ¿Ve posible utilizar otra vía diferente de la firma del Acuerdo de Asociación para presionar al Gobierno ucraniano con relación a la injusta situación de la Sra. Timoshenko?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de febrero de 2014)

La Comisión Europea sigue convencida de que el Acuerdo de Asociación sería la mejor solución para hacer frente a los retos económicos de Ucrania, tanto a corto como a largo plazo. Es el Gobierno de Ucrania el que ha tomado la decisión de suspender los preparativos para la firma del Acuerdo de Asociación con la UE. Según lo declarado por el Consejo Europeo en sus conclusiones de 20 de diciembre de 2013, «el Consejo Europeo sigue dispuesto a firmar el Acuerdo de Asociación con Ucrania, inclusive en lo relativo a las zonas de libre comercio de alcance amplio y profundo, tan pronto como dicho país esté dispuesto. El Consejo Europeo hace un llamamiento a la moderación, el respeto de los derechos humanos y fundamentales, y por una solución democrática de la crisis política en Ucrania que satisfaga las aspiraciones del pueblo ucraniano.». La buena disposición de Ucrania se refiere, entre otras cosas, a que registre más progresos en lo que respecta al problema de la justicia selectiva, tal como se exigió en las conclusiones del Consejo de Asuntos Exteriores de diciembre de 2012 y se reiteró las conclusiones de ese mismo Consejo de 20 de enero de 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013477/13
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Signing of the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement reaches deadlock and Yulia Tymoshenko begins new hunger strike

On 28 and 29 November 2013, the EU's Eastern Partnership Summit, which is due to be attended by all the leaders of the EU and of Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan and Belarus, will be held in Vilnius, Lithuania.

The signing of the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement had been one of the main attractions of the summit until last week, when the Ukranian Government decided that it would not sign the agreement, leading supporters of closer ties with the EU to take to the streets in protest. This also coincided with the Ukranian Parliament's decision not to allow the imprisoned Yulia Tymoshenko to be transferred abroad to receive treatment for an increasingly debilitating medical condition. According to reports, Ukraine's President has buckled under pressure from Russia, in part to put an end to constant trade blockades, and also to ensure that he has the economic support of Vladimir Putin ahead of his 2015 re-election campaign.

Since mid-2012 I have submitted two written questions (P-004512/2012 and E-007804/2012) about the treatment of Ms Tymoshenko by the Ukranian authorities, and have expressed my concern at the behaviour of Mr Yanukovich's government in this regard. In its answers to my questions, the Commission stressed its commitment to the signing of the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement as the 'route to a modern and democratic Ukraine' and to the objective of 'redress[ing] the effects of selective justice, including the cases of Yulia Tymoshenko and others'. Yesterday, however, Ms Tymoshenko, the former prime minister of Ukraine, began another hunger strike in protest at the seriousness of her own situation and that of her country.

In view of the current situation, namely the paralysis in the negotiations on the signing of the Association Agreement following the decision by Ukraine's President, and the refusal to approve a law which would ultimately lead to an improvement in Yulia Tymoshenko's health, can the Commission answer the following:

Will there be a change of strategy with regard to relations between the EU and Ukraine? Does it see any means other than the signing of the Association Agreement of putting pressure on the Ukranian Government regarding the injustice suffered by Ms Tymoshenko?

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

The European Commission remains convinced that the Association Agreement would be the best solution to tackle the economic challenges of Ukraine, both in the short and in the long term. It is the Government of Ukraine which has taken the decision to suspend preparations for the signature of the Association Agreement with the EU. As stated by the European Council in its conclusions of 20 December 2013, 'The European Union remains ready to sign the Association Agreement, including Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area, with Ukraine, as soon as Ukraine is ready. The European Council calls for restraint, respect for human and fundamental rights and a democratic solution to the political crisis in Ukraine that would meet the aspirations of the Ukrainian people.' Ukraine's readiness naturally refers, inter alia, to further progress on the issue of selective justice, as required in the FAC conclusions of December 2012 and reiterated in the FAC conclusions of 20 January 2014.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-013478/13
til Kommissionen
Anne E. Jensen (ALDE)
(27. november 2013)

Om: Førerretten til bil

I Kommissionens direktiv 2009/112/EF af 25. august 2009 foretages følgende ændringer i bilag III til direktiv 91/439/EØF: Punkt 6: »(…) Er der grund til at nære formodning om, at ansøgerens syn ikke er tilstrækkeligt godt, skal vedkommende undersøges af en kompetent lægelig myndighed. Ved undersøgelsen skal der lægges særlig vægt på følgende: synsstyrken, synsfeltet, synsevnen i tusmørke, følsomhed over for blænding og kontraster, dobbeltsyn og andre synsfunktioner, som kan bringe færdselssikkerheden i fare.

For førere i gruppe 1 kan udstedelse af kørekort overvejes i »ganske særlige tilfælde«, hvor normen for synsfelt eller synsstyrke ikke kan overholdes; i sådanne tilfælde skal føreren undersøges af en kompetent lægelig myndighed for at påvise, at der ikke foreligger andre nedsættelser af synsfunktionen på grund af bl.a. blænding, kontrastfølsomhed og synsevne i tusmørke. Føreren eller ansøgeren skal også aflægge en af en kompetent myndighed tilrettelagt praktisk prøve med positivt resultat.«

Kommissionen forklarer således, at der i »ganske særlige tilfælde« kan aflægges en praktisk køreprøve for at vurdere egnetheden for at bibeholde kørekortet hos ansøgeren med nedsat synsevne.

Mener Kommissionen, at ansøgeren altid har ret til at aflægge en køreprøve i de tilfælde, hvor der er tvivl om, hvorvidt ansøgerens syn er godt nok? Eller mener Kommissionen, at det er op til en kompetent lægelig myndighed at vurdere, om ansøgeren overhovedet må aflægge en køreprøve?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Siim Kallas
(27. januar 2014)

Mindstekravene med hensyn til fysisk og psykisk egnethed til at føre motorkøretøj er fastlagt i bilag III til direktivet om kørekort ([1]), og de er afgørende for færdselssikkerheden. Medlemsstaterne kan altid indføre strengere krav til de kørekort, de udsteder.

Med hensyn til den bestemmelse i bilaget, som det ærede medlem henviser til, er det op til medlemsstaterne at fastlægge, hvilken kompetent national myndighed der skal afgøre, hvornår der er tale om »ganske særlige tilfælde«, og hvornår en ansøger skal have foretaget en undersøgelse og aflægge praktisk køreprøve.

([1]) Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets direktiv 2006/126/EF af 20. december 2006 om kørekort (EUT L 403 af 30.12.2006).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013478/13
to the Commission
Anne E. Jensen (ALDE)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: The right to drive a car

In Commission Directive 2009/112/EC of 25 August 2009, point 6 of Annex III to Directive 91/439/EEC is amended as follows: '(…) Where there is reason to doubt that the applicant's vision is adequate, he/she shall be examined by a competent medical authority. At this examination attention shall be paid, in particular, to the following: visual acuity, field of vision, twilight vision, glare and contrast sensitivity, diplopia and other visual functions that can compromise safe driving.

For group 1 drivers, licensing may be considered in "exceptional cases" where the visual field standard or visual acuity standard cannot be met; in such cases the driver should undergo examination by a competent medical authority to demonstrate that there is no other impairment of visual function, including glare, contrast sensitivity and twilight vision. The driver or applicant should also be subject to a positive practical test conducted by a competent authority.'

The Commission thus explains that in 'exceptional cases' applicants can be subject to a practical driving test in order to assess the suitability of visually impaired applicants keeping their driving licence.

Does the Commission consider that applicants always have the right to take a driving test in cases where there are doubts as to whether their vision is good enough? Or does the Commission think that it is up to a competent medical authority to assess whether the applicant should be subject to a driving test?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(27 January 2014)

The minimum standards of physical and mental fitness for driving are defined in Annex III of the Diriving Licence Directive ([1]) and are essential to ensure road safety. Member States can always introduce stricter requirements for the licences they issue.

As regards the provision in the annex to which the Honourable Member is refering to, it is up to the Member States to determine which competent national authority decides when these 'exceptional cases' apply and when an applicant should be subject to an examination and practical test.

([1]) Directive 2006/126/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on driving licences (OJ L 403, 30.12.2006).

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-013479/13
til Kommissionen
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(27. november 2013)

Om: EU-rejsekort

Jeg hår fået en henvendelse fra en borger, der arbejder som rejseleder. Vedkommende er flere gange, når han har rejst med grupper, pensionister etc. i EU, blevet konfronteret med, at han skal have et EU-rejsekort for at opnå rabat på museer eller lignende attraktioner.

Når de har fremvist dansk pas, er de blevet afvist med henvisning til en EU-bestemmelse om et krav til et bestemt rejsekort.

Når jeg har kontaktet de danske myndigheder, kender de ikke til et sådant kort.

Kender Kommissionen til en bestemmelse om et EU-rejsekort, der kræves for at få gruppe- eller aldersrabat ved turistattraktioner i EU?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Michel Barnier
(30. januar 2014)

Kommissionen har ikke kendskab til eksistensen af et EU-rejsekort, der giver gruppe- eller aldersrabat ved turistattraktioner i EU.

Turistattraktioner i medlemsstaterne bør være tilgængelige for borgere, der er bosiddende i andre medlemsstater, uden forskelsbehandling. Navnlig skal alle differentieringer i adgangen til en tjenesteydelse, f.eks. prisforskelle, være begrundet i objektive kriterier i overensstemmelse med artikel 20, stk. 2, i direktiv 2006/123/EF (»servicedirektivet«).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013479/13
to the Commission
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: EU travel pass

I have been approached by a citizen who works as a courier and who, when travelling with groups, pensioners, etc. in the EU, has often been told that he has to have an EU travel pass in order to obtain discount rates for admission to museums and similar attractions.

When he has shown his Danish passport, he has been turned away and told that there is an EU provision requiring a particular travel pass.

I have contacted the Danish authorities; they are unaware of any such pass.

Is the Commission aware of any provision requiring an EU travel pass in order to obtain group or age-related discounts for tourist attractions in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(30 January 2014)

The Commission is not aware of the existence of any EU travel pass enabling group or age-related discounts for tourist attractions in the EU.

Tourist attractions in Member States should be accessible for citizens residing in other Member States in a non-discriminatory way. In particular, any differentiation in the access to the service, such as for example price differences, would require a justification by objective criteria in accordance with Article 20 (2) of Directive 2006/123/EC ('the Services Directive').

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-013480/13
til Kommissionen
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(27. november 2013)

Om: Stort kørekort til epileptikere

Af EU's 3. kørekortdirektiv fremgår det, at kørekort til køretøjer i gruppe 2 hverken må udstedes til eller fornyes for ansøgere og førere, der har eller kan få epileptiske anfald. Mange epileptikere er dog i den situation, at de ikke har haft anfald i mange år, og deres epilepsi er fuldstændig kontrollerbar, når de tager deres medicin korrekt. For nogle af dem har det været deres levebrød at køre lastbil, og de nye regler har således rigtig alvorlige konsekvenser.

Mit spørgsmål til Kommissionen er derfor:

Burde der ikke være mulighed for at søge dispensation, hvis man som epileptiker har været anfaldsfri i en længere periode eller årrække?

Hvilke overvejelser har man gjort sig omkring de konsekvenser, reglerne kan have for de epileptikere, der mister deres levebrød som følge af de nye regler?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Siim Kallas
(27. januar 2014)

Mindstekravene med hensyn til fysisk og psykisk egnethed til at føre motorkøretøj findes i bilag III til direktivet om køretøj ([1]).

I direktivet (i punkt 12.14 i bilag III hertil) fastlægges et krav til førere af køretøjer i erhvervsmæssigt øjemed om, at der skal være gået ti år uden anfald og uden indtagelse af medicin mod epilepsi. Nationale myndigheder kan tillade førere med gode prognoseindikatorer at køre tidligere.

Kommissionen vil gerne understrege, at medlemsstater kan indføre strengere krav, hvis de finder det nødvendigt.

Det primære formål med disse lægelige krav er at beskytte førere, der lider af epilepsi, samt andre trafikanter mod uheld, der skyldes, at føreren får et anfald under kørslen.

([1]) Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets direktiv 2006/126/EF af 20. december 2006 om kørekort (EUT L 403 af 30.12.2006).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013480/13
to the Commission
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Heavy vehicle driving licences for people with epilepsy

The Third EU Driving Licence Directive lays down that driving licences for Group 2 vehicles may not be issued or renewed for applicants and holders who suffer or may suffer from epileptic seizures. However, many people with epilepsy are in a situation where they have not had seizures for many years and their epilepsy is fully controllable when they take their medication correctly. For some of them driving a lorry has been their livelihood, so the new rules have really serious consequences for them.

I should therefore like to ask the Commission:

Should there not be the option for people with epilepsy who have been free from seizures for a long time, maybe a number of years, to apply for a dispensation?

What consideration has been given to the consequences the rules may have for people with epilepsy who lose their livelihoods as a result of the new rules?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(27 January 2014)

The minimum standards of physical and mental fitness for driving are provided for in Annex III of the Driving Licence Directive ([1]).

This directive lays down, in point 12.14 of its Annex III, the requirement for the professional drivers of a 10 years freedom from further seizures which has to be achieved without the aid of anti-epileptic drugs. National authorities may allow drivers with recognised good prognostic indicator to drive sooner.

The Commission would like to underline that Member States are allowed to introduce stricter requirements if they deem it appropriate.

These medical requirements have the primary objective to protect drivers with epilepsy as well as other road users from road accidents due to possible seizures at the wheel.

([1]) Directive 2006/126/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on driving licences (OJ L 403, 30.12.2006).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-013481/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Sharon Bowles (ALDE) και Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(27 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Δάνεια με προνομιακούς όρους και εξυπηρέτηση του χρέους των ελληνικών πολιτικών κομμάτων στην κυβέρνηση

Σε συνέχεια προηγούμενων γραπτών ερωτήσεων όσον αφορά την χρηματοδότηση ελληνικών πολιτικών κομμάτων (E-011048/2011 και P-002640/2013) και μετά την απάντηση του Υπουργού Εργασίας στο ελληνικό κοινοβούλιο, ο οποίος επιβεβαίωσε την ύπαρξη ληξιπρόθεσμων οφειλών εκ μέρους της Νέας Δημοκρατίας (ΝΔ) και του Πασόκ (ΠΑΣΟΚ), ύψους 360 000 ευρώ προς τον Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Κοινωνικής Ασφάλισης (ΙΚΑ), από τον παρελθόντα Ιούλιο το θέμα της εξυπηρέτησης των δανείων των πολιτικών κομμάτων επανέρχεται για άλλη μια φορά στην επικαιρότητα.

Τα δύο κόμματα του κυβερνητικού συνασπισμού εμφανίζονται να χρωστούν πάνω από 270 εκατομμύρια ευρώ σε ελληνικές τράπεζες, οι οποίες μετά την ανακεφαλαιοποίησή τους ελέγχονται από το κράτος σε ποσοστό περίπου 90%. Σύμφωνα με την απάντηση της Επιτροπής στις 12 Ιανουαρίου 2012, ανακύπτει πρόβλημα ηθικού κινδύνου σε σχέση με τα εν λόγω χρέη.

Το 2012, σε μία περίοδο περιορισμένης ρευστότητας όταν οι τράπεζες δεν ήταν σε θέση να χρηματοδοτήσουν ενυπόθηκα στεγαστικά και άλλου τύπου δάνεια, τα κόμματα του κυβερνητικού συνασπισμού, όπως προκύπτει από τους ισολογισμούς τους, έλαβαν περαιτέρω τραπεζική χρηματοδότηση ύψους 30 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ.

Σύμφωνα με την απάντηση της Επιτροπής της 18ης Απριλίου 2013, οι εποπτεύοντες εντολοδόχοι σε όλες τις υπό αναδιάρθρωση τράπεζες άρχισαν τη δραστηριότητά τους στις 16 Ιανουαρίου 2013, προκειμένου να εξασφαλίσουν συμμόρφωση με τις αρχές αμεροληψίας και ανεξαρτησίας από πολιτικές επιρροές (άρθρο 3.4.2 του μνημονίου συμφωνίας).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή: σύμφωνα με τα δεδομένα που διαθέτει η Επιτροπή από τους ελεγχόμενους από αυτήν εποπτεύοντες εντολοδόχους οι οποίοι ορίστηκαν στις υπό αναδιάρθρωση ελληνικές τράπεζες, εξακολουθούν τα δύο κόμματα του κυβερνητικού συνασπισμού να εξυπηρετούν τα χρέη τους (συμπεριλαμβανομένων των τόκων και των αποσβέσεων);

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Στο πλαίσιο της πρώτης αναθεώρησης του δεύτερου προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής της Ελλάδας, το Μνημόνιο Συνεννόησης για τους Ειδικούς Όρους της Οικονομικής Πολιτικής προβλέπει τον διορισμό εντολοδόχου παρακολούθησης σε όλες τις τράπεζες που τελούν υπό αναδιάρθρωση. Τον Ιανουάριο του 2013, οι εντολοδόχοι παρακολούθησης ξεκίνησαν εργασίες παρακολούθησης σε τέσσερις κεντρικές τράπεζες. Οι εντολοδόχοι επαληθεύουν την ορθή διακυβέρνηση και τη χρήση εμπορικών κριτηρίων σε σημαντικές αποφάσεις πολιτικής. Στο έργο της παρακολούθησης υπάγεται επίσης η διαδικασία έκδοσης νέων δανείων και η αναδιάρθρωση υφιστάμενων πιστώσεων προς τους συνδεδεμένους δανειολήπτες, συμπεριλαμβανομένων πολιτικών κομμάτων. Με βάση τα διαθέσιμα στοιχεία, από τον Ιανουάριο του 2013 δεν χορηγήθηκε κανένα νέο δάνειο σε πολιτικό κόμμα. Τρεις από τις τέσσερις υπό παρακολούθηση τράπεζες έχουν χορηγήσει δάνεια στα πολιτικά κόμματα που αναφέρετε στην ερώτησή σας. Η συντριπτική πλειονότητα των εν λόγω δανείων είναι μη εξυπηρετούμενα ήδη από τον Ιανουάριο του 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013481/13
to the Commission
Sharon Bowles (ALDE) and Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Privileged loans and debt servicing by Greek political parties in government

Following previous written questions concerning the financing of Greek political parties (E-011048/2011 and P-002640/2013) and the response to the Greek parliament of the Minister of Labour, who confirmed that New Democracy (ND) and the Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK) have had overdue debts amounting to EUR 360 000 to the national social security organisation (IKA) since July 2013, the question of the servicing of these political parties' loans is once again topical.

The two governing parties appear to owe a total of more than EUR 270 million to Greek banks, which, following their recapitalisation, are now about 90% state-controlled. The Commission's answer of 12 January 2012 refers to the moral hazard issue as arising in relation to these debts.

In 2012, a period of limited liquidity when the banks were unable to finance loans or mortgages, the governing parties, as is clear from their balance sheets, obtained additional bank funding of EUR 30 million.

According to the Commission's answer of 18 April 2013, the monitoring trustees in all banks under restructuring started their activity on 16 January 2013, in order to ensure compliance with the principles of fairness and independence from political influence (Section 3.4(2) of the memorandum of understanding).

According to the data held by the Commission-controlled monitoring trustees appointed to the restructured Greek banks, are the two governing parties still servicing their debts (interest and amortisation included)?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(7 February 2014)

In the context of the 1st review under the 2nd economic adjustment programme for Greece, the memorandum of understanding on Specific Economic Policy Conditionality provided for the appointment of a monitoring trustee in all banks under restructuring. In January 2013 the monitoring trustees started to monitor four pillar banks. The trustees are verifying proper governance and the use of commercial criteria in key policy decisions. This includes also monitoring the process of new lending and restructuring of existing loans of the connected borrowers including political parties. Based on the available information no new loan to a political party has been granted since January 2013. Three of the four monitored banks hold loans to the political parties described in your question. The vast majority of these loans are non-performing, as they were already in January 2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013482/13
alla Commissione
Giommaria Uggias (ALDE)
(27 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Attivazione del Fondo di solidarietà per l'alluvione in Sardegna

Nei giorni scorsi la regione italiana della Sardegna è stata colpita da una catastrofe naturale di gravissime proporzioni. Un ciclone ha infatti causato violentissime alluvioni su tutto il territorio regionale, causando 16 vittime, 1 disperso e migliaia di sfollati, nonché danni ingentissimi alle infrastrutture e alla popolazione.

In considerazione di quanto segue:

— questo evento atmosferico eccezionale ha avuto un impatto drammatico sul territorio regionale, causando profonde e ripercussioni probabilmente durevoli sulle condizioni di vita dei cittadini e sulla stabilità economica della regione stessa;

— le zone colpite hanno subito gravissimi danni dal punto di vista infrastrutturale; in particolare è stato significativamente compromesso il sistema dei trasporti con danni ingenti alle strade, ai ponti e alla rete ferroviaria che risultano in molti tratti inagibili a causa delle frane e degli smottamenti;

— l'alluvione ha colpito con violenza i centri abitati causando l'inagibilità di un numero particolarmente elevato di abitazioni;

— l'alluvione ha altresì causato ingenti danni all'agricoltura e ha anche danneggiato fabbriche, aziende artigiane e commerciali, con gravissime ricadute negative sul sistema produttivo della Sardegna;

— la catastrofe naturale ha inoltre coinvolto siti di notevole interesse culturale e paesaggistico e, tra questi, il deposito archeologico delle navi romane di Olbia.

Si chiede alla Commissione se le autorità italiane hanno presentato domanda di attivazione del Fondo di solidarietà dell'UE di cui al regolamento (CE) n. 2012/2002 e quali procedure sono state da essa attivate per fornire interventi di solidarietà economica alle popolazioni della Sardegna?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(3 febbraio 2014)

La Commissione è perfettamente a conoscenza della situazione in Sardegna ed è in contatto con le autorità regionali e nazionali sin dal manifestarsi della catastrofe. Per mobilitare il Fondo di solidarietà le autorità nazionali italiane devono presentare una domanda alla Commissione entro dieci settimane dal verificarsi della catastrofe, vale a dire entro il 27 gennaio in funzione della data del primo danno causato. Il dipartimento nazionale della Protezione civile, che conosce molto bene le condizioni e le procedure del Fondo di solidarietà, ha comunicato che intende presentare domanda. La Commissione è pronta a fornire ulteriori orientamenti e consigli se verrà richiesto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013482/13
to the Commission
Giommaria Uggias (ALDE)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Mobilisation of the Solidarity Fund for the floods in Sardinia

The Italian region of Sardinia was recently hit by an extremely severe natural disaster when a cyclone caused violent flash floods across the region. Sixteen people died, one person is missing and thousands more are displaced, while extensive damage has been caused to infrastructure and the population.

This exceptional weather event has had a serious, and most probably lasting, impact on local living conditions and the economic stability of the region.

Serious damage has been caused to infrastructure in the areas affected; in particular the transport system has been significantly affected by the extensive damage caused to roads, bridges and railway lines, many of which have had to be closed because of landslides.

The flooding has caused havoc in built-up areas, and a particularly large number of homes are now uninhabitable.

The flooding has also caused extensive damage to farms, as well as factories, handicraft businesses and commercial enterprises, with very serious consequences for the Sardinian production system.

A number of sites of major cultural and scenic importance, including the archaeological remains of Roman ships at Olbia, have also been affected by the natural disaster.

Can the Commission say whether the Italian authorities have submitted a request for the EU Solidarity Fund to be mobilised under Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002, and what steps has the Commission taken to provide financial support to the people of Sardinia?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(3 February 2014)

The Commission is fully aware of the situation in Sardinia and has been in contact with the authorities at regional and national level from the outset of the disaster. In order to mobilise the Solidarity Fund, the national Italian authorities need to present an application to the Commission within 10 weeks of the start of the disaster, i.e. by 27 January depending on the date of the first damage caused. The national Civil Protection Department — which is very familiar with the conditions and procedures of the Solidarity Fund — has communicated that they intend making an application. The Commission stands ready to give further guidance and advice, if required.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-013483/13
do Komisji
Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)
(27 listopada 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Kwestia dot. interpretacji przepisów art. 49 ust. 4 rozporządzenia wykonawczego Komisji (UE) nr 543/2011

Proszę o wyjaśnienie czy i w jakich przypadkach i okolicznościach, nie naruszając przepisów art. 103a ust. 1 lit. b rozporządzenia (WE) nr 1234/2007 mówiących, że w planie dochodzenia do uznania za organizację producentów owoców i warzyw muszą znaleźć się tylko te inwestycje, które są niezbędne do uznania, możliwe jest (zgodnie z art. 49 ust. 3 rozporządzenia wykonawczego Komisji (UE) nr 543/2011) uznanie za organizację producentów owoców i warzyw grupy, która nie zrealizowała wszystkich niezbędnych do uznania, zakwalifikowanych do realizacji z wykorzystaniem wsparcia finansowego UE inwestycji zatwierdzonych w planie dochodzenia do uznania i przeniosła do programu operacyjnego ww. niezrealizowane inwestycje bez zmiany zatwierdzonego planu dochodzenia do uznania?

Jednocześnie proszę o wyjaśnienie, do kogo (do organu czy do podmiotu, który był grupą) skierowany jest przepis art. 49 ust. 4 rozporządzenia 543/2011, tj., kogo dotyczy czteromiesięczny termin, o którym mowa w tym przepisie? Czy dotrzymanie ww. terminu leży na podmiocie, który był grupą producentów czy na organie wydającym decyzję o ewentualnym uznaniu za organizację producentów tej byłej grupy?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Daciana Cioloşa w imieniu Komisji
(29 stycznia 2014 r.)

Istnieje szereg sposobów, w jakie grupy producentów, które nie zrealizowały wszystkich inwestycji zawartych w ich planach uznawania, mogą jednak spełnić kryteria uznawania.

Na mocy art. 25 rozporządzenia (UE) nr 543/2011 ([1]) organizacja producentów, która jest uznana w odniesieniu do produktu wymagającego zapewnienia środków technicznych, uznawana jest za wywiązującą się ze swoich zobowiązań, jeżeli zapewnia odpowiednie środki techniczne sama lub za pośrednictwem swoich członków bądź poprzez spółki zależne lub outsourcing.

W związku z tym, jeżeli dodatkowi członkowie przystępujący do grupy producentów mogą jej zapewnić te środki techniczne, niektóre z inwestycji przewidzianych w pierwotnym planie uznawania mogą okazać się niepotrzebne. Tak samo jest w przypadku, gdy producenci postanowią, że z ekonomicznego punktu widzenia outsourcing pewnych form działalności jest korzystniejszy niż dokonywanie niezbędnych inwestycji. Biorąc pod uwagę fakt, że plan uznawania obejmuje maksymalnie okres pięciu lat, w trakcie wdrażania programu może się jednak okazać, że potrzeby inwestycyjne zostały wstępnie zawyżone.

Zgodnie z art. 49 ust. 4 tegoż rozporządzenia, to państwo członkowskie ustala okres, rozpoczynający się po zrealizowaniu planu uznawania, w którym była grupa producentów musi zostać uznana za organizację producentów. Oznacza to, że po zrealizowaniu planu uznawania, była grupa producentów musi się ubiegać o takie uznanie przez właściwy organ państwa członkowskiego i uzyskać je w wymienionym terminie.

([1]) Dz.U. L 157 z 15.6.2011, s. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013483/13
to the Commission
Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Interpreting the provisions of Article 49(4) of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 543/2011

Could the Commission please explain whether and in what cases and circumstances, without prejudice to the provisions of Article 103a(1) point (b) of Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007, which refers to the fact that the recognition plans for fruit and vegetable producer organisations may only include those investments required to attain recognition, it would be possible — pursuant to Article 49(3) of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 543/2011 — for a fruit and vegetable producer group to be recognised as an organisation even if it had not carried out all of the investments set out in the recognition plan that are required for recognition and eligible for EU financial support and had transferred the aforementioned unimplemented investments to an operational programme without modifying the already-approved recognition plan?

Could the Commission please also explain to whom (to a government agency or to the entity that used to be a group) Article 49(4) of Regulation 543/2011 is directed — that is to say, whom does the four-month period concern? Is it incumbent upon the entity that used to be a producer group or to the government agency issuing the decision on recognising the former group as a producer organisation to adhere to the aforementioned deadline?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

There are several possibilities for a producer group that has not implemented all the investments in their recognition plan to nevertheless fulfil the recognition criteria.

According to Article 25 of Regulation (EU) No 543/2011 ([1]), a producer organisation, which is recognised for a product for which the provision of technical means is necessary, shall be considered to fulfil its obligation where it provides an adequate level of technical means itself, through its members, through subsidiaries, or by outsourcing.

In this context, if additional members who join the producer group can provide these technical means to the producer group, some of the investments foreseen in the original recognition plan might no longer be needed. The same is true if the producers decide that it is economically more interesting to outsource a certain activity instead of making the necessary investments. Given the fact that a recognition plan covers a maximum period of five years, it is also possible that during the implementation of the programme it becomes evident that the investment needs had been initially over-estimated.

According to Article 49(4) of that regulation, the former producer group must obtain recognition as a producer organisation within the deadline fixed by the Member State. This means that after the end of the implementation of the recognition plan, the recognition has to be requested by the former producer group and granted by the competent authority of the Member State within this deadline.

([1]) OJ L 157, 15.6.2011.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-013484/13
do Komisji
Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)
(27 listopada 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Kwestia dotycząca rozliczania zakupu drzewek w programach operacyjnych

Zgodnie z pkt. 1 załącznika IX do rozporządzenia wykonawczego Komisji (UE) nr 543/2011 z dnia 7 czerwca 2011 r. ustanawiającego szczegółowe zasady stosowania rozporządzenia Rady (WE) nr 1234/2007 w odniesieniu do sektora owoców i warzyw oraz sektora przetworzonych owoców i warzyw, co do zasady, ogólne koszty produkcji ponoszone przez organizację producentów nie kwalifikują się do objęcia pomocą finansową. Wyjątek stanowią m.in. koszty szczególne związane ze środkami na rzecz poprawy jakości. We wszystkich przypadkach nie kwalifikują się koszty grzybni (nawet certyfikowanej), nasion ani roślin innych niż wieloletnie.

W związku z powyższym, mając na uwadze, że np. założenie sadu ma charakter inwestycji, proszę o wyjaśnienie czy do zakupu drzewek sadowniczych (roślin wieloletnich) w ramach ww. działania, w celu obliczenia pomocy należy:

1. zakwalifikować do wsparcia całkowity koszt zakupu drzewek, czy też

2. uwzględnić wyłącznie koszty szczególne (określone jako różnica pomiędzy kosztami standardowymi i kosztami faktycznie poniesionymi, o których mowa w załączniku IX ust. 1 tiret 1 do rozrządzenia wykonawczego Komisji (UE) nr 543/2011)?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Daciana Cioloşa w imieniu Komisji
(20 stycznia 2014 r.)

Jak ustanowiono w art. 60 ust. 6 rozporządzenia wykonawczego Komisji (UE) nr 543/2011 ([1]), inwestycje w przypadku drzew owocowych, bez względu na to, czy są to szkółki drzew czy też nie, mogą być realizowane, pod warunkiem że przyczyniają się do realizacji celów programów operacyjnych zgodnie z art. 103c rozporządzenia Rady (WE) nr 1234/2007 ([2]) (np. planowanie produkcji). Inwestycje te, w tym działania związane z ich realizacją, takie jak karczowanie, przygotowanie gleby, przesadzanie, wydatki na pracowników i/lub zakup roślin potwierdzone wystawieniem niepowtarzalnej faktury za realizację inwestycji, kwalifikują się w pełni do wsparcia UE.

Ogólne koszty produkcji oraz koszty osobowe nie kwalifikują się jednak do wsparcia, z wyjątkiem przypadków, o których mowa w pkt 1 oraz pkt 2 lit. b) ppkt (i) i (ii) załącznika IX do rozporządzenia wykonawczego Komisji (UE) nr 543/2011. Określenie konkretnych kosztów ma zastosowanie do tych wyjątków.

([1]) Dz.U. L 157 z 15.6.2011.
([2]) Dz.U. L 299 z 16.11.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013484/13
to the Commission
Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Accounting for tree purchases in operational programmes

Pursuant to point 1 of Annex IX to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 543/2011 of 7 June 2011 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 in respect of the fruit and vegetables and processed fruit and vegetables sectors, general production costs borne by producer organisations are in principle ineligible for financial assistance. However, specific costs linked with quality improvement measures are an exception to this rule. In all cases, costs for (even certified) mycelium, seeds and non-perennial plants are not eligible.

In this connection, and given that establishing an orchard bears the characteristics of an investment, could the Commission please explain which of the following should be done in order to calculate the amount of assistance when purchasing fruit trees (perennial plants) as part of the aforementioned programme:

1. submit the entire cost of purchasing the trees for assistance, or

2. take account solely of the specific costs (defined as the difference between theconventional costs and the costs actually incurred, as referred to in Annex IX(1), indent 1to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 543/2011)?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(20 January 2014)

Investments in fruit trees, whether nursery trees or not, may be implemented provided that they contribute to the objectives of the operational programmes under Article 103c of Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 ([1]) (for instance planning of production) as it is established in Article 60(6) of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 543/2011 ([2]). These investments, including operations linked to their implementation such as grubbing-up, soil preparation, replanting, labour force and/or purchase of plants evidenced by means of a unique invoice for the investment, are fully eligible for EU support.

General production and personnel costs, however, are not eligible except in the cases mentioned in point 1 and (2)(b)(i) and (2)(b)(ii) respectively, of Annex IX to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 543/2011. The definition of specific costs applies to those exceptions.

([1]) OJ L 299, 16.11.2007.
([2]) OJ L 157, 15.6.2011.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-013485/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(27 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Θεσμικό πλαίσιο προστασίας των «Πληροφοριοδοτών» — Whistleblowers

Τα εκτεταμένα περιστατικά αδιαφάνειας και διαφθοράς, καθώς και σωρεία περιπτώσεων όπου παραβιάζονται τα ελάχιστα πρότυπα ή οι νόμιμες πρακτικές σε εργασιακό, περιβαλλοντικό και οικονομικό επίπεδο, στο πλαίσιο είτε της λειτουργίας των επιχειρήσεων και των δημόσιων υπηρεσιών είτε της διεξαγωγής δημόσιων και ιδιωτικών έργων, καταδεικνύουν, αφενός, την ανάγκη εντατικοποίησης των ελέγχων με την παράλληλη ενίσχυση των ελεγκτικών μηχανισμών και, αφετέρου, ότι το κόστος τέτοιου είδους εγκληματικών παραβάσεων θέτει εν αμφιβόλω θεμελιώδη ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα, δημιουργώντας στρεβλώσεις στην εύρυθμη οικονομική, παραγωγική και, κατ' επέκταση, αναπτυξιακή δραστηριότητα με συνέπεια τη διαμόρφωση μιας αγοράς «πολλών ταχυτήτων» έξω από τους υφιστάμενους νόμους και κανόνες. Πολλές τέτοιες περιπτώσεις εντοπίστηκαν με τη βοήθεια εργαζομένων/πληροφοριοδοτών (whistleblowers) που δείχνουν σθένος και προχωρούν σε καταγγελίες παραβατικών πρακτικών ή συμπεριφορών αψηφώντας το οικονομικό, επαγγελματικό, κοινωνικό και οικονομικό κόστος.

Σε αυτήν την κατεύθυνση ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Πόσες τέτοιες περιπτώσεις έχουν καταγραφεί στην ΕΕ από την αρχή της κρίσης τόσο στο δημόσιο όσο και στον ιδιωτικό τομέα;

— Ποιες ευρωπαϊκές χώρες έχουν θεσπίσει νομοθετικό πλαίσιο που προστατεύει τους πληροφοριοδότες (whistleblowers); Τι περιλαμβάνει αυτή η προστασία (αναφέρονται ενδεικτικά: προστασία έναντι απόλυσης, προστασία στοιχείων/προσωπικών δεδομένων, οικονομική αποζημίωση); Ισχύει για όλους τους κλάδους ιδιωτικών, κρατικών και δημοσίων δραστηριοτήτων;

— Εξετάζει τη θεσμοθέτηση ενός ελάχιστου προτύπου προστασίας σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο με την εκπόνηση σχετικής πρότασης οδηγίας για την προστασία των πληροφοριοδοτών (whistleblowers); Υπάρχει νομική βάση για κάτι τέτοιο;

Απάντηση της κ. Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(14 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει καταγεγραμμένα αρχεία περιπτώσεων πληροφοριοδοτών (whistleblowing) στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ. Επί του παρόντος η Επιτροπή δεν εκπονεί νομοθετική πρόταση στον τομέα αυτό. Ωστόσο, η πρώτη έκθεση της ΕΕ για την καταπολέμηση της διαφθοράς, που εκδόθηκε στις 3 Φεβρουαρίου 2014 (COM(2014)38 τελικό), εξέτασε τα τελικά αποτελέσματα και τον αντίκτυπο των συνολικών προσπαθειών που καταβάλλονται κατά της διαφθοράς, καθώς και ό,τι αφορά την προστασία πληροφοριοδοτών.

Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι η αποτελεσματική προστασία πληροφοριοδοτών από αντίποινα αποτελεί βασική πτυχή των πολιτικών για την καταπολέμηση της διαφθοράς. Η Επιτροπή έχει ήδη στηρίξει μέσω των προγραμμάτων της δύο διαδοχικές μελέτες που εκπονήθηκαν από την οργάνωση «Διεθνής Διαφάνεια» (Transparency International) σχετικά με τους υφιστάμενους μηχανισμούς προστασίας στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ. Η πρώτη μελέτη ολοκληρώθηκε στις αρχές του 2010 και κάλυπτε 10 κράτη μέλη, ενώ η πλέον πρόσφατη μελέτη δημοσιεύθηκε στις αρχές του Νοεμβρίου 2013 και καλύπτει όλα τα κράτη μέλη ([1]). Η νέα μελέτη εξέτασε τις αρχές ορθής πρακτικής όσον αφορά τη νομοθεσία σχετικά με τους πληροφοριοδότες και αξιολόγησε την σχετική τρέχουσα νομοθεσία σε όλη την ΕΕ σε σχέση με τις αρχές αυτές.

Τα πορίσματα της έκθεσης της ΕΕ για την καταπολέμηση της διαφθοράς, σε συνδυασμό με τα συμπεράσματα της προαναφερθείσας πρόσφατης μελέτης, θα ληφθούν υπόψη από την Επιτροπή όταν θα εξετάσει, σε μεσοπρόθεσμη βάση, την αναγκαιότητα περαιτέρω δράσης στο επίπεδο της ΕΕ στον τομέα αυτό.

([1]) http://issuu.com/transparencyinternational/docs/2013_whistleblowingineurope_en

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013485/13
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Institutional framework for the protection of whistleblowers

Incidents involving corruption and a lack of transparency are commonplace, and there have been a multitude of cases in which minimum standards or legal practices have been violated in an employment, environmental and economic context, both in private companies and the public services and in the handling of public and private projects. This demonstrates, on the one hand, the need to intensify controls while enhancing control mechanisms and, on the other, that such criminal offences compromise fundamental human rights, creating distortions in the smooth functioning of economic, productive and, by extension, development activities in Greece; this is creating a 'multispeed' market operating outside existing laws and rules. Many such cases have been identified with the help of employee-whistleblowers who have demonstrated courage in denouncing violations and non-compliant behaviour in defiance of the economic, professional, social and economic cost of their actions.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

— How many such cases have been recorded in the EU since the beginning of the crisis in both the public and the private sectors?

— Which European countries have adopted a legal framework to protect whistleblowers? What does this protection involve (for instance: protection against dismissal, data/privacy protection, financial compensation)? Does it apply to all sectors of private, state and public activities?

— Will it consider adopting a minimum standard of protection at European level by drawing up a proposal for a directive on the protection of whistleblowers? Is there any legal basis for so doing?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(14 February 2014)

The Commission does not hold any records of whistleblowing cases registered in EU Member States. Currently the Commission is not preparing any legislative proposal in this area. However, the first EU Anti-Corruption Report, adopted on 3 February 2014 (COM(2014) 38 final), looked into the end-results and impact of the anti-corruption efforts as a whole, including in relation to protection of whistleblowers.

The Commission believes that effective protection of whistleblowers against retaliation is a key element of anti-corruption policies. The Commission has already supported through its programmes two consecutive studies conducted by Transparency International on the existing protection mechanisms in the EU Member States. The first study was finalised at the beginning of 2010 and covered 10 Member States, while the most recent one was published at the beginning of November 2013, covering all Member States ([1]). The new study looked into good practice principles for whistleblower legislation and assessed current legislation on whistleblowing across the EU against these principles.

The findings of the EU Anti-Corruption Report, jointly with the conclusions of the abovementioned recent study, will be considered by the Commission when analysing in the medium term whether further action at EU level is necessary in this area.

([1]) http://issuu.com/transparencyinternational/docs/2013_whistleblowingineurope_en

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013486/13
alla Commissione
Pino Arlacchi (S&D)
(27 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Campo di Harmanli in Bulgaria

Stando a un rapporto pubblicato da Amnesty International il 19 novembre 2013, la situazione dei diritti umani nel campo di Harmanli, nel sud-est della Bulgaria, dove circa 1 000 richiedenti asilo sono detenuti in un'ex base militare, sono deplorevoli e peggiorano ogni giorno. I richiedenti asilo alloggiano in containers di metallo, tende e in un edificio fatiscente, mentre l'inverno si avvicina a grandi passi.

Benché il campo di Harmanli sia già affollato, le autorità bulgare continuano a inviarvi nuovi richiedenti asilo. La settimana scorsa i ricercatori di Amnesty International hanno assistito all'arrivo di un gruppo di uomini siriani. I nuovi arrivati hanno ricevuto solo un fragile materasso e due sottili coperte umide.

I residenti del campo non sono autorizzati a uscire per comprare il cibo essenziale. Devono invece fare affidamento su una fornitura di alimenti di base come patate, riso e pane. Molti di loro vivono in queste condizioni già da un mese. Ai sensi del diritto internazionale, i residenti hanno il diritto di accesso immediato alle procedure di asilo adeguate. Le autorità bulgare sono inoltre obbligate per legge a garantire che i richiedenti asilo abbiano accesso a beni di prima necessità come cibo adeguato, riparo e servizi igienico-sanitari.

Alla luce di quanto sopra:

1. quali azioni intende la Commissione adottare?

2. Può la Commissione valutare se sia opportuno intraprendere eventuali azioni volte a far sì che la Bulgaria rispetti gli obblighi assunti nell'ambito della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'UE?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(21 gennaio 2014)

La Commissione, assistita da Frontex e dall'Ufficio europeo di sostegno per l'asilo, segue da vicino la situazione negli Stati membri i cui sistemi di asilo sono, o potrebbero essere, esposti a pressioni dovute a un aumento dell'afflusso di cittadini siriani o di altri gruppi di migranti o di richiedenti asilo. La Bulgaria è tra questi Stati.

La Commissione è già da tempo in stretto contatto con le autorità bulgare per discutere le eventuali misure da prendere e l'eventuale sostegno dell'UE. L'allargamento e il miglioramento delle capacità di accoglienza e la capacità delle autorità bulgare di trattare le richieste di protezione in maniera tempestiva ed adeguata figurano tra le priorità individuate con le autorità bulgare.

La Commissione fornisce alla Bulgaria circa 8 milioni di euro in finanziamenti di emergenza per sostenere il paese nella gestione del maggiore afflusso di richiedenti asilo e migliorare la situazione in loco. Un importante obiettivo di questo finanziamento sarà quello di aumentare e migliorare le capacità di accoglienza e di alloggio dei richiedenti asilo. Inoltre, l'Ufficio europeo di sostegno per l'asilo ha firmato un piano operativo con la Bulgaria, che consente l'impiego di esperti distaccati da altri Stati membri per sostenere le autorità bulgare in loco. I gruppi di esperti sono già operativi.

La Commissione monitora da vicino l'utilizzazione fatta dalle autorità bulgare del sostegno fornito e il rispetto, da parte della Bulgaria, degli obblighi che le incombono a norma del diritto dell'UE. In quanto custode dei trattati, la Commissione non esiterà ad adottare le misure opportune per garantire la piena conformità dalla Bulgaria con il diritto dell'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013486/13
to the Commission
Pino Arlacchi (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Harmanli camp in Bulgaria

According to a report released by Amnesty international on 19 November 2013, the human rights situation in the Harmanli camp in south-eastern Bulgaria, where around 1 000 asylum-seekers are being detained on a former military base, are deplorable and worsening every day. The asylum-seekers are being held in metal containers, tents and a dilapidated building, with winter rapidly approaching.

Although the Harmanli camp is already crowded, the Bulgarian authorities are continuing to send new asylum-seekers there. Last week, Amnesty International researchers witnessed the arrival of a group of Syrian men. The newcomers were given nothing more than a flimsy mattress and two thin, damp blankets.

The camp's residents are not allowed to leave to buy essential food. Instead, they have to rely on a supply of staples like potatoes, rice and bread. Many of them have been living in these conditions for as long as a month. Under international law they are entitled to have immediate access to proper asylum procedures. The Bulgarian authorities are also obliged by law to ensure that asylum-seekers have access to basic necessities such as proper food, shelter and sanitation.

Given the above:

1. What action is the Commission planning to take?

2. Can the Commission evaluate whether any action should be taken to ensure that Bulgaria fulfils its obligations under the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights?

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

The Commission, assisted by Frontex and the European Asylum Support Office (EASO) , is closely following the situation in the Member States whose asylum systems are, or could come, under pressure due to an increased inflow of Syrian nationals or other groups of migrants and/or asylum-seekers. Bulgaria is one of these Member States.

The Commission has already for some time been in close contact with the Bulgarian authorities to discuss possible measures that could be taken, as well as possible support from the EU. Enlargement and improvement of reception capacities, as well as the capacity of the Bulgarian authorities to process requests for protection in a timely and adequate manner, were identified, together with the Bulgarian authorities, as priorities.

The Commission is providing some EUR 8 million in emergency funding to Bulgaria to support the country in managing the increased influx of asylum-seekers and improve the situation on the ground. A notable goal of this funding will be to increase and improve reception and accommodation capacity for asylum-seekers. In addition, EASO has signed an Operational Plan with Bulgaria, allowing for the deployment of experts seconded by other Member States to support the Bulgarian authorities on the ground. The teams of experts are already operational.

The Commission is closely monitoring the use made by the Bulgarian authorities of the support provided and compliance by Bulgaria with its obligations under the EC law. As guardian of the Treaties, the Commission will not hesitate to take the appropriate steps to ensure full compliance by Bulgaria with EC law.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-013487/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(27 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Συμφωνίες ΕΕ-Κίνας

Στη 16η σύνοδο κορυφής ΕΕ-Κίνας, η ΕΕ ευελπιστεί ότι θα διευρύνει και θα εμβαθύνει την ολοένα και αυξανόμενη συνεργασία της με την Κίνα, η οποία έχει αναπτυχθεί με την πάροδο των ετών. Στόχος είναι να υπογραφεί διμερής επενδυτική συμφωνία, καθώς και να προωθηθεί ο διάλογος σχετικά με την κλιματική αλλαγή και την αύξηση των επενδύσεων και της καινοτομίας.

Σε τι ενέργειες προτίθεται να προβεί η Επιτροπή, προκειμένου να προωθήσει την πράσινη ανάπτυξη, η οποία είναι επίσης σημαντική για τις δύο πλευρές και η οποία θα συμβάλει στη βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη της παγκόσμιας οικονομίας;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Στην 16η διάσκεψη κορυφής ΕΕ-Κίνας και τα δύο συμβαλλόμενα μέρη συμφώνησαν ότι ένας κόσμος που είναι ασφαλής και ευημερεί πρέπει επίσης να βασίζεται στην πράσινη και βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη. Το στρατηγικό θεματολόγιο συνεργασίας ΕΕ-Κίνας 2020 καθορίζει τον κοινό στόχο για την προώθηση της συνολικής στρατηγικής εταιρικής σχέσης ΕΕ-Κίνας κατά τα επόμενα έτη. Η πράσινη ανάπτυξη θα αποτελέσει βασικό τομέα της στρατηγικής και πρακτικής συνεργασίας και η ΕΕ και η Κίνα έχουν δεσμευτεί για την προώθηση της συνεργασίας σε περιβαλλοντικές εμβληματικές πρωτοβουλίες με στόχο τη μεγιστοποίηση των συνεργιών μεταξύ του οικολογικού πολιτισμού της Κίνας και των θεμάτων που αφορούν την αποδοτική χρήση των πόρων στην ΕΕ. Και οι δύο πλευρές συμφώνησαν επίσης ότι έχουν κοινή ευθύνη για την προώθηση της βιώσιμης ανάπτυξης σε παγκόσμια κλίμακα και δεσμεύτηκαν να ενισχύσουν τη συνεργασία τους μέσω πολυμερών μηχανισμών και πλαισίων.

Μέσω της διμερούς μας συνεργασίας με την Κίνα, η πράσινη ανάπτυξη θα προωθηθεί με την ενίσχυση της συνεργασίας σε τεχνολογίες χαμηλών εκπομπών διοξειδίου του άνθρακα και υψηλής ενεργειακής απόδοσης, ενισχύοντας τη συνεργασία στη βιώσιμη γεωργική παραγωγή, αντιμετωπίζοντας τα ζητήματα που αφορούν την ατμόσφαιρα και τα ύδατα και προωθώντας τη διατήρηση και τη βιώσιμη χρήση των δασών και της βιοποικιλότητας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013487/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: EU-China deals

The EU is hoping to widen and deepen the increasing cooperation which it has developed over the years with China at the 16th EU-China summit. The aim is to sign a Bilateral Investment Agreement and to advance talks on climate change and increasing investment and innovation.

What action is the Commission taking to promote green growth, which is also important for both sides and would contribute to the sustainable growth of the global economy?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 February 2014)

At the 16th EU-China Summit both parties agreed that a safe and prosperous world also needs to be based on green and sustainable growth. The EU-China 2020 Strategic Agenda for Cooperation sets out the shared aim to take forward the EU-China Comprehensive Strategic Partnership over the coming years. Green growth will be a key area of strategic and practical cooperation and the EU and China are committed to promoting cooperation on environmental flagship initiatives with a view to maximising the synergies between China's ecological civilisation and the EU's resource efficiency agenda. Both sides also agreed that they have a common responsibility for advancing global sustainable development and committed to enhancing their cooperation within the multilateral mechanisms and frameworks.

Through our bilateral partnership with China green growth will be promoted by furthering cooperation in low-carbon and energy efficient technologies, strengthening collaboration in sustainable agricultural production, tackling air and water issues and by promoting the conservation and sustainable use of forests and biodiversity.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-013488/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(27 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Πλεόνασμα και έλλειμμα

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση των 27 κατέγραψε πλεόνασμα ύψους 59,9 δισ. ευρώ στις εμπορικές συναλλαγές με τις ΗΠΑ, έλλειμμα ύψους 85,1 δισ. ευρώ στις εμπορικές συναλλαγές με την Κίνα, καθώς και αντίστοιχο έλλειμμα ύψους 58,6 δισ. ευρώ με τη Ρωσία.

Τι μέτρα λαμβάνει η Επιτροπή έτσι προκειμένου να επιτύχει μεγαλύτερη ισορροπία όσον αφορά τις εμπορικές συναλλαγές με την Κίνα και την Ρωσία;

Απάντηση του κ. De Gucht εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Στον σημερινό κόσμο των παγκόσμιων αλυσίδων αξιών, τα αγαθά δεν παράγονται πλέον σε μία μόνο χώρα. Οι ευρωπαϊκές επιχειρήσεις έχουν ενσωματωθεί πλήρως στις παγκόσμιες αλυσίδες παραγωγής. Συνεπώς, η εξέταση μόνο των εμπορικών ισοζυγίων με μεμονωμένες χώρες δεν παρέχει πλήρη εικόνα των εμπορικών σχέσεων της ΕΕ με τον υπόλοιπο κόσμο. Στην πραγματικότητα, εκτός από τις εισαγωγές πετρελαίου, η ΕΕ καταγράφει ολοένα και περισσότερα πλεονάσματα μεταποιημένων προϊόντων, γεγονός που δείχνει την ανταγωνιστικότητα της ΕΕ σε παγκόσμιο επίπεδο.

Κατά τη διάρκεια των διαπραγματεύσεων για την πρόσφατη προσχώρηση της Ρωσίας στον Παγκόσμιο Οργανισμό Εμπορίου (ΠΟΕ), η Επιτροπή εξασφάλισε μεγαλύτερη πρόσβαση στις αγορές για τις επιχειρήσεις της ΕΕ. Η Επιτροπή συνεχίζει να εξετάζει τα προστατευτικά εμπορικά μέτρα της Ρωσίας και κίνησε διαδικασία επίλυσης των διαφορών του ΠΟΕ κατά του μεροληπτικού τέλους ανακύκλωσης των αυτοκινήτων που επιβάλλει η Ρωσία. Εξάλλου, το 2008 η ΕΕ και η Ρωσία άρχισαν διαπραγματεύσεις για μια νέα συμφωνία με σκοπό να βελτιωθεί η κανονιστική σύγκλιση.

Ενώ στόχος της εμπορικής πολιτικής της ΕΕ δεν θα πρέπει να είναι η επιδίωξη ισοζυγίου των διμερών συναλλαγών με μεμονωμένες χώρες, η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι υπάρχει ανάγκη να αντιμετωπιστεί η έλλειψη ισορροπίας σχετικά με την αμοιβαία πρόσβαση στην αγορά όσον αφορά την Κίνα, εστιάζοντας στα εμπόδια πρόσβασης στην αγορά για εξαγωγές και επενδύσεις της ΕΕ σε συγκεκριμένους τομείς όπως: απαιτήσεις του ΠΟΕ, δικαιώματα διανοητικής ιδιοκτησίας, επενδύσεις, πρόσβαση στην αγορά, επιδοτήσεις, εξαγωγικές πιστώσεις, πρότυπα, κρατικές επιχειρήσεις, υπηρεσίες, και διαφάνεια και προβλεψιμότητα της κυβέρνησης.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013488/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Surplus and deficit

The EU-27 recorded a surplus of EUR 59.9 billion in trade with the US, a deficit of EUR 85.1 billion in trade with China and a deficit of EUR 58.6 billion in trade with Russia.

What actions is the Commission taking in order to achieve more balanced trade figures with China and Russia?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(6 February 2014)

In today's world of global value chains, goods are no longer produced in one single country. European companies are deeply integrated in global production chains. Therefore, looking only at trade balances with individual countries does not offer a full picture of the EU's trade relations with the rest of the world. In fact, excluding oil imports, the EU is recording ever increasing surpluses of manufactured goods, which underlines the EU`s competitiveness worldwide.

During the negotiation process for Russia`s recent accession to the World Trade Organisation (WTO), the Commission ensured enhanced market access for EU businesses. The Commission continues to address Russia`s trade protectionist measures and launched a WTO dispute settlement proceeding against the discriminatory Russian car recycling fee. Besides, the EU and Russia started negotiations in 2008 on a New Agreement with a view to improve regulatory convergence.

While the purpose of EU trade policy should not be to pursue a balance in bilateral trade with individual countries, the Commission believes that there is a need to tackle the imbalance in mutual market access with regard to China, by focusing on market access barriers for EU exports and investments in specific areas such as WTO compliance, intellectual property rights, investment, market access, subsidies, export credits, standards, state-owned enterprises, services, and transparency and predictability in government.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-013489/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(27 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Η προσεχής προσομοίωση αντοχής των τραπεζών σε ακραίες καταστάσεις (bank stress tests)

Μιλώντας στους *Financial Times*, ο πρόεδρος της Ευρωπαϊκής Τραπεζικής Αρχής (ΕΒΑ) Andrea Enria προειδοποίησε ότι τα τυχόν οφέλη από τις επικείμενες προσομοιώσεις αντοχής των τραπεζών σε ακραίες καταστάσεις, θα εκμηδενιστούν αν δεν αναθεωρηθούν επίσης η διαδικασία λήψης αποφάσεων και ο ρόλος των εθνικών αρχών. Είπε ότι απαιτούνται ευρωπαϊκοί μηχανισμοί λήψης αποφάσεων, και, γι' αυτό, θα πρέπει η λειτουργία της ΕΒΑ να αναθεωρηθεί και να αποφευχθούν οι διακρατικές επιτροπές. Εάν αυτά δεν συμβούν, είπε ο Enria, η Ευρώπη ανοίγει την πόρτα για την επόμενη κρίση.

Θα ήθελα να ζητήσω από την Επιτροπή να σχολιάσει την παραπάνω δήλωση και να απαντήσει στα ακόλουθα ερωτήματα:

1. Σε ποιες ενέργειες έχει προβεί η Επιτροπή προκειμένου να αναθεωρηθεί η ευρωπαϊκή διαδικασία λήψης αποφάσεων και ο ρόλος των εθνικών αρχών όσον αφορά τον τραπεζικό τομέα;

2. Ποια μέτρα έχει λάβει η Επιτροπή για να εξέλθει από την τρέχουσα κρίση και να κλείσει την πόρτα σε μια ενδεχόμενη νέα κρίση;

3. Τι πιστεύει για την ανάγκη αναθεώρησης των επιχειρήσεων της ΕΒΑ και τις διακρατικές επιτροπές;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(30 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

1. Ο κανονισμός του Συμβουλίου για τη δημιουργία ενιαίου εποπτικού μηχανισμού (ΕΕΜ) ([1]) αναθέτει στην Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα (ΕΚΤ) τα βασικά καθήκοντα και εξουσίες για την εποπτεία των πιστωτικών ιδρυμάτων. Ο κεντρικός ρόλος της ΕΚΤ στο πλαίσιο του ΕΕΜ θα διασφαλίσει αυστηρή και αντικειμενική εποπτεία όλων των τραπεζών στα συμμετέχοντα κράτη μέλη. Με τον όρο ΕΕΜ νοείται το σύστημα χρηματοπιστωτικής εποπτείας το οποίο αποτελείται από την ΕΚΤ και τις αρμόδιες εθνικές αρχές των κρατών μελών της ζώνης του ευρώ, καθώς και των κρατών μελών εκτός της ζώνης, του ευρώ που έχουν αναπτύξει στενή συνεργασία με την ΕΚΤ.

2. Μετά τη χρηματοπιστωτική κρίση, η Επιτροπή έχει αναλάβει εκτεταμένο οικονομικό πρόγραμμα μεταρρυθμίσεων με στόχο την αύξηση της σταθερότητας και της διαφάνειας του χρηματοπιστωτικού τομέα και την εξασφάλιση ότι οι χρηματοπιστωτικές αγορές λειτουργούν προς όφελος της πραγματικής οικονομίας. Στον τραπεζικό τομέα, η δέσμη μέτρων ΟΚΑ IV ([2]), το πλαίσιο για την ανάκαμψη και την εξυγίανση των τραπεζών και η οδηγία για τα συστήματα εγγύησης των καταθέσεων, σε συνδυασμό με την παράλληλη δημιουργία της τραπεζικής ένωσης (ΕΕΜ και ενιαίος μηχανισμός εξυγίανσης) και την εφαρμογή μέτρων διαρθρωτικής μεταρρύθμισης θα συμβάλουν στη σταθερότητα του ευρωπαϊκού τραπεζικού τομέα και στην οικονομική ανάπτυξη.

3. Στο πλαίσιο της δημιουργίας του ΕΕΜ, τέθηκαν σε εφαρμογή στοχευμένες τροποποιήσεις του κανονισμού για την Ευρωπαϊκή Τραπεζική Αρχή (ΕΑΤ), καθώς και μηχανισμοί διακυβέρνησης, για να εξασφαλιστεί ότι η ΕΑΤ λειτουργεί για το συμφέρον της ΕΕ στο σύνολό της. Με την αναθεώρηση του ευρωπαϊκού συστήματος χρηματοπιστωτικής εποπτείας θα αξιολογηθούν όσο το δυνατόν βαθύτερα οι μηχανισμοί διακυβέρνησης των Ευρωπαϊκών Εποπτικών Αρχών (ΕΕΑ), καθώς και η ΕΑΤ. Η Επιτροπή προτίθεται να εγκρίνει την έκθεση επανεξέτασης εντός των επόμενων εβδομάδων. Περαιτέρω τροποποιήσεις των ιδρυτικών κανονισμών των ΕΕΑ, μπορεί να ακολουθήσουν σε μεταγενέστερο στάδιο.

([1]) Κανονισμός (ΕΕ) αριθ. 1024/2013 του Συμβουλίου της 15ης Οκτωβρίου 2013 για την ανάθεση ειδικών καθηκόντων στην Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα σχετικά με τις πολιτικές που αφορούν την προληπτική εποπτεία των πιστωτικών ιδρυμάτων (ΕΕ L 287 σ. 63).

([2]) Κανονισμός αριθ. 575/2013 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου της 26ης Ιουνίου 2013, σχετικά με τις απαιτήσεις προληπτικής εποπτείας για πιστωτικά ιδρύματα και επιχειρήσεις επενδύσεων και την τροποποίηση του κανονισμού (ΕΕ) αριθ. 648/2012. Οδηγία 2013/36/ΕΕ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 26ης Ιουνίου 2013, σχετικά με την πρόσβαση στη δραστηριότητα πιστωτικών ιδρυμάτων και την προληπτική εποπτεία πιστωτικών ιδρυμάτων και επιχειρήσεων επενδύσεων, για την τροποποίηση της οδηγίας 2002/87/ΕΚ και για την κατάργηση των οδηγιών 2006/48/ΕΚ και 2006/49/ΕΚ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013489/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Upcoming bank stress tests

Speaking to the *Financial Times*, European Banking Authority (EBA) chairman Andrea Enria warned that any benefits from the upcoming bank stress tests will be negated unless the decision making process and the role of national authorities is also revised. He said that European decision-making mechanisms are needed and, for that, the EBA operation must be revised and inter-state committees must be avoided. Unless these things happen, Enria said, Europe is opening the door to the next crisis.

I would ask the Commission to comment on the above statement and to reply to the following questions:

1. What actions is it taking in order to revise the European decision-making process and the role of national authorities with regards to the banking sector?

2. What actions is it taking to exit from the current crisis and to close the door on a possible further crisis?

3. What does it think about the need to revise EBA operations and inter-state committees?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(30 January 2014)

1. The Council Regulation establishing the Single Supervisory Mechanism (SSM) ([1]) entrusts the ECB with key tasks and powers for the supervision of credit institutions. The central role of the ECB within the SSM will ensure strict and objective supervision of all banks in participating Member States. The SSM means the system of financial supervision composed of the ECB and national competent authorities of Euro Member States and those non-Euro Member States which established a close cooperation with the ECB.

2. Following the financial crisis, the Commission has engaged in a comprehensive financial reform agenda with the aim to increase the stability and transparency of the financial sector, and ensure that financial markets work for the benefit of the real economy. In the banking sector, the CRD IV package ([2]), the framework for Bank recovery and resolution and the Deposit Guarantee schemes Directive together with the parallel establishment of the Banking Union (SSM and Single Resolution Mechanism) and structural reform measures will contribute to a stable European banking sector conducive to economic growth.

3. In the context of the establishment of the SSM, targeted amendments to the EBA Regulation, including governance arrangements, were introduced to ensure that the EBA works in the interest of the EU as a whole. The review of the European System of Financial Supervision will assess in more depth the governance arrangements of the European Supervisory Authorities (ESAs), including the EBA. The Commission intends to adopt the review report in the next weeks. Further amendments to the ESAs founding regulations may follow at a later stage.

([1]) Council Regulation (EU) No 1024/2013 of 15 October 2013 conferring specific tasks on the European Central Bank concerning policies relating to the prudential supervision of credit institutions (OJ L287 p. 63).

([2]) Regulation No 575/2013 of the European Parliament and the Council of 26 June 2013 on prudential requirements for credit institutions and investment firms and amending Regulation (EU) No 648/2012. Directive 2013/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on access to the activity of credit institutions and the prudential supervision of credit institutions and investment firms, amending Directive 2002/87/EC and repealing Directives 2006/48/EC and 2006/49/EC.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013718/13
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(3 de diciembre de 2013)

Asunto: Tintas perjudiciales en los embalajes alimentarios

En un simposio organizado recientemente en Breda (Países Bajos), científicos han explicado que las tintas utilizadas en los embalajes alimentarios contenían entre 6 000 y 7 000 componentes diferentes que podrían migrar hacia los alimentos. Señalan que las tintas tienen componentes que no son inofensivos y que pueden dañar la salud de los consumidores.

Existe un vacío legislativo en la materia. Evidentemente, existen normas en el marco de la Unión respecto a los embalajes alimentarios pero nada específico en lo que concierne a las tintas.

Muchos actores concernidos piensan que la Unión Europea debería intervenir en esta materia.

En 2012, el eurodiputado Gastón Franco hizo una pregunta escrita a la Comisión Europea precisamente respecto a este tema (pregunta E-008008/2012).

La Comisión le respondió que estaba estudiando el caso de las tintas y que haría una evaluación de impacto en 2013.

¿Ha culminado la Comisión el estudio mencionado?

¿A qué conclusiones ha llegado la Comisión?

¿Tomará la Comisión algún tipo de iniciativa?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de febrero de 2014)

Todos los materiales y objetos destinados a entrar en contacto con los alimentos deben cumplir las normas de seguridad generales establecidas en el artículo 3 del Reglamento (CE) n° 1935/2004 ([1]). Estas requieren que los materiales y objetos estén fabricados de conformidad con las buenas prácticas de fabricación para que, en las condiciones normales o previsibles de empleo, no transfieran sus componentes a los alimentos en cantidades que puedan, entre otras cosas, representar un peligro para la salud humana.

Además, el Reglamento (CE) n° 2023/2006 de la Comisión ([2]) obliga a los operadores de empresas a que su producción se ajuste a las buenas prácticas de fabricación establecidas en dicho Reglamento y a establecer y aplicar un sistema de aseguramiento de la calidad eficaz y documentado y garantizar su cumplimiento. No obstante, no es obligatorio llevar a cabo el análisis de las sustancias que migran.

No se han establecido disposiciones específicas para tintas, colas ni productos similares a escala de la UE. Todavía no se ha establecido a escala de la Unión ninguna lista de sustancias que pueden utilizarse en la producción de tintas. La Autoridad Europea de Seguridad Alimentaria (EFSA) recopiló información sobre las sustancias que se utilizan en materiales no plásticos en contacto con los alimentos disponibles en Europa. Este informe ([3]) destaca que la normativa nacional suiza relativa a las tintas de los envases incluye una lista positiva con cerca de 1 000 sustancias utilizadas en tintas de impresión, la mayoría de las cuales fueron sometidas a una evaluación de riesgos en el contexto de materiales plásticos en contacto con alimentos en la EU. Aproximadamente otras 4 000 sustancias de esta lista no se han sometido a una evaluación de riesgos. En 2014, la EFSA, junto con su red de Estados miembros, tiene previsto estudiar más detenidamente los criterios de prioridad de las evaluaciones de seguridad de los materiales no plásticos en contacto con alimentos.

Actualmente, la Comisión evalúa si es necesario llevar a cabo iniciativas y una mayor armonización a nivel de la Unión. Estos trabajos están establecidos en una hoja de ruta ([4]). Se prevé que se dispondrá de los resultados en 2015.

([1]) Reglamento (CE) n 1935/2004 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 27 de octubre de 2004, sobre los materiales y objetos destinados a entrar en contacto con alimentos y por el que se derogan las Directivas 80/590/CEE y 89/109/CEE (DO L 338 de 13.11.2004, p. 4).
([2]) Reglamento (CE) n° 2023/2006 de la Comisión, de 22 de diciembre de 2006, sobre buenas prácticas de fabricación de materiales y objetos destinados a entrar en contacto con alimentos (DO L 384 de 29.12.2006, p. 75).
([3]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/139e.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/planned_ia/docs/2014_sanco_005_fcm_specific_provisions_for_materials_other_than_plastics_en.pdf

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-013490/13
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(27 november 2013)

Betreft: Schadelijke bestanddelen drukinkt verpakkingen voedingswaren

Professor De Meulenaer van de vakgroep voedselveiligheid en -kwaliteit van de Universiteit Gent heeft, naar aanleiding van een studiedag rond contactmaterialen voor levensmiddelen, op een lacune gewezen in de Europese wetgeving met betrekking tot de migratie van componenten afkomstig uit drukinkten. In tegenstelling tot de bestaande Europees geharmoniseerde wetgeving voor plastic contactmaterialen voor levensmiddelen ontbreekt deze nog voor drukinkten die worden toegepast op contactmaterialen voor levensmiddelen. Verschillende van deze componenten kunnen echter toxisch zijn, zodat een gevaar ontstaat voor de volksgezondheid.

Is er Europese wetgeving die bepaalt welke stoffen al dan niet gebruikt mogen worden in de inkt voor verpakkingen van voedsel?

Indien niet, plant de Commissie initiatieven op dit gebied?

Indien wel, zou dit gaan om de te verkiezen optie van een „positieve" lijst (welke producten de inkt wel mag bevatten) of van een „negatieve" lijst (welke producten de inkt niet mag bevatten)?

Welke andere/bijkomende maatregelen kan de Commissie nemen met het oog op consumentenbescherming?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-013528/13
aan de Commissie
Esther de Lange (PPE) en Ivo Belet (PPE)
(28 november 2013)

Betreft: Inkt in verpakking

Er bestaan geen specifieke Europese regels voor inkt die gebruikt wordt voor de bedrukking van verpakkingen van voedingswaren en die in direct contact komt met het voedsel. Deskundigen stellen dat sommige van de bestanddelen van deze inkt slecht zijn voor onze gezondheid en die van onze kinderen wanneer de stoffen in aanraking komen met of opgenomen worden door het voedsel.

In 2012 heeft de „EFSA Scientific Cooperation (ESCO) Working Group" een rapport gepubliceerd met een inventarisatie van andere stoffen dan plastic, die vrijkomen uit materialen die bestemd zijn om in contact te komen met levensmiddelen. Inmiddels is de Commissie begonnen met het bestuderen van mogelijke maatregelen.

Waarom bestaan er op Europees niveau nog geen specifieke regels voor het veilig gebruik van inkt voor de bedrukking van verpakkingen van voedingswaren?

Heeft de Commissie inmiddels een overzicht van de verschillende soorten inkt en hun bestanddelen die op de Europese markt worden gebruikt in verpakkingen van voedsel?

Heeft de Europese Autoriteit voor voedselveiligheid (EFSA) ook zelf al onderzoek gedaan naar de veiligheid van de verschillende soorten inkt en hun bestanddelen, en de gevolgen daarvan voor de volksgezondheid? Waarom heeft EFSA nog geen volledige risico-analyse gemaakt van deze stoffen en concrete voorstellen gedaan?

Is de Commissie bereid snel opdracht te geven aan EFSA om de veiligheid van deze stoffen te beoordelen en op basis daarvan zelf waar nodig specifieke maatregelen voor te stellen, zoals een lijst met toegelaten of verboden stoffen, of maximumwaarden voor veilig gebruik?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-013608/13
aan de Commissie
Mark Demesmaeker (Verts/ALE)
(2 december 2013)

Betreft: Veiligheid van voedingsverpakkingsmateriaal

Materiaal dat in contact komt met voeding, laat daarin sporen na. Een verpakking kan stof en water tegenhouden, maar voor sommige bestanddelen uit de kleurrijke inkt zijn ze doorlaatbaar. Dat zeggen wetenschappers van de vakgroep voedselveiligheid en -kwaliteit van de Universiteit van Gent.

De inkt waarmee de verpakkingen van voedingswaren bedrukt zijn, bestaat uit 6 000 tot 7 000 verschillende bestanddelen. De verpakking houdt die niet allemaal tegen. De stoffen uit de inkt belanden dus in de voedingswaren. En sommige daarvan zijn blijkbaar niet onschuldig: een aantal verstoort het immuunsysteem of lokt zelfs kanker uit. Sommige stoffen uit de inkt zijn zelfs al in heel kleine concentraties schadelijk voor de gezondheid. Hetzelfde geldt voor de lijmen waarmee voedingsverpakkingen worden „dichtgelijmd".

Er bestaan blijkbaar geen regels die deze materie regelen. Kan de Commissie dit bevestigen? Bestaan er op Europees niveau wettelijke regels die voorschrijven aan welke voorwaarden c.q. criteria de bestanddelen van verpakkingsinkt, verpakkingslijmen, e.d. moeten voldoen?

Bestaat er een Europese lijst van stoffen die producenten in hun inkt mogen gebruiken en welke niet?

Bestaat er Europese regelgeving die de screening op verpakkingsmateriaal voorschrijft zodat de schadelijke stoffen kunnen worden gedetecteerd?

Kan de Commissie aangeven of er door de Europese instellingen/instanties reeds onderzoek is verricht naar de veiligheid van verpakkingsmateriaal (inkt, plastic, metaal e.d.), en met name naar de invloed van deze materialen op voedingswaren?

Zal de Commissie voorstellen doen omtrent deze materie?

Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(17 februari 2014)

Alle materialen en voorwerpen die bestemd zijn om met levensmiddelen in contact te komen, moeten voldoen aan de algemene veiligheidseisen die met name zijn vastgelegd in artikel 3 van Verordening (EG) nr. 1935/2004 ([1]). Op grond van deze eisen moeten materialen en voorwerpen met inachtneming van goede fabricagemethoden worden vervaardigd, zodat zij bij normaal of te verwachten gebruik geen bestanddelen afgeven aan levensmiddelen in hoeveelheden die onder meer voor de menselijke gezondheid gevaar kunnen opleveren.

Uit hoofde van Verordening (EG) nr. 2023/2006 van de Commissie ([2]) moeten exploitanten van bedrijven er bovendien voor zorgen dat hun productie plaatsvindt met inachtneming van de goede fabricagemethoden die in die verordening zijn vastgelegd, en moeten ze een doeltreffend en gedocumenteerd kwaliteitsborgingssysteem vaststellen, uitvoeren en handhaven. Een gedegen onderzoek naar migrerende stoffen is echter niet verplicht.

Op het niveau van de Unie zijn er geen specifieke voorschriften voor inkt, lijm en gelijkaardige producten vastgelegd en er bestaat nog geen EU-lijst van stoffen die mogen worden gebruikt in inkt. De Europese Autoriteit voor voedselveiligheid (EFSA) heeft gegevens verzameld over stoffen die worden gebruikt in de in Europa beschikbare niet-kunststofmaterialen die met levensmiddelen in contact komen. In dat verslag ([3]) wijst zij erop dat de Zwitserse nationale regelgeving betreffende verpakkingsinkt een positieve lijst bevat van ongeveer 1000 in drukinkt gebruikte stoffen, waarvan het merendeel in de context van in de EU met levensmiddelen in aanraking komende kunststofmaterialen aan een risicobeoordeling is onderworpen. Ongeveer 4000 andere stoffen op deze lijst hebben geen risicobeoordeling ondergaan. In 2014 wil de EFSA zich samen met de lidstaten dieper buigen over criteria voor het prioriteren van veiligheidsevaluaties voor niet-kunststofmaterialen die met levensmiddelen in aanraking komen.

De Commissie onderzoekt momenteel of er nood is aan verdere harmonisatie en aanvullende initiatieven op het niveau van de Unie. Deze werkzaamheden zijn vastgelegd in een routekaart ([4]). De bevindingen zullen naar verwachting in 2015 beschikbaar zijn.

([1]) Verordening (EG) nr. 1935/2004 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 27 oktober 2004 inzake materialen en voorwerpen bestemd om met levensmiddelen in contact te komen en houdende intrekking van de Richtlijnen 80/590/EEG en 89/109/EEG (PB L 338 van 13.11.2004, blz. 4).
([2]) Verordening (EG) nr. 2023/2006 van de Commissie van 22 december 2006 betreffende goede fabricagemethoden voor materialen en voorwerpen bestemd om met levensmiddelen in contact te komen (PB L 384 van 29.12.2006, blz. 75).
([3]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/139e.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/planned_ia/docs/2014_sanco_005_fcm_specific_provisions_for_materials_other_than_plastics_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013490/13
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Harmful components of printer's ink on food packaging

At a one-day seminar on food contact materials, Professor De Meulenaer of the Food Safety and Quality Department at the University of Ghent has drawn attention to a lacuna in European law with regard to the migration of components from printer's inks. Whereas legislation on food contact plastics has been harmonised at European level, the same has yet to be done in the case of printer's inks for use on food contact materials. Yet some of these substances can be toxic, presenting a public health hazard.

Is there any European legislation indicating which substances may or may not be used in ink on food packaging?

If not, is the Commission planning any initiatives in this field?

If so, is the preferable approach being applied, namely that of a 'positive' list (indicating which products ink is permitted to contain), or does the 'negative' list approach apply (indicating which products ink must not contain)?

What other/additional measures can the Commission take in the interests of consumer protection?

Question for written answer E-013528/13
to the Commission
Esther de Lange (PPE) and Ivo Belet (PPE)
(28 November 2013)

Subject: Ink in packaging

There are no specific European rules governing ink which is used for the printing of food packaging and comes into direct contact with food. Experts say that some of the components of this ink are bad for our health and that of our children when these substances come into contact with, or are absorbed by, food.

In 2012, the EFSA Scientific Cooperation (ESCO) Working Group published a report listing substances other than plastic released from materials intended for contact with foodstuffs. Since then, the Commission has started looking into possible measures.

Why are there still no specific rules at European level for the safe use of ink for the printing of food packaging?

Does the Commission now have an overview of the different types of ink and their components that are used in food packaging on the European market?

Has the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) also already conducted its own investigation of the safety of the different types of ink and their components, and their implications for human health? Why has EFSA still not carried out a full risk analysis of these substances and come up with concrete proposals?

Is the Commission prepared to ask EFSA soon to assess the safety of these substances and, on that basis, to propose specific measures itself where necessary, as well as a list of permitted or prohibited substances, or maximum limits for safe use?

Question for written answer E-013608/13
to the Commission
Mark Demesmaeker (Verts/ALE)
(2 December 2013)

Subject: Safety of food packaging materials

Material that comes into contact with foodstuffs leaves traces behind in the foodstuffs. Packaging can keep matter and water out, but they are permeable to some constituents of the vividly coloured ink. That is the message from scientists in the Department of Food Safety and Food Quality at the University of Ghent.

The ink with which the packaging of foodstuffs is printed consists of 6-7 000 different constituents. The packaging does not keep all of these out. The substances from the ink therefore end up in the foodstuffs. Some of them, it seems, are not harmless — a number of them disrupt the immune system or even cause cancer. Some of the substances from the ink are even hazardous to health even in really low quantities. The same applies to the glues with which food packaging is sealed tight.

There appear to be no rules governing this matter. Can the Commission confirm this? Is there legislation at European level governing what conditions or criteria the constituents of packaging ink, packaging glues and the like must comply with?

Is there a European list of which substances producers can and cannot use in their inks?

Is there European legislation prescribing the screening of packaging materials so that harmful substances can be detected?

Can the Commission tell me whether European institutions and bodies have already carried out research into the safety of packaging materials (inks, plastics, metals, etc.), and specifically into the impact of these materials on foodstuffs?

Does the Commission intend to produce proposals on this matter?

Question for written answer E-013718/13
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(3 December 2013)

Subject: Harmful inks in food packaging

At a recent symposium in Breda in the Netherlands, scientists explained that inks used in food packaging contain between 6 000 and 7 000 different components that could be transferred to food. They note that the inks have components that are not harmless and may be harmful to consumers' health.

There is a legislative gap in this area. Of course, there are rules within the framework of the Union with respect to food packaging, but nothing specifically regarding inks.

Many concerned stakeholders believe that the European Union should take action in this area.

In 2012, MEP Gaston Franco submitted a written question to the Commission on this very subject (Question E-008008/2012).

The Commission replied that it was looking into the issue of inks and that it would carry out an impact assessment in 2013.

Has the Commission completed the abovementioned study?

What conclusions has the Commission reached?

Will the Commission take any action?

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(17 February 2014)

All materials and articles intended to come into contact with food are covered by the general safety rules set out in particular in Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 1935/2004 ([1]). These require that materials and articles shall be manufactured in compliance with good manufacturing practice so that, under normal or foreseeable conditions of use, they do not transfer their constituents to food in quantities which could, amongst others, endanger human health.

Moreover Commission Regulation (EC) No 2023/2006 ([2]) obliges business operators to produce in conformity with good manufacturing practice established in that regulation and to establish, to implement and to adhere to an effective and documented quality assurance system. A screening of migrating substances is, however, not mandatory.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1935/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 October 2004 on materials and articles intended to come into contact with food and repealing Directives 80/590/EEC and 89/109/EEC, OJ L 338, 13.11.2004, p. 4.

([2]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 2023/2006 of 22 December 2006 on good manufacturing practice for materials and articles intended to come into contact with food, OJ L 384, 29.12.2006, p. 75.

Specific rules for inks, glues and similar products are not established at Union level. A Union list of substances that can be used in inks has not yet been established. The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) collected information on substances used in non-plastic food contact materials available in Europe. This report ([3]) highlighted that the Swiss national regulation on packaging inks includes a positive list with about 1 000 substances used in printing inks,the majority of which were risk assessed in the context of plastic food contact materials in the EU. Another approximately 4000 substances on this list are not risk assessed. In 2014, EFSA plans to further explore criteria for prioritisation of safety evaluations for non-plastic food contact materials with its network of Member States.

The Commission currently evaluates if further harmonisation and initiatives at Union level are necessary. This work is set out in a roadmap ([4]). Results are expected for 2015.

([3]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/139e.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/planned_ia/docs/2014_sanco_005_fcm_specific_provisions_for_materials_other_than_plastics_en.pdf

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-013491/13
do Komisji
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(27 listopada 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Dystrybucja środków w ramach Programu Rozwoju Obszarów Wiejskich

Przedstawione do chwili obecnej projekty dokumentów UE w zakresie programowania rozwoju obszarów wiejskich w perspektywie finansowej 2014-2020 jasno określają, że podstawowym celem przyszłej polityki rolnej jest poprawa jakości życia na obszarach wiejskich oraz efektywne wykorzystanie ich zasobów i potencjałów poprzez zrównoważony i wielofunkcyjny rozwój obszarów wiejskich, rolnictwa i rybactwa. Podejmowane działania powinny uwzględniać pięć kluczowych zagadnień: kapitał ludzki, jakość życia, bezpieczeństwo, konkurencyjność i środowisko. Tymczasem z dokumentów przygotowanych przez resort rolnictwa wynika wprost, że środki finansowe zostaną skierowane w przytłaczającej większości do sektora rolnictwa. Decyzja ta zmienia zatem stosowaną od początku ubiegłej dekady definicję obszarów wiejskich, które w programie znowu zaczynają być postrzegane wyłącznie jako obszar produkcji rolnej. Skutki takiej zmiany zawartości PROW mogą wykraczać daleko poza wymiar ekonomiczny kolejnej perspektywy finansowej. Polityka taka wydaje się być także sprzeczna z polityką UE określoną w dokumentach dla funduszu, z którego PROW jest finansowany. Nie należy także lekceważyć zagrożenia, że przez zabieg włączenia infrastruktury wiejskiej do programów regionalnych – jak proponuje Ministerstwo – obszary te tracą swoją specyfikę i zaczynają być traktowane na równi z obszarami zurbanizowanymi, co w konkurencji o środki stawia je już na starcie na przegranej pozycji. Uważam, że obszary wiejskie powinny być jak dotychczas finansowane z Programu Rozwoju Obszarów Wiejskich, który uwzględnia ich specyfikę i kładzie nacisk na wsparcie najsłabszych gmin. Inne fundusze powinny działać wspierająco w stosunku do tego programu, nie mogą go jednakże zastępować.

W związku z tym zwracam się do Komisji z następującymi pytaniami:

1. Czy Komisja ma świadomość, że takie nieprawidłowości mają miejsce?

2. Czy takie rozporządzanie środkami jest zgodne z wytycznymi Komisji dotyczącymi rozdzielania funduszy w ramach Programu Rozwoju Obszarów Wiejskich?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Daciana Cioloşa w imieniu Komisji
(29 stycznia 2014 r.)

Przez cały okres programowania 2014-2020 Europejski Fundusz Rolny na rzecz Rozwoju Obszarów Wiejskich funkcjonuje w ramach wspólnych ram strategicznych, jak wszystkie europejskie fundusze strukturalne i inwestycyjne (ESI). W Polsce strategię tych funduszy określi umowa o Partnerstwie, którą zatwierdzi Komisja Europejska. To właśnie ta umowa o partnerstwie ma między innymi ustalić strategię przewidującą zintegrowane podejście do wykorzystania funduszy ESI w myśl strategii „Europa 2020". Postanowienia umowy określą również sposób uzupełniania się przez poszczególne fundusze, koordynując ich interwencje.

Władze polskie przedłożyły niedawno nieformalny projekt umowy o partnerstwie. Odpowiednie służby Komisji odpowiedziały, opatrując go uwagami. Uwagi Komisji przesłano zainteresowanym organom polskich władz pismem z dnia 22 października 2013 r., oczekując odpowiedzi – w szczególności ze strony Ministerstwa Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi.

Jak dotąd służby Komisji nie otrzymały polskiego projektu programu rozwoju obszarów wiejskich (PROW) na lata 2014-2020. Do najistotniejszych kryteriów oceny programu należy jego spójność z umową o partnerstwie.

Instytucja zarządzająca polskim PROW podjęła prace nad tym dokumentem oraz konsultacje z zainteresowanymi stronami. Służby Komisji nie rozpoczęły jeszcze formalnych negocjacji. Kwestie podnoszone przez Szanownego Pana Posła będą zapewne po części omawiane na etapie negocjacji.

1. Z chwilą otrzymania PROW Komisja oceni jego zgodność z nowymi ramami prawnymi oraz umową o partnerstwie.

2. To władze polskie mają prawo decyzji o wykorzystaniu funduszy ESI z uwzględnieniem potrzeb Polski i w kontekście realizacji celów strategii „Europa 2020".

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013491/13
to the Commission
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Distribution of funds under the Rural Development Programme

The draft EU documents that have thus far been presented on rural development programming for the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework clearly stipulate that the basic objective of agricultural policy in the future will be to improve quality of life in rural areas and to ensure that their resources and potential are used effectively by developing rural areas, agriculture and fisheries in a sustainable and multi-functional manner. The actions to be taken should take account of five key issues: human capital, quality of life, security, competition and the environment. Yet, documents drafted by the Polish Ministry of Agriculture show clearly that the overwhelming majority of funds will be directed towards the agricultural sector. That decision therefore changes the definition — in use since the beginning of the last decade — of rural areas, which the Rural Development Programme (RDP) now defines exclusively as areas of agricultural production. The consequences of making such changes to the RDP could extend far beyond the economic dimension of the next MFF. This policy seems to contradict EU policy as set out in the documentation of the fund that finances the RDP. Furthermore, we should not underestimate the danger posed by incorporating rural infrastructure into regional programmes — as the Ministry proposes to do — of those regions losing their specificities and being treated as being on an equal footing to urban areas, which are already leaving rural areas choking in their dust in the race for funds. I feel that rural areas should be financed, as they have been up to now, through the RDP, which takes their specificities into account and places emphasis on supporting the weakest communities. Other funds should support this programme — not replace it.

1. Is the Commission aware that such irregularities are taking place?

2. Is such a use of funds in compliance with Commission guidelines on the distribution offunds under the Rural Development Programme?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

For the 2014-2020 programming period, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development operates under the Common Strategic Framework with all the European Structural Investment (ESI) funds. The strategy for these funds in Poland will be contained in a Partnership Agreement to be approved by the Commission. Among other things that Partnership Agreement will set out the strategy for an integrated approach in the use of ESI funds in line with the EU 2020 strategy. It will also indicate how they will complement each other in their interventions.

Poland recently submitted informally a draft of the Partnership Agreement. Commission services concerned have commented on it. Those comments were sent to Poland in a letter dated 22 October 2013 and the response of the Polish authorities, including the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, is awaited.

To date the draft Rural Development Programme for Poland 2014-2020 (RDP) has not been submitted to the Commission services. One of the fundamental criteria for the analysis of the programme will be its consistency with the Partnership Agreement.

The RDP Managing Authority has started drafting the RDP and consulting stakeholders. The Commission services have yet to commence formal negotiations. Some of the issues raised by the Honourable Member will no doubt be discussed at that stage.

1. Once the Commission receives the RDP it will assess its compliance with the new legal framework and the Partnership Agreement.

2. The decision on how to use the ESI funds to address a Member State needs and achieve the EU 2020 objectives belongs to the Member State.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-013494/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(27 de noviembre de 2013)

Asunto: Directiva 2011/7/UE sobre morosidad

En las preguntas E-003999/2013 y E-004000/2013 el Sr. Tajani respondió, en nombre de la Comisión: «Por lo que se refiere a la medida de transposición española, España ha implementado la Directiva 2011/7/UE por el Real Decreto-ley 4/2013, que se notificó el 22 de febrero de 2013. El Gobierno español ha decidido que el Real Decreto-ley solo se aplicará a los contratos concluidos después de febrero de 2013.

La Comisión está realizando actualmente un análisis jurídico de las medidas nacionales notificadas, incluida la legislación nacional española, para comprobar que las medidas se ajustan a lo dispuesto en la Directiva. A este respecto, la Comisión está en contacto con las autoridades españolas competentes.

La Comisión supervisará de cerca la correcta aplicación de la Directiva a nivel nacional a través del grupo de expertos sobre morosidad, que será convocado para una tercera reunión que tendrá lugar en los próximos meses. La Comisión también apoya la correcta aplicación a través de la campaña de información sobre la morosidad en los pagos, en marcha desde octubre de 2012 en todos los países de la UE».

A la vista de lo anterior:

¿Ha concluido ya la Comisión el análisis jurídico de la transposición de la Directiva 2011/7/UE en el Estado español?

En caso afirmativo, ¿está satisfecha la Comisión con el resultado?

Respuesta del Sr. Tajani en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de febrero de 2014)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a las respuestas dadas a las preguntas escritas E-003999/2013 y E-004000/2013 ([1]).

Tal como se ha indicado, España implementó la Directiva 2011/7/UE mediante el Real Decreto-Ley n° 4/2013, que se notificó el 22 de febrero de 2013.

Tras la evaluación preliminar, la Comisión decidió solicitar información adicional a las autoridades españolas acerca de las medidas de transposición.

Se espera recibir la respuesta durante el primer trimestre del año y, cuando se haya recibido la información solicitada, la Comisión podrá completar el análisis jurídico de las medidas de transposición.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013494/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Directive 2011/7/EU on late payments

The answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission to written questions E-003999/2013 and E-004000/2013 was as follows: 'As regards the Spanish transposition measure, Spain has implemented Directive 2011/7/EU by Royal Decree Law No 4/2013, which was notified on 22 February 2013. The Spanish Government has decided that the Decree law will only apply to contracts concluded after February 2013.

The Commission is currently undertaking a legal analysis of the notified national measures, including the Spanish national law, to verify whether the measures comply with the directive. With regard to this, the Commission is in contact with the competent authorities in Spain.

The Commission will closely monitor the correct implementation of the directive at national level through the late payment expert group that will be called for its third meeting in the following months. The Commission also supports correct implementation through the Late Payment Information Campaign that has been running since October 2012 in all EU countries'.

Has the Commission now completed its legal analysis of the transposition in Spain of Directive 2011/7/EU?

If so, is the Commission satisfied with the findings?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(5 February 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-003999/2013 and E-004000/2013 ([1]).

As indicated, Spain has implemented Directive 2011/7/EU by Royal Decree Law No 4/2013, which was notified on 22 February 2013.

After the preliminary assessment, the Commission decided to request additional information to the Spanish authorities on the transposition measures.

The reply is expected in the first quarter of the year and once the requested information has been received, the Commission will be able to complete the legal analysis of the transposition measures.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013495/13
to the Commission
George Lyon (ALDE)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Amending the Treaty on European Union

If Article 48 is used to amend the Treaty on European Union, is there a requirement for unanimity in the European Council for the change to take effect?

Could the Commission provide a definition of the principle of continuity of effect in the context of the Treaties?

Finally, could the Commission clarify whether a territory which has seceded from an existing Member State could apply the principle of continuity of effect with regard to EU membership?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(23 January 2014)

1. Any amendments to the Treaties made in accordance with Article 48 TEU shall enter into force after being ratified by all the Member States in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements.

2. The 'principle of continuity of effect' is a concept developed in the context of international law, expressed in Article 34 of the 1978 Vienna Convention on Succession of States in respect of Treaties. That Convention has not entered into force and the Commission is not in a position to give an interpretation of that instrument.

3. The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its replies to parliamentary questions E-008133/2012, P-009756/2012, and P-009862/2012 ([1]).

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

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-013499/13
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(27 november 2013)

Betreft: Gevolgen van onafhankelijkheid (follow-up)

Op 26 november 2013 heeft de Schotse regering een gedetailleerde gids gepubliceerd over het proces dat tegen maart 2016 tot de onafhankelijkheid van Schotland zou kunnen leiden en de economische, sociale en juridische gevolgen ervan. Volgens de gids zou de regering in Edinburgh ongeveer 18 maanden hebben om te onderhandelen over zijn onafhankelijk statuut en de voortzetting van zijn lidmaatschap van de EU. De onderhandelingen zouden gebaseerd worden „op het beginsel van continuïteit van het effect": Schotlands transitie naar onafhankelijk lidmaatschap zou gebaseerd zijn op de bestaande EU-verdragsbepalingen en -verplichtingen die op Schotland als deel van het VK van toepassing zijn ([1]).

1. Heeft de Commissie kennis van deze gids met als titel „Scotland's Future"?

2. Is deze beleidsnota volgens de Commissie een correcte interpretatie van de verdragen?

3. Met betrekking tot bepaalde scenario's, zoals de afscheiding van een deel van een lidstaat of de oprichting van een nieuwe staat, heeft de Commissie in haar antwoord op mijn vorige vraag verklaard dat deze niet neutraal zouden zijn ten opzichte van de EU-verdragen. Staat de Commissie andere interpretaties van de verdragen op dit vlak toe? Wat vindt de Commissie over het beginsel van continuïteit van het effect van de bestaande EU-verdragsbepalingen en -verplichtingen?

4. Denkt de Commissie dat Schotland het pond kan behouden en buiten de Schengenruimte zonder grenzen kan blijven ondanks het feit dat alle toekomstige landen moeten toetreden tot de eurozone en de Schengenzone?

Antwoord van de heer Barroso namens de Commissie
(17 januari 2014)

1. Ja.

2.-4. De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid naar de antwoorden op de parlementaire vragen E-008133/2012, P-009756/2012 en P-009862/2012 ([2]).

([1]) http://euobserver.com/news/122246.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/nl/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013499/13
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Consequences of independence (follow-up)

On 26 November 2013, the Scottish Government published a detailed guide on the process that might lead to Scottish independence by March 2016, and the economic, social and legal consequences. According to the guide, the Edinburgh Government would have about 18 months to negotiate the status of its independence and its continued membership of the EU. The negotiation would work 'on the basis of the principle of continuity of effect', meaning that Scotland's transition to independent membership would be based on the existing EU Treaty obligations and provisions that apply to Scotland as part of the UK. ([1])

1. Is the Commission aware of this guide called 'Scotland's Future'?

2. In the Commission's opinion, is this policy paper a correct interpretation of the Treaties?

3. Regarding certain scenarios such as the separation of one part of a Member State or the creation of a new state, in its previous answer to me the Commission stated that these would not be neutral as regards the EU Treaties. Does the Commission allow other interpretations of the Treaties on this issue? What does it think about the principle of continuity of effect of existing EU Treaty obligations and provisions?

4. Does the Commission think it would be possible for Scotland to keep the pound sterling and to stay out of the Schengen border-free area despite of the fact that all prospective EU countries are required to join the euro and the Schengen Area?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(17 January 2014)

1. Yes.

2 - 4. The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its replies to parliamentary questions E-008133/2012, P-009756/2012, and P-009862/2012 ([2]).

([1]) http://euobserver.com/news/122246
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013500/13
alla Commissione
Giommaria Uggias (ALDE)
(27 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Accesso facilitato alle procedure di erogazione di garanzie fideiussorie obbligatorie per accedere ai Fondi FSE

Il 5 febbraio 2013 la Regione Sardegna ha istituito il «Fondo regionale di finanza inclusiva», il quale opera sostenendo economicamente le banche o gli istituti finanziari affinché questi possano accordare le garanzie per i finanziamenti FSE alle persone che ne abbiano i requisiti (stato di disoccupazione e progetto approvato).

Questo sistema di bypass finanziario è imposto dal «Vademecum dell'operatore regionale — versione 3.0 — Novembre 2010» che dispone al punto 2.2.2 che «Le polizze fideiussorie devono essere rilasciate da soggetti indicati dall'art. 2 del Decreto del Ministero del Tesoro 22.4.1997 ossia dalle banche, dalle imprese di assicurazione indicate nella Legge 348 del 10.6.1982 o dagli intermediari finanziari iscritti nell'elenco speciale ex art. 107 del D. Lgs. 385 del 1.9.1983, che svolgono in via esclusiva o prevalente attività di rilascio di garanzie» e quindi non direttamente dal fondo di cui sopra.

La maggior parte dei bandi regionali per i finanziamenti alle imprese è rivolta alle categorie più svantaggiate, cioè i disoccupati, ma tali obblighi finanziari imposti ai beneficiari per accedere ai finanziamenti stridono con la realtà. Inoltre in questo momento l'iter procedurale fondo-banca-finanziamento della Regione Sardegna risulta poco chiaro e tende a scoraggiare la maggior parte di coloro che si avvicinano a questa opportunità.

Considerato quanto sopra, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se sia possibile, data l'impossibilità di sollevare dall'obbligo di fidejussione bancaria i beneficiari del finanziamento, richiamare la Regione Sardegna affinché renda tale iter più semplice?

2. Quali rimedi ha previsto per l'accesso ai fondi 2014-2020 onde evitare nuovamente il verificarsi di tali inconvenienti, che scoraggiano dal loro intento coloro che desiderano accedere ai finanziamenti FSE per fare impresa?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(30 gennaio 2014)

1. Il programma operativo 2007-2013 per la Sardegna nell'ambito del Fondo sociale europeo (FSE) cofinanzia attività volte ad agevolare l'accesso al microcredito, in particolare all'indirizzo dei gruppi svantaggiati. La Commissione è consapevole delle difficoltà che questi gruppi incontrano per ottenere una garanzia bancaria che, in forza della legislazione nazionale, è la pre-condizione per ricevere finanziamenti pubblici. La Commissione plaude pertanto alla recente iniziativa della regione Sardegna di istituire un «Fondo regionale di finanza inclusiva». Tale fondo si prefigge di concedere garanzie ai beneficiari del FSE e alle persone svantaggiate che intendono avviare un'impresa.

2. Per quanto concerne il prossimo periodo di programmazione, i servizi della Commissione ([1]) hanno invitato l'Italia a ridurre gli oneri amministrativi e a promuovere la semplificazione a vantaggio dei beneficiari del FSE. La Commissione riserverà un'attenzione particolare a questo aspetto all'atto di esaminare l'accordo di partenariato e i programmi operativi relativi all'Italia.

([1]) Posizione dei servizi della Commissione sullo sviluppo di un accordo di partenariato e di programmi in Italia per il periodo 2014-2020.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013500/13
to the Commission
Giommaria Uggias (ALDE)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Facilitated access to procedures for the issue of guarantees required to obtain ESF funds

On 5 February 2013, the regional government of Sardinia established the 'Fondo regionale di finanza inclusiva' (Regional Fund for Inclusive Finance), which provides financial support to banks or financial institutions so that they may grant guarantees for ESF funding to persons who meet the requirements (they must be unemployed with an approved project).

This financial 'bypass' system is laid down by point 2.2.2 of the Regional Operators' Guidebook — version 3.0 of November 2010, which states that 'Surety policies must be issued by the parties specified by Article 2 of the Treasury Decree of 22 April 1997, namely banks, insurance companies indicated by Law No 348 of 10 June 1982 or financial intermediaries registered on the special list pursuant to Article 107 of Legislative Decree No 385 of 1 September 1983, which carry out exclusively, or as their principal activity, the issue of guarantees'. It is therefore not laid down directly by the above fund.

Most regional invitations to tender for business funding are targeted at the most disadvantaged, that is, the unemployed, but these financial obligations imposed on beneficiaries in order to access the funding do not take account of reality. Moreover, as things stand, the 'fund-bank- funding from the regional government of Sardinia' procedure is unclear and tends to discourage most people who look into this opportunity.

1. Given that it is not possible to dispense with the requirement for beneficiaries of the funding to hold a guarantee, can the Commission state whether it could reprimand the regional government of Sardinia and urge it to simplify this procedure?

2. What solutions does it plan regarding access to 2014-2020 funds to avoid a repeat of such obstacles which discourage those who wish to access ESF funding to start a company?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(30 January 2014)

1. The Sardinia European Social Fund (ESF) Operational Programme 2007-20013 co-finances activities to promote access to micro-credit, in particular for disadvantaged groups. The Commission is aware of the difficulties encountered by such groups in obtaining a bank guarantee, which is, by virtue of national legislation, a pre-condition to receive public funds. The Commission therefore welcomes the recent initiative of the Sardinia region to set up a 'Financial Inclusion Regional Fund'. The fund aims to grant guarantees for ESF beneficiaries and disadvantaged people who intend to start a business.

2. As for the next programming period, the Commission services ([1]) have invited Italy to reduce the administration burden and to promote simplification for ESF beneficiaries. The Commission will pay particular attention to this aspect when examining Italy's Partnership Agreement and operational programmes.

([1]) Position of the Commission Services on the development of a Partnership Agreement and Programmes in Italy for the period 2014-2020.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-013501/13
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(27 november 2013)

Betreft: Aanpak van misbruiken van 3D printing

In haar antwoord op parlementaire vraag E-006850/2013 stelt de Commissie dat in vergaderingen met deskundigen bekeken zal worden hoe het mogelijk misbruik van 3D printers (in combinatie met de vrij beschikbare software om wapens te produceren) het best kan aangepakt worden.

De controle op het verbod om wapens met een 3D printer te vervaardigen (cfr Richtlijn 91/477/EEG) is niet evident. De politiediensten in Manchester hebben recent in het kader een grootschalige politieactie tegen georganiseerde misdaadbendes bij een inval ontdekt dat de bende met een 3D-printer vuurwapens maakte.

1. Welke pistes zijn tijdens het overleg met deskundigen verkend en zijn inmiddels reeds conclusies getrokken?

2. Onderzoekt de Commissie of er een mogelijkheid bestaat om dergelijke toepassingen van 3D printing onmogelijk te maken (via ingrepen mbt de hardware of software)?

3. Onderzoekt de Commissie ook andere mogelijke misbruiken van 3D printing?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(29 januari 2014)

De Commissie is zich bewust van de veiligheidsrisico's van het gebruik van 3D-printers voor de productie van wapens. Deze activiteit valt al onder de EU-wetgeving.

In Richtlijn 91/477/EEG ([1]) zoals gewijzigd, worden verplichtingen vastgesteld voor de productie en aankoop van wapens door particulieren, overeenkomstig artikel 5 van het Protocol van de Verenigde Naties tegen de illegale vervaardiging van en handel in vuurwapens. In deze richtlijn betekent „illegale vervaardiging" de vervaardiging of assemblage van vuurwapens, delen en onderdelen daarvan die illegaal zijn verhandeld of de assemblage of vervaardiging zonder toestemming of markering.

Op dit moment wordt er met deskundigen overlegd om na te gaan wat de mogelijke kwetsbare punten zijn op de markt. Dit kan gaan over wapens die geproduceerd worden voor criminele doeleinden of wapens die geproduceerd worden civiele of militaire doeleinden en door verkoop op de criminele markt terechtkomen. Mogelijke zwakke punten zullen worden bestudeerd in het voor 2015 geplande evaluatieverslag over de vuurwapenrichtlijn. Dit zou kunnen leiden tot wijzigingsvoorstellen voor de vuurwapenrichtlijn.

([1]) Richtlijn 91/477/EEG van de Raad van 18 juni 1991 inzake de controle op de verwerving en het voorhanden hebben van wapens, PB L 256 van 13.9.1991 en tot wijziging van Richtlijn 2008/51/EG van de Raad, PB L 179, van 21.5.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013501/13
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(27 November 2013)

Subject: Addressing misuses of 3D printing

In its answer to Written Question E-006850/2013 the Commission states that meetings with experts will be held to evaluate the best options to properly address the possible misuse of 3D printers (as well as the freely available software to manufacture weapons).

It is not easy to monitor compliance with the ban on producing weapons with a 3D printer (e.g. under Directive 91/477/EEC). In a recent large-scale crackdown on organised crime in Manchester, police discovered in a raid that a gang was producing firearms with a 3D printer.

1. What avenues were explored during the meetings with experts, and have any conclusions yet been drawn?

2. Is the Commission looking into whether there is any way of rendering such applications of 3D printing impossible (e.g. by interventions in hardware or software)?

3. Is the Commission also investigating other possible misuses of 3D printing?

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

The Commission is aware of the security risks of the use of 3D printers to produce weapons. This activity is already covered by EU legislation.

In particular, Directive 91/477/EEC ([1]) as amended establishes obligations for the manufacture of weapons or acquisition of weapons by private individuals, reflecting Article 5 of the Protocol of the United Nations against the Illicit Manufacturing and Trafficking of Firearms. For the purpose of this directive, 'illicit manufacturing' means the manufacturing or assembly of firearms, their parts or components which have been trafficked, or assembly and manufacture without authorisation or without marking.

Consultations with experts have just started to be able to identify the potential vulnerabilities in the market where firearms are produced for criminal purposes or where firearms produced for civilian or military use are diverted to criminal markets at point of sale. Possible vulnerabilities will be considered in the evaluation report on the Firearms Directive scheduled for 2015 which may lead to amending proposals of the Firearms Directive.

([1]) Council Directive 91/477/EEC of 18 June 1991 on control of the acquisition and possession of weapons, OJ L 256, 13.9.1991 and the amending Council Directive 2008/51/EC, OJ L 179. 5.2008.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-013503/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(28 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Τα γυναικεία επαγγέλματα πλήττονται εντονότερα κατά τη διάρκεια της κρίσης

Σύμφωνα με το σημείωμα του Κοινοβουλίου με τίτλο *Η πολιτική όσον αφορά την ισότητα των φύλων στην Ελλάδα,* οι νόμοι 3863 και 3865 του 2010 εισήγαγαν σημαντικές αλλαγές στο συνταξιοδοτικό σύστημα, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της άρσης ευνοϊκών προϋπαρχουσών ρυθμίσεων για πρόωρη συνταξιοδότηση γυναικών με ανήλικα παιδιά στον δημόσιο τομέα: η ηλικία συνταξιοδότησής τους αυξήθηκε σταδιακά από 50 έτη (2010) σε 65 έτη (2013) όσον αφορά την πλήρη συνταξιοδότηση, χωρίς να υπάρξουν οιαδήποτε άλλα μέτρα για την στήριξη της μητρότητας. Το ενδιάμεσο πλαίσιο σχετικά με τη Δημοσιονομική Στρατηγική (2011-2015), το οποίο συνόδευε τη δεύτερη συμφωνία διάσωσης του Ιουλίου 2011, εισήγαγε περαιτέρω περικοπές στις συντάξεις και έναν αριθμό άλλων μέτρων που μείωναν τις διάφορες παροχές. Ο κατάλογος των βαρέων και ανθυγιεινών επαγγελμάτων περιορίστηκε τον Νοέμβριο του 2011, με περίπου 180 000 εργαζομένους να αφαιρούνται από αυτόν· ο κατάλογος αυτός περιελάμβανε επαγγέλματα μεταξύ άλλων όπως κομμώτριες, ταμίες στα σούπερ μάρκετ, καθαρίστριες, που ασκούνται κυρίως από γυναίκες. Το δεύτερο πακέτο διάσωσης περιελάμβανε επίσης «κούρεμα» της κατοχής ομολογιών, πράγμα το οποίο επηρέασε σε πολύ μεγάλο βαθμό τα ταμεία κοινωνικής ασφάλισης, επειδή έχασαν πάνω από 12 δισ. ευρώ τα οποία κατείχαν υπό μορφή κυβερνητικών ομολόγων. Αφετέρου, οι περικοπές στις συντάξεις συνέβαλαν στην αύξηση του κινδύνου φτώχειας, κυρίως για άτομα άνω των 75 ετών· οι διαφορές μεταξύ των φύλων είναι σημαντικές, με περίπου 30% των γυναικών ηλικίας άνω των 65 ετών να βρίσκονται το 2010 ενώπιον του κινδύνου φτώχειας και αποκλεισμού, σε σχέση με περίπου 23% των ανδρών.

Υπό το φως των ανωτέρω, η Επιτροπή καλείται να απαντήσει στις ακόλουθες ερωτήσεις:

1. Ποια είναι η λογική στην οποία βασίζονται όλες αυτές οι σημαντικές περικοπές στις συντάξεις, οι περικοπές των παροχών και η αφαίρεση εργαζομένων (κυρίως γυναικών) από τον κατάλογο βαρέων και ανθυγιεινών επαγγελμάτων;

2. Μπορεί η Επιτροπή να εξηγήσει τον λόγο για το επαναλαμβανόμενο φαινόμενο τα γυναικεία επαγγέλματα να πλήττονται πρώτα και σκληρά από την οικονομική κρίση;

3. Μπορεί να αναφέρει με ποιόν τρόπο είναι δυνατό να τεθεί τέρμα στο φαινόμενο αυτής της επιδείνωσης, η οποία αυξάνει τόσο την ανεργία των γυναικών όσο και τον κίνδυνο πτώχειας που τις απειλεί, από κοινού με άτομα ηλικίας 75 ετών και άνω;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Φεβρουαρίου 2014)

Η μεταρρύθμιση του συνταξιοδοτικού συστήματος στην Ελλάδα ([1]) είχε διάφορους στόχους: εξασφάλιση της δημοσιονομικής βιωσιμότητας του συστήματος· απλοποίηση του ιδιαίτερα κατακερματισμένου συστήματος· βελτίωση της διαφάνειας και αύξηση της δικαιοσύνης, αφενός, με την ενίσχυση της σχέσης μεταξύ των καταβληθεισών συνεισφορών και των παροχών που λαμβάνουν οι συνταξιούχοι και, αφετέρου, με την καθιέρωση της ελάχιστης βασικής σύνταξης. Οι μεταρρυθμίσεις ήταν απαραίτητες προκειμένου να διασφαλιστούν μακροπρόθεσμα επαρκείς συντάξεις, ενώ οι περικοπές αφορούν τις υψηλότερες κύριες και επικουρικές συντάξεις. Ο κατάλογος των επικίνδυνων επαγγελμάτων εξορθολογίστηκε σύμφωνα με τις βέλτιστες διεθνείς πρακτικές.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί με μεγάλη προσοχή τις κοινωνικές εξελίξεις και τις κοινωνικές επιπτώσεις των μέτρων που θεσπίζονται από τα κράτη μέλη. Κατά τη διάρκεια του ευρωπαϊκού εξαμήνου του 2013, η Επιτροπή επεσήμανε τις διαφορές μεταξύ των φύλων εις βάρος των γυναικών τόσο στην απασχόληση όσο και την ανεργία ([2]).

Στην περίπτωση της Ελλάδας, στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος προσαρμογής, λαμβάνεται υπόψη ο παράγοντας της δίκαιης μεταχείρισης για την προστασία των ευάλωτων ομάδων. Το τρέχον συνολικό σχέδιο δράσης για την απασχόληση περιλαμβάνει βραχυπρόθεσμο πρόγραμμα δημοσίων έργων με κύριο στόχο τους μακροχρόνια άνεργους. Το πρόγραμμα εστιάζεται επίσης στη βελτίωση της κοινωνικής ασφάλειας, επιχειρώντας ιδίως την καλύτερη στόχευση των κοινωνικών παροχών. Οι αρχές σχεδιάζουν καθεστώς ελάχιστου εισοδήματος που θα καθιερωθεί σε πιλοτική βάση το 2014.

([1]) Εγκρίθηκε τον Ιούλιο του 2010.
([2]) Βλ. SWD(2013)358 τελικό.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013503/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(28 November 2013)

Subject: Women's occupations hit harder during crisis

According to Parliament's note entitled *The Policy on Gender Equality in Greece*, 'Laws 3863 and 3865 of 2010 introduced significant changes in the pension system, including waiving favourable pre-existing regulations for early retirement of women with under age children in the public sector: their retirement age was gradually raised from 50 years (2010) to 65 years (2013) for qualification of full benefit, without any counter measure for supporting motherhood. The Mid-term Fiscal Strategy Framework (2011-2015), which accompanied the second rescue deal of July 2011, introduced further pension cuts and a number of other measures cutting down on benefits. The list of arduous and unhygienic occupations was shortened in November 2011, with about 180 000 workers removed; this included occupations such as hair stylists, supermarket cashiers, cleaners, predominantly populated by women. The second bailout package also involved the "haircut" of bondholding, seriously affecting social insurance funds, as they had to lose over 12 billion euros held in government bonds. On the other hand, pension cuts have contributed to increasing poverty risk, particularly for people 75 years and older; gender differences are pronounced, with about 30% of women aged 65 and over at risk of poverty and exclusion in 2010, compared to about 23% for men.'

In the light of this, the Commission is asked to answer the following:

1. What is the logic behind all of these significant pension cuts, the cutting of benefits and the removal of workers (predominantly women) from the list of arduous and unhygienic occupations?

2. Can it explain the reason for the repeated pattern of women's occupations being the first to be hit hard by the economic crisis?

3. What can be done to end this pattern of deterioration, which increases both unemployment among women and their risk of poverty, along with the risk of poverty for people 75 years and older?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(6 February 2014)

The Greek pension reform ([1]) had several objectives: ensure the fiscal sustainability of the system; simplify the highly fragmented system; enhance transparency and increase fairness by strengthening the link between contributions paid and pension benefits received and introducing a minimum pension. Reforms were needed to provide adequate and safe pensions over the long run and cuts were directed to the highest main and supplementary pensions. The list of hazardous professions was streamlined in line with best international practice.

The European Commission pays great attention to social developments and to the social impact of measures decided in the Member States. During the European Semester 2013, the Commission highlighted the existence of gender gaps in employment and unemployment which are disadvantageous to women ([2]).

In the case of Greece, the adjustment programme takes into account equity considerations with a view to protecting the vulnerable. A comprehensive employment action plan is being implemented which includes a short term public works scheme targeted to the long term unemployed. It also focuses on improving the country's social safety net, in particular through better targeting social benefits. The authorities are designing a minimum income scheme to be introduced on a pilot basis in 2014.

([1]) Adopted in July 2010.
([2]) See SWD(2013) 358 final.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-013504/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28. November 2013)

Betrifft: EU-Subventionen für Atomenergie

Nach wie vor wird Atomenergie von der EU subventioniert (insgesamt 2,5 Mrd. EUR für die Jahre 2012-2013). Obgleich weniger riskante und für die Umwelt besser verträgliche Alternativen zur Auswahl stünden, hält die Kommission an einer breiten Förderung der Atomenergie fest. Im Vergleich zur Windenergie setzt Atomenergie zwischen 9 bis 25-mal mehr CO_2 frei und ist damit im Bereich des Emissionsausstoßes den erneuerbaren Energien unterlegen. Dennoch werden für die Subventionierung der Atomenergie Mittel verwendet, die im Sinne einer „nachhaltigen Entwicklung Europas" eigentlich auf ein „hohes Maß an Umweltschutz und Verbesserung der Umweltqualität" hinwirken sollten (Art. 3 EUV).

Kernenergie ist darüber hinaus eine veraltete Technologie: Ausfälle von Atomkraftwerken — die regelmäßig vorkommen — verursachen Störungen im Stromnetz, weil dabei eine verhältnismäßig große Menge an Strom plötzlich und ohne Vorwarnung verloren geht. Ein Ausfall im Bereich von erneuerbaren Energiequellen (Wind, Wasser, Solar) ist hingegen abgestuft und damit einfacher zu antizipieren.

Zudem nimmt der Bau von AKW in der Regel sehr viel Zeit in Anspruch (17 Jahre Bauzeit sind keine Seltenheit), was wiederum einen Effizienznachteil gegenüber erneuerbaren Energiequellen darstellt.

Allgemein ist Atomenergie teuer und auf Dauer wirtschaftlich nicht rentabel: Der Atomenergiepreis wäre 30 % höher als der Offshore-Wind-Energiepreis wenn das 1 Mrd. EUR Haftungsdeckelungsprivileg der AKW-Betreiber, das an sich gesehen schon jeglicher Vernunft und Erfahrung der letzten Atomkatastrophen widerspricht, entfallen würde. Die Schäden und Langzeitfolgen der Katastrophen in Tschernobyl und Fukushima werden zurzeit mit 133 Mrd. bzw. 187 Mrd. EUR beziffert, wobei 7 % des ukrainischen Staatshaushaltes noch immer für die konkreten Auswirkungen von Tschernobyl aufgewendet werden.

1. Warum wird eine gefährliche, ineffiziente und teure Methode der Energiegewinnung so massiv gefördert? Wie rechtfertigt die Kommission angesichts der obenstehenden Kritikpunkte das Festhalten an der Subventionierung von Atomenergie?

2. Wie lässt sich dies mit dem Ziel einer nachhaltigen Entwicklung Europas vereinbaren?

3. Wie lässt sich die Subventionierung bzw. das Haftungsdeckelungsprinzip mit dem freien Wettbewerb im Binnenmarkt vereinbaren? Haben AKW-Betreiber dadurch nicht einen beträchtlichen Wettbewerbsvorteil gegenüber alternativen Energiegewinnungsmethoden?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(6. Februar 2014)

1. Nach Artikel 194 AEUV ([1]) kann jeder EU-Mitgliedstaat selbst über den Energiemix in seinem Hoheitsgebiet entscheiden. Die Kommission fördert nicht die Nutzung der Kernenergie, sondern bemüht sich darum sicherzustellen, dass der Rechtsrahmen in den EU-Mitgliedstaaten, die über Kernkraftwerke verfügen, höchsten Sicherheitsstandards entspricht.

Zu diesem Zweck können im Rahmen der Euratom-Darlehensfazilität sowie von der EIB ([2]) Finanzmittel bereitgestellt werden. Weitere Informationen dazu finden sich auch in den Antworten der Kommission ([3]) auf frühere schriftliche Anfragen.
Nationale Pläne, die eine öffentliche Unterstützung vorsehen, sind der Kommission mitzuteilen, die sie anschließend nach dem EU-Beihilferecht auf Vereinbarkeit mit dem Binnenmarkt prüft ([4]).

2. Es ist Sache der Mitgliedstaaten, die Vor- und Nachteile der einzelnen Energiequellen gegeneinander abzuwägen. Dabei müssen sie EU-Rechtsvorschriften ([5]), die Ziele der Strategie Europe 2020 und Sicherheitsstandards für den Nuklearbereich berücksichtigen, die sämtlich auf die Gewährleistung einer nachhaltigen Entwicklung in der EU ausgerichtet sind.

([1]) Vertrag über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union.
([2]) Europäische Investitionsbank.
([3]) Insbesondere auf die schriftlichen Anfragen E-005501/2013 und E-009613/2013: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html
([4]) Eine solche Beihilfe hat das Vereinigte Königreich kürzlich gemäß Artikel 107 AEUV in Bezug auf das Kernkraftwerk in Hinkley Point, Somerset, mitgeteilt. Die Kommission hat am 18. Dezember 2013 bekanntgegeben, dass sie diese Beihilfe eingehend prüfen und den Beteiligten dabei Gelegenheit zur Stellungnahme geben wird.
([5]) Einschließlich der Bestimmungen des AEUV über den Umweltschutz.

3. Die von dem Herrn Abgeordneten angesprochenen Fragen werden gegenwärtig von der Kommission geprüft. Die Kommission hat kürzlich eine Ausschreibung für eine Studie eingeleitet, in der die vergangenen und derzeitigen Kosten der Stromerzeugung und die Energiesubventionen in der EU umfassend analysiert werden sollen.

Die Kommission bewertet derzeit — auch unter Berücksichtigung von Wettbewerbsaspekten — die Situation der Haftung im Nuklearbereich auf EU-Ebene und wird zu diesem Thema eine Mitteilung herausgeben. In diesem Zusammenhang müssen alle Grundprinzipien der nuklearen Haftung gegenüber Dritten berücksichtigt werden. Dazu zählt nicht nur die beschränkte Haftung von Kernkraftwerksbetreibern, sondern auch das zentrale Prinzip der alleinigen, verschuldensunabhängigen Haftung der Betreiber und ihre Verpflichtung, eine Versicherung mit der erforderlichen Deckung abzuschließen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013504/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28 November 2013)

Subject: EU subsidies for nuclear energy

Nuclear energy continues to be subsidised by the EU (to the tune of EUR 2.5 billion in total for 2012-2013). Although alternatives exist that are less risky and less harmful for the environment, the Commission continues to broadly promote nuclear energy. Nuclear energy releases between 9 and 25 times more CO_2 into the atmosphere than wind energy and therefore fares less well than renewable energies as far as emissions are concerned. Nevertheless, funds that should actually be used in pursuit of 'a high level of protection and improvement of the quality of the environment' (Article 3 TEU) in order to promote 'the sustainable development of Europe' are instead being used to subsidise nuclear power.

Nuclear energy also uses obsolete technology: the frequent nuclear power plant failures disrupt the electricity grid because a relatively large amount of electricity is suddenly cut off without any warning. A failure in the area of renewable energy sources (wind, water or solar energy), on the other hand, is staggered and is thus easier to anticipate.

Moreover, the construction of nuclear power plants usually takes a very long time (a construction time of 17 years is not uncommon), which in turn makes them less efficient than renewable energy sources.

In general, nuclear energy is expensive and not economically viable in the long term: the nuclear energy price would be 30% higher than the offshore wind energy price without the EUR 1 billion liability cap, a privilege enjoyed by the operators of nuclear plants that is indefensible, given the experience of the recent nuclear disasters. The damage and long-term consequences of the Chernobyl and Fukushima disasters are currently estimated at EUR 133 billion and EUR 187 billion, respectively, while 7% of the Ukrainian state budget is still being spent on tackling the specific consequences of Chernobyl.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Why is a dangerous, inefficient and expensive method of energy generation being so massively promoted? How does it justify retaining the subsidies for nuclear energy in the light of the above criticisms?

2. How can this position be reconciled with the objective of the sustainable development of Europe?

3. How can the subsidies and the liability cap principle be squared with freedom of competition in the internal market? Do nuclear power plants not thereby enjoy a significant competitive advantage over alternative energy production methods?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(6 February 2014)

1. According to Article 194 TFEU ([1]), it is for each EU Member State (MS) to determine the mix of energy sources used in its territory. The Commission does not promote the use of nuclear energy, but aims to ensure that the existing legal framework in the EU MS using nuclear energy meets the highest safety standards.

To achieve this objective, financing may be provided under the Euratom loan facility and by the EIB ([2]). For more information, the Honourable Member is referred to the Commission's replies ([3]) to previous written questions.

National plans where public support is foreseen need to be notified to the Commission, which would then assess their compatibility with the internal market under the EU state aid rules ([4]).

2. It is for each MS to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of each energy source. In doing so, it must conform to EU legislation ([5]), Europe 2020 targets and nuclear safety standards, all of which aim at ensuring sustainable development in the EU.

([1]) Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.
([2]) European Investment Bank.
([3]) In particular, Commission's replies to previous written questions E-005501/2013 and E-009613/2013; http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([4]) Such aid has recently been notified by the UK under Article 107 TFEU in relation to the nuclear power plant at Hinkley Point, in Somerset. The Commission announced, on 18 December 2013, that it would open an in-depth investigation into the scheme, giving interested parties the opportunity to comment.
([5]) Including the TFEU provisions on environment.

3. The issues touched upon by the Honourable Member are currently examined by the Commission. The Commission has recently launched an open tender for the preparation of a study providing a comprehensive analysis of the historical and current power generation costs and energy subsidies in the EU.

The Commission is assessing the situation with regards to nuclear liability at EU level, also taking into account aspects relating to competition and will come forward with a communication on the issue. In this context, all fundamental principles of nuclear third party liability will have to be considered, including not only the capped liability of nuclear operators, but also the primary principle of strict and sole liability of such operators and their obligation to financially secure the applicable coverage.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-013505/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28. November 2013)

Betrifft: Die Genehmigung von staatlichen Subventionen für das AKW Hinkley Point C

Aktuellen Berichten von Medien und führenden Nichtregierungsorganisationen (Greenpeace, Global 2000) zufolge will die britische Regierung das Atomkraftwerk Hinkley Point C dadurch unterstützen, dass Abnahmepreise festgesetzt werden, die auf dem Markt so nicht erzielbar wären, also einem Drittvergleich nicht standhalten würden (92,5 GBP pro Megawattstunde für die nächsten 35 Jahre, das heißt doppelt so hoch wie der derzeitige Marktpreis). Zudem solle eine Rückvergütungsklausel für getätigte Investitionen gelten, falls das AKW aus Gründen, die weder „safety" noch „security" betreffen, geschlossen werde.

Die Festsetzung eines unverhältnismäßig hohen, fast schon surreal wirkenden Abnahmepreises für die nächsten 35 Jahre und das Einführen einer „reimburse clause" zum Schutz von Investitionen stellen einen direkten Vorteil für die Betreiber des AKW Hinkley Point C und damit eine Wettbewerbsverzerrung dar. Die Beihilfe beeinträchtigt den zwischenstaatlichen Handel mit Energie (Warenverkehrsfreiheit) und die Dienstleistungsfreiheit an sich (das Betreiben eines AKWs fällt leichter, wenn man sich als einer der wenigen Betriebe auf eine derartige Investitionsschutzklausel berufen kann; alternativen Energiegewinnungsmethoden wird der Wettbewerb bzw. der Marktzugang erschwert, da die Subventionen bzw. Absicherungen dem AKW Hinkley Point C einen enormen Wettbewerbsvorteil verschaffen).

Sind diese Maßnahmen verfahrenstechnisch der Generaldirektion Wettbewerb in der Kommission anzuzeigen, von dieser zu prüfen und schließlich zu genehmigen bzw. abzulehnen? Wenn nein: warum nicht?

Inwieweit stellen diese Maßnahmen nach Meinung der Kommission Einschränkungen des Wettbewerbs und des Binnenmarktes dar?

Sind diese Einschränkungen gerechtfertigt? Wenn die Kommission dies so sieht, inwieweit würden die Maßnahmen einer Verhältnismäßigkeitsprüfung standhalten?

Antwort von Herrn Almunia im Namen der Kommission
(28. Januar 2014)

Die Behörden des Vereinigten Königreichs haben die Maßnahmen, die möglicherweise staatliche Beihilfen für das Kernkraftwerk Hinkley Point C umfassen, am 22. Oktober 2013 im Einklang mit Artikel 108 AEUV notifiziert, so dass die Kommission diese Maßnahmen vor dem Hintergrund der Rechtsvorschriften über staatliche Beihilfen würdigen kann.

Nach einer ersten Bewertung leitete die Kommission eine eingehende Untersuchung der vom Vereinigten Königreich geplanten Beihilfe zum Bau und Betrieb eines neuen Reaktors am Standort Hinkley Point in Somerset ein und nahm am 18. Dezember 2013 einen Beschluss an. Dem Beschluss liegen die vorläufigen Zweifel zugrunde, die die Kommission hinsichtlich der Vereinbarkeit der Maßnahme mit den EU-Beihilfevorschriften hegt. Mit der Einleitung einer eingehenden Untersuchung erhalten interessierte Parteien die Möglichkeit, zu der Maßnahme Stellung zu nehmen. Dem Ergebnis der Untersuchung wird dadurch nicht vorgegriffen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013505/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28 November 2013)

Subject: Approval of government subsidies for the Hinkley Point C nuclear plant

Recent reports in the media and by leading NGOs (Greenpeace and Global 2000) suggest that the British Government intends to support the Hinkley Point C nuclear plant by fixing a purchase price that could not be obtained on the market and would not comply with the arm's length principle. (GBP 92.5 per megawatt/ hour for the next 35 years, i.e. twice as high as the current market price). Furthermore, a 'reimburse clause' is due to apply to investments that have been made, should the nuclear power plant be closed down for reasons other than 'safety or security'.

Setting a disproportionately high, almost surreal, purchase price for the next 35 years and introducing a 'reimburse clause' to protect investments provide a direct advantage for operators of the Hinkley Point C nuclear plant and thus create a distortion of competition. This subsidy affects interstate trade in energy (movement of goods) and the freedom to provide services *per se* (the operation of a nuclear power plant is easier when you are one of the few companies able to invoke such an investment protection clause; competition and market access are made more difficult for alternative energy production methods, since the subsidies or guarantees give the Hinkley Point C nuclear plant a huge competitive advantage).

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

From a procedural point of view, should these measures be reported to the Commission's Competition DG for scrutiny and, finally, approval or rejection, whichever is appropriate? If not, why not ?

To what extent do these measures constitute restrictions of competition and of the internal market in the Commission's opinion?

Are these restrictions justified? If the Commission concurs, how well would they fare in a proportionality test?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(28 January 2014)

The UK authorities notified the measures involving potential state aid to the nuclear power plant at Hinkley Point C on 22 October 2013, in line with the obligation set out in Art 108 TFEU and allowing the Commission to assess those measures under state aid rules.

Following its initial assessment, the Commission opened an in-depth investigation on the UK's plans to subsidise the construction and operation of a new nuclear power plant at Hinkley Point in Somerset with a decision adopted on 18 December 2013. The decision is based on the Commission's preliminary doubts about the compatibility of the measure with EU State aid rules. The opening of an in-depth inquiry gives interested parties an opportunity to comment on the measure, but does not prejudge the outcome of the investigation.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-013510/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(28 Νοεμβρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Διασπάθιση πόρων της ΕΕ

Σύμφωνα με το Ευρωπαϊκό Ελεγκτικό Συνέδριο, το αρμόδιο όργανο για τον έλεγχο των οικονομικών των θεσμικών οργάνων της ΕΕ, το μερίδιο του προϋπολογισμού της ΕΕ το οποίο σπαταλάται, αυξήθηκε σημαντικά το 2012, ανερχόμενο σε περισσότερα από 6 δισ. ευρώ. Οι ελεγκτές διαπίστωσαν παρατυπίες που αφορούν 4,8% των συνολικών δαπανών το 2012, αυξημένες σε σχέση με 3,9% κατά το 2011.

Τα σημαντικότερα προβλήματα αφορούν ενισχύσεις για την αγροτική ανάπτυξη, το περιβάλλον, την αλιεία και την υγεία. Επιπλέον, το Ελεγκτικό Συνέδριο ανέφερε ότι, «η πλειονότητα των σφαλμάτων πηγάζει από την πλημμελή εφαρμογή ή την εσφαλμένη κατανόηση των περίπλοκων κανόνων που διέπουν τα καθεστώτα δαπανών της ΕΕ», παρά το γεγονός ότι πολυάριθμες περιπτώσεις ύποπτης απάτης αναφέρθηκαν κατά το παρελθόν έτος στην υπηρεσία καταπολέμησης της απάτης της ΕΕ.

1. Πιστεύει η Επιτροπή ότι υπάρχουν ανεπαρκείς δημοσιονομικοί έλεγχοι στην ΕΕ;

2. Για ποιό λόγο η αναλογία των παρατυπιών αυξάνεται κάθε έτος από το 2009;

3. Ποιές προσπάθειες καταβάλει και τι μέτρα λαμβάνει η Επιτροπή για να αντιμετωπίσει αυτό το πρόβλημα;

4. Ποιοί είναι οι λόγοι για τη διασπάθιση πόρων;

5. Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι αυτή είναι η 19η συνεχόμενη φορά που το Ευρωπαϊκό Ελεγκτικό Συνέδριο έχει εκφράσει σοβαρές επιφυλάξεις όσον αφορά τον τρόπο με τον οποίο η ΕΕ διαχειρίζεται τις ετήσιες δαπάνες, μπορεί η Επιτροπή να αναφέρει εάν διαθέτει επαρκείς πληροφορίες για να καλύψει και να διορθώσει λάθη πριν πραγματοποιηθούν οι πληρωμές;

Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(30 Ιανουαρίου 2014)

1. Σφάλματα σε επίπεδο μεμονωμένων δικαιούχων συμβαίνουν κυρίως στο πλαίσιο της επιμερισμένης διαχείρισης (περίπου 80% του προϋπολογισμού της ΕΕ) όταν τα κράτη μέλη είναι υπεύθυνα για τον έλεγχο της νομιμότητας και της κανονικότητας των πληρωμών σε τελικούς δικαιούχους. Η Επιτροπή ελέγχει την αποτελεσματικότητα των συστημάτων ελέγχου των κρατών μελών και εκτελεί εκ των υστέρων διορθώσεις και ανακτήσεις στο πλαίσιο πολυετούς προοπτικής. Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι το σύστημα δημοσιονομικού ελέγχου και η πολυετής προοπτική ανακτήσεων/διορθώσεων έχουν απώτατο στόχο την προστασία του προϋπολογισμού της ΕΕ[1]. Το Συνέδριο ακολουθεί ετήσια προσέγγιση στο επίπεδο μεμονωμένων δικαιούχων και δεν λαμβάνει υπόψη τις περισσότερες από τις εν λόγω διορθώσεις.

2. Σε σύγκριση με τα έτη που προηγούνται του 2009, το συνολικό ποσοστό σφάλματος μειώθηκε σημαντικά. Εκτός από τις αλλαγές στη μεθοδολογία του Συνεδρίου, η ετήσια αύξηση οφείλεται κυρίως σε:

α. περίπλοκους κανόνες επιλεξιμότητας,

β. ανεπαρκείς ελέγχους των δαπανών από τα κράτη μέλη,

γ. μη συμμόρφωση με τους κανόνες για τις δημόσιες συμβάσεις σε επίπεδο κρατών μελών.

3. Με τη βελτίωση των κανόνων για την περίοδο χρηματοδότησης 2014-2020 αντιμετωπίστηκαν πολλές αδυναμίες. Μεταξύ των κυριότερων προσπαθειών περιλαμβάνονται οι ακόλουθες:

α. καθιέρωση μέτρων απλούστευσης,

β. προστασία του προϋπολογισμού της ΕΕ μέσω προληπτικών/διορθωτικών μέτρων,

γ. στενότερη συνεργασία με τα κράτη μέλη.

4. Το ποσοστό σφάλματος που υπολόγισε το Συνέδριο δεν αποτελεί μέτρο προσδιορισμού της διασπάθισης πόρων. Τα έργα και τα προγράμματα που χρηματοδοτούνται από την ΕΕ μπορούν να επιτύχουν τους στόχους τους, ακόμη και αν έχει διαπιστωθεί σφάλμα. Επιπλέον, το Συνέδριο καταλήγει στο συμπέρασμα ότι οι λογαριασμοί είναι αξιόπιστοι και ότι τα έσοδα και οι αναλήψεις υποχρεώσεων είναι νόμιμα και κανονικά.

5. Βλέπε σημείο 1: οι διορθώσεις και οι ανακτήσεις στις οποίες προβαίνει η Επιτροπή προστατεύουν αποτελεσματικά τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013510/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(28 November 2013)

Subject: Misspent EU funds

According to the European Court of Auditors, the body responsible for scrutinising the EU institutions' finances, the share of the EU's budget which is misspent rose sharply in 2012, amounting to more than EUR 6 billion. The auditors found irregularities affecting 4.8% of total spending in 2012, up from 3.9% in 2011.

The biggest problems concerned allocations for rural development, the environment, fisheries and health. Moreover, the Court said that 'the majority of errors arise from misapplication or misunderstanding of the complex rules of EU expenditures schemes', although several cases of suspected fraud were reported to the EU's anti-fraud office last year.

1. Does the Commission think that there are inadequate financial controls in the EU?

2. Why has the proportion of irregularities increased every year since 2009?

3. What efforts and action is the Commission taking to tackle the problem?

4. What are the reasons for misspending?

5. Bearing in mind that this is the 19th time in a row that the European Court of Auditors has given the EU a less-than-clean bill of health when it comes to annual spending, can the Commission state whether it has sufficient information to detect and correct errors before the money is paid out?

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

1. Errors at individual beneficiaries' level mainly occur in shared management (around 80% of the EU budget) where MS are responsible for controlling the legality and regularity of their payments to final beneficiaries. The Commission checks the effectiveness of the control systems of the MS and applies *ex-post* corrections and recoveries from a multiannual perspective. The Commission considers the financial control system and the multiannual perspective of recoveries/corrections adequate to ultimately protect the EU budget[1]. The Court follows an annual approach at the level of individual beneficiaries and does not take into account most of such corrections.

2. Compared to the years before 2009, overall the error rate has significantly decreased. Apart from the Court's changes to its methodology, the yearly increase can be mainly explained by:

(a) complex eligibility rules;

(b) deficient controls of expenditure by Member States (MS);

(c) non-compliance with public procurement rules at MS level;

3. Many weaknesses have been addressed by improving the rules for the 2014-2020 financing period. Main efforts are the:

(a) introduction of simplification measures;

(b) protection of the EU budget through preventive/corrective measures;

(c) stronger cooperation with MS.

4. The Court's calculated error rate is not a measure of misspent money. EU funded projects and programmes can achieve their objectives even if an error was found. Moreover the Court concludes that the accounts are reliable, revenues and commitments are legal and regular.

5. See point 1: the corrections and recoveries by the Commission adequately protect the EU budget.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-013512/13
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(28 novembre 2013)

Objet: Projet «Ferme des mille vaches» dans la Somme (France)

En France, dans le département de la Somme, est en train de se construire une ferme de type industriel de 500 vaches laitières et autant de génisses à partir de capitaux apportés par un dirigeant de groupe industriel du bâtiment et des travaux publics. Le projet est d'aller à terme vers une ferme industrielle de 1000 vaches et quasiment autant de génisses gestantes.

Dans ce type d'exploitation, les vaches ne sortent plus. Elles sont confinées dans des espaces extrêmement restreints d'environ dix mètres carrés par animal, suivant le modèle américain. Elles sont alimentées en continu à partir de produits extérieurs à l'exploitation, et dont la plus grande part est importée de pays hors Union européenne.

À côté de l'exploitation sera installé l'un des plus gros méthaniseur d'Europe pour produire de l'énergie. Ainsi la mission première de cette installation ne serait pas la production laitière mais celle d'énergie.

Un tel projet gigantesque va à l'encontre de ce que défendent les institutions européennes en matière d'environnement et de cadre de vie.

Une telle concentration animale favorisera des épizooties, la qualité de vie des animaux y sera très dégradée, la qualité de l'eau menacée et un ballet incessant de camions viendra dégrader encore l'environnement.

1. La Commission est-elle informée d'un tel projet et de ses multiples nuisances?

2. La Commission compte-t-elle diligenter une étude d'impact du fonctionnement d'une telle ferme industrielle?

3. Un tel projet est-il conforme aux orientations de la Commission en matière de développement durable agricole, d'environnement, d'emploi et de vie des territoires?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(24 janvier 2014)

La Commission est consciente que la création d'exploitations de ce type est prévue, au moins dans certains États membres.

La législation de l'Union s'appliquera quelle que soit la taille de l'exploitation. Les États membres sont chargés de veiller à sa bonne exécution.

En ce qui concerne le bien-être des animaux, les vaches devraient être traitées conformément aux règles énoncées dans la directive 98/58/CE ([1]) et dans la recommandation du Conseil de l'Europe concernant les bovins ([2]). Cette dernière est un élément de la convention européenne sur la protection des animaux dans les élevages ([3]), qui fait partie de la législation de l'UE.

Conformément à la directive 2011/92/UE concernant l'évaluation des incidences de certains projets publics et privés sur l'environnement, un tel projet relève de l'annexe II et devrait faire l'objet d'une procédure de vérification préliminaire. Cette procédure n'est pas menée par la Commission, mais par les autorités nationales compétentes, avant l'octroi de l'autorisation, et elle vise à déterminer si le projet risque d'avoir des incidences importantes sur l'environnement. Dans le cadre de cette procédure, les autorités nationales doivent prendre en considération les critères pertinents établis à l'annexe III de la directive.

En ce qui concerne la qualité de l'eau, si l'exploitation est située dans une zone vulnérable aux nitrates, elle devra respecter les règles fixées par la directive 91/676/CEE du Conseil ([4]), dont l'objectif est de réduire la pollution directe ou indirecte des eaux par les nitrates provenant de l'agriculture et d'en prévenir l'extension.

([1]) JO L 221 du 8.8.1998, p. 23.
([2]) http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal_affairs/legal_co-operation/biological_safety_and_use_of_animals/farming/Rec%20cattle%20E.asp#TopOfPage
([3]) http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/QueVoulezVous.asp?CL=FRE&CM=1&NT=087
([4]) JO L 375 du 23.9.1991, p. 1, modifiée par le règlement (CE) nº 1882/2003 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 29 septembre 2003 et par le règlement (CE) nº 1137/2008 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 22 octobre 2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013512/13
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(28 November 2013)

Subject: 'Thousand-cow farm' project in France

An industrial-scale farm which will house 500 dairy cows and the same number of heifers is being built in the Picardy region of France with funding from a construction industry entrepreneur. Ultimately, the plan is that it should house 1 000 cows and almost as many in-calf heifers.

Cows on this kind of farm never see daylight. In keeping with the US farming model, they live in extremely cramped conditions, with just 10 m^2 of space each. They are fed on huge quantities of off-farm products, which are, for the most part, imported from non-EU countries.

One of Europe's largest biogas production plants is to be built next to the farm. The project's main purpose would thus seem to be energy, rather than dairy, production.

This kind of mammoth project is at odds with everything the EU stands for as regards the environment and quality of life.

The presence of so many animals in such a small area would lead to outbreaks of disease, the cows would suffer serious hardship and the risk of water contamination would be high, while the constant comings and goings of lorries would further damage the environment.

1. Is the Commission aware of this project and of the countless problems it will cause?

2. Does it intend to conduct an assessment of the impact of an industrial-scale farm of this kind?

3. Is this kind of project consistent with the Commission's approach to sustainable agricultural development, the environment, employment and life in rural areas?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(24 January 2014)

The Commission is aware that such holdings have been planned, at least in some Member States.

Irrespective of the size of the holding, Union law shall apply. Member States are responsible for ensuring proper implementation of these rules.

Concerning animal welfare, the cows would have to be kept in accordance with the rules laid down in Directive 98/58/EC ([1]) and the Council of Europe recommendation concerning cattle ([2]). The latter forms part of the European Convention for the protection of animals kept for farming purposes ([3]) which is part of EC law.

According to Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, such a project falls under Annex II and should be made subject to a screening procedure. This procedure is not carried out by the Commission but by the relevant competent national authorities before consent is given and aims to determine whether the project is likely to have significant effects on the environment. In doing so, the national authorities must take into account the relevant criteria laid down in Annex III of the directive.

As regards water quality, if the holding is located in a nitrate vulnerable zone it will have to respect the rules of Council Directive 91/676/EEC ([4]), aimed at reducing water pollution caused or induced by nitrates from agricultural sources and at further preventing such pollution.

([1]) OJ L 221, 8.8.1998, p. 23.
([2]) http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal_affairs/legal_cooperation/biological_safety_and_use_of_animals/farming/Rec%20cattle%20E.asp#TopOfPage
([3]) http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/QueVoulezVous.asp?NT=087&CM=1&DF=&CL=ENG
([4]) OJ L 375, 31/12/1991 P. 1 — 8, as amended by Regulation (EC) No 1882/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 September 2003 and Regulation (EC) No 1137/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2008.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013513/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento: Crisi e medie imprese in Francia

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007218/2010, la Commissione ha nuove informazioni dalla Francia sulla situazione delle sue medie imprese? In caso contrario, può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013514/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento: crisi e medie imprese in Germania

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007219/2010, ha la Commissione nuove informazioni dalla Germania sulla situazione delle sue medie imprese? In caso contrario, può la Commissione richiedere tali informazioni?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013515/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento: Crisi e medie imprese in Grecia

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007220/2010, la Commissione ha nuove informazioni dalla Grecia sulla situazione delle sue medie imprese? In caso contrario, può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013516/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento: Crisi e medie imprese in Irlanda

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007221/2010, può la Commissione indicare se ha nuove informazioni dall'Irlanda sulla situazione delle sue medie imprese e in caso contrario può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013517/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 novembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento: Crisi e medie imprese in Spagna

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007235/2010, può la Commissione indicare se ha nuove informazioni dalla Spagna sulla situazione delle sue medie imprese e in caso contrario può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013674/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 dicembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento: crisi e medie imprese in Portogallo

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007202/2010, dispone la Commissione di nuove informazioni dal Portogallo sulla situazione delle sue medie imprese? In caso contrario, può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013675/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 dicembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento: crisi e medie imprese in Romania

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007205/2010, dispone la Commissione di nuove informazioni dalla Romania sulla situazione delle sue medie imprese? In caso contrario, può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013676/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 dicembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento: crisi e medie imprese in Belgio

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007212/2010, dispone la Commissione di nuove informazioni dal Belgio sulla situazione delle sue medie imprese? In caso contrario, può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013952/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 dicembre 2013)

Oggetto: Crisi e microimprese in Germania — Aggiornamento

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007165/2010, la Commissione dispone di nuove informazioni dalla Germania sulla situazione delle sue microimprese e in caso contrario può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013953/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 dicembre 2013)

Oggetto: Crisi e microimprese in Italia — Aggiornamento

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007168/2010, la Commissione dispone di nuove informazioni dall'Italia sulla situazione delle sue microimprese e in caso contrario può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013954/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 dicembre 2013)

Oggetto: Crisi e microimprese nei Paesi Bassi — Aggiornamento

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007173/2010, la Commissione dispone di nuove informazioni dai Paesi Bassi sulla situazione delle sue microimprese e, in caso contrario, può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013955/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 dicembre 2013)

Oggetto: Crisi e microimprese nel Regno Unito — Aggiornamento

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007176/2010, la Commissione dispone di nuove informazioni dal Regno Unito sulla situazione delle sue microimprese e, in caso contrario, può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013956/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 dicembre 2013)

Oggetto: Crisi e microimprese in Belgio — Aggiornamento

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007181/2010, la Commissione dispone di nuove informazioni dal Belgio sulla situazione delle sue microimprese e in caso contrario può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013957/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 dicembre 2013)

Oggetto: Crisi e microimprese in Francia — Aggiornamento

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007164/2010, la Commissione dispone di nuove informazioni dalla Francia sulla situazione delle sue microimprese e in caso contrario può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013958/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 dicembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento: crisi e piccole imprese in Grecia

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007193/2010, la Commissione ha nuove informazioni dalla Grecia sulla situazione delle sue piccole imprese e in caso contrario può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013959/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 dicembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento: crisi e piccole imprese in Italia

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007195/2010, la Commissione ha nuove informazioni dall'Italia sulla situazione delle sue piccole imprese e in caso contrario può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013960/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 dicembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento: crisi e piccole imprese in Spagna

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007208/2010, la Commissione ha nuove informazioni dalla Spagna sulla situazione delle sue piccole imprese e in caso contrario può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013961/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 dicembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento: crisi e piccole imprese in Belgio

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007185/2010, la Commissione ha nuove informazioni dal Belgio sulla situazione delle sue piccole imprese e in caso contrario può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013962/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 dicembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento: crisi e piccole imprese in Francia

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007191/2010, la Commissione ha nuove informazioni dalla Francia sulla situazione delle sue piccole imprese e in caso contrario può chiederne?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-013963/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 dicembre 2013)

Oggetto: Aggiornamento: crisi e piccole imprese in Germania

In relazione all'interrogazione E-007192/2010, la Commissione ha nuove informazioni dalla Germania sulla situazione delle sue piccole imprese e in caso contrario può chiederne?

Risposta congiunta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(29 gennaio 2014)

La disponibilità delle statistiche ufficiali europee in questione non è cambiata dal 2010. Eurostat non raccoglie statistiche sui fallimenti di imprese, né sulle loro motivazioni e nemmeno sull'impatto che essi hanno sul mercato del lavoro e sul PIL dell'Europa.

Tuttavia, il regolamento (CE) n. 295/2008 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, dell'11 marzo 2008, relativo alle statistiche strutturali sulle imprese (rifusione) ([1]) stabilisce un modulo dettagliato per la raccolta delle statistiche sulla demografia delle imprese. Esso prescrive agli Stati membri di elaborare statistiche relative alla natalità, alla mortalità e ai tassi di sopravvivenza delle imprese ripartite in classi di ampiezza di occupazione delle imprese utilizzando definizioni e metodologie comuni.

In tale contesto, per «mortalità delle imprese» s'intendono tutte le imprese precedentemente attive che non sono più presenti tra le imprese attive da almeno due anni (dopo un controllo per accertare un'eventuale riattivazione). La Commissione può fornire dati riguardo alla mortalità delle imprese con meno di 10 dipendenti (microimprese) e con 10 o più dipendenti (piccole, medie e grandi imprese considerate assieme), compreso il relativo impatto sull'occupazione, senza tener conto delle ragioni specifiche della mortalità: tra queste vi può essere il fallimento, ma anche numerose altre cause. Le ultime statistiche disponibili riguardano il 2010 ([2]) .

([1]) GU L 97 del 9.4.2008.
([2]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/european_business/special_sbs_topics/business_demography

(English version)

Question for written answer E-013513/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 November 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and medium-sized enterprises in France

With reference to Written Question E-007218/2010, can the Commission say whether it has any new information from France on the situation of its medium-sized enterprises? If not, can it request such information?

Question for written answer E-013514/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 November 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and medium-sized enterprises in Germany

With reference to Written Question E-007219/2010, can the Commission say whether it has any new information from Germany on the situation of its medium-sized enterprises? If not, can it request such information?

Question for written answer E-013515/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 November 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and medium-sized enterprises in Greece

With reference to Written Question E-007220/2010, can the Commission say whether it has any new information from Greece on the situation of its medium-sized enterprises? If not, can it request such information?

Question for written answer E-013516/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 November 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and medium-sized enterprises in Ireland

With reference to Written Question E-007221/2010, can the Commission say whether it has any new information from Ireland on the situation of its medium-sized enterprises? If not, can it request such information?

Question for written answer E-013517/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 November 2013)

Subject: Update on the crisis and medium-sized enterprises in Spain

With regard to Question E-007235/2010, has the Commission received fresh information from Spain on the situation of medium-sized enterprises, and if not, can it request this information?

Question for written answer E-013674/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 December 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and medium-sized enterprises in Portugal

With reference to my Written Question E-007202/2010, has the Commission received any new information from Portugal on the situation of its medium-sized enterprises? If not, will the Commission request this information?

Question for written answer E-013675/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 December 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and medium-sized enterprises in Romania

With reference to my Written Question E-007205/2010, has the Commission received any new information from Romania on the situation of its medium-sized enterprises? If not, will the Commission request this information?

Question for written answer E-013676/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 December 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and medium-sized enterprises in Belgium

With reference to my Written Question E-007212/2010, has the Commission received any new information from Belgium on the situation of its medium-sized enterprises? If not, will the Commission request this information?

Question for written answer E-013952/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 December 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and micro-enterprises in Germany

With reference to my Written Question E-007165/2010, has the Commission received any new information from Germany on the situation of its micro-enterprises? If not, will the Commission request this information?

Question for written answer E-013953/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 December 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and micro-enterprises in Italy

With reference to my Written Question E-007168/2010, has the Commission received any new information from Italy on the situation of its micro-enterprises? If not, will the Commission request this information?

Question for written answer E-013954/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 December 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and micro-enterprises in the Netherlands

With reference to my Written Question E-007173/2010, has the Commission received any new information from the Netherlands on the situation of its micro-enterprises? If not, will the Commission request this information?

Question for written answer E-013955/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 December 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and micro-enterprises in the United Kingdom

With reference to my Written Question E-007176/2010, has the Commission received any new information from the United Kingdom on the situation of its micro-enterprises? If not, will the Commission request this information?

Question for written answer E-013956/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 December 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and micro-enterprises in Belgium

With reference to my Written Question E-007181/2010, has the Commission received any new information from Belgium on the situation of its micro-enterprises? If not, will the Commission request this information?

Question for written answer E-013957/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 December 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and micro-enterprises in France

With reference to my Written Question E-007164/2010, has the Commission received any new information from France on the situation of its micro-enterprises? If not, will the Commission request this information?

Question for written answer E-013958/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 December 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and small enterprises in Greece

With reference to my Written Question E-007193/2010, has the Commission received any new information from Greece on the situation of its small enterprises? If not, will the Commission request this information?

Question for written answer E-013959/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 December 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and small enterprises in Italy

With reference to my Written Question E-007195/2010, has the Commission received any new information from Italy on the situation of its small enterprises? If not, will the Commission request this information?

Question for written answer E-013960/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 December 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and small enterprises in Spain

With reference to my Written Question E-007208/2010, has the Commission received any new information from Spain on the situation of its small enterprises? If not, will the Commission request this information?

Question for written answer E-013961/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 December 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and small enterprises in Belgium

With reference to my Written Question E-007185/2010, has the Commission received any new information from Belgium on the situation of its small enterprises? If not, will the Commission request this information?

Question for written answer E-013962/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 December 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and small enterprises in France

With reference to my Written Question E-007191/2010, has the Commission received any new information from France on the situation of its small enterprises? If not, will the Commission request this information?

Question for written answer E-013963/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 December 2013)

Subject: Update: crisis and small enterprises in Germany

With reference to my Written Question E-007192/2010, has the Commission received any new information from Germany on the situation of its small enterprises? If not, will the Commission request this information?

Joint answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(29 January 2014)

The availability of the official European statistics in question has not changed since 2010. Eurostat does not collect statistics on company bankruptcies, nor on their reasons or impact on the European employment market and GDP.

However, Regulation No 295/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2008 concerning structural business statistics (recast) ([1]) provides a detailed module for the collection of statistics on business demography. It requires Member States to produce statistics on enterprise births, deaths and survival rates broken down by size class of employment of enterprises using common definitions and methodology.

In this context, an enterprise death is defined as an enterprise that was previously active but has not been present among the active enterprises for at least two years (after checking for any reactivations). The Commission can provide data on the number of deaths of enterprises with less than 10 employees (micro-enterprises) and 10 or more employees (small-, medium-sized and large enterprises taken together), including the related impact on employment, irrespective of the specific reasons for their death, which may include bankruptcies but also a number of other reasons. The latest available statistics relate to 2010 ([2]) .

([1]) OJ L 97, 9.4.2008.
([2]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/european_business/special_sbs_topics/business_demography

ISSN 1977-088X (elektronische Ausgabe)
ISSN 1725-2407 (Papierausgabe)

Amt für Veröffentlichungen der Europäischen Union
2985 Luxemburg
LUXEMBURG

DE